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One priority of the Agenda Europe 2020 is to promote spillover from the cultural and creative sectors. However, research into and our fundamental understanding of spillover effects are deficient. This—widely accepted—discrepancy between policy and its evidence base and key importance for the role of the cultural and creative industries in society and politics to 2020 prompted ecce to launch a publication series entitled “to be debated” and to focus its first edition on spillover effects.

In 2012 the EU communication “Promoting cultural and creative sectors for growth and jobs in the EU” kicked off the current interest in spillover. “Being at the crossroads between arts, business and technology, cultural and creative sectors are in a strategic position to trigger spillovers in other industries.”

It seems this statement has ended—at least politically—the debate on whether spillover effects are external or not. From migration and integration to climate change and health services as well as urban development—in all these sectors innovations are expected, and are also supported to be triggered by the creative industries.

Subsequent funding programmes of the Agenda Europe 2020, which have just started in 2014, also promote this trigger effect. Cities, regions and member states have followed the call of the European Commission in 2012 to stop underestimating the effects of the creative industries. Now, in 2014, investments and programmes have started all across Europe. On the one hand this shows that creative spillover effects meet demands and needs in other sectors. On the other, spillover talk sparks scepticism: just another buzz word without underlying empirical soundness and success?

In addition to this, many sectors like health or energy are not fully aware of the support and the triggers the creative industries are meant to deliver. Is spillover in danger of overkill without underlying empirical soundness and success?!

Creative spillover has advanced from policy objectives to funding priorities within just two years: a quick career, but hardly sustainable if understanding and perception do not make up too soon.

“to be debated SPILLOVER” puts the trigger effects of the creative industries into context, thereby supporting a more profound debate about what kind of research is needed. ecce is therefore publishing this paper in the hope that it itself will trigger debates in politics, research, economics and society.

For a start, ecce calls for a research agenda “Spillover 2020”, ideally shared by all Dgs of the European Union. Key issues must be explored with high priority to fill the research gap on spillover because it is a vital part for the success of the Agenda Europe 2020.

How to differentiate between normal external effects of the creative industries and spillover effects?

Who does the ‘spilling’? What is it that ‘spills over’?

It is still unclear today whether spillover effects are external between sectors or internal within creative organisations.

These and other questions emerged during the EU funded project CATALYSE conducted in collaboration with the Forum d’Avignon and Forum d’Avignon Bilbao. Its topic: the catalytic effects of culture on regional and urban development. The project closed with a masterclass workshop led by Dr. Jonathan Vickery, University of Warwick, held in Dortmund in February 2014. Following the CATALYSE project Vickery and his students formulated open research questions, conclusions and historical analyses on spillover.

The author of “to be debated SPILLOVER”, Jonathan Vickery, is Director of the Centre for Cultural Policy Studies at the University of Warwick, and has published extensively on creative cities and creative industries. He is also board member of the UNESCO conference “Habitat” to be debated plans to substantiate and fill buzz words like spillover with scientific concepts and standards. It is a workbook and a basis that helps—also newcomers to the cultural and creative industries—to access a topic and its diverse debates. “to be debated SPILLOVER” thus also a starting point for the series “to be debated” in the following years presenting and questioning latest developments and trends, but topics and buzz words in the creative industries.

About the author:

Jonathan Vickery is Associate Professor and MA Programme Director, Centre for Cultural Policy Studies, University of Warwick, UK.

He has worked as an independent artist and designer, and has taught in architectural history and theory, design, urbanism and organization studies. He has published research in art theory, urban and cultural policy, regeneration and cities. He was a co-editor of the journal Architect, is now Chair of the non-profit research company “the Art of Management and Organization”. He has been involved in local cultural development, urban regeneration and a wide range of reviewing for major academic funding councils, both UK and EU. At Warwick he established three independently funded masters programs, and currently Director of the MA in Arts, Enterprise and Development. His most recent book (co-edited with Ian King) is Experiencing Organization (Libri; Oxon). His monograph Creative Cities and Public Policies on art, democracy and urban lives (Routledge) will appear in 2015.
Policy background. The European Union (unlike the Council of Europe) has historically been reticent in the area of cultural policy. Given how ‘culture’ in Europe is embedded in the history of national institutions and traditions, the ‘principle of subsidiarity’ remains a central tenet of the Treaty on European Union (the Maastricht Treaty of 1993 updated as the Lisbon Treaty of 2009). And yet, to date, the EU is making increasingly urgent calls for greater intercultural cooperation between member states, particularly on projects featuring urban, innovation or spillover dimensions. The communication ‘European Agenda for Culture in a Globalising World’ re-emphasised the role of culture in the Lisbon Strategy in the cause of growth and jobs, and argued for a concerted policy effort to enable creative entrepreneurs and the cultural industries to become a source and stimulus for industrial and business innovation. 2009 was the ‘European Year of Creativity and Innovation’, which produced the high profile Manifesto from the European Ambassadors for Creativity and Innovation (Richard Florida being one of the main proponents). The continued success of the European Capital of Culture is one strand of European cultural policy where regional and city-based public policy, backed up by substantial public funding.

The setting. Culture has become a major driver for urban development and its several policy sub-fields. Within the EU structural funds 2007-2013 more than six billion euros were spent on culture (European Parliament, 2012, p. 9). Still, investments in culture are viewed with scepticism by politicians, policy-makers and citizens alike. Despite the quantitative figures on the economic success of its sectors. This ‘perception gap’ was the starting point of CATALYSE, an EU-funded project of three partners in France, Germany and Spain, in order to raise awareness of the benefits and spillover effects of culture and creative industries in urban development. The three partners – the Forum d’Avignon, Paris, the European centre for creative economy (ecce), Dortmund, and Bilbao Metropol 30, Bilbao – engaged in a one-year cooperation from March 2013 to May 2014 featuring four types of activity: study; conferences; research & action workshops; and a student mastersclass workshop. CATALYSE aimed to use ideas and debates to generate faster ways of initiating new practices in urban economic policy and development, reflecting this process scientifically at the beginning as well as at the end.

The CATALYSE student mastersclass workshop3 (from which this publication emerged) was entitled ‘Streamlining Culture in Urban Developments in Europe’ and was the starting point of CATALYSE’s students’ policy aspirations are unprecedented and still to be developed. What they mean in practice, of course, is now for us to determine, and the many funded European projects to work out and make a reality.

The new EU cultural funding programme Creative Europe (2014-20) declares an express interest in dissolving the institutional and ideological boundaries between arts and enterprise, the creative industries and other industries, and in promoting explicit interconnections between cultural policy objectives and the objectives of urban, industry and enterprise policy programmes. A central initiative of the hugely significant and new Europe 2020 Strategy is the ‘Innovation Union’, which identifies culture and creativity along with Europe’s profound social diversity as important resources for macroeconomic development. The Europe 2020 programme itself defines ‘innovation’ in terms of a strategic use of cultural, social and urban resources. Innovation may include a range of outcomes – new products and processes, services (commercial or institutional), marketing, branding and design – but must, states the program’s founding document, develop a situation-specific approach: “innovation in business models, design, branding and services that add value for users and where Europe has unique talents”. Another Europe 2020 initiative, ‘An integrated industrial policy for the globalisation era’, similarly situates cultural and creative industries as sources and providers of innovation. In all, these broad policy aspirations are unprecedented and still to be developed. What they mean in practice, of course, is now for us to determine, and the many funded European projects to work out and make a reality.

i. the recent history and current shifts in European policy
ii. the specific policy formulations of spillover currently in circulation
iii. the changes in the cultural sector itself – the economisation of culture – and how this provides for new conditions for thinking about spillover; and
iv. the construction of models and matrices of spillover that would, in turn, provide a set of indicators.

The text below is a synthesis of readings, dialogue, discussion and ideas provoked by the seminar – it is not a seamless statement or study. It represents the diversity of views and critical insights that have emerged from multiple participants as well as the recent influential activities of ecce and relevant publications (some of which are cited and quoted below). Given the embryonic state of the policy discourse of ‘spillover’, this report is deliberately designed to provoke questions and further research, and does not stand as a comprehensive overview of the policy discourse. It equally does not document the workshop exercises so much as articulates their intellectual content – to generate pertinent questions for further research. It is intended that this document is an intellectual stimulus to a new research agenda, where a Eu-

---

1 European Agenda for Culture in a Globalising World (EC, 2007)
2 An integrated industrial policy for the globalisation era (EC, 2010)
3 Visit www.e-europe.eu for reports, etc. and www.research-action.eu for further reading.
Spillover can involve any area of the economy. Our focus is largely what the recent URBACT baseline report on the Creative SpIN thematic project calls ‘creative spillover’ (Creative SpIN, 2012). The term ‘creative’ refers to the broad expanse of the ‘creative economy’, and does not necessarily admit the dynamic and multiple possibilities that ‘creative’ activity demands, or at least promises. A creative spillover will hopefully serve to extend the peripheral vision or the policy imagination for both cultural and creative, able to encompass the qualitative as well as quantitative nature of actions and impacts, reactions, interactions, and the more subtle dynamics of influence. Crossing borders in the context of creative spillover, there are three approaches and pan-European policies of cultural and economic development, the importance of the term to neo- functionalist regionalism theory is instructive (see Haas; Rosemond). With the European vision of Jean Monnet as seminal inspiration, neo-functionalist theory sought to understand the processes of spillover and mutually-enhancing integration for furthering European cross-border relations. Examining the geo-politics of European regions, neo-functionalism identified how patterns and forces of integration in some industries could generate multiple causal motions of integration in other industries. Attended to the multiple impacts of cross-border and multi-sector collaboration, and the momentum of such forces of integration was enhanced by ‘spillover effects’. If in the present day ‘integration’ is a benign, if nondidactic, term, for a neo-classical economic framework (as much as Enlightenment modern art theory) it was anathema. For the development of autonomous disciplinary regions of thought, specialisation, unique methods and discrete objects of analysis, was the modern path to progress. Integration moulded the world’s seminal categories, introduced unwanted contingencies, muddied the specialist understanding of the object of knowledge. In short, talk of integration challenged the very epistemic basis of the modern scientific mind—set as much as the principle vehicle of modernity itself, whose very existence relies on fixed and absolute boundaries—the nation state.

Of course, many neo-functionalist observations on the nature of socio-economic integration are now assumed common to theories of globalization. They also serve to remind us that when discussing ‘spillover theory’, particularly in the context of public policies of the creative and cultural industries, we are talking about more than industry—more than ‘knowledge transfer’ or industrial collaboration as traditionally conceived. For spillover has a broader geo-political dimension, which involves both exploiting and generating forces of integration, collaboration, dialogue and cross-border collegiality, promoting a sense of collective project and other arenas of allegiance. Knowledge is power and economic power is political power, and so where new forms of allegiance or interconnection emerge, a political dimension is inevitable. This becomes particularly apparent when we are discussing the application of ‘spillover’ as a practice involving public institutions, cultural resources and artistic practices (most of which, in Europe, remain bounded by national traditions and the structures of national public funding).

Following from this, another significant aspect of neo-functionalist theory is that with increasing integration arises the evaluation and empowerment of non-state, civil society agency and individual citizens themselves. Spillover has unexpectedly emerged in entrepreneurship theory as intrinsic to the strategic development of the decision-making, and management, business innovation and market mobility of single, dynamic, agents of new enterprise. Spillover

8 Introduction: Institutiona...construction? (Han, 2004)
9 The Uniting of Europe and the Foundation of EU Studies (Rosamond, 2005)
Demarcation of Concepts

is not simply a dissemination of general ‘influences’, but if approached with a strategic focus can help generate specific ideas, projects and ventures in response to perceived market opportunities.

> Spillover raises questions of agency and legitimacy - what right does culture or the creative industries have to operate in other industrial or social sectors? Who authorises such actions?

Knowledge Transfer - a technical process, of internal distribution or the exporting of knowledge, information, data, documentation, and concomitant skills in managing and using knowledge. It became a significant public policy term in the 1990s, where universities and public institutions were encouraged to shift their R&D, data and documentation, into the private domain for industrial exploitation. While IFPs were often shared or favourable to the giver, the receiver, into the private domain for industrial exploitation.

For an extended study of creative spillover, we would need to consider a theoretical delimitation of the activities of the creative economy so as not to confuse them with the pervasive impacts of ‘consumer culture’ generally. It is easy to understate consumer culture’s power of influence. Consumption is not simply decision-making on purchases or the acquisition of goods and services, it is a significant realm of knowledge. For the process of consumption involves the passage and transmission of ideas, new terminologies, knowledge, behavioral intelligence and a range of stimulus shaping everyday perceptions and realities. We need, therefore, to differentiate spillover from the pervasive effects of the ‘culture industries’ and identify specific spheres of professional or market activity into which ‘spill’ generates value.

We therefore require a formulation of specific criteria for spillover, capturing and evaluating the specificity of the spillover facility of creative economy actors, in turn learning how to ‘model’ the spillover motion or dynamic. However, we face a difficulty, observed in a well known NESTA report: ‘...what happens when the knowledge cannot be codified? In what sense is it able to ‘spill over’?’ The report continues: ‘Perhaps a more convincing economic argument for public funding of research in these cases would be to incentivise researchers to deploy the skills and competences they have developed through their research experience in other socially valuable contexts - including the private, public and third sectors.’ (p.36).

Creative Spillover

> How do creative activities traverse different jurisdictions or territories?

> Spillover is more (or should be more) than a dissemination of influences. It is not equivalent to older policy terms - Knowledge Transfer, Social Impact or Public Value. These distinctions are important.

> Could the patterns of spillover be used to generate a new ‘map’ of the creative economy?

> Which ‘spill’ generates value by provoking new knowledge, capabilities or providing new resources?

> Extrapolation: Spillover might involve:

1. Converting practice into theory then back into practice: Creative Clusters and Trans-valuation: putting creativity on the map (NESTA, 2010)

In the need to ‘codify’ knowledge, as the report put it, we need to be aware of the implications of over-rationalisation or borrowing seemingly relevant terminology (we could probably think of many ‘side effects’ - contingent impact, ‘cross over’, ‘positive feedback loop’, and so on), or indeed of transferring skills from ‘other socially valuable contexts’

Spillover is not just a process that needs explaining, but a series of situations that require management. As observed by Chaplin et. al. in an earlier report, spillovers requires more than just an understanding of processes: it must contain many other things, such as a strong rational for the actors involved. Spillovers might generate specific rewards or returns. But sometimes these are not predictable, and thus essential terms of reference, contractual frameworks or conditions of investment are impossible to construct at the outset. How then can we construct the conditions for the conditions of spillover to emerge? We need to be aware of the potential contingencies and indeterminacies endemic to spillover.

> Which ‘spill’ generates value byprovoking new knowledge, capabilities or providing new resources?

2. A process of dialogic formation and development that might be place specific, or place ambivalent, or optimised by focusing on the resources of place and contributing to the broad economic development picture.

> Converting practice into theory then back into practice: Creative Clusters and Trans-valuation: putting creativity on the map (NESTA, 2010)
Knowledge spillovers, where firms benefit from new ideas, discoveries or processes developed by other firms, e.g., through their R&D activities.

Product spillovers, where the demand for a firm’s product increases as a result of the product development of another firm, such as when the demand for CD players rises as a result of the development of the CD.

Network spillovers, where firms gain benefits from other organisations or other agencies. External spillover is thus of more interest given its propensity for generating social and cultural value outside the limited orbit of the single organisation. And yet, ‘external’ spillover remains significantly less catered for by existing policy, management, and organisation research, notwithstanding the available research in value and supply chains, B2B and markets.

Training spillovers, when labour that is trained on one industry moves to another, as when actors trained in the subsidised theatre move to commercial theatre or television.

Artistic spillovers, where the innovative work of an artist or a company advances an art form to the benefit of other artists or companies.

The problem for the researcher is that the stated outcomes of spillover may, of course, also come about through other means. Our challenge in the future is to identify the specificity of spillover activity and which activities generate such outcomes in a specified, more predictable and measurable way. Furthermore, there is a distinction between similar outcomes being produced by ‘internal’ or by ‘external’ spillover. The ‘internal’ spillover crosses the internal boundaries of organisational systems or structures, such as inside a firm; the external spillover takes place between organisations or other agencies. External spillover is thus of more interest given its propensity for generating social and cultural value outside the limited orbit of the single organisation. And yet, ‘external’ spillover remains significantly less catered for by existing policy, management, and organisation research, notwithstanding the available research in value and supply chains, B2B and markets.

The historical inspiration of ‘Jacob’s spillovers’ (1969) and ‘Porter’s spillover’ (1990) in this context is thus critical. Both ‘Jacob’s’ and Porter articulated strong (and different) theoretical views on the productive dynamics of interactions between organisations in specific places or regions of industry, with Jacob alerting us to the ‘place’ specific and urban environmental conditions of spillover. For both thinkers, spillover can operate within the standardised processes of R&D, RII, manufacturing and production and business transactions, yet can also emerge from innovations or more ‘spontaneous’ interaction alongside changes in operating environments. While arguments remain on whether spillover is served by geographic concentrations of expertise and specialisation or through diversity, the implication is that the relations between businesses are intrinsic to industrial growth and the growth of the local and regional economy. This makes spillover relevant to urban and regional public policy, not just economic, industry, trade, and enterprise or industry policies. And the task of the public policy maker can more easily be articulated in terms of understand development and not just ‘growth’ (as registered in, say, employment and taxation).

Porter’s work has influenced much research in external spillover, but perhaps is most influential on internal or endogenous growth. Spillover became an interest for a wide range of economists who held that economic growth (at least in contemporary knowledge-based economies) was a matter of ‘internal’ factors (and not external factors like general technological progress, or movement in market structures). Famously developed by Paul Romer at Stanford University in the late 1980s and 1990s, ‘endogenous growth theory’ defined economic growth in terms of human capability, knowledge, social interaction and the facility for innovation within an organisation or firm. This became highly relevant after the de-industrialisation of the West in the 1970s and subsequent re-industrialisation through technology in the 1980s, facilitated by the rise of the political conditions of neoliberalism and ‘free market’ economic policies. Neoliberalism broadly involved a political disinvestment in the previous ‘external’ mechanisms of labour organisations, welfare systems, social security, interest rates and currency values, in favour of investment in strategies of organisational development, enhancing flexibility and mobility fit for a market driven by fast-thinking and discerning consumers, and for wealth creation by entrepreneurs and small businesses.

Porter’s new famous ‘The Competitive Advantage of Nations’ (1990) held that economic growth was generated not just by competition (among existing actors in the market), but through a developing facility for competitiveness that was highly localised, interdisciplinary, and involved a rapid increase in the capabilities for adaptation, innovation and responses to external change. The various waves of ‘new economic growth theory’, which emerged in force in the 1990s, revolved around a paradox: that the new dominant forms of economic value emerged not from material conditions of production but the human facility for communication, knowledge, creative action and experience. In other words, the sources of economic production were (potentially, at least) the sources of individual self-fulfilment and happiness. There was a quasi-democratic ring to this economic theory, where economic growth was located in labour and
the worker, albeit where their labour value now extended from production into regions of subjectivity and personal expression. Firms increasingly demanded personal investment, and used expressive visual communication and brand ‘values’ through which to communicate with workers and market alike. A new era of humanism seemed to dawn, celebrated in best-selling books like Pine and Gilmore’s The Experience Economy13, David Brooks’ Bobos in Paradise14, and Anderson and Ray’s The Cultural Creatives15. Human, social characteristics were once associated with artistic eccentricity or even political resistance were now valued as resources for firms needing to innovate and communicate creatively in the marketplace.

The historical narrative that underpinned new growth theory is now accepted as the standard narrative on the so-called ‘post-industrial’ society (although there are many versions: Post-industrial or Post-Fordist/city economies emerged through the economic decline of the 1970s–1980s, and is characterized by a contraction of manufacturing capacity and labour, new divisions of labour favouring services, and an expansion of corporate office complexes as an integral part of a city centre architectural identity. Impacts on labour include the emergence of the so-called ‘creative class’ and increased competition within the West. Corporations (and not governments or public institutions) become the drivers of change, as they feed off SME innovation and creativity. A new middle class of elite service professionals and managers emerge - the so-called ‘creative class’. The creative class is young and active - and demands more cultural services and cultural places and spaces. The historic role of cities as centres of arts, design, and culture, become important again in the context of the new ‘mixed economy’ of production, consumption and spectacle. A ‘New Economy’ where cultural policies facilitate the revival of the city centre. (See Hutton12)

The new networked information society of branded goods and service organisations and firms. The problem for European policy makers is that the shape, growth and dynamics of clusters are still determined by place-specific factors - the industrial history of the city, current urban planning capabilities, suitable urban spaces, transport and the ease of movement, and image or brand identity. There are different frameworks for the policy theorisation of clusters, each one being ‘agglomeration’ - where effective communication and interaction among different industries, sectors, and firms might be specific to urban economies. (See Hutton12)

Clusters and agglomeration

Industrial development for advanced nations rests on their knowledge capacity, combined with technological capability and use of media, and policy. There have been many attempts to formalise these ideas into cluster theory, and much debate continues over whether clusters can be defined or measured. In modern economic theory the concept of the cluster was introduced by Alfred Marshall (as ‘industrial districts’) and since then cluster theory has become one of the most influential frameworks through which to understand the contemporary economy (as long as the creative industries are discussed). There are many ways to understand a cluster and many ways a cluster is formed - in response to conditions embedded in the topography, political geography, social situation and cultural provision. Clusters are formed for the way the agglomeration of organisations generate a value over and above the production capability of individual organisations. Clusters are formed by a way of exploiting this extra value, new development, and making it an object of policy, and in turn, an objective for the strategies of organisations and firms.

The concept of cluster has generated terms commonly used in urban policy since the late 1980s - ‘cultural quarter’ or ‘creative centre’ - each of which now feature in many European city urban policies. Cluster is now an established policy field of the European Commission, especially the Directorate General Enterprise and Industry, funding discussion of which are the European Cluster Memorandum (January 2008) and EC communication ‘Towards world class clusters in the European Union’. These have brought together innovation and SME policy, and are being assisted by the European Cluster Alliance (since 2006), the European Cluster Observatory (since 2007) and an EC-based cluster policy working group.

The problem for European policy makers is that the shape, growth and dynamics of clusters are still determined by place-specific factors - the industrial history of the city, current urban planning capabilities, suitable urban spaces, transport and the ease of movement, and image or brand identity. There are different frameworks for the policy theorisation of clusters, each one being ‘agglomeration’ - where effective communication and interaction among different industries, sectors, and firms might be specific to urban economies. (See Hutton12)

The new networked information society of branded goods and service organisations and firms. The problem for European policy makers is that the shape, growth and dynamics of clusters are still determined by place-specific factors - the industrial history of the city, current urban planning capabilities, suitable urban spaces, transport and the ease of movement, and image or brand identity. There are different frameworks for the policy theorisation of clusters, each one being ‘agglomeration’ - where effective communication and interaction among different industries, sectors, and firms might be specific to urban economies. (See Hutton12)

The new networked information society of branded goods and service organisations and firms. The problem for European policy makers is that the shape, growth and dynamics of clusters are still determined by place-specific factors - the industrial history of the city, current urban planning capabilities, suitable urban spaces, transport and the ease of movement, and image or brand identity. There are different frameworks for the policy theorisation of clusters, each one being ‘agglomeration’ - where effective communication and interaction among different industries, sectors, and firms might be specific to urban economies. (See Hutton12)
It is unsurprising that the debates on clusters often take place with the academic study of urban geography, urban planning or urban culture. Within these debates, the spaces of clustering act as either a tool or a source of urban planning. Social and economic organizations and cultural sectors, cities are at the heart of these debates. The role of cultural policy in urban economic development has become significant in relation to the way clusters have played a role in the revitalisation of European cities and regions through policies of urban regeneration. The ‘creative city’ and ‘creative class’ discourses have become instrumental in this, where Charles Landry and Richard Florida maintain a significant influence on European Union policy makers. There is a strong sense in which Landry’s seminal theory of the creative city is intrinsically concerned with spillover – its target is the traditions of modern urban planning, where the city was ‘zoned’ and partitioned, and it did not envisage the rapid cultural change.

Questions for Further Research:

- What are the drivers potential initiatives in the city, what are the opportunities and challenges for creative and commercial uses of urban space?
- How is industrial and cultural development symbiotic with cultural heritage, and how does the historical narrative of an area influence the provision of public policy?
- What structure or organisation is essential for vertical or horizontal engagement in spillover, or combining these trajectories (experimentally)?

The central hypothesis of this report is that applying a cultural policy perspective to urban development, and using artistic disciplines as well as cultural commercial manifestations – drives a qualitative transformation in cities themselves, not just quantitative economic growth. Qualitative transformation belows the deeper evolution process by which the conditions for a new approach to production is forged – where individuals, the city, society and the economic system find new directions to become an integrated entity. The conditions that this transformation are, therefore, understood.

Essential Reading 1: ‘Creativity, Culture and the City: A question of Interconnection’ (A study of the Forum d’Avignon Ruhr – Charles Landry, 2013)

This study was inspired by the European Capital of Culture 2010 in the Ruhr in order to generate sustainable development strategies for the region beyond the year 2010. It states that ‘The best cultural policies combine a focus on enlightenment, empowerment, entertainment, employability so creating an economic impact (p. 25)’.

Richard Florida’s creative class theory was an economic growth theory with less of concern for the civic urbanity and public culture of the city. For that reason Florida is probably, unfortunately, more influential; his theory of growth promises an economic prosperity without the complexities of social participation and political change. Landry, however, demanded a shift in the political consciousness of the city – the city’s management needed to think creatively, and their principle aim was the development of an expansive, responsive and creative public realm. This would enfranchise all of a city’s institutions, firms, citizens and interest groups, and enfolded in the project of the economic growth of the city. In other words, the impetus for growth was firstly political, generated social mobilisation, and then entailed a sustained economic development. For Florida, economic growth was driven by successful businesses, and fuelled more effectively by attracting professionals from outside; these professionals were mobile, and (one could logically infer) had no intrinsic
The EU Smart City Initiative

Florida's framework also lends itself to spillover strategy given the pervasiveness of creativity and its generative relation to industrial innovation. Moreover, Florida's framework makes the complex economics of agglomeration, knowledge networks and entrepreneurial ecosystems easy for policymakers simply by locating economic growth in the relationship between private firms and the labour market. Cities, for Florida, are in a competitive challenge to attract the right firms, as the firms compete to attract the right creative class labour. Cities must cultivate a 'creative ecosystem' - though it was never entirely clear what this is, or how a city creates one. However, Florida's theory of growth cannot actually be applied to a whole city. In urban policies around Europe it is applied to a segment of the city (like older models of 'urban regeneration' and its deramification of city segments). It has, in some ways, morphed into the new ideals of Smart City23, Science City and Media City, as these are similarly limited in their specific urban environments.

The Hybrid Problem: "Creative Class City"

One serious problem across Europe is the way central ideas extracted from the frameworks of both Landry and Florida have been put together as a kind of hybrid 'creative class city', consequently creating a simple policy formula. This formula invariably involves devising a city brand; converting old industrial buildings into a new art museum, if possible clustering around this building new creative and media agencies along with a few more established companies (attracted by financial incentives); boosting consumption and property rentals by attracting more students along with 'pumped up' local colleges and university social facilities; promoting an annual schedule of public festivities culminating in at least one internationally marketed 'mega-event'; contracting the services of an internationally famous architect to provide a celebrated landmark building in their signature-style design, along with an artist to undertake a major work of public art; marking out spaces, zones or designated buildings as the location of exciting new developments - incubators, labs, hot-desking facilities and start-up enterprises. Lastly, using local and national media, destination marketing, business promotion and celebrity endorsement, to generate outside attention for the city.

These are all very attractive urban components, and yet through European one can witness how these have been used to greater or lesser effect: some have become either purely commercial and detached from the social culture of the city, or exist purely from public subsidy and have become an uneasy burden on the city's finances. Many a European city were in the throes of constructing the full panoply of 'creative class' components when in 2007 the global financial crisis halted construction; some reconstruction has continued but many cities are now left with a range of strategically disconnected sites. These scenarios suggest that we need a more rigorous engagement of cultural policy with urban planning (non-existent in most European cities), as a means of delivering genuinely European integrated sustainable development. In the meantime, cultural researchers need to understand the strategic relations between these urban components of the creative city - and spillover relations could be the key. Locating and investing in the potential spillover relations between each cultural component could make growth internal to development. In so many European cities new cultural institutions and agencies appeared overnight in the rush to capitalise on the trend to creativity, yet a paucity of real development strategy means a question mark of future viability continually hangs over the head of the organisation. A focus on spillover could mean that the separate entities of a given place (the businesses, institutions, government, other agencies and organisations, the public, and so on) might themselves find a role in the processes of creative city development through forging new forms of civic political participation through culture, as well as generating new forms of value.
In the last ten years of criticism and debate on the relation between culture, the city, creativity and economic growth, the importance of the spaces and places of industry has become a central object of theory. Are these paradigms, and their terminologies, still useful in specifying the relation between culture and place? Is ‘creativity’ really a substantive concept (Landry; Florida)? They each indicate how policy intends to cultivate what it claims to be a ‘natural’ phenomenon. Yet, as Edensor, et. al. assert, policies for culture in Europe (particularly the UK) have, over the past two decades repressed or even dissolved the culture already present, and begun to work towards defining or refining tools and methods for identifying, enhancing and innovating spillover processes that could be inclusive for all kinds of social life in economic development. This may attract a charge of ‘instrumentalism’. The term instrumental (like ‘economy’) also needs to be re-defined by arts and culture. The arts and culture have always been part of the broader economy (or even, indeed, other parts of the public realm). The term instrumentalism & the need of re-defining the term instrumentalism.
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The Arts Council England commissioned and published report entitled ‘The contribution of the arts and culture to the national economy’ observed that there is little explicit spillover research assess the means by which arts and culture have always been part of the broader economy (or even, indeed, other parts of the public realm). The term instrumentalism & the need of re-defining the term instrumentalism.
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The Arts Council England commissioned and published report entitled ‘The contribution of the arts and culture to the national economy’ observed that there is little explicit spillover research assess the means by which arts and culture have always been part of the broader economy (or even, indeed, other parts of the public realm). The term instrumentalism & the need of re-defining the term instrumentalism.

In the last ten years of criticism and debate on the relation between culture, the city, creativity and economic growth, the importance of the spaces and places of industry has become a central object of theory. Are these paradigms, and their terminologies, still useful in specifying the relation between culture and place? Is ‘creativity’ really a substantive concept (Landry; Florida)? Have creative clusters emerged through intrinsic mutually-enhancing dynamics, or externalities like rent levels or lack of supply, or even what Andy Pratt calls the ‘xerox policy making’ of city governments influenced by fashion (Pratt, 2009)? Policy fashion includes present – what they call the ‘vernacular everyday’.

Culture, arts, culture and the broader economy
Creative spillover, we suggest, could become a strategic facility for positioning the arts and culture within the productive mechanisms of the broader economy – helping, in turn, to re-define that economy, generate alternative or extended value frameworks for that economy, and alert the key actors in that economy to the significant social dimensions of economic development. Culture is not just aesthetic productions and their appreciative audiences – it is practices of representation, design and models of innovations, institutions, organisations, enterprises and spaces, discourse, communications, meaning and identity. It has a profound social content, direction and impact. We should thus attempt to work towards defining or refining tools and methods for identifying, enhancing and innovating spillover processes that could be inclusive for all kinds of social life in economic development. This may attract a charge of ‘instrumentalism’.

Pursuing policy in its instrumental contexts

Section conclusion:

- How can spillover become a fully integrated component of city government policies promoting clustering?
- How can spillover research assess the means by which arts, culture and creative industries generate non-cultural value when located in certain urban contexts?
- How can certain cluster formations enable non-cultural organisational entities – not just in terms of ‘contributions to’ the urban economy?
- How can we devise policies for developing the ‘cultural economy’ where spillover is in-built?
- How can creative city policy contexts serve to define spill over as a specific series of engagements with other organisational entities - not just in terms of ‘contributions to’ the urban economy?
- How can we devise policies for developing the ‘cultural ecosystem’, ‘cultural milieu’ and ‘cultural ecology’, where spillover is in-built?

Art, culture and the broader economy
Creative spillover, we suggest, could become a strategic facility for positioning the arts and culture within the productive mechanisms of the broader economy – helping, in turn, to re-define that economy, generate alternative or extended value frameworks for that economy, and alert the key actors in that economy to the significant social dimensions of economic development. Culture is not just aesthetic productions and their appreciative audiences – it is practices of representation, design and models of innovations, institutions, organisations, enterprises and spaces, discourse, communications, meaning and identity. It has a profound social content, direction and impact. We should thus attempt to work towards defining or refining tools and methods for identifying, enhancing and innovating spillover processes that could be inclusive for all kinds of social life in economic development. This may attract a charge of ‘instrumentalism’.

The term instrumental (like ‘economy’) also needs to be re-defined by arts and culture. The arts and culture have always had a profound ‘use value’, even though its ‘use’ may have not been adequately defined or extended into the broader economy (or even, indeed, other parts of the public realm).
Implications for spillover might therefore involve:

Creative and cultural engagement in spillover activities can promote sustainable development within industry, and import a broader social consciousness to industrial economy.

Creative and cultural sectors could develop their own economic sustainability through providing intellectual and creative inputs, perhaps packaged in terms of properly funded schemes or training for specific industry sectors.

Creative and cultural sectors develop and use their location within the city to mediate specific relationships between the city and industry, maximising the potential of both.

Creative and cultural sectors become a framework within which the social populace of a city develop their capacity for industriousness, knowledge of regional, national and global economies, and sector-specific skills.

In the EU communication of September 2012, ‘Promoting cultural and creative sectors for growth and jobs in the EU’ 27, it states that ‘... the contribution that cultural and creative sectors can bring to social and economic development in the EU is still not fully recognised... Being at the crossroads between arts, business and technology, cultural and creative sectors are in a strategic position to trigger spillovers in other industries’.

---

Essential Reading 2: ‘The contribution of the arts and culture to the national economy: An analysis of the macroeconomic contribution of the arts and culture and of some of their indirect contributions through spillover effects felt in the wider economy’ (Arts Council England, 2013)

This report contains a substantive assessment of the phenomenon of spillover. Among the many observations and points it makes are the following: 1: The commercial creative industries are intrinsic to the supply chain of arts and “cultural” industries. Many commercially successful products (whether films or video games) can have their source in ideas and concepts developed in arts and culture. 2: Arts and culture are a business resource (for knowledge, inspiration, ideas, concepts and so on) that can translate into higher wages and productivity. They also provide services that allow some to develop from ICTs, data access and management to professional development. 3: Arts and culture are spaces of incubation, training, and experience; they are facilitation. They can generate social benefits, more inclined to innovation (not risk aversion). Moreover, the report notes that there are chronic problems with the sourcing and analysing of appropriate data from the arts and cultural sectors. There is a need for a greater understanding of the role of arts and culture in the “business economy” by way of defining the value they contribute to the national macroeconomic picture (particularly museum sector). The relation between the “creative” and other values of the arts and culture needs further research.

27 Promoting cultural and creative sectors (EC, 2012)
> What is the distinction between the ‘trigger’, or actively facilitating spillover? Who does the ‘spilling’? What is it that ‘spills over’?

Arts and culture as sources of innovation

A key development in European union policy right now is the expansion of the concept of innovation and how the arts and culture are identified as key sources of innovation: ‘...these sectors have an impact on innovation in other industries...innovation is increasingly driven by non-technological factors such as creativity, design and new organisational processes or business models. A flurry relies on creative eco-systems in which the quality and diversity of partnerships across different sectors and types of actors is decisive’ (p.3). The opportunities and challenges for the increase in innovation are indicated which the quality and diversity of partnerships across different sectors and types of actors is decisive’ (p.3). The opportunities and challenges for the increase in innovation are indicated.
Section conclusion:

Spillover has, to some extent, been responsible for the ways in which the arts and cultural sectors (and certainly the creative industries) have emerged and developed their range of professional competencies. We can therefore define spillover as an opportunity for endogenous and sectorial development – not just a potential series of diversions from core competencies, or a ‘giving away’ of intellectual resources to industry ‘for free’. Spillover itself can be a form of cultural production. However, if spillover becomes an established policy concept, then cultural policies (funders, sponsoring organisations, etc.) will no doubt begin to demand that spillover is factored into the production process of any cultural project. And if spillover becomes the dominant concern of funders and sponsors, will cultural content itself be denigrated in favour of maximum spillover activities? How can we ensure that the creative and cultural sectors play a major role in determining the terms of the contract, and the criteria wielded by national and European policy communities? Part of this process is rehearsing the development of indicators – identifying the areas and strategic approaches of policy mechanisms in facilitating the relation between arts, culture and the CCIs and the broader economy and society. How do we develop indicators that expand possibility, not reduce it?

Questions for Future Research

- How do we mediate the connection between thinkers and writers, researchers and policy makers, cultural institutions and agencies, creative businesses and workers, and thereby cultivate a more substantial public sphere of policy ideas, scrutiny and debate for the role of culture and creativity in sustainable economic development?
- How does the experience or consciousness of spillover phenomenon affect the current processes of cultural production? How can cultural organisations or creative agencies build or count intelligent infrastructure that multiplies spillover?
- How can spillover be identified and evaluated without engendering new strictures on production? How do we value the disruption and reorientation generated by spillover, and not just its positive impact?
- How can spillover as a theoretical term for policy be explained within a broader understanding of innovation – as a multi-dimensional, multi-stakeholder process?

The creative (commercial) industries have received a considerable amount of research and policy attention over the past few decades. But has this been at the expense of a more integrated sustainable cultural policy? Cultural policy in many countries remains principally concerned with the arts and public cultural services, even if it still tacitly assumes that the arts and creative industries are co-extensive and share some intrinsic ground in culture. Most European countries seem to maintain that the arts can only remain a realm of public subsidy (and thus categorically separate), and that most of the needs of the creative industries are met by trade, enterprise or industry policy (and have no need of cultural policy). There remains little research on these assumptions. Below we attempt to define...
The profound historic-artistic and heritage dimension of the European city (which in the past comprised expertise in crafts and artisanal manufacturing, architecture, fine arts, music and literature) has become unstable and each practice occupying an unseemly position within the urban economy. Where writers and poets once animated a city’s cultural life, they tend to be relevant only as featured attractions in a specific framework of events, such as festivals. The once enigmatic cultural life of the European city has been largely dissolved through various forces of change—some of which involve an urban policy regime that impulsively favours expertise from outside the city, or a ‘mega-event’ approach common to many creative city strategies. Successive forms of municipal cultural planning since the Second World War have been successful in preserving large institutions, but not at cultivating local arts and the sub-cultures of creative practitioners needed for a vibrant city of culture. Artists have been successful in preserving large institutions, but have incorporated economic practices (in management, architecture, fine arts, music and literature) as an important current reference point in these debates, and have promoted two things:

- The need for a new concept of “economy” in public policy specifically for European cities (i.e. that encompasses the informality of cultural life—and the role of the artist).
- The need to recover the political imaginary of the European city—the city as “work of art” (expressive, symbolic, not merely socio-economic).

These points raise a further question on the role of the arts within the creative economy—do they actually play one? There is a strong sense in which arts policy in European member states has been marginalised from the key developments in urban economy policy, and as we see with Florida, it is possible to design a ‘creative city’ through enterprise policy and urban policy combined, without involving cultural policy and the institutions of the city’s arts, museums, and heritage. There is a sense also in which that because the arts are often central to the city’s historic infrastructure of buildings, their popularity with visitors is alone enough: the city does not need to fully integrate the arts into its urban economic development, for its contribution to the visitor economy and heritage engagement (and its social and educational dimensions) can satisfy city policy makers enough. Yet, this approach leaves the arts in an historical silo, without the capacity for spillover, and a consequent political marginalisation from policy making is the price that is paid.

Cultural organisation: In the last decade, in response to shifts in the broader economy (and, in turn, political changes), arts organisations have “invented” the gallery space, and generated new knowledge and skills in the management of the arts’ new organisational formation. They have developed means of international networking and straddling the nebulous new territory between the old economy of “public” and “private”. In the new organisational formation. They have developed means of international networking and straddling the nebulous new territory between the old economy of “public” and “private”. Competition in the cultural sector is now intense, and brings with it a need to build a supportive constituency of sector and industry professionals and sponsoring networks. Arts organisations are now also under duress through a continual need to change, adapt and respond to fast changing audience demands. Art audiences are indeed “markets” but with added levels of social and cultural complexity. There are three major ways in which art institutions have responded to these debates:

1. Art institutions have changed— in terms of their conception of cultural space, representation and communication, and production itself. Each of these spheres of activity have served to absorb How the arts and culture have already been “industrialised”, and have incorporated economic practices (in management and organisation), albeit for policy makers still remain distinct from the world of creative industries.

However, the arts throughout Europe testify to a significant degree of “industrialisation”, where their mechanism of institutional management and production have been restructured according to the constitution of the new economy of the inner city. The pathway of modernity ran from the industrialisation of culture (the mass production of cultural goods since the 1930s) to the ‘culturalisation’ of industry, where ordinary manufacturing is now “like the production of culture” (Lash & Urry, 1994, p. 123). Many major art institutions across Europe see no paradox emerging from their adaptation of corporate management strategy frameworks and values designed for mainstream industrial production and services. Yet there is little research on the production of art (call it “studio production”), this is far too limited understanding of how art is actually produced—but as distinct from art’s exhibition, its interpretation, its history. How have the arts and artistic creativity shifted in their methods of production, distribution, and consumption through the period of the emerging creative economy? Within production, of course, the making of art involves specific processes and generating products that might be of use within spillover activity (which we will consider below). Artistic production per se, however, is rarely a subject even of cultural policy—the artist or creative producer is categorically a free economic agent, whose interests are primarily private, and only in the context of publicly funded projects, institutional or organisation sponsored activity do they become an “object of policy.”
Organisational Model: The Multi-site

In terms of representation and organisation, art institutions are now permeable and mobile. Consider the tendency for the ‘multi-site’ organisational model. A good example is the Museumsquartier Wien or more vividly referred to as the ‘Museums Quartier’ in English. Established by advertising a large former flour mill and an education ‘institute’ (which is a partnership organisation), the museum is event and ‘live’ culture-driven and whose itinerary is constructed through a consistent dialogue between Mikser, local practitioners and agents of international innovations. The space is rented on purely commercial terms but from a private owner highly sympathetic to the organisation’s aims. It can host retail events, eating, performance, lectures and exhibitions, with a particular emphasis on both design and music. Music events are used to attract younger people – introduce them to design and visual art; quality cuisine is another enigmatic element. The multi-purpose organisation is not focussed or invested in tangible assets or owning the ‘art public’ itself is formed through shifting market conditions, respond to and integrate organisational change, and look at the now-famous Mikser House in Belgrade – as a large fulcrum space (the old flour mill). These spaces are managed strategically from the central building yet have local autonomy in day-to-day management. They include a ‘project space’, a satellite gallery in the city centre, a research space in the local university, a bookshop (from independent research, a studio (production) space for professional artists, and an education ‘institute’ which is a partnership organisation). Multi-site as an organisational phenomenon has complexified our perception and experience of the art gallery as a privileged place of ownership, expertise, display and exhibition. It has opened its spaces for active co-production, against the tendency for art viewing to descend into passive visual consumption. In terms of representation and organisation, art institutions are now permeable and mobile. Consider the tendency for the ‘multi-site’ organisational model. A good example is the Museumsquartier Wien or more vividly referred to as the ‘Museums Quartier’ in English. Established by advertising a large former flour mill and an education ‘institute’ (which is a partnership organisation), the museum is event and ‘live’ culture-driven and whose itinerary is constructed through a consistent dialogue between Mikser, local practitioners and agents of international innovations. The space is rented on purely commercial terms but from a private owner highly sympathetic to the organisation’s aims. It can host retail events, eating, performance, lectures and exhibitions, with a particular emphasis on both design and music. Music events are used to attract younger people – introduce them to design and visual art; quality cuisine is another enigmatic element. The multi-purpose organisation is not focussed or invested in tangible assets or owning the ‘art public’ itself is formed through shifting market conditions, respond to and integrate organisational change, and look at the now-famous Mikser House in Belgrade – as a large fulcrum space (the old flour mill). These spaces are managed strategically from the central building yet have local autonomy in day-to-day management. They include a ‘project space’, a satellite gallery in the city centre, a research space in the local university, a bookshop (from independent research, a studio (production) space for professional artists, and an education ‘institute’ which is a partnership organisation). Multi-site as an organisational phenomenon has complexified our perception and experience of the art gallery as a privileged place of ownership, expertise, display and exhibition. It has opened its spaces for active co-production, against the tendency for art viewing to descend into passive visual consumption.
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What has emerged is something significant for our concern with spill-overs. For the arts sector across Europe gradually absorbed, adapted, and shaped the corporate management of cultural organisations ushered in by NPM. These included strategy making, management, marketing, financial, stakeholder building (investors, subscribers, audiences, etc.); partnerships (project collaboration, sharing resources, maximising efficiency); reporting (performance measurement, monitoring, staff reviews, production measurement, internal and independent assessment, evaluation meeting targets, measuring growth, assessing satisfaction, etc.).

We are now in a situation where policy makers have forgotten the historicity and political completion of all those mechanisms, and use them as if they are self-evidently critical to the effective management of a cultural organisation.

While the ‘art world’ might complain that this discussion has little to do with ‘culture’ or the ‘art’ itself, (and exhibitions aficionados and the curators of international art discourse routinely side-step the question), the organisational production of culture is significant to the meaning and value and public function of culture. The corporatisation of the art museum – along with the rise in power and profile of the international art markets, the influence of the private dealer, the patronage of select private art galleries, the entrepreneurial creativity, the freelance work and the world of cultural media, particularly blended magazines – is a constant that art practice and artists themselves negotiate, work with and within, and respond to in their art. In the last few decades, new movements in art have fully absorbed the need for networked organisations, markets, consumer brands, corporate communications and the curating by the media for celebrity.16

One significant aspect of arts sector activity worth mentioning in this context is marketing and digital media. As a generalisation, marketing (and not public culture, politics or cultural production itself) has become a principle framework for the construction and development of organisational identity and 'spillover'. The changes have been significant. In the world of internet broadcasting we can now enter a virtual audience for internet broadcast theatres (Berliner Philharmoniker Digital Concert Hall), and the New York Philharmoniker Digital Concert Hall, internet broadcast music (Berliner Philharmoniker Digital Concert Hall), and the New York Philharmoniker Digital Concert Hall, internet broadcast music (Berliner Philharmoniker Digital Concert Hall), and the New York Philharmoniker Digital Concert Hall, internet broadcast music (Berliner Philharmoniker Digital Concert Hall).

In the world of internet broadcasting we can now enter a virtual audience for internet broadcast theatres (Berlin). The rise of ‘new genre’ public art and huge public commissions opened the space for the construction and development of organisational identity and ‘spillover’. The changes have been significant. In the world of internet broadcasting we can now enter a virtual audience for internet broadcast theatres (Berlin).
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Towards a Research Agenda for Creative Spillover

From the sections above, we propose the following research topics in support of a new research agenda. Theoretical work needs to be done to demarcate creative spillover from other forms of spillover, and the unplanned dimension of spillover from planned (and potential) forms of spillover – i.e. that which can be used in strategies of economic development, producing models and techniques that can be replicated or used for improvisation. A critical assessment needs to attend to the common rhetoric of spillover ‘effects’ and the assumption that linear cause-effect logic produces the greatest value. We need a fuller understanding of spillover actors and the most effective instigators of spillover; spillover tools and techniques; the structure of agent to agent relations; the management of innovation processes; models of innovation application and the roles of creativity; effects and affects and varieties of value; side effects and fringe benefits; evaluation and assessment and post-spillover decision-making. A comparative assessment can be made of spillover as it operates within different spheres, cultural, social or public, business and commerce, and industrial. Spatial settings are also major factors – urban city, regional, national or pan-European.

We also need to extend the analytical tools and parameters of cultural policy analysis. This could begin by considering the following topics:

1. The art economy, the cultural economy, the creative economy: in cultural policies throughout Europe the concept of ‘economy’ is confusing, but also sometimes too general or inappropriate in its application. We need to use the European Commission’s policy reconstruction of ‘the economy’ within the broader framework of Integrated Sustainable Development. Furthermore, where most models of creative economy (Work Foundation; NESTA; DCMS; etc.) are models of a national economic system, we need a European framework, and a discourse that is pan-European, and capitalise on cross-border synergies.

Section conclusion:

- Most art organisations, particularly public organisations, have experienced radical changes in the constitution of culture as a realm of institutional life, impacting on the fundamental historical character of culture, redefined through management strategy, which in turn has shaped the contents of cultural production.
- Where there is a confused or blurred boundary within the economy between public and private, cultural organisations have become hybrid, often managing a range of uneven or contradictory demands by public sponsoring bodies.
- Cultural organisations across sectors have become experienced in negotiating a political landscape that demands both corporate management models as well as public or social value; they have innovated user sensitive and audience specific strategies for growth and delivery, yet remain an historical silo.
- There remain un-researched areas, particularly on the role of institutions in shaping their urban environments (as distinct from merely being located in a place and contributing to its traffic or visitor numbers, or a few public services).
- Art and culture to some degree remain ideologically and institutionally wedded to outsized concepts of aesthetic or cultural autonomy, without visibly pursuing alternative models. In this area, ‘private’ cultural entrepreneurs (Slačić, Lalic) can often appear more explicit in their social rationales than public institutions.
- Digital media has facilitated the construction of a range of different subject positions for the public – traversing the older dichotomy of ‘citizen-consumer’ – and yet, has this generated a cultural public sphere for people to participate in the shaping of life in their city?

Need of Fuller Understanding of Spillover Actors, Instigators and Tools
Need of Extension of the Analytical Tools and Parameters
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2: There is little research on artistic and cultural production itself, particularly in terms of organisation, management and entrepreneurship, and their relation to broader shifts in the economy. What research there is tends to focus on the political dimension of what it perceives as neoliberal management practices. We need a fuller review of the organisational dimension of creative and cultural sectors, along with resources made available by the discussions of knowledge transfer, social impact and public value – learning about the extensive role spillover could involve or make use of these activities but also clearly demarcating spillover from other forms of influence.

3: The subject of spillover might consequently be viewed in many quarters as another means of using public resources for private capital - placing the cultural sector under an obligation to serve the economy, where the economy is defined by foreign corporations in collusion with national governments steadily eroding public culture and its social bases. Spillover for the arts and cultural sector, however, need not signify a crude instrumentalisation of public resources. But we need stronger reasons how. Advocacy of spillover requires a critical facility for contending with theoretical and practical implications of instrumentality and uses of public culture, and attends to the distinctiveness in historical provenance, value and productivity of each type of civil society and public agency.

4: To this end, creative spillover must itself be defined in terms of cultural production - where the activities of spillover sponsored by public policy initiatives reintroduce culture, creativity and public value into organisations whose social moral capital has been eroded by a fixation on profit. Creative spillover can mean something more than standard spillover value - it can be creative in method as well as content, where social, cultural, educational, cultural and human capital are added to a project or organisational environment. Spillover needs to be evaluated in the context of a multi-dimensional conception of capital.

5: A major problem for many European countries is an increasing lack of industriousness, enterprise and self-reliance in the social populace or workforce itself. Creative spillover can be defined less in terms of transfer or provision, than in terms of intervention, participation, engagement and partnership. This could serve to construct a social dimension to spillover activity – as opportunity for involvement, skills development and so on – but where industry is provided with routes of reciprocation. The objective is not just industry, but industriousness as a social phenomenon.

6: The arts, culture and the creative industries all draw inspiration from the ‘informal economy’ and the social culture of everyday life. Value in spillover could emerge from informal dimensions of inter-organisation relationships, offering access to the ‘informal economy’ of unplanned or unexpected synergies between cultural and industrial sectors, particularly in clusters in urban and city contexts.
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