

MASTER THESIS FINAL VERSION

CONNECTING CREATIVITY

Master Arts, Culture & Society 2015-2016 / Erasmus School of History,
Culture and Communication / Erasmus University Rotterdam

Anaïs LAPIERRE

Student n°374251

Supervisor:

Dr. Pauwke Berkers

Second reader:

Dr. Koen van Eijck

Acknowledgements

As the acknowledgements section might have been the funniest one to write of all, without any disrespect, it seemed essential for me to keep it as light and fun as possible. So there it is.

First of all, I would like to warmly thank my supervisor Pauwke Berkers for his great guidance, his essential support and, more particularly, for his calm and patience when dealing with my long-stressed-hysterical emails. I will always try to keep your advice in mind and stay cool. Hartelijk bedankt!

Then, I would like to thank my grand-mother who has highly contributed to this year. However, I will do it in French, because everyone knows: French people do not speak English. Merci Mamie chérie d'avoir cru en moi pour mon Master, j'espère que tu es fière parce que tout ça c'est un peu grâce à toi. Tu es la meilleure.

After that, I would like to thank my parents, but I will keep in English, just so that my father may practice a bit. Thank you Papou and Mamounette for your love and support. And especially, thank you for letting me, literally, squat the whole living-room for my data coding, preventing you from opening windows and doors in the same time to avoid the wind and demanding complete silence for seven days! I am a terrible daughter. But it's over now, you can breathe. I love you.

Then, I would also like to thank Thijs. You believed in me and you gave me so much inspiration.

Next, the important ones, all my extraordinary classmates, this little family which gave me strength and happiness. More particularly, Cynthia who put me back on track so many times, Quinten for the everyday motivational WhatsApp messages and the forest walks, Grand-ma Floor for the songs and laugh, Karolina for the lovely attentions and encouragements, Sarah for the unforgettable memories of playing violin and plate covers. Thank you guys.

A person to warmly thank is Charlotte, who welcomed me in March and gave me the best moral support I could ever think of. It is definitely thanks to you that I managed to finish my year with a big smile on my face.

Lastly, I would like to thank all my lecturers this year. They have transmitted us valuable knowledge and their true passion for arts and culture! They have also brought us a great support all along the year.

Voilà. Merci.

Table of contents

Acknowledgements	1
I. INTRODUCTION	4
1. Topic	4
2. Motivations	5
3. Relevance	6
4. Overview.....	7
II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	8
PART 1 – Cultural and creative entrepreneurship.....	8
1. Cultural and creative entrepreneurs: Definition	8
2. Cultural and creative enterprises	10
3. CCEs and the social capital	13
4. Conclusion	15
PART 2 – Network theories and concepts.....	16
1. Open and closed networks in entrepreneurship.....	16
2. Open and closed networks in the creative industries.....	18
3. Conclusion	21
III. METHODOLOGY	22
1. Research aim	22
2. Research strategy and design.....	22
3. Research method	23
3.1. Data collection and sample	23
3.2. Operationalization.....	25
3.3. Data analysis.....	26
IV. FINDINGS	28
1. Introduction.....	28
2. Collaborations	28
2.1. Main use of closed networks.....	29
2.2. Lesser use of open networks.....	30
3. Promotion.....	32
3.1. Main use of open networks.....	32
3.2. Lesser use of closed networks.....	34
4. Distribution.....	35
4.1. Main use of open networks.....	35
4.1.1. Wider open networks with distributors and sales representatives	35

4.1.2. Sociality networks with customers.....	37
4.2. Lesser use of closed networks.....	38
5. Finance	38
5.1. Main use of closed networks.....	38
5.2. Lesser of open networks	40
6. Other support.....	41
6.1. Main use of closed networks.....	41
6.2. Lesser use of open networks.....	43
7. Recap of the findings.....	43
V. CONCLUSION and DISCUSSION	46
1. Conclusion	46
2. Contributions.....	48
3. Discussion	50
References.....	52
Appendixes	55
Appendix 1. Interview guide.....	55
Appendix 2. Table of results	56

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Topic

In the post-industrial age, digitization and globalization are increasingly changing the structure of Western contemporary cities. The evolution of economic activities creates a shift from manufacturing industries based on production towards a service industry based on information and knowledge. This phenomenon leads the municipalities to re-think the structure of the cities to adapt to the changes. The goal is to regenerate the urban system while keeping residents, visitors and investors satisfied (Lavanga, 2004). Therefore, since the late 1970s, the urban policies started to focus on the cultural aspect of the cities and its economic potential. Using 'culture' is indeed an effective strategy to "renew the image of the city" (p.7) while also enhancing the life of the local communities (Lavanga, 2004). That is why the cultural and creative industries have increasingly been promoted and encouraged by the local authorities, in a time when European governments are also cutting cultural public funding (Zebraki & Smulders, 2012). Indeed, the cultural and creative industries have the potential to culturally and economically revitalize the cities, through the use of art and culture, while reinforcing the local communities' identity. The British government has been the first to recognize the existence of the creative industries and determined thirteen sectors composing them (Flew, 2011; O'Connor, 2007). The sectors may vary from the arts to design, but also from media to advertising. Interestingly, all the different sectors are composed of different types of workers; artists, freelancers, employees and entrepreneurs. The focus of this thesis will thus be on the entrepreneurs operating in the creative industries which may be called *creative entrepreneurs*.

Creative entrepreneurs are individuals developing their own enterprises, mixing both business skills and artistic skills. Creative entrepreneurs are employing their creative talents to produce and sell their innovative and creative products on various markets (Leadbeater & Oakley, 1999). Although creative entrepreneurs try to be mainly independent, they still rely on different social actors to extend their businesses (Scott, 2012). Notably, they often co-operate with other individuals from the creative industries such as artists, other entrepreneurs or intermediaries. However, the establishment of collaborations is not an easy task. Creative entrepreneurs must have a strong social capital and should be able to wisely mobilize it (Scott, 2012). It actually means that to increase or stabilize their social capital they are required to work on their personal network. More precisely, it is necessary for them to create useful professional connections with different social actors to successfully expand their enterprises (Antcliff, Saundry & Stuart, 2007). However, the specific role and mobilization of these professional connections into the development process of creative enterprises remain unclear.

Therefore, my research question for this thesis is the following: **How do the creative entrepreneurs of Rotterdam leverage their personal networks to develop their enterprises?**

The research question is followed by two sub-questions which are:

- **What are the specific roles of their networks?**
- **What are the characteristics of the networks of creative entrepreneurs?**

The main goal of this research is thus to shed light on the different ways the creative entrepreneurs of Rotterdam mobilize their personal and professional bonds to prosperously extend their enterprises. More particularly, this research aims at determining the type of individuals involved in creative entrepreneurial activities and their peculiar inputs in the development process of the enterprises. Therefore, this study intends to identify the different types of networks adopted by creative entrepreneurs. Especially, the structure of these networks as well as their specific roles will be vigorously researched. Indeed, it will be demonstrated that entrepreneurial practices and the mobilization of networks are closely linked to each other; it is through their personal networks that creative entrepreneurs may actually carry out their entrepreneurial activities.

2. Motivations

The establishment and the success of the Schieblok, a significant creative cluster in the center of Rotterdam, was the trigger that led to research on the creative industries. When starting to collect information, most of the documents that have first been found were mainly concentrated on the economic, urbanistic and cultural development of the cities. The human side of the creative industries was often partially or even completely neglected by academics and policy-makers. That is why, tackling a sociological angle appeared as the right way to study the creative industries in Rotterdam, considered as emergent creative city in the Netherlands. The government of Rotterdam is indeed strongly stimulating creative activities within the city, by notably supporting the cultivation of creative clusters (Lavanga, 2004). As creative clusters tend to foster collaborations and support through networking practices (Evans, 2009), the attention was thus turned towards the relationships and professional connections elaborated between creative practitioners, and more particularly in the domain of creative entrepreneurship. As more and more studies tend to support the idea that creative people use informal ways to create new social relations indispensable for their career (Comunian, 2012b; Baker & Hesmondhalgh, 2010; Neff, 2005; Wittel, 2001), the wish emerged to know more about how the creative entrepreneurs of Rotterdam select and employ their social connections to extend their enterprises. Furthermore, as creative entrepreneurship is a mix of both business and art, it appeared interesting to combine literature from the domain of economy and the domain of the arts for this study. Moreover, previous studies on networks discovered in economic entrepreneurship and in the

creative industries show that they may differ in their roles and characteristics (Aldrich & Zimmer, 1990; Grabher, 2005; Wittel, 2001). Therefore, it seemed definitely appropriate to look deeper into the peculiar functions and characteristics of networks in creative entrepreneurship.

3. Relevance

This study is academically relevant for three major reasons. First of all, many academics start to recognize the importance of networks within the creative industries (Atzema et al., 2013; Antcliff et al., 2007; Comunian, 2012a; Comunian, 2012b). Comunian (2012a) made a study on the networks linking creative, public, private and not-for-profit sectors in which she states in conclusion: "Only an ego-centric approach based on the use of resources and connections by creative practitioner can shade a light on the way the creative economy works" (p.15). Indeed, the creative economy depends on the ability of the creative practitioners to expand their economic capital. The augmentation of their economic capital actually relies upon the way they mobilize their social capital to foster fruitful collaborations (Scott, 2012). Therefore, to have a better comprehension on how the creative economy works, it appears essential to first understand how the creative practitioners use their networks to finally gain economic advantages (Comunian, 2012b; Scott, 2012). Sociological researches may thus be necessary to understand the economic activities occurring within the creative industries. The study of networks in the creative industries is therefore not only relevant for the field of sociology, but also for the field of economy. Second, previous researches have demonstrated that the networks established in the creative industries have different structures and functions (Comunian, 2012a; Grabher, 2005; Wittel, 2001). However, Comunian (2012a) notes that there is a lack of studies over the use of formal and informal networks within the creative milieu. By researching the roles and characteristics of creative entrepreneurs' networks, this study would thus bring more knowledge to that matter. Third, too few researches have been done on the networks in creative entrepreneurship. Many studies are either centered on the networks in economic entrepreneurship, or on the networks elaborated between project-based workers in the creative industries (Aldrich & Zimmer, 1990; Grabher, 2005; Wittel, 2001). Thus, this research, by first combining economic and sociological literature, has the potential to bring new insights in the domain of creative entrepreneurship.

Furthermore, this study has also society relevance as it will particularly focus on the city of Rotterdam. Indeed, the municipality of Rotterdam increasingly encourages creative entrepreneurship within the city (Romein & Trip, 2009). The council of Rotterdam has also decided to focus on the establishment of creative clusters to generate cultural and economic growth (Lavanga, 2009). This study would therefore be beneficial for the council of Rotterdam. It would allow them to have a better understanding on the creative entrepreneurial activities engaged within the city.

4. Overview

This thesis is a qualitative research based on a prior theoretical framework and supported by an empirical research made through a collection of interviewees with creative entrepreneurs of Rotterdam. Above of all, the theoretical framework in chapter II is divided in two parts: *Cultural and creative entrepreneurship* and *Network theories and concepts*. The first part highlights the entrepreneurial practices in the cultural and creative industries. It also introduces the notion of social capital and its necessity in (creative) entrepreneurship. The second part addresses in more details the theories and concepts linked to networking practices in entrepreneurship as well as in the creative industries. In the chapter III, the methodology of the empirical research, the data collection and the data analysis methods are explained. In short, twelve semi-structured interviews of approximately one hour have been conducted with creative entrepreneurs of Rotterdam. Then, the chapter IV describes the findings of the research. Finally, the Chapter V gives the conclusion of this study by answering the research question and by addressing the contributions and limitations.

II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

PART 1 – Cultural and creative entrepreneurship

Cultural and creative entrepreneurship is a topic situated in between different disciplines that are economy, entrepreneurship and art (Swedberg, 2006). That is why it primarily requires analyzing and comparing the different point of views on this subject. The first part of the theoretical framework will therefore focus on the meaning of cultural entrepreneurship in today's society. Divided into three main sections, this part aims at clarifying the different theoretical notions and definitions linked to this practice. It will also highlight the various activities and values – economic, social and cultural - that are involved in the entrepreneurial activities occurring into the creative milieu.

Consequently, the first section will introduce the notion of '*cultural entrepreneur*'. The meaning of '*entrepreneur*' and '*entrepreneurship*' in both the economic and cultural field will be discussed. Besides, the characteristics of the cultural entrepreneur will be revealed. In the second section, the social, cultural and economic activities of cultural enterprises will be described. Finally, the third section will concentrate on the notion of '*social capital*'. It will be mentioned that the mobilization and conversion of social capital is essential for the cultural entrepreneurs to develop their enterprises.

1. Cultural and creative entrepreneurs: Definition

Before to determine the common characteristics that share cultural and creative entrepreneurs, it is first adequate to define the general notion of entrepreneurship. The term of '*entrepreneur*' originally comes from the French word '*entreprendre*', which signify '*to undertake*'. The entrepreneur is therefore perceived as a person who takes the resolution to start and execute an important task. In the academic literature, entrepreneurs have been described in many various ways during the past centuries. The first mention of the term '*entrepreneur*' has been found in "*Essai sur la nature du commerce en général*" (1755) by Cantillon (Aspromourgos, 2012). Entrepreneurs are there described as bearer of risk and uncertainty because they buy products at a certain price to sell them at an uncertain price. Later, it is Schumpeter (1934) who takes over the term to describe entrepreneurs as individuals generating economic growth through the introduction of innovative products upon markets. Here, entrepreneurs are primarily innovators; they must create new goods through new methods of production and find new markets. Comparatively, Weber (1947) conceives entrepreneurs as a special kind of person; the entrepreneur is a charismatic character who has the power to attract the attention of other individuals and convince them to follow him in his actions. He is a leader. In contemporary literature, entrepreneurship is defined as the ability to identify opportunities that can generate economic, cultural or social values through the creation of innovative products and services

while opening new markets (Ahmad & Seymour, 2008). All in all, economic entrepreneurs can be defined as risk-takers, innovators and leaders, able to recognize economic opportunities and take advantages of them to generate economic, cultural or social values.

Subsequently, to define Cultural and Creative Entrepreneurs (CCEs), it is first important to understand in which professional sectors they operate. That involves to give an insight into the discussion over the cultural and creative economy. Above all, the first scholars that drew an appropriate definition of the CCEs were Leadbeater and Oakley (1999) in "The Independents: Britain's new cultural entrepreneurs". At the time of their publication, they were considering the cultural entrepreneurs as working in the 1990s' cultural industries which included "multimedia, design, computer games, Internet services, fashion and music" (p.20). In the end of the 1990s, the cultural industries became more known under the broad name of 'creative industries' (O'Connor, 2007). The British Department of Culture, Media and Sport indeed declared the existence of the creative industries which thus incorporated thirteen industries: Architecture, music, arts and antique markets, performing arts, crafts, publishing, design, software and computer services, designer fashion, television and radio, film and video (Flew, 2012). However, many academics and organizations did not recognize the creative industries as a whole and made a separation between the arts, the cultural activities and the creative activities (Throsby, 2008; Work Foundation, 2007). That is why, KEA (2006) created a concentric model of the creative economy: In the centre the core arts field (including fine art, performing arts and heritage) can be found, the first circle around the core comprises the cultural industries (including the media sectors and music), the last circle around the first includes the creative industries and activities (including design, architecture and advertising). The report explains that this concentric model is "centered around the focus of origin of creative ideas, and radiating outwards as those ideas become combined with more and more inputs to produce a wider range of products" (p.53). All three domains thus rely on the use of "creativity" to function. Creativity being commonly associated to artistic practices, it especially implies the creation and the share of unique and authentic ideas and knowledge (Gahan, Glow & Minahan, 2007). From core art fields to creative industries, both cultural and non-cultural products incorporate artistic values in their products through authentic and original forms and content. It is also frequent that individuals working in these fields have been originally trained in the arts, which is why they are often qualified as 'creative people' (O'Connor, 2007). Furthermore, in the same report, KEA (2005) also differentiates the cultural sector from the creative sector. The cultural sector comprises the core arts field and the cultural industries. The creative sector on the other side includes the creative industries and activities. It is important to mention that both cultural and creative sectors use culture as an asset but in a different way (Kooyman, 2014). While the cultural sectors "embody cultural expression" through the creation of goods and

services, the creative sectors “use culture as an input” (Kooyman, 2014, p.2). Consequently, cultural entrepreneurs are considered as operating within the cultural sector and creative entrepreneurs within the creative sector. However, from cultural to creative sectors, the most important element to retain is that CCEs are sharing many common characteristics, mainly related to the uncertainty of entrepreneurial practices and the use of culture and creativity in their activities (HKU, 2010, Kooyman, 2014).

The definition of economic entrepreneurship being clarified and the sectors being determined, it is now appropriate to characterize the CCEs. While economic entrepreneurship only aims at generating new products that will bring profit in the field of economy, CCEs aim at creating innovative products that will be primarily appreciated for their cultural and creative nature, although they may also bring economic advantages (Swedberg, 2006). However, the question that arises is: what is then the difference between artists and CCEs? The main difference may be that artists, at least traditionally, are mostly, even only, interested in creating the content of the cultural products while cultural entrepreneurs are not only producing but also deeply involved in the distribution process of the cultural goods (Bilton, 2008). Indeed, “cultural entrepreneurs reject the idea that art is an inherently self-fulfilling and self-sufficient sphere.” (Bilton, 2008, p.6). However, an important point to note is that the creator and the entrepreneur can be the same person, but can also be two different individuals (Aageson, 2008). Consequently, taking back the definition of economic entrepreneurship and cultural entrepreneurship cited above, cultural entrepreneurs can be conceived as following: They are creative individuals and bearer of risks, able to identify opportunities that can generate economic, social and especially cultural values through the creation and spread of innovative creative goods or services, that are consumed and appreciated for their cultural and creative content. Thus, as economic entrepreneurs, cultural and creative entrepreneurs seem to share common characteristics; they are innovative, risk-takers, networkers, leaders and labor-intensive (Aageson, 2008). On the same line, HKU (2010) writes that cultural and creative entrepreneurs “operate in difficult market conditions; produce goods that are 'cultural' by nature; work with people that are often more content-driven than commercially oriented” (p.14). Finally, CCEs “usually create very small enterprises that exist on the basis of more permanent networks” (HKU, 2010, p.14). That is what the second section will now develop.

2. Cultural and creative enterprises

Cultural and creative enterprises are ventures in which the creation, the production but also the marketization of cultural goods and services are generated. While these ventures are sources of economic, cultural and social opportunities for creators, they also help fostering local cohesion and identity by representing and generating cultural value for the local population (Aageson, 2008). This

second part will show that these enterprises are often strategically located and self-managed by cultural entrepreneurs (Aageson, 2008).

First of all, cultural and creative enterprises are often strategically located in cities. As Western governments and municipalities increasingly encouraged the development of the creative industries, they also started to support the top-down and bottom-up implementation of cultural and creative clusters and districts into their cities (Evans, 2009). These creative clusters are buildings and areas located inside or outside the urban ring, in which the different domains of the creative industries can be found (Lavanga, 2004). These cultural spots reveal to be ideal environments for the cultivation and growth of cultural start-ups and enterprises (Leadbeater & Oakley, 1999). It is thus in these favorable creative milieus that many CCEs congregate to build their enterprises. Indeed, there are some advantages to develop an enterprise into a creative milieu. First, renting a space in a creative cluster is often cheaper than renting a space in a business building (Evans, 2009). It thus gives the opportunity to CCEs to have their own working space without having to pay a high price every month. Second, creative clusters are shared by many creative practitioners from different sectors. This gathering often fosters mutual support between them which also lead to the building of creative communities (Evans, 2009). Last but not least, working in a creative cluster also encourages creativity by the sharing of artistic ideas and knowledge (Leadbeater & Oakley, 1999). Therefore, the low prices, the mutual support and creativity lead many CCEs to choose creative clusters as a location for their enterprises.

Second, there are many reasons why CCEs develop and maintain small enterprises. In fact, CCEs build start-ups or run micro (less than 10 employees) to small (less than 50 employees) and medium (less than 250 employees) sized enterprises (SME). However, HKU's study shows that more than the half of the cultural and creative enterprises are micro-sized and employ between one to three people (HKU, 2010, p.18). First, Leadbeater and Oakley (1999) note that CCEs believe in "small is beautiful" (p.26). Indeed, the primary reason for CCEs to keep their enterprises small-sized is to remain autonomous and keep a sense of ownership. The second reason is actually more technical. Running a very small enterprise is a way for entrepreneurs to reduce the risks linked to the uncertainty of their ventures (Leadbeater & Oakley, 1999). As Castillon (1755) first mentioned, entrepreneurs are bearer of risks and uncertainty. The field of culture is particularly unstable because of the change in trends and fashion, but entrepreneurial practices are even more risky (Leadbeater & Oakley, 1999). Indeed, as already mentioned, CCEs must produce but also find a way to distribute the products and services. Finding and opening new markets are complicated tasks and the demand is not always apparent neither regular (Aageson, 2008). CCEs thus reduce the big risk of failure by keeping their enterprise small and, instead, favor collaborations with external individuals from and out of the creative sector

(Oakley, 2014). Therefore, CCEs often keep their enterprises small both to stay independent and reduce the risk and uncertainty linked to entrepreneurial and cultural activities.

Third, cultural and creative enterprises are considered to have an artistic and cultural mission and vision (Aageson, 2008). Originally, CCEs are passionate about art and culture. It appears that economic profit is not the unique goal for the cultural entrepreneur, otherwise, as Klamer (2011) notes, “he is rather a businessman” (p.154). On one hand, producers or not, CCEs give a huge importance to the creative and artistic expressions attached to their products and services (Oakley, 2014). The products have artistic values in terms of aesthetics and perception; it is about the artistic quality offered and the experience lived by the customers through the goods or services (Aageson, 2008). That is also primarily why CCEs chose to be independent. Independence offers them the opportunity to work with their artistic talents, freely produce their own creations and “give them a sense of authorship and ownership” (Leadbeater & Oakley, 1999, p.22). However, they also often initiate artistic collaborations with other content creators (Bilton, 2008). On the other hand, cultural and creative enterprises are considered to carry cultural values. First, the cultural and creative aspects of their products are made to support the local culture and identity. Second, creative enterprises may also enhance the livelihoods of those involved in the activities (Aageson, 2008). The primary mission of CCEs is therefore the creation of artistic and cultural values for all people directly or indirectly involved in the enterprise through the development of creative goods and services.

Fourth, CCEs run enterprises that are also market-orientated. In fact, cultural entrepreneurs need to use the market to spread and promote their creative products in order to gain sufficient economic capital for the survival of their enterprises. So, not only they must create artistic and cultural values but also wealth for the different individuals directly involved into the enterprise, which can also initiate tensions. It appears indeed that “there is an inevitable tension between the marketing concept and the Romantic idea of the arts” (Lee, 2005, p.5). That is why Klamer (2011) argues that “the market will be an instrument for the cultural entrepreneur, but not much more than that” (p.154). However, finding niche-markets to sell and spread their products and services is a priority for CCEs (Aageson, 2008; Leadbeater & Oakley, 1999). As the Schumpeter’s view on entrepreneurs, CCEs are innovative. They must be able to create an original vision for their enterprise which not only will reach new markets but also respect the cultural, and even artistic, features of the products (Aageson, 2008). Being creative and innovative both in terms of content and management of the enterprise is the key solution (Klamer, 2011). Thus, they need to have some basic business skills to implement strategies and business models for the long-run of their enterprises (Bilton, 2008). Furthermore, it has been observed that CCEs first focus on the local markets targeting the local populations. However, one of the disadvantages to be part of the local creative milieu is that it is a hyper-competitive environment (Leadbeater & Oakley,

1999). Indeed, CCEs are often competing with other creative people making and distributing their own innovative and creative products in the same area. That is why they need to find broader markets. For that, they often need the help of professional agents or promoters “who will give them access to the markets beyond their locality” (Leadbeater & Oakley, 1999, p.32). Thus, it seems that CCEs need to have the right people around them, which will deeply encourage the development of the enterprise.

Therefore, for the accomplishment of their artistic and cultural mission and the research of markets, CCEs strongly rely upon the use of their personal networks. Indeed, most of the help and advice that they receive come from their personal networks (KHU, 2010). CCEs entrepreneurs must therefore be networkers. Networks help them for several reasons. First, it fosters all kind of professional collaborations (Comunian, 2012b). CCEs indeed have to deal and persuade a wide range of individuals from volunteers to artists, and from opinion makers to financial investors to work with them (Klamer, 2011). Second, as seen above, it can give them access to markets but also all other kind of professional support (Comunian, 2012b). Thus, they must have the ability to gain and maintain a network of people in and outside the creative milieu that will support their vision and possess the complementary skills in marketing and communication that they might need (Aageson, 2008; Leadbeater & Oakley, 1999). Last, networks foster funding opportunities (Comunian, 2012b). Being in contact with potential investors is a plus if CCEs desire to grow. It is thus important, if not essential, for CCEs to have a strong “network of people in the cultural field as well as marketing, production and finance” (Aageson, 2008, p.98). Bilton (2008) adds that these networks often “exist in an invisible world of informal relationships and non-commercial transactions which are difficult to record” (p.7). Consequently, it has been observed that CCEs deeply rely upon the mobilization of their social capital to expand their enterprise (Anderson & Jack, 2002).

3. CCEs and the social capital

In the previous section, it has been mentioned that CCEs need to employ their personal network for both the artistic and marketing development process of their enterprises. Therefore it appeared essential that CCEs need to cultivate and mobilize their social capital. That is why, this new section will try to shed light on the notion of social capital and its possible mobilization and conversion by CCEs. It will also be shown that social capital can actually have different forms.

First, the cultivation of social capital is essential for entrepreneurs to reach success. According to Bourdieu (1986), social capital is defined by “the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition” (p.88). In other words, it represents the resources that are available to an individual or a group by its affiliation to a network. The volume of social capital that an

individual possesses depends on the size of its network and on the volume of other capitals – economic, cultural or symbolic- that its connections possess. The profits that can be made are the main reasons of the maintenance of the social ties, although it is not always deliberate. Moreover, the social capital is not stable and requires individuals to work on the maintenance of their connections. Anderson and Jack (2002) have shown that “social capital is not a ‘thing’ but a process” of building bridges between individuals which need to be nurtured and preserved (p.207). In entrepreneurial practices, well preserved social bonds helps to get easily access to information and resources. Other studies on entrepreneurship have demonstrated that entrepreneurs greatly rely upon their social capital to extent their enterprise and even to reach success (Adler & Kwom, 2002; Baron & Markman, 2000). Indeed, entrepreneurs employ their social capital to make new acquaintances, to find and maintain businesses opportunities, to get information and resources and also to become known (Anderson & Jack, 2002).

Moreover, the mobilization but also the conversion of social capital seems advantageous for entrepreneurs in the creative industries. Bourdieu (1986) considers that depending on how individuals use their social capital, they have the ability to adjust their economic and cultural capital. In the cultural field, Scott (2012) also observed that cultural entrepreneurs are not only employing their social capital but also their cultural capital to stimulate collaborations with other creators or intermediaries. Collaborations are the way for them to augment the symbolic capital of their cultural goods. CCEs actually start to be known in the cultural milieu through the appropriation of the symbolic capital that the cultural product has gained. Only then, it becomes possible to gain new customers and establish professional collaborations, which will enlarge their economic capital. Therefore, as Bourdieu (1986) states, cultural entrepreneurs have the possibility to adjust their alternative capitals through the use of social capital. By combining and converting social and cultural capital, they may increase their symbolic capital and finally their economic capital.

Furthermore, Putnam (2000) explains that social capital can actually have different forms. The main distinction made is between ‘bridging’ and ‘bonding’ social capital. The bonding capital is inclusive. It is mobilized and created by individuals within inward looking networks – or closed networks -such as communities. This capital encourages specificity and solidarity within the group. Conversely, Putnam explains that the bridging capital is exclusive. This one is employed and generated when individuals connect to outward looking networks – or open networks. Moreover, Putnam mentions that individuals starting entrepreneurial activities require both bonding and bridging social capital. While bonding capital can generate support to get financial resources, access markets and trustful labor, the bridging capital will help them to get, exchange and diffuse information. Being part of open networks will thus help them to “getting ahead” (p.23). Davidsson and Honig (2003) measured

that nascent entrepreneurs were having a higher social capital than individuals not involved in entrepreneurial activities. More particularly, their bonding capital, based on strong ties, with family and friends was stronger thanks to their active encouragement and trust. Also, their bridging capital, based on weak ties, was stronger through their engagement and membership in business networks. It seems thus important that entrepreneurs cultivate both bonding and bridging capital to improve their enterprises. In other words, CCEs must be part of open as well as closed networks.

Consequently, the employment of social capital seems fundamental for CCEs to connect with important figures from and outside the creative milieu that will foster collaboration and the acquisition of information and resources (Glynn & Lounsbury, 2001). CCEs thus tremendously rely upon their social capital – both bonding and bridging - to successfully extent their businesses and so enlarge their cultural but also economic capital. The accumulation of social capital is therefore the primary goal for CCEs. As the volume of social capital “depends on the size of the network of connections [they] can effectively mobilize” (Bourdieu, 1986, p.89) it is essential for cultural entrepreneurs to extent and sustain personal and professional ties both through open and closed networks.

4. Conclusion

To sum up, by combining literature from the economic and sociological domains, the notion of cultural and creative entrepreneurs and their activities has been highlighted. It has been demonstrated that CCEs can be conceived as being innovative and risk-taking individuals, able to identify opportunities that can generate economic, social and especially cultural values, depending on the stakeholders. It is thus through the building of enterprises, ranging from micro to medium, that they take care of the creation of innovative cultural products that will be distributed and particularly appreciated in the cultural spheres (Aageson, 2008; Swedberg, 2006). Further, the literature has shown that cultural and creative enterprises are both mission-driven and market-focused (Aageson, 2008). That is why, CCEs often collaborate with other skillful people from and outside the creative milieu which will support the vision of the enterprise (Leadbeater & Oakley, 1999).

Consequently, having a network of people on which they can rely is thus necessary, if not indispensable, for the survival of cultural and creative enterprises. CCEs must absolutely work on the creation and maintenance of their social capital to foster collaborations and the acquisition of resources (Putnam, 2000). More importantly, the accumulation of both bonding and bridging capital is imperative in entrepreneurship. In other words, the advancement of culturally and economically successful enterprises goes through the establishment and maintenance of social ties within both open and closed networks. That is why the second part will more particularly focus on the networks theories and concepts in entrepreneurship and the cultural and creative industries.

PART 2 – Network theories and concepts

In sociology, the bridging and bonding views of social capital have been greatly influenced by network theories. That is why Adler & Kwom (2002) mention that “this view of social capital is reflected in the egocentric variant of network analysis” (p.19). The understanding of bonding and bridging capital in entrepreneurship is thus deeply linked to the understanding of entrepreneurs’ personal networks functioning. Therefore, before to start the research about CCEs’ personal networks, the second part will explain more about some networks theories and concepts found in the literature in link with entrepreneurship and the creative milieu.

Consequently, the first section will focus on the characteristics of open and closed networks in economic entrepreneurship. By combining literature on entrepreneurship and on the creative industries, their specific role in the development of enterprises will be revealed. The second section will explore two models of networks found within the creative industries that can be associated to the principle of open and closed networks. To finish, the particular networking practices observed in the creative industries will be highlighted.

1. *Open and closed networks in entrepreneurship*

In social sciences, the analysis of egocentric networks goes essentially through the understanding of the nature of the ties between a focal person and the individuals around her/him. The strength of the tie between two persons depends on the “level, frequency and, reciprocity” of the relationship (Aldrich & Zimmer, 1990, p. 11). This tie can thus vary from weak to strong. One of the most common ways to analyze entrepreneurs’ social networks is to employ the concept of role-set, which “consist of all those persons with whom a focal person has direct relations” (Aldrich & Zimmer, 1990, p. 11). In the case of entrepreneurs, the individuals present in the role-set can range from customers, to distributors, to investors or even from family members to partners. Depending on the individual concerned, the strength of the tie may again vary from weak to strong. Besides, it seems that the strength of ties and their mobilization may have a significant impact on entrepreneurial activities. That is why it is now interesting to take a closer look at the characteristics of both open and closed networks and to highlight their specificities in terms of relationships.

First, it has been noted in the first part that individuals nurture their bonding capital within closed networks (Putnam, 2000). Closed networks are thus considered as fostering solidarity and specificity between the different people. These types of networks are often present within communities. Tönnies (2001) introduced the notion of ‘Gemeinschaft’ (translated ‘community’), which basically represent a group of people linked with each other through the sharing of common traditions or objectives. He shows that if people remain linked to each other, it is essentially because they work

on the maintenance of their bonds, through direct interactions. In 'Gemeinschaft', individuals have a sense of belonging and support each other. Closed networks are thus often found in social environments, such as communities, in which members know, trust and support each other (Putnam, 2000). However, this kind of networks may often be exclusive and the members can bear some moral and physical obligations (Antcliff, Saundry & Stuart, 2007). Further, the type of ties found in closed networks is generally strong. Indeed, relations in communities are defined by strong level of emotional construction and dependency such as with family and friends (Granovetter, 1973). In the entrepreneurship field, Putnam (2000) writes that closed networks may help entrepreneurs to get financial support, resources, access markets and effective labor. On the same way, Granovetter (1973) explains that strong ties with individuals are very useful for personal support and reliable information. However, and interestingly, he also points that strong ties leads to the exchange of redundant information. That is why he promotes instead the strength of weak ties in terms of exchange of information, which are actually present in open networks.

Accordingly, the creation of bridging capital is found when individuals connect to outward looking networks, or also called the open networks (Putnam, 2000). While closed networks are restrained in communities, open networks are instead wider and can observed in the whole society. In opposition to 'Gemeinschaft', Tönnies (2001) considers 'Gesellschaft' in which the relationships are more impersonal and the membership heterogeneous. Individuals in the Gesellschaft participate in the functioning and stability of the global society. Therefore, open networks are considered to be implanted in the wider society, outside of communities. This type of networks is also more based on individualism and people are mainly judged according to their reputation (Antcliff et al., 2007). The type of ties identified in these networks are thus weak because there is less, if not none, emotional construction and dependency between individuals (Granovetter, 1973). In entrepreneurial activities, the individuals that are observed in that type of networks can be professional relations such as colleagues and business partners. Furthermore, open networks seems to have significant roles in the advancement of enterprises. On one hand, open networks are made for 'getting ahead' because they increase the exchange of information (Putnam, 2000). Indeed, weak ties are necessary to get new and non-redundant information (Granovetter, 1973). On the other hand, maintaining a large role-set made of weak ties is fundamental for entrepreneurs to reach economic success; the weak ties being indeed beneficial to get business advice, external resources and new customers (Aldrich & Zimmer, 1990). Nonetheless, it appears that "all weak ties are not equally useful for acquiring social resources" (Aldrich & Zimmer, 1990, p.20). Indeed, entrepreneurs must be able to create links with profitable individuals in the position to give them the right information and resources. In addition, Antcliff et. al (2007) noticed in their research that open networks are actually 'not so open'. Sometimes, the access is

“dependent on a range of factors including status, reputation, ability, social and familial connections” (p. 388). The access to certain open networks thus depends on the position occupied by the entrepreneur within the social space (Bourdieu, 1989).

Therefore, it is likely that to be successful, entrepreneurs must actually gain and maintain a balanced number of weak and strong ties (Witt, 2004). On one hand, closed networks and the strong ties between family and friends encourage solidarity and trust. On the other hand, open networks and the weak ties between colleagues and partners, seem to provide better and newer information about business matters and resources. Consequently, it is essential for entrepreneurs to have a diverse role-set to reach economic success (Aldrich & Zimmer, 1990). In the table 1 the information of this section is summarized by showing the main roles of open and closed networks in economic entrepreneurship. Nevertheless, as just mentioned, this first section has only focused on economic entrepreneurial activities. Cultural entrepreneurs are instead involved in cultural matters, less appealed by economic profit, and work in creative environments in which creativity and support are present. Therefore it is now interesting to look at the literature relating to open and closed networks within the creative milieu.

Table 1 – Recap on the roles of open networks and closed networks in economic entrepreneurship

	Open networks	Closed networks
Type of network	Society-based	Community-based
Type of individuals	Colleagues and partners	Family and friends
Character of communication	Professional/Public (informational)	Personal/Private (“narrational”)
Input	New information Resources	Information Resources Support and trust
Nature of the ties	Weak and short or long-lasting	Strong and long-lasting
Relationship	Professional (towards private)	Private (towards professional)

2. Open and closed networks in the creative industries

Many sociological studies have been done on the networks within the creative industries to understand the establishment of collaboration, the exchange of knowledge and information and the influence on creativity (Atzema et al., 2013; Bilton, 2010; Gu, 2010; Kong, 2005). Likewise, the studies that are presented in this second section introduce two conceptual networks models observed in the

creative industries. The first model explores the concept of 'sociality network' (Wittel, 2001) while the second presents the concept of 'communality network' (Grabher, 2005). These two network models can certainly be associated to the concept of open and closed networks, as they actually share many similarities in their principles and characteristics. However, they also have some differences that will be highlighted.

In relation to the notion of 'Gesellschaft' -or 'society'- by Tönnies (2001), Wittel (2001) introduces the concept of sociality network. This type of network is indeed implanted within the society and exhibits some similarities with the previously cited 'open networks'. Wittel (2001) conducted a research on the way individuals build and sustain their personal networks in the British cultural industries. He observed that cultural workers, by working more and more on project-based and short-term collaborations, were breaking the common bureaucratic structures (long-lasting careers and collaborations). He explains that while long careers led to the building of professional communities within companies, project-based jobs rely instead on individualism and ephemerality. Therefore, not only the corporate structures were changing but also the professional relationships. In sociality networks, relationships are not based on narratives with the share of common history and experience. Instead, as Granovetter (1973) and Aldrich and Zimmer (1990) already noted about open networks, the relationships are based on the active exchange of information and knowledge. Like in *Gesellschaft*, the relationships are primarily impersonal, but also professional, although they can evolve into private. However, in sociality networks, individuals construct ephemeral but intense ties when working on short-term projects. This phenomenon was also visible during social events such as openings and parties reuniting all kind of actors playing in the cultural industry's scene. Therefore, individuals tend to build strong ties when working or meeting during events, but ephemeral as these ties do not last in time. Here lies the difference with the point of view of Granovetter (1973) and Aldrich and Zimmer (1990) whom present the ties as being weak in open networks. Further, the maintenance of the ties mostly lies on 'catching-up' moments during work or off-work. Finally, Wittel (2001) insists on the fact that these types of networks are especially flourishing into the cultural industries and more particularly during project-based works and off-work events (e.g. parties, networking events, conferences, exhibitions...).

In opposition to 'sociality', Grabher (2005) introduces the concept of 'communality' network. His research was made on the different types of networks built in the software and advertising industries, in which the individuals are working on project-based. He elaborated the notion of 'Communality' to characterize the networks that are essentially based on the creation of professional communities. Contrarily to sociality, individuals fabricate long-lasting and intense ties with other social actors. Individuals first build private relationships that transform into professional. Where Granovetter

(1973) and Aldrich and Zimmer (1990) considered that strong ties were essentially created with family and friends and weak ties with professional collaborators, Grabher (2005) shows that strong ties can also be found in professional environments. On the whole, connections are made through the share of narratives and personal stories. The relationships are thus based on personal experience and history. On the same way, Atzema et al. (2013) used these network models to analyze the types of networks used in the independent publishing sector. They actually find that the two networks –sociality and communality- are adopted differently. It depends on the nature of the relationships build between independent publishers and the other social actors, and more particularly on the mission they must achieve with each other. In this case, the mobilization of closed and open networks is therefore strategic.

Finally, two types of networks are presented here: ‘Sociality’ which relates to open networks and ‘communality’ relating to closed networks. Each of them has its own characteristics. In short, network sociality is based on ephemeral but intense ties, professional (towards private) connections and exchange of knowledge and information (Wittel, 2001). Conversely, communality is based on long-lasting and intense ties, private and professional connections, and personal narratives (Atzema et al., 2013; Grabher, 2005). The table 2, based on these network models, recapitulates the characteristics of the connections. However, some differences with economic entrepreneurs’ open and closed networks have also been mentioned. Again, these distinctions can be attributed to the fact that ‘sociality’ and ‘communality’ operate within the creative fields, while entrepreneurship’s open and closed networks apply in the economic domain.

Table 2 – Recap on the roles of ‘Sociality network’ and ‘communality network’ based on Grabher’s table 1 (2005)

	Sociality	Communality
Type of individuals	Collaborators/Potential collaborators	Collaborators
Character of communication	Professional/Public (informational) Face-to-face	Personal/Private (“narrational”) Face-to-face
Input	Knowledge and reputation	Narration and trust
Nature of the ties	Strong but ephemeral	Strong and long-lasting
Relationship	Professional towards private	Private towards professional
Social practice	‘catching up’ or ‘hanging out’	‘setting up meeting’ or ‘staying in’

3. Conclusion

Consequently, this second part has examined the literature relating to the use and characteristics of networks in economic entrepreneurship and in the creative industries. In the first section, the attention was turned towards the role of open and closed networks in pure economic entrepreneurship. The literature has shown that it is recommended to build and maintain social ties in both open and closed networks when starting entrepreneurial activities. Indeed, the weak ties found in open networks help for the exchange of information, while the strong ties in closed networks foster trust and support (Granovetter, 1973; Putnam, 2000). Likewise, success can only be reached through the acquisition of good information and resources and personal support. Nonetheless, the building of ties in creative entrepreneurship might probably be different than for economic entrepreneurship. In fact, the second section has indeed shown that open and closed networks can have different functions and characteristics in the creative industries. Although sociality and communality networks are attributed to project-based work in the creative industries, they already highlight some networking practices specific to the creative milieu. On one hand, in sociality networks, ties are strong but ephemeral whereas economic entrepreneurs' open networks often exhibit weak ties (Wittel, 2001). On the other hand, trust and support can be received by professional partners and collaborators in communality networks (Grabher, 2005). In comparison, economic entrepreneurs' closed networks are more frequently associated with family and friends. Finally, in the creative industries, not only the ties and relationships are different, but the networking practices are also particular. Many creative people are connecting with each other into informal places and events such as parties, which leads to the blurred boundary between socializing for pleasure and networking for work (McRobbie, 2002; Neff, 2005; Wittel, 2001).

Therefore the literature depicting the networks in economic entrepreneurship and in the creative industries draws two different models of networks that have their own characteristics. Again, they are different in the nature of relationships, inputs, social practices and individuals concerned, which is why the networks seem to have different utilities. By comparing entrepreneurs' networks from the economic domain and the networks set up in the creative milieu, it is appropriate to suppose that the structure of CCEs' networks might be different from the structure of common economic entrepreneurs. Moreover, the first part has highlighted that the success of CCEs is not only valuable in terms economic values but primarily in terms of artistic and cultural values (Klamer, 2011). That is why, it is valuable to explore the structure of creative entrepreneurs' networks and their utility as well as the networking practices. The following methodology section will thus explain in more details the goal and structure of this research.

III. METHODOLOGY

1. Research aim

Before to give a detailed overview of the methodology, it is capital to understand the two main objectives of this research. In the previous part, the literature review has highlighted the importance of cultivating and mobilizing social capital in the creative industries, but also in economic entrepreneurial activities. In creative entrepreneurship, Scott (2012) has demonstrated that CCEs subsequently convert their social and cultural capital into economic and symbolic capital. Therefore, following Scott's study (2012), the goal of this research is to understand the manner creative entrepreneurs mobilize their social capital in their activities before to be able to convert it. As "social capital is not a 'thing' but a process" of building social bridges through network practices (Anderson & Jack, 2002, p.207), deep analysis of creative entrepreneurs networks seems to be the best solution to comprehend this phenomenon. Based on Putnam's theory (2000) of 'bonding' and 'bridging' social capital and the subsequent presence of open and closed networks, this study concretely aims at exploring two aspects of creative entrepreneurs' networks. On one hand, it will highlight the characteristics of creative entrepreneurs' personal networks and the potential existence of open and closed networks. On the other hand, it will point out the functions of their networks by understanding the way they use their personal connections to develop their enterprises.

2. Research strategy and design

The strategy of this research has been carefully taken into consideration. That is why, a qualitative approach has been selected to study creative entrepreneurs' personal networks. This research is indeed "based on the idea that qualitative research efforts should be concerned with revealing multiple realities as opposed to searching for one objective reality" (Guest, Namey & Mitchell, 2013, p.6). Moreover, it takes interpretivist epistemological considerations as this research will "grasp the subjective meaning of social actions" happening in the life of creative entrepreneurs (Bryman, 2012, p.30). The interpretative choice has been indeed favored because this research is profoundly based on the perception of creative entrepreneurs. Furthermore, other studies on the analysis of networks in the creative industries and in entrepreneurial practices have chosen to use qualitative approaches such as Atzema et al. (2013) in their study of the relationships developed by cultural intermediaries in the publishing sector, or even Anderson & Jack (2002) in their study of networking practices in entrepreneurial activities. This study thus stands in the tradition of these previous studies using qualitative approaches, as they have been proven to be efficient and valid in this particular way. Therefore, this research will be qualitative and interpretative.

Furthermore, in qualitative research, the theory is an outcome which makes the study inductive. In the case of this thesis, the research is not completely inductive as it is based on prior theory found in the literature. It is thus not purely based on grounded theory. Indeed, the approach can be conceived as deductive in the sense that it will test the literature theory on the role of networks in the creative industries and the concept of open and closed networks. However, this research might still be considered as inductive in the way that it also aims at generating new theoretical elements in the field of cultural and creative entrepreneurship. Indeed, the theories found are related to other fields such as entrepreneurship and the project-based work in creative industries. That is why, the approach is both inductive and deductive as the main theoretical concepts and their features are tested and strategically applied in this research to finally develop a new theory about creative entrepreneurs' personal networks and their utility.

Finally, this study adopts both a cross-sectional design and study case design. First, it is a cross-sectional study because it is based on interviews collected at single point in time. For a purpose of consistency and because of the time restriction, the research will more particularly focus on fashion designers of Rotterdam. However, each designer is considered as a specific case, a specific entity because of their gender, age and social background, which leads to a collection of qualitative data connected to many variables. These variables are thus studied to "detect patterns of association" (Bryman, 2012, p.58) linked to the structure of creative entrepreneurs' networks and their use. Second, it may take a case study design because the study is centered on creative entrepreneurs living and practicing their activities in Rotterdam in the Netherlands. Consequently, mixing both designs appeared to be the best solution to accomplish a complete and valuable research.

3. Research method

3.1. Data collection and sample

The data are collected through 12 semi-structured interviews lasting from 45 to 75 minutes. In fact, semi-structured interviews give more space and freedom for the interviewees to answer. As the questions relate to the relational dynamics between the respondents and the members of his networks, it is appropriate to keep the questions open and flexible. Semi-structured interviews give the freedom to adapt the questions according to the respondents' answers, or to insist on a point that must be developed more in details. The interviews are also more fluid and natural. Furthermore, the data are collected in the city of Rotterdam in the Netherlands during the month of April 2016. That is why, the final analytic sample of subjects is composed of creative entrepreneurs practicing in Rotterdam. The attention is on independent and self-employed individuals working in one of the 13 creative industries. More particularly, the subjects are entrepreneurs, that is to say they must have

created and must be sustaining their own micro-enterprises. Micro-enterprises are indeed the most common type of enterprises found in creative entrepreneurship (HKU, 2010). The study is thus centered on creative enterprises employing between one to nine persons. These ones must produce but also distribute through markets their creative products. In total, 12 CCEs are selected (See Table 3). For a purpose of consistency and because of time restriction, the research concentrates on creative entrepreneurs working in the fashion design industry of Rotterdam, one of the 13 sectors of the creative industries and activities.

Table 3. Interviewees' personal information

NB	Sex	Date of birth	Professional background	Product	Status	Number & Characteristics of employees	Workplace	Motivations to be entrepreneur
1	M	1987	Graphic design (Artez) Industrial product design (Rotterdam)	Menswear	Owner	3 freelancers + 1 intern + 1 family member	Shop Atelier	Be independent
2	F	1989	Fashion communication (HKU)	Leather bags	Owner	1 Freelancer	Studio	Be independent
3	F	1989	Fashion design (Wdk)	Menswear	Owner	3 family members 5 Interns	Shop Studio	Having business on her own
4	M	1985	Graphic design (Graphisch Lyceum) Fine art (WdK)	Menswear	Co-owner (2 business partners)	3 to 6 freelancers	-Shop	Be different Be independent
5	F	1983	Fashion design (wdK)	Women and menswear	Owner	3 interns	Studio	Be independent
6	F	1990	Fashion design (WdK)	Women and menswear	Owner	3 Interns	Studio	Be independent
7	F	1975	Design (wdK)	Reusable bags	Owner	4 employees + Life partner	Shop Atelier	It just happened
8	F	1988	Fashion design (wdK)	Women and menswear	Owner	2 interns	Studio	It just happened
9	M	1987	Fashion design (wdK) Fashion master (ArteZ)	Menswear	Owner	2 to 3 freelancers + usually around 5 interns	Studio	Be independent
10	M	1979	Social sciences (Erasmus Uni) Teacher MBO	Shoes	Co-owner (One business partner)	5 employees + 1 intern	Shop Atelier Office	Having business on his own
11	F	1973	Fashion design Photography	Jeans	Co-owner (with life partner)	Freelancers + Interns	Atelier	Be independent
12	F	1986	Fashion design (WdK)	Womenswear	Owner	2 interns	Shop Atelier	Be independent

The sample of subject has first been found through personal connection and secondly through LinkedIn by researching and examining the profiles of different creative practitioners in Rotterdam. Once all the respondents were selected, the first approach was made either through direct talk, social media or phone if the phone number was available on their website. Some of the respondents have also been identified through what is called the 'snow ball effect' by asking the selected respondents to share the contact of other potential interviewees.

Through phone, by email or face-to-face, the purpose of the study was briefly explained and the amount of time needed for the interview was given. In case they accepted the request, the choice of location was theirs; indeed it is better if they feel at ease. Surprisingly, all the respondents answered positively to the request and chose to have the interview in their studios or shops. The interviewees were recorded on a phone and the recording was directly stored on Dropbox after the interview. The interviews were thus immediately transcribed on Word.

3.2. Operationalization

The interview guide is based on those four topics (See appendix 1 for the Interview Guide). As it has been noted that the conversion of social capital lead creative entrepreneurs to increase their economic, symbolic and cultural capitals. The increasing of these forms of capital can be made through the benefits that their social capital can bring them. More concretely, the previous theories elaborated on networking practices in the creative industries have shown that networks help creative practitioners to get four main benefits: *funding opportunities*, *support*, *access to markets* and *collaborations* (Aageson, 2008; Comunian, 2012b). As seen in the literature review, the '*funding opportunities*' relates to public subsidies or private investments. Funding opportunities can thus help CCEs to increase their economic capital. Then, '*support*' is based on the physical, psychological and material help that people may offer them. It thus gives CCEs the opportunity to enlarge their economic capital through business support or gift of material and their cultural capital through artistic and cultural advice and exchange. After that, '*access to markets*' represents the promotion and distribution process of creative products. Being promoted can thus enhance CCEs' symbolic capital through the development of fame and prestige. On the other hand, the distribution can both augment their symbolic capital, again through fame, but also their economic capital, through sales. Finally, '*collaborations*' relates to the people working together on the same project having complementary skills or not. Like in 'support', 'collaborations' can expand symbolic capital, through collaboration with famous people, economic capital, through collaboration with wealthy organization or individuals and finally, cultural capital by working with artistically talented people. These four themes will thus structure the interviews. Consequently, Comunian's networks theory (2012b) will thus be the basis of this research as it concretely displays the main functions that networks can have in the creative

industries. It thus gives a focus and structure to go further on the exact functions of creative entrepreneurs' networks.

Furthermore, within these four topics, the questions are about creative entrepreneurs' relationships with the individuals involved in these activities (funding, support, access to market and collaboration). The questions are based on the features associated to the network theories in the creative industries (Wittel, 2001; Grabher, 2005); the 'type of individual', the 'character of communication', the 'input' and the 'relationship' and 'social practices'. However, the questions are not straight forward, but aim at discovering progressively the type of relationships that are cultivated. By applying these features to the interview questions, it can highlight the characteristics of the networks that are used by creative entrepreneurs. It will explore the different relationships sustained by creative entrepreneurs in their entrepreneurial practices. Consequently, the concept of open and closed networks (Putnam, 2000) in creative entrepreneurship will thus be tested and, if they exist, the specific characteristics of each will be discovered. The final goal is thus to find the functions of their personal networks and also identify their characteristics.

3.3. Data analysis

Above all, the data from the transcriptions have not been analyzed through any software; the printed and annotated coding method was instead favored. Then, according to Saldaña (2012), there are two cycles coding methods: the first is Structural Coding and the second is In Vivo Coding. The first cycle coding method is Structural Coding: The data have been organized around the two sub-questions. Therefore the coding has been made through conceptual phrases representing the following topics of inquiry: *Role of networks* and *Relationships*. These conceptual phrases have thus been applied to segments of data that relate to these topics. The similar coded segments were then collected together for more details coding. The second cycle of coding was In Vivo Coding (or also called Verbatim coding). The code was referring to a word or short phrase from the actual language of the respondents summarizing the essence of the piece. The code was mainly focusing on the type of relationships sustained with the individual mentioned.

Once the second cycle was done, the data have been collected and classified in tables (see Appendix 2), first according the role of the network such as *Collaboration*, *Promotion*, *Distribution*, *Finance* and *Support*, and secondly according to the nature of ties sustained between the respondents and the individuals cited. In the theoretical framework, it has been mentioned that the strength of the ties vary from weak to strong, and from long-lasting to short-lasting. Aldrish and Zimmer (1990) explain that the strength of ties actually depends on the level, frequency and reciprocity of the relationship. The data were thus classified according to the type of individuals cited by the interviewees, their

inputs, their social practices and the relationships sustained with them. This classification allowed the identification of the nature of ties sustained between the interviewees and the individuals involved. Consequently, the results are thus articulated around the roles of the networks and the types and characteristics of the networks used by creative entrepreneurs. The final results are therefore presented in the next chapter.

IV. FINDINGS

1. Introduction

This next chapter will present the findings of the research. Above all, the different sections are articulated around the themes broached during the interviews, that is to say *Collaborations, Promotion, Distribution, Finance* and *Other support*. Those themes have been chosen because they are the main roles of the networks in the creative industries according to Comunian (2012b). In each section, the results are organized around the nature of the ties maintained by the creative entrepreneurs which can vary from weak to strong, and from ephemeral to long-lasting. As mentioned in the theoretical framework, the types of networks are mainly characterized by the nature of the ties sustained. It has been seen that weak ties are considered to be found in open networks while strong ties are considered to be found in closed networks. The differentiation between open and closed networks is thus made on that basis. Therefore, each section first starts with the general findings, that is to say the type of networks the most and least employed by creative entrepreneurs and their specific implications. After that, the rest of the section goes further into details by giving the types of individuals involved and by analyzing their inputs, their relationships and their social practices through the use of theoretical elements. The variations and exceptions between the respondents are also highlighted.

2. Collaborations

On the whole, it has been observed that collaborations are based on personal and artistic affinities. Indeed, the results unveil that creative entrepreneurs tend to use in priority their close networks when they want to collaborate on artistic projects with creative individuals. Indeed, collaborations are mostly generated with people working with media and other art forms with whom they have complementary skills while seeking for artistic quality. They have generally strong bonds with them; they are friends for a long time but also work together. They build also friendly relationships after working together. The act of building and maintaining ties with these individuals is not forced, it is rather “organic” (Interviewee 4 & 9). In comparison, they make a lesser use of their open networks. They only favor them for more technical and professional collaborations such as website building and design. In fact, when working on short-term projects with web designers they tend to cultivate strong but ephemeral ties while some might have even weaker connections with website builders.

2.1. Main use of closed networks

Above of all, when asking about their collaborations, ten out of twelve respondents were immediately talking about artistic collaborations. The type of individuals cited were mostly artists ranging from fine art such as designers or sketch artists to media art such as photographers and movie makers. It is indeed common that CCEs initiate artistic collaborations with other creative people (Bilton, 2008). CCEs usually have strong bonds with them. Indeed, half of the relationships were first private and turned into professional relationships, while the other half were first professional and evolved into private. Furthermore, these collaborations bring creative entrepreneurs two major benefits. On one hand, they essentially seek for artistic quality and complementary skills. The artistic value of their products being of great importance (Oakley, 2014), artistic collaborations brings them the guarantee of a high artistic quality. Choosing artistic collaborators within their closed networks helps them to get effective collaborators (Putnam, 2000). Also, it is often easier for them to work with people they know because the communication about the project is simpler and faster as the interviewee 2 and 8 explain:

“it's a lot faster, a lot better, so that's super nice, she's just super independent, so that's really nice, we just see eye to eye the picture that we want in the end” (Interviewee 8)

Moreover, working with other creative people is a way to share creative knowledge and ideas (Leadbeater & Oakley, 1999). Indeed, it brings them complementary skills in artistic domains in which they have little to no expertise. It often results in products that are artistically complete and original. Artistic collaborations also gives another perspective on their own work, which helps them to develop their own artistic skills and potential. Complementary skills are thus very important for the interviewees:

“we are planning to do more collaboration so I make a shape, they draw and I make a shape... Because my work is more abstract and their work is really illustrative and detailed so...” (Interviewee 1)

“when a photographer and when a sketch or someone else take a look at it they give you another perspective” (Interviewee 9)

“we always a fixed idea on how things should be and if you give it away and you just don't tell anything about it, you'll just get images that you wouldn't do yourself” (Interviewee 11)

On the other hand, five respondents asserted that the trust set up between them and their collaborators is essential. Trust is perceived as an intellectual understanding between the two parts, but also about the fair commercialization and promotion of the products. More than trust, it is also about loyalty. In the case of an official publication, they would make sure that the name of their collaborators appears as the interviewee 9 explains:

“last week at the denim days we had full wall with our sketch and also with her name always on there, so with the magazines they spot it and publish, so it's nice when you do collaboration it has to be on a trusting based on you and the artists and then never one or ever use his things without the mention of their work” (Interviewee 9)

In communality networks, Grabher (2005) explains that, in the creative industries, professional communities are formed, in which people share personal but also professional moments. The most important feature associated to these networks is trust. The individuals that are part of these networks generally build trustworthy relationships in which work and private moments can be securely shared. The fact that CCEs develop personal and professional relationships with creative collaborators on the basis of trust means that communality networks can be found in creative entrepreneurship activities and more particularly when they are related to the artistic activities. Moreover, the act of creating and maintaining the bonds with artistic collaborators is qualified as “organic”. They do not force the building of relationship, as it should be based on affinity and trust.

“if I don't like you, I don't work with you, or then we can start working and building a relationship and everything, so it's really about that than just making friendship just to use them on the long run, it's more of an organic thing for me, it builds up from being a friendship to working relationship, being a working relationship to friendship, so it's a more organic thing and it grows in the amount of time that you are spending with them, I always look at not diminishing that trust that they have with me as well, it's about working with people and also being honest with them”

As in communities, the members do not betray each other which is why the respondents trust and respect each other. It is even more visible in their social practices which are hanging in and out with each other and share personal stories:

“we can take a drink at night and then we can talk about just the personal stuff but remember if I go to work tomorrow then it will be less” (Interviewee 4)

The relationships with the other creative people are thus not only based on artistic and professional trust but also personal affinities which reflects the use of closed networks by CCEs for artistic collaborations.

2.2. Lesser use of open networks

In contrast to the use of closed networks, four of the respondents have also collaborated with creative individuals with whom they had strong but ephemeral bonds, which often lasted only during the time of their common project. The individuals cited were also working in the creative industries and were mostly web-designers or simple designers with whom they shared professional but also personal moments during the collaborations. Interestingly, the inputs that they have brought to the

interviewees are not related to art, but instead are more technical or even social. First, it brought the respondents technical skills and knowledge. Indeed, working with other creative people encourages the share of skills and knowledge (Leadbeater & Oakley, 1999), as the interviewee 11 admits:

“he designed our first website, who was more like technical website person, and hmm we introduced our first website in 2000 which was quite early actually, and it was a very professional looking website” (Interviewee 11)

In addition, the collaboration also brought the respondents social advantages such as new contacts and even the public attention through the use of their collaborators’ contacts. In sociality networks, where bonds are also strong but ephemeral, it is common that individuals exchange knowledge and information while working on the same project (Wittel, 2001), which is actual the case of the respondents. They shared both technical knowledge through the making of their website designs and public information through the share of contacts.

Furthermore, only two of the respondents declared that they have collaborated with individuals with whom they had weaker connections. Interestingly, those ones are actually not part of the creative industries as they are professional web builders. What is more, is that both of the respondents sustained very professional relationships with them. Their collaborations were based on the exchange of technical services related to website building:

“if you want more complicated, they have to do it but they do it well, we just call them, it's not very cheap but it's, they are reliable and professional” (Interviewee 10)

What is noticeable is that from strong and ephemeral to weak bonds, it is recurrent that their social practices with these types of collaborators are events meetings and talks during which they exchange professional information and offer their services. Again, in sociality networks, the phenomenon of knowledge and information exchange is often observed during off-work social events in which people ‘catch up’ as the interviewee 12 explains:

“A couple of years ago, and I think we just bumped into each other at the Film Festival, hmm, we started to talk about what we did” (Interview 12)

However, as in sociality networks, they also organize professional meetings during which they talk about their projects and exchange their knowledge. Therefore, creative entrepreneurs seem to have more technical collaborations with individuals that are part of their open networks. The collaborators that are useful for technical skills and knowledge but also for the sharing of contacts and with whom they sustained strong but ephemeral ties are more likely to be found in sociality networks. In contrast,

the collaborators with whom they have weak bonds and exchange technical services are more likely to be found in very open networks, out of the creative industries.

3. Promotion

In creative entrepreneurship, the promotion of the products seems to be in majority made through the use of open networks. Indeed, it is mostly made through people with whom they have weak connections however also working in the creative industries. Their open networks help them to reach both local and global exposure. Among these individuals, the other creative entrepreneurs and creative people generally offer free local exposure. However, they are also sharing useful contacts, and make recommendations to other people which extent global opportunities. An interesting finding is the fact that creative entrepreneurs also make use of celebrities to attract press attention which often open broader markets. Finally the customers has also a important role in the promotional process by advertising the products on social media. However, creative entrepreneurs also tend to use their closed networks through press agents whom they know personally before to work with and with whom they have strong bonds. It brings them valuable promotional services. Moreover, their friends tend to promote their work for free to the general public and so support the vision of the enterprise.

3.1. Main use of open networks

First of all, nine out of the twelve interviewees generally use their contacts with individuals that are part of the creative industries to promote their products. In equal number, individuals such as other creative entrepreneurs, other creative people and celebrities have been cited by the respondents. However, as the inputs and social practices of the other creative entrepreneurs and creative people are rather similar, it is adequate to analyze them first and together.

Being in touch with other creative entrepreneurs and creative people mostly bring to creative entrepreneurs two major benefits; free exposure and new contacts. First, the respondents are often offered by other creative people the opportunity to expose their work during events or in their private locations for free. It is indeed common in the creative industries that little businesses support each other to share promotional opportunities (Comunian, 2012b). It offers the respondents a way to present their products to new potential customers. It is also a manner to share the image of their label and express the values to a new public:

“when they have a party they invite us, and we were there for selling the socks with Laan's artworks and all the painters there they got a pair of shoes from us, so all these collaborations we don't do especially to earn money, because we earn money with this, with regular shoes, but hmm these collaborations takes a lot of time, but it's nice to make that connection and that's to show the image and the lifestyle and the values of the brand [...] that's promotion and show what you want” (Interviewee 10)

Moreover, the respondents often gain new useful contacts via these individuals. Weak ties indeed allow entrepreneurs to get new business relations (Aldrich & Zimmer, 1990). These individuals have thus a role of connector, that is to say they put the interviewees in touch with people that might be necessary for the promotion of their work such as press agents, journalists or celebrities:

“so there are few celebrities that I am familiar with, but also a few that I didn't know, so it's just about talking to their stylists” (Interviewee 9)

Surprisingly, all the respondents recognized that they created their connections with these individuals during social events meetings. It is during informal meetings such as openings or parties that the respondents connect the most while the relationship remains professional. They indeed do not discuss their private life, and favor the exchange of business information. In sociality networks, it is common that people share business knowledge and information during social events (Wittel, 2001). However, contrarily to strong and ephemeral bonds, they sustain weak ties with these individuals.

Furthermore, four of the interviewees admitted using the popularity of celebrities to promote their products. They get in contact with the celebrities and donate their products for free in exchange of wearing them during mediatized events and projects. In this way, it brings the press attention while advertising the products for free. Once again, weak ties allow the respondents to expose their work to a larger audience:

“it was really specific that I wanted to do that because it gives you a lot of press [...]so from one celebrity that we used, we already had so much coverage” (Interviewee 9)

“we had some famous guys wearing our shoes, so we gave them things away and now they saw them on television and then yeah” (Interviewee 10)

Lastly, two interviewees admitted that the customers also advertise their products by talking to other potential customers but also by participating into the promotional process of the products through social media. The respondents purposefully trigger the customers to share the story of the brand by posting pictures on social media or sharing their experience with the people around them.

“But also one other guy, he's a social media guy and he posted on the Facebook of [brand kept anonymous] "I was walking in New York City and there were five people who came into me to ask me where I bought the sweater". So yeah I mean, this kind of things are really good for the brand” (Interviewee 1)

All in all, weak bonds allow the respondents to reach both local and global exposure. It is mostly during social events that the respondents create these bonds with individuals that will be necessary

for the promotion of their products. Open networks are thus useful for the exchange of contacts and information within the creative industries and beyond in order to access new markets.

3.2. Lesser use of closed networks

An interesting finding is that four of the respondents work in close collaboration with press agents that they actually personally know. As in communality networks, they often knew each other for a long time and were even friends before to start working together. They thus had a personal relationship that evolved into a professional relationship. That is why, when they are not working on projects, they appreciate to see each other during their leisure time:

“We went for a beer, or dinner, we went on holidays together but also we had like this sewing class every week here, and yeah she was there” (Interviewee 5)

On a professional ground, these press agents act like intermediaries that will help them access markets beyond their locality (Leadbeater & Oakley, 1999). Their mission is to get and keep in contact with potential distributors by promoting the products of the respondents. They also take contact with press agencies to attract media and press attention:

“she's really really good at calling like clients and shops or whatever to just promote me” (Interviewee 8)

For three of the respondents, working with press agents is easier as they have the feeling that they understand their style and trust them to promote their products in the right way. Indeed, the respondents confessed having a lack of marketing skills to promote their work themselves. Close press agents thus bring them complementary skills in marketing and communication (Aageson, 2008). What is more is the fact that three of them actually obtain these promotional services for a very low price or even for free.

“also my PR agency because I didn't know how to that, I was totally new in that world and hmm for a really low price because we knew each other, they promoted me in the fashion world” (Interviewee 3)

The strength of the bonds between the respondents and their press agents thus guarantees professional quality and good prices. Here again, closed networks such as communality networks nurture trust on a personal but also professional basis.

Finally, three of the interviewees declared that their friends had also an important role in the promotion of their products. By wearing the products, their friends advertise the labels for free. The more their friends wear the products and share pictures of them on social media, the more the general public sees them. Their friends thus offer them the opportunity to approach new potential customers by simply wearing their products.

“it brought me promotion in the fact that a lot more people know about the brand” (Interviewee 8)

The members from their closed and personal networks such as friends are thus beneficial for the interviewees to promote their products beyond their own network. Friends are thus supporting and carrying the vision of some of the respondents’ enterprises.

4. Distribution

On the whole, creative entrepreneurs tend to use their open networks to distribute their products and access both local and wider markets beyond their locality. In fact, the official distribution is often made through people with whom they have weak bonds and strictly professional relationships such as with local and global shops owners and sales representatives. Those ones are beneficial to obtain sales platforms and to open market opportunities. However, a surprising finding is that creative entrepreneurs tend to create strong but ephemeral or long-lasting relationships with their customers. Indeed, customers bring them inspiration for their creations. The customers are thus not only buyers, but also co-creators. Creative entrepreneurs try to involve them as much as possible into their creative enterprises. Here lies the difference between economic entrepreneurs and creative entrepreneurs; the use of creativity set up a special type of bond between the creative entrepreneurs and their clients. That is why the relationships quickly evolve from professional to personal. In opposition, a few members of their closed networks owning their own shops are also helping in the distribution process of their products. In this case, the shop owners are actually more supporting them than really involved in the sales of the products.

4.1. Main use of open networks

4.1.1. Wider open networks with distributors and sales representatives

First of all, more than the half of the interviewees uses their open networks to distribute their products on markets. As they must access local but also wider markets beyond their locality to sell and spread their products (Aageson, 2008), the respondents tend to get in touch and develop several weak bonds with potential shop owners and sales representatives from and outside the city. Being in contact with various shop owners is beneficial in two ways; to get sales platforms and advice. The sales representatives generally offer them new sales opportunities beyond their locality.

Interestingly, four of the respondents admitted that they went straight to the shops and met the shop owners in person. They indeed revealed that having a direct contact, face-to-face, with the shop owners were increasing the chances to initiate business activities. Indeed, their goal is to build new ties with potential distributors in order to be more convincing. Face-to-face connections bring

generally better results than calls or emails which are often ignored. Once the connection is made, most of the shop owners accept to sell their products.

“so I went there and I spoke to her in person and she was like really, really kind and really enthusiastic about the bags” (Interviewee 2)

Moreover, two respondents also declared that the shop owners can be sources of business advice. In entrepreneurship, Granovetter (1979) already explained that weak ties were important to obtain new and non-redundant information. The shop owners thus may share information about other potential shops or about the quality of the production.

“I went to a shop in Utrecht and he said the t-shirt you use are not that good, you should try Continental t-shirts” (Interviewee 1)

Finally, as local markets are often hyper-competitive, creative entrepreneurs often need to work with agents that access markets beyond their locality (Leadbeater & Oakley, 1999). That is why, two interviewees are actually used to deal with sales representative who open them new sales opportunities in the Netherlands and in the world. They often created these weak ties through direct contacts during commercial events.

Furthermore, both the relationships with distributors and sale representatives are strictly professional and punctuated by professional meetings. During the meetings, they exchange about the evolution of sales, fixing objectives and giving the directives to follow in the near future. The relationships are thus purely professional and based on business and mutual economic profit.

“when you start working with them you set up targets, you say for example “this year we want to open ten shops, ten selling points” so you talk about how it goes, how people receive the last collection” (Interviewee 7)

“it's like just business, "what do you want, when you want it and how much money do you have”” (Interviewee 4)

What is thus noticeable is that the distribution activities are more related to economic entrepreneurial activities than artistic activities which are typical to creative entrepreneurship (Aageson, 2008). The types of networks used by the respondents are thus very open such as the ones from economic entrepreneurs; the members sustain weak ties and strictly professional relationships. And as Aldrich & Zimmer (1990) noted, open networks in economic entrepreneurship are made to get business information and spread their products on wider markets.

4.1.2. Sociality networks with customers

As noted in the introduction of this section, one valuable finding is the fact that five of the respondents share intense and creative moments with their customers. These moments occur during sales meetings at their shops or studios. The customer has a very important role in the creation process of the products by sharing their opinions and creative ideas. They contribute to the development of the products but also of their creative enterprises. These short-term bonds usually bring the respondents creative inspiration. However, some of the respondents also try to reinforce the ties with the customers in order to increase their fidelity.

First, when the customers are visiting their shops or studios, they are welcome to give their feedbacks about the products. They can express their preferences and choose the fitting details such as the colors and fabrics. The respondents want the customers to feel at ease and to participate in the making process of the products. Aageson (2008) noted that creative entrepreneurs must be innovative and creative in the way of distributing their products and services. That is why the goal of the respondents is to create special moments with the customers that will remain in their minds. Some of the respondents even offer drinks to their customers during their visits.

“normally when they come to my studio it's about, what I'm saying "this is my studio, and this is my other collections" and they can see how my interns work and also I'm getting to measure their sizes but you see that they are really liking that because yeah then they have my character, they see who I am and jmm that's really nice, so the conversation is really easy and it's really nice and really inspiring a lot of times” (Interviewee 3)

Therefore, as in sociality networks, the respondents tend to build strong but ephemeral relationships with the customers in the way that they do not keep in touch longer than during the sales meetings. It is like short-term collaborations with their customers, who can thus be qualified as co-creators.

However, it has been also observed that three of respondents organize exceptional private sales that are known and accessible only by the closest customers.

“a couple of weeks ago I did a studio sale, where usually there are a lot of people coming in that I already know that they have things or they are friends” (Interviewee 12)

These sales events give the customers the impression that they have a special status in their enterprise and that are part of a little fashion community. Here, the goal is to reinforce the bonds with the customers in order to create a long-term relationship instead of ephemeral. This phenomenon is the most visible in closed networks such as communality networks, in which the members are loyal towards each other and create more long-term personal relationships (Grabher, 2005). This particular

relationship is however reserved to a little part of their clients, which is why it does not represent the general relationships sustained with their customers.

4.2. Lesser use of closed networks

Only two of respondents declared that the members from their closed networks were distributing their products in their shops. They are individuals with whom they share private moments during their leisure time. The fact that they personally know each other fosters the commercial collaborations. However, both the interviewees confessed that the sales were actually very limited if not inexistent and the interviewee 6 even admitted to have removed her products:

“they are in [name]'s store but I just picked them up because I don't have the feeling that people was buying it” (Interviewee 6)

Putnam (2000) wrote that closed networks helps to get access to markets, but it can be observed here that the distribution through closed networks are more about personal support than actual official distribution. The official distribution is therefore more effective when spread within open networks than closed networks.

5. Finance

On the whole, the financing part of creative enterprise is often related to their closed networks. Creative entrepreneurs mobilize their strong bonds to get access to private funding. They generally privately lend money from people with whom they have very close and personal relationships such as family and close friends. A surprising finding however is that their friends' parents sponsored two of the respondents earlier in their career. Indeed, the access to funding is often the critical matter in creative entrepreneurship. Creative entrepreneurs rarely get subsidized by the governments and the banks are often reluctant when it comes to official loans. However, creative entrepreneurs know how to use their open networks to get in contact with private corporations that will offer funds and sponsors. Some creative entrepreneurs also manage to get advice from their banks to access special types of private loans.

5.1. Main use of closed networks

When asked about the way they finance their enterprise, the most common answer was that they all finance everything by themselves. However, nine of the interviewees admitted that they got supported financially by the members of their closed networks at the creation of their enterprise. Putnam (2000) already highlighted that closed networks helps to get financial support and resources. Instead of borrowing money from private corporations, they preferred to lend money from their family or close friends.

“I couldn't start a collection just from scratch so I have a loan from my sister” (Interviewee 2)

“When we first started I had a loan from someone in the family really to do the first production” (Interviewee 7)

Moreover, some other respondents revealed that their parents actually donated them the starting fund to start their enterprises. In contrast, one interviewee does not get direct funds from her family; her mother prefers to regularly buy some of her products. Surprisingly, two of the interviewees got sponsored by their best friends' parents at the beginning of their career. Their friendship was so strong and long-lasting that their friends' family felt the need to help them realizing their projects. Although the members of the respondents' close networks got involved in the financing part of their enterprises, the relationships remained strictly personal. It is not about business or profit, it is rather about personal support.

The reasons why they usually favored private loans is that it is complicated for the respondents to get subsidies and bank loans. On one hand, as mentioned in the theoretical framework, creative enterprises are market-orientated (Aageson, 2008). Therefore, due to the commercialization of their creative products, creative entrepreneurs rarely, if not never, get subsidized by the government. Comunian (2012b) wrote that individuals working in the creative industries often get helps from the public sector institutions to get access to funding structures. It can be thus observed that it is not the case in creative entrepreneurship.

“because I really want to make this brand and live off the brand and the thing is that people usually give subsidies to like artists, so it's super annoying” (Interviewee 8)

On the other hand, the banks are not always favorable to lend them money due to the artistic aspect of the products and so the instability of their ventures. As Aageson (2008) indicated creative entrepreneurial practices are risky as the demand for creative products is not always regular neither apparent. The change is trend is often fast in the field of culture which the creative enterprises unstable on long-term (Leadbeater & Oakley, 1999).

“we cannot have a loan from the bank or anything, because the bank only finance for example if we would like to have decoration or to do the inside of the shop then it's possible but if you want to loan money because you are growing really fast and you want to have money to invest in goods, products, then they would not give you a loan because it's too risky they say, they cannot do anything with the stock ” (Interviewee 7)

Therefore, the strength of the ties between the respondents and their family and friends made possible the access to funds. Here again, it is visible that highly closed networks are based on trust and personal support between members.

5.2. *Lesser of open networks*

It is been observed that four of the respondents however managed to employ their weak ties with private corporations to improve the finance of their enterprises. As Aldrish & Zimmer (1990) noted in economic entrepreneurship, the open networks are fundamental to get external resources. It is also the case in creative entrepreneurship. First of all, two of the interviewees sustain weak bonds with private corporations to get access to sponsors. These corporations often deliver funds as well as free products in exchange of promotional services. These business deals allowed the respondents to finance their projects.

“so I had a sponsor DermLogica, it's for face stuff and they gave me five thousands” (Interviewee 3)

“we had shoes sponsors, sometimes shows sponsors, we had accessories and they usually sponsor with things that I put on my models and I also get money to finance the shows, so it's really about that kind of deals” (Interviewee 9)

They often took contact with the ambassadors of the corporations during informal events or by emails. Secondly, two other respondents nurture their weak bonds with their bankers. They indeed often advise the interviewees about financial deals and loans. In both cases, the respondents nurture their bonds through official meetings, which is why the relationships always stay strictly professional.

However, one of the interviewee also use her weak bonds to get subsidies. She admitted that she knows some of the members of the subsidy's jury which allowed her to get access to governmental funds several times.

“it's not anonymous [...]subsidies are always about knowing people” (Interviewee 5)

Aldrish and Zimmer (1990) mentioned that entrepreneurs must be able to strategically use their weak ties to access external resources. In the case of the interviewee, sustaining the bonds with some members of jury was financially beneficial.

All in all, Aldrish and Zimmer (1990) noted that open networks may help economic entrepreneurs to access financial resources. The findings indicate that their weak bonds with corporations and members of the subsidy's jury may indeed be profitable for creative entrepreneurs in order to finance their projects and enterprises.

6. Support

On the whole, support is mainly found by creative entrepreneurs through their strong and long-lasting bonds with members from their closed networks. Indeed, not only their family and friends bring them significant financial support, as seen in the previous section, but also moral support and professional help. They mostly cultivate very personal relationships with these individuals which can also sometimes become professional. Interestingly, the creative entrepreneurs' life partners seem to be highly supportive and some of them are even helping to deal with business matters. However, creative entrepreneurs seem to also use their weak ties with other creative people and people from other professional fields to get business advice and information. They generally maintain professional relationship with them.

6.1. Main use of closed networks

Above all, all of the interviewees admitted getting the most support from their relatives. In economic entrepreneurship, Granovetter (1973) already notified that closed networks were bringing personal support and reliable information. In the case of the respondents, it is true that they may obtain different types of support; moral support, professional help and advice.

First, more than half of the respondents declared that their family was usually present to morally and emotionally support them. Some of the participants however admitted that their family did not always understand the complications linked to their entrepreneurial activities. But it does not change the fact that they are always present during the good and bad moments that they cross.

“my family also, but they are just really like, not that they don't see the struggle or something, but they are just super optimistic always, so they are just there for the always positive support” (Interviewee 8)

Moreover, five of the respondents admitted that their family was sometimes or on a more regular basis helping them with their businesses. The tasks are generally effectuated for free. Instead of paying a professional in the domains, the respondents favor informal ways of support (Comunian, 2012b). It can be artistic tasks such as photography but also more administrative and business tasks such as the sending of invoices and settling the taxes. In the same way, three interviewees declared that their family was giving important business advice, and they are often discussing the artistic concepts together.

“My father is helping me on the, on the administration part right now so he was like "ok you need to sell... four five bags a month while you earn money yourself” (Interviewee 2)

Finally, it is crucial to note that the respondents consider the relationship with their family strictly private. Although some of the members of their family may be professionally involved through

informal ways, the respondents explained in majority that their family remained a private island, on which they could get rest and affection. They are present for the mental support and they do not represent the enterprise.

“my family is more really really private I don't get them involved in the company, only the stories but none of my family is an entrepreneur or, they all work for bosses and have a different life” (Interviewee 4)

However, there is one exception in the case of the interviewee 3 who is working closely with her parents. Her parents being real economic entrepreneurs are supporting her by managing the business side of the enterprise. And she admitted having a special business relationship with her parents: “my relationship with my family is really not family wise”. Thus, she considers her parents to be more like professional collaborators.

Secondly, ten of the respondents declared that their friends were extremely supportive. Entrepreneurial practices are full of risk and uncertainty (Leadbeater & Oakley, 1999), which is why the respondents often need to share their difficulties but also their successes. By following the evolution of the enterprises, their friends principally offer moral support through motivational speeches and discussions. Moreover, they may also help them professionally by sharing business and artistic advice. Some of the respondents lacking business skills get their help to implement business plans and strategies.

“they can help me working creatively but some of them I mean one is actually more in financing, but in a total different direction so sometimes he's like "Ok let's sit together and look through your Excel file”” (Interviewee 12)

While some respondents have only personal relationships with their friends, it has been discovered that half of the interviewees had both personal and professional relationships with them. Indeed, their friends are also often working into the creative industries. Comunian (2012b) already noticed that the best support was coming from individuals practicing the same activities or working in the same domains. This kind of networks can thus be affiliated to communality networks which often enhance both personal and professional support between the members.

Finally, five of the interviewees admitted that their life partners were of big help in their enterprises. Not only they are supporting emotionally, but they are also involved in the business matters, sharing responsibilities. Some of them are even engaged in a dual leadership (de Voogt, 2006); while the respondents may be more focused on the artistic aspects, their partners deal with the managerial and business side of their enterprises.

“he's in contact with all the sales agents, hmm, he is working with someone else on, hmm, yeah the whole financial part” (Interviewee 7)

The respondents are thus greatly mobilizing their closed networks to get support. Two types of closed networks are thus apparent. One is a highly closed network in which family and close friends share very personal relationships through private moments. The other one is more connected to communality networks in which friends and sometimes life partners share both private and professional relationships. In the end, both types of networks convey strong support and trust.

6.2. Lesser use of open networks

Weaker bonds seem to bring valuable advice to the respondents. While closed networks deliver strong support, open networks are also indispensable to exchange non-redundant business information in entrepreneurship (Granovetter, 1973; Putnam, 2000). Three interviewees indeed admitted that other creative people were good sources of advice. While they may employ their weak ties to get information about new available and cheap locations, some others exchange tips about distributions and finance. Their relationships are purely professional although they may sometimes meet each other during informal events.

“we were working in Arnhem together with other designers that were also working there like [names], and we were always tipping each other” (Interviewee 11)

However, only the interviewee 7 revealed that she had recourse to legal advice through an official designer advice platform. The services are charged but available at any time. The same interviewee also gets free business advice through people from other professional fields, that help her “on friendly basis but that are not friends”. They usually meet at home and exchange business and financial information.

In conclusion, the findings of this section thus allowed to have a clearer idea on the utility of each networks in the supporting process. It has indeed been observed that closed networks are generally more useful for the respondents to get informal support and reliable information. The respondents even get professional help free of charge through family and friends, which is why it is not always officially noticeable. In opposition, weak connections in open networks do not strongly support the interviewees but only bring new information or very specific type of advice.

7. Recap of the findings

On the whole, the findings brought valuable information about the way the respondents mobilize their networks to expand their enterprises. This last part will thus give an overview of the general patterns observed by summarizing the main findings mixed with academic literature. It thus

allows to draw the types of networks used by the respondents with their characteristics and specific roles.

On one hand, the respondents tend to mobilize two types of social networks such as those found in the creative industries: the 'closed networks' related to communality networks (Grabher, 2005) and 'open networks' related to sociality networks (Wittel, 2001). First, the members of the 'closed networks' are generally artistic collaborators and press agents. The difference with the communality networks suggested by Grabher (2005) is that the relationships are not always evolving from personal to professional. Instead the members can actually set up a strong personal relationship after their first professional collaboration. Next, these types of networks are adopted by the interviewees to organize regular collaborations with other creative individuals. They may also obtain both personal and business support and advice. Through their strong bonds, they may also be able to promote their products, generally free of charge. Finally, these types of networks can be qualified as "organic" as they are build and sustained through affinity and trust. Secondly, the 'open networks' in which they share strong but ephemeral ties such as in sociality networks comprises individuals such as collaborators from other professional fields, other creative people and their customers. The relationships between the parties often evolve from professional to personal. These types of networks are beneficial for the respondents to organize short-term technical collaborations but also to distribute and get creative inspiration and ideas through their customers.

On the other hand, the respondents tend to use social networks that are similar to the ones found in economic entrepreneurship that are of two types: the 'highly closed networks' which are more community-based and the 'wider open networks' which are more society-based (Putnam, 2000). First, the 'highly closed networks' are reserved for types of individuals such family and close friends with whom they share personal relationships. These types of networks are fundamental for the respondents to obtain financial support through private loans, but also personal support and advice. Secondly, for the commercial side of their enterprise, they employ their weak bonds through 'wider open networks'. These weak ties are created with individuals such as shops owners, other creative entrepreneurs and private corporations. These professional or "business" relationships lead the interviewees to foster the distribution and promotion of their products. They may also more easily obtain private loans. Lastly, these types of networks favor business support and the exchange business advice and information. Contrarily to 'highly closed networks' that are organically built, these types of networks can be more qualified as "forced" because they are obviously based on mutual profit and exchange.

Therefore, the findings, mixed with existing theories on networking practices in economic entrepreneurship and in the creative industries mentioned in the theoretical framework, lead to the creation of a new typology. Indeed, it finally allows identifying the exact composition and the specific roles of the creative entrepreneurs' closed and open networks. The table 1 recapitulates the main findings that has just been reported.

Table 1. Models of networks used by the respondents

	CLOSED NETWORKS		OPEN NETWORKS	
Type of networks	Highly closed networks (Community-based)	Closed networks (communality networks)	Open networks (sociality networks)	Wider open networks (Society-based)
Nature of the ties	Strong and long-lasting	Strong and long-lasting	Strong but ephemeral	Weak
Type of individuals	-Family -Close friends	-Artistic collaborators -PR agents	- Other collaborators -Customers -Other creative people	- Shop owners - Other creative entrepreneurs - Private corporations
Type of relationship	Personal	Personal towards professional OR Professional towards personal	Professional towards personal	Professional
Role of the networks	-Personal support and advice -Finance (with private loans)	-Regular collaborations - Personal and business support and advice -Promotion	-Short term collaborations - Distribution - Creative inspiration	-Promotion -Official distribution -Finance (official loans) -Business support and advice

V. CONCLUSION and DISCUSSION

1. Conclusion

This last part will finally answer the main questions asked in the beginning of the research. Through the use of theoretical concepts and according to the findings, it is now possible to answer the research question which is: *How do creative entrepreneurs leverage their personal networks to develop their enterprises?* Indeed, following the two sub-questions, the characteristics of the networks mobilized by creative entrepreneurs and their specific roles in the expansion of their enterprises have been found. Consequently, this section will describe the main findings and conclude.

The findings have demonstrated once again that creative entrepreneurship is an undeniable mix between art and economic entrepreneurship (Swedberg, 2006). It is noticeable not only in practice, through the production and distribution of creative products, but also in the manner creative entrepreneurs use their personal networks to artistically and economically expand their enterprises. Their networks are thus a mix of the networks identified in entrepreneurship and the ones found in the creative industries. In reality, entrepreneurial practices and the use of networks are closely linked to each other; it is through their personal networks that creative entrepreneurs may execute their entrepreneurial activities. In other words, it is through the mobilization of their social capital that they may increase their other forms of capital (Scott, 2012). Therefore, by discovering the functions and composition of the creative entrepreneurs' personal networks, this research finally reveals the exact role of social capital in creative entrepreneurship and its following conversion into alternative forms of capital.

Above all, the mobilization of bonding social capital appears to be the basis for the augmentation of creative entrepreneurs' economic capital. In fact, creative entrepreneurs tend to use their bonding social capital through their closed networks such as 'highly closed networks' and 'closed networks' related to communality networks. In both networks, the members share strong and long-lasting bonds. Firstly, their 'highly closed networks', mostly composed of family and close friends, may be profitable to expand their economic capital at the beginning of their career through unofficial financial support. It also brings them worthy personal and professional advice. Secondly and more importantly, their closed networks, similar to communality networks as the members sustain personal and professional relationships, are essential to foster their cultural and symbolic capital. Through their valuable artistic collaborations, creative entrepreneurs boost the artistic quality of their products and services, which nurtures their cultural capital. Moreover, the combination of promotion and artistic quality through their strong bonds may thus increase the symbolic capital of their products and services. As these collaborations are often free or cheap because of the strength of the bonds, it does

not decrease their economic capital. All in all, closed networks are thus beneficial for creative entrepreneurs to gain artistic quality and fame but also artistic and business advice. Creative entrepreneurs thus mobilize their bonding capital to collect cultural, symbolic and few economic capital, which is the basis for the conversion into economic capital. This conversion of capitals, fundamental for the development of creative enterprises, is thus mainly made through their open networks.

Thus, the increasing of creative entrepreneurs' economic capital is mostly effectuated through the mobilization of bridging social capital. It is in open networks such as 'open networks', similar to sociality networks, and 'wider open networks' that the members activate their bridging capital. On one hand, bridging capital in 'open networks' allows creative entrepreneurs to raise both cultural and economic capitals. The members of these networks such as technical collaborators, other creative people and customers, with whom they have professional towards personal relationship, bring them creative inspiration but also technical knowledge. This increases their cultural capital. More importantly, they also use their bridging capital to cultivate relationships with the customers. Through the sales of their products and service, the customers stimulate the creative entrepreneurs' economic capital. On the other hand, the mobilization of bridging capital is indispensable for creative entrepreneurs to access markets through the promotion and distribution of their products and services. Their weak bonds with other creative entrepreneurs, shops owners and private corporations, may first bring creative entrepreneurs symbolic capital with the free exposure of their work. Next, their economic capital may also increase significantly. Indeed, it is through the mobilization of bridging capital that they may sell their works but also get business advice and information. However, it is important to mention that the promotion and the distribution of their products and services would not be possible if the products were of poor artistic quality and not primarily known (Scott, 2012). Creative entrepreneurs thus mobilize their cultural and symbolic capital gained through their closed networks to access the markets, and so convert it into economic capital. All in all, creative entrepreneurs favor their weak bonds in open networks to economically expand their enterprises, through the prior use of the artistic quality and fame of their products and services gained through their closed networks.

Consequently, it is now possible to answer the question of this study. The mobilization of both closed and open networks is fundamental in the fruitful development of creative enterprises. The employment of bonding capital via closed networks seems to be the priority for creative entrepreneurs. They may augment their cultural and symbolic capital necessary for the following accumulation of economic capital. The increasing of economic capital however is mostly achieved by the mobilization of bridging capital through open networks. Creative entrepreneurs must thus be able

to accumulate bridging capital and so engaged themselves into open networks to economically expand their creative enterprises. Thus, one last point to note is that it has been found that in creative entrepreneurship, as in the creative industries (Neff, 2005; Wittel, 2001), the making of new acquaintances goes through the frequentation of informal social events. Creative entrepreneurs by going to informal events are more likely to prosperously boost their bridging capital and so their economic capital.

2. Contributions

This study brings three major contributions to the academic field and one valuable contribution to society, more particularly to the city of Rotterdam. First, this research has added new knowledge on the role of social capital in successful creative entrepreneurial activities. Second, this study brings new insight on the employment of formal and informal networks to foster professional collaborations in the creative industries. Finally, this study brings more knowledge about creative entrepreneurship in Rotterdam but also in general.

Above all, a lot of academic literature emphasizes on the importance of mobilizing social capital in economic entrepreneurship and in project-based work in the creative industries (Adler & Kwom, 2002; Antcliff et al., 2007; Putnam, 2000). However, too few studies have focused on the employment of social capital in creative entrepreneurship (HKU, 2010; Scott, 2012). While Scott (2012) mentioned the significance of the mobilization and conversion of the different forms of capital in cultural entrepreneurship, this study went further on the understanding of this phenomenon. It brings indeed more knowledge about the use and conversion of capitals in creative entrepreneurship by revealing the exact composition of creative entrepreneurs' social capital and its primary role in the collection of the other forms of capitals. This study has indeed determined the structure of creative entrepreneurs' networks and their functions in the successful advancement of creative enterprises. This may thus nurture the academic literature on creative entrepreneurship and the indispensable mobilization of social capital. Moreover, it also gives more elements on the functioning system of the creative economy (Comunian, 2012a). By considering the social interactions in creative entrepreneurship, it also allowed to shed light on the economic activities, sometimes informal and underground, taking place within the creative industries.

Moreover, the role of formal and informal networks in the creative industries has been highlighted, but not exactly found (Comunian, 2012b). This study has shown that many activities are effectuated by creative entrepreneurs through formal and informal ways. Obviously, all artistic collaborations and professional support that creative entrepreneurs gain through their closed networks are made through informal ways. The individuals maintain strong relationships with each

other by sharing private moments. Closed networks are thus often informal networks because of the nature of the relationships and social practices. However, it is not always the case. Informal networks can also be found in open networks in which people share weak bonds. It has been mentioned in the findings that the promotion and technical collaborations are often initiated with other creative practitioners that creative entrepreneurs have met during informal social events. These types of events range from openings to parties. Therefore, it is interesting to observe that from weak to strong bonds, artistic collaborations, support and promotion are often launched through informal networks in creative entrepreneurship. On the contrary, formal networks are mainly identified within open networks. In creative entrepreneurship, the distribution and official financing part are executed through formal professional meetings with official and private infrastructures. This study has therefore brought new insights in the structure and role of formal and informal networks in creative entrepreneurship. It gives thus new elements on the way individuals working in the creative industries favor formal and informal ways to foster professional collaborations.

Finally, this study has focused on creative entrepreneurship in Rotterdam in the Netherlands and brought new valuable knowledge about creative entrepreneurial activities. The Netherlands are indeed deeply involved in the establishment of creative industries and the municipality of Rotterdam strongly encourages creative entrepreneurship within the city (Lavanga, 2004; Romein & Trip, 2009). It has been presented that by analyzing creative entrepreneurs' networks it is also a manner to learn about entrepreneurial practices, which gives more information about creative entrepreneurial activities within the city. Moreover, this study has then highlighted the importance of having diversified and efficient networks to be able to maintain entrepreneurial activities. However, the findings have displayed that the public sector are not enough interacting with creative entrepreneurs. More interactions between creative and public sectors may lead to more promotion and distribution of the creative products and services. Therefore, the municipality should encourage young creative entrepreneurs to extend their networks and foster the interactions between creative, private and public sectors through the eventual establishment of social platforms within the city. Finally, this research has also highlighted some of the encountered struggles in creative entrepreneurship which are mainly related to finance. Only a few respondents have had accessed to public funding, the others are financing their enterprises through their closed networks or side-jobs. As the access to subsidies is limited, once again the city of Rotterdam should stimulate the social interactions between the creative, public and private sectors which may boost the exchange of resources and so stimulate the economy.

3. Discussion

To conclude this thesis, it appeared essential to open a discussion over five major limitations of this study and give the subsequent recommendations for future researches.

First, this research has been carried out in only one single creative sector which is the field of fashion and in only one location which is the city of Rotterdam. Therefore, it would be valuable to elaborate the same study in other sectors from the creative industries. Indeed, in the other creative fields, the products are different and may sometimes be intangible, in the case of theater plays or shows. The platforms to spread the products and services may thus be different, however the social bonds used to foster the access to markets may vary or stay the same. Consequently, it would be interesting to execute new researches on the way creative entrepreneurs use their networks to cultivate their enterprises in other sectors and compare the final results.

Second, this study was centered on real world networking practices by analyzing face-to-face social interactions. Thus, the virtual networks established on social media, such as “connectivity” networks (Grabher, 2005, p.16), has not been taken into account. For the future studies, researchers could examine the effects of virtual interactions on the building and maintenance of networks, and their potential impacts on entrepreneurial activities.

Third, no prior research on the composition of the respondents’ personal networks has been effectuated. It is thus likely that the respondents self-selected the collaborators that they wanted to mention according to, for instance, their memory or the social importance of the person cited. Consequently, many collaborators have probably been forgotten. Therefore, it would be worthy before to interview creative entrepreneurs about their networks to do more researches about their previous collaborations. For instance, it could be through the analysis of content found on the Internet relating to their previous projects. In this way, the networks’ study would be more precise and complete.

Fourth, the reciprocity of the relationships has not been tested. Only the perspective of the respondents on their relationships with other people has been taken into account. That is why, future researches could consider to interview the individuals that have been cited by the respondents in order to determine the reciprocity of the relationships set up between them.

Lastly, because of time restriction, this research focuses only on one economic stage of the enterprise; it concentrates on micro-enterprises employing from one to three individuals. Moreover, the networks of creative entrepreneurs were studied at only one point in time – like a snapshot (Comunian, 2012b). It is indeed complicated to capture the evolution of the relationships. Therefore, it would be valuable to look for the employment of networks in other stages of creative enterprises.

Next studies could observe creative enterprises over a period of five years and see the evolution of their networks. Another idea would be to compare the networks of the same types of creative enterprises in different economic stages.

References

- Aageson, T.H. (2008). Cultural Entrepreneurs: Producing Cultural Value and Wealth. In Anheier, H.K., & Isar, Y. R. (Ed.). *The Cultural Economy* (pp. 92-106). London: Sage.
- Adler, P. S., & Kwon, S. W. (2002). Social capital: Prospects for a new concept. *Academy of management review*, 27(1), 17-40.
- Ahmad, N., & Seymour R.G. (2008). *Defining Entrepreneurial Activity*. Paris: OECD.
- Aldrich, H, & Zimmer, C. (1986). Entrepreneurship through social networks. *The art and science of entrepreneurship. Ballinger, Cambridge, MA*, 3-23.
- Anderson, A. R., & Jack, S. L. (2002). The articulation of social capital in entrepreneurial networks: a glue or a lubricant?. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 14(3), 193-210.
- Antcliff, V., Saundry, R., & Stuart, M. (2007). Networks and social capital in the UK television industry: The weakness of weak ties. *Human Relations*, 60(2), 371-393.
- Atzema, O., Heebels, B., & Van Aalst, I. (2013). Social Networks and Cultural Mediators: The Multiplexity of Personal Ties in Publishing. *Industry and Innovation*, 20(8), 701-718.
- Baker, S., & Hesmondhalgh, D. (2010). 'A very complicated version of freedom': Conditions and experiences of creative labour in three cultural industries. *Poetics*, 38(1), 4-20.
- Baron, R. A., & Markman, G. D. (2000). Beyond social capital: How social skills can enhance entrepreneurs' success. *The Academy of Management Executive*, 14(1), 106-116.
- Bilton, C. (2008). *Cultures of management: cultural policy, cultural management and creative organisations* (pp. 24-44). Icfai University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986) The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.) *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education* (pp.241-258). New York: Greenwood.
- Bryman, A. (2012). *Social research methods*. Oxford university press.
- Cantillon, R. (1755). *Essai sur la nature du commerce en général* [Essay on the nature of commerce in general]. London: Fetcher Gyler. Available on <https://goo.gl/0Ye9mO>.
- Comunian, R. (2012a). A relational creative city: mapping networks between public, private and not for profit sector in the creative industries. *Revista Crítica de Ciências Sociais*, 99, 99-124.
- Comunian, R. (2012b). Exploring the role of networks in the creative economy of North East England: economic and cultural dynamics. *Encounters and Engagements between Economic and Cultural Geography*, 143-157. Springer Netherlands.
- Davidsson, P., & Honig, B. (2003). The role of social and human capital among nascent entrepreneurs. *Journal of business venturing*, 18(3), 301-331.
- De Jong, J. P., Marlet, G., & Stam, E. (2008). Creative industries in the Netherlands: Structure, development, innovativeness and effects on urban growth. *Geografiska Annaler. Series B, Human Geography*, 119-132.
- De Voogt, A. (2006). Dual leadership as a problem-solving tool in arts organizations. *International Journal of Arts Management*, 9(1), 17-22.

- Evans, G.L (2009). From cultural quarters to creative clusters - creative spaces in the new economy. In M.Legner (Ed.), *The sustainability of cultural quarters: international perspectives*. Stockholm: Institute of Urban History
- Flew, T. (2012). *The creative industries: culture and policy*. Sage. Available from <https://goo.gl/WfzGBQ>.
- Gahan, P., Glow, H., & Minahan, S. (2007). A creative twist: Management theory, creativity and the arts. *Journal of Management and Organization*, 13(1), 41-50.
- Glynn, M. A. & Lounsbury, M. (2001). Cultural entrepreneurship: Stories, legitimacy, and the acquisition of resources. *Strategic management journal*, 22(6-7), 545-564.
- Grabher, G. (2004). Learning in projects, remembering in networks? Communitarity, sociality, and connectivity in project ecologies. *European urban and regional studies*, 11(2), 103-123.
- Granovetter, M. S. (1973). The strength of weak ties. *American journal of sociology*, 1360-1380.
- Gu, X. (2010). Social networks and aesthetic reflexivity in the creative industries. *Journal of International Communication*, 16(2), 55-66.
- Guest, G., Namey, E. E., & Mitchell, M. L. (2012). *Collecting Qualitative Data: A Field Manual for Applied Research*. SAGE Publications.
- Hogeschool voor de Kunsten [HKU]. (2010). *The Entrepreneurial Dimension of the Cultural and Creative Industries*. Utrecht. Retrieved on https://www.kreativwirtschaft.at/document/11_StudyontheEntrepreneurialDimensionoftheCulturalandCreativeIndustries.pdf.
- KEA (2006) The Economy of Culture in Europe. Report prepared for the European Commission, Directorate-General for Education and Culture, Brussels.
- Klamer, A. (2011). Cultural entrepreneurship. *The Review of Austrian Economics*, 24(2), 141-156.
- Kong, L. (2005). The sociality of cultural industries: Hong Kong's cultural policy and film industry. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 11(1), 61-76.
- Kooyman, R. (2014). The Cultural Entrepreneurial Characteristics: Approaching the Middel East [PowerPoint slides]. Retrieved from <http://www.slideshare.net/rkooyman/the-cultural-entrepreneuriel-characteristics-approaching-the-middel-east>
- Lavanga, M. (2004). Creative industries, Cultural Quarters and Urban Development: The Case Studies of Rotterdam and Milan. In G.Mingardo & M.van Hoek (Eds.), *Urban Management in Europe Voll.II: Towards a sustainable development*. Rotterdam: Erasmus University.
- Leadbeater, C., & Oakley, K. (1999). *The Independents: Britain's new cultural entrepreneurs*. Demos. Retrieved on <http://www.demos.co.uk/files/theindependents.pdf>.
- Lee, H. K. (2005). When arts met marketing. *International journal of cultural policy*, 11(3), 289-305.
- McRobbie, A. (2002). Clubs to companies: Notes on the decline of political culture in speeded up creative worlds. *Cultural studies*, 16(4), 516-531.
- Neff, G. (2005). The changing place of cultural production: The location of social networks in a digital media industry. *The annals of the American academy of political and social science*, 597(1), 134-152.

- Oakley, K. (2014). Good work? Rethinking cultural entrepreneurship. *Handbook of Management and Creativity*, 145.
- O'Connor, J. (2010). *The cultural and creative industries: a literature review*. Creativity, Culture and Education.
- Putnam, D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Romein, A., & Trip, J. J. (2009, December). Key elements of creative city development: An assessment of local policies in Amsterdam and Rotterdam. In *City Futures' 09, 4-6 June 2009, Madrid*. Universidad Rey Juan Carlos of Madrid.
- Saldaña, J. (2012). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*, 14 (pp. 1-28). Sage.
- Schumpeter, J. A. (1934). *The Theory of Economic Development: An Inquiry into Profits, Capital, Credit, Interest, and the Business Cycle*. Harvard University Press. Available on <https://goo.gl/0n52Sd>.
- Scott, M. (2012). Cultural entrepreneurs, cultural entrepreneurship: Music producers mobilising and converting Bourdieu's alternative capitals. *Poetics*, 40(3), 237-255.
- Swedberg, R. (2006). The cultural entrepreneur and the creative industries: Beginning in Vienna. *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 30(4), 243-261.
- The Work Foundation. (2007). *Staying Ahead: The economic performance of the UK's Creative Industries*. Department for culture, media and sport.
- Throsby, D. (2008). The concentric circles model of the cultural industries. *Cultural Trends*, 17 (3), 147-164.
- Tönnies, F. (2001). *Community and civil society* (J. Harris & M. Hollis, Trans.). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1887). Retrieved from <http://catdir.loc.gov/catdir/samples/cam041/00046753.pdf>.
- Weber, M. 1947. *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*. New York, USA: Oxford University Press.
- Witt, P. (2004). Entrepreneurs' networks and the success of start-ups. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 16(5), 391-412.
- Wittel, A. (2001). Toward a network sociality. *Theory, culture & society*, 18(6), 51-76.

Appendixes

Appendix 1. Interview guide

Abbreviations coding:

Capitals	Feature
Symb = Symbolic capital Eco = Economic capital Cult = Cultural capital	TI = Type of Individual CC= Character of Communication Rship = Relationship SP= Social Practice

Interview guide

Hello X, my name is Anaïs Lapierre. Thank you for letting me do this interview with you. The interview will approximately take an hour. In the frame of my research on CCEs, I am going to ask you some questions about the activities related to your creative enterprise, but also about the people with whom you may have contact with in the frame of these activities. If during the interview you do not feel at ease with a particular question, feel free to let me know about that. Also, there is no wrong or right answer, feel free to say what you think is right. It is important to tell you that I will keep all the information you will share anonymous. The information will only be used for the educational purposes only and will not be published anywhere without your prior consent. Are you ready?

Capitals	Feature	<u>INTRODUCTION & LAST PROJECT:</u>
Symb+Eco+cult	TI Input SP CC Rship SP	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Could you please introduce yourself? 2. Before to create your enterprises, what were you doing for a living? What is your background? 3. What was the trigger for you to start your own enterprise? 4. Now, could you tell me more about your enterprise? How many employees are currently working for you? What is your main goal to achieve? 5. What means did you need to create this enterprises then? How did you find your working location? 6. Now, could you introduce the last/most important project you have worked on? <p><u>COLLABORATION (depending on answer, go to the right section for questions)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. Could you tell me about the collaboration within your last project? 8. Who were these people? 9. What did they bring you? [<i>Fame, inspiration, money</i>] 10. How and where did you meet this people? 11. What kind of conversation do/did you have with them? 12. What kind of relationship did you develop with them? 13. Do you sometimes hang out with them? <p><u>ACCESS TO MARKET:</u> <i>Promotion</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 14. Now about the project again or in general, how did/do you promote your work? [<i>depending on previous answer</i>] 15. Who are the people that talked about it or promoted it? [<i>Famous?</i>] 16. What did they do?
Symb	TI Input Rship	

Symb + eco	Rship CC SP	<p>17. How did you get in contact with these people? 18. What do they mean for you? 19. What kind of conversation do you have with them? Private/public? 20. In what occasions do you talk with them? 21. IN GENERAL, how do you promote your brand? (start again at 23)</p>
Symb + Eco	TI Rship	<p><i>Distribution</i></p> <p>22. Can you tell me how you distributed and sold your work? 23. Who are your customers? [<i>Famous or with money?</i>] 24. How do you know them?</p>
Eco	TI Input TI CC Rship SP	<p>25. In which places can we find or buy your work? 26. Who are the people distributing your work? 27. How did you get in contact with them? 28. How did they contribute to the distribution of your work? 29. How do you talk to each other? 30. What is your relationship with them? 31. Have you already seen them again? Where?</p> <p>FUNDS:</p> <p>1. Could you tell me how did you finance this project? 2. Who helped you with that? 3. In what ways did they help you? 4. How did you talk to each other? Was it easy or complicated? 5. How do you know them? 6. In what occasions do you see these people? 7. How do you feel with them? 8. IN CASE OF PUBLIC FUNDS: How did you heard about this funds? (Begin at question 19 again)</p> <p>IN GENERAL, where come from the investment made in your enterprise?</p>
Eco+ cult+ Symb	TI Input CC Rship SP	<p>SUPPORT:</p> <p>9. What kind of difficulties did you encounter during the process? 10. Whom do you get your support from? Who are these people? 11. In what ways do they help you? 12. What is the tone of the conversation? 13. How do you feel with them? 14. Where do you like to meet these people?</p> <p>FINAL QUESTION</p> <p>15. We arrive at the end of the interview, would you like to add something about what we have talked about? 16. Do you have any final comment?</p>

The interview is now finished. I hope it went well. I will keep you updated about the results of my research if you want so. Thank you for your participation.

Appendix 2. Table of results

1. COLLABORATION

Nature of the ties	Type of individual	Quotes	F	Input	Quotes	F	Social Practi ce	Quotes	F	Relation -ship	Quotes	F
Strong and long-lasting	Photography and movie makers	<p>2. "she is a photographer"</p> <p>4. "Photographer and video guys"</p> <p>5. "he's doing the website and the films"</p> <p>8. "she is a photographer"</p> <p>9. "he's doing photography"</p> <p>11. "she did a lot of our photographer"</p>	6	Artistic quality	<p>2. "that was good work"</p> <p>4. "made good photography"</p> <p>8. "She brought me super nice pictures"</p> <p>9. "brings you something artistically"</p> <p>11. "we were so happy with her photography"</p>	5	Hangi ng in and out	<p>2. "in Berlin [...] came over"</p> <p>4. "visiting him [...] You talk a lot about everything"</p> <p>5. "Hang out together"</p> <p>8. "opening evening and she brought some beers"</p> <p>9. "see him each week [...] just hanging outside"</p> <p>11. "I try to see her"</p>	6	Persona l to professi onal	<p>2. "It is again more like a friendship but, but, we work together"</p> <p>5. "I met him through my, he was the best friend of my ex-boyfriend [...] we were together from 2012 [...] it is a friend"</p> <p>8. "she came to our opening and she brought some beers [...] we became really close [...] since a year or so, we thought it would be nice [...] to just make something together"</p>	3
				Complem entary skills	<p>2. "she knows exactly what I want/complementary skills"</p> <p>5. "he understand my style/similar in aesthetic"</p> <p>8. "we share the same opinion on pictures/lot faster, lot better"</p> <p>11. "you'll just get images that you wouldn't do yourself"</p>	4				Professi onal to persona l	<p>4. "we went visiting him and directly had a sort of clic and I saw his pictures and I was like "oh my god I love these pictures [...] then you become good friends"</p> <p>9. "I met him because [...] I asked him to be in one of my shows and since we really started a relationship more like friends"</p> <p>11. "business friends, we are still friendly but it's like a long distance [...] I try to go to see her"</p>	3
				Trust	<p>4. "We will never backstab each other"</p> <p>5. "I trust him"</p> <p>8. "she said "ok just leave, I'll do it myself", it's a lot faster, a lot better"</p> <p>11. "it's really an understanding"</p>	4						

				Artistic exchange	5. "be nice for my portfolio, for her portfolio" 11. "using each other works"	2							
Other creative people	1." he was doing a silkscreen printing workshop" 4. "he's a sort of fashion guy" 6. "a painter" 7. "a design agency" 9. "sketch artist" 11."graphic designer" 12. "graphic designer"	7	Complementary skills	1. "my work is more abstract and their work is very illustrative" 4. "And here, he really knew how to make drawings" 6. ""do you know somebody who can design cloth?"" 9. "gives you another perspective" 11. "they have a vision within their field"	5	Hanging in and out	1."You chill" 4. we can take a drink" 6."we spending time together" 9. "we have wine [...] my birthday they are here" 11. "he will come over this week-end" 12. "we go out for dinner"	6	Personal to professional	1."It was more informal because you chill [...] I met him more when the workshop was done [...] but we are planning to do more collaborations" 7. "also a friend [...] I knew them since art school [...] it's best to have a professional relationship otherwise your friendship might come in danger" 9. "a group of people I was used to hang out with and it was one of them [...] if there is friends and you want to do business, then it has to be on a clear business level"	3		
				Artistic quality	1. "It will already bring me" 4. " drawings, how to make it well" 7. "I really like his work" 11. "lot of work for free"					4	Professional to personal	4. "On a party he went to us [...] he just throw it at us like "Ok the tee-shirts are crap [...] I can do it for less and it could be better" [...], and then I was sending him an email [...] it's sort of business relationship [...] he grew to be a friend" 6. "after like three meetings, we were good friends" 11. "he invited us to give a lecture on an event he organized, and we stayed friends [...] we always try to pay him" 12. " I knew from the workfield [...] became closer friends"	4
				Free work as a "favor"	11. "lot of work for free"					1			
				Trust	9. "it has to be on a trusting base"					1			

	Producer of fabric	9. "Production company"	1	Artistic quality	9. "they are making fabrics for me and I make some garment for them, so they know how the fabric does and what the fabric looks like"	1	Hang in and out	9. "from Thursday till Sunday we were at their home, so I'm also just there with their family and everything"	1	Professional to personal	9. "I flew to the other side of Italy, and I met the company and it was like, like an immediate clic so, hmm, they also always say that I am part of the family so, hmm yeah since then I'm always working with them"	1
				New contacts	9. " they introduced me to Renzo Rosso from Diesel, they introduced me to very important and high big players in this this industry"							
				Trust	9. "you have the keys of the company, you can do whatever you want"							

Nature of the ties	Type of individual	Quotes	F	Input	Quotes	F	Social Practice	Quotes	F	Relation-ship	Quotes	F
Strong but Ephemeral	Web designers	8. "website design" 11. "graphic designer"	2	Design skills	8. " She made my webshop [...] I just had to deliver the pictures" 11. "he designed our first website [...] and it was a very professional looking website"	2	Hanging in and out	8. " we hang out, a lot"	1	Professional to personal	8. "It's nice to see her [...] didn't know Faye before I worked in Bar" 11. "I knew him through a girl I met at my internship [...] Hmm we don't talk to each other a lot but yeah we're still friends on Facebook but I don't see him a lot anymore [...] friendly relationship "	2
				New contacts	"he introduced us to other people"	1						
	Designers	3. "other designers" 10. "designed the Markthal"	1	Sharing knowledge	3. "make something with each other and that was really interesting"	1	Events meeting	3. "you're meeting people and then you think that's a connection and you think "yeaah" and it's a really nice vibe as well, but in a forced kind of vibe, in the fashion week, everything and every meeting was really, really, oh no it's awful"		Professional to personal	3. "Everything goes from business also really in personal wise" 10. "We talk with his wife [...] it was quite easy going [...]that was pretty relaxed"	1
	Fame	10. "we got quite a lot of attention, so that was quite good [...] more famous"	1	Professional meeting	10. "he invited us to his house [...] we came with the							

							design and he approved it [...] it was quite easy going"					
	Students	3. "people from Graphic Lyceum"		Artistic quality	3. "with them I made the most beautiful movie that I couldn't imagine"		Hanging out	3. "they were really bands [...] feel with them [...] really good"		Personal to professional	3. "it was friends of my ex-boyfriend [...] I came in that kind of group [...]" then I thought "maybe why not"	1

Nature of the ties	Type of individual	Quotes	F	Input	Quotes		Social Practice	Quotes	F	Relationship	Quotes	F
Weak	Web builder	10. "professional website [...] an external company" 12. "webbuilder"	7	Technical skills and services	10. "make us the web shop" 12. "he could re-do my website"	2	Professional meetings	10. "they have to do it but they do it well, we just call them" 12. "we talk about what we did"	2	Professional	10. "they are reliable" 12. "professional"	2
							Events talks	12. "we just bumped into each other at the Film Festival"	1			
	Photographer	12. "photographer"	1	Artistic quality	12. "great picture [...] super good quality"	1	Events Talks	9. "saying hello in a party [...] we know each other work [...] it was like an opening night, and we met [...] so "we should work together""	1			
			New contacts	12. "maybe some other contact [...] you are kinda sharing your network with each other"	1							

2. PROMOTION

Nature of the ties	Type of individual	Quotes	F	Input	Quotes	F	Social Practice	Quotes	F	Relation-ship	Quotes	F
Strong and long lasting	Press agent	3. "I had a PR agency behind me, and that was because of a friend of mine that wanted to work with me" 5. "she's doing the PR" 8. "good friend [...] calling like clients and shops" 9. "I also know my PR agent"	4	Promotional services	3."they promoted me in the fashion world" 5. "she's doing my email and keep in contact with shops, people" 8. "calling like clients and shops or whatever just to promote myself" 9. "most of my promo is done"	4	Hanging in and out	5." We went for a beer, or dinner, we went on holidays together" 8."she brought some beers" 9."we have a lot of drinks, we go out for dinners"	3	Personal to professional	3."it was my best friend for years" 5. "it was personal" 9. "a girl that I know from my friends and everything, she was part of the same friend group"	3
				Complementary skills	3. "I don't want to talk, it's really hard" 5. "it's really hard to promote your own work" 8. "I'm not really good at promoting myself"	3	Working	3."nice project together" 5."one day a week she's here" 8." because we are here most of the time"	3	Professional to personal	8." then she came here after six month of something, we became really close and me and Charlitta"	1
				Free or low price	3."for a really low price" 8."she's doing it as a friend's favor [...] she's just doing it for free"	2						
	Friends	2."a friend of mine" 4. "lot of friends" 8. "a good friend"	3	Free advertising	4."if you like this clothing no problem but we want to see it back on Instagram [...] more donations" 8."it brought me promotion in the fact that a lot more people know about the brand"	2	Hanging out	2."Let's eat something, let's have a drink"	1			
				Mutual opportunity	2."it was an opportunity but for her as well"	1						

Nature of the ties	Type of individual	Quotes	F	Input	Quotes	F	Social Practice	Quotes	F	Relation-ship	Quotes	F
Weak	Other creative entrepreneurs	1."the owners of Groos" 2."Joost from Groos" 5."Erik, hmm the director" 10."the guy who owns that place"	4	Free exposure	1."a podium to show my work" 5. "new way to show my collections" 10."they invite us [...] to show the image [...] the value of the brand [...] that's promotion"	3	Events meetings	1."Friday afternoon events [...] you check hands" 2. "the last time at Tegendraads opening [...] more like a social relation" 5."sometimes we saw each other [...] you say nothing more than you have to say" 10. "when they have a party, they invite us"	4	Professionals	1."Really formal" 2." we talked to Joost and we said "Hey we are looking for a workspace, do you still have some space left" 10."we respect the people there"	3
				Putting in touch	2."she was in contact with Groos [...] she was searching for local makers"	1				Personal to professionals	5."I met him at the academy"	1
	Other creative people	5. "a lot of people from the artistic scene" 9."stylists" 11."the mother of Dutch fashion" 12."curator at Boijmans"	4	Putting in touch	9. "because I know a lot of stylist from these celebrities [...] it's just about calling them and asking them if they want to do that" 5." When they hear something like people need a fashion designer or yeah, they call my name" 11. " or via Angelic, maybe not even the organization but Angelic, she knew everyone"	3	Events meetings	5." People that I see sometimes" 9."there is a party we all come together" 11." like when there was a party or a drink" 12. "bumped into each other in openings"	4	Professionals	5." it's not a big friendship" 9. "people I work with" 11. "friendly business relationship" 12. "more professional"	4
				Exposure offer	""project could we have it?""	1						
	Celebrities	3."I used international model" 4."a celebrity" 9."celebrities" 10. "some famous guys"	4	Press attention	3."my PR could use "Christian [name] is coming to dddd, and walking for the show" 9."it gives you a lot of press [...] so much coverage" 10." they saw them on television"	3	Project working	3."He flyed to Holland to do, to walk my show" 9."celebrity that we use"	2			
				Free advertising	4."people see the t-shirts or see on a celebrity"	1				Donations	10."some famous guys wearing our shoes, so we gave them away"	

	Clients	1."just a client" 10. "customers"	2	Free advertising	1."the people that wear it tell the story to other people" 10."we ask them "ok like and share""	2	Virtual contact	1."a social media guy and he posted on the facebook of Tegendraads" 10."that's how we maintain contact with the customers [...] facebook is our main tool"	2			
	PR agent	7."somebody [...] who started her agency" 12. "PR agency"	2	Promotional services	7. "represent us" 12. ""represent you""	2	Professional meetings	7. " when working with them" 12."we had a meeting"	2	Professional	7."Professional level" 12."strictly professional"	2

3. DISTRIBUTION

Nature of the ties	Type of individual	Quotes	F	Input	Quotes	F	Social Practice	Quotes	F	Relationship	Quotes	F
Strong and long lasting	Shop owners	1."a hairdresser" 6."Jeff's store"	2	Sales platforms	1."hang it there" 6."I put clothes there"	2	Hang out	1."this group of people I hang with" 6."go to this part tonight"	2	Personal to professional	1."it's also a good friend of mine" 6."we really like each other"	2

Nature of the ties	Type of individual	Quotes	F	Input	Quotes	F	Social Practice	Quotes	F	Relationship	Quotes	F
Strong And long-lasting or Ephemeral	Customers	3."clients" 7."your customers" 9."clients" 10."customers" 12."the customers"	5	Creative inspiration and participation	3."it's really nice, it's really inspiring" 7."it's nice to get positive feedbacks" 9. "we talk about the garnements, about the fabrics" 10. "we invite him here for a coffee and then he talks about what he likes about the shoes"	4	Sales meetings	3."they come to my studio" 7."we did some sample sales" 9."when they come here" 10. "we have events [...] customers come all the time" 12."studio sales"	4	Professional towards personal	3."the conversation is really easy and it's really nice" 7. "we are pretty close to them" 9. "really friendship but it's also work" 10."we've got a personal relationship with our customers" 12. "I find it important to kind of know each other, know the customers"	4
				Fidelity	12. "but a lot of them keep on coming back [...] I did a studio sale,where usually there are a lot of people coming"	1						

Nature of the ties	Type of individual	Quotes	F	Input	Quotes	F	Social Practice	Quotes	F	Relation-ship	Quotes	F
Weak	Shop owners	1."one other shop, in Utrecht" 2. "Margreeth Olthorn" 6."Tjeerd" 7. "them [women behind us] [...] they have fashion shops" 8. "Tjeerd, the guy from Groos" 11. "more design shops" 12. "a lot of stores"	7	Sales platforms	1."hang my stuff in the shop" 2. "I sell my bags" 6. "to sell at Groos" 7."they also sell my bags" 8. "hang my shirts here" 11. "sell the glue jeans at some design shops" 12. "selling it with consignment"	7	Professional meetings	1."I went to the shop" 2."I went there and I spoke to her in person" 7. "we do business" 11. "over the phone or via internet"	4	Professional	1."formal relationship" 6. "personal and business" 7." agency I see them on a professional level, although I knew her, you know from Rotterdam, it's not someone I call to hang out with" 11. "purely professional"	4
	Sales representative	4."the brand ambassador" 7. "Japanese agent"	2	New sales opportunities	4."we are talking about business [...] I'm like "ok what do you want?"" 7. "they started selling"		Professional meetings	4. "a girl comes here" 7. "you set up targets"	2	Professional	4."It's like just business" 7."it's all about business"	2

4. FINANCE

Nature of the ties	Type of individual	Quotes	F	Input	Quotes	F	Social Practice	Quotes	F	Relation-ship	Quotes	F
Strong and long-lasting	Family	1."my father" 2."my sister" 3. "my mum" 6. "my mother" 7."someone in the family" 8. "my mother or my sister" 9. "my brother in law" 10. "my family"	8	Loan	2."I had a loan from my sister" 7. "I had a loan from someone in the family" 8."I can borrow money from mother or my sister" 9. "my brother in law signed it"	4	Being together	6." we are going out fir the dinner [...]we went on vacation"		Personal	1. "my family, they are here for me" 2. "my mother is the coach" 3." I need them around me" 6." yes my mother is supporting me" 7."it's very good" 9. "my family it's more yeah, support mentally"	7
				Donations	1."at the beginning my father helped financing" 3." we have to pay the whole building so, that's not really, that's my mum"	2						

				Product purchase	6." my mother sometimes buy something from me"	1						and emotionally" 10. "they are proud"	
	Themselves	1."I just financed it myself" 6."everything I do myself" 9."finance everything myself" 12."I did everything myself"	4										
	Friends' parents	3."the parents" 9."parents of my best friend"	2	Sponsor	3. "She said "my parents want to sponsor you"" 9."parents of my best friend helped me out, so they sponsored me"	2				Personal		3."my best friend for years" 9."my best friend"	2
	Friends	4."Uriah [...] Steven"	1	Investment	4." "ok if you invest now, you invest in my idea and make my t-shirt and then you are part of my idea and we can grow"	1	Being together	4."this year we have to go on a vacation; because we have to talk to each other, we have to be with each other"	1	Personal		4." the core has to be tight"	1

Nature of the ties	Type of individual	Quotes	F	Input	Quotes	F	Social Practice	Quotes	F	Relation-ship	Quotes	F
Weak	Corporations	3. "sponsor of Smart" 9. "sponsorship deals"	2	Funds	3."they gave me 5000" 9. "I also get money to finance my shows"	2	Virtual contact	3."By email first" 9. "we get an email address, we send an email there"	2	Professional	3. "work with them" 9. "It's really business"	2
				Products	9. "we had shoes sponsors [...] we had accessories [...] things that I put on my models"	1	Official meetings	3."You have to contact to visit [...] If they come here then I have to be like a doll [...] and then you have a talk about how great you are"	1			
	Bankers	5." Banks" 7. "ING Bank"		Loans	5."I got it once, before, so they know that I'm paying back"	1					Professional	5."with the loans, the banks, it's a different thing" 6."really business relation"
		Advice	7."you should go talk to them, I know other little	1								

					entrepreneurs that could finance”							
	Members of subsidies’ jury	5.”Mostly through subsidies [...] I had some old teachers in the jury”	1	Favoritism	5.”It’s not anonymous [...] subsidies are always about knowing people”	1						
	Other creative people	11. “people that we knew from the fashion scene”		Investment	11.”it was a crowdfunding thing”					Professional	11.”Business, but friendly business”	1

5. SUPPORT

Nature of the ties	Type of individual	Quotes	F	Input	Quotes	F	Social Practice	Quotes	F	Relationship	Quotes	F
Strong and long-lasting	Family	1.”my aunt [...] my brother [...]” 2.”my father [...] my mother” 3.”my parents” 4. “my family” 5.”father” 6.”my mother” 7.”my parents [...] my brother” 8. “my family” 9.”my family” 10. “my family” 11.”parents” 12.”Family”	12	Moral support	2. “my mother is the coach” 4. “more the place you tell your stories [...] just motivation” 6.”my mother is supporting me [...] “you need to do more”” 8.” They are always optimistic always [...] always positive support” 9.” I can always call them of course [...] support mentally and emotionally” 11.”they always supported what I did [...] never questioned me [...] always very supportive” 12. “mental support”	7				Personal	4.”my family is really more private” 5.” I’m a person that get closed to a really few people” 7. “it’s very good” 12. “I’m quite close to my mother and brother”	4
				Professional help	1.”just send the invoices, my aunt is working on that” 2.”my father cuts the bags” 3.” They are really business wise, they are really focus on business” 7.”my brother for example	4			Professional	3.”my relationship with my family is really not familywise”	1	

				he does nearly all our photography [...] it's cheap"							
			Advice	1."we spoke to my father [...] it was such an eye opener" 5."he talk a lot about the concept" 7."you can share about business"	3						
			Administration help	2."my father is helping me on the administration part"	1						
			Physical help	1."my brother supported me on fixing the shop"	1						
			No support	10."now my parents they are proud of what I do but in the beginning they thought it was a stupid idea [...] no real support at the beginning"	1						
Friends	1."a friend" 2. "we are friends" 3."friends" 4."friends" 5."my friends" 6. "friends" 7."lot of entrepreneurs friends" 8."Els, Charlitta and Marloe" 9."everybody" 12."friends"	10	Moral support	2." with Rafaella we talk a lot, I mean she knows exactly what I'm doing" 4. "we talk to each other" 5."people around that support you [...] not directly business wise" 8." Mental support" 9."they support me" 12. "moral support"	6	Hanging out	1."a cool guy to chill with" 4."this year we have to go on a vacation" 7. "you visit each house, you spend family and holidays time" 9."we have wine [...] we eat"	4	Personal	3."few friends, they are really supporting me" 4. "Few friends [...] sort of unbreakable" 5." The close ones"	3
			Advice	1."He said "shouldn't you try to go to Bart?"" 6."friends that have their own business [...] "show me how it works" 7."business advice" 8."give the most advice" 9."we talk about the collection, [...] the concept"	5				Personal to professional	1."I knew him from going out [...] it's a cool guy to chill with" 2." it is again like more a friendship, but but, we worked together" 12."some of them were at school with me"	3
			Professional help	1."we did a release in Groos and he just helped to make it possible" 12."help working creatively [...] one more financing"	2				Professional to personal	8."we get along very well [...] you get to see the people you work with" 9."it's about this bond with the people you work and the people you consider your friends"	2

	Life partner	3."my boyfriend" 5."my boyfriend" 7."my partner" 9."my partner" 11."my partner"	5	Professional help	5."making company plans" 7." he does, yeah, well, many things we all do many many things" 9."my partner who does the sponsorship deals" 11." I'm working with Geert"	4				Personal to professional	5."making company plans" 7." he does, yeah, well, many things we all do many many things" 9."my partner who does the sponsorship deals" 11." I'm working with Geert"	4
				Moral support	3."he's helping me, because I had a burn out" 12."always in it together"	2				Personal	3."he's a big thing in my life now"	1

Nature of the ties	Type of individual	Quotes	F	Input	Quotes	F	Social Practice	Quotes	F	Relationship	Quotes	F
Strong but ephemeral	Designer	3."another designer"	1	Artistic help	"to work with me on patterns because I was really bad in patterns [...] he was walking there to teach me"	1	Project working	"to work with me"		Professional to personal	"at that time it was really professional [...] it became really personal"	1

Nature of the ties	Type of individual	Quotes	F	Input	Quotes	F	Social Practice	Quotes	F	Relationship	Quotes	F
Weak	Other creative people	6." she's in the party scene" 11."other designers"	3	Advice	6."I was posting on Facebook I need an atelier and she write me a text" 11."we were tipping each other"	2				Professional	6."working with you together" 12."working in Arnhem together with other designers"	2
	Platform for designer	7."BNO, it's a platform for designer [...] legal advice"	1	Legal advice	7."you can ask them legal advice, but also about brand, branding and how to protect your brand name and your ideas"	1	Phone and virtual contact	7."you just call them and they help you out [...] they send newsletters"	1	Professional	"They know all their members but no, it's not a close relationship"	1
	People from other professional field	7." Different types of people, people who are lawyers"		Free business advice	"if you have a business problem [...] you tend to speak to those people"	1	Home meeting	"you come by Wednesday night, I will help you out"	1	Personal	"help you out on friendly basis but that are not friends [...] they help you out for nothing so it's completely different than a business relationship"	1