

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/344831089>

Platform Spaces: When culture and the arts intersect territorial development and social innovation, a view from the Italian context

Article in *Journal of Urban Affairs* · October 2020

DOI: 10.1080/07352166.2020.1808007

CITATIONS

65

READS

487

3 authors:



[Luca Tricarico](#)

Italian National Research Council

75 PUBLICATIONS 763 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



[Zachary M. Jones](#)

Politecnico di Milano

35 PUBLICATIONS 371 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



[Gaia Daldanise](#)

Italian National Research Council

31 PUBLICATIONS 310 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



Platform Spaces: When culture and the arts intersect territorial development and social innovation, a view from the Italian context

Luca Tricarico ^a, Zachary Mark Jones ^{b,c}, and Gaia Daldanise ^d

^aLuiss University; ^bDASTU, Politecnico di Milano; ^cPolitecnico di Milano; ^dNational Research Council of Italy (CNR), Institute of Research on Innovation and Services for Development (IRISS)

ABSTRACT

This contribution intends to overview and frame a conceptual model for Cultural and Creative Enterprises (CCEs) that we call *Platform Spaces*. The paper contextualizes and discusses the main issues and challenges facing the CCE sector, identifying the need for more complex concepts better able to distinguish new policies and approaches being experimented with in Italy and across Europe. As Italy is currently experiencing a particularly rich period regarding the development of cultural creative activities based largely on social innovation, both in terms of organization management and relation with territorial development, it is an ideal context in which to explore the emergence of this new model. The paper describes three diverse examples of *Platform Spaces* based on multi-stakeholder cooperation mechanisms, arts and culture, and the engagement of local communities to not only ensure the accessibility of their activities but also to meet territorial development goals. With this analysis, the paper discusses a new conceptual framework that can be relevant both in theory and in practice, identifying policy recommendations to address territorial development approaches for *Platform Spaces*.

The emerging need for a new cultural concept

Culture, creativity, and the arts have taken on an unprecedented role in cities. Particularly during the last two decades academic research has accompanied these trends by contributing new concepts and configurations aiming at describing and capturing the range of effects of this phenomenon. Richard Florida's (2005) much discussed promotion of the creative class represents just one example of the attempts to both describe as well as promote the new role of culture and creativity in cities. Eleonora Redaelli (2019) overviews the impressive diversity as well as a lack of unity in the existing conceptual approaches used to capture these trends, from cultural planning and creative industries to cultural districts and creative placemaking. It is also worth noting the difficulties that distinguish this sector (i.e. Shade & Jacobson, 2015) in terms of unequal distribution of opportunities dependent upon access to amenities, universities, diversity, and other place-related factors in accounting for the growing divergence of skills across locations (Florida & Mellander, 2014). Additionally, many top-down cultural policy initiatives, such as the designation of "official" cultural districts have in many instances led to vaguely defined areas of cities that lack consistent qualities that might serve to unify these zones and are too often left outside of local development strategies (Nuccio & Ponzini, 2017; Rushton, 2015).

One context where researchers have noted a growing role for the cultural enterprise sector within regional development policies and institutional reorganizations is in Italy (Billi & Tricarico, 2018). These

processes aim at addressing a twofold challenge: to test new entrepreneurial and organizational approaches borrowed from other policy fields while also experimenting with “cultural innovation” through the collaborative governance of cultural heritage and assets. The term “cultural innovation” refers on one hand to the introduction of “elements of change” in policies that support the production and use of cultural goods and services while also implementing social innovation through cultural activities on the other (British Council, 2018; Cerreta et al., 2020; Clemente & Giovane Di Girasole, 2019; Deliyannis & Papadopoulou, 2017; European Commission, 2010; KEA European Affairs, 2017; Napolitano & Marino, 2016; Sung et al., 2020). These approaches tend to be carried out by community-based initiatives (Peirce & Steinbach, 1990; Rothman & Zald, 1985) that fulfill their goals by using, producing, and exploiting tangible and intangible cultural assets. International law first defined the concept of cultural assets in the 1954 Hague Convention (art. 1) and updated in the 1970 UNESCO Convention (art. 1). The concept has subsequently evolved beyond tangible, built heritage to include intangible cultural expressions that earlier international frameworks did not take into account and which transmit cultural expressions, regardless of their possible commercial value (UNESCO, 2003, 2005). In reference to the Italian context, there have been an increasing number of instances of “diffused cultural innovation” (Bonomi & Masiero, 2014) supported by means of a creative allocation of local interests and financial resources. These have given rise to new hybrid organizations (Venturi & Zandonai, 2016) ranging from for profit, nonprofit, to public private partnerships established in the midst of the economic crisis to not only meet emerging social needs but also to generate opportunities for territorial development (Borin, 2017; Tricarico & Zandonai, 2018).

Recognizing this wide ranging literature and new emerging role of the cultural enterprise sector, this paper aims to develop the concept of *Platform Spaces* to more precisely define such instances where these range of issues intersect. *Platform Spaces* are cultural and creative places where social innovation plays a key role in community engagement activities as well as generating horizontal/collaborative interactions among different stakeholders and their interests while aligning with territorial development targets (Table 1). The approach of *Platform Spaces* should be understood as going beyond just an immediate local impact and framed as part of a territorial shift of regional development policies working toward developing the capacity to generate financial resources and utilize cultural assets (see Figure 1). Within this perspective, the main research question we pose is: how can *Platform Spaces* effectively respond to the wider debate of the growing role of social innovation and culture within territorial development approaches? Can the concept of *Platform Spaces* more effectively describe emerging approaches and phenomena than existing terminology within the cultural management and planning fields? To respond to these questions, the paper is structured as follows: in Section 2 we explain the methodological framework and the purpose of the work, in Section 3 we address the discussion by identifying promising aspects as well as identify the missing intersection between the literatures on Cultural and Creative Enterprises, Social Innovation and Territorial Development. In Section 4 we then introduce the Italian context and three different examples (rather than full in-depth case-studies) of *Platform Spaces* to demonstrate and further reason on its conceptualization. The conclusions in Section 5 then analyze the main findings regarding organizational and policy implications of this model across a wide range of contexts. Our aim in describing the opportunities and criticalities of the *Platform Spaces* approach is to provide a relevant and useful tool for practitioners and scholars involved in cultural entrepreneurship studies and initiatives in order to experiment with practical, analytical, and policy approaches that bridge the gap among cultural and creative enterprises, social innovation, and territorial development (Friedmann & Weaver, 1979).

Methodological framework for identifying and defining *Platform Spaces*

As will be further demonstrated through the literature review and the examples presented in sections 3 and 4, the four defining aspects of *Platform Spaces* are located at the intersection of four topics: the governance and management of cultural assets and spaces; economic activities linked to the arts,



Table 1. Strategic Framework of the three examples of Platform Spaces.

Platform Space	Cultural Asset and spaces	Cultural Economic Activities	Social Innovation and Governance experimentations	Territorial development targets	Financial Resources
Ketos Project	Public owned – historical building (Palazzo Amati)	Local Ecotourism Local Arts & Craftsmanship Digital Making & Exhibition	Hub for local Cultural Associations Coalition Open Research and Education platform	Cultural and Art Associations Tourism Associations Non profit Associations Creative and Craft Industries Local Community Tourists	Philanthropy Public Real Estate Assets Revenues of Services in the Marketplace
Ex Fadda	Former Fadda Winery; 50 hectares of agricultural land	Performing Arts Sport Activities Education Programs Agriculture & Food production with social inclusion targets	Hub for local Cultural Associations Coalition Citizen engagement to co-design urban regeneration policies	Cultural, Art and Sport Associations Local Welfare Services Youth individuals in Creative and Craft Industries Local Community and informal groups	EU Structural Funds Revenues of Services and Products in the Marketplace Public Real Estate Assets
Case di Quartiere	Former historical public baths in San Salvario district; other public buildings	Performing arts & exhibitions Education programs	Audience engagement and co-creation practices Experimenting new territorial welfare services combining local public and private projects' incubators Social inclusion projects and services	Cultural and Art Associations Local Community and neighborhood informal groups	Local Authorities Funds, Philanthropic investments, National awards, Revenues of Services in the Marketplace Fundraising and crowdfunding Public Real Estate Assets

the attraction of financial resources and the co-management of initiatives. From this point of view, *Platform Spaces* may be fully situated as an example of multipolar administration as opposed to bipolar models where the public administration addresses external subjects exclusively as suppliers of goods and services (Bombardelli, 2016). This synergistic effect could provide new strategies for territorial development agenda based on the strategic lines of the open management of cultural heritage, social innovation/creativity paths, and collaborative governance (Ansell & Gash, 2008).

The *Case del Quartiere* network in particular is an example of an open social innovation network of organizations generated through an open governance of each initiative, led by the local authority alongside other local actors that has helped to preserve its role within larger processes without sacrificing its impact at the local level. In this perspective, the approach promoted by the Torino Strategic Plan 2025 has been based upon this experience of promoting the connection between the regeneration of spaces and social inclusion, the integration of urban regeneration interventions, and the governance of public spaces to improve social innovation (Associazione Torino Internazionale, 2015).

The examples of *Platform Spaces* presented here were also employed as engines for the regeneration of spaces and services based on the valorization of common cultural assets (both of tangible historic structures and intangible local traditions), where beneficiaries also play an active role in the planning and management of their activities (Orlandini et al., 2014). To ensure the legitimacy of such collaborative experiences, regeneration policies that might aim to reproduce *Platform Spaces* must take into account an appropriate accountability of their activities as connected to social innovation practices that strengthen the link between enterprises and territories by developing active citizenship and creative innovation. In each of the examples, *Platform Spaces* also paid great attention to the provision of public space, representing a critical point for policy makers especially regarding marginal/peripheral regions. Some scholars (Okano & Samson, 2010; Phelps, 2012) have underlined that an adequate presence of public spaces is crucial to sustain activities such as experimental social and cultural innovation practices. While certain aspects of these examples could indeed be described as cultural or creative hubs, such terms would fail to capture their overall complexity and range of impact. As argued and demonstrated, the formulation of *Platform Spaces* is particularly open, flexible, and adaptable to a range of contexts which may look quite different in situations outside of the Italian context. Even the examples presented here represent quite different cases in terms of scale, spread, governance and management, funding, and actual cultural and artistic content present. We view this range of possible models not as a weakness, but rather a key aspect providing robustness to the concept of *Platform Spaces* that allows it to better characterize these instances whereas much of the existing terminology falls short in fully capturing the embedded complexity.

Notes

1. Informal interviews with Project Managers have been conducted by the authors during individual research experiences.
2. <https://www.joniandolphin.it/wordpress/2017/chisiamo/>.
3. <https://associazioneterra.oneminutesite.it/>.
4. <https://www.madeintaranto.org/il-futuro-di-taranto-nel-manifesto-della-citta-vecchia-e-del-mare/>.
5. <https://www.facebook.com/pages/category/Professional-Service/Associazione-Culturale-Marco-Motolese-107514499324879/>.
6. <http://www.dipendenze-emmanuel.org/posts/list/centri/>.
7. <http://www.teatrocrest.it/>.

Acknowledgments

This article is the result of a collective research activity undertaken by the three authors. The final written version can be attributed as follows: Conceptualization - LT, GD, ZMJ; Methodology - LT, GD, ZMJ; Formal Analysis - ZMJ, LT, GD; Investigation - LT, GD, ZMJ; Data Curation and Case Studies - LT, GD, ZMJ; Original Draft Preparation - ZMJ, LT, GD; Review and Editing - ZMJ, LT, GD; Visualization - GD; ZMJ, LT.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

About the authors

Dr. Luca Tricarico is a post-doc researcher at Luiss Guido Carli University (Dept. of Business & Management). With background in Planning and Public Policy Analysis (PhD at Politecnico di Milano), his research interests include institutional, organizational and policy implications of social innovation; community-based organizations and territorial approaches to entrepreneurship; and social impact finance and proximity-based local economic development. He has published articles in national and international scientific journals in the field of planning, management and urban studies. In 2014, together with Sara Le Xuan, he published the book *Imprese Comuni: Community Enterprises e Rigenerazione Urbana nel Regno Unito* for Maggioli Editore. In 2018, together with Flaviano Zandonai, the book *Local Italy: i domini del settore comunità in Italia* was published by the Giangiacomo Feltrinelli Foundation.

Zachary Mark Jones is a Postdoctoral Research Fellow at the Politecnico di Milano, where he completed his PhD in Urban Planning, Design and Planning. His teaching and research activities span architectural and urban design, planning, built heritage, cultural mega-events and cultural policy. After studying in the U.S., he has spent a number of years expanding his research interests across Europe where, in addition to completing his PhD in Italy, he was a Fulbright Student in Croatia, a Visiting Research Fellow at Kadir Has University in Turkey and a Visiting Researcher at the Institute of Cultural Capital in the UK. In addition to a number of published journal articles, he is also the author of the recent book *Cultural Mega-Events: Opportunities and Risks for Heritage Cities* in the Routledge Research in Planning and Urban Design series.

Gaia Daldanise has a PhD in Urban Planning and Evaluation and is a regional representative of the Italian Youth Association for UNESCO—Campania and is a member of Blam (Salerno), Friends of Molo San Vincenzo (Naples) and PLUS hub (Pisticci) associations as well as the secretariat for RETE—Association for the collaboration between ports and cities. Since 2014, she has been carrying out research activities at CNR IRISS, where she is currently working on collaborative urban planning processes for the city-port system regeneration along with co-design and co-evaluation approaches of creative cultural services for cultural heritage valorization. She has worked in international research projects including: Horizon 2020 Project “Circular models Leveraging Investments in Cultural Heritage adaptive reuse (CLIC)”; “BESECURE Best Practice Enhancers for Security in Urban Environment” (FP7-SECURITY – Specific Program “Cooperation”: Security); and “Estudio de la Amenaza Sismica y Vulnerabilidad Física del Gran Santo Domingo” (UNDP project). She has received, with the Blam team, an award for the “Welfare che impresa!” competition with the project “Play ReCH (Reuse Cultural Heritage).” She received a special mention (Edoardo Mollica Award 2016) for young researchers. A list of her scientific publications can be found at: https://www.iriss.cnr.it/prodotti/?fwp_prodotti_autore_cnr=2298.

ORCID

Luca Tricarico  <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-2621-4130>

Zachary Mark Jones  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-6423-957X>

Gaia Daldanise  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7998-7511>

References

- Abbasi, M., Cullen, J., Li, C., Molinari, F., Morelli, N., Rausell, P., & Van Dam, K. (2019). A triplet under focus: Innovation, design and the city. In N. G. Concilio & I. Tosoni (Eds.), *Innovation capacity and the city* (pp. 15–41). Springer.
- Agenzia per lo Sviluppo Locale di San Salvario Onlus. (2017). *Cultura e sviluppo. Identità territoriale, comunità di riferimento e progettazione condivisa nel caso San Salvario* [Culture and development. Territorial identity, community of shared reference and planning in the San Salvario case]. San Salvario Onlus. <https://sansalvario.org/2017/04/19/cultura-e-sviluppo/>
- Agenzia per lo Sviluppo Locale di San Salvario Onlus. (2019). *Casa di Quartiere di San Salvario* [Neighborhood house of San Salvario]. San Salvario Onlus. <http://www.casadelquartiere.it/storia-della-casa-del-quartiere-san-salvario-torino/>
- Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2008). Collaborative governance in theory and practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(4), 543–571. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mum032>
- Art Fund. (2018). *Cultural hubs: How to create a multidimensional experience*. <https://www.artfund.org/assets/downloads/art-insights-cultural-hubs.pdf?pdf=culturalhubs>

- Assirelli, G., Barone, C., & Recchi, E. (2019). "You better move on": Determinants and labor market outcomes of graduate migration from Italy. *International Migration Review*, 53(1), 4–25. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0197918318767930>
- Associazione Torino Internazionale. (2015). *Torino Metropoli 2025* [Turin Metropoli 2025]. (A. Prat, S. Mangili, R. Saraco, F. Roagna, & D. Silvi, Eds.). Turin: Torino Internazionale. www.torinostrategica.it
- Bacot, H. (2008). Civic culture as a policy premise: Appraising Charlotte's civic culture. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 30(4), 389–417. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9906.2008.00405.x>
- Bailey, N. (2012). The role, organisation and contribution of community enterprise to urban regeneration policy in the UK. *Progress in Planning*, 77(1), 1–35. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.progress.2011.11.001>
- Bailey, N., Kleinhans, R., & Lindbergh, J. (2018). The implications of Schumpeter's theories of innovation for the role, organisation and impact of community-based social enterprise in three European countries. *Journal of Entrepreneurial and Organizational Diversity*, 7(1), 14–36. <https://doi.org/10.5947/jeod.2018.002>
- Barca, F., McCann, P., & Rodríguez-Pose, A. (2012). The case for regional development intervention: Place-based versus place-neutral approaches. *Journal of Regional Science*, 52(1), 134–152. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9787.2011.00756.x>
- Bianchi, M. (2019). Renewing the city through public participation and cultural activities. The case study of Gillet square, a community-led urban regeneration project. *Journal of Entrepreneurial and Organizational Diversity*, 8(1), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.5947/jeod.2019.001>
- Billi, A., & Tricarico, L. (2018). Regional development policies in Italy: How to combine cultural approaches with social innovation. In F. Calabrò, L. Della Spina, & C. Bevilacqua (Eds.), *International symposium on new metropolitan perspectives* (pp. 277–287). Springer.
- Bollo, A., Pais, I., Raimo, C., Dubini, P., Marrone, G., Casati, R., Latronico, V., & Tondelli, J. (2016). *La cultura in trasformazione. L'innovazione e i suoi processi* [Culture in transformation. Innovation and its processes]. CheFare, Ed. Minimum Fax.
- Bolzoni, M. (2019). Who shapes the city? Non-profit associations and civil society initiatives in urban change processes: Role and ambivalences. *Partecipazione e Conflitto*, 12(2), 436–459. <https://doi.org/10.1285/i20356609v12i2p436>
- Bombardelli, M. (2016). Prendersi cura dei beni comuni per uscire dalla crisi [Taking care of the common goods to get out of the crisis]. Editoriale Scientifica.
- Bonini Baraldi, S., & Salone, C. (2020). Governance, economic sustainability and socio-spatial relationships. In I. Lami (Ed.), *Abandoned buildings in contemporary cities: Smart conditions for actions. Smart innovation, systems and technologies* (Vol. 168, pp. 133–145). Springer.
- Bonomi, A., & Masiero, R. (2014). *Dalla smart city alla smart land* [From smart city to smart land]. Marsilio Editori.
- Borin, E. (2017). *Public-private partnership in the cultural sector: A comparative analysis of European models*. ENCATC.
- Boschma, R. (2005). Proximity and innovation: A critical assessment. *Regional Studies*, 39(1), 61–74.
- Bosi, G. (2017). *L'impresa culturale. Diritto ed economia delle comunità creative* [The cultural enterprise. Law and economics of creative communities]. Il Mulino.
- British Council. (2018). *European creative hubs network*. <https://www.creativehubs.eu/>
- Burnell, J. (2013). Small change: Understanding cultural action as a resource for unlocking assets and building resilience in communities. *Community Development Journal*, 48(1), 134–150. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cdj/bss059>
- Camarda, D., Rotondo, F., & Selicato, F. (2015). Strategies for dealing with urban shrinkage: Issues and scenarios in Taranto. *European Planning Studies*, 23(1), 126–146.
- Campanoli, G. (2014). *Riusiamo l'Italia: da spazi vuoti a start-up culturali e sociali* [Let's reuse Italy: From empty spaces to cultural and social start-ups]. Gruppo 24 ore.
- Campbell, P., Cox, T., & O'Brien, D. (2017). The social life of measurement: How methods have shaped the idea of culture in urban regeneration. *Journal of Cultural Economy*, 10(1), 49–62. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17530350.2016.1248474>
- Cardellicchio, N., Annicchiarico, C., Di Leo, A., Giandomenico, S., & Spada, L. (2016). The Mar Piccolo of Taranto: An interesting marine ecosystem for the environmental problems studies. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 23(13), 12495–12501.
- Cerreta, M. (2010). Thinking through complex values. In M. Cerreta, G. Concilio, & V. Monno (Eds.), *Making strategies in spatial planning: Knowledge and values* (pp. 381–404). Springer Science & Business Media.
- Cerreta, M., Daldanise, G., Di Lauro, P., & La Rocca, L. (2020). Collaborative decision-making processes for cultural heritage enhancement: The Play ReCH Platform. In *Systems of Systems-Engineering, Modeling, Simulation and Analysis* (pp. 1–30). IntechOpen. <https://www.intechopen.com/online-first/collaborative-decision-making-processes-for-cultural-heritage-enhancement-the-play-rech-platform>.
- Cerreta, M., Daldanise, G., & Sposito, S. (2018). Culture-led regeneration for urban spaces. Monitoring complex values networks in action. *Urbani Izziv/Urban Challenge Journal*, 29(1), 9–28. https://www.urbani-izziv.si/en-gb/Summary_p/id/70/id_k/p/id/2
- CHCfE consortium. (2015). *Cultural heritage counts for Europe*. International Cultural Centre.

- cheFare (2015). “Di casa in casa” project. Retrieved from <https://bando.che-fare.com/progetto-archiviato/di-casa-in-casa-2/>
- Chesbrough, H., Vanhaverbeke, W., & West, J. (2006). *Open innovation: Researching a new paradigm*. Oxford University Press on Demand.
- Cicerchia, A. (2015). Why we should measure what we should measure. *Economia della Cultura*, 1, 11–22. <https://doi.org/10.1446/80344>
- Clement, J., Shipilov, A., & Galunic, C. (2018). Brokerage as a public good: The externalities of network hubs for different formal roles in creative organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 63(2), 251–286. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0001839217708984>
- Clemente, M., & Giovane di Girasole, E. (2019). Friends of Molo San Vincenzo: Heritage Community per il recupero del Molo borbonico nel porto di Napoli [Friends of Molo San Vincenzo: Heritage Community for recovery of the Bourbon pier in the port of Naples]. In L. Pavan Woolfe & S. Pinton (Eds.), *Il valore del patrimonio culturale per la società e le comunità, la convenzione del Consiglio d'Europa tra teoria e prassi* [The value of cultural heritage for society and communities, the Council of Europe convention between theory and practice] (pp. 173–189). Linea Edizioni.
- Comunian, R. (2011). Rethinking the creative city: The role of complexity, networks and interactions in the urban creative economy. *Urban Studies*, 48(6), 1157–1179. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098010370626>
- Cooke, P. N., & Lazeretti, L. (2008). *Creative cities, cultural clusters and local economic development*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Cunningham, S. (2002). From cultural to creative industries: Theory, industry and policy implications. *Media International Australia Incorporating Culture and Policy*, 102(1), 54–65. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1329878X0210200107>
- Cutter, S. L., Barnes, L., Berry, M., Burton, C., Evans, E., Tate, E., & Webb, J. (2008). A place-based model for understanding community resilience to natural disasters. *Global Environmental Change*, 18(4), 598–606. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2008.07.013>
- d'Ovidio, M., & Coppola, A. (2018). Embedded economic practices in the city of Taranto. *Territorio*, 87, 98–104. <https://www.medra.org/servlet/MServlet?hdl=10.3280/TR2018-087016>
- d'Ovidio, M., & Rabbiosi, C. (2017). *Makers e Città: La rivoluzione si fa con la stampante 3d* [Makers and Cities: The revolution is made with the 3d printer]. Fondazione Giangiacomo Feltrinelli.
- Daldanise, G., & Cerreta, M. (2018). PLUS hub: A cultural creative process for Pisticci regeneration (Matera, Italy). *BDC. Bollettino Del Centro Calza Bini*, 18(1), 127–145.
- De Lucia, C., Balena, P., Melone, M. R. S., & Borri, D. (2016). Policy, entrepreneurship, creativity and sustainability: The case of ‘principi attivi’ (‘Active ingredients’) in the Apulia region (southern Italy). *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 135, 1461–1473. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.06.068>
- De Vidovich, L., & Tricarico, L. (2019). Innovazione sociale ai margini: Contesti e strumenti per una politica regionale [Social innovation at the margins: Contexts and tools for a regional policy]. In A. Califano (Ed.), *Ecosistemi digitali* [Digital ecosystems] (pp. 63–80). Fondazione Giangiacomo Feltrinelli.
- Deliyannis, I., & Papadopoulou, E. (2017). Creating innovative cultural heritage experiences using adaptive game-based augmented-reality and web technologies. *American Journal of Arts and Design*, 1(1), 8–14. <http://www.sciencepublishinggroup.com/journal/paperinfo?journalid=106&doi=10.11648/j.ajad.20160101.12>
- Di Iacovo, F. (2008). *Agricoltura sociale: quando le campagne coltivano valori* [Social agriculture: When the countryside cultivates values]. Franco Angeli.
- Donolo, C. (1997). *L'intelligenza delle istituzioni* (Vol. 223) [The intelligence of the institutions]. Feltrinelli.
- Dovey, J., Pratt, A., Moreton, S., Virani, T., Merkel, J., & Lansdowne, J. (2016). *The creative hubs report: 2016*. British Council. <https://creativeconomy.britishcouncil.org/media/resources/HubsReport.pdf>
- European Commission. (2006). *The economy of culture in Europe*. KEA European Affairs. <https://keanet.eu/publications/the-economy-of-culture-in-europe/>
- European Commission. (2010). *Green paper. Unlocking the potential of cultural and creative industries*. European Commission. https://www.hhs.se/contentassets/3776a2d6d61c4058ad564713cc554992/greenpaper_creative_industries_en.pdf
- European Creative Hubs Network. (2018). *Rete delle case del quartiere* [Network of houses in the neighborhood]. <https://www.creativehubs.eu/hub/rete-delle-case-del-quartiere/>
- European Research Partnership on Cultural and creative spillovers (ERPCCS). (2017). *Cultural and creative spillovers: Research case studies 2016-2017*. European Cultural Foundation. Retrieved from <https://www.culturalfoundation.eu/library/creative-and-cultural-spillovers-research-case-studies-2016-2017>
- European Union. (2007). *European agenda for culture*. European Commission. https://ec.europa.eu/culture/policy/strategic-framework_en
- European Union. (2017). *The Cultural and Creative Cities Monitor*. European Commission. <https://bit.ly/2GhU40U>
- Evans, P. (2002). Collective capabilities, culture, and Amartya Sen's *Development as Freedom*. *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 37(2), 54–60. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02686261>
- Fitzpatrick, D. M. (2018). *Governance of mutual housing in London* [Doctoral dissertation]. University College London. <https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/10047446/>

- Florida, R. (2005). *City and creative class*. Routledge.
- Florida, R., & Mellander, C. (2014). The rise of skills: Human capital, the creative class, and regional development. In M. M. Fischer & P. Nijkamp (Eds.), *Handbook of regional science* (pp. 317–329). Springer.
- Friedmann, J., & Weaver, C. (1979). *Territory and function: The evolution of regional planning*. University of California Press.
- Frost-Kumpf, H. A. (1998). *Cultural districts: The arts as a strategy for revitalizing our cities*. Americans for the Arts.
- García, M., Eizaguirre, S., & Pradel, M. (2015). Social innovation and creativity in cities: A socially inclusive governance approach in two peripheral spaces of Barcelona. *City, Culture and Society*, 6(4), 93–100. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ccs.2015.07.001>
- Gibson, C., & Gordon, A. (2018). Rural cultural resourcefulness: How community music enterprises sustain cultural vitality. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 63, 259–270. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2016.11.001>
- Gill, R., Pratt, A. C., & Virani, T. E. (Eds.). (2019). *Creative hubs in question: Place, space and work in the creative economy*. Springer.
- Gorbis, M., & Vian, K. (2016). Building cultural prosperity. What we can learn from cultural innovators, and why it's important. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*. <http://bit.ly/2ehceEz>
- Grimm, R., Fox, C., Baines, S., & Albertson, K. (2013). Social innovation, an answer to contemporary societal challenges? Locating the concept in theory and practice. *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research*, 26(4), 436–455. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13511610.2013.848163>
- Grodach, C., O'Connor, J., & Gibson, C. (2017). Manufacturing and cultural production: Towards a progressive policy agenda for the cultural economy. *City, Culture and Society*, 10, 17–25. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ccs.2017.04.003>
- Haisch, T., & Klöpffer, C. (2015). Location choices of the creative class: Does tolerance make a difference? *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 37(3), 233–254. <https://doi.org/10.1111/juaf.12148>
- Heath, S. C., Rabinovich, A., & Barreto, M. (2017). Putting identity into the community: Exploring the social dynamics of urban regeneration. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 47(7), 855–866. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2296>
- Hernes, T. (2007). *Understanding organization as process: Theory for a tangled world* (Vol. 2). Routledge.
- Huggins, R., & Clifton, N. (2011). Competitiveness, creativity, and place-based development. *Environment and Planning A*, 43(6), 1341–1362. <https://doi.org/10.1068/a43559>
- Iaione, C. (2016). The CO-city: Sharing, collaborating, cooperating, and commingling in the city. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 75(2), 415–455. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajes.12145>
- Inti, I., Cantaluppi, G., & Persichino, M. (2014). *Temporioso: Manuale per il riuso temporaneo di spazi in abbandono, in Italia* [Temporioso: Manual for the temporary reuse of abandoned spaces, in Italy]. Altra Economia.
- Jackson, W. A. (2005). Capabilities, culture and social structure. *Review of Social Economy*, 63(1), 101–124. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00346760500048048>
- Jessop, B., Moulaert, F., Hulgård, L., & Hamdouch, A. (2013). Social innovation research: A new stage in innovation analysis? In F. Moulaert, D. MacCallum, A. Mehmood, & A. Hamdouch (Eds.), *The international handbook on social innovation: Collective action, social learning and transdisciplinary research* (pp. 110–130). Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Karlsen, J., & Larrea, M. (2014). *Territorial development and action research: Innovation through dialogue*. Routledge.
- KEA European Affairs. (2017). *Culture for cities and regions*. KEA European Affairs. <http://www.cultureforcitiesandregions.eu/>
- Kleinhans, R. (2017). False promises of co-production in neighbourhood regeneration: The case of Dutch community enterprises. *Public Management Review*, 19(10), 1500–1518. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2017.1287941>
- Kleinhans, R., van Ham, M., Reuschke, D., & Syrett, S. (2017). Unravelling the nexus between entrepreneurship, neighborhoods and communities—introduction. In M. van Ham, D. Reuschke, R. Kleinhans, C. Mason, & S. Syrett (Eds.), *Entrepreneurial neighborhoods. Towards an understanding of the economies of neighborhoods and communities* (pp. 1–17). Edward Elgar Publishers.
- Kleinhans, R., Bailey, N., & Lindbergh, J. (2019). How community-based social enterprises struggle with representation and accountability. *Social Enterprise Journal*, 16(1), 60–81. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SEJ-12-2018-0074>
- Lo stato dei Luoghi. (2020). *Rete nazionale di attivatori di luoghi e spazi rigenerati a base culturale* [National network of activators of culturally-based regenerated places and spaces]. <https://www.lostatodeiluoghi.com/chi-siamo/>
- Lowe, J. S. (2004). Community foundations: What do they offer community development? *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 26(2), 221–240. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0735-2166.2004.00198.x>
- Mangialardo, A. (2017). Il social entrepreneur per la valorizzazione del patrimonio immobiliare pubblico [The social entrepreneur for the enhancement of public real estate assets]. *Scienze regionali*, 16(3), 473–480. <https://doi.org/10.14650/87466>
- Mangialardo, A., & Micelli, E. (2017). New bottom-up approaches to enhance public real/estate property. In A. Mangialardo & E. Micelli (Eds.), *Appraisal: From theory to practice* (pp. 53–62). Springer.
- Manzini, E. (2017). La produzione sociale di luoghi in un mondo connesso [The social production of places in a connected world]. In P. Venturi & S. Rago (Eds.), *Da Spazi a Luoghi. Proposte per una nuova ecologia dello sviluppo* [From Spazi in Places. Proposals for a new development ecology] (pp. 101–108). AICCON.

- Markusen, A. (2006). *Cultural planning and the creative city*. Paper presented at the American Collegiate Schools of Planning annual meetings, Ft. Worth, TX.
- Mercer, C. (2006). *Cultural planning for urban development and creative cities*. http://www.kulturplan-oresund.dk/pdf/Shanghai_cultural_planning_paper.pdf
- Mırsırlısoy, D., & Günçe, K. (2016). Adaptive reuse strategies for heritage buildings: A holistic approach. *Sustainable Cities and Society*, 26, 91–98. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2016.05.017>
- Montalto, V., & Saisana, M. (2017). *The cultural and creative cities monitor (C3 Monitor)* (2016 ed.). JRC. <https://doi.org/10.2760/036071>
- Moroni, S., De Franco, A., & Bellè, B. M. (2020). Vacant buildings. Distinguishing heterogeneous cases: Public items versus private items; Empty properties versus abandoned properties. In I. Lami (Ed.), *Abandoned buildings in contemporary cities: Smart conditions for actions* (pp. 9–18). Springer.
- Moulaert, F. (2009). Social innovation: Institutionally embedded, territorially. In D. MacCallum, F. Moulaert, K. Hiller, & V. Haddock (Eds.), *Social innovation and territorial development* (pp. 11–24). Ashgate.
- Moulaert, F., & Van den Broeck, P. (2018). Social innovation and territorial development. In J. Howaldt, C. Kaletka, A. Schröder, & M. Zirngiebl (Eds.), *Atlas of social innovation: New practices for a better future* (pp. 26–29). Sozialforschungsstelle, TU Dortmund University.
- Moulaert, F., MacCallum, D., Mehmood, A., & Hamdouch, A. (Eds.). (2013). *International handbook of social innovation: Social innovation: Collective action, social learning and transdisciplinary research*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Moulaert, F., Swyngedouw, E., Martinelli, F., & Gonzalez, S. (Eds.). (2010). *Can neighbourhoods save the city?: Community development and social innovation*. Routledge.
- Mulgan, G. (2007). *Social innovation. What it is, why it matters and how it can be accelerated*. Young Foundation.
- Mulgan, G., Tucker, S., Ali, R. and Sanders, B. (2007). *Social innovation: What it is, why it matters and how it can be accelerated*. Said Business School.
- Murray, R., Caulier-Grice, J., & Mulgan, G. (2010). *The open book of social innovation*. NESTA.
- Napolitano, M., & Marino, V. (2016). *Cultural heritage e made in Italy. Casi ed esperienze di marketing internazionale* [Cultural heritage and made in Italy. Cases and experiences of international marketing]. Editoriale Scientifica.
- NESTA. (2013). *A manifesto for the creative economy*. NESTA. <http://www.nesta.org.uk/sites/default/files/a-manifesto-for-the-creative-economy-april13.pdf>
- Nuccio, M., & Ponzini, D. (2017). What does a cultural district actually do? Critically reappraising 15 years of cultural district policy in Italy. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 24(4), 405–424. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0969776416643749>
- OECD. (2019). *Under pressure: The squeezed middle class*. <https://doi.org/10.1787/689afed1-en>
- Okano, H., & Samson, D. (2010). Cultural urban branding and creative cities: A theoretical framework for promoting creativity in public spaces. *Cities*, 27, S10–S15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2010.03.005h>
- Orlandini, M., Rago, S., & Venturi, P. (2014). Co-produzione. Ridisegnare i servizi di welfare [Co-production. Redesigning welfare services]. *Aiccon Short Paper*, 1, 2014.
- Palmiotti, D. (2019). *Fondazione Con il Sud avvia il Centro Euromediterraneo di Citizen Science* [Con il Sud Foundation launches the Euro-Mediterranean Center of Citizen Science]. Il Sole 24 ORE. <https://bit.ly/3aHbbHm>
- Peirce, N., & Steinbach, C. (1990). *Enterprising communities: Community-based development in America, 1990*. Council for Community-Based Development.
- Perulli, P. (2016). *The urban contract: Community, governance and capitalism*. Routledge.
- Phelps, N. A. (2012). The sub-creative economy of the suburbs in question. *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, 15(3), 259–271. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1367877911433748>
- Phills, J. A., Deiglmeier, K., & Miller, D. T. (2008). Rediscovering social innovation. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 6(4), 34–43.
- Piemonte, H. (2017). *La (quasi) impresa. Manuale d'uso per operatori culturali* [The (almost) enterprise. User manual for cultural operators]. Gruppo 24 ore.
- Potts, J., Hartley, J., Banks, J., Burgess, J., Cobcroft, R., Cunningham, S., & Montgomery, L. (2008). Consumer co-creation and situated creativity. *Industry and Innovation*, 15(5), 459–474. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13662710802373783>
- Pratt, A. C. (2015). Resilience, locality and the cultural economy. *City, Culture and Society*, 6(3), 61–67. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ccs.2014.11.001>
- Pulignano, V., Ortiz Gervasi, L., & De Franceschi, F. (2016). Union responses to precarious workers: Italy and Spain compared. *European Journal of Industrial Relations*, 22(1), 39–55. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0959680115621410>
- Redaelli, E. (2019). *Connecting arts and place: Cultural policy and American cities*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Rete delle case di quartiere. (2018). *VIS Valutazione Impatto Sociale Casa del Quartiere di San Salvario* [VIS Social Impact Assessment of the San Salvario Neighborhood House]. Agenzia per lo Sviluppo Locale di San Salvario Onlus. <https://agenziasansalvarioblog.files.wordpress.com/2019/07/vis-sansalvario-2018.pdf>
- Rete delle case di quartiere. (2019). *Rete delle case di quartiere* [Network of neighborhood houses]. <http://www.retecasedelquartiere.org/>

- Reynaud, C., & Miccoli, S. (2019). Population ageing in Italy after the 2008 economic crisis: A demographic approach. *Futures*, 105, 17–26.
- Rifkin, J. (2014). *The zero marginal cost society: The internet of things, the collaborative commons, and the eclipse of capitalism*. Palgrave Macmillan, St. Martin's Press division.
- Rodwell, D. (2014). Heritage as a driver for creative cities. In D. Wiktor-Mach & P. Radwański (Eds.), *The idea of creative city: The urban policy debate Cracow 17–18 October 2013* (pp. 11–26). European Scientific Institute.
- Roodhouse, S. (Ed.). (2010). *Cultural quarters: Principles and practice*. Intellect Books.
- Rothman, J., & Zald, M. N. (1985). Planning theory in social work community practice. In S. Taylor & R. Roberts (Eds.), *Theory and practice of community social work* (pp. 125–153). Columbia University Press.
- Rushton, M. (2015). Cultural districts and economic development in American cities. *Poetics*, 49, 20–29. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2015.02.003>
- Sacco, P., Ferilli, G., & Tavano Blessi, G. (2018). From culture 1.0 to culture 3.0: Three socio-technical regimes of social and economic value creation through culture, and their impact on European cohesion policies. *Sustainability*, 10(11), 3923. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su10113923>
- Santagata, W. (2009). *White paper on creativity. Towards an Italian model of development*. Citeseer.
- Sarti, S., & Zella, S. (2016). Changes in the labour market and health inequalities during the years of the recent economic downturn in Italy. *Social Science Research*, 57, 116–132. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2015.12.010>
- Saunders, T., & Mulgan, G. (2017). *Governing with collective intelligence*. NESTA.
- Scaffidi, F. (2019). Soft power in recycling spaces: Exploring spatial impacts of regeneration and youth entrepreneurship in Southern Italy. *Local Economy*, 34(7), 632–656. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0269094219891647>
- Scott, A. J. (2006). Creative cities: Conceptual issues and policy questions. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 28(1), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0735-2166.2006.00256.x>
- Sforzi, J., & Bianchi, M. (2020). Fostering social capital: The case of community-owned pubs. *Social Enterprise Journal*, 16(3), 281–297. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SEJ-07-2019-0050>
- Shade, L. R., & Jacobson, J. (2015). Hungry for the job: Gender, unpaid internships, and the creative industries. *The Sociological Review*, 63(1_suppl), 188–205. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-954X.12249>
- Solima, L. (2005). *L'impresa culturale: Processi e strumenti di gestione (Manuali un)* [The cultural enterprise: Processes and management tools (Manuals a)]. Carocci editore.
- Sonda, G. (2016, Novembre-Dicembre). Taranto: A social innovation lab. Bottom-up urban regeneration practices. *Tafters Journal*, 91. <http://bit.ly/2HY8mmT>
- Stilgoe, J., Owen, R., & Macnaghten, P. (2013). Developing a framework for responsible innovation. *Research Policy*, 42(9), 1568–1580. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2013.05.008>
- Su, R., Bramwell, B., & Whalley, P. A. (2018). Cultural political economy and urban heritage tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 68, 30–40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2017.11.004>
- Sung, H., Kushner, R. J., & Hager, M. A. (2020). Exploring the dimensional structure of the arts in communities. In R. Phillips, M. A. Brennan, & L. Tingxuan (Eds.), *Culture, community, and development* (pp. 59–72). Routledge.
- Tengberg, A., Fredholm, S., Eliasson, I., Knez, I., Saltzman, K., & Wetterberg, O. (2012). Cultural ecosystem services provided by landscapes: Assessment of heritage values and identity. *Ecosystem Services*, 2, 14–26. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoser.2012.07.006>
- Throsby, D. (2008). The concentric circles model of the cultural industries. *Cultural Trends*, 17(3), 147–164. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09548960802361951>
- Timeus, K., & Gascó, M. (2018). Increasing innovation capacity in city governments: Do innovation labs make a difference? *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 40(7), 992–1008. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07352166.2018.1431049>
- Tönurist, P., Kattel, R., & Lember, V. (2017). Innovation labs in the public sector: What they are and what they do? *Public Management Review*, 19(10), 1455–1479. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2017.1287939>
- Torre, A. (2014). Proximity relations at the heart of territorial development processes: From clusters, spatial conflicts and temporary geographical proximity to territorial governance. In A. Torre & F. Wallet (Eds.), *Regional development and proximity relations* (pp. 94–134). Edward Elgar.
- Tracey, P., Phillips, N., & Haugh, H. (2005). Beyond philanthropy: Community enterprise as a basis for corporate citizenship. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 58(4), 327–344. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-004-6944-x>
- Tremblay, D. G., & Pilati, T. (2013). Social innovation through arts and creativity. In F. Moulaert, D. MacCallum, A. Mehmood, & A. Hamdouch (Eds.), *The international handbook on social innovation: Collective action, social learning and transdisciplinary research* (pp. 67–79). Edward Elgar.
- Tricarico, L. (2014). *Imprese di Comunità nelle Politiche di Rigenerazione Urbana: Definire ed Inquadrare il Contesto Italiano, Euricse Working Papers 68x14* [Community Enterprises in Urban Regeneration Policies: Define and Frame the Italian Context, Euricse Working Papers 68 × 14]. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2439144>
- Tricarico, L. (2016). Imprese di comunità come fattore territoriale: Riflessioni a partire dal contesto italiano [Community enterprises as a territorial factor: Reflections starting from the Italian context]. *CRIOS*, 11(11), 35–50. <https://doi.org/10.3280/CRIOS2016-011004>
- Tricarico, L. (2017). Community action: Value or instrument? An ethics and planning critical review. *Journal of Architecture and Urbanism*, 41(3), 221–233. <https://doi.org/10.3846/20297955.2017.1355278>

- Tricarico, L. (2018a). Community energy enterprises in the distributed energy geography. *International Journal of Sustainable Energy Planning and Management*, 18, 81–94. <https://somaesthetics.aau.dk/index.php/sepm/article/view/2348>
- Tricarico, L. (2018b). Impresa culturale, impatto sociale e territorio: Nuovi approcci e strategie di sviluppo [Cultural enterprises, social impact and territory: New approaches and development strategies]. In G. M. Caroli (Ed.), *Evidenze sull'innovazione sociale e sostenibilità in Italia: IV Rapporto CERIS sull'Innovazione Sociale* [Evidence on social innovation and sustainability in Italy: IV CERIS Report on Social Innovation] (pp. 107–127). Franco Angeli.
- Tricarico, L., Galimberti, A., Campanaro, A., Magoni, C., & Labra, M. (2020). Experimenting with RRI tools to drive sustainable agri-food research: The SASS case study from Sub-Saharan Africa. *Sustainability*, 12(3), 827. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12030827>
- Tricarico, L., & Geissler, J. B. (2017). The food territory: Cultural identity as local facilitator in the gastronomy sector, the case of Lyon. *City, Territory and Architecture*, 4(1), 16. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40410-017-0072-2>
- Tricarico, L., & Le Xuan, S. (2014). *Imprese Comuni. Community enterprises e rigenerazione urbana nel Regno Unito* [Common Enterprises. Community enterprises and urban regeneration in the UK]. Maggioli.
- Tricarico, L., & Pacchi, C. (2018). Community entrepreneurship and co-production in urban development. *Territorio*, 87, 69–77.
- Tricarico, L., Quaglia, S., & Sganzzetta, L. (2018). Community entrepreneurship in sustainable food places. *Territorio*, 87, 105–112. <https://doi.org/10.3280/TR2018-087017>
- Tricarico, L., & Zandonai, F. (2018). *Local Italy: I domini del settore comunità in Italia* [Local Italy: The domains of the community sector in Italy]. Fondazione Giangiacomo Feltrinelli.
- UNESCO. (2003). *Convention for the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage*. Paris. http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=17716&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html#STATE_PARTIES
- UNESCO. (2005). *Convention on the protection and promotion of the diversity of cultural expressions*. UNESCO. http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=31038&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html
- Unioncamere-Fondazione Symbola. (2016). *Io sono Cultura - 2016. L'Italia della qualità e della bellezza sfida la crisi* [I am Culture - 2016. The Italy of quality and beauty challenges the crisis]. Unioncamere. <https://bit.ly/3aEPqbh>
- Unioncamere-Fondazione Symbola. (2017). *Io sono Cultura - 2017. L'Italia della qualità e della bellezza sfida la crisi* [I am Culture - 2017. The Italy of quality and beauty challenges the crisis]. Unioncamere. <https://bit.ly/3aEPqbh>
- Unioncamere-Fondazione Symbola. (2018). *Io sono Cultura - 2018. L'Italia della qualità e della bellezza sfida la crisi* [I am Culture - 2018. The Italy of quality and beauty challenges the crisis]. Unioncamere. <https://bit.ly/3aEPqbh>
- Untaru, S. (2002). Regulatory frameworks for place-based planning. *Urban Policy and Research*, 20(2), 169–186. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0811140220144470>
- Valentino, P. A. (2013). L'impresa culturale e creativa: Verso una definizione condivisa [The cultural and creative enterprise: Towards a shared definition]. *Economia Della Cultura*, 23(3), 273–288. <https://doi.org/10.1446/74832>
- Venturi, P., & Zandonai, F. (2016). *Imprese ibride: Modelli d'innovazione sociale per rigenerare valori* [Hybrid companies: Models of social innovation to regenerate values]. EGEA.
- Virani, T. E. (2019). Exploring the relationship between creative hubs and urban policy in East London. In R. Gill, A. Pratt, & T. Virani (Eds.), *Creative hubs in question. Dynamics of virtual work* (pp. 341–358). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Waitt, G., & Gibson, C. (2009). Creative small cities: Rethinking the creative economy in place. *Urban Studies*, 46(5–6), 1223–1246. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098009103862>
- Wang, H., & Zeng, Z. (2010). A multi-objective decision-making process for reuse selection of historic buildings. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 37(2), 1241–1249. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2009.06.034>
- Willis, M. A. (2004). Living cities: Collaborative investing for healthy neighborhoods. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 26(2), 139–149. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0735-2166.2004.00192.x>
- Yin, R. J. (1994). Designing case studies. In R. K. Yin (Ed.), *Case study research: Design and methods* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Yin, R. K. (2013). Validity and generalization in future case study evaluations. *Evaluation*, 19(3), 321–332.
- Zamagni, S. (2017). I luoghi dell'economia civile per lo sviluppo sostenibile [The places of the civil economy for sustainable development]. In P. Venturi & S. Rago (Eds.), *Da spazi a luoghi. Proposte per una nuova ecologia dello sviluppo* [From spaces to places. Proposals for a new development ecology] (pp. 11–20). AICCON.

**FOR FULL ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT VERSION
CONTACT lricarico@luiss.it**