

Repositório ISCTE-IUL

Deposited in *Repositório ISCTE-IUL*:

2023-11-28

Deposited version:

Accepted Version

Peer-review status of attached file:

Peer-reviewed

Citation for published item:

Costa, P. (2022). Valuing culture and creativity impacts in a global technological era: Reshaping the analytical framework. *European Planning Studies*. 30 (9), 1656-1675

Further information on publisher's website:

10.1080/09654313.2021.2023109

Publisher's copyright statement:

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Costa, P. (2022). Valuing culture and creativity impacts in a global technological era: Reshaping the analytical framework. *European Planning Studies*. 30 (9), 1656-1675, which has been published in final form at <https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2021.2023109>. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with the Publisher's Terms and Conditions for self-archiving.

Use policy

Creative Commons CC BY 4.0

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a link is made to the metadata record in the Repository
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Valuing Culture and Creativity Impacts in a Global Technological Era: Reshaping the Analytical Framework

Pedro Costa (ISCTE- Instituto Universitário de Lisboa / DINÂMIA'CET-iscte, Lisboa, Portugal)

pedro.costa@iscte-iul.pt

Abstract:

In a global world, increasingly mediated by new technologies, but where place, communities and territories assume even more importance, the valuing of culture and creativity faces new conceptual and operational challenges.

This paper addresses these challenges in order to question the measurement tools usually applied in valuing the impact of culture in society, proposing a new conceptual grid to assess the impacts of creative and cultural activities, in all their diversity and multidimensionality. This results from an intense co-construction process, over the few past years, involving a variety of cultural agents, both in Portuguese and European contexts, in the scope of several research projects.

This analytical framework is proposed to help disentangling the increasing complexity and diversity of the mechanisms underlying creation of value in cultural activities and to facilitate the self-assessment of its impacts, in all their diversity, in a particular territory or community. A specific grid is presented, comprising 5 main dimensions (cultural, economic, social, environmental; citizenship and participation), for assessing the territorial impacts of cultural activities. These are subdivided in 15 sub-dimensions, and operationalized in 75 different indicators. This analytical framework is being transposed to a digital application that allows the systematization, self-assessment and self-awareness of value creation and their impacts by the agents of the cultural/creative sector.

Keywords:

Value; Culture; Impacts Assessment; Territory; Multidimensional Toolkit

1. Introduction: Valuing Culture and Creativity in a Global Technological Era

In a global world, increasingly mediated by new technologies, but where place, communities and territories assume even more importance, the valuing of culture and creativity faces new conceptual and operational challenges. The very role of creative activities and culture is being challenged by the current digital transition (Lazzeretti, 2020).

A diversity of anchoring mechanisms link global economic, social and cultural processes to the specificities of each territory. Cultural activities and creativity, which are central in these processes, are increasingly challenged by technologic mediation and by new forms of production and consumption. New intangible added values are generated, based on symbolic value and identity, where creativity, technology transfer, intangible heritage or craftsmanship are crucial components. All the traditional functions associated to cultural activities and creative processes (and the way they produced value and this value was recognized and appropriated, by minor or larger spheres of the society) are facing new opportunities and threats, and the way the diverse (cultural, economic, social,...) value(s) of culture are perceived and measured require new conceptualizations and operative tools.

This paper addresses these challenges in order to question the measurement tools usually applied in valuing the impact of culture in society, drawing upon a research program that mobilizes and crosses work developed in the scope of four different research projects ongoing at DINAMIA'CET-ISCTE in recent years (RESHAPE, ARTSBANK, IMPACTOS-AR, CREATOUR), which contribute to this discussion in several ways - working with artists, cultural promoters, creative tourism agents and public authorities, in several territorial contexts, both at Portuguese and European levels, assessing the impact of their activities in their communities. Combining the work developed (and still ongoing) in these 4 research projects, and assuming the co-construction of knowledge with all the agents involved in those projects, we aim to propose a new analytical framework and a toolkit to help disentangling the increasing complexity and diversity of these mechanisms of creation of value and to facilitate the assessment of its social impacts in any particular territory or community, in all their diversity and multidimensionality.

In a world marked by deep change, the cultural field is no exception. All the intervenient in the creative (and reputation-building) processes see their traditional roles blur: they are all increasingly "prosumers", as the distinctions between creators/producers/consumers often disappear; they become all gatekeepers, as their role in the intermediation and reputation process change, and all share increasingly, voluntarily or inadvertently, a diversity of kinds of symbolic, aesthetic and tacit knowledge about the contents they experience or they create. The circuits and processes of intermediation clearly are changing, not just in the more global and tech mediated cultural and creative industries, but in all kinds of artistic products and in heritage goods. The fruition and consumption modes, the way creation and production is made, all these are in profound reconfiguration, and naturally this brings challenges to the mechanisms of creation of value.

The formation of value seems to be a much more decentralized process, compared to the past, despite the very strong concentration of distribution channels, in particular the big globalized platforms for distribution and experiencing of contents. As always, power relations (fueled by technological, economic, social and cultural disparities) play a crucial role in this game. The opinion of any blogger or influencer seems to have sometimes larger reach than the one of an expert or those of the traditional cultural intermediaries and gatekeepers. In this supposed

flattened world, which are the voices to be heard? And which ones are effectively heard? It is fundamental to understand the new mechanisms of dissemination of information in creative activities, as this always the key-factor to the organization of these markets. The processes of spreading of knowledge and the diversity of kinds of cultural capital, in a much less hierarchical cultural field, should be under scrutiny. In other words, it is fundamental to acknowledge the diversity of interests, motivations and expectations (and therefore, also the diversity of “value grids”) that are inherent to these processes and that are assumed by the various agents intervenient in the cultural and creative processes

Therefore, it is essential an effective assumption of the multidimensionality of the value created by cultural and creative production/consumption, comprising several layers of social, artistic, economic, environmental, participative dimensions of value. It requires new frameworks for that analysis, with the development of more flexible (and adaptative) “grids” as well as new procedures for collecting, treating and analyzing data, both quantitative and qualitative, that could be used to assess the importance and impacts that these activities bring to the well-being of the persons involved in these processes, to the society as a whole, and to the community and territories where these processes take place.

The recognition of the importance of the link to the territories and the communities where these processes are embedded is essential, assuring the understanding of the creative dynamics as the product of the territorial anchoring of global (cultural, economic, social) processes in specific contexts, outside which they cannot be analyzed (nor their value understood).

In line with Pier Luigi Sacco’s notion of paradigm “Culture 3.0” (based on a regime enhanced by open communities of practice, rather than the patronage relations, or the weight of cultural and creative industries that marked the predecessor paradigms), culture is here assumed as one of the most important platforms for behavioral change, at the most diverse levels of society, and that is not naturally compatible with the conventional tools normally used to measure the social and economic impacts of creative and cultural activities (quite often merely reduced to the assessment of quantitative and economic-dimension-oriented aspects). Being artistic and cultural practices assumed as increasingly “sense making” and “sense giving” for the ones involved in all creative and productive process, the effective production of meaning, that results of these, in each particular case, can not be perceived in such a simplistic manner.

In order to address these profound changes, an effective perception of the mechanisms underlying value creation requires innovative methodologies and processes. Therefore, this paper discusses and proposes a general grid to assess the multidimensionality of value, drawing upon preceding work of co-creation of knowledge with creative and cultural agents, developed in the scope of the above mentioned research program, delivering a new analytical framework to do it. Being the delivering of this grid the main purpose of this paper, we do not enter here in detail in the inherent and precedent conceptual debates on impact assessment processes, and on its methodological challenges, neither in the discussion on specific results arising from operationalization and the application of this grid to specific cultural agents, which are both done elsewhere (Tomaz et al, 2020; Gato et al, 2021; Costa et al, 2021).

The paper organizes as follows. Next section will address the need for reshaping the analytical framework for impacts measurement in cultural activities, acknowledging its multidimensionality, and drawing attention to the identification of some particular challenges that need to be addressed considering the current digital shift. In Section 3, our research framework and the process of co-construction of a new assessment framework are briefly explained. In section 4, the typologies are presented, with the description of the analytical grid that results from this research, and the paper finishes with a brief concluding note

2. Cultural activities, multidimensionality of value and measurement of their territorial impacts: the need for Reshaping the Analytical Framework

The issue of value and its measurability have been naturally a fundamental question in the history of economic thought and particularly in the history of cultural economics (e.g. Throsby, 2001). In face of the deep transformations of contemporary societies, and the rise of what Alan Scott (2008) labels as cognitive-cultural capitalism, particular challenges are raised to the analysis of value creation in general, and in the activities intensive in symbolic and aesthetic knowledge (such as cultural and artistic ones), which have their particular mechanisms of value creation, linked to specific intermediation and gatekeeping processes, as well as strong asymmetries in the information and in the cultural and social capital required for the complexities or particularities of the codification and de-codification processes of meaning in these activities (cf. Caves, 2002; Becker, 1984; Costa, 2007).

Recent dynamics in cultural and creative activities (which Pier Luigi Sacco, 2011, labels as culture 3.0) unveil a new paradigm, based on open communities of practice, where consumption and production are increasingly blurred, and culture is seen as network organized, in the way of construction of diversified forms of collective sense making (contrary to the previous “regimes”, of Culture 1.0, based on patronage, and culture 2.0, fueled by cultural and creative industries).

Being marked by the centrality of aesthetic-symbolic knowledge (compared to the other components of knowledge essential for innovative dynamics – technical and analytical knowledge), cultural and creative activities are particularly central for the enlightenment of creation of value processes, at this stage of cultural-cognitive capitalism. The understanding of the territorial expression of cultural activities, the study of the creative milieus and the enlightenment of the territorial dynamics that embed cultural activities’ development are essential components for this (cf. Camagni et al, 2004; Kebir et al, 2018). Basically, the disentangling of the value of arts and culture in social fabric can only be seen from this perspective, understanding fully the relation of creative processes and cultural dynamics with the local communities and their territories, even if these processes are anchored in globally structured economic, social, and symbolic mechanisms (Kebir et al, 2018).

In fact, territorialized production complexes based on cultural activities became increasingly important, as these activities distinguished as central in the promotion of regional development and urban competitiveness. Drawing upon the broad literature developed in recent decades in several scientific fields (Scott, 2000, 2014; Camagni et al. 2004; Costa 2007; Cooke and Lazzarretti, 2008; Lazzarretti and Vecco, 2018), we assume its importance, penetrating into the mechanisms that are underneath those creative dynamics and how they can be mobilized to promote territorial development, taking the co-creation of knowledge between artists, stakeholders and local communities as a privileged point of view.

Recognizing that the territory may be able to access and introduce present knowledge in other locations and scales, and to jointly (re)contextualize and spread it in a sustained manner between the various actors and sectors present in that place, and thus foster its development, vitality and competitiveness (Crevoisier and Jeannerat, 2009; Vale, 2009), we assume the fundamental relevance of these creative milieus, linked to specific governance mechanisms, for urban competitiveness and territorial vitalization.

Therefore, the disentangling of the value of arts and culture in social fabric can only be seen at this light, understanding fully the relation of creative processes and cultural dynamics with the

local communities and their territories, even if these processes are anchored in global processes or even globally structured economic, social, and symbolic mechanisms.

As it is pointed out in the scope of RESHAPE project “for the lack of a more effective method, the value of contemporary art is often reduced just to visible results or products. Processes developed by artistic practices mainly end up to be invisible or unrecognized so the audiences and decision-makers often don’t recognize the importance and the value of arts in society.”¹ It is important to understand the influence of the artists and their work in the local context, urban or rural, the way it is embedded in the territory, as well as perceive practices which create intangible value for society and discuss the pertinence of the support to it. Therefore, it is also essential to recognize the relativity of value.

New understandings and dynamics in culture require new methodological approaches and operative tools to examine, communicate and sensitise cultural actors, policymakers and the public about the various values associated with the specific and multifaceted nature of these activities and the impacts on local territories and communities at the economic, social, environmental, cultural-artistic and participatory level. Traditional impact assessment methods are usually quite unsatisfactory, tending to focus on short-term indicators, often quantitative, and on easily collectible data, not contemplating the multiple effects on local territories and communities. In the name of comparability, these exercises tend to be often quite reductionist and simplistic, merely focused on the assessment of the most quantifiable dimensions and, above all, on the economic impacts of these activities (both direct or indirect). To this end, indicators that are readily available, based on available empirical data or on the conduct of brief questionnaire surveys, are privileged, reinforcing the trend towards an overvaluation of the economic aspects, easily quantifiable, in these processes². In addition, these impact assessment exercises typically have several other problems, such as the fact that they focus predominantly on more commodified cultural provision, on larger events, on activities carried out in more formal/institutional contexts, or provided in urban centres (neglecting or not being adapted to other realities). Thus, most of these exercises fail in not responding to the complexity of reality, the multidimensionality, multiplicity and time-range of impacts, and the specificity of each situation (UNESCO, 2009, 2012, 2019; Tomaz et al., 2020). On the other hand, merely qualitative case studies, based on in-depth fieldwork with cultural agents and the communities, despite its frequently interesting results, end up always facing the barriers related to the difficulties of generalization, extrapolation and non-comparability with different realities.

Despite the huge debates on impact assessment conceptual challenges, which we will not address here in detail (cf. Tomaz et al, 2020, and Gato et al, 2021, for the roots of our conceptual approach and for our discussion on this, as well as, e.g, Belfiori and Bennet, 2010; Galloway, 2009; CHCfE Consortium, 2015; CAE, 2018; Dessein et al, 2015), it is important to refer a diversity of methodological approaches and technique used in this field, at several levels and scales, including the toolbox approach, quantitative valuation methodologies (including market and non market based techniques, in line with traditional cultural economics approaches), as well as a diversity of qualitative methods, mostly used for assessing socio-cultural values (CHCfE Consortium, 2015).

¹ RESHAPE Webpage <https://reshape.network/trajectory/value-of-art-in-social-fabric>

² And these are often the ones already expected in an unquestionable or uncritical way by the institutions on which projects or promoters depend, financially or institutionally, for the development of these activities.

It is important to notice that an academic response to this demand, assuming the aforementioned challenges faced by these activities in contemporaneity, must also consider the tensions between research and policy advocacy around the impact of arts and culture and the development of methodologies for their measurement and evaluation, and how they influence the decision-making processes (e.g. Belfiore & Bennett, 2010; Galloway, 2009). The pragmatic need of operative answers must always be balanced with a quality that helps not just to justify funding and advocate the activity, but is useful for a self-awareness of the diverse impacts of each activity and the way it influence individuals' and community lives.

Summing up, to evaluate the effects of a specific cultural project in a territory, we must assume that its effects (multiple, subjective, perceived both collectively and individually,...), have to be seen at the light of the (different kinds of) value they create for the actors in the community/society - that is, the value(s) that is recognized by them, in their diversity. Therefore this value has to be assumed as (i) multidimensional; (ii) relative and contextual (e.g. varying depending on the individual, social or territorial context); and (iii) always referring to the subjectivities of the agents involved in the activity (carrying different perceptions, motivations, interests), both at supply and demand sides.

That is, to understand the importance and impacts of creative activities in territories/communities, we must move from (or combine with) the general ambition of (more immediate) measurability to the perception (and self-awareness) of the multidimensionality of the value, finding innovative ways to capture it (and, at the limit, to confront it with other comparable contexts).

In order to address that complexity in a more effective way we have been developing a framework for analysis which encompasses a diversity of dimensions related to the creation of this value (and to the measurement of its impacts). For instance, in the field of creative tourism, in low density areas we've been able to co-create and test with pilot-projects new instruments to assess and to allow self assessment and self-awareness of the diversity of quantitative and qualitative impacts of territorially embedded creative projects (e.g. Tomaz et al, 2020; Gato et al, 2021³). By the same token, we've been working with artists, producers, and other cultural agents in understanding the impacts of cultural activities in social fabric and in the territories/communities, within the diversity of the above mentioned projects (RESHAPE; IMPACTS_AR; ARTSBANK).

Several other research projects, at international level, have been also recently trying to develop new tools (some of them based on interesting participatory practices) to help the measurement of these multiple impacts, at different levels, and raise the awareness of the cultural agents and policy makers to this issue (e.g. Sacco's methodology for measuring the impact of cultural heritage activities; the "Impact Playbook" developed by Europeana to support cultural heritage organisations⁴, the works of Flanders Arts Institute; the research of Paul Heritage and Leandro Valiati on the "Relative Value" for Arts and Humanities Research Council, and their work on the currency of cultural exchange). Drawing upon the broad contemporary debates on the social value of the art (e.g. Belfiore and Bennet, 2010; Galloway, 2009; CHCfE Consortium, 2015; CAE, 2017), and European initiatives aiming to develop new perspectives and improved methodologies for capturing the wider societal value of culture, including but also beyond its economic impact, interesting research is being conducted Europe-wide, such as UNCHARTED

³ Previous versions of our analytical framework, directed for the specific case of creative tourism initiatives, can be consulted in these references.

⁴ Cf Verwayen et al (2017); <https://pro.europeana.eu/page/impact#impact-playbook>

(Understanding, Capturing and Fostering the Societal Value of Culture) project⁵ or MESOC (Measuring the Social Dimension of Culture) project⁶.

All these interesting examples, with several variants, relate to the strong social need that is felt around the world in order to develop new forms of measuring the value and impacts of cultural and creative activities, and overcome many of the blockages that have been crucial to the frequent instrumentalization of these activities in relation to other economic, social or political objectives. In this sense, all these projects - and our research program in particular - correspond to a social need that has been recurrently identified in the contact with the stakeholders, the policy makers and the communities and creative actors that structure this field.

This need of an academic response to this social demand is amplified by the responsibility of giving answer to some specific challenges that stem from the current digital shift in our societies, which undoubtedly conditions the functioning of cultural activities and the perception of their value(s). The digital transition requires us to draw attention, amongst other factors, to (i) the new challenges for understanding value creation with much more decentralized gatekeeping mechanisms and mediation processes, and evolving attitudes towards originality and creativity; (ii) the questionings on the resilience of much more flexible and informally network based business models; (iii) the importance of the participatory turn in culture and the role of new forms of participation in the co-production of meaning and value in these activities; (iv) the increasing challenges in the management of the relation between personal life, leisure and work; (v) the development of experiences of fair(er) governance models in the sector; or (vi) the increasing role of the negative externalities induced by these activities and all the problems related to their regulation, just to cite some fundamental areas.

3. The process: co-constructing a pragmatic self-assessment framework

A multidisciplinary research team⁷ has been developing at DINAMIA'CET-iscte an investigation that mobilises and crosses the work produced in different action-research projects carried out in recent years (CREATOUR, RESHAPE, IMPACTOS-AR, ARTSBANK⁸), co-producing knowledge with artists, cultural promoters, creative tourism agents and public authorities, in several territorial contexts, both at European and Portuguese levels (cf Costa et al; 2019, Tomaz et al, 2020; Gato et al, 2021).

This broad research program aims to deepen knowledge about the mechanisms of creation and sharing of value in cultural and creative activities in contemporaneity, about the impacts (on all their economic, social, artistic, environmental diversity) of these activities on the social fabric,

⁵ <https://uncharted-culture.eu/>

⁶ <https://www.mesoc-project.eu/>

⁷ We naturally acknowledge the important contributions of all colleagues involved - in a "variable geometry" - in all these projects, particularly Elisabete Tomaz, Margarida Perestrelo, M^a Assunção Gato, Ana Rita Cruz and Ricardo Lopes, as well as the partners and community members involved in all of them. We also appreciate the discussions held with the 8 Reshapers engaged on trajectory 3 of RESHAPE ("Value of art in social fabric"): Bojan Krištofić, Caroline Melon, Jean-Lorin Sterian, Margarita Pita, Marina Urruticochea, Minipogon, Tewa Barnosa, and Zoe Lafferty.

⁸ And more recently, also a 5th project - "STRONGER PERIPHERIES – a Southern Coalition" (funded by Creative Europe program) - in the testing and application of the framework presented in this paper.

and about the role of culture in the transformation of behaviours (and in the renegotiation of identities). In parallel, it intends to deepen knowledge about the importance of the territorialised logics of cultural and creative dynamics in this creation of value and the importance of the local anchoring on globalised (cultural, economic, social) processes as a factor of value creation, disentangling the symbolic mediation mechanisms behind these processes.

In practice, this presupposes to develop a pragmatic analytical grid that allows and enhances the awareness and the perception about the multidimensionality of value creation by cultural and creative activities (and operationalization of its measurement, for each concrete agent), which implies to test and apply, from a perspective of co-creation of knowledge with cultural and creative agents, this grid to a diversity of empirical situations that are provided by parallel research projects. The aim is to develop a toolkit that can be used autonomously by cultural agents and policymakers to perceive the diversity of factors underlying value creation and the multiplicity of impacts of cultural and creative activity on society and on their specific communities.

These broad objectives have been pursued, in the framework of the four research projects mentioned above, in multiple but complementary ways.

At the national level, the CREATOUR project⁹ allowed to co-design and test with a diversity of stakeholders a conceptual and analytical framework designed to measure the impacts of 40 pilot initiatives of creative tourism in the particular context of small cities and rural areas in Portugal. The experience revealed the challenges, opportunities and constraints in the diversity of situations found and the necessity to develop a qualitative self-assessment tool that could be adaptable to a diversity of contexts.

The development and adaptation of this analytical grid to other contexts, and particularly, to “independent” cultural and creative activities, was possible with the collaboration of 8 “Reshapers” (artists, curators, cultural managers), from all Europe, that reunited in the scope of RESHAPE project¹⁰ to discuss the value of art in the social fabric.

In parallel to these projects, ARTEMREDE, a network of 15 municipalities in Portugal, which combines programming with cultural training and community-oriented work, is working with DINAMIA’CET-iscte on a project¹¹ to assess the impact of the activities of their associated city-councils on their respective communities, being open to testing new approaches and methodologies tools.

In addition to this, the use of exploratory methodologies, and particularly urban artistic interventions, to work with the communities has been used in the disentangling of the effects of these activities in the territories, in the scope of ARTSBANK project¹². This has been another way of exploring, in practice, new tools to try to question the notions of value and the evolving perceptions that the cultural agents and policymakers have about it, and the way they measure the impacts of cultural and creative activities.

The work carried out in the projects mentioned above, with a diversity of stakeholders, exposed some vulnerabilities of usual impact assessment procedures, in public and private entities, given

⁹ CREATOUR - Creative Tourism Destination Development in Small Cities and Rural Areas (SAICTPAC/0003/2015) (project No. 16437), funded by the Portuguese Foundation for Science and Technology (FCT/MEC) through national funds and co-funded by FEDER through the Joint Activities Programme of COMPETE 2020 and the Regional Operational Programmes of Lisbon and Algarve.

¹⁰ RESHAPE – Reflect, Share, Practice Experiment, funded by EC, Creative Europe Program.

¹¹ IMPACTOS-AR – Study on the impacts of the activities of ARTEMREDE, funded by ARTEMREDE municipalities network.

¹² ARTSBANK – Creative milieus at "Margem Sul": triggering territorial development through co-creation of knowledge in the contemporary metropolis (several sources of funding).

the nature of the culture and the specific circumstances of each project, location, or scale intervention. At the same time, these projects confirmed the difficulties of stakeholders in providing and communicating evidence on some qualitative effects and their value in achieving more sustainable development in these territories and communities. In addition, they highlighted the need to integrate these evaluation exercises into their internal processes of the definition of objectives and reflection on possible gaps, challenges and opportunities that may arise from the identification of multiple effects of their activities (Gato et al, 2021; Costa et al, 2021).

There is a general awareness of the scope of the impacts of these activities and their multidimensionality for everyone involved. This is generally complemented with the clear perception of the individual/institutional diversity of motivations and expected impacts. Additionally, it is also often clear the perception of discrepancies between the (intrinsic) motivations of the actors and their discourses (mostly based on extrinsic motivations, particularly related to funding issues).

The mobilisation of the knowledge from these stakeholders was important in the development of an integrative and multidimensional approach to impact assessment, crossing these different streams of research and allowing a co-construction of the broad analytical framework that is presented in the next section (after that operationalised in a toolkit accessible in a digital application/platform allowing the systematisation, self-assessment and self-awareness of value creation and its impacts by actors in the cultural/creative sector).

4. Reshaping the analytical framework: an operative typology

Considering this conceptual and methodological context, we've been operationalizing an operative framework, through a step by step process (cf. Tomas et al, 2020; Gato et al, 2021) which assumed the assessment of the impacts of the creative activities through the lens of the territorial development perspective. This implied to assume 5 main dimensions to embody the multidimensionality of sustainable development (Ferrão, 1995; Costa, 2007, 2015), drawing upon the vast discussions on the dimensions of sustainability and the debate on "culture" as the 4th pillar of sustainable development. Naturally this took into account the contemporary debates on the shifts in cultural policies and cultural participation and their role in territorial development (Bonet et al, 2018; Dupin-Meynard and Négrier (2020); Costa, 2015). Still, it was also particularly grounded on the discussions on how to assess sustainability and sustainable development (Singh et al, 2009; Waas et al, 2014; Sala et al, 2015), and on the debates how to bring this evaluation and its measurement to the fields of culture (Bianchini, 1999; Dessein et al, 2015; Duxbury, 2011; Duxbury et al, 2007, 2012, 2016; Meireis and Rippl, 2018; Hawkes, 2001; Nurse, 2006; CAE, 2017; CHCfE Consortium, 2015) and creative tourism (Korez-Vide, 2013; Richards, 2018; Duxbury and Richards, 2019, Tomaz et al, 2020; Gato et al, 2021); as well as in its discussion and adoption on multiple international organization agendas (e.g. WTO, 2004; UNEP/WTO, 2005; UN, 2015; UCLG, 2015; EC, 2018; EU, 2018; UNESCO, 2015; 2019);

Naturally this inspired by several previous exercises and proposals, that can be found in many of these references, as well as in the scope of the aforementioned contemporary debates on the social value of the art and in the diverse projects that are being internationally developed on this topic. All those were inspiring and important to this work, as well as the tacit empirical knowledge brought by all our co-creator cultural agents, who worked with us in this research.

But some main innovative aspects can be highlighted, that distinguish this proposal from other frameworks:

- The structuring around 5 main sustainable development “pillars” (instead of the more frequent assumption of culture as the 4th pillar by cultural actors - e.g. CHCfE Consortium (2015) – or the assumption of citizenship, participation and governance issues as this 4th pillar, by several international institutions);
- The fact of being the result of debate and co-construction with a diversity of cultural agents, with different roles, in several cultural fields and contexts;
- The fact of assuming its worth essentially as a self-assessment tool and a self-reflective instrument, that can be used for different contexts and different kind of actors, rather than have extensive comparative ambitions;
- But, at the same time, the fact that the assumption of this natural relativity, does not prevent comparability, which is possible - for specific purposes and in certain conditions – due to the its scale implementation (for details on the toolkit implementation see Costa et al, 2021);
- Not having the ambition to reach a composite index or a single number (just envisaged at the level of each dimension, eventually);
- And the fact of being applicable to a diversity of contexts and situations, particularly the ones less “covered” by conventional assessment methodologies (such as informal activities, or low density territories).

The final results are presented below and detailed in the respective figures.

Regarding the first of the five main dimensions (Cultural Value), we assume 3 subdimensions (cf Figure 1 for details and indicators):

- (i) Artistic/cultural relevance (related to the intrinsic artistic and creative value of the projects and its subjective importance);
- (ii) Cultural richness (including cultural enrichment and heritage safeguard as well as creating and reinventing sustainable cultural heritage);
- (iii) Creative embeddedness in the community/territory (associated to the artistic/creative rooting in community, territorial embeddedness and the relations with community wellbeing).

Concerning the second dimension (Economic value), we propose 3 assessment subdimensions (cf Figure 2 for details and indicators):

- (iv) Economic Viability (referring to the direct generation of economic activity and vitality of the promoters, the “direct economic boost” resulting from the activity itself);
- (v) Economic growth and local prosperity (assuming here all the indirect economic effects in the community and the externalities affecting the agents in that territory);
- (vi) Structural change (relating to other induced economic effects, the transformations in the structural context or changes in economic structure).

The third dimension (Social Value) is operationalized through the following subdimensions (cf. Figure 3 for details and indicators):

- (vii) Social cohesion and equity (assuring a degree of equity and inclusion in the access, and enhancing community cohesion, internally and externally);
- (viii) Participants fulfilment (providing fruitful and meaningful experiences, knowledge improvement and opening mentalities);

(ix) Engagement with social fabric (related to the involvement of local community in the activities).

For the fourth dimension (Environmental Value) we assume the following subdimensions (cf. Figure 4 for details and indicators):

(x) Valorization and protection of the physical environment (assuming physical integrity and reliable valorization of physical resources);

(xi) Responsible use of resources (addressing an efficient management of resources);

(xii) Environmental quality and biodiversity (ensuring the minimization of negative environmental externalities and ecosystems protection).

And finally, for the fifth dimension (Citizenship and Participation Value) we propose these 3 subdimension (cf. Figure 5 for details and indicators):

(xiii) Identity expression (assuming the potential for the expression of identities and the freedom - and empowerment - for identity affirmation);

(xiv) Civic Participation (including participation and access issues, citizenship rights, as well as citizens' cultural expression as means for inclusion);

(xv) Governance and quality of processes and policies (ensuring quality formal and informal regulating mechanisms in the creative sector, as well as democratic and transparent structures).

In order to shed additional light, in this necessarily summarized and schematic presentation, to the contents of each subdimension and the way they are being operationalized, it is provided, in the 4th column of the table, an example of operationalization in the form of a question to rate (in a 1-7 scale)¹³ by the respondent, and in the 5th column a brief rationale of the mechanisms inherent to the contribution of each indicator used to territorial sustainable development.

¹³ As it is being applied in practice. Please note that in parallel to this scale questions we envisage to apply, in certain research cases, additional quantitative and qualitative questions for each sub-dimension.

Figure 1. Operationalization of the “Cultural” dimension

Dimension	Subdimension	Indicators	Question to rate (1-7 scale): <i>Concerning the development of the community/territory, your activity/project allowed/contributed to:</i>	Rationale (Culture -> Territorial Development)
1. Cultural	1. Artistic/cultural relevance	1.1. Intrinsic cultural value and artistic "quality"	- Develop an artwork/creation/experience with quality and artistic/cultural relevance	Intrinsic cultural value and artistic quality of the activity developed; increasing artistic/cultural quality
		1.2. Empowerment of artists/creators	- Empower artists/creators and strengthen their artistic skills and reflective ability	Artists' empowerment and enhancement of artistic skills; foster cultural knowledge and artists' reflexivity
		1.3. Contribution to a (more) creative society	- Promote human creativity, and a more creative society, recognizing and integrating different (formal and informal) cultural expressions	Promotion of creation and human creativity, both individually and collectively; developing a (more) creative society, recognizing and integrating different cultural expressions
		1.4. Social recognition of creative value	- The recognition, by peers and/or the community, of the artistic value of the work/activity carried out and of its creators	Reputation; recognition of value (by peers / community); Legitimation of artistic value of the artworks / heritage / author / place / milieu

		1.5. (Degree of) novelty and artistic innovation	- Do something innovative and/or bring something new, original, different, in artistic terms	Bringing novelty, innovation, a certain degree of creativity, even if relative
2. Cultural richness		2.1. Preservation and safeguarding of cultural heritage	- Ensure the identification, valorization and/or conservation of tangible/intangible cultural heritage	Safeguard of heritage, traditions, etc.; including Intangible heritage value creation
		2.2. Accumulation, valorization and intergenerational transmission of locally-based know-how	- Value and transmit local know-how (and/or its intersections with external knowledge/cultures)	Intergenerational knowledge transmission
		2.3. Differentiation and uniqueness	- Integrate local heritage and distinctiveness features to promote/create unique and innovative cultural experiences	Cultural differentiation
		2.4. Reinvention of tradition	- Reinterpret local traditions and ways of doing, to bridge cultural gaps	Reinterpretation of ancestral traditions; modernization and adaptation of traditional knowledge
		2.5. Cultural diversity	- Value and promote cultural and social diversity in your activity (representation of different cultural perspectives in the events/activity)	Promotion, valorization (and preservation) of local cultural and social diversity; Ensuring representation of different cultural perspectives in the activities
		3.1. Articulation of creation with the community and its daily life	- Develop artistic/cultural experiences focused on the community and/or increase the	Creative anchoring in the community

3. Creative embeddedness (in the community/territory)		relevance of art and culture in the daily life of the community	
	3.2. Rooting in the local creative environment and consolidation of the creative ecosystem	- Develop a creative activity embedded in the local creative milieu, and/or collaborate with the local creative ecosystem	Improvement of collaboration amongst local artistic scene; densification of a cultural milieu; embeddedness of creative ecosystem in the community
	3.3. Strengthening local cultural identity (and appropriation of activities by the community)	- Strengthen local cultural identity (with the appropriation of the activities by the community)	Local appropriation of artistic activities; Identity enhancement (appropriation by the community - cultural and social identification)
	3.4. Openness and hybridization of local identities	- Encourage behaviours oriented towards sustainability, tolerance and acknowledgement of diversity, opening mindsets and enhancing cosmopolitanism	Evolution / transformation of identities (recognizing multiplicity of identity belongings); nurturing the opening of mindsets; stimulating cosmopolitanism and cultural diversity; opening the "local" to the "world")
	3.5. Personal conditions for creation	- Create conditions in the personal lives of artists and cultural workers that facilitate their activity (e.g., individual time management, work-life balance, work/leisure relationship, ...)	Management of personal conditions that allow artistic creation; "quality time"; possibility of individual time management; personal/family life compatibility; balance with leisure and living conditions

Source: Own elaboration

Figure 2. Operationalization of the “Economic dimension

Dimension	Subdimension	Indicators	Question to rate (1-7 scale): <i>Concerning the development of the community/territory, your activity/project allowed/contributed to:</i>	Rationale (Culture -> Territorial Development)
2. Económico	4. Economic Viability	4.1. Revenue/income creation with the activity developed (for the promoter and its partners)	- Generate (new sources of) income for your organization and its partners	Direct economic impact of this activity to the promoter/partners
		4.2. Market expansion and generation of new markets	- Reach new (or larger) audiences/markets	Development of audiences / loyalty relations
		4.3. Enhancement of autonomy and enabling economic self-sustainment (and resilience of the "business model")	- To ensure your economic sustainability and some long-term financial independence for your activity/organization	Project’s self sufficiency and improvement of economic resilience for the promoter institution
		4.4. Notoriety and appreciation of the promoter's (/creator/author) brand	- Generate notoriety and recognition for your activity and promote your brand/name	Notoriety and reputation value generated for the promoters.
		4.5. Creation of new organizational/institutional solutions	- Improve the practices and logics of your organization's operation, internally and externally	New logics of operation and practices; creation of innovative institutional tools or solutions; create/adapt governance models (e.g. public/market support) for more efficient operation

5. Economic growth and local prosperity	5.1. Value creation in other economic sectors (accommodation, transport, catering, traditional local products, tour operators,...)	- Create market for other businesses (e.g. transport, restaurants, accommodations) or add value to other local traditional/cultural products and local commerce	Indirect economic effects on other activities and local businesses.
	5.2. Contribution to the development (and visibility) of a local creative cluster/milieu/scene	- Contribute to the development of a local creative cluster and the external awareness of your creative product/activity (increasing the visibility as a creative place)	Cross-fertilization and positive externalities within local creative milieu
	5.3. Incorporation of creative content (aesthetic and symbolic) in other sectors' value chains	- Aggregate creative contents/products and experiences in other economic value chains (e.g. tourism, design, traditional product brands, etc.)	Indirect/induced economic effects in non-related value-chains
	5.4. Increase in local control and autonomy	- Expand the local control to a larger part of the value chain, within the scope of globalized production/creation processes	Ensuring larger control of parts of the global value chain, maximizing local-global anchoring opportunities in the territory
	5.5. Negative economic implications on the community (negative externalities) (*)	- Cause additional economic losses or costs to other economic agents or residents in the community (e.g. increased costs in accessing infrastructures, with the maintenance of heritage, increase in land prices, gentrification,	Negative externalities (e.g. negative economic impacts to other actors in the community; increased costs in access to infrastructures; in upholding heritage, positive and negative impacts in land prices; gentrification; displacement)

			displacement, devaluation of land prices,...)	
6. Structural change	6.1. Quality of jobs offered	- Improve the quality of employment generated by your organization generates (e.g, stability in contracts, overcoming jobs seasonality,...)	Structural employment creation in the promoter (e.g, ensure job stability, extend the season for creative products and services,...)	
	6.2. Generation/preservation of employment in the territory/community	- Raise work opportunities in the cultural/creative sector (or in maintaining traditional crafts)	Structural employment creation in the community / creative milieu	
	6.3. Stimulation to investment in the territory/community	- Encourage other/new investments in the cultural/creative sector and related activities	Demonstration effect; inducing new “followers” in the activity	
	6.4. Promotion of collaboration and networking	- Enhance collaboration with other agents and networks, internally and externally to local community	Deepening of collaboration among actors and accumulation of relational capital, endogenously and exogenously to the territory	
	6.5. Development of business/management skills and soft skills for access to finance	- Support the development of entrepreneurial skills (marketing, management, funding programs, etc) and experience in applying for funding opportunities	Development of soft skills as well as specialized codified and tactical knowledge	

Source: Own elaboration / (*) Reverse scale

Figure 3. Operationalization of the “Social” dimension

Dimension	Subdimension	Indicators	Question to rate (1-7 scale): <i>Concerning the development of the community/territory, your activity/project allowed/contributed to:</i>	Rationale (Culture -> Territorial Development)
3. Social	7. Social cohesion and equity	7.1. Promoting equity in access to culture and expansion of cultural capital	- Increase (more equative) access to cultural knowledge and creative experiences	Creation of "cultural habits" and generic cultural capital in the population (e.g. traditional role of educational services)
		7.2. Fight to exclusion and promotion of inclusion (and access conditions) of minorities or specific population segments	- Promote the access and inclusion for social excluded and/or economically disadvantaged people (as well as affected by digital illiteracy)	Increasing access for specific segments (less accustomed to cultural consumption), e.g., vulnerable populations, the elderly, disabled, prisoners, ethnic minorities, digitally excluded,...
		7.3. Promotion of social cohesion	- Promote social cohesion and its "values"	Enhancing social cohesion (integration of different sectors/actors) as well as promoting the values of cohesion and equity also in the creative "content" itself
		7.4. Contribution to territorial attractiveness and population retention	- Encourage the retention and/or establishment of new residents in the community (particularly younger generations)	Demographic vitality; contributing to combat desertification and retain population; enhance territorial attractiveness and fix population

			(particularly young adults in low density and rural areas); promote territorial cohesion.
		7.5. Promotion of social innovation and community development	- Stimulate social innovation ideas in the cultural/creative sector and community development Support social innovation projects and social entrepreneurship in the creative/cultural field
	8. Participants fulfilment	8.1. Personal fulfillment of the participants (enjoying the creative experience)	- Satisfy and culturally enrich participants through aesthetic pleasure and artistic fulfillment during the creative experience Satisfaction of cultural “needs” of audiences/tourists visiting the event/destination; aesthetic enjoyment; "feel"; construction of meaning; realization of cultural/religious/historical value
		8.2. Creation of cultural habits and recurrence of participants	- Increase participants' availability to enjoy creative goods and develop their cultural habits Improvement of cultural capital and loyalty of participants; enhancing the recurrence of visits; increasing cultural habits; creation and qualification of audiences
		8.3. Opening mentalities and changing behaviours	- Confront participants with themselves and contribute to change mindsets and behaviors "Open horizons" and allow individual empowerment; promotion/production of new narratives, worldviews and subjectivities
		8.4. Learning, knowledge and understanding of the world	- Stimulate participants' interest in learning and promote their knowledge Art as education, providing participants with new tools for knowledge; art as an educational

				tool; art as a platform for knowing and understanding the world
		8.5. Wellness and personal development	- Promote the physical and psychological well-being of participants and their personal development	Physical and psychological well-being, and personal development of all actors; Participants' wellness; Healthy living for residents; Relation with leisure, sports and recreation.
	9. Engagement with social fabric	9.1. Suitability and adaptation to community	- Foster experiences that meet the needs of local population and the expectations of the participants	Cultural negotiation with the community
		9.2. Social participation	- Sustain an active community participation in your activities	Social participation (active audience participation in the events)
		9.3. Involvement and social appropriation	- Engage different (local) stakeholders in the planning and development of activities	Enabling social appropriation; individual/group formal/informal taking of ownerships; community involvement
		9.4. Negative impacts on residents' quality of life and conflict in the community (*)	- Cause disturbances in the daily lives of residents (e.g., noise, traffic or parking congestion, saturation of collection systems, pollution, etc.) and/or conflicts in the community	Negative externalities: social external impacts
		9.5. Community awareness of the importance of creative activities	- Raise awareness among audiences and the community about the benefits of promoting/experiencing cultural/creative activities	Public and community awareness of the benefits of culture and creative tourism

--	--	--	--	--

Source: Own elaboration / (*) Reverse scale

Figure 4. Operationalization of the “Environmental” dimension

Dimension	Subdimension	Indicators	Question to rate (1-7 scale): <i>Concerning the development of the community/territory, your activity/project allowed/contributed to:</i>	Rationale (Culture -> Territorial Development)
4. Environmental	10. Valorization and protection of the physical environment	10.1. Generation of alternatives to massification and management of carrying capacities	- Control the negative impacts of your activity in physical environment, respect carrying capacities, and combat massification	Considering the scale of activities, reduce impacts in physical environment; resistance to high-impact activities and massification
		10.2. Appreciation and protection of the landscape	- Value the landscape in the creative experience and maintain the integrity and quality of rural and/or urban landscapes	Valuing and protecting the landscape; Seizing visual landscape; Using integrity of rural and urban landscapes as resources for creative experiences
		10.3. Use and valorization of existing physical and natural resources and infrastructures	- Create or (re)use local physical/natural structures/resources for creative experiences	Adequate use and valorisation of existing physical resources

		10.4. Vitality and appropriation of public space	- Transform (regenerate/appropriate) public spaces through cultural/creative experiences	Revitalize public spaces (through creativity) and promote urban regeneration/revitalization
		10.5. Physical integrity (*)	- Contribute to affect or destroy the physical characteristics of the local system and/or the physical environment (and natural resources) where your activity takes place	Negative impacts on the physical environment; irreversible (or hardly reversible) changes; depredation of natural resources
	11. Responsible use of resources	11.1. Efficient planning of resource use in activities, encouraging the use of local resources	- Promote the efficient use of resources in your activity, encouraging their reduction, recycling and reuse (and enhancing the use of local resources)	Reduce emissions and ecological footprint (from the supply side); reduce travelling and flows of goods; encouraging reduction, reuse, recycling
		11.2. Reduction of the carbon footprint of audiences/visitors	- Minimize the carbon footprint of participants, and encourage greener forms of travel (e.g soft mobilities or collective transport)	Reduce carbon emissions and ecological footprint (from the audiences/visitors side)
		11.3. Management of scarce natural resources	- Reduce the use of scarce or threatened natural resources (e.g., water)	Decrease in the use of scarce / non-renewable resources; water conservation
		11.4. Energy efficiency	- Promote energy efficiency in your activity (including use of equipment and facilities), in face of the possibilities available	Enhancement of energy efficiency in the activity; energy conservation

		11.5. Taking advantage of the small scale	- Take advantage of the small scale to reduce the externalities and negative impacts (physical and social) of your activity	Valuing the small scale as a way to reduce the externalities of cultural/creative activity; exploring the benefits of small-scale creative tourism projects; plan to reduce waste, noise, congestion
	12. Environmental quality and biodiversity	12.1. Pressure on traffic and parking infrastructure and transport systems (*)	- Further overload traffic and parking infrastructure and/or transport systems, as a result of your activity	Negative externalities arising from cultural / creative tourism projects, in environmental terms (e.g., congestion of road infrastructure, parking, transport system)
12.2. Pressure on supply and sanitation systems and waste collection/treatment systems (*)		- Further overload the infrastructure of supply systems (water / energy), sanitation or waste collection and treatment, due to your activity.	Negative externalities arising from cultural / creative tourism projects in environmental terms (e.g., pressure on collection and treatment systems (waste, sewers, etc.)	
12.3. Pollution and degradation of natural resources (*)		- Generate a significant increment of noise and other types of pollution (water, air, ground, sound, visual), or contribute to the degradation of local natural resources	Negative externalities arising from cultural / creative tourism projects in environmental terms (e.g., air pollution, water quality, noise, species and biodiversity loss, etc.)	
12.4. Protection of local ecosystem		- Ensure the protection of local ecosystems	Ecosystem protection, by the activity itself, or by the content/message conveyed	

		12.5. Awareness of environmental quality values, biodiversity and ecological footprint reduction	- Raise awareness on the need to reduce ecological footprints and integrate biodiversity and environmental values into the planning and implementation of the cultural/creative projects	Awareness on the need to reduce the ecological footprint; general environmental awareness
--	--	---	--	---

Source: Own elaboration / (*) Reverse scale

Figure 5. Operationalization of the “Citizenship and participation” dimension

Dimension	Subdimension	Indicators	Question to rate (1-7 scale): <i>Concerning the development of the community/territory, your activity/project allowed/contributed to:</i>	Rationale (Culture -> Territorial Development)
5. Citizenship and Participation	13. Identity expression	13.1. Recognition and provision of place for the expression of diversity and identity multiplicity	- Make room for diversity and for the affirmation of the multiplicity of identities and identity belongings	Acknowledge / allow / represent / give space for the expression of diversity and multiple identities
		13.2. Empowerment (of individuals and groups) for the expression of (their) identities	- Empower for the personal, free and open expression of the "self" for everyone, safeguarding in particular the rights of minorities (e.g., gender, ethnic, religious, cultural identities).	Empower individuals and groups for the expression of subjectivities, and their multiple identities
		13.3. Provision of a safe space	- Provide a safe space for individuals or populations at risk (e.g., stigmatized minorities, refugees,	Provide security through culture and art by providing safe space for populations at risk (and promoting

		people in situations of war or conflict, victims of domestic violence, marginality)	the respective risk management); Enhance culture as "safe space (e.g., welcoming gender or religious minorities, refugees, or victims of war, conflict, marginality, domestic violence, etc)
	13.4. Promotion of intercultural and cross-cultural intersections	- Promote intercultural and transcultural intersections	Enhancing cross cultural dialogue as enabler of the transformation of local identities
	13.5. Promotion of tolerance and openness to difference	- Promote tolerance and openness to difference	Encourage tolerance, open mindsets and enhance cosmopolitanism
14. Civic Participation	14.1. Enabling of citizenship and individuals' involvement in social life	- Foster involvement in collective social life and active citizenship	Culture as promoter of citizenship; exploring all relations between arts and citizenship
	14.2. Furthering of cultural audiences engagement and participation in the artistic processes	- Engage audiences and allow their participation in decision making processes	Enable cultural participation, in a diversity of ways: active spectatorship, participatory programming, involvement in creative processes, participatory cultural management, etc.
	14.3. Creative freedom	- Enable artistic freedom and free creative expression	Promote/assure artistic freedom

		14.4. Empowerment in the access to culture	- Empower citizens with tools and skills, in order to facilitate accessibility(ies) to creative production and cultural enjoyment (e.g. cultural barriers, language, skills to overcome digital shift)	Promoting accessibility to culture, from the perspective of audiences' skills development / cultural capital
		14.5. Promotion of questioning and critical thinking	- Make room for questioning, reflexivity, and critical thinking	Provide "space for struggle"; enable critical thinking; promote reflexivity within the artistic field
	15. Governance and quality of processes and policies	15.1. Development of fair, supportive and efficient governance models	- Develop/improve fairer, supportive and efficient governance models (internally and externally to the institution) that allow the sustainability of creative projects	Improvement of fairer, more solidary and efficient governance models; potentially assuming multiple and diverse governance logics (based on market, public support, networks, untraded interdependencies, etc.), aiming resilience of the activity (including visibility/reputation within the institution - in hierarchical structures); solidarity funding
		15.2. Solidification of the (formal and informal) mechanisms for regulating the creative ecosystem	- Enhance capacity building and institutional structuring of local cultural/creative ecosystem, developing space for collective or collaborative projects, and creating	Community empowerment through capacity building and collaboration between stakeholders; promotion of spaces for collaboration and collaborative practices in collective

			collaborations between local actors and/or with external actors.	processes; coordination through associations, networks, alliances
		15.3. Influence in the development of public policies	- Have a demonstration effect for public policies and/or contribute to the development of new policies, plans and measures	Contribution to new policy developments; inductive effect on public policies; evolution of open governance standards and procedures
		15.4. Transparency in governance structures	- Ensure transparent governance mechanisms	Guarantee of transparency and accountability in the functioning
		15.5. Democracy	- Promote democracy and cultural democratization in the community, assuming culture as an universal right	Promotion of democracy and cultural democratization, as well as development of culture as a right

Source: Own elaboration

5. Conclusive note

In this paper we propose a new analytical framework to help disentangling the increasing complexity and diversity of the mechanisms of creation of value in cultural activities and to facilitate the assessment of its social impacts in a particular territory or community, in all their diversity.

This is particularly important considering the current digital transition, as the organization of the creative sector is confronted with wide challenges, including, among others, (i) the new challenges for understanding value creation with much more decentralized gatekeeping mechanisms and mediation processes, and evolving attitudes towards originality and creativity; (ii) the questionings on the resilience of much more flexible and informally network based business models; (iii) the importance of the participatory turn in culture and the role of new forms of participation in the co-production of meaning and value in these activities; (iv) the increasing challenges in the management of the relation between personal life, leisure and work; (v) the development of experiences of fair(er) governance models in the sector; or (vi) the increasing role of the negative externalities induced by these activities and all the problems related to their regulation. The assumption of the relativity and multidimensionality of value by the cultural agents, and their capacitation with tools which enable them self-assessing the impacts they have in increasingly wider fields is therefore crucial.

In this sense, we followed an assessment approach based on the notion of value, assuming that the value produced by culture activity is necessarily multidimensional, contextual, and relative, dealing with different perceptions, motivations and interests of all those involved in these activities. Therefore, we assume that the fundamental would be to provide the cultural agents a toolkit that would provide them the awareness of the diversity of impacts and the multidimensionality of the value generated by their activity, as well as the diversity of valuations (individual and social) and different interests/motivations at stake. The focus is on the importance of the (self)monitoring of the value generated, both for extrinsic reasons (e.g. to influence access to finance or definition of public policies) and intrinsic motivations (for the development and resilience of the activity itself).

Our departing point was the work developed in the scope of diverse research projects held in DINAMIA' CET-iscte in recent years (RESHAPE, ARTSBANK, IMPACTOS-ARTEMREDE, CREATOUR), which have been working with artists, cultural promoters, creative tourism agents and public authorities, in several territorial contexts, both at Portuguese and European levels, in the assessment of the impacts of their activities in their communities.

Combining the work developed (and still ongoing) in these 4 research projects, we propose an analytical assessment framework which expresses the diversity and multidimensionality in value creation, focused in the impacts of creative activities in their territories and communities. The specific grid that is presented in this paper, comprises 5 main dimensions for assessing the territorial impacts of cultural activities: cultural, economic, social, environmental; citizenship and participation. These are subdivided in 15 sub-dimensions, and operationalized in 75 different indicators. This impacts self assessment toolkit has been developed and tested with cultural and creative actors in some of these projects, and is being transposed to a digital application/platform that allows the systematization, self-assessment and self-awareness of value creation and their impacts by the agents of the cultural/creative sector.

References

- Becker, H.S (1984) *Art worlds*. London: University of California Press.
- Bianchini, F. (1999), "Cultural planning for urban sustainability", in L. Nyström (ed.) *City and Culture. Cultural Processes and Urban Sustainability* Karlskrona: Swedish Urban Environment Council.
- Belfiore, E., & Bennett, O. (2010), Beyond the "Toolkit Approach": Arts Impact Evaluation Research and the Realities of Cultural Policy-Making. *Journal for Cultural Research*, 14(2), 121–142.
- Bonet, L.; Calvano, G; Carnelli, L; Dupin-Meynard, F.; Négrier, E. (Eds.) (2018), *Be SpectActive! Challenging Participation in Performing Arts*. Spoleto: Editoria & Spettacolo
- CAE (2018), *The Value and Values of Culture*, Brussels: Culture Action Europe
- Camagni, R., D. Maillat e A. Matteaccioli (Eds.) (2004) *Ressources naturelles et culturelles, milieux et développement local*, Neuchâtel: EDES
- Caves, R. (2002), *Creative Industries: Contracts between Art and Commerce*, Cambridge / London: Harvard University Press
- CHCfE Consortium (2015), *Cultural Heritage Counts for Europe*. Europa Nostra, ENCATC, Heritage Europe, International Cultural Centre, Krakow, Raymond Lemaire International Centre for Conservation at KU Leuven, The Heritage Alliance, England
- Cooke, P. and L. Lazeretti (org.) (2008), *Creative cities, cultural clusters and local development*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar
- Costa, P. (2007), *A Cultura em Lisboa: Competitividade e desenvolvimento territorial*. Lisboa: Imprensa de Ciências Sociais
- Costa, P. (Coord.) (2015), *Políticas Culturais para o Desenvolvimento: Conferência ARTEMREDE*, Santarém: Artemrede
- Costa, P.; Lopes, R. V.; Bassani, J. (Eds.) (2019), *BRR2018: Quando a periferia se torna trendy*, Lisboa / São Paulo: DINAMIA'CET-IUL/FAU-USP
- Costa, P.; Tomaz, E.; Perestrelo, M.; Lopes, R. (2021, forthcoming), Acknowledging the multidimensionality of value creation in cultural activities: an impact self-assessment toolkit. In Guibentif, P. et al (org.), *Entre Transições: Retrospectivas, Transversalidades, Perspetivas*, Lisboa: DINAMIA'CET-Iscte
- Crevoisier, O., & Jeannerat, H. (2009). "Territorial knowledge dynamics: from the proximity paradigm to multi-location milieus". *European Planning Studies*, 17(8), 1223-1241.
- Dessein, J; Soini, K.; Fairclough, G.; Horlings, L. (Eds.) (2015) *Culture in, for and as Sustainable Development. Conclusions from the COST Action IS!007 Investigating Cultural Sustainability*, Jyväskylä: Jyväskylä University Press
- Dupin-Meynard, F.; Négrier, E. (Eds., with Bonet, L.; Calvano, G.; Carnelli, L.; Zuliani, E.) (2020), *Cultural Policies in Europe: a Participatory Turn?*, Toulouse: Éditions de L'Attribut et Occitanie en scène
- Duxbury, N. (2011), "Shifting strategies and contexts for culture in small city planning: interlinking quality of life, economic development, downtown vitality and community sustainability", in A. Lorentzen and B. van Heur (eds), *Cultural Political Economy of Small Cities*, London: Routledge, pp. 161–78.

Duxbury, N.; Baltà, J.; Hosagrahar, J.; Pascual, J. (2016), "Culture in urban development policies: An agenda for local governments", in UNESCO (org.), *Culture: Urban Future - Global Report on Culture for Sustainable Urban Development*. Paris: UNESCO, 204-211

Duxbury, N.; Gillette, E. (2007), *Culture as a Key Dimension of Sustainability: Exploring Concepts, Themes, and Models*. Creative City network of Canada. Centre of Expertise on Culture and Communities.

Duxbury, N.; Jeannotte, M.S. (2012), "Including culture in sustainability: an assessment of Canada's Integrated Community Sustainability Plan's". *International Journal of Urban Sustainable Development*. 4 (1), pp.1–19.

Duxbury, N.; Richards, G. (2019), *A Research Agenda for Creative Tourism*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar

EC (2018), *A New European Agenda for Culture, Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the European Council, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions*, COM(2018) 267 final, 22.5.2018. Brussels: European Commission.

EU (2018), *Draft Council conclusions on the Work Plan for Culture 2019-2022*, 13886/18 CULT 132, Brussels: Council of the European Union

Ferrão, J. (1995) "Colectividades Territoriais e Globalização: Contributos para uma Nova Acção Estratégica de Emancipação", *INFORGEIO*, Lisboa, nº 9/10, pp. 65-75

Galloway, S. (2009). Theory-based evaluation and the social impact of the arts. *Cultural Trends*, 18(2), 125–148.

Gato, M. A.; Tomaz, E.; Costa, P.; Cruz, A. R.; Perestrelo, M. (2021), "An Impact Assessment Tool for Creative Tourism: Insights from its application to CREATOUR project", in Duxbury, N., Albino, S., Carvalho, C. P. (Eds.) *Creative Tourism: Activating Cultural Resources and Engaging Creative Travellers*. CABI, Forthcoming

Hawkes, J., (ed.) (2001). *The Fourth Pillar of Sustainability: Culture's Essential Role in Public Planning*. Victoria: Common Ground Publishing / Cultural Development Network.

Kebir, L.; Crevoisier, O. ; Costa, P ; Peyrache-Gadeau, V. (Eds.) (2017), *Sustainable Innovation and Regional Development: Rethinking Innovative Milieus*, Cheltenham/Northampton: Edward Elgar

Korez-Vide, R. (2013), "Promoting sustainability of tourism by creative tourism development: how far is Slovenia", *Innovative issues and approaches in social sciences* 6 (1), pp.77–102.

Lazzeretti, L. (2020), "What is the role of culture facing the digital revolution challenge? Some reflections for a research agenda", *European Planning Studies*, DOI: 10.1080/09654313.2020.1836133

Lazzeretti, L.; Vecco, M. (orgs) (2018), *Creative Industries and Entrepreneurship: Paradigms in Transition from a Global Perspective*, Cheltenham/Northampton: Edward Elgar

Meireis, T., and Rippl, G. (eds.) (2018) *Cultural Sustainability: Perspectives from the Humanities and Social Sciences*. London: Routledge

Nurse, K. (2006). Culture as the fourth pillar of sustainable development. Prepared for: Commonwealth Secretariat. *Small states: economic review and basic statistics* 11, pp.28–40.

Richards, G. (2018). "The experience footprint : a tool to measure leisure and event experience"s. *Uncover*, 2018(2), 8-9

Sacco, P.-L. (2011) "Culture 3.0: A new perspective for the EU 2014-2020 structural funds programming", *EENC (European Expert Network on Culture) Paper*, April 2011

- Sala, S., Ciuffo, B., Nijkamp, P. (2015) "A Systemic Framework for Sustainability Assessment", *Ecological Economics* 119 (November): 314-25.
- Scott, A. J. (2000), *The Cultural Economy of Cities*, New Delhi, London and Thousand Oaks: Sage
- Scott, A.J. (2008), *Social Economy of the Metropolis: Cognitive-Cultural Capitalism and the Global Resurgence of Cities*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Scott, A.J. (2014), 'Beyond the creative city: cognitive–cultural capitalism and the new urbanism', *Regional Studies*, 48 (4), pp. 565–78.
- Singh, R.H., Murty, R., Gupta, A.B., Dikshit, A. (2009) "An Overview of Sustainability Assessment Methodologies", *Ecological Indicators* 9 (2): 189-212.
- Soini, K. and Dessein, J. (2016). Culture-Sustainability Relation: Towards a Conceptual Framework. *Sustainability* 8 (2), p.167.
- Throsby, D, (2001), *Economics and Culture*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Tomaz, E.; Costa, P.; Gato, M. A.; Cruz, A. R.; Perestrelo, M. (2020), Discussing impact assessment on creative tourism: A theoretical and analytical model, *DINAMIA'CET Working Papers*, WP 2020/5, Setembro 2020, Lisboa: Dinamia'CET_iscte
- Vale, M. (2012), *Conhecimento Inovação e Território*, Lisboa: Edições Colibri
- Verwayen, H.; Fallon, J.; Schellenberg, J.; Kyrou, P. (2017), *Impact Playbook For Museums, Libraries, Archives and Galleries*, Den Haag: Europeana Foundation
- UCLG (2015), *Culture 21: Actions. Commitments on the role of culture in sustainable cities*. Barcelona: United Cities and Local Governments / Agenda 21 for culture
- UN (2015) *Transforming our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*, New York: United Nations
- UNEP and WTO (2005). *Making Tourism More Sustainable – A Guide for Policy Makers*. UNEP, Division of Technology, Industry and Economics, Paris.
- UNESCO (2009), *The 2009 UNESCO Framework for Cultural Statistics*, Montreal: UNESCO Institute for Statistics
- UNESCO (2012), *Measuring the Economic Contribution of Cultural Industries: A review and assessment of current methodological approaches*, Montreal: UNESCO Institute for Statistics
- UNESCO (2015) "UNESCO's Work on Culture and Sustainable Development: Evaluation of a Policy Theme." *Final Report*. Nov 2015. UNESCO.
- UNESCO (2019), *Culture | 2030 Indicators*, Paris: UNESCO
- Waas, T., Hugé, J., Block, T., Wright, T., Benitez-Capistros, F., Verbruggen, A. (2014) "Sustainability Assessment and Indicators: Tools in a Decision-Making Strategy for Sustainable Development", *Sustainability* 6 (9): 5512-34
- WTO (2004) *Indicators of Sustainable Development for Tourism Destinations: A Guidebook*. Madrid: World Tourism Organization.