

Published by the European Research Partnership on Cultural and Creative Spillovers in 2018

Executive Summary

cultural
and
creative
spillovers
in europe

a follow-up review

Nicole McNeilly



this report was commissioned
by the european research
partnership on cultural and
creative spillovers

about us

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 time¹. 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 has a subsequent broader 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 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.

partners

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 £860 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.



¹<http://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regdoc/rep/1/2012/EN/1-2012-537-EN-F1-1.Pdf>

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.



ALBA | CHRUTHACHAIL

The **European Centre for Creative Economy (ecce)** 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. ecce supports the creative economy and the development of creative locations and spaces in the region. A central part of the work of ecce is to organise debates on culture and the creative industries in the Ruhr region that are relevant across Europe. ecce 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 1954. 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 220 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.



research partners

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 (e)valuation 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 aims: it assesses 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 milieu 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 diffuse and more 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 phenomenon? 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 enterprise, 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.

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 cooperation. 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 innovations 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.

Within cultural production (and management 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 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 management 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 organisations, 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 Europe, we created the first International Evidence Library on cultural and creative spillover effects, comprising 98 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 analysis of the documents in the evidence library. The Partnership aspired 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 organisations, 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 recommendations 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 methodologies 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 discussions, 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, involving 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, 2015². An increasing need emerged, therefore, to articulate in detail cultural and creative spillovers as a research area as it has evolved since the 2015 report, with significant updates and contextual considerations.

² Council of the European Union Conclusions, 30 April 2015 (OR. en) 8346/15: Conclusions on cultural and creative cross-overs to stimulate innovation, economic sustainability and social inclusion

Three years since providing the preliminary evidence review (TFCC, 2015), the Partnership decided to commission this follow-up evidence research review, with the aim of tracking the extent to which research in the cultural and creative industries has progressed against the findings and recommendations in the 2015 report. It scrutinises and acts upon the following questions:

Does the definition of spillover as articulated in the 2015 report remain accurate in the context of current research?

Have the research focus and priorities remained strong?

Can we identify progress both in the development of more robust qualitative methods and empirical causal approaches?

Have new spillover methodologies or other methods pertinent to the research of spillover effects in CCIs emerged?

Are there any new or additional areas of research emerging that can be mapped against the original 17 spillover categories as identified in the 2015 report?

What additional perspectives or contextual changes might contribute or help advance research into spillovers?

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

This report has been commissioned by the European Research Partnership on Cultural and Creative Spillovers, a consortium of partners from 14 countries, composed of national cultural funding agencies, regional cultural development bodies, foundations, universities and organisations operating Europe-wide.

The first Preliminary evidence review on cultural and creative spillovers (TFCC, 2015). This set out a definition of spillover co-created with the Partnership and informed by evidence gathered by the partners and peers from across Europe, as follows:

‘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)

This follow-up review provides a snapshot of how the debate on spillover has progressed. It has the objective of responding to the core research desires of the Partnership and tracking the extent to which research in the arts, culture and creative industries has progressed against the findings and recommendations in the preliminary review.

This document is informed by an analysis of 73 reports providing a range of geographical perspectives. 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. The evidence library is available separately to this report.³

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.⁴ 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*).

³https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1-VKJE-DGss1TaUNyPrT-JZkoFHqKtNvItiA-Y_GNhkFY/edit?usp=sharing

⁴This was also noted in the case studies commissioned by the Partnership (*European Research Partnership on cultural and creative spillovers, 2017*), where knowledge and network spillovers were found most often.

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.

⁵ See for example, *Julie's Bicycle in England*
<https://www.juliesbicycle.com/resource-ace-report1617>

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 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.⁵ The following **negative spillovers** were noted:

- 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.
- The arts, culture and creative industries can have **negative implications for the environment** (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**, 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 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 project-ism 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.⁶

⁶ <https://knowhownonprofit.org/funding/commissioning/cultural-commissioning/evidencing-the-social-value-of-arts-and-culture>

The challenge of evidencing of 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 (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.

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. Schrijvers et al., 2015: 20).

definition

Debates on the definition of the arts, culture and creative industries continue to dominate the European cultural and creative research sphere. In this context, the proliferation of multiple understandings and usages of the term spillover and the duality of the crossover/spillover argument has not been beneficial. The term ‘spillover’ is not used extensively in cultural and creative policy or research, whereas the term ‘crossover’ is the focus of various research and policy considerations (e.g. Lazzaro, 2018; HKU, 2016). Progress on the spillover debate has thus been hindered by definitional uncertainty. Rather than presenting a new definition, the Research Partnership is confident that there is value in keeping a broad, malleable definition in order to capture new dimensions of value and to provoke new debate around value.

final thoughts

Communicating the value of spillover in the arts, culture and creative industries

Communication of value is a weakness in the sector (Levä in NEMO, 2016) - good news does not reach beyond sectoral boundaries. Levä 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 (Sacco et al., 2017: 2), 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 (Bucci 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). 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 considering the value of investment, participation and consumption. It is important 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). Research needs to embrace intersectionality and go further to consider how outcomes for different social groups are or could be affected by trends in participation.

recommendations for future research

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; Gielen et al., 2015; Sokka et al., 2017).



To read the full report please see
<https://ccspillovers.weebly.com/>

For more information email
ccspillover@gmail.com



CCS