

Policies towards creativity versus practices of innovation: on interrelations between institutional changes and creativity that leads to innovative practices in the arts
Lyudmila Petrova, PhD student, Erasmus University, the Netherlands

Introduction

The use of concept and importance of creativity became too broad and too vague when creative policies are discussed. Moreover, there is too less attention on the fact that not all the creative performances are innovative when focus on specific art field. Therefore it is important to deepen the understanding of creativity that leads to innovative practices/performances (creative breakthroughs) in the arts before decide on how to support creativity.

The investigation will consist of two related tracks. The first track traces the concept of creativity and the attempts to stimulate creativity and innovation by means of policies (top down approach). The second track will look at the impact that different financial sources as part of the institutional settings have on creativity. The analysis of the financing of the arts and thus of creativity will consider the various public and private sources and their interrelations. The question here is whether institutional arrangements, including financial arrangements, influence creative processes and innovation.

The analysis will address the following questions: (1) What are the forces behind creative/innovative performance in the arts? (2) How new art works and styles are influenced by changing of institutional settings? (3) What conditions foster an environment that motivate an innovative performance (experimentation)? (4) What is the government's role in supporting creativity? The aim is to examine different policies institutional approaches towards the innovation/creativity in the arts; whether policies interfere or facilitate.

The aim is to examine different institutional policies towards the innovation/creativity in the arts; whether policies interfere or facilitate.

Theoretical ground

In cultural economics creativity is considered as a characteristic of the product (production side). There is lack of acknowledgment of creativity on the demand and distribution sides. However, according to Caves (2000) it is more important to acknowledge the innovation in the arts as a process. Process innovation regards creativity in the supply side, distribution side and demand side. Therefore in this research I aim to distinguish between creativity and innovation when arts is produced, distributed and consumed. The analysis includes investigation in qualities ascribed to the art product (production/supply level) acknowledged by the intermediaries (distribution level) and by the consumers (demand level) and also characteristics acknowledge by other parties/supporters involved - policy makers, companies, etc.

Accordingly, factors that influence/motivate creativity/innovation could be investigated when the arts is produced, distributed, consumed and supported.

operators, etc.). In this study the arts are considered to be part of the cultural and creative sector.

The research will consist of a qualitative and quantitative analysis. The qualitative part will consists of the mapping out of official policy documents Related concepts:

The claim to be investigated here is whether institutional arrangements (including financial arrangements) influence the creative/innovative outcome and how factors of creativity

on the supply, on the distribution and on the consumption sides interrelate when policies are implemented. And more, whether one set of criteria crowding in or crowding out another.

Methodology

The research involves both: (1) theoretical and conceptual analysis with the specific purpose of investigating and, when possible, integrating what has been done in various disciplines (economics, sociology, psychology, cultural studies, philosophy); (2) empirical analysis in the form of case studies, statistical analysis and surveys.

When tackling the issue of creativity and innovation, the analysis will investigate the understanding that policy makers have of creative processes as well as those producing and distributing the arts (such as artists, curators, cultural. The aim is that of detecting: the policy objectives; the criteria used to support creativity; the weight given to different values (economic, artistic, social, etc.); the kind of projects that received support and their outcomes; etc. The qualitative investigation will also include interviews with policy makers; interviews with other stakeholders involved in the policy implementations (e.g. agencies, expert committees, artists, cultural operators, curators, bureaucrats, etc.). The inclusion of the reflections of the different stakeholders involved, could allow us to verify the effects of different cultural policy strategies towards creativity distinguishing between strategies' aims/intentions and their actual results/effects. The quantitative analysis will, when possible, collect data on the financing of the arts by public (governments' subsidies, awards and grants) and private (sponsorship, donations, etc.) sources, when one or another cultural policy strategy is implemented.

In order to evaluate policies towards creative/innovative processes and their effects, there is need to compare different policies in different (institutional) settings. I choose to focus on the Netherlands and Bulgaria as case studies. The comparison of the both countries could provide interesting insights because of the differences in their institutional settings and cultural policies. It is interesting to compare what is the impact on the art field of the lack of consistent cultural policy (BG) and, on the other side, of the existence of relatively intensive cultural policy to support the arts (in NL).

Particularly, the study will focus on the visual arts and on the situations in the Netherlands and Bulgaria. The study will compare the impact of public and private financing on individual artists and cultural institutions in the Netherlands and Bulgaria and especially in the cities where most art activities take place: Sofia and Plovdiv – for Bulgaria, Amsterdam and Rotterdam – for the Netherlands. In the Netherlands a policy of direct subsidies to artists has been in place for quite a long time. A revision of this policy was followed by a strong debate about the impact of such a policy on the artists and especially on their creativity. As a new EU member state, Bulgaria provides an interesting example of a different design and implementations of the cultural policies towards the arts and creativity. It is interesting to investigate what kinds of strategies were chosen (bottom up – initiated from the art sector itself or top down – government implementation had a greater role for the development of the arts) and what their outcomes are.

The comparison of different social, political and economic processes among the two countries can enrich the understanding of the added values of policies directed at creativity, and may enable to draw conclusions for a European policy towards creativity.