



King's Research Portal

Document Version

Early version, also known as pre-print

[Link to publication record in King's Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Comunian, R., Wilson, N., Faggian, A., & Heinonen, J. (Eds.) (2022). *A Modern Guide to Creative Economies*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on King's Research Portal is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Post-Print version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version for pagination, volume/issue, and date of publication details. And where the final published version is provided on the Research Portal, if citing you are again advised to check the publisher's website for any subsequent corrections.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Research Portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

This is a draft chapter. The final version is available in *A Modern Guide to Creative Economies* edited by Roberta Comunian, Alessandra Faggian, Jarna Heinonen and Nick Wilson, published in 2022, Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd
<https://www.e-elgar.com/shop/gbp/a-modern-guide-to-creative-economies-9781789905489.html>

1. Introduction

Roberta Comunian, Alessandra Faggian, Jarna Heinonen and Nick Wilson

1.1 Why a "modern guide" to *creative economies*? And why now?

The proposal and initial idea behind "*A Modern Guide To Creative Economies*" coincided with the start of a new project for the four editors. In 2019 we received a Horizon 2020 European award¹ titled "*Developing Inclusive & Sustainable Creative Economies*" (DISCE). From the offset, it was clear that while much research has been undertaken and published in the last 20 years on the creative economy, there were still many challenges in defining, understanding and supporting the sector. The two most visible challenges identified through extensive literature reviews during the project (Comunian et al. 2020; Wilson et al. 2020; Dent et al. 2020) were that the creative economy was often not inclusive and sustainable. Inclusivity and sustainability were identified as the focus of the research project but also a way in which the project was also tasked to contribute to a new perspective on growth – beyond GDP – for the future of the European creative economy (see Gross in this volume). While the DISCE project is still ongoing and the findings will be disseminated later in 2022, this *Modern Guide* edited collection provided an invaluable instrument for the editors to reflect and critically engage with our understanding and approaches to this field of research.

During the project, it was clear our understanding of the "creative economy" – i.e. creativity and cultural activities as a sector of the economy - was not enough. We opted for the use of the plural term "creative economies". This builds on the view presented by UNDP and UNESCO (2013: 12) that the "creative economy is not a single superhighway, but a multitude of different local trajectories found in cities and regions in developing countries". While UNDP and UNESCO (2013) here are trying to address concerns of inclusivity in relation to developing contexts, from our perspective, the same level of inclusivity is also required within developed economies and societies. Furthermore, as also articulated by Comunian et al. (2021), it is vital to acknowledge that there is "not one single creative economy but a multiplicity of creative economies which can feature overlapping and diverging agendas" (p.6). It is crucial to account for the range of business models and objectives which often extend to the social sphere (Comunian et al., 2020)

as well as for new possibilities emerging from the connection between creativity and cultural development (Wilson et al., 2020; De Beukelaer, 2015)

The other important dimension highlighted by the book is the need to look at creative economies from a range of scales and perspectives (Comunian, 2019). The plurality of data, sources, and voices that this multidisciplinary collection includes empowers further interdisciplinarity and opportunities for dialogue across researchers that are key to more inclusive approaches. Another critical dimension of this *Modern guide* is that it gives voice to many young and emerging researchers who have recently contributed to the creative economies debate with new methods and approaches.

The creative economies have now been studied for more than two decades². However, the need to update, expand and question our understanding has never been more needed and essential due to the impact of Covid-19 on our society, economies, and communities. While the contributions and research in this book pre-date the pandemic and could not reflect on its impact (Comunian and England, 2020), the importance of reflecting on the role and value of creative economies in our lives and society has never felt more important.

1.2 Current challenges to our understanding of creative economies

Overall, across fifteen chapters, the book engages with some key current challenges and limitations of our knowledge of creative economies. In particular, we identify here eight areas where the book contributes but also where overall more research is needed and should be expanded in the next decade.

Defining and quantifying creative economies

One of the key challenges in understanding creative economies is to define their value and potential beyond the economic sphere, to include their societal contribution and network formation. This requires an interdisciplinary approach and identifying a common language and framework. Much of the debate around a proper definition of the "creative economies" relates to whether the definition should be based on a set of firms belonging to specific sectors (the so-called creative and cultural industries, CCI) or on the skills of individuals and their talent (Comunian et al. 2010; Comunian et al. 2022). Given how central these sectors have been to policy in recent years, policy is not neutral in shaping our understanding of the creative economies. One good example of this is the historical account of the emergence of the creative industries definition and policy in the UK in 1998 (Gross, 2020). Adding to this already complicated scenario is the role of policy directly funding and contributing to some of the sectors and activities that are part of creative economies. Another important role is also played by international policy organisations trying to harmonise definitions and data across countries, either at the European level (Wiesand and Söndermann 2005) or internationally (UNDP and UNESCO 2013). The relationship between public, private and non-profit activities varies across countries and shapes not only their trajectory but also the inclusiveness and sustainability of some of the sectors included in these complex ecologies (de Bernard et al. 2021; Wilson and

Gross (2017). It is essential to highlight the ecological nature of the creative economies, which are made of complex relationships and interdependencies between more informal activities characterised precisely by not being explicitly recognised or directly supported and more formal and visible ones. Capturing the complexity and ecological nature of the creative economies is fundamental to devise better policies and make them more inclusive and sustainable in the long term (Wilson et al. 2020).

New and old Methodologies

One of the significant challenges in our understanding of creative economies in the last twenty years has been that, while there is interest from a range of disciplines to contribute, there is very little dialogue across disciplines on how to better capture the working and dynamics of the sector. This book is an attempt to make this wide range of disciplines talk to each other in a fruitful way hence contributing to building a better picture of creative economies. In this attempt, the dialogue between different methodologies is also key. In fact, while quantitative methods are key and important to identify trends and macro-dynamics (Higgs et al. 2008) other, more qualitative methods are also needed to explore rationales, motivations and push and pull factors in the development of the sector and, above all, its impact on society. As highlighted in the book, ecological and network-based approaches have been very promising in breaking some of the silos in which our understanding of creative economies has been confined in the past twenty years (Dovey et al. 2016; de Bernard et al. 2021). Another important contribution comes from new and old approaches to mapping and contextualising the value of creative economies in space from local communities to regional economies and national and international profiles (Bakhshi et al. 2013; Brennan-Horley et al. 2010). Finally, creative and co-participatory methods are also critical to allow a range of voices and experiences to be heard (Greene et al. 2013; Hargreaves and Hartley, 2016) within creative economies and have yet to be fully explored.

Diversity in entrepreneurship

Entrepreneurship is presented as a key factor in economic growth and innovation as well as a solution to many societal challenges locally and globally. Given that much of the research in entrepreneurship deals with the "exceptional" high-growth gazelles and unicorns which represent only a small fraction of all entrepreneurs. There is a need to understand better the majority of entrepreneurship, i.e. "everyday entrepreneurship" which portrays the diversity in entrepreneurship (Welter et al., 2017; Dodd et al., 2021). Similarly, Naudin (2018) argues that entrepreneurship research ignores a contextualised understanding of the phenomenon taking place in a variety of structural and cultural conditions and most importantly it does not capture the injustices and inequalities" that impact on culture and those who work on the field (Naudin, 2018, p. 2). Investigating cultural and creative entrepreneurs challenges understanding on entrepreneurship. Heroic and even mythical stories about high-growth entrepreneurship and entrepreneurs found in Silicon Valley turn to more mundane and everyday entrepreneurship when we look at the entrepreneurial actors in the creative economies. Investigating entrepreneurship in creative economies does not imply diluting the power or impact of

entrepreneurship but rather widening its scope to capture entrepreneurial behaviour also in other contexts. It rather means widening our understanding of diversity in entrepreneurship and challenging the "elite" ideal type of an entrepreneur (Dodd et al., 2021). Furthermore, it challenges us to consider entrepreneurship, education and cultural policies from a new perspective.

Entrepreneurship education in higher education

Entrepreneurship scholars have debated whether entrepreneurship can be taught or not, and particularly whether higher education institutions have their role to play here. Oftentimes entrepreneurship is associated with practice, whereas university education is based on academic research and scholarly knowledge aiming to develop the students' theoretical and critical thinking. These approaches seem highly different from each other, posing a challenge to entrepreneurship education in higher education (Heinonen and Hytti, 2010). The above challenge is equally relevant when considering whether and how to connect entrepreneurship education to creative degrees. Furthermore, there is an additional challenge of balancing between the commercial notion of entrepreneurship and the non-commercial notion of art. How to cope with the tension between artistic ambition and economic profit goals? This is a highly topical question as it is acknowledged that working as an entrepreneur or freelancer is very common in creative economies (Ball et al., 2010). The question is relevant for policymakers, educators and entrepreneurs themselves. In any educational setting, there is a need to understand and define (i) the context in which entrepreneurship education is taking place (institutional, university-specific context), (ii) the content to be taught and learnt (themes, topics and concepts) and (iii) the learning environment in which learning occurs (physical spaces and pedagogical aspects of learning) which all impact on (iv) learning outcomes to be achieved (Ilonen, 2020). This is also something that needs to be considered when planning how to make entrepreneurship education accessible to creative degree students

Understanding networks and ecologies and place

In the last twenty years, there has been increased attention to the role of networks and ecologies in creative economies research, as mapped by de Bernard et al. (2021). However, these studies still struggle to capture and evidence the broader connections of creative economies within our social and cultural life, beyond economic supply-chains. Current research has also acknowledged the tension between urban (core) vs. regional (peripheral) creative economies. There is evidence of strong urban concentration. Capital cities typically dominate, whilst significant concentrations are also found in secondary or medium-sized cities, which have been the focus of the DISCE project as case studies (Gross et al. 2019). The creative economy and its benefits are distributed geographically unevenly, but the mobility of creative workers is also important to think about more sustainable versions of creative economies. This is a core-periphery relation, where metropolitan centres benefit and are the sources of cultural jobs. At the same time, regional cities and local clusters have found it difficult to thrive and sustain. However, focusing on a better understanding of the network and ecologies that inhabit each place and city allows for a more distinctive and grounded approach to the value they create and

how they can become more sustainable or inclusive. Ecological perspectives are also becoming increasingly central on how policy can engage with the sector (Gross et al. 2020). In particular, it is essential to question who has the power to shape creative economies and their policies. Research conducted by members of the DISCE team demonstrates the need – and emerging possibilities – for more participatory approaches to leadership and governance within creative economies, which can be based on more participatory and inclusive processes of data collection but also policy deliberation in cities and communities (Wilson & Gross, 2017; Gross & Wilson, 2018).

Place, mobility and education: opportunities for creative development

Within broader networks and ecologies, the role played by education in connecting creatives and communities to place and creating opportunities for mobility and exchange is pivotal. As discussed by Comunian et al. (2022) higher education can play multiple roles in supporting local creative economies and their development. This also has broader implications in connection to ideas of inclusivity and sustainability. Wilson and Gross (2017) highlight three over-arching concerns that rethink "inclusive and sustainable growth" from the perspective of a Human Development approach (Sen, 2001; Nussbaum, 2011), and which have important implications for our understanding of employment and skills development in the CCI sector beyond human capital and talent (Comunian et al. 2020). Firstly, the pipeline for those working in the sector is determined, in part, by the cultural opportunity, freedom or "capability" each and every person actually has (or not) to give form and value to their experiences and to co-create culture. This is an opportunity, freedom, or "capability" (Sen, 2001; Nussbaum, 2011) that is by no means universal. Second, this freedom is supported at a collective level (across families, friendships, networks, organisations and industries) by the level of cultural care or "solidarity" available from others to develop the interests, skills and behaviours required for professional practice. Thirdly, given the ecological nature of the sector, employment and relevant skills development is contingent on the cultural connectivity that characterises any local, regional or national cultural ecosystems. This is important for widening notions of "creative careers" beyond those in full- or part-time employment in the creative and cultural industries (Brook et al. 2020; Brooks and Comunian, 2018).

Ideas of growth, development and value

Recent research has focused on the relationship between culture and development. The relationship between culture and development needs to be put under scrutiny: some commentators focus on culture for development, others culture in development, and others still, culture as development (Dessein et al. 2015). Wilson et. al (2020) identify three underlying conceptual and methodological "needs" in furthering our knowledge of inclusive and sustainable creative economies and their relationship with cultural development: (1) to develop new understandings of the "economy", the "creative economy" and "sustainable" economic development in the context of increased attention, globally, towards development,

sustainability, prosperity, climate change, and human use of finite natural resources; (2) to question how values are recognised at the collective level, and how this recognition impacts – and is impacted by – people's experiences of value. Specifically, questioning what gets valued, by whom, and what kinds of (overlapping) systems of value recognition are in place at local, regional, national, and international levels and (3) to take an ecological/systemic and 'inclusive' approach to the creative economy.

Whilst the notion of "cultural development" is used in specific ways by some researchers and policymakers, the overall discursive space of "culture and development" is exceptionally fuzzy, with different actors relating "culture" and "development" in quite different (and often conceptually hazy) ways. By drawing attention to processes of valuation – including the experience of value – as integral to what culture comprises, Wilson et al. (2020) aim to provide a new way of understanding what "cultural development" consists of, that can go some way towards cutting through the current thicket of terms. Wilson (2020) argues that culture can best be understood as involving both the systems we collectively put in place for recognising value, and our experiencing value(s) for ourselves. As well as moving the focus beyond the unhelpful polarisation of culture as "arts and heritage" or as our "entire way of life", this theorisation challenges the dominant focus on the narrative of cultural values, and suggests the need to turn our attention instead towards processes of valuing.

The emerging importance of care in creative economies

Within recent academic work (Wilson, 2018 and Gross, 2018), attention is directed towards care as a promising alternative analytical lens through which to understand how inclusive and sustainable creative economies could be developed in practice. Wilson et al. (2020) argue that it is important to take due account of the reality of how people actually live their lives, i.e. with diverse caring responsibilities, which pull in competing directions, and which are largely invisibilised; and how creative economies function – in part, via practices of care. Central to the politics of care are questions of its distribution and visibility. Who undertakes the labour of care? How is this labour made visible (and invisible)? What kinds of value are afforded to care? By whom? Within DISCE we are examining these questions in the specific contexts of the creative economy. How, why and with what consequences does care operate within creative economies? Tronto characterises care as "a reaching out to something other than self [...] lead[ing] to some type of action" (Tronto, 1993: 102). Tronto provides a framework that can be applied to all social relations. As Tronto's work exemplifies, care ethics highlights ontological connectedness – humans, in their very being, are relational animals – in direct contrast to the accounts of the individuated, "rational" subject that underpin many liberal theories. Eva Feder Kittay uses the term "inevitable dependency" (2015) to illustrate the ubiquitous relevance of care need and care-giving. The care literature suggests that there is also a wider socio-economic argument to be made for establishing greater visibility for care as a matter of public policy. Some of the implications of these debates regarding care within creative economies are discussed in the final chapters of this book.

1.3 About this book

The book contains fifteen chapters from a multidisciplinary network involving academics from a range of disciplines and geographical contexts. Their contributions provide an engaging platform to unpack a range of critical issues in relation to the development of creative economies. The book is structured in four parts.

The first part, *Creative economies - challenging definitions and exploring new methods* explores criticalities and challenges in defining the creative economies, both from a quantitative statistical perspective but also as an area of policy interest. Furthermore, it proposes a reflection on new methodologies and approaches to research in the field that might open up opportunities to capture the complex cultural and creative ecosystems (de Bernard et al. 2021) that we study.

The second part, *Creative economies and entrepreneurship - rethinking inclusivity and business model* discusses a variety of ways in which entrepreneurship is present and visible in creative economies. By doing so, it expands the understanding of how entrepreneurship is connected with creative economies and how this could be better reflected in policies, particularly in cultural and educational policies in order to make the sector more sustainable and inclusive to entrepreneurial endeavours.

The third part, *Creative economies - focus on networks, place and mobilities*, explores more closely the role of networks, place and mobility. It challenges current assumptions and explores dynamics of attachment to a specific location in relation creative careers and higher education (Comunian and Gilmore, 2016). It explores how higher education has become a hub (Ashton and Comunian, 2019). The focus moves on networks, collaboration and the importance of places but also the importance to reflect on creative work from a range of perspectives from the statistical (Dent et al. 2020) to the self-reflective experience of individuals in the sector (Dent, 2020; Schraff 2016).

In the final part, *Creative economies Re-imagined* offers insights on the possibility to re-imagine *creative economies to be more inclusive and sustainable*. It builds on recent literature exploring an alternative understanding of growth against prevailing accounts that limit its understanding to "economic success". As Wilson et al. (2020), there are important interconnections to be made with opportunities for human development and cultural development (Sen, 2001), cultural democracy and freedom (Wilson and Gross, 2017) and care and hope (Wilson 2019; Gross 2019).

Part I: Creative economies - challenging definitions and exploring new methods

The first part of the book includes four chapters that reflect on the definitional challenges in capturing creative economies. It also introduces new quantitative tools to investigate them with a spatial focus. Although these chapters highlight the specificities of different methods,

policies and countries, they all agree on the importance of an inclusive definition and place-specific understanding of creative economies.

In the second chapter, *Modular solutions and creative coding* **Scott Brook** focuses on the development of creative and cultural industries in Australia both from a policy and a statistical mapping framework. He argues that the new statistical framework has brought the creative economy into existence as an experimental policy object. Within the broad framework, it was important that specific challenging economic concepts were included in the discussion on one side the vision of creativity as a human capital able to foreground the importance of innovation and automation-resistant human skills; on the other the fact that cultural activities can be framed as goods and services that are outputs to a publicly valued industry. However, within the policy "success" of this newly established framework in Australia, Brook highlights the disconnect between the CCIs discourse and statistical measures and higher education policies. In particular, the challenges of connecting courses to labour market outcomes and the overall role higher education can and should play in developing CCIs.

In the third chapter *On GIS and the Creative Economy* **Manfredi de Bernard, Roberta Comunian and Federica Viganò** reflect on the use of geographical information systems (GIS) in relation to the creative economy. They map past research and reflections on the value of GIS approaches to the creative economy field, assessing opportunities and challenges. By conducting a systematic and critical literature review to map the main approaches and contributions to this method in connection with the study of the creative economy, they prove the increased interest in exploring spatiality and spatial dynamics. In addition, they use a small research project mapping the craft economies of a rural mountain valley (Val Gardena, Italy) to consider the implications of doing GIS research in practice. The literature review, together with the results of a small project, highlights the distinctive value of GIS methods but also the value of integrating it with other research methods.

In the fourth chapter, *Using social network analysis* **Jon Sword** examines how social network analysis (SNA) can be used to understand the creative industries. It highlights how networks are crucial to the effective functioning of the creative and cultural industries (CCIs). Decades of research have highlighted this importance for activities across the value chain. SNA offers the opportunity to schematically and visually explore connections between different agents in the CCIs. It can also help analyse and understand how networks are formed, relationships between individuals and other groups of nodes, and statistically identify connected communities. The chapter explores the different ways in which SNA has been applied to the study of CCIs by reviewing current academic and grey literature. A more detailed application of SNA research is provided that uses data on UK creative companies to explore how they define their activities using Standard Industrial Classification codes. In so doing, the chapter highlights some of the challenges and limitations of applying SNA to the CCIs.

In the final chapter, *Measuring Creative and Cultural Industries* **Alessandro Crociata and Chiara Burlina** explore the challenging issue in measuring creative economy by means of cultural and creative industries (CCIs). They argue that it is essential to develop a more

comprehensive and systematic understanding of CCIs within a taxonomies background with mobile definitional boundaries. A key step towards this direction is providing robust evidence about CCIs' definitions and measurement by using available statistical information concerning the European creative economy. In the chapter, different sources are used to consider information on CCIs at the Country level. Some data are also present at regional (NUTS2) and province (NUTS3) level. At the city, level is difficult to have finer grain observations and there is a lack of proper monitoring tools in this spatial unit of analysis. A scholarly debate on composite indices is articulated. The authors also consider new challenges presented by impact metrics as they become more and more relevant in terms of rethinking inclusive and sustainable growth for the creative economy. Some composite indices have been already built and discussed but, given the complexity of cultural production and consumption processes and the heterogeneity of players involved, suitable and comparable data is still missing.

Part II: Creative economies and entrepreneurship - rethinking inclusivity and business models

Narrowing down from the definitional and statistical issues of creative economics, the second part of the book includes three chapters that focus on the phenomenon of entrepreneurship in creative economies. In creative economies, it is common to work as a freelancer or an entrepreneur (Ball et al. 2010). Creative entrepreneurs oftentimes work on a small scale and on a part-time basis (Kohn and Wewel, 2018), combing self-employment with paid employment simultaneously (Hennekam and Bennett, 2016). However, profit-seeking behaviour may be remote for creative entrepreneurs who rather focus on their meaningful and creative work beyond its economic rationale (Brown et al., 2010). There is no one or right way to "do" entrepreneurship and earn one's living in creative economies, but the variety of examples discussed in the three chapters demonstrate the diversity of the phenomenon of entrepreneurship, particularly in creative economies.

Nuancing existing studies which focus on creative entrepreneurship, in the sixth chapter, *Experiences of belonging to the creative economy*, **Lenita Nieminen and Arja Lemmetyinen** explore how creative and cultural micro-entrepreneurs experience belonging to the local creative economy or whether they identify more with the creative place brand. The study focuses specifically on the micro-entrepreneurs' social embeddedness in the entrepreneurial process comprising social structures and entrepreneurial networks. Using phenomenological interviews with four entrepreneurs in the areas of heritage, art, design, and creative services, the study applies Wenger's community of practice approach as a lens in the narrative analysis. From the research, it emerges that entrepreneurship as such was not the primary feature defining their identity, but the micro-entrepreneurs described themselves as artists or art lovers. Furthermore, they did not associate themselves or their enterprises with the creative place brand. The studied micro-entrepreneurs represent a typical mundane or everyday entrepreneurship with a variety of motivations other than the economic.

In the seventh chapter, *Cultural Entrepreneurship*, **Annette Naudin** asserts the need to study cultural entrepreneurship and related policies in an environment with high levels of population diversity. By drawing on a series of policy interventions aimed at cultural entrepreneurs from diverse ethnic backgrounds, the study focuses on the challenges and opportunities for policymakers who seek to address inequalities in the cultural workforce. There is growing evidence of injustices in arts, media, and cultural work in the UK, which point to systemic inequalities (O'Brien and Oakley, 2015) and poor representation within cultural labour markets (Saha, 2017). The case study reflects on a series of localised cultural policy initiatives that highlight: a) the role of cultural intermediaries; b) place and the hyperlocal context; and c) problems with using terms such as "diverse" to describe inequalities. Naudin highlights that cultural entrepreneurs do not operate in a vacuum, and local policymakers need to appreciate the connections between super-diverse communities, locality, structure and the values which underpin these relationships.

In the eighth chapter, *Creative entrepreneurship in 2021 and beyond*, **Ruth Bridgstock** builds upon her earlier conceptual article "Not a dirty word: arts entrepreneurship and higher education" (2013), which highlighted that all creative practitioners are entrepreneurs and creative entrepreneurship can be understood in a way which is congruent with the creative ethos. Bridgstock takes the 2013 article as a base and explores how thinking and practice in creative entrepreneurship have changed and developed over the last decade due to networks and the fourth industrial age, and what implications the changes have for creative education. The study presents the ways in which entrepreneurship is a central part of creative practice, namely enterprise, new venture creation and career self-management. It also highlights that successful creative entrepreneurship is nuanced and individualised and develops and changes over time through experience. Therefore, Bridgstock argues that a challenge for creative entrepreneurship educators in the twenty-first century is currency and relevance. In addition, she suggests that it is equally important to foster creative entrepreneurship literacy and thus support learners to make informed and value-congruent choices about their creative careers

Part III: Creative economies - focus on networks, place and mobilities

Broadening the focus from individual entrepreneurs, the four chapters in the third section consider the complex and integrated nature of creative work and the networks and ecology that take place in different locations. Here creative workers (or aspiring creatives) are identified and understood with respect to how they contribute to multiple and overlapping networks and ecologies. While they cultivate a career and work, they also develop opportunities for cultural production, creative intermediation and local creative ecologies that facilitate further collaboration but also shape specific geographical context as supportive to future creative workers and creative economies. Beyond being containers or landscapes of creativity, specific spaces are able to support, encourage as well as provide opportunities for development for creative economies. The chapters in this part of the book illustrate the importance of specificity and scale and contribute perspectives from a range of geographical contexts and experiences.

In the ninth chapter *This must be the place* **Fabrizio Montanari, Lorenzo Mizzau, Damiano Razzoli and Stefano Rodighiero** question the connections between place and creative workers using the case studies of Reggio Emilia in Italy. They explore what features of the specific urban contexts are seen by the local creative workers as enabling factors and which ones are perceived as inhibiting their work. The paper uses qualitative interviews with creative workers to illustrate how the life of individual creatives and their work interact within the context of the city and how important dimension of quality of life, place-based identity and local networks add to the attachment and subjective connections of creative workers with their city. The authors highlight how this could be also particularly important for creatives as they start their careers in a specific location and for which the need of support and belonging in local networks might be more important. They also suggest that this might also have implications in consideration of the impact of Covid-19 on cities and potential move and mobility of creatives between metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas.

Further nuancing our understanding of early stages of creative careers is the tenth chapter *Crafting Professionals* by **Lauren England**. England provides an interesting reflection on how spatial and social dynamics can influence the higher education (HE) experience and professional development, focusing specifically on crafts students. She analyses the literature on networks in creative career development and the role of place in educational contexts, and draws from interviews with crafts educators and students from four HE providers in England conducted between 2016-2018. England considers place and educators the two key and connected mediators of networks within craft HE. She discusses opportunities and challenges for professional network development and argues that educators' role as network brokers and mediators, combined with geographical exposure, influences students' identification of potential career pathways. The chapter concludes with reflection on the role of networks in early craft career development and the implications of their spatial and social mediation, including the potential for regional socio-economic inequalities and barriers to accessing craft careers to be reinforced.

In the following chapter *Emerging spatial relations of artists and art scenes*, **Silvie Jacobi** explores further the connections between education and place. She focuses explicitly on the location choice, place engagements and mobility dynamics of art school students and graduates in the cities of Manchester and Leipzig. The chapter firstly highlights the importance of place within creative industries research as interconnected and relational phenomena and questions the reliance on talent attraction and sector clusters to make a successful creative city. Secondly, Jacobi considers what practices are developed in understanding the formation of a sense of place and spatial relations in the art world. Key literature is introduced to allow for better positioning of the research question and subject area contemporary art and the art world within the field of creative cities and regions, after which place concepts and theories are introduced to detail from what theoretical perspective empirical findings were analysed. After outlining case study contexts, Jacobi discusses in the empirical section similarities and differences between the cases Manchester and Leipzig and their respective art schools, with the aim to summarise key findings and analyse them in their significance for understanding

geographical dynamics of the art world as an example of mobilities in creative work and networks.

In the twelfth chapter *Exploring contemporary visual arts careers*, **Jessica Tanghetti** considers the case study of contemporary visual artists (CVA) in Italy instead. She explores patterns within the early stages of their career. Careers in the creative sector have been widely investigated for their peculiarities and unstable structures. However, the work of contemporary visual artists has not received much attention. Careers in CVA are the result of a multitude of social, personal and professional factors, including country of origin, education, networks and mobility. Based on the existing literature and previous work done in the field, the study builds on a longitudinal analysis of the career pathways of emerging contemporary visual artists in Italy. More specifically, the study analyses the relation between the *curricula vitae* (CV) of artists and career progress, considering together education, professional experiences, networks and mobility. In doing so, attention is also placed on the role played by gender and geographical and mobility aspects in providing opportunities for CVA at the start of their careers.

Part IV: Creative economies Re-imagined

The four chapters that comprise Part IV offer various complementary takes on the need to re-imagine creative economies to be more inclusive and sustainable.

In the thirteenth chapter *Re-futuring creative economies*, **Mark Banks** argues that the capitalist foundations of economic life remain the foundational premises of current 'creative economy' policy. Moreover, such policy lacks *any* explicitly environmental or (wider) ecological priorities or perspectives. As he observes, in an era of unfolding and urgent crises, 'such a lack seems – to say the least – both inadequate and inappropriate.' Banks laments how orthodox narratives of creative economy have come to fix a set of *banal utopian imaginaries* across political and civic institutions. Such imaginaries secure existing arrangements of power and inequality and close down the possibilities of other more progressive forms of creative economy coming into being. For Banks, the most orthodox imaginaries of the creative economy appear to be instrumentally and artificially narrowing the range of possible ways of thinking about culture, economy, technology and ways of being human. As he puts it, they are in danger of 'defuturing the future'. But there is some hope. In the face of *de*-futuring we must look to *re*-future - rejecting the authority of the already prescribed future-present in order to rethink the fundamental categories we live by. In this respect, Banks suggests that the creative economies of tomorrow might serve us better if they drew more on heterodox, feminist and ecological social and economic thought.

This is a cue taken up in the next chapter (fourteen) in which **Tamsyn Dent** focuses on forms of *Inclusive solidarity* and collective mobilisation that emerge as forms of resistance within the UK creative economy. We move from 'bad dreams' to the very real lived experience of working in the UK creative economy and groups of "creative workers" responses to the labour conditions they face in the neoliberal economy. Here processes of re-imagining are being undertaken by and through creative workers working in solidarity with each other. The processes of resistance

reported on constitute a vital part of what any inclusive and sustainable creative economy *is*. They respond to questions of inequality that are inclusive and holistic and which transcend individual personal experience. The model of mutual aid and changemaking introduced in this chapter draws particular attention to the "dissonance" between a politically celebrated economically resilient creative economy and precarious "harmful" nature of the creative labour people actually do. The transformative role of the participants that Dent interviews as part of the Developing Inclusive and Sustainable Creative Economies (DISCE) research project is cast as being different from other forms of "activism": they are not process-oriented; they identify as organisers, not activists; they are themselves precariously positioned. What is highlighted here is the resistance and solidarity of "changemakers" acting from within the workforce.

In the fifteenth chapter *Growth of What? New Narratives for the Creative Economy, Beyond GDP*, **Jonathan Gross** asks "how do we know when creative economies are doing well?" He provides a historical overview of the creative industries and their young sibling, the creative economy, in the UK, and how these have been defined and measured. The story that the creative economy has sought to enable is one of growth – the growth of the creative industries. As Gross explores, however, many difficulties with this ensue. In keeping with Banks' call for re-futuring creative economy discourse, Gross suggests that interventions can usefully be made "upstream" – by challenging the problems of GDP and its position within prevailing neoliberal economic discourse and by asking questions of growth: "growth of what?" One answer to this question that Gross draws the reader's attention to is Kate Raworth's "doughnut economics". Another is Amartya Sen's alternative economic narrative framework: *Development as Freedom*. Sen's capability approach to human development is introduced as a compelling underpinning to a new way to think about and position cultural policy. The chapter introduces Gross's research in the Developing Inclusive and Sustainable Creative Economies (DISCE) project that uses the capability approach to reconceptualise accounts of cultural opportunity (implicit and explicit) within existing cultural policy. It is argued that real-world experiments in developing alternative narratives for public policy will be crucial if research offering new ways to understand the "success" of creative economies is going to make a sustained difference at scale. In short – we need new stories.

In the final chapter, **Nick Wilson** takes up this challenge by first asking the rather awkward question: *What is the creative economy – really?* As a spur for looking forwards, and an exercise in re-imagination, he suggests we don't actually know what it is now. At the same time, and in keeping with the book's overall theme of offering a "modern guide to creative economies" Wilson situates his argument within the long durée of historical time; this sets up a critique of the limited ways in which "creativity" has become commoditised. Instead of focusing on a blinkered commoditisation of creativity, Wilson's re-imagined creative economy is one where we manage the resources required to enable "cultural capability" – the freedom to recognise what we have reason to value. Attention is drawn to experiential, artful and axiological capabilities that are essential in developing our freedoms to undertake practices of valuing. These are central constituents of a Cultural Development Framework being developed within the DISCE project.

Each of the contributors to this last part of the book would agree that the job of those involved in re-imagining creative economies, be they critical, creative economy scholars, policymakers, activists, organisers, or creative workers, is not simply to make alternative and better futures apparent, but to contribute positively to their progressive imagining and building. With so many big crises in the world, it might be easy to see why re-imagining creative economies is not at the top of policymakers "to do" lists. But the job of re-futuring highlighted here is urgent and pressing. As a wise person once said – "there is no time"; the future is now.

References

- Ashton, D., & Comunian, R. (2019). Universities as creative hubs: Modes and practices in the UK context. *Creative Hubs in Question*, 359-379.
- Bakhshi, H., Freeman, A., & Higgs, P. (2013). A dynamic mapping of the UK's creative industries.
- Ball, L., Pollard, E. & Stanley, N. (2010). *Creative Graduates, Creative Futures*. London: Council for Higher Education in Art and Design.
- Brennan-Horley, C., Luckman, S., Gibson, C., & Willoughby-Smith, J. (2010). GIS, ethnography, and cultural research: Putting maps back into ethnographic mapping. *The Information Society*, 26(2), 92-103.
- Bridgstock, R. (2013), Not a dirty word: arts entrepreneurship and higher education, *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education*, 12 (2-3), 122–137
- Brokalaki, Z., & Comunian, R. (2021). Beyond the hype: Art and the city in economic crisis. *City*, 25(3-4), 396-418.
- Brook, S., Comunian, R., Jewell, S., & Lee, J. Y. (2020). More than a day job, a fair job: music graduate employment in education. *Music Education Research*, 22(5), 541-554.
- Brook, S., & Comunian, R. (2018). "Dropping out and working": The vocational narratives of creative graduates. In *The Palgrave Handbook of Creativity at Work* (pp. 125-141). Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.
- Brown, J., Nadler, R., & Meczynski, M. (2010). Working on the Edge? Creative Jobs in Birmingham, Leipzig and Poznan. In Musterd S., Murie A. (Eds.), *Making competitive cities*. Wiley-Blackwell, Oxford: 208–232.

Comunian, R. (2019) "Complexity thinking as a coordinating theoretical framework for creative industries research". A Research Agenda for Creative Industries. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing. 39-57

Comunian, R., Faggian, A., & Li, Q. C. (2010). Unrewarded careers in the creative class: The strange case of bohemian graduates. *Papers in regional science*, 89(2), 389-410.

Comunian, R., & Alexiou, K. (2015). 14 Mapping the Complexity of Creative Practice. *Cultural Mapping as Cultural Inquiry*, 276.

Comunian, R., Hracz, B. J., & England, L. (2021). Understanding and Supporting Creative Economies in Africa: Education, Networks and Policy: A policy report. King's College, London.

Available at:

https://kclpure.kcl.ac.uk/portal/files/159173745/Understanding_Supporting_Creative_Economies_Africa.pdf

Comunian, R., & England, L. (2020). Creative and cultural work without filters: Covid-19 and exposed precarity in the creative economy. *Cultural Trends*, 29(2), 112-128.

Comunian R, England, L., Faggian, A. and Mellander, C. (2022) *The Economics of Talent*. Springer

Comunian, R., & England, L. E. (2018). Creative regions: from creative place-making to creative human capital. In *Handbook on the Geographies of Regions and Territories* (p. 169). Edward Elgar.

Comunian, R., Hracz, B. J., & England, L. (Eds.). (2020). *Higher Education and Policy for Creative Economies in Africa: Developing Creative Economies*. Routledge.

de Bernard M., Comunian R. and Gross J. (2021) Cultural and creative ecosystems: a review of theories and methods, towards a new research agenda, *Cultural Trends*, DOI: [10.1080/09548963.2021.2004073](https://doi.org/10.1080/09548963.2021.2004073)

Dent, T., Comunian, R., Conroy, B., Pica V., Wilson N. and Burlina, C. (2020) *Creative and Cultural Workforce in Europe Statistics Report*. DISCE Publications. Published Online: <https://disce.eu/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/DISCE-Report-D3.2.b.pdf>

De Beukelaer, C. (2015). *Developing cultural industries: Learning from the palimpsest of practice*. European Cultural Foundation.

Dent, T. (2020). Devalued women, valued men: motherhood, class and neoliberal feminism in the creative media industries. *Media, Culture & Society*, 42(4), 537-553.

Dessein, J., Soini, K., Fairclough, G., Horlings, L., Battaglini, E., Birkeland, I., Duxbury, N., De Beukelaer, C., Matejić, J., Stylianou-Lambert, T. and Mihailova, M., 2015. *Culture in, for and as sustainable*

development: Conclusions from the COST Action IS1007 Investigating Cultural Sustainability.
University of Jyväskylä.

Dodd, S., Anderson, A. & Jack, S. (2021). Let them not make me a stone – repositioning entrepreneurship. *Journal of Small Business Management*, doi:10.1080/00472778.2020.1867734

Dovey, J., Moreton, S., Sparke, S., & Sharpe, B. (2016). The practice of cultural ecology: Network connectivity in the creative economy. *Cultural Trends*, 25(2), 87-103.

Greene, C., Ramster, G., Alexiou, K., Zamenopoulos, T., Alevizou, G., Outten, A., & Gorzanelli, C. (2013). Creative communities, creative assets: Exploring methods of mapping community assets. *Nordes*, 1(5).

Gross, J. D. (2020). The Birth of the creative industries revisited: An oral history of the 1998 DCMS mapping document. Available
[https://kclpure.kcl.ac.uk/portal/files/125010567/Gross J. 2020 The Birth of the Creative Industries Revisited.pdf](https://kclpure.kcl.ac.uk/portal/files/125010567/Gross_J._2020_The_Birth_of_the_Creative_Industries_Revisited.pdf)

Gross, J., Heinonen, J., Burlina, C., Comunian, R., Conor, B., Crociata, A., Dent, T., Guardans, I., Hytti, U., Hytönen, K. and Pica, V., (2020). *Managing Creative Economies as Cultural Ecosystems*.

Gross, J. (2019) Practices of hope: care, narrative and cultural democracy. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*

Gross, J., Comunian, R., Conor, B., Dent, T., Heinonen, J., Hytti, U., Hytönen, K., Pukkinen, T., Stenholm, P., and Wilson, N. (2019) DISCE Case Study Framework. DISCE Publications. Published online: <https://disce.eu/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/DISCE-Report-D3.1-D4.1-D5.1.pdf>

Gross, J., & Wilson, N. (2020). Cultural democracy: an ecological and capabilities approach. *International journal of cultural policy*, 26(3), 328-343.

Jacobi, S., & Comunian, R. (2015). Resilience, creative careers and creative spaces: bridging vulnerable artist's livelihoods and adaptive urban change. In *Resilient territories: Innovation and creativity for new modes of regional development*. Cambridge Scholar Press.

Hargreaves, I., and Hartley, J. (2016). *The Creative Citizen Unbound: How social media and DIY culture contribute to democracy, communities and the creative economy*. Bristol: Policy Press

Higgs, P., Cunningham, S., & Bakhshi, H. (2008). Beyond the creative industries: Mapping the creative economy in the United Kingdom.

Kittay, E. F. (2015) Centring justice on dependency and recovering freedom. *Hypatia* 30(1).

Kohn, K. & Wewel, S. (2018). Skills, Scope and Success: An Empirical Look at the Start-Up Process in Creative Industries in Germany. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 27(3), 295-318.

Martin, L., & Wilson, N. (Eds.). (2018). *The Palgrave Handbook of Creativity at Work*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Naudin, A. (2018). *Cultural Entrepreneurship. The cultural worker's experience of entrepreneurship*. Routledge Studies in Entrepreneurship. Routledge Taylor & Francis Group: London and New York.

Nussbaum, M. C. (2011). *Creating Capabilities*. Boston: Harvard University Press

O'Brien, D. and Oakley, K. (2015), Cultural Value and Inequality: A Critical Literature Review. Available at <https://ahrc.ukri.org/documents/project-reports-and-reviews/cultural-value-and-inequality-a-critical-literature-review/>

Saha, Anamik (2017), *Race and the Cultural Industries*. Cambridge: Polity Press

Sen, A. (2001). *Development as Freedom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Scharff, C. (2016). The psychic life of neoliberalism: Mapping the contours of entrepreneurial subjectivity. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 33(6), 107-122.

Tronto, J. (1993) *Moral Boundaries: A Political Argument for an Ethic of Care*. New York: Routledge

UNDP and UNESCO (2013) *Creative Economy Report: Widening Local Development Pathways*. Paris: UNDP/UNESCO

Welter, F., Baker, T., Audretsch, D. B., & Gartner, W. B. (2017). Everyday Entrepreneurship—A Call for Entrepreneurship Research to Embrace Entrepreneurial Diversity. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 3(41), 311-321.

Wiesand, A. J., & Söndermann, M. (2005). *The "creative Sector": An Engine for Diversity, Growth, and Jobs in Europe*. European cultural foundation.

Wilson N, Gross J, Dent T, et al. (2020) Rethinking Inclusive and Sustainable Growth for the Creative Economy: A Literature Review. Available at: <https://disce.eu/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/DISCEReport-D5.2.pdf>

Wilson, N. (2018) Creativity at work: Who cares? Towards an ethics of creativity. In *The Palgrave Handbook of Creativity at Work*. L. Martin and N. Wilson (eds.). Springer. Chapter 30

Wilson, N. & Gross, J. (2017) *Caring for Cultural Freedom: An ecological approach to supporting young people's cultural learning*. London: A New Direction.

Wilson, N., Gross, J. & Bull, A. (2017) *Towards Cultural Democracy: Promoting Cultural Capabilities for Everyone*. London: King's College London.

¹ The editors would like to acknowledge the European Union Horizon 2020 funded project DISCE (Developing Inclusive and Sustainable Creative Economies), grant agreement N. 822314 for the opportunity to develop further some of the ideas presented in this book introduction and in general for the opportunity it offered to international exchange and collaboration between the editors. We also acknowledge the exchanges and input that the project teams across the three institutions with which the editors are affiliated namely King's College London (United Kingdom), Gran Sasso Science Institute (Italy) and University of Turku (Finland) .

² Here we consider specifically the start of the debate about the economic value of creative industries as coinciding with the first DCMS (Department of Culture, Media and Sport) 'Creative Industries Mapping Document' launched in 1998 in UK. However, we acknowledge similar and connected research was also pre-existing under the umbrella term of 'cultural industries'.