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In 2012, the European Commission made the spillover effects of the arts, culture and the creative industries a subject of its agenda for the first time. The European Research Partnership on Cultural and Creative Spillovers was launched in 2014. It aims to evaluate, in a holistic way, cultural and creative spillovers, which we define as:

- The process by which activities in the arts, culture and creative industries have a subsequent broad impact on places, society or the economy through the overflow of concepts, ideas, skills, knowledge and different types of capital.

Our collaborative research process has included partners from 14 countries and is composed of national cultural funding agencies, regional cultural development bodies, foundations, universities and organisations operating Europe-wide. Most of the organisations in the Partnership have a role in redistributing public funding through a variety of grants and public subsidies. We came together through a shared desire to demonstrate the value of public funding for arts and culture and to investigate how we could map the value chains within and between the arts, culture and creative industries and between those sectors and the wider economy and society.

We had two core objectives in mind: to evaluate the relationship of public funding to spillovers; and to recommend methodologies that may be able to capture spillover effects. We also advocate for longer-term European funding to address the wider research gap in this area and to strengthen development of the case for public support of the arts, culture and creative industries.

Arts Council England is the national development body for arts and culture across England, working to enrich people’s lives. Arts Council England supports a range of activities across the arts, museums and libraries - from theatre to visual art, reading to dance, music to literature, and crafts to collections. Great art and culture inspires us, brings us together and teaches us about ourselves and the world around us. In short, it makes life better. Between 2018 and 2022, Arts Council England will invest £1.45 billion of public money from government and an estimated £660 million from the National Lottery to help create these experiences for as many people as possible across the England.

The Arts Council of Ireland is the Irish government agency for developing the arts. It works in partnership with artists, arts organisations, public policymakers and others to build a central place for the arts in Irish life.

Creative England invests in talented people and their creative ideas, nurturing England’s richly diverse games, TV, film and digital media industries. The organisation helps identify future opportunities to grow the economy and generate jobs. Creative England aims to grow the brightest, the best, and those with the most promise so that individuals and businesses can achieve their full creative and commercial potential.

Creative Scotland is the public body that supports the arts, screen and creative industries across all parts of Scotland on behalf of everyone who lives, works or visits there. It enables people and organisations to work in and experience the arts, screen and creative industries in Scotland by helping others to develop great ideas and bring them to life. It distributes funding from the Scottish Government and The National Lottery.

The European Centre for Creative Economy (ECC) stems from RUHR.2010 - the first European Capital of Culture that has come to accept the cultural and creative economy as an essential pillar of its programme and part of cultural diversity. ECC supports the creative economy and the development of creative locations and spaces in the region. A central part of the work of ECC is to organise debates on culture and the creative industries in the Ruhr region that are relevant across Europe. ECC is funded by the Ministry of Culture and Science of the State of North Rhine-Westphalia.

The European Cultural Foundation (ECF) is an independent foundation based in the Netherlands, which has been operating across Europe since 1914. ECF strives towards an open, democratic and inclusive Europe in which culture is valued as a key contributor. ECF bridges people and democratic institutions by connecting local cultural change-makers and communities across wider Europe because they firmly believe that Europe and its neighbourhood can be powered by culture. ECF supports creative collaborations that contribute to fostering democratic societies. They do this through grants, awards, programmes, advocacy, online platforms for knowledge exchange, and more.

The European Creative Business Network (ECBN) is a network of cultural and creative industries development agencies. They represent 19 board members and over 230 creative centres. As a non-profit foundation, based in the Netherlands, their aim is to help creative entrepreneurs to do business and collaborate internationally. ECBN supports the project in-kind through financial administration, contracting and payments.

Lyudmila Petrova (Erasmus University, Rotterdam, the Netherlands) is a co-founder of the Centre of Research in Arts and Economics (CREARE) and a director of the CREARE School of Cultural Economics. She holds a MA in cultural economics and cultural entrepreneurship and is an active member of the cultural economics community. She is also a research associate at Erasmus School of History, Culture and Communication (ESHCC), Rotterdam, the Netherlands. Being passionate about arts, she is teaching, researching, presenting and publishing in the areas of the creative economy, spillovers of cultural and creative industries, cultural entrepreneurship, financing of the arts and culture, creativity and innovation and international cultural policy. For the last 5 years, she is working on the design and implementation in different contexts of a culture evaluation tool “The Value-Based Approach”.

Dr Jonathan Vickery (University of Warwick, England) is director of the masters programme in Arts and Development at the Centre for Cultural and Media Policy Studies, at the University of Warwick, UK. He has acted as consultant for cities and arts organisations, and involved in management of a community theatre, a community festival, two arts research organisations, and the collaborative Shanghai City Lab (2013-15). He has edited and written on contemporary art, cultural politics, development and the public realm. He was co-editor of the journal Aesthesis (2006-9) and from 2017 he is co-Editor in Chief of the Journal of Law, Social Justice and Global Development.
The term ‘spillover’ is used as a synonym for economic ‘externalities’, signifying a power of influence, impact or effects of one area of production on areas outside the limited orbit of that one area. The term has since been adopted by other disciplines (psychology and media the most notable), and the ‘spill’ metaphor has maintained a sense of the unexpected or accidental effect. However, the first major commission of the European Research Partnership resulted in the landmark study by the Tom Fleming Creative Consultancy (TFCC) in 2015, which identified a range of both intentional and unintentional spillover effects when it came to the arts and culture. The study proposed that spillover research worked towards a ‘holistic’ approach, aiming to comprehend not just the role of specific arts or cultural organisations but the whole ‘ecology’ of culture of a place. This involved policy frameworks and the role of discourse, value chains, networks and organisational fields. Consequently, the Partnership has attempted to identify and measure the hybrid means by which the arts and culture interconnect social life and economic activity, industry with community, and human with technological development, and so define a broader measure of value.

How do spillover research methods provide useful tools in understanding the value, impact and effects of the arts and culture in specific places?

The purpose of this new report, authored by Nicole McNeilly, is not simply to track the progress of the European Partnership since the initial TFCC 2015 report. It serves the following, more complex, research aim: to assess the areas of spillover research promising to be the most productive and of impact - this is particularly important for new rising policy areas (such as knowledge and industry spillovers, and creative milieux and place branding). It assesses how evolving methodologies are being refined and directed as more effective research instruments - how do spillover research methods provide useful tools in understanding the value, impact and effects of the arts and culture in specific places? Do these evolving methods continue to cohere with the ‘holistic’ approach recommended by the TFCC 2015 report with its 17 identified spillover categories? Is the European Partnership closer to identifying proven spillover effects, or are the ‘effects’ becoming more diffuse and complex?

This present report also represents a key stage in the European Partnership’s strategy for commissioning research. Are further commissions required to identify unexplored spillover phenomena? Or, has commissioned research provided evidence and a range of recommendations that remain to be scrutinised, assessed or acted upon? What tangible future actions might be delivered by the European Research Partnership on Cultural and Creative Spillovers in response to this assessment? In doing this, this follow-up research also serves another crucial function - to identify the discourse of spillover research. The production of discussion, reports, analysis and intellectual debate is itself a form of cultural value, and a contribution to broader social and economic spheres. As a European Partnership in an age of ‘Brexit’, the continued alliance of UK cultural funders with European colleagues is of political significance - that culture can remain ‘European’ and a space of cooperation and collaboration on value is significant.

The initial motivation for a Europe-wide research project on cultural and creative spillovers emerged from the need to meet persistent demands by government and municipal authorities for evidence and detailed justification on public investment in the arts, culture and the creative industries. The key members of the European Research Partnership on Cultural and Creative Spillovers are cultural funders, and all operate within a framework determined by both stakeholder and governmental policy demands within which they need to devise ever more robust arguments for continued expenditure on culture - hopefully an increasing expenditure on culture and creative industries. The Partners are driven by a commitment to the arts and culture, and are so more ‘motivated’ than ‘objective’ observers. But their motivation does not emerge from self-interest so much as a deep experience of the transformative power of arts and culture on places, people, cities, regions and countries. In 2017, the Partners commissioned four major evidence studies (from Poland, the Netherlands, Italy and Finland), and with much discussion on the need for development in the area of methodology, have commissioned this summary review to capture the sum total of progress made so far in the study of cultural and creative spillovers.

On one level, cultural funding bodies all over Europe have become accustomed to the demands for evidence - of value, impact, return on investment, and the role of the arts and culture in economic or social development. There is a consensus, both across EU member states and within the European Parliament, that the arts and culture are sources of unique value and can also deliver on other public policy aims - whether in stimulating new enterprises, integrating minority communities, or contributing to urban development. In recent years, new research advances have been made in positioning culture as a vital component to civil society and democracy (the new Council of Europe Indicator Framework on Culture and Democracy), urban development (the European Commission’s Joint Research Centre’s Cultural and Creative Cities Monitor) and International Relations (the EU’s New European Cultural Diplomacy Platform).

Culture and the arts are therefore being analysed and monitored more closely than ever before. In parallel, they are also being re-defined as a strategic resource and means of value production for a whole range of political, social and economic contexts. While this serves to give creative and cultural professionals a greater role and share of public funds, it also serves to position culture within a matrix of political obligations, and to potentially over-inflate the capacity and capability of cultural organisations and sectors.

The TFCC’s Joint Research Centre’s Cultural and Creative Cities Monitor) and International Relations (the EU’s New European Cultural Diplomacy Platform).

Culture and the arts are therefore being analysed and monitored more closely than ever before. In parallel, they are also being re-defined as a strategic resource and means of value production for a whole range of political, social and economic contexts. While this serves to give creative and cultural professionals a greater role and share of public funds, it also serves to position culture within a matrix of political obligations, and to potentially over-inflate the capacity and capability of cultural organisations and sectors.

For the Partners, a greater visibility for the arts, culture and creative industries within national and regional political orders of priority is potentially productive and potentially a source of both capacity-building and creative empowerment. But cultural and creative sectors and organisations across the EU need to match the determination of governmental and public funding organisations in their powers of analysis, monitoring and strategic advocacy, not least in funding strategies to empower creative practitioners and cultural managers in research and representation. Why should a government or city municipality provide special protections, spaces and resources for culture - how, where, and to what extent? This common if multifaceted question demands a theorised and defensible understanding of the role of the arts, culture and creative industries in public, civil and democratic life, as well as its impact on (or, powers of intervention in) social and economic development.

We need a substantive response to this question, so often taken to be a matter of political principle and not political argument. We need a response that is grounded in research and which will stand up to the further (predictable) demands for evidence (however ‘evidence’ is defined). Moreover, we do not regard this question simply as a matter of bureaucratic diktat and the ‘audit society’ obsession with measurement and monitoring so beloved of American-influenced New Public Management. It is a question central to cultural value as represented in the public sphere, and where the distribution of public resources is conducted on defensible common interests (not sectorial or minority privilege). Moreover, ‘society’ across Europe is rapidly changing in form and complexion. New social phenomenon as well as crises (health, security, immigration, digital media and education, and so on) are rightly demanding radical increases in public resources. The arts and culture should, the Partners believe, not only stand alongside social services (like health provision and education) of equal value, but play a role in redefining what those services are and mean and how they produce value.
Arts, culture and creative industry policies across Europe have remained for the most part the
remit of member states and their national traditions (the principle of subsidiarity as established
in the Treaty on European Union, 1992), and now with Brexit and the rise of populism in Eastern
Europe, national sovereignty has been reinforced. UNESCO and the Council of Europe have, in
the past, been the principle actors in policies for international or pan-national cultural coopera-
tion. But it has been the rise of the creative industries, creative cities and cultural globalisation
in general that seems to have convinced most countries of the need to share or collaborate on
strategic approaches to the arts and culture. Indeed, the concept of ‘spillover’ emerged through
a set of observations on post-War Europe that despite post-war nationalism, increasing innova-
tions in industrial activity were resulting in productive cross-border cooperation. And moreover,
cross-border cooperation was generating dynamics later defined as ‘functional spillovers’, with
unexpected impacts creating further possibilities for innovation, as well as shared interests and an
integration of resources and capabilities.

The Partners are concerned with the historic ‘autonomy’ of the arts and culture – a hard-won
autonomy from state co-option or political interference. And yet, they are equally concerned that
arts, culture and creative industry organisations, along with their national or municipal funders,
do not have the methodologies or research tools for thinking strategically and delivering on the
full spectrum of value for their public or for society. Within cultural production (and manage-
ment and organisation) is latent intelligence, knowledge, know-how and social potential to effect
change and contribute to broader development needs – from obvious areas like training and skills
to the less-than-obvious place-making and social cohesion.

The European Research Partnership on Cultural and Creative Spillovers – following the initial
2015 report – is particularly interested in knowledge spillovers, industry spillovers and network
spillovers. Indeed, spillover research will attend to a range of value forms and their production in
specific contexts. It aims to evolve methodologies as much as the gathering and use of evidence
in advocacy and argument. It aims to define the spillover of individual arts and cultural organi-
sations, as well as cultural value chains, cultural ecology and ecosystems. It also aims to maintain
European research cooperation and our common cultural heritage and creative discourses and to
understand how spillover can expand through the increasing condition of diversity and need for
interculturalism.

In 2014, the European Research Partnership on Cultural and Creative Spillovers was launched.
The Partners shared a desire to demonstrate the value and effects of the arts, culture and creative
industries on society and the wider economy. In collaboration with researchers from across Eu-
ropes, we created the first International Evidence Library on cultural and creative spillovers,
comprising 94 documents from 17 European countries, including literature reviews, case studies,
surveys and quantitative analyses. In 2015, the Partnership published a preliminary evidence
review, conducted by Tom Fleming Creative Consultancy (TFCC), the focus of which was an analy-
sis of the documents in the evidence library. The Partnership aimed to better understand the
evidence (and reasons for the lack of evidence) on cultural and creative spillovers, and in response,
develop innovative methodologies and so create a deeper, more robust and shared European
evidence base. This aspiration remained of particular relevance and timeliness for arts organisa-
tions, cultural sectors and EU cultural policymaking, given the increase in political expectation on
creativity and culture and demands for evidence.

The Partnership therefore instigated a secondary research stage, building on the recommenda-
tions of the 2015 TFCC report. It funded qualitative and mixed methods research in the form of
four case studies from across Europe, the aim of which was to interrogate a range of methodolo-
gies that have and can be used to identify and evaluate the relationship between creative activity
and its spillover effects.

During this stage, the Partners were part of a comprehensive exchange of ideas, methods and dis-
cussions, obtaining new insights into research as a field of practice, its challenges and alternative
approaches. Many new projects and funding opportunities for spillover effects were uncovered,
including innovations in health and wellbeing, in creative milieus or in place branding. This was
registered by the conclusions of the Council of the European Union, 2015.\(^2\) An increasing need
did not have the methodologies or research tools for thinking strategically and delivering on the
full spectrum of value for their public or for society. Within cultural production (and manage-
ment and organisation) is latent intelligence, knowledge, know-how and social potential to effect
change and contribute to broader development needs – from obvious areas like training and skills
to the less-than-obvious place-making and social cohesion.

The European Research Partnership on Cultural and Creative Spillovers – following the initial
2015 report – is particularly interested in knowledge spillovers, industry spillovers and network
spillovers. Indeed, spillover research will attend to a range of value forms and their production in
specific contexts. It aims to evolve methodologies as much as the gathering and use of evidence
in advocacy and argument. It aims to define the spillover of individual arts and cultural organi-
sations, as well as cultural value chains, cultural ecology and ecosystems. It also aims to maintain
European research cooperation and our common cultural heritage and creative discourses and to
understand how spillover can expand through the increasing condition of diversity and need for
interculturalism.

The Partners would like to thank Nicole McNeilly for her dedication and collaboration in deliver-
ing this review, for asking the right questions and being eager to find their answers.

\(^2\) Council of the European Union Conclu-
sions, 30 April 2015 (C(2015) 196): Conclusions on cultural and creative spillo-
vers to stimulate innovation, economic sustainability and social inclusion.
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spillover mapping

Like in the preliminary review, the evidence library for this report was established by the inclusiveness of the preliminary definition, not because each report actively sought to comment on or demonstrate spillover effects (see also TFCC, 2015: 23). Nonetheless, a mapping exercise provided insight into new areas of research strength and negative spillovers.

Knowledge spillovers are found most often in the evidence library, followed by network spillovers. Industry spillovers are found least. Evidence was found that could reflect almost all of the spillover sub-categories identified by TFCC in 2015. There is also continuity in evidence strengths (innovation via knowledge spillovers, health and well-being via network spillovers, creative milieu and place branding via network spillovers), and new areas of strength also emerge.

In this review, as an area of spillover strength, knowledge spillover sub-categories are most strongly represented in the evidence library. Many network spillover sub-categories are also found multiple times. Industry spillovers are found least often in the evidence library, but only one spillover sub-category was not found in any report (Stimulating urban development, regeneration and infrastructure).
New spillover areas were identified that should be further explored to see if they have wider significance. Suggestions of where they might fit in the industry/economic/network spillover classification are added in italics.

• **Pro-civic, democratic and political behaviours and participation** (knowledge spillover) where the arts, culture and creative industries promote civic and democratic engagement as well as European values.

• **Influence through soft power** (network spillover) where the arts, culture and creative industries play a key (but often difficult to measure) role in facilitating dialogue and economic and political interactions between nations.

• **Environmental awareness and pro-environmental behaviour, sustainable growth** (knowledge or industry spillover) where the arts, culture and creative industries promote sustainable practice and engagement with environmental issues.

• **Culture as sustainable international development tool or a method for inclusive growth** (network or industry spillover) where the arts, culture and creative industries play a core role in international development and inclusive growth.

Increasingly, research seems to be taking into account the full spectrum of impact when evaluating activity. More negative spillovers emerged in the course of this review. Many of them are dichotomies: for example, the arts, culture and creative industries have negative implications for mental health and well-being (Gross and Musgrave, 2017: 33). As precarity can be said to be a working condition for many creative professions, this has significant implications.

• The precarity of a career in the arts, culture and creative industries, in this case music, can have negative implications for mental health and well-being (Gross and Musgrave, 2017: 33). As precarity can be said to be a working condition for many creative professions, this has significant implications.

• Investment in the arts, culture and creative industries often leads to clustering which can worsen rather than improve regional imbalances (Garcia et al., 2018).

• New digital dissemination and consumption mechanisms spurred by the creative industries have resulted in a loss of value throughout the creative supply chain, affecting SMEs in particular (Ernst and Young, 2014: 24).

• Regeneration is usually accompanied by the exclusion of pre-existing communities (Crossick and Kaszynska, 2016: 8).

• Culture can be a source of conflict, playing a part in initiating and perpetuating antagonisms (Crossick and Kaszynska, 2016: 70).

• Artists can be ‘perpetrators of “place taking” and “artwashing” especially in communities of colour in majority-white countries’ (World Cities Culture Forum, 2016: 8).

• The agglomeration of digital platforms makes it hard to find and access Europe’s rich, diverse, digital cultural output (imec-SMIT VUB, KEA and IDEA Consult, 2017: 14; see also Vlassis, 2018: 426).

Not all of the reports included in the evidence library consisted of primary research, thus the positive and negative spillovers identified should be tested for their relevance. The existing framework should be evaluated and as a part of this, the existing spillover sub-categories could be mapped against alternative impact frameworks or indices, with a view to understanding how they further or hinder the measurement of spillover. Future research should consider the further development of the framework or investigate how an understanding of spillover effects in existing indices or frameworks could add value and progress the debate.

### the relationship between the arts and cultural sectors and the creative industries - and the role of public funding

Understanding the links between the arts and culture sectors and creative industries is impeded by a lack of a shared definition, the difficulties of measurement and the challenge of understanding multi-level and multi-directional linkages. The varied arguments presented show that the need to be accountable for public investment continues to be a major driver behind evaluation in the arts, culture and creative industries. Multiple sources note the challenge of evidencing positive effects as the result of public investment. Others continue to question the assumed role of public funding as leverage for private investment and the requirement for evaluation to demonstrate non-cultural value from public funding. These debates add perspective to a much fuller picture of the ecology of the arts, culture and creative industries, but do not prove a positive spillover-generating role for public funding within it.

#### findings from the methodological review

Qualitative methodological approaches appear to be increasingly valued in their own right, and for their contribution to a more rounded and robust mixed methods approach in which qualitative data can add the nuance and sometimes, the indications of causality that quantitative data can lack. The benefits of quantitative methodological approaches include testing hypotheses or findings from a micro-scale on a national scale. Demonstrating outcomes and attributing causality to activity in the arts, culture and creative industries remains challenging.

The case for longitudinal data collection continues to grow but is hindered by the short-term projection of the sector. This challenges the attribution of causality between long-term goals and provides little robust evidence in other respects. Proxies have potential but in the case provided in the evidence library (University of Edinburgh, 2017), the findings are reductive of the complexity of the research area (soft power), potentially lacking insight that is gained from mixed or qualitative approaches (e.g. McPherson et al., 2017). Similarly, and as suggested by TFCC (2015), economic evaluations (e.g. social return on investment) may provide interesting insights for the sector. They have a mixed reception but may be of interest if applied rigorously in specific contexts (e.g. health) to provide insight into cost savings. Such methodologies may be of interest to further the case for the cultural commissioning of health and well-being projects.

The challenge of evidencing causality is a continuing theme. This is accompanied by calls for the further use of experimental methods, including the use of randomised control trials (RCTs). These rarely feature in the evidence library and other evidence reviews find a lack of such methods (See and Kokotsaki, 2016; Tsegaye et al., 2016). This is nonetheless combined with a ‘backlash’ against RCTs as the gold standard of research approaches (Crossick and Kaszynska, 2016; All-Party Parliamentary Group on Arts, Health and Wellbeing, 2017).
Some of the reports in the evidence library emphasise the need to have a wide range of methodological approaches at hand to respond to the huge variety of practice in the arts, culture and creative industries. There is no one-size-fits-all approach. As such, we see a focus on the need to tailor (primarily qualitative or mixed-methods) research approaches to the project and furthermore, to the creative outputs that emerge.

These methods include embedded ethnographic methodologies like observation and the valuation of creative outputs. There is great potential for an understanding of spillover at an individual level and for mapping how (quality of) participation leads to impact, but such methods have to be further rigorously developed and validated (Goethe Institut, 2016). Increased confidence in the application of rigorous qualitative methodological approaches, even when they are not strictly replicable, may allow for further understanding and wider social valuing of the intrinsic value of the arts, culture and creative industries.

The very identification of spillover is challenging. As seen in the evidence library, and from the case studies commissioned by the Partnership in 2016, logic modelling has the potential to delineate spillovers from project outcomes but this needs to be further explored.

There is also no simple way to further progress the identification or measurement of cultural and creative spillovers. Rather, there are some principles that could be borne in mind regarding the future measurement of spillover effects:

- The measurement of spillover will only be possible when it is easily understood by the sector and presented in a framework that accounts for temporal and contextual dynamics.
- There is no one-size-fits-all approach to spillover evaluation and methodological approaches should be designed to be appropriate to the activity. This includes having confidence in the rigorous application of qualitative methods.
- Professionals in the sector should be able to understand, and perhaps even apply, their own methodological approaches (Picherty, 2017). An increased understanding of methods will support a better objective assessment of the reliability of findings (Oman and Taylor, 2018) and remove the potential for over-claiming.
- Partnerships with universities can provide opportunities for rigorous and longitudinal mixed-methods approaches to evaluation.
- Pre-emptive mapping of spillover effects before project activity begins has value. In particular, this can isolate project activity goals from spillover. This also supports a longitudinal approach by building measurement in from the beginning of activity.
- Longitudinal approaches are necessary to show the duration and value of spillover impact over time.

The Research Partnership should continue to advance its goals for a holistic approach and for the progression of robust qualitative methods in the measurement of spillovers in the arts, culture and creative industries. This should help further the conversation about the core value of culture itself. However, the sector should be actively encouraged to contribute to conversations about the importance of culture to society (e.g. Schippers et al., 2015: 20).
recommendations for future research into cultural and creative spillovers

1. Continue to explore definitional challenges
Debates on the very definition of the arts, culture and creative industries continue to dominate the European cultural and creative research sphere. We cannot measure the sector if we do not share an opinion about what it is. Likewise with spillover: this report shows that progress on the spillover debate has been hindered by definitional uncertainty but continued collaboration and discussion is recommended to explore what is problematic with the existing definition of cultural creative spillover.

2. Further test the spillover framework
The identified spillovers (from TFCC 2015 and this review) should be tested for their relevance. The framework presented in 2015 by TFCC of 17 spillover sub-categories could be further developed to make it multi-dimensional and to capture the complexity of spillover effects (e.g. time, affected actor, negative spillover). The 17 spillover sub-categories and newly identified spillovers could also be mapped against alternative frameworks with a view to investigating if this will provide additional perspective or further the measurement of spillover.

3. Collaborate and involve all actors in research
A debate on the full value of culture and creative spillover should support a continued discussion around the methodological means to capture spillovers. It should not, however, remain abstract from the processes and ‘the interconnected elements of the system that makes their emergence possible’ (European Research Partnership on cultural and creative spillovers, 2017: 9). This is where collaboration with others actively researching this field is important. Partnerships between universities should be promoted. Furthermore, future research will benefit from collaboration with those working in the arts, culture and creative industries outwith the policy and research field.

4. Promote a holistic approach and the progression of robust qualitative methods
The evidence library shows that qualitative and mixed-methods approaches are increasingly valued because this adds nuance to economic understanding and provides insight into the dynamics of clustering. Nonetheless, the challenge remains of demonstrating the value of activity and investment in the arts, culture and creative industries. The Research Partnership should continue to advance its goals for a holistic approach and for the progression of robust qualitative methods in the measurement of spillovers in the arts, culture and creative industries.

5. Support risk and innovation at policy level
Policymaking and new research developments take time. Thus, ambitions to advocate for the further holistic measurement of spillover effects must be balanced with an understanding that further work is required to support this case. The call for ‘a policy-level appreciation that the types of spillover generated can not always be predetermined’ (TFCC, 2015: 17) is still relevant. Policymakers and funders should be encouraged to fund activity that is risky and that could have benefit in multiple unknown ways, including ways that are not critical to project success (also King’s College London, 2017; Gidzen et al., 2015; Sökska et al., 2017).
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In an increasingly uncertain world, culture can be seen as both a cause and cure of society’s ills (Durer, Miller and O’Brien, 2018: 4). This is the context in which the debate on the value of the arts, culture and creative industries, and this report, should be seen. The indications are that spending in this area is increasingly legitimated in policy contexts, but the feeling remains that their value is still neither known fully nor appreciated. A conversation about the broader value of the arts, culture and creative industries - their benefits and weaknesses - is still to become part of the objective conversation about their value to society and the economy.

This report first considers the current value debate. It then presents the project brief, and methodology and limitations of the approach, one of which is the geographic concentration of the evidence library. The spillover mapping exercise is discussed in the findings, showing the evidence strengths compared to the preliminary evidence review. It also highlights new spillover areas and notes an increase in negative spillovers compared to the 2015 review. The research questions of the Partnership are then addressed, first discussing the challenge of defining and measuring the arts and cultural industries and creative industries (separately and combined), then considering the implications this has on our understanding of the links within the arts, culture and creative industries ecology and the relationship between spillover and public funding in this.

The report continues by discussing the methodological findings that show progress in the qualitative and mixed-methods approaches advocated by the Partnership, whilst noting that significant challenges remain in terms of demonstrating causality. This is followed by methodological recommendations that could help further the measurement of spillover in the arts, culture and creative industries. The final section presents how ‘spillover’ is understood in the evidence library, noting the lack of a shared definition. This definition presents the Research Partnership’s understanding of cultural and creative spillover as follows:

> Collaborations between cultural actors and non-cultural actors are nothing new; the CCS [creative and cultural sectors] are said to have a natural ‘convergence or confluence culture’. However, the degree of integration and intertwining of creative value chains with other sectors has never been so high. The increased complexity of societal challenges and the speed of technological advances have been important drivers of this process.’ imec-SMIT-VUB et al. (2017: 12).

Since Frontier Economics’ study, in which spillovers are presented in an economic framework as a ‘positive externality’ (Frontier Economics, 2007), the ways of talking about and demonstrating the value of the arts, culture and creative industries (in and of itself, within the sector and from the sector to other sectors) have understandably diversified. The report, Cultural and creative spillovers in Europe: Report on a preliminary evidence review (TFCC, 2015) (hereafter referred to as the preliminary evidence review or preliminary review) emerged from the idea that methodologies are available and being used (in or outside of the arts, culture and creative industries) that can firmly evidence spillover effects. In 2015, Tom Fleming Creative Consultancy (TFCC) and the European Research Partnership on Cultural and Creative Spillovers co-created a definition of spillover as follows:

> ‘Spillover is a process by which an activity in one area has a subsequent broader impact on places, society or the economy through the overflow of concepts, ideas, skills, knowledge and different types of capital. Spillovers can take place over varying time frames and can be intentional or unintentional, planned or unplanned, direct or indirect, negative as well as positive.’ TFCC (2015: 8)

This definition presents the Research Partnership’s understanding of cultural and creative spillover for the purposes of this research project. The Partnership recognised that multiple definitions were possible (and debate was encouraged). Coming to a final definition was not the objective of this review - the complexity of the definition reflects somewhat the complexity of society and the challenge at hand and a malleable understanding has benefits in capturing new dimensions of value.

The preliminary review has had attention across Europe and its recommendations have been variously presented at different national and international policy and research events by the Research Partnership. This includes a dedicated hearing of the European Parliament Intergroup on Cultural and Creative Industries in January 2016 and a presentation at the European Cultural Forum in 2016. The concept of spillover was advocated for in the first report of the European Parliament on a policy for the cultural and creative industries in late 2016 (European Parliament, 2016).
Not surprisingly, the preliminary review has been cited or referenced in a number of reports in the evidence library, for example, Varbanova (no date), Austrian Institute for SME Research and VVA Europe (2016), SDG Economic Development (2017), CEBR (2017), Culture Action Europe and Budapest Observatory (2018) and Lazzaro (2018). This suggests that it has been a valuable contribution to the literature. Physical copies of the preliminary review were widely disseminated by the Research Partners, and the digital report was available on the former project website, ccspillovers.wikispaces.com and on project partner websites. Analysis undertaken by the author in February 2018 suggests that around 53 unique domains reference ccspillovers.wikispaces.com. Since June 2018, the Partnership has a new website: https://ccspillovers.weebly.com/.

Research into spillovers thus remains a legitimate line of enquiry for the Research Partnership for many reasons. As well as their relevance in the policy field, spillover is increasingly recognised for its potential to demonstrate value. Garcia et al. write that there is a risk that spillovers may not be taken into account in terms of the potential of the arts, culture and creative industries although ‘they are a positive outcome for UK creative industries regionally and nationally’ (2018: 30). In the context of understanding the value of the bookselling sector in the UK, CEBR write that spillovers may be even more important than economic measurement, despite challenges in ‘measurement, quantification and monetisation’ (2017: 9).

The latter quote reminds us that methodological challenges will not disappear. Discussions of methodologies rarely conclude with an ideal methodological approach (e.g. one that is replicable or one-size-fits-all) because evaluations can not be standardised (Goethe Institute, 2016: 7). The best models are customised to the project (and informed by clearly articulated goals or objectives) (Crossick and Kazynska, 2016: 9; Tsegaye et al., 2016) and take advantage of the wealth of available methodologies. Measuring the value of the arts, culture and creative industries may never have a gold standard, and accepting this could present a way of progressing an understanding of spillovers and of valuing cultural research.

This was the position taken by the Research Partnership when commissioning four case studies in 2016. These case studies used varied qualitative and mixed-methods approaches to investigate how the spillover effects identified in the 2015 preliminary evidence review could be evidenced in discrete cultural activities across Europe (see European Research Partnership on Cultural and Creative Spillovers, 2017).

This follow-up report is informed by a review of 73 European and worldwide reports from the EU (eight countries), the USA, Switzerland, Eastern Partnership countries and global institutions. Each report was analysed using content analysis, presenting the findings and a short summary in a template that documented the contribution of the report to the topic. This report does not present the analysis of these reports, but these are available in a separate document. Similarly, the evidence library, including classifications such as country, methodological approach and funding content (if known), is also available in an alternative document. The evidence library can also be seen in the bibliography.

brief

In 2015, the European Research Partnership on Cultural and Creative Spillovers commissioned the first review of spillover effects in the arts, culture and creative industries from TFCC. This review, commissioned three years later, has a number of objectives:

• Track the extent to which research in the arts, culture and creative industries has progressed against the findings and recommendations in the 2015 TFCC report.
• Evaluate the current definition and understandings of ‘spillover’.
• Consider the methodologies used to identify spillover effects, and whether new areas of research strength are emerging.
• Address the questions that are still important to the Partnership, such as the linkages between the arts, culture and creative industries, and the role public funding plays in the generation of spillover.
• Propose recommendations for future research into cultural and creative spillover effects.

To answer these questions, a follow up evidence review was agreed. There were key aspects of the preliminary review that were not required in this review, for reasons of time or of suitability. A thorough assessment of the quality of the methodologies presented (e.g. via a quality scale, as in TFCC, 2015) and the presentation of extensive methodological recommendations for the measurement of spillover effects were not an explicit part of the brief. The brief also did not require the in-depth evaluation of the case studies commissioned by the Partnership and published in 2017.
As in 2015, content from Europe was to be prioritised. Reports were categorised by which country they referred to or originated from (whichever was most relevant in the report). There was no guidance on maximum or minimum number of reports, but the count stands at 73 items. The 2015 review considered 98 reports (TFCC, 2015). All types of reports or publications (e.g. open access or behind a paywall, digital or print) could be considered for their contribution to the debate on spillovers. The majority of reports are freely available.

Contributed content

Members of the Research Partnership were invited to contribute research articles. No differentiation has been made in the evidence library between material contributed by the Research Partners or by the author. Only a small number of reports were presented for inclusion by members of the Partnership.

An important follow-up to the publishing of the preliminary evidence review in 2015 was the creation and maintenance of a dedicated Wikispace, from which a call was made for additional reports to be listed for the follow-up review. Additional reports or evidence suggested on the Wikispace were included in the evidence library, with the exception of two that were judged to have little to contribute to the report (they were published long ago and the concepts presented were not relevant). Additional content that the author was aware of that had potential value for the debate was also added to the library.
Chart 2. Reports in the 2018 evidence library categorised by their country of origin/country of focus.

- Reports from the UK feature most in the evidence library. NB: Does not include pan-European reports, or reports from USA and Eastern Partnership countries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country/area</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK (England)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK (whole)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worldwide</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK (Scotland)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Partnership Countries</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK (Wales)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>73</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For example, between the knowledge spillover of increasing visibility, tolerance and cultural exchange between communities and the network spillover of building social cohesion, community development and integration (see TFCC, 2015: 23).

Compared to TFCC (2015), the report has a more limited geographic coverage. Additionally, geographic classification was different. In this report, the EU was considered separately from global reports; proportionally there are also more EU-wide reports than in 2015. The Netherlands has since replaced Scandinavian countries and Germany as the country with the most reports after the UK. At the same time, it replicates a UK dominance. This was perhaps inevitable due to both authors originating from the UK, but it is also reflective of the degree to which the UK has led the field in cultural evaluation and creative industries policy formulation (TFCC, 2015: 20). This has been variously referred to in the literature. In the Goethe Institute report, it is noted that the UK’s openness to and promotion of evaluation stems from an explicit policy direction that encourages the arts and culture industries to pursue wider cultural aims (Goethe Institute, 2016: 6). Although writing in the Dutch context, Grotenhuis also begins his article on the Dutch creative industries with a presentation of DCMS economic estimates, referencing growth as a global trend (2017).

In a report for the International Network for Contemporary Performing Arts (IETM), Shishkova writes that this ‘distortion is predefined by the historic advantage given to the Anglosphere of the long-term tradition in evaluating public spending for culture. Most research on culture and performing arts published online originate from the English-speaking world: England, Scotland, Wales, Ireland, Canada, USA and Australia’ (Shishkova, 2015: 5). The concentration of reports from Western Europe is a disadvantage of the report, even if the aim was to be illustrative.

### Geographic range

Geographical and language imbalance must be noted. All reports are in English (or at least have an English summary). The majority of reports (39) refer to the UK (if cross-UK, Scottish, English and Welsh reports are considered together). Europe (as a whole) is then the second largest at 18 reports, with the Netherlands following with nine reports.

**A similar mapping exercise was undertaken and is presented in Appendix 1, noting the caveats above. It shows that knowledge spillovers are found most often in the evidence library, followed by network spillovers. Industry spillovers are found least. Evidence was found that could reflect almost all of the spillover sub-categories found by TFCC. There is also continuity in the evidence strengths (innovation via knowledge spillovers, health and well-being via network spillovers, creative milieu and place branding via network spillovers) that were identified in 2015, and new areas of strength also emerge.**

### Challenge of the spillover mapping exercise

This was challenging in many respects. Firstly, not all of the reports included in the evidence library consisted of primary research. The inclusion of evidence reviews would create the possibility of duplications of spillover claims. Therefore, only a small amount of the evidence library was considered for mapping (see Appendix 1). Secondly, the challenge of presenting a spillover mapping is questionable when the reports themselves, more often than not, do not refer to spillovers. Thirdly, the definition of spillover is still contested, and including evidence referencing such a broad range of terms (e.g. impact, values, benefits) and not only spillover means that it gives a limited perspective on spillover strengths. For this reason, counts of spillovers identified in the evidence library are not given. Finally, the research brief did not require the evidence library to be assessed in terms of quality. Mapping is also challenged by overlapping spillover sub-categories.7

This report also attempts to show where new significant spillovers have emerged but this is more of an indication for future research than a definitive presentation of new spillovers. For that reason, the framework has not been updated with the new spillover themes. Similarly, negative spillovers were identified. The current spillover framework does not (but, arguably could) incorporate negative spillovers. A number of reports reflect innovation via knowledge spillovers, a number of reports reflect health and well-being via network spillovers, creative milieu and place branding via network spillovers that were identified in 2015, and new areas of strength also emerge.

### Spillover mapping exercise

Recognising that culture has various values and listing its positive effects does not automatically generate cultural policy targets. Culture — in all its many facets — may well achieve a certain impact, but government need not necessarily pursue that impact in its cultural policy.8

Schrijvers et al. (2015: 10)

In 2015, a mapping exercise attempted to find where spillovers could be evidenced in the arts, culture and creative industries. TFCC categorised the identified spillovers into 17 sub-categories within the existing framework of knowledge, network and industry spillover (2015).

A similar mapping exercise was undertaken and is presented in Appendix 1, noting the caveats above. It shows that knowledge spillovers are found most often in the evidence library, followed by network spillovers. Industry spillovers are found least. Evidence was found that could reflect almost all of the spillover sub-categories found by TFCC. There is also continuity in the evidence strengths (innovation via knowledge spillovers, health and well-being via network spillovers, creative milieu and place branding via network spillovers) that were identified in 2015, and new areas of strength also emerge.

### Reflection on the 2018 evidence library (see Appendix 1)

- The majority of knowledge spillovers are reflected multiple times in the evidence library.
- Network spillovers are also strongly found in the evidence library, particularly for the strength identified by TFCC in 2015. Creating an attractive ecosystem and creative milieu, city branding and place making. One spillover was not mapped in any of the reports, Stimulating urban development, regeneration and infrastructure.
- Industry spillovers are found least in the evidence library.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2015 evidence strengths (TFCC, 2015: 10)</th>
<th>Comment on 2018 evidence library</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Innovation via knowledge spillovers</td>
<td>A number of reports reflect innovation via knowledge spillovers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and well-being via knowledge and industry spillovers</td>
<td>Health and well-being not included in knowledge or industry spillovers in the 2015 report — so understood to refer to network spillovers. If so, there are a number of reports that demonstrate this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative milieu and place branding/positioning via network, knowledge and industry spillovers</td>
<td>Strong, reflected only through network spillovers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chart 1: Comparison of the spillover strengths noted in TFCC (2015), compared with findings from this review.**
The spillover mapping exercise presents a ‘descriptive research [of] what the arts already do’ (Vickery, 2018) in terms of both positive and negative spillover effects. It is necessary to build on this and consider how to take what the framework and evidence shows and, where possible, make this useful for the sector.

**Operationalising the spillover framework**

The framework of 17 identified spillover sub-categories in the preliminary review was not designed to act as an evaluation framework, but rather to illustrate the findings of the review. Nonetheless, this framework was tested in the course of the commissioning of four case studies in 2016.

TFCC recognises the overlap between the identified spillover sub-categories (2015: 24). Clarity is required on the definitions of each spillover sub-category as well as the definitions of the overarching spillover categories (industry, knowledge, network). To be operationalised as a framework, there should be no overlapping terms (also Sokka et al., 2017: 31) and these should be easily understood by those in policy and research and by those working in the arts, culture and creative industries.

The commissioned case studies (European Research Partnership on Cultural and Creative Spillovers, 2017) tested the application of the spillover framework to a degree and thoughts on its operationalisation should be noted. Although TFCC also acknowledged the flow between spillover sub-categories (2015: 24), Sokka et al. (2017) critique the model for failing to show how spillovers are interlinked; they may depend on each other, emerge at the same time, and rarely come alone (2017: 31-32).

Lacking vertical and horizontal relationships, it also gives no perspective of whose value is being created and at what level, e.g. is this from an individual, wider community or governmental perspective (2017: 33)? The framework also does not give an indication of timespan or conceptualise how to distinguish between public and private funding (2017: 33). Sokka et al. also criticise the model for failing to show how spillovers are interlinked; they may depend on each other, emerge at the same time, and rarely come alone (2017: 31-32).

**New spillover areas**

Four new potential spillover sub-categories emerged from the review that did not fit under existing classifications and were significant enough to be added separately (e.g. due to how often they were referenced or the importance of those references). These did not all come from first-hand research, therefore they should be further explored to see if they have wider significance. They are also not added to TFCC’s framework, but suggestions of where they might fit are added in italics.

- **Pro-civic, democratic and political behaviours and participation** (knowledge spillover). Cultural participation has been identified as having a strong effect on democratic security at several different levels (Anheier et al., 2016: 12) – there ‘appears to be clear evidence of a link between cultural participation and indicators of inclusive societies, with the caveat that the direction of cause and effect is uncertain’ (Anheier et al., 2016: 23). Crossick and Kasznika write that cultural participation ‘may produce engaged citizens, promoting not only civic behaviours such as voting and volunteering, but also helping articulate alternatives to current assumptions and fuel a broader political imagination’ (2016: 7, also 58). In a recent report by Culture Action Europe and the Budapest Observatory, democracy and political/civic engagement is described as one of four areas where cultural activity has reportedly had proven impact (2018). They write that culture is ‘inherently involved in the promotion of European values and healthy, inclusive democracies’ (2014: 7).

- **Influence through soft power** (network spillover). This is a further area identified by Culture Action Europe and the Budapest Observatory in which cultural activity has reportedly had proven impact (2018). Although debate remains over the definition of soft power and the terms cultural diplomacy and cultural relations, culture as soft power has been recognised at European policy levels and in the literature. Sacco et al. write that the connection between soft power and cultural and creative
production (and participation) is so strong and direct that it does not need extensive justification (2017: 16). Nonetheless, the challenge of measuring soft power influence remains and McPherson et al. note that increasing interest in an evidence base. A report by the University of Edinburgh arts out proxies by which to measure ‘political, economic, and cultural outcomes’, and after extensive statistical modelling, they found that ‘soft power assets or influences matter in statistically significant ways for attracting international students, tourists, foreign direct investment, and for a country’s political attractiveness around the world’ (2017: 35). Bazalgette writes that the ‘cultural and creative sectors are the engine of the UK’s international image and soft power’ (2017: 4), adding that soft power is an ‘untangible benefit’ (2017: 12). Crossick and Kaszynska (2016: 55) describe various sources that describe the challenge of measuring the impact of culture on soft power but the continued and growing belief in the importance of cultural relations.

- Environmental awareness and pre-environmental behaviour, sustainable growth (knowledge or industry-spillover). Sacco et al. (2017) note that cultural participation can foster ‘social mobilization and awareness about the social consequences of individual behaviours related to environmentally critical resources’ (2017: 14). Duxbury et al. (2016) contextualize the powerful role of culture in sustainable urban development, including the power of ‘local [traditional community knowledge for contextualized resilience’ in face of climate change (2016: 32). In Bucci et al. (2014), culture is positioned as a growth engine without detrimental environmental effects but with significant spillover to society and the economy. In a short conference report by the World Cities Forum (2016), they note the increasingly important role of culture in city policy and planning, recognizing that there are multiple benefits for the artist and for the government, including cohesion and environmental awareness and related positive environmental behaviours.

- Culture as sustainable international development tool or a method for inclusive growth (network or industry-spillover). The authors of a UNESCO report write that evidence has been collected that can both show the positive contribution of culture to sustainable development and the negative impact of development that is not sustainable on culture (2014: iv). They write that culture should be protected due to the value it has for improving “people’s well-being and quality of life as a core dimension of sustainable development” (2014: iv, italic by the author). UNESCO’s Culture for Development Indicators project reflects the institution’s desire to “broaden the debate about sustainable development and to document culture’s contribution to providing core economic and non-economic benefits” (UNESCO, 2015: 5). In developing case studies about the value of public libraries to place-shaping, Shared Intelligence concludes that public libraries are a tool for inclusive growth (2017: 5).

negative spillover

‘Over the centuries people have believed that the arts have profound effects, both positive and negative’. Broadwood (2012)

While many reports discuss the limitations or lack of evidence to substantiate the positive claims for the arts, culture and creative industries, many fewer discuss negative effects (found across policy fields, Levitt, 2013). That said, although some reports begin with the assumption that arts and cultural activity are positive (e.g. Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation, 2017: 11), more negative spillovers emerged in the course of this review than in the preliminary review.

In a guide to managing and increasing the social impact of arts projects, the authors write that “art projects’ outcomes are often unpredictable, and art does not lead automatically to good results (MAPSI, 2016: 11). This may suggest that cultural and creative industries research is becoming more self-critical accompanied by a stronger awareness that cultural and creative investment is not always positive (Garcia et al., 2018) and that the strength of impact generated may be limited (e.g. People United, 2017: 28; Gielen et al., 2015). In one report, the lack of research into the negative effects of arts and cultural activity was explicitly questioned (Gielen et al., 2015: 63). One interviewee referenced in the evaluation of Cultural Destinations challenged the assumption that the arts ‘will deliver wonderful things’ (The Tourism Company and SQW, 2017: 44-49).

In this context, the following negative spillovers were of note:

- The precarity of a career in the arts, culture and creative industries, in this case music, can have negative implications for mental health and well-being (Groos and Mangrave, 2017: 33). As precarity can be said to be a working condition for many creative professions, this has significant implications.

- The arts, culture and creative industries can have negative implications for the environment. ‘The environmental impacts of activity may be negative, particularly in the context of an event or festival which draws a significant number of people to an area, although travel impacts could be mitigated by encouraging or facilitating use of public transport’ (Ecorys, 2014: 2).

- Investment in the arts, culture and creative industries often leads to clustering which can worsen rather than improve regional imbalances (Garcia et al., 2018).

- New digital dissemination and consumption mechanisms spurred by the creative industries have resulted in a loss of value throughout the creative supply chain. ‘value transfers along the chain of the creative economy are reshaping long established business relations: today, internet players and technical intermediaries are taking more and more value at the expense of content creators’, and predominantly from the SMEs who make up the majority of the workforce (Ernst and Young, 2014: 24).

- Regeneration is usually accompanied by the exclusion of pre-existing communities. ‘regeneration of places is usually accompanied by gentrification, the rise of the ‘experience economy’, and the disruption and exclusion of communities as those who live there and produce there are forced out by rising property prices’ (Crossick and Kaszynska, 2016: 8).

- Culture can be a source of conflict, playing a part in initiating and perpetuating antagonisms (Crossick and Kaszynska, 2016: 70).
Artists can be ‘perpetrators of ‘place taking’ and ‘artwashing,’ especially in communities of colour in majority-white countries (World Cities Culture Forum, 2016: 4).

The agglomeration of digital platforms makes it hard to find and access Europe’s rich, diverse, digital cultural output: ‘online markets are becoming increasingly concentrated, at the potential expense of creators and traditional intermediaries’ (Vlassis, 2018: 426).

Many of these are part of a dichotomy. The arts, culture and creative industries have negative implications for the environment and are at the same time suggested to be leaders in bringing environmental issues to the forefront of civil society and doing their bit to reduce their environmental impact. Culture can be both a source of conflict and a tool for cohesion. Cultural programmes responding to themes of cultural cohesion have proliferated, even when culture has the potential to replicate inequality (O’Brien and Oakley, 2015). Being a musician can lead to negative mental health, yet also to increased attainment in children.

In a similar vein, ERS Research and Consultancy review evidence that shows that greater levels of participation in cultural activity are not always linked to increased positive effects and that active participation is not always more beneficial than consumption (2017: 34-35). Importantly, Lazaro questions how we can encourage the generation of spillover/crossover effects while ensuring that these are positive (2016). These nuances are important to keep in mind, particularly when determining policy interventions.

The lack of an agreed definition weakens the potential of the arts, culture and creative industries

In KEA’s 2015 feasibility study on data collection and analysis in the arts, culture and creative industries, the authors acknowledge over 20 years’ worth of activity to improve mapping. They write that despite these efforts, ‘the economic and social value of the cultural and creative industries remains largely underestimated due to the sectors’ specificity’ (KEA, 2015: 5). This has significant implications for an understanding of the value of the sector:

Bakhshi and Cunningham write that a reclassification of culture as separate from the creative industries is a necessary precondition to allow better measurement of both sectors, and to fully understand the extent of cultural activity which to-date remains poorly understood (2016). The report suggests that reclassification could help policymakers understand the ‘widening range of further entanglements based on the undeniable role that culture plays in social inclusion, technological diffusion, and even health (whether the impacts are positive or negative)’ (Bakhshi and Cunningham, 2016: 7). They write that the ‘inadequate attention’ paid to the ‘cultural reasons for promoting the cultural wellbeing of the nation’ might be better addressed, leading to better policy conditions for which an understanding of cultural value is ‘unencumbered by an untoward economism’ (2016: 6).

However, methodologies and data sources present a challenge. Last suggests that in Scotland, a distinction is made in policy terms ‘not to treat the arts as a subset of the creative industries, but rather to recognise their distinct importance’, but the approach is nonetheless likely to be inaccurate due to data limitations (Last, 2016: 12). In a Welsh context, the challenge remains that ‘the Arts footprint is not neatly delineated in official statistical classifications and that there are crossovers in terms of creative and cultural industries’ (ERS Research and Consultancy, 2017: 41). The authors of KEA’s feasibility study write that it is ‘notoriously difficult to measure the value of the output of non-industrial sectors such as museums, galleries and libraries but also performing arts’ (KEA, 2015: 7), even if they can be easily identified (Ehler and Morgano, 2016). SDG Economic Development (2017) write that one of the three ‘definitional and methodological issues to consider when studying the relationship between arts and culture and the creative industries’ is the varied understanding of the concepts of the creative industries, economy and occupations (2017: 10).

A reclassification of the arts and cultural sector separately to the creative industries could allow for more nuanced valuation

 KEA (2015: 6)

the European Union still has an incomplete and narrow picture of its creative capacity and the contribution of its cultural and creative sectors to its economic and social achievement. As a result, citizens and their political representatives often take the view that investment in culture is not a priority and have difficulties in linking culture and innovation.  KEA (2015: 6)

definition of the arts, culture and creative industries

It is important to reflect on the often referenced argument that any understanding of value of the arts, culture and creative industries is impeded by the lack of agreement about what constitutes those industries and restricted by available data sources. This section considers what the evidence library adds to the debate, especially in reference to understanding spillovers and the value of the arts, culture and creative industries. It is divided into two strands. Firstly, that the arts and culture industries should be measured (and thus better provided for in policy terms) separately to the creative industries. The second is that the arts, culture and creative industries are measured in various ways in different reports and in different contexts, removing the opportunity to compare and understand value at a pan-national or pan-European level. This weakens the overall potential of the arts, culture and creative industries.
In Stano et al. (2015), it is written that the lack of a clear definition of the arts, culture and creative industries is one of five factors that hinder the development of appropriate indices or a ‘proper way to monitor the cultural and creative activities in the cities’ (2015: 10).

Ehler and Morgano write that we lack awareness of the ‘real economic potential’ of the arts, culture and creative industries because we ‘are missing a clear definition of what “cultural and creative industries” are’ (2016, no page numbers). They call for the adoption of a ‘comprehensive’ and ‘enlarged’ definition of the creative industries (Ehler and Morgano, 2016), but write that ‘any innovative activity could bear a creative character and rely on creative input’ and thus be part of this understanding (Ehler and Morgano, 2016). This statement shows that any definition of the creative industries could easily incorporate an understanding of what has been conceptualised as the wider creative economy (see Bakhshi, Hargreaves and Mateos-Garcia, 2013).

Bakhshi and Cunningham commend steps taken to measure ‘cultural GVA’, ‘cultural employment’ and ‘cultural exports’ statistics in the UK, stating that this is the result of statistical harmonisation initiated by Eurostat (2016: 9). Nonetheless, the continued debate on what constitutes the arts, culture and creative industries is a challenge for understanding and measuring spillover and has implications at national and international levels.

**The relationship between arts and culture and the creative industries**

There are two key conceptual challenges to understanding the links between the arts and culture industries and the creative industries. Firstly, the challenge of measuring the arts and cultural sector as separate from the creative industries. Secondly, the arts and culture sectors are often conflated with the publicly funded sector, and likewise, the creative industries with commercial funding (if less so than the former).

In addition to definitions of the arts, culture and creative industries, spillover effects are one of the ‘definitional and methodological issues to consider when studying the relationship between arts and culture and the creative industries’ (SDG Economic Development, 2017: 10). There is an inevitable challenge in measuring ‘direct interactions between those operating in the two sectors’ (2017: 10). The report acknowledges the challenges of understanding the interactions between the arts and culture industries and the creative industries, noting the difficulty of ‘untangling the different categories of activity once research delves into the individual business or the individual artist - the statistical categories and definitions of sectors and roles often melt into air’ (2017: 32).

In a report for Nesta and the Arts Council of Wales, ERS Research and Consultancy (2017) state that the ‘reliable measurement of productivity gains or synergies with creative industries has not been conclusively demonstrated’ (ERS Research and Consultancy, 2017: 44). This is nonetheless an area of importance. Crossick and Kaszynska suggest that although economic measurement has proliferated, the quality and insight of such reports is still to be questioned. They call for more attention to be given to the ways in which arts and culture feeds into the creative industries (Crossick and Kaszynska, 2016: 8).

**The value of public funding and the responsibilities of the funder**

To summarise, understanding the links between the arts and culture industries and the creative industries is impeded by poor definitions and the challenge of measurement, the challenge of the multi-level linkages and a lack of research into how these links could be better understood.

The brief shared a research question with the preliminary review: ‘to evaluate the relationship of public funding in the spillover context’ (TFCC, 2015: 10). The next section considers the calls in the evidence library and wider literature for the valorisation of informal cultural participation in addition to formal and traditionally supported activity in the arts, culture and creative industries and the challenge of attributing change to public funding investment.

**Informal cultural participation and public funding**

In a report by King’s College London, it is suggested that informal culture is undervalued and unrecognised at a policy level (2017: 4). A number of reports in the evidence library take the perspective that an understanding of cultural value is dependent on the inclusion of informal participation (e.g. Bakhshi and Cunningham, 2016; Crossick and Kaszynska, 2016; King’s College London, 2016; Gielen et al., 2016: 44; Schrijvers et al., 2015: 22). This relates to a value hierarchy in which formal cultural participation is seen as most important, but which has significant implications in terms of diversity of access and perpetuating inequality (O’Brien and Oakley, 2015) and which is replicated in commissioned research (Oman and Taylor, 2018).

Some authors present the macro value of activity in the arts, culture and creative industries - that which has broader effects beyond individual participation. The writers of imec-SMIT: VUB et al. argue that activities in arts and culture should be considered ‘merit goods’ or ‘public goods’ because they do not only benefit those who see and pay for them but also for society in general (2017: 61). Nonetheless, relying on such a perspective can have negative implications for conversations about equitable distribution of funding and the increased focus on understanding the value of individual participation in the arts.

**The challenge of differentiating publicly funded arts and culture from the commercial sector**

The diversification of income and investment sources makes it challenging to identify changes that result from public funding (see European Research Partnership on Cultural and Creative Spillovers, 2017: 25). Shishkova, when creating a review into social impact studies, noted that there was ‘no evidence found for entirely private (without any public funding) organisations that have carried out any documented evaluation of their impact’ (2015: 4). Similarly, Anheier et al. note that ‘the link between direct or indirect funding for culture and cultural participation is unlikely to be direct...[because] many other factors mediate the relationship between investments in culture and the objective of high levels of participation’ (2016: 26), such as policy intention.
Furthermore, Crossick and Kaszynska write that it is ‘an error to see publicly-funded and commercial arts and culture as separate worlds, one dependent on the taxpayer and the other on the market. They operate as part of a complex ecology of talent, finance, content and ideas’ (2016: 8). This is supported by a report from King’s College London in which it is written that everyday cultural creation and participation ‘is inextricably linked with publicly-funded and profit-making culture’ (2017: 53). Writing about Crossick and Kaszynska’s report, the authors of CASE write that ‘[en]forcing the divide between the type of ‘supply’ (publicly-funded, private/commercial, voluntary/amateur, etc.) is less useful in determining how and what values are derived from cultural engagement’ (Trends Business Research Ltd et al., 2016).

Value between the arts and cultural sectors, and in contexts related to public funding, is referenced elsewhere, for example: ‘The non-profit cultural sector contributes research and development for commercial cultural providers, while public funding enables them to take risks with creative content and ideas’ (Crossick and Kaszynska, 2016: 8). For example, Arts Council England’s report attempts to map how arts and culture - but not just publicly funded arts and culture - ‘supports the functioning and growth of the creative industries’ (SDG Economic Development, 2017: 6).

Public funding in the arts and culture can help to nurture ideas that are of value to the creative industries and support the development of individuals who move into the creative industries to work full-time or to work with the creative industries as suppliers of services or ideas (SDG Economic Development, 2017: 12). The report acknowledges the challenges of understanding the different categories of activity once research delves into the individual business or the individual artist - the statistical categories and definitions of sectors and roles often melt into air’ (SDG Economic Development, 2017: 32).

Frontier Economics (2015) present an analysis of the BBC’s contribution to the creative industries, framed through the return on investment of the publicly funded licence fee to the creative industries (2015: 1). The key contributions the BBC makes to the UK creative industries are seen as support for British musical talent and investments in innovative digital content consumption technologies (2015: 1). One news report suggests, in a similar vein, that Swedish musical talent (and its dominance in the global pop music industry) has been supported by the state provision of music education for pupils, inside and outside of school, and of an infrastructure to support music making for adults (O’Rane, 2018).

Ernst and Young suggest that public investment in the creative industries has sustained the sector via a ‘modest...pump-priming effect’ in the midst of economic turmoil (Ernst and Young, 2014: 25). They state that this has leveraged ‘private investment or support’ (without reference to specific evidence) (Ernst and Young, 2014: 25).

In some cases across Europe, there is a policy-level appreciation of the potential value of spillovers/crossovers of the arts, culture and creative industries. In a Dutch context, ‘creative solutions’ are acknowledged for their value in tackling ‘public issues while generating economic returns’ (Ministry of Education, Culture and Science, Ministry of Economic Affairs, 2014: 12). It is written that ‘The Netherlands’ creative power lies not only within the domain of the creative industries, but in particular in crossovers to other domains, where applied creativity generates value’ (Ministry of Education, Culture and Science, Ministry of Economic Affairs, 2014: 13). In a Welsh context, the sector is reliant on public funding, but generates spillovers and multiplier effects to the wider economy through ‘potential gains to productivity, innovation and the visitor economy’ (ERS Research and Consultancy, 2017: 40).

Creating value in non-cultural and creative sectors

There are significant research challenges in terms of demonstrating causality between publicly funded arts activities and the broader economic (or economically quantified) impact that we may intuitively believe exists (ERS Research and Consultancy, 2017: 44). ERS Research and Consultancy write that the ‘suggestion for synergies with the creative sector are that there are spillovers, helping to drive practice in the creative sector through arts-inspired innovation. The influences of the arts here can be clearly attributed, but less easily measured’ (2017: 44). CERR, in their report for Arts Council England, similarly write that the challenges of measuring spillovers have not changed since their 2013 report (CERR, 2017: 9).

Thus, evidence remains a challenge (Grotenhuis, 2017). We lack ‘robust methodologies for demonstrating the value of the arts and culture, and...[need to show] exactly how public funding of them contributes to wider social and economic goals’ (Crossick and Kaszynska, 2016: 4), with the idea that clarity can bring about more effective support (2016: 5).

In a report for the Council of Europe on the Indicator Framework on Culture and Democracy (IFCD), the authors write that there is positive evidence between public funding of culture and cultural education and cultural participation (Anheier et al., 2016: 26). Various other positive effects are identified. Caveats exist, however, and future research to demonstrate causality in these and other linkages would benefit from longitudinal and more comparative data, and from ‘qualitative research at the national and sub-national level’ (Anheier et al., 2016: 29).

From Borin we learn that the leverage of private investment from public funding is not necessarily guaranteed, as she presents recommendations on how public funders must improve the image of public investment to remove the commercial sector perceptions of ‘inefficiency and ineffectiveness’ (Borin, 2015: 36). Elder and Morgano write of the need for ‘the positive effects of public investment...[to be] understood more clearly [...] to provide the levels of analysis required to attract more private investment’ (Elder and Morgano, 2016).

Schippers et al. (2015) argue strongly that ‘the publicly-funded culture sector should not be at the service of other fields of policy: it should be assessed on its own merits’ (2015: 10). They offer a conclusion that ‘we must lower our expectations of what culture and cultural policy are capable of achieving. Policymakers should concentrate more on the unique properties of culture and improve the culture sector’s ability to face new and existing challenges’ (2013: 13). The authors note
that the continued, somewhat paternalistic ‘civilisation’ perspective of the arts being good for you (or your social position and opportunities) has evolved into a desire to quantify the ‘assumed positive effects of cultural participation’ on people and society as a means of legitimising cultural policy and cultural spend (Schrövers et al., 2015: 1), even when the evidence remains elusive (2015: 21).

In a report for Nesta and the Arts Council of Wales, it was recommended that public funders should be willing to ‘support what works, seeking to use methods that make clear links between inputs and outputs, in short demonstrating replicability when others take up these new ideas’ (ERS Research and Consultancy, 2017: 8).

**Summary**

The varied arguments presented above show that the need to be accountable for public investment continues to be a major driver behind evaluation in the arts, culture and creative industries.

Multiple sources note the challenge of evidencing positive effects as the result of public investment. Others continue to question the assumed role of public funding as leverage for private investment and the requirement for evaluation to demonstrate non-cultural value from public funding of culture. These debates add perspective to a much fuller picture of the ecology of the arts, culture and creative industries, but do not prove a positive spillover-generating role for public funding within it.

**spillover, the individual perspective and everyday participation**

In the final report of the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC) Cultural Value Project, the authors ground an understanding of value from the perspective (primarily) of individual experience of the arts and culture. Such a perspective takes in participation in funded and commercial cultural activity and also informal, amateur, participatory practices, noting that it is here ‘where most people find their cultural engagement’ (Crossick and Kaszynska, 2016: 7). What emerges is the ‘imperative to reposition first-hand, individual experience of arts and culture at the heart of enquiry into cultural value’ (Crossick and Kaszynska, 2016: 7; also Holst, 2017: 4).

Drawing on the findings of the Cultural Value Project, Gordon-Nesbitt writes that to ‘unravel the association between arts engagement and health, much greater attention needs to be paid to the particular experience of engaging with art, film, music and theatre’ (Gordon-Nesbitt, 2018: 316). This has implications for measurement: ‘the individual, qualitative experience of arts engagement is taken to be paramount in manifesting health effects [that] may ultimately serve to focus attention away from quantitative measurements of cultural value’ (2018: 317).

King’s College London (2017) sets out a framework for a new understanding of the formal and informal cultural ecology, with a focus on the generation of ‘cultural capability’, understood as opportunities to be creative throughout an individual’s life (cultural democracy) (2017: 3). The authors suggest that a move towards cultural democracy in everyday life is predicated on a focus on what individuals actually do in their everyday lives (outside of publicly funded culture) (2017: 5). This creates both the potential for exponential returns on investment (2017: 8) and a need for new methodological approaches (2017: 9). Sacco et al. argue that active individual participation is key to the generation of strong positive spillover effects (2017: 12). In this context, they argue for a focus on how cultural access changes behaviour, rather than a focus on economic outcomes (Sacco et al., 2017: 10).

The complexity should not be underestimated (Sokka et al., 2017: 43; SDG Economic Development, 2017: 32). This has methodological implications. Awarding importance to the individual perspective lends weight to qualitative methodological approaches and to outcomes that can be classified as knowledge spillovers - which were identified as an area of strength in the preliminary review (TFCC, 2015). Lazzaro (2016), however, outlines that knowledge crossovers (new ideas and processes) are the most challenging to capture.

A focus on the individual perspective might fit within a spillover framework (it currently does not according to the authors of one of the case studies commissioned by the Research Partnership, Sokka et al., 2017: 33), but consideration must be given to how to incorporate and give equal weight to industry and network spillover, which Lazzaro suggests are more relevant to the creative economy field than knowledge crossovers (2016).
The research could still use an upgrade in many areas. But what we know so far should cheer any arts advocates (Tsegaye et al. 2016).

The challenge of measuring the value of arts and culture pervades in both discussions about econometric and quantitative (e.g. Oman and Taylor, 2018) and qualitative methodological approaches. Crossick and Kaszynska argue that many research methods ‘especially but not only in... qualitative methods’ do not ‘meet the necessary standards of rigour in specification and research design’ (2016: 9). The object of measurement, spillover, adds to this challenge.

Spillovers are described variously as being ‘indirectly measured’ (2015: 26) and ‘impossible to quantify’ (Frontier Economics, 2015: 44). Four years after their initial review, CEBR presented a revised economic assessment that did not include a refreshed evaluation of spillovers, noting the continued methodological challenges (2017: 9). This indicates a lack of progress regarding methodologies in this research area. Vickery, writing as the preliminary review was published, wrote that instead of giving up, we should address the methodological limitations of this area of research (2015).

The evidence library - an overview

The items in the evidence library were categorised according to the type of methodology presented. The largest group (n=25), were those reports that did not present any type of scientific methodology (e.g. advocacy documents, policy guidance, conference reports, feasibility studies, toolkits). Qualitative methodologies were the second most represented (n=18). This was followed by evidence reviews (n=11), primarily quantitative methodologies (n=10) and mixed-methods (n=9).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodological approach</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No scientific method used</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence review</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-methods</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is challenging to compare this to the preliminary review because different classifications were used (see TFCC, 2015: 22). For example, above, qualitative classification includes surveys, interviews, etc, whereas in 2015 these were separated. Similarly, the classification above considers non research based reports (e.g. policy reports) as ‘No scientific method used’, and this forms the largest category. TFCC’s classifications showed that the majority of reports (n=44) used mixed-methods, but this also included reports that may have been considered ‘No scientific method used’ in this context.

In the 2018 evidence library, 22 items referred to spillover directly. Noting the limitations of the evidence library approach, it is interesting that of the reports using primarily quantitative methodologies (n=10), half refer to spillovers and half do not (n=5 for both). This is not surprising considering the economic origins of the term. Similarly, for mixed-methodological approaches (n=9), just under half refer to spillovers (n=4).

Progression of qualitative and mixed-methods approaches

There is evidence of a positive change in the increasing use of qualitative and mixed-methods approaches. Furthering the recommendations presented in the preliminary evidence review, Crossick and Kaszynska state that qualitative and quantitative methods can be ‘fruitfully combined’ (2016: 9). Reports like that of the Goethe Institut note the increase in research quality from mixed-methods approaches (2016: 9).

Holst notes that in the Danish and Nordic context, quantitative-only evidence frameworks and an accompanying favouritism or ‘evidence hierarchy’ are being replaced by a ‘combined qualitative and quantitative paradigm combining research approaches’ (2017: 4). In a review of performing arts impact evidence, Shishkova writes that that quantitative/economic research dominates despite ‘numerous assertions for a shift from estimating economic impact towards assessment of the social value of culture and the arts’ (2015: 5). She suggests that there is an increased use of mixed-methods approaches, and for more research to be ‘confident enough to put the stress on the intrinsic’ (i.e. non-economic impacts measured qualitatively) (2015: 5).

Qualitative methods used by BOP Consulting on a programme for young people with additional challenges or barriers to access do not attempt ‘to prove that specific approaches will definitely lead to specific outcomes’ (2017: 2) but rather show the complexity of experiences encountered, putting value on collecting and learning from participant experiences in-depth (BOP Consulting, 2017). The collection of intrinsic impacts is harder to measure than short-term quantifiable outcomes (BOP Consulting, 2017: 7). Their report on ‘how the ‘journey’ to extended skills and capacities begins through the aesthetic experiences of participations’ (2017: 9) goes some way towards illuminating the gap in our understanding of how participation transforms into impact (ERS Research and Consultancy, 2017: 7) and makes us consider the role of quality of experience in the generation of positive spillover effects.
qualitative approaches give necessary perspective to quantitative findings

The value of qualitative research in providing crucial and valuable perspectives to quantitative data is noted in many reports. The All-Party Parliamentary Group on Arts, Health and Wellbeing recommends that qualitative data approaches are made more robust by rigorous sampling of individual testimonies, which in themselves could be further strengthened by observation and tools such as reflective diary writing (2017: 36) and a non-biased array of case studies (2017: 37). The authors of CEHR (2017a) note that a qualitative research approach (surveys/interviews) was instrumental in creating an understanding of the spillover effects of bookselling (2017a: 12). Similarly, a 2016 Culture, Heritage and Sport Evidence (CASE) review calls for qualitative evidence to substantiate and give further insight into the economic findings presented in their report to investigate the nuances that influence the strength of outcomes (Trends Business Research Ltd et al., 2016: 4).

In a report on the Indicator Framework on Culture and Democracy (IFCD), Anheier et al. write that ‘if one assumes that cultural participation contributes to the development of inclusive societies, then strengthening the cultural industries would make sense’ (2016: 24). However, to better demonstrate the direction of correlation, future research would benefit from longitudinal and more comparative data, and from ‘qualitative research at the national and sub-national level... to unpack and more closely examine the circumstances behind the relationships’ (2016: 29).

Ernst and Young themselves take a mixed-methods approach when measuring cultural and creative markets in the EU; interviews help them account for missing quantitative data (2014: 10). In a report on cultural relations, McPherson et al. write that existing metrics fail to give the necessary perspective on soft power outcomes, requiring qualitative approaches (2017: 17; see also Doeer and Nesbitt, 2017). Tanner writes that existing measurements (e.g. page visits) are not meaningful or indicative in understanding impact (Selwood, 2010 in Tanner, 2012: 23), later presenting a mixed-methods evaluation approach (2012: 24).

progression of more robust, causal approaches

Attributing causality is not straightforward. This is the case irrespective of the specific field or sector, or whether the evidence is quantitative, from, say, large statistical data sets, or qualitative, from, say, service users’ views. Attributing causality is so tempting, and leads some people to claim stronger links than are actually in place, especially where the causality seems, to them, so plausible. Levitt (2013)

Gaps in causality are frequently referenced in the evidence library, for example, between increased exports and soft power outcomes (McPherson et al., 2017: 9; see also Doeer and Nesbitt, 2017) and between cultural investment and tourism increases (The Tourism Company et al., 2017: 48). Schrijvers et al. (2013) write that ‘there is no convincing evidence of the positive impact of cultural participation, in part because sound methodologies for measuring that impact have yet to be developed’ (2015: 25). Olsberg SPI and Nordicity (2017) agree, acknowledging the significance of spillovers to an understanding of the total value of the screen sector, but note that this understanding is limited by the lack of robust methodological approaches.

proxy approach and experimental approaches

Soft Power Today (University of Edinburgh, 2017) tries to find causal links and to set a framework for the tangible measurement of how attraction (introduced as the core component of soft power, 2017: 7) results in influence. Setting out proxies by which they measured ‘political, economic, and cultural outcomes’ and after extensive statistical modelling, they find that ‘soft power assets or influences matter in statistically significant ways for attracting international students, tourists, foreign direct investment, and for a country’s political attractiveness around the world’ (2017: 35). They also used existing research techniques and data sources, such as cultural media analytics, network analysis and data science (2017: 26–27). They suggest that the proxy approach is more effective (than a qualitative approach) as the concepts at hand ‘perceptions, understandings, or trust’, University of Edinburgh, 2017: 26) are challenging to define and easily misunderstood.

Glen et al. advocate a move from generalised research to experimental, project-specific measurement frameworks (2015: 6–5). We can see that this is already happening in some cases. People United (2017) benefit from a partnership with an academic partner to create a robust approach that meets the requirements of each project activity, using mixed methods in experimental approaches that include randomised control trials (RCTs) (2017: 12–34).

Croskiss and Kaszynska present recommendations that differ from TFCC by standing against the application of a ‘gold standard’ being given to research using experimental methods and/or randomised control trials, noting that context and research objectives are most important for designing research approaches (2016: 9). This is a view shared by the All-Party Parliamentary Group on Arts, Health and Wellbeing who write that ‘Medical research criteria - in which large-scale randomised controlled trials are the gold standard and qualitative assessments are often viewed sceptically [sic] - are unsuited to evaluation of the arts in health’ (2017: 5). It is clear that there are concerns and inconsistencies surrounding the generation of evidence in this field, and note a ‘recent shift away from RCTs... in favour of good observation data’ (2017: 35).
This is furthered by an evidence review by the North American think tank for arts and society, Createquity, in which the authors write that they ‘support methodological diversity, and are not dogmatic about valuing “gold standard” study designs such as randomized controlled trials at the expense of all other types of research’ (Tsegaye et al., 2016). Nonetheless, they note that studies with causal designs are more valuable than ‘descriptive and case-study based research’ due to their scarcity and the more challenging measurement approach (although guidance is now being published on RCT design that could be of use to the sector, see Edovald et al. (2016)). Because their research objective was linked to causality, it ‘is appropriate to privilege designs that make a convincing attempt to rule out alternative hypotheses for any observed effects’ (Tsegaye et al., 2016).

the macro vs the micro perspective

The majority of the evidence library suggests that the arts, culture and creative industries have value, for the sectors themselves and/or other sectors. Most evaluations focus on project-level activity, without evidence of how impacts can be scaled. Only a few reports look at a potential spillover effect in scale. These include two reports that investigate the causal relationship between cultural participation and well-being (Węcziak-Białowska and Białowsi, 2014; Węcziak-Białowska, 2016) and one that investigates associations between (broader) cultural participation and educational attainment in young people (ERSI, 2017) using national-level datasets.

Węcziak-Białowska writes that ‘reported evaluations of a causative influence of creative engagement with the arts or passive cultural participation on population health and well-being, are scarce’ (2014). Research approaches are criticized: research on the benefits of active/passive engagement with culture often fails to determine causality by not considering ‘unobserved individual level factors from cross-sectional analysis (often regression) or the phenomenon of reverse causality’ (Węcziak-Białowska, 2016) (a limitation noted, for example, by the authors of ERSI, 2017). This study using Swin data shows that although some positive correlation is found (‘a positive relationship between cultural participation or engagement with the arts’ and self-reported health and general life satisfaction), when methods of evaluation are applied the results ‘showed that long-term health and well-being outcomes were not significantly improved by indulgence in any particular cultural activity’ (Węcziak-Białowska, 2016).

Irrespective of type and nature of involvement, these findings do not discount the possibility that ‘frequent and various engagements with the arts in general may be of benefit to social participation and social inclusion’ (Węcziak-Białowska, 2016). However, the results ‘showed that long-term health and well-being did not improve significantly as a result of any specific activity in the cultural arena’ and this provides ‘little evidence to justify health promotion messages for involvement with the arts’ (Węcziak-Białowska, 2016).

The second study, this time in a Polish context, finds that there was a ‘positive association between cultural attendance and self-reported health’ which was found to be ‘very weak...[but] highly significant, owing to the very large sample size’ (Węcziak-Białowska and Białowsi, 2016). However, it disproves the ‘often suggested positive causative relationship’ because ‘no evidence was found to corroborate a positive impact from cultural attendance on physical health’ (2016). The authors conclude with a recommendation that policymakers should not consider ‘passive cultural participation as a measure of health promotion’ (2016).

In the third study, ERSI use Irish longitudinal data for two age cohorts to understand the impact of cultural participation linked to outcomes in ‘academic skills and socio-emotional wellbeing’ (2017: 9). They write that this helps mitigate the challenge of disentangling ‘the direction of causality when cultural activities and outcomes are measured at the same point in time’ (ERSI, 2017: 98). A longitudinal perspective provides an opportunity to ‘examine the effect of earlier participation on later outcomes’ (ERSI, 2017: 94). The research approach, however, can not provide evidence of causality (because it can not account for variables such as individual characteristics); the longitudinal approach only allows them to present evidence of association between cultural activity and positive and mixed outcomes (e.g. ERSI, 2017: 91). Despite the challenges presented in interpreting such data, and the potential that macro-level assessments of the effects of cultural activity are rarely positive or demonstrate causality, Crossick and Kasynska call for ‘long-term questions about arts and cultural engagement [and positive health outcomes] to be included in major UK cohort studies in the future and for these questions to be stable over time to enable longitudinal research’ (2016: 8).

quantity versus quality

Gielen et al. (2015) note in their review that evidence strengths are often linked to quantity, not quality. In an evidence review by the North American think tank Createquity, a grid is created that plots quantity (for example, do the majority of reports support the finding?) against quality (Tsegaye et al., 2016). To assess quality, the authors understand quality to be high when evidence consists of ‘multiple studies with causal designs (experimental or quasi-experimental); medium when it is ‘a single study with a causal design, or multiple studies that otherwise make a compelling case for causal interpretation in the judgment of our team’, and low when none of these conditions are met (Tsegaye et al., 2016).

In their review, See and Kokontaki (2016) focus only on quality, assessing their evidence library into three categories (2016: 7): firstly, areas of promise or potential; secondly, areas with inconclusive evidence; and finally, unpromising arts activity. They find that ‘at the moment there just isn’t enough robust evidence to be able to demonstrate a causal link between arts education and academic attainment’ (2016: 1). The rigour of their approach means that their findings are much more critical than those presented in Tsegaye et al. (2016) (or in other reviews like Culture Action Europe and Budapest Observatory, 2018). This is perhaps another finding that in many circumstances, quantity over quality of research pervades and is exacerbated by the sector’s inability to critically assess research approaches (e.g. Oman and Taylor, 2018).
progression of longitudinal measurement

We want to emphasize that durable effects can only be achieved through long-term participation in (organized) culture - even if short-term effects can sometimes be measured.

Gielen et al. (2015: 63)

The deployment of ethnological methods such as field observations and “thick description”, which ensure participatory evaluation with the involvement of all stakeholders, is also the subject of intensive discussion and further development, as is that of art-based evaluation methods.

Goethe Institute (2016: 7)

New ethnographic methods have significant potential in the field but that they must be accompanied by conversations about scientific validity (Goethe Institute, 2016: 7).

quantifying spillover in financial terms (e.g. sroi)

Where it is mentioned, the evidence library is mixed over the use of economic quantification of non-economic effects (like sector responses in general, see Oman and Taylor, 2018). Several reports question the approaches of economic valuation in the sector (Ricovy, 2014) and the robustness of economic evaluation are questioned in one instance - the evaluators of the Cultural Destinations programme caution against the strikingly high economic impact estimations provided by the individual projects involved (2017). Gielen et al. note the challenge of using non-cultural methodologies (including Social Return on Investment - SROI) in the cultural sphere (2016: 64). On the other hand, regarding health and well being, the All-Party Parliamentary Group on Arts, Health and Wellbeing (2017) state that this method provides weight to any evaluation of cultural intervention.

operationalising logic modelling to understand spillover

The European Venture Philanthropy Association (2013) presents a logic model approach to measuring impact using a mixed-methods evaluation approach. Like Tanner (2012), whose methods are also structured on a logic model, they do not address the challenge of measuring unintended or indirect impact. The Goethe Institute argue that evaluations should contain space for the measurement of unforeseeable impact, which is a fundamental component of project outcomes (2016: 9). This brings up a conceptual question about the utility and operationalisation of a logic model framework for measuring unintentional spillover effects.

Sokka et al. (2017), in writing their report for one of the case studies commissioned by the Partnership, suggest that a logic model approach “separated the goals, inputs, implementation and direct results of the cultural projects from the spillovers” (2017: 3). They make the differentiation from impact by saying that “spillovers can generate from the beginning of the individual projects without direct relation to the actual project goals” (2017: 24). In the project logic model, they appear to conceptualise spillovers within wider long-term impacts, “some of which can be regarded as spillovers” (2017: 23). Vickery (2017) challenges the focus on cause and effect as a linear construction for the arts, culture and creative industries, which are by their nature non-linear. The logic model exists to show linear causality between activity, outputs and outcomes: it may be most useful in delineating desired or potential project impact from spillover effects. Thus there remains the challenge of proving causality of spillover when it occur at different points of the logic chain.
Qualitative methodological approaches appear to be valued in their own right, and for their contribution to a more rounded and robust mixed-methods approach in which qualitative data can add the nuance and sometimes, the indications of causality, that quantitative data can lack. The benefits of quantitative methodological approaches include testing hypotheses or findings from a local or project scale on a national scale (e.g. well-being). Demonstrating outcomes and attributing causality to activity in the arts, culture and creative industries is challenging depending on the level at which you approach it. It is potentially easier using methods suitable for micro level project evaluation than at a national or international macro level, relying on large scale datasets. This national/macro perspective is necessary to challenge the ‘positive’ benefits mentality in the sector, as well as to drive further improvements on time-series data collection.

The case for longitudinal data collection continues to grow but is hindered by the short-term projectism of the sector. This challenges the attribution of causality between long-term goals and provides little robust evidence in other respects. Promises have potential but, in the case provided in the evidence library (University of Edinburgh, 2017), the findings are reductive of the complexity of the research area (soft power), potentially lacking insight that is gained from mixed-methods or qualitative approaches (e.g. McPherson et al., 2017). Similarly, and as suggested by TFCC (2015) economic evaluations (e.g. social return on investment) may provide interesting insights for the sector. They have a mixed reception but may be of interest if applied rigorously in specific contexts (e.g. health) to provide insight into cost savings. Such methodologies may be of interest to further the case for the cultural commissioning of health and well being projects.11

The lack of evidence of causality is noted extensively. This is accompanied in many cases by a call for the further use of experimental methods, including the use of RCTs. These rarely feature in the evidence library – People United (2017) is one case where RCTs are used as part of a mixed-methods approach. Other reports note the rarity of such methods in the sector (see and Kokotsaki, 2016; Tsegaye et al., 2016). This is nonetheless combined with a ‘backlash’ against RCTs as the gold approach. Other reports note the rarity of such methods in the sector (See and Kokotsaki, 2016; Vickery, 2017). An increased understanding of methods will support a better objective assessment of the reliability of findings (Oman and Taylor, 2018) and remove the potential for over-claiming.

The benefits of quantitative methodological approaches include testing hypotheses or findings from a local or project scale on a national scale (e.g. well-being). Demonstrating outcomes and attributing causality to activity in the arts, culture and creative industries is challenging depending on the level at which you approach it. It is potentially easier using methods suitable for micro level project evaluation than at a national or international macro level, relying on large scale datasets. This national/macro perspective is necessary to challenge the ‘positive’ benefits mentality in the sector, as well as to drive further improvements on time-series data collection.

The very identification of spillover is challenging. In the evidence library, and from the case studies commissioned by the Partnership, it appears that logic modelling has potential to be able to map spillovers as separate to project outcomes across the value and activity chain, but this needs to be further explored. Following on from the recommendation in the preliminary evidence review to explore action research, Sollka et al. write that this is also a useful tool for delineating potential spillover effects from broader project outcomes and impact (2017).

There is also no simple way to present methodologies to further progress the measurement of cultural and creative spillovers. Rather, there are some principles that could be borne in mind regarding the future measurement of spillover effects:

- The measurement of spillover will only be possible when it is easily understood by the sector and presented in a framework that accounts for temporal and contextual dynamics.
- There is no one-size-fits-all approach to spillover evaluation and methodological approaches should be designed to be appropriate to the activity. This includes having confidence in the rigorous application of qualitative methods.
- Professionals in the sector should be able to understand, and perhaps even apply, their own methodological approaches (Vickery, 2017). An increased understanding of methods will support a better objective assessment of the reliability of findings (Oman and Taylor, 2018) and remove the potential for over-claiming.
- Partnerships with universities can provide opportunities for rigorous and longitudinal mixed-methods approaches to evaluation.
- Pre-emptive mapping of spillover effects before project activity begins has value. In particular, this can isolate project activity goals from spillover. This also supports a longitudinal approach by building measurement in from the beginning of activity.
- Longitudinal approaches are necessary to show the duration and value of spillover impact over time.
In 2015, TFCC and the Research Partnership co-created the following definition of ‘spillover’, for the purposes of the review:

‘We understand a spillover(s) to be the process by which an activity in one area has a subsequent broader impact on places, society or the economy through the overflow of concepts, ideas, skills, knowledge and different types of capital. Spillovers can take place over varying time frames and can be intentional or unintentional, planned or unplanned, direct or indirect, negative as well as positive.’ TFCC (2015: 15)

The preliminary review explained that ‘spillover’ is ‘at times used interchangeably with terms such as cross-overs, value-added or subsumed within a wider set of outcomes, impacts or values’ (TFCC, 2015: 14). The holistic ground-up definition assisted in the generation of the first international evidence base on spillover effects. It should be noted that, like in this report, the evidence base was created because of the inclusiveness of this definition, not because each report actively sought to comment on or demonstrate spillover effects (see also TFCC, 2015: 23).

22 out of 73 reports in the evidence review use the term ‘spillover’,² but TFCC’s statement that there is ‘no consistently recognised definition of the term ‘spillover’ in the context of the arts, culture and the creative industries’ (TFCC, 2015: 14) remains true. The references to spillover in the evidence library include various presentations of TFCC’s definitions, new definitions and reiterations of alternative definitions, as well as various confusions with crossover, impact, effect, value and benefit. The lack of definition is the initial conceptual limitation of the term. This review provides an opportunity to assess the definition, informed by the evidence gathered and the three years that have passed, in order to provide better direction for research in this area. This review presents what others say spillover is and chips away at what it is not.

What is spillover?

The lack of a shared definition may have negative implications for spillover as a research focus (e.g. Crociata et al, no date). Similarly, the case studies commissioned by the Partnership show that in applied settings, the practical identification and measurement of spillover is challenged by the lack of definition (European Research Partnership on Cultural and Creative Spillovers, 2017: 24; Sokka et al., 2017: 43).

This section will attempt to further analyse the use and definitions of the term ‘spillover’ (and ‘crossover’, often used synonymously) in the material presented in the evidence library. Vickery presents the challenges of definition, writing that ‘the defined object of research (“creative and cultural spillover”) is an open question’ (Vickery, 2015). Sokka et al. write that the existing definition is ‘rather indefinite’ (2017: 41). Lazzaro (2016) states that there is no rigorous definition of spillover, and many publications in the evidence library do not clearly define their understanding of the term when using it.

Lazzaro defines spillovers as the ‘Unplanned or unintentional, positive/negative effects of actions with different purposes’ or externalities (2016, see 08:10). In The value and values of culture, the term ‘spillover’ is used interchangeably with ‘crossover’ but later linked to ‘transformative power’ (Culture Action Europe and Budapest Observatory, 2018: 36).

In a report by the Austrian Institute for SME Research and VVA Europe, the authors discuss the role of spillovers and crossovers in the same paragraph, without defining either (2016: 11). Later, they propose that spillover is representative of ‘cross-sectoral fertilisation’ (2016: 269) (also seen as ‘cross-sectoral innovation’ by imec-SMIT-VUB et al., 2017: 82). In a Goethe Institute report, a concept of ‘transfer’ is proposed that helps to conceptualise long-term impact ‘beyond the sphere of activity and into society’ (Goethe Institute, 2016: 13), which could be understood as spillover.

Ehler and Morgano (2016) write that the creative industries are recognised for their ‘ability to trigger noticeable positive effects in other industrial sectors, such as tourism, retail, and digital technologies’, which is understood as spillover (no page number). Lexi in Nemo (2016) suggests that spillovers are the result of museums’ ‘purposefully…striving to be present in sectors other than cultural heritage’ (Nemo, 2016: 19). This is similar to Petrova’s understanding, where she suggests that entrepreneurs create knowledge spillover in the inevitable reshaping of their knowledge and skills in order to be better suited to and relevant in other sectors (2016).

In an economic impact evidence review for the Department of Culture, Media and Sport, Ecorys (2014) present but do not clearly define ‘wider economic effects’- these can be considered as non-direct economic impact (part of the indirect value chain) or as spillover (outside of the value chain, e.g. livability of an area) (2014: 1). This is a similar situation for wider (non-economic) impacts (understood as spillover effects), such as media coverage leading e.g. to tourism, volunteering and environmental impact (2014: 2).

Where can spillovers be found?

In most cases, spillovers are suggested to be found primarily in other sectors (Grotenhuis, 2017; Austrian Institute for SME Research and VVA Europe, 2016; Trends Business Research Ltd et al., 2016; imec-SMIT-VUB et al., 2017; Ehler and Morgano, 2016). The Dutch Ministry of Education, Culture and Science and Ministry of Economic Affairs (2014) suggest that crossovers are found in ‘other domains’ (2014: 13). Similarly, Crociata et al. write that crossovers play a ‘bridging role’ in stimulating innovation from the creative industries in other sectors (2014). Bazalgette uses the term ‘enablers’ (2017: 12), and Ernst and Young describe them as ‘powerful catalysts of value’ for other vital industries (2014: 27).

Borin (2015) writes that (positive) spillovers can be found in ‘networks that cut across several domains (public, private and non-profit) and create cooperation between related fields such as

²This includes spellings like spill-over, spillover, etc. In 2015, 28 out of 73 reports.
[culture and] tourism, education and sustainability’ (2015: 31). Spillovers and cross-sectoral fertilisation can be observed along the entire value chain (Austrian Institute for SME Research and VVA Europe, 2016: 3), but not necessarily mapped sequentially (imec-SMIT-VUB et al., 2017: 66). Furthermore, Olsberg SPI and Nordicity (2015) identify spillover as ‘impacts beyond [the activity]... supply chain’ (2015: 13). This finding is shared by Sokka et al. (2017) when they write that spillover is discrete from impact because it can occur at any point of activity with no relation to the project goals (2017: 24).

Less attention is paid to the spillover effects of the arts, culture and creative industries on their own sector (except when the linkages between the arts and culture and the creative industries are explored). Bazalgette (2017) does not define spillover either, but it is understood that it can be found within the creative economy and in other sectors (e.g. 2017: 54, 66; also Varbanova, no date). Ernst and Young present a circular model of digital innovation, where activity in the creative industries spurs digital innovation in presentation, dissemination and consumption which in turns drives further innovation in creative content (Ernst and Young, 2014: 27).

In economic conceptualisations of spillovers, spillover is measured at a tertiary level. Consideration of spillover is often presented after direct impact, indirect impact and multipliers (e.g. Olsberg SPI and Nordicity, 2015; CEBR, 2017a). In a report by Frontier Economics on the contribution of the BBC to the UK’s creative industries, spillovers are presented after first and second round impacts (Frontier Economics, 2015: 26). In a report by Trends Business Research Ltd et al., spillover is considered after the delivery of direct and indirect impacts to be able to ‘enhance the cumulative and total impact’ resulting from investment in a culture, heritage and sport ecosystem (2016: 11).

Spillover is thus often seen as an indirect effect (Lazzaro, 2016; Ecorys, 2014), separate from direct economic effects. The authors of CEBR write that spillovers are ‘impacts [that] are not captured in standard measures of value like price, turnover or GDP’ (2017a: 12). Frontier Economics define spillovers as ‘benefits to other organisations such as increased productivity’ (2015: 6). In defining impact as ‘positive outcomes’, Trends Business Research Ltd et al. present spillover as separate from the ‘direct and indirect impacts’ of a culture, sports and heritage ecosystem (2016: 10). They write that spillovers can be generated ‘which further enhance the cumulative and total impact of those assets and investment’ (Trends Business Research Ltd et al., 2016: 11).

Spillovers can be economic and non-economic (e.g. Ecorys, 2014; Austrian Institute for SME Research and VVA Europe, 2016). Last argues that economic values are contingent on the creation of non-economic value (Last, 2016). When discussing spillover, Trends Business Research Ltd et al. most frequently refer to literature on economic or innovation spillover (2016: 61–62). This is not necessarily surprising considering the economic origins of the term (see e.g. Frontier Economics, 2007), but it could indicate that a broader understanding or use of non-economic spillovers is still not as accepted. This may have implications on the use and valuing of non-economic spillover in research and policy (see e.g. Sokka et al., 2017: 33).

Summary

Spillover can be generated by, within and outside of the arts, culture and creative industries. It can also act in a circular fashion, inspiring its own generation through innovation in other sectors. It can happen during any part of the activity, supply chain or value chain (separating it from impact).

It is considered to be found at a tertiary level after direct and indirect impact. To arrive at a full understanding of spillover, it is necessary to define it in opposition to crossover.

how is spillover different from crossover?

Spillover is not conceptually so different from crossover (HKU, 2016). One core element is often referred to in the literature about crossover that is referred to less consistently in that of spillover: intentionality. In the Netherlands, programmes (e.g. see Grotenhuis, 2017, various Crossover Works articles) have been set up to stimulate crossover between the creative industries and other industries. This suggests an intentionality behind the activity. Vickery presents crossover as direct and intentional (2015). Similarly, in the commissioned case studies, when applying the framework from the preliminary evidence review, a separation was made of spillover from project goals, understanding spillover to occur ‘when activities valorise other values than those that were initially intended’ (European Research Partnership on Cultural and Creative Spillovers, 2017: 21; also Sokka et al., 2017: 24). Spillovers may thus fit more naturally within project evaluations like that of People United, for example, who present the need for an evaluation approach that leaves room for ‘unpredictable outcomes’ (2017: 13).
Projects that operationalise crossover take a somewhat different perspective. Lazzaro regards crossover as a type of strategic design strategy, suggesting intentionality (Lazzaro, 2016; HKU University of the Arts, 2016). Crossovers are also understood both as a process and an outcome of activity, which spillover is not (Lazzaro, 2016). Varbanova (no date) suggests that crossovers are not the outcome but the initiating activity or process, from which we should ask if crossover as intentional collaboration is one of several preconditions of spillovers.

In Crociata et al. (no date), the authors argue ‘that crossovers are a crucial way through which culture and creativity can find a new role in European strategies by exploiting its yet untapped capacity to adaptively respond to broader societal and economic challenges’. This clearly confirms the intentionality behind the term, and the abstract suggests a push to move the debate beyond spillover to active crossover generation/capture (Crociata et al., no date).

Conclusions

This report will not set out a new or revised definition of spillover. However, based on the above, it is recommended that the Partnership continues to explore what is problematic with the existing definition of cultural creative spillover. Issues around intentionality and its separation from existing (and often more used) terminology may continue to hinder a debate on measurement, which is the real focus of the Research Partnership. The Framework presented in 2015 of three spillover categories and 17 sub-categories should be tested and improved. Future activity will benefit from collaboration with those working in the arts, culture and creative industries, while also including existing stakeholders the policy and research field.

Communication of value is a weakness in the sector (Levi in NEMO, 2016) - good news does not reach beyond sectoral boundaries. Levi writes that institutions may do more for other sectors, but this will not always be matched by funding from non-cultural budgets (in NEMO, 2016: 20). In UNESCO (2014) it is written that advocacy of cultural value should not come from only the cultural sector (2015: iii). Evidence is ‘momentarily’ impressive (Bocca et al., 2017: 28), and almost outweighed by the need for political will (All-Party Parliamentary Group on Arts, Health and Wellbeing, 2017: 49).

Culture as an intrinsic part of growth

Investment in the arts, culture and creative industries can be a driver and enabler for sustainable development (UNESCO, 2015), creating growth that is not (as) harmful to the environment (as other industrial sectors) by maximising the potential of human capital (Bocca et al., 2014). Many assert the intrinsic (and independent) value of culture and cultural outcomes as a precondition for the generation of other types of value (e.g. Trends Business Research Ltd et al., 2016; Culture Action Europe and Budapest Observatory, 2018: 2; also European Research Partnership on Cultural and Creative Spillovers, 2017: 10). Understanding how quality affects that interaction is particularly important (e.g. BOP Consulting, 2017).

Implications for diversity

Inequality of access to the arts, culture and creative industries is a necessary consideration when discussing outcomes like education and health benefits because of the imbalance in engagement across the (UK’s) social strata (Gordon-Nesbitt, 2018: 317). Anheier et al. write that the ‘strength of a country’s cultural industry is related not only to the level of cultural participation, but also even if less so – to the level of equality of access’ (2016: 28). Similarly, cultural diversity can be affected by fewer content platforms and funnelled access to limited content. Research, like that of ERSI (2017), needs to embrace intersectionality and go further to consider how outcomes for different social groups are or could be affected by trends in participation. This is a necessary and timely area of consideration for research into spillover effects.

1. Continue to explore definitional challenges
Debates on the very definition of the arts, culture and creative industries continue to dominate the European cultural and creative research sphere. We cannot measure the sector if we do not share an opinion about what it is. Likewise with spillover, this report shows that progress on the spillover debate has been hindered by definitional uncertainty but continued collaboration and discussion is recommended to explore what is problematic with the existing definition of cultural creative spillover.

2. Further test the spillover framework
The identified spillovers (from TFCC, 2015, and this review) should be tested for their relevance. The framework presented in 2015 by TFCC of 17 spillover sub-categories could be further developed to make it multi-dimensional and to capture the complexity of spillover effects (e.g. time, affected actor, negative spillover). The 17 spillover sub-categories and newly identified spillovers could also be mapped against alternative impact frameworks or indices with a view to investigating if this will provide additional perspective or further the measurement of spillover.

3. Collaborate and involve all actors in research
A debate on the full value of culture and creative spillover should support a continued discussion around the methodological means to capture spillovers. It should not, however, remain abstract from the processes and ‘the interconnected elements of the system that makes their emergence possible’ (European Research Partnership on Cultural and Creative Spillovers, 2017: 9). This is where collaboration with others actively researching this field is important. Partnerships between universities should be promoted. Furthermore, future research will benefit from collaboration with those working in the arts, culture and creative industries outwith the policy and research field.

4. Promote a holistic approach and the progression of robust qualitative methods
The evidence library shows that qualitative and mixed-methods approaches are increasingly valued because this adds nuance to economic understanding and provides insight into the dynamics of clustering. Nonetheless, the challenge remains of demonstrating the value of activity and investment in the arts, culture and creative industries. This is problematic when, according to general scientific principles, the evidence base is reportedly weak, and the debate is matched by those who argue that different research principles should be applied to the cultural and creative industries (e.g. those arguing against RCTs as a gold standard in the arts). The Research Partnership should continue to advance its goals for a holistic approach and for the progression of robust qualitative methods in the measurement of spillovers in the arts, culture and creative industries. This should help further the conversation about the core value of culture itself. The sector should be actively encouraged to contribute to conversations about the importance of culture to society (e.g. Schilijevs et al., 2015: 20).

5. Support risk and innovation at policy level
Policymaking and new research developments take time. Thus, ambitions to advocate for the further holistic measurement of spillover effects must be balanced with an understanding that further work is required to support this case. The call for “a policy-level appreciation that the types of spillover generated can not always be predetermined” (TFCC, 2015: 17) is still relevant. Policymakers and funders should be encouraged to find activity that is risky and that could have benefit in multiple unknown ways, including ways that are not critical to project success (also King’s College London, 2017; Gienel et al., 2015; Sokka et al., 2017).

Appendices

Appendix 1 - evidence library


BOP Consulting (2017) How do you draw a rainbow the wrong way? Creative Scotland. Available from: http://www.creativescotland.com/resources/professional-resources/research/creative-scotland-research/how-do-you-draw-a-rainbow-the-wrong-way?dm_1-0,0,0,0,0


appendix 3 – spillover mapping

knowledge spillover

*Knowledge spillovers refer to the new ideas, innovations and processes developed within arts organisations and by artists and creative businesses which spill over into the wider economy and society without directly rewarding those who created them* TFCC (2015: 26)

Stimulating creativity and encouraging potential

- Study of the House Art Scheme (Haastrup and Sørensen, 2017)
- Liverpool Biennial 2016 - evaluation (BOP Consulting, 2016)
- Changing the world through Arts and Kindness (People United, 2017)
- How do you draw a rainbow the wrong way? BOP Consulting (2017)
- Cultural Entrepreneurship in the context of spillovers within the cultural and creative industries - Petrova (2018)
- Bookselling Britain: The contributions to - and impacts on - the economy of the UK's bookselling sector (CEBR, 2017a)
- Arts and cultural participation among children and young people - Insights from the Growing Up in Ireland study (ESRI, 2016)
- A more integrated approach - game jams for crossover innovation (Crombie, Renger and Mersch, 2016)

Increasing visibility, tolerance and exchange between communities

- Arts & Kindness (Jo Bradwood, 2012)
- Changing the world through Arts and Kindness (People United, 2017)
- Cultural Entrepreneurship in the context of spillovers within the cultural and creative industries (Petrova, 2018)
Testing new forms of organisation and new management structures

- Evaluation of Cultural Destinations (The Tourism Company and SQW, 2017)
- Cultural Entrepreneurship in the context of spillovers within the cultural and creative industries (Petrova, 2018)

Facilitating knowledge exchange and culture-led innovation

- Evaluation of Cultural Destinations (The Tourism Company and SQW, 2017)
- Cultural Entrepreneurship in the context of spillovers within the cultural and creative industries (Petrova, 2018)
- A more integrated approach - game jams for crossover innovation (Crombie, Renger and Mersch, 2016)
- Creative Nation (Mateos-Garcia, J., Klinger, J. and Stathoulopoulos, K., 2018)

Changing attitudes in participation and openness to the arts

- Study of the House Art Scheme (Haatrup and Sørensen, 2017)
- Changing the world through Arts and Kindness (People United, 2017)
- Evaluation of Cultural Destinations (The Tourism Company and SQW, 2017)
- How do you draw a rainbow the wrong way? (BOP Consulting, 2017)
- Bookselling Britain: The contributions to - and impacts on - the economy of the UK's bookselling sector (CEBR, 2017a)
- Re-writing the story: The contribution of public libraries to place-shaping (Shared Intelligence, 2017)

Increase in employability and skills development in society

- Study of the House Art Scheme (Haatrup and Sørensen, 2017)
- How do you draw a rainbow the wrong way? (BOP Consulting, 2017)
- Cultural Entrepreneurship in the context of spillovers within the cultural and creative industries (Petrova, 2018)
- Arts and cultural participation among children and young people - Insights from the Growing Up in Ireland study (ESRI, 2016)
- A more integrated approach - game jams for crossover innovation (Crombie, Renger and Mersch, 2016)
- Re-writing the story: The contribution of public libraries to place-shaping (Shared Intelligence, 2017)

Strengthening cross-border and cross-sector collaborations

- Liverpool Biennial 2016 - evaluation (BOP Consulting, 2016)
- Evaluation of Cultural Destinations (The Tourism Company and SQW, 2017)
- A more integrated approach - game jams for crossover innovation (Crombie, Renger and Mersch, 2016)
- Creative Nation (Mateos-Garcia, J., Klinger, J. and Stathoulopoulos, K., 2018)
industry spillover

The vertical value chain and horizontal cross-sector benefits to the economy and society in terms of productivity and innovation that stem from the influence of a dynamic creative industry business, artists, arts organisations or artistic events. TFCC (2015: 32)

Improved business culture and boosting entrepreneurship

• A more integrated approach - game jams for crossover innovation (Crombie, Renger and Mersch, 2016)
• Cultural Entrepreneurship in the context of spillovers within the cultural and creative industries (Petrova, 2018)
• Creative Nation (Mateos-Garcia, J., Klinger, J. and Stathoulopoulos, K., 2018)

Impacts on residential and commercial property markets

• Bookselling Britain: The contributions to and impacts on the economy of the UK’s bookelling sector (CEBR, 2017a)

Stimulating private and foreign investment

• Economic Contribution of the UK’s Film, High-End TV, Video Game, and Animation Programming Sectors (Olsberg SPI and Nordicity, 2015)
• Bookselling Britain: The contributions to and impacts on the economy of the UK’s bookelling sector (CEBR, 2017a)
• Soft Power Today (University of Edinburgh, 2017)

Improving productivity, profitability and competitiveness

• Economic Contribution of the UK’s Film, High-End TV, Video Game, and Animation Programming Sectors (Olsberg SPI and Nordicity, 2015)
• Creative Nation (Mateos-Garcia, J., Klinger, J. and Stathoulopoulos, K., 2018)

Boosting innovation and digital technology

• A more integrated approach - game jams for crossover innovation (Crombie, Renger and Mersch, 2016)

network spillover

The impacts and outcomes to the economy and society that spill over from the presence of a high density of arts and/or creative industries in a specific location (such as a cluster or cultural quarter). TFCC (2015: 37)

Building social cohesion, community development and integration

• Changing the world through Arts and Kindness (People United, 2017)
• Cultural participation and inclusive societies - A thematic report based on the Indicator Framework on Culture and Democracy (IFCD) (Anheier et al., 2016)
• Cultural Entrepreneurship in the context of spillovers within the cultural and creative industries (Petrova, 2018)

Improving health and wellbeing

• Study of the House Art Scheme (Haastrup and Sorensen, 2017)
• Liverpool Biennial 2016 - evaluation (BOP Consulting, 2016)
• How do you draw a rainbow the wrong way? (BOP Consulting, 2017)
• Arts and cultural participation among children and young people - Insights from the Growing Up in Ireland study (ESRI, 2016)

Creating and attractive ecosystem and creative milieu, city branding and place making

• Economic Contribution of the UK’s Film, High-End TV, Video Game, and Animation Programming Sectors (Olsberg SPI and Nordicity, 2015)
• Bookselling Britain: The contributions to and impacts on the economy of the UK’s bookelling sector (CEBR, 2017a)
• Creative People and places - Year 3 Ecorys Report: Impact, Outcomes and the Future at the End of Year 3 (Ecorys, 2017)
• Evaluation of Cultural Destinations (The Tourism Company and SQW, 2017)
• Liverpool Biennial 2016 - evaluation (BOP Consulting, 2016)

Stimulating urban development, regeneration and infrastructure

• None mapped from the selection

Boosting economic impact from clusters and regions

• Liverpool Biennial 2016 - evaluation (BOP Consulting, 2016)
• Creative Nation (Mateos-Garcia, J., Klinger, J. and Stathoulopoulos, K., 2018)