1. Introduction: on the relationship between entrepreneurship and creativity
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1.1 CREATIVITY AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP – TWO EMERGENT TOPICS IN SEVERAL RESEARCH FIELDS AND PUBLIC POLICY ARENAS

Creativity and entrepreneurship seem to be central concepts for understanding the driving forces in 21st-century capitalist economies and societies. In the knowledge-intensive domains of the economy, these phenomena are closely intertwined and interdependent, making it sometimes difficult to distinguish clearly between the two. The economic views on the relationship between both phenomena offer one perspective (see the edited volume of Book and Phillips 2013 for another). There are several examples of proof of the increased relevance of creativity in economic development and related government policies. Perhaps the most popular is connected with Florida’s concept of the creative class (Florida 2005a, b), followed by related concepts such as the creative city, creative regions or creative economy, with enormous popularity not so much among researchers (there are in fact some very critical views of Florida’s idea: see Peck 2005 and Krätke 2010), but more particularly among practitioners in the field of local economic development policies, city planning and the like. There is also much empirical evidence of an increasing relevance of entrepreneurship. If, in line with the argumentation of Sternberg and Wennekers (2005), entrepreneurship is understood as a combination of some elements of behavioral entrepreneurship with some aspects of the dynamic perspective of occupational entrepreneurship, then new venture creation is the hallmark of entrepreneurship. In that sense entrepreneurship has become an important field of research that now goes far beyond the traditional focus on the individual entrepreneur and includes contextual impacts of and reasons for entrepreneurial activities and entrepreneurial attitudes. But entrepreneurship has also made enormous gains in the field of public policy. Examples include the attempts of national, regional and local policymakers to support start-ups with publicly funded infrastructure like business incubators in almost every country worldwide.
Entrepreneurship has progressively become a dense and pluridisciplinary research field, gaining particular dynamism since the controversies in the 1980s about the trait approach. At that time, the latter dominated theoretical debate in entrepreneurship research (Gartner 1988, 1989; Carland et al. 1988). In practice, it showed important diversity in its use by different scholars and theoretical schools (Chell 2008). Subsequently, the psychological perspective was completed by other alternative and competing approaches, contributing to an increasing internal differentiation and institutionalization of the growing field. A recent bibliometric study shows that entrepreneurship research developed steadily during the 1990s, starting from quite a low level compared with the state of this academic discipline today, and expanding especially during the first decade of the 21st century (Meyer et al. 2013). Entrepreneurship research developed very well in Anglo-Saxon countries, where between 2003 and 2009 more than 70 percent of the publications inventoried by Meyer et al. (2013) were concentrated, while large non-Anglo-Saxon countries, such as France, Italy, Spain and China, were on an equal level with smaller countries such as Belgium, the Netherlands and Finland (ibid., p. 4). Meyer et al. (2013) identified five major “clusters” of entrepreneurship research: “cognitive aspects of entrepreneurship”, “demographic and personality determinants of entrepreneurship”, “theoretical perspectives on entrepreneurship”, “entrepreneurial and innovation finance” and “eclectic approaches on entrepreneurship” (ibid., pp. 6–9). The last of these categories, which accounts for the highest number of documents (30 percent of the sample), is itself quite heterogeneous, but this is true also of other clusters, such as “theoretical perspectives on entrepreneurship” (18 percent of the sample). In these two clusters, we can find, among others, those scholars developing a regional perspective on entrepreneurship.

Basically, the term “entrepreneurship” still reflects the influences of pioneering economists, starting with Joseph Schumpeter, who focused on the innovative capacities of the entrepreneur to reverse market equilibrium through creative destruction. The entrepreneur’s creative destruction meant a new arrangement of existing elements (such as technology) on the
market in order to realize innovations. Other scholars later contributed to the further development of the concept. For example, Kirzner stressed the role of incremental innovations and of alertness to the discovery of new opportunities by the entrepreneur—opportunities which competitors do not see or perceive early enough in order to become first-movers (Kirzner 1997). Then later developments in the 20th and 21st centuries led to a strong differentiation of the academic field of entrepreneurship which we have outlined only briefly in broad terms above.

It can be noted that early on, in the work of Schumpeter, the idea of “creativity” is associated with the entrepreneur in the concept of “creative destruction.” However, with the growth and internal differentiation of the field, research on creativity tended to generate its own, separate theoretical corpus of work for which the contribution of psychological research was essential. Creativity research developed as a domain not limited to the sole economic creativity (entrepreneurship). Furthermore, the large number of issues associated with entrepreneurship that could be studied favored progressively a rather broad research orientation, integrating new disciplines, finally leading to a relativizing of the centrality of research on creativity for entrepreneurship scholars.

The origins of entrepreneurship as an academic subject can be found in the United States, where the Babson College founded its entrepreneurship research conference (BCERC) in 1981. Acs and Audretsch (2010) recalled that, before then, the literature on entrepreneurship was mostly fragmented (ibid., p. 1), the best research being published in disciplinary journals (devoted to the fields of economics, sociology, management, financial economics and other disciplines, such as economic geography, strategy, psychology, etc.). Since the late 1980s and during the 1990s, the various works then became increasingly better assembled thanks to the expansion of non-disciplinary literature and thanks to the emergence of journals specific to entrepreneurship (ibid., p. 2). However, “entrepreneurship scholars had not completely developed the theoretical latticework to support substantial cross-disciplinary contribution until the final years of the 20th century” (ibid.). During the following decade a trend towards refocusing entrepreneurship research emerged (ibid.). In line with this evolution, Acs and Audretsch gave a definition and identified the core topics of entrepreneurship that are useful to recall for our purpose of clarifying the relationship between entrepreneurship and creativity. According to them, “entrepreneurship embraces all business that are [sic] new and dynamic, regardless of size or line of business, while excluding businesses that are neither new nor dynamic, as well as, all non-business organizations” (ibid.). Furthermore, the core topics they indicate “are the entrepreneurial process, the nature of entrepreneurial opportunity and the process...
of its exploitation, the emergence of new ventures, as well as the interaction between entrepreneurship and organizations” (ibid.). Accordingly, the major areas of entrepreneurship that they considered were “opportunity” (ibid., p.6; are entrepreneurial opportunities an objective fact or are they socially constructed?), “the emergence of new ventures” (ibid., p.8; how do firms emerge, form as new organizations, and what importance does high-impact entrepreneurship have, contributing to significant innovation, new employment, economic change and productivity?), “the market context” (ibid., p.9; with a focus on information and market processes, risk and uncertainty, innovation and technological change), “the social context” (ibid., p.12; with a focus on a social psychological and/or sociological perspective, such as entrepreneurial cognition, organizational populations and communities, personal and situational factors), “the global context” (ibid., p.14; debates linked to the global knowledge economy), and finally “the entrepreneurial society” (ibid., p.15; implications of entrepreneurial action for economic growth, role of public policy).

The increasing weight of entrepreneurship research is reflected also by its diffusion among disciplines that traditionally were unrelated to the topic. This is the case, for example, with economic and organizational sociology, studying the role of social networks and communities for firm foundation (Granovetter 1995; Aldrich 2005; Aldrich and Ruef 2006; Grossetti and Barthe 2008; Krauss 2009), a development that started in the 1990s and showed particular dynamism during the first decade of the 21st century.

In contrast, the concept of creativity covers a larger scope than the type of creativity required for sole entrepreneurship (creativity in economic terms). Creativity may be defined as “the ability to make or otherwise bring into existence something new, whether a new solution to a problem, a new method or device, or a new artistic object of form” (Encyclopædia Britannica Online). Human creativity does not occur in a vacuum, but is subject to framing conditions, for example the state of development of society, technology, culture and, more specifically, of the professional and/or peer community concerned. Creativity has to develop with existing structures. These enable action and at the same time are continuously transformed by creative activity aimed at change. This is the way artists work; for example, their creativity being linked to their social positions within the artistic field (Bourdieu 1993). Creativity in this case means being able to break with the status quo while benefiting from the existing structures. This particular social role has important psychological and cognitive consequences for the individuals concerned. Accordingly, psychologists have much insisted on cognitive processes and capacities (Ward 2004), in particular “divergent thinking” and its central role for creativity (Sternberg 2006, p.87). Robert Sternberg himself and his colleagues devel-
oped a confluence approach according to which creativity is not based on an individual factor but on the convergence of several resources (intellectual skills, knowledge, thinking styles, personality, motivation and environment; ibid., pp. 88–90). Creativity implies decision-making; that is the decision and ability to take over “ideas that are unknown or out of favor, but that have growth potential” (ibid., p. 87f). However, creative individuals typically meet with resistance, since they risk disturbing established orders and interests in society. This resistance is a typical feature of creativity. Its absence may indicate a low level, or even the non-existence, of creativity: “people typically want others to love their ideas, but immediate universal applause for an idea often indicates that it is not particularly creative” (ibid., p. 90).

The role of creativity for economic development finally has been increasingly recognized since the end of the 20th century. The inter-rerelationships between culture, technological and social innovation, and economic growth became a central topic in the debates on policy-making, also stimulating academic research (Flew and Cunningham 2010). In this context, particular attention had been paid to sectors traditionally perceived as “creative”, globally all being more or less linked to “culture.” The use of the term “creative industries” by the British Department of Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) since the end of the 1990s (DCMS 1998, 2001) was essentially inspired by a reinterpretation of the role cultural activities could play in the future development of the knowledge economy in the 21st century. It was based on the assumption that cultural creativity would play a central role in postindustrial economies (KEA 2009) and that cultural activities might have positive external effects on other economic sectors. The externalities generated by the activities of a museum on the local economy (Johnson 2003, pp. 316, 319) are an example that may illustrate this phenomenon. This raises the general question of if, and how, cultural activity and creativity may affect economic creativity (see also Falck et al. 2011). Research on the foundation of new museums, such as the Guggenheim Museum in Bilbao (Plaza and Haarich 2013) or the Centre Pompidou in Metz (Krauss 2013), provides some evidence that cultural facilities do indeed have the potential to stimulate the formation of new innovation networks and to influence (and modify) economic behavior positively in the local and regional context.

In terms of macroeconomic effects, it is acknowledged that the “creative” sectors of the economy and the stronger links between artistic/cultural, scientific, technological and economic creativity will play a central role in future economic growth (UNCTAD 2010). Numerous products and services today are at the interface of these different kinds of creativity, often linking modern technology (such as ICT), high-level artistic and cultural
content (cultural taste, design, story-telling, filmmaking, communication, etc.) and economic creativity. So far, during the past decade, the creative economy has grown significantly faster than the rest of the economy, which is also reflected in the important growth of international trade in the products and services of creative industries (international trade in “creative” goods and services grew on average 14 percent annually between 2000 and 2008; ibid., p. 23). This gives a first idea about the great potential such combinations of creativity can have for economic development.

From a regional economist’s perspective, the concept of the “creative class” (Florida 2002, 2005a, b) follows a similar idea, using a broad definition of creativity and of the category of creative people. Creative individuals are not equally distributed throughout a country, but tend to concentrate in urban agglomerations and in culturally valued places, which underpins the spatial dimension of creativity. However, they are also assumed to be spatially mobile, being able to move to the places they find the most attractive. According to Florida, their presence in a place is the starting point and can therefore be seen as a major variable explaining the dynamism of urban spaces and metropolitan areas, not only in mere economic terms, but also with regard to cultural and social standards. The creative class comprises different creative professions embracing people employed in knowledge-intensive industries and services (high-tech, cultural and creative industries, consultancy, legal and financial services, business management, etc.). Its super-creative core is composed of scientists, engineers, computer engineers, university professors, artists, designers, architects and writers. The particularity of Florida’s approach consists of a rather broad understanding of creativity and the creative class, while insisting on the role of creative professionals for regional development. According to Florida, creative people are mobile and move to regions and places where entry barriers are low and tolerance is high, implying that creative people precede jobs and companies; that is, knowledge-based companies follow creative people and not the other way round.

Florida’s arguments, which were first published more than ten years ago, were quite well received in public debate and among policymakers, but provoked a strong debate in research about the novelty and empirical foundation of the proposed interpretation, as well as its consequences for urban planning (Glaeser 2005; Peck 2005). This showed early on a fundamental need for further research regarding the basic concepts and the supposed causal relationships of this approach.

It is quite obvious from these brief introductory remarks that both fields, entrepreneurship and creativity, have a strong (and increasing) relevance for government policies. Entrepreneurship support policies, particularly in the form of public subsidies or assistance for start-ups and/or their
founders, have become very popular in almost every country and on almost every continent in the last two decades. The largest research consortium dealing with entrepreneurial activities and attitudes worldwide, the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM), has an explicitly policy-oriented goal; that is, to guide policymakers in formulating effective and targeted policies and programs to stimulate and support the efforts of entrepreneurs (see also gemconsortium.org). While academic, empirically based assessments of the impact of such entrepreneurship support policies are still relatively rare (see Colombo et al. 2013 for a recent and methodologically ambitious attempt), there are no signs that these activities will be reduced in the near future. Governments’ entrepreneurship support policies are still popular, now at all spatial levels: the European Union supports new firms and entrepreneurs (see Sternberg 2012a for an empirical assessment as well as Storey and Tether 1998) at the supranational level, several countries do so (see Verheul et al. 2002 for an overview), as do many (subnational) regional governments (see, for example, the efforts of each of the 16 German federal states), and finally at the local level each larger and medium-sized city tries to support start-ups with various instruments, with business incubators or innovation centers the most popular instruments.

As for creativity and creative industries/economies/class and the like, the relationship to government policies is even stronger. Florida’s concept explicitly addresses policymakers that should—according to Florida—support the local music scene rather than investing in new pedestrian zones or real estate in the suburbs. As early as the 1990s in many Western countries the creative industry and the creative economy began presenting themselves as the avant-gardes of the post-Fordistic economies and they were and still are heavily subsidized by public government (see Howkins 2001 and the Creative Industries Mapping Document published by the UK DCMS 2001). Very often this process is related to an increase in the relevance of cultural economies (and in some cases even considered as synonymous with creative economies); that is, an “aestheticization” of the economy takes place, as Reckwitz (2013) describes that process that led to the creative economy as the currently dominating mantra of local/regional economic development policy (Sternberg 2012b).

In recent years government programs have increasingly tried to connect both target groups of economic development policies, creative industries/creative people on one hand and new firms/entrepreneurs on the other, within the same programs. Based on one of Florida’s assumptions, that members of the creative class are more prone to start a firm than the rest of the population, facilities like business incubators specifically dedicated to founders in creative industries (e.g., media, fashion, design) are developed and often located in an area of a city that has the attributes...
supposedly appreciated by founders and by creative people. The responsible policymakers may have increasingly recognized the strong relationship between both phenomena, entrepreneurship and creativity. This does not mean, however, that the target groups are always happy about the government policy attempts to support them: see, for example, on the one hand the reluctance of several (real or potential) founders of start-ups to accept assistance from public support programs (see Brixy et al. 2013) and, on the other, the resistance of some bohemians as part of the creative class to government policies to support them (and ‘their’ part of the city), for example the Gängeviertel area of Hamburg (cf. www.buback.de/nion), particularly when there is a threat of gentrification and endogenous creative people are to be addressed.

1.2 ORGANIZATION OF PARTS AND CHAPTERS

This handbook of research on entrepreneurship and creativity will respond to the need to set in order the various research on entrepreneurship and creativity, focusing on the interrelationships between both topics and domains, with a particular sensibility for spatial and government policy issues. It brings together contributions to three major domains, representing the state of current research and outlining future perspectives. More specifically, these are (1) the role of creativity for entrepreneurial activities; (2) the impact of the local and regional environment on entrepreneurship and creativity; and (3) the role that government policies may play in favor of entrepreneurship (economic creativity) and creative economic development. A particular characteristic of this handbook is the emphasis on the spatial implications of creativity and the consequences for government policies aimed at economic development linked to the idea of creativity. These are domains where further research is needed, especially empirical investigations, but also theoretical modeling.

The book is organized according to a multidisciplinary idea of the relationship between entrepreneurship and creativity. This means that, among others, psychologists, economists, economic geographers and sociologists belong to the 23 contributors of the 13 chapters of our volume, recognizing the need to treat these topics from an interdisciplinary perspective. Starting with the editors and authors of this introduction, two disciplines come together: economic/organizational sociology and economic geography.

The main structure of the Handbook of Research on Entrepreneurship and Creativity consists of three parts. We start with Part I that focuses on the role of creativity for entrepreneurial activities and includes five chapters written by specialists from engineering science, developmental
and educational psychology, regional planning and economic geography, economics, management philosophy and organizational theory, as well as from management science. It answers fundamental questions, which makes it possible to investigate in greater depth the central concept of creativity, as well as its role in entrepreneurial activity. Those questions are: “How can we understand the psychological paradoxes of creativity?”, “What role does social capital play in creativity and economic development?”, “How can we conceptualize entrepreneurial creativity in the form of organization creation (‘entrepreneuring’)?”, “What are the particularities of knowledge creation in entrepreneurial teams?” and “Are creative people more entrepreneurial than non-creative people and what are the determinants of their self-employment?”

From a psychological perspective David and Arthur Cropley develop a model of the interaction between innovation and entrepreneurship that considers six fundamental psychological paradoxes of creativity. Their model is based upon a taxonomy of five dimensions of novelty production (including process, motivation, personal properties, feelings and press) and five phases of production (preparation, activation, generation, illumination and verification). The authors argue that management behavior needs to be adapted to the needs of the particular phase currently in operation, as (partially contradictory) aspects of the psychological constellation (entrepreneurship), which facilitates innovation, really can coexist because they are important in different phases of the innovation process.

The chapter by Hans Westlund, Martin Andersson and Charlie Karlsson stresses the importance of creativity as an integral element of social capital. They point out that creativity brings change to existing norms, values and networks of a society’s existing social capital, but that it also influences economically relevant aspects like culture, knowledge, communication, leisure, production and consumption. Having analyzed the close relations between creativity, entrepreneurship and innovation, the authors conclude that entrepreneurship and creativity are quite high up on the policy agenda worldwide, but creativity and social capital are not. While problems with materializing the related theoretical concepts in policy action are probably one of the main reasons, this chapter's central conclusion is more than plausible: “there is a great potential in integrating research on social capital and creativity with the research on innovation and entrepreneurship. This potential is not only scientific but indeed also policy relevant!”

In chapter 4 Daniel Hjorth develops a processual conceptualization of a form of entrepreneurship that he calls “entrepreneuring” or organization creation. Surprisingly enough, the issue of organization creation still suffers from a lack of attention in entrepreneurship research. According to Hjorth this has to do with a lack of dialog between the fields of
entrepreneurship research and organizational studies, for example when it comes to a definition of organizations with the help of organization theory terms. Based upon Say’s (1880) perspective of an entrepreneur as a coordinating, planning and communicating organizer, Hjorth builds upon the central concepts of assemblage, desire and the virtual, and is then able to describe entrepreneuring as a particular form of creation. Entrepreneuring is understood as the narratively performed fiction that intensifies the desire for and investment in a particular virtuality to become actualized and thereby assembles and extends the productive capacity of an assemblage. Finally, Hjorth impressively explains how important literature is for the development of the process conceptualization of entrepreneuring as organization creation.

Chapter 5, written by Haïfa Naffakhi-Charfeddine, sheds light on the process of knowledge creation within entrepreneurial teams. In her exploratory chapter the author first describes the knowledge management process during the early phases of venture creation. Based on this literature review she discusses the increasing relevance of the knowledge creation process within entrepreneurial teams given the empirically well-proven fact that start-ups with a team of founders become, first, more and more frequent, and, secondly, that these team start-ups are on average more successful than solo entrepreneurs. Leadership and conflict-solving skills are key factors during the knowledge-creating process within entrepreneurial teams. The author proposes a four-step process of knowledge creation within entrepreneurial teams, including an early phase of learning about the other team members’ business ideas followed by a phase of creating a “tacit language and shared understanding”, then the exchange of and negotiations about diverging opinions based upon different perspectives and experiences, and finally the integration phase. The author stresses that team creativity is the result of divergent thinking in groups as reflected in ideational fluency, and that the more intensive the exchange between team members, the larger the increase in creativity. During the entrepreneurial process, each team member contributes to a collective and tacit knowledge that may be interpreted as an important asset of the young venture. That asset, as a kind of organizational memory, is mainly the result of learning by doing and of decision-making. This memory also consists of explicit collective knowledge codified in the explicit and implicit culture of the organization.

In the final chapter of Part I Michael Fritsch and Alina Sorgner refer to Florida’s concept of the “creative class” in their attempt to analyze the extent and the determinants of self-employment in creative professions at the individual level. Based upon micro-level data from the German Socio-Economic Panel (7,918 individuals with 850 self-employed persons)
they show that creativity and entrepreneurship coincide not only within regions, due to the fact that regional culture may stimulate the creativity of an individual living in that very region, but also within individuals. After reviewing three main theoretical concepts theorizing entrepreneurial creativity (the cognitive, personality and developmental approaches), the authors provide empirical evidence for the hypothesis that creativity and entrepreneurship are not completely different phenomena but that they are likely to coexist within the same person. Consequently attributes of places and regions may have an influence in the regional level of entrepreneurship. The presence of (many) members of the “creative class” is one of these attributes. The resulting creativity spillover can partially be explained by the function of creative people as role models. Another finding of this study is that the “creative class” is anything but a homogeneous group when their entrepreneurial attitudes and activities are analyzed: the creative core, creative professionals and non-creative professionals differ significantly with regard to regional and individual characteristics related to a person’s proclivity to be self-employed.

Part II of the handbook then focuses on the influences of the local and regional environment on entrepreneurship and creativity, assembling contributions primarily from urban and economic geographers, and economists, some of whom also include references to sociological work and reflections. The questions explored concern the emergence of new forms of entrepreneurship in creative industries, characterized by the perplexing constellation of individual and collective dynamics, and their connection (individual professionalization vs. social embededdedness in creative “scenes”), the link between the creative regional environment and the emergence of opportunities (in particular, individual opportunity perception) and, finally, the impact of the urban environment in the form of its networks and relational and emotive qualities on cultural entrepreneurship (e.g. book publishers).

The first of these chapters is ideally connected with the last chapter of the previous part. Bastian Lange analyzes entrepreneurship in creative industries in two specific (and not typical) German cities which were significantly transformed post-reunification: Berlin and Leipzig. His key question is how entrepreneurs in such industries develop strategies to cope with the paradox between individual professionalization and dependence on social contexts and professional scenes. Using a sociological perspective Lange develops the argument that the conceptualization of the term “scene,” a very important term for the chapter, is very helpful in order to explain the logic of the actions of cultural entrepreneurs caught in paradoxical circumstances. Using two existing databases on Berlin’s and Leipzig’s creative industries, the author shows that the understanding of
the concept “scene” is applicable to the context of entrepreneurial action. “Scene” should be viewed as a social spatial, structural category. These scenes are formed around organizational and professional elites and they are not homogeneous networks. As in both Berlin and Leipzig (as in many other cities in Germany) the creative industries have become an important target group of local economic development policies (see Sternberg 2012), at least one of the findings of this chapter is policy-relevant: informal networks (between cultural entrepreneurs) based upon collocation practices can be analyzed for their space-structuring effects.

Michael Stuetzer, in the second contribution of Part II, investigates whether the presence of the creative class as defined by Richard Florida is associated with three constructs at the regional level: objective opportunity/condition, opportunity perception and subjective business ideas. In his quantitative analysis he applies multi-level techniques and logit regressions and stresses a hitherto underresearched topic: the geography of individual opportunity perception. The author combines data at the regional and individual levels (from GEM Germany). These rich data sources allow him to show for the planning regions in Western Germany that the regional creative environment, as indicated by the regional share of employment in the creative class, correlates positively with the individual perception of entrepreneurial opportunity. Regional bridging social capital—approximated by the regional start-up rate (as the best network contacts for aspiring entrepreneurs are other entrepreneurs)—has a positive direct effect on individual entrepreneurial opportunity perception. However, Stuetzer also finds a positive moderating effect of social capital on the relationship between the creative environment and the individuals’ entrepreneurial opportunity perception.

In the last chapter of Part II Barbara Heebels, Irina van Aalst and Oedzge Atzema analyze in a case study how actors in a particular creative industry in a specific country use personal networks and urban places to deal with the tensions between culture and commerce in a globalized world. Based on 21 qualitative interviews with owners and/or directors of Dutch trade book publishing houses, the authors intend to contribute to the debate on the role of urban place for cultural production—and they do so explicitly from a relational perspective. Since the 17th century, Amsterdam has been the primary urban center for book publishers in the Netherlands. As book publishing is still a people business, personal networks between publishers and authors and geographical proximity are important for both actors. As the authors show, however, the publisher’s role has recently changed to that of a dynamic cultural mediator whose main aim is to strategically develop and maintain strong and weak ties to authors, journalists and booksellers. The role of place—conceptualized with the four dimensions
of place as location, as locale, as a social construct and sense of place—has changed as well: it should be considered a process interdependent with social networks. As professionalization in publishing has led to an increase in business-oriented ties and trust-oriented personal contacts, the specific localities of publishers are constructed in a strategic way. Consequently the relational and emotive aspects of place have become more important while sheer geographical proximity has lost some of its relevance as a quality of the urban environment.

The final part of the book is dedicated to government policies (including education policies in favor of universities) to support entrepreneurship and creative industries. In this part, scholars from sociology (economic sociology, urban sociology, sociology of science and innovation), urban planning (planning theory, urban and cultural policy, heritage preservation, strategic use of iconic architecture), art and design, business education, and entrepreneurship and enterprise education, meet together, reviewing policy approaches in favor of entrepreneurial activity, creativity and creativity-based economic growth. The questions they examine deal with the practical implications of the theoretical approaches for government policies.

In the first chapter Michel Grossetti provides a review of government policies to promote innovation-based economic development. Starting with government support of the chemical industry in the late 18th century in Languedoc/France and ending with the current era of attracting creative industries inspired by Florida’s idea, the author develops an essay with a very personal perspective based on the individual’s own and others’ empirical research in France and other European countries. Starting with an overview of social networks and clusters in the French innovation system Grossetti is rather skeptical concerning government policies to attract mobile members of the creative class. His main argument is that soft location factors such as amenities and others in reality do not belong to the important determinants of the spatial mobility of highly skilled, creative people in Europe.

The second chapter of Part III is explicitly dedicated to creative city policies. Marianna d’Ovidio and Davide Ponzini provide an extensive review and discussion of government policies and private initiatives under the banner of supporting the “creative city.” The authors choose Milan and the fashion industry as a case study, as Milan is located in the richest region of the country, has in modern times always been the main economic engine of Italy, and serves both as a symbol of the technological and economic progress of the nation and as a centre of cultural and intellectual life. Their analysis results in a rather pessimistic assessment of creative city policies. According to the authors such policies are often an attractive
rhetoric for conventional economic and cultural policies or, even worse, a means for vesting real estate and business interests. There is no doubt that cultural and creative industries have increased their role in the economy of post-Fordist cities and that they have attracted considerable attention from scholars and urban policymakers since the early 2000s in particular. Since that era, the new urban economy may be defined as a cognitive cultural economy. Cities, more than any other type of place, make the relationship between production (of design or innovation, for example) and the local context more explicit. In the current (however, already slightly declining) era of “entrepreneurial urbanism,” with its dynamic combination of material (physical environment such as buildings) and non-material factors (cultural atmosphere, creativity and others), related creative city policies had a great communicative impact, and were considered by many policymakers a panacea for almost every segment of urban life, including the renewal of stigmatized cities or neighborhoods. The authors criticize the growth-centered vision that instrumentalized creative production and cultural consumption. Consequently they suggest (re)evaluating the related urban policies with strong reference to the specific local conditions and analyzing who benefits from these policies—and who does not.

The final two chapters of the book deal with education’s role in the relationship between entrepreneurship and creativity. First, the entrepreneurial university is analyzed to ascertain whose evolution has important practical implications for government policies incentivizing entrepreneurship and economic creativity. As Henry Etzkowitz makes clear in his contribution, modern-day academics are both targets and actors of the diffusion of entrepreneurship in society, becoming increasingly involved, for example, in technology transfer, firm foundation and regional economic development. The main message of his well-known triple-helix model is not that universities become firms or governments become businesses. Rather, as each assumes some of the capabilities of the other, each institution maintains its primary role and distinct identity. Each institutional sphere is thus more likely to become a creative source of innovation and to support the emergence of creativity that arises in other spirals. The triple-helix model comprises three basic elements when it comes to government, university and industry: a more prominent role for the university in innovation; a movement towards collaborative relationships among the three major institutional spheres in which innovation policy is increasingly an outcome of interaction rather than a prescription from government; and, in addition to fulfilling their traditional functions, each institutional sphere also “takes the role of the other.” For Etzkowitz the emergence of university–industry–government relations—a tri-institutional model of society—is the great transformation of the late 20th and early 21st centu-
ries, and, according to him, it has a great potential for emerging economies as well.

Last but not least, the perspective is enlarged by approaching the creativity–entrepreneurship couple in a larger field beyond academia: Andy Penaluna, Kathryn Penaluna and Ivan Diego provide a profound analysis of education in enterprising creativity. This chapter aims to locate creativity within entrepreneurship education. The focus is on the need for creative thoughts in any educational context that claims to teach how to create or to develop enterprises. Based on an intensive literature review from several fields, the authors compare the related empirical evidence with that of pedagogic approaches from creative industries. This chapter develops answers to questions such as whether or not entrepreneurial creativity can be taught and how appropriate assessments (in teaching) are for creativity. Insights from research in cognitive neurology (and neuroscience in particular) play an important role in this chapter. Specifying brain processes that enable, enhance and develop creativity needs to be better understood in order to let teachers and students profit from more creativity in enterprise education.
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