

[Author copy of publisher proofs]

Hitters, H.J.C.J., Bhansing, P.V. & Wijngaarden, Y.G.D. (2020). Entrepreneurship in creative clusters: motivations, identities and interactions. In M. Komorowski & I. Picone (Eds.), *Creative Cluster Development Governance, Place-Making and Entrepreneurship* (Cities and Regions Series) (pp. 98-110). New York: Routledge

Entrepreneurship in creative clusters

Motivations, identities and interactions

Erik Hitters, Pawan Bhansing and Yosha Wijngaarden

Introduction

In the creative and cultural industries (CCIs), entrepreneurs choose to co-locate in clusters to minimize transaction costs as well as to achieve knowledge and networking externalities. In addition, such locations offer resources that are less explicit such as identity, image, reputation, learning and community support (Bhansing, Hitters & Wijngaarden, 2018; Theodorakopoulos, Kakabadse & McGowan, 2014; Wijngaarden, Hitters & Bhansing, 2019). Especially, entrepreneurs that are in the early stages of developing their business are expected to favour co-location to tap into these resources. This is one of the reasons behind the increasing policy-driven creation of creative clusters around the globe (see [Chapter 1](#) for more elaboration).

Following by the work of economist Joseph Schumpeter (1934), entrepreneurs are seen as central to the creation of economic growth and wealth, and starting entrepreneurs in particular are an important stimulus for innovation. In fact, entrepreneurship, innovation and creativity are oftentimes used interchangeably in economic growth policies. Especially in approaches that foster urban, regional and local economies, cluster development is expected to foster the process of entrepreneurship. However, while there is ample evidence to suggest that clusters contribute to economic growth, the role of entrepreneurship therein has hardly been the subject of academic research.

In this chapter we will explore to what extent creative clusters have an impact on entrepreneurs and whether they offer a viable approach to foster entrepreneurship. Following Wennekers and Thurik's (1999, pp. 46–47) definition, entrepreneurship is the manifest ability and willingness of individuals, on their own or in teams [...], to perceive and create new economic opportunities [...] and to introduce their ideas in the market, in the face of uncertainty and other obstacles, by making decisions on location, form and the use of resources and institutions.

Creative entrepreneurs are typically exposed to highly uncertain and competitive market environments and to scarce resources, which demand an appropriate level of radical or incremental innovative efforts. Traditionally, entrepreneurs renting space in a creative cluster

desire a relatively low-cost housing option and low economic search costs for contracts (see [Chapter 4](#) for more elaboration on the space of creative clusters). Furthermore, creative clusters have been widely used as a strategy for urban renewal and the reuse of vacant office buildings and factories (Evans, 2009). But are these creative clusters enabling entrepreneurship and if so, how do they achieve that? This chapter's goal is to provide a novel theoretical approach that conceptualizes the impact of creative clusters on entrepreneurship. Within the specific cluster context, entrepreneurs get the opportunity to focus on growing their business and presumably their entrepreneurial capabilities. We argue that there are three key production-related elements of entrepreneurship in creative clusters, which we will consecutively address.

First, the chapter will focus on creative entrepreneurs' professional identity and identity work, that is, the active shaping of their professional identity. The identity of the creative entrepreneur is complex as it tries to combine the seemingly contradictory aspects of creative value and commercial thinking. Second, we will discuss the motivations of creative entrepreneurs. We will investigate entrepreneurs' inspiration, which refers to a specific type of motivation that allows the transformation of creative ideas into creative products and services. Third, we will look at whether and how co-working and co-location, on the micro-level, stimulate interactions, collaborations and potentially innovation in the CCIs. The findings of the chapter are based on a variety of empirical data. With this research, we hope to contribute to the understanding of the context of clusters for professional activities to take place and its utilization in entrepreneurship.

Research on clustered production and creative entrepreneurship

The clustering of creative entrepreneurs, businesses and artists has inspired research from numerous academic disciplines. Many supply side externalities have been identified in the clustering literature, for instance, infrastructures (Gordon & McCann, 2005), labour market pooling (Baptista & Swann, 1998), and knowledge spillovers or social networks (e.g. Comunian, 2011; Grabher, 2004). Notions of 'buzz' (Asheim, Coenen & Vang, 2007; Storper & Venables, 2004) and noise (Grabher, 2002) 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' (Storper & Venables 2004; Bhansing, Hitters & Wijngaarden 2018) of indirect in-group contact. However, clusters can also be approached in terms of production, where the locality functions as the spatial and social context in which creative entrepreneurs are able to produce cultural, symbolic and experiential goods. Within economic geography, it has been argued convincingly that creative entrepreneurship needs to be understood as a socially and spatially embedded process, resulting in certain places at certain times developing as foci of remarkable creativity and productivity (Audretsch & Belitski, 2013; Pratt & Jeffcutt, 2009; Scott, 2006). They suggest that entrepreneurs co-located in a place can be seen as an attribute of such locations, which may subsequently be important in evoking inspiration, interactions, collaborations and, ultimately, innovation (Wijngaarden, 2019).

Thus, entrepreneurial activities are embedded in a social and economic environment and they are performed within a particular context (Granovetter, 1983). Researchers find that co-located entrepreneurs seek collaboration, network formation, cross-fertilization and advice

from each other (Bøllingtoft & Ulhøi, 2005; Ebbers, 2014). Moreover, place and location inform ‘who we are’ and provide expectations of appropriate behaviour (Cheng, Kruger & Daniels, 2003). The meaning of place is socially constructed and continuously reconstructed by, for example, social, political and economic processes. These meanings are diverse and include instrumental or utilitarian functions as well as immaterial values such as belonging and attachment. Place, then, can be considered a fundamental component of identity (Lalli, 1992; Proshansky, Fabian & Kaminoff, 1983). Likewise, we assume that place and location are key aspects of an entrepreneur’s context and self-concept. In other words, for co-located creative entrepreneurs, the context of the place where they work is related to their professional identity (see also [Chapter 4](#) for more insights on the meanings of place in creative clusters).

The context of co-location in creative clusters is mostly defined by close spatial proximity and even co-working practices (see [Chapter 6](#) for more on co-working), where entrepreneurs share spaces, offices and facilities. Capdevila (2013) argues that such co-working spaces can be seen as micro clusters, similar to the industrial cluster, yet at a smaller level (see [Chapter 5](#) for a discussion on the different spatial levels of creative clusters). Thus, co-working spaces can be considered an alternative mode of organization, connecting larger, formal organizations and institutions that focus on exploiting creative work to creative individuals (Capdevila, 2013, 2015). Instead of taking the firm as the unit of analysis, such an approach fits the most prominent organizational form in the CCIs: that of the individual creative worker (Hesmondhalgh, 2012). This allows for extrapolating the cluster literature to a micro-level analysis of co-working spaces. Research indicates that such places enable the transfer of knowledge along members, mainly committing to relations with fellow co-workers and thereby refraining from a competitive mode of work (Capdevila, 2013, 2015; Wijngaarden 2019).

Researching entrepreneurs in ten Dutch clusters

We examined entrepreneurs in ten small-scale creative clusters in the Netherlands. These ten locations are members of the Dutch Creative Residency Network. At the time of the data collection (February 2016 to August 2016), the Dutch Creative Residency Network consisted of 24 members in total. Our ten locations were spread throughout the Netherlands and were of different sizes. The smallest cluster in our sample accommodates 50 entrepreneurs, and the largest houses 400 entrepreneurs; combined, these house 998 entrepreneurs. The backgrounds of the creative entrepreneurs are diverse, including visual arts, performing arts, food, media, design and creative marketing companies.

The findings are based on a comprehensive data set, combining two sets of survey data of entrepreneurs (N = 319 and N = 218) in ten locations, participant observations in eight locations, some 15 short pilot interviews, 43 in-depth interviews with co-located creative workers, and several shorter and in-depth interviews with the managers or directors of the cases included in this research.

Creation of entrepreneurial, innovative and artistic identity

An entrepreneur’s identity is an important aspect of their business. The entrepreneur’s professional identity is defined as “an individual’s self-definition as a member of a profession

and is associated with the enactment of a professional role” (Chreim, Williams & Hinings, 2007, p. 1515). One can argue that the professional identity of an entrepreneur relates to motives and values, which in turn influence new product development, new venture creation and the exploitation of new market opportunities. For entrepreneurs in the CCIs, such organizational, innovative and artistic values are crucial elements of their identity (Bhansing, Leenders & Wijnberg, 2016; Bhansing, Wijngaarden & Hitters, 2020; Mencarelli & Pulh, 2006). Understanding the dynamics of identity may shed light on how cultural and creative entrepreneurs manage their innovative capabilities.

In our study of the locations, we were interested in the formation of the creative entrepreneurs’ professional identities and the underlying processes of identity work. By identity work we refer to an individual entrepreneur’s attempt to shape his/her identity (Sveningsson & Alvesson, 2003). Because of the tensions between artistic/creative values and economic values, creative entrepreneurs have strong identity needs, which require them to overcome ambiguities and shape processes of identity work (Inversini, Manzoni & Salvemini, 2014; Round & Styhre, 2017). There is, however, little research on the construction and development of entrepreneurial identity, and it is especially complex in the CCIs, in which entrepreneurs need to balance running a business with producing quality, aesthetics and newness.

We investigated the identity work of co-located creative entrepreneurs in our ten locations. Our goal was to explore the influence of location by focusing on other entrepreneurs at the location and locational pressures towards identity change. In using the concepts of identity work and professional identity, we argue that changing entrepreneurial identities are connected to the advancement of entrepreneurial goals. Our focus on co-located creative entrepreneurs reveals that context provides a deeper understanding of identity and identity work. As argued before, creative entrepreneurs’ professional identity is intertwined with entrepreneurial activities and outcomes (Bhansing, Wijngaarden & Hitters, 2020). The research revealed three main results in this context:

(1) Our first main result is that *the professional identity of creative entrepreneurs corresponds to the primary goals of creative entrepreneurs*, and has three components: securing the business part (organizational); developing new products (innovative); and incorporating artistic and or cultural qualities into their work (artistic). The substance of the identity of creative entrepreneurs is highly important if one wants to classify their potential and accordingly to nurture and assess their success. It also suggests that the enactment of the role of a creative entrepreneur is substantially different from that of entrepreneurs in other industries, who are likely to be characterized more by the successful creation of new ventures and the identification of market opportunities.

(2) Our second main result is that *a cluster context offers identity motives and identity inspirators*, which can influence the above-mentioned components of the entrepreneurial identity. The influence of co-location appears to be the most prevalent in increasing creative entrepreneurs’ self-view with respect to the organizational and innovative components of professional identity, that is, their self-perceived competence in running their business and bringing products or services to the market. For co-located creative entrepreneurs, being surrounded by other entrepreneurs who have shown themselves to

be successful in the organizational aspects of their business seems to transfer to the entrepreneurs' self-image.

(3) *The self-esteem that the location offers is also related to the organizational component.* The more the cluster is connected to one's positive self-image, the higher the level in the organizational component of the professional identity, as we witnessed. Moreover, in this dimension, our results suggest that efficacy influences identity change. Being located in a creative cluster serves as a signal that shows that the place where one works corresponds to one's self-efficacy. The cluster houses those creative entrepreneurs who are able to make a living from their activities, and being housed there seems to negotiate the self-perception of efficacy. The latter suggests that the location may have a reputation for innovation that negotiates this perception of the professional identity. In addition, creative entrepreneurs in the location who have artistic and cultural qualities are recognized as such, and this is the primary influence on a positive identity change in the artistic component. This suggests that it is important to have other entrepreneurs with artistic qualities nearby, and that these identity inspirators serve as role models in negotiating and establishing one's own artistic qualities.

Motivation to develop new products and services

After having established the effect of a creative cluster on creative entrepreneurs' professional identity formation, we now turn to the matter of entrepreneurs' motivations. What impels them to think up and create specific products or services, and how do specific locations inform that process? We know that an entrepreneur's motivational state of mind is central to his/her organizational success (Amabile, 1996; Shane, Locke & Collins, 2003) and that context may influence that motivational state. For example, in social psychology research it has been well established that the presence of others influences the performance of tasks (Zajonc, 1965). Research in geography points at the influence of the 'buzz' or 'feel' of a place, created by interactions between individuals (Asheim, Coenen & Vang, 2007; Storper & Venables 2004). Nevertheless, while entrepreneurs' attitudes, feelings and emotions have received considerable attention, it is still unclear how specific places or other individuals may provide a context for entrepreneurs' motivations (Carsrud & Brännback, 2011).

Turning creative ideas into creative products or services is a crucial activity for the creative entrepreneur. Creative entrepreneurs' activities are not so much founded in the exploitation of opportunities, but more in their need for autonomy and creativity (Hesmondhalgh & Baker, 2010; Neff, Wissinger & Zukin, 2005). This inspiration, we argue, is the motivational response to a creative idea, preceding the process of transforming ideas into products or services (Oleynick, Thrash, LeFew, Moldovan & Kieffaber, 2014; Bhansing, Hitters & Wijngaarden, 2018). So, central to the motivational state of the creative entrepreneur is inspiration, which is "evoked in response to getting a creative idea and that compels the individual to transform the creative idea into a creative product" (Thrash, Maruskin, Cassidy, Fryer & Ryan, 2010, p. 470). In turn, this inspiration is highly associated to feelings of passion. As individuals arguably do their most creative work when they feel passionate (Amabile & Fisher, 2000), it is imperative to understand passion and the relationship between passion and inspiration.

Entrepreneurial passion is defined as “consciously accessible intense positive feelings experienced by engagement in entrepreneurial activities associated with roles that are meaningful and salient to the self-identity of the entrepreneur” (Cardon, Wincent, Singh & Drnovsek, 2009, p. 517). It can nurture creativity and the recognition of new opportunities (Baron, 2008), enhance mental activity and provide meaning to everyday entrepreneurial activities. In our view, it is important to add contextual attributes concerning place to the conceptualization of passion. Building on earlier research (Bathelt, Malmberg & Maskell, 2004; Zajonc, 1965), we conceptualize the influence of other individuals in a specific location as ‘localized passion’. This localized passion has two components: the first is passion as a characteristic of the cluster (passion atmosphere), and the second is the perceived passion in other entrepreneurs in the cluster (passion in others). We argue that localized passion and passion for work are antecedents for inspiration in the processes of new product and service development and show that passion in others is contagious and inspiring.

We investigated the role of the creative cluster environment in which the motivations of entrepreneurs take shape (Bhansingh, Hitters & Wijngaarden, 2018). Overall, entrepreneurs are often characterized as being motivated by a high need for achievement and independence (Brockhaus, 1982), and this is generally connected to a theoretical perspective that focuses on individual characteristics. However, we argue and show that individuals in the entrepreneur’s environment also influence the entrepreneur’s motivation or drive in the realization of creative ideas.

The results of our study suggest two factors of localized passion: passion atmosphere and passion in others. Our survey items measuring passion atmosphere are an attempt to capture the ‘something in the air’ or ‘buzz’ or the aggregate level of passion that can be noticed in a specific location. Indeed, we found significant differences between the locations on this item. The items for passion in others address the perceived passion in other entrepreneurs. In addition, we developed a measurement for passion for work as a way of assessing entrepreneurial passion (cf. Baum & Locke, 2004; De Clercq, Honig & Martin, 2013; Vallerand et al., 2003). It comprises how involved an entrepreneur is with a broader range of professional activities, which we considered to be more appropriate for the cultural and creative industries.

In our ten locations, we found a clear relationship between localized passion and inspiration, indicating that qualities of the cluster affect the creative outputs of entrepreneurs. Moreover, our results provide empirical support for our expectation that passion has a positive significant influence on inspiration. First, passion in the creative atmosphere (buzz) is key. Entrepreneur noticed that they had a positive influence on other entrepreneurs by bringing across the importance of passion at the location. Second, the perceived passion of other entrepreneurs influences how passionately engaged the entrepreneur is with his/her own creative work. Finally, the more passionately engaged the entrepreneur is in professional activities, the more inspired he or she will feel. This means that the more the creative cluster as a whole is characterized by passion (localized passion), the more the individual entrepreneurs are inspired to turn their creative ideas into creative products or services.

Co-working, interaction and collaboration

The creative cluster thus affects entrepreneurial identity formation and it sparks entrepreneurial passion and inspiration. It underscores the argument in this chapter that a creative cluster can foster entrepreneurship which in turn will positively influence the success of a cluster. This invokes the question to what extent and how interactions between co-located creative workers promoted knowledge spillovers, collaboration and innovation in the CCIs. Interaction and collaboration are often assumed to be conducive to creative production in co-located business settings. Co-working spaces and other forms of shared workspaces allow the development of ‘co-present interaction’, which is fundamental to social intercourse (Friedland & Boden, 1994) (see also [Chapter 6](#)). It is this social environment, the proximity of peers for collaboration and exchange, that fosters creativity and professional success, with cooperation being an interorganizational way of managing a complex work environment (Wijngaarden, 2019).

Hence, looking into micro-interactions enables us to provide empirical foundations for the more structural theoretical assumptions behind knowledge exchange and innovative practices in creative workplaces (Wijngaarden, Hitters & Bhansing, 2020). Concepts from social geography, sociology or economics, such as ‘buzz’ or ‘creative work’, are considered aggregates of micro-phenomena (Reveley & Down, 2009). However, where individual creativity is widely studied (e.g. Amabile, 1996; Hirst, Van Knippenberg & Zhou, 2009; Tierney, Farmer & Graen, 1999), much less is known about the micro-level in relation to the clustering literature that historically focused on the regional (macro) and the organizational (meso) level (Capdevila, 2013).

Especially in the creative industries, where project ecologies are ubiquitous (Grabher, 2001), knowing who is who, in terms of specializations, trustworthiness and matching personalities is critical. Indeed, the knowledge dynamics described by the cluster theory are clearly visible in the micro-clusters of flexible workspaces and co-working spaces. Such spaces are an essential tool for building and maintaining a professional and personal network. We observed that for numerous co-located creative workers, the promise of a pool of informal exchange of help, advice or goods is essential (Wijngaarden, Hitters & Bhansingh, 2020).

This indicates that though the formal collaboration is limited in quantity and in contribution to great innovative breakthroughs, co-working offers collegiality and trust (Banks, Lovatt, O’Connor & Raffo, 2000) that grant essential assets to freelance creative workers. It secures access to local social connections for informal help and social interactions. In a labour market where flexible, precarious freelance work dominates (Hesmondhalgh, 2012; Hesmondhalgh & Baker, 2010; McRobbie, 2016) and on the job training therefore is limited, co-working spaces function as an alternative mode of organization, not only between formal organizations and creative individuals (Capdevila, 2013, 2015; Cohendet, Grandadam & Simon, 2010), but also between formal education and informal labour.

Moreover, respondents also emphasized the buzz or ‘industrial atmosphere’ (Marshall, 1919) that they experienced in ‘third places’ (Brown, 2017): the coffee machines, smoking areas outside of the buildings, during lunch and around ping-pong tables and other leisure facilities. These places were considered crucial for discussing state-of-the-art issues and ideas with peers, for staying informed about the latest gossip and for tacit learning of the practices of creative entrepreneurship (cf. Gertler, 2003; Polanyi, 1967).

It also suggests that entrepreneurial success depends on these interactions with others. Some entrepreneurs underscored that they could not have been successful if they would not have been

part of this local creative community. Using the terminology of Granovetter (1983), the results indicate that co-locating does not only grant them access to a web of strong ties, but also to a wider network of weak ties through informal interactions, exposing them to innovative new ideas (Wijngaarden, Hitters & Bhansingh, 2020).

Formal collaboration seemed to be first and foremost a matter of personal preferences and histories – it occurred both in places with a lower and a higher openness or community management, though it occurred slightly more often and organically in the more open locations (i.e. the traditional co-working spaces). These creative workers are invited to communicate by their proximity to others, strengthening personal ties and mutual trust, whereas for the more closed locations, such collaborations were less common. Finally, we observed that especially in places with an active community management, specifically tacit knowledge exchange was more common, as managers or hosts tended to ‘curate’ the needs and potentials of their creative workers (e.g. Brown, 2017)

Does co-location foster creative entrepreneurship?

The context of co-located creative entrepreneurs offers three crucial sets of benefits for creative production.

(1) The first is *possibilities for the formation of a professional and entrepreneurial identity* through the co-presence of important others. Our results show that the professional identity of creative entrepreneurs has three components: the ability to run their business; the ability to innovate or adapt services and products; and the ability to include cultural or artistic qualities into these products or services. These components follow different formational processes. We contribute to the literature about identity work by showing that the place and the people in this place play a role in the development of professional identity. Others are not only important in the identity work for confirming identity. Others at a specific place may serve as an example with respect to the development of particular entrepreneurial goals. In addition, place is connected to the pressures brought by identity motivations for change. Therefore, our studies contribute to the understanding of the locational context in which the professional activities take place and its utilization in identity work. By understanding this better, cluster managers or local governments can facilitate identity change more easily by manipulating the visibility of identity inspirators and underlying the self-esteem and efficacy that one feels when joining a co-location. This in turn may increase creative entrepreneurs’ innovative capabilities.

(2) Second, our research has shown the *importance of entrepreneurial and localized passion as crucial to motivation and inspiration*. Passion is an antecedent for inspiration. Localized passion seems to be internalized in the way entrepreneurs feel about their professional activities, and this positively increases the individual passion of the entrepreneur. This suggests that the context in which entrepreneurs try to realize their ideas affects the motivational process, and that the mere presence of passionate peers in the nearby environment has a positive effect. In our setting, the other entrepreneurs are located in the same building, but do not necessarily observe the professional activities of other entrepreneurs directly. It seems that the entrepreneurs are aware of other entrepreneurs, that these entrepreneurs may face similar issues and barriers and that they

are involved in similar creative processes. Moreover, our results suggest that this awareness is not significantly influenced by the degree of interaction the creative entrepreneur has with other creative entrepreneurs within the building. Our study provides new evidence that motivation is a complex but also a deeply social process. Social facilitation not only occurs when others observe activities directly, but also by knowing that peers are working passionately in their environment. In addition, our findings also suggest that inspiration may be evoked by the people within and the feel of an environment. This way of evoking inspiration may stand next to the objects that Vallerand et al. (2003) mention in their conceptualization of inspiration. As entrepreneurs are involved in making new combinations and developing new products and services, surrounding themselves with a passionate environment and individuals may provide a more controlled and steady supply for the evocation of inspiration. This also underscores, next to the high need for autonomy, the importance of the social aspects and the context of entrepreneurship. The co-located working environments offered by the clusters in our study prove to be essential for entrepreneurship in the CCIs. They provide a passionate environment for many of the small businesses which are typical of these industries. Our results corroborate earlier indications that creative entrepreneurs need specific contexts and the presence of others to be inspired (cf. Drake, 2003).

(3) Thirdly, *cultural production in co-located CCIs is highly dependent on day-to-day interactions, but these interactions are dependent on specific conducive environments.* Our research corroborates the findings of Fuzi (2015), Merkel (2015) and Spinuzzi (2012) that in co-working spaces, and especially in more closed forms of flexible workspaces, the notion that co-working is a decisive factor in fostering collaboration and innovation is naive. Yet, looking at the micro-level, we learned that proximity is an essential facilitator of potential collaborative prospects. Offering especially help in practical issues, including providing alternative perspectives on creative work, as well as the transfer of, for example, administrative or computer skills are not considered as explicitly innovative. They contribute to a fertile ground aiding optimal personal creative and professional development. Cluster managers and policymakers, then, need to be aware of the crucial role of active community management as the key to a successful cluster in terms of collaboration and interaction (see Chapter 2 for more insights about the roles of mediators in creative clusters). It can induce a form of collegiality which is unique for freelance creative workers and provides a pool of ample (tacit) knowledge that has the potential of indirectly promoting innovative new products, services or methods (Wijngaarden, Hitters & Bhansing, 2020).

Conclusions

Our research set out to answer questions about the impact and effectiveness of creative clusters in the context of entrepreneurship. Our findings need to be interpreted from within the context in which our research was executed. In our cases we focused on entrepreneurs that are located in creative clusters, but we do not know to what extent our findings are valid as well for entrepreneurs not located in clusters, or creative entrepreneurs in general.

Our research yielded a number of tangible findings with respect to aspects of entrepreneurship and creative and cultural production. Creative clusters are used by creative entrepreneurs to show that they are entrepreneurial, innovative and artistic. Creative clusters reinforce their identity as creative entrepreneurs. When co-located, creative entrepreneurs appreciate the sense of collegiality with other entrepreneurs. Creative entrepreneurs are sensitive to the atmosphere of the location, the passion for their work and contacts with their peers and partners.

We have shown that creative clusters and the day-to-day interactions that take place therein, offer entrepreneurs the ability to blend the building of their business with their creative drive. We argue that place and the people in this place play a crucial role in the development of professional entrepreneurial identities. In order to understand these processes, it is crucial to look at micro-interactions in the CCIs (Pratt & Jeffcutt, 2009). Interacting with others at work confirms identity and drives motivation and inspiration, but also serves as an example with respect to the development of particular entrepreneurial goals.

Creative entrepreneurs appreciate co-location in one building or complex, and generally perceive a high level of added value of creative business co-location. First, a creative cluster provides a context that stimulates the creative entrepreneur in the development of products and services. Secondly, it gives the creative entrepreneur the chance to show them who he/she is. And thirdly, creative clusters are essential for a functioning ecosystem of the CCIs. For such an ecosystem, it is necessary that there are ample and affordable workplaces for starting and growing creative entrepreneurs.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by Dutch Research Council (NWO) under the NWO Creative Industry grant [file number 314-99-110] and is made possible with the cooperation of the Dutch Creative Residency Network (DCRN).

References

- Amabile, T. M. (1996). *Creativity in Context: Update to the Social Psychology of Creativity*. Boulder, CO: Routledge.
- Amabile, T. M. & Fisher, C. M. (2000). Stimulate creativity by fueling passion. In E. Locke (ed.), *Handbook of Principles of Organizational Behavior*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 331–341.
- Asheim, B., Coenen, L. & Vang, J. (2007). Face-to-Face, buzz, and knowledge bases: Sociospatial implications for learning, innovation, and innovation policy. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 25(5): 655–670. <https://doi.org/10.1068/c0648>.
- Audretsch, D. B. & Belitski, M. (2013). The missing pillar: The creativity theory of knowledge spillover entrepreneurship. *Small Business Economics*, 41(4): 819–836.
- Banks, M., Lovatt, A., O'Connor, J. & Raffo, C. (2000). Risk and trust in the cultural industries. *Geoforum*, 31(4): 453–464. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0016-7185\(00\)00008-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0016-7185(00)00008-7).
- Baptista, R. & Swann, P. (1998). Do firms in clusters innovate more? *Research Policy*, 27(5): 525–540. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0048-7333\(98\)00065-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0048-7333(98)00065-1).
- Baron, R. A. (2008). The role of affect in the entrepreneurial process. *Academy of Management Review*, 33(2): 328–340.

- Bathelt, H., Malmberg, A. & Maskell, P. (2004). Clusters and knowledge: Local buzz, global pipelines and the process of knowledge creation. *Progress in Human Geography*, 28(1): 31–56.
- Baum, J. R. & Locke, E. A. (2004). The relationship of entrepreneurial traits, skill, and motivation to subsequent venture growth. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(1): 587–589.
- Bhansing, P. V., Hitters, E. & Wijngaarden, Y. (2018). Passion inspires: Motivations of creative entrepreneurs in creative business centres in the Netherlands. *Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 27(1): 1–24.
- Bhansing, P. V., Leenders, M. A. & Wijnberg, N. M. (2016). Selection system orientations as an explanation for the differences between dual leaders of the same organization in their perception of organizational performance. *Journal of Management & Governance*, 20(4): 907–933.
- Bhansing, P. V., Wijngaarden, Y. & Hitters, E. (2020). Identity work in the context of co-located creative entrepreneurs: How place influences professional identity. *International Journal of Arts Management*, 22(2): 7–23.
- Bøllingtoft, A. & Ulhøi, J.P. (2005). The networked business incubator – Leveraging entrepreneurial agency? *Journal of Business Venturing*, 20(2): 265–290.
- Brockhaus, R. H. (1982). The psychology of the entrepreneur. In C. A. Kent, D. L. Sexton & K. H. Vesper (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Entrepreneurship* (pp. 39–57). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Brown, J. (2017). Curating the “Third Place”? Coworking and the mediation of creativity. *Geoforum*, 82: 112–126. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2017.04.006>.
- Capdevila, I. (2013). Knowledge dynamics in localized communities: Coworking spaces as microclusters (SSRN Scholarly Paper No. ID 2414121). Retrieved from Social Science Research Network website: <https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=2414121>.
- Capdevila, I. (2015). Co-working spaces and the localised dynamics of innovation in Barcelona. *International Journal of Innovation Management*, 19(3): 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.1142/S1363919615400046>.
- Cardon, M. S., Wincent, J., Singh, J. & Drnovsek, M. (2009). The nature and experience of entrepreneurial passion. *Academy of Management Review*, 34(3): 511–532.
- Carsrud, A. & Brännback, M. (2011). Entrepreneurial motivations: What do we still need to know? *Journal of Small Business Management*, 49(1): 9–26.
- Cheng, A. S., Kruger, L. E. & Daniels, S. E. (2003). “Place” as an integrating concept in natural resource politics: Propositions for a social science research agenda. *Society & Natural Resources*, 16(2): 87–104.
- Chreim, S., Williams, B. E. & Hinings, C. R. (2007). Interlevel influences on the reconstruction of professional role identity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(6): 1515–1539.
- Cohendet, P., Grandadam, D. & Simon, L. (2010). The anatomy of the creative city. *Industry and Innovation*, 17(1): 91–111. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13662710903573869>.
- Comunian, R. (2011). Rethinking the creative city: The role of complexity, networks and interactions in the urban creative economy. *Urban Studies*, 48(6): 1157–1179.
- De Clercq, D., Honig, B. & Martin, B. (2013). The roles of learning orientation and passion for work in the formation of entrepreneurial intention. *International Small Business Journal*, 31(6): 652–676.
- Drake, G. (2003). “This place gives me space”: Place and creativity in the creative industries. *Geoforum*, 34(4): 511–524.
- Ebbers, J. J. (2014). Networking behavior and contracting relationships among entrepreneurs in business incubators. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 38(5): 1–23.
- Evans, G. (2009). Creative cities, creative spaces and urban policy. *Urban Studies*, 46(5–6): 1003–1040. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098009103853>.
- Friedland, R. & Boden, D. (eds.). (1994). *NowHere: Space, Time, and Modernity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Fuzi, A. (2015). Co-working spaces for promoting entrepreneurship in sparse regions: The case of South Wales. *Regional Studies, Regional Science*, 2(1): 462–469. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21681376.2015.1072053>.
- Gertler, M. S. (1995). “Being there”: Proximity, organization, and culture in the development and adoption of advanced manufacturing technologies. *Economic Geography*, 71(1): 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.2307/144433>.
- Gertler, M. S. (2003). Tacit knowledge and the economic geography of context, or the undefinable tacitness of being (there). *Journal of Economic Geography*, 3(1): 75–99. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jeg/3.1.75>.
- Gordon, I. R. & McCann, P. (2005). Innovation, agglomeration, and regional development. *Journal of Economic Geography*, 5(5): 523–543. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jeg/lbh072>.
- Grabher, G. (2001). Ecologies of creativity: The Village, the Group, and the heterarchic organisation of the British advertising industry. *Environment and Planning A*, 33(2): 351–374.
- Grabher, G. (2002). The project ecology of advertising: Tasks, talents and teams. *Regional Studies*, 36(3): 245–262. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0343400220122052>.
- Grabher, G. (2004). Learning in projects, remembering in networks? Communality, sociality, and connectivity in project ecologies. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 11(2): 103–123. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0969776404041417>.
- Granovetter, M. S. (1983). The strength of weak ties: A network theory revisited. *Sociological Theory*, 1(1): 201–233. <https://doi.org/10.2307/202051>.
- Hesmondhalgh, D. (2012). *The Cultural Industries*. London [etc.]: SAGE.
- Hesmondhalgh, D. & Baker, S. (2010). “A very complicated version of freedom”: Conditions and experiences of creative labour in three cultural industries. *Poetics*, 38(1): 4–20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2009.10.001>.
- Hirst, G., Van Knippenberg, D. & Zhou, J. (2009). A cross-level perspective on employee creativity: Goal orientation, team learning behavior, and individual creativity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(2): 280–293. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2009.37308035>.
- Inversini, M., Manzoni, B. & Salvemini, S. (2014). Daniel Boulud: The making of a successful creative individual business model. *International Journal of Arts Management*, 16(2): 55–63.
- Lalli, M. (1992). Urban-related identity: Theory, measurement, and empirical findings. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 12(4): 285–303.
- Marshall, A. (1919). *Industry and Trade: A Study of Industrial Technique and Business Organization, and of Their Influences on the Conditions of Various Classes and Nations*. London: Macmillan.
- McRobbie, A. (2016). *Be Creative: Making a Living in the New Culture Industries*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Mencarelli, R. & Pulh, M. (2006). Positioning the supply of live performance: Innovative managerial practices relating to the interaction of spectator, performance and venue. *International Journal of Arts Management*, 8(3): 19–29.
- Merkel, J. (2015). Coworking in the city. *Ephemera; Leicester*, 15(1): 121–139.
- Neff, G., Wissinger, E. & Zukin, S. (2005). Entrepreneurial labor among cultural producers: “Cool” jobs in “hot” industries. *Social Semiotics*, 15(3): 307–334.
- Oleynick, V. C., Thrash, T. M., LeFew, M. C., Moldovan, E. G. & Kieffaber, P. D. (2014). The scientific study of inspiration in the creative process: challenges and opportunities. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 8: 1–8.
- Polanyi, M. (1967). *The Tacit Dimension*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Pratt, A. C. & Jeffcutt, P. (2009). *Creativity, Innovation and the Cultural Economy*. London: Routledge.
- Proshansky, H. M., Fabian, A. K. & Kaminoff, R. (1983). Place-identity: Physical world socialization of the self. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 3(1): 57–83.

- Reveley, J. & Down, S. (2009). Stigmatization and self-presentation in Australian entrepreneurial identity formation. In D. Hjorth & C. Steyaert (eds.), *The Politics and Aesthetics of Entrepreneurship*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Round, H. & Styhre, A. (2017). Reality bites: Managing identity ambiguity in an advertising agency. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 26(2): 202–213.
- Schumpeter, J. A. (1934, 1980). *The Theory of Economic Development*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Scott, A. J. (2006). Entrepreneurship, innovation and industrial development: Geography and the creative field revisited. *Small Business Economics*, 26(1): 1–24.
- Shane, S., Locke, E. A. & Collins, C. J. (2003). Entrepreneurial motivation. *Human Resource Management Review*, 13(2): 257–279.
- Spinuzzi, C. (2012). Working alone together: Coworking as emergent collaborative activity. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 26(4): 399–441. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1050651912444070>.
- Storper, M. C. & Venables, A. J. (2004). Buzz: Face-to-Face contact and the urban economy. *Journal of Economic Geography*, 4(4): 351–370. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jnlecg/lbh027>.
- Sveningsson, S. & Alvesson, M. (2003). Managing managerial identities: Organizational fragmentation, discourse and identity struggle. *Human Relations*, 56(10): 1163–1193.
- Thrash, T. M., Maruskin, L. A., Cassidy, S. E., Fryer, J. W. & Ryan, R. M. (2010). Mediating between the muse and the masses: Inspiration and the actualization of creative ideas. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 98(3): 469–487.
- Tierney, P., Farmer, S. M. & Graen, G. B. (1999). An examination of leadership and employee creativity: The relevance of traits and relationships. *Personnel Psychology*, 52(3): 591–620. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1999.tb00173.x>.
- Theodorakopoulos, N., Kakabadse, N. K. & McGowan, C (2014). What matters in business incubation? A literature review and a suggestion for situated theorising. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 21(4): 602–622.
- Vallerand, R. J., Blanchard, C., Mageau, G. A., Koestner, R., Ratelle, C., Léonard, M. & Marsolais, J. (2003). Les passions de l'âme: On obsessive and harmonious passion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85(4): 756–767.
- Wennekers, S. & Thurik, R. (1999). Linking entrepreneurship and economic growth. *Small Business Economics*, 13(1): 27–56. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1008063200484>.
- Wijngaarden, Y. (2019). *Places of co-working: Situating innovation in the creative industries* (ERMeCC Doctoral Dissertations, Vol. 19). Rotterdam: Erasmus Research Centre for Media, Communication and Culture.
- Wijngaarden, Y., Hitters, E. & Bhansing, P. V. (2019). Close to the “local cool”: Creative place reputation in Dutch “ordinary cities”. *Creative Industries Journal*, 12(1): 86–104.
- Wijngaarden, Y., Hitters, E. & Bhansing, P. V. (2020) Cultivating fertile learning grounds: Collegiality, tacit knowledge and innovation in creative co-working spaces. *Geoforum*, 109: 86–94. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2020.01.005>.
- Zajonc, R. B. (1965). Social facilitation. *Science*, 149(3681): 269–274.