Creative city, mobility, and creativity: Finnish artists in Berlin

Johanna Hautala [a]* and Paulina Nordström[b]

aDepartment of Geography and Geology, University of Turku, Turku, Finland

bDepartment of Global Development and Planning, University of Agder, Norway

*johanna.hautala@utu.fi

Creative city, mobility, and creativity: Finnish artists in Berlin

Creative city, creativity, and mobility are interconnected. In creative city research, the interest of the creative class members in mobility is focused on long-term mobility: they 'move in' to a creative city. 'Once in' the creative city, the city is seen to (automatically) support the creativity of the individuals. However, artists and other creative class members constantly visit and work temporarily in creative cities. Moreover, the creation processes of individuals in the creative cities are less known. We focus on mobilities along the process of creation from 'creative moments' to 'creative outcomes'. We investigate Finnish artists in Berlin to analyse how the artists use mobilities ('move in', 'once in' and 'once out') to support their creative process. We apply interviews of 16 Finnish artists in 2014−2015 and a survey one year later. The results demonstrate visitor, transnational, and migrant mobilities, each with particular support for the creation process and with different geographies of mobilities. We contribute to the research on creative cities by elaborating the interrelatedness of creativity, mobility, and a creative city. According to the results, creative cities are not the only important sites for creation processes. Creative moments experienced in creative cities may be turned into creative outcomes elsewhere.

Keywords: creativity; mobility; creative city; artist; Berlin

Introduction

The idea of creative cities thrives. These cities are homes for creative class members including artists, researchers, designers, and other occupations (Florida 2002; Florida et al. 2008). Now a buzzword adopted in policies of numerous cities worldwide, creative cities aim for socio-economic prosperity by enticing new creative class members to move in. The atmosphere, interaction, and amenities in creative cities support the individuals' creativity, which results in new ideas, innovations, and other valuable outcomes. This basic reasoning relies on three interrelated concepts: creativity, mobility, and the creative city. However, these concepts and their relations remain

vague in research on creative cities.

First, creative city research holds an occupation-based perspective of creativity, which is problematic. Not all artists are creative all the time, and not all of their outcomes are considered creative (i.e., novel and valuable contributions) in their domains (Elster 2000; Gaut and Livingstone 2003; Gaut 2010). We analyse creativity as an individual's creation process where 'creative moments' (Nordström 2018) are turned into 'creative outcomes'. Better knowledge of what the creative class members actually do in creative cities is needed (Montgomery 2005; Martin-Brelot et al. 2010; Verdich 2010; Chow 2017). Therefore, we need to analyse the creation process of individuals who help make the creative city and who are affected by the city (Jacobs 2012).

Second, research on creative cities recognizes only long-term mobility, or migration. When considering the creation process of individuals in the analysis, however, we encounter various long and short-term mobilities. During the creation process, individuals, objects, and imagination move internationally and temporally into creative cities, between them, and away from them (Hautala and Jauhiainen 2018). Thus, it is not only the migrants who construct the creative cities. Although creative cities like Berlin and Paris are critical for the exhibition of artists' work (Vivant 2013; Hirvi 2015), these cities are not the only important sites for creation processes. Recent empirical research found that remote places can benefit creativity (Wojan et al. 2007; McGranahan and Wojan, 2007; Sánchez-Moral 2017). In general, international mobility supports individuals' creativity (Fee and Gray 2014; Maddux et al. 2014).

In this article, we focus on the processes of creation and mobilities to better understand how mobility, creativity, and creative cities are connected (Borén and Young 2013a; Faggian et al. 2014; Kong 2014). We study the core members of the creative class, artists, who are either living in or visiting Berlin. Berlin is an iconic

creative city (Novy and Colomb, 2013; Alfken et al. 2015; Hirvi, 2015; Lang and Schüßler 2018): a European artistic hotspot that attracts artists worldwide (Alfken et al. 2015; Hirvi 2015; Velthuis 2013, 300). We follow the new mobilities turn and consider mobility as the corporeal travel of artists, the physical movement of their key objects for creating art, and the imaginative travel of thoughts to bring situated memories into a creation process (Sheller 2017, 629). We analyse mobility as 'move in', 'once in', and 'once out'. We ask: How are Finnish artists in Berlin practicing mobilities to support their creative processes? The empirical study consists of interviews and a survey one year afterwards of 16 Finnish artist in Berlin from 2014 to 2015. We find three mobility practices that the artists use to support their creativity: visiting, transnational, and immigrant mobility. Each has particular geographies in the creation processes within and beyond creative cities.

Creative cities: Creativity, mobility, and city

Considering creativity from two viewpoints: creative cities and the process approach

The creative city literature has grown on two fundamental lines of contribution: the creative class and creative cities by Richard Florida (2002; 2005; Florida et al. 2017), and the 'toolbox' approach for making creative cities by Charles Landry (2000; see also Landry and Hyams 2012). In general, both lines hold an occupation-based perspective on creativity. A 'creative class' exists within 'creative fields' such as art, culture, and entertainment, and within knowledge-based professions like science and engineering (Florida 2002; 2003, 8). Moreover, the question of what derives economic development grounds both lines. Landry (2000; see also Landry and Bianchini 1995) aims to solve problems related to the decline of industrial capitalism by mobilizing creativity. For

Florida et al. (2008, 4), the creative class, their interactions, and their activities are the sources of economic development. In general, Florida's creative city research is influential but has also raised criticism, specifically among geographers. The core of the critique is the vague interpretation of creativity that leads to the generalisation of creativity across occupations and the unclear relation between creativity and the creative city that also lacks empirical grounds (O'Callaghan, 2010; Borén and Young, 2013a; Mould, 2014; Pratt, 2011). Such interpretation easily applies creativity as a globally consistent model for urban growth that may actually limit spontaneity in cities (Whiting and Hannam, 2017). Instead, everyday vernacular (Edensor et al., 2009), marginal (Gibson, 2010; McLean, 2018), and precarious (Gill and Pratt, 2008) creativity require a focus on individuals, creative collaborations, and subversive practices (Mould, 2015).

We take forward such critical interpretations of the creative city by starting from the core of creativity: the individual. According to Florida (2005, p. 4), 'every human being is creative'. However, empirical research on creative cities is often based on regional and statistical empirical materials and methods, which is why the relation between creativity and individuals remains unclear. The city and the region are put into the centre of the creation process (Florida et al. 2017, 90). Therefore, individual creativity is quite straightforwardly connected to the creative cities that are 'cauldrons of creativity […] vehicles for mobilizing, concentrating and channeling human creative energy.' (Florida 2005, p. 1) and 'turn that [creative] energy into technical and artistic innovations' (Florida 2005, p. 1). In other words, through creative process, ideas are translated into innovations, or 'concrete, effective outcomes' (Scott 2014, p. 569). Cities have a critical mass of various cultures, skills, perspectives, companies, events, and more, united through interaction. This is considered a source of creativity and innovation (Florida et al. 2017; Bóren and Young 2013a; Bennett 2010). Patents, start-

up activity, and even the highly digitalized music industry are concentrated in cities (Florida et al. 2017, 93). Indeed, Florida et al. (2017) argue that innovation would not exist without cities.

The literature on creative cities can be seen as part of the wider research on the spatialities of creativity (Meusburger 2009; Hautala & Ibert 2018; Nordström 2018). Creativity fuelled by interaction with other people and with objects (e.g., tools for making art) happens somewhere and at some time. Recently, geographical empirical research on creativity has begun looking outside centres like creative cities to analyse the meaning of peripheries and remote places for creation processes (e.g., Bain 2013; Gibson 2010; Glückler 2014; Shearmur & Doloreux 2016; Hautala & Jauhiainen 2019). In the USA, for example, high arts employment has been identified in a significant number of rural counties (Wojan et al. 2007, 712). Peripheral and remote places may support particular phases in the careers of creative class members and in creation processes. For example, peripheries have lower living costs and allow temporary disconnection from 'mainstream' influence due to its absence of power and control over the centres (Hautala 2015; Barnes 2018; Grabher 2018). This is not to argue that creative cities do not matter, but to encourage viewing their role from the perspective of the individual's creation process.

From the process perspective, individuals—even artists—are not creative all the time. Neither are all the outcomes of the individuals—even the artists—recognized as creative by the domain. Such natural fluctuation and uncertainty is not recognized by the creative city literature, where creativity is a standard feature of the creative class. Instead, any individual in any occupation and activity can be creative (see Edensor and Millington, 2019). We follow the process perspective and consider two

ways how creativity is realized in the interactive process of creation between individuals and between individuals and objects.

First, the process of creation may result in outcomes that are considered 'creative', i.e., novel and valuable contributions to the domain, like music or novels (Amabile 1996; Cskikszentmihalyi 1997; Hautala & Ibert 2018). The domains include various actors such as peers, critiques, and audiences. Novelty is usually relational and incremental for a domain. Its value can (e.g., economic) or cannot (e.g., aesthetic) be measured (Antal et al. 2015). In art, the novelty and value of artwork is generally recognized by (international) prizes, long-term scholarships, or positive critiques in leading newspapers and other key forums. This part in our understanding of creativity resonates partly with the 'instrumental' definition of creative input as a producer of economic growth and well-being (Bóren and Young 2013b; Wojan et al. 2007). However, the strong focus on this instrumental definition is criticized in research on creative cities (Peck 2005; Markusen 2006; Mould 2014; Rushton 2015). The aims of the artist's creation 'cannot be conflated with neoliberal urban political regimes' (Markusen 2006, 1921).

The second part of our understanding of creativity recognizes the 'moments of creativity' experienced by individuals along the creation process. Such moments occur through meaningful and serendipitous encounters where the site, the individuals, and the objects interact and intertwine (Crouch 2010; Nordström 2017). The encounter forces the individual to think, to learn, and to become a different person (Deleuze 1969/1990). One may experience a 'flow' of using skills and thoughts to the utmost to create something novel (Csikszentmihalyi, 1997) that could not have been created before this 'site of encounter' (Nordström 2018, 15−22). The encounters are

experienced on the move and 'across multiple spaces', and they are always connected to previous events in another space and time (Crouch 2010, 139−140).

Considering mobilities and creative cities from a process-perspective

While creative city literature connects the terms mobility, creativity, and city (Florida 2002; 2005; Florida et al. 2017), the understanding of their interconnectedness remains vague. We apply the idea of mobility and the process perspective to unpack this interconnectedness. We follow the wider 'mobility turn' within social sciences (e.g., Hannam et al. 2006) and consider mobilities along the creation process to break down the rather territorial view of creative cities as attractors and 'containers' of the creative class and of creativity (see also Sheller 2017, 628). Creative cities consist of long-lasting material structures (e.g., streets and buildings) and institutions (e.g., key art organisations) that enable the mobilities of individuals, objects, and imagination (Sheller 2017, p. 630; Gosetti-Ferencei 2018). Such lasting structures are not eternal but change slowly and are rather immobile compared to the creation process, related mobilities, and serendipitous encounters. Mobility and immobility, as well as movement and rest, belong to the creation process (see Merriman 2015, 89−91). Mobilities vary from the accustomed (everyday) mobilities of individuals and objects in a known environment, to the frictional mobilities into and within unknown environments, and to the mobilities of a person's imagination to another environment.

From the process perspective, the interconnectedness of mobility, creativity, and a creative city can be analysed through its three parts: the mobility of the individual belonging to the 'creative class' into the creative city ('*move in*'); how the creative city supports individuals' creativity through temporary, frictional, or accustomed (everyday) mobilities ('*once in*') (Cresswell 2006, 2010; Sheller and Urry 2006; Bissel 2015; Sheller 2017); and what happens when individuals move out ('*once*

out') from the creative city. However, because this research commonly understands the highly mobile (Sánchez-Moral 2017) creative class' mobility as *permanent long-term migration* (e.g., Bennett 2010; Kong 2014), the 'move out' from the creative city has received minimal research. When studied, the research mainly detects reasons that might cause artists to 'move out' from the city or within the city, such as a life cycle (Montgomery 2005) or gentrification (Miller 2004; Zukin and Braslow 2011). Therefore, we concentrate on the first two parts of the mobility process in this literature review.

The first part, 'moving in' to creative cities, is vastly covered. The creative cities aim to attract new creative class members who are considered the key for developing the well-being and the economies of the cities. The decision to 'move in' combines various push and pull factors, like a lack of opportunities in the place of origin, improving the work–life balance, the cost of living, social networks, and personal historic trajectories (Markusen and Schrock 2006; McGranahan and Wojan 2007; Verdich 2010; Martin-Brelot et al. 2010). A rich culture, buzz, a climate of people, a perceived vibrancy, tolerance, inclusiveness, and an openness to diversity (see Florida 2002, 231; Florida 2008; Bennett et al. 2009, 138; Bóren & Young 2013a, 196) allow a location to attract and retain talent (Hansen and Niedomysl, 2009), at least to some extent. In Germany, the cities' amenities were not found to explain the agglomeration of artists (Alfken et al. 2015). Moreover, the claim of a highly mobile creative class is now problematic. The European creative class is less mobile than their American counterpart (Martin-Brelot et al. 2010, 866−867). In Sweden, migration among creative workers is only marginally higher than among other professional groups (Hansen and Niedomysl 2009). Creative class members, including artists (Alfken et al. 2015), are heterogeneous with varying motivations and mobility dynamics (Bóren and

Young 2013a, 207; Markusen 2006, 1921). Artists move to creative cities for various reasons, such as personal networks, career development, vibrant urban environments, affordable communities and workspaces, increased opportunities to create art in the established industry, and bigger audiences (Markusen 2006, 1921; Markusen and Schrock 2006, 1683; Bennett 2010, 125; Bóren & Young 2013a, 208; Hirvi 2015; Mainemelis et al. 2016).

The second part, 'once in', is often neglected in creative city research: 'the major shortcomings with the work of Florida are that he often considers who these creative people are, rather than what they really do' (Cohendet et al. 2010, 92). According to the general reasoning, once a creative class member moves into a creative city, the environment automatically supports creativity. The creative city has many other creative workers and enables diversity and interaction, which 'seemingly confirms a capability for eliciting creativity' (Wojan et al. 2007, 713). Some have found evidence that being in a creative city indirectly increases individuals' opportunities for creative work (Bennett 2010; Bóren and Young 2013a). According to Bennett (2010, 125) a creative city has more opportunities for creative work because of an established industry or because of a larger population base. Cohendet et al. (2010) aim to better understand the creative process in creative cities by unpacking their anatomy into three layers. The 'upperground' includes the formal organizations and institutions that can, in our terms, officially recognize whether an outcome is 'creative' in a domain. The 'underground' includes individuals and groups outside of formal organizations. The 'middleground' communities and events reveal the underground scene to the 'upperground'. Similarly, Bóren and Young (2013a) found that artists' "networks of contacts and engagements with localized creative infrastructures are vital for their everyday creative practices". These networks influence how artists enter the scene and move there.

Mobility, creativity, and cities generally have strong but complex relations. Empirical research beyond the creative cities has shown that long-term international mobility (i.e., working abroad) supports individuals' creativity (e.g., Fee and Gray 2014; Franzoni et al. 2014; Maddux et al. 2014). Short-term international mobility (e.g., visits, meetings, and events) is also a critical part of work for today's creative class. While empirical research of short-term international mobility covers topics such as stress, stimulation (Gustafson 2014), obligations of presence (Storme et al., 2017), and mobility as 'a strategy to cope with the precarity of freelance work' (Watson and Beaverstock 2016, 1430), short-term mobility's relation to creativity and the creation process is much less known (Brydges and Hracs 2018). Both short-term and long-term mobilities of individuals and their key objects of creation are inherent in the process perspective. Individuals within 'creative fields' have a home base where they practice temporary, mediated, and virtual mobilities (Brydges and Hracs 2018). A home base is not necessary in the creative city. Also 'particular rural and small-scale characteristics tend to attract workers in creative occupations' (Verdich 2010, 139).

However, individuals may *visit* a particular creative city repeatedly. For artists' creation process, short-term international mobility is often critical and supported by a network of residences. Artists who strive for international recognition show their artwork internationally. It is important to visit, to learn about the 'core domain', to build networks, and to be visible in key creative cities such as London, New York, Paris, and Berlin (Alfken et al. 2015; Hirvi 2015; Hautala and Jauhiainen 2018). Thus, artists often move with or without key objects and take (or send) their artwork to the exhibition site, or they travel with objects that enable them create art on site. In summary, most contemporary creation processes consist of many geographical locations.

Empirical study

The artists and their creative outcomes

The empirical study consists of 16 artists from various fields (table 1); half are female, and half are male. Including various fields forms a comprehensive picture of how artists use mobility to creative cities, in creative cities, and from creative cities to support their creativity. Seven of the artists stayed in Berlin temporarily, and nine immigrated there. Of these nine immigrants, two had just moved in, while the others had lived in Berlin for several years. All the immigrants spoke German, and 15 artists were Finnish citizens. One non-Finnish artist who was visiting Berlin had lived in Finland for several years. The artists of this study consider themselves professional artists and had a practice for funding their artwork. An exception was artist 1 who recently graduated with an art degree from higher education. The key practice included successfully applying funding from Finland and from abroad. Two had, at times, turned art into an entrepreneurial activity of producing music or managing art organizations (artists 5 and 6).

Table 1. The interviewed artists.

The first part of our definition of creativity considers the international and local recognition of the artists' outcomes in their domains. We form three basic categories: *repeated international recognition* (≥ two prizes, two positive critique in the domain's leading forums, two respected grants allowing ≥ one year of work, or a permanent position in a leading organization in the domain); *international recognition* (one prize, an agreement with the domain's leading organization, or a positive critique in the

domain's leading forums); and settling to *local recognition* and local activities near retirement (adopted from Hautala & Jauhiainen 2018) (Figure 1).

Figure 1. Recognition of the artists' outcomes as 'creative' in their domains.

The artists represent different career stages. Six early-career artists aged 35 years or younger have worked as an artist for at least a few years, have held exhibitions, or have otherwise worked in Finland and abroad. Most have an arts-related education. The quality or creativity of their outcomes gained international recognition in their domain once for four artists and repeatedly for two artists (figure 1). Six mid-career artists have worked as an artist after graduation for at least 10 years. Four of them (7, 10, 11, and 12) hold a funded long-term position in their field either through a major grant or through organizational affiliation. The other two fund their art through an art-related side job during breaks in art funding. The four late-career artists are near retirement and at least 60 years old. Some actively make art (artists 14 and 15) while others work less and without time limits, carefully choosing only the most interesting projects (artists 13 and 16). They are best characterized as settling on mostly local activity in Berlin, but two of them had a long career with repeated international recognition.

Materials and methods

The artists for this study were found via key organizations for the Finnish artists in Berlin: the Artists Association of Finland, the Finnish Institute in Berlin, the Finnish Embassy in Berlin, and five key Finnish artists' residencies in Berlin. The materials consist of 16 interviews conducted in Berlin in 2014 and 2015, a follow-up survey with answers from 13 interviewees collected about a year after the interview (2015−2016),

and the interviewees' webpages where they described their working processes and Berlin. The interview themes of mobility (Berlin, home, and other places), the creation process, and artwork are applied in this article. In the survey, the artists visiting Berlin were asked to consider their Berlin visit's meaning for their artwork (artists 1−7 and 11). The artists living in Berlin were asked to consider what a recent visit to Finland or another country meant for their artwork (artists 8−10, 12, and 15−16). Artist 11 chose to describe Berlin in her survey questions because of her immigration there at the time of the interview. All the survey questions were answered with the artists' own words. The questions were concerned with the visit's effects on the artists and on their artistic practice, with the artists' plans to visit Berlin again, and with their new ideas during and after the visit. The artists also reported if they 'brought back' new techniques, practices, and/or networks from the visit. The interviews were transcribed into text word-by-word. From the texts (interviews and survey), the key content was identified through the descriptions of mobility, artwork, creativity, Berlin, and Finland. With content analysis (Hsieh and Shannon 2005), the key content was further summarized by concentrating on the mobilities of artists, their objects, and imagination. With these quotations from the text materials, we identified three key mobility practices that support the artists' creative processes as preliminary answers to the research questions. The results section was guided by the gaps in the creative city literature.

Finnish artists in Berlin: Three mobility practices to support creativity

We identified three mobility practices that Finnish artists in Berlin used to support their creative process: visiting mobility, transnational mobility, and immigrant mobility. Visiting 'creative cities' abroad was a mobility practice for all the artists of this study. However, the seven transnational artists (2, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, and 14) and the five

immigrant artists (10, 12, 13, 15, and 16) are two different groups within our sample. The remaining four artists (1, 3, 4, and 7) were Finland-based artists visiting Berlin.

Visiting: creative moments in Berlin and creative outcomes at home

Altogether, seven of the interviewed artists were temporarily visiting Berlin (one is a transnational artist living in London). Five of them have achieved international recognition for their work, and two repeatedly. Most were accommodated for a few weeks to a few months in residencies for artists. Artists selected via application process received financial support to stay in residencies. Moreover, Finnish artists also often visit Berlin through independently arranged accommodation (artists 5 and 6).

Their key reasons to visit ('move in') Berlin were building networks and experiencing art. Some artists held exhibitions in Berlin and collected further materials and ideas for creation process. On one hand, the visiting practice moves artists and their developing art objects and ideas into and away from Berlin. For the DJ (artist 6), a laptop was enough to continue composing new songs, whereas artist 7 was in Berlin to collect materials for new artwork. On the other hand, five artists left their key art-making objects at home, which is why particular active creation processes (e.g., finishing paintings) were on hold. Simultaneously, Berlin has triggered new ideas for new creation processes. Thus, material structures of the city, objects that stay at home, and moments of rest in particular creation processes represent immobility, and they are also important for the creativity of artists who visit Berlin.

'Once in' Berlin, the retreat allows focus and a shift from the everyday rhythm to temporary mobilities. Artist 7 states, 'the most important thing for me in here [is…] to have undefined time. It is often the source of creativity, invention, and synthesis.' Artist 4 reflects on his mobility with relation to pace: 'this speed of life here […] everybody is kind of just in transit, […] just like me, just passing by.' The artists'

temporary mobility is to 'walk and wonder' in Berlin. Some days, they have a
destination: places to experience art, Berlin, or meetings with critics, curators, peers,
and more. Some days, the artists have no plan but follow their interests and observe
events like flâneurs (Benjamin 1969) or tourists (Richards 2011). All artists described
considering the history and reconstruction of Berlin during these walks, and three artists
mentioned the Mauer as a specific site. Although such activities in Berlin support the art
occupation, the activities resemble those of 'creative tourists' searching for creative
experiences and learning about the local culture (Richards 2011: 1235−1239). As artist
4 notices: 'Residency is more like a retreat when you go there just to think and have
clear ideas and meet the people and live the life.'

As the visitors did not compete for resources in the local art scene, they
interpreted Berlin as a utopia where being an artist seemed an easy way of living.
However, since many visiting artists are constantly 'passing by', this utopic view partly
constructs the 'creative atmosphere' in Berlin (Böhme 2017). The art itself becomes a
shared platform for wondering: what is Berlin about? Moreover, the artists realized in
Berlin what makes their art a novel and valuable contribution—in other words, why
some of their artworks are considered creative outcomes within their domain. This was
combined with a boost in the artists' identities in Berlin:

> what is my role in this? Does this art thing make any sense? Being here kind of
> made the thought easier, I got confidence that this matters. […] Here you see that
> people do art […] they can be older and still they are not in a trouble. (Artist 1)

> when you leave your everyday, leave your workspace, then you see […] what your
> work is from further away. […] More where you locate yourself. […] What is
> special in your work in relation to here. (Artist 3)

Via the sensuous walk and wonder practice (e.g., Middleton 2010; Pinder 2011;
Kärrholm et al. 2017), the artists encounter people, objects, and fluid materials of the

city that enable creative moments. Such serendipitous encounters (Crouch 2010) with new people, new sounds, and new materials were memorized for possible use in later creation processes. Berlin has 'forms, colors, scents, and sounds' (Artist 6) that stimulate the senses and make one ask questions (all the visitors and the newly arrived artists 11 and 14). All the visitors recorded such events through text, sketches, photographs, or sound. Most artists continued interpreting their observations during the night. For instance, two visual artists drew, one visual artist and one performance artist discussed, and the musician 'jammed' with peers. For most of the visitors, their main ongoing process of finishing new artwork was 'on hold' in Berlin. However, they experienced and recorded various 'creative moments' in Berlin that 'charged' creativity:

> At first I thought I am not going to do anything here. But […] you kind of charge yourself all the time. Then I had to go and buy some paper (to draw). The thoughts just multiply. (Artist 3)

> I could distance myself from everyday work […] it resets your brain and seems to open a new episode in spiritual life and art […] on the way back home, the idea mill started grinding. (Artist 9)

The 'creative moments' are not limited to one particular location and time; rather, they were fostered by encounters that later materialized in artworks, most often in Finland. The creative work is based on creative moments 'where-ever […] simply right in front of you' (Artist 4). It is difficult to identify the exact sources that initiate the creative process. However, some examples demonstrate that the visit to Berlin triggers ideas that contribute to the process of creating new artwork. For example, artist 3 found a long-lasting theme for making art, 'memory, stability, and transience', from her previous visit to Berlin. Artist 1 returned to Finland to create his best artwork yet based on an idea he got in Berlin. After returning home, many reported bursts of creativity. For example, artist 3 described her work as 'more focused', which 'is visible

in my art', partly because 'I can place my own art better into the domain'. The artists' imagination travels back to Berlin to re-experience the (recorded) creative moments. This experience is then transformed into their concrete artwork in their own studios in Finland where they left their key objects for making art. However, this is perhaps not the case for writers and musicians, whose key object for making art is a laptop or paper and pen that travels with them. Artists 9 and 6 are good examples of this. They transformed creative moments in Berlin into outcomes in Berlin.

> I wrote many of the poems in this book in Berlin. […] there is something in this place that is connected to the book. […] what is in Berlin, is connected to the history […] the environment has a strong effect on my writing. I cannot shut it away. (Artist 9)

Transnational mobility: Creativity and friction in-between two sites

Artwork from the seven transnational artists (three early-, three mid-, and one late-career) has been internationally recognized as creative, and the work of four artists has been repeatedly recognized. Six of these artists moved to Berlin (one to London) for reasons that combine opportunity, curiosity, vivid art scenes, and the city's low cost of living (see also Hirvi 2015). On the one hand, it was a win-win situation: These artists lived in the inspiring 'creative city' with much lower living costs than Finland. Because the artists were Finnish, they could apply for funding for their art in Finland, which they considered easier than receiving funding in Germany (or the UK). Thus, the funding would support their creation process in Berlin for longer periods than in Finland. On the other hand, transnational mobility was a survival strategy. Once in Berlin, the transnational artists needed to adjust to the local art scene, the restricted resources, and the harsh competition (see also Jacob 2013, 451):

> Germany is difficult, because the competition is so hard […] you need to justify very well what you do and why and believe in yourself […] if you cannot do it, you are easily labelled as unprofessional or uninteresting. (Artist 8)

> This is a difficult city. It is so big and there are so many who really try. There are a lot of clubs, but also a lot of DJs and those who are ready to play gigs. (Artist 6)

Grasping 'the size of the art domain' is a crucial difference between transnational artists and visitors. The visitors benefit from experiencing the huge art domain by identifying the 'novelty value' of their work and by finding support for their artistic identity. However, the huge art field means fierce competition among artists for resources and opportunities to exhibit, to play, or to show art. Therefore, the same field questioned the transnational artists, who describe 'surprising' difficulties and a harsh 'reality' as an artist in Berlin (Artist 5). They even feel they are 'losing identity' (Artist 8). Berlin was no utopic creative city that supports all artists.

> When you come here and you realize that no one cares, everybody is an artist, you lose your identity. […] if you continue doing art nevertheless, it will lay on a stronger ground. […] Then it is really your own inner need […] I have learnt to work much harder, here is a hideous working culture, from morning to evening and night. I have learnt to focus, become better, continue. (Artist 8)

To survive as artists in Berlin, they build a practice where artistic creativity is born 'in-between' Berlin and Finland. Therefore, our two analytical categories of mobility merge: 'once in' and 'once out' become 'in-between'. The transnational artists, their objects, and their imagination are constantly 'on-the-move' between Berlin and Finland. The competitive art culture of Berlin makes artists improve their work. All the artists had had their favourite spaces in Berlin to support creativity. Four artists (2, 3, 6, and 9) emphasised the meaning of their affordable studio. Working in a studio away from home created a daily mobility routine, and the space supported specific creation

processes (e.g., included high fidelity). More importantly, Berlin was a city where all Berlin-based transnational artists constantly encountered 'creative moments'. For example, artist 6 described how the jamming sessions with new people inspire him and how his album 'develops on-the-go'. Berlin is full of stories for artist 11's books:

> I should walk eyes closed and ears shut. And even then the problem is that ideas just roll into my head […] if I see a mitten down the street, or a shoe […] I start to think, whose is this? Who dropped this? And the way a person walks or speaks, or somebody's read lips. Or I see a couple in a train who don't talk to each other, or hear one side of a phone conversation. […] I immediately start to fill up the conversation in my head […] this big city is unbelievable, like some rare treasure island. (Artist 11)

Through their in-between practice, the Finnish artists can choose the best of the Finnish art scene (e.g., funding and audience) while avoiding much of the restrictive institutionalization of artists in Finland. There is a good 'looseness' that seems natural for transnational artists who 'feel peaceful […] being a nomad, the experience of not belonging anywhere' (artist 2) or note that the '(Finnish) language is my only home country, otherwise I think my feet are rather loose' (artist 11, writer). This looseness and the friction between Berlin's and Finland's art scenes become the source of creativity. For artists 5 and 11, Berlin was another chance, a city to recreate yourself as an artist. Artist 5 was not able to climb higher in the Finnish art domain, but in Berlin she could 'rip myself away from the (Finnish) institutions to renew myself'. In Berlin, the artist 11 (writer) avoided having her artwork judged as (non-)creative by a small Finnish domain and one powerful newspaper. For visual artist 8, her Finnish audience was more likely than the German audience to interpret her art as creative.

> here, only what you write, matters. They have no idea of who I am as a person, and they don't know into which box to push me […] Finland is cruel in that way. If you get classified into a box, you rarely get out. (Artist 11)

> Finnish audience is easier and more open for my artwork, because they look at them from a different perspective than here. […] Here one must justify why you have chosen a particular paper or nails for hooking. […] In Finland one is not so critical, they let all the flowers bloom, and there is no need to tear up things into their starting point. (Artist 8)

Migrant-accustomed mobilities: Creativity, the show, and Berlin

Nine artists from our sample had migrated to Berlin. Five of these we call migrant artists (10, 12, 13, 15, and 16). They had lived permanently in Berlin for over 10 years, they spoke fluent German, and most had a German spouse and family. All the migrant artists had either created a permanent position in the Berlin art scene (e.g., opera house and theatre) or were 'insiders' of the local art domains and supported themselves as artists. Thus, the migrants' mobility practice was accustomed to Berlin. Their art was valued as 'novel' by the audience and the domain in Berlin and Germany and internationally. Two of the five migrant artists were mid-career, and three were near retirement. These late-career artists were content with local recognition and activity. For example, for artist 16, Berlin represented an idyll for a meaningful life:

> Really nice friends and the economy is really cool. Nice crowd. We just sit here and there are like no social responsibilities. (Artist 16)

Four migrant artists operate within performative art domains where the key outcome is a 'here and now' show experienced together with the audience. They include a professional pianist (artist 10), an opera singer (artist 12), a theatre director (artist 13), and a former violist (artist 15). Artist 16's (writer) interest in Berlin originated in the 80s for ideological reasons. Interestingly, only one transnational artist operated in a performative art domain (artist 14, theatre director). Artist 14 was near retirement and

seldom directing plays, but was writing a book in Berlin. In general, before moving to Berlin as early career artists, the migrants were accustomed to moving between various 'creative cities' internationally. Three artists moved to Berlin because of opportunity and curiosity, to follow love (artists 10 and 15), and to attain international funding for theatre directing in Berlin (Artist 13). Two artists had visited Berlin beforehand and found the city and its art scene to be intriguing. With new opportunities (i.e., buying a flat or getting a contract with an opera house), the decision to move was an easy one. In general, as well as for these migrants, the low cost of living in Berlin attracts young artists (Hirvi 2015; Colomb 2012, 139). Gentrification affects which areas in Berlin the artists move to:

> Younger Finnish artists live mostly in Mein Köln. It is much cheaper for now. […] They think this (Prenzlauer Berg) is too middle-class. There was an anarchistic phase after the reunification […] empty spaces. One could fix things up. But that's gone. Now this is about the most expensive area in Berlin. (Artist 10)

However, these stories also include interesting immobilities (i.e., structures that sustain mobility), such as art domains structured strongly around organizations (e.g., theatre and opera) or art practices learnt in a long-term master-apprentice relationship (e.g., becoming a professional pianist). The pianist (artist 10) followed his professor to Berlin. Whereas the possibilities to be an opera singer or theatre director in Finland are limited, such organizations exist in Berlin on both sides of the former Mauer. This makes Berlin a unique 'creative city' for particular art domains, and it was one key reason to move to Berlin for artists 12, 13, and 15.

'Once in' Berlin, the city was the home base from where these artists created their international careers with regular shows and periods working abroad. For these artists, the 'creative moments' occurred in the show between the artist and the

audience, and not in Berlin per se. The meaning of the art could not be experienced without 'being there'.

> We performers are energy dealers […] [concert] should have beauty that just takes you along. (Artist 10)

> We create art so that the listener would have a moment for her own thoughts, take wing and fly. We create art so that the everyday could disappear for a moment and there would be room for dreams and even happiness. Touching [through art] can also mean that you stop. […] experience a moment of eternity. (Artist 12)

Although the migrant artists described 'creative moments' in various international locations, it does not mean that the show's location would not matter. For example, a concert hall inside a rock made artist 12 realize that 'a particular tune […] feels mind blowing heavenly in that environment'. A theatre director (artist 13) who had directed plays in various European cities first learnt the contemporary challenges of the city and then selected a play that speaks to its audience.

'Once out' from Berlin for this group included repeated visits to Finland for holidays and for meeting friends and family. Based on the survey, these visits were not critical for their creation process. During these periods in Finland, their creation processes were on hold and the key objects for making art were left in Berlin. However, some reported making progress in supporting activities, such as developing a 'social media strategy' during a walk in the forest (artist 10).

Conclusions

In general, literature on creative cities treats members of the creative class as migrants who choose a home, the city, to move to (Bennett 2010; Kong 2014). The creative city is seen as supporting the creativity of these migrants, and the creative class and their

interactions are seen as contributing to the cities' economic development (Bóren and Young 2013b; Wojan et al. 2007). Because understanding the sources of economic development is the original motivation for creative city literature (Florida et al. 2008, 4), the creation process is the key for a more detailed analysis of the relations between creativity, mobility, and creative cities. The core question is: what actually happens in the creative city during the creation processes of the very heterogeneous members of the creative class? This is studied very little. Moreover, an international creation process may involve mobilities between creative cities and out of them. Not every creative city advances the creativity of every artist at all times. A transnational artist who lives partly in Berlin and partly in Finland said:

> Praha was not at all important for me. Whereas Paris felt right away like another home. And I did not adjust well in Switzerland. I like more metropoles like Paris, Berlin, New York. Where happens a lot, where is a lot to see. A lot to experience and sense. […] Praha was like, I could not get further with my work. Like physically, it was August and the city was so full of tourists that it was difficult for me to orientate myself in this hot and noisy place.

We elaborate the understanding of creative cities from the perspectives of processes and international mobilities. We consider creativity a process of creation, including (i) 'moments of creativity' that are applied to bring about (ii) 'creative outcomes', or novel and valuable contributions in the domain. The process of creation includes individuals' various mobilities, key objects, and imagination. We conducted an empirical research of 16 Finnish artists visiting or living in Berlin. We investigated how Finnish artists in Berlin practice mobilities ('move in', 'once in', and 'once out') to support their creative process.

As the key contribution, we present two points to elaborate upon creative city research. First, we identified three mobility practices that artists use to support their

creative process: visiting, transnational, and migrant mobility. Although all the artists applied visiting mobility, the artists living in Berlin were divided into transnationals and migrants. Not just the migrants – the focus of the creative city research – but also the temporary visitors and transnationals construct creative cities and their economic development. Looking only at where artists live, many transnational artists would be considered migrants. However, these groups have important differences. The transnational artists have created a mobile artistic practice 'in-between' Berlin and Finland. This frictional mobile practice means that they live and work in Berlin but that their audience, and often their funding, is Finnish.

Many artists visited or used affordable buildings in rundown neighbourhoods, as this triggers gentrification processes (Richards, 2011; Whiting and Hannam, 2017). The visitors' narrative of Berlin as a utopia for artists also constructs Berlin and may attract some artists to move in. However, the movers later realised that Berlin is not a utopia and that it requires competing for limited resources within the big art scene. These conclusions suggest possibly minor but complex economies built on the constant mobilities of artists, objects, and imaginations that construct creative cities.

Second, we present mobilities in the creation process where creative cities are not the *only* important sites. These mobilities are critical for current international creative cities because the creation process and its 'creative outcomes' may 'escape' and benefit another local economy. Visitors and transnationals experienced and recorded 'creative moments' in Berlin that they applied in the creation process. However, most of the visitors returned to Finland where they turned these moments into 'creative outcomes'. If the transnationals operated only in the local German domain, their outcomes might not be considered creative. Thus, being 'in-between' was crucial for them in turning 'creative moments' into 'creative outcomes'.

For the migrants in performative arts, it was the show, instead of Berlin per se, that enabled the 'creative moments'. However, Berlin represented a uniquely creative city for migrants, with many respected organisations and institutional practices to support their careers.

As the final conclusion, our findings connect better mobility and creativity. So far, creativity has been a rather marginal concern within the mobilities research (for exception: Barry 2018; Lin 2019). However, the detailed mobilities interestingly contribute to the research of creativity. In this paper, short-term visits and long-term migration were considered and unpacked from a process perspective into three stages of mobility: 'move in', 'once in', and 'once out'. We demonstrated how the two building blocks of creativity (moments and outcomes) may be experienced and realized in different places and different mobility stages. Moreover, the mobilities turn suggests that mobilities require immobilities. Immobilities also contribute to creativity. For performative artists, they may secure a career through institutionalized organizations and practices. For visitors, immobile key objects for making art can prime creativity to burst after reuniting with the objects 'once out'.

References

Alfken, C., T. Broekel, and R. Sternberg. 2015. "Factors Explaining the Spatial Agglomeration of the Creative Class: Empirical Evidence for German Artists, European." *Planning Studies*, 23(12): 2438−2463. doi:10.1080/09654313.2014.979767.

Amabile, T. 1996. *Creativity in Context*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Antal, A., M. Hutter, and D. Stark. 2015. *Moments of Valuation: Exploring Sites of Dissonance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bain, A. 2013. *Creative Margins: Cultural Production in Canadian Suburbs*. University of Toronto Press, Toronto.

Barnes, T. 2018. A marginal man and his central contributions. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space,* 50(8): 1697–1715. doi:10.1177/0308518X17707524.

Barry, K. 2018. "Art and Materiality in the Global Refugee Crisis: Ai Weiwei's Artworks and the Emerging Aesthetics of Mobilities." *Mobilities*. doi:10.1080/17450101.2018.1533683.

Benjamin, W. 1969. "Paris: Capital of the Nineteenth Century." *Perspecta* 12, 163−172. doi:10.2307/1566965.

Bennett, D. 2010. "Creative Migration: a Western Australian case study of creative artists." *Australian Geographer* 41 (1): 117−128. doi:10.1080/00049180903535626.

Bennett, T., M. Savage, E. Silva, A. Warde, M. Gayo-Cal, and D. Wright. 2009. *Culture, Class, Distinction*. London: Routledge.

Bond, P., C. DeSilvey, and J. Ryan. 2013. *Visible Mending: Everyday Repairs in the South West*. Axminster: Uniformbooks.

Borén, T., and C. Young. 2013a. "The Migration Dynamics of the "Creative Class": Evidence from a Study of Artists in Stockholm, Sweden." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 103 (1): 195−210. doi:10.1080/00045608.2011.628263.

Borén, T., and C. Young. 2013b. "Getting Creative with the 'Creative City'? Towards New Perspectives on Creativity in Urban Policy." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 37 (5): 1799−1815. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2427.2012.01132.x.

Brydges, T., and B. Hracs. 2018. "The locational choices and interregional mobilities of creative entrepreneurs within Canada's fashion system." Regional Studies, in print, DOI: 10.1080/00343404.2018.1478410

Böhme, G. 2017. *The Aesthetics of Atmospheres*. London: Routledge.

Cresswell, T. 2006. On the Move: Mobility in the Modern Western World. Abingdon: Routledge.

Cresswell, T. 2010. "Towards a Politics of Mobility." *Environment and Planning D: Space and Society* 28 (1): 17–31. doi:10.1068/d11407.

Chow, Y. F. 2017. "Exploring Creative Class Mobility: Hong Kong Creative Workers in Shanghai and Beijing." *Eurasian Geography and Economics* 58 (4): 361–385. doi:10.1080/15387216.2017.1365311.

Cohendet, P., D. Grandadam, and S. Laurent. 2010. "The Anatomy of the Creative City." *Industry and Innovation* 17 (1): 91–111. doi:10.1080/13662710903573869.

Colomb, C. 2013. "Pushing the urban frontier." *Journal of Urban Affairs* 34 (2): 131–152.

Crouch, D. 2010. "Creativity, Space and Performance. Community Gardening." In *Spaces of Vernacular Creativity*, edited by Edensor, T., D. Leslie, S. Millington, and N. Rantisi, 129–140. London: Routledge.

Deleuze, G. 1969/1990. *The Logic of Sense*. London: The Athlone Press.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. 1997. *Flow and the Psychology of Discovery and Invention*. New York: HarperPerennial.

Edensor, T., D. Leslie, S. Millington,and N. Rantisi, eds. 2010. *Spaces of Vernacular Creativity*. London: Routledge.

Edensor, T. D., and S. D Millington. 2019. Spaces of Vernacular Creativity Reconsidered. In *Creative Placemaking: Research, Theory and Practice,* edited by Courage, C. and McKeown, A. London: Routledge.

Elster, J. 2000. *Ulysses Unbound: Studies in Rationality, Precommitment, and Constraints*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Faggian, A., R. Comunian, and Q. Cher Li. 2014. "Interregional Migration of Human Creative Capital: The Case of ''Bohemian Graduates''." *Geoforum* 55, 33–42. doi:10.1016/j.geoforum.2014.05.003.

Fee, A., and S. Gray. 2012. "The expatriate-creativity hypothesis: A longitudinal field test." *Human Relations*, 65(12), 1515–1538. doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726712454900

Florida, R. 2002. *The Rise of the Creative Class: And How It's Transforming Work, Leisure, Community and Everyday Life*. New York: Basic Books.

Florida, R. 2003. "Cities and the Creative Class." *City & Community* 2 (1): 3–19. doi:10.1111/1540-6040.00034.

Florida, R. 2005. *Cities and the Creative Class*. New York: Routledge.

Florida, R., P. Adler, and C. Mellander. 2017. "The City as Innovation Machine." *Regional Studies* 51 (1): 86–96. doi:10.1080/00343404.2016.1255324.

Florida, R., C. Mellander, and K. Stolarick. 2008. "Inside the Black Box of Regional Development—Human Capital, the Creative Class and Tolerance." *Journal of Economic Geography* 8 (5): 615–649. doi:10.1093/jeg/lbn023.

Franzoni, C., G. Scellato, and P. Stephan. 2014. The mover's advantage: the superior performance of migrant scientists. *Economics Letters* 122(1), 89–93. doi:10.1016/j.econlet.2013.10.040.

Gaut, B. 2010. "The Philosophy of Creativity." *Philosophy Compass* 5 (12): 1034–1046. doi:10.1111/j.1747-9991.2010.00351.x.

Gaut, B., and P. Livingston. 2003. *The Creation of Art. New Essays in Philosophical Aesthetic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gibson, C. 2010. "Guest Editorial—Creative Geographies: tales from the 'margins'." *Australian Geographer,* 41 (1): 1–10. doi: 10.1080/00049180903535527

Gill, R. and A. Pratt. 2008. "In the Social Factory? Immaterial Labour, Precariousness and Cultural Work." *Theory, Culture & Society,* 25 (7–8): 1–30. doi: 10.1177/0263276408097794

Glückler, J. 2014. "How controversial innovation succeeds in the periphery?" *Journal of Economic Geography* 14(5), 903–927. doi:10.1093/jeg/lbu016.

Gosetti-Ferencei, J. 2018. *The Life of Imagination: Revealing and Making the World*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Grabher, G. 2018. "Marginality as strategy: Leveraging peripherality for creativity." *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space* 50(8), 1785–1794. doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/0308518X18784021

Gustafson, P. 2014. "Business Travel from the Traveller's Perspective: Stress, Stimulation and Normalization." *Mobilities* 9 (1): 63–83. doi:10.1080/17450101.2013.784539

Hannam, K., M. Sheller, and J. Urry. 2006. "Editorial: Mobilities, Immobilities and Moorings." *Mobilities* 1(1): 1–22. doi:10.1080/17450100500489189

Hansen, HK., and T. Niedomysl. 2009. "Migration of the Creative Class: Evidence from Sweden." *Journal of Economic Geography* 9 (2): 191–206. doi:10.1093/jeg/lbn046.

Hautala, J. 2015. Interaction in the artistic knowledge creation process. *Geoforum* 65, 351–362.

Hautala, J., and O. Ibert. 2018. "Creativity in Arts and Sciences: Collective Processes from a Spatial Perspective." *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space* 50 (8): 1688–1696. doi:10.1177/0308518X18786967.

Hautala, J., and J. Jauhiainen. 2018. "Creativity-Related Mobilities of Peripheral Artists and Scientists." *GeoJournal*. doi:10.1007/s10708-018-9866-3.

Hirvi, L. A. 2015. ""A Suitcase Full of Art": Transnational Mobility among Berlin-based Visual Artists from Finland." *Ethnologia Europaea* 45 (1): 98–113.

Hsieh, H-F., and S. E. Shannon. 2005. "Three Approaches to Qualitative Content Analysis." *Qualitative Health Research* 15 (9): 1277–1288. doi:10.1177/1049732305276687.

Jacob, D. 2013. "The eventification of place: Urban development and experience consumption in Berlin and New York City." *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 20 (4), 447–459. doi: 10.1177/0969776412459860.

Jacobs, J. M. 2012. "Urban Geographies I: Still Thinking Cities Relationally*." Progress in Human Geography* 36 (3): 412–422. doi:10.1177/0309132511421715.

Kong, L. 2014. "Transnational Mobilities and the Making of Creative Cities." *Theory, Culture & Society* 31 (7/8): 273–289. doi:10.1177/0263276414549329.

Kärrholm, M., M. Johansson, D. Lindelöw, and I. A. Ferreira. 2017. "Interseriality and Different Sorts of Walking: Suggestions for a Relational Approach to Urban Walking." *Mobilities* 12 (1): 20–35. doi:10.1080/17450101.2014.969596.

Landry, C. 2000. *The Creative City: A toolkit for Urban Innovators*. London: Earthscan.

Landry, C., and B. Bianchini. 1995. *The Creative City*. London: Demos.

Landry, C., and J. Hyams. 2012. *The Creative City Index: Measuring the Pulse of the City*. London: Comedia.

Lang, B., and E. Schüßler. 2018. "Unpacking the Middleground of Creative Cities: Spatiotemporal Dynamics in the Configuration of the Berlin Design Field." *Regional Studies* 52 (11): 1548– 1558 doi:10.1080/00343404.2017.1413239.

Lin, J. 2019. (Un-)becoming Chinese creatives: transnational mobility of creative labour in a 'global' Beijing. *Mobilities* (in print). doi:10.1080/17450101.2019.1571724.

Maddux, W., Bivolaru, E., Hafenbrack, A., Tadmor, C., and A. Galinsky. 2014. "Expanding opportunities by opening your mind". *Social Psychological and Personality Science* 5(5), 608–615. doi:10.1177/1948550613515005.

Mainemelis, C., S-M. Nolas, and S. Tsirogiann. 2016. "Surviving a Boundaryless Creative Career: The Case of Oscar-Nominated Film Directors, 1967-2014." *Journal of Management Inquiry* 25 (3): 262–285. doi:10.1177/1056492615616871.

Markusen, A. 2006. "Urban Development and the Politics of a Creative Class: Evidence from a Study of Artists." *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space* 38 (10): 1921–1940. doi:10.1068/a38179.

Markusen, A., and G. Schrock. 2006. "The Artistic Dividend: Urban Artistic Specialisation and Economic Development Implications." *Urban Studies* 43 (1): 661–686. doi:10.1080/00420980600888478.

Martin-Brelot, H., M. Grossetti, D. Eckert, O. Gritsai, and Z. Kovács. 2010. "The Spatial Mobility of the 'Creative Class': A European Perspective*." International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 34 (4):854–870. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2427.2010.00960.x

McGranahan, D., and T. Wojan. 2007. "Recasting the Creative Class to Examine Growth Processes in Rural and Urban Counties." *Regional Studies* 41 (2): 197–216. doi:10.1080/00343400600928285

McLean, H. 2018. "Regulating and Resisting Queer Creativity: Community-Engaged Arts Practice in the Neoliberal City." *Urban Studies* 55 (16): 3563–3578.

Merriman, P. 2015. "Mobilities I: Departures." *Progress in Human Geography* 39 (1): 87–95. doi:10.1177/0309132514527030.

Meusburger, P. 2009. "Milieus of Creativity: The Role of Places, Environments, and Spatial Contexts. In *Milieus of creativity: an interdisciplinary approach to spatiality of creativity*, edited by Meusburger, P., J. Funke, and E. Wunder, 97–153. Dordrecht: Springer.

Middelton, J. 2010. "Sense and the City: Exploring the Embodied Geographies of Urban Walking." *Social & Cultural Geography* 11 (6): 575–596. doi: 10.1080/14649365.2010.497913.

Miller, T. 2004. "A View from a Fossil: The New Economy, Creativity and Consumption – Two or Three Things I Don't Believe in*." International Journal of Cultural Studies* 7 (1): 55–65. doi:10.1177/1367877904040605.

Montgomery, J. 2005. "Beware 'the Creative Class'. Creativity and Wealth Creation Revisited." *Local Economy* 20 (4): 337–343. doi:10.1080/02690940500298706.

Mould, O. 2014. "Tactical Urbanism: The New Vernacular of the Creative City." *Geography Compass* 8 (8): 529–539. doi: 10.1111/gec3.12146.

Mould, O. 2015. *Urban Subversion and the Creative City*. London: Routledge.

Novy, J., and C. Colomb. 2013. "Struggling for the Right to the (Creative) City in Berlin and Hamburg: New Urban Social Movements, New 'Spaces of Hope'?." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 37 (5): 1816-1838. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2427.2012.01115.x.

Nordström, P. (2017). "Through Laser Scanned Point Clouds to Techno-Sight and a Landscape on the Move." *GeoHumanities* 3 (1): 122–143. doi:10.1080/2373566X.2017.1289820.

Nordström, P. (2018). *Creative Landscapes: Events at Sites of Encounter*. Turun yliopiston julkaisuja, Sarja A 2, Biologica, Geograhica, Geologica.

O'Callaghan, C. (2010). Let's Audit Bohemia: A Review of Richard Florida's Creative Class Thesis and Its Impact on Urban Policy. *Geography Compass* 4 (11): 1601–1617.

Peck, J. 2005. "Struggling with the Creative Class." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 29 (4): 740–770. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2427.2005.00620.x.

Pinder, D. 2011."Errant Paths: The Poetics and Politics of Walking*." Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 29 (4): 672–692. doi:10.1068/d10808.

Pratt, A.C. 2011. "The Cultural Contradictions of the Creative City." City, Culture and Society 2 (3): 123-130.

Richards, G. 2011. "Creativity and Tourism: The State of the Art." *Annals of Tourism Research* 38 (4): 1225–1253. Doi: 10.1016/j.annals.2011.07.008.

Rushton, M. 2015. "Cultural Districts and Economic Development in American Cities." *Poetics* 49: 20–29. doi:10.1016/j.poetic.2015.02.003.

Sánchez-Moral, S. 2017. "The Mobility of "Creative Workers" and Their Potential Contribution to the Recovery of Old Industrial Cities in Spain." *The Town planning review* 88 (1): 93–107. doi:10.3828/tpr.2017.8.

Shearmur R., and D. Doloreux. 2016. "How open innovation processes vary between urban and remote environments." *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 28(5-6), 337–357. doi:10.1080/08985626.2016.1154984.

Sheller, M., and J. Urry. 2006. "The New Mobilities Paradigm*." Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space* 38 (2): 207–226. doi:10.1068/a37268.

Sheller, M. 2017. "From Spatial Turn to Mobilities Turn." *Current Sociology* 65 (4): 623–639. doi:10.1177/0011392117697463.

Scott, A. J. 2014. "Beyond the Creative City: Cognitive–Cultural Capitalism and the New Urbanism." *Regional Studies* 48 (4): 565–578. doi:10.1080/00343404.2014.891010

Storme T., J.R. Faulconbridge, J.V. Beaverstock, B. Derudder, and F. Witlox. 2017. "Mobility and Professional Networks in Academia: An Exploration of the Obligations of Presence." *Mobilities* 12 (3): 405-424. doi: 10.1080/17450101.2015.1116884

Watson, A., and J. V. Beaverstock. 2016. "Transnational Freelancing: Ephemeral Creative Projects and Mobility in the Music Recording Industry." *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space* 48 (7): 1428–1446. https://doi.org/10.1177/0308518X16641412

Whiting, J. and K. Hannam. 2017. "'The secret garden': Artists, bohemia and gentrification in the Ouseburn Valley, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK." *European Urban and Regional Studies* 24 (3): 318–334. doi:10.1177/0969776416643750

Velthuis, O. 2013. "Globalization of markets for contemporary art.", *European Societies*, 15 (2), 290–308. doi: 10.1080/14616696.2013.767929

Verdich, M. 2010. "Creative Migration? The Attraction and Retention of the "Creative Class" in Launceston, Tasmania." *Australian Geographer* 41 (1): 129–40. doi:10.1080/00049180903535642

Vivant, E. 2013. "Creatives in the City: Urban Contradictions of the Creative City." *City, Culture and Society* 4 (2): 57–63. doi:10.1016/j.ccs.2013.02.003.

Wojan, T. R.. D. M. Lambert, and D. A. McGranahan. 2007. "Emoting with Their Feet: Bohemian Attraction to Creative Milieu." *Journal of Economic Geography* 7 (6): 711–736. doi:10.1093/jeg/lbm029.

Zukin, S., and L. Braslow. 2011. "The life cycle of New York's Creative Districts: Reflections on the Unanticipated Consequences of Unplanned Cultural Zones." *City, Culture and Society* 2 (3): 131–140. doi:10.1016/j.ccs.2011.06.003.