

# Non-Paper I

“Ceci n’est pas un papier”

# Value Creation: A Creative Economies Perspective

**Simon Grand & Christoph Weckerle**

# Management Summary auf Deutsch

CreativeEconomies.com, der Forschungspartner des Kompetenzzentrum Kultur- und Kreativwirtschaft des Bundes (KKKW), entwickelt Non-Papers. Dabei geht es nicht um abgeschlossene wissenschaftliche Argumente in einer möglichst finalisierten Form. Es geht vielmehr um eine Einladung zur Reflexion, zur Debatte, zum Widerspruch, zur Auseinandersetzung mit aktuellen Entwicklungen und möglichen Perspektiven für die Creative Economies. Orientierungspunkt ist für uns eine Frage, die sich Akteure der Creative Economies immer wieder stellen: «what if?» (durch die Diskussionen erweitert um zwei weitere Fragen: «what for?» und «so what?»). Etablierte Konzepte und Vorstellungen («Kreativwirtschaft als Ressourcen-Pool für die Wirtschaft», «Kreativität als Basis für (technologische) Innovation», ...) werden kritisch reflektiert; bekannte Begriffe und Black Boxes (wie «Kreativität», «Wertschöpfung», «Unternehmertum», «Kultur», ...) werden de-konstruiert; nicht weiter hinterfragte Selbstverständlichkeiten («zunehmende Ökonomisierung», «Prekarisierung der Kulturschaffenden», ...) werden thematisiert. Das ist kein Selbstzweck, sondern wir wollen so neue Perspektiven und alternative Möglichkeiten für Akteure im Feld der Creative Economies entwickeln.

Dabei nimmt das Non-Paper I mit seinen Themen Wertschöpfung, Bewertungssysteme, Kurations- und Innovationsprozesse wichtige Aspekte des vielschichtigen Ökosystem der Creative Economies in den Fokus. Auf diese Weise definieren wir ein zukunftsfähiges und dynamisch angelegtes Programm, welche einerseits die wichtigen Diskurslinien aufnimmt und andererseits für das KKKW eine attraktive und zugleich fundierte Forschungsagenda darstellt. Das Non-Paper I verstehen wir als Ausgangspunkt und Grundlage für weiterführende, stärker fokussierte Zugänge in weiteren Non-Papers. Diese sehen wir dann als «Tiefenbohrungen» im Terrain von Non-Paper I. «Entrepreneurial Strategies» und «Company Building» werden erste Themen sein, welche sich aufgrund der Diskussionen und der vorliegenden Beobachtungen und Beschreibungen aufdrängen. Das Zusammenspiel zwischen der Beschreibung eines Ausgangspunktes (Non-Paper I) und den weiterführenden Analysen (Non-Papers II ff.) entspricht der hohen Dynamik in den Creative Economies. Dabei wird immer zentral sein, dass mit dem Format des Non-Papers spekulative und experimentelle Zugänge im Zentrum stehen.

Jedes Non-Paper soll dabei eine andere Form haben, passend zum Gegenstand. Das vorliegende Non-Paper I arbeitet mit dem Format einer Serie von nummerierten Propositionen zu zentralen Begriffen und Konzepten

(was das Paper sehr dicht und voraussetzungsreich macht: umso wichtiger ist eine weiterführende Diskussion der einzelnen Propositionen, wichtige Aussagen werden teilweise auch in nächsten Non-Papers weiter vertieft). Das Non-Paper I richtet sich dabei bewusst an Expertinnen und Experten der Creative Industries Diskussion. Das Paper bietet ihnen die Möglichkeit, hinter Begriffe, Konzepte, Diskurse, ... zu schauen, sozusagen in den backstage-Bereich des Diskurses. Die einzelnen Propositionen wurden im März & April 2018 in verschiedenen Workshops mit Akteuren der Creative Economies in Berlin diskutiert, mit Bezug zu konkreten Erfahrungen getestet, und bewertet. Die vorliegende revised version ist eine Überarbeitung des ursprünglichen Non-Papers I vor diesem Hintergrund: neu mit einem Management Summary und kurzen Zusammenfassungen der einzelnen Teile auf Deutsch; mit diversen Präzisierungen; mit zusätzlichen Propositionen.

Nach einer kurzen Diskussion einiger Mainstream Positionen im Feld der Kreativwirtschaft («Cultural and Creative Industries: CCIs, Part 0), die bis heute viele Debatten prägen, fokussiert das Non-Paper I auf das Thema «Wertschöpfung» («value creation», Part 1). Von «Aussen» wird immer wieder gefragt, worin die Wertschöpfung der CCIs besteht. Und von «Innen» wird immer wieder argumentiert, dass diese Frage am Kern der Kreativwirtschaft vorbeizieht. Wir fragen nach und adressieren Black Boxes, die eine differenziertere Auseinandersetzung möglich machen: «Wert» und «Schöpfung», «Kreativität» und «Industrie», «Kulturalisierung» und «Ökonomisierung». Wir behaupten, dass die in diesen Black Boxes implizierten Frontstellungen viele spannende Entwicklungen im Feld der Creative Economies verdecken. Nur wenn wir diese Black Boxes öffnen und kritisch diskutieren schaffen wir die Basis, um das «in between» und «beyond» etablierter Vorstellungen zu sehen und zu entwickeln. Entsprechend machen wir uns für «Creative Economies» im Plural als Beschreibung des Feldes stark.

Ausgehend von dieser Grundsatzdiskussion schlagen wir in einem zweiten Schritt vor (Part 2: «Re-Framing Essential Concepts»), von der aktuellen globalen Debatte zu den Creative Economies zu profitieren und weiterführende Zugänge zu den CCIs zu entwickeln. Im Kern sagen wir: Kurations- und Innovationsprozesse haben eine inhärent politische Dimension: in jedem Entwurf alternativer Möglichkeiten für die Zukunft ist eine kritische Auseinandersetzung mit der Gegenwart impliziert. Entsprechend ist es zentral, die Beurteilungen und Bewertungen des Neuen explizit zu machen und die implizierten Bewertungsdimensionen zu reflektieren. Es gibt keine gegebenen selbstverständlichen Bewertungssysteme (Bewertungsdimensionen, -prozesse, -instrumente, ...), sondern diese werden immer wieder in Frage gestellt und neu verhandelt.

Akteure der Creative Economies haben deshalb zugleich ihre Wertschöpfung, deren Bewertung und die Etablierung von Bewertungssystemen im Blick. Diese bedingen sich gegenseitig, es gibt nicht das eine ohne das andere.

Der Schlussteil (Part 3: «Developing Entrepreneurial Strategies») wird hier nicht weiter vertieft und bildet neu den Ausgangspunkt für das Non-Paper II. Ausgehend von den diversen Diskussionen in Berlin (s. [www.creativeeconomies.com](http://www.creativeeconomies.com)) ist deutlich geworden, dass das Themenfeld «Unternehmerische Strategien im Feld der Creative Economies» eine eigene Diskussion verdient und eine andere Form braucht (keine Propositionen, sondern Behauptungen).

Unternehmerische Strategien lassen sich als die spezifischen Ansätze sehen, mit denen Akteure Wertschöpfung, Bewertung und Bewertungssysteme behaupten, entwickeln, etablieren und immer wieder neu bestätigen.

Zürich & Berlin, September 2018

## Basic Idea of this series of Non-Papers

**Summary:** Non-Papers entwickeln keine abgeschlossene wissenschaftliche Argumentation in einer möglichst finalisierten und fixierten Form. Es geht um eine Einladung zur Reflexion, zur Debatte, zum Widerspruch, zur Auseinandersetzung mit aktuellen Entwicklungen und möglichen Perspektiven für die Creative Economies. Etablierte Konzepte und Vorstellungen werden kritisch reflektiert; bekannte Begriffe und Black Boxes werden dekonstruiert; nicht weiter hinterfragte Selbstverständlichkeiten werden thematisiert. Unsere Überzeugung ist, dass so festgefahrene Debatten eine neue Dynamik gewinnen können; und dass alternative Möglichkeiten für Akteure im Bereich der Creative Economies sichtbar werden. Die Non-Papers stehen zueinander in einer inhaltlichen Abhängigkeit: Das Non-Paper I steckt ein Terrain ab und zeigt Tendenzen auf, die in der Folge in weiteren, mehr fokussierten Non-Papers vertieft werden.

CreativeEconomies.com, the KKKW (Kompetenzzentrum Kultur- und Kreativwirtschaft des Bundes) research partner, is developing a series of non-papers dedicated to exploring state-of-the-art perspectives on important phenomena, puzzles, developments and controversies related to the creative economies. The focus lies on the global debate. The translation and interpretation of the non-papers for the German context will be jointly realised with the KKKW and in close interactions with multiple actors in the creative economies and beyond.

We call these research papers non-papers as they do not intend to provide definitive academic arguments characteristic of more traditional scientific papers. Instead, their guiding question is “What if?” This question allows us to concentrate on a fundamental quality of many strategies in the creative economies: the exploration of current and future possibilities, beyond well-established or widely understood views and approaches. As a consequence, these non-papers raise questions, explore topics and formulate propositions that need to be tested, sharpened and translated into tangible initiatives in workshop bringing together various kinds of creative economy actors (see also chapter “Approach of ...”).

These non-papers will thus serve as reference points for open debates about the present and the future of the creative economies. They will also inspire the development of specific strategies and programmes. The initial exploring and testing of our ideas and propositions in these non-papers will take place on a discussion platform organised and moderated by KKKW in Berlin. We see this unique organisation and the city of Berlin as particularly promising test environments and as inspiring spaces within the current dynamic and global debate on the future of the creative economies and their multiple actors.

→ The first discussions of Non-Paper I show that it is challenging for many reasons (language policy of the administration, specific vocabulary, ...). The next Non-Papers will be written in German (with a Management Summary in English). At the same time, the work-in-progress approach implicit in the suggested process of writing Non-Papers is seen as a very productive way of entering a debate and exploring new perspectives. The next Non-Papers will explore a new form and format.

## Approach of the Research Venture CreativeEconomies.com

**Summary: Das research venture CreativeEconomies.com ist ein not-for-profit Forschungs-Venture der Zürcher Hochschule der Künste (ZHdK), in Partnerschaft mit dem RISE Management Innovation Lab der Universität St.Gallen (HSG). Es wird von Christoph Weckerle und Simon Grand kuratiert, in enger Zusammenarbeit mit diversen Ko-Kuratoren, unter anderem mit Desmond Hui (Hongkong), Frédéric Martel (Paris), Andy Pratt (London), Serge von Arx (Oslo). Seit 2018 ist das research venture offiziell Forschungspartner des KKKW in Berlin und entwickelt gemeinsam mit den Ko-Kuratoren Christoph Backes und Sylvia Hustedt eine Serie von Non-Papers. Die darin artikulierten Ideen, Propositionen, Behauptungen, Argumentationen, ... reflektieren die aktuellen Entwicklungen der Creative Economies und ihrer Akteure, vor dem Hintergrund globaler Perspektiven und Diskurse. Gemeinsam mit dem KKKW-Team, den KKKW-Partnern und der KKKW-Community werden Übersetzungen dieser zum Teil sehr grundsätzlichen Überlegungen in konkrete Cases, Formate, Initiativen, Strategien, ... erarbeitet.**

The research venture CreativeEconomies.com curates experiments, projects and initiatives that explore, design, map, investigate and reflect on new opportunities for value creation across global networks in the field of the creative economies. In this way, this not-for-profit venture develops and debates valuation devices for cultural, technological and economic performance.

The research outcomes of the venture include: (1) tools and maps for describing and explaining how fundamental economic models and principles—in the public and in the private sector—are changing and creating new economies; (2) methods and practices for modeling, strategising and mapping their advancement while making models and principles accessible to controversial debate and creative advancement; (3) devices and narratives able to judge and justify the multiple aspects relevant for such new models and principles to be valuable, successful, relevant and desirable.

The venture combines different research approaches to advance our understanding and practice in these three areas through a series of approaches:

- identifying promising new economic patterns, models, mechanisms, procedures, devices and practices currently being explored in science, culture, society and business
- mapping and modeling important patterns and processes to ground such debates in a sound empirical basis, at a macro- and at a micro-level
- enabling controversial debates on a global scale, through a series of expert panels with curators from fields like urban planning, consulting, design, etc.
- developing judgement devices for appropriately evaluating novel, critical and unconventional approaches to the taken-for-granted status quo
- exploring fundamental economic models and principles and their future development in unconventional formats (exhibitions on shopping, banking, uncertainty, value, etc.)
- moderating strategy workshops for institutions reflecting on and exploring their past, present and future value creation from a broader perspective
- offering formal and informal educational contexts in order to transfer the established knowledge to different key groups (executives, young generation, ...)

→ The Non-Paper Series is a format developed in collaboration with the Kompetenzzentrum Kultur- und Kreativwirtschaft KKKW in Berlin, in intense discussions with our co-curators Christoph Backes and Sylvia Hustedt, as well as their team and their partners in the German government. KKKW activities and initiatives, in particular the Phase XI Programme, as well as the multiple actors in Berlin's and Germany's creative economies provide a unique context for exploring, testing and advancing various points discussed in our Non-Papers.

## Focus Areas of Non-Paper I

**Summary: Das Non-Paper 1 fokussiert auf das Thema «Wertschöpfung» («value creation», Part 1), in Form einer Serie von Propositionen. Dabei fällt auf: von «ausen» wird immer wieder gefragt, worin die Wertschöpfung der CCIs besteht. Und von «innen» wird immer wieder argumentiert, dass diese Frage am Kern der Kreativwirtschaft vorbeizieht. Wir fragen nach und hinterfragen Black Boxes, die eine differenziertere Auseinandersetzung verdienen: «Wert-Schöpfung», «Kreativ-Industrien», Dynamiken der «Kulturalisierung» und «Ökonomisierung».**

**Wir schlagen weiter vor (Part 2: «Re-Framing Essential Concepts»), von der aktuellen globalen Debatte zu den Creative Economies zu profitieren und neue Zugänge zu den CCIs zu entwickeln. Im Kern sagen wir:**

**Kreations- und Innovationsprozesse haben eine inhärent politische Dimension. Entsprechend ist es wesentlich, die Beurteilungen und Bewertungen des Neuen explizit zu machen und die implizierten Bewertungssysteme (Bewertungsdimensionen, -prozesse, -instrumente, ...) explizit zu thematisieren.**

Non-Paper I explores an important, underexplored and controversial topic for the creative economies on a global scale: “value creation.” This topic is interesting for several reasons:

(a) value creation is a central economic framework (also value chain, value constellations, ...) that deserves critical analysis → we observe that critical, controversial reflection on this focus is important for many actors in Berlin: to transcend the taken-for-granted, economic view by explicitly considering the richness and complexity of “value creation” in the creative economies;

(b) the deconstruction of taken-for-granted value creation processes and the development of new value constellations (including new business models, platform strategies, alternative funding constellations, partnerships and networks) are fundamental issues; → the Berlin ecosystem is particularly insightful, as it is characterised by a unique constellation of actors: artists in many different fields, designers, researchers, engineers, social initiatives, educational engagements, political activists, venture capitalists, historical institutions, ..., locally embedded and globally connected;

(c) value creation implies processes of valuation, which are often taken-for-granted, but would need explicit exploration;

(d) such valuation mobilises judgement devices, whose performative impact needs to be understood;

(e) in this perspective, valuation implies a heterogeneity of value dimensions, which inherently imply tensions and controversies;

(f) this resonates with the current inflation of value references in almost every social context; → the Berlin Creative Economies ecosystem and its actors are particularly explicit about the controversial nature of “values,” in particular the multiple tensions between an economic and financial understanding of value creation, in relation to a political, social and cultural perspective. Furthermore, historical, ideological, ... aspects are systematically and recurrently addressed and mobilised in many discussions;

(g) as a consequence, value creation, valuation and judgement, and the judgement devices and value dimensions mobilised are inherently political. → it is thus not a coincidence that the political and cultural nature of value

creation, creativity and innovation, economisation and culturalisation, ... is a focal point and a recurrent issue in the multiple encounters, conversations and debates with actors from the Berlin scene. We observe a multitude of attempts to mobilise entrepreneurial strategies to advance “in-between” established notions, programmes and positions.

# PART 0

## The Creative Industries

### Mainstream

**Summary:** Wir beobachten in vielen Debatten einen vergleichsweise klar umrissenen **Mainstream in der Auseinandersetzung mit der Kultur- und Kreativwirtschaft (CCIs): die CCIs werden als Ressource gesehen, um Standorte attraktiv zu machen, als Wissen und Methoden, um damit neue Arbeitsformen zu entwickeln (spill over), Kreativität für Innovation bereitzustellen. Als zentrale Herausforderung wird dabei die Dynamik der CCIs gesehen: sie erfinden sich immer wieder neu, Akteure sind oft schwer zu fassen, sie entziehen sich bewusst Versuchen der Kategorisierung und Instrumentalisierung. Entsprechend sehen wir oft Fronstellungen, Pattsituationen und Unverständnis. Wir sagen, dass ein Perspektivenwechsel wichtig ist: das Fluide, Dynamische, Kritische, Subversive des Feldes ist eine zentrale Qualität, die wir nicht als Problem, sondern als Möglichkeit verstehen sollten, um eingespielte Sichtweisen und Arrangements weiterzudenken, Dinge neu zu sehen, innovative Verknüpfungen auszuprobieren, und so neue Möglichkeiten zu entwerfen, zu entwickeln und zu testen.**

The discussion surrounding the so-called creative industries seems to be part of most of the debates in the cultural sector, as well as in many other industries. The intersection of culture and economy is often discussed as a driving force for new products and services, for creation and innovation, for future oriented job potentials, for new approaches towards megatrends like digitisation and globalisation or for novel ways of discussing economic models or value creation.

These dynamic discussions on the creative industries motivate a great number of transfer-oriented activities—be it from the cultural sector towards other industries (→ “experience,” “culturalisation,” “aesthetisation”, ...), or be it from the field of economic development towards the arts and culture (→ “economisation”). These activities often seem to be barely sustainable since they are not more than unspecific transfers from practices or traditions from one sector to another. The following examples are just a few cases taken from a much larger number:

**0.1 promotion:** The cultural sector has its own historical tradition in patronage and public funding. Therefore, in many countries in Europe there is an ongoing discussion whether and through which programmes the creative industries might be funded in a similar way as is already the case with the arts and culture in the public sector. The upshot of such discussions is often less traditional arts funding and at the same time not enough money and knowledge to support the creative industries. → as a con-

sequence, in-depth reflection on the role of governance in this context is essential.

**0.2 knowledge creation:** The prominence of creative methodologies (like design thinking) and the rise of co-working spaces seem to be two highly dynamic developments in the field of the creative industries. There is hardly any neighbourhood in a larger city without a space where collaborative working modes and cooperation between the submarkets of the creative industries are enabled, or even pushed. Nevertheless, research suggests that the exchange relations between the creative industries and other industrial segments seem to be at least of similar importance. → see also the statistical evidence (e.g. Creative Economies Reports Switzerland 2016 and 2018).

**0.3 innovation:** This resonates with the insight that more promotion and more creative practices and collaborative arrangements do not automatically lead to more innovation, neither in specific companies nor in industries and societies. As a consequence, the search for successful models for translating creativity into innovation (in diverse forms as products, services, technologies, business models, ...) becomes a major field of interest. At the same time, such a focus is criticised for being biased towards commercial impact and thus for instrumentalising the arts. → we argue that a more differentiated reflection on “value creation” (Non-Paper I identifies some important areas of reflection) and “entrepreneurship” (the focal point of Non-Paper II) in the field of the Creative Economies is essential to advance our understanding here, as well as to identify, create and develop robust entrepreneurial strategies and value creation constellations for the future.

**0.4 growth:** In a related line of argumentation, many actors and organisations in the creative industries seem to be hard to copy since they work in open structures, instable personal constellations and are particularly talented in dealing with uncertainties. On the other side, exactly these characteristics are responsible for a weak scaling potential. Rather than working for some time with a clear and consistent focus, these industries tend to move from one project to the next. As a result, traditional approaches in industry policy do not work successfully. → Therefore, we agree with the KKKW that it is important to better understand and to systematically invest in entrepreneurial strategies, company building, platform development, ... and to explicitly address scaling processes, which at the same time inherently imply questions about creative impact.

In order to fully benefit from the potential of the creative industries, we need to move beyond shallow, taken-for-granted views on the creative industries. The unquestioned creative industries mainstream must be deconstructed to gain more precise views and more in-depth analyses of specific cases and singular strategies. → Instead of a linear, unproblematic transfer between the creative

scene and the outside world, we suggest focusing on the uncertain, dynamic and creative translation (Callon, Latour) taking place “in-between” different actors, fields, modes of knowing, methodologies, competences, strategies, ... In doing so, it is essential to understand that most creative economy actors do not see themselves as part of the Cultural and Creative Industries (CCIs), which implies an attempt to categorise what cannot be covered by established categories.

A research-driven approach in this field is needed to understand some crucial aspects of the CCIs (Grand & Weckerle on Phase XI): (1) value(s), different concepts of value creation and evaluation → the focal topic of Non-Paper I; (2) alternative concepts of resources invested in and by the CCIs → see the framework in the Phase XI publication ([www.creativeeconomies.com](http://www.creativeeconomies.com)); (3) new entrepreneurial strategies which are different from concepts of self-management → the focal topic of Non-Paper II; (4) modern understandings of governance which takes the uncertainty and complexity of the CCIs seriously → an essential topic for a future Non-Paper, to be explored in greater detail in different formats (workshops, meetings, conferences, ...) with the KKKW and its partners in the German government.

As a consequence, we propose shifting the focus from answers to questions, towards controversies and heterogeneities, by re-framing concepts, by challenging terminologies, by re-modeling the field and by asking new questions.

## PART 1

### Current Debates & Controversies

**Summary: Wertschöpfung («value creation») verknüpft wie selbstverständlich zwei Kernthemen der CCIs: Wert und Kreation. Zugleich impliziert Wertschöpfung für viele eine ökonomische Wertung: es geht oft unhinterfragt um Wertschöpfung durch bestehende und neue Produkte und Lösungen, und damit um Kommerzialisierung und kommerziell erfolgreiche Innovation. Wir plädieren dafür, die beiden Black Boxes «Wert» und «Kreation» und ihre Verbindung systematisch zu hinterfragen, um neue Perspektiven zu entwickeln für ein differenzierteres Verständnis von Wertschöpfung.**

#### “Value Creation” – “Value” – “Creation”

1.1a value & creation: In the perspective of the recent global creative industries and creative economies discussion, it is interesting to realise that “value creation” connects to two highly debated core concepts: (1) “value,” very often seen one-dimensionally as economic value, or instead critically in terms of social, moral and ethical value (Ullrich, Karpik); and (2) “creation,” which resonates with the recent hype around innovation, creativity and the related disruption and transformation (Joas, Reckwitz). This makes “value creation” a fundamental topic for any well-considered and precise exploration of the current status of and future perspectives for the “cultural and creative industries”. In this perspective, it becomes visible that the CCIs are a twofold concept, one that refers to individual creativity in a cultural context on the one hand, and to a corporate, industry context on the other.

Proposition 1.1a: We suggest deconstructing taken-for-granted concepts of “value creation” to open up new opportunities and perspectives for future value creation possibilities.

→ Typically, actors in the creative economies do not discuss their activities in the perspective of value creation. At the same time, “creation” is central to what they do. Moreover, they constantly “value” what they and what others do (in terms of “being interesting,” “matching,” “having quality,” “being new,” “relevance,” “impact,” etc.). Instead of looking for an alternative term to replace “value creation” in these discussions, we suggest deconstructing the black box, in order to make it a relevant language device to thematise and discuss essential practices and processes in the creative economies.

→ While deconstructing value creation in the context of the creative economies, it is important at the same time to affirm the relevance of the creative economies for value

creation and innovation in the context of agenda setting, as propagated by the KKKW. The current interest in the dynamics of the creative economies is a unique opportunity for mobilising their potential for economic, cultural, political and social fields. Developing an attractive positive language to talk about “value creation” and “creative economies” is thus of primary importance (see the Phase XI initiative as a paradigmatic example of how this could work and where the challenges lie).

Proposition 1.1b: As a result of this deconstruction, attempts to transfer concepts between “the creative” and “the industrial” are problematic and require re-framing as generative translation.

→ We see such a translation focus as an invitation in two directions: for the actors in the creative economies to re-frame what they actually do in terms of value creation (thereby understanding that “economisation” is not a natural, linear process, but implies an in-depth exploration of what the economy and economics might actually mean (there are multiple “economies”); and for the actors outside the creative economies to re-think their understanding of value creation (by considering the subversive, critical, aesthetic, historical, ... power of art and culture). We see this as an essential precondition for “both sides” to engage in more inspiring modes of collaboration.

## 1.2 Deconstructing the Concept of “Creation” and “Creativity”

**Summary: Dekonstruktion und Disruption sind in Mode: dahinter steht offensichtlich die Agenda, bestehende Selbstverständlichkeiten, Organisationen und Institutionen herauszufordern. Zusätzlich verstärkt wird diese Agenda durch die Forderung nach mehr «Kreativität» und «Innovation». Zugleich sind Dekonstruktion und Disruption im Kern negativ fokussiert: sie nehmen Dinge auseinander und diagnostizieren Herausforderungen. Viel zentraler ist dann, positive Gegenentwürfe zu entwickeln und alternative Möglichkeiten aufzuzeigen. Wir sehen viele aktuelle, aber auch langjährige und teilweise historische Initiativen in den Creative Economies als inspirierende Versuche, Alternativen zu entwickeln. Die Creative Economies sind in diesem Sinn immer auch Laboratorium für Alternativen.**

1.2a deconstruction & disruption: The reference to “industries” in these debates is linked to an interest in better understanding whether and how established value creation processes in almost all economic but also political and social contexts are deconstructed and disrupted by creation and innovation, especially in relation to digitisation (Mar-tel). In this respect, the context of the creative industries

and particular segments (e.g. music industry, media industry, film industry or social media) are early examples of how fundamental such deconstruction and disruption can be. At the same time, Silicon Valley and other “creative clusters” exemplify how creation methodologies (design thinking, agile development, creative destruction, disruptive technologies, ...) and entrepreneurial strategies enable enterprises and other organisations to leverage such disruptions as opportunities, and to succeed in the future (Turner).

→ it is important to recognise the paradoxical connection between disruption and the CCIs: on the one hand, CCIs actors are important drivers of this disruption through their commitment to new technologies (digitisation, ...), methodologies (design thinking, ...), business models, ... ; on the other hand, some areas of the CCIs are particularly heavily affected by digitisation and the disruption of traditional models (like the media, the music industry, film, ...), transforming the entire “value constellation” of established industries or between industries (Christensen)

Proposition 1.2a: The CCIs provide the ideal context for any systematic and inspiring reflection on “value” and “creation”—scientifically, entrepreneurially, artistically and politically.

1.2b innovation economies & the creativity dispositif: Deconstruction and disruption are primarily discussed in relation to creation and innovation, not only as a primary source leading to disruption and transformation, but also as a promising way to address or even strategically lead such disruption (Schumpeter, Christensen). This explains the current hype around new approaches to creation and innovation, as well as the diagnosis of our economies and societies as knowledge or innovation societies and economies. In this context, the underlying creativity dispositif is seen as increasingly dominating multiple fields of action (Novotny, Stehr, Knoblauch, Reckwitz). Obviously, there is a basic assumption that individuals, collectives and organisations from the CCIs are competent and experienced in dealing with such situations and processes, as well as with the implicit openness and uncertainty that characterises creation and innovation.

Proposition 1.2b: This reflection requires a systematic analysis of the current hype around creativity and innovation, as a precondition for identifying and testing concepts for future value creation.

→ Interestingly, it is argued in philosophy, sociology and the cognitive sciences among others that “creativity” is essential for social action in general (Joas, Reckwitz, ...). Through the practice turn and process turn in cultural and social theory (Schatzki, Knorr Cetina, ...), creativity and creation processes are identified as core constituents for our understanding of agency, intelligence and society. But unfortunately, this fundamental reflection is



mixed with the hype around creativity and innovation. A more systematic theoretical reflection on social practice as creative action would be very important and deserves more systematic attention in the discourse on the creative economies.

### 1.3 Deconstructing the Concept of “Value” in relation to “Creativity”

**Summary: Wertediskussionen sind heute inflationär: Politik beruft sich auf Werte, Unternehmen arbeiten an ihrer Wertebasis, die Berufung auf moralische Werte gehört zum guten Ton (inkl. einer damit verbundenen «Moralisierung»), ... . Wir behaupten, dass es einen engen Zusammenhang gibt zwischen den Diskussionen zu «Kreativität» und «Innovation», diesen Wertediskussionen, und den Auseinandersetzungen zu Ökonomisierung und Kulturalisierung. Dabei wird «Kreativität» selber als Wert behauptet, «Werte» werden je nach Kontext mit ökonomischem Wert gleichgesetzt oder im Gegenteil in Opposition dazu gebracht. Eine Reflexion zu Wertschöpfung muss dem nachgehen.**

1.3a social values and moralising critique: In parallel to this hype around creativity and innovation, we observe an emphasis on social values as important complements to economic values. This is often related to a moralising critique of industrial, economic logic, which is challenged as increasingly dominating every area of society, far beyond the economic sphere and technological innovation. It is interesting to realise that individuals, collectives and organisations from the CCIs are again identified as particularly competent and experienced in grounding such a critical attitude. The art sphere is discussed as the most exemplary and as one of the last societal fields that preserves its independence in the face of the dominant industrial, economic logic.

Proposition 1.3a: We must understand how and why the critique of the economic logic underlying innovation, and the hype around innovation, can both be grounded in a concept of artistic creation.

1.3b creativity & values: Interestingly, recent sociological diagnoses of the present times see a close connection between the hype around creativity and an inflation of value referencing. On the one hand, creativity and innovation almost naturally imply positive valuation, which leads us to argue that innovation is change or transformation without negative connotations (Reckwitz). On the other hand, referring to creativity is often seen as an essential viewpoint and “creativity” thus as a value in itself. It is used to oppose, criticise and subvert a purely economic

understanding of “values”. In this respect, we observe an inflation of value references of different societal fields (Ullrich). Discussions can be understood as a consequence of the contingency characterising any value reference in our reflexive modernity (Beck, Giddens, Nassehi). Finally, “creativity” seems to be constitutive of human action in general (Joas) and can thus serve as a point of reference whenever human “values” are seen as threatened. Such valuations correlate with the observation of an increasing culturalisation of every societal field, by way of a counter-movement to the often-criticised economisation.

Proposition 1.3b: Instead of adding to the hype around creativity and values, we need to understand the intimate connection between valuation processes and creation processes.

Proposition 1.3c: Neither economisation nor culturalisation can be understood as linear, non-problematic transfer, but instead need to be understood as highly political translation.

→ The creative economies are obviously at the center of this debate and development. We observe a variety of associated phenomena, patterns and processes:

- In the creative economies, we observe a multitude of different attempts and strategies to assign value to “creativity” (for location quality, innovation, political agenda-setting, ...);
- Valuation is inherently uncertain and controversial. This explains the high relevance of valuation mechanisms and judgement devices to establish and stabilise valuation;
- We see a heterogeneity of self-valuations among creative economy actors (precarious situation, self-exploitation, barter economy, ingenuity, megalomania, community, ...);
- We recognise a continuous tension between the fulfilment of valuation criteria and related expectations, as well as multiple forms of opposition and subversion
- Typically, the assignment of value to specific artifacts, performances, projects and initiatives has a strong staging, storytelling, curatorial, ... dimension (incl. creating magical moments)
- As a consequence, an essential capability in the creative economies is the competence to assert and claim value, together with Inkompetenzkompensationskompetenz (incompetency compensation competency) (Lübbe)

## 1.4 & 1.5: Global Perspectives on “Value Creation” in the Creative Economies

1.4 global competition & soft power: In the political discourse, we observe a related dynamics with respect to the importance of soft power in the global competition for dominating the narratives, values and perspectives guiding societies and cultures. Different global actors like China, the United States of America or Russia, but also Islamic countries engage in soft power and its global impact. At the same time, the European position in such a global competition for soft power is less focused (Martel); furthermore, there is an inherent tension between the former dominance of Italian, French or English culture and the very heterogeneous situation in Europe today. As a consequence, the CCIs, as sources both of cultural creation and production and of the values correlated with creativity and culture, will move centre stage as clusters of actors who might and will impact Europe in future.

Proposition 1.4: The cultural and creatives industries in Europe, and their multiple interrelations around the world, are essential for future strategic positioning on a global scale.

→ We suggest approaching the global dimension of the creative economies discourse not only as a geographical notion. Instead, we suggest a constant re-framing of activities, initiatives and strategies. In this perspective, the creative economies are both embedded locally and connected globally. They should be understood as invitation for zooming-in und zooming-out as a continuing change of perspective.

1.5a current challenges & future possibilities: At the same time, we observe a much more pragmatic and instrumental approach to addressing the CCIs. Many actors simply approach them overall or specific areas and industries within them as sources of economic value, technological innovation and the invention of new industries. In this perspective, the focus shifts from the cultural and creative “content” to the abstract, economic “context”: the importance of the CCIs for future turnover, profitability and employment. In this view, some areas and industries (e.g. software) are clearly predominant. The art sphere is re-framed as an important source of economic value creation through the art market, while the economic impact on other fields like theatre, dance or film is less clear and linear. This resonates with the political distinction made between creative fields that can economically sustain themselves and creative fields that only survive if they are supported by the political system or by patronage. At the same time, such an opposition masks the many highly creative advancements taking place “in-between” the economic and the artistic, the scientific and the political.

Proposition 1.5b: Instead of opposing economic and artistic rationales, it is key to understand their “in-between.” Doing so will lead to new models for future value creation “beyond” traditional criteria.

This implies that the CCIs are at the same time seen as allowing the critique of economisation to be based on cultural and social values while at the same time also driving the actual dynamics of creativity and innovation in the direction of “disrupting everything.” Taking this Janus-faced quality of creativity and critique seriously and exploring the detailed dynamic emerging from it will allow us to better understand the unique potential and future relevance of the cultural and creative economies, not only for artistic creation and technological innovation but also for political strategies and related value creation across societal fields. Research on creation processes, but also on valuation processes, implicit in all innovation, deconstruction, disruption or transformation, suggests that these dynamics are not linear and cannot be directed and instrumentalised in any predetermined way: we need to take seriously the implied uncertainties, which at the same time open up opportunities for future directions.

Proposition 1.5c: We can understand creation, innovation, valuation and value creation processes only ex post and never ex ante: it is inherently uncertain how they unfold over time.

Proposition 1.5d: Any attempt to work on the future (future industries, competences, value creation, ...) needs to be indirect, experimental, improvisational and often implicit.

→ More generally, we observe that value creation in the creative economies (and we would argue that this is also valid more generally) takes place in fields of tension, and thus always “in-between,” “at the edge of” and “beyond” clear perspectives, categories and positions: between local and global, creativity and innovation, economisation and culturalisation, ex ante and ex post, work and ingenuity, singularity and mainstream, ...

## PART 2 Re-Framing Essential Concepts

**Summary:** Ausgehend von unserer Grundsatzreflexion zu Wertschöpfung, Kreativität, Wert schlagen wir in einem zweiten Schritt vor, von der aktuellen globalen Debatte zu den Creative Economies zu profitieren und weiterführende Zugänge zu entwickeln. Im Kern sagen wir dabei: Kreations- und Innovationsprozesse haben eine inhärent politische Dimension: in jedem Entwurf alternativer Möglichkeiten für die Zukunft ist eine kritische Auseinandersetzung mit der Gegenwart impliziert. Entsprechend ist es zentral, die Beurteilungen und Bewertungen des Neuen explizit zu machen und die implizierten Bewertungsdimensionen zu reflektieren. Es gibt keine gegebenen selbstverständlichen Bewertungssysteme (Bewertungsdimensionen, -prozesse, -instrumente, ...), sondern diese werden immer wieder in Frage gestellt und neu verhandelt. Akteure der Creative Economies haben zugleich ihre Wertschöpfung, deren Bewertung und die Etablierung von Bewertungssystemen im Blick. Diese bedingen sich gegenseitig, es gibt nicht das eine ohne das andere.

Taking the current debates seriously implies rethinking taken-for-granted perspectives and reframing the discussion on CCIs. Such rethinking will reveal the potential of the current CCIs for future value creation. It will also develop appropriate strategies for identifying, creating, realising and scaling the enormous potential of the CCIs.

Any attempt at linear transfer, at instrumentalising engagement or at paternalistic guidance will miss the potential and relevance of the CCIs. We argue that it will be important to take seriously the political dimension of creativity and innovation, the explicit or implicit critical perspective implicit in any artistic and cultural engagement, the strong connection between value creation, judgement and valuation processes as well as the judgement devices mobilised in such processes. This would at the same time allow us to move beyond the hype around creativity and innovation, as well as beyond the tendency to use art and culture in the competitive game for soft power.

A dedicated European perspective on the CCIs would consider such complexities not as a problem or as an issue, but rather as an opportunity and potential for novel routes to future value creation:

## 2.1 The Political, Critical, Normative, Judgmental Dimension of Creation and Innovation

**Summary:** Aktuelle und zukünftige Wertschöpfung, und die damit verbundenen Prozesse der Kreation und Innovation sind inhärent politisch und normativ: Wertschöpfung impliziert Bewertung, und diese impliziert Bewertungssysteme, die oft kontrovers sind. Kreation und Innovation implizieren immer die Entwicklung alternativer Möglichkeiten: auch diese sind oft kontrovers. Dabei stellen Alternativen das Bestehende in Frage, das heisst sie implizieren Kritik. Entsprechend ist es wesentlich, genauer zu verstehen, wie in solchen Kontexte Bewertungen, Entscheidungen, Urteile zustande kommen.

2.1a the political dimension of innovation processes: State-of-the-art scientific research on creativity and innovation, as well as the related processes, emphasise the inherently political dimension of such processes (Bijker, Pinch, Garud, Orlikowski). Actually, the famous term “creative destruction” (Schumpeter), which characterises entrepreneurial strategies and related innovation processes, already addresses this inherently political dimension: “creativity” and “innovation” are not neutral or positive by nature (Boltanski & Thévenot, 1991; Thévenot, 2006). We should rather ask more systematically which “creativity” we see as inspiring, subversive, good, interesting and according to which criteria (do we value their criticism, their experimental attitude, their radicalness, their improvisational quality, their aesthetic ambition, ...). The same holds true for innovation, which should be discussed systematically in terms of whether it is seen as really relevant, desirable and as a societal priority (Auger, Dunne, Raby). As we can observe, the hype around creativity and innovation often obscures such questions. But at the same time, such questions emerge on the political and societal agenda, when their consequences for life, work, social contexts, ecological environments, political institutions, ... are discussed.

Proposition 2.1a: Addressing, discussing and answering questions concerning the desirability of innovations more systematically would fundamentally enrich current debates.

2.1b the critical dimension of creation processes: Interestingly, creation processes provide a particularly inspiring and productive context for exploring the inherently political qualities of innovation. If we understand creation processes as the emergence of potential futures, novel possibilities and alternative perspectives, this always also implies a critical relation to the present and the past. By

contrasting the “what is” with the “what could be,” creation processes open up a tension between the present and the future. As we can learn from the scientific description of and philosophical reflection on artistic strategies and design practices, critique and creativity are intimately connected. Recent approaches like critical design (Raby, Dunne), design fiction (Bleeker), speculative design (Auger, Dunne, Raby), strategy design (Grand), as well as a more systematic interest in exploring the specific qualities of the artificial (Simon), the political (Erlhoff), the project (Findeli), risk taking (Grand & Weckerle), ... in artistic and designerly creation confirm this observation.

Proposition 2.1b: Creation processes are valuation processes, both systematically interrelating creativity and critique in developing new possibilities and alternative perspectives.

2.1c making judgement and valuation explicit: As we learn from the discussion so far, valuation based on value judgement, as well as the justification of such valuation, are inherent in innovation and creation processes (Bijker). Recent research more generally argues that judgement and valuation are at the same time particularly difficult, but also important given the contingencies, uncertainties and ambiguities characterising today’s knowledge societies (Callon, Karpik). However, the hype around creativity and innovation, the opposition between economy and culture, the linear transfer view that connects artistic practices and economic value creation often obscure these valuation processes (Latour). This can of course be important in some instances, to black-box the inherent uncertainties and implied controversies (Gomez & Jones). However, in many instances an explicit discussion of judgement and valuation would be important.

Proposition 2.1c: Since judgement and valuation are controversial in the face of uncertainty, it can be instrumental to black-box them. At the same time, it can be essential to make them explicit.

Judgement devices are tools, methods and arrangements making judgement and valuation possible in the face of contingencies, uncertainties and ambiguities (Karpik). Knowledge creation in general, and cultural and artistic creation in particular, are especially insightful contexts for understanding judgment and valuation processes in greater detail. Any artistic position is an assertion that can be questioned, challenged and refuted. As a consequence, we observe an inflation of the judgement devices being deployed to stabilise and protect such claims: rankings, prices, likes, critiques, stories, curators and collections that identify and frame particular artistic positions as valuable, important and relevant. At the same time, such devices are controversial themselves and require critical reflection and further development. Depending on whether the value of particular artistic positions can be taken-for-granted or is contested, very different valuation

dynamics emerge. Being contested, however, is not necessarily a problem, as it generates attention, which can in turn be seen as a positive valuation. At the same time, not being contested can imply a lack of interest, which can lead to devaluation.

Proposition 2.1d: Since any judgement and valuation under uncertainty can be contested, judgement devices are essential for stabilising, protecting or changing value attributions.

→ The discussions show: the creative economies are a paradigmatic context for studying and exploring the multitude of valuations, decisions, selections, judgements ... implicit in any value creation and innovation process. This makes the creative economies an exemplary context for a global scene that questions and challenges taken-for-granted, stable valuation systems and replaces them with continuous debates and controversies concerning values. As a consequence, values are replaced by processes of valuation, objectivity shifts towards processes of objectivation, measures are seen as embedded in measurement procedures, judgements require judgement devices, ... The challenge is to stabilise valuation in the face of contingent valuation systems.

## 2.2 The Importance and Impossibility of Explication, Justification, Legitimation

**Summary: Weil Werte und Bewertungen und die damit verbundenen Bewertungssysteme kontingent sind, müssen sie systematisch stabilisiert werden. Das macht es einerseits besonders wichtig, robuste Erklärungen, Begründungen, Legitimationen zu etablieren. Zugleich ist es unter Unsicherheit und im Kontext von Kontroversen gerade nicht möglich, eine Wertsetzung abschließend zu erklären oder zu begründen. Vielmehr geht es darum, durch unterschiedlichste Praktiken, Prozesse und Devices dafür zu sorgen, dass kontroverse Bewertungen zumindest vorläufig und für eine gewisse Zeit ausser Frage gestellt und als möglicherweise richtig akzeptiert und gelebt werden können.**

2.2 multitude & heterogeneity of value references: Obviously, there is no limit to the number of values which can be mobilised in judgement and valuation processes. Some researchers have observed an inflation of judgements and related value references in today’s society and culture (Reckwitz, Ullrich). Since taken-for-granted valuations are increasingly difficult to stabilise in a pluralistic world characterised by contingencies and uncertainties, situated value claims and subjective judgements become more important without, however, gaining any institutionalised

relevance. As a consequence, we see a high volatility of judgement and valuation in many instances. Also evident is a complex web of value references, which distinguishes or combines economic and moral, aesthetic and political, cultural and historical, religious and technical value dimensions. In addition, we observe a multitude of platforms, communities and movements which engage in judgement and valuation processes to make their specific valuation visible, prominent and relevant. This raises interesting political questions: Who is valuing in whose name? How is the representation of specific perspectives and interests organised?

Proposition 2.2a: We are currently observing a great heterogeneity and high volatility of valuations, which leads to a competition among valuation dimensions and judgement devices.

Proposition 2.2b: Any judgement or valuation is inherently political, as it explicitly or implicitly claims to represent particular interests, expectations, desires and ideals.

→ The Creative Economies are an exemplary context for exploring how decision making, valuation, judgement, selection in the face of uncertainty and controversy are made possible. Evident throughout is the close connection between value creation, valuation and valuation systems. At the same time, their fragility becomes visible and requires continuous engagement to establish, stabilise and protect specific valuations against competing alternatives. Various important patterns and processes become apparent:

- A close connection between different value-related processes, including valuation, value creation, value affirmation, value attribution, value justification, judgement devices, ... ;
- Value creation, valuation and valuation systems are embedded in a generational dynamics: every new generation (X, Y, Z, ...) is identified with changing values and new valuation systems;
- Given the contingent, controversial nature of values, we observe the emergence of parallel universes, which are often disconnected and make translations challenging;
- At the same time, valuations only stabilise if asserting values, confirming valuations, giving feedback, engaging in controversies, mobilizing others, ... are interconnected;
- Furthermore, valuation is involved in a temporal dynamics, which connect valuation ex ante and ex post, stabilise valuation through circularities and tautologies, and ...;
- It is repeatedly argued that economisation and monetarisation can be explained as an attempt to simplify valuation in the face of such valuation controversies and complexities;
- As an alternative, we suggest suspending valuation and consciously avoiding any discussion about valuation systems.

## 2.3 Re-framing CCl's in a Creative Economies Perspective

**Summary: Um der Vielfalt, Heterogenität und Dynamik des Feldes gerecht zu werden verfolgen wir seit einigen Jahren eine Creative Economies Perspektive (im Gegensatz zu einer Kultur- und Kreativwirtschafts Perspektive). Damit versuchen wir verschiedene Dinge zu adressieren: die multiplen Beziehungen zwischen Formen der Kreation und der Ökonomie (die wir zugleich als Wirtschaft (economy) und als Ökonomie (economics) verstehen). Die Vielfalt der Ideen, Modelle, Organisationsformen und Ausprägungen des Ökonomischen, die sich in und zwischen den Feldern der Kultur, Wirtschaft, Wissenschaft, Technologie, Politik, Gesellschaft entwickelt haben und weiterhin entwickeln. Und damit zugleich die Vielfalt von Begriffe, Praktiken und Methoden des Kreativen. Damit machen wir uns für eine Perspektive stark, die Wertschöpfung im hier skizzierten Sinn immer wieder neu thematisiert, weiterdenkt und hinterfragt.**

2.3 arguing for a creative economies perspective: We argue that today's predominant concepts of the CCl's are not able to address the inherently political and critical aspect of creation and innovation. Furthermore, they are not able to address the inherently controversial, contested nature of the judgements and valuations implied. This primarily results from a lack of differentiation and complexity in their conceptualisations: culture, creativity, industry and economy are seen as clear entities (with their inherent logic). These can be connected linearly (either as an opposition between culture and economy, creativity and industry or as a linear transfer from one to the other). We therefore propose "creative economies" as an alternative perspective, one that emphasises the inherent multitude and heterogeneity of any concept of industry and economy by indicating the inherent plurality of the implied "economies." At the same time, this alternative perspective emphasises the close connection between creation processes and valuation processes, the inherently critical quality of creativity, as well as the political nature of any innovation process.

Proposition 2.3a: In order to open the black boxes implied in any CCl's discussion, we propose reframing it in a creative economies perspective.

Proposition 2.3b: The dynamics around the creative core (opting in vs. opting out) will be a major driving force for value creation in the creative economies.

→ In our creative economies perspective, we cannot assume that CCl's exist as a defined field of action. We rather have to acknowledge and deconstruct the inherent

controversies, through which value creation and the implied interconnections between creation and valuation, value propositions and valuation systems, resources and values are seen by the actors involved. To make such controversies visible, we suggest exploring a multitude of approaches, formats and methodologies: statistical analysis and mappings, case studies and interviews, debates and workshops, journalistic essays and models, non-papers and projects, ... . Our perspective expects that the creative economies as fields of action undergo recurrent transformations and shifts. Each actor potentially or actually re-defines the field of action.

## PART 3

# Developing Entrepreneurial Strategies

**Summary: Konsequenterweise kann es in einer Creative Economies Perspektive nicht darum gehen, allgemeine und generische Aussagen darüber zu machen, wie Kreation und Wert, Wertschöpfung und Bewertung zusammenhängen. Vielmehr muss es darum gehen, die Vielfalt der «Unternehmerischen Strategien» zu diskutieren, die singuläre Verknüpfungen vorschlagen. Die bisherige Diskussion der draft version des Non-Papers I haben gezeigt, dass diese Diskussion ein eigenes Non-Paper II verdient. Einige erste Überlegungen stellen wir hier dennoch einmal an. Wir sagen, dass unternehmerische Strategien sich als die je spezifischen Ansätze verstehen lassen, mit denen Akteure der Creative Economies Wertschöpfung, Bewertung und Bewertungssysteme im Zusammenspiel behaupten, entwickeln, etablieren und immer wieder neu bestätigen. Die weitere Vertiefung im Non-Paper II wird deshalb auch die Form und das Format der Behauptung weiterführen.**

## 3.1 Important Dimensions of Entrepreneurial Strategies

Focusing on entrepreneurial strategies in the creative economies requires exploring the implied concepts of strategy. This resonates with recent research in the field of strategic management, inviting us to challenge taken-for-granted, unquestioned conceptualizations of strategy. This has identified a series of phenomena, issues and patterns that require further conceptual and empirical exploration, as well as critical reflection and experimentation (Mintzberg & Lampel, Rumelt, Chia & Holt, Grand):

Strategy as projecting desirable futures: Strategy can be seen as a future-oriented practice which shapes how individuals, organisations, networks or collectives project and realise possible, desirable and relevant futures while creating and establishing the necessary preconditions for sustaining such futures. This implies dealing with fundamental uncertainty and ambiguity (“we do not know what we will know in the future”), as well as with possible and not-yet-possible worlds (“we do not know what will be possible in the future”). This particular field of expertise and experience seems to be characteristic of actors in the creative economies. → In the perspective of Non-Paper I, we extend this strategy dimension by explicitly addressing the importance of valuation processes and value systems, which in turn allow one to ground the discussion on desirability.

Strategy as how organisations generate distinctive value: Strategy addresses the question of value creation, in

particular how an organisation creates relevant value for its relevant stakeholders today, and how this leads to a robust position and good performance and success, as well as how current value creation (as “outcome” and “process”) must be further developed, advanced, adapted and transformed to ensure future value creation. As discussed, taken-for-granted views of “value,” “value creation,” “relevance” and “performance” must be fundamentally reflected, discussed and reframed in the context of a creative economies perspective. → While many strategy discussions see value creation as rather obvious, our argumentation in Non-Paper I indicates how far we need to further explore the implied decision making, valuation and selection processes.

Strategy as being different, singular, unique: Strategies are inherently relative to other strategies and thus dependent on multiple contexts and references. This explains the competitive logic that characterises strategy making. In this respect, discussing entrepreneurial strategies in a creative economies perspective is particularly productive, as they systematically explore potentials and opportunities for generating not only different and distinct, but also singular and unique positions. As discussed, valuing and judging singular strategies is particularly challenging. → Thus, our discussions suggest that we should further explore strategy as a way of generating creative impact, understood not only as being different, but also as making a difference that makes a difference. This also resonates with our emphasis on the critical and political dimension of any attempted value creation.

Strategy as how an organisation moves forward: Rei Kawakubo famously argued: “My work takes place where creating a company as a whole and creating clothes overlap. There cannot be one or the other.” Thus, strategy focuses not only on value creation, but always also on generating and sustaining the enabling conditions and organisational contexts that allow for such successful value creation, today and tomorrow. This resonates with our emphasis on scaling (see above), which requires an in-depth understanding of the implied organising processes. → So far, our discussion has not explored the organisational and institutional dimension implied in value creation. Better understanding the organising implied in value creation resonates with the focus of the KKKW on company building as a major initiative to move the creative economies scene forward. This also links the strategy discussion to the question of scaling.

→ Strategy as community, network and partnership development: Given the fragility, contingency, dynamics and global reach of value creation in a creative economies perspective, it is highly important to explore how such value creation is not only embedded in an organisational setting, but also connected to other actors, organisations and communities. Creating a unique setting around the organisation (understood as an ecosystem, in terms of a

partnering and networking approach, in the form of community building, implying platform and business models, ...) is thus highly strategic and relevant for stabilising value creations, valuations and value systems.

→ Strategy as resource allocation: Strategies are not visible in what actors, organisations and communities postulate, but in what they are doing. A particularly straightforward dimension of doing is the creation, mobilisation and allocation of relevant resources. This also implies that an initiative or project always depends on the resource streams defining its actual and future action space: making a business, depending on patronage and funding, building on strategic investments, ... make a fundamental difference to the strategic action space. In particular, it defines to what extent resources for shaping the future are mobilised.

## 3.2 Important Theoretical Perspectives on Entrepreneurial Strategies

→ More fundamentally, our perspective on entrepreneurial strategies, in connection with creation and innovation, value creation, valuation and value systems benefits from recent attempts to reframe strategy in a process- (“strategy process”), practice- (“strategy-as-practice”) and sense-making (“strategic sensemaking”) perspective:

Strategy as process: Due to the future orientation, organisational processes and uncertainties and controversies implied in strategy making, we need to understand strategy not only as an outcome, but also as a process, as the temporal unfolding of specific collective action patterns characterising value creation, opportunity development, decision making, resource allocation, ... This is especially insightful and important for understanding entrepreneurial strategising when value creation connects with creation and innovation, whose hallmarks are their inherent openness and temporality.

Strategy as practice: More recently, strategy research and strategic management have shifted their focus from strategy as outcome and strategy as process towards strategy as practice. This implies that it is essential to understand entrepreneurial strategies as they are created, realised and changed (including the specific methodologies, equipment, tooling, routinisation, ... mobilised in such practices). It is also essential to understand how such strategies are embedded in multiple communities-of-practice. Learning to strategise means developing a specific repertoire of strategising practices as a source of distinction.

Strategic sensemaking: Strategy making is a communicative event. How specific actors and organisations express,

articulate, debate and formulate questions and propositions about “value creation,” “future orientation,” “opportunity creation” and “competitive distinction” makes a difference. This can be addressed as the specific discursive modes necessary for collectively interpreting and debating things as “strategic.” Actors in the creative economies teach us how diverse and specific such discursive approaches can be, and to what extent they make a difference.

Thus, the creative economies are a particularly promising context for studying entrepreneurial strategies and related practices and processes of strategising in the perspective of generating distinctive value and projecting desirable futures. We can understand the creative economies as laboratories for exploring entrepreneurial strategising in its variety and heterogeneity. Importantly, every strategy is characterised by a paradox: seeking to learn and transfer the successful strategies of other actors and organisations while facing the impossibility of such learning and transfer, as learning from others is never enough to develop one’s own singular and unique strategy. Only by creating, articulating and realising its own distinct strategy can an organisation make a real difference through its value creation.

## Consequences

**Die Auseinandersetzung mit Wertschöpfung («value creation») und Bewertung («valuation») hat im Rahmen der Diskussionen zum Non-Paper I verschiedene Erkenntnisse und Konsequenzen ergeben. Ohne Anspruch auf Vollständigkeit sind folgende Punkte wesentlich:**

**Eine regelmässige Reflexion der eigenen Wertschöpfung, aktuell und in Zukunft, ist für jede Organisation und Institution relevant, nicht nur in den Creative Economies. Eine sinnvolle und wirksame Strategiediskussion kommt ohne diesen Bezug nicht aus. Der Kontext der Creative Economies ist dabei besonders relevant und inspirierend, weil Wertschöpfung sich hier explizit zwischen («in between») unterschiedlichsten Dimensionen bewegt und dabei eine Heterogenität von Wertvorstellungen referenziert.**

**Die eigene Wertschöpfung schärfen und weiterentwickelt bedeutet immer zugleich, sich mit den dabei referenzierten Bewertungen auseinanderzusetzen und diese regelmässig zu reflektieren und zu prüfen. Weil jede Bewertung kontingent ist und potentiell in Frage gestellt werden kann, müssen die entsprechenden Wertvorstellungen, Bewertungsprozesse und Wertsysteme etabliert, immer wieder neu bestätigt und gegebenenfalls weiterentwickelt werden. Das ist ein zweiter zentraler Fokus jeder unternehmerischen Strategie.**

**Mit Blick auf Kreation und Innovation macht die Diskussion deutlich, dass Kurationsprozesse mit Bewertungsprozessen verknüpft sind, in unterschiedlichen Aspekten: jeder Entwurf einer neuen Alternative impliziert eine Bewertung und Kritik des Bestehenden; Kuration und Innovation sind inhärent politische Prozesse; es muss in Strategiediskussionen auch immer wieder um die Frage gehen, ob anvisierte Innovationen nicht nur kommerziell vielversprechend, sondern auch für die Kunden relevant, gesellschaftlich wünschenswert, wirklich sinnvoll, ... sind.**

**Diese Aspekte sind wesentlich für die Auseinandersetzung mit zentralen Themen des KKKW: creative impact impliziert eine Bewertung der Wirkung; company building impliziert immer auch die Entwicklung eines firmenspezifischen Bewertungssystems; unternehmerische Strategien verknüpfen Wertschöpfungen und Bewertungen zu einer singulären, differenzierenden und attraktiven Position; die governance der Creative Economies muss sich in dieser Perspektive neu erfinden, um wirksam mitzugestalten und sinnvoll zu investieren.**

**Das Non-Paper II zum Thema «Unternehmerische Strategien in den Creative Economies» greift diese Konsequenzen wieder auf und vertieft sie weiter. Als Form und Format formuliert das Non-Paper II eine Reihe von unternehmerischen Behauptungen, die kontrovers zu diskutieren sind.**

Zürich & Berlin, June 2018