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Chapter 1

“Birds of a feather...”

Introduction
INTRODUCTION

Creative cities, creative class, creative industries

“Societies the world over are facing enormous challenges today. The economic crisis has left its mark on them. Their populations are ageing; and the fossil fuels on which they run are becoming scarcer. Population growth has put pressure on the quality of life, infrastructure and environmental quality of cities worldwide. But there is good news too. The Netherlands is actively helping to face these global challenges. Innovativeness and creativity – both crucial factors in our response to the issues facing society – are innate to the Dutch. [...] Creativity and innovation are superbly combined in the creative industries” (Erp, Slot, Rutten, Zuurmond, & Németh, 2014).

This quote from the former Dutch Minister of Education, Culture and Science and Minister of Economic Affairs in the report Designing a Country\(^1\) leaves little to the imagination. The Netherlands is thought to possess the power to resolve global challenges by means of the innovative creative industries. Indeed, the creative and cultural industries are booming, and not only for their presumed societal impact. Newspapers and policy reports on regional, national and international level all aim to tap into the wealth the cultural and creative sectors ought to bring. While the Western economies since the early 2000s have witnessed periods of steep decline, most cultural and creative economy related figures demonstrated continuing growth (see e.g. the Creative Economy Reports of UNCTAD – the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development). As such, these industries are incorporating an increased segment of the overall economy (Bontje, Musterd, Kovács, & Murie, 2011; Fleischmann, Daniel, & Welters, 2017; Koops & Rutten, 2017) and are employing an ever growing number of individuals (Koops & Rutten, 2017).

\(^{1}\) Issued by the Dutch Ministry of Education, Culture and Science.
This peak in interest in the cultural and creative industries emerged parallel to the advent of explicit creative industries policies in the recent three decades. From the onset of this creative industries mania, these economic and policy considerations have been explicitly connected to spatial settings, most importantly within the urban context and ‘the art of city making’ (Landry, 2006). In the 1990s, the focus was mainly on flagship projects such as the Guggenheim museum in Bilbao or, closer to home, the Kunsthall in Rotterdam (Mommaas, 2004). In contrast, and partly in relation to severe cutbacks on culture, the period from approximately the 2000s has been characterised first and foremost by the notion of the entrepreneurial, creative city² (Bianchini & Landry, 1995; Landry, 2000; Cooke & Lazzarotti, 2008) and more recently the resurgence of the urban start-up, co-working or maker movements (Capdevila, 2014; Fiorentino, 2018; Merkel, 2015; Moriset, 2013). For urban policies, the catalyst of this creative city debate has been the famous The Rise of the Creative Class publication (Florida, 2002), which sealed the bonds between place, creative production and innovation. Clusters³ of creative industries became the vehicle of post-modern innovation, as well as the post-Fordist solution to declining urban economies (Bille & Schulze, 2006; Lash & Urry, 1994; Zukin, 1995).

² The ‘creative city’ as a policy concept emerged in the mid-1990s and was popularised around 2000. Yet, its meaning has remained exceptionally fuzzy, with the concept changing its meaning throughout the years. In its earliest formulation, ‘creativity’ denoted an approach to understand how creativity helps cities to innovate and solve their problems. In the more recent conceptualisations, it was increasingly tied to cities in which the creative industries were supported and flourishing (Montgomery, 2005). A final interpretation is strongly driven by Florida’s (2002) notion of the creative class, whose presence was supposed to determine the city’s economic success (Comunian, 2011). In either case, and contrary to the co-working and maker movements, such policies were mostly top-down implemented measures to reach economic goals.

³ Clusters are, in the words of Porter (2000), “geographic concentrations of interconnected companies, specialized suppliers, service providers, firms in related industries, and associated institutions […] in a particular field that compete but also cooperate” (p. 15). In this dissertation, the term cluster is primarily used for small-scale clusters, creative business centres or co-working spaces. Clusters in the terminology of Porter, however, range from very small to encompassing several countries.
Reinterpreting innovation

In line with the emergence of the creative industries, creative cities, the creative class and creative clusters, the conception of innovation has changed too. While traditionally innovation was understood to involve goal-driven, corporate-led and top-down endeavours, more recent interpretations of innovation point towards new bottom-up developed initiatives as pursued by the metropolitan oriented makers movement (Fiorentino, 2018). The traditional approaches, preoccupied with investing in research and development (R&D) and the development of new technologies, have generally been a poor fit to the creative industries, which rarely consider their innovative pursuits as efficient investments in technologies in order to generate novelty (Benghozi & Salvador, 2016; Protogerou, Kontolaimou, & Caloghirou, 2017), but rather as “those creative efforts that strike the market as unusually distinctive, satisfying, and/or productive in opening new ground” (Caves, 2000, p. 202).

Nevertheless, these industries are highly dependent on the creation of original and novel works of art, products and services (C. Jones, Svejenova, Pedersen, & Townley, 2016) with their innovation residing mostly in aesthetic properties (semiotic codes) and material bases (C. Jones, Lorenzen, & Sapsed, 2015; see also Stoneman, 2009). Equally important in this regard are the creative industries’ persisting structural characteristics, such as the dominance of freelance, project-based work and informal networks. These characteristics have a tremendous influence on how and what kind of novelties are produced (e.g. ranging from a typical new game (Stoneman, 2009) to something ‘new to the field’ (Castañer & Campos, 2002) such as a crowdfunding revenue model (Protogerou et al., 2017; Jaw, Chen, & Chen, 2012). It is especially in agglomerative settings, such as creative clusters or, having gained momentum over the last decade, the co-working space, where such innovative capabilities are thought to come to fruition (Capdevila, 2015; Schmidt, Brinks, & Brinkhoff, 2014; Mariotti, Pacchi, & Vita, 2017).

As such, contrary to the persisting romantic myth of the individual artistic genius (Bilton, 2013; Bourdieu, 1993; Hes-
Unfolding the knot of innovation in the creative industries

Evidently, this convergence of cities and place, the creative industries and innovation, has sparked a great number of expectations, assumptions, but also questions. How can we consider and operationalise innovation in a setting in which traditional measures are strikingly absent? (How) does place contribute to such innovations? What do creative workers gain from flocking together? By exploring ten collaborative creative workplaces in the Netherlands, this dissertation delves into this intersection of place, creative work and innovation and aims to dissect how place-based affordances affect creative workers and potentially contribute to their innovativeness. In this sense, this dissertation pays due attention to the situatedness of creative production in acknowledging the vicinity and networks of peers and support systems, and the spatial contexts in which these agents operate. With this situatedness, I refer to what Pratt (2011) and Pratt, Gill and Spelthann (2007) see as a sensitivity to the local institutional, social, geographical and regulatory contexts, but also to the idea that what is recognised as creative or innovative resides not just in individual minds, but especially in industrial, social and cultural contexts (Belussi & Sedita, 2008; Potts, Hartley, et al., 2008; see also Sunley, Pinch, & Reimer, 2011).

I thus perceive, in line with Bourdieu (1986, 1993), creative production as a field with economic, social, cultural and symbolic capital shaping work and social practices, taking place...
in various milieus, forging enduring connections, conventions and forms of mutual influence and experimentation (Bottero & Crossley, 2011).

**Proximity as a proxy for innovation**

Recently, collaborative workplaces have risen to the public attention as new, highly innovative and entrepreneurial milieus (e.g. Capdevila, 2013; Niaros, Kostakis, & Drechsler, 2017; Parrino, 2015; Bouncken & Reuschl, 2018; Schmidt, 2019; Schmidt et al., 2014; Butcher, 2018 on co-working spaces, and e.g. Baptista & Swann, 1998; Bathelt, Malmberg, & Maskell, 2004; Chapain, Cooke, Propris, MacNeill, & Mateos-Garcia, 2010; Gordon & McCann, 2000; O’Connor, 2004 on creative clusters). These workplaces offer forms of cultural\(^4\), symbolic\(^5\) and social\(^6\) capital not available to creative workers otherwise, including the essential social elements required for collaborative forms of innovation particular to the creative industries (C. Jones et al., 2016; Pratt & Jeffcutt, 2009).

Interestingly yet not surprisingly, parallel to the emergence of the creative industries as a legitimate field, many cities witnessed the appearance and expansion of collaborative creative workplaces, such as cultural or creative clusters (Cooke & Lazzeretti, 2008; Turok, 2003), brownfields (Andres & Golubchikov, 2016), creative hubs (Evans, 2009; Virani et al., 2016), incubators (Ebbers, 2013), cultural quarters (Hitters & Richards, 2002; Mommaas, 2004), makerspaces (Niaros et al., 2017), open creative spaces (Schmidt, 2019), ‘breeding places’ (Peck, 2012) and nowadays particularly prominent: co-working spaces (Cap-\(\ldots\))

---

4 Referring to the “long-lasting dispositions of the mind and body” (embodied cultural capital), cultural goods (objectified cultural capital) and e.g. educational qualifications (institutionalised cultural capital) (Bourdieu, 1986, p. 17).

5 “Capital-in whatever form-insofar as it is represented, i.e., apprehended symbolically, in a relationship of knowledge or, more precisely, of misrecognition and recognition, presupposes the intervention of the habitus, as a socially constituted cognitive capacity” (Bourdieu, 1986, p. 27), or more concisely: the creative workers’ prestige or credibility within a social field (Bourdieu, 1993).

6 “The aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition” (Bourdieu, 1986, p. 21).
devila, 2015). What all have in common, though, is that they are business centres focussing on freelancers and small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) often operating in the cultural and creative industries.7

The extensive popularity of these (creative) collective workplaces has strongly influenced the way in which culture, the arts, the creative industries, as well as innovation and the modern city are debated until this very moment. A large number of nations, regions and cities have spent considerable effort on mapping these creative workers, as well as their workplaces, in spatial and economic charts (HKU, 2010; Lazzarette, Boix, & Capone, 2014; Cunningham & Higgs, 2009; Koops & Rutten, 2017; Bakhshi, Freeman, & Higgs, 2012; Department for Culture, Media and Sport [DCMS], 2001). Whereas these mapping exercises may provide an accurate view of the ‘what’, the ‘how’ or ‘why’ of the relationship between place, the creative industries and innovation remains largely uncovered. Yet, until today, a substantial amount of time and resources is spent on developing and operating such workplaces.

Paradoxes of co/working/spaces
These designated places facilitating co-location and collaboration, presently often conceived in the format of co-working spaces, are, quite literally, conceptualised as the nexus of this new interpretation of innovation. By conjoining the elements of co(llaboration), working and space, they are thought to allow new forms of (spatial) organisation that may contribute to sparking

---

7 This dissertation is concerned with designated spaces (ranging from one room to one or several buildings) housing freelancers and SMEs in the creative industries. As the many terms used for such settings indicate, and as I elaborate upon later in this chapter, there are many different flavours and configurations of such forms of organization. In the absence of a fitting ‘general’ term (I consider ‘clusters’ too broad and Schmidt’s (2019) proposed ‘open creative lab’ slightly too ‘lablike’ for much of the work in the creative industries), such spaces are most often referred to as collaborative or collective workplaces. However, I am also employing different terms in accordance to the literature I am engaging with. More specifically, when I am using the term co-working, I interpret this in a broader sense, including traditional co-working spaces, but also those spaces that can be defined as (creative) collective workplaces.
unplanned, serendipitous encounters and bottom-up collaborative initiatives (Jakonen, Kivinen, Salovaara, & Hirkman, 2017; Moriset, 2013; Waters-Lynch & Potts, 2017; Olma, 2016; Fabbri, 2016). Their setting as an intermediate organisation (meso-level) between the urban structures (macro-level) and the individual creative worker (micro-level) makes them a sociologically interesting phenomenon – connecting the interactions between 1] the city, its histories and built environment, 2] local and national urban and cultural policies and 3] (freelance) labour market conditions (see also Cohendet, Grandadam, & Simon, 2010; Lange & Schüßler, 2018).

However, this intermediary locus of such spaces also exposes their paradoxical nature. First, the ideology of creative industries innovation, embedded in the discourse of self-employed work and creative entrepreneurship – often loosely connected to the idea of mobile, self-organised, flexible and virtual work (Gandini, 2016; Jakonen et al., 2017; Ross, 2003) – seems to be at odds with the rediscovery of place as articulated in the clustering and co-working rhetoric. While the final decades of the twenty-first century have been characterised by a declining interest in place and the rise of a (digital) nomadic, no-collar (Ross, 2003) class of (tele)workers whose ties to traditional office environments have been irrefutably broken, the number of collaborative workplaces is rising dramatically (DESKMAG, 2019). Work can be and is increasingly done from home, non-places (Augé, 2008) and third places (Oldenburg, 1989). Yet, co-workers are willing to pay an (often substantial) fee renting a desk in a flexible workplace. How is it possible that place, at the same time, is both losing and gaining importance for creative work?

Second, the idea of ‘accelerated’ (or even staged (Goffman, 1959)) serendipity as a catalyst for innovation seems to stand in a remarkable contrast to the organised nature of such workplaces, usually quite curated, structured and imbued with rituals (Blagoev, Costas, & Kärreman, 2019; J. Brown, 2017; Butcher, 2018). If serendipity refers to something inherently unplanned, how can it be captured in specific socio-spatial settings? Of course, this idea is not novel, with e.g. Jacobs’ (1970) seminal thesis on
urban diversity yielding innovative activities having inspired urban policy makers for decades. Yet, where such spatial planning initiatives usually occur on the macro-level, co-working spaces aim to translate and organise this to a micro-management of encounters (Jakonen et al., 2017; see also Goffman, 1961).

**Persisting black boxes**

This leads to the overarching question of how co-location contributes to innovation for creative entrepreneurs and SMEs. Or, formulated differently, is it possible to disentangle how the different forms of capital creative workers are able to draw from both specific spatial characteristics as well as the vicinity of peers, competitors, potential collaborators, clients and networks contribute to innovation? The early and now classic publications of e.g. Storper (1995), Porter (2000) and Scott (2000) underlined the relevance of co-location for fostering innovation by stressing the importance of face-to-face contact, networking and project-based working (see also e.g. Grabher, 2004). Others, such as Molotch (1996, 2002) and Lloyd (2002) have pointed at the importance of place in terms of innovative identity and reputation. Moreover, despite digitalisation and increasing global connections (Cairncross, 1997; Castells, 1996; Urry, 2002), place has refrained from becoming obsolete (Drake, 2003) and is still charged with historical features and meaning, influencing practices of creative labour (Hutton, 2006; Smit, 2011).

However, does this now, thirty years past the emergence of the creative industries as a legitimate field (Cho, Liu, & Ho, 2018), mean that we have unravelled the black box of innovation (Pratt & Jeffcutt, 2009)? The short answer is: not quite. Assumptions about the innovative capabilities of creative workers, such as the idea that the creative industries are inherently innovative and that co-location induces individual and collective innovativeness, have been made, remade, refuted, recontextualised, proclaimed dead and returned to the living. Yet, fully grasping the workers’ experiences and innovative practices has remained both a blank spot and a Herculean task (Camelo-Ordaz, Fernández-Alles, Ruiz-Navarro, & Sousa-Ginel, 2012; Pratt & Jeffcutt, 2009).
In a similar vein, empirical evidence on this presumed relationship, particularly with the interference of place as moderator, is weak, fragmented and limited (Jaaniste, 2009; Lee & Rodríguez-Pose, 2014b; Protogerou et al., 2017; Sunley, Pinch, Reimer, & Macmillen, 2008). Moreover, a systematic understanding of what drives such innovation (C. Jones et al., 2016) and the role of co-location in these processes is absent (Capdevila, 2015; Gandini, 2015; Niaros et al., 2017). Much of the research so far has concentrated either on the micro-, meso- or macro-level, with little attention to the overlaps and synergies between these levels. Finally, existing research on innovation in the creative industries has focussed on the macro-level, while research paying attention to the micro-level, more specifically the experiences of creative workers and entrepreneurs themselves, has remained relatively scarce (Capdevila, 2015; Miles & Green, 2008; Pratt & Jeffcutt, 2009; Protogerou et al., 2017).

**Research question and outline**

How can we recognise the innovative capabilities of the creative industries in a way that the alleged (societal) potential of the creative industries can come to full fruition? Drawing upon a set of academic fields and topics, which – notwithstanding their increasing interconnectedness – have hitherto been relatively isolated, including geography, creative labour, entrepreneurship, innovation studies, and (cultural) sociology, I seek to understand these processes of innovation within the specific boundaries of creative workplaces, and how they foster, shape, and are shaped by creative work and production. In particular, this dissertation focusses on the intricate ways in which creative workers engage in the field of cultural production, learn the rules of the game, accumulate and use their capital, and the practical skills and knowledge they need for developing potential innovative output (Bourdieu, 1986, 1993; see also e.g. C. Jones et al., 2016).

Chapter 2-7 present empirical case studies that aim to, step by step, disentangle the relationship between place, the creative industries, and innovation. Overall, it can be divided in three overarching segments.
The first, covering Chapter 2 and 3, seeks to contribute to the existing literature on innovation in general, and the creative industries in particular, by digging deeper into the concept of innovation, and particularly how this is perceived and pursued by creative workers. These two chapters are primarily driven by the problematic nature of innovation in the creative industries, which on the one hand explicitly draws upon the idea that these sectors are inherently innovative (e.g. Müller, Rammer, & Truby, 2009; Handke, 2006; Lash & Urry, 1994), while on the other hand acknowledging the incongruence of applying an etic concept to the creative field (see among many others Stoneman, 2009; Oakley, 2009; Pratt & Gornostaeva, 2009; Jaaniste, 2009).

Building upon qualitative interviews as well as a survey among Dutch creative entrepreneurs, these chapters provide a definition of innovation that does justice to the situated, contextualised approach of this dissertation (Chapter 2), and postulate four factors that could potentially catalyse innovation: passion, partnerships, peers and place (Chapter 3). While individual, entrepreneurial passion to innovate (Schumpeter, 1934; Amabile, 1988; Drucker, 1985; Brandstätter, 2011; see also e.g. the critical perspectives of C. Jones et al., 2016; Gartner, Davidsson, & Zahra, 2006; Zahra & Wright, 2011; Bhansing, Hitters, & Wijngaarden, 2018) and partnerships with clients and research institutions (Colapinto & Porlezza, 2012; Etzkowitz & Leydesdorff, 1997) have been addressed quite extensively by e.g. research on management and entrepreneurship, peers and place are exemplary for the contextual factors distinctly tied to spatial settings and are explored further in the subsequent chapters.

The second part zooms in on peers, the influence of the proximity of other creative workers on knowledge exchange, social practices and potentially innovation. Both Chapter 4 and Chapter 5 are concerned with the social capital (J. M. Jacobs, 1962; Bourdieu, 1986) afforded by collective workplaces, but aim to move beyond the proposition that the mere co-location will yield collaborative spirits, bursts of knowledge exchange and innovative outputs (as already questioned by Fuzi, 2015; Merkel, 2015; Spinuzzi, 2012). Informed by qualitative, in-depth inter-
views with co-located creative workers, workplace managers and ethnographic fieldwork in such workplaces, both chapters tie the existing, macro-oriented research on most prominently creative clusters, knowledge exchange and innovation (Cooke & Lazzeretti, 2008; O’Connor, 2004; Porter, 1998; Pratt, 1997; Shefer & Frenkel, 1998) to more micro-processes of co-working practices, interactions and rituals.

Chapter 4 questions the assumption that proximity equals collaboration and sparks innovation. Instead, it proposes that proximity does contribute to the development of a fertile learning environment, offering a form of ‘surrogate collegiality’, in which essential tacit skills required for innovation can be gained and transferred. Chapter 5 dives even deeper in the micro-perspective by exploring not what kind of interactions take place, but rather how such interactions occur in the first place. Inspired by the symbolic interactionalist work of Goffman (1959, 1963, 1967) as well as the interaction rituals approach developed by Collins (1981, 2005), it disentangles how proximity could foster optimal conditions that afford the exchange of words to begin with, and the exchange of knowledge as a potential succeeding step in the chain of interactions. In combination, both chapters provide further insights into the promises and practices of co-located creative workers that could, but not necessarily will, foster innovation in the longer run.

Chapters 6 and 7, the third part, concern mainly how place provides symbolic capital to creative workers. Though – again – not necessarily being a sufficient condition for innovation, such capital both provides the legitimation required for professional and entrepreneurial success, as well as individual motivation and inspiration (as e.g. put forward by Drake, 2003; Heebels & Van Aalst, 2010). More than the preceding chapters, and building upon in-depth interviews with creative entrepreneurs and workplace managers, they focus on how creative workers engage with their physical and symbolic environments. Chapter 6 emphasises how the proximity of creatives does not necessarily generate collaborative practices (quite similar to the findings of Chapter 4 and 5), but may provide ‘artistic dividend’ (Markusen
& Schrock, 2006). The presence of other creatives translates into a local, creative reputation that provides a narrative allowing tapping into the creative city discourse and creative and/or professional legitimation and inspiration. Chapter 7 explores how the physical, historical and symbolic value of the (usually post-industrial) building of the creative, shared workplace provides an air of authenticity by commodifying local histories while at the same time adhering to a global narrative of post-industrial aesthetics. Such symbolic spatial assets grant legitimacy and inspiration not available otherwise.

This, in short, comes down to the following research and sub-questions:

**RQ:** (How) does co-location contribute to the self-perceived innovative capabilities of freelancers and SMEs in the creative industries?

**Part 1: Innovation in the creative industries**

**SQ1:** Which definition of innovation does justice to the particularities of the creative industries? (Chapter 2)

**SQ2:** What do creative workers see as sources of their innovativeness? (Chapter 3)

**Part 2: Social interaction, proximity and innovation**

**SQ3:** (How) does co-location contribute to social interactions, knowledge exchange and potentially innovation? (Chapter 4)

**SQ4:** How do such interactions occur and develop in collaborative workplaces? (Chapter 5)

**Part 3: Affordances of the symbolic properties of collaborative workplaces**

**SQ5:** How do existing and developing networks and place reputation interact? (Chapter 6)

**SQ6:** How do the users and managers balance the appeal to global ‘creative industries aesthetics’ for authenticity and symbolic capital with the desire to preserve and sustain the local historical spaces and symbols? (Chapter 7)
Before presenting the methods, data collection, data analysis and epistemological considerations in the remainder of this chapter, I will first further contextualise these questions by reassessing some relevant concepts and developments mentioned above: innovation in- and outside the creative industries, the urban cultural economy and creative industries (both macro-level changes), social networks, proximity and place (meso-level forms of organisation) and finally propose a more micro-level approach to studying spatialised innovation in the creative industries.

**TAKING STOCK OF THREE DECADES OF CREATIVE INDUSTRIES RESEARCH**

In this section, the core concepts of this dissertation will be explained, starting with a discussion of creativity and innovation. This is followed by an explanation of two major *macro-level* developments driving the paradoxical nature of co-location and co-working spaces: the reinvention of the city as a site for cultural production and the changing labour market conditions in especially the sectors that we now call the creative industries. These two developments require a further explanation of the relationship between place, the creative industries, creative work and their connection to innovation at large. Although this dissertation – in the upcoming empirical studies – will focus mostly on a *micro-level* examination of these factors and how this interacts with *meso-level* conditions, it is first necessary to understand the macro-frameworks of influence. To further clarify the macro-level trends, I then proceed to discuss their implications for the *meso-level* by diving deeper into the persisting importance of place in a global age, and how this materialises in the work and experiences co-located creative labourers. This section ends with a conclusion in which a *micro-approach* to place, creative industries and innovation will be proposed.
Whose innovation, which innovation?

“It is tempting to ask whether innovation and creativity might not be the new ‘snake oils’. Certainly, no one has managed to bottle either” (Pratt & Jeffcutt, 2009, p. 3).

Unravelling creativity and innovation

In this dissertation, I do not seek to understand or delineate the particular types of innovation, but rather how creative workers perceive this innovativeness, and especially in which contexts this may occur (i.e. their practices). As I explained in the introduction, the concepts of creative work, innovation and place have been increasingly and intricately linked. Innovation and creativity in the context of the creative industries, nevertheless, seem to be used interchangeably, with both bearing equal neoliberal appraise and romantic idealism (Oakley, 2009). As Pratt and Jeffcutt (2009) sharply observe: “which person, group, firm, city or region would aspire to be uncreative (and not innovative)? Put in this way, of course, nobody” (p. 3). They present both concepts as being used as ‘magic bullets’ or ‘snake oils’, thrown at problems – see e.g. the opening quote of this dissertation – yet without much clarity on what they mean (and whether and where they differ). Are they one and the same? The answer to this question depends on the context and (academic) field, yet there are some overarching guidelines on which most researchers seem to agree.

Before aiming to disentangle both concepts, I would first like to point out that this dissertation is about the creative industries, but not essentially about creativity. It intends to unravel the (perhaps Gordian) knot on the intersection of creative work, place and innovation. Does this mean that it is inherently about creativity? My answer would be: partly yes, but to a larger extent, no. To start with the latter: the creative industries are – literally – considered as being creative. Are they necessarily? This question is surprisingly difficult to answer. The reason for that lies in the former. Quoting the Department of Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) (2001) definition of the creative industries: “[they] have their origin in individual creativity, skill and talent and […] have the po-
potential for wealth and job creation through the generation and exploitation of intellectual property” (p. 4). Following this line of thought, creativity is at the centre of creative work. Yet, what does creativity mean in this context, and how does it relate to innovation?

Despite the various perspectives on what both terms mean (also in relation to each other) (Pratt & Jeffcutt, 2009), most researchers seem to agree on the proposition that creativity is the ‘idea’ part of innovation. Some see it as an individual trait, yet others – more in line with the positioning of this dissertation – as a collective effort or process informed by various (social) factors (Amabile, 1988; Amabile, Barsade, Mueller, & Staw, 2005). Innovation, then, is usually considered the implementation or extension of such ideas, in which “a raw creative idea is converted into an innovative product or service” (Bilton, 2009, p. 23). Innovation is built on elements of creativity and is – and this is also the perspective I take in this dissertation – most notably considered the successful implementation of creative ideas (Amabile et al., 2005). Creativity, therefore, is an essential prerequisite, but on its own not the same as innovation. Yet, innovation is usually considered more than just the execution of creative ideas and, especially within the creative industries, drawing the line between the two seems to be difficult. Therefore, the next section will dive deeper into the history and applications of the concept of innovation.

A very brief history of innovation

The creative industries in general, and the co-located creative industries in particular, are imbued in a discourse of innovation. These industries are increasingly considered one of the drivers of innovation (Castañer & Campos, 2002; Comunian, Chapain, & Clifton, 2010; Cooke & De Propris, 2011; Handke, 2006; Miles & Green, 2008; Müller et al., 2009). For example, these industries are believed to provide new ideas and innovative input to the ‘general economy’ (they ‘produce’ R&D (Lash & Urry, 1994)), while fostering adaptations and new developments by

---

8 Chapter 2 provides a more in-depth discussion of the definition of innovation.
the usage of new technologies (Müller et al., 2009). However, innovation thrives on an incoherent conceptualisation and a plethora of meanings, built on only scarce empirical evidence (Lee & Drever, 2013; Sunley et al., 2008).

Originally, innovation was coined by researchers involved in economics and engineering. An important scholar in the early discussion of the concept of innovation was Joseph Schumpeter, who considered the entrepreneur playing the principle role in innovative production (Schumpeter, 1939, 1934). Innovation to him, in short, was defined as a new combination of means of production, distinguishing it from invention, which “is without importance to economic analysis” (p. 85) and mere reproductions of existing business models (Schumpeter, 1939). Some two decades later, especially outside the prestigious universities, innovation emerged as a separate, autonomous field of study (e.g. Freeman, 1974 in Europe; and Arrow, 1962; and Romer, 1990 in the United States). Economists in these years treated innovation mostly in terms of allocation of resources to R&D (in contrast to other ends) and the economic effects of innovation. Important in this respect was also the development of the Frascati (published from the 1960s – on R&D) and Oslo manuals (from the 1990s – on innovation).

These manuals, historically, focussed on innovations in terms of R&D expenditure in sectors such as industrial production and agriculture. The OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development) coined this approach technological product and processes (TPP) innovation.

---

9 The later versions, though, have increasingly distinguished the multiple forms innovation can take, among which product innovation, the introduction of a significantly improved (in terms of technology, materials, uses) goods or services; process innovation, the implementation of a significantly improved or new processes of production or delivery; organisational innovation, the implementation of a new organisational method in business practices, organisations or relations and finally, marketing innovation, the implementation of new marketing methods, including significant new design, packaging or promotion (OECD, 2006).
The cultural turn and innovation

The social sciences have in the recent decades become subject to a ‘cultural turn’, shifting attention from (functional) social, political and economic structures to culture and beliefs (Garnham, 2005; Pratt & Jeffcutt, 2009). Around the turn of the millennium, this too translated to a growing interest in the creative industries, which in itself became subject to growing expectations and interests from policy makers and researchers. More specifically for the creative industries, this interest shifted to the industries’ entrepreneurial cultures, economic contributions and especially innovation (C. Gibson & Klocker, 2005).

Yet, despite the growing number of publications on innovation in cultural settings and particularly the creative industries, the term has remained notoriously diffuse in definition and description. This is partly an inheritance of the dominance of the TPP definitions outlined by the Frascati and Oslo manuals, which poorly fit sectors other than the technological. Nevertheless, a number of researchers have aimed to develop definitions of innovations more suitable to the peculiarities of the creative industries, such as stylistic innovation (Cappetta, Cillo, & Ponti, 2006) and formal innovation (G. Bianchi & Bartolotti, 1996). Both of these, however, mainly attempt to cover one aspect of a product: their aesthetic or symbolic value.

Other definitions offer a broader approach. Miles and Green (2008) and Green, Miles and Rutter (2007), for example, argue that in the creative industries, innovations do not occur only in R&D laboratories, but often simply ‘on the job’ in ‘everyday problem solving’ or in interaction with consumers – a form that is missed in most measures of innovation and is therefore hidden. Stoneman’s (2009) soft innovation refers to innovation in goods and services that mainly affect the aesthetic or intellectual appeal rather than functional performance of a product. Besides giving alternative definitions, some authors explicitly differentiate the creative industries innovations from other, often technological innovations. Caves (2000) sees creative industries innovation primarily in terms of process innovation, new combinations of existing elements or fringe styles. Pratt and Gor-
nostaeva (2009) emphasise that innovation in the creative industries is not a technological big bang, but rather a more organic and systemic process that is influenced by complex structures in regulation and the market. Cultural product and process (CPP) innovation – the creative counterpart of TPP innovation – is based on the expressive-reflexive knowledge systems of the humanities and social sciences and copyrighted products (Jaaniste, 2009).

There have been very few empirical studies that considered the innovation processes within the creative industries. Aside some specific industries cases (e.g. Cohendet & Simon, 2007; Grantham & Kaplinsky, 2005; Hothen & Champion, 2011; Lazzeretti, 2013; Tschang, 2007) or studies aiming to measure or map the scope of innovation in specific regions (e.g. Chaplain et al., 2010; Grantham & Kaplinsky, 2005; Lazzeretti, 2013; Lazzeretti et al., 2014; Lee & Drever, 2013), the actual forms and shapes of the creative industries in terms of innovation is still an understudied subject.

As such, despite the plethora of studies presuming the innovative activities of the creative industries, and the many conceived sources of innovation, the actual processes of innovation taking place in creative work are predominantly still a black box. As Pratt and Jeffcutt (2009) argue, traditional measures of innovation will hardly provide deeper insights in creative innovation. They propose a more qualitative approach by primarily focussing on formal and informal interactions. This dissertation aims to proceed this line of thought in order to refine the current understanding of innovation in the creative industries by looking at the micro-level and its interactions with the meso-level in creative work in relation to innovation.

The spatial turn in innovation research
In addition to the cultural turn inseparably connecting the two hitherto incompatible concepts of cultural production and innovation, innovation was subject of a different kind of turn as well: the ‘spatial turn’ (Amin & Cohendet, 2004). Especially since the 1980s, research on innovation has increasingly acknowledged
the spatiality of processes of learning and knowledge exchange. Amin and Cohendet (2004) distinguish two major forms of spatiality influencing the innovativeness of firms. The first one, less relevant for this dissertation, refers to national systems of innovation (Lundvall, 1992) and emphasises the influence of mostly national institutions as a resource fostering innovation. The second one, which I will discuss in greater depth later in this section, concerns the idea that agglomeration and spatial proximity promotes innovation.

This second form of spatiality is supported by the traditional proposition in economics that (especially urban) proximity decreases transaction costs and stimulates knowledge flows through firm linkages and inter-firm contact (see e.g. Glaeser, 1998; Porter, 1995), as well by the growing literature on tacit knowledge. Tacit knowledge is thought to facilitate learning by doing, social learning and the exchange of knowledge not available through codified channels (Nooteboom, 2000). Important here too is the assumption that tacit learning is dependent upon relational conditions, including face-to-face interactions, networking, trust and cultural proximity, each of which are facilitated and promoted by spatial proximity (see among others Banks, Lovatt, O’Connor, & Raffo, 2000; Bathelt et al., 2004; Ettlinger, 2003; Gertler, 2008). The focus of this approach thus lies on interactions – ranging from macro to micro – in cities, clusters (Amin & Cohendet, 2004), or in the case of this dissertation, workplaces. The next sections will address the intersections of place, the creative industries and innovation on the macro- and meso-level, and build towards the micro-level approach that I will pursue in this dissertation.

**Macro-level changes**

*Why we think about the urban when we talk about the creative industries*

*The city “is not a spatial entity with social consequences, but a sociological entity that is formed spatially”* (Simmel, in Frisby & Featherstone, 1997, p. 131).
Due to the suburbanization of the urban middleclass and the outsourcing of traditional manufacturing industries, mid-century Western metropolises were in drastic need of reinvention. Former industrial neighbourhoods had become derelict sites of urban decay, and cities were forced to rethink their development and policies. A few decades later, the twenty-first century city is no longer the manufacturing and production deprived area it used to be. In fact, the inner city has seen the return of production districts, the emergence of clusters of new industries - both spontaneous and policy invoked - and the reoccurrence of the comingling of leisure and work (Hutton, 2006). Sassen (1994) and Castells (1996) underscored cities’ renewed importance as ‘nodes’ and ‘powerhouses’ in global networks. This resurgence of the city is the result of three parallel developments.

First, the character of the urban production sector changed. In the last decades, the aesthetics and ‘sign value’ (Lash & Urry, 1994) of products have become inextricably connected with especially cultural and creative production. The emergence of a ‘symbolic economy’ emphasises a shift to a more culture focused consumption and production pattern (Zukin, 1995). Similarly, Amin (1994; see also Garnham, 2005) argued that the building blocks of this post-Fordist economy – design, innovation, knowledge technologies and communication – especially come to fruition in cities. Scott (1997) stated that we are witnessing a “very marked convergence between the spheres of cultural and economic development,” and that “capitalism itself is moving into a phase in which the cultural form and earnings of its outputs become critical if not dominating elements of productive strategy” (p. 323) (see also Lash & Urry, 1994). Culture has thus become an important source of economic growth and job creation, especially in the Western metropolises (Department for Culture, Media and Sport [DCMS], 2007; Kloosterman, 2004). This transformation had a profound spatial influence on the reconstruction of urban landscapes in which much of this culture is produced and consumed (Hutton, 2006; see also e.g. Massey, 1984).10

---

10 Hutton focusses here on the postmodern built forms, but I would argue that the adaptive reuse of industrial buildings is a particular postmodern metropolitan spatial form.
Second, specific policies have also profoundly influenced the process of urban and creative clustering, as clusters have become a ‘toolkit’ (cf. Landry, 2000) for urban planners and cultural consultants seeking to attract new jobs, CEOs and elite consumers by investing in (often visible) cultural infrastructures (Pratt, 2008a). Even though the idea of clustering (Marshall, 1919) has been promoted for almost a century, authors such as Landry (2000, 2006) and Florida (2002) popularised the (not undisputed) notion of the creative cluster as the main reference point for the cultural economy and innovation. Policies stimulating urban and creative clustering emerged from the late 1990s, starting in the United Kingdom and rapidly spreading to continental Europe, Asia and North America (Gong & Hassink, 2017). These policies were developed with the aim of reaching five goals: urban regeneration, supporting the cultural sectors, enhancing artistic and cultural heritage, supporting creativity and innovation and strengthening the local identity11 (Cinti, 2008). Doing this, urban policy makers tapped into a variety of discursive fields in the process of creative cluster development, such as place marketing, the revitalisation and commercialisation of the cultural field, finding a use for old, often industrial buildings, promoting cultural diversity and democracy and, most relevant for this dissertation, stimulating innovation (Andres & Golubchikov, 2016; Gainza, 2018; Grodach, Currid-Halkett, Foster, & Murdoch, 2014; Mommaas, 2004).

Third, the creative industries themselves have demonstrated a particular appetite for agglomeration in urban, preferably metropolitan areas (Scott, 2000).12 Since the late 1960s, a growing number of artists and the cultural middle class found their homes in declining, abandoned industrial buildings at the inner city’s fringes, many of which endowed with all the features

11 See Chapter 7 of this dissertation for a more in-depth discussion of the influence of local identities on creative clusters (and co-working spaces).
12 Though they are increasingly also to be found in rural areas (Harvey, Hawkins, & Thomas, 2012) or ‘ordinary’ cities (Wijngaarden, Hitters, & Bhansing, 2019a - Chapter 6 of this dissertation; C. Gibson, 2010; C. Gibson, Luckman, & Willoughby-Smith, 2010; see also for example the recent publication of Kagan, Kirchberg, & Weisenfeld, 2019).
of Fordist-era construction (Zukin, 1982). These groups were mainly attracted to workplaces offered by the central – yet affordable – urban fringe (Banks et al., 2000; Gainza, 2018; Zukin, 1982). Others contended that mainly the spatial scale of the urban region attracted the creative workers (see among others Evans, 2009; Hall, 2000; J. Brown, 2015; O’Connor, 2004; Pratt, 1997; Scott, 1999, 2000; Smit, 2011). Next to urbanity, factors as rents, the vicinity of art schools and relevant networks, and workplace adaptability are considered important aspects in the preferences, stimuli and success of creative workers (Gainza, 2018; Montanari, Scapolan, & Mizzau, 2018; Montgomery, 2007).

From the 1990s, economic geographers started linking this research on networks and agglomeration externalities to the context of the creative industries (Hesmondhalgh, 2012), with this idea of co-location being exceptionally influential in how we perceive innovation and creative work on the meso- and micro-level. Nevertheless, the appetite for urban agglomeration is induced too by other macro-level developments regarding the creative industries as a discursive field and practice, which will be addressed prior to diving into the the meso- and micro-level. 

**Creative work: the forerunner of the post-Fordist economy?**

“Just imagine how good it feels to wake up every morning and really look forward to work. Imagine how good it feels to use your creativity, your skills, your talent to produce a film […] or to edit a magazine. […] Are you there? Does it feel good?” Quoted in Nixon and Crewe (2004, p. 129).

This well-known and often criticised quote stems from the United Kingdom’s DCMS, the Design Council and the Arts Council of England (2001). While claims like these are nowadays usually met with suspicion equal to the decoying emails offering million-dollar inheritances and face creams promising eternal youth, this is indicative of the sentiments surrounding creative work in the new millennium. Moreover, it helps us to get a grip on the conceptualisation and position of ‘creative work’ in today’s world.
Creative work is most often defined as work in the creative industries, the industries that—reiterating the DCMS (2001) definition—“have their origin in individual creativity, skill and talent and which have the potential for wealth and job creation through the generation and exploitation of intellectual property” (p. 4) and that are “supplying goods and services that we broadly associate with cultural, artistic, or simply entertainment value” (Caves, 2000, p. 1). From the production side, they are considered to be involved in the production of social meaning and deal primarily with the industrial production and circulation of texts (Hesmondhalgh, 2012). In the DCMS (2001) conceptualisation, the creative industries capture the sub-sectors of advertising, architecture, the art and antiques market, crafts, design, designer fashion, film and video, interactive leisure software, music, the performing arts, publishing, software and computer services, television and radio.

The origin of this term can be traced back to Adorno and Horkheimer, who coined it ‘the culture industry’ (1944). Compared to the current day’s adoration, however, their analysis was much gloomier. For them, culture had an idealist perspective, representing the “exceptional forms of human creativity” having the ability to provide alternative human conditions (Hesmondhalgh, 2012, p. 24). With its commodification and ‘industrialisation’, they argued, culture lost its utopian capacities and alienated artists from creative production (Garnham, 2005). From the late twentieth century, this perception of the culture industries\(^{13}\) took a more positive angle. Especially in the final years of the millennium, loosely translated into the term ‘creative industries’, it became an influential buzzword in policy discourses, initially in the United Kingdom, but soon spreading all over the globe.

\(^{13}\) With many researchers (e.g. Miège, 1989) changing the singular form to plural – the cultural industries - to do justice to the complexities of the industries and the different logics at work (Hesmondhalgh, 2012; Lange & Schüßler, 2018).
In these discourses\textsuperscript{14}, abstract notions about the functions of creativity, creative work and especially the creative class (Florida, 2002; see also Pratt, 2008a) became determinants of local and national cultural policies, with policies often quite literally ruminating Florida’s terminology (Grodach, 2013; C. Gibson & Klocker, 2004; Evans, 2009) without paying much attention to the dynamics of the local production systems and practices of (creative) workers (Scott, 2007). This cannot be seen independently from neoliberal (cultural) management policies, which promoted individual creativity and, as a result, imported the hitherto considered incompatible concepts of innovativeness and entrepreneurialism into the discourse of cultural production (Hesmondhalgh, 2012; Hesmondhalgh & Pratt, 2005; C. Jones et al., 2016).\textsuperscript{15}

The creative industries too are characterised by freelance work, with freelancers usually defined as “skilled professional workers who are neither employers nor employees, supplying labour on a temporary basis under a contract for services for a fee to a range of business clients” (Kitching and Smallbone, 2008, p. v, cited in Merkel, 2019, p. 531). Indicative for such freelance work is that it takes place in urban (Merkel, 2019) mixed economies of creative labour (Banks, 2007; McRobbie, 1998) consisting of multiple for-

\textsuperscript{14} Without wanting to do anything close to discourse analysis, my interpretation of discourse here is rather Foucauldian, in the sense that I perceive it as a system producing knowledge and meaning, forming specific materialities (in this case, I see co-working spaces as such an effect) and related to the historical configuration of power structures (which emphasises the ties to the neoliberal ideology) (see Foucault, 1982).

\textsuperscript{15} This does not mean that the current term of creative industries is uncontested. On the contrary, some authors, including Hesmondhalgh and Pratt (2005) articulate their preference for the alternate formulation of ‘the cultural industries’, as, they argue, creativity is not just a distinguishing character of the creative industries, nor does it justice to the historical character of cultural production (Hesmondhalgh, 2012). Other alternative terms have also been proposed, including the cultural economy (Pratt & Jeffcutt, 2009; Scott, 2000; C. Gibson & Kong, 2005) and media industries (Deuze, 2007, 2009; Mayer, Banks, & Caldwell, 2009). Nevertheless, considering the dominance of the term creative industries, both in policy as well in academic discourses (Galloway & Dunlop, 2007), I will confine myself to the creative industries (while acknowledging the limitations of this concept).
mal, informal, ‘black’ and barter economies, or even forms of free labour (Alacovska, 2018). This development sparked a large number of researchers in especially critical labour studies to investigate the working conditions and experiences of freelance workers in general, and particularly within the creative industries (Banks & Hesmondhalgh, 2009; Conor, Gill, & Taylor, 2015; Gill, 2014; Gill & Pratt, 2008; McRobbie, 2002; Ross, 2009).

As creative workers have been considered as more deeply intrinsically motivated compared to their non-creative counterparts (Cnossen, Loots, & Van Witteloostuijn, 2017; Loots & Witteloostuijn, 2018), work may become more of a vocation than a business. Obviously, this has advantages in e.g. perceived freedom and autonomy (Hesmondhalgh & Baker, 2010; Banks, 2010), expressive qualities of work (Banks, 2007), abundance of ‘leisure culture’ (McRobbie, 2002) and passion for work (Bhansing et al., 2018). Yet, a large portion of the creative workforce – especially women and minorities (Eikhof & Warhurst, 2013; Gill & Pratt, 2008; McRobbie, 2016) – experiences low pay, (social) insecurity, (self-)exploitation, the encroachment of work into leisure time, and uncertain, irregular and bulimic work patterns (see among others Banks & Hesmondhalgh, 2009; Hesmondhalgh & Baker, 2010; Gielen, 2009; Pratt, 2002; McRobbie, 2002, 2016).

Especially for the creative industries, such labour market conditions have been particularly decisive and increasingly normalised, with the flexible yet vulnerable labour force branded as the precariat – the neoliberal, post-Fordist equivalent of the traditional proletariat (Ross, 2008). Such precariousness concerns “all forms of insecure, contingent, flexible work – from illegalised, casualised and temporary employment, to homeworking, piecework and freelancing” (Gill & Pratt, 2008, p. 3). While this evidently plays out at the micro-level of the – often self-employed – creative worker, it has roots in macro-level social and policy developments. Especially the neoliberal redefinition of work, with its entrepreneurisation, actualisation and management of the self (Bandinelli & Gandini, 2019; De Peuter, 2014; Gill, 2010), has profoundly influenced the (self)perception of freelance workers.
Important here too are the affordances of digital technologies, evoking a presumed ‘death of geography’ (Morgan, 2004; Pratt, 2002) or ‘death of distance’ (Cairncross, 1997). Such twenty-first century information and communication technologies allow knowledge and creative workers to work from any place at any time, or in other words, “detaches economic activity from its geographical and socio-economic context” (Clare, 2013, p. 52). Yet, despite these modern transport opportunities and the growing digitalisation (Toffler, 1984), especially urbanists and geographers have emphasised the persisting importance of place and proximity in the creative industries (Boden & Molotch, 1994; Gertler, 1995). These macro-level social changes – including the renewed interest in cities as sites of cultural production, the retraction of the welfare state and increasingly flexible, fragmented and precarious (creative) labour market – are reflected in new forms of social organisation, perhaps most visibly in the rise of co-working spaces (Spinuzzi, Bodrožić, Scaratti, & Ivaldi, 2019).

Meso-level: Collaborative workplaces: social capital and place
As touched upon in the previous section, freelancers are navigating a relatively placeless and casualised job market while at the same time bearing the full responsibilities and risks of their careers (e.g. McRobbie, 2016). Many of these freelancers in the creative industries, especially those in the increasingly expanding digital sectors, need little more than a laptop and a Wi-Fi connection, which has detached them from the traditional office workplaces. Quite paradoxically though, many seek to work in the proximity of other freelancers (e.g. Bathelt, 2005), and in more social and spatially fixed settings than required by their freelance work practices (Bandinelli & Gandini, 2019; Waters-Lynch & Potts, 2017). These (assumed) social and spatial affordances will be discussed in the following sections.

16 I conceive place, in line with Gieryn (2000) as a geographic location that has a material form and is invested with meaning and value. A space, conversely, would be a place devoid of meaning, people, representation, practices, etc. However, throughout the literature, these two seem to be used interchangeably (note the term co-working spaces). As such, I will follow this guideline, except when the literature I am relating to (e.g. citing) imposes otherwise.
Social networks

“Freelancers can be seen to have a role, but not a place” (Mould, Vorley, & Liu, 2014, p. 2442), or do they?

A preliminary solution to the individual work/collective setting paradox can be formulated following the macro-developments outlined above. In order to traverse the minefield of the neoliberal labour market (Banks, 2007), many creative workers expand their spheres of business and become part of an (urban) community by active and passive networking (Neff, Wissinger, & Zukin, 2005). New ties of trust are thought to help in breaking down industry boundaries, and are essential to the creative process, stimulating unforeseen collaborations or new cultural products. Moreover, as creatives more often derive motivation from production, they are more inclined to stay self-employed or a micro-company (Loots & Witteloostuijn, 2018). As a result, they are dependent upon collaboration with others for larger projects. Caves (2000) calls this the ‘motley crew property’ of the creative industries. These networks or communities are often established and grounded in cultural facilities. Third places such as cafes, bars, restaurants or clubs supplement or replace the second place of the traditional workplace in their importance for exchanging ideas and facilitating these networks in after-work socialising (Oldenburg, 1989; see also Currid, 2007; Neff et al., 2005).

As such, working in a communal setting, such as a co-working space, can be a strategic means to minimise labour market insecurities (Waters-Lynch & Potts, 2017). These coping mechanisms, increasingly essential for surviving in an increasingly volatile, informal and risky independent labour market, are not just driven by financial considerations such as low fees, but also by overcoming the isolation of freelance work and getting access to the relevant pools of know-how (Merkel, 2019). Most prominently though, they could grant access to the social capital—“the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession

17 With home being the first place (Oldenburg, 1989).
of a durable network of more or less institutionalised relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition” (Bourdieu, 1986, p. 21) and the relevant entrepreneurial and skills and attitudes compulsory for contemporary creative work (Butcher, 2018).18

Usually “conceived as office-renting facilities where workers hire a desk and a wi-fi connection [… and] where impendent professionals live their daily routines side-by-side with professional peers, largely working in the same sector” (Gandini, 2015, pp. 194–195), co-working is a typical urban phenomenon (Schmidt, 2019) that rose to mythical proportions over the last decade. Only in 2005, the first co-working space appeared in San Francisco. In these founding years, co-working mainly revolved around the normative values of accessibility, openness, sustainability, community, and collaboration (Capdevila, 2015; Gandini, 2015), as later explicitly formulated in the Coworking Manifesto (2014). Nevertheless, nowadays, there is a growing diversity in such workplaces, with on the one hand the global ‘WeWork’ and similar enterprises, building upon a commercial, profit-driven business model and housing hundreds to sometimes even thousands of freelancers and SMEs, and on the other hand a persisting group of ‘independent’, grassroots workplaces often receiving some form of public support and articulating values of authenticity, community and common resources (Avdikos & Kalogeresis, 2017; Merkel, 2019; Schmidt, 2019).

Collaborative workplaces have been heterogeneous too in the sense that they usually are open to any occupation, sector or status (Parrino, 2015), though they tend to be used primarily by freelancers working in one of the creative sectors (Spinuzzi, 2012; Waters-Lynch, Potts, Butcher, Dodson, & Hurley, 2016). Taking off especially after the financial crisis and with the rise in precarious working conditions (Avdikos & Kalogeresis, 2017; De Peuter, Cohen, & Saraco, 2017; Merkel, 2019), the number

18 Though these workplaces are distinctive from the corporate worlds in terms of autonomy and human self-recognition, they are not undisputedly utopic solutions. Ross (2003) argues how the ‘humane’, flexible workspace also serves to commodify human creativity and playfulness.
of such spaces by the end of 2019 is projected to be around 22,400 (DESKMAG, 2019).

Also in the Netherlands, one can find a large number of co-working spaces, especially in urban areas. Though it is difficult to estimate the exact number, there are a few indicators that the density of collaborative workplaces in the Netherlands is high. Only the larger co-working operators already own some 280 spaces, yet this figure does not include all of the international co-working operators (e.g. Seats2Meet), let alone the many independent co-working spaces. Moreover, the Netherlands has a particularly strong history of transforming industrial buildings into creative collaborative workplaces (see Chapter 7 of this dissertation), with approximately thirty of them united under the banner of the national Dutch Creative Residency (DCR) Network. Such buildings can be organised similar to co-working spaces, with several users co-locating in one or more designated rooms, but can also refer to more hybrid forms in which some facilities or areas (e.g. kitchens, pantries, meeting rooms) are shared, yet the offices themselves tend to be separated. Only in the Amsterdam region, some 60 buildings have been transformed into such ‘breeding places’ (broedplaatsen) housing usually self-employed creative entrepreneurs. Therefore, based on this data, one can easily deduct that there must be at least a few hundred collaborative workplaces spaces in The Netherlands.

This rise is reflected in an ever increasing number of publications on co-working, most of them focusing especially on community and collaboration (Spinuzzi et al., 2019), for example from sociological (Gandini, 2015; Garrett, Spreitzer, & Bacevice, 2017; Ivaldi, Pais, & Scaratti, 2018; Merkel, 2019; Moriset, 2013), management, entrepreneurship and organisation (Blagoev et al., 2019; Bouncken & Reuschl, 2018; Butcher, 2018) or planning and economic geographical (Avdikos & Kalogeresis, 2017; J. Brown, 2017; Capdevila, 2013; Parrino, 2015) perspec-

tives. Nevertheless, what all publications have in common is the acknowledgement of the importance of proximity and space.

**Proximity and place**

“So places […] are best thought of not so much as enduring sites but as moments of encounter, not so much as ‘presents’, fixed in space and time, but as variable events; twists and fluxes of interrelation” (Amin & Thrift, 2002, p. 30).

Place matters, because social networks are grounded in particular places where culture is produced and consumed. Firms profit from being located in the proximity of other creative firms, as this gives opportunities for (serendipitous) encounters (Amin & Thrift, 2002; Hall, 1998) and the exchange of informal and tacit knowledge (Gertler, 2003; O’Connor, 2004). Banks et al. (2000) demonstrate that new ties of trust help in breaking down industry boundaries, and are essential to the creative process, stimulating unforeseen collaborations or new cultural products. These contacts may be formal, but often occur spontaneously (see also Bathelt et al., 2004). In this way, places are assumed to contribute to social interactions and exchange of information, ideas and innovation (Heebels & Van Aalst, 2010; Scott, 1999, 2006). Proximity has, for a long time, been considered an important source of inspiration for creative workers (Drake, 2003).

The underlying principle here lies in the changes in labour market structures outlined above. As, among others, Giddens (1991) has pointed out, traditional life courses, as well as certain and stable work practices have disappeared over the last few decades. Individuals have to find their ways while enduring ‘necessity of choices’ and risks of the modern social order (Banks et al., 2000). In this discourse, geographers pointed out the importance of proximity as key to gaining access to the relevant networks and the informal access to local rumours, impressions, recommendations, trade folklore and strategic misinformation (see also Pratt, 2002). Or, in other words, they considered the exposure to ‘noise’ or ‘buzz’ essential assets of co-location (see
also Asheim, Coenen, & Vang, 2007; Gertler, 2008; Grabher, 2002a; Storper & Venables, 2004). Significant too here is the growing importance of project based working in society in general (Grabher, 2002), and the creative industries specifically (Neff et al., 2005), for which access to informal information or gossip about potential collaborators is crucial.

Nevertheless, much of the creative industries and especially clustering literature from the late 1990s to the early 2010s emphasised the relevance of spatial proximity through a macro- or meso-lens (Cooke & Lazzeretti, 2008; Florida, 2002; Lazzeretti et al., 2014; Power, 2002), looking mainly at larger corporations or the urban or regional context. Yet, the rapid rise in collaborative workplaces has both permitted and demanded an increased interest in the importance of space from a micro-per-
spective of social proximity. Collaborative workplaces are theo-
risied by Capdevila (2013) as urban microclusters, bearing similar characteristics to the macro-level industrial clusters in terms of knowledge dynamics and innovative capacities, but obviously on a much smaller scale.

As such, co-location cannot be explained only from the perspective of precarious labour market conditions as outlined above. There is also another narrative at stake: that of spatiality fostering innovation in such spaces. For example, similar to the clustering discourses peaking around the turn of the millennium, the contemporary co-working hype too is infused with a promise of innovation through spatial proximity (Capdevila, 2015; Gandini, 2015; Niaros et al., 2017). However, the evidence for the role of co-working spaces (or agglomeration in general) for innovation processes tends to be anecdotal, with some researchers warning against the overly high expectations of the innovative potential of such collaborative workplaces (Brinks, 2019; Schmidt, 2019). Existing research on innovation in co-working spaces, for instance, is often informed by research on larger

---

22 Clusters in the original terminology of Porter (2000), popularised in the 1990s, range from very small to encompassing several countries, with much of the earlier literature focussing primarily on the larger scale. However, increasingly, such concepts have been applied to more micro-setting, including neighbourhoods and even individual buildings.
firms (Schmidt, 2019; see e.g. Richter, Jackson, & Schildhauer, 2018; Suire, 2019) outside of the creative industries.

Rather than being the drivers or initiators of innovation, Schmidt (2019) argues that collaborative workplaces are better considered as being embedded within spatio-temporal innovation processes. More specifically, this means that they are conceptualised as intermediaries between the individual creative worker and larger firms (Capdevila, 2015) or as platforms potentially affording innovative outcomes. In a similar vein, Cohendet, Grandadam, and Simon (2010) consider such community oriented spaces to be a ‘middleground’ essential for connecting the creative individuals of the ‘underground’ to the ‘upperground’ of more established firms and institutions experienced in both the development of innovative ideas as well the subsequent marketisation. It is in this connection where place-based externalities and innovations may emerge (see also Lange & Schüßler, 2018), with co-working spaces being “novel but complementary structures in localized innovation systems” (Schmidt, 2019, p. 6). Therefore, in sum, I perceive co-working spaces as having an intermediary function in the urban organisation of creative work, as well as in fostering the industries’ innovative potential. Yet, how this connection is constructed, negotiated and commodified – both in terms of social as well as cultural and symbolic capital – is still subject to closer scrutiny, which I do in this dissertation.

A micro-approach to place, creative industries and innovation

Particularly, I am interested in the relationship between (the urban) place, creative work and innovation from a micro-level, lived experience. In this, I am loosely inspired by the work of Soja (1996), who, drawing upon Lefebvre (1992) puts forward a trialectic approach to understanding spaces – most prominently the idea of Thirdspace (not to be confused with third places

23 Soja (1996) uses the word ‘space’ differently from Gieryn (2000) mentioned earlier in this section. In Soja’s work, spaces are not quite devoid of meaning. On the contrary. The way he conceptualises ‘space’ fits well with how ‘place’ is usually understood.
introduced earlier in this chapter (Oldenburg, 1989)). The purpose of such a trialectic approach lies in the ambition to move beyond the traditional dualistic view of space, usually differentiating only the spatial practices or representations.

In a nutshell, Soja discerns a Firstspace, *perceived* space or the ‘things in space’ perspective (Borch, 2002). This designates the spatial configuration of a space: the built form in an urban (or rural) setting. This lens allows the mapping, measurement and a relatively easy description of a place, which would entail the spatial setting of a collaborative workplace, both internally as well as in a broader urban context. The Secondspace is what he calls the *conceived* space or ‘thoughts about space’ (Borch, 2002). Secondspace is a mostly symbolic or ‘imagined’ space, driven by an ideal or existing theme. More concretely, this could refer to the conceptualisation: what are these spaces considered to represent? Such a representation includes the branding of a co-working space, the values it aims to transmit, the language, the logos, the discourses, or the adherence to a given ideal (e.g. the Coworking Manifesto, 2014).

Where much of the existing literature has focussed upon the conceived practices of creative clusters, agglomeration in creative workplaces and co-working (e.g. management, organisation, location within the city) or the representation of such workplaces (e.g. the co-working theme or ideal), the *lived* experiences of creative workers from a micro-perspective – especially concerning agglomeration and innovation – are only captured superficially. In other words, much attention has been paid to the *discourses* surrounding place, creative work and innovation, but the *practices* remain much less unveiled. Yet, it is this micro-level where much of both the organisation of the ‘middleground’ – the meso-level of the co-working space – and the underground – the (freelance) creative worker – is constructed, altered, contested and negotiated (Cohendet et al., 2010; see also Lange & Schüßler, 2018; Merkel, 2015) (See Table 1).
Table 1: Macro-, meso- and micro-perspectives on co-working spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City/urban context</th>
<th>Macro</th>
<th>Upperground</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Collaborative) workplace</td>
<td>Meso</td>
<td>Middleground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freelancers</td>
<td>Micro</td>
<td>Underground</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In line with Massey (2005) and Merkel (2019), I see (co-working) spaces as co-constitutive and as processes. Spaces play essential and active roles in the formation and reproduction of entrepreneurial or creative identities (Merkel, 2019). There is a need to reconsider how creative workers shape community practices in co-working spaces, but also to focus on the effect of such communities on creative workers themselves. Former studies on co-working spaces are often informed by qualitative interviews, questioning co-workers and space managers on e.g. collaboration, social organisation or management procedures. Additionally, a large number too take a (self-proclaimed) ethnographic approach, but overall, they do not always pay extensive attention to the mundane, daily experiences of the co-workers (though there are some exalting exceptions, e.g. De Vaujany & Aroles, 2018). This is what this dissertation will do, and where Soja’s (1996) notion of the Thirdspace is helpful.

The Thirdspace combines both the Firstspace and Second-space and refers to the lived point of view. This is the space of representation, the space of inhabitants and users. Or, in his own words, “a fully lived space, a simultaneously real-and-imagined, actual-and-virtual locus of structured individuality and collective experience and agency” (Soja, 1996, p. 11). For co-working spaces this can refer to, for example, moving beyond the spatial, measurable settings of the workplace on the one hand, and the way it is planned and promoted on the other. This invites further exploring of the lived experiences of workplaces’ users. In order to do this, Soja proposes another trialectical approach, incorporating the spatial, historical and social perspective.

In this dissertation, I follow this call for a trialectic approach informed by historical, social and spatial lenses by seeing co-working and collective workplaces in their historical, spatial setting (i.e. their buildings’ histories and urban contexts – Chapter 6 and 7) and the effects on the social practices. But, I also will
look at social interactions as spatially afforded and historically determined (i.e. the constitution and evolvement of social interactions in spatially confined settings – Chapter 4 and 5). Yet, prior to commencing with these empirical studies, I will first provide some further information on the research setting, data collection and methods employed.

**DATA AND METHODS**

This section describes the data collected and methods employed in this dissertation. It starts with a brief discussion of the research setting and the ten cases (creative workplaces) covered by this research. In this, I will also elaborate on the specificities of the Dutch case, and explain how this relates to international developments. Second, I will share some considerations about the units of analysis and account for the terminology used and selection criteria employed. Finally, some details regarding data-collection and analysis will be addressed, including the research aims, the steps taken in the qualitative studies (ethnographic and in-depth interviews) and quantitative study, and some notes about coding and analysis. This section ends with some considerations on dealing with self-reported data.

**Research setting**

*Cases and research project*

Since the late twentieth century, the cultural and creative industries have become increasingly important in especially Europe and North America. From the 1990s, beginning in England, old, often industrial buildings were transformed into workplaces for creative firms. This trend soon spilled over to other countries, including the Netherlands. Here, either bottom-up initiatives emerged in former squat buildings, or more top-down structures were designed by e.g. housing associations looking for solutions for the abandoned industrial districts or investment companies jumping on the trendy creative clustering bandwagon.
This research is part of the *Cultures of Innovation in the Creative Industries* (CICI) project, in which ten of such spaces in The Netherlands are studied with the aim of understanding the processes of innovation in such locations. The CICI project builds on a unique collaboration with the Dutch Creative Residencies (DCR) Network, the umbrella organisation of creative clusters, creative hubs or co-working spaces in the Netherlands. Ten DCR affiliated locations have agreed to participate in this study, which was approximately one-third of all affiliated residencies at the time of the start of the project (see Table 2).

As indicated in Table 2, 24 collective workplaces exist in different shapes and forms and are growing increasingly diverse (Schmidt et al., 2014). In the literature, several types of offices have been distinguished. I make a distinction between four of these forms that are most relevant for this dissertation, ranging from least to most ‘curated’: 1] regular business centres: workplaces without any facilities or services. 2] Serviced offices: offering office infrastructures for members, but also front-office support. 3] Co-working spaces: in which desks can be rented, often also offer meeting rooms and which are mostly community-oriented. And 4] Incubators and accelerators: accommodating start-ups and providing advice and mentoring programmes (Fuzi, 2015; Weijs-Perrée, Koevering, Appel-Meulenbroek, & Arentze, 2019).

The participating locations cover the full gamut of collective workplaces, indicating a form of maximum variation sampling. First, as Table 2 indicates, some of them are more alike the ideal-typical co-working space (such as Klein Haarlem’s and Creative Factory’s flex rooms), whereas others are closer to serviced offices in the sense that the buildings house SMEs and freelancers in separate rooms or offices, while sharing some (basic) facilities. Second, they range from housing a few dozen creatives to housing a few hundred, with some locations being more or less mono-disciplinary and others hosting a wide range of (creative) businesses. Third, some locations are located on the urban

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Inhabitants city</th>
<th>Type of office</th>
<th>Type of firms</th>
<th>Tenants (2014)</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belcanto</td>
<td>Haarlem</td>
<td>161,975</td>
<td>Business centre</td>
<td>Diverse (also ‘non-creative’)</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BINK36</td>
<td>Den Haag</td>
<td>540,582</td>
<td>Serviced office</td>
<td>Diverse (also ‘non-creative’)</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Factory</td>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
<td>647,646</td>
<td>Serviced office/co-working space</td>
<td>Diverse (mostly creative)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch Game Garden</td>
<td>Utrecht</td>
<td>354,942</td>
<td>Serviced office/incubator</td>
<td>Gaming oriented</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Grayter Fabriek</td>
<td>’s Hertogenbosch</td>
<td>154,379</td>
<td>Serviced office</td>
<td>Diverse (mostly creative)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazemeijer Hengelo</td>
<td>Hengelo</td>
<td>80,736</td>
<td>Serviced office</td>
<td>Diverse (also ‘non-creative’)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honig fabriek</td>
<td>Koog a/d Zaan</td>
<td>156,280 (Zaanstad)</td>
<td>Business centre</td>
<td>Diverse (also ‘non-creative’)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klein Haarlem</td>
<td>Haarlem</td>
<td>161,975</td>
<td>Serviced office/co-working space</td>
<td>Diverse (mostly creative)</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strijp-S (Apparatenfabriek and Klokgebouw)</td>
<td>Eindhoven</td>
<td>232,520</td>
<td>Serviced office/co-working space</td>
<td>Diverse (mostly creative)</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vasim</td>
<td>Nijmegen</td>
<td>176,884</td>
<td>Serviced office</td>
<td>Diverse (mostly creative), strong focus on festivals</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>916</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
fringe of a large city, with others being more in the periphery of the Netherlands, outside of the creative centres. Finally, a number of cases are or have been managed by a housing association or investment company (e.g. BINK36, Strijp-S and De Gruyter Fabriek), whereas others are more self-organised, former squat organisation (e.g. De Vasim). This is relevant, because geographic location, size, diversity and organisational structure may influence the potential networks, community development and symbolic value of the workplace.

Nevertheless, the aims and practices within these small-scale clusters are surprisingly similar: all house primarily freelancers and SMEs in the creative sector, and all of them are located within either industrial heritage (e.g. Strijp-S, Creative Factory, Honig Fabriek, Hazemeijer Hengelo) or depreciated office buildings (e.g. Belcanto, Dutch Game Garden). Their geographical locations within the urban structure are also quite similar: all but one (Dutch Game Garden) have found their place on the urban fringe, just outside the city centre, often in a relatively neglected area. Finally, all locations aim to increase synergy between their users by, for example, organising events, and all also consciously work on developing their identity and reputation – though differing in effort, scale and frequency. In conclusion, although this dissertation takes the perspective of the creative worker rather than the workplace in the sense that doing a comparative case study is not one of the main aims of this study, the diverse selection of cases provides interesting in-depth information about practices and processes within different settings, while still being sufficiently alike to allow comparisons between different forms of work organisation.

The Netherlands in international perspective
Cases like the ten workplaces included in this dissertation are not particular to the Netherlands. One can find such spaces throughout – but not limited to – the western world. Studies of for example Andres (2011) on La Friche in Marseille, Battaglia and Tremblay (2011) and Tironi (2009) on Problenou and the 22@ district in Barcelona, Blagoev et al. (2019) on betahaus
in Berlin, Cohendet et al. (2011) on the *Quartier de l’Innovation* in Montreal and again @22 in Barcelona, Kagan, Kirchberg, and Weisenfeld (2019) on the creative networks and settlements in Hannover and Grodach (2011) on several art spaces in the Dallas–Fort Worth region have demonstrated the many ways in which creative workers have organised themselves by co-locating. Remarkably, many of the observed processes seemed to be very similar (e.g. in social networks, interactions, the origin and developments and the interference of municipal actors).

An important driver behind this isomorphism (cf. DiMaggio & Powell, 1983) can be found in the evangelism of the global-urban creative class and ‘creative cities phenomenon’, most prominently propagated by the academic-consultant Richard Florida, who counselled numerous cities throughout the western world and beyond in the early 2000s on their branding efforts – including Amsterdam in 2003 (Peck, 2012) and Rotterdam in 2005 (Lavanga, 2006). As such, in many European cities, including Berlin, Marseille and Lausanne, local authorities have invested in creative workplaces to encourage cultural production and promote a city’s pursued brand or image (Gainza, 2018; see also e.g. Fiorentino, 2018 on public investments in creative workplaces in Rome).

In a similar vein, the urban developments discussed in the previous section, in which post-industrial areas were used and adapted by artists and transformed into creative shared workplaces, are richly described in the Anglo-Saxon literature (Banks et al., 2000; Zukin, 1982) as well as elsewhere in Europe (Gainza, 2018; Andres & Golubchikov, 2016). Merkel’s (2015) and Cohendet, Grandadam & Simon’s (2011) international comparative studies too show many similarities between co-working spaces and collective workplaces around the western world (and perhaps beyond) – again indicating isomorphism in co-working practices. In fact, De Vaujany, Dandoy, Grandazzi and Faure (2019) – who embarked on co-working tours in 13 countries – point out that international co-working spaces are strikingly similar. As one of the authors autoethnographically describes:
“This makes me realize, again, how global our world has become. People share the same information, the same training (e.g. standardized MBA programs), the same providers and partly the same problems (housing costs in big cities, economic competition, the need for more sustainable development, etc.). The same buzzwords are used in Paris and in London. However, despite a real advantage of appearing global and familiar, these spaces also embody a feeling of loss: a loss of identity, a loss of the pleasure of travelling around the world in search of new cultures/routines/habits, a loss of disorientation” (p. 9).

The Netherlands shows quite similar developments – perhaps even stronger than elsewhere, with nearly all mid-sized to larger cities housing at least one of such converted, post-industrial ‘creative clusters’ (Mommaas, 2004). Nevertheless, the Dutch context is also idiosyncratic, differing from most other countries in two important ways. First, the Netherlands is characterised by a strong involvement of (semi-)public institutions in the transformation of industrial buildings to post-industrial shared workplaces. The public housing sector, different from social housing associations elsewhere in the world, has been of great influence. This due to their powerful position in society and in urban planning, and especially their role beyond providing a segment for the lower income housing (Van Kempen & Priemus, 2002). In two of this dissertation’s cases, BINK36 and Strijp-S, a housing association (respectively Vestia and Trudo) was explicitly involved in the transformation and management of the locations, and in at least three others (Creative Factory, Klein Haarlem and Belcanto) a housing association played a determining role either through (partial) ownership or through substantial investments.
Second, the involvement of – and collaboration with – municipal policies has in the Netherlands always been strong, most famously represented by Bureau Broedplaatsen department in Amsterdam\(^{25}\) (Cnossen, 2018; Peck, 2012; Plevoets & Sowińska-Heim, 2018), but to a lesser extent also visible elsewhere in the Netherlands.\(^{26}\) For example, De Gruyter Fabriek has received significant investments from as well as involvement by the Bossche Investerings Maatschappij (which is strongly tied to and partially funded by the municipality of Den Bosch) and the (temporary) ownership of the Creative Factory by the municipality of Rotterdam. This involvement of (semi-)public institutions obviously has strong implications for the development of such workplaces. First, this leads to many locations having a rather ‘top-down’ origin, and many of them are still governed in such a way (with a manager deciding much of the internal policies, contrary to e.g. the idea of alternative organisation in heterotopic workplaces (Vidaillet & Bousalham, 2018)). Second, this also allows many of such workplaces to have a non-profit financial structure, which enables them to keep the rental fees relatively low and therefore makes these locations available to a relatively broad range of (creative) workers.

**Units of analysis: workers, entrepreneurs, individuals**

Nevertheless, the goal of this dissertation is not to compare and contrast ten different collective workplaces in the Netherlands. Instead, it concentrates on the individual working in the creative industries. It aims to capture the ways in which co-location influences the perceptions and practices of creative workers – thus it sets out to focus particularly on the relationship between the micro and the meso.\(^{27}\) This means that I am first and fore-
most interested in their experience as individuals (yet working in a social, potentially collaborative setting) and start from the perspective of the creative worker. Obviously, though, this raises another question: who may call him-/herself a creative worker? I will answer this question in three steps. First, by placing creative work in the context of the Dutch creative industries. Second, by distinguishing different ways in which individuals working in the creative industries are addressed (most prominently creative workers and creative entrepreneurs), and third, by presenting my own answer or solution to this question.

In the Netherlands, the creative industries are well represented in the overall economy. In 2015, almost one in nine businesses fits within the category of the creative industries (Koops & Rutten, 2017). And quite similar to much of the western world, this group of creative workers has been increasing over the last decades. Growing even faster than the national average job growth, the creative industries in the Netherlands have proven to be relatively resistant to the financial crisis of the mid 2000s. Again, similar to the developments outlined in the previous section, most of this job growth occurred in the category of freelance work – with larger companies decreasing rather than growing (Koops & Rutten, 2017). Yet, how should we address and delineate this group of individuals working in the creative industries? The academic literature in this field presents two broad approaches here, that of creative entrepreneurship, and that of creative work.28

The perspective of creative or cultural entrepreneurship is prevalent in research within or more closely linked to the field of economics and management. With a majority of the businesses in the creative industries being self-employed or SMEs (Stam, Jong, & Marlet, 2008), the ties between both creative work and entrepreneurship, historically conceived as individuals

28 Also acknowledging yet leaving aside the many other labels, such as culturepreneurs (Lange, 2006, 2009), makers (Schmidt, 2019) or hackers (Rosner & Fox, 2016). The creative class (Florida, 2002) too has been an influential angle, especially in the early 2000s, yet considering that it would encompass close to half of the Dutch workforce, it would not be very helpful in this regard (Stam, Jong, & Marlet, 2008).
who carry out new combinations of means of production and innovative endeavours (Schumpeter, 1934), have been intuitively strong. Boix-Domenech, Lazzeretti and Sanchez-Serra (2018) list a number of mechanisms explaining this connection, among others the co-occurrence of creativity and entrepreneurship in the creative workforce, the assumption that creative workers are relatively more entrepreneurial and more likely to start new firms, and Florida’s (2002) thesis that creatives tend to locate in places offering fertile grounds for entrepreneurship (i.e. cities). Creative entrepreneurship too, often defined as “the creation or identification of an opportunity to provide a cultural product, service or experience, and of bringing together the resources to exploit this as an enterprise” (Rae, 2005, p. 186), however, raises another question: when does a – perhaps reluctant (cf. Boyle, 1994) – freelance worker become an entrepreneur? Even successful ‘entrepreneurs’ in the creative industries would not necessarily consider themselves as such, especially considering that they tend to be more often motivated by creative freedom and self-expression than entrepreneurial pursuits (Rae, 2004).

Another perspective uses the – more neutral – term of ‘creative worker’. This term, which I have been using most regularly throughout this dissertation, finds much of its heritage in the ‘critical labour studies’ outlined in the preceding section. Especially in the United Kingdom, this way of addressing those working in the creative industries (quite literally!) has been prominent (see e.g. Conor et al., 2015; Garnham, 2005; Hesmondhalgh & Baker, 2008, 2010; e.g. Pratt, 2011; Throsby, 2001a). However, this does raise the question of when work becomes creative. Markusen, Wassall, DeNatale and Cohen (2008) and Potts, Cunningham, Hartley & Ormerod (2008) distinguished those working in the creative industries (but again: what are the creative industries?) and those doing cultural or creative work and therefore have a creative occupation – not necessarily within the creative industries (but when is such an occupation creative?).

29 This school of research particularly views creative work in the light of twenty-first century capitalist forms of production, especially the neoliberalist political order impelling the precarious labour conditions outlined in the preceding section (De Peuter, 2014).
Nevertheless, despite their different histories and connotations, many authors seem to use both creative entrepreneurs and creative workers interchangeably (e.g. Eikhof & Haunschild, 2006; Christopherson, 2008; Hracs & Leslie, 2014; Smit, 2011). Though there are unmistakable overlaps between the two terms – and I do not mean to argue that they cannot be used interchangeably – the reluctance of many respondents in the qualitative study to identify as an entrepreneur\textsuperscript{30} induced my decision to opt for the notion of creative work rather than creative entrepreneurship in this dissertation. Still, this does not present a solution to the challenge of delineating the population. What makes an individual identify as a creative worker? Is it confined to work within the borders of what we call the creative industries (and whose definition do we follow here?), or should one aim to include those doing ‘creative’ work outside of those sectors (but what makes work creative?). For this dissertation, I have opted to steer away from these considerations by taking a simpler strategy: self-identification. Considering I am interested in the experiences of the individuals working in co-located settings in buildings earmarked as creative clusters (or hubs, collective workplaces, etc.), the (individual’s) decision to locate in such a setting can be considered a proof of having at least some affinity with the creative industries.

Data-collection and analysis

Research aims

This dissertation relies on a mixed-methods and constructivist grounded theory-informed, bottom-up approach (Charmaz, 2006; see also Strauss & Corbin, 1990). This entails that it aims to derive the analytic categories not from preconceived concepts or hypotheses, but rather from the data (Charmaz, 2001) – though acknowledging that having an empty mind, not informed by any existing theories, would be impossible (Charmaz, 2006). Such a ‘bottom-up’ approach indicates that, contrary to many comparative studies in this field, the starting point is not

\textsuperscript{30} Though this beyond the scope of this dissertation, there seems to be an internalised conflict between economic and artistic logics at stake here (cf. Caves, 2000; Eikhof & Haunschild, 2007).
the outcome in terms of entrepreneurial or development, products or economic growth, but rather the processes that occur before these results come about. Measuring innovation is therefore not, and never has been one of the goals of this dissertation. Instead, the focus lies on the creative workers’ practices and experiences, and their choices (and legitimations thereof) for specific locations.

To do this, I have employed various research methods, mostly qualitative, but also quantitative (as I will describe in the following paragraphs – see also Figure 1). The catalysing question here was what innovation actually is in the creative industries. As described earlier, the answer to this question is more strongly imbued with assumptions than with empirical research. Therefore, the overarching aim is to understand (verstehen) the experiences of co-located creative workers, and to situate this in the wider (temporal and specifically spatial) macro-level fabric of the social, urban and to a lesser extent also policy and managerial contexts. Following the iterative roadmap prescribed by the grounded theory approach, I draw upon several ‘waves’ in the research process, starting with first cycle of short pilot interviews with creative workers and workplace managers. These served to inform 1] a second cycle of 43 in-depth qualitative interviews with co-located creatives, as well as a number of (follow-up) interviews with managers, 2] ethnographic fieldwork primarily confined to one particular (co)workplace and 3] a survey (n=182) amongst the same population of creative workers.

**Figure 1: Research design**

![Research design diagram](image-url)
First cycle of qualitative research
In the first months of 2014, all (co)workplaces included in the case selection were visited. During these visits, which usually took between a half and full day, the managers as well as a number of creative workers were interviewed. These first interviews – both for the managers and the workers – were open interviews: explorative and broad conversations in which the managers and creative workers were asked to reflect upon their workplace. In total, ten managers (see Appendix B), and twenty creative workers were interviewed. The former taking up to three hours, while the latter were often quick conversations lasting approximately ten to thirty minutes. The sampling method in this cycle consisted primarily of convenience sampling, with the respondents either being invited by the gatekeepers, the managers, or by unplanned encounters in the corridors, lunchrooms, at coffee machines, etc. The data of this first wave of interviews consisted of transcriptions or elaboration of jottings (when the interviews took place ‘on-the-go’) of the interviews, as well as field note reports of every visit to a location based on on-location jottings.

Second cycle of qualitative research
The second cycle of interviews consisted of in-depth interviews with creative workers in order to gain a more thorough understanding of the experiences of the workers and the processes taking place in their shared workplaces. In total, 43 in-depth interviews have been conducted (see Appendix A). Two interviews were double or triple interviews, eventually resulting in a sample of 46 respondents. Most of the respondents have been contacted through email lists distributed by the locations’ managers, though a number have been retrieved by snowball sampling and convenience sampling (by encountering creatives in lunch rooms, in the elevator or in corridors).

Contrary to the first cycle open interviews, these interviews were semi-structured, guided by a topic list (see Appendix C)

31 With the exception of De Vasim and De Honig Fabrick, where the pilot interviews took place respectively in December 2013 and October 2014.
covering a variety of topics regarding innovation, their work practices as well as their understanding of co-working. This topic list was mainly built on the concepts derived from the open interviews (without wanting to pretend that I am uninformed by theory (cf. Charmaz, 2006)). Rather than just reporting factual information (and thus contrary to e.g. expert interviews), they were aimed at capturing the respondents’ experiences, explored how they justified their choices and perceptions, and discussed how they related to their (built or social) environment. Due to the iterative, grounded theory inspired approach, it was subject to a continuous process of adjustment. However, generally, the changes between the first and final version have been minor and primarily concerned the phrasing of the questions.

The in-depth interviews took place between September 2014 and October 2015. Out of the 46 respondents, 17 identified as female, and 29 as male. Their ages ranged across the full scope of the labour force, with the youngest being recent graduates in their early 20s, and the oldest nearing retirement age. The respondents worked in one or several of the DCMS sub-sectors of the creative industries, ensuring a maximum variation sample. Seven worked in advertising, one in architecture, six in arts and antiques, three in crafts, seven in design, three in designer fashion, six in digital- and entertainment-media, four in film, video, photography and seven in music, performing and visual arts and two in software and electronic publishing. All of the respondents were either self-employed or were working in (usually as the founder or ‘director’) micro-enterprises. Though I have not explicitly inquired on the respondents’ level of education, many referred to their educational backgrounds, which were, in many cases, creativity oriented (design academy, game academy, fine arts, music education, film academy) and higher education (‘HBO’ or ‘WO’).

All interviews were conducted face-to-face, usually in the respondents’ workplace (though occasionally in a lunchroom on the location or ‘on the go’, while walking around). On average, the recorded length was 56 minutes (ranging from 30 to 97 minutes), however, most interviews in practice took much
longer, with many respondents taking a long time – sometimes an hour or more – to show me around their workplace while telling about their work.

**Ethnographic fieldwork**

I have aimed to supplement the discursive elements (from the interviews) by immersing myself in the practices of creative work in action (Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw, 2011) by means of one month of fieldwork in one particular case, as well as roughly 20 days of fieldwork in the other locations’ public sphere or third places. As described in Chapter 5, with approximately 43 days, the ethnographic fieldwork was not substantial enough to count as ‘thick description’ (Geertz, 1973), yet, it was approached as a means to triangulate findings from the in-depth interviews. During the fieldwork, I have always been overt in my position, introducing myself to participants during visits and presenting myself on the (more or less mandatory) Facebook group and during introductory talks. Fieldnotes mostly written contemporaneously (keeping a notepad open and making jottings and notes throughout the day) and after visits, inscribing the notes right after leaving the fieldwork every day. Considering that continuously typing and writing is commonplace in co-working spaces, jotting notes has been relatively non-intrusive (Emerson et al., 2011).

Most attention has been paid to how people interacted, not only verbally but also by observing their non-verbal communication (strongly influenced by the work of Goffman, 1959, 1967). I also paid particular attention to the affordances of space in terms of interactions: how and whether spatial characteristics stimulated or hampered such social interactions. As periods of interactions were often followed by longer periods of non-interaction, there often was ample time to transform the jottings to actual fieldnotes.

**A sense of ‘place’**

With the in-depth interviews capturing the *saying*, and the ethnographic component shedding light on the *doing* of individuals confined to a particular space, the influence of these spatial set-
tings themselves – the situatedness and material culture – too are a pertinent source of information. The physical layout and spatial arrangements, as well as the usage of physical objects in these environments (O’Toole & Were, 2008), at least partly determines how individuals – creative workers – are using a co-working space. My aim here is to move beyond the mere idea that place “is simply location. It is where people do things” (Rodman, 1992, p. 640). In this sense, I follow Massey’s (1994) earlier presented position in that place is imbued with cultural implications and social relations. This ties in well with the idea that individuals can reproduce social structures, but also may transform them (cf. the idea of structuration developed by Giddens, 1984). I consequently view co-working spaces as potentially influencing the behaviour of their users, but users also being able to adapt them to suit their needs, practices and beliefs.

More specifically, this means that I have aimed to observe (both ethnographically as well as in the interviews) how the space has physically afforded (J. J. Gibson, 1979) certain forms of behaviour (and failed to afford others), but also how individuals negotiate, justify, conflict over, adapt, engage with, colonise, claim, transform or in any other way relate to spaces (see e.g. O’Toole & Were, 2008 on the individualisation of workplaces). The same holds for material culture, the objects in certain spaces, with which individuals can engage in several ways (or, on the contrary, decide not to). The interior design thus affords a certain seating arrangement, yet users have the agency to change or adapt this. A shared coffee machine affords certain serendipitous encounters, but users may also refrain from using it and bring one of their own instead. In my research, therefore, I have tried to remain sensitive to how co-working space users are using the space and objects. As described above, my main strategies here have been inquiring about their usage in the in-depth interviews and observing the spatial and material arrangements of the co-working space.
Coding and analysis

Though specific details on analysis can be found in the methods section of each empirical chapter, there are some general considerations on the level of the full dissertation that I would like to point out. First, because nearly all pilot interviews have been conducted ‘in situ’, they have not been recorded and transcribed. Yet, extensive notes have been taken before, during and after the interviews, leading to a – nevertheless – rich body of text suitable for analysis. All of the in-depth interviews, as well as most (but not all) of the interviews with managers have been recorded and transcribed. All fieldnotes and transcriptions were coded and analysed using Atlas.ti.

As mentioned above, in coding, I took a constructivist grounded theory based approach in the sense that, despite my interest in e.g. the micro-aspects of cluster theory related concepts, I aimed to derive the analytic categories not only from these preconceived concepts, but as much as possible from the data (Charmaz, 2001). In especially the pilot (first cycle) interviews as well as in the interviews with the managers, the coding was primarily what in grounded theory is called ‘open coding’. This means that, in these interviews, more or less every piece of text was coded (Friese, 2012) by in vivo, process, and initial coding strategies in order to capture as many ideas as possible. After that, I analysed the fieldnotes and open codes in a few iterative cycles (i.e. making the first move towards axial coding) by employing a combination of techniques: focussing on recurring topics (all chapters), metaphors (Chapter 6), similarities and differences (Chapter 2), theory-related material (Chapter 4), cutting and sorting per topic (the full dissertation on a more macro-level) (Ryan & Bernard, 2003). Three overarching themes stemmed from these pilot interviews: innovation, collaboration and reputation, which were eventually translated to the three major themes of this dissertation.

For the first in-depth (second cycle) interviews with respondents, I repeated this iterative process of open coding a number of times in order to get a better grasp on the specifics within each theme. This, again, indicates that I used in vivo,
process and initial coding strategies. Yet, further in the data-collection, on the macro-level of this dissertation, only the most salient patterns were coded, limiting myself to lumper coding – taking a rather broad-brush approach to capture the most important perspectives on a certain theme – and focussed coding (cf. axial coding) – selecting the most significant and frequent codes to continue specific lines of inquiry. However, an exception here is the more ethnographically oriented chapter (Chapter 5), which was guided more by theoretical concepts derived from the literature on interaction rituals (i.e. R. Collins, 2005; Goffman, 1967), such as sacred objects, arriving and retreating from a scene and front- and backstage settings. Finally, looking at more specific details in order to answer the research questions, a final cycle of selective coding was used (Saldaña, 2012).

Survey
The qualitative material was, for one chapter (Chapter 3), supplemented by a survey covering the same population as the interviews. The goal of this survey was to – for at least one of the studies – explore whether and how certain phenomena observed in the pilot and qualitative studies also held among a larger population. All quantitative data was obtained by the Cultures of Innovation in the Creative Industries (CICI) Survey Part 2. This survey focussed on, among other items, the valuation of the respondents’ location, their creative/innovative identities, place reputation, inspiration and innovation. It was developed based on the in-depth interviews with the places’ managers as well as the respondents.

The units of analysis were the creative workers renting spaces in one of the locations covered by this project. A sample of 916 firms located in 9 out of the 10 cases in this research project were sent an invitation to a survey with a cover letter explaining the topic and importance of the research project. In 8 locations, the respondents were notified about the study by the locations’ managers, who distributed an email which emphasised their involvement in this research project as well as further instructions guiding the (online) questionnaire. In one
workplace, a research assistant distributed and collected surveys on paper by delivering a mail package which included a paper version of the questionnaire as well as an accompanying letter instructing them on anonymity measures. The locations’ managers sent follow-up reminders after 2 and 4 weeks. A total of 182 surveys were completed, representing a response rate of 20%. The survey was only available in Dutch.

**Dealing with self-reported data**

As emphasised before, this dissertation focusses mainly on how creative workers experience the influence of their location, and to a lesser extent on how this affects their perceived innovativeness. At face-value, this could make one inclined to think that this dissertation is problematically based upon self-reported data on innovation. Obviously, self-reported data has a long history of being considered ‘incorrect reporting’, with studies demonstrating a low correlation between self-reported and observed data (Bernard, Killworth, Kronenfeld, & Sailer, 1984). But is this, in this case, really a problem? I would argue: not necessarily, for several distinct reasons.

First, while acknowledging the difficulties with triangulation, especially when taking a constructivist approach like this dissertation does (Silverman, 2013), the combination of the discursive elements and actions of the respondents, quantitative data, and the insights into the managerial perspectives do provide some opportunities to counter the potential biases that come from self-reported data – perhaps not about innovation, but potentially about collaborative practices, interactions and other actions. By applying the just outlined procedure this dissertation (including pilot interviews, interviews, ethnography/survey), these narratives also build up and grow in their richness.

More specifically, in the analysis, I followed a procedure close to what Moran-Ellis et al. (2006) call ‘following a thread’, in which multiple methods are used to generate several datasets in the same investigation. Taking, after some exploration, one thread from one data-set that is then followed across the other sets to generate a more multi-faceted picture of the phenome-
non. In this dissertation, this thread would entail the pilot and in-depth interviews with creative workers in which they actively construct their narrative about innovativeness and co-location (see e.g. Holstein & Gubrium, 2007; Holstein, Gubrium, & Gubrium, 1995), supplemented by fieldnotes (ethnographic and concerning the physical and material settings – informing Chapter 7) and a survey (informing Chapter 3).

Second, as discussed earlier in this introduction, innovation and the creative industries have a problematic relationship, with traditional measurements, conceptualisations and definitions hardly fitting the practices of creative work. So, is it in any case – at all – possible to measure such innovations? This brings me to a follow-up question, taking this criticism in broader terms. Measuring innovation in general is problematic in the first place, with much research taking proxies (e.g. R&D expenditure, patents or ‘new’ products or services) as indicators of innovativeness. Yet, do they really capture what innovation is about? The answer to both questions, in my perspective, would hardly be positive. Of course, this response might not be truly answering the question of self-reported data. Yet, considering that I aspire to capture how the co-located creative workers experience their (social, material and symbolic) environments, and how this, in their own perception, leads to what they themselves consider innovation (cf. the notion of Thirdspace, see Soja, 1996), quantitatively ‘measuring’ innovativeness might not at all be the right step to take here. Much more, I will focus on how innovation is constructed in biographical narratives (Giddens, 1991) in connection to the day-to-day world, the interactions with others, and global and local settings.

Having elaborated upon the methods and the challenges in studying innovation in the creative industries, the next two chapters will dive deeper into this issue of innovation in the creative industries. This will be followed by four other empirical chapters, further exploring two potential sources (or drivers) of innovation: proximity of other creatives and the (symbolic) value of place.
“Birds of a feather...”
Part I

Innovation in the creative industries
Chapter 2

“Innovation is a dirty word”

Contesting innovation in the creative industries
INTRODUCTION\

Innovation is one of the numerous terms in (social) science that are conceptualised in many different traditions of thinking. Yet at the same time, the term has had a profound influence on both policy and production. Innovation is exceptionally hard to quantify in measures and rates, making it a complex concept to work with. This holds for innovation in technological and production processes, but even more so for the creative and cultural industries, which often lack the traditional measures of innovation such as R&D expenditure and patents (Chapain et al., 2010). Many still view innovation in an atomistic and linear manner, with inventions as inputs and market success as outputs. Additionally, most research on innovation focusses on the science, technology, engineering and mathematics (hereafter STEM) sectors, making the concept not, or only to a limited extent, applicable to other industries, such as the service industries or creative industries (e.g. Jaaniste, 2009).

At the same time, broader social and industrial developments such as the culturalisation of the economy (Scott, 1997; Lash & Urry, 1994) and the growing importance of creativity and the knowledge economy (Leadbeater, 2000) alter the realm of what we see as ‘new’ or ‘innovative’. Together with the seminal works of for example Florida (2002) and Landry (2000), these developments led to the assumption that the creative industries are a key contributor to innovation economies. Ideas, processes, products and talent that are developed by the creative industries drive productivity in- and outside these industries (Cunningham, 2013). Therefore, ever since the creative industries became a fashionable discourse and policy construct in the 1990s, policy documents and grey literature increasingly presented innovation as synonymous to creativity and the creative industries (Oakley, 2009) by, for example, stating that “[k]nowledge and creativity are becoming powerful drivers of economic growth in the contemporary globalizing

Innovation is a dirty word” (UNCTAD, 2010, p. 209). These discourses were strongly tied to Throsby’s (2001b) concentric circle model in which the creative arts are considered to be generators of ideas developed by other industries, and are, as Oakley (2009) argues, also applied by the general economy. Ultimately, this resulted in a wide variety of policy measures to stimulate the creative economy (e.g. the European Agenda for Culture’s Policy Handbook or the Dutch Top Sector of the Creative Industries), without fully understanding how the innovativeness of the creative industries would spill over into the wider economy.

Yet (or furthermore), both in academic as well as in this grey literature, the creative industries are often underrepresented in the sense that innovation in these sectors is difficult to grasp and measure statistically (Miles & Green, 2008; Cunningham, 2008). With these social and policy changes in mind, the call for a new approach to innovation in the creative industries becomes more urgent. As Hutter and Stark (2015) argued:

“[a]s modern society transforms itself into a society of continuous self-change, the scope of innovation widens to all processes that introduce something new. A very broad definition is needed to capture cases as diverse as the shapes of specific synthesizer sounds to new labour market policies, or from a new fashionable style of painting to the invention of a mathematical proof” (p. 1).

We seek to take the first step in developing such a new, broad definition of innovation by focussing on the creative industries. As mentioned above, these industries are, both in research and in policy documents, often heralded as the quintessential innovative industries (Evans, 2009), yet, they are problematic in the assessment of their innovativeness. Despite their heterogeneity, their mode of production differs from most other sectors in the sense that it is characterised by a continuous stream of improvements and changes (Lee & Rodríguez-Pose, 2014a). Every website, sculpture, theatre production and photograph that is not a replication of other works of art receives its value by being something unique and new (Caves, 2000). Arguably, an at-
omistic and linear approach to innovation can therefore not be upheld when discussing the creative industries. This raises the question of how creative industries innovation may be different from other forms of innovation, such as innovation in the STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics) sectors. We seek to refine the conceptualisation of innovation specifically for the creative and cultural industries by building on the findings on 43 in-depth interviews with creative workers about their definitions, experiences and interpretations of innovation in their field of work. Our aim is to contextualise innovation in a way that does justice to the manifold practices of creative industries workers, while revealing its highly social and spatial embeddedness in creative industries production systems.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The conceptualisation of innovation has strong historical roots which provide important insights in the current issues in the usage of the term. Initially, innovation was coined by researchers involved in technology development and economics. The early discussion was heavily influenced by the work of Joseph Schumpeter, who considered the entrepreneur to be the principle player in innovative production. Schumpeter’s often cited definition of innovation covers the width innovation still has today: the introduction of a new good, the introduction of a new method of production, the opening of new markets, the conquest of a new source or supply of raw materials or half-manufactured goods, and the implementation of a new form of organisation (Schumpeter, 1934). In his definition, innovation is considered to be a new combination of means of production, distinguishing it from invention, which “is without importance to economic analysis and mere reproductions of existing business models” (Schumpeter, 1939, p. 85).

This importance to economic analysis has nowadays become an increasingly difficult aspect, as profit, especially in the
creative industries, is not always the main indicator for success. On the other hand, innovation in Schumpeterian terms does fit the current creative industries: innovation became a term strongly tied to individual entrepreneurship. As individual entrepreneurship in the form of SMEs or freelancers is abundant in the creative industries (Hesmondhalgh, 2012), these industries undeniably fit this aspect of a Schumpeterian approach to innovation.

However, in the years of Schumpeter and the subsequent decades, the most prominent means of production were often focussed on industries other than the creative. The vast majority of research on innovation published in the decades following Schumpeter’s definition focused on R&D in sectors such as agriculture, manufacturing and mining. This research was frequently based on the OECD’s Frascati (from 1962) and Oslo (from 1992) manuals, which employed a technological product and processes (hereafter TPP) definition of innovation. TPP innovation is defined as: “implemented technologically new products and processes and significant technological improvements in products and processes” (OECD & EUROSTAT, 1997, p. 31). Not surprisingly, these TPP approaches to innovations poorly fit other sectors, such as the service or the creative industries (Stoneman, 2009; Eltham, 2013) because their innovations often take a different shape than those in the TPP industries.

As argued above, in early and mid-twentieth century, the creative industries were not often considered to be a relevant area of economic analysis and academic research on innovation. This changed towards the end of the century. Especially over the last two decades, the corpus of academic literature and policy reports discussing this presumed association between the

33 As described in Chapter 1, I take creative entrepreneur and creative worker largely as synonymous.
34 Even though the more recent Oslo Manuals (e.g. the Third Edition) increasingly acknowledge non-technological facets of innovation, it still fails to include many aspects of innovation in the creative industries (Chapain, Cooke, Propris, MacNeill, & Mateos-Garcia, 2010).
creative industries and innovation has grown tremendously (e.g. Brandellero & Kloosterman, 2010; Desrochers, 2001; Gordon & McCann, 2005b; Grantham & Kaplinsky, 2005; Landry & Bianchini, 2005; Oakley, Sperry, & Pratt, 2008; O’Connor, 2004; Pratt & Jeffcutt, 2009; Scott, 1999, 2006).

The creative industries, often used interchangeably with the terms cultural industries or cultural economy, are considered those industries that “have their origin in individual creativity, skill and talent and which have the potential for wealth and job creation” (Department for Culture, Media and Sport [DCMS], 1998). In the Netherlands, a common definition demarcates the creative industries as those industries producing products and services that are the result of creative labour (Rutten, Muskens, Manshanden, & Koops, 2004). Other definitions highlight the importance of cultural, artistic or entertainment value in products and services (Caves, 2000), the industries that “deal primarily with the industrial production and circulation of texts” (Hesmondhalgh, 2012, p. 16) or a group of core creative arts that diffuse outwards to other (creative industries related) industries through concentric circles (Throsby, 2008).

How did a mostly STEM sector oriented concept as innovation become affiliated with the creative industries? In the recent years and along with the rising importance of a cultural economy or even the culturalisation of global capitalism (cf. Scott, 1997), creativity has been increasingly instrumental to economic and employment growth agendas. Especially in knowledge economies, the industries producing non-tangible goods and ideas are considered important foundations of innovation and subsequently economic progress. Therefore, also encouraged by Florida’s (2002) work on the creative class, the importance of enhancing creativity and innovation trickled through to many levels of policy and politics.

However, despite this peak of interest in the creative industries and innovation, academic research sparsely studied the specific features of innovation in the creative industries. Moreover, the development of an overarching (i.e. multidisciplinary yet cohesive) conceptualisation of innovation in the creative in-
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Industries for the policy field has been hampered by the fact that, throughout Europe, the cultural and creative industries have been coined a key economic sector whose innovative capacities were believed to branch out or spill over to the wider economy (Department for Culture, Media and Sport [DCMS], 1998; UNCTAD, 2008). The enthusiasm for the innovative capacities of the creative industries was mostly based on assertions rather than actual evidence for the link between creativity, culture and innovation (Oakley, 2009). Inevitably, such a normative approach obstructed the development of a more fitting definition of innovation in the creative industries in many policy papers. Consequently, in the policy field, innovation in the creative industries is mostly considered in its relation to spill-overs to the broader economy (Pratt & Jeffcutt, 2009), but how is innovation defined in contemporary academic research on the creative industries? In many existing accounts of research on innovation in the creative industries, a TTP like approach to innovation is adopted, using atomised and linear unidirectional depictions of the innovation process (e.g. Godin, 2006), where creativity is generally seen as an external input to ‘non-creative’ sectors or waning regions and cities. The same holds for other definitions of innovation, for example, the one developed by Gordon and McCann (2005b), who stated that “[i]nnovation involves the successful implementation of a new product, service, or process, which for most activities entails their commercial success” (p. 525), or the definition of Fagerberg, Mowery and Nelson (2005), which can be summarised in carrying out a new idea for a product or process. Both studies argue that innovation is different from the mere inception of an idea or invention, and consider successful implementation a core aspect of innovation. In the creative industries, however, commercial success is not

35 Obviously, the creative industries are a heterogeneous construction; some sectors, such as the arts, have a different view on innovation than for example web design or advertising (Stam et al., 2008). However, in this chapter, research on the creative industries refers to these industries in general. For more in-depth studies regarding innovation in specific creative disciplines, we refer to e.g. Cohendet and Simon (2007), Grantham and Kaplinsky (2005) and Tschang (2007) (see also the overview of Miles & Green, 2008).
always the most prominent objective of production.

In other discourses and as mentioned in the introduction, the creative industries are considered innovative by nature, with creative practitioners continuously producing new products and services. However, in these discourses, innovations take a different form than in the STEM sector innovations, as such innovations often are minor and subtle aesthetic changes in a product’s look or design, or its production process (Stoneman, 2009). In either case, the context specific, organisation dependent and institutionalised nature of the underlying processes has remained largely obscured from the analysis.

Even though among others Castañer and Campos (2002), Caves (2000), Miles and Green (2008), Stoneman (2009), Cappetta, Cillo and Ponti (2006), Jaaniste (2009), Bilton (2009, 2015), Lorenzen and Frederiksen (2008) and Gordon and McCann (2005b) proposed one or several conceptualisations and definitions of innovation in the creative industries, they employ a rather diffuse set of concepts. For example, their conceptualisations range from hidden innovation (innovation that is hidden from traditional measures, without a scientific or technological basis or created from novel combinations, or small local innovations taking place ‘under the radar’ (Miles & Green, 2008)), stylistic innovation (the reassignment of meanings to an existing product or its change in aesthetic characteristics (Cappetta et al., 2006)), soft innovation (innovation in products that are not generally considered functional in nature but are mainly aesthetic (Stoneman, 2009)) to artistic innovation (the introduction of something new in a(n) (organisational) field (Castañer & Campos, 2002)). Even though overlap can be found, each definition highlights a different interpretation of the term.

Besides formulating alternative definitions, some authors explicitly differentiate the innovations in the creative industries from other, often technological innovations. According to Caves (2000), creative industries innovation primarily consists of process innovation, new combinations of existing elements or fringe styles, while ‘normal’ innovation emerges mainly from purposive and typically costly efforts built on scientific and en-
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Pratt and Gornostaeva (2009) also address the difference between creative industries and innovation in other sectors: the former is often not a technological big bang, but a more organic and systemic process that is influenced by complex structures in regulation and the market. Another distinction is made between CPP innovation and TPP innovation, with the former considered to be the creative counterpart of the latter. Instead of the STEM sectors and patents, CPP innovation is based on the expressive-reflexive knowledge systems of the humanities and social sciences and copyrighted products. It includes the R&D, application and diffusion of cultural products and the way they are made, delivered and distributed. On the production side, the driving forces behind CPP innovation are often creative inspiration, while on the consumer side, innovation is often driven by developments in consumer tastes (Jaaniste, 2009). Lee and Rodríguez-Pose (2014a) differentiate several forms of innovations: original, fully new innovations versus learned innovations; innovations already existing yet new to the firm.

Nevertheless, while the aforementioned studies address the exceptional nature of creative innovation, Lee and Rodríguez-Pose (2014b) argue that innovation in the creative industries does not take a different form than innovation in other sectors. Their approach to innovation is often reflected in innovation measurement documents. For example, the Community Innovation Survey is one of the measures used to quantify innovation in the creative industries (e.g. Bakhshi & McVittie, 2009). This survey relies heavily on the Oslo Manual, using a broad yet technological view on innovation. This indicates that the STEM oriented approach to innovation in the creative industries is still present, despite the many disputers around the nature of innovations especially within these industries.

In sum, contemporary research offers a wide variety of conceptualisations of innovation in relation to the creative industries. Yet, a coherent conceptualisation of innovation in the field of the creative industries is needed. Instead of taking a theoretical approach, we propose to focus on the experiences of prac-
titioners in the creative industries. By doing this, we aim to provide a definition of innovation that captures the idiosyncrasies of innovation in the creative industries, yet that also does justice to the general tendencies of their field of work. This leads to the following research question: what do creative practitioners experience as innovation in their field of work, and how do they give meaning to this concept? The literature review indicates that innovation takes on many different shapes, dependent on the approach of the author and the industrial sectors. Therefore, a useful line of thought – and one that we propose to follow here – is to adopt a process approach to innovation within a field of innovation and creativity (cf. Bourdieu, 1993; Pratt & Jeffcutt, 2009). Based on the particularities of the creative industries addressed in the aforementioned research, ‘newness’ in the creative industries often has a different meaning compared to innovation in the STEM sectors. Therefore, we expect that innovation emerges in places by agents in a structural context, embedded in interactive processes of embodied learning and feedback. In order to answer the research question, we have taken a qualitative approach by exploring the meanings, definitions and explanations given to innovation by creative workers in the Netherlands.

**DATA COLLECTION AND METHODS**

In the pilot interviews with creative workers conducted in the winter of 2013-2014, we found that many respondents do not identify with most common conceptualisations of innovation, as they considered these definitions to be mostly associated with technologically based industries. Therefore, a second cycle of 43 in-depth follow-up interviews has been conducted with creative workers in order to gain a more refined and grounded understanding of the meanings of innovation both to producers and researchers (see Chapter 1).

All interviews were subsequently coded and analysed using Atlas.ti by taking a primarily semantic and inductive thematic
coding approach (Braun & Clarke, 2006). In these coding processes, we have chosen to focus on the definitions given to innovation in general, the definition of innovation in the respondents’ field, their self-evaluation in terms of innovativeness, the context in which innovation occurs and the relationship between specific places and innovation.

RESULTS

Not surprisingly and similar to the plethora of definitions coined by academics and policy makers, the respondents did not articulate one coherent vision on the meaning of innovation. In fact, many respondents struggled to come up with a general definition of innovation in the first place. There often was a noticeable reluctance to reflect on innovation and their own innovativeness.

The reluctance to discuss these topics has two reasons that resonate with the history of the concept of innovation and the creative industries. First, many respondents considered innovation to be a term that is associated with the STEM sectors: sectors that are highly different from the field the respondents are operating in. Evidently, this is strongly tied to the heritage of innovation being historically predominantly used for R&D and patent focused sectors. Second, this indifferent attitude to innovation was partly caused by the aforementioned perceived increasing importance of innovation for the creative industries. Respondents did not associate with it, nor did they feel represented by the often articulated idea of the creative industries as an engine for economic growth and innovation (e.g. Department for Culture, Media and Sport [DCMS], 1998; UNCTAD, 2008). In fact, a few respondents expressed negative thoughts about this creative industries ‘innovativeness imperative’, and considered the term ‘innovation’ to be a platitude, or to be misused or overused for the creative industries.
“I don’t feel myself, I am not feeling like an innovator. I see it more like… I think about something technological or eh, something smart we don’t know yet. Eh, I don’t often have that in my work. I am also not doing very innovative things. But… what I… what I feel about this place [a start-up cooperation] is that it wants to go forward, to break free from the established patterns, the business patterns that exist. So we are all searching, sometimes unconsciously, […] because we’re self-employed, you want to do things differently. You want to break away from the systems so to say. That’s perhaps not very innovative, but it is progressive, thinking ahead, or… different.” [Claire, Design]

“I have not been thinking about [innovation]. I don’t have an answer [to the question what is innovation]. […] I don’t consider myself innovative. I am creative.” [Leo, Film, video and photography]

“I start to see innovation a bit as a dirty word, because it is overused. […]. It starts to lose its meaning. […] Often I lose my interest in presentations when it says: it is about innovations of [makes snoring sounds and pretends to fall asleep].” [Tom, Design]

However, when the creative workers were asked to give a definition of innovation in relation to their own experiences, many respondents did develop a definition that covered either innovation in general, or innovation in their fields. This indicated that innovation has indeed become an empty term for many creative workers, but as soon as it connected to specific contents or their own experiences, it immediately became meaningful. From our analysis, three distinct patterns of innovation definitions arose, reflecting the full gamut of existing definitions: innovation as something completely new, innovation with a social impact and innovation as a continuous process of renewal.
The complete newness approach

The first of these definitions highly resembles the atomistic, linear interpretation often voiced in the context of the STEM sectors and TPP innovation: the form of innovation mostly to be found in the OECD (e.g. 1962, 1992; 1997) manuals. Innovation here is presented as something that is completely new; an object, process or service that was not yet in existence before. The newness here could be found in technology, techniques, new materials and new forms of software or computer programmes (see also the definition Bakhshi & Throsby, 2012). Noticeably, these accounts of innovation require radical change and a strong creative imagination: being able to see things that are not yet existing. Most respondents formulating this complete newness approach to innovation, however, rarely felt like they themselves were able to do this. Such a form of innovation was, for most, reserved for the STEM sectors.

“Innovation is when you create something that is not yet existing.”
[Kim, Film, video and photography]

“I think innovation is something […] that does not exist yet. And I find that difficult, because actually everything exists. And then you quickly move towards technological progress.” [Claire, Design]

Nevertheless, even though the majority of creative workers argued that this complete newness innovation is rare in the creative industries, some referred to a number of other aspects that were frequently associated with innovation in the creative industries. Firstly, innovativeness is considered to be strongly related to, or even inseparable from, technology and technological development. A new camera that provides new possibilities, faster computers giving more opportunities to create state-of-the-art designs and new chemical techniques that enable novel forms of ceramic glazing are all examples of externally developed technologies that influence the potential for creative practitioners. Instead of seeing technological product and process innovation
(TPP) and cultural product and process innovation (CPP) as two mutually exclusive aspects of innovation, this implies an alternative concentric circle model, with technology diffusing to the outer circles containing the creative industries.

The examples are not limited to the respondents’ disciplinary field and experiences of their own work. A number of respondents referred to developments and objects outside their daily lives, and even outside Schumpeter’s broad scheme of forms of innovation; travelling to Mars being probably the most imaginative example. A noteworthy pattern here is the recurrent reference to tangible ‘innovative’ objects, in particular the 3D printer, which was often considered the epitome of innovation. In our analysis, we found numerous references to this object, as well as ways in which it could be used to transform their creative work practices and its astonishing influence on society. This – again – is an example of a technological breakthrough that influences the work and experiences of creative workers.

“My first association of innovation without thinking it through is eh, a 3D printer or Tesla.” [Abel, Advertising]

“A 3D eh, 3D metal printer, that’s what I think is an innovation. What it does, it touches upon people, upon society. It contributes to society.” [Bjorn, Advertising]

The social impact of innovation

As described in the opening sentence of this innovation, there is a strong alleged connection between innovation and solving societal problems. In the interviews, this innovation as having a social impact is also a recurrent theme, and is the second definition of innovation that emerged from the analysis. Here, what makes an innovation an innovation is not its newness, but its social impact or relevance. Making the world a better place is a characterising element for defining innovation for these creative workers. This could be related to technological developments such as the aforementioned 3D printer, or development in business models and apps like taxi service Uber, for example, by being able
“Innovation is a dirty word”

“Personally I see [innovation] as a development, so people that develop something, innovate something, innovation that matters. So eh, a technological or creative development […], a development that improves people and society.” [Bjorn, Advertising]

“If you develop a technology, it wouldn’t solve anything. If it doesn’t realise someone’s dream, yes, it’s not innovative. And technology is perhaps easy to make tangible, but social innovation […], you need to look very carefully because otherwise you wouldn’t recognise it” [Eric, Software and electronic publishing].

Innovation as a continuous process of renewal

The third and final definition of innovation that was voiced by the creative workers is, in most cases, closest to their personal experiences. Even though many respondents referred to complete newness and innovation with social impact, few were involved in
major breakthroughs such as 3D printing and articulated having explicit social commitments themselves – they considered themselves first and foremost creative workers, and not predominantly the saviour of the world (although some did argue that they wanted “to make the world a better place” [Marcus, Advertising]). Therefore, a number of creative workers developed a definition of innovation that is similar to what Lorenzen and Frederiksen (2008) consider a constant form of product innovation resulting in continuous streams of small adjustments.

Indeed, the respondents argued that they rarely develop fully new products; on the contrary, most products are a variation on a pre-existing design, suggesting a very soft innovation (Stoneman, 2009) like approach. This can be either a combination of old and new, such as a garment with new technological functions or an existing website design with a new plugin, or even old with old, such as the development of new innovative artwork collections or combining one’s existing work with someone else’s in order to develop an unexpected outcome. Improving efficiency of existing processes is also an aspect of innovation that was mentioned repeatedly. In either case, the linear, ‘great breakthrough’ idea of innovation was dismissed for a notion that focussed much more on small steps and unexpected creative outcomes – see also formal innovation (G. Bianchi & Bartolotti, 1996) and stylistic innovation (Cappetta et al., 2006) here. In sum, innovation, in this third form, is not something new; it is a process of continuous renewal.

“Innovation is renewal. And renewal does not have to be a new product. [...]. Giving something a new function. Finding cooperation with a business that is not obvious.” [Jessica, Arts and antiques]

“Renewing, innovating [is] finding an adjustment that gives something just a different value than what it had before.” [Brenda, Arts and antiques]
“A lot of entrepreneurs here that are creative, they deal with innovation differently than companies like Philips. [...] I think [what they do] is also innovation, but more indirectly. You can develop a material, and with this material, I can make something. That is indirect innovation.” [Andreas, Design]

With regard to innovation as renewal, it is important to note that for many creative workers, making something new or changing an object or process is not an ultimate goal or their incentive to work. On the contrary, many argued that without continuously developing new products and services, an artist cannot survive. Creative workers, thus, are repeatedly on the outlook for renewal and innovation. However, some respondents stress that these improvements can hardly be measured, and the degree of innovation is only relative to what is perceived as ‘new’ or ‘better’ within their own economic network. In this field, market success may be seen as an objective indicator; entrepreneurial (peer) recognition as a more subjective indicator of innovation. Such indicators tie in rather neatly with a Bourdieusian (1993) framework of analysis and fit the definition of innovation in the creative industries as described by Castañer and Campos (2002): innovation in the creative industries is characterised by innovativeness within a specific field.

“[Talking about an existing project] I find it very interesting, is it innovative? I find it a good move, but is it really innovative? In this sector it may be innovative. I don’t think many businesses this size made this step.” [Marcus, Advertising]

“The others are also on the move, and if you’re not renewing or doing innovative work, and you’re doing the same for too long, then eventually the competition will roll past you, [...] because you’ve become out-dated. [...] Especially as an artist.” [Sebastian, Music and visual and performing arts]

This confirms the distinction of several forms of innovation outlined by Lee and Rodriguez-Pose (2014a), who discerned
original or new to the market innovation and learnt or new to the firm innovation in new services and products or new processes. The latter is much more common in the creative industries, and is often a result of the recombination of existing knowledge, ideas or technologies being already applied elsewhere. Stam, De Jong and Marlet (2008) also found that in the Netherlands, creative firms excel most prominently in new product and service innovation, whereas the introduction of goods and services to the industry is more on par with other industries.

In conclusion, the first two definitions, innovation as complete newness and to a lesser extent the social impact of innovation, indicate that there are some differences between innovation in the creative industries and innovations in other industries. The innovations elsewhere are often regarded as grand technological breakthrough and often as a development that could change society for the better. Even though a number of respondents argued that they were involved in (spin-off) social innovation or fully new innovative products or services, most respondents claimed that their work does not have such a character or impact (even though many were involved in a form of community arts of engagement).

If it is not the STEM sector or TPP oriented definition that fits their work best, how should we address innovation in the creative industries? Arguably, the third definition provides an answer to this question. Innovations, according to many respondents, always occur in a context. For example, applying a newly learned technique for developing photographic films (see also the learned innovation definition of Lee & Rodríguez-Pose, 2014a), or combining several existing forms of art. The explanation for this distinction can be found in the difference between the goal and the means. In many creative industries, innovation is not regarded a goal as, for example, patents are for the STEM sectors. On the contrary, to do their everyday work, creative workers have no other options than creating a new or adjusted product or service. This leads to a significantly different and broader approach to innovation.
CONCLUSION

In our research, we have sought to refine the conceptualisation of innovation specifically for the creative and cultural industries by exploring the definitions, experiences and interpretations of innovation of creative practitioners in- and outside their respective field of work. Our findings are based on an analysis of 43 in-depth interviews. We aimed to do justice to the many aspects of the creative industries by taking these particular practitioners’ views as a starting point for our analysis.

Our first observation is that many respondents at first felt little affinity with the concept of innovation in their own fields of work, despite (or perhaps because of) the assumed relationship between innovation and the creative industries. The innovation and creative industries discourse that emerged from the 1990s especially in, but not limited to, the field of cultural policies, contributed to the developments of many cultural and creative industries through (increased) subsidies and other forms of investments (Oakley, 2009; Pratt & Jeffcutt, 2009). However, the results of this study indicate that such an ‘innovation and the creative industries’ hype also has detrimental effects in the sense that it could alienate the actual creative workers from these policies. Indeed, some of the respondents did not identify with this innovation imperative and they voiced two distinct arguments for this. On the one hand, they felt ‘tired’ of the ubiquitous discourse of the innovative capacities of the creative industries, and on the other hand, many argued that the concept did not fit their practices as creative workers.

This is strongly related to another significant finding of our research: the overall conception of innovation in a general sense among practitioners in the creative industries is still a fairly traditional notion of technological improvement and the adaption of ground breaking technologies for manufacturing new products. A good illustration of this definition is the example of the 3D printing often voiced by the respondents as the epitome of innovation. At the same time, many argued that such technological progress alone cannot fulfil the conditions for innovation;
innovation, according to some respondents, has to have a social impact as well. The most prominent examples tell us that the common assumption of invented technologies as being external to the creative field still is widely supported, even among creative workers. However, once the creative practitioners hypothesised about their own work, and considered, for instance, how such an invention can be used as input in the creative process in order to generate innovative output, several respondents synthesised existing common notions of innovation with their own working practices and developed a more nuanced definition of innovation for the creative industries.

This synthesis was voiced by a significant part of our respondents who dismissed linear models of innovation when talking about their own practices, and focussed much more on the exceptional nature of their specific creative industry. Here, the emphasis in their definitions of innovation within their own field was not on ground breaking technologies, but rather on incremental improvements and experiments (which Caves, 2000 sees as inherent to creative work). These small ‘innovations’ were rarely considered as being fully new within the economy or the creative industries in general, and in some cases not even within their own sector. On the contrary, respondents argued that this newness was highly contextual and localised. Similarly, many rejected the idea of being specifically innovative individuals, yet at the same time, they saw their work as innovative (within a specific context) in a self-evident way. Likewise, they linked innovation to creativity or even the necessity of a creative drive in their work. Innovation in their field, they argued, is intertwined with their everyday work; it is part and parcel of working in sectors such as the creative industries as was also indicated by Hutter and Stark (2015). This also corroborates the findings of Oakley et al. (2008) for British artists and advertising professionals. In addition to such contextualised forms of innovation, some respondents also referred to social and communicative effects of innovation, which resonates with Dogruel’s (2014) conceptualisation of media innovations.
In conclusion, we argue that innovation in the creative industries is best understood by taking a holistic view, including its sources and outcomes, and that innovation is a process or a by-product of a process that is more than mere creativity or successful implementations of novel ideas or products. Contrary to STEM sectors innovation, in which innovation is goal-oriented and often a costly and well-planned procedure (Caves, 2000; Pratt & Gornostaeva, 2009), the results indicate that for creative workers, innovation in the creative industries is a process and a by-product of creative production. It is dependent upon openness to the environment and the utilisation of existing or creating new methods that increase or deliver high quality outputs that are new in specific contexts. The goal of this innovation is not so much developing the spill-overs to the wider economy as many policy reports indicate (e.g. UNCTAD, 2010) but rather achieving an artistic or social goal that allows the creative worker to continue her or his practices. Innovation, in this, is not an objective in itself, but rather a means to achieving a sustainable business continuation.

Thus, our perspective partly overlaps with the traditional view of TTP and the more recent CPP innovation (Jaaniste, 2009), yet it places less emphasis on the market and societal acceptance. In our view, and most similar to the notion of artistic innovation as described by Castañer and Campos (2002) or Pratt and Jeffcutt’s work (2009), innovation in the creative industries should be considered a field-specific process that has value in specific contexts and locations and takes different shapes in different settings. This allows an introspective view on the creative industries and, thus, a better way of understanding innovation in this particular context. Moreover, such a definition indicates that many innovations are produced out of the motivations to make things better or to make better things, but also that these innovations are shaped and created by their localities and the idiosyncrasies of the creative fields.
DISCUSSION AND LIMITATIONS

What does this mean for research on innovation and the creative industries? In current research, innovation is defined in many different ways, either through contrasting it to TPP innovation (e.g. Caves, 2000; Pratt & Gornostaeva, 2009; Jaaniste, 2009) or by developing a specific creative industries innovation definition (Cappetta et al., 2006; Castañer & Campos, 2002; Miles & Green, 2008; Stoneman, 2009). In cultural policy, a similar attitude towards innovation and the creative industries can be observed (Oakley, 2009). The primary concern in both fields is that, even though innovation and the creative industries are considered to be tightly interwoven, little attention is paid to how we should consider innovation within these industries.

Our analysis indicates that innovation in the creative industries is often contextual, meaning that the changes in style, form, product, service or organisation are rarely fully new. On the contrary, most innovations are new in a specific field (following Castañer & Campos, 2002): a specific place, a sub-sector or a particular scene. Obviously, evaluating such forms of innovation is much more complicated than those that can easily be quantified, such as the traditional measures of for example R&D expenditure and patents (see also Gordon & McCann, 2005b). Yet, the current assumptions on which much of the policy reports and to a lesser extent academic research is built, do not fully catch all these nuances of innovation in the creative industries. Taking our proposed contextualised field approach to innovation helps in nuancing the link between innovation and the creative industries, and opens up doors to new forms of analysis that include the many forms of innovation in these sectors.

Such a field approach requires a sensitivity to the multitude of interactions that contribute to the development and adoption of creative products and services, as well as a conscientious study of the products’ and services’ contributors and its consumers. In the words of Pratt & Jeffcutt (2009): ‘Interaction is the key, but interaction that cuts across the conventional boundaries of this field
“Innovation is a dirty word” (e.g. commercial/non, formal/non, arts/cultural etc.)” (p. 274). In practice, this demands a careful and in-depth analysis of the many facets of the practices of creative workers, including but not limited to: social (micro) interactions and cooperation, co-location, the creatives’ physical environment (e.g. cities, neighbourhoods, buildings and offices) and education. This too is the line of research that will be pursued in the upcoming chapters of this dissertation.

The explorative nature of this study does raise some additional questions that could be addressed in future research. The first issue is related to the overlap between the creative industries and workers. Nearly all respondents were either self-employed or were part of a small sized enterprise. Even though this is common for the creative industries (Hesmondhalgh, 2012), this could indicate a conflation between entrepreneurship and creative workers. Future research on entrepreneurship and innovation could clarify whether the findings are indeed characteristic of the creative industries, or if they are a result of generic attitudes of small entrepreneurs and those working in SMEs. Furthermore, our sample primarily consisted of Dutch creative workers located in the Netherlands. Cultural connotations of a concept such as innovation (e.g. Mueller & Thomas, 2001) may have influenced how it is discussed among the respondents. Discussing innovation in the Netherlands with creatives or entrepreneurs might therefore yield different results compared to doing similar research in other countries. Cross-cultural or cross-national comparative research could explore the generalisability of the findings of this study.

Additionally, while this chapter aims to take a new step in reconceptualising innovation in the creative industries, further steps are needed for developing a more in-depth understanding. First of all, this analysis is based on self-reported definitions of innovation; this allows an insight in the self-perceived practices of creative workers, but does not capture their actual multi-faceted innovation practices. Moreover, little is known about how this continuous, field-specific form of innovation occurs and how this could be measured (if at all) or assessed. Therefore,
further research is needed to investigate the sources and forms of innovation of creative workers. Such research should examine the daily practices of innovation of creative entrepreneurs in order to develop a better understanding of the negotiations of newness and creative (re)production in order to fully grasp the many shades of innovation in the creative industries. This is exactly what the next chapter aims to do.
“Innovation is a dirty word”
Chapter 6

Close to the ‘local cool’

Creative place reputation in Dutch ‘ordinary cities’
As the previous two chapters have demonstrated, interactions between creative workers – instigated by interaction rituals – are an important condition for potential knowledge exchange, and therefore potential increase in innovativeness. Especially for the creative industries, which are perhaps more than any other industry associated with intuitive practice, learning-by-doing and tacit, non-transferrable skills, being inside the important networks is essential. It is in these networks that knowledge is obtained, transformed and then, in an innovative new way, plugged into global circuits (O’Connor, 2004). These networks do not only exist socially, but also in terms of symbolic capital. Moreover, the notion that it is especially the metropolitan appeal of a place that attracts creatives (Hall, 2000; e.g. O’Connor, 2004; Pratt, 1997) overlooks the many creative clusters and co-working places outside of the global cities. Some of the ten cases included in this research, in fact, cover much smaller cities in the Netherlands.

So, why do creative workers, businesses and artists have the tendency to flock together – within and outside of the metropolitan core? This question has inspired a large number of research initiatives from numerous academic disciplines. Clustering literature, for instance, pointed at the importance of improved access to supply side externalities such as infrastructures (Gordon & McCann, 2005b) and social resources (Baptista & Swann, 1998) like knowledge spillovers or social networks (e.g. Comunian, 2011; Grabher, 2004). The notions of ‘buzz’ (Asheim et al., 2007; Storper & Venables, 2004) and ‘noise’ (Grabher, 2002b) expand this social aspect of clustering by seeing co-location not only in terms of direct collaboration, but also as a matter of simply ‘being there’ (Gertler, 1995) and absorbing the ‘psychological motivation’ or ‘localised passion’ (Bhansing et al., 2018; Storper & Venables, 2004) of indirect in-group contact. However, clusters are also approached in terms of production, where

---

the locality functions as a ‘seal of quality’ (Molotch, 1996, 2002),
authentic neo-bohemia (Lloyd, 2002), or provides ‘artistic divi-
dend’ (Markusen & Schrock, 2006).

We propose that the common denominator in these ap-
proaches is the cluster’s reputation, and that this (multifacet-
ed) reputation plays an important role in the locational deci-
sion-making practices of creative workers. Yet, Montanari,
Scapolan and Mizzau (2018) recently argued that the activation
of these decision-making processes lacked investigation and
that there is a “call for a more nuanced understanding of the factors
associated with both the attraction and retention” of creative workers
(J. Brown, 2015, p. 2352). This chapter addresses this issue by
looking in-depth at the locational decision-making practices and
experiences of co-located creative workers in the Netherlands,
concentrating especially on second and third tier cities.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Reputation and the creative industries beyond the me-
tropolises

Much of the aforementioned debate has focussed on the ur-
ban context (P. Collins & Cunningham, 2017), and especially on
the first tier cities and prominent metropolitan or creative cities
(White, 2010) such as Amsterdam (Kloosterman, 2004; Peck,
2012), Beijing and Shanghai (Liu, 2009), London (Lee & Drever,
2013), Vancouver (Hutton, 2004), New York (Currid, 2007), San
Francisco (Pratt, 2002), Paris (Aubry, Blein, & Vivant, 2015) and
Berlin (Heebels & Van Aalst, 2010; Lange, 2009). These global
cities are believed to inhabit the diversity and tolerance pursued
by creative workers (Florida, 2002; J. M. Jacobs, 1962; Lawton,
Murphy, & Redmond, 2013), as well as the creative milieu (Hall,
2000), the ‘cool jobs’ (David & Rosenbloom, 1990; Neff et al.,
2005; Scott, 2005; Storper & Scott, 2009), the neo-bohemic vi-
brancy (Lloyd, 2002), and the relevant networks, clusters, infra-
structures and embedded knowledge (Banks et al., 2000) that
allegedly would foster creative and professional success and in-
novation.
Yet, some authors (e.g. Petridou & Ioannides, 2012) argue that current research on the creative industries has an ‘urban bias’, with a distinct gap in the literature on the link between culture and creativity in more peripheral areas. In a similar vein, Amin and Graham (1997) state that the focus in much of the literature has too often been on what they call single cities, the famous metropolises such as Los Angeles, which are conveniently thought to encompass all global urban trends. Even within such ‘extraordinary’ cities, they argue, only certain places, such as creative or industrial areas, are emphasised. This partial representation tends to overlook the context that does not fit the authors’ argumentation. Moreover, overgeneralisation from only a few examples to ‘unexceptional’, ‘ordinary’ cities – these cities that are not among the top creative cities or world financial centres – calls for research on such places in order to counter this bias.

At the same time, however, there is a growing interest in the amenities and pull-factors of the rural based creative industries, on rural cultural production and on fairs and festivals. Often trying to escape the fast-paced urban life, many creatives are attracted to the beautiful and inspirational landscapes, the (relative) remoteness, quietness (White, 2010), quality of life and a strong, close-knit communities (P. Collins & Cunningham, 2017). In such places, nature is “right on your doorstep” (C. Gibson, Luckman, & Willoughby-Smith, 2010, p. 31) and serves as a driver of creativity and authenticity.

The area ‘in between’ the metropolitan and rural worlds, conversely, has received little attention so far. Far less is known about how reputation works in second tier cities, and how these ‘ordinary’ cities attract and retain their creative workers (P. Collins & Cunningham, 2017). Noticeably, many creatives work outside of the world’s metropolises, and many of these places are competing to attract creatives (J. Brown, 2015). Creative places in these second or third tier cities can have advantages compared to their metropolitan counterparts, for example in providing affordable studios (Champion, 2010). Yet, empirical research also demonstrates that they are sometimes considered just a step towards ‘graduating’ towards a more appealing area
in order to obtain more high-profile clients or develop a more attractive brand (Champion, 2010). Similarly, the research of Brown (2015) on Birmingham’s creative workers’ locational decision-making considerations indicates that the primary factor leading to migration was mostly serendipitous, not so much the appeal of urban amenities or the ‘quality of place’. Again, her respondents cited their residence in Birmingham being contested by others, as it was considered ‘second rate’. Many of them expressed a (speculative) desire to move to the creative global cities, such as Berlin, Paris and Chicago.

This chapter therefore focusses on the attraction and retention of creatives in creative clusters in the ‘ordinary’ second and third tier cities by looking at the places’ soft infrastructures: the networks or a specific images that are meaningful factors in the attractiveness of certain places for creatives (Cardoso & Meijers, 2016). What is it that attracts creatives to these places and which roles do networks, ‘buzz’ and knowledge exchange play in this regard? We are interested in the reputation of clusters that lack the appeal of a world city or the rural amenities, and how such reputation economies play out in the day-to-day working practices of creative workers (Conor et al., 2015) outside of the world’s creative metropolises.

To answer these questions, this chapter presents a qualitative analysis of 43 interviews with Dutch co-located creative workers and artists that provide an in-depth insight in their historical and current decision-making processes as well as their experiences of working in co-working spaces and clusters. It examines how networks influence a place’s reputation and, subsequently, how this reputation can affect creative work, the place’s sustainability, and the value it adds to places and products.

This chapter is structured as follows: the next two sections address some important theoretical concepts and their relation with locational decision-making processes and co-location in the creative industries. This is followed by the data-collection and methodological choices. The results are structured in three sections, discussing the global network of clusters, the affordances of reputation, and image and reputation as pull-factors. It ends with a conclusion, discussion and limitations.
Co-location, networking and ‘buzz’

From the early 1990s, the co-location of creative industries and workers has risen to the attention of both academics and urban policy makers by the emerging concept of clustering (e.g. Porter, 2000). Clustering tendencies have been particularly visible in the field of cultural production and in creative work (Pratt, 2008b). The emergence of countless industrial and particularly creative clusters indicate that, even in a globally connected era (c.f. Cairncross, 1997), place is still important because local networks are grounded in particular places where culture is produced and consumed (Currid, 2007; Markusen, 1996).

The importance of networks is often associated with the increase in face-to-face, project-based working, which is especially prevalent in the creative industries (Currid, 2007; Grabher, 2002a, 2002b; Neff et al., 2005). This project-based working often takes place in third places (Oldenburg, 1989), such as lunchrooms and pubs located in the vicinity of offices and studios. In these places, creative workers are exposed to their peers, ideas and the appropriate norms and practices within a creative community (J. S. Brown & Duguid, 1991; Grabher, 2002a).

However, these places never become successful in isolation (Maskell, 2014), and networks are often not limited to one particular local ecosystem. In processes of knowledge creation, Bathelt and Cohendet (2014) suggest that for the creative industries, local and global dimensions are intrinsically interwoven. On the one hand, creative work is shaped by processes internal to local communities and organisations, such as ‘buzz’ (Bathelt et al., 2004) or ‘creative slack’ (Cohendet & Simon, 2007). By being exposed to all kinds of informal informative ‘noise’ and gossip, creative workers become aware of tacit knowledge, suitable potential project-members (see also Asheim et al., 2007) and the local and global rumours, impressions, recommendations, strategic misinformation and trade folklore (see also Pratt, 2002).

On the other hand, these processes are also entangled with linkages to external, often global, knowledge pools that generate inspiration and creativity. Such pipelines are strong or weak ties between firms or people that connect clusters with creative
and non-creative places around the world, making them nodes in multiple other production chains (Bathelt et al., 2004; Pratt, 2008b). These pipelines, we hypothesise, function as reputation-al pipelines, as these do not only allow the exchange of knowledge, but also a continuous awareness of – literally – one’s place in the world. Therefore, we propose that co-location in a creative place – even in smaller cities – plays an intermediary role in connecting a creative worker’s existing knowledge with the (tacit) knowledge of both the local ecosystem, as well as facilitating the linkages with larger networks of potential clients, customers or project members (e.g. the work on strong and weak ties of Granovetter, 1983).

The affordances of reputation
In the current global economy, urban place branding activities have soared, with cities competing to attract the ever-growing stream of visitors and global companies. Subsequently, many cities or areas have been labelled (by city marketeers, policy makers, businesses or residents) as having a creative, innovative or knowledge-based image. Such branding endeavours are aimed at gearing urban local images towards specific audiences (Yigitcanlar, Guaralda, Taboada, & Pancholi, 2016). Research of Montanari, Scapolan and Mizzau (2018) confirms that such an image is important, as creative workers base their locational choices (partly) on expectations regarding a place’s image. Subsequently, this (socially constructed) image, together with physical and structural aspects such as the historical heritage, look, ruggedness and grittiness (Andres & Golubchikov, 2016; Bain, 2003; Heebels & Van Aalst, 2010; Lloyd, 2002; Smit, 2011), influences the place’s reputation: the consistent appreciation of its characteristics and amenities.

According to Scott (2000), creative clusters are idiosyncratic in the sense that each of them focusses on specific goods and services, and develops a distinct culture and reputation. At the same time, the success of a cluster also depends on its ability to transpose the local culture onto the global networks. The cultural and creative industries are thus, Scott (2000) argues, effective-
ly ingrained in different localities that host dense networks of mutually dependent SMEs through for instance networking and pitching events, trade fairs, arts festivals, game conferences and design weeks (see also Pratt, 2008b). New technologies also allow co-located workers to become more aware of their position in a global network of creative places.

Furthermore, the reputation of a place is expected to attract new creative workers, seeking to reap the benefits of these social externalities (Asheim et al., 2007; Drake, 2003). In the words of Maskell (2001):

“Already existing firms located elsewhere might be tempted to relocate […] to the cluster because of the real or imagined advantages of getting better access to the local knowledge base or to the suppliers or customers already present. [A] dominant position will also attract entrepreneurs with ambitions to start firms in the particular industry” (pp. 932–933).

Another yet markedly different reputation related practice concerns the marketisation of creative goods and services, in which the creative image serves as a marketing tool for locally produced products and services (e.g. Heebels & Van Aalst, 2010; Scott, 1997). Molotch (1996, 2002), for example, states that being located in the proximity of an influential creative network may provide a ‘seal of quality’, and Currid and William’s (2010) research demonstrates that places of cultural production and consumption seek to be associated with branded locations within the city.

Similarly, Zukin (1995) argues that creative workers deliberately affiliate their brands or their products with their place’s heritage or the creative community they are located in – as I will also explain in the following chapter. Zarlenga, Ulldemolins and Morato (2016), emphasised that co-located gallery holders make locational decisions based upon consciously creating an image by associating with their local community. As a result, these gallery holders try to prevent the inflow of art galleries with a lower artistic level that could jeopardise the reputation of
the cluster’s quality brand. Hence, in the words of Scott (2000):
creative clusters are hubs of social reproduction where “crucial
cultural competencies are maintained and circulated”, but also are “mag-
nets for talented individuals from other places who migrate to
these centres in search of professional fulfilment and who in
turn help to maintain local cultural energies” (p. 33).

In conclusion, clusters and co-working spaces house im-
portant local networks, but also maintain ties with other, global
places. Therefore, creative workers seeking a workplace are of-
ten familiar with several local and global clusters, and base their
locational decisions on the cues about these localities. However,
even though it is generally accepted that reputation has an im-
portant influence on the success of co-located creative workers
and the sustainability of a cluster by recruiting a viable inflow
of new creatives, less is known about how creative workers ne-
gotiate their knowledge about different localities and how they
include the reputation of places (and their ‘residents’) in their
professional and creative decision-making processes.

What makes a specific place interesting, what are the roles
of local and global networks, and how does this work in sec-
ond and third tier cities without a global appeal? Finally, how do
creative workers tap into the ‘creative slack’ and commodify a
reputation in their work, and what value does this add to their
creative products as well as to particular places? We hypothesise
that the social prospects of co-location are a major influence on
the decision-making processes in places without a global appeal.
Therefore, these micro-processes that are often neglected in
current spatial decision-making studies (Montanari et al., 2018)
are the central focus of this chapter.

DATA COLLECTION AND METHODS

This study builds on the 43 interviews with co-located creative
workers as described in Chapter 1 (second cycle in-depth in-
terviews). Respondents were interviewed about their locational
decision-making, the expectations and experiences of co-lo-
cating with other creative workers. Our sample included eight
locations in second and third tier cities\textsuperscript{42} in the Netherlands:
Belcanto in Haarlem, BINK36 in The Hague, Creative Factory
in Rotterdam, De Gruyter Fabriek in Den Bosch, De Vasim in
Nijmegen, Dutch Game Garden in Utrecht, Klein Haarlem in
Haarlem and Strijp-S in Eindhoven. These locations are very
diverse in the sense that they range from central to more pe-
ripheral areas within the city, house fifty to five-hundred work-
ers, are mono-disciplinary or include a wide variety of sectors
– both creative and not so creative. We therefore adopted an
embedded multiple case study design, in order to add to the
robustness of our study (Yin, 2009). The diversity in cases
assures a more balanced view, including places geared towards
networking, and those that do not facilitate these services.

The respondents were asked about their ‘locational narra-
tives’: the stories they tell about the relationship between place
and their professional life. Particular attention was paid to the
decision-making processes in the early years of their career, the
decision to choose for their current locations, as well as their ex-
periences as ‘residents’ in these places, and (hypothetical) future
plans. Moreover, we inquired how they perceive and describe
the local atmosphere, how their business contacts comment
on their location and how they (aim to) present themselves to
these contacts. Finally, the respondents reflected upon their so-
cial practices and interactions, as well as the knowledge they ex-
changed with their co-located peers.

The coding process was primarily semantic and inductive.
Some 20 short pilot interviews with respondents from the
same population preceded the 43 in-depth interviews, which
functioned as the basis for initial theme formation. Recurrent
themes in these pilot interviews were explored further through
a literature review that resulted in the theoretical framework

\textsuperscript{42} We define second tier cities as cities outside of the capital whose economic
and social performance affects the national economy (ESPON/SGPTD 2012
in Cardoso & Meijers, 2016), often having a population between 500,000 to
1,000,000 (Williams et al., 2015). A third-tier city has a population between
100,000 and 500,000 (Williams et al., 2015). All cases fit in either of the two
categories.
above. The coding processes consisted of several rounds of open coding and axial coding, and eventually selective coding around the theme of reputation and the most prominent concepts in the literature (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Additionally, themes were refined and tested for internal homogeneity and external heterogeneity (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

RESULTS

Local pipelines, global imagination
We are living in a globally connected era, in which firms are increasingly (internationally) interconnected, knowledge flows are impossible to contain in a locally demarcated area, and in which once far-away destinations are now at our fingertips. This ‘space of flows’ (Castells, 1989) points towards a global ecology of cities, in which co-located creative workers form an imagined community (B. Anderson, 1983) of creative spaces that compete for (creative) workers and firms (Florida, 2002), and local industries reimagining themselves as global players (Sanson, 2014).

Though contrary to what the ‘death of distance’ (Cairncross, 1997) inspired literature and the omnipresence of comparable creative clusters in the western world would suggest, our respondents were working and exchanging information in a mostly local (extended) network (comparable to what Castells (2012) considers the ‘space of places’). Such a network existed often within their own location, in the neighbourhood or the immediate surrounding area, which is also the most prominent reason for respondents not having ambitions to relocate to more prominent cities like Amsterdam or abroad. A few respondents mentioned networks ranging from the local music scene [Sebastian, Music and visual and performing arts] to a national orientation (the Dutch game designers) [Thomas, Digital and entertainment media]. Working in an international network is, as Lucas [Music and visual and performing arts] explained, for his field less prevalent than working locally.
However, global pipelines did exist in a more symbolic form. Surprisingly, a symbolic relationship to other places was used by respondents for consciously connecting to a certain global culture that fitted their own desired image. Here, being part of such a global culture not only served as a means to participate in the relevant networks, but also for inspirational and marketing purposes. Respondents actively and explicitly referred to other, often notable creative places or global cities, particularly Berlin, New York and London. They used this as examples of how the reputation of their location could grow and how the most creative places often appear in certain derelict areas. This provided an appealing perspective:

“If this cluster wasn’t here, this would have been a neighbourhood for junks only. Because there's more traffic now, and more people, the reputation gets better. East Berlin is the best example of this of course, yes, how you can make a derelict place into a good one” [Daniel, Crafts].

Being part of this ‘global imagined community’-like network (B. Anderson, 1983) of creative places provided inspiration and creativity, as well as legitimacy for their creative work in less evocative cities. Others stated that these creative metropolises are fashionable, and many customers or clients want to be associated with this, like the clients of Kim [Film, video and photography], who argued that “[My clients] want a bit New York, a bit meatpacking. You know. For that, this place is trendy.” Therefore, knowledge pipelines served much more often as sources of inspiration than as actual forms of collaboration. Respondents actively engaged in connecting the reputation of their location to that of other, more famous places.

However, we witnessed an almost reversed tendency when discussing other (creative) places in their vicinity. Almost all respondents mentioned such places, most often in the same city. Surprisingly though, the majority of respondents referred to nearby clusters in a negative tone, emphasising their lack of creativity, innovation or professionalism. Kim [Film, video and
photography] for example, described her relation to a nearby creative place in the following manner: “I thought about moving [to this other place], but I couldn’t afford it. The units they offered were way too small. And yes eh, all those hipsters… […] I prefer to belong to the creatives.” We observed a negative relation between how long they have been working in a specific place, and their identification with other places, such as the evaluation of Monique [Arts and antiques] demonstrates:

“[A nearby creative cluster] was nice before, there was always something happening there. [But now] you don’t hear anything anymore. At least, I hear nothing about [it]. It is what I said, it has become a bit lethargic. A bit boring.”

This resonates with Scott’s (2000) idea that creative clusters are idiosyncratic with a distinct culture and image. The longer the creatives worked at one specific place, the more they aligned their identity to that of their location. At the same time, however, they commodified the ‘imagined community’ of creative places. Even though these networks mostly appear to be locally oriented, global pipelines, real and imagined, do exist. Our respondents tapped into this global network of creative places for image building, inspiration and imagination, as well as for legitimation purposes.

The image as an asset
Accordingly, and in line with existing research, the reputation of a place was of importance to the local creative workers, also in second and third tier cities. Comparable to the larger metropolitan areas with well-established creative or entrepreneurial reputations, the places in our research, in these smaller cities, were adding symbolic value to the locally produced creative products and services by providing a legitimate narrative and access to an aura of creativity that would normally be out of their reach, as is explained by the following section on the commodification of place reputation.
Similar to the idea of idiosyncratic clusters mentioned above, it was not possible to pinpoint one specific ‘perfect’ image that would yield the optimal value in terms of a positive, attractive reputation. Different creative workers and clients appreciated different aspects of a place’s potential image. Some respondents stated, for example, that they preferred their location to have a creative image, while others preferred a more professional image, and finally, a few mentioned the importance of being part of a ‘cool’ network.

We observed that creative image is especially important for the respondents working on the margins of the creative industries, such as in ICT design or those having a more administrative core task. These workers used their location in order to promote a creative image; an image they expected (and found) their clients to appreciate. In short, they capitalised on their co-located creative workers and especially artists to market their own services and products as more creative. Bjorn [Advertising] for example, noticed that it’s easier to win projects: “People are more inclined to choose for you. People find you more easily. When you talk about [this location], people say, oh yes, that’s creative, you know.”

Next to the creative image, other respondents preferred their location to have a more professional image. Being able to show that you are able to pay for a professional office or studio is an important sign of being a proficient creative worker. These respondents were, in many cases, more on the artistic side of the creative industries, such as photographers and those working in the fine arts. In such a situation, they felt that an unprofessional image would harm their own reputation and would jeopardise contact with their potential commercial customers. These creatives often preferred to associate themselves with the more professional networks in order to be able to communicate a more professional image to their clients. Kim [Film, video and photography] explained this in the following way:
“There is an organisation that rents offices to artists for only half of the original price. I don’t really like that, because they are not as commercial and use taxpayers’ money to lie on the ground naked and make some pictures there. […] I’m fine with that you do this, but just pay the full price for it, just like I do, [my neighbour] does and everyone else does. I think that is a little eb, bad for our reputation.”

In sum, explicit association with a place to create a professional or creative reputation is strongly related to the networked image other workers use to promote their services and products. Being able to show that one is part of a well-regarded in-group impresses peers, clients and business contacts, and adds symbolic value to the work. These places have become a local networked “institution, everyone knows where the cluster is located” [Alex, Film, video and photography] and what it entails. Consequently, being part of a networked place is being part of a ‘cool place’ (Pratt, 2002), or, in the words of Thomas [Digital and entertainment media]: “The big buildings and visibility and being part of a very large network of people, that has a certain coolness factor.” In the absence of the global metropolitan creative appeal, the network of the ‘local cool’ thus serves as a distinguishing appeal of creative places in ‘ordinary’ cities (see also Champion, 2010).

**Image and reputation as pull-factors**

Evidently, the reputation of a creative collaborative workplace is primarily influenced by the creative workers it houses and has housed in the preceding years. We observed that the presence of other workers as well as the possible positive effects of existing social networks are among the most prominent reasons why the respondents made the decision to locate in a particular place. As the vast majority of creative workers are working on a freelance (Hesmondhalgh & Baker, 2010) and often project basis (Grabher, 2002a, 2004), the prospect of being part of a network is highly attractive and considered a valuable asset to their creative work. Mark [Software and electronic publishing], for example, explicitly mentioned the importance of this network:
“I once went to a lecture here in this building, so I already knew it before I moved here. And there were [...] many people working in the same sector as I do, and they were all located in this building. [...] That’s why I liked [this place].”

For Mark, and similar to the arguments of Banks et al. (2000), co-location provided access to relevant potential collaborators and networks of knowledge exchange. Many of the interviewees corroborated this expectation in their narratives about their locational decision-making histories, such as Kathryn [Designer fashion], who wanted to be surrounded by creatives because she “[…] just like[s] being amongst other creatives where you can, possibly, cooperate with. Even if it’s just meeting people in the bicycle parking and just have a chat.”

Being able to be part of a creative community is an important motivation: respondents frequently highlighted that they find it incredibly important to be able to ‘be yourself’ and to surround themselves with likeminded creatives. Here, the access to the ‘buzz’ was a major factor for (re)locating to a creative cluster. This ‘buzz’, evidently ubiquitous in the larger, creative cities, is more difficult to find in second and third tier cities. As creative workers are dependent on this ‘buzz’, and in many cases, the availability of tacit knowledge for their professional and creative success, our respondents explicitly emphasised that, in their locational decision-making processes, they were explicitly focused on the local places that were considered to contain such an environment. Julia [Music and visual and performing arts] mentioned that such a creative reputation was highly important for her locational decision-making process:

“I knew that this was a fun place and a lot of things were happening here […]. Why I have chosen this place? This is why I came back to the Netherlands [from working abroad]: to be among other creatives, because I was very isolated before. I was the only one doing creative work […]. Now I am one of the many creatives. It is super inspirational.”
Interestingly, despite this importance of being surrounded by creatives, Julia was located in one of the smaller cities in our sample, a city that was, according to the respondents and even more than some other cities in the sample, not known as particularly creative. The (local) creative reputation of the workplace was essential here: non-creative companies, shops and especially chain stores were not always welcomed in such locations. Many interviewees emphasised that they certainly would not want chain stores in their vicinity, as this diminished the uniqueness and cultural appearance of the area. They explicitly referred to endeavours to keep a national bagel bakery franchise and major supermarkets away from their creative clusters. Curating and preserving the creative ‘local cool’, these respondents argued, contributed both to their own inspiration as well as conveying a certain, beneficial image. Sebastian [Music and visual and performing arts] emphasised this by stating:

“Look, everyone who visits us thinks: wow, man, this is really like East Berlin, or eh, that feeling, you know. And that eh, that remains just so cool for me. [...] I think it is a beautiful building. And that feeling, every time I enter this place, I think, yes [in an enthusiastic voice], you know”.

The effect of these networks on reputation and cluster sustainability was clearly visible in one of our cases that witnessed a period of decline before and during conducting the interviews. Here, insecurity about the future prospects of these places led to the departure of several tenants. In the words of Louis [Design]:

“Because the future of this building [as a creative cluster] is insecure, there was no inflow of new people at all. And people that found it difficult, having such an insecure future, they left. So yes, it’s only a very small club of people that remained.”

This obviously had a very negative effect on the place’s reputation, as Rachel [Design] argued:
“For a while we had a community manager, that was fantastic! She just arranged things, people came to this place and she showed the outside world who we were. But since she is gone, this just didn’t happen at all. Everything just stays inside. And as long as no one knows that we’re here, no new tenants will come, and you won’t find the atmosphere that this place should have”.

Hence, the networks evidently have a significant impact on creative workers. They provide a place with a matching and attractive reputation that is essential for cluster sustainability. As creative workers are often actively pursuing the relevant creative atmospheres, ‘buzz’, and vicinity of noteworthy other firms and individuals, the prospect of co-locating in such a place is vital in their choices. This inflow is regulated by the place’s networks. Through these networks, contacts with other (local) creatives are established and maintained, spreading and affirming the reputation of the workplace, and invigorating the local ‘buzz’. However, when places obtained the reputation of diminishing ‘buzz’ or creativity, this immediately was reflected in the decreasing contentment of existing, and stagnating attraction of new creative workers. Therefore, in order to survive in the global community of creative places, in which there is a persisting appeal of other – global and local – creative cities and clusters, a positive reputation, and thus a sustained inflow of new creatives, is paramount. Outside of the famous creative and metropolitan cities, being close to the local cool is crucial for both the success of creative workers as well as their localities.

CONCLUSION

Building upon 43 coded interviews with creative workers in the Netherlands, this chapter focussed on the reputation of creative places and co-working spaces in second and third tier cities. It is well-known that major metropolises, such as Amsterdam, Paris, Berlin, New York and London, have an enormous attraction on creative workers and artists (Boix, Hervás-Oliver, & Blanca,
2015). Even outside these cities, however, they tend to co-locate; to work in the close vicinity of other creatives. Also in smaller and the traditionally less ‘creative’ cities, such as Den Bosch and Rotterdam in the Netherlands, places with a specific creative reputation have mushroomed. How does such a reputation arise in places that do not naturally or historically have such a strong attraction, and how does this interact with the existing and developing networks of creative workers and artists?

With this chapter, we have aimed to explore a field that has so far lacked investigation (Petridou & Ioannides, 2012). A rich quantity of work has been published on metropolises, capitals and the quintessential creative cities, but little is known how these aspects play out beyond the global metropolises (P. Collins & Cunningham, 2017). Our research indicates that, despite the often applauded and intensifying influence of the networked information society or the so called ‘space of flows’ (Cairncross, 1997; Castells, 1996), most respondents worked and remained in their ‘space of places’, confined to their local territories, histories and networks. Yet, place reputation is nevertheless strongly tied to both local and global networks. Remarkably, many respondents argued that they felt part of a global community of creative places, not in the form of formal or informal cooperation, but mainly through tapping into the narratives of existing (international) creative clusters. This indicates a form of pipeline that is not dictated by interactions, collaborations, formal networks (Bathelt et al., 2004; Maskell, 2014), or places in production chains (Pratt, 2008b), but rather an imagined connection to a global web of places. Other local places, however, were often denounced as less inspiring or less creative, which indicates that even within smaller cities, several place related narratives exist, in which the ‘residents’ aim to absorb and propagate the specific symbolic values their own cluster offers.

Evidently, and in line with the vast amount of work on locational decision-making practices of creative workers (e.g. Currid, 2007), creatives appreciated the reputational aspects of working in a cluster: the creative, professional or networked image. Here, co-locating with other creatives is a matter of status.
We observed that this held for co-locating with creative SMEs and freelancers in general, and not only for larger prominent firms. As the first step for many creative workers and artists is often working from their homes (similar to the work of e.g. Merkel (2015) and Spinuzzi (2012)), being able to pay the rent for an office, studio or unit in a clustered building is a step up – even if it is in an ‘ordinary’ city. It provides a seal of quality (Molotch, 1996, 2002) that could, depending on the place and the type of work, be creative and/or professional. The findings suggest that workers in the more core creative sectors (in the model of Throsby, 2008) are looking for a slightly more professional atmosphere, whereas those doing more traditional work seek the creative edginess to profile their company.

In order to sustain their reputation, the proximity or inflow of less prestigious companies and chain stores was not appreciated; being part of a unique local cultural network, grounded in a specific place, was considered key to being a serious creative worker or artist. This unique brand is propagated in their presentation, for example, by explicitly using the reputation for their own branding practices in referring to their (co-)working space on their websites, or in conversations with potential clients or business contacts. This suggests that the notion of ‘place in product’ (Molotch, 2002), which is, like the majority of work on place reputation, confined to the ‘single’, ‘extraordinary’ city (Amin & Graham, 1997), can be applied to the ‘ordinary’ city as well. In such places, these efforts took the shape of emphasising the workers’ place as a node in a global network of renowned places. This subsequently strengthened the location’s reputation and attracted new creatives seeking to be part of this network. Reputation, in this sense, contributes to and affects the life cycle of these clusters (cf. Martin & Sunley, 2011).

In conclusion, creative workers and artists in ‘ordinary’ or second and third tier cities are, as they lack access to the symbolic capital of world cities and creative cities, probably even more dependent on co-locating. With ‘buzz’ and the relevant networks localised in particular, sometimes linked, yet often competing places within the city, creative workers commodify
these places’ affordances in actual networking and absorbing the local ‘buzz’, as well as for branding purposes. Through this branding and networking, the reputation was performed and spread throughout the city and further, which facilitated the attraction and retention of creative workers, ensuring the cluster’s viability and sustainability.

DISCUSSION AND LIMITATIONS

All cases in this study are situated in second and third tier cities. The Netherlands, however, is rich in creative clusters, with more or less all medium sized (and often small as well) cities housing at least one, but often more, of such endeavours. This might make locational decision-making more of a deliberate process similar to that what can be expected in the world’s metropolises. Nevertheless, such second tier cities have other pull-factors than famous metropolises such as New York or Paris (J. Brown, 2015) and cities in other regions. Cross-national comparative research could reveal whether the findings from this study are also applicable elsewhere in the world, and how the findings from Haarlem and Den Haag relate to practices in for example London, Los Angeles and Berlin.

Additionally, the cases in this study have been limited to what Andres and Golubchikov (2016) call brownfields, or which are addressed as creative hubs (Evans, 2009) or breeding places (Peck, 2012). Even though the sample in this study is diverse in size, institutionalisation, funding, organisational structure and level of urbanity, all cases are loosely organised and production oriented. Such places are often less institutionalised than for example museum quarters (Mommaas, 2004) and other consumption-oriented places, and cannot be compared to such more centralised efforts.
Chapter 8

“...flock together”

Conclusion
CONCLUSION

Birds of a feather flock together. Indeed, this seems true for many industries, thinking about, for example, the traditional wine cluster around Bordeaux, automobiles from Detroit or watches and knives from Switzerland. The creative industries especially have been subject to a wide range of research projects and policies, aiming to understand, justify, criticise and strengthen the co-location of creative firms and entrepreneurs. Why have clusters of creative industries received so much attention; how come they have been the topic of so many policy initiatives; why are they imagined to solve global societal problems? The answer to these questions can be summarised in one word: innovation.

The (co-located) creative industries are often considered as a forerunner of the post-Fordist economy; the knowledge economy defined by flexibility and its focus on creativity and innovative work practices. Especially these industries were supposed to bring the innovative ideas to the general economy and society. This principle inextricably linked the creative industries to innovation – a term that beforehand was most prominently applied to the STEM sectors. In recent decades, therefore, a school of thought emerged which anticipated the creative industries to provide important creative and innovative input for solving societal challenges – like the Designing a Country white paper (2014) quoted in the introduction – and the general economy. The creative industries too were expected to attract larger (innovative) firms and higher educated labour forces (catalysed by the famous yet contested work of Florida, 2002). As a result, many cities have pursued a strategy to attract the creative industries by investing in – or stimulating – co-location in, for example, creative business centres, creative hubs, creative clusters, ‘brownfields’, or co-working spaces. The rationale behind such investments is the hypothesis that co-location fosters the cross-pollination of innovative ideas (Bassett et al., 2002; Malmberg et al., 2005; Urry, 2002).
On the other hand, some researchers are much more sceptical about the agglomeration externalities, especially with regards to innovation. On the macro-level, Gordon and McCann (2005b) argued that the idea that agglomeration would immediately translate into innovative efforts is, in the best case, slightly naïve and lacking empirical support. Others, e.g. O’Connor (2004), Ben Letaifa and Rabeau (2013) and especially Boschma (2005) acknowledged that proximity could potentially facilitate interaction, but warned against a ‘lock in’ effect, with geographical closeness hampering rather than fostering innovativeness. On the meso- and micro-level, a number of authors emphasised that co-working is not necessarily working collectively, arguing, for example, that there is little evidence that co-location would drive innovations, or that co-working immediately (or at all) results in interactions and knowledge exchange (J. Brown, 2017; Fuzi, 2015; Spinuzzi, 2012; Spinuzzi et al., 2019). Co-working, consequently, is dependent upon ‘curation’ by community facilitators in order to be collaborative (J. Brown, 2017; Fuzi, 2015; Parrino, 2015).

Therefore, while much has been written on innovation in general and in the creative industries, and in particular about the spatial aspects of innovation, the exact ways in which such innovation occurs and diffuses is extremely difficult to disentangle. Similarly, despite several policy initiatives to boost the opportunities for the creative industries, what makes them innovative is hard to define for such a diverse and broad sector. Understanding whether and how co-location contributes to the innovativeness of creative firms helps in developing effective policies and sustainable business models for the creative industries. This is especially urgent, as, over the last decades, investments in such spaces have been widespread. With the flourishing economy in Western Europe at this moment, it is likely that such clusters, often located in relatively neglected and affordable areas in the city, will soon feel – or are already feeling – the increasing pressure of rising rents, real estate brokers and gentrification trends (cf. the “cycles” of gentrification described by Zukin, 1982).
In this conclusion, I will address these issues by first (tentative-ly) answering the overarching research question. Next, I will summarise the general findings and highlight the academic con-tributions of this dissertation. In particular, I will focus on 1] relating the macro-level to the micro-level, 2] the situatedness of innovation, and 3] the forms of capital provided by collaborative workplaces. Thereafter, I will address some limitations and suggestions for future research. This conclusion – and therefore this dissertation – ends with discussing several practical implica-tions of the findings.

So, does co-location contribute to innovation? And if so, how?

This brings me back to the overarching research question I have aimed to answer in this dissertation: (how) does co-location contribute to the self-perceived innovative capabilities of freelancers and SMEs in the creative industries? In order to do this, I have drawn upon and combined insights from several academic fields. Starting from (economic) geography, I have engaged with the claim that co-location (in clusters) has effects on the firms’ innovativeness. Tak-ing concepts such as ‘buzz’, face-to-face and tacit knowledge as a starting point, I aimed to disentangle how this mechanism works out on a micro-level, the level of the individual creative worker. Chapters 4 and 5 specifically demonstrated how tacit knowledge can be transferred through collegial behaviour and informal mentorships, and how such social settings develop in ritualistic daily rhythms. These mechanisms will be discussed more in-depth later on in this chapter.

Following the literature of (critical) labour studies, I con-nected the affordances of co-location to the working conditions in the creative industries, showing that especially for these indus-tries, there is added value in co-working in order to compensate for the relatively precarious labour conditions. Concepts from (cultural) sociology, then, helped to shed light on the practic-es of creative workers in co-working spaces, both by providing tools for understanding interactions in workplaces, but also for gaining more insight into practices of distinction. The applica-
tion of these concepts onto co-working settings allows taking a closer look at the spatial attributes and limitations of front- and backstage boundaries, performances and rituals. This spatial perspective is highly indicative of social behaviour, yet often either overlooked or just addressed superficially in these contexts.

So, how does this relate to innovation? Does co-location indeed make creative workers more innovative? Considering the difficulties (or the impossibility) of actually capturing innovation in the creative industries, this question can only be answered tentatively. Taking these disclaimers into account, my answer would be: yes, but indirectly. Co-location does not necessarily lead to collaboration, and this collaboration only rarely sparks innovation. But does that mean that we should disregard this thesis altogether? I would say no. Co-location has a lot to offer—especially for a group that is highly dependent on project-based work, informal interactions, advice, authenticity and reputation—in order to compensate for limited on-the-job or even educational training in practical, more entrepreneurial skills, and to enhance one’s creative or professional credibility and reputation. By co-location, creative workers gain access to a ‘rich soup’ (Iammarino & McCann, 2006) of tacit knowledge.

Moreover, it also allows them to acquire a more credible professional or creative reputation, both by being able to tap into the almost universal—at least in the western world—appreciation of (post-)industrial aesthetics, as well as by the sheer proximity of other, well-regarded creatives. More specifically, this means that on this ‘middle-ground’ of creative collective workplaces, the symbolic global flows and local histories intersect and feed into each other, sparking new hybrid forms of aesthetic, spatial and spatial configuration. Creative workers interpret global styles and apply them in local settings, and surround themselves with aesthetics and other creatives in order to connect to the global city prestige. In itself, none of these factors directly contributes to innovation. Yet, in combination, they provide a fertile soil on which innovative ideas can grow (through informal help and tacit knowledge exchange) and eventually can be harvested and implemented (by having suf-
ficient creative or professional credibility to bring products or services to the market).

**ACADEMIC CONTRIBUTIONS**

**From macro-developments and perspectives to micro-experiences**

As mentioned above, a large body of research has been published on the intersection of place, innovation and the creative industries, originating from a wide variety of academic fields. In this dissertation, I have aimed to map some of the macro-perspectives on these topics, and apply these to the micro-level of individual creative workers. Moreover, much of this research has been guided by specific meso-level forms of organisation: collaborative workplaces in which individuals seek peer proximity while doing solitary work.

Classic economic geography literature emphasised the importance of concepts such as ‘buzz’, face-to-face interactions (e.g. Asheim et al., 2007; Bathelt et al., 2004; Currid & Williams, 2010; Storper & Venables, 2004), ‘noise’ (Grabher, 2002a), ‘something in the air’ (Crewe & Beaverstock, 1998), ‘milieux’ (Breschi & Lissoni, 2001; Hall, 2000; Maillat, 1998; Törnqvist, 2004) or localised knowledge spillovers (Krugman, 1997; McCann & Simonen, 2005), with many of such studies aiming to ‘measure’ such effects by looking at e.g. patents (Fischer, Scherngell, & Jansenberger, 2009; Maurseth & Verspagen, 2002) or inter-firm linkages (e.g. Bathelt, 2007). Yet, how these agglomeration externalities work out in the daily practices of creative workers, and how they themselves experience and negotiate such contacts with their co-located peers is rarely touched upon. In other words: while it is quite evident that something happens in what are usually called clusters of firms or freelancers, *what exactly* remains a pressing question.

What I have aimed to do here, drawing upon self-reported data and observations on the lived experiences of creative workers, is shedding some light on the mechanisms behind such
externalities. I would like to point out two implications in this regard. First, on the level of individual creative workers, co-location is, quite similar to earlier findings of e.g. Ebbers (2013), hardly ever leading to (formal) forms of collaboration. There is rarely any financial remuneration for the tasks, work or help exchanged. Inward- and outward contracting is uncommon, often non-existent. This confirms the idea that ‘measuring’ the impact of co-location (or even innovation) by looking at (formal) collaboration is at least difficult, if not impossible. Yet, this does not mean that we should disregard the importance of co-locating all-together for this particular field. Looking (qualitatively) at the lived experiences of creative workers allowed me to observe important effects of co-working, including collegiality, informal exchanges and social support. These effects, however, occur mostly on the informal level rather than the formal (cf. Alacovska, 2018), constituting a form of barter economy for advice, feedback, passing on projects or informal mentorship.

Second, and related to this barter economy and social support: there is a strong connection between agglomeration externalities and the literature on (creative) labour markets. However, this is rarely acknowledged in the existing literature in neither the geographic nor the creative labour field. Co-location may bridge the gap between (micro-)firms or freelancers and the transfer of informal knowledge that is not readily available by other means (e.g. formal education and other forms of schooling). Through (project based) working, interacting with other creatives and ‘learning by watching’, individuals learn the tricks of the trade (Eikhof & Warhurst, 2013). This shows that (what I call) collegiality is an underestimated phenomenon. Such collegiality is not about the exchange of codified knowledge, but rather the exchange of social support: the opportunity to share thoughts and ideas in a brief and informal manner, to have access to learning practical skills, to be able to express frustration, or to unite against other parties, such as the municipality or the management. Obviously, especially in today’s individualised labour market with solitary work practices, this is much more difficult to acquire (yet not less important!).
What is significant here, and what I also will address in the next paragraphs, is that these forms of contact that might tend to go unnoticed play an essential role in the development of creative, business, practical, and entrepreneurial skills that could eventually – but not necessarily – foster innovation. Such forms of exchange occur on a serendipitous, unplanned basis, finding their origin in informal interactions on the work floor transforming the mundane into more profane gatherings and events (cf. R. Collins, 2005; Durkheim, 1912). These interactions are usually not content-driven but sparked by the daily practices and rituals, leading to a collegial social conduct and – in some cases – a lively but informal barter economy guided by reciprocity and trust.

Instead of corroborating that these externalities exist, I have aimed to depict the steps taken and required for making such face-to-face interactions work. This includes the opportunity for collective effervescence to occur during, after or parallel to the mundane day-to-day work practices (Durkheim, 1912; R. Collins, 2014), for example by allowing rituals and forms of organisation to develop organically and by stimulating mutual exchange practices (cf. Mauss, 2011). This shows that, indeed, collective workplaces form a ‘middleground’ (Cohendet et al., 2010; Lange & Schüßler, 2018), not only aggregating the micro-level, but also adding another layer of organisation to it.

By working in the vicinity of others, individuals are exposed to different perspectives, work rhythms, but also connections to (potentially) other actors, including the larger ‘upperground’ organisations. As argued extensively in much of the more macro-oriented literature (Bathelt, 2005; Grabher, 2001; Maskell, 2001), creativity needs frequent face-to-face interactions in order to flourish and to be effective. Collaborative workplaces are obviously excellent facilitators of such face-to-face interactions and the empirical chapters have demonstrated that such spaces contribute to the development of common knowledge bases (Cohendet et al., 2010; see also Lange & Schüßler, 2018). Through these mechanisms and the development of not only spatial, but also social and cultural proximity, innovation is thought to materialise (e.g. Boschma, 2005; Maskell & Malm-
berg, 1999). Yet, unpacking this notion of innovation is subject to a separate, equally extensive discussion.

Situating innovation in the micro-level: partnerships, place, peers and passion

What my dissertation contributes to this field of research – and where it is at least somewhat innovative itself – is taking the perspective of creative workers themselves as a starting point, i.e. grounding this conceptualisation in empirical research. This builds upon the idea of the lived experienced outlined above, yet instead of taking what creative workers do as a starting point, I was interested in what they think about innovation and their own innovativeness.

In order to do this, I took a micro, practitioners’ view on innovation: what is it, and what strengthens or evokes the innovation of creative workers? The empirical findings are quite clear in this respect: the technologically oriented (TPP-like) definitions of innovation – often used in economics and non-creative fields of practice and research – do little justice to the daily experiences of creative workers. This led to the proposal that innovation in the creative industries is a field-specific and contextual process. In other words, what is new in one context, place or sector does not necessarily has to be innovative in others. More specifically, this indicates a form of innovation that has little overlap with the traditional notions of innovation in the sense that it rejects the idea of having a ‘universal’ newness, be it a new product, means of production, source or material, the opening of new markets or new industry structure (e.g. Schumpeter, 1934). It does emphasise that innovation is important in the creative industries and in the work of creatives (though some have little affinity with the term itself); yet that traditional means of analysis have little success in catching such

46 Obviously, this perspective is not new. Since the mid-2000s, many researchers have aimed to capture innovation in the creative industries in alternative definitions – either as opposites to existing, traditional conceptualisations or by developing a fully new approach (Béraud, Castel, & Cormerais, 2012; Castañer & Campos, 2002; Jaaniste, 2009; Miles & Green, 2008; Pratt & Jeffcutt, 2009; Stoneman, 2009).
innovative practices. This dissertation, therefore, still echoes the call of Pratt and Jeffcutt (2009) to take a holistic, process-oriented approach when aiming to understand innovation in the creative industries.

The succeeding study – while acknowledging the rather ephemeral nature of innovation in the creative industries – aimed to further explore this topic by asking the question how such innovations come into being. Again, I relied on empirical methods, more specifically, a qualitative, self-reported approach aiming to capture the perspectives of the creative workers. Surprisingly, the question of what contributes to innovation in the creative industries has so far been rarely addressed in research on the creative industries. In fact, most of such studies consider the creative industries themselves a source of innovation in the wider economy, but ignore the question what actually makes the creative industries innovative (e.g. Bakhshi & McVittie, 2009; Müller et al., 2009; Bakhshi et al., 2008).

Here, based on in-depth interviews as well as a survey, I discern four separate sources of innovation for creative workers, ranging from very much internal to the creative worker to external forces. From external to internal: innovation can be driven by partnerships (with external partners/research institutes, etc), place (the ‘look and feel’ may provide inspiration to come up with new products), peers (collaboration and support of spatially proximate peers) and the creative workers’ personal passion (drive to innovate). With partnerships and passion being the topic of a wide range of studies looking at either institutions and innovation (e.g. Lundvall, 1992) or individual innovative or creative traits (e.g. Stock, von Hippel, & Gillert, 2016; Williamson, Lounsbury, & Han, 2013; Brandstätter, 2011), the four final empirical chapters have zoomed in on peers (Chapters 4 and 5) and place (Chapters 6 and 7). These chapters contend that innovation is driven not by the conscious and continuous exchange of creative ideas, but rather by offering a pool of capital or a ‘rich soup’ (Iammarino & McCann, 2006) that is not easily available to most individual creative workers (as freelance work is the most prevalent form of organisation). Such assets may nurture
a fertile ground that encourages creative workers to develop and implement their creative ideas that are new to their particular field or place.

Social and symbolic capital in collective workplaces

Evidently, co-working spaces or collective workplaces have something to offer. Creative workers pay an often substantial amount of money for their desks or studios, even though having such a physical workplace is, for many creative workers, not a necessity in the sense that they can do their work from a multitude of spaces, either first or third (Oldenburg, 1989). In other words, while being able to work from the ‘electronic cottage’ (Toffler, 1984), a growing number of self-employed workers decide to move to the ‘electronic village’. Is this, indeed, an illogical expenditure of economic capital, or is there a goal of acquiring other forms of capital (Bourdieu, 1990)? If so, what is it that they get from their investments (Bourdieu, 1986)? This question has been (often implicitly) haunting the field of research interested in co-working for more than a decade.

Indeed, existing research highlights the potential of community or collaboration (Garrett et al., 2017; Spinuzzi et al., 2019), but also points to knowledge exchange (Capdevila, 2015), an escape from the isolation and alienation of solitary (tele)work (Gurstein, 2001; Kjaerulff, 2010; Spinuzzi, 2012; Tremblay, Paquet, & Najem, 2006), socialising (Spinuzzi, 2012), the spaces’ (political) emancipatory function (Vidailet & Bousalham, 2018) or access to external resources by deriving credibility from the co-working spaces’ ‘brand’ (Fabbri & Charue-Duboc, 2014). Yet, what these studies indicate is much more the rationales of deciding to work in a co-working space (i.e. locational-decision making processes) than the actual assets or externalities.

Moreover, most studies discussing co-working seem to agree on – as described above – the limitations of most of these assets, with workplace users tending to ‘work alone, together’ while being ‘good neighbours’ (Spinuzzi, 2012), or, in the words of Parrino (2015): experiencing co-working as “little “co” and very “working”” (p. 270). What this dissertation shows is what creative
workers may (think to) gain from co-locating. Not by measuring outcomes in terms of successful collaborations, fruitful interactions or any other countable or tangible successes, but rather by observing the practices and situated experiences of the creative workers. Based on the empirical chapters, I distinguish affordances in especially social capital and symbolic capital (cf. Bourdieu, 1986).

Chapter 4 and 5 demonstrate that, indeed, direct economic gains are rare, and the chances of (directly) engaging in truly collaborative efforts are limited. Yet, this does not mean that the importance of social capital of co-working spaces should be disregarded. Based on these chapters, I would like to contribute two important points to this discussion. First, while much research has focused on the term ‘community’ (e.g. Blagoev et al., 2019; Garrett et al., 2017; Spinuzzi et al., 2019), a poorly defined concept mostly encompassing the – rather vague – notions of knowledge sharing (Capdevila, 2015) and possible relational implications of co-locating (Parrino, 2015), I would argue that co-working rather constitutes a form of ‘surrogate collegiality’ (cf. Alacovska, 2018), referring mainly to an atmosphere affording informal help (much more than collaboration) and mentorships.

Often concealed as playfulness (Ross, 2003; Waters-Lynch et al., 2016), such collegiality allows but not necessarily imposes collaborative and communal behaviour. By co-locating, therefore, creative workers gain entry to a pool of social capital, which can be accessed by participating in this community and investing in social relations. Eventually, this can – but does not have to – pay off in terms of informally acquired gigs, feedback or future partnerships. Important here too is that co-location may function as a ‘middleground’ (see also e.g. Capdevila, 2013; Cohendet et al., 2010; Lange & Schüßler, 2018; Merkel, 2015) between freelance creative labour and (creative) formal education.

Second, contrary to most studies emphasising the importance of hosting or managers (without wanting to deprecate their – mostly positive – influence), the fieldwork for Chapter 5 revealed that an important catalyst of the constitution of such
social capital can be found in bottom-up occurring interaction rituals. Successful interactions have been able to spark a chain reaction paving the way for future forms of (informal) help, knowledge exchange and potentially innovative efforts. Participating in these rituals too – together with this layer of collegiality – helps both novice and more experienced creative workers to learn the ‘tricks of the trade’ and to present themselves as successful creative workers (cf. Butcher, 2018 on rituals facilitating the “learning to co-work”).

Moreover, co-locating also affords a different, less often recognised kind of capital in the economic geography literature, more in line with what Bourdieu (1984) sees as symbolic capital. Chapter 6 demonstrates how spatial proximity to other, well-regarded creatives can provide a form of dividend; not only because of the potential affordances in terms of social capital, but also because it grants credibility and legitimation as a professional or creative individual. Interestingly, this mechanism does not only work in the worlds’ – abundantly studied – creative metropolises, but also in settings that have received far less acclaim. Perhaps especially in ‘ordinary cities’ (Amin & Graham, 1997) this is even more relevant, as symbolic capital – the creative workers’ prestige, credibility or credibility within a social field (Bourdieu, 1993) – is less readily available. In such locations, creative workers are not or less able to tap into the global city discourses that have been dominating the creative field for more than two decades (see e.g. Scott, 2000; Zukin, 1995; Sassen, 1994). By surrounding themselves with other creatives, however, they are able to show that they are part of a (potentially well-regarded) network of creatives, even though the saturation of creatives in their cities is generally relatively low. Instead of being able to derive symbolic capital by saying they work in a place in Berlin, they can say (and did this throughout the qualitative studies) that they work in a place like Berlin.

The final empirical chapter continues this spotlight on symbolic capital, but concentrates mainly on the built environment, in this case, converted industrial buildings. This chapter, even more so than the preceding, engages with the concept of au-
authenticity work: how the respondents aim to present themselves as genuine creative workers. I discerned a number of elements that especially granted symbolic capital, including field-specific aesthetics (concrete floors, industrial elements), spatial configurations (size and adaptability of the building), but also less tangible components such as the buildings’ history. This capital can, according to this chapter, be converted to other forms of capital by attracting potential clients or partners through increased credibility, as well as contribute to the creative workers’ inspiration. This adds to existing research on the spatial characteristics of shared workplaces. This research usually discussed either the material (functionality or physical affordances), quoting one of Spinuzzi’s (2012) respondents: “if you’re going to be sitting somewhere for three or four hours, the chair better be comfortable” (p. 422), or the symbolic (elements inspiring creative workers, yet with little attention to how these mechanisms actually work (e.g. Drake, 2003; Heebels & Van Aalst, 2010)) characteristics. Moreover, by exploring the nexus between global and local input, it provides further insights into how these local and global symbols are used and converted in order to acquire symbolic capital.

LIMITATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

A qualitative, micro-level approach to innovation
In this dissertation, I have aimed to disentangle how creatives see innovation, what might spark such innovation in their eyes, and how co-location of individual creative workers can contribute to innovation. As the notoriously diffuse ways in which innovation in the creative industries is described, applied and understood indicate: this is quite an arduous task. In Chapter 2, I defined innovation as “a field-specific process that has value in specific contexts and locations and takes different shapes in different settings.” My definition is particularly helpful in understanding the idiosyncrasies of innovation in the creative industries as it opens up the scope to include local (material, social and symbolic) features
and their effects on (perceived) innovativeness. However, it offers little guidance to those aiming to measure, count or calculate innovativeness in this field – though whether or not this is at all possible remains a separate question.

An area for future research is provided by the four sources of innovation: partnerships, place, peers, and passion. Chapter 3 has taken a first step to map these sources and to provide insight into their relative importance. Yet, this dissertation does not provide a ranking of the most – or least – important sources. Future research could use this typology to further understand what drives innovation in the creative industries. Moreover, these sources can also be connected to other fields of research – for example and as proposed in Chapter 3 – by relating partnerships to e.g. triple helix research (e.g. Etzkowitz & Leydesdorff, 1997), place inform research on agglomeration externalities (Gordon & McCann, 2005a; Porter, 2000; Van der Panne, 2004), peers to further understand ‘buzz’, knowledge exchange and (micro-) interactions between creative workers (Asheim et al., 2007; Bathelt, 2007; Storper & Venables, 2004) and passion to nuance research on individual creativity (Ardichvili et al., 2003).

The crux of these limitations lies in the micro- and meso-level approach pursued in this dissertation. I have taken the lived, situated experience of creative workers as an anchor point. While this provides an opportunity to observe macro-level assumptions in the daily work of creative individuals, it – building on the limitations mentioned above – does not offer a conclusive answer to the question how much innovation occurs in such collaborative workplaces. Therefore, quantitative research can take the next steps to operationalise this definition and these sources of innovation – which are grounded in the experiences of creative workers – to draw further conclusions about innovativeness in different settings or among different (sub)sectors.

Cases and comparisons
This research is built around ten collective, creative workplaces in the Netherlands. These cases have been limited to what Andres and Golubchikov (2016) call brownfields or are addressed
as creative hubs (Evans, 2009) or breeding places (Peck, 2012). Even though the sample in this study is diverse in size, institutionalisation, funding, historical background, organisational structure and level of urbanity, they are remarkably similar in other respects. All are loosely organised and production-oriented. Such places are often less institutionalised than for example museum quarters and other consumption-oriented places, and cannot be compared to these more centralised efforts (e.g. the Tilburg Veemarktkwartier described by Mommaas, 2004; or the Westergasfabriek by Hitters & Richards, 2002).

In all ten collective workplaces, creative workers can rent an office or a desk in a co-working setting. Colloquially, we refer to such workplaces as co-working spaces. Nevertheless, they differ from ‘traditional’ co-working spaces that are built towards collaboration and being in the immediate proximity of others. In most cases, the majority of offices are separated by walls or other physical structures, making them less co-working than most ‘traditional’ co-working spaces. Nevertheless, they have many characteristics that made them highly similar to the more ideal-typical co-working space. For example, many locations have open floors, ‘flex-desks’ or ‘flex-rooms’ geared towards more co-working oriented settings too. Moreover, they often share other facilities, such as meeting rooms, coffee corners, public spaces, lunch rooms, etc. In all locations, creative workers often had lunch or drinks together, giving users ample opportunities for encounters and interactions.

On their websites too, they present themselves as co-working spaces, or as places sparking interactions and innovation. For example, the Creative Factory states that they are “an innovative and industrial building for new ideas and networks in Rotterdam”\(^47\), and De Gruyter Fabriek that they are “[…] buzzing. Work is being done. Like before: hard and long. But especially also like today: innovative and inspiring”\(^48\). This also ties in with the buildings’ histories: all of them are adaptively reused buildings, mostly (8 out of 10) local industrial heritage, which obvi-

\(^{47}\) [http://www.creativefactory.nl](http://www.creativefactory.nl), page visited on April 18, 2019.

\(^{48}\) [https://www.degruyterfabriek.nl](https://www.degruyterfabriek.nl), page visited on April 18, 2019.
ously affects the way in which creative workers experience their material surroundings (e.g. post-industrial aesthetics).

Therefore, though this dissertation sheds some light on the differences between the ten locations – without articulating this as a specific research aim – future research could do a more rigorous comparison of certain types of workplaces (Fuzi, 2015; Weijs-Perrée et al., 2019) in order to investigate their success in fostering innovation. Or, formulated differently: is the soup equally rich in all cases (cf. Iammarino & McCann, 2006)? And which ingredients would especially make the soup richer? Such attempts should make distinctions between more homogenous and heterogeneous groups of creative workers, more open versus closed settings, differences in the places’ aesthetic, symbolic and historical values, the presence or absence of incubation programmes, and the focus on the creative industries (as creative workers stand out in motivation and growth opportunities, see e.g. Loots & Witteloostuijn, 2018).

Moreover, all ten locations were included in this Cultures of Innovation in the Creative Industries (CICI) research project by means of self-selection: the managers themselves opted to partake in the project. This indicates a potential selection bias in the sense that on the one hand, only locations with active managers and already successful collaborative cultures might have felt stimulated to participate. On the other hand, locations dealing with financial instability might have hoped that by assessing the innovative cultures of the particular place might offer them stronger legitimacy as a successful creative workplace (vis-à-vis the municipality or other funding agents).

Another issue regarding case selection (and respondent sample – see also the next section) concerns the international generalisability of the findings. As discussed in the methods section in Chapter 1, the Netherlands houses a large number of collective workplaces and co-working spaces, and features particular national policies and practices. This includes organisational forms and funding of the workplaces, the interference of (semi)public institutions, the large number of freelancers, and strong representation of the creative industries in the Netherlands (e.g. Koops & Rutten, 2017).
Similarly, nearly all cases are in smaller, second- or even third-tier cities, with the most prominent Dutch creative powerhouse, Amsterdam (cf. Sassen, 1994), not present in the sample. Such second-tier cities have other pull-factors than famous metropolises such as New York or Paris (J. Brown, 2015), which might have a profound influence on the symbolic capital creative workers can derive from their workplaces. Cross-national comparative research could reveal whether the findings from this study are also applicable elsewhere in the world, and how the findings from Haarlem and Den Haag relate to practices in for example London, Los Angeles and Berlin. Such a comparison could provide better insights into the ways in which symbolic capital as acquired and exchanged, and how authenticity is constructed in an increasingly global world.

**Respondents**

Obviously, also the choice in respondents for both the qualitative and the quantitative studies bears some limitations. The first issue concerns the overlap between the creative industries and entrepreneurship. Nearly all respondents were either self-employed or were part of a small-sized enterprise. Even though the prevalence of freelancers and micro-firms is emblematic for the creative industries (Hesmondhalgh, 2012), this could indicate a conflation between entrepreneurship in general and creative work. Future research on entrepreneurship and attitudes towards innovation could clarify whether the findings are indeed emblematic for the creative industries, or if they are a result of generic attitudes of self-employed entrepreneurs and those working in SMEs.

Moreover, particular cultural connotations of a concept such as innovation (e.g. Mueller & Thomas, 2001) may have influenced the respondents’ view presented in this dissertation. Discussing innovation in the Netherlands with creative workers might yield different results compared to similar discussions in other countries. With the number of freelancers in the Netherlands being high (and growing), and the Netherlands having developed an exceptionally strong knowledge economy (Koops &
Rutten, 2017), innovativeness might be something that is more natural for Dutch creatives. On the other hand, the strong public sector (and weaker market-orientation of the artistic sector) might dampen the need to be entrepreneurial and innovative for some creatives (see e.g. Bysted & Jespersen, 2014; Stam et al., 2008). Finally, the actual collaborative and innovative practices (i.e. social capital) also remain subject to further research. Are respondents in the Netherlands more or less eager to engage in co-working than their peers abroad? Although existing studies indicate little difference between countries (e.g. Merkel, 2015, which includes Berlin, New York and London), especially ethnographic cross-national comparative research could confirm whether the results of this study would indeed also be applicable elsewhere.

Finally, this dissertation took a cross-sectional approach in the sense that it observed creative workers at a certain point in time. Notwithstanding the focus on (locational) narrative construction (cf. Giddens, 1991), the opportunities for observing changes over time (e.g. in the development of social ties, the ‘commodification’ of the credibility derived from working in a well-regarded workplace) have been absent. Future research could take a longitudinal approach, following a number of creative workers after joining a co-working space in order to observe the potential for capital conversion (cf. Bourdieu, 1986), which obviously takes more time in some cases than in others. For example, being able to benefit from increased social capital could occur quickly after joining a co-working space by engaging in curated events, yet, becoming part of a co-working community might take much longer to pay off (if at all). Similarly, creative workers may immediately benefit from higher symbolic capital by surrounding themselves with attractive post-industrial aesthetic design in terms of inspiration, but boosted credibility fostering connections with clients will probably take more time.

In terms of generalisability, I also have to point out that I have focussed on creative workers within shared workplaces. Though many – especially self-employed – creatives do make use of such a facility, this is not the case for all. Some are em-
bedded in larger companies, others are even more nomadic in the sense that they have no fixed location from which they work, and finally, working from home is not uncommon either. Of course, there is a group of creative workers that ‘drop out’ of such workplaces as well for various reasons and proceed to work from other places. Obviously, this does not mean that these creative workers cannot be innovative. Therefore, it might be relevant to compare co-located creative workers with creative workers outside of such workplaces.

**PRACTICAL RECOMMENDATIONS**

This dissertation is about the creative industries, but the findings transcend the creative industries. Creativity has generally become more important to competitiveness, and highly related to terms such as the knowledge economy and information society. Moreover, due to the uncertain labour market of especially the last two decades, policy makers turned to the creative sector as a ‘miner’s canary’ for the wider economy, assuming that the industries’ labour market structures will soon manifest in all sectors (Hesmondhalgh, 2012). The characteristics of creative work therefore presumably have wider implications for the modern workplace in general. ‘Spatially embedded’ concepts, including networked, project-based working, ‘buzz’ and ‘noise’, are – as described in the dissertation – important for the creative industries, but also increasingly considered the rationale for the nature of labour in the twenty-first century (cf. Ross, 2003; Jessop, 2016; Gertler, 1988).

This final section describes some implications of the findings for especially policy makers and workplace managers. It is organised around the macro- and meso-level, first discussing the position of co-working or collective workplaces as a tool for urban planners and policy makers, followed by some thoughts about the role of hosts in fostering interactions, potential knowledge exchange, and innovation.
Co-working spaces as a tool for urban planners
Co-working spaces have not appeared out of thin air. Their emergence is rooted in broader societal and urban developments. As described in Chapter 1, collective workplaces and co-working spaces find their nascence in two parallel developments. First, (creative) production has increasingly become synonymous to the idea of freelance, flexible work. In the Netherlands and abroad, the number of self-employed creative workers has grown dramatically, and obviously, the nature of their work demands specific, new ways of organising their daily practices. Many creative workers seek the proximity of their peers because of the need for sociality, the appreciation of tacit knowledge exchange, the pressure to escape the isolation of self-employed work, and the aspiration to develop a credible professional or creative reputation.

Yet, based on the literature review in Chapter 1, I would argue that we should be cautious in seeing co-location as a cure to the perils of today’s precarious work. They are much more of a symptom of, than an antidote to insecure labour conditions. Many creative workers would – and some also complained about this during the interviews – benefit much more from having a more secure income and a social safety net rather than a place in which they can (or must) exhibit their entrepreneurial pursuits (see e.g. Gill & Pratt, 2008; Hesmondhalgh & Baker, 2010; Ross, 2008, 2009). In this, I also echo the words of Schmidt (2019) in that policies tend – perhaps too quickly – to utilise such work-places to govern creative labour processes without addressing the decline in social security schemes.

Moreover, users of such spaces are primarily – still – a white, higher educated population. There seems to be little space for (especially ethnic) diversity in such locations (cf. Schmidt, 2019). If we follow Jane Jacobs’ account of diversity and innovation (often applied to the urban level) when assessing the innovative capabilities in co-working spaces (i.e. on the micro-level), a homogeneous, middle class population will probably not be a benefit (J. M. Jacobs, 1962; Galliano et al., 2015; Van der Panne, 2004; see also Department for Business, Innovation & Skills,
2013 for a discussion of the effects of workplace diversity). Policy makers and workplace managers could take this into account when developing workplace policies and aim to integrate a wider audience than the typical creative worker.

Increasingly too, co-working spaces are – recycling much of the earlier creative cluster gentrification discourses (Lloyd, 2002; Whiting & Hannam, 2017; Zukin, 1982) – seen as boons to the city’s ills (Hesmondhalgh, 2012). Co-working spaces have become part of many cities’ placemaking initiatives (Moriset, 2013) and are supported to foster entrepreneurial innovation (Schmidt, 2019). However, existing empirical studies (e.g. Nijkamp, 2016) showed that investing in creative workplaces with the aim of raising real estate value or inducing gentrification processes is quite problematic. In the case of this dissertation, I observed that the temporary nature of such efforts can be detrimental for the long-term success of developing a collegial atmosphere and eventually a successful community. Moreover, most of the cases in this dissertation are located in relatively disadvantaged neighbourhoods. Yet, despite many respondents and managers articulating a positive attitude towards their potential role in neighbourhood regeneration, the embeddedness within the neighbourhood was often weak.

I therefore agree with Rus and Orel (2015) that investing resources in transforming post-industrial workplaces in a top-down manner is a challenging, and potentially too costly approach. Instead, supporting existing creative communities, those that are already successful and experienced in this field, may be a better instrument to attain creative communities that might eventually contribute to innovation. Such a top-down and bottom-up synergy, as Rus and Orel (2015) claim, has indeed proven to be successful in releasing the, what they call, ‘creative energy’ in existing communities in some of the locations in this research. Examples of this are e.g. De Gruyter Fabriek and Strijp-S, which were both occupied by an enduring community of artists and creatives (often with anti-squat contracts49) who

49 A form of real estate policy common in the Netherlands in which vacant buildings are occupied by a number of users (with very little to no rights or rent protection) in order to prevent squatters from using the property.
were supported by a top-down policy aspiring to transform the building into a legitimate creative hub. However, in situations in which either larger institutions (e.g. the municipality in the case of de Vasim, or a real estate developer in the case of de Honigfabriek) had little regard for the existing communities, or in which a top-down policy was developed without much support for the bottom-up initiatives, it has proven to be more difficult to develop or consolidate a sustainable community.

**Co-working hosts and managers: orchestrating serendipity**

Despite the importance of bottom-up, self-organising capacities of creative workplaces, many empirical studies have demonstrated the hosts’ or managers’ evident role in the social success of such spaces, as well as their contribution to (individual) innovativeness (e.g. J. Brown, 2017; Merkel, 2015). Such a new form of curating – caring for something – has of course always existed both in gatekeeping as well as in guiding behaviour face-to-face in physical spaces (e.g. clerks). Yet, recently, it became a more fashionable concept in the co-working discourse (Jansson & Hracs, 2018). This community management or curation in co-working spaces consists of, in the words of Merkel (2019), being an ‘active catalyst’, helping members exchange ideas and work and therefore making co-working spaces more than just a regular office space. Indeed, this dissertation, in line with existing research on co-working spaces, highlighted that just filling an empty room or building is not always enough to develop a vibrant community. Some curation by a facilitator or host is thought of as an effective step towards transforming working into co-working (or at least something closer to collaborative efforts) (J. Brown, 2017; Merkel, 2019; cf. Schmidt, 2019).

Especially for building a community – that is, successfully combatting isolation in work – this has proven to be important. Merkel (2019) uses the term ‘mothering’ here. In the interviews too, respondents talked about managers or hosts using these terms (e.g. ‘grandfather’), or managers seeing themselves as ‘campsite bosses’, watching over the campers but not interven-
ing too much. Such a welcoming attitude has been considered especially important in fostering pro-social behaviour and mutual support systems that could, in the longer run, foster knowledge exchange and innovation.

Also in line with the findings of Merkel (2019), co-locating has some other advantages, including providing visibility. Other co-workers, hosts or managers can showcase co-working members to a potential public, including other co-workers, policy makers, firms or partners. This is especially important for self-employed creatives, who are dependent on such collaborations and contacts with other partners for their creative and professional success. Indeed, this advantage of co-working was, in many cases, mentioned in the interviews, with respondents engaging in narratives about how they got in touch with other actors, and what they got out of these contacts. Similarly, many respondents emphasised how working among well-regarded peers and in aesthetically appropriate buildings imbued with symbolic historical value enhanced their credibility and creative or professional reputation. In this, hosts or community managers could play an essential role in actively connecting actors in order to strengthen strong ties, to induce weaker ties (Granovetter, 1983), and to curate the ‘look and feel’ of the places (Heebels & Van Aalst, 2010).

However, there is one critical remark I would like to make here. Many respondents in the qualitative studies emphasised the importance of hosts in catalysing social interactions, and the absence of such hosts in some locations (either due to cutbacks or because they were never present) was lamented by the local workplace users. Nevertheless, the ethnographic chapter in this dissertation demonstrated that hosts were neither a necessary, nor a conditional prerequisite for having social interactions. Interactions can be instigated by curated activities such as organising breakfasts, lunches, or drinks, but they also may occur naturally and bottom-up through the emergence and performance of interaction rituals. Co-working hosts, therefore, should also leave room for such rituals to develop organically, for example, by not intervening too much in the daily practices (e.g. adapta-
tions of the workplace, the problem-solving capacities of the group) of creative workers.

Overall, my research has demonstrated that innovation in the creative industries is not a phenomenon that is captured easily. It has been guiding much of our thoughts on how we perceive these industries: as forerunners of the post-Fordist knowledge economy as well as something that is sparked by agglomeration – another aspect in which the creative industries stand out. Innovation in this context does not necessarily refer to a radical, field changing product or practice, but rather to a product or service that pertains newness in a given context. Do we find more of such innovations in situations where individual creative workers indeed consciously decide to flock together? That remains difficult to say, based on my mostly qualitative approach. Yet, what I can say is that place continues to matter. It matters, because bodily co-presence continues to yield fruitful interactions promoting the diffusion of ideas, and it matters, because it grants authenticity and credibility to those working on a sector that thrives on exactly that.
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## Appendix A
In-depth interviews with co-located creative workers\(^{50}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>DCMS Sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jimmy</td>
<td>Dutch Game Garden</td>
<td>03/03/2014</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Digital and entertainment media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monique</td>
<td>BINK36</td>
<td>01/09/2014</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Arts and antiques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>BINK36</td>
<td>01/09/2014</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Arts and antiques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>BINK36</td>
<td>09/09/2014</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Software and electronic publishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>BINK36</td>
<td>09/09/2014</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Film, video and photography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>Belcanto</td>
<td>12/09/2014</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Music and visual and performing arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Belcanto</td>
<td>12/09/2014</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Crafts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Klein Haarlem</td>
<td>18/09/2014</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie</td>
<td>Klein Haarlem</td>
<td>18/09/2014</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Film, video and photography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abel, Marcus and Joey</td>
<td>Klein Haarlem</td>
<td>18/09/2014</td>
<td>M, M, M</td>
<td>Advertising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peggy</td>
<td>Bink36</td>
<td>19/09/2014</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Designer fashion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>BINK36</td>
<td>19/09/2014</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Film, video and photography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo</td>
<td>BINK36</td>
<td>30/09/2014</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Film, video and photography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>BINK36</td>
<td>30/09/2014</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Music and visual and performing arts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{50}\) Anonymised
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sebastian</td>
<td>BINK36</td>
<td>30/09/2014</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Music and visual and performing arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Andreas and Adam</em></td>
<td>Strijp-S</td>
<td>09/10/2014</td>
<td>M/M</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bjorn</td>
<td>Strijp-S</td>
<td>22/10/2014</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Advertising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Thomas</em></td>
<td>Strijp-S</td>
<td>22/10/2014</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Digital and entertainment media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn</td>
<td>BINK36</td>
<td>28/10/2014</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Designer fashion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy</td>
<td>De Gruyter Fabrick</td>
<td>11/11/2014</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Advertising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda</td>
<td>De Gruyter Fabrick</td>
<td>20/11/2014</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Arts and antiques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne</td>
<td>De Gruyter Fabrick</td>
<td>20/11/2014</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>De Gruyter Fabrick</td>
<td>20/11/2014</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Software and electronic publishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>Vasim</td>
<td>24/11/2014</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Arts and antiques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>Vasim</td>
<td>24/11/2014</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Music and visual and performing arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Vasim</td>
<td>25/11/2014</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Crafts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>Vasim</td>
<td>25/11/2014</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Music and visual and performing arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francois</td>
<td>Vasim</td>
<td>25/11/2014</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Arts and antiques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axel</td>
<td>Vasim</td>
<td>01/12/2014</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Music and visual and performing arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Vasim</td>
<td>01/12/2014</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Company</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>De Gruyter Fabriek</td>
<td>02/12/2014</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Digital and entertainment media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Strijp-S</td>
<td>03/12/2014</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Advertising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire</td>
<td>Strijp-S</td>
<td>03/12/2014</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Strijp-S</td>
<td>03/12/2014</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>Vasim</td>
<td>15/12/2014</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Music and visual and performing arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td>De Gruyter Fabrie</td>
<td>22/12/2014</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Arts and antiques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Strijp-S</td>
<td>23/01/2015</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Advertising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis</td>
<td>Creative Factory</td>
<td>03/05/2015</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sander</td>
<td>Dutch Game Garden</td>
<td>10/06/2015</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Digital and entertainment media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>Creative Factory</td>
<td>30/07/2015</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin</td>
<td>Dutch Game Garden</td>
<td>24/09/2015</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Digital and entertainment media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Dutch Game Garden</td>
<td>24/09/2015</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Digital and entertainment media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Creative Factory</td>
<td>05/10/2015</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Crafts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix B

## In-depth interviews with managers\(^{51}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Pascal</em></td>
<td>De Vasim</td>
<td>16/12/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Constantin</em></td>
<td>De Gruyter Fabriek</td>
<td>10/01/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Olaf and Tim</em></td>
<td>Klein Haarlem</td>
<td>13/01/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Theo</em></td>
<td>BINK36</td>
<td>17/01/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Anton</em></td>
<td>Strijp-S (Apparatenfabriek and Klokgebouw)</td>
<td>23/01/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Eduard</em></td>
<td>Belcanto</td>
<td>03/02/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Paul</em></td>
<td>Hazemeijer Hengelo</td>
<td>10/02/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Abigail</em></td>
<td>Creative Factory</td>
<td>27/02/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Simon</em></td>
<td>Dutch Game Garden</td>
<td>03/03/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Dominic</em></td>
<td>Honigfabriek</td>
<td>27/10/2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{51}\) Anonymised
Appendix C

Topic list in-depth interviews

Introduction respondent:
• Can you tell me something about yourself as creative worker?
• How did you end up in this location?
• Why are you here, and not somewhere else (e.g. in a ‘general’ business centre, creative cluster or office)?

Building, neighbourhood and reputation:
• How does it feel to work here?
• How do people react when you mention that you’re located in this building?
• What kind of reputation does this place have, you think?
• Has this place’s reputation been important for you in your locational-decision making processes?
• How do you think the people working here profit from the reputation of this area/building?
• What kind of workers would you like to see here, in this location?
• How does this overlap with the current population?

Interactions:
• Do you often talk to other creative workers here? How often? About what?
• Can you tell me about an interaction you’ve had with another creative worker? Is this a usual kind of interaction? Or is this an exception?
• How does information spread in this building?
• Do you sometimes collaborate with other creative workers here? (if so: example, if not: would you want to do this? Why (not)).
• In general, what do you think of the other creative entrepreneurs?

52 Translated from Dutch.
Building, visually:
- What do you think of the building in which you work?
- Could you describe the building in a few words?
- What kind of possibilities does the building offer?
- What do you know about the building’s history?
- What value does this history have for you personally?

Facilities, management:
- Are there specific facilities here you really appreciate?
- Are there any facilities here that you’re missing?
- Are there any selection criteria that decide who is welcome to locate here, and who is not? What do you think of this?
- Are there any organised activities? What do you think of this?
- Does the manager try to establish a kind of atmosphere in this building? What kind of atmosphere? What do you think of this?

Innovation
- In general, how would you define innovation?
- And within your own field of work, what is innovative?
- What is, in your opinion, the role of technology in innovation?
- Do you see yourself as innovative?
- What makes you innovative? What contributes to innovation for you?
- What kind of role does place play in this?
- Is there something I did not ask but what you consider relevant?
Appendix D
Information sheet in-depth interviews

Erasmus University Rotterdam is looking for respondents to interview for the Cultures of Innovation in the Creative Industries (CICI) project

Why? Our goal is to gain insight into the innovation processes in the creative industries. What is the relationship between creativity, innovation and co-location? How do creative entrepreneurs work and how do they become and remain innovative? Which characteristics of a location contribute to the successful development of a firm, and how can this be improved?

How? We will conduct interviews in 10 creative creative collective workplaces throughout the Netherlands on the experiences of working in such buildings. In addition, an online survey is sent to all companies based in these 10 locations with short questions about this subject.

When? We started with the first interviews in September 2013 to investigate the current state of affairs. Interviews will be conducted again between September 2014 and December 2015. In this period, the survey will be distributed as well. A final conference and report will follow mid-2016.

Who? Principal investigator Erik Hitters, senior researcher Pawan Bhansing and junior researcher Yosha Wijngaarden of the Erasmus University Rotterdam. Also visit our website www.ciciproject.nl, or contact our researchers: wijngaarden@eshcc.eur.nl.
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Appendix E
Information sheet survey\textsuperscript{54}

Dear tenant, sir/madam,

Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

This is the second part of the CICI survey. You can complete this survey regardless of whether or not you have completed the first part.

This survey is intended for (creative) entrepreneurs/artists who are located in a creative collective workplace or creative cluster, including freelancers, managers and/or founders of an organisation and people who carry out activities under their own name. The organisations of the foregoing persons are in this survey referred to as ‘firm’.

This research is being carried out as an initiative of the CICI project of the Erasmus University Rotterdam and DCR Network and not on behalf of a third party. All participants are anonymised. The purpose of this research is to gain insight into your creative process and the influence of other (creative) entrepreneurs/artists on this process. You can find more information about the research on our website www.ciciproject.nl. On our website, the results of the first survey will be presented early 2016. A final conference will also take place in 2016 where, among other things, we will provide feedback to the managers of the locations.

Among the participants who have fully completed the questionnaire, we will draw five prizes. The winners have the choice of:
- A dinner voucher;
- Fujifilm Instax 210 camera with which you print your photo directly;
- Museum card + The Rijksmuseum Cookbook;

Completing the questionnaire will take approximately 15 minutes. Please note: there are no right or wrong answers.

If you have any questions, please contact Pawan Bhansing (bhansing@eshcc.eur.nl).

\textsuperscript{54} Translated from Dutch.
English summary

The creative and cultural industries are booming. Newspapers and policy reports on regional, national and international level all aim to tap into the wealth the cultural and creative sectors ought to bring. While the Western economies since the early 2000s have witnessed periods of decline, the cultural and creative economy showed continuing growth, are incorporating an increased segment of the overall economy, and are employing an ever growing number of individuals.

This peak in interest in the cultural and creative industries emerged parallel to the advent of explicit creative industries policies in the recent three decades. From the onset of this creative industries mania, these economic and policy considerations have been explicitly connected to spatial settings, most importantly within the urban context and ‘the art of city making’ (Landry, 2006). For urban policies, the catalyst of this creative city debate has been the famous *The Rise of the Creative Class* publication (Florida, 2002), which sealed the bonds between place, creative production and innovation. Clusters of creative industries became the vehicle of post-modern innovation, as well as the post-Fordist solution to deteriorating urban economies (Bille & Schulze, 2006; Lash & Urry, 1994; Zukin, 1995).

In line with the emergence of the creative industries and creative clusters, the conception of innovation has changed too. While traditionally innovation was understood to involve goal-driven, corporate-led and top-down endeavours, more recent interpretations of innovation point towards new bottom-up developed initiatives (Fiorentino, 2018). The traditional approaches, preoccupied with investing in research and development (R&D) and the development of new technologies, have generally been a poor fit to the creative industries, which rarely consider their innovative pursuits as efficient investments in technologies in order to generate novelty.

Nevertheless, these industries are highly dependent on the creation of original and novel works of art, products and services (C. Jones, Svejenova, Pedersen, & Townley, 2016) with their...
innovation residing mostly in aesthetic properties (semiotic codes) and material bases (C. Jones, Lorenzen, & Sapsed, 2015; see also Stoneman, 2009). Equally important in this regard are the creative industries’ persisting structural characteristics, such as the dominance of freelance, project-based work and informal networks. These characteristics have a tremendous influence on how and what kind of novelties are produced. It is especially in agglomerative settings, such as creative clusters or, having gained momentum over the last decade, the co-working space, where such innovative capabilities are thought to come to fruition.

Such collective workplaces facilitating co-location and collaboration are conceptualised as the nexus of this new interpretation of innovation. By conjoining the elements of co(l)laboration, working and space, they are thought to allow new forms of (spatial) organisation that may contribute to sparking unplanned, serendipitous encounters and bottom-up collaborative initiatives (Jakonen, Kivinen, Salovaara, & Hirkman, 2017; Moriset, 2013; Waters-Lynch & Potts, 2017; Olma, 2016; Fabbri, 2016). Their setting as an intermediate organisation (meso-level) between the urban structures (macro-level) and the individual creative worker (micro-level) makes them a sociologically interesting phenomenon – connecting the interactions between 1] the city, its histories and built environment, 2] local and national urban and cultural policies and 3] (freelance) labour market conditions (see also Cohendet, Grandadam, & Simon, 2010; Lange & Schüßler, 2018).

However, this intermediary locus of such places also exposes their paradoxical nature. First, the ideology of creative industries innovation, embedded in the discourse of self-employed work and creative entrepreneurship – often loosely connected to the idea of mobile, self-organised, flexible and virtual work (Gandini, 2016; Jakonen et al., 2017; Ross, 2003) – seems to be at odds with the rediscovery of place as articulated in the clustering and co-working rhetoric. While the final decades of the twenty-first century have been characterised by a declining interest in place and the rise of a (digital) nomadic, no-collar (Ross,
2003) class of (tele)workers whose ties to traditional office environments have been irrefutably broken, the number of collaborative workplaces is rising dramatically (DESKMAG, 2019). Work can be and is increasingly done from home, non-places (Augé, 2008) and third places (Oldenburg, 1989). Yet, co-workers are willing to pay an (often substantial) fee renting a desk in a flexible workplace. How is it possible that place, at the same time, is both losing and gaining importance for creative work?

Second, the idea of ‘accelerated’ (or even staged (Goffman, 1959)) serendipity as a catalyst for innovation seems to stand in a remarkable contrast to the organised nature of such workplaces, usually quite curated, structured and imbued with rituals (Blagoev, Costas, & Kärreman, 2019; J. Brown, 2017; Butcher, 2018). If serendipity refers to something inherently unplanned, how can it be captured in specific socio-spatial settings? Of course, this idea is not novel, with e.g. Jane Jacobs’ (1970) seminal thesis on urban diversity yielding innovative activities inspiring urban policy makers for decades. Yet, where such spatial planning initiatives usually occur on the macro-level, co-working spaces aim to translate this to a micro-management of encounters (Jakonen et al., 2017; see also Goffman, 1961).

This leads to the overarching research question of (how) does co-location contribute to the self-perceived innovative capabilities of freelancers and SMEs in the creative industries? Or, formulated differently, is it possible to disentangle how the different forms of capital creative workers are able to draw from both specific spatial characteristics as well as the vicinity of peers, competitors, potential collaborators, clients and networks contribute to innovation? Drawing upon a set of academic fields and topics, which – notwithstanding their increasing interconnectedness – have hither-to been relatively isolated, including geography, creative labour, entrepreneurship, innovation studies, and (cultural) sociology, I seek to understand these processes of innovation within the specific boundaries of creative workplaces, and how they foster, shape, and are shaped by creative work and production. In particular, this dissertation focusses on the intricate ways in which creative workers engage in the field of cultural production, learn
the rules of the game, accumulate and use their capital, and the practical skills and knowledge they need for developing potential innovative output (Bourdieu, 1986, 1993; see also e.g. C. Jones et al., 2016). After presenting an introduction, some contextual and theoretical considerations and the data and methods employed in Chapter 1, Chapter 2 to 7 present empirical case studies that aim to, step by step, disentangle the relationship between place, the creative industries, and innovation. Overall, the empirical chapters can be divided in three overarching segments.

The first part, covering Chapter 2 and 3, seeks to contribute to the existing literature on innovation in general, and the creative industries in particular, by digging deeper into the concept of innovation, and particularly how this is perceived and pursued by creative workers. These two chapters are primarily driven by the problematic nature of innovation in the creative industries, which on the one hand explicitly draws upon the idea that these sectors are inherently innovative (e.g. Müller, Rammer, & Truby, 2009; Handke, 2006; Lash & Urry, 1994), while on the other hand acknowledges the incongruence of applying an etic concept to the creative field (see among many others Stoneman, 2009; Oakley, 2009; Pratt & Gornostaeva, 2009; Jaaniste, 2009).

Building upon qualitative interviews as well as a survey among Dutch creative entrepreneurs, these chapters provide a definition of innovation that does justice to the situated, contextualised approach of this dissertation (Chapter 2), and postulate four factors that could potentially catalyse innovation: passion, partnerships, peers and place (Chapter 3). While individual, entrepreneurial passion to innovate (Schumpeter, 1934; Amabile, 1988; Drucker, 1985; Brandstätter, 2011) and partnerships with clients and research institutions (Colapinto & Porlezza, 2012; Etzkowitz & Leydesdorff, 1997) have been addressed quite extensively by e.g. research on management and entrepreneurship, peers and place are exemplary for the contextual factors distinctly tied to spatial settings and are explored further in the subsequent chapters.

The second part zooms in on peers, the influence of the proximity of other creative workers on knowledge exchange,
social practices and potentially innovation. Both Chapter 4 and Chapter 5 are concerned with the social capital (J. M. Jacobs, 1962; Bourdieu, 1986) afforded by collective workplaces, but aim to move beyond the proposition that the mere co-location will yield collaborative spirits, bursts of knowledge exchange and innovative outputs (as already questioned by Fuzi, 2015; Merkel, 2015; Spinuzzi, 2012). Informed by qualitative, in-depth interviews with co-located creative workers, workplace managers and ethnographic fieldwork in such workplaces, both chapters tie the existing, macro-oriented research on creative clusters, knowledge exchange and innovation (Cooke & Lazzaretti, 2008; O’Connor, 2004; Porter, 1998; Pratt, 1997; Shefer & Frenkel, 1998) to more micro-processes of co-working practices, interactions and rituals.

Chapter 4 questions the assumption that proximity equals collaboration and sparked innovation. Instead, it proposes that proximity does contribute to the development of a fertile learning environment, offering a form of ‘surrogate collegiality’, in which essential tacit skills required for innovation can be gained and transferred. Chapter 5 dives even deeper in the micro-perspective by exploring not what kind of interactions take place, but rather how such interactions occur in the first place. Inspired by the symbolic interactional work of Goffman (1959, 1963, 1967) as well as the interaction ritual approach developed by Collins (1981, 2005), it disentangles how proximity could foster optimal conditions that afford the exchange of words to begin with, and the exchange of knowledge as a potential succeeding step in the chain of interactions. In combination, both chapters provide further insights into the promises and practices of co-located creative workers that could, but not necessarily will, foster innovation in the longer run.

Chapters 6 and 7, the third part, concern mainly how place provides symbolic capital to creative workers. Though – again – not necessarily being a sufficient condition for innovation, such capital both provides the legitimation required for professional and entrepreneurial success, as well as individual motivation and inspiration (as e.g. put forward by Drake, 2003; Heebels &
Van Aalst, 2010). More than the preceding chapters, and building upon in-depth interviews with creative entrepreneurs and workplace managers, they focus on how creative workers engage with their physical and symbolic environments. Chapter 6 emphasises how the proximity of creatives does not necessarily generate collaborative practices (quite similar to the findings of Chapter 4 and 5), but may provide ‘artistic dividend’ (Markusen & Schrock, 2006). The presence of other creatives translates into a local, creative reputation that provides a narrative that allows tapping into the creative city discourse and creative and/or professional legitimation and inspiration. Chapter 7 explores how the physical, historical and symbolic value of the (usually post-industrial) building of the creative, shared workplace provides an air of authenticity by commodifying local histories while at the same time adhering to a global narrative of post-industrial aesthetics. Such symbolic spatial assets grant legitimacy and inspiration not available otherwise.

So, does co-location contribute to innovation? And if so, how? Considering the difficulties (or the impossibility) of actually capturing innovation in the creative industries, this question can only be answered tentatively. Taking all disclaimers into account, my answer would be: yes, but indirectly. Co-location does not necessarily lead to collaboration, and this collaboration only rarely sparks innovation. But does that mean that we should disregard this thesis altogether? I would say no. Co-location has a lot to offer – especially for a group that is highly dependent on project-based work, informal interactions, advice, authenticity and reputation. By co-location, creative workers gain access to a ‘rich soup’ (Iammarino & McCann, 2006) of tacit knowledge. Moreover, it also allows them to acquire a more credible professional or creative reputation, both by being able to tap into the almost universal – at least in the western world – appreciation of (post-)industrial aesthetics, as well as by the sheer proximity of other, well-regarded creatives. More specifically, this means that on this ‘middle-ground’ of creative collective workplaces, the symbolic global flows and local histories intersect and mutually feed into each other, sparking new hybrid
forms of aesthetic and spatial configurations. Creative workers interpret global styles and apply them in local settings. They surround themselves with aesthetics and other creatives in order to connect to the global city prestige. In itself, none of these factors directly contributes to innovation. Yet, in combination, they provide a fertile soil on which innovative ideas can grow through informal help and tacit knowledge exchange. These ideas eventually can be harvested and implemented by having sufficient creative or professional credibility to bring products or services to the market.
Nederlandse samenvatting

De creatieve en culturele industrie bloeit. Kranten en beleidsrapporten op regionaal, nationaal en internationaal niveau fêteren de rijkdom die de culturele en creatieve sector moet opleveren. Terwijl de westelijke economieën sinds het begin van de jaren 2000 perioden van achteruitgang hebben gekend, vertoonden de meeste cijfers over de culturele en creatieve economie een aanhoudende groei. De creatieve industrie neemt een steeds groter deel van de totale economie in, waarbij groeiend aantal individuen hun boterham verdient met werk in deze sectoren.

Deze piek in belangstelling voor de culturele en creatieve industrie ontstond gelijktijdig met de komst van expliciet beleid voor de creatieve industrie in de afgelopen drie decennia. Vanaf het begin van deze ‘creatieve industrie manie’ zijn deze economische en beleidsoverwegingen expliciet verbonden met het ruimtelijke perspectief, vooral binnen de stedelijke context en het idee van ‘the art of city making’ (Landry, 2006). Voor stedelijk beleid was de katalysator van dit creatieve stad-debat de beroemde publicatie The Rise of the Creative Class (Florida, 2002), dat plaats, creatieve productie en innovatie onlosmakelijk heeft verbonden. Clusters van creatieve industrieën werden het vechtje van postmoderne innovatie, evenals de post-Fordistische oplossing voor verslechterende stedelijke economieën (Bille & Schulze, 2006; Lash & Urry, 1994; Zukin, 1995).

Parallel aan de opkomst van de creatieve industrie en creatieve clusters is ook het concept van innovatie veranderd. Hoewel traditioneel werd gedacht dat innovatie doelgerichte, door bedrijven geleide en top-downinspanningen omvat, wijzen recentere interpretaties van innovatie op nieuwe bottom-up ontwikkelde initiatieven (Fiorentino, 2018). De traditionele benaderingen, die zich vooral bezighouden met investeren in onderzoek en ontwikkeling (R&D) en de ontwikkeling van nieuwe technologieën, passen over het algemeen slecht bij de creatieve industrie, die haar innovatieve activiteiten zelden beschouwt als efficiënte investeringen in technologieën om vernieuwing te genereren.
Desalniettemin is de creatieve industrie sterk afhankelijk van de creatie van originele en nieuwe kunstwerken, producten en diensten (C. Jones, Svejenova, Pedersen en Townley, 2016), en vinden zij hun innovatie voornamelijk in esthetische eigenschappen (semiotische codes) en materiële bases (C. Jones, Lorenzen, & Sapsed, 2015; zie ook Stoneman, 2009). Even belangrijk in dit verband zijn de structurele kenmerken van de creatieve industrie, zoals de dominantie van freelance, projectmatig werken en informele netwerken. Deze kenmerken hebben een enorme invloed op hoe en wat voor soort vernieuwing er wordt geproduceerd. Het is vooral in agglomeraties, zoals creatieve clusters of, steeds populairder, de co-working spaces, waar wordt gedacht dat dergelijke innovatieve praktijken kunnen plaatsvinden.

Zulke collectieve werkplaatsen die co-locatie en samenwerking mogelijk maken worden gezien als het knooppunt van deze nieuwe interpretatie van innovatie. Door de elementen co(laboratie), werken en plaats samen te voegen, wordt gedacht dat ze nieuwe vormen van (ruimtelijke) organisatie mogelijk maken die kunnen bijdragen aan het in gang zetten van ongeplande, toevallige ontmoetingen en bottom-up samenwerkingsinitiatieven (Jakonen, Kivinen, Salovaara en Hirkman, 2017; Moriset, 2013; Waters-Lynch & Potts, 2017; Olma, 2016; Fabbri, 2016). Hun instelling als een intermediaire organisatie (mesoniveau) tussen de stedelijke structuren (macroniveau) en de individuele creatieve werker (microniveau) maakt ze een sociologisch interessant fenomeen. Het verbindt de interacties tussen 1] de stad met haar historie en gebouwde omgeving, 2] lokaal en nationaal stedelijk en cultureel beleid, en 3] (freelance) arbeidsmarktomstandigheden (zie ook Cohendet, Grandadam, & Simon, 2010; Lange & Schüßler, 2018).

Deze intermediaire locus van dergelijke plaatsen legt echter ook hun paradoxale aard bloot. Ten eerste, de ideologie van innovatie in de creatieve industrie, ingebed in het discours van freelance werken en creatief ondernemerschap - vaak verbonden met het idee van mobiel, zelf georganiseerd, flexibel (tele)werk (Gandini, 2016; Jakonen et al., 2017; Ross, 2003) - lijkt op gespannen voet te staan met de herontdekking van plaats zoals
gearticuleerd in de creatieve cluster retoriek. Waar de laatste decennia van de eenentwintigste eeuw werden gekenmerkt door een afnemende belangstelling voor ‘plaats’ en de opkomst van een (digitale) nomadische, no-collar (Ross, 2003) klasse van (tele) werknemers wier banden met traditionele kantooromgevingen zijn verbroken, neemt het aantal collectieve werkruimten, met name co-working spaces, dramatisch toe (DESKMAG, 2019). Werk kan en wordt steeds vaker gedaan vanuit huis, non-places (Augé, 2008) en ‘derde plaatsen’ (Oldenburg, 1989), maar creatieve werkers zijn nog steeds bereid een (vaak substantieel) bedrag te betalen om een bureau te huren op een flexibele werkplek. Hoe is het mogelijk dat ‘plaats’ tegelijkertijd belang verliest en wint voor creatief werk?

Ten tweede lijkt het idee van ‘versnelde’ (of zelfs geënsceeneerde (Goffman, 1959)) serendipiteit als katalysator voor innovatie in een opmerkelijk contrast te staan met de georganiseerde aard van dergelijke werkplaatsen, die meestal enigszins gecureerd, gestructureerd en doordrenkt met rituelen zijn (Blagoev, Costas, & Kärreman, 2019; J. Brown, 2017; Butcher, 2018). Als serendipiteit verwijst naar iets dat inherent niet gepland is, hoe kan het dan worden vastgelegd in specifieke sociaal-ruimtelijke omgevingen? Natuurlijk is dit idee niet nieuw, met bijvoorbeeld Jacobs’ (1970) baanbrekende werk over stedelijke diversiteit en innovatieve activiteiten dat al decennialang stedelijke beleidsmakers inspireert. Maar waar dergelijke ruimtelijke planningsinitiatieven zich meestal op macroniveau voordoen, trachten zulke collaboratieve werkruimten dit te vertalen naar en organiseren in een micromanagement van ontmoetingen (Jakonen et al., 2017; zie ook Goffman, 1961).

Dit leidt tot de volgende overkoepelende onderzoeksvraag: (hoe) draagt co-locatie bij aan de zelf-ervaren innovativiteit van freelancers en MKB-bedrijven in de creatieve industrie? Of, anders geformuleerd, is het mogelijk om te ontrafelen hoe de verschillende vormen van kapitaal dat creatieve werkers kunnen putten uit zowel specifieke ruimtelijke kenmerken als de nabijheid van collega’s, concurrenten, potentiële medewerkers, klanten en netwerken bijdragen aan innovatie? Voortbouwend op een reeks acade-
mische velden en onderwerpen, die - ondanks hun toenemende onderlinge verbondenheid - tot nu toe relatief geïsoleerd zijn geweest, waaronder geografie, studies omtrent creatief werk, ondernemerschap, innovatiestudies en (culturele) sociologie, probeer ik deze innovatieprocessen te begrijpen binnen de specifieke grenzen van creatieve werkplekken, en hoe deze worden bevorderd en gevormd door creatief werk. Dit proefschrift richt zich in het bijzonder op de complexe wijzen waarop creatieve werknemers zich bezighouden met culturele productie, het ‘spel leren spelen’, hun kapitaal verzamelen en gebruiken, en de praktische vaardigheden en kennis die ze nodig hebben om potentieel innovatieve output te ontwikkelen (Bourdieu, 1986, 1993; zie ook bijvoorbeeld C. Jones et al., 2016). Na het eerste hoofdstuk, dat de inleiding, enkele contextuele en theoretische overwegingen en de gebruikte data en methoden presenteert, bestaan hoofdstuk 2 tot en met 7 uit empirische casestudies die erop gericht zijn de relatie tussen plaats, de creatieve industrie en innovatie stap voor stap te ontwarren. Over het algemeen kunnen de empirische hoofdstukken worden verdeeld in drie overkoepelende segmenten.

Het eerste deel, dat hoofdstuk 2 en 3 behelst, tracht bij te dragen aan de bestaande literatuur over innovatie in het algemeen, en de creatieve industrie in het bijzonder. Het gaat dieper in op het concept van innovatie, en met name hoe dit wordt ervaren en nagestreefd door creatieve werknemers. Deze twee hoofdstukken worden voornamelijk gedreven door de problematische aard van innovatie in de creatieve industrie, dat enerzijds expliciet is gebaseerd op het idee dat deze sectoren inherent innovatief zijn (bijv. Müller, Rammer, & Truby, 2009; Handke, 2006; Lash & Urry, 1994), terwijl er anderzijds de incongruentie bestaat van het toepassen van een etic concept op het creatieve veld (zie onder andere Stoneman, 2009; Oakley, 2009; Pratt & Gornostaeva, 2009; Jaaniste, 2009).

Voortbouwend op kwalitatieve interviews en een enquête onder Nederlandse creatieve ondernemers biedt dit deel een definitie van innovatie die recht doet aan de gesitueerde, gecontextualiseerde benadering van dit proefschrift (hoofdstuk 2), en
Nederlandse samenvatting

postuleert het vier factoren die mogelijk innovatie zouden kunnen katalyseren: *passie, partnerschappen, collega’s en plaats* (hoofdstuk 3). Terwijl de individuele, ondernemende *passie* om te innoveren (Schumpeter, 1934; Amabile, 1988; Drucker, 1985; Brandstätter, 2011) en *partnerschappen* met klanten en onderzoeksinstituties (Colapinto & Porlezza, 2012; Etzkowitz & Leydesdorff, 1997) relatief uitgebreid zijn bestudeerd door bijvoorbeeld onderzoek naar management en ondernemerschap, zijn *collega’s en plaats* exemplarisch voor contextuele factoren van innovatie die beïnvloed worden door de ruimtelijke omgeving. Deze twee bronnen worden verder onderzocht in de opvolgende hoofdstukken.


Hoofdstuk 4 contesteert de veronderstelling dat nabijheid gelijk staat aan samenwerking en inherent tot innovatie leidt. In plaats daarvan stelt het dat nabijheid bijdraagt aan de ontwikkeling van een vruchtbare leeromgeving, een vorm van ‘surrogaat collegialiteit’, waarin essentiële onbewuste (tacit) vaardigheden die benodigd zijn voor innovatie kunnen worden opgedaan en overgedragen. Hoofdstuk 5 duikt nog dieper in het micro-perceptief, niet door te onderzoeken wat voor soort interacties plaatsvinden, maar eerder hoe dergelijke interacties in de eerste

De hoofdstukken 6 en 7, het derde deel, hebben vooral betrekking op hoe een plaats symbolisch kapitaal biedt aan creatieve werkers. Hoewel dit - nogmaals - niet noodzakelijkerwijs een voldoende voorwaarde voor innovatie is, biedt dit kapitaal zowel een legitimatie als een succesvol creatief ondernemer, als wel individuele motivatie en inspiratie. Meer dan de voorgaande hoofdstukken, en voortbouwend op diepte-interviews met creatieve ondernemers en werkplekmanagers, richten deze hoofdstukken zich op hoe creatieve werknemers omgaan met hun fysieke en symbolische omgevingen. Hoofdstuk 6 benadrukt hoe de nabijheid van creatieve niet noodzakelijkerwijs samenwerking genereert (vrij gelijk aan de bevindingen in hoofdstuk 4 en 5), maar wel kan zorgen voor ‘artistiek dividend’ (Markusen & Schrock, 2006). De aanwezigheid van andere creatieveen vertaalt zich in een lokale creatieve reputatie die zich verbindt met het idee van de creatieve stad en creatieve en/of professionele legitimatie en inspiratie biedt. Hoofdstuk 7 onderzoekt hoe de fysieke, historische en symbolische waarde van het (vaak post-industriële) gebouw van de creatieve, collectieve werkplek een sfeer van authenticiteit geeft door lokale geschiedenissen te commodificeren, maar tegelijkertijd ook de globale, post-industriële esthetische trends volgt. Dergelijke symbolische (globale en lokale) verbindingen verlenen legitimiteit en inspiratie aan de gebruikers van het pand.

Om terug te komen op de hoofdvraag: draagt colocatie bij aan innovatie? En zo ja, hoe? Gezien de moeilijkheden (of de

Bovendien stelt het hen ook in staat een meer geloofwaardige professionele of creatieve reputatie te verwerven, zowel door gebruik te maken van de bijna universele - althans in de westelijke wereld - waardering van (post-)industriële esthetiek, als ook door de pure nabijheid van andere, gewaardeerde creatieven. Meer specifiek betekent dit dat op deze ‘middleground’ van creatieve collectieve werkplekken, de symbolische mondiale stromen en lokale geschiedenis elkaar kruisen en elkaar voeden, waardoor nieuwe hybride vormen van esthetische en ruimtelijke configuratie kunnen ontstaan. Creatieve werknemers interpreteren globale stijlen en passen deze toe in lokale situaties. Ze omringen zich met een bepaalde esthetiek en andere creatieven om zich te verbinden met de globale creatieve steden. Op zichzelf draagt geen van deze factoren rechtstreeks bij aan innovatie. Maar in combinatie bieden ze een vruchtbare bodem waarop innovatieve ideeën kunnen groeien door informele hulp en onbewuste (tacit) kennisuitwisseling. Deze ideeën kunnen uiteindelijk worden geoogst en geïmplementeerd door creatieven die voldoende creatieve of professionele geloofwaardigheid te hebben om producten of diensten op de markt te brengen.
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The creative industries are booming. Creative workers flock together in cities, clusters and co-working spaces, which all are assigned incredible innovative capabilities. This dissertation engages with three paradoxes arising from the increasingly common forms of co-located creative work: ‘nomadic’ workers seeking to locate in specific places, the overrepresentation of solo-preneurs in collective settings, and the ambition to plan serendipitous innovation. Unpacking the different forms of capital creative workers are able to draw from specific spatial characteristics, this dissertation illustrates how the vicinity of peers, competitors, potential collaborators and networks contributes to self-perceived innovativeness.