University of Groningen

The creative industries: conflict or collaboration?

Nijzink, Douwe ; van den Hoogen, Quirijn; Gielen, Pascal

Published in:
International Journal of Cultural Policy

DOI:
[10.1080/10286632.2015.1069824](https://doi.org/10.1080/10286632.2015.1069824)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2015

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Nijzink, D., van den Hoogen, Q., & Gielen, P. (2015). The creative industries: conflict or collaboration? An analysis of the perspectives from which policymakers, art organizations and creative organizations in the creative industries are acting. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 23(5), 597-617.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10286632.2015.1069824>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

The creative industries: conflict or collaboration? An analysis of the perspectives from which policymakers, art organizations and creative organizations in the creative industries are acting

Douwe Nijzink*, Quirijn Lennert van den Hoogen and Pascal Gielen

*Faculty of Arts, Research Centre Arts in Society, University of Groningen, P.O. Box 716,
9700 AS Groningen, The Netherlands*

(Received 26 February 2015; accepted 2 July 2015)

This paper compares and contrasts the instruments and values formulated in the creative industries policies of three peripheral municipalities of between 150,000 and 220,000 inhabitants in the Netherlands (Groningen, Arnhem and Eindhoven) with the needs of the creative industries itself. The needs of the creative industries have been empirically researched by conducting an online survey ($n = 556$) and twelve in-depth interviews with professionals from different types of organizations in the creative industries. In this study, the theoretical framework of Boltanski, Thévenot and Chiapello is used in the analysis of policy documents, the outcomes of the online survey, and the in-depth interviews in order to uncover differences and similarities in perspectives from which art organizations, creative organizations and policymakers are acting in the creative industries.

Keywords: creative industries; Boltanski; art; values; policy

Introduction

In the past fifteen years, the creative industries have been of great interest to scholars, policy-makers and economists, because of the unusual but intriguing combination of culture and economics. The increase in policy documents, partnerships, academic articles, and books on the creative industries in many different countries all over the world demonstrates that it has become an important topic in cultural policy and academic circles on an international level (Hesmondhalgh and Pratt 2005, p. 1). In the UK for example, the importance of the creative industries was acknowledged as far back as 1998, the year that the Department of Culture, Media and Sport created a ‘mapping document’ to define the creative industries and formulate policy instruments to support the sector (Creative Industries Task Force 1998). In the Netherlands, the potential of the creative industries was not recognized by the government until 2009. In that year, the Dutch national government labelled the creative industries as one of the ‘top sectors’ of the country and decided that it should be one of their main policy interests. However, not only national governments are interested in the creative industries, but also local administrators are trying to get a grip on the positive effects of having a stimulating creative economy, by formulating and executing policy instruments. Several cities

*Corresponding author. Email: douwenijzink@gmail.com

in the Netherlands are trying to use the local creative industries as a way of marketing themselves to lure in creative workers, academics and tourists.

In the Netherlands, but also in other countries, the subsidized 'autonomous' arts are part of the creative industries, according to the definitions used in policy documents and research papers (Topteam Creatieve Industrie 2011). This mix of art and commerce seems strange, because the arts are quite different from other creative organizations, where earning money is a main objective. Even though art and culture belong to the creative industries on paper, municipalities still make a distinction between policies that focus on subsidizing the cultural sector and policies that aim to stimulate creative businesses. In addition, some scholars are sceptical about the combination of traditional cultural policy with (economic) creative industries policy, because they think that their primary concerns are different (McGuigan 2009, Oakley 2009). Whereas creative organizations can be characterized by the production of economic value, the arts are known for their creation of artistic and public value. This means that, within the creative industries, art and creative organizations are acting from different perspectives and would therefore probably benefit from different policy measures. Creative industries policy would therefore not suit the needs of all the different types of organization in the creative industries.

This paper investigates how peripheral cities in the Netherlands can develop policies that meet the needs of the creative and cultural sector. The role of the local administration regarding culture and creativity, the policy instruments deployed, and the values formulated in creative industries and cultural policy documents are compared with the needs of the different organizations in the creative industries themselves. Our research focused specifically on three peripheral cities, because previous research mainly investigated central cities (e.g. London or Amsterdam) and did not compare the differences in regional creative industries policies within a country. The municipalities of Groningen (195,418 inhabitants), Arnhem (149,827), and Eindhoven (218,433) were chosen as case studies (CBS 2013). The needs of the creative industries were empirically researched by conducting an online survey ($n = 556$) and twelve in-depth interviews with professionals from different types of organizations in the creative industries. In this study, the theoretical framework of Boltanski, Thévenot and Chiapello was used in the analysis of policy documents, the outcomes of the online survey, and the in-depth interviews in order to uncover differences and similarities in the perspectives from which art organizations, creative organizations and policy makers are acting. Rather than testing an argument, our empirical research aims to explore the different values and needs in the creative industries in order to contribute to the theory-building on the scope, characteristics and tensions in the creative industries policies.

In the first part of this paper, we address the theoretical background of our research. In the first section, an overview is given of the definitions of the creative industries, policy on the creative industries and the position of the arts in the creative industries, with a focus on the Dutch situation. After this overview, we discuss the method of the empirical research, including the operationalization of the theoretical framework of Boltanski, Thévenot and Chiapello in the analysis of the policy documents, the online survey and the in-depth interviews. In the second section, the results of the empirical research are summarized with an emphasis on the comparison between the role of municipalities, the policy instruments they use, and the needs of the art and creative organizations in the creative industries. We conclude

with a reflection on the usefulness of the theory of Boltanski, Thévenot and Chiapello as a research tool and, we offer some general policy recommendations for creative industries policies in peripheral cities, based on the results of our research.

Theoretical background

The creative industries

Over the past decades, national, regional and local authorities have been increasingly stressing the importance of the creative industries. This development has also sparked academic interest in the creative industries among scholars from diverse fields, such as cultural policy research, urban planning, sociology and economics. Scholars have evaluated and compared creative industries policy by governments (Caust 2003, Currid and Williams 2010), focused on cultural governance from an neo-institutional approach (Healey 2004, Lange *et al.* 2008, Redaelli 2011), created models and theories to understand the mechanics of the creative industries (O'Connor 2009, Barkey and Godart 2013), criticized the influence of economics on the arts and cultural policy (Costa *et al.* 2007, Oakley 2009), and tested the ideas of important thinkers on the creative industries in practice (Kloosterman 2005, Bille 2010). In this discourse, there is no consensus on the meaning of the term 'creative industries' or on the differences between the 'creative industries' and the 'cultural industries'. Some authors use the term 'creative industries' as a synonym for the cultural industries (Throsby 2001, Hesmondhalgh and Pratt 2005) while others argue that the cultural industries are part of the creative industries (McGuigan 2009, Winkel *et al.* 2012). The term 'cultural industries' itself was created decades before 'creative industries' – by Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno in 1944 – to negatively describe the commodification of art and culture (Garnham 2005, Adorno and Horkheimer [1944] 2007). It is ironic, however, that the original, negative connotation of the term introduced by Adorno and Horkheimer has disappeared entirely and that the term is now used to refer to a sector where a conjunction between economics and culture is seen as something positive.

Richard Florida, especially due to his book *The Rise of the Creative Class* (2002), has come to be regarded as an important thinker on the creative industries. His ideas are often explicitly mentioned in policy documents (e.g. Gemeente Groningen 2008). Florida describes a class of people on the basis of their 'creative' occupation (e.g. in science, architecture, design, the arts, and entertainment) (2002). According to Florida, creative cities attract the creative class to boost the regional economy with what he calls the 'three Ts' (technology, talent and tolerance). Many scholars and policymakers mark Florida as the trendsetter of the creative industries discourse (Kloosterman 2005, McGuigan 2009). However, he mainly defines the characteristics of creative labour (i.e. the creative class and the creative city) and does not discuss the kind of products and services that are created (i.e. the creative industries). Furthermore, he was not the first to identify the relationship between creativity and economics (e.g. Caves 2000). Other scholars who have contributed to the creative city and creative industries discourse include Throsby (2001), Hartley (2005), Landry (2008). Throsby argues that the creative industries can be characterized by (1) the involvement of creativity in the production process, (2) the

creation and communication of symbolic meaning, and (3) the output being a form of intellectual property (2001, p. 4). These unique features of the creative industries, described by Throsby, are also present in definitions of the creative industries used in research articles and policy documents of governments all around the world (e.g. Ministerial Creative Industries Mapping Group 2001, Kloosterman 2005, McGuigan 2009).

Creative industries policy

In 1998, The Department of Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) of the national government of the United Kingdom was one of the first to successfully create a mapping document and formulate policy goals to stimulate and promote the creative industries. The Ministerial Creative Industries Mapping Group of the DCMS defines the creative industries as ‘those industries which have their origin in individual creativity, skill and talent and which have a potential for wealth and job creation through the generation and exploitation of intellectual property’ (2001, p. 5). When the British definition is compared with the three characteristics of the creative industries stated above, we can see that it mainly refers to the first and the third, namely, the involvement of creativity in the production process and the output being a form of intellectual property. In the Netherlands, the British case is often used as a successful example of how a government can promote and support the creative industries with policy instruments to stimulate the national economy (Rutten *et al.* 2011).

The creative industries in the Netherlands have been an important policy area for the national government since 2009. In addition, municipalities support their local creative industries to promote the uniqueness of the region. These municipalities, with diverse creative industries, can join together in the CLICK network organization that has been created by the national government (Topteam Creatieve Industrie 2011). Despite regional and local differences, the creative industries in the Netherlands are generally defined by the Central Bureau for Statistics (CBS 2012) and Kloosterman (2005) as ‘the various sectors where initial creation is the most important; creating forms, meaning or aesthetic and symbolic value’. If we compare the Dutch definition to the characteristics of Throsby, we can see that it mainly refers to the first and second aspects, namely the involvement of creativity in the production process and the creation and communication of symbolic meaning. Where the British definition relies on the extrinsic, economic effects of the creative industries (e.g. the exploitation of intellectual property), the Dutch definition focuses on the unique output of the creative industries (e.g. aesthetic and symbolic value). So, it seems that the Dutch emphasize other aspects of the creative industries policies than the British do.

These differences in perspectives on the creative industries are also visible in the sectors that these two countries count among the creative industries. In the UK, the original definition of the creative industries contains the following sectors: advertising, antiques, software, music, theatre, publishing, television and radio (Creative Industries Task Force 1988). Over the years, the categorization of the creative industries in the UK has been subject to several changes. Now, the definition of the DCMS also includes museums, galleries and libraries (2015, p. 10). In the Netherlands, the creative industries consist of three sectors; (1) the art and cultural heritage sector, (2) the media and entertainment industry, and (3) the creative

services (Kloosterman 2005, Marlet and van Woerkens 2012). In the first sector, the creation of artworks from an ‘artistic and cultural necessity’ is the focal point and therefore there is less scope for ‘commercial exploitation’ of the output (Rutten *et al.* 2011, p. 11). Exemplary industries belonging to this sector are the visual arts, museums, theatre and heritage. The other two sectors rely more on the commercial exploitation of their products and reaching large audiences. Examples include television and radio industries, game developers, architects, and the fashion industry (Rutten *et al.* 2011, p. 12). Both examples demonstrate that the definitions of the creative industry are different and still changing. Policymakers are double-minded on the scope of the creative industries and the exact role of the arts and cultural heritage sector.

The position of the arts within the creative industries is also an important topic to scholars. Some argue that the traditional arts and cultural policy are redefined within this paradigm of the creative industries and the market-driven economy (Cunningham 2001, Caust 2003). On the one hand, it can open up new possibilities for cultural organizations, according to supporters of this development, by being less dependent on public subsidies (Hartley 2005). On the other hand, critics state that traditional art organizations create different values (e.g. artistic and public values) than other organizations in the creative industries do, and should therefore not be merely appraised in terms of an economy-oriented approach to creative industries policy (Caust 2003, p. 52). Furthermore, researchers argue that while in the short run the creative industries and creative class notions may provide (much-needed) legitimization for *cultural* policies, we should question whether such policies might not be more harmful than productive in the long run, as they might deplete creativity by imposing a frame which is alien to them (McGuigan 2004, Throsby 2010).¹ So, it remains obscure whether or not the arts dovetail with the creative industries paradigm; it is clear that both governments and scholars have conflicting ideas on this particular issue. As a result, it may not always be apparent which types of values are favoured in creative industries policies or how the differing focus of creative, cultural or arts organizations are evaluated within such policies.

The orders of worth

To investigate such value differences between organizations in the creative industries, we use the framework created by the French sociologists Luc Boltanski, Laurent Thévenot and Ève Chiapello. In 1991, Boltanski and Thévenot published a book called *De la justification: les économies de la grandeur* with the description of six orders of worth, each of them with their own value regime (Boltanski and Thévenot [1991] 2006). These six worlds are expanded in 1999 by Boltanski and Chiapello with a seventh world in the book *Le nouvel esprit du capitalisme* ([1999] 2005).² According to Boltanski and Thévenot, a world is more or less a secularized theological order that is imposed ‘on everyone and governs people’s actions’ (2006, p. 127). Each of the seven worlds has its own principles, values, subjects, relationships, manifestations and signs of decline, which are schematized in a table (see Appendix 1). The orders of worth are relevant for our empirical research because they accurately address the different tensions in the creative industries (policies). Furthermore, this conceptual framework can be used to overcome the ambiguities in the creative industries and the unclear role of arts and cultural

heritage. We shall briefly discuss the seven orders of worth below, and relate their guiding principles to our study of the creative industries.

The first world is the *inspired world*, with inspiration as its highest principle and bizarreness, spontaneity, and emotionality as its most important values. In the creative industries, this order of worth refers specifically to values such as creativity and authenticity. The second world is called the *domestic world*, where tradition and hierarchy are the highest principles, and trust, honesty and wisdom are important values. This world relates to the creative industries when it focuses on the experience of actors and the importance of traditions (e.g. cultural heritage). In the *world of fame*, public opinion is the highest principle and significant values are reputation, recognition and visibility. In the creative industries, this order of worth refers to the public opinion and the creation of public appeal, which is important for both art and creative organizations. The fourth world is the *civic world*, where the common cause and the general interest are the highest principles. This world can be characterized by the values of legality, unity, and participation, and is used in our study on the creative industries to emphasize the importance of the general interest and social involvement. The *market world* is the fifth world, with competition and rivalry as its highest principles, and winning, moneymaking and marketability as the most important values. When this value regime is used by actors in the creative industries, it refers to entrepreneurship, financial success and opportunism. Boltanski, and Thévenot label the *industrial world* as the sixth world, with efficiency as its highest principle. Appropriate values in this value regime are reproducibility, routines and innovation, which are also used in our study of the creative industries. The seventh and last world is the *projective city*, with networking as the highest principle, and flexibility, mobility, and engagement as its most important values. In our study of the creative industries, this value regime refers to values as flexibility, networking and collaboration.

Boltanski, Thévenot and Chiapello argue that actors have access to all seven worlds but, in specific situations, these actors can explicitly or implicitly refer to the principles of one or two worlds. More concretely, an actor (e.g. artist, creative entrepreneur or city official) can use principles and values from the inspired world or market world to explain and legitimize his actions, but can also use them to reject and criticize principles and values from other value regimes. For example, an artist can legitimize his actions by referring to the values of the inspired world (e.g. inspiration and creativity), while also using these principles of the inspired world to offer critique of other value regimes, such as the market world (e.g. competition and moneymaking) and the industrial world (e.g. efficiency and reproducibility). According to Boltanski, Thévenot and Chiapello, these critiques can result in conflicts between worlds and some value regimes are more likely to mutually collide than others. These conflicts can be solved by creating a compromise between two worlds: in other words by looking for the 'common good' between two different value regimes (2006, p. 277). However, Boltanski, Thévenot and Chiapello point out that compromises are temporary and that one world should not be dominant over another.

In our research, the creative industries are the most obvious example of a compromise between different worlds. Even though all the value regimes are used in the creative industries, it seems the world of inspiration, market and industry are the most visibly present. This means that conflicts in the creative industries will probably be created between the creativity and uniqueness of the world of

inspiration, the competition and moneymaking of the market world and the routines and efficiency of the industrial world. Interestingly, Boltanski and Thévenot describe routines as the downfall of inspiration, which would indicate an important disagreement between the world of inspiration and the industrial world. Furthermore, even the market world and the industrial world can collide, if an actor is too opportunistic (i.e. market) or too much driven by routines and procedures (i.e. industry). These are just examples of how the value regimes can be used when studying the creative industries. In our exploratory empirical research we have used all the orders of worth of Boltanski and Thévenot in the analysis of policy documents, the online survey and the in-depth interviews in order to uncover the hidden values behind the actions of the different organizations in the creative industries and to see which regimes are most relevant to which type of actors.

Method

For our empirical research we defined two types of organizations in the creative industries, namely, 'art organizations' and 'creative organizations', a distinction municipalities use themselves. Organizations that are traditionally more focused on the creation of artistic and public values are labelled 'art organizations'. These organizations often describe themselves as 'autonomous'. Good examples of these are the visual arts, theatre, museums, heritage, and libraries. Organizations focusing on the commercial exploitation of intellectual property and 'applying' creativity in products and services are labelled 'creative organizations'. In this classification, we count all the organizations that are not part of the arts themselves, but are also part of the creative industries. Good examples are television, radio, publishing, software, architects and fashion. This distinction does not mean that art organizations are not creative or that creative organizations cannot produce art, but the terms are used to characterize two sectors within the creative industries, so that the differences and similarities between them can be investigated.

The empirical research consisted of four steps, (1) the collection of statistical data, (2) the analysis of policy documents, (3) an online survey, and (4) in-depth interviews. For step one, we asked three municipalities (Groningen, Arnhem and Eindhoven, see Figure 1) for data on the number and type of creative businesses, employment in the creative industries and the number of jobs in the creative industries in comparison to the total number of jobs in order to assess the role of the creative industries in the total economy of each city. During step two, we analyzed policy documents, research reports and other publications on the creative industries in the three municipalities to uncover the actors in the field, the most important value regimes, conflicting value regimes, the role of the local government and the policy instruments they use to support the creative industries. With the information from steps one and two we could create an online survey for creative organizations in step three to obtain data on the most important value regimes, conflicting value regimes, the current and preferred role of the municipality, and the current and preferred policy instruments of the municipality. About 13% ($n = 556$) of the people who received an invitation to participate in the online survey actually filled it in. There were some small differences between Groningen ($n = 222$, 39.9%), Arnhem ($n = 183$, 32.9%) and Eindhoven ($n = 151$, 27.2%). In total 27.3% ($n = 152$) of the respondents were identified as an art organization and 72.3% ($n = 404$) as a creative organization. During the last step of our empirical research, we conducted in-depth

Figure 1. Location of Groningen, Arnhem, and Eindhoven in the Netherlands.

interviews with relevant individuals from the creative industries in Groningen, Arnhem and Eindhoven to discover the reason why certain values are important and why certain values create conflicts. We wanted to find out how they see the role of the local government and which policy instruments are most fruitful in their opinion. Per municipality, we talked with four people, namely, someone from the economic department of the municipality, someone from the culture department of the municipality, someone from a creative organization, and someone from an art organization. This meant that we conducted twelve in-depth interviews in total. Data were collected between March 2014 and July 2014.

For the analysis of the value regimes in the policy documents, the online survey and the in-depth interviews, we operationalized the theoretical framework of Boltanski, Thévenot and Chiapello (see Table 1). We looked at the argumentation in the policy documents, research reports and other publications on the creative industries, and compared it with the seven worlds. For example, when the municipality of Groningen argues that it is ‘important to create room for entrepreneurs, for experiments and for networks’ (2008, p. 3), it implicitly refers to the market world (entrepreneurs), the industrial world (experiment) and the projective city (networks). In the online survey we asked the respondents to scale the importance of a certain value for their own organization on a 5-point Likert scale, from ‘very unimportant’ to ‘very important’. We also asked the respondents to scale the values that can create conflicts for their own organization. They could choose from ‘not at all’ to ‘to a high degree’ on a 5-point Likert scale. For each of the seven value regimes, we operationalized three important values and two conflicting values (see Table 1).

Table 1. Operationalization of the theoretical framework of Boltanski, Thévenot and Chiapello.

Value regimes	Important values in survey	Conflicting values in survey	Values in-depth interviews
Inspiration	Creativity Passion Self-development	Artistry Creativity	Authenticity Creativity
Domestic	Experience Tradition Authority	Conventions Traditions	Norms and values Traditions
Fame	Recognition Reputation Public opinion	Public interest Public opinion	Public interest Reputation
Civic	Public support Social involvement General interest	Law and policy General interest	Public support General interest
Market	Financial success Opportunism Entrepreneurship	Entrepreneurship Competition	Entrepreneurship Moneymaking
Industrial	Functionality Innovation Efficiency	Efficiency Routines	Efficiency Routines
Projective city	Collaboration Networking Flexibility	Collaboration Flexibility	Networking Flexibility

During the in-depth interviews we used fourteen cards, each of them with the description of a value, and asked the respondent to make a ranking with their most important values on the top and their least favourite values at the bottom. This yielded an overview of the differences and similarities in perspectives and values between art organizations, creative organizations and policy makers in the creative industries.

Results

Creative industries in the cities

The creative industries in Groningen can mainly be characterized by a large cultural sector (Marlet *et al.* 2011, p. 6), but also the music industry and the IT sector are important sectors in Groningen. In Arnhem, the creative industries are focused on fashion and design, because it relates to the fashion education programmes of the Hogeschool ArteZ that are available in the city (Gemeente Arnhem 2010, p. 3). The creative industries in Eindhoven specialize in design, because of the Design Academy, the relevant Bachelor's and Master's Degree programmes of the Technical University of Eindhoven, and the presence of industrial businesses such as Philips in the city. Within the creative industries, the art and cultural heritage sector is the largest and the media and entertainment industry is the smallest (see Table 2). The data also show that the profiles of the creative industries in Groningen (i.e. cultural sector) and Eindhoven (i.e. design) correspond with the number of organizations and employment in the art and cultural heritage sector and the creative services in the two cities. On average, the number of organizations in

Table 2. Number of organizations and employment in the Dutch creative industries.

		Creative industry			Total
		Art and cultural heritage sector	Media and entertainment industry	Creative services	
Number of organizations	Groningen	1,286	504	811	2,601
	Arnhem	892	419	764	2,075
	Eindhoven	865	524	1,319	2,708
	Total	3,043	1,447	2,894	7,384
Employment	Groningen	2,740	1,552	1,673	5,965
	Arnhem	2,000	1,160	1,230	4,390
	Eindhoven	1,576	897	2,302	4,775
	Total	6,316	3,609	5,208	15,133

Sources: Research and statistic departments of the municipalities of Groningen, Arnhem and Eindhoven.

the creative industries is 4% of the total number of organizations (46,859) and the employment in the creative industries is around 15.8% of the total employment (379,345) (Gemeente Arnhem 2013, Gemeente Eindhoven Gemeente Eindhoven 2013). So overall, the contribution of the creative industries to the total economy in these three cities is not very substantial. However, information about sales and profits in the creative industries was not available and is therefore not included in the analysis.

The role of the municipality

In policy documents, the three municipalities state that they currently have a stimulating and facilitating role in the creative industries (Gemeente Groningen 2008, Gemeente Arnhem 2010, Gemeente Eindhoven 2011a, 2011b). This role of the municipality was also acknowledged during the in-depth interviews. Officials of the culture department of the municipalities provided opinions, such as ‘even though the cultural sector has to be guided sometimes, the general role of the municipality is to facilitate’ (cultural official in E), or ‘a municipality can’t create jobs, but is there to facilitate and stimulate’ (cultural official in G). The online survey also asked questions about the role of the municipality. 33.8% of the respondents agreed that the municipalities have a supporting and facilitating role. However, 18.9% think that the municipalities are quite reserved and 18.9% don’t know what the current role of the municipality is. On average, the municipality is more reserved according to the art organizations (28.9%) than according to the creative organizations (20.8%). In the online survey, the respondents were also asked to indicate which role they would prefer the municipality to take in the creative industries, so that the current and desired roles could be compared. According to 84.7% of the respondents, the preferred role of a municipality is supporting and facilitating. This means that, whereas 84.7% of the respondents prefer a stimulating and facilitating role by the municipality, only 33.8% think that this role is actually fulfilled. In this comparison, there were no big differences between art organizations and creative organizations in the creative industries.

Policy instruments

The three municipalities describe several policy instruments to support and stimulate the creative industries. Overall, they try to organize network meetings, support entrepreneurship with starting finances and guides, relate cultural policy to economic policy, connect partners to each other, and create an online platform for visibility (Gemeente Arnhem 2006, 2010, 2011, Gemeente Groningen 2008, Frye and Krijger 2011, Gemeente Eindhoven 2011a, 2011b, van de Vorst *et al.* 2011).

We also asked the respondents to the online survey about the policy instruments that municipalities are currently using, so that they could be compared to the claims made in the policy documents and the instruments that the organizations in the creative industries would prefer to have (see Table 3). According to the 556 respondents, the three municipalities are currently ‘promoting the city with city marketing’ (45%), ‘providing tenant buildings for creative entrepreneurs’ (36.5%) and ‘investing with finances’ (35.1%). In total, 24.6% of the respondents did not know which policy instruments the municipalities are currently using. We also asked respondents to indicate the policy instruments they would prefer. The three most popular ones were ‘providing affordable studio space’ (60.4%), ‘providing tenant buildings for creative entrepreneurs’ (56.3%) and ‘investing with finances’ (54.5%). The three least popular policy instruments were ‘creating an online platform’ (31.3%), ‘organizing competitions’ (25%) and ‘conducting research on the creative industries’ (23.9%). When we compare the current policy instruments to the preferred policy instruments, we see that ‘promoting the city with city marketing’ is not very popular (31.6%, place 11 of 14), even though respondents claim it is currently the most used policy instrument for municipalities. A logical explanation is that municipalities are better acquainted with the theories of Florida

Table 3. Current and preferred policy instruments of municipalities according to the creative industries.

Policy instruments	Current (%)			Preferred (%)		
	TOT	AO	CO	TOT	AO	CO
1. Creating an online platform	11.3	7.2	12.9	31.3	30.9	31.4
2. Formulating creative industry policy	25.2	23.7	25.7	36.3	32.9	37.6
3. Investing finances	35.1	32.2	36.1	54.5	63.2	51.2
4. Investing knowledge	10.8	5.9	12.6	44.2	40.8	45.5
5. Investing time	14.4	9.9	16.1	36	38.2	35.1
6. Organizing competitions	9.5	7.9	10.1	25	21.7	26.2
7. Organizing meetings to find investors	8.8	5.9	9.9	39.6	42.8	38.4
8. Organizing network meetings	32.2	21.1	36.4	41.2	39.5	41.8
9. Promoting the city with city marketing	45	34.9	48.8	34.5	31.6	35.6
10. Conducting research on the creative industries	16	11.2	17.8	23.9	18.4	26
11. Organizing meetings to search for new insights	13.1	11.8	13.6	37.4	29.6	40.3
12. Providing affordable business accommodation	21.6	14.5	24.3	47.5	42.8	49.3
13. Providing affordable studio space	31.1	26.3	32.9	60.4	68.4	57.4
14. Providing tenant buildings for creative entrepreneurs	36.5	27.6	39.9	56.3	56.6	56.2
None of the above	6.3	9.2	5.2	2.2	1.3	2.5
Don't know	24.6	27	23.8	4.9	6.6	4.2
Other	6.7	10.5	5.2	6.5	7.2	5.9

Notes: TOT = total, AO = art organizations, CO = creative organizations.

and the effects an image of a city can have for regional employment, cultural diversity and the establishment of new people and businesses in the city. We also see that the instruments that are described in the policy documents do not correspond directly with the current and preferred policy instruments of municipalities, according to the respondents. Whereas policy makers want to focus on collaboration and visibility, organizations in the creative industries are more in need of affordable workspace. This means that the policy of the three municipalities does not suit all the needs of organizations in the creative industries, and it would be useful to investigate if those two could be better aligned.

The orders of worth in creative industries policy

According to policymakers, the market world is, on average, the most meaningful value regime in the creative industries (see Figure 2). In policy, the creative industries are a compromise between the market world, the industrial world and the world of inspiration, but if we look at the municipalities individually, they appear to use different combinations of values: Groningen (market, inspiration and civic), Arnhem (market, industry and fame) and Eindhoven (industry, inspiration and market/projective city). We thus see that, within one small country, municipalities refer in their policies to different values associated with the creative industries, and therefore also create other compromises. Note that, in Eindhoven, the industrial world is deemed more relevant, which corresponds to the profile of the creative industries of Eindhoven with its focus on design and the presence of many industrial businesses in the city. Thus, not only is the presence of industrial businesses characteristic of Eindhoven, the way they argue and think also reflects the importance of the values associated with the industrial world. On average, the industrial world still comes second and the world of inspiration is the third most important value regime. In

Figure 2. The seven worlds in policy documents on the creative industries in the municipalities of Groningen, Arnhem and Eindhoven.

Groningen, the inspired world is deemed more meaningful, which corresponds to the fact that the cultural sector is larger in this city. The three municipalities agree that the domestic world is the least important value regime in the creative industries.

The orders of worth in the creative industries

The results of the online survey show that the world of inspiration is the most important value regime in the creative industries, for both art organizations and creative organizations (see Table 4). This was also the case in the in-depth interviews. For example the respondent from the art organization in Groningen said that creativity and authenticity (the world of inspiration) is the ‘source from which everything originates’ and the respondent from the creative organization in Arnhem stated that ‘not much could be done without creativity’. The projective city is the second most important value regime and, again, there are no differences between the three cities and the art organizations and creative organizations. During the in-depth interviews it became clear that the projective city is meaningful for respondents, because they relate the values associated with this value regime to the way they have to work, namely being flexible and creating networks. The importance of the world of fame and the industrial world is different for art organizations and creative organizations. Whereas the art organizations rank the world of fame third and the industrial world fifth, we see that the creative organizations think exactly the opposite. There was also no consensus on the importance of the world of fame and the industrial world between the respondents of the in-depth interviews, but in general they are not negative towards these value regimes. The only exception is the value *routines* that can be associated with the industrial world, because all the interviewees placed this value at the bottom of their list. This result corresponds to the order-of-worth model of Boltanski, Thévenot and Chiapello, as they argue that routines would mark the decline of the world of inspiration. The respondents to the online survey place the market world on the fourth rank, the civic world sixth and they agree that the domestic world is the least important value regime in the creative industries. In general, the respondents to the in-depth interviews do not want to be associated with the domestic world, because ‘it impedes us to from seeing the world with clear eyes’. The respondent from the art organization in

Table 4. The most important value regimes in the creative industries in Groningen, Arnhem and Eindhoven.

	Total			Groningen			Arnhem			Eindhoven		
	TOT	AO	CO	TOT	AO	CO	TOT	AO	CO	TOT	AO	CO
Inspiration	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Projective city	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Industrial	3	5	3	3	5	3	4	6	3	3	6	3
Market	4	4	4	5	4	4	3	4	4	4	3	4
Fame	5	3	5	4	3	5	5	3	5	5	4	5
Civic	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	5	6	6	5	6
Domestic	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7

Notes: TOT = total, AO = art organizations, CO = creative organizations.

Arnhem argues that his organization ‘critically reflects on existing traditions and norms and values’, but he does not think they are important.

Policymakers and organizations in the creative industries agree on the fact that the domestic world is the least meaningful value regime in the creative industries. However, if we compare the importance of the other value regimes among policymakers and the creative industries, we see that there are some differences. Policymakers are of the opinion that the market world is the most important value regime, but organizations in the creative industries believe that the inspired world is the most relevant and rank the market world fourth. So, policymakers mainly refer to values such as *financial success* and *entrepreneurship*, whereas the actors in the creative industries argue that *creativity* and *flexibility* are the most important. Also, art organizations do not agree with policymakers about the fact that the industrial world is the second most important world in the creative industries. They place that value regime at a lowly fifth place and attach more value to the world of fame, which is placed third. Thus, policymakers and the organizations in the creative industries have different opinions about the importance of certain values and value regimes in the creative industries, which can indicate that creative industries policy does not fully correspond with the values the creative industries want to convey.

Conflicts between orders of worth in the creative industries

In creative industries policy documents, policymakers sometimes describe certain problems that require a solution, and these problems can often be analyzed as a conflict between two or more value regimes. Because there are only a few conflicts outlined in policy documents, we give some examples of the problems that, according to policymakers, exist in the creative industries. In the *Masterplan Mode & Vormgeving 2011–2014* [Masterplan Fashion & Design 2011–2014], the municipality of Arnhem argues that fashion organizations can be characterized by ‘a high level of creativity’, but they also acknowledge that the business side of these organization is often underdeveloped (Gemeente Arnhem 2010, p. 9). This can be interpreted as a conflict between the world of inspiration (i.e. creativity) and the market world (i.e. business side) and they are eager to find a solution to this problem. In Eindhoven, a conflict between the world of inspiration (i.e. creativity) and the industrial world (i.e. structure) is described when it is argued that ‘creative entrepreneurs are not bound to structure’ and are therefore not ‘skilled enough in developing their business’ (Frye and Krijger 2011, p. 4). The authors continue with the remark that creative entrepreneurs should therefore be supported in order to prepare them for the business world, so that their enterprises can succeed. The problems described in policy documents are mainly conflicts between the world of inspiration and other worlds, such as the market world, the industrial world, and the world of fame. So, policymakers recognize the importance of the inspired world for the organizations in the creative industries, but they also acknowledge that it can create conflicts with value regimes they consider important, such as the market world and the industrial world, as we can observe in Figure 2.

The results of the online survey show that the market world creates the most conflict in the creative industries, and this is the case for both art organizations and creative organizations (see Table 5). The market world is problematic according to the respondent from the creative organization in Eindhoven, because commercial companies are mainly focused on making money, and it is therefore hard for a

Table 5. The value regimes that create conflicts in the creative industries in Groningen, Arnhem and Eindhoven.

	Total			Groningen			Arnhem			Eindhoven		
	TOT	AO	CO	TOT	AO	CO	TOT	AO	CO	TOT	AO	CO
Market	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1
Industrial	2	4	2	2	5	2	2	4	2	2	4	2
Civic	3	2	5	3	2	4	3	2	5	3	1	3
Projective city	4	6	3	4	6	3	5	6	4	4	7	4
Domestic	5	5	6	5	3	5	7	5	6	7	5	6
Fame	6	3	7	6	4	7	4	3	7	6	3	7
Inspiration	7	7	4	7	7	6	6	7	3	5	6	5

Notes: TOT = total, AO = art organizations, CO = creative organizations.

creative organization to collaborate with a commercial enterprise. She also states that these problems are already created in education because, in her opinion, the teachers at the Design Academy believe that ‘entrepreneurship hinders free creativity’. According to the official of the culture department of the municipality of Groningen, conflicts between the world of inspiration and the market world are often created by municipalities themselves, because they insist that art organizations should also focus on entrepreneurship. If we look at Table 5, we see that creative organizations experience more conflicts with the world of inspiration, the industrial world and the projective city than art organizations do. As we have shown earlier, art organizations think that the industrial world is not particularly important and perhaps that is also the reason why they are less exposed to the conflicts this value regime can create. Also, creative organizations are more likely to work with commercial companies and would therefore have to deal more with the industrial world and the projective city. On the other hand, art organizations experience more conflicts with the world of fame and the civic world than creative organizations in the creative industries do. An explanation for this can be their dependence on subsidies which brings obligations towards social (civic) and image (fame) values, as these can be the focus of the city governments (see van den Hoogen 2014). So, by looking at the value regimes that are creating conflicts in the creative industries, we see more differences between art organizations and creative organizations. The inspired world is the most important value regime in the creative industries and also creates the fewest problems, which indicates that creativity, artistry and authenticity are meaningful values in the entire creative industries. However, most of the conflicts are created when there is a collision with the world of inspiration, something that is also recognized by policymakers, albeit from a different perspective. Whereas policymakers see the values associated with the market world and the industrial world as the main goals, and the inspired world as a means that can create conflicts that they have to overcome, the creative industries believe that the inspired world is the ‘source from which everything originates’ and sees the market world and the industrial world as problematic – but necessary – value regimes they have to cope with.

The policy instruments of municipalities that are preferred by the respondents to the online survey can play a role in solving these conflicts between value regimes. For example, the creative industries are desperately in need of cheap studio space and accommodation, and would like the municipality to facilitate these aspects a little more so that the creative industries would have to worry less about rent and

moneymaking (i.e. the market world). It could then focus more on creative enterprises (i.e. world of inspiration). Municipalities can also use the policy instruments of ‘investing with knowledge’, ‘organizing network meetings’ and ‘organizing meetings to find investors’ in order to support the entrepreneurship of organizations in the creative industries and ease the problems with the market and industrial worlds (see Table 3). Furthermore, municipalities can use policy instruments such as ‘creating an online platform’, ‘formulating creative industries policy’ and ‘organizing meetings to search for new insights’ in order to create visibility, to bring organizations in the creative industries together, and to ensure that the needs of the art organizations and the creative organizations in the creative industries are better aligned. According to the interviewees, the municipality is ‘neutral’ and has the ‘best overview of the field’, and should therefore focus on this ‘general interest’ of all the different organizations in the creative industries. So, municipalities can play an important role in solving conflicts between value regimes by keeping the general interest of the entire creative industries in mind and by using specific policy instruments as compromise instruments.

The position of the arts in the creative industries

As discussed previously in academic publications, it is not yet clear whether or not the arts dovetail within the creative industries paradigm, which is also supported by our data. The interviewees from the art organizations were reluctant to respond when we asked if they belong to the creative industries. The respondent from the art organization in Groningen said that they are ‘creative, but do not want to be associated with the industry part’, and the interviewee in Eindhoven argued that ‘creativity is much more autonomous than just designing some small vases’. Also policymakers acknowledge that the position of the arts in the creative industries is problematic. The official of the culture department in Arnhem stated that the creative industries mainly refer to ‘production and economy’ and that therefore a large part of the traditional cultural sector will never be creative industries. In the same municipality, the official of the economic department maintained a strict distinction between culture and the creative industries, where the first refers to the arts and the latter to graphic and fashion designers. In Eindhoven, the official of the culture department of the municipality argued that the cultural sector is ‘such a different sector’ and will always be the ‘odd one out’, but to solve this problem she tries to focus on the overlaps between the two sectors. So, even though municipalities acknowledge on paper that the arts are part of the creative industries, their position is more nuanced in real-life practice. Nevertheless, the arts are quite a large sector within the creative industries in the Netherlands, if we look at the number of organizations and employees involved, and it would be fruitful for municipalities to pay more attention to the role that this sector could play in the creative industries. This research shows that there are some similarities between art organizations and creative organizations, such as the importance of the world of inspiration. This could provide municipalities with opportunities to unite the different organizations in the creative industries.

Conclusion

In this paper, we demonstrated that Dutch local creative industries policies mainly focus on collaboration and visibility. From a value perspective, the policies aim to reconcile the world of inspiration with the market and industrial worlds. However,

these are not necessarily the most important value regimes in the creative and cultural sector. As a result, local creative industries policies do not fully correspond with the needs of the creative industries in general, because the latter prefers affordable workspace and attaches more importance to the world of inspiration, the projective city, and the industrial world. Furthermore, policymakers and the creative industries think differently about the importance of the world of inspiration. Policymakers see this value regime as something that can create conflicts they have to overcome, or that can create values associated with the market world and the industrial world, whereas actors in the creative industries believe that the inspired world is the 'source from which everything originates' and see the market world and the industrial as problematic although necessary (i.e. these represent value regimes they have to cope with). These tensions between value regimes in the creative industries create different types of conflicts for art organizations and creative organizations, which can be addressed by municipalities. In their creative industries policy, municipalities could approach the creative industries from the similarities between art and creative organizations; in other words, on the basis of the importance of the world of inspiration. In this way, policymakers address all the organizations they count among the creative industries and not only the organizations that focus on commercial and industrial values. Furthermore, municipalities can play an important role in solving conflicts between value regimes, by keeping the general interest of the entire creative industries in mind and by using policy instruments as conciliatory instruments.

The application of the theoretical framework of Boltanski, Thévenot and Chiapello had some important limitations and benefits for our research. A limitation of our research method is that some values and value regimes, which can also be important in cultural and creative policies, were not addressed in our operationalization of the value regimes. For example, the notion of sustainability in creative milieus was omitted. Theoretically, sustainability can be accounted for within the industrial polity (e.g. as a durable working method) or in the inspired polity (e.g. as an idea). However, creativity can also be seen as a sustainable value in and of itself, which would require the formulation of a separate value regime.³ The fact that these cities link their creative policies to the nature of the creative milieus in the city (most notably Arnhem to fashion design, and Eindhoven to industrial design) indicates that they do take the sustainability of such milieus into account. But, as was discussed above when reviewing the scholarly debate, putting creativity within the finality of economic exploitation, which in fact is done in creative policies, might be harmful for creativity in the long run. The focus on the inspired regime as a conciliar rather than conflicting value between both types of organizations, might offer a way out of this debate, although our research does not allow to draw conclusions on the matter. Nor is it possible to ascertain whether or not these particular types of city, peripheral in the country and of only medium size, will be able to develop successful creative policies in the long run.

A benefit of the theoretical framework of Boltanski and Thévenot was that it helped us uncover the differences in values between policy makers, art organizations and creative organizations. The orders of worth were not only fruitful for us as scholars, but also for the people we interviewed, because they 'made them think' about what is most important for their organization, business or policy field. Furthermore, the orders of worth were also beneficial for different parties in the creative industries in gaining better understanding of one another, even though they

speak different languages and find other values important. With one set of concepts, we showed how policymakers, creative organizations, and art organizations relate to each other by unveiling their similarities and differences. Policymakers can use the orders of worth as a common language to understand the different organizations in the creative industries. As a result, municipalities can use this information to align their policy goals and instruments more closely with the actual needs of both art organizations and creative organizations in the creative industries.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Notes

1. Throsby (2010) describes legitimations of cultural policy as ‘a Trojan Horse whereby culture is smuggled into the policy chamber where its voice can at least be heard’ (p. 7) and argues that ‘the need for policy to deliver cultural as well as economic benefits must be recognized’ (p. 197).
2. This additional order is not called ‘world’ because the French word ‘cité’ is translated differently in *The new spirit of capitalism* than it is in *On justification*, but the projective city could also be described as the network or project world.
3. In a comparable way, Latour (1995) has suggested viewing environmental sustainability as an inspired value (i.e. as an idea) and as a civic value (i.e. as a common good) as well as a value in and of itself, leading to the addition of a green value regime. See also Thévenot *et al.* (2000).

References

- Adorno, T.W. and Horkheimer, M., 2007 [trans. 1944]. *Dialectiek van de Verlichting: Filosofische fragmenten* [Dialectic of Enlightenment: Philosophical fragments]. Amsterdam: Boom.
- Barkey, K. and Godart, F.C., 2013. Empires, federated arrangements, and kingdoms: using political models of governance to understand firm’s creative performance. *Organization studies*, 34 (1), 79–104.
- Bille, T., 2010. Cool, funky and creative? The creative class and preferences for leisure and culture. *International journal of cultural policy*, 16 (4), 466–496.
- Boltanski, L. and Chiapello, È., 2005. *The new spirit of capitalism*. London: Verso.
- Boltanski, L. and Thévenot, L., 2006. *On justification: economies of worth*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Caust, J., 2003. Putting the “art” back into arts policy making; how arts policy has been “captured” by the economists and the marketers. *International journal of cultural policy*, 9 (1), 51–63.
- Caves, R.E., 2000. *Creative industries: contracts between arts and commerce*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- CBS, 2012. *Monitor Topsectoren: Uitkomsten eerste meting* [Monitor top sectors: Results first assessment]. Den Haag/Heerlen: Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek.
- CBS, 2013. *Demografische kerncijfers per gemeente 2013* [Key demographic figures per municipality 2013]. Den Haag/Heerlen: Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek.
- Costa, P., *et al.*, 2007. A discussion on the governance of ‘creative cities’: some insights for policy action. *Norsk Geografisk Tidsskrift – Norwegian journal of geography*, 61 (3), 122–132.
- Creative Industries Task Force, 1998. *Creative industries: mapping document*. London: Department for Culture, Media and Sport.
- Cunningham, S., 2001. From cultural to creative industries: theory, industry, and policy implications. *Culturelink*, Special issue 2001, 19–32.

- Currid, E. and Williams, S., 2010. Two cities, five industries: similarities and differences within and between cultural industries in New York and Los Angeles. *Journal of planning education and research*, 29 (3), 332–335.
- DCMS, 2015. *Creative industries economic estimates January 2015. Statistical release*. London: Department for Culture, Media and Sport.
- Florida, R., 2002. *The rise of the creative class*. New York: Basic Books.
- Frye, E. and Krijger, J., 2011. *ECCE De Gids. Een tool voor creatieve en innovatieve ondernemers in de economische waardeketen* [ECCE the guide. A tool for creative and innovative entrepreneurs in the economic value chain]. Eindhoven: Frye Concepts.
- Garnham, N., 2005. From cultural to creative industries: an analysis of the implications of the “creative industries” approach to arts and media policy making in the United Kingdom. *International journal of cultural policy*, 11 (1), 15–29.
- Gemeente Arnhem, 2006. *Ruimte voor creatieve milieus – versie 081106* [More space for creative milieus – version 081106]. Arnhem: Gemeente Arnhem.
- Gemeente Arnhem, 2010. *Masterplan Mode & Vormgeving 2011–2014. ‘Bloei cultuur, groei economie’* [Master plan fashion & design 2011–2014. ‘Thriving culture, growing economy’]. Arnhem: Gemeente Arnhem.
- Gemeente Arnhem, 2011. *STROOM Cultuurbeleid Arnhem* [STREAM cultural policy Arnhem]. Arnhem: Gemeente Arnhem.
- Gemeente Arnhem, 2013. *Arnhem in Cijfers* [Arnhem in numbers] [online]. Arnhem: Onderzoek & Statistiek. Available from: <http://www.arnhem.incijfers.nl/> [Accessed 13 Jun 2013].
- Gemeente Eindhoven, 2011a. *Creatieve industries Eindhoven. Tools & Activities* [Creative industries Eindhoven. Tools & Activities]. Eindhoven: Gemeente Eindhoven.
- Gemeente Eindhoven, 2011b. *Invloed van huisvesting op innovatie en ontwikkeling van de creatieve industrie* [Impact of housing on innovation and the development of the creative industries]. Eindhoven: Gemeente Eindhoven.
- Gemeente Eindhoven, 2013. *Eindhoven in cijfers* [Eindhoven in numbers] [online]. Eindhoven: Bureau Beleidsinformatie en Onderzoek. Available from: <http://eindhoven.buurtmonitor.nl/> [Accessed 13 Jun 2013].
- Gemeente Groningen, 2008. *Groningen = creatieve stad* [Groningen = creative city]. Den Bosch: ETIN Adviseurs.
- Gemeente Groningen, 2013. *Gronometer* [online]. Groningen: Onderzoek en Statistiek. Available from: <http://groningen.buurtmonitor.nl/> [Accessed 13 Jun 2013].
- Hartley, J., 2005. *Creative industries*. Malden: Blackwell.
- Healey, P., 2004. Creativity and urban governance. *Policy studies*, 25 (2), 87–102.
- Hesmondhalgh, D. and Pratt, A., 2005. Cultural industries and cultural policy. *International journal of cultural policy*, 11 (1), 1–13.
- Kloosterman, R., ed., 2005. *Cultuur en creativiteit naar waarde geschat* [Assessing the value of culture and creativity]. Utrecht/Amsterdam: Stichting Atlas voor gemeenten/SEO Economisch Onderzoek.
- Landry, C., 2008. *The creative city: a toolkit for Urban innovators*. 2nd ed. London: Earthscan.
- Lange, B., et al., 2008. Berlin’s creative industries: governing creativity? *Industry and innovation*, 15 (5), 531–548.
- Latour, Bruno, 1995. Moderniser ou écologiser? A la recherche de la ‘septième’ cite [Modernization or Ecologization. The search for the ‘seventh’ value regime]. *Ecologie politique*, 13, 5–27.
- Marlet, G., and van Woerkens, C., 2012. *Atlas voor gemeenten 2012. De 50 grootste gemeenten van Nederland op 40 punten vergeleken* [Atlas of municipalities 2012. The 50 largest municipalities in the Netherlands compared on 40 points]. Nijmegen: VOC uitgevers.
- Marlet, G., Ponds, R., and van Woerkens, C., 2011. *Het belang van cultuurstad Groningen* [The importance of Groningen as a city of culture]. Utrecht: Atlas voor gemeenten.
- McGuigan, J., 2004. *Rethinking cultural policy*. Maidenhead: Open University Press/McGraw-Hill Education.
- McGuigan, J., 2009. Doing a Florida thing: the creative class thesis and cultural policy. *International journal of cultural policy*, 15 (3), 291–300.

- Ministerial Creative Industries Mapping Group, 2001. *Creative industries: mapping document*. London: Department for Culture, Media and Sport.
- O'Connor, J., 2009. Creative industries: a new direction? *International journal of cultural policy*, 15 (4), 387–402.
- Oakley, K., 2009. The disappearing arts: creativity and innovation after the creative industries. *International journal of cultural policy*, 15 (4), 403–413.
- Redaelli, E., 2011. Analyzing the 'creative city' governance: relational processes in Columbus, Ohio. *City, culture and society*, 2 (2), 85–91.
- Rutten, P., Marlet, G., and van Oort, F., 2011. *Creatieve industrie als vliegwiel Onderzoek in opdracht van Creative Cities Amsterdam Area* [Creative industries as incubator. Research commissioned by creative cities Amsterdam area]. Haarlem: Paul Rutten Onderzoek.
- Thévenot, Laurent, Moody, Michael, and Lafaye, Claudette, 2000. Forms of valuing nature: arguments and modes of justification in French and American environmental disputes. In Michèle Lamont and Laurent Thévenot, eds. *Rethinking comparative cultural sociology, repertoires of evaluation in France and the United States*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 229–272.
- Throsby, D., 2001. *Economics and culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Throsby, D., 2010. *The economics of cultural policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Topteam Creatieve Industrie, 2011. *CLICK//Innovatiecontract op hoofdlijnen: Topsector Creatieve Industrie* [CLICK/Innovation contract in broad terms: Top sector creative industries]. Eindhoven: CLICKNL.
- van den Hoogen, Q.L., 2014. New local cultural policy evaluation methods in the Netherlands: status and perspectives. *The international journal of cultural policy*, 20 (5), 613–636.
- van de Vorst, F., Frye, E., and Krijger, J., 2011. *De Gids. Creatief en innovatief ondernemen* [The guide. Creative and innovative entrepreneurship]. Eindhoven: Gemeente Eindhoven.
- Van Winkel, C., Gielen, P., and Zwaan, K., 2012. *De hybride kunstenaar: de organisatie van de artistieke praktijk in het postindustriële tijdperk* [The hybrid artist: the organization of the artistic practice in the post-industrial age]. AKV/St Joost (Avans Hogeschool).

Appendix 1. Schematization of the orders of worth

	Inspired	Domestic	Fame	Civic	Market	Industrial	Project
Higher common principle	Inspiration	Tradition, hierarchy	Public opinion	General interest	Competition, rivalry	Efficiency	Networking, activity
State of worth	Bizarre, unusual, emotional	Trust, honesty, wisdom	Recognition, reputation, visibility	Representation, rules, commonality	Winning, desirability, money	Functionality, reliability, innovation	Trust, communication, adjustment
Human dignity	Passion, creation	Habits, good manners	Recognition, respect	Civil rights, participation	Desire, materialism	Activity, energy	Engagement, participation
Subjects	Artists, spirits, madmen	Fathers, family, kings	Opinion leaders, journalists	Representatives, members	Businessmen, clients, buyers	Experts, professionals	Mediators, coaches, expert
Objects	Mind, dreams, artworks	Good behaviour, ranks, titles	Brands, press, public relations	Rights, laws, policy	Luxury items, wealth	Methods, plans, tasks, resources	Alliances, partnerships
Investment	Risk	Duty, respect	Revealing secret	Solidarity	Opportunism	Investment	Flexibility, tolerance
Relation of worth	Originality, uniqueness	Authority, honour	Identification	Membership, delegation	Possessions	Control, responsibility	Communication, adaptability
Relationships	Creation, imagining	Reproduction, training, respect	Influence, promotion	Mobilization, assembly	Negotiation, buying, selling	Formalization, standardization	Mobility, diversity
Figures	Unconscious, imagination	Families, conventions	Positioning, public, audience	State, republic, democracy	Market	Organizations, systems	Network
Test	Adventure, mental voyage	Celebrations, social events	Presentation, demonstration	Assemblies, council meeting	Deal	Trials, experiments	Time between projects
Judgment	Intuition, illumination	Appreciation, critique	Rumours, trends, sensation	Consultation, voting, elections	Price, value	Effectiveness, functionality	Ability to participate
Evidence	Symbols, images, signs	Good behaviour, anecdotes	Fame, being known	Laws, rules, statutes	Money, profit, results	Measurability	Part of a project
Decline	Habits, routines	Impoliteness, gossip	Indifference, unknown	Isolation, individualism	Enslavement to money	Objectification	Corruption, cronyism

Source: Based on Boltanski and Thévenot (2006) and Boltanski and Chiapello (2005).