

Education and Training for the Creative Economy: The Need for New Intermediaries

Professor Andy C Pratt

Professor of Cultural Economy,
City, University of London

In an interdependent creative economy, where the traditional arts and cultural fields interact and amalgamate with the creative industries, what strategies will help the landscape thrive? Andy Pratt examines the issues involved and makes a case for new skill sets of translation and intermediation.

Backstory

In the last 25 years we have become aware of the existence, and growth, of the creative industries. These creative industries are different to the traditional arts and cultural fields (which are usually not-for-profit, informal, and/or state-funded). Specifically, they are defined as activities that primarily generate economic value via trading in intellectual property rights, what we would recognise as commercial culture.

The creative industries represent the blending of popular culture and technology that first emerged in the 1930s with film and took off in the 1960s with music and television. In the 2000s, a new technological revolution occurred with respect to the economics as well as craft of cultural production (and, critically, distribution and consumption) which was remade courtesy of the internet and digitisation.

There are many different dimensions of this growth and change, not least that they are particularly sensitive to demographic changes, especially in countries that are dominated by growing youth cohorts (the biggest producers and consumers of

the creative industries) such as those of Southeast Asia, China and India. This growth also has a consequence for education and training, the focus of this paper. Naively, one might expect that the employment prospects and demand for artists (of various kinds) would be the answer. However, I want to argue that, on closer reflection, it is not just more but quite different arts and cultural worker skill sets that will be required, specifically, those of translation and intermediation.

Convergence and Growth

While the contemporary debate about the creative industries began in Europe, it has quickly evolved into a global discourse. This international debate has explored the subtlety and apparent contradictions of the growth of what has become known as the creative economy by United Nations (UN) agencies. The creative economy is a field that bridges the old one of arts and culture, and that of the new creative industries. It is a complex amalgam of commercial and state, as well as formal and informal activities woven together in, by what is best termed, a “creative ecosystem”. UN agencies have refined definitions and, critically, developed monitoring and measures of employment and trade that have surprised many in terms of the scale of importance of the creative economy to wider economies, and to global trade. In an about-turn, politicians and policy makers have latterly come to recognise that the creative economy is about jobs and growth, as well as about identity, branding and soft power. The question is how to support the creative economy?



Figure 1. A cameraman films the crowd at a pop concert.
Photo by Max Ravier from Pexels.

While they were initially conceived of as separate, the creative industries are, in practice, closely related to the traditional fields of arts and culture. The relationship is better characterised as, on one hand, a co-dependency of the for- and not-for-profit activities, state, formal and informal activities. Indeed, some have argued that the fine arts act as the R and D lab of the creative industries. On the other hand, we can note the development and profusion of art forms, disciplines or industries, their lively interaction, and the convergence between them. These two dimensions underpin a dynamic and fast changing field.

The creative economy is growing, and it plays an increasingly important role in both economy and society that politicians, industry, and the general population are fast becoming aware of. However, the logical question is: are we feeding the “pipeline” with sufficiently-trained creatives to achieve and sustain this potential? This is a challenge: does it require simply “more” creatives, or, as I will argue here, a different type of expertise from the traditional one

based on craft skills and excellence? And, what does that mean for education systems?

The Creative Ecosystem

Our traditional notion of artistic and creative training has been focused on particular art forms, training, skills and excellence reflected in the old division of commercial and non-commercial creative and arts activities, as well as the implicit economic value and cultural quality judgements that follow. This sort of formation was suited to the autonomous field of culture that we were familiar with in the early and mid-20th century. In the early 21st century, the role of technology generated low-cost distribution and reproduction, and hence huge makers/audiences were supercharged by the growth, demographics, and in disposable income that the youth represent.



Figure 2. Visitors at S.E.A. Focus 2024. Image courtesy of S.E.A. Focus.

Here, new needs have been created for multimedia and cross-disciplinary arts production, as well as commercial creative disciplines, working in parallel with state-funded activities.

This fast evolving “cultural soup” of activities can be best understood as a vibrant and interdependent ecosystem. As noted above, the different art forms are overlapping, and the traditional boundaries between the commercial and non-commercial are being eroded. This does not mean that everything is becoming the same; rather, that a new organisational form is emerging. Critical to understanding this is the production cycle.

Academics and policy makers have defined this production cycle as progressing through five phases: creating, making, distributing, exchanging and archiving. No matter the art form, this cycle needs to be followed though. Critically, if the cycle is broken or unbalanced, development stalls. Too many artists, not enough venues, lots of performances but too small audiences because they were not educated to appreciate the art forms, not enough skilled artists

to generate output, etc. The challenge then is not only to produce artists and creatives, but all the allied and related enabling activities that mobilise the production system. We’re all familiar with the list of credits that we view at the end of a film; we are often surprised at the job names and length of this list, but we recognise that, without their support, the “stars” would not be able to do their job: they are co-dependent.

This explains why art schools and others involved in creative education have expanded their scope of late, adding the craft skills of writing, scenery, costume, filming and lighting, as well as those of digital effects. However, it has not stopped there. The expertise of management, finance and legal is critical, on the one hand, if artist rights are to be protected and, on the other hand, if intellectual property is to be exploited as a revenue stream. Early experiments in adding a “Business 101” to arts courses have given way to developing new hybrids that appreciate the unique challenges of the creative economy and its unique risk profile, as well as the need for “new intermediaries” to activate this.

Intermediation is key to understanding the “magic” of managing risk innovation/creativity. The received idea of knowledge transfer (akin to passing on a “parcel of knowledge”) ignores the power and processes of networking and collaboration. Instead, we should understand this as an active and intelligent creation of new knowledge in a creative translation and mediation process. Put simply a process where $1+1=3$, a generative process.

The challenge is that, on the one hand, the typical success rate is 20% for a new product or service in the creative sector and, on the other hand, there are potential monopoly profits from the “winner takes all” nature of many cultural fields. Constantly changing products and services requires reinvention, and this necessitates agile processes and personal commitment to learn how to work in and across such project-based enterprises. Let alone to thrive and survive is a hall mark of the contemporary cultural worker. Flexibility is brought for the corporate at the costs of risk and precarity for the individual. Like in a game of musical chairs while the music plays, all seems to go well; however, when the music stops, there is a problem with insufficient chairs. The music stopped with COVID-19.

Learning from COVID-19

One of the lessons that was already known in the creative economy but reinforced by COVID-19 was the challenge of interdependence and resilience. When things stopped, we began to appreciate the precarious state that creative production existed in. The constant pace of activity had obscured the

delicate interdependencies that mediated between different forms and processes. Moreover, we had failed to fully appreciate how often the “added” value was the very ways in which the different components were intermediated and assembled. Quite literally the creative economy is more than the sum of its parts, the overlooked “oil that lubricates the system” the intermediary who possesses not only specific artistic, craft and technical skills, but also deploys the ability to translate ideas and mediate between various agents. It is these translation and intermediation activities that enable the creative economy to thrive. Accordingly, if we want to grow and sustain the creative economy, it is not simply more artists that we need, but more intermediaries.

Two new areas of expertise are required: first, managing in, with and between the commercial and state sectors; and second, managing with the process of cultural production. The former is more obviously understood, the latter needs some elaboration. Both are difficult. Managing within cultural production refers to the challenge of aligning the cycle of cultural production. An artist on their own does not communicate to anybody. However, given an informed audience, a venue, and opportunity to meet other audiences, then there is the potential to grow and develop.

It is striking that this transversal—relational—horizontal networking that is characterised by the creative sector has been slow to be appreciated. Once recognised, it remains difficult to map and monitor (as it is, by definition, “in-between” organisations, measurement, and accounting systems), let alone to support and sustain. These challenges are not only for creative practitioners across the ecosystem, but for policy makers who are also constrained by their own “silos” of organisation and remit. Policy-making has often been seen as a task of balancing inputs and outputs (artists and cultural experiences).

However, perhaps it is time to focus on governing and sustaining the ecosystem rather than legislating on the value of potential outputs.

The task is to recognise organisational challenges, as well as those of individual workers who need to be able to reach across organisational boundaries (commercial/not-for-profit, state/civil society, etc.) to make things happen. Organisational flux is possible when there are skilled individuals that not only have particular skills in a narrow field, but also have the translation skills to work across boundaries. This is a lesson that is being learned in the cultural sector, and that is percolating to the wider economy as well.

The creative economy is not a unicorn; rather, to mix metaphors, it is more “a canary in the coal mine”. On reflection, we will also need to rethink the relevance of the traditional science and maths (STEM) toolkit. In short, it’s not simply a question of adding some arts/creativity to this model (referred to as STEAM) as seems to be implied by revisions to the 2021 OECD Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) test; rather we need to go further in developing new connective skills and institutions that can translate and mediate what traditionally have been seen as separate knowledge domains of the arts and sciences: only this will deliver real added value (commercial and cultural). □

About the Author



Andy C Pratt is UNESCO Chair of Global Creative Economy, and Professor of Cultural Economy, City, University of London. He established the first Department of Culture and the Creative Industries in the world at King's College London. He previously taught at LSE, and UCL, and had held visiting professor positions at many institutions including Singapore Management University (SMU) in Singapore, Zurich University of the Arts (ZHdK) and Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule Zürich (ETH) in Zurich. He specialises in the analysis of the cultural industries globally, and his current research projects include trans-local cultural production chains and diversity in the creative economy. He has worked with UNESCO, UNCTAD, WIPO, and many national and city government on these topics. Until 2023, he was Editor-in-Chief of the international interdisciplinary journal *City, Culture and Society*.

Bibliography

Gill, Rosalind, Tarik E Virani, and Andy C. Pratt. 2019. *Creative Hubs in Question: Place, Space and Work in the Creative Economy*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Pratt, A. C. 2017. "Innovation and the Cultural Economy." In *The Elgar Companion to Innovation and Knowledge Creation*, edited by H. Bathelt, P. Cohendet, H. S. and L. H. Simon, 230-243. London: Edward Elgar.

Pratt, A. C. 2018. "Beyond Resilience: Learning from the Cultural Economy." In *The Role of Art and Culture for Regional and Urban Resilience*, edited by P. Cooke and L. Lazzeretti, 127-139. London: Routledge.

Pratt, A.C. 2021. "Creative Hubs: A Critical Analysis." *City, Culture and Society*: 24(1).

Pratt, A. C. 2023. "Film Making as a Creative Ecosystem: The Case of Soho in London." In *Global Creative Ecosystems: A Critical Understanding of Sustainable Creative and Cultural Production*, edited by T. E. Virani, 21-38. Berlin: Springer.

Virani, T.E., ed. 2023. *Global Creative Ecosystems: A Critical Understanding of Sustainable Creative and Cultural Production*. Berlin: Springer.