**Minnesota Journal of Business Law and Entrepreneurship**

**Volume 2026, "Special Issue International Conference - SoMCON 2026"**

**ISSN: 1540-3270**

# Education for the Orange Economy: Rethinking Curriculum, Pedagogy, and Policy for Creative Industry Workforce Development

**[1]Menka Sharma, [2]Dr. Mohammad Junaid Alam**

[1,2]NIET, Noida Institute of Engineering and Technology and Sharda University

Menka.sharma@niet.co.in

**Abstract**

The creative and cultural industries, collectively termed the Orange Economy, represent one of the fastest-growing sectors in the global economy, contributing significantly to GDP, employment, and innovation. Traditional education systems remain largely disconnected from the demands of creative industries, perpetuating skills mismatches and constraining graduates' employability. This article critically examines how higher education institutions, curriculum frameworks, and skill-development regimes must be redesigned to support the Orange Economy. Drawing on conceptual analysis and international evidence — particularly from emerging economies — this article proposes an integrated framework linking education, creativity, employability, and economic value creation. It argues for interdisciplinary curriculum redesign, innovative pedagogical approaches including experiential and project-based learning, and strengthened academia-industry-government collaboration. Strategic implications are offered for educators, institutions, and policymakers seeking to prepare learners for meaningful participation in the creative economy while advancing sustainable development and the future of work.

**Keywords:** Orange Economy; creative industries; curriculum design; employability; higher education; experiential learning; creative economy policy; vocational training; India

## I. Introduction

The global economy is undergoing a fundamental transformation in which creativity, culture, and innovation occupy an increasingly central role in economic and social development (UNCTAD, 2018). The creative and cultural industries — encompassing design, media, performing arts, digital content, architecture, advertising, and cultural heritage — are now recognized as significant drivers of economic growth, employment, and exports in both developed and developing societies (Flew & Cunningham, 2021). The concept of the 'Orange Economy' was introduced by the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) to describe the economic and social value generated by human creativity and cultural capital (Buitrago Restrepo & Duque Márquez, 2013).

The Orange Economy's global footprint is considerable. Creative industries inject an estimated $2.25 trillion into the world economy annually and support over 29.5 million jobs (UNESCO, 2021). In India, the creative economy accounts for approximately 2.5% of GDP and employs over 8 million individuals, with substantial growth projected (NITI Aayog, 2020). Across Latin America, Africa, and Southeast Asia, the sector is driving rapid economic diversification (De Beukelaer & Spence, 2019).

Despite this dynamism, a critical gap persists between prevailing educational paradigms and the actual workforce demands of creative industries. Traditional education — premised on industrial-era assumptions of standardization, specialization, and rote learning — is poorly suited to the highly interconnected, rapidly evolving world of creative work (Robinson & Aronica, 2015). Skills mismatches endure, graduates face underemployment in a growing sector, and education systems consistently fail to cultivate the creativity, entrepreneurship, and adaptability that creative industries demand (Bridgstock, 2013; Comunian et al., 2021).

This education-employment disconnect carries significant consequences. Creative work requires not merely technical or artistic skill but also entrepreneurialism, digital literacy, cultural awareness, intellectual property literacy, and collaborative capability (Throsby, 2020). These demands are intensified by the Fourth Industrial Revolution — the integration of AI, automation, and virtual reality into creative production — which is reshaping value creation and the skills landscape (Higgs et al., 2019). Education must not merely close existing gaps but prepare learners for the industry's continuing transformation.

The rationale for rethinking creative education extends beyond economic productivity. Creative industries underpin cultural conservation, social inclusion, and multiple Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) (UNESCO, 2022). Embedding creativity and cultural education within curricula holds promise for addressing unemployment, inequality, and cultural heritage preservation (Cunningham et al., 2020).

This article examines three core questions: (1) What are the theoretical underpinnings of the relationship between education and the Orange Economy? (2) What curricular and pedagogical innovations are necessary to maximize the education-employment nexus in creative industries? (3) What institutional and policy structures are necessary to sustain education-creative economy linkages?

The article proceeds as follows. Part II establishes conceptual foundations by examining the theoretical basis of the Orange Economy. Part III diagnoses the education-employment mismatch in creative sectors. Parts IV and V analyze curriculum redesign and innovative pedagogical approaches respectively. Part VI examines the institutional and policy dimensions, including a detailed analysis of short-term vocational training for the Indian context. Part VII presents an integrated conceptual framework. Part VIII concludes.

## II. Background and Conceptual Framework: The Orange Economy And Creative Industries

### *A. Defining the Orange Economy*

The Orange Economy concept emerged from a comprehensive framework developed by the IDB, which treats creativity and culture as strategic economic assets (Buitrago Restrepo & Duque Márquez, 2013). The framework encompasses three dimensions: creative industries producing cultural goods and services; the cultural economy; and the creative field encompassing innovation-related industries (Quartesan et al., 2020). Crucially, the concept repositions creativity as transcending artistic expression to include design, technology, entrepreneurial innovation, and knowledge-based services.

The UK's Department for Culture, Media, and Sport (1998) originally defined thirteen creative industries — including advertising, architecture, arts, crafts, design, fashion, film, music, performing arts, publishing, software, television, and video games — providing a foundational taxonomy that subsequent scholars refined. Caves (2000), Howkins (2001), and Florida (2002) elaborated on creativity's economic dimensions, emphasizing symbolic value, intellectual property, and the 'creative class' as drivers of growth. Flew and Cunningham (2021) identify distinctive characteristics of creative industries: a focus on symbolic goods, heavy reliance on intellectual property, a blend of art and commerce, project-based organizational structures, and network-dependent production. These characteristics necessitate distinctive approaches to workforce development.

### *B. Human Creativity as Economic Resource*

Central to the Orange Economy framework is the treatment of human creativity as a renewable and expandable economic resource that generates value through innovation, expression, and knowledge creation (Howkins, 2001; UNCTAD, 2018). Unlike traditional factors of production, creativity can expand as it is applied (Potts et al., 2008). Schumpeter's (1942) theory of creative destruction illuminates the economic dynamism of creative industries, where disruption and transformation are endemic. Endogenous growth theory (Romer, 1990; Lucas, 1988) identifies knowledge and human capital — expressed through creativity — as primary engines of sustainable economic growth.

Bourdieu's (1986) concept of cultural capital provides a sociological complement: cultural knowledge, skills, and aesthetic sensibilities function as assets generating economic and social advantage (Throsby, 2020). Education systems play a critical role in cultivating cultural capital, though unequal access to cultural education can perpetuate socioeconomic stratification (O'Brien et al., 2017). Amabile's (1996) componential theory further specifies three prerequisites for creative output: domain-relevant skills, creativity-relevant processes, and intrinsic task motivation — a triad with direct implications for curriculum design.

### *C. Creative Economy and Development: Opportunities and Critiques*

UNCTAD's (2018) conceptualization frames creative industries as vehicles for advancing multiple development objectives, including poverty reduction, social inclusion, environmental sustainability, and cultural diversity preservation. Empirical evidence supports this framing: creative industries generate employment opportunities (particularly for youth and women), promote entrepreneurship, facilitate cultural heritage preservation, and enable participation in digital economy value chains (Cunningham et al., 2020; UNESCO, 2022). For emerging economies, creative industries offer pathways to bypass traditional industrialization through digital platform access (Flew & Cunningham, 2021).

Critical scholarship, however, cautions against uncritical adoption of the creative economy discourse. Peck (2005), Oakley and O'Brien (2016), and Banks and O'Connor (2009) identify risks including widening inequality, gentrification-induced community displacement, precarious labor conditions, and homogenization toward Western cultural forms. An equitable Orange Economy requires policies that proactively distribute creative opportunities across social classes, regions, and demographic groups (Comunian & England, 2020).

## III. Comparative and Empirical Analysis: The Education-Employment Mismatch

### *A. Nature and Extent of Skills Gaps*

Extensive evidence documents persistent and multidimensional skills mismatches between creative industry requirements and creative graduates' capabilities (Bridgstock, 2013; Comunian et al., 2021; Ashton, 2015). Ball et al. (2010) found that employers consistently identify deficits in business and entrepreneurial skills — including financial management, marketing, negotiation, and business planning — among creative graduates. Daniel (2016) documented technology-related mismatches, with employers reporting inadequate proficiency in industry-standard software, digital technologies, and data analytics.

Intellectual property literacy represents another critical gap. Bridgstock (2013) identified widespread confusion among creative graduates regarding copyright, licensing, contracts, and intellectual property monetization — competencies essential in a digital environment characterized by platform capitalism and algorithmic content curation (Flew & Cunningham, 2021). Employers also identify deficits in higher-order transversal skills: communication for non-technical audiences, professional networking, self-promotion, collaborative work, and project management (Comunian et al., 2021; Ashton, 2015; Bennett & Lemoine, 2014).

The USEM employability framework (Yorke & Knight, 2006) — comprising Understanding, Skills, Efficacy beliefs, and Metacognition — helps interpret these deficits. Creative graduates typically demonstrate strong disciplinary Understanding but weaknesses in metacognitive skills and broad capability breadth (Bridgstock, 2013). This pattern reflects structural educational inadequacies rather than individual student deficiency.

### *B. Structural Limitations of Conventional Educational Models*

The education-employment mismatch in creative industries stems substantially from structural limitations inherent in conventional educational models (Robinson & Aronica, 2015; Ashton, 2015). Traditional higher education organizes learning around discrete disciplinary departments — fine arts, design, media studies, business, technology — with minimal interdisciplinary integration (Comunian & England, 2020). This structure

is antithetical to creative industries, where successful practice integrates artistic, technical, business, and cultural knowledge (Davies et al., 2013).

Pedagogically, most creative programs remain instructor-led, emphasizing knowledge transmission over active learning, creative exploration, and problem-solving (Ashton, 2015). Assessment is disproportionately oriented toward individual performance in controlled settings rather than collaborative, authentic project work reflecting professional practice (Biggs & Tang, 2011). The theory-practice gap is compounded by institutional inflexibility: long curriculum approval cycles, rigid course structures, and limited interdisciplinary programming impede responsiveness to industry evolution (Ashton, 2015).

### *C. Systemic Challenges and Comparative Evidence*

Beyond pedagogical constraints, systemic factors compound education-employment mismatches. Creative education massification — exponential growth in creative program enrollment outpacing industry employment growth — produces credential inflation and heightened competition for limited opportunities (Oakley et al., 2017; Banks & Hesmondhalgh, 2009). Creative labor market characteristics — project-based structures, freelancing cultures, informal recruitment networks, and geographic clustering — further complicate conventional career preparation (Comunian & England, 2020).

Equity dimensions are particularly salient. Creative industry careers are strongly stratified by socioeconomic status, with advantaged graduates disproportionately benefiting from family networks, unpaid internship access, and financial capacity to sustain themselves during precarious early career stages (O'Brien et al., 2017; Oakley & O'Brien, 2016). Digital transformation introduces additional complexity, creating new creative production and distribution modalities while requiring critical understanding of platform dependencies and algorithmic governance (Higgs et al., 2019; Srnicek, 2017).

## IV. Policy Analysis: Curriculum Redesign And Pedagogical Innovation

### *A. Principles of Curriculum Redesign*

Curriculum transformation addressing the education-employment gap must be grounded in several core principles (Ashton, 2015; Bridgstock & Cunningham, 2016). First, interdisciplinarity: effective creative economy curricula must transcend conventional disciplinary boundaries, integrating arts, technology, business, social sciences, and humanities to develop students' capacity to synthesize knowledge across domains (Davies et al., 2013; Throsby, 2020). Second, practice-orientation: curricula must prioritize practical capability development through authentic problems, real-world projects, and industry engagement rather than predominantly theoretical knowledge acquisition (Biggs & Tang, 2011; Jackson, 2015). Third, adaptability and future-orientation: given rapid technological and market change, curricula must develop adaptive skills, learning agility, and metacognitive capabilities enabling continuous skill evolution (World Economic Forum, 2020; Bridgstock, 2013).

### *B. Core Curriculum Components*

From these principles, several curriculum components prove essential. Creative and artistic foundations provide domain knowledge and craftsmanship, delivered with awareness of evolving technologies, cultural contexts, and professional practices (Throsby, 2020). Digital competencies — encompassing not just software proficiency but data analytics, AI applications, virtual reality, platform economics, and critical digital literacy — are increasingly fundamental across all creative disciplines (Higgs et al., 2019; Srnicek, 2017). Business and entrepreneurship education, encompassing business models, financial management, marketing, intellectual property, and contract negotiation, addresses persistent curriculum gaps (Ball et al., 2010; Bridgstock, 2013). Professional practice development — including networking, self-presentation, career navigation, and collaborative work practices — must be taught explicitly rather than assumed (Ashton, 2015).

***C. Contextualizing Curriculum for Emerging Economies***

Curriculum design for emerging economies requires contextual adaptation. Curricula should explicitly develop capabilities for valorizing local cultural assets — traditional knowledge systems, indigenous creative practices, and cultural heritage — while avoiding essentialism and enabling access to global creative markets through digital platforms (UNESCO, 2022; Flew & Cunningham, 2021). Given limited formal employment in creative industries within many emerging economies, entrepreneurship and self-employment preparation warrant heightened emphasis (NITI Aayog, 2020; Ball et al., 2010). Sustainability integration — connecting creativity explicitly to SDGs and development imperatives — provides both pedagogical coherence and policy legitimacy (De Beukelaer & Spence, 2019; UNESCO, 2022).

***D. Pedagogical Innovation***

Pedagogical transformation is as critical as curriculum redesign. Experiential learning (Kolb, 1984) and project-based learning (PBL) (Blumenfeld et al., 1991; Krajcik & Shin, 2014) align naturally with creative practice, developing problem-solving, collaborative, and metacognitive skills through sustained engagement with authentic challenges. High-quality PBL incorporates real-world creative problems, student voice and autonomy, extended time horizons enabling iteration, and explicit skill scaffolding throughout (Ashton, 2015; Jackson, 2015).

Studio pedagogy — prominent in architecture, design, and fine arts — offers transferable models emphasizing learning through action, expert modeling, iterative development, and community-of-practice formation (Crowther, 2013; Schön, 1983; Wenger, 1998). Work-integrated learning (WIL), encompassing client projects, industry mentorships, and collaborative studios involving industry practitioners, has demonstrated effectiveness in developing professional skills, identifying career pathways, and improving employability (Jackson, 2015; Billett, 2014). Digital pedagogy encompasses not only technology-enhanced learning delivery — blended, online, virtual — but critical digital literacies equipping students to understand and navigate platform capitalism and algorithmic cultural production (Morris & Stommel, 2018; Srnicek, 2017).

Assessment practices must correspondingly evolve. Portfolio assessment — consistent with creative industries' own portfolio-based recruitment — provides authentic evaluation of creative competencies while building professional presentation skills (Klenowski, 2002; Bridgstock, 2013). Performance-based assessment (presentations, pitches, exhibitions), collaborative assessment (peer and self-evaluation), and process-based assessment (reflective writing, learning journals) collectively offer multidimensional evaluation aligned with creative work's nature (Ashton, 2015; Sawyer, 2012; Boud et al., 2013).

## V. Proposed Reforms: Institutional, Policy, And Vocational Dimensions

***A. Universities as Creative Ecosystem Enablers***

Higher education institutions must reconceptualize their roles from isolated knowledge producers to active creative ecosystem participants (Comunian & England, 2020; Flew & Cunningham, 2021). This requires institutional innovation across several dimensions. Universities should develop creative hubs — makerspaces, fabrication laboratories, media production facilities, co-working spaces, and incubators — providing shared infrastructure accessible to students, alumni, and community members (Higgs et al., 2019; Ball et al., 2010). University-industry partnerships must deepen beyond episodic collaboration to embedded strategic relationships: industry advisory boards informing curriculum development, adjunct faculty from practice, collaborative research addressing industry challenges, and technology transfer mechanisms supporting intellectual property commercialization (Comunian et al., 2021; Bridgstock & Cunningham, 2016).

***B. Public Policy Frameworks***

Government policy plays indispensable roles in enabling creative education-employment linkages. Funding mechanisms — dedicated streams for creative education infrastructure, scholarship programs, practice-led research grants, and WIL facilitation — address capital constraints and access barriers (De Beukelaer &

Spence, 2019; Comunian & England, 2020). Curriculum and quality frameworks should specify competency outcomes rather than content, preserving institutional autonomy while ensuring professional relevance through industry participation in accreditation (Ashton, 2015; Bridgstock & Cunningham, 2016). Skills development initiatives beyond formal education — continuing education, micro-credentials, digital learning platforms, and portable training accounts — address lifelong learning imperatives (World Economic Forum, 2020; OECD, 2019). Inclusive access policies — targeted financial aid, widening participation initiatives, regional investment, compensated internship requirements, and flexible study options — are necessary to address persistent socioeconomic stratification in creative careers (O'Brien et al., 2017; Comunian & England, 2020).

***C. Multi-Stakeholder Collaboration Models***

Effective creative education-employment linkages require sustained multi-stakeholder collaboration among universities, industry, government, and civil society (Comunian et al., 2021; UNCTAD, 2018). Triple helix arrangements (Etzkowitz & Leydesdorff, 2000) create structured partnerships for regional creative economy development. Industry advisory mechanisms — advisory boards, entrepreneurs-in-residence, regular intelligence consultations — embed ongoing industry input into institutional practice (Ball et al., 2010; Bridgstock, 2013). Sectoral skills bodies provide coordination across institutions through competency frameworks, skills councils, and apprenticeship systems (OECD, 2019; Jackson, 2015). Innovation intermediaries — cultural agencies, industry associations, economic development organizations — facilitate ecosystem connections and boundary-spanning functions (UNCTAD, 2018; Comunian & England, 2020). Effective collaboration requires trust-building, clear governance, adequate resourcing, and regular evaluation for continuous improvement (Ashton, 2015; Bridgstock & Cunningham, 2016).

***D. Short-Term Vocational Training for Indian Youth: A Priority Policy Reform***

The Indian context presents distinctive challenges and opportunities warranting specific policy attention. With over 65% of India's population under 35 and persistently high youth unemployment, short-term vocational training programs offer critical pathways for rapid skill development in creative industries (NITI Aayog, 2020; Ministry of Skill Development and Entrepreneurship [MSDE], 2021). Several structural factors justify this policy emphasis.

Scale, urgency, and accessibility: approximately 12 million youth enter the Indian labor market annually, necessitating skill development pathways beyond traditional degree programs (MSDE, 2021). Short-term programs reduce barriers for youth from disadvantaged backgrounds unable to pursue multi-year qualifications or withstand extended income loss (Mehrotra et al., 2014; Agrawal, 2012). Industry responsiveness: short-term programs can update content rapidly in response to technological change, addressing the lag inherent in formal curriculum revision (Bai & Pandey, 2020). Regional and linguistic diversity: vernacular-language delivery and distributed training centers enable participation from India's diverse linguistic communities and tier-2/tier-3 cities (UNESCO, 2019). Integration potential: India's existing skill development ecosystem — including Pradhan Mantri Kaushal Vikas Yojana (PMKVY), the National Skill Development Corporation (NSDC), and sector skill councils — provides infrastructure short-term creative training can leverage (MSDE, 2021).

Priority training areas, based on Indian creative industry growth trajectories, include: digital media and content creation (video production, graphic design, animation, photography); web and app development for creative applications; fashion and textile design; media and broadcasting; traditional arts with contemporary market applications; gaming and interactive media; and digital marketing for creative businesses (FICCI & EY, 2021; NITI Aayog, 2020; KPMG, 2022).

Effective short-term vocational training demands distinctive pedagogical design. Competency-based modular architecture enables flexible entry/exit, credential stacking, and customization (Rausch et al., 2014). Intensive hands-on practice — constituting 60-70% of training time — must prioritize practical skill over extensive theory (Billett, 2014). Industry-standard tools, project-based learning with portfolio development, industry mentorship integration, entrepreneurship embedding, and vernacular language delivery are all essential design elements (Ashton, 2015; Jackson, 2015; Ball et al., 2010; UNESCO, 2019).

Quality assurance requires National Skill Qualification Framework (NSQF) alignment through sector skill councils such as the Media and Entertainment Skills Council (MESC), competency-based assessment with industry practitioner participation, industry-recognized certification preparation, and systematic placement tracking (MSDE, 2021; Brookhart, 2013; Majumdar, 2019). Financing mechanisms must address accessibility: PMKVY subsidies, income-contingent deferred payment models, employer-sponsored training, targeted scholarships for disadvantaged groups, and stipends for those requiring income replacement (MSDE, 2021; Agrawal, 2012; Mehrotra et al., 2014).

Critically, short-term vocational training should be integrated with formal education pathways through credit transfer and articulation, bridge programs facilitating degree program entry, work-study pathway combinations, prior learning recognition, and digital credential platforms enabling lifelong learning documentation (Majumdar, 2019; OECD, 2019; MSDE, 2021).

## VI. Future Implications for Business Law and Entrepreneurship

### *A. Emerging Legal and Regulatory Challenges*

The Orange Economy's expansion generates significant legal and regulatory challenges requiring prospective attention. Intellectual property frameworks — governing copyright, licensing, and platform content moderation — will increasingly determine creative workers' economic security and incentives for production. Platform capitalism and algorithmic governance raise novel questions about labor rights, data ownership, and market concentration that existing legal frameworks inadequately address (Srnicek, 2017; Flew & Cunningham, 2021). Education systems must prepare creative workers not merely to navigate these environments but to advocate for equitable legal structures.

### *B. Technology, AI, and the Future of Creative Work*

Artificial intelligence is fundamentally reshaping creative production — generating content, personalizing distribution, and automating routine creative tasks (Higgs et al., 2019). This transformation creates both displacement risks and new creative modalities requiring education systems to develop AI literacy, human-AI collaboration capabilities, and critical evaluation of algorithmically mediated cultural production. Virtual and augmented reality technologies are creating new creative industries requiring specialized skills and interdisciplinary knowledge. Educational responses must anticipate these trajectories rather than reactively address them.

### *C. Areas for Future Research*

Several areas merit scholarly attention. Longitudinal studies tracking Orange Economy graduates' career trajectories — examining the effectiveness of different educational interventions across diverse contexts — would provide evidence essential for evidence-based curriculum reform. Comparative analysis of creative education-employment linkages across national regulatory contexts would illuminate the relationships between policy frameworks and outcomes. Research specifically examining equity dimensions — how different educational interventions affect access and success for marginalized groups — addresses critical social justice imperatives. Finally, legal and policy research examining intellectual property reform, platform regulation, and labor rights in creative industries would complement education-focused analysis.

## VII. The Education for Orange Economy Framework (EOEF)

The Education for Orange Economy Framework (EOEF) synthesizes this article's arguments through five interconnected levels operating within broader contextual forces.

Level 1 — Foundations: The evolving landscape of creative industries, guiding educational philosophy (creativity-centered, experiential, interdisciplinary, equity-oriented), and the enabling policy environment establish the conceptual and contextual parameters shaping educational interventions.

Level 2 — Educational Inputs and Processes: Interdisciplinary curriculum design; experiential, project-based, studio, and work-integrated pedagogical approaches; portfolio and performance-based assessment; and adequate physical and digital infrastructure translate foundational principles into operational educational experience.

Level 3 — Student Learning and Development: Students develop domain expertise, transversal competencies (design thinking, systems thinking, communication, collaboration, digital literacy), professional capabilities (entrepreneurship, networking, intellectual property literacy), creative dispositions (curiosity, resilience, aesthetic sensibility), and metacognitive capacities (self-awareness, learning agility).

Level 4 — Employability and Career Pathways: Educational outcomes translate into employment readiness, entrepreneurship capability, portfolio career management, network capital, and adaptive capacity — recognizing the diversity of creative career pathways beyond traditional employment.

Level 5 — Value Creation and Impact: Individual creative careers generate economic value (income, employment contribution), cultural value (heritage, identity, diversity), social value (community cohesion, inclusion), innovation value (creative problem-solving, new product development), and sustainable development contributions aligned with SDG imperatives.

## VIII. Conclusion

The creative and cultural industries constituting the Orange Economy represent one of the twenty-first century's most dynamic economic sectors, offering pathways to employment, entrepreneurship, cultural expression, and sustainable development. Yet traditional education systems — designed for industrial-age imperatives — prove increasingly inadequate for preparing learners to participate effectively in creative economies. The persistent education-employment mismatch manifests in skills gaps, graduate underemployment, and systemic failure to cultivate the creativity, adaptability, and entrepreneurial capabilities that creative sectors demand.

This article has argued that addressing this disconnect requires transformation across multiple dimensions simultaneously: curriculum content and structure must become genuinely interdisciplinary and practice-oriented; pedagogical approaches must shift toward experiential, project-based, studio, and work-integrated models; assessment must evolve toward portfolio, performance-based, and process-oriented evaluation; institutions must function as creative ecosystem enablers rather than isolated knowledge producers; policy frameworks must invest in inclusive access, industry collaboration, and lifelong learning; and short-term vocational training — particularly in contexts such as India — must be developed as a priority policy instrument and integrated with formal education pathways.

The Education for Orange Economy Framework (EOEF) proposed here provides an integrated conceptual architecture for understanding how educational inputs translate through student development into employability, career participation, and ultimately multidimensional value creation. This framework situates educational transformation within its essential policy and institutional context, resisting reductively technocratic approaches that focus narrowly on skill matching while ignoring broader equity, cultural, and developmental imperatives.

The Orange Economy's potential — for economic dynamism, cultural vitality, social inclusion, and sustainable development — will only be realized if education systems undergo the fundamental redesign this article prescribes. The stakes extend beyond creative industries themselves: reimagining creative education is integral to reimagining the kind of societies in which human creativity, in all its dimensions, is cultivated, valued, and equitably shared.

**References**

[1] Agrawal, T. (2012). Vocational education and training in India: Challenges, status and labour market outcomes. Journal of Vocational Education & Training, 64(4), 453–474. https://doi.org/10.1080/13636820.2012.727851

[2] AICTE. (2020). National Education Policy 2020 and role of technical education. All India Council for Technical Education.

[3] Amabile, T. M. (1996). Creativity in context: Update to the social psychology of creativity. Westview Press.

[4] Ashton, D. (2015). Creative contexts: Work placement subcultures and cultures. British Journal of Sociology of Education, 36(6), 905–923. https://doi.org/10.1080/01425692.2013.868786

[5] Bai, B., & Pandey, M. (2020). Skill development for employability in India. Indian Journal of Industrial Relations, 55(3), 459–475.

[6] Ball, L., Pollard, E., & Stanley, N. (2010). Creative graduates, creative futures. Institute for Employment Studies.

[7] Banks, M., & Hesmondhalgh, D. (2009). Looking for work in creative industries policy. International Journal of Cultural Policy, 15(4), 415–430.

[8] Banks, M., & O'Connor, J. (2009). After the creative industries. International Journal of Cultural Policy, 15(4), 365–373.

[9] Barron, B., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2008). Teaching for meaningful learning. In L. Darling-Hammond et al. (Eds.), Powerful learning: What we know about teaching for understanding (pp. 11–70). Jossey-Bass.

[10] Bennett, N., & Lemoine, J. (2014). What VUCA really means for you. Harvard Business Review, 92(1/2), 27.

[11] Biggs, J., & Tang, C. (2011). Teaching for quality learning at university (4th ed.). Open University Press.

[12] Billett, S. (2014). The standing of vocational education. Journal of Vocational Education & Training, 66(1), 1–21.

[13] Blumenfeld, P. C., Soloway, E., Marx, R. W., Krajcik, J. S., Guzdial, M., & Palincsar, A. (1991). Motivating project-based learning. Educational Psychologist, 26(3–4), 369–398.

[14] Boud, D., Cohen, R., & Sampson, J. (2013). Peer learning in higher education. Routledge.

[15] Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education (pp. 241–258). Greenwood.

[16] Bridgstock, R. (2013). Not a dirty word: Arts entrepreneurship and higher education. Arts and Humanities in Higher Education, 12(2–3), 122–137.

[17] Bridgstock, R., & Cunningham, S. (2016). Creative labour and graduate outcomes. International Journal of Cultural Policy, 22(1), 10–26.

[18] Brook, O., O'Brien, D., & Taylor, M. (2020). Culture is bad for you: Inequality in the cultural and creative industries. Manchester University Press.

[19] Brookhart, S. M. (2013). How to create and use rubrics for formative assessment and grading. ASCD.

[20] Buitrago Restrepo, P. F., & Duque Márquez, I. (2013). The Orange Economy: An infinite opportunity. Inter-American Development Bank.

[21] Caves, R. E. (2000). Creative industries: Contracts between art and commerce. Harvard University Press.

[22] Comunian, R., & England, L. (2020). Creative and cultural work without filters. Cultural Trends, 29(2), 112–128.

[23] Comunian, R., Gilmore, A., & Jacobi, S. (2021). Higher education and the creative economy. Geography Compass, 4(9), 1370–1385.

[24] Crowther, P. (2013). Understanding the signature pedagogy of the design studio. Journal of Learning Design, 6(3), 18–28.

[25] Cunningham, S., Flew, T., & Swift, A. (2020). Media economics. Red Globe Press.

[26] Daniel, R. (2016). Undergraduate architecture students, design thinking and critical thinking dispositions. Journal for Education in the Built Environment, 11(1), 23–48.

[27] Davies, A., Fidler, D., & Gorbis, M. (2013). Future work skills 2020. Institute for the Future for the University of Phoenix Research Institute.

[28] De Beukelaer, C., & Spence, K. (2019). Global cultural economy. Routledge.

[29] Etzkowitz, H., & Leydesdorff, L. (2000). The dynamics of innovation. Research Policy, 29(2), 109–123.

[30] FICCI & EY. (2021). Re-imagining India's M&E sector. Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce & Industry and Ernst & Young.

[31] Flew, T., & Cunningham, S. (2021). Creative industries: From origins to the metaverse. Cultural Science Journal, 13(1), 1–28.

[32] Florida, R. (2002). The rise of the creative class. Basic Books.

[33] Garrison, D. R., & Vaughan, N. D. (2008). Blended learning in higher education. Jossey-Bass.

[34] Higgs, P., Cunningham, S., & Bakhshi, H. (2019). Beyond the creative industries: Mapping the creative economy in the United Kingdom. Nesta.

[35] Howkins, J. (2001). The creative economy: How people make money from ideas. Penguin.

[36] Jackson, D. (2015). Employability skill development in work-integrated learning. Studies in Higher Education, 40(2), 350–367.

[37] Klenowski, V. (2002). Developing portfolios for learning and assessment. RoutledgeFalmer.

[38] Kolb, D. A. (1984). Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development. Prentice-Hall.

[39] KPMG. (2022). Media and entertainment industry report: India. KPMG India.

[40] Krajcik, J. S., & Shin, N. (2014). Project-based learning. In R. K. Sawyer (Ed.), The Cambridge handbook of the learning sciences (2nd ed., pp. 275–297). Cambridge University Press.

[41] Lucas, R. E. (1988). On the mechanics of economic development. Journal of Monetary Economics, 22(1), 3–42.

[42] Majumdar, S. (2019). Emerging challenges and trends in TVET in the Asia-Pacific region. UNESCO-UNEVOC International Centre.

[43] Mehrotra, S., Gandhi, A., Sahoo, B. K., & Saha, P. (2014). Creating employment in the twelfth Five-Year Plan. Economic & Political Weekly, 49(19), 63–73.

[44] Ministry of Skill Development and Entrepreneurship. (2021). National Skill Development Mission: Framework for implementation. Government of India.

[45] Morris, S. M., & Stommel, J. (2018). An urgency of teachers: The work of critical digital pedagogy. Hybrid Pedagogy.

[46] NASSCOM. (2021). Indian tech industry: Strategic review 2021. National Association of Software and Service Companies.

[47] NITI Aayog. (2020). India's creative economy: The regional and international integration dimensions. Government of India.

[48] NSDC. (2021). National Skills Qualification Framework implementation guidelines. National Skill Development Corporation.

[49] O'Brien, D., Laurison, D., Miles, A., & Friedman, S. (2017). Are the creative industries meritocratic? Cultural Trends, 25(2), 116–131.

[50] Oakley, K., & O'Brien, D. (2016). Learning to labour unequally. Social Identities, 22(5), 471–486.

[51] Oakley, K., Laurison, D., O'Brien, D., & Friedman, S. (2017). Cultural capital: Arts graduates, spatial inequality, and London's impact. American Behavioral Scientist, 61(12), 1510–1531.

[52] OECD. (2019). Getting skills right: Future-ready adult learning systems. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.

[53] Peck, J. (2005). Struggling with the creative class. International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 29(4), 740–770.

[54] Potts, J., Cunningham, S., Hartley, J., & Ormerod, P. (2008). Social network markets: A new definition of the creative industries. Journal of Cultural Economics, 32(3), 167–185.

[55] Quartesan, A., Romis, M., & Lanzafame, F. (2020). Cultural and creative industries in the face of COVID-19: An economic impact outlook. UNESCO.

[56] Ranjan, R., & Jha, J. K. (2019). Skill development in Indian creative industries: An analysis. International Journal of Training and Development, 23(4), 320–335.

[57] Ratto, M., & Boler, M. (Eds.). (2014). DIY citizenship: Critical making and social media. MIT Press.

[58] Rausch, A., Seifried, J., Wuttke, E., Kögler, K., & Brandt, S. (2014). Reliability and validity of competence models. In S. Billett et al. (Eds.), International handbook of research in professional and practice-based learning (pp. 949–980). Springer.

[59] Robinson, K., & Aronica, L. (2015). Creative schools: The grassroots revolution that's transforming education. Viking.

[60] Romer, P. M. (1990). Endogenous technological change. Journal of Political Economy, 98(5, Part 2), S71–S102.

[61] Sawyer, R. K. (2012). Explaining creativity: The science of human innovation (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.

[62] Schön, D. A. (1983). The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action. Basic Books.

[63] Schumpeter, J. A. (1942). Capitalism, socialism and democracy. Harper & Brothers.

[64] Sen, A. (1999). Development as freedom. Oxford University Press.

[65] Srnicek, N. (2017). Platform capitalism. Polity Press.

[66] Textile Ministry. (2020). Annual report 2019–20. Ministry of Textiles, Government of India.

[67] Throsby, D. (2020). Economics and culture (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

[68] UNCTAD. (2018). Creative economy outlook: Trends in international trade in creative industries. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development.

[69] UNESCO. (2019). Recommendation on adult learning and education. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

[70] UNESCO. (2021). Re|shaping policies for creativity: Addressing culture as a global public good. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

[71] UNESCO. (2022). Culture in crisis: Policy guide for a resilient creative sector. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

[72] Wenger, E. (1998). Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity. Cambridge University Press.

[73] Williamson, B. (2017). Big data in education: The digital future of learning, policy and practice. SAGE Publications.

[74] World Economic Forum. (2020). The future of jobs report 2020. World Economic Forum.

[75] Yorke, M., & Knight, P. T. (2006). Embedding employability into the curriculum. Higher Education Academy.