

Author's accepted manuscript (postprint)

Educating for Creativity: Are Universities in Sync With Creative Arts Industry Needs?

Curda, G. J.

Published in: Proceedings of the International Conference on Intellectual Capital, Knowledge Management and Organisational Learning, ICICKM

DOI: 10.34190/IKM.20.029

Available online: 2020

Citation:

Curda, G. J. (2020). Educating for creativity: Are universities in sync with creative arts industry needs? Proceedings of the International Conference on Intellectual Capital, Knowledge Management and Organisational Learning, ICICKM. 1, 132-141. doi: 10.34190/IKM.20.029

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Academic Conferences International in Proceedings of the International Conference on Intellectual Capital, Knowledge Management and Organisational Learning, ICICKM in 2020.

Educating for Creativity: Are Universities in Sync With Creative Arts Industry Needs?

Gregory Curda

Faculty of Social Sciences, Nord University, Steinkjer, Norway

gregory.j.curda@nord.no

DOI: 10.34190/IKM.20.029

Abstract: Historically, the subject of the value and effectiveness of a university education in the creative arts has not seen the volume of research that traditional knowledge transfer fields have, but recently this subfield is getting more attention. This research looks into the state of collaboration between universities and industry within the creative studies in the USA and its impact on the student. Core values of the three sectors, academia, industry, and student are looked at in an effort to identify common ground as well as disparities in thought and behavior among the sectors. This study asks the basic question, “How can we best accomplish the balancing of students’ expectations of career readiness, university’s academic responsibilities, and creative industry’s recruiting requisites?”. The study attempts to find clues by looking into the nature of these three diverse viewpoints to find common ground and also identify which areas need more attention. The theoretical discussion looks at knowledge transfers as a starting point and takes up discussions on several subjects like tacit vs explicit knowledge, the relevance of each, and the challenges involved in the knowledge transfer process, given the nebulous nature of creativity itself. The USA data material was gathered from a structured questionnaire and a series of focus interviews, conducted with industry professionals, creative arts professors, and creative arts students. Data was collected in the summer of 2019, in Chicago, IL, Los Angeles, CA, and Tallahassee, FL, USA. Limitations in the data collection include a generally small sample size, especially among students, and a narrow field of creative industries and studies represented, with focus mostly on film and television. These limitations are the result of research time constraints, university privacy policies, and interview availability. Findings indicate that professors and professionals are generally aligned on many topics which should be beneficial to the students. However, the students seem to be out of step with that alignment in several key areas.

Keywords: knowledge transfer, creativity, university, creative industries

1. Introduction

The study of university/industry relations has enjoyed quite a bit of discussion regarding knowledge transfer and its effects on productivity, innovation, and competitiveness, mostly in relation to greater knowledge transferred in a top-down fashion, (Lam, 2018). Bidirectional knowledge transfer between management and staff has also been seen as effective in industrial goal achievement. One sector that proves problematic in terms of knowledge transfer models is the creative industry, due in part to the apparent differences in thought between industry needs, academic interpretation of those needs, and student expectations. Complicating the issue is the assumption that successful creative work demands both theoretical and practical knowledge. A great portion of this knowledge can be acquired in an explicit way, while many of the ingredients necessary for a successful career in the creative industries remain a tacit “secret”, kept within the vault of experience possessed by industry professionals (Dooley and Sexton-Finck, 2017; McVeigh, 2016).

This article examines the collaboration and communication among the sectors of industry, academia, and students in the field of film and television, from a United States perspective, and their various roles of each sector in the knowledge transfer process. Some professionals from the music Industry are also represented. Data collection in 2 of the largest U.S. market locations offers a view of the most likely environment for optimal collaboration and effective knowledge transfer methods to the students. Discussion of the data will involve the analysis of the degree to which the university programs stimulate and develop the student’s creative and technical abilities in a way that is consistent with industry needs. Another important discussion explores the current industry view of their desired profile of potential employees. Survey question charts and relevant quotes from the interviews will aid the discussions. These will lead us to the following research questions:

RQ1: Is the combined knowledge transfer process organized in an optimal way?

RQ2: Are there conflicting interests between the university’s need for scientific rigour, the students’ ambitions, and the needs of creative industry?

This article begins with initially a discussion relating to the theoretical aspects of knowledge transfer processes as presented in the literature. Then the data material is presented, based on a structured questionnaire and focus interviews with professors, students and professionals primarily from the film and television segment of

the creative industry in the United States. Finally, an analysis, conclusions, and suggestions for further research are offered.

2. Theoretical background

2.1 Introductory remarks

A complete literature review of knowledge transfers in organizations from the last 50 years could fill up a book of several hundred pages. This chapter only gives some highlights that are most relevant to the research questions. Knowledge transfers as a concept has appeared in sciences like education and psychology for at least a century. In economics/business and organizational science we saw this concept coming up in the two last decades before 2000. A definition that is still used was suggested by Argote et al (2000), where they define "*Knowledge transfer in organizations is the process through which one unit (e.g. group, department, or division) is affected by the experience of another*" (Argote et al, 2000, p. 2). Any definition of knowledge transfer needs clarification of level, context and organizational characteristics. All knowledge is personal (Polanyi, 1962) and communication (transfers) takes place between persons. More than one person can be (and usually are) involved in knowledge transfers at the same time. In this study we have surveyed and interviewed three groups, professors in creative arts studies, students in creative arts studies, and creative arts industry professionals. As a point of departure, the above definition is appropriate for studying knowledge transfers among these groups, and we can assume that the knowledge is interpreted reasonably equally by the groups because they belong to same professional community.

Most researchers choose their own taxonomies when analyzing a comprehensive concept like knowledge transfer. A commonly used delineation by Spraggon and Bodolica (2012), chose three groups: knowledge conversion, knowledge transfer barriers and enablers, and media richness, which will be used in the analysis here because this is relevant to the conveyance of both process and concept in the creative industries.

2.2 Knowledge conversion

This stream roots back to Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995) and the SECI model. As this is one of the most famous works in the field, a short recapitulation should suffice. The model is based on a four-stage process, working in a circular fashion, where the stages are:

- 1. Socialization: tacit – tacit knowledge
- 2. Externalization: tacit – explicit knowledge
- 3. Combination: explicit – explicit knowledge
- 4. Internalization: explicit – tacit knowledge.

Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995) claim they build on the tacit knowledge concept from Polanyi (1962) and in addition, say they include some aspects from Japanese philosophy. There has been a lot of discussion about the validity of the tacit knowledge concept in their analysis see e.g. Gourlay (2006) and Tsoukas (2005). One main point is that Polanyi mostly spoke about the tacit component as a process. Explicit knowledge by definition can be measured, stored and retrieved, whereas tacit knowledge is often defined as the opposite of explicit, residing in peoples' minds as a potential. When the conversion of tacit knowledge is done – the knowledge is not tacit anymore – it is explicit when it has become identifiable. According to Polanyi (1966, pg 10) "Knowledge is always depending on context and is part of a skill." In this article we will analyze knowledge conversion processes following Polanyi's own epistemological assumptions and understanding see e.g. Westernen (2012) and Westernen et al. (2018) because knowledge conversion is seen as a criterion for successful productions in the creative industries.

2.3 Knowledge transfer barriers and enablers

There is extensive literature on this subject which refers back to communication theory like the objectivist model by Shannon and Weaver (1949). This is a linear model where the sender encodes a message and sends it through a media to a receiver who decodes it. The message, however, can be disturbed by media "noise". Building on this, but also allowing for interpretation, Szulanski (1996) formulates a model of transfer of knowledge in four steps:

Step 1: The initiation.

This includes all events that are at the origin of the transfer. A transfer occurs when the need is formulated in such a way that it initiates a response from the organization. During the initiation phase, the problems that arise are often related to the identification of needs and the definition of the terms of the transfer.

Step 2: The implementation.

Implementation begins when the decision to proceed with the transfer of knowledge is taken. At this stage, resources start to flow between the sender and the receiver, and social links between them are established. The transferred knowledge and practice undergo adaptations based on the anticipated needs of the receiver in order to prevent problems and to allow the introduction of new knowledge.

Step 3: “Ramp-up”.

The receiver has just started using the transferred knowledge. At this stage, the receiver's focus is on solving unforeseen problems that prevent him from fully utilizing the advantages of the transferred practice.

Step 4: Integration.

Integration begins at the point where the receiver begins to take advantage of the new practice, transferring it into profitable use and building up to improved/changed routines. The sender and the receiver are now using the same practice together. This joint use of the same knowledge promotes better coordination of activities between the sender and the receiver.

This model has been developed and changed in many directions, see e. g. Foss et al. (2010) and Minbaeva (2007) but in most cases the fundamental structure remains the same. An interesting sum up is given by Riege (2005) in his article “Three-dozen knowledge-sharing barriers managers must consider”. When we compare the arguments in this article with later research, we see at least three groups of barriers:

- 1. Arguments related to the resource situation – do the organization put aside enough time and money for optimum knowledge exchange
- 2. Knowledge level arguments – is there a level of sufficient understanding between sender and receiver
- 3. Cultural arguments – among the cultural arguments, trust seems to be of special importance.

The second point about knowledge levels is especially relevant in this study.

2.4 Media richness

Presented here are just some short comments about media richness theory. For more detailed treatment of this field see a new article by Ishii, Lyons and Carr (2019) that looks at media richness theory for today and the future. Media richness theory is normally in the domain of technology and ICT in knowledge management books (Hislop 2009). The theory was first presented by Daft and Lengel (1986) and stated a connection between the medium that was used for communication and the richness of the communication characteristics.

Table 1: Media richness model

Richness	Medium	communication characteristics
Highest	Face to face interaction	Most information rich Most relevant for sharing tacit knowledge Resource demanding
High	Video conferencing	Information rich
Medium	Telephone	Some information richness
Low	E-mail	Low information richness

Source: Adapted from Hislop (2009).

The main criticism of the theory is the linearity assumption that media richness decreases when communication modes change as in Table 1. In any event, it is clear that results vary when we change communication characteristics.

3. Data collection and analysis

3.1 Data collection

The data collection is based on a Questback survey to students, professors and industry professionals in California, Illinois, and Florida in July 2019. A greater than expected lack of access to participants, given the summer school break, led to 35 surveys sent and 29 returned for a response rate of 83%. Additionally, 21 focus interviews were conducted in Chicago and Los Angeles for comparative purposes. Interview question areas mirrored the topics of the survey but were formulated in a more casual way to invite personal perspectives from the interviewees.

Table 2: Participants in the project.

	Survey Frequency	Survey Percent	Interview Frequency	Interview Percent
Student	5	17,2	2	9,5
Professor	13	44,8	6	28,6
Industry pro	11	37,9	13	61,9
Total	29	100,0	21	100,0

Source: Own data collection.

The main part of the data collection involved the respondents giving their opinions to 25 statements using a 7-point Likert scale, where the corresponding numeric values are 1: Strongly disagree, 2: Disagree, 3: Partly disagree, 4: Neutral, 5: Partly agree, 6: Agree, 7: Strongly agree.

3.2 Discussion of results

Taken from my professional experience, knowledge transfer in the creative industries usually followed an apprenticeship model where craft knowledge was passed directly from pro to apprentice. This was favourable in an industrial context because both explicit and tacit knowledge were combined in a bespoke methodology and philosophy for the specific firm they worked for. However, Statement 28 shows that most professionals and professors agree that the apprenticeship model is no longer feasible due to financial and temporal constraints, yet the students seem unaware of industry’s dilemma.

Table 3: Survey statement 28

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total
Creative industry pro	Count	0	1	2	1	4	1	2	11
	%	0,0%	9,1%	18,2%	9,1%	36,4%	9,1%	18,2%	100,0%
University professor	Count	1	3	0	0	4	4	1	13
	%	7,7%	23,1%	0,0%	0,0%	30,8%	30,8%	7,7%	100,0%
University student	Count	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	5
	%	20,0%	20,0%	20,0%	20,0%	20,0%	0,0%	0,0%	100,0%
Total	Count	2	5	3	2	9	5	3	29
	%	6,9%	17,2%	10,3%	6,9%	31,0%	17,2%	10,3%	100,0%

Source: Own data collection.

The need for training apparently exists, and professors seem to agree that universities have an opportunity to bridge this gap, but can industry and academia co-exist, and perhaps more importantly, will the student benefit from this or simply be lost in academia’s translation of what industry wants?

Industry often complains that universities are not preparing their students for the realities of the job. Table 4 indicates that the professionals are unsure about the curriculum. Oddly, even some professors and students believe it is not industry’s responsibility to provide meaningful collaboration or participate in the knowledge transfer process.

Table 4: Survey statement 12

		12: The university profile of the creative arts curriculum is intentionally directed to make the students understand the needs of the creative industries. Crosstabulation							Total
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Creative Industry pro	Count	1	0	3	3	2	1	1	11
	%	9,1%	0,0%	27,3%	27,3%	18,2%	9,1%	9,1%	100,0%
University professor	Count	0	0	0	1	2	4	6	13
	%	0,0%	0,0%	0,0%	7,7%	15,4%	30,8%	46,2%	100,0%
University student	Count	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	5
	%	0,0%	0,0%	0,0%	20,0%	20,0%	40,0%	20,0%	100,0%
Total	Count	1	0	3	5	5	7	8	29
	%	3,4%	0,0%	10,3%	17,2%	17,2%	24,1%	27,6%	100,0%

Source: Own data collection.

"I've looked at (some) course outlines, and I don't know if what they're teaching is what's going to really help them when they get out."

Connie Kazmer, Editorial Coordinator, Warner Bros. Pictures, Burbank CA

"The film industry is in an interesting moment in time in terms of its engagement with the academy, I'm not really totally sure, how deep the thinking has ever been in that equation."

Michael Niederman, Professor, Columbia College, Chicago IL

"There's no reason why they (industry) should help these kids, they (students) need to get out there and work this as hard as they (professionals) did to get in, so I don't see any reason why they (industry) should help."

Harry Cheney, Professor, Chapman University, Orange CA

"I don't really think it's incumbent upon them (industry) to do anything. I think it's incumbent upon the academic institutions themselves to do something..."

Kashif Alvi, MFA Candidate, Chapman University, Orange CA

While survey results show that students and professors seem convinced of their ability to understand industry, the industry professionals are not so sure. Further compounding this is an academic view that collaboration is not industry's concern, leaving academia, or even the students themselves to bear the brunt of industrial preparation.

Statement 29 addresses the state of collaboration directly, and we find that only 15% of professors and 20% of students take a positive view, with the vast majority of all sectors being either highly neutral or negative.

Table 5: Survey statement 29

		29: The creative industries have the optimal level of cooperation with universities to aid today's creative course programs. Crosstabulation							Total
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Creative Industry pro	Count	0	4	3	4	0	0	0	11
	%	0,0%	36,4%	27,3%	36,4%	0,0%	0,0%	0,0%	100,0%
University professor	Count	0	2	5	4	1	1	0	13
	%	0,0%	15,4%	38,5%	30,8%	7,7%	7,7%	0,0%	100,0%
University student	Count	1	1	0	2	1	0	0	5
	%	20,0%	20,0%	0,0%	40,0%	20,0%	0,0%	0,0%	100,0%
Total	Count	1	7	8	10	2	1	0	29
	%	3,4%	24,1%	27,5%	34,5%	6,9%	3,4%	0,0%	100,0%

Source: Own data collection.

"In terms of the collaboration between the universities and various organizations with students, I think for the most part, they are all very student supportive, and very young-filmmaker supportive. There are a lot of organizations... that have big internship mentoring programs that they're putting in place."

Cece Hall, Sound Designer, Paramount Pictures and Professor, UCLA, Los Angeles CA

"My impression of the collaboration between the entertainment business and education is there is not much of one other than the fact that often you'll see interns from schools working at the movie studio or often you'll see some movie executives who will teach occasionally at a film school. But other than that, there isn't much."

Gregory Curda

Jeff Bacon, Business Affairs, Fox Searchlight Pictures, Los Angeles CA

“Are industry and education working together in as far as preparing people for coming into the real world? I think there’s a little bit of a gap happening right now.”

Rob Ruccia, Chief Engineer, Uptown Recording, Chicago IL

“I think the communication between the industry and academia is kind of shattered and there are certain geographical areas in our country where we try to build up more of a collaborative sense, but it’s not all over.

Jason Schallak, Adjunct Professor, Columbia College, Chicago IL

Even in two of the biggest markets in the U.S., the overall heaviness of neutrality suggests that all sectors are to a large degree either ambivalent or in the dark on this matter. It seems even in a favourable environment, there is still a job to be done.

In Statement 10, the distinction between concept and craft is looked at. Both are needed to produce art, yet concept requires more theory and innovation, while craft requires more skills in areas like workflow and technology. Art can be thought of as a combination of concept (theory) and process (craft). Modern university film programs attempt, to a greater or lesser degree, to marry these constructs to create more rounded graduates for entry into the workforce. This is a worthy goal yet as seen in Table 6, the students have an apparent misunderstanding or mistrust of this marriage, or don’t yet understand the value therein.

Table 6: Survey statement 10

10: Theoretical knowledge can be lost if there is too much collaboration with industry. Crosstabulation									
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total
Creative Industry pro	Count	3	1	2	2	2	1	0	11
	%	27.3%	9.1%	18.2%	18.2%	18.2%	9.1%	0.0%	100.0%
University professor	Count	1	8	1	2	1	0	0	13
	%	7.7%	61.0%	7.7%	15.4%	7.7%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
University student	Count	0	1	0	1	0	2	1	5
	%	0.0%	20.0%	0.0%	20.0%	0.0%	40.0%	20.0%	100.0%
Total	Count	4	10	3	5	3	3	1	29
	%	13.8%	34.5%	10.3%	17.2%	10.3%	10.3%	3.4%	100.0%

Source: Own data collection.

“The theory is what often enables the continued learning and the practice enables the present expertise and hopefully success, but it is the marriage of the two that really puts you on the road to, as I like to say, a career, not a job.”

Michael Niederman, Professor, Columbia College, Chicago IL

Both professionals and professors know the value of the theoretical in industrial implementation, but this escapes the students. Clearly the message is not getting across to students, so a vital part of the understanding is being lost.

Statements 12 and 18 examine the strategy and curriculum of the university in relation to industry needs. While response to both is generally positive, we notice negativity on the part of the professionals regarding curriculum matters, and positive/negative splits among the professionals and the students when it comes to the university strategy. Professors are confident about their intentions and programs. The splits in the pro thinking seem a bit more understandable than the student division about their university’s strategy.

Table 7: Survey statement 12

12: The university profile of the creative arts curriculum is intentionally directed to make the students understand the needs of the creative industries. Crosstabulation									
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total
Creative Industry pro	Count	1	0	3	3	2	1	1	11
	%	9.1%	0.0%	27.3%	27.3%	18.2%	9.1%	9.1%	100.0%
University professor	Count	0	0	0	1	2	4	6	13
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.7%	15.4%	30.8%	46.2%	100.0%
University student	Count	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	5
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	20.0%	40.0%	20.0%	100.0%
Total	Count	1	0	3	5	5	7	8	29
	%	3.4%	0.0%	10.3%	17.2%	17.2%	24.1%	27.6%	100.0%

Source: Own data collection.

Table 8: Survey statement 18

		18: It is a clear strategy of the university that students shall be able to get a job in the creative industries after finishing education. Crosstabulation							Total
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Creative industry pro	Count	0	1	3	1	5	0	1	11
	%	0,0%	9,1%	27,3%	9,1%	45,5%	0,0%	9,1%	100,0%
University professor	Count	0	0	0	0	4	6	3	13
	%	0,0%	0,0%	0,0%	0,0%	30,8%	46,2%	23,1%	100,0%
University student	Count	1	0	1	0	0	2	1	5
	%	20,0%	0,0%	20,0%	0,0%	0,0%	40,0%	20,0%	100,0%
Total	Count	1	1	4	1	9	6	5	29
	%	3,4%	3,4%	13,8%	3,4%	31,0%	27,8%	17,2%	100,0%

Source: Own data collection.

“I don't think the theory versus practice argument is an argument. When I hear that with my peers talking about it as an argument, I think it's ridiculous, because the truth is, students are best equipped to succeed when theory and practice are well married.”

Michael Niederman, Professor, Columbia College, Chicago IL

“Film is created with a social, political, and historical context. And I think that requires you to understand the world you're in and also to understand film history, and aesthetic theories, and that's something I find that at least at the graduate level isn't being communicated to us, at least taught to us. I think you need to find a balance between the two, and I find right now I'm getting too much of the practice and not enough the theoretical background.”

Kashif Alvi, MFA Candidate, Chapman University, Orange CA

The professionals want to believe in academia's intentions but question the methods. The professors and students are confident that their curriculum is putting them on the right path, but the students, like the professionals, are uneasy about the university's strategy. Only the professors are certain of both.

In response to the need for craft skills, and to some extent, the tacit component that accompanies extensive industry experience, many universities in the United States are making use of industry professionals, either on staff or as guest lecturers. This practice seems to be fairly widespread but requires some flexibility on the part of academia with regards to academic qualifications. Theoretical subjects still benefit from professors with MFAs or PhDs, but the typical practical professor profile does not match these requirements. It is widely recognized that length of experience and body of work are far more applicable ingredients than advanced degrees.

It is evidenced by responses to Statement 21, that there is a demand and desire for an industry practitioner presence on the faculty, imparting a clearer view of industrial reality. It is also evidenced by interview comments that industry professionals may not hold the advanced degrees commonly required for teaching positions. Statement 19 results point to a general belief that strict academic requirements should be upheld, with only 18% of professionals and 38% of professors disagreeing. At the same time in Statement 22, most professionals and professors believe that industry experience should have more weight in credentialing, yet a full 80% of students believe it should not.

Table 9: Survey statement 21

		21: Practical instruction from industry professionals does not lend a better real-world view compared to theory. Crosstabulation							Total
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Creative industry pro	Count	4	5	0	1	1	0	0	11
	%	36,4%	45,5%	0,0%	9,1%	9,1%	0,0%	0,0%	100,0%
University professor	Count	4	6	1	1	0	1	0	13
	%	30,8%	46,2%	7,7%	7,7%	0,0%	7,7%	0,0%	100,0%
University student	Count	1	2	0	1	1	0	0	5
	%	20,0%	40,0%	0,0%	20,0%	20,0%	0,0%	0,0%	100,0%
Total	Count	9	13	1	3	2	1	0	29
	%	31,0%	44,8%	3,4%	10,3%	6,9%	3,4%	0,0%	100,0%

Source: Own data collection

Table 10: Survey statement 19

		19: It is appropriate that universities are strict concerning the academic credentials needed when hiring professors.							
		Crosstabulation							
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total
Creative industry pro	Count	0	2	0	2	4	2	1	11
	%	0,0%	18,2%	0,0%	18,2%	36,4%	18,2%	9,1%	100,0%
University professor	Count	0	3	2	0	2	4	2	13
	%	0,0%	23,1%	15,4%	0,0%	15,4%	30,8%	15,4%	100,0%
University student	Count	0	0	1	0	1	2	1	5
	%	0,0%	0,0%	20,0%	0,0%	20,0%	40,0%	20,0%	100,0%
Total	Count	0	5	3	2	7	8	4	29
	%	0,0%	17,2%	10,3%	6,9%	24,1%	27,8%	13,8%	100,0%

Source: Own data collection.

Table 11: Survey statement 22

		22: Competence and achievement in industry should be more heavily recognized as credentials for teaching than they are today. Crosstabulation							
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total
Creative industry pro	Count	0	2	0	2	1	2	4	11
	%	0,0%	18,2%	0,0%	18,2%	9,1%	18,2%	36,4%	100,0%
University professor	Count	1	0	2	0	2	6	2	13
	%	7,7%	0,0%	15,4%	0,0%	15,4%	46,2%	15,4%	100,0%
University student	Count	0	2	2	0	0	1	0	5
	%	0,0%	40,0%	40,0%	0,0%	0,0%	20,0%	0,0%	100,0%
Total	Count	1	4	4	2	3	9	6	29
	%	3,4%	13,8%	13,8%	6,9%	10,3%	31,0%	20,7%	100,0%

Source: Own data collection.

“The notion of academic credentials versus industry credentials is always a complicated thing, in large part, I think because it’s hard sometimes for the academy to understand what someone’s real work means.

Michael Niederman, Professor, Columbia College, Chicago

“So almost everybody here except for the film studies people are hired because of their experience, not because of their degrees and so we look at their resume, what have they done and then they have to come in and prove that they can teach.”

Harry Cheney, Professor, Chapman University, Orange CA

“The vast majority of the people teaching are people who have had a lot of field experience, people who had years in the industry. And that’s what’s really important because it’s not just imparting the actual working situation and the skills that are required, you also want to give the students a sense of what it is like working in these industries, and what the relationships require, and what the various aspects, the sort of interpersonal aspects of it.”

Cece Hall, Sound Designer and Professor, UCLA, Los Angeles CA

“In many studies, that (PhD) is probably important, like someone with a PhD in film studies. But in many other (practical) studies, I don’t think it’s important. I understand how academia has these requirements, but I think in certain instances, these restrictions should be loosened.”

Gregg Barbanell, Foley Artist, Los Angeles CA

Statements 19 and 22 therefore present us with somewhat of a conundrum regarding required credentials for professors. The survey data is contradictory in itself, directly contradicts interview findings, and seems counter-intuitive to the goal of academic/industry collaboration. Also, it is the students’ reactions that are most perplexing, essentially denying the value of professional experience.

One quite surprising result not reflected in the survey but voiced strongly by the professionals in interviews is the need for “soft” or general people skills. Coupled with this is an industry thought that students feel entitled to internships and positions upon graduation without a willingness to work their way up.

“I’m looking for someone that’s proactive...a hard worker, yes, somebody that’s grateful and a nice person. If I have somebody that’s overqualified and is a jerk and someone that’s less qualified and is a nice person, I will pick that person that’s nice every single time.”

Gregory Curda

Connie Kazmer, Editorial Coordinator, Warner Bros. Pictures, Burbank CA

"Work ethic is critically important in the film business. People notice that. Willingness to go a little above and beyond, people notice that. Being a nice person, people notice that. These people skills are very important. If you're perceived as being Mr. I-know-it-all, Mr. Arrogant or whatever, you're doomed."

Gregg Barbanell, Foley Artist, Los Angeles CA

"I can't tell you the things that I encountered over the years (with interns) , ranging from a surprising lack of knowledge to a very annoying sense of entitlement that well, 'I should just be able to walk in and you'll sit me down with your client and you'll empty the ashtrays for me.'"

John McCortney, President, AirWave Recording, Chicago IL.

"I've noticed more and more the sense of entitlement that comes with people's submissions for internships like, 'Hey I know Pro Tools, let me work at your studio.' But to me, everyone knows Pro Tools."

Rob Ruccia, Chief Engineer, Uptown Recording, Chicago IL

It appears that one of industry's prime hiring requirements involve adeptness at the soft skills. Gone are the days of the prima donna, in favour of a more malleable personality. Perhaps industry is signalling that they prefer to take care of the "hard" skills portion of the education themselves, much as they did under the old apprenticeship model, yet also admit that they do not have the capacity to do so.

4. Conclusions and suggestions for further research

We have examined the collaboration and educational components necessary to bring graduates into the job market in some of the most ideal conditions possible. Yet, in conjunction with Research Question 1, we still see that industry, academia, and students are not aligned in what we might view as an optimal way. All the intent seems to be there, but a bit less so from an industry standpoint. Academia seems to be making an effort, especially in the area of employing professionals in the faculty, yet students seem to be at odds with professionals in the industry and more aligned with their professors, even in this seemingly favourable environment. This raises several questions about our assumptions of an ideal collaborative model, academia's interpretation of industry needs, and the students' creative goals.

We must therefore consider, in light of Research Question 2, whether there is something about the creative industry, creative studies, or even with the non-definable nature of creativity itself which prevents the ideal and forces us to settle for the achievable. Industry barriers such as fiscal and temporal constraints on training for interns or new employees, academic conflict between scientific inquiry and practical skills-based learning, and students' apparent uncertainty of the synergy between the academic and industrial components are all likely culprits in the prevention of the ideal.

Admittedly with the limitation of the low sample size of the students, an accurate view of collective student thinking might not be available, but a similar study in Norway (Curda and Westeren, 2019) indicated student uncertainty in much the same way. The observed data here might indicate an unconscious acknowledgment of Polanyi's concepts of tacit knowledge as a process (Polanyi, 1962, 1966), requiring individual acquisition as a result of their own experiences, rather than being transferred in an academic setting by either professors or industry professionals. Students appear to view the tacit skill sets of the professors and professionals more in a historical context, seemingly outdated given the students' modern view of the world and envisioned creative potential. Perhaps the nebulous nature of creativity itself contributes to this evolving issue as changing technology and new media consumption habits have separated contemporary students from the traditional world and values of either their professors or the industry professionals.

References

- Argote, L., Ingram, P., Levine, J. M. and Moreland, R. L. (2000) "Knowledge transfer in organizations: Learning from the experience of others", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, Vol 82, No.1, pp.1-8.
- Curda, G. and Westeren, K.I., (2019), September. "Knowledge Transfers Between Academia and the Creative Industry". In *ECKM 2019 20th European Conference on Knowledge Management*, Vol 1, pp 254-261.
- Daft, R. L., & Lengel, R. H. (1986) "Organizational information requirements, media richness, and structural design." *Management Science*, Vol 32, No. 5, pp 554-571.

Gregory Curda

- Dooley, K, and L Sexton-Finck. (2017) "A focus on collaboration: Fostering Australian screen production students' teamwork skills", *Journal of Teaching and Learning for Graduate Employability*, Vol 8, No. 1, pp 74-105.
- Foss, N. J., Husted, K. and Michailova, S. (2010) "Governing knowledge sharing in organizations: Levels of analysis, governance mechanisms, and research directions", *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol 47, No. 3, pp 455-482.
- Gourlay, S. (2006) "Towards conceptual clarity for 'tacit knowledge': a review of empirical studies", *Knowledge Management Research & Practice*, Vol 4, No. 1, pp 60-69.
- Hislop, D. (2009) *Organizational culture and knowledge management*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Ishii, K., Lyons, M. M., & Carr, S. A. (2019). "Revisiting media richness theory for today and future", *Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies*, Vol 1, No.2, pp 124-131.
- Lam, A. (2018) "Boundary-crossing careers and the 'third space of hybridity': Career actors as knowledge brokers between creative arts and academia", *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, Vol 50, No. 8, pp 1716-1741.
- McVeigh, Margaret. (2016) "Finding the lightbulb moment: creativity and inspiration in the teaching of the craft of screenwriting", *ASPERA (The Australian Screen Production Education and Research Association) 2016: Screen Production Research: The Big Questions*.
- Minbaeva, D. B. (2007) "Knowledge transfer in multinational corporations", *Management International Review*, Vol 47, No. 4, pp 567-593.
- Nonaka, I. and Takeuchi, H. (1995) *The knowledge-creating company: How Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Polanyi, M. (1962) *Personal Knowledge*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London
- Polanyi, M. (1966) *The Tacit Dimension*, Doubleday & Company, Garden City, NY.
- Riege, A. (2005) "Three-dozen knowledge-sharing barriers managers must consider", *Journal of Knowledge Management*, Vol 9, No. 3, pp 18-35.
- Shannon, C. and Weaver, W. (1949) *The Mathematical Theory of Communication*, University of Illinois Press, Urbana.
- Spraggon, M., & Bodolica, V. (2012) "A multidimensional taxonomy of intra-firm knowledge transfer processes", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol 65, No. 9, pp 1273-1282.
- Szulanski, G. (1996) "Exploring internal stickiness: Impediments to the transfer of best practice within the firm", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol 17, Winter Special Issue, pp 27-43.
- Tsoukas, H. (2005) "Do we really understand tacit knowledge?" in Little, S. and Ray, T., eds. (2005), *Managing knowledge: An essential reader*, Sage, London.
- Westeren, K.I. (2012) *Foundations of the knowledge economy: innovation, learning and clusters*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham.
- Westeren, K. I., Cader, H., Sales, M. F., Similä, J. O. and Staduto, J. A. R. (2018) *Competitiveness and Knowledge: An international comparison of traditional firms*, Routledge, London.