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Abstract

The creative industries are booming in terms of growth in employment both in Denmark and internationally. It appears that the leading commodity today, is the human ability to be creative. However, in the realm of creative production only the final creative outcome is valued, and thereby merely assumes that the input is creative. If the creative input i.e. creativity is not explored then this could leave a gap in unexplored potential in this new leading commodity.

Creative industries value creative production, i.e. tangible products or services with intangible value. These products or services must to some extent be novel, original, or artistic; but the extent to which they are this, is determined by professional critics and stakeholders.

One industry which is also booming is gastronomy, and especially in Denmark with the emergence of the New Nordic Cuisine and the international success of Noma. Gastronomy is not recognised as a creative industry despite this international acclaim. Gastronomy does differ from the normal conception of creativity, which subscribes that creative people thrive with freedom and autonomy. Gastronomy is organised by means of structure, hierarchy and values craftsmanship and skills, but nevertheless the outcome is often novel and original and also artistic as it is an experience for the diner.

This project explores the connection between art and craft in creative industries and in gastronomy, in order to answer the research questions of this project which are; why gastronomy is not considered a creative industry?; and how does a structured approach to creativity influence creative performance?

The project concludes that some gastronomic outcome is novel, original and artistic. It is therefore concluded that the reason why gastronomy is not considered a creative industry is due to the lack of recognition within the domain. The project also concludes that within gastronomy, creativity is induced by means of skills, which are applied in a structured process to create new dishes. It is concluded that with guidelines such as the New Nordic Cuisine Manifesto, the limitation of only using seasonal products set a clear task and a challenge that induced creative performance in gastronomy.
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“Minds are like parachutes – they only function when they are open.”
- Sir Thomas Robert Dewar (1864 - 1930)
1. **INTRODUCTION**

The human brain is infinite, or at the very least unexplored, with infinite possibilities. The same can be said for creativity and creative thinking; it remains unexplored with infinite possibilities. Some would argue that we are now in a knowledge-based economy in which knowledge and information are the focus of business endeavours (Bowditch 2005). Others argue that we have moved past that and into an experience-based economy in which production should be differentiated by means of experience (Pine 1998). Finally, there are those who argue that we are now in a creativity-based economy, in which production is differentiated based on its creative and intangible value (Howkins 2002).

According to a mapping of the creative economy in the UK, conducted by the Department for Culture Media and Sport (DCMS) in 2008, the creative industries were among the most important contributors to the economy in the UK, mainly due to the growth in employment (Higgs 2008). Creative workers are important, and increasingly it appears, in today's economy. A Danish mapping from 2011, conducted by the Danish Enterprise and Construction Authority's division for research and analysis (FORA), saw a similar pattern in growth in employment in the creative cluster in Copenhagen. The mapping found that the creative industries are among the most innovative in Denmark, in terms of production and service (Rosted, 2011).

The Danish creative industries are booming. The mapping conducted by FORA (Rosted 2011) indicates that software, computer games, social media & web services, advertising, media, radio & TV, fashion, cinema, art and crafts, architecture, design, performing arts, museums and galleries were all booming in employment growth. The mapping found that the demand for creative production is high, also internationally (Rosted 2011). This gives export opportunities, and therefore international recognition of creative production is important.

Denmark is indeed apparent on the international scene and this is much due to the gastronomic endeavours in recent years. Denmark is praised for its gastronomic endeavours and an article in New York Times from 2011 (Moskin 2011) speaks of the *Nordic invasion*, with a headline stating that the *New Nordic Cuisine Draws Disciples*. Copenhagen-based restaurant Noma was in 2010 and 2011 named the world’s best restaurant (S. Pellegrino 2010; S. Pellegrino 2011). In 2011, Danish Chef Rasmus Kofoed won the title as world's finest chef at
Bocuse d’Or which, “(...) is famous for highlighting tremendous talent like no other event can (…), bringing together technical skills and creativity.” (Bocuse d’Or 2011).

Despite the international acclaim and recognition, gastronomy is not considered a creative industry according to most scholars or the mappings on the creative economy (Higgs 2008, Rosted 2011). The creative economy values creative production. But it would appear that focus is on the finished outcome since it is only at this point that it can be recognised and valued as creative production. It appears that something is not creative until someone says it is, or indeed the right people say it is. This might be a reason why the creativity-based economy appears to be restricted only to a selected few industries. These are recognised for their creative output and the people employed in these industries are therefore deemed creative. Due to the restricted nature of the creative economy, it appears that creative production is a case of art for art’s sake, and thereby only possible for those which are creative (Caves 2002).

But even Pablo Picasso and other Spanish artists were inspired by gastronomy in their Bodegón paintings, depicting various foods. The paintings are recognised as art and creative production, but the motives are not. Perhaps gastronomy is simply not recognised as creative yet?

As mentioned above, the creative economy values creative production and thereby only on outcome, and it appears that the process behind creative production is not considered. This leaves a rather big gap since creative production could quickly become a limited resource. But what happens, when the musician cannot compose a new number one record, the artist cannot paint a new work of art, or the director a new theatre production? Does this mean that these artists are no longer inspired or indeed creative? And is the creative economy thus confined to random ideas? If this is the case then the creative economy would be based on a numerous case of one-hit wonders. But this does not appear to be the case if, as argued by the mappings conducted by the DCMS (Higgs 2008) and FORA (Rosted 2011), the creative economy is booming in growth.

A common question asked when fashion designers present their collection is, what inspired you? But inspiration could merely represent a starting point and does not say much about
the process of getting from A to B. And what happens when the inspiration is no longer there? If indeed creativity is viewed as a completely organic process, then it is not a process which could be managed, encouraged or even used as a strategic tool to gain competitive advantage, which is something that the creative economy values. This focus on creativity as an entirely organic process could leave a huge gap in unexplored potential. Therefore it would seem relevant to explore the process of creative production.

One myth surrounding creative industries and creative workers is that they succeed because they are not restricted by the rules that other industries are, and that they have more autonomy and freedom to be creative (Florida 2003). But this myth appears to hold some flaws. In theatre for instance, none of the actors are driven by autonomy or freedom. They have a predefined character, and a script and know exactly what to do and when, and theatre is in that sense structured and managed. But the performing arts are nevertheless recognised as a creative industry (Higgs 2008).

It appears that production and organisation in gastronomy is hierarchical, rule-driven and indeed very structured and traditional. Despite this very structured system, restaurants around the world continue to produce creative outcome. Aesthetically beautiful dishes, which are seasonally inspired like a fashion collection, designed like architectural structures, visually presented to appetize, and composed like a symphony to evoke emotions. These dishes are meticulously prepared and take hours of work in the kitchen before the finished result can be presented. But once the finished dish is presented, it is theatrically played out; it is as an experience.

Gastronomy could thus be an example of an industry, in which creativity thrives with rules and guidelines, rather than total autonomy. If creativity is not regarded as an entirely organic process, it could be regarded as a human ability that can be improved through skills, education and extensive knowledge.

If a restaurant like Noma can continuously produce creative outcome, in an environment which values training and skills and is highly structured and rule-based, then perhaps there is something to be learned from this way of grasping creativity? As Richard Florida (2003) notes in his book on the Creative Class, “Only by understanding the rise of this new class and
its values can we begin to understand the sweeping and seemingly disjointed changes in our society and begin to shape our future more intelligently” (Florida 2003: xxvii).

1.1. RESEARCH QUESTIONS
The object of this project has resulted in the following research questions:

- Why is gastronomy not considered a creative industry?
- How does a structured approach to creativity influence creative performance?

1.2. METHODOLOGY
The methodological approach will be outlined in the following to define the empirical and social foundations of the project. In order to establish the relevance of this project, the underlying assumptions and implications of the research will be outlined. This will be done by outlining the research philosophy which formed the foundation of the research design chosen, in order to explore the research questions of this project.

1.2.1 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES
From studies and literature research on the field of creative industries, it became apparent that gastronomy was not included in the definitions presented. From the basic findings on the field of creative industries, it was assumed that gastronomy could be fall under the definition of a creative industry. This assumption thus formed the first objective of the project; to explore why gastronomy is not considered a creative industry. The studies and literature research on the field of creative industries outlined another finding; that in the literature on creative industries it was argued that creativity unfolds when people experience autonomy and freedom. This formed the basis for the second objective of this project; to explore how a structured approach to creativity influences creative performance. It was therefore assumed that gastronomy and the work of chefs would function as a valid example of an industry which adopts a structured approach to creativity and thereby enhances creative performance. Another implication for the relevance of this project was formed from observations on the growing interest of the New Nordic Cuisine both in Denmark and internationally. Conse-
quently, the New Nordic Cuisine was included in the research of this project to derive a conclusion that was current and relevant.

1.2.2 RESEARCH PHILOSOPHY

The assumptions which came to define the research questions of the project are based on findings in existing literature and empirical data. In this sense it is believed that the theoretical basis of the literature in creative industries is valid and relevant. In a historical perspective the literature on creative industries is, however, somewhat new and it was therefore relevant to explore the scope of the field in order to detect potential gaps. Therefore the ontological stance of this project is not based on a priori reasoning and it was therefore relevant to explore the social and empirical world in order to develop a grounded approach (Esterberg 2002).

The ontological stance of the project resulted in an inductive research approach (Justesen 2010). Due to the observations made in the literary field of creative industries, which formed the basis of the research objectives of this project, inductive argumentation was applied in order to explore the more general principles of the field. Since the research questions of the project were based on assumptions, an inductive approach would support this, believing that the findings of the project would follow probable reasoning (Esterberg 2002). Probable reasoning suggests that the findings could be applied to general principles (Esterberg 2002).

It was observed that the literature on creative industries and the herein definition of these industries did not include gastronomy. It was therefore relevant to examine both the empirical data on creative industries and on gastronomy. The empirical data on creative industries was explored in order to explore the gap that was present in the existing literature of creative industries. It was also relevant to examine the social world in order to add other perspectives to the two empirical fields.

The epistemological position of the research is therefore phenomenology. As stated before, the ontological stance of this project is not based on a priori reasoning but rather an empirical and social a posteriori reasoning derived from personal, empirical and social consciousness. (Kant 1781). This reasoning introduced by Immanuel Kant (1781) supposes that while we do inherit some form of preconceived realisation (a priori) independent of experience,
justified and grounded experience is derived from empirical realisation (a posteriori). In this sense a justified and grounded a posteriori reasoning is applied in order to analyse and illustrate the empirical research findings of this project. This therefore supposes that the research of this project is conducted with analytical and critical approach and reasoning.

1.2.3 Research Strategy
The phenomenological approach implies, first and foremost, that the aim of this project is to describe and understand social and empirical phenomena. This implies that the research is not only grounded in empirical data but also in social context (Justesen 2010). Therefore secondary data was collected and analysed. The secondary data includes both grounded theory and also articles and research papers to ensure that the empirical data is current and relevant. This was also applied not only in terms of facilitating a critical framework for the research, but also in facilitating new findings in terms of constructing or reconstructing data. In order to gain insight and apply the research in a social context, a qualitative research approach was relevant as primary data. The qualitative approach is applied to gain insight into the perspective and thoughts of others in order to understand social and psychological phenomena (Gronewald 2004). The qualitative research approach followed that participants, deemed relevant for the purpose of answering the research questions, were chosen.

1.2.3.1. Secondary data
The purpose of collecting secondary data was to understand the scope of creative industries and creative production in terms of value creation. Therefore, the literary field of creative-industries and production was researched and relevant empirical data was applied. This field is thus explored on the basis of literature from Richard Caves (2002), James Bowditch & Anthony Buono (Bowditch 2005), Gareth Morgan (1997) John Howkins (2002), Richard Florida (2003) and David Hesmondhalgh (2007). To apply a relevant and updated view, mappings on the creative economy conducted by the DCMS (Higgs 2008) and FORA (Rosted 2011) were also researched. To understand the full scope of creative production it was relevant to explore the field of creativity to understand the underlying social and psychological implications of the field. This field was explored by literature and research conducted by Teresa Amabile (1996; 1998) and Mihalyi Csikszentmihalyi (1997).
With the project objectives in mind, it was relevant to understand the scope of gastronomy in terms of historical and cultural implications. Therefore, the literary field of gastronomy was explored on the basis of literature by Linda Civitello (2004), Amy Trubek (2000), Priscilla Clark (1975), Bent Dahl et al. (2009), Richard Wrangham (2009) Phyllis Bober (1999), Prosper Montagnè (1977), Andrew Dornenburg and Karen Page (Dornenburg 1996). In order to narrow the scope of the project and ensure that research was relevant and current, the New Nordic Cuisine Manifesto (Risvik 2008) was explored.

Once the theoretical framework was explored it became apparent that both the literary field of creative production and gastronomy needed to be explored further, in order to apply an objective and critical view. This was done by means of various articles from periodicals, research papers and articles from print-and online media. To answer the second research question, a research conducted by Michael Ottenbacher and Robert Harrington (Ottenbacher 2007) was applied. Their research presents the Innovation Development Process of Michelin-starred Chefs (Ottenbacher 2007). According to Ottenbacher and Harrington (Ottenbacher 2007) the aim of the research was to understand how Michelin-star chefs “develop new food creations in their restaurants” (Ottenbacher 2007: 444). The research was conducted by means of semi-structured interviews with Michelin-started chefs in Germany and resulted in an innovation process model.

With the topic in mind it was important to get a current and updated view and for this purpose documentaries and interviews were also explored. The documentary The World’s Finest Chef on Rasmus Kofoed’s preparation and participation at Bocuse d’Or 2011 (Dinesen 2011) and the DR1 TV documentary Noma på Kogepunktet (Noma at Boiling Point) on the life in the kitchen of Noma (Vorting 2008) were watched evaluated and applied. Also the BBC programme HARD dtalk in which host Stephen Sackur visits Noma and interviews René Redzepi (Sackur 2012), was applied. The programme was originally broadcasted on TV, but this was only available in the UK. It was later aired on BBC Radio, where the author listened to it (Sackur 2012).

During the course of the research, the secondary data was compared as it was collected, thus ensuring a critical framework for the research and the data collection.
1.2.3.2. Primary Data
The qualitative approach was applied in order to ensure that the research of this project was also grounded in social reflection. Due to the explorative aim of this project, primary data was collected in the form of interviews, in order to make sense of the implied phenomena of the empirical data. Therefore, empirical first-hand data was construed by means of interviews.

To get the wide scope of the project, notable people with relation to the field of gastronomy were selected. In that sense, it was assumed that it would not be relevant to interview several chefs to get their take on creative production as this would be one-directional. Due to the inductive approach adopted, the literature suggested that the domain plays a notable role in the field of creative industries. Based on these findings six prominent people with relevance within the field of gastronomy and the New Nordic Cuisine were selected. These were: Claus Meyer, founder of the New Nordic Cuisine Manifesto; Niels Lillelund, food and wine critic at Politiken; René Redzepi, chef at Noma; Thorsten Vildgaard, creative sous-chef at Noma; Rasmus Kofoed, chef at Geranium; and Adam Aamann, chef and founder of Aamanns Etablissement. These people were approached by e-mail or phone in the fall of 2011 and this resulted in three interview participants; Claus Meyer, Niels Lillelund and Torsten Vildgaard. René Redzepi, Rasmus Kofoed and Adam Aamann declined due to busy schedules. Because of this, secondary data was instead sampled on the three in the form of articles and documentary films and a radio programme. These are accounted for in the outline of the secondary data.

1.2.3.2.1. INTERVIEWS
The interviews were construed as semi-structured interviews (Justesen 2010). This means that an interview guide was prepared with themes and central questions. The semi-structured interview was chosen as it is argued that this form of interview allows the interviewer to ask the interviewees the same central questions, adapted according to their position in relation to the purpose of the research (Justesen 2010). As the interviewees all had different professions, their reflections had different purposes for the research. Also the semi-structured interview was applied in order to ask open questions and also follow-up questions to interesting topics proposed by the interviewees during the course of the interviews. Considering the phenomenological stance of this project, the purpose of the inter-
views was to understand, rather than explain the social phenomena from the perspective of the interviewees (Justesen 2010).

1.2.3.2.2. SELECTION OF INTERVIEWEES
The interviewees were chosen based on their profession and prominence. Thus, they all had different professions and were therefore believed to give insight into three different perspectives deemed relevant for the purpose of this project. In that sense the reason for choosing interviewees with different professions was to generate data-triangulation (Groenwald 2004) and thereby contrast the data and gain insight into different perspectives on the field. Consequently, Claus Meyer was chosen as the first interviewee as he is a co-founder of the New Nordic Cuisine Manifesto. Claus Meyer is a prominent and visible character in the field of gastronomy and it was deemed relevant to gain insight into the underlying reasons behind the New Nordic Cuisine. The second interviewee was chosen to gain insight into the domain and critical view on gastronomy. In this sense it was deemed relevant to interview Niels Lillelund as he is a journalist and a professional food -and wine critic with many years of experience in the field. The third interviewee was chosen to represent the field of gastronomy from a practical stance. It was therefore deemed relevant to gain insight into the perspective of a chef and Torsten Vildgaard was chosen as he is creative sous-chef at the current number one restaurant in the world; Noma.

1.2.3.2.3. INTERVIEW PROCEDURE
The interviews were conducted by the author of this project and conducted in the mother-tongue of the author and the interviewees; Danish. The interviews were all conducted in the course of November 2011 with face-to-face meetings with the interviewees, and took place in locations in Copenhagen chosen by the interviewees. The interviews varied in length from 15-40 minutes. The interviews were recorded and later transcribed. The transcribed interviews were later translated into English by the author. In translating from one language to another some meaning might be distorted, however, the author attempted to translate the interviews in a manner that was true and respectful to the original meaning.
1.2.3.3. Methodological Reflection

Given the explorative nature of this project, the qualitative research method was considered to be the most appropriate. However, it should be noted that the qualitative research method can hold some bias. It is argued that the role and beliefs of the interviewer can to some extent influence the perspectives of the interviewees. Therefore the interviews were recorded and transcribed in order for the author to detect any such bias or leading questions and consider the ramifications of this. However, due to the phenomenological stance of this project, it is the intention of the research to understand the perspectives of the interviewees and in that sense not determine a case of right and wrong (Justesen 2010). This stance also implies that experience occurs through empirical and social realisation and therefore the interviews were reflected upon after they were completed.

In this case the interviews were recorded and later transcribed. Technical aspects therefore also play a role as background noise can distort the interview. In this case, the interview with Claus Meyers was not recorded from the beginning of the meeting, due to technical difficulties. This initial non-recorded part of a couple of minutes was introductive conversation therefore it is not believed to have to construed the meaning of the interview. However, only the recorded part of the interview was included in the reflections of the data.

It should be noted that the author has not been trained in conducting interviews, apart from theoretical knowledge obtained through tutorial studies. This may have implications for how the interviews were structured and conducted and consequently the findings. However, the reflections made on the interviews are believed to have reduced any bias on the part of the author.

In terms of evaluating the findings of qualitative research, it is argues that validity and reliability are mainly applicable to quantitative research (Bryman 2003). In that sense it is argued that qualitative research should be evaluated according to different criteria. Such criteria could according to Bryman and Bell (Bryman 2003) include evaluating if the findings of the qualitative research are trustworthy and authentic. This includes assessing the credibility and transferability of the findings (Bryman 2003). It is believed that the findings are credible as the qualitative research was conducted through means of triangulation. It is assessed that the interviews were conducted using good practice and they were also compared and analysed in accordance with the theoretical findings of the secondary data. It is believed that the findings are transferable to the extent that they facilitated in casting a light
on the secondary data, as the interviews applied social meaning to the data. In that sense the findings of the interviews facilitated in providing depth and details of different domains, which the author might not otherwise have encountered.

1.2.3.3. Delimitation
This project aims at exploring creative industries and creative production. In this sense the realm of economic value is added. However, for the purpose of this project economical aspects will only include the analysis of tangible and intangible production but not in terms of monetary and economic value. Intangible products are often differentiated by means of intellectual property law and rights. However this field will not be explored in this project. This follows that the aim of this project is to explore why gastronomy is not considered a creative industry. It is therefore not relevant to discuss if gastronomy should fall under such protection, as it is not currently recognised within the creative economy. To that it should be noted that the aim of this project is not to distinguish the value of gastronomic output. The project does recognise that there are many variations of production within the field of gastronomy but it is not the aim of this project to make such a distinction.

Finally, the project is interested in exploring creative production by means of creative input. However, for the scope of this project this will not include exploring in depth research of cognitive psychological aspect but will instead consist of general notions on the field of creativity.
1.3. **THESIS STRUCTURE**
The thesis is divided into three parts and this section will briefly outline the structure of the thesis.

Part one will present the two central fields of creative production and gastronomy, narrowing down the field of creative production from outcome to input and the field of gastronomy from past to present.

Part two will analyse the coherence between the two central fields and outline central concept of creative production and creativity in order to answer the research questions of the project.

Part three will discuss the central topics of this project and put these into perspective. Finally a conclusion will be made on the findings of this project.
PART ONE

“Tell me what you eat, and I will tell you what you are.”
- Jean Anthelme Brillat-Savarin (The Physiology of Taste 1825)
2. Introduction to Part One
The literature on gastronomy as a creative industry is rather limited. This is due to the fact that gastronomy is not considered in the definitions on creative industries. This project is interested in exploring the field of creativity as a human ability and a means for creative production. Before exploring the field of creativity, the project will first present the current field of creativity as an economic resource from the terms The Creative Economy by John Howkins (2002) The Creative Class by Richard Florida (2003) and the Creative Industries by Richard Caves (2002).

Indeed this project finds it problematic that an economy based on the value of creative outcome fails to address the implications of input. Therefore, to explore the full scope, it is relevant to understand the field of creative production (outcome) in terms of the creative economy; the creative class and creative industries before narrowing the scope and exploring creativity (input) in terms of creative processes and performance.

2.1. The Importance of Creativity
Creativity is often conceived as artistic expression. According to Teresa Amabile (1998), “We tend to associate creativity with the arts and to think of it as the expression of highly original ideas.” (Amabile 1998: 78). Original ideas are not a new concept in the realm of business, in terms of innovate production, but as Amabile (1998) notes “[…] in business, originality is not enough. To be creative, an idea must also be appropriate – useful and actionable.” (Amabile 1998: 78). Creativity and creative production have mainly been perceived as belonging to those that cultivated it, such as artists, designers, actors, singers etc. who were most likely perceived as having a special “talent”.

In that sense, creativity is a rather limited resource if it requires having a special “talent”. If, on the other hand, creativity is perceived as a human ability, one which we all possess and can cultivate, then it suddenly becomes a much larger resource, and in terms of business; a resource which can generate new and original ideas. Perceiving creativity as a limited resource could be a reason why many businesses have chosen to specialise innovation to one department, such as research and development or have chosen to outsource it in terms of marketing and advertising. Thus the notion of integrating creativity in business and cultivat-
ing it as a strategic tool is rather new. Therefore the idea of integrating and cultivating creativity as a strategic tool, and an innate ability, is also rather new.

In order to understand creativity and creative production, it is relevant to explore the realm of the creative economy and the creative industries. This will provide the full scope of creative production in terms of historical implications of creativity as an economic commodity. Once the field of creative production has been explored then the scope can be narrowed down to exploring the area of creativity the processes that go into creative production and consequently influence creative performance.

### 2.1.1. Creative Production

Bowditch and Buono (2005) argue that business is all about optimising, and especially on optimising human labour. In the Agricultural age, focus was on land and the human physical input, which after the invention of machines went through a transition and led to the Industrial Age (Bowditch 2005). In the Industrial Age focus was put on raw materials and ways of making physical labour and manufacturing more efficient. This machine focus underwent another transition once technological advances made physical labour more redundant, and gave rise to the Post-Industrial Age (Bowditch 2005). The Post-industrial Age focuses on intellectual technology and puts information and knowledge as a leading commodity for industries (Bowditch 2005). The post-industrial age focuses on optimising labour with human intellect and knowledge and thus gave rise to the Knowledge Economy “[...] where human intelligence, creativity, and insight is the key resource [...].” (Morgan 1997: 116).

Instead of merely focusing on the human body as a means for labour, the human brain is now in focus. This increasing focus on human intelligence and creativity saw the birth with the experience economy and the creative economy (Bowditch 2005).

The experience economy was described by Pine and Gilmore (1998) who state that, “An experience occurs when a company intentionally uses service as the stage, and goods as props, to engage individual customers in a way that creates a memorable event.” (Pine 1998: 98). The core of the experience economy is that businesses should apply an experience to a product or service to defeat competition. As implied, the focus is therefore on the ability of creating and staging an event and not on creativity as an innate ability in itself.
It appears that experience and creativity are both important in the mind of the consumer. The two terms are therefore not mutually exclusive but rather two concepts that can complement each other. However, the scope of the experience economy offers too narrow a scope on creativity and the creative efforts that must be present in order to create an experience.

2.1.2. THE CREATIVE ECONOMY

The term the Creative Economy was introduced by John Howkins (2002) in an effort to combine creativity and economics to create extraordinary value. His definition focuses on creativity as a tool to actively defeat competition. According to Howkins, “[…] people with ideas […] have become more powerful than people who work machines.” (Howkins 2002: ix). Richard Florida (2003) supports this notion, stating that, “Human creativity is the ultimate economic resource.” (Florida 2003: xiii).

In this view, creativity is thus a human resource and an ability which can be cultivated and used economically. At the core of the creative economy, Howkins (2002) defines 15 sectors; advertising, architecture, art, crafts, design, fashion, film, music, performing arts, publishing, research and development, software, toys and games, TV and radio, and video games (figure 1). Howkins (2002) is mainly interested in the protection of creativity in terms of intellectual property law; copyright, patent, trademark and design.

In Howkins’ view creativity is a talent and an aptitude which must be present in both thought and action (Howkins 2002). Howkins therefore claims that creativity can become an economic asset, when creative efforts result in a product or service. The main problem, however, in dealing with creativity is that the product or service often has intangible assets and these must, according to Howkins (2002) be protected by means of intellectual property law. Like the experience economy, the creative economy does not offer a full scope of the creative process that goes into creative production. The creative economy merely assumes that it does exist. The problem with the definition proposed by Howkins (2002) is that he bases a new economy on creativity, but neglects to offer a definition of the production; i.e. that process that goes into creative production and thus creates economic value.
2.1.3. **Creative Industries**

The realm of creativity can be defined from an economic stance as it includes the production of goods and service. Another focus on this is more industry and thereby production based. Richard Caves (2002) defines the creative industries as those "[...] supplying goods and services that we broadly associate with cultural, artistic, or simply entertainment value." (Caves 2002: 1).

This definition entails that a creative industry is one, which supplies products and services, thus an industry, but the product or service must have creative contents. Caves (2002) argues that creative industries include book and magazine publishing, the visual arts, the performing arts, sound recordings, cinema and TV films, even fashion and toys and games (figure 1). Great emphasis is placed on the artistic and cultural value of the goods and services supplied. These factors appear to distinguish creative industries from other industries which focus more on industrial aspects of production. The emphasis on the cultural and artistic is shared by David Hesmondhalgh (2007) in his definition of the Cultural Industries, which he defines "[...] as those institutions [...] that are most directly involved in the production of social meaning." (Hesmondhalgh 2007: 12). In this definition greater emphasis is placed on cultural value and less on creative value. According to Hesmondhalgh (2007) the core of the cultural industries are; broadcasting, film, the content aspects of the Internet industry, music, print and electronic publishing, video and computer games, advertising and marketing (Hesmondhalgh 2007).

Like the creative economy and the experience economy, the two terms of creative industry and cultural industry are not mutually exclusive, as there are similarities and ways in which they complement each other. A creative product can, according to Caves (2002), have cultural value, but whether a cultural product can have creative value is, according to Hesmondhalgh (2007), more uncertain. Because a product or service is creative it is not automatically cultural. It could have cultural value, but that is not always apparent or recognised at the off-set. In that sense the creative industries appear to be more concerned with creative production, whereas cultural industries appear to be more concerned with the cultural influence of the products. Furthermore, cultural industries "[...] deal primarily with the industrial production and circulation of texts." (Hesmondhalgh 2007: 12), in this case texts refer to cultural artefacts, and in that sense symbolic creativity (Hesmondhalgh 2007). The creative
industries do not appear to put equal focus on symbolic creativity but rather the function and production of creativity.

2.1.3.1. Art and craft

The discussion of cultural versus creative inhere another discussion about art versus craft. Creative production often demands skills or crafts, as these form the basis for tangible production. Creative product can have intangible value but this intangible value is not necessarily considered as art. This is due to the purpose and intent of the production. Some creative production is the result of predefined tasks and thus not a case of art for art’s sake (Caves 2002). For instance architects are often hired to design a building, but this does not make the outcome any less creative. In the same manner, Howkins (2002) argues that science is equally creative due to the innovative and novel quality of production but it will probably not be considered as works of art. To this Howkins (2002) states, “[…] the creativity is the same; the creative products are different.” (Howkins 2002: xi).

In that sense craft can result in creative production and even art, but this depends on the purpose intended with the production. In this discussion the definition of cultural industries, proposed by Hesmondhalg (2007), comes into play, stating that there is, or should be, symbolic meaning in production if it is to have cultural value. One notion that does seem to be a common denominator in this discussion is that creativity can result in a tangible product but these products must be valued on intangible aspects.

2.1.3.2. Tangible versus intangible production

In the definition of the creative industries, the terms artistic and cultural were mentioned. In the realm of economy and industry, these concepts are rather intangible. Creative products are as such tangible but Caves (2002) argues that it is the intangible aspect which characterises the creative products from others stating that, “A creative product is an “experience good” […] but the buyers’ satisfaction will be a subjective reaction.” (Caves 2002: 3). In this sense Caves (2002) supports the notion that experience and creativity complement each other. The notion of the intangible appears to be a defining character of creativity and creative production. Florida (2003) supports the notion of the intangible, not only in terms of value of the product but also in terms intangibility of the creative capacity, as it is in the head of the creator. Howkins (2002) also highlights the intangible value in the creative economy by focusing on intellectual property law as a means to protect. Protecting a tangi-
The intangible value of creative products also adds another dimension, which Caves (2002) calls the *nobody knows property*. Since reaction and experience to a creative product or service are subjective, it cannot be anticipated for. For this reason it is difficult to assess the quality of creative production, i.e. a movie, theatre play etc. since the experience and perception will be subjective. Caves argues that no two (creative products) are similar, but it might rather be a case of no two experiences are identical. This means that creative products are both vertically and horizontally differentiated (Caves 2002). In other words, there are numerous paintings, movies, songs and plays, which are all different but for some reason, some are preferred over others. Caves (2002) calls this the *infinite variety property* of creative industries, and this infinite variety creates a vital role for critics and gatekeepers.

The intangible value of a creative product cannot be refunded like other tangible products can, if the consumer is dissatisfied. For this reason creative industries often make use of critics, mainly professional, to rate the quality of the creative production. The critics offer expert advice in their review of theatre plays, films, music etc., which consumers read as they “[...] can access no other independent evidence before buying the ticket.” (Caves 2002: 189).

The only other viable source is word-of-mouth, which today is increasingly popular with the use of social media, such as Facebook, Twitter and blogs (Gabler 2011). These are in many cases not professional critics, but nonetheless they offer a subjective review of the creative product. Even so, there are within every creative industry a handful of respected critics whose opinions are valued (Caves 2002). Besides these critics and reviews, creative industries also make use of awards and prizes both to rate the value and quality of a creative product but also to “[...] signal quality to consumers and thereby bring pecuniary gain to producers.” (Caves 2002: 196).

According to Caves (2002) a distinctive feature of the creative industries is a greater sense of involvement in the production. To this, Caves (2002) distinguishes the creative from what he refers to as *humdrum*; the ordinary and repetitive activities which do not require the same level of involvement as the creative. Also since the production is often novel, the de-
mand for a creative product and service is often uncertain. This might offer an explanation as to why creative workers are considered to have more autonomy, as they might not be creating a product that is in demand, but rather supplying a product or service which they feel is missing. The notion of intangibility is important, as it is stated that creative products add value. This value appears to be the intangible.

Creative production could be done by one person. However, Caves (2002) also argues that it sometimes requires multiple people with diverse and specialised skills. In the realm of creative industries, inputs are not always substitutable since it requires creative input which differs from person to person, which implies that creative workers are less redundant than say a machine.

2.1.4. The Creative Class

The increased focus on creativity, and especially as an economic force, has given rise to what Richard Florida (2003) has introduced as *The Creative Class*. The Creative Class is according to Florida, now the dominant class in society and creativity “*[…] is now the decisive source of competitive advantage.*” (Florida 2003: 5). Like Howkins (2002), Florida (2003) states that the reason for this is due to the economic growth of the creative economy. Another important view is, according to Florida (2003), that unlike many industrial and technological discoveries and inventions, “*Human creativity is a virtually limitless resource. Every human being is creative in some way. Each of us has creative potential that we love to exercise and that can be turned into valuable ends.*” (Florida 2003: xiv). This supports the view that creativity is an aptitude and a resource, and broadens the scope by adding that creativity is a limitless resource. Whether or not it is limitless is probably too early to tell but it does imply that the notion of creativity as merely a “talent” is too simple, and that the field needs to be explored further. Also as stated by Florida (2003), “*Every human being is creative in some way.*” (Florida 2003: xiv). This adds another dimension; that creativity is not for the limited few, and that many industries could benefit from the *limitless resource* of creativity as this need not be a resource only available to those industries deemed creative.
Florida (2003) claims that the main difference between the Creative Class and other classes is that members of the Creative Class are those who are paid to be creative. Unlike those who are paid to fulfil a predefined task, those in the Creative Class have more autonomy and are valued on their knowledge and ability to execute creative tasks. At the core of the Creative Class Florida (figure 1) includes people in; architecture and design, education, arts, music and entertainment and science and engineering, "[...] whose economic function is to create new ideas, new technology and/or new creative content." (Florida 2003: 8). Around this core Florida (2003) includes another group which he refers to as creative professionals. The creative professionals are found in law, business and finance and healthcare and related fields, and these people "[...] engage in complex problem solving that involves a great deal of independent judgement and requires high levels of education or human capital." (Florida 2003: 8).

Florida defines which industries he regards as creative, however, since Florida regards creativity as a human ability and as an economic function, this core could, in theory, be widened to include other industries. Figure 1 summarises the industries deemed creative according to the definitions provided by Howkins (2002), Caves (2002) and Florida (2003).

In the realm of the creative economy and the Creative Class, it is apparent that there are many definitions as to which industries are recognised as creative. A common denominator
is that creativity is perceived as a resource and that the growing interest in the area is due to its economic value. Consequently, certain industries are perceived as creative since they use creativity as a resource in gaining competitive advantage. This development has meant that the importance of, and need for creativity has received increasing attention also from a political stance. Not only due to its novel and innovative effect and economic value, but also due to its cultural value, export opportunities, and tourism (Higgs 2008).

To sum up, literature implies that creativity can be defined as a creative economy in that it is of economic value since it supplies products and services with creative, cultural and experience value and therefore it can also be defined as a creative industry. Creative production is; tangible products or services with intangible value. Finally creativity can be defined as a human ability and in that sense as a Creative Class whose members have the specific task of creating and being creative. According to Florida (2003), “Creativity is not a tangible asset [...], but rather a common good. Despite it being a limitless resource Florida (2003) argues that, “It is something essential that belongs to all of us, and that must always be fed, renewed and maintained – or else it will slip away.” (Florida 2003: xxvi). The definitions regarding creative production merely provide the wider scope of creative outcome. In order to understand the input needed in creative production, it is relevant to explore the field of creativity.

Creativity and the creative economy are still, in view of history, rather new and unexplored fields. Creativity is not a new concept but what is new is the conception of creativity as an aptitude, which can be cultivated and learned like learning to use a machine, a computer etc. It is therefore worth exploring the concept of creativity. And if human efforts appear always to focus on optimising, focus should now be on optimising creativity, i.e. a continuous effort in the human ability to keep being creative.

2.2. Creativity
In order to narrow the scope even further and to cast a light on the common denominator, inherent in the various definitions of creative production, it is relevant to explore the field of creativity. Creative production is viewed as an economic resource, and therein focus is mainly on the outcome of creativity and thus supposes that creativity is inherent in the input provided by creative people. To gain further insight into the field of creativity, from a notion that creativity and creative production is also possible for those not deemed creative, it is
relevant to look at the field of creativity from a socio-psychological view and the literature on the field.

As noted in an article published by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (Unctad, 2010), There is no simple definition of “creativity” that encompasses all the various dimensions of this phenomenon. Indeed, in the field of psychology, where individual creativity has been most widely studied, there is no agreement as to whether creativity is an attribute of people or a process by which original ideas are generated. (Unctad, 2010). To explore creativity and indeed productivity and performance, the field of creativity will be explored using the research of Teresa Amabile (1996) (1998) and Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi (1997) as their research focuses on creativity and creative performance.

2.2.1. Thoughts on Creativity
It is difficult to find a definition of creativity which encompasses all elements of the field. According to Howkins (2002), “Creativity is the ability to generate something new. It means the production by one or more people of ideas and inventions that are personal, original and meaningful. It is a talent, an aptitude.” (Howkins 2002: ix). By this definition creativity is a natural ability (talent, aptitude). However, talent implies that it is only something a few possess, whereas aptitude implies that creativity is something all humans possess.

If creativity is viewed as a natural ability, this only implies that humans are able to be creative, not necessarily that they are. Therefore creativity is not necessarily a question of being able to, which according to Howkins (2002) is a given, but rather a question of doing. All humans have the ability to be creative but not all realise that they can be creative. To this Howkins (2002) states that creativity is about creating something new and original. Caves (2002) defines the opposite of creativity as humdrum, which is the ordinary and unoriginal. In that sense, why is it that when all humans have the ability to paint and add colours to canvas, not all are recognised as artists to the like of Pablo Picasso? According to Csikszentmihalyi (1997) “[...] creativity does not happen inside people’s heads, but in the interaction between a person’s thoughts and a sociocultural context. It is a systemic rather than an individual phenomenon.”(Csikszentmihalyi 1997: 23).
According to this definition, creativity has to be recognised in social interaction and context. It appears that something is not creative until someone says it is. Thus, it has to be recognised as being creative, and by appropriate professionals. This could be one of the reasons why critics and reviews, or gatekeepers, as defined by Caves (2002), are valued in the creative industries, since this type of professional review would recognise the product as creative.

It is argued that creativity is a natural ability inherent in all human beings, but this ability remains intangible and is therefore recognised and determined based on the outcome or creation, such as a product. It is thus determined according to the tangible outcome but, valued based on the intangible. Amabile (1996) notes that, “the identification of a thought process or subprocesses as creative must finally depend upon the fruit of that process - a product or response.” (Amabile 1996: 33). Therefore, she proposes that a product or a person is not creative until appropriate observers perceive the product or response as creative. Since creativity is often viewed from an economic point, focus is on the outcome, but not many offer a definition of what creativity is, but rather define what it is not. However, to understand the full scope of creativity it is relevant to explore the factors which appear to be important in the production process of creativity.

2.2.2. The Creative Process
According to Amabile (1996) the study of creativity has in the past been too limited to those already deemed creative, stating that research has focused on “[…] the distinctive personality characteristics of outstandingly creative persons, or the special cognitive abilities of creative artists and scientists, or […] the social environments that hinder or foster creativity.” (Amabile 1996: 81). Past research has, according to Amabile (1996) been too narrow since creativity is also to be found in personality and cognitive characteristics which apply to many different people, and thus not merely to those which are regarded as creative persons.

In this sense creativity, and therein the creative process is not considered as belonging only to a selected few but rather as cognitive characteristics which many possess. Furthermore Amabile (1996) proposes a set of components which affect creative performance and which must be presents in creativity production. Csikszentmihalyi (1997) supports this notion stating that it is misleading to think that creativity “[…] occurs inside the heads of some special
people.” (Csikszentmihalyi 1997: 23). Csikszentmihalyi (1997) argues that creativity is a systematic phenomenon, which occurs “[…] in the interaction between a person’s thoughts and a sociocultural context.” (Csikszentmihalyi 1997: 23). Instead of making a clear definition of creativity, Amabile (1998) argues that creativity is a function comprised of three components; expertise, creative-thinking skills, and motivation (Figure 2). These three components are, according to Amabile (1998), all conducive in the production of creativity.

![Figure 2: From Amabile (1998: 78)](image)

In a professional setting Amabile’s research (1998) indicated that creativity is killed more than it is supported. One of the essential components is Expertise, which implies that people require knowledge or skill (Amabile 1998). Implied in the term is also that expertise must be extensive and specialised knowledge on the task at hand. Expert knowledge on the task at hand lead to the second component; Creative-thinking Skills, which implies that people must also apply and use their knowledge in an original way to create something new or different (Amabile 1998). According to Amabile (1998) the first two components are, however, not sufficient since the third component Motivation will determine what people will do. In other words, with expertise and creative-thinking, people have the ability to be creative but they must also feel motivated in order to be creative.
The three components presented above are the building blocks for creativity but can be elaborated further. Csikszentmihalyi (1997) also presents three components. These are *Domain, Field and Person* (Csikszentmihalyi 1997: 28). As such, the components presented by Csikszentmihalyi (1997) are not that different from those presented by Amabile (1998). *Domain* refers to profession and skill; and *Person* refers to when people use their skills in the production of something novel within their domain. One component differs. Whereas Amabile (1998) values motivation, Csikszentmihalyi (1997) argues that *Field* is essential in the production of creativity. He argues that creativity is not valid unless it is recognised by gatekeepers within the domain (Csikszentmihalyi 1997). Both field and motivation seem equally important, since there must be a reason why not all people are creative if they have the ability do so (motivation). But it also seems that no matter how creative people sometimes are, if their work is not recognised or valued it is not even relevant (field). Amabile (1998) stresses the importance of nurturing an environment that induces creative performance and the social psychology of creativity. Csikszentmihalyi (1997), on the other hand, stresses the importance of domain and the sociocultural context. The two views, and the components presented, are not mutually exclusive but could rather complement each other when exploring creativity from an economic view. Both views appear equally relevant, but in order to understand the psychological components of creativity, Amabile’s Components of Creative Performance (1996) will be explored.

### 2.2.3. COMPONENTS OF CREATIVE PERFORMANCE

The three components of creativity presented by Amabile (1998) which affect creative performance are; *Expertise, Creativity-Thinking Skills and Motivation*. As depicted in figure 2, these are presented with the components centred on creativity. The figure depicts which components influence creative performance, but only offers a rather limited scope. To explore the larger scope and to gain more insight, it is relevant to look at Amabile’s *Components of Creative Performance* (1996). In this Amabile (1996) presents the three determining components of creative performance which are; *Domain-Relevant Skills, Creativity-Relevant Skills and Task Motivation* (figure 3). Amabile notes that the production of creativity within this model must be deemed as creative by appropriate gatekeepers (domain) and thereby also involves the component of *Field* proposed by Csikszentmihalyi (1997).
2.2.3.1. Domain-Relevant Skills
Amabile (1996) suggest that within any area or domain people must have some acquired skills to execute the task at hand. To execute the task, skills must obviously be relevant to the domain and are in this sense regarded as a cognitive pathway to solving challenges or tasks. Skills are in this light comprised of factual knowledge about the specific domain, and technical skills acquired within that domain, and also include some special skills or talents (Amabile 1996). Within this frame, knowledge about a certain area of expertise, as well as technical skills, are required elements for creativity. The importance of intellectual abilities is thereby stressed, but Amabile (1996) also highlights “talent”. Talent in this context is described as a natural aptitude or special skill which an individual may possess (Amabile 1996). Csikszentmihalyi (1997) also views talent as a natural ability to do something well but notes that creative results can be achieved “[...] without any exceptional talent being evident.” (Csikszentmihalyi 1997:27). Amabile (1996) furthermore notes that “[...] skill need not (and probably can never) appear in its most mature state with no special training or experience; certainly, a talent can be developed.” (Amabile 1996:86).

This indicates that formal and informal education and training are required elements for creativity and creative performance. Innate cognitive abilities are equally important traits but these can be developed or enforced through training and education (Amabile 1996).

2.2.3.2. Creativity-Relevant Skills
Amabile (1996) argues that knowledge and technical skills are necessary elements in creativity, however, these skills must be applied properly if the outcome is to be creative. Crea-
tivity-relevant skills are thus concerned with the *appropriate cognitive abilities*, which induce creativity (Amabile 1996). These cognitive abilities refer to an individual’s way of using the acquired knowledge, and in many cases the level of creativity is established within this frame (Amabile 1996). Extensive knowledge within an area is therefore not sufficient. This specialised knowledge must be applied in a different way using *knowledge of heuristics* (Amabile 1996). This process indicates that an individual must be consciously aware of changing or applying knowledge both implicitly and explicitly. Furthermore, the concept of heuristics also indicates that creativity is a process, and not merely an outcome, since it builds on past experience and current knowledge. To this the *work style* is also relevant to creativity. However, it is suggested by Amabile (1996) that this is specified according to the individual. Within this frame individuality and personality traits are thus important to the outcome and the way of applying knowledge to a task. According to Amabile (1996), research suggests that intrinsic motivation is a personality trait which is especially relevant to creativity. Although personality traits are important, Amabile (1996) notes the possibility of other useful traits, which are not necessarily inherent but which can be taught through training.

2.2.3.3. Task Motivation
It is virtually impossible not to mention motivation in the realm of work, production and management. Motivation is often a puzzle to managers and a discussion among scholars, and in the production of creativity it cannot be ignored.

Motivation to perform best at any task is important, and Amabile (1996) argues that intrinsic motivation has a positive effect on creativity. However, other factors are also conducive. Amabile (1996) notes that the general notion within organisational psychology is that, unlike extrinsic motivation, intrinsic motivation often suggests a freedom and lack of control. However, Amabile (1996) characterises intrinsic motivation as a trait and a state, and suggests that sufficient interest in an area could induce intrinsic motivation; “*Task motivation can be seen in this context as the most important determinant of the difference between what a person can do and what he will do.*” (Amabile 1996: 93). This suggests that however extensive the acquired knowledge is, if it is not applied properly the full outcome will not reveal itself.
In this sense creativity is a process, in which many factors are important, and in which an individual has the potential to produce something creative. Former research indicated that extrinsic motivation was conducive to intrinsic motivation and creativity (Amabile 1996). However, new research has produced new findings, and thus Amabile (1996) notes that the previously separated hydraulic and additive models have now been united. The hydraulic model proposes that intrinsic motivation and creativity must decrease as extrinsic motivation increases (Amabile 1996). Whereas the additive model proposes that intrinsic motivation and creativity need not decrease as extrinsic motivation increases. In fact, Amabile (1996) argues that extrinsic motivation could even have a positive effect on intrinsic motivation. Therefore the union of the two now indicates that “[...] extrinsic motivation need not undermine intrinsic motivation and creativity.” (Amabile 1996: 117). This broadens the scope, since previous research and perceptions indicates that creativity functions best without any extrinsic factors, such as boundaries and guidelines. According to Amabile (1996) “[...] some types of extrinsic motivation may enhance creativity.” (Amabile 1996: 117).

This opposes a lot of the previous perceptions such as Florida (2003) who argues that “[...] creative people tend to rebel at efforts to manage them overly systemically.” (Florida 2003: 133). In this discussion extrinsic motivation need not be of monetary value, but can be a task or a challenge given by external participants. The solution for the task, and manner in which to solve it, can be motivated by means of intrinsic factors. Amabile (1998) therefore opposes the view of Florida (2003), stating that “[...] specified strategic goals often enhance people's creativity.” (Amabile 1998: 81). This indicates that giving a person a blank piece of paper and telling them to produce something creative might not be the best motivation, but a blank piece of paper and a specific task or guideline, might be conducive to creativity. On that note it appears that creative production is therefore also possible in settings where specific tasks are given, and thereby more controlled.

2.2.3.4. Creative Performance Model
According to Amabile (1996) it is not possible to determine exactly which of the three components, presented in figure 3, are necessary for creativity. She rather assumes that all three are necessary, and more importantly that they all influence creative performance (Amabile 1996). The three elements are part of a larger componential framework of creativity (Amabile 1996), in which the creative process is sequenced in five steps. This framework aims at describing how the three components; task motivation, domain-relevant skills, and
creativity-relevant skills influence each step of the creative process. This sequential framework proposed by Amabile (1996) could suggest that creativity is not an entirely organic process, but rather that it could be somewhat systematic. The framework can, according to Amabile (1996) be applied to both high and low levels of creativity. The sequence of the creative process is: 1) problem or task presentation; 2) preparation; 3) response generation; 4) response validation and communication; 5) outcome.

The sequential presentation of the framework does not indicate that creativity is not a complex task. It is rather to demonstrate how motivation, skills and training all influence creativity, and how the manner in which they are applied will influence creative performance. Having said that the first step of problem or task presentation, proposes that guidelines could be conducive to creative performance. This opposes the view of Florida (2003) who argues that creative people succeed due to autonomy and freedom.

The final stage will either result in an outcome of success or failure. If the outcome is neither, then you return to step 1, 2, 3 or 4. The framework thus proposes that creativity can be thought of as a rather systematic process, perhaps not a conscious process, but it could indicate a process that could induce creativity when inspiration does not come naturally; thus indicating that a conscious approach to creativity could be advantageous.

From the research conducted by Amabile (1996; 1998) it would appear that there are central components which affect creative performance. The notion of skills, both domain and creativity related, implies that creativity demands formal and informal training and therefore is not a case of mere “talent”. Furthermore the notion of motivation, both intrinsic and extrinsic, implies that creativity can to some extent be managed and that creative performance can be induced.

The first half of part one presented the field of creativity, narrowing the scope from creative production (output) to creativity (input). The second half of part one will present the field of gastronomy and explore the historical and cultural implications of field and present the New Nordic Cuisine.
3. Gastronomy

As mentioned in the introduction, gastronomy is not considered in the creative economy. It can therefore be assumed that the production or outcome of gastronomy is not recognised as creative. This might, as indicated in the introduction, be due to the fact that gastronomy is not yet recognised as creative by the domain, i.e. the proper gatekeepers or professional critics. In that sense the field of gastronomy may be too “young” to receive proper critical acclaim or perhaps the field is merely unexplored. Perhaps gastronomy has only been valued on the tangible outcome, thus leaving the intangible value unexplored. It would appear that in the realm of creative production, it is difficult to separate art and craft and in gastronomy to merge the two. Howkins (2002) finds it even more difficult to separate creativity and art but notes that creativity is the same but the products are different. It is therefore relevant to explore the field of gastronomy to understand both craft and art, and the historical -and cultural influences that affect the two.

Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary defines gastronomy as; *the art and practice of cooking and eating good food* (Wehmeier 2000). By this definition gastronomy entails both craft (practice) and art. Research indicates that the historical and cultural heritage of gastronomy is deeply rooted in anthropological, economic, social and even linguistic context (Civitello 2004). A historical perspective indicates that the cultural implications of gastronomy were much codified by French Chefs with the emergence of French Haute Cuisine (Trubek 2000) and Priscilla Clark notes that, “[...] cuisine is not food, it is food transcended, nature transformed into a social product, an aesthetic artefact, a linguistic creation, a cultural tradition.” (Clark 1975: 32). If gastronomy is to be considered within the realm of creativity it is relevant to explore the history of gastronomy and the development until present with the emergence of the New Nordic Cuisine.

The existing literature on the gastronomy is rather narrow, in terms of defining the processes involved in production. There are an infinite number of cookbooks, but the literature on the field of gastronomy is mainly occupied with the historical implications food and gastronomy and the physiological, psychological, cultural and social aspects of the field. To get a better understanding of the field it is relevant to explore the craft of gastronomy and indeed the historical and cultural implications.
3.1. A Historical Perspective

Traditionally, cooking can be described as the result of preparation of raw goods. According to some scientists, cooking is the first man-made revolution when man discovered how to control fire (Dahl 2009). Food is the fuel of mankind, like air and water; human beings cannot live without food. However, besides being a basic necessity, food and cooking has evolved through millenniums and is for some much more than a basic necessity for survival.

It is difficult to determine when cooking was invented, as it is difficult to determine when man discovered fire and learned how to control it. It is even more difficult to determine when cooking as a profession had its offset. According to Professor of Biological Anthropology Richard Wrangham (2009) cooking is the essential part of human evolution stating that, “I believe the transformative moment that gave rise to the genus Homo, one the great transitions in the history of life, stemmed from the control of fire and the advent of cooked meals. Cooking increased the value of our food. It changed our bodies, our brains, our use of time, and our social life. It made us into consumers of external energy and thereby created and organism with a new relationship to nature, dependent on fuel.” (Wrangham 2009: 2).

The theory proposed by Wrangham (2009), proposes that the fact that humans began cooking their food is what set us apart from other species. This idea also proposes that preparation of food is more than mere survival and a human necessity, but concerned with enjoyment of delicious tastes. As Wrangham suggests; cooked food (...) makes our food safer, creates rich and delicious tastes and reduces spoilage (Wrangham 2009: 13). In that sense deliciousness is an essential part of cooking.

Mankind has always, through agriculture, found ways to utilise and process the raw goods around them (Bowditch 2005). Whether it be through farming, growing grains, vegetables and fruit, or catching seafood or fostering animals to utilise meat and dairy products. The basic essentials of cooking and eating have been determined by the availability of food and goods. The availability has been determined by climate and region and cooking has developed using technology, both in terms of agricultural technology, cooking techniques and even through science (Civitello 2004). Dishes have been invented using new ways of preparing and putting together goods and flavours, and have been passed down orally or written as notes. Indeed Roland Barthes (Bober 1999) also notes that food "[…] is at one and the
same time a system of communication, a body of imagery, a protocol of customs, of situations, of behaviours.” (Bober 1999: 2).

3.1.1. Gastronomy and the Culinary Arts
Cooking has evolved into being much more than fuel for mankind, and has been enjoyed in social settings for millennia (Bober 1999). Recording of banquets are found in texts and imagery from ancient Egypt, Mesopotamia, Greece, Rome and the middle Ages (Bober 1999). In ancient Greece the archimageiros (chef de cuisine) prepared banquets for his masters (Bober 1999). The Romans formed Collegium coquorum, an academy training cooks, and thereby cooking became a prestigious profession (Montagnè 1977).

Historically, cooking was therefore not only prestigious for those preparing food but also for those hosting the banquets, and cooking can be traced back millennia as a cultural and social phenomenon. The historical heritage is apparent in the words still used today; gastronomy derived from ancient Greek from the words gastra (stomach) and nomia (law), from early Rome the word culinary (from Latin meaning kitchen), and from French the word cuisine (meaning kitchen) (Montagnè 1977). In his book The Physiology of Taste from 1825, French Gastronomer Jean Anthelme Brillat-Savarin states that, “Gastronomy is the intelligent knowledge of whatever concerns man’s nourishment.” (Civitello 2004: 174).

Over the course of history cooking became an art, and the term gastronomy is now, according to Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary defined as the art and practice of cooking and eating good food (Wehmeier 2000). By this definition cooking and enjoying food is an art form. It is today a prestigious profession and form of expression, as it was in ancient time, but is now also an economic commodity and even in some cases an experience that diners are willing to pay a lot of money for.

Gastronomy is therefore the overall definition of cooking and enjoying food. Another similar definition is the culinary arts, which is defined as the art of cooking food (Bober 1999). Culinary art is, therefore, the main discipline being taught at culinary schools, since it is concerned with the preparation of goods and creating meals. The culinary arts are thus the narrow scope, since it is concerned with the preparation of food, whereas gastronomy is also concerned with the enjoyment of food. In that sense, gastronomy offers the wider scope of
the two since it encompasses not only cooking and presentation but also the social, cultural and psychological aspects of cooking. It not only encompasses the craftsmanship of cooking as the culinary arts, but also the societal aspect of food. Gastronomy places equal focus on the experience and sensorial aspect of cooking and enjoying food.

The two terms thus support each other. There are many variables and branches within, but gastronomy is in this project used to describe an industry, a profession and art. As mentioned, the history of cooking is long and the development is vast. However, for the sake of this project the historical focus will be on the French Cuisine. The techniques are still those being taught at culinary schools today, and the history and traditions of the French Cuisine are still prevalent in today's top kitchens and restaurants.

3.2. The French Influence
The development of cooking has led to it being more than a device for satisfying hunger. It has developed into a profession which requires skills. Techniques, recipes and rules have been written down and passed down through generations and from master to apprentice (Trubek 2000). The traditions taught at culinary schools today have their origin from the French cuisine (Trubek 2000). According to Amy Trubek (2000) all fine dining has its offset in the French cuisine as “[...] the French invented the cuisine of culinary professionals.” (Trubek 2000: 3).

French Cuisine is thus the offset of the classic food preparation used in restaurants and kitchens. According to Trubek (2000) cooking as a profession had its outset in the homes of aristocracy where cooks prepared fine food for the bourgeoisie society. It was also during the sixteenth century that the French term haute cuisine was invented, which is defined as fine food. In the kitchens of the aristocracy, cooks began to articulate a theory of cooking and develop cookbooks, recipes and cooking techniques. According to Trubek this is when cooks became professional chefs, from the French word Chef de Cuisine and when “[...] haute cuisine became codified.” (Trubek 2000: 11). To that it can be noted that most people can cook but a chef is a trained professional who masters the profession of cooking.

The codification of the culinary arts and haute cuisine is a result of the cookbooks and recipes published in late sixteenth century France (Trubek 2000). Recipes and techniques have
always been passed down through generations but publishing cookbooks meant that a codified and indeed general system of rules and techniques developed (Trubek 2000). It is difficult to date back the first cookbooks but some of the first codifications of French Culinary arts are a collection of recipes - *La Fleur de Toute Cuisine* by Pidoux from 1543, and *Le Viandier* by Taillevent dating back to around 1570 (Montagnè, 1977). Trubek (2000) notes that, “*Cookbooks function as utilitarian manuals, providing the necessary knowledge to accomplish a culinary task, yet at the same time sending clear signals about right and wrong practice.*” (Trubek 2000: 25). According Trubek (2000) one of the founding books of French Haute Cuisine is *Le Cuisinier Français* by La Varenne from 1651, a systematic book with cooking techniques. Another influential book, perhaps the most, *la Guide Culinaire* was published in 1903 by Auguste Escoffier, a theoretical book with instructions of classic French cuisine (Montagnè 1977). The instructions of Escoffier are still taught in culinary schools today as the components are deemed essential in gastronomy. *The five components of classical French haute cuisine are stocks, sauces, knife skills, cooking methods, and pastry* (Trubek 2000: 13).

The French influence is still apparent in modern cuisine. One of the reasons for this is the fact that a lot of cooking techniques, with offset in French cuisine, are still taught at culinary schools and thus form the basis of cuisine today (Trubek 2000). To understand the French influence in modern cuisine, it is relevant to explore the heritage which is still apparent today.

**3.2.1. The Chef**

To be assured, a chef is not something you become overnight. It requires education, training, skills, dedication and endless hours in the kitchen. Becoming a chef is a profession which requires skill, education, training and dedication.

In Denmark becoming a trained chef takes 3 years and 9 months, if the student has no prior training or education (Copenhagen Hospitality College). The only requirement is an elementary school education; Danish 9th or 10th grade school level. It is a craft, so besides education in school it also requires apprenticeship in a kitchen and is finalised with an apprenticeship test conducted by the Hospitality College (Copenhagen Hospitality College). This naturally
only result in a diploma and means that training is over, becoming a chef and truly mastering the profession takes years in the kitchen and extensive knowledge and experience.

During the training and apprenticeship, training chefs are taught cooking techniques, knowledge of raw goods and produce, knife skills, presentation and hygiene (Dahl 2009). One of the most obvious heritages from the French cuisine is the chefs "uniform"; the so-called chefs' white, which is consistent of a white double-breasted jacket, white apron, chef's pants and sometimes even a chef's hat; a so-called toque. According to Gastronomer (Dahl 2009) a textbook used for teaching at Copenhagen Hospitality College, the classic uniform of the chef is still used today to enhance the traditions of the craft. The jacket protects the chef from heat and hot fluids but besides the practicality of it, the chefs white must also remain hygienic and presentable to the customer (Dahl 2009). According to Trubek (2000) this French cuisine tradition and dominance is due to the fact that “[…] the French invented the cuisine of culinary professionals.” (Trubek 2000: 3). In that sense it can be argued that the French are responsible for codifying the culinary arts and haute cuisine as it is known today in western culture.

### 3.2.2. Techniques
Culinary education has its offset in the five senses (smell, touch, hearing, sight, taste) (Dahl 2009). According to Gastronomer (Dahl 2009) the more powerful and well developed the senses are, the better and more intense the tasting experience will be. Creating a meal is centred on a full experience of incorporating all five senses. Aromas will evoke the smelling sense, texture and temperature will evoke the touch sense and sounds such as crunch the hearing sense (Barham 2010). The taste sense is evoked by the five flavours (sweet, salt, sour, bitter and umami) and finally the visual is stimulated through presentation and composition of colour and aesthetics (Dahl 2009). To stimulate all the senses, seasonality is another guiding term often used in gastronomy. Seasonality refers to using goods and ingredients when they are at their peak in the year. Cooking with the four seasons in mind has always been used, since historically mankind has always been forced to use goods that were available to them. Today the seasonality has been somewhat washed out since goods from all over the world are available all year round. However, to ensure that the goods are as fresh as possible, chefs still use goods that are in season in their region. Besides the practicality of using seasonal goods Dornenburg and Page (1996) also argue that, "Cooking with
the seasons also has the power to satisfy innate or learned food cravings.” (Dornenburg 1996: 28).

Flavour, aesthetics and ethics are thus elements which are taken into consideration when creating a meal and the basic techniques taught at culinary schools reflect this. Among the basic techniques are knife skills and cutting techniques. A chef’s tools are essential, most chefs have their own set of knives, and yes that is plural because one knife is not sufficient (Dahl 2009). Each knife has a purpose and is essential in creating the desired outcome when preparing a dish. The basic techniques which chefs are taught at culinary schools today are the same as those invented by the French. Cutting and chopping techniques still include; julienne, chiffonade, brunoise, parisienne. Cleaning, peeling, skinning, carving, de-boning, filleting are techniques taught for preparing fish, seafood, poultry, venison and meat. Cooking techniques also have a clear French influence as the basics of Escoffier are still those taught such as blanching, steaming, poaching, boiling and braising and frying anglaise or meunière. Fond (stock), bouillon, consommé, glace and sauce techniques equally have their origin from the French Cuisine. Even in the kitchen and the restaurant the vocabulary is derived from French, with words such as mise en place, service, a la carte (Dahl 2009).

Perhaps one of the biggest influences seen by Escoffier in kitchens today is his Brigade de Cuisine (The Kitchen Brigade) (Civitello 2004). This system meant that the kitchen was and is run like a military operation, with a clear structure and a top-down chain of command. At the top of this system is the chef and just under him the sous chef. The kitchen is organised into different stations, each responsible for different elements of the food production, with the chef de partie or station chef in charge of the different stations. The different stations cook elements of the dish, the garnish, the sauce, the meat and all the elements are assembled in a timed operation. This Kitchen Brigade is still the system used in many kitchens today, and depending on the size of staff, the system can be expanded or reduced (Civitello 2004: 244).

3.2.3. Novelty
In the world of cuisine there is always a tendency towards reforming classic or traditional into something new. When Escoffier released his La Guide Culinaire he reformed the classic French cuisine into a more modern version. Since then chefs like Paul Bocuse, Fernand
Point, Pierre Troigros and Michel Guérard were pioneers of what they called *nouvelle cuisine* and by then Escoffier's cuisine became *Cuisine Classique* (Trubek 2000).

Trubek (2000) sites anthropologist Sidney Mintz who states that, “*Not every society has a cuisine, but a society must have a cuisine in order to have a haute cuisine.*” (Trubek 2000: 4). In that sense it can be argued that gastronomy is the overall definition of cooking and enjoying food whereas cuisine is a style of cooking often in reference to a region or country i.e. Italian cuisine, French cuisine. Once a region or country then has an established cuisine it can begin to develop Haute Cuisine. Regional cuisines like the Italian, French, Japanese, and Chinese, Spanish or Mediterranean have become distinguished for their styles and the goods used for cooking (Civitello 2004). They are each known for their use of regional products and their culinary identity has developed through centuries. The Danish cuisine was by many considered outdated and the influence of other world cuisines had taken over and the development of the Danish cuisine demanded a reformation.

This reformation came in the form of the New Nordic Cuisine (Risvik 2008), which included all the countries in the Nordic region and the produce from this. The argument presented by Mintz, in the above, became very clear in the example of the world’s best restaurant Noma in Copenhagen. When Noma first had its outset it was not an instant success. It was too extreme and unfamiliar for a lot of diners and even critiques (Christensen 2008). This might have to do with the fact that people were only familiar with the traditional Danish Cuisine, and the dishes served at Noma were nothing like the familiar which they knew. However, with the emergence of the New Nordic Cuisine, not only incorporating the Danish Cuisine but the all cuisines of the Nordic Region, the dishes served at Noma began to make sense and the success soon followed. Noma is not a product of the Danish Cuisine but derived from the New Nordic Cuisine. Once the cuisine was established, haute cuisine restaurants soon followed in the capitals of the Nordic Countries. The sequence is therefore, according to Mintz, first food, then cuisine, then haute cuisine (Trubek 2000: 4). Compared to other regional cuisines, the New Nordic Cuisine is rather young, but the potential is vast. It was not an organic process that happened naturally, but rather like the French Cuisine, it has developed from at set of rules and guidelines, much like those proposed in the first cookbooks of the French and the components which were deemed essential by among other Escoffier (Civitello 2004).
3.3. The New Nordic Cuisine

“In November 2004, Nordic chefs, food writers and other professionals gathered to discuss the potential for developing a new Nordic food culture. The meeting resulted in a 10-point manifesto outlining how best to develop this New Nordic Cuisine.” (Risvik 2008: 5)

The New Nordic Cuisine Manifesto (Risvik 2008) was brought to live through a desire to create a common Nordic food identity. It consists of 10 points (figure 4) which “[...] express(ed) the values on which a New Nordic Cuisine must be based if it is to make its mark in the world by virtue of its flavours and identity.” (Risvik 2008: 6). As the world has become more diversified so has culinary identity and culture of most countries. Countries are no longer reliant on local produce as the basis for the meals prepared, since products are imported and exported. The concept of seasonal products and local produce has been washed out as products are imported and it is possible for the Nordic region to import products such as strawberries even in the winter, as they are not in season until summer.

As the world becomes more diversified the counter reaction is now becoming increasingly apparent, a clear appreciation of anything local and a pride in history, origin and tradition. This is one of the key points in the Manifesto. It is not a desire to alienate everything foreign, but simply a wish to protect and develop the already existing. A desire to use local produce when it is in season, and a pride in developing something Nordic, and creating a culinary identity like other countries have. According to one of the founders of the Manifesto, “New Nordic Cuisine has become a movement, driven by the desire for a common culinary identity and inspired by the excellence of our raw materials.” (Risvik 2008: 5). Many other cuisines have developed a clear identity such as the French, Italian, Spanish, Japanese and Chinese kitchen. (Civitello 2004) But the Nordic cuisine has not managed to develop a clear identity. The problem in this is that if culinary tradition is not upheld and recipes are not passed down through generations, then at some point they will be lost. This leaves the population with a missing common culinary culture and identity, and the Nordic Cuisine Manifesto was created to avoid this.
The Ten Points of the New Nordic Cuisine Manifesto

1. To express the purity, freshness, simplicity and ethics that we would like to associate with our region
2. To reflect the different seasons in the meals.
3. To base the cooking on raw materials which characteristics are especially excellent in our climate, landscape and waters.
4. To combine the demand for good taste with modern knowledge about health and well-being.
5. To promote the Nordic products and the variety of the Nordic producers – and to disseminate the knowledge of the cultures behind them.
6. To promote the welfare of the animals and a sound production in the sea and in the cultivated as well as wild landscapes.
7. To develop new possible applications of traditional Nordic food products.
8. To combine the best Nordic cooking
9. To combine local self-sufficiency with regional exchange of high-quality goods.
10. To cooperate with representatives of consumers, other cooking craftsmen, agriculture, fishing industry, food industry, retail and wholesale industry, researchers, teachers, politicians and authorities on this joint to the benefit and advantage of all in the Nordic countries.

Figure 4: New Nordic Cuisine Manifesto (Risvik 2008) (Own contribution)

The manifesto is not only meant to be used in restaurants and the culinary world, but is a movement that should be implemented in all gastronomy and also in the population’s daily lives. In 2004 Claus Meyers and René Redzepi, co-founders of the Manifesto decided to open a restaurant, which would come to epitomise the New Nordic Cuisine (Risvik 2008). The restaurant was named Noma, a contraction of NOrdisk MAd (Nordic Food) and despite innovative dishes it was not a success from the beginning (Christensen 2008). But success soon followed and today Noma is recognised as the number one restaurant in the world (S. Pellegrino 2011).
3.4. **Partial Conclusion**

Part one of the thesis presented the two central fields of creative production and gastronomy.

Through the literature review on creative production it became evident that gastronomy is not included in the definitions of the creative economy, the creative industries or the creative class. It also became apparent these all value creative production, i.e. tangible products or services with intangible value. However, it was found that these are only valued on the outcome and therefore have to be recognised as creative by the proper gatekeepers.

It was found that creativity is a human ability; thereby indicating that it is not only for those deemed creative or having a special talent. The literature on the field of creative production, however, only offered a distinction of the outcome of creative production. Therefore the input level was explored. It was found that research indicates that there are three components which affect individual creative input, and that the domain ultimately determines the level of creative output.

It is therefore concluded that in order to receive recognition of creative production, a domain will have to be constructed or reconstructed. One such change of a domain appeared with the emergence of the New Nordic Cuisine, which reconstructed the existing domain of gastronomy. Finally it was found that gastronomy and chefs apply the central components which affect creative performance in a structured manner.

Part two outlines analysis of the domain which will have to be reconstructed in order for gastronomy to be recognised and valued on creative output. Finally part two will outline the analysis of the manner in which gastronomy applies the central components which affect creative performance.
“Cookery is as old as the world, but it must also remain, always as modern as fashion.”

- Phileas Gilbert (1857-1942)
4. CREATIVE PRODUCTION

As argued by Howkins (2002), we are now in a creativity based economy, in which creative production is valued, not only in terms of the finished tangible product but also the intangible value which the product holds. Those creating value through creative production should be recognised for their work. From the findings in part one it appears that three aspects are important in creative production; 1) Creative production is the result of tangible products or services which have intangible value; 2) Creative production must to some extent be novel, original, cultural or artistic; 3) creative production must, it appears, be recognised as creative by the proper gatekeepers.

If as argued by Howkins (2002), “[...] people with ideas [...] have become more powerful than people who work machines.” (Howkins 2002: ix), then these people with ideas deserve to be recognised and acknowledged. Even more important novel and original ideas deserve to be recognised and acknowledged. As Howkins (2002) argues, “Creativity is possible [...] where novelty and invention are possible. It flourishes most when and where they are rewarded.” (Howkins 2002: xi). One industry which appears to have been neglected in recognition of creative production and rewarded for novelty and invention is gastronomy.

The literature on the field of creative production, does not consider gastronomy as part of the creative economy (Howkins 2002), the creative industries (Caves 2002) or the Creative Class (Florida 2003), nor do the mappings on the creative economy include gastronomy (Higgs 2008; Rosted 2008).

The field of the creative economy, creative production, creativity and gastronomy were explored in part one. Part two of the thesis will analyse the coherence and differences between the two in order to answer the research questions of the project, first by analysing why gastronomy is not considered a creative industry. From the findings in part one; it appears that recognition is crucial in the creative economy. Therefore if gastronomy is to be considered as part of creative economy someone must recognise production as creative. It is therefore relevant to explore and compare gastronomy to those industries deemed creative, to analyse if the tangible and intangible production holds merit to gatekeeper critique.
4.1. TRANSFORMING THE DOMAIN

Csikszentmihalyi (1997) argues that, “Creativity is any act, idea, or product that changes an existing domain, or that transforms an existing domain into a new one.” (Csíkszenmihaly 1997: 28). The history of gastronomy would alone prove as an argument that the production is creative since the influence on culture or domain as Csikszentmihalyi (1997) calls it, cannot be denied. Véronique Chossat (2008) argues that the paradigm shift which occurred in French cuisine with the emergence of the Nouvelle Cuisine in the 1970’s where chefs no longer merely reproduced classics but invented new dishes meant that, “[…] gastronomy has become a creative discipline.” (Chossat 2008: 2). In this view it could be argued that the continuous influence on culture is a reason why gastronomy is creative. Chossat (2008) furthermore argues that, “Gastronomy is both a creative and a cultural industry mixing subtly heritage and creativity.” (Chossat 2008: 4).

In November 2010 The Meal of the French became protected by UNESCO (2010) and added to the list World Intangible Heritages. The List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding is “[…] composed of intangible heritage elements that concerned communities and States Parties consider required urgent measures to keep them alive.” (UNESCO 2010). Some regional products are protected under Protected Geographical Status (PGS) defined by European Union Law (European Commission 2011), such as Champagne, Parmigiano-Reggiano and Gorgonzola, but the recognition of a regional cuisine is rather new. This also serves as proof that when discussing whether gastronomy should be considered a creative industry, it is not merely the actual dish which is considered within the field of gastronomy, it is the entire setting which surrounds it; the idea, preparation, presentation, atmosphere and service. These all constitute it as an industry but could also constitute gastronomy as a creative industry.

To this, a distinction should be made within the field of gastronomy. Creative production only occurs if the outcome is to some extent novel or original. Not all gastronomic endeavours fall under this distinction as they are merely the result of replicating recipes or indeed reproducing classic dishes; these gastronomic endeavours are not creative nor is the product creative. Instead those that are truly original and create something novel deserve to be recognised and acknowledged for this as they attempt to change or transform the existing domain. Recognition and acknowledgement would furthermore be important within the
field of gastronomy as it would help distinguish humdrum (Caves 2002) from novel and original production. Thereby clearly distinguishing the craft and art aspect or indeed recognising the merger of the two, when this is the outcome of production. It is not the aim of this project to map out which gastronomic endeavours are not creative, but rather to explore if creative production is present. As Caves (2002) argues, “Art claims a superior reality that separates the artist from the craftsman.” (Caves 2002: 4). Since the reality and indeed the superior reality of gastronomy have not been determined in the field of creative production, a separation cannot be made. However, recognising gastronomy as creative production could open a future discussion of the distinction between art and craft in gastronomy and clearly distinguishing those that manage to merge the two.

The cultural impact has been apparent with the emergence of French haute cuisine (Trubek 2000) which transformed the existing domain. This is now also apparent with the emergence of the New Nordic Cuisine, introducing what could be a new paradigm shift. Claus Meyers argues that, “[...] to get a historic dimension, what you create must have some roots (be historically grounded), and that goes for innovation in all industries.” (Appendix 1). The New Nordic Cuisine is as the word implies an attempt to create something new and not merely replicating the existing.

**4.2. Creative Industries Revised**

In Caves’ definition of creative industries (2002), gastronomy is not included. He argues that creative industries are those, “[...] in which the product or service contains a substantial element of artistic or creative endeavour [...]” (Caves 2002: vii). Whether or not the contribution of creative or artistic elements in gastronomy is not, according to Caves, substantial enough is impossible to say. But from the definition presented by Caves, it could be argued that gastronomy does meet the requirements of the creative industries.

It appears that there are various definitions of which industries contribute to creative production. The industries deemed creative vary according to literature, and definitions of the creative economy, the creative class, and the creative industries. To get a full grasp of creative production and get a more updated view on the field, the analysis of creative production will use the definition conducted by a mapping of the creative economy (Higgs 2008; Rosted 2011). As mentioned in the introduction in part one, mappings have been conducted both in
the UK and Denmark concerning the potential and growth of the creative economy. According to the DCMS (Higgs 2008), creative industries are those “[...] which have their origin in individual creativity, skill and talent and which have a potential for wealth and job creation through the generation and exploitation of intellectual property.” (Higgs 2008: 3).

Despite the historical impact of gastronomy, the reason for it not being included in the realm of creativity could be, as Chossat (2008) argues, that true innovation did not occur until the 1970’s. However, others would argue that innovation has been present all the time, and that the emergence of the French Nouvelle Cuisine merely represented a paradigm shift in gastronomy (Chossat 2008). One thing is certain, gastronomy involves production and consumption. And to the likes of many creative industries, Barrère and Chossat (2004) argue that gastronomy involves the consumption of “[...] both tangible and intangible cultural heritage assets.” (Barrère 2004: 98).

This aspect of both tangible and intangible consumption is a key aspect in the realm of creative production. And it could be argued that gastronomy is consumed both as a meal (tangible) and as an experience (intangible). Furthermore, gastronomy not only involves consumption of affordable and indeed tangible supermarket products, it also involves the consumption of intangible, and indeed high priced experiences of haute cuisine restaurant visits. Sophie Daunais (2010) argues that, “(…) for many, high cuisine is, without a doubt, a fantastic example of creativity, often encompassing design, science, architecture, and the art of mixing flavors and textures (Dunais 2010: 1).

Dornenburg and Page (1996) equally compare gastronomy to creative industries and argue that, “As in literature, there can be a poetry to the way dishes are described on a menu. As in music, there is a rhythm to a great meal, when it flows from one course to another like symphony. As in painting and sculpture, the visual aspects of a dish can enhance the appreciation of it. As in theatre, the way something is presented – by people in costumes, with music playing, with precise timing – is as much part of the experience as the thing itself. And as in architecture, while the subjects in question are at their most basic level functional – providing us with food or shelter – great food, like a great building has the potential to inspire.” (Dornenburg 1996: 2). As argued it would appear that gastronomy shares a lot of similarities with crea-
4.2.1. **Science and Gastronomy**

Howkins (2002) argues that creativity flourished in sciences most apparent in research and development. Howkins argues that “[...] sciences are attempting to imagine (to visualize) and describe (to represent) the nature and meaning of reality.” (Howkins 2002, xi). The presence of science is also apparent in the field of gastronomy. According to Ottenbacher & Harrington (2007) a merger of science and gastronomy appeared when Ferran Adrià, a Spanish chef of the former number one restaurant in the world, El Bulli, began experimenting with new cooking techniques resulting in molecular gastronomy. According to Ottenbacher and Harrington (2007) he was the first to successfully merge science and gastronomy and thereby merge perception and reality. Molecular gastronomy is a gastronomic movement and according to Barham et al. (2010) very much made famous by chefs such as Ferran Adria of restaurant El Bulli; the world’s best restaurant in 2002, 2006, 2007, 2008 and 2009 (S. Pellegrino 2002; 2006; 2007; 2008; 2009), and British chef Heston Blumenthal of restaurant Fat Duck; the world’s best restaurant in 2005 (S. Pellegrino 2005).

The occurrence of science in gastronomy is, as some would probably argue, not a new phenomenon in food production, but in the realm of haute cuisine it is. Vega and Ubbinks (2008) define molecular gastronomy as “[…] a scientifically oriented approach towards understanding the basic mechanisms occurring during cooking […].” (Vega 2008: 372). The mechanisms that occur during cooking have previously been explored in the preparation of new dishes, but molecular gastronomy is a purely scientific process. The scientific approach has also been adopted by the New Nordic Cuisine and in 2008 Noma established the “Nordic Foodlab” to generate knowledge about the goods in the Nordic Region (Redzepi 2008). In an interview with the BBC programme HARDtalk, René Redzepi argued that the Nordic Foodlab was established in a quest for deliciousness (Sackur 2012). Since gastronomy is much related to science this might be a reason why creative production has not been recognised. Production may have been valued based on technical and craftsmanship skills rather than valued on aesthetics and artistic skills. However, many chefs would disagree with this notion, since gastronomy is about more than the craftsmanship and complex technical skills. Although the approaches used at the Nordic Foodlab appear more like the ones in labora-
tory, rather than a kitchen, René Redzepi argues, “[…] this space is not a science lab as such, it’s run by chefs. We’re here for deliciousness, not for the science of it. But to create better deliciousness we need to understand the science of it.” (Sackur 2012). Gastronomy does it appears, involve innovation and novel production but the visual and aesthetics are equally important.

4.2.2. Words and Gastronomy
Gastronomy is already visible in publishing with the numerous amounts of cookbooks available. But often gastronomy uses the written word in other instances. Publishing is all about stories and the written word indeed has power (Hesmondhalg 2007). In gastronomy the description of a menu can, according to Dornenburg and Page (1996), generate the same level of poetic justice as literature. The menu can list more than mere ingredients and goods, as the courses are sometimes dubbed with names or titles. Also the order of the courses can tell a story as can the individual dish. Creative sous-chef at Noma, Torsten Vildgaard (Appendix 3) states that, “There is usually something philosophically behind the course, it’s more than just food, there is a thought behind it and a reason behind everything. So we explain “what story are we trying to tell here!” (Appendix 3). He furthermore states that once a dish is finished the chefs are not just explained how to cook the dish, but are also told about the story behind the dish. According to Torsten Vildgaard (Appendix 3), the chefs often present the dish, and merely stating what is on the plate is not sufficient; they also have to explain the story of the dish.

As Torsten Vildgaard (Appendix 3) argues there is thus much more to the dish, than just food. The dish must tell a story and that story must also be visibly present on the plate. Presentation is a key aspect in gastronomy. As mentioned in part one; colour, texture and composition are all taken into account when creating a dish (Dahl 2009).

In the same manner that an artist will often start with a blank canvas, the starting point in gastronomy is a clean plate. This blank canvas or plate is then filled with colour, in different shapes and sizes and once finished it is given a name or a title. Like art, gastronomy is equally about aesthetics, no matter how delicious the food may be, presentation is everything. It is often said that we first eat with our eyes and in that sense the visual presentation of a dish is crucial. Dornenburg and Page (1996) argue that, “The moment of composition is
the point at which a chef has the opportunity for expression and to largely determine what a customer will receive.” (Dornenburg 1996: 15). In the same manner that Pablo Picasso had his Blue Period; chefs can be inspired by colour and formats. Torsten Vildgaard (Appendix 3) states that in the creation of a new dish, “[...] there are also times where we only choose a format as the starting point and only choose to work with red elements, so that sort of dictates the creativity.” (Appendix 3). With that starting point in mind, the finished dish ended up being “[...] red with beetroots and roses and mallard.” (Appendix 3).

4.2.3. Performance and Gastronomy

It appears that within gastronomy and indeed creative industries, a form of expression must be chosen. As Dornenburg and Page (Dornenburg 1996) argue, there is also a certain rhythm to the composition of a menu, as in the composition of music. Torsten Vildgaard (Appendix 3) states that at Noma all the elements and the different stations have to work together, almost to the likes of an orchestra, and find the right timing and pace for preparing the course. This pace and timing is even more important in the case of Noma, since the kitchen is open, so the diner can see everything that goes on in the kitchen. In that sense not only the restaurant (dining area) but also the kitchen becomes a stage as in performing arts or theatre.

The scene is set in the restaurant with the right decor functioning as a backdrop for the dining experience. In that sense the dining room itself is not the experience but is used as a tool to set the mood for the dining experience. At Noma, the chefs often serve and present the course and present the story behind the course. Torsten Vildgaard (Appendix 3) explained that, (...) in that sense the chefs become a huge part of the dining experience (Appendix 3). To that it can be added that the surroundings not only play a part in setting the mood but also adds the intangible aspect of gastronomy. The tangible aspect of gastronomy, the dish, can be replicated but the intangible; the experience will not be the same since the surroundings would be different; and the experience would be equally subjective according to each diner.

Caves (2002) argues that the performing arts are creative. However, the fact of the matter is, that the script and play is rehearsed to perfection and once the play premieres, it is performed and repeated night after night, which would appear to include some humdrum activity (Caves 2002). But if the performing arts despite this are deemed creative, then gastron-
omy could too fall under this scope. Some gastronomic endeavours serve not only dishes but an experience, and dishes and the experience has to be the same every day, both during lunch and dinner service. The standard is always extremely high and there is no room for mistakes or “do-over’s”. This strive for perfection was also stressed by Torsten Vildgaard (Appendix 3) who stated that at Noma they always strive for perfection.

Just like theatre there is also a leading star in gastronomy, and in restaurants the chef serves as the main character. And like a play there are many actors and extras and behind-the-scenes people which all ensure that the entire experience is performed perfectly every time. The chef also has an understudy in his sous-chef and according to Balazs (2002) “[…] the second in command has to be able to be the perfect complement to the chef.” (Balazs 2002: 254). The sous-chef must therefore be able to take the demanding place of the “star” and perform to the same standard if the chef is not able to do so.

4.2.4. FAME AND GASTRONOMY
Chefs are no strangers to another creative industry, television. The chef “star” status, mentioned before, is probably most known in the realm of TV cooking shows. Sohpie Dunais (2001) argues that, “Visibility has become one of their main considerations.” (Dunais 2001: 7). “Their” referring to chefs and according to Dunais this development is called the “chef phenomenon”. These chefs “[…] have incredible visibility, making prestigious newspapers, magazine covers, appearing in TV programs […] and ultimately become new stars.” (Dunais 2001: 7).

This “star” or in some cases “superstar” phenomenon should not underestimated as Caves (2002) argues, “The superstar has enviable economic choice.” (Caves 2002: 73). Basically it can boost sales; both in terms of quality and quantity. Recognition and stardom helps brand these chefs and their image, and in that also their restaurants. It helps sell books, restaurant bookings and in some cases even merchandise. Howkins (2002) argues that this recognition is about being fascinating to others but most importantly, being famous for being creative.

This is apparent with TV chefs who have acclaimed worldwide recognition such as Jamie Oliver, Heston Blumenthal and Gordon Ramsey. In Denmark this trend is also apparent with chefs like Nikolai Kirk, Camilla Plum and confectioner Mette Blomsterberg, and even Claus
Meyer and the brothers Adam and James Price, who despite their fame as TV chefs, are in fact not educated as chefs (Christensen 2008). These "star" chefs become synonymous with the style of food they prepare and their name alone can sell books and some even endorse products or launch their own kitchen product lines. Their restaurants become famous and this is despite the fact that these superstar chefs are often not the active chef in the kitchen. Instead this is also a good example of the visual aspect and importance of gastronomy.

On TV and in magazines, the food is only visually accessible. The viewer or reader cannot smell or taste the food, which is a crucial part of food since it intrigues the senses, but this appears to be irrelevant in the production of the visuals. Torsten Vildgaard (Appendix 3) argues that gastronomy has indeed become all about image and claims that after Noma was awarded as the number one restaurant in the world (Sct. Pellegrino 2010; 2011) René Redzepi had an almost “rockstar status”. (Appendix 3). Food critic Niels Lillelund (Appendix 2) see a problem in this development of the “chef phenomenon” stating that, "The tendency has lead to cooking becoming a spectator’s sport, meaning that people would rather spend time watching cooking programmes on TV but they do not want to cook themselves; they actually spend more time watching." (Appendix 2). Niels Lillelund (Appendix 2) claims that internationally there have always been famous chefs, especially in France, but the very visible chef, such as the TV chef is a rather new phenomenon (Appendix 2).

To that it could be argued that most creative industries are “spectator sports”. They do not demand much physical participation on the part of the consumer. After all theatre, music, movies and art are enjoyed and watched, but the level of physical participation is limited to the consumer showing their enthusiasm and appreciation by clapping. Although the view presented by Niels Lillelund does contain some truth, the level of participation he is talking about is restricted to the tangible value of the product. The intangible, however, seems merely to induce consumer participation. Because the lack of tangible participation appears merely to heighten the level of intangible participation, since people talk about and discuss the experience. In fact, research conducted by the Danish Social Research Institute suggested that participation in cultural activities rose extensively in Denmark from 1975 to 1998 (The Danish Ministry of Culture 2001). The report by the Danish Social Research Institute on Denmark Creative Potential from 2001 states that, “There has never been so many demanding entertainment and involvement, wanting to discuss, experience and participate.”
Creativity in Gastronomy (The Danish Ministry of Culture 2001: 26). Participation within creative industries thus involves sharing the experience with others, for there is sometimes no tangible product to show. Caves (2002) argues that consumers value this form of non purposive conversation and adds that, “[...] word-of-mouth is a far more powerful transmitter of information on creative goods than on goods that lack their cachet as a social catalyst.” (Caves 2002: 181). This tendency of sharing information has seen a boom in the rise of social media, since everyone can now voice their opinion and share their experience (Gable 2011).

As mentioned, the “spectator sports” view on gastronomy voiced by Niels Lillelund (Appendix 2), does hold some truth. Why would someone buy a cookbook, if they never cook? Perhaps because they merely like the images in the book, or perhaps they like the look of the book as it sits on the shelf. In that sense it could be argued that the consumption of creative products induces social status. Consumers may purchase cookbooks but never cook. But this merely adds another dimension to the realm of creative consumption; conspicuous consumption. Conspicuous consumption is a theory proposed by Thorstein Veblen (Trigg 2001) who proposed that people consume to elevate their status in a social hierarchy. According to Andrew B. Trigg (2001), “To own property is to have status and honor, a position of esteem in this hierarchy: to have no property is to have no status.” (Trigg 2001: 100). And if the property consumed is intangible, the only way of elevating status is to share the experience.

But this is perhaps a common denominator in the consumption of creative products and services, or indeed in conspicuous consumption. Because in the case of creative industries we are often not talking about products or services that are merely “bare essentials” such as shelter, food and clothes. We are often talking about high-end products and services, and high-end products are more expensive, due to their intangible value.

4.2.5. Fashion and Food
A creative industry which shares a lot of commonalities with gastronomy is the fashion industry. They are both deeply rooted in French history and both share their love of haute-ness, having invented haute couture and haute cuisine (Trubek 2000). Directly translated from French, haute means high, referring to production which is high end, both in terms of quality and price.
In France fashion is protected by *The Fédération Française de la Couture, du Prêt-à-Porter des Couturiers et des Créateurs de Mode*, a federation which protects Haute Couture fashion and men's and women's Prêt-à-Porter (ready-to-wear) fashion (Parmal 2006). The federation establishes standards and qualities which must be met in order to be considered a member. The Federation protects the fashion houses which are designated as *Haute Couture*, a legally protected and controlled label which can only be granted by the French Ministry of Industry (Parmal 2006).

In the same manner, there are institutions, although not governmental, which protect haute cuisine and gastronomy. The French Guide Michelin is probably the most well established institution to uphold the standards of haute cuisine (Trubek 2000). The guide has existed and handed out Michelin stars since 1926 and established standards by which a restaurant can belong to the realm of Haute Cuisine (Trubek 2000). Although it is not a governmental institution, Guide Michelin offers the same guidance and standards and it appears that it is respected as much as the The Fédération.

Equally respected in the gastronomic world is the *S. Pellegrino World’s 50 Best Restaurants*, an annual list, "[...] of the opinions and experiences of over 800 international restaurant industry experts," (S. Pellegrino 2011), which in 2010 and 2011 appointed Noma as the number one restaurant in the world. These institutions, both within fashion and gastronomy, function to protect and govern these industries, and only once these institutions and stakeholders have recognised the finished (creative) products, is it worth something. In fact one argument as to why gastronomy is not considered a creative industry is the lack of recognition. Dornenburg and Page (1996) blame the relatively late emergence of critical commentary and argue that, "Without the presence of educated customers and critics, who was to say that some professional cooking could indeed be called culinary art?" (Dornenburg 1996: 5).

Recognition is important in Creative Industries. As implied by Caves (2002) it is the only way of assessing and validating the *nobody knows property* of creative production. But with the absence of professional critical input until the beginning of the 20th century, the production of cookbooks and texts, such as a menu helped in gaining some form of recognition. In the same manner that fashion magazines cultivated the fashion field, so did gastronomic texts. According to Priscilla Ferguson (1998) the use of gastronomic texts meant that, “Din-
ers, thus converted into readers, became full-fledged participants in the gastronomic field.” (Ferguson 1998: 600).

4.2.6. Beauty is in the Eye of the Beholder

The level of recognition appears to be equally important in both fashion and gastronomy. Fashion and gastronomy both involve consumption. According to Caves (2002), “Consumption of creative goods, like all other goods, depends on “tastes”, but for creative goods those tastes emerge from distinctive processes.” (Caves 2002: 173). This level of taste is developed and refined and thus consumption is not only concerned with bare essentials. If fashion and gastronomy were merely a matter of basic survival, social and cultural elements would have no meaning in the matter of consumption. Culture, trends, texture, seasonality, taste, colour and appearances have all influenced the manner in which fashion and food is consumed. Both fashion and food are concerned with current and future trends. They both look backwards and consider and use history as a means for inspiration. They are both the result of craft and believe that skills and training are necessary in order to achieve the optimal result. According to Caves (2002), “The designers know current and past styles, and they cast about among current developments in the fine arts, literature, and social happenings that can be translated into innovative design elements.” (Caves 2002: 183).

In the world of consumption, influenced by supply and demand, the designers have a lot of influence on the trends they create. However, in the world of creative products the demand aspect is often uncertain. There is not always a demand for creative products, since consumers are not always aware that they need the specific creative product. According to Caves (2002) this nobody knows property of creative goods implies that production of creative products is often high risk, since the need for the product is not always apparent. Furthermore, many creative products are experiences and therefore intangible which makes the demand for the product difficult to establish. According to Caves (2002), “A creative product is an experience good [...] but the buyer’s satisfaction will be a subjective reaction.” (Caves 2002: 3). This is one of the main features of creative products, as many creative products are experiences and intangible, consumers cannot get a refund if they do not like it. If consumers do not like a play, a movie or a concert, they cannot get a refund since the creative product has already been consumed when it was experienced. Since this is a main aspect of creative products, it is again a testimony that gastronomy should belong to the creative indus-
tries. Fashion is considered a creative industry despite the fact that if the consumer is not pleased with the product purchased; they can get a refund for the product, and can furthermore sell it to others since the product is tangible. This is not the case in gastronomy. Once the consumer has consumed the “experience” of the meal, they cannot get a refund (unless they refuse to pay) and they cannot sell the experience to others. If they were to go home and copy the recipes, they might be able to duplicate the tangible aspect of the meal, but the experience cannot be duplicated as the decor, atmosphere and service is not the same as in the restaurant they visited.

Since there is not always a demand for creative products, creative industries are very reliant on stakeholder opinions, such as reviews and word-of-mouth critique. Restaurants therefore rely on the reviews given by critiques and therefore the opinion of e.g. the Michelin Guide is crucial for creating a demand in the mind of the consumer. Since consumers cannot return a creative product, they are often reliant on critic's review of plays, concerts and movies since their “subjective and professional” opinion will often be a deciding factor before choosing to purchase the experience. This also provides the critics with a lot of power of the destiny of the creative industries as “the potential patron can access no other independent evidence before buying the ticket.” (Caves 2002: 189). Unlike the word of mouth review, it is of course assumed that the opinion of the critics is professional, neutral and objective, but it still remains viable in the mind of the consumer.

As mentioned, there is not necessarily a demand for these creative products and experience goods, so it is up to the fashion designer and the culinary designer to supply this demand. And since the consumer is not always aware that they were missing this particular experience, the designer will sometimes have to educate and convince the consumer to have a positive reaction.
5. EXPLORING CREATIVITY IN GASTRONOMY

“You don't act on your creative urges without the chef’s sanction. That is made very clear. I want automaton-like reproduction of an idea or a theme. But as people prove themselves, I allow them to express themselves, with guidance. The chance to be creative is a reward and an expression of trust. It's the carrot.” - Anthony Bourdain (Morse 2002: 7-8)

The quote above, presented by American Chef Anthony Bourdain, might sound a bit harsh but it does paint a picture of the life in the kitchen of top restaurants. In the world of restaurant kitchens, it would appear that people are in fact managed systematically. As mentioned in part one, most restaurants still adopt the very hierarchical Brigade System, introduced by Escoffier (Civitello 2004). With this chefs and apprentices have a clear role and function in the kitchen and their work is in this sense very much systematised and managed. Once the creative process of creating the dish is done and the dish is ready for the menu, it must be replicated to perfection several times each night. This process, called service, is not creative, it is systematic and repetitive.

As Anthony Bourdain states (Morse 2002), chefs are not allowed to improvise in the kitchen. Service is a systematic chain of events and if one link in the chain is weak, the chain breaks. This opposes the view of Florida (2003) who argues that, “[...] creative people tend to rebel at efforts to manage them overly systematically.” (Florida 2003: 133). Gastronomy and the kitchen of restaurants display a good example of the creative process and creative production but a rather disciplined and structured approach to both.

5.1. CREATIVE PERFORMANCE IN GASTRONOMY

According to Balazs (2002) the formalization in gastronomy seems to foster the development of creativity, instead of hindering it. According to Balazs (2002) top restaurants have both a high level of creativity and a strong formalization of work and production processes. However, she claims that, “Key is to know when and how to standardize without killing the spirit of creativity and innovation.” (Balazs 2002: 2562). However, she does also stress that this is mainly apparent in the initial phase of creating a new dish, once the dish is created and ready for the menu, the standardization kicks in, and the process is duplicated dish after dish, every day and every night.
Nevertheless the finished product, the finished dish, does create intangible value to the diner. To this Torsten Vildgaard (Appendix 3) states “[...] I would say that it is a very creative profession I have, but one which is not as creative when it comes to the more tangible aspects, than it is more about the craft.” (Appendix 3). The chef must master the craft before he, as Anthony Bourdain (Morse 2002) states, is allowed to be creative. The service part of gastronomy is thus not where creativity unfolds, but the process that goes into creating the dish is. But it would appear that this is, as implied, a process and not something that is a result of improvisation or chance.

The current literature of creative production does not include research on the creative process, but rather the finished product. To answer the second question of this project it is relevant to explore the creative process to identify whether a process can be detected, and how this process influences creative performance. As mentioned in part one, Amabile (1996) argues that there are three components which influence creativity. These are; domain-relevant skills, creativity-relevant skills, and task motivation. To explore creative performance in gastronomy, it is therefore relevant to explore the presence of these in gastronomy.

5.1.1. Gastronomy and Domain-relevant skills
In gastronomy, knowledge about the domain is essential. From the findings in part one it appears that there is a clear set of skills and techniques that a chef must master. Formal education is taught at culinary schools and here knowledge is acquired about food products, taste, technical skills and presentation (Dahl 2009). Chefs must have knowledge and technical skills and these are what they are judged on if they are to pass the apprenticeship test (Dahl 2009). In the documentary “Noma at the boiling point” René Redzepi (Vorting 2008) marked a day as one of the worst days in the history of Noma, because a chef cut a rump of lam lengthwise leaving it tough. The chef did not display the proper skills and was consequently dismissed from his section. Cutting skills are so elementary that René Redzepi argued, “This is something you should know the second week of school” (Vorting 2008). Gastronomy does require both formal and informal training and Torsten Vildgaard argues that, It is alpha omega! (Appendix 3). Once the skills are in place, then the chef can be creative, or as Anthony Bourdain would argue; then the chef is allowed to be creative (Morse 2002).
In regards to the domain, it is relevant to point out that the chef must also be aware of the domain in which he is in, as this might require new domain-relevant skills. Indeed by adopting for instance the New Nordic Cuisine, the chef chooses a sense of direction. This sense of direction dictates the goods which can be used and the chef must acquire knowledge about this domain in order to master it.

5.1.2. Gastronomy and Creativity-relevant Skills
If creative production is to be novel and original, creativity-relevant skills must be applied (Amabile 1998). Domain-relevant skills are in this sense only tools or means for application, but creativity-relevant skills determine the manner in which these tools are applied and the level of originality.

As implied, the domain is important as this determines which creativity-relevant skills should be applied. Many chefs and restaurants have a style or a starting point that they choose to work from. In the case of the New Nordic Cuisine, creativity-relevant skills must therefore be applied within this domain. If chefs have adopted the guidelines of the manifesto they must use seasonal products from the Nordic Region and in that sense it would be irrelevant to use i.e. foie gras or pineapple. In that sense the creativity-relevant skills are somewhat restricted but this seems only to induce creativity in gastronomy.

Torsten Vildgaard (Appendix 3) emphasises the importance of this when working on a new dish, stating that, “So when we think of red elements, we think of red Nordic elements, and then we try to put together red elements that taste delicious.” (Appendix 3). In that sense extensive knowledge is not sufficient as knowledge of heuristics must be applied in order to creative something novel. It could therefore be argued that within gastronomy a chef’s knowledge of heuristic is constantly challenged, due to the restriction of seasonality. Chefs know that products can only be used for a limited period before they run out of season, so they must constantly create new dishes. Claus Meyer supported this notion stating that, “[...] those trippings that the New Nordic Cuisine Manifesto represents for a chef, have been extremely conducive for the creativity in the New Nordic Cuisine.” (Appendix 1).
This constant challenge implies that the environment is very receptive to creative production. This could induce creativity since new and original ideas are valued and considered relevant. Torsten Vildgaard (Appendix 3) states that the chefs that work in the kitchen are encouraged to be creative. He explains that every Saturday night after service there is a session where the different stations have been asked to create a dish (Appendix 3). During the session the dish is tasted and praise and critique is given, thus challenging the chefs’ knowledge of heuristics.

5.1.3. Gastronomy and Task Motivation
The Saturday session at Noma, mentioned in the above, is a good example of a means for motivation. As argued by Amabile (1998) motivation is a key component in creative performance. And it is indeed important in gastronomy where repetition occurs daily. In the realm of the creative economy there is mention of the starving artist since extrinsic motivation, such as monetary value is often not a factor (Caves 2002). Many creative industries are crafts and therefore besides formal education, informal education or apprenticeship is important. In the documentary “Noma at the Boiling Point” it was made clear that there are both apprentice chefs, and chefs from all over the world that work at Noma for free. The value of work experience from working at Noma, is so important for the chef’s resume that they work there without compensation. (Vorting 2008). This indicates that extrinsic motivation of predefined tasks and challenges such as the Saturday session induce creativity.

As noted by Amabile (1996), former research indicated a struggle between the hydraulic and additive models of motivation. However, a union between the two models now indicate that intrinsic motivation is not undermined by extrinsic motivation, and also that extrinsic motivation can in some cases induce intrinsic motivation. Torsten Vildgaard supports this notion stating that, “Everytime you experience success, whether it is finishing a course or having a good session then it motivates you, because we are so passionate about what we do, it motivates you to come to work the next day.” (Appendix 3). Torsten Vildgaad (Appendix 3) also argues that the constant strive for perfection at Noma, can even induce motivation as he was sometimes inspired, “[...] Out of mere pressure!” (Appendix 3). Pressure to create a new dish or finalise the dish they are working on. It appears that both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation induce creativity in gastronomy. Despite the pressure of constantly having to create new dishes as the seasons change and the repetitive work of service; the strive for perfection,
that Torsten Vildgaard mentions could be an extrinsic motivation factor that actually induces intrinsic motivation and indeed creativity.

5.1.4. ARTISTIC ASPIRATION

As argued, domain-relevant skills are an important component in creative performance. In the realm of creative production and creativity, the notion of talent must be mentioned. Amabile (1996) argues that talent refers to a special skill that a person has a natural aptitude for. Talent may indeed be present in creative production, but seeing that it is a special skill, it can be cultivated through training. The problem with the notion of talent within creative production is that it sometimes limits the field to only include a selected few, and that it furthermore discards the notion that creativity can be cultivated by all. To this discussion Florida (2003) argues that, “Yet our society continues to encourage the creative talents of a minority, while it neglects the creative capacities of many more.” (Florida 2003: xiv). Therefore if creativity is to be considered an aptitude and an ability that all people possess, perhaps the term creative aspiration is more appropriate than talent. This is not to discard the notion of talent, indeed some people can have talent, but to discard the notion that creativity is only for the selected few. Rather, creative aspiration implies that people possess a natural aptitude for creativity, and through formal and informal training and indeed interest in a domain, this aptitude can be cultivated.

According to Ottenbacher and Harrington (2007) restaurants must be innovative in order to maintain competitive advantage. Dishes, settings, and ingredients can easily be copied, as there is no protection of copyright, and therefore chefs must constantly be creative and invent new dishes. However, Ottenbacher and Harrington (2007) argue that this cannot merely be up to coincidence but must be the result of systematic innovation, in order to achieve long-term competitive advantage.

Horng, Hu and Lin (Horng 2009) support this and argue that due to increased competition on the area, it is no longer enough to rely on a good reputation and excellent standard and well-known dishes. The dishes must now also be creative and innovative in order to gain competitive advantage.
The idea proposed by Florida (2003), that creative people do not like to be managed, does not seem to hold true in the field of gastronomy. Torsten Vildgaard (Appendix 3) argues, “[...] you can turn limitations into something positive. You can turn it into a sense of freedom. What we try to do, it might sound a bit naïve but we don’t choose to see it as a limitation, is to see it as though we are creating something new and we try to stay pretty open-minded [...].” (Appendix 3). Skills are essential in order to master the craft and give chefs the freedom to be creative with a purpose. Everything else is purely experimentation. It could be argued that many great ideas have come from nothing and literally happened by chance. But these are far too rare and creativity does not have to be left to chance. In that sense a task or challenge can provide guidelines or as Torsten Vildgaard argues limitations, and thereby creativity can be managed and encouraged to induce and optimize innovation on a high level.

5.2. The Creative Process
It appears that generation of novel ideas in gastronomy is rather structured. Ottenbacher and Harrington (2007) attempted to identify and outline this generation process in a research based on interviews with 12 Michelin-star chefs. The research resulted in a Seven Step Innovation Development Model, which indicates that there is a clear process that affects creative performance in gastronomy. The seven steps of the Innovation Development Model are; idea generation; screening; trial & error; concept development; final testing; training; and commercialization. This model somewhat matches the Componential Model of Creativity presented by Amabile (1996), although her model only presents five steps. The five steps of the Componential Model of Creativity are; problem or task identification; preparation; response generation; response validation and communication; and outcome. The two models can thus cast a light on the process that goes into creative performance and indeed creative performance in gastronomy.

5.2.1. Idea Generation
According to the research of Ottenbacher and Harrington (2007) the first step when creating a new dish is idea generation. Research indicates that a starting point for chefs is often decides which products to use. The criteria are primarily seasonality of the product. In the case of the New Nordic Cuisine, a further limitation has been set, since the products must be from the Nordic Region (Risvik 2008). According to Ottenbacher & Harrington “[...] the differentiator is not the product itself but rather the quality of the product.” (Ottenbacher 2007:...
9). And in this chefs must have domain-relevant skills and knowledge about products in order to assess if the quality meets the standards. Torsten Vildgaard (Appendix 3) states that the courses on Noma’s menu are changed as the products run out of season, thereby creating a clear task. This coincides with the first step of the Componential Model of Creativity proposed by Amabile (1996). Amabile argues that the first step of problem or task identification can either be internally or externally stimulated depending on task motivation. The task of creating a new dish with new products that are in season is thus externally stimulated but the format for the dish can be internally stimulated. At Noma the process of creating a new dish, often starts with a meeting in which ideas for a new dish are discussed and often a format would be agreed upon. This format could according to Torsten Vildgaard (Appendix 3) be colour, shape or product oriented. The meeting thus helps to establish a clear task, create a new dish and identify the format for the dish, and thereby generating new ideas for a dish.

Having tacit skills and knowing how to use them allows the chef to draw on inspiration from experience and know-how. According to Ottenbacher and Harrington (2007) sources of inspiration for dishes can come from various places. A chef can start with the product itself and find inspiration in that or can draw inspiration from classical dishes, travels, literature etc.

5.2.2. Screening
Before deciding whether or not an idea is appropriate, chefs screen the idea to decide the outcome. Once a format has been agreed upon, Torsten Vildgaard states that he and his team begin working on the dish. According to Ottenbacher & Harrington (2007) before actually cooking the dish, the chef tends to imagine and cook the dish in his head first, gathering all the different elements and components of the dish, before actually testing it in the kitchen. When asked if he visualises the dish before preparing it Torsten Vildgaard said, "Every day, every single day!" (Appendix 3). So it appears that there is a clear sense of direction before even cooking the dish the first time. Almost like a fashion designer or architect who would visualise a design and then draw a sketch, so the chef visualises the dish before creating it the first time. In the documentary The World’s Finest Chef (Dinesen 2011), the winner of Bocuse d’Or in 2011, Rasmus Kofoed, drew a sketch of the dish. Amabile (1996) identifies the second step of her componential framework as preparation. At this step domain-relevant
skills come into play as these will determine the duration of the preparatory stage. If the chef has sufficient domain-relevant skills the duration process will be shorter.

5.2.3. **Trial & Error**
The trial and error step is when chefs rely get to be creative. According to Ottenbacher and Harrington (2007) a chef can, using tacit knowledge, most likely imagine how the dish should taste, or at the very least have a very clear idea about it, before cooking it. Rasmus Kofoed depicts this process rather well in the documentary *The World’s Finest Chef*, where he states that, “We always start by playing around and trying something silly. You have to start somewhere like putting parsley in liquid nitrogen. It might be a disaster but it can give you a new idea about using something else and suddenly it’s spot on.” (Dinesen 2011).

This trial & error step is thus a good example of chefs using tacit knowledge and combining it with new inspiration for dishes. Their knowledge of products and preparation is used in combination with new ways of developing dishes, and challenging the classics. According to Torsten Vildgaard (Appendix 3) the dish is tasted by him and his team before presenting it to René Redzepi and they evaluate if seasoning and preparation is perfect. Torsten Vildgaard states that at Noma “[…] we strive for perfection.” And adds “[…] it’s one thing to taste it the first time and say ”Yes it’s good”, but then we know that we can do better. If we dig even deeper into our sub-conscience and our taste-buds, we can really get the course under our skin in a completely different way.” (Appendix 3).

Amabile (1996) identifies the third step of the componential framework as *response generation*. This third step is much reliant on the creativity-relevant skills as these will establish the level of innovation and originality. The third step of *response generation* proposed by Amabile thus also encompasses the *concept development* step proposed by Ottenbacher and Harrington.

5.2.4. **Concept Development**
As part of the trial & error step, the dish is prepared enough times to ensure that it can be replicated identically at every service (Ottenbacher 2007). Some elements might be adjusted to ensure that the process can be meticulously and perfectly prepared every time. Consequently, once the dish has been approved and deemed ready, the final recipe is written
down, and sometimes pictures of the final dish are taken (Ottenbacher 2007). The difficulty of this phase lies in the replication of the dish; simply since the quality of replication will rely on the chef’s domain-relevant skills. Naturally chefs can cook according to recipes, but their tacit and domain-relevant skills are crucial in this process, when it comes to preparing the dish. A recipe or instruction will not provide taste and to that the chef must know how the dish should taste and season it accordingly. Often instead of written instructions, haute cuisines will rely on memory rather than written instructions (Harrington 2007). Thus, chefs memorize the dish by repeatedly preparing it until it lives up to the standards of the chef-de-cuisine and the taste and seasoning of the dish is also memorized. Although the dish now lives up to the standards of the restaurant and has passed other criteria, many restaurants still wish to test if the dish lives up to market standards (Ottenbacher 2007). Chefs select their products based on quality and are not willing to compromise. Thus, they will not use inferior products to ensure that a dish can be put on the menu, but would rather not have the dish on the menu (Harrington 2007).

Another key element in the concept development phase is presentation and plating. The entire look and appearance of the dish must be perfect (Ottenbacher 2007). In haute cuisine this part of the development of the dish can take a substantial amount of time. Not only are the products, preparation and taste crucial, but the presentation is equally important. Torsten Vildgaard (Appendix 3) states that the process of developing a new dish can vary in duration and thus be a rather short process or sometimes the duration can extend to months even up to six months.

The concept development phase is where one might argue that creativity and innovation ceases. This is the phase where standardisation occurs and the work process goes from being playful and spontaneous to scheduled and planned (Ottenbacher 2007). However, in the realm of creative industries this does not have to be hamper creativity. The limitations created in this phase could induce creativity rather than eliminate it completely. This could be in terms of better and easier ways of preparing certain components of the dish. To this Amabile (1996) argues that intrinsic motivation can add to the domain-relevant skills and thus induce creativity-relevant skills. However, as argued by Amabile (1996) extrinsic factors need not be inhibitory to creativity but can induce intrinsic motivation.
5.2.5. Final Testing
To pass the final approval, the dish must be tasted by the chef-de-cuisine. According to Ottenbacher and Harrington (2007) other stakeholders could come into play at this step, such as the sommelier of the restaurant. Amabile (1996) proposes that the fourth step in creativity production is response validation. In that step she too stresses the importance of testing whether the product is appropriate in connection with domain-relevant skills. It is at this step that the validation of the product is determined. Torsten Vildgaard (Appendix 3) stresses the importance of perfection at this stage. In that sense it can be argued that besides the appearance of the five senses (smell, touch, hearing, sight, taste) the level of creativity will be determined by a sixth sense; perfection.

5.2.6. Training
Once the dish has been perfected and has received final approval, the dish must be trained (Appendix 3). Training is connected to teaching chefs of the different sections to prepare the dish. This can also be done before the final testing of the dish (Ottenbacher 2007). But sometimes the dish must have final approval before it is taught to other chefs in the restaurant. Again this step requires the sixth sense of perfection. In training for Bocuse d’Or Rasmus Kofoed and his assistant (apprentice chef) thus practiced the dishes for the competition for six months to ensure perfection (Dinesen 2011).

5.2.7. Commercialisation
The final step of the Innovation and Development Process is when the finished and approved dish is put on the menu and served to guests (Ottenbacher 2007). Here the success of the dish can be given as instant feedback from guests and seen in the number of dishes ordered. Amabile (1996) proposes that the final step of creative production is outcome. The final step thus includes evaluation of success or failure. If the outcome is a success or indeed a failure the creative process comes to an end. However, if the outcome is neither a success nor a failure the process must be revised and consequently return the stages 1, 2, 3, or 4 (Amabile 1996).

5.3. Critique
Based on the research of Ottenbacher and Harrington (2007) it could be argued that there is a sequential process in the creative production of gastronomy. However, rather than con-
cluding that this process is applicable to all creative production it is more viable to regard the model as a process that determines creative performance, as Amabile (1996) proposes. In that sense, instead of proposing a pre-set process that must be followed, the model indicates that there is a process that determines the success or failure of creative performance. This would ensure that the process of creative performance is perhaps a more conscious process.

Stier and Sandt (2007) criticize the Innovation Development Model of depicting a process that is linear and well-structured. Stier and Sandt (2007) find the actual process of innovation to be more chaotic and impulsive than the one proposed by Ottenbacher and Harrington (2007). However, it could be argued that creative performance can only be improved through a process such as the one proposed by Harrington and Ottenbacher (2007).

Stier and Sandt (2007) argue that creativity cannot be modelled in a well-structured way, stating that, “Creativity cannot be put into a box available when needed.” (Stierand 2007). The research of Ottenbacher and Harrington (2007) is one of the first of its kind, attempting to develop an innovation process model. In that sense the research on the field of gastronomy and creativity is still too limited to get a full grasp of the validation of Ottenbacher and Harrington’s research (2007). Perhaps creativity cannot be put into a box as Stier and Sandt (2007) argue but this notion would merely leave creativity to the art for art’s sake giving it no sense of direction. Despite their critique of the linear-depiction of the Innovation Development model, Stierand and Sandt (2007) do recognise the validation of the different stages. In that sense, the level of structure of creative production could be contested but there appears to be agreement that creativity is nevertheless a process. Amabile (1996) too supports this notion with her Componential Framework and furthermore argues that creativity does function better with structure and task motivation.

It would appear that gastronomy provides a good example of an industry that applies and values structure to obtain creative output. Domain-relevant skills are valued in terms of formal and informal training, as these form the building blocks for the craft of chefs. The domain-relevant skills are, however, not sufficient in the production of creative and original output. Here chefs rely on creativity-relevant skills. It appears that this is what merges the craft and art of gastronomy. If creativity-relevant skills are not present, chefs rely on repro-
ducing classic dishes instead of creating new ones. It is at this point that a creative process is important, if inspiration for a new dish does not come naturally. In that sense it appears that a task or challenge can help induce creative performance. Not by means of providing the chef with total autonomy to create but rather through setting limitations such as seasonal products. This challenges the chef to use domain-relevant skills and applying them to the task at hand. And by challenging the existing domain, the creativity-relevant skills are also challenged.
“I have a clear idea of how the plates should look and taste. You have a starting point and then you develop it further and constantly optimize it; in terms of the visual presentation so you can reveal the secret of each ingredient in its purest form with excellent flavour and in harmony with the others.”

- Rasmus Kofoed (The World’s Finest Chef 2011)
6. **Discussion**

Part one and two presented and explored the two central fields of this project; creative production and gastronomy. Following the examination of the two central fields and the analysis of the data, it would appear that there some future challenges concerning the two fields. With the research questions of this project in mind, some of these challenges will be discussed in following.

6.1. **Good, Better, Best!**

The success of the New Nordic Cuisine cannot be denied. It would appear that the framework and limitations provided by the ten-point Manifesto induced gastronomic creativity on many levels, and as noted in an article in the NY Times, *The New Nordic Cuisine Draws Disciples* (Moskin 2011). As the front-runner of the New Nordic Cuisine, Noma has offered creative output with success, and has for two years been named the world’s best restaurant. But what follows reaching the top and being named the best?

In his theory on conspicuous consumption, Thorstein Veblen (Trigg 2001) claimed that consumption was a means for social status. Therefore he claimed that those at the bottom of the hierarchy would always emulate those at the top (Trigg 2001). This implies that those at the top of the hierarchy create trends that trickle-down to the bottom of the hierarchy. In that sense, it would appear that Noma is currently at the top of a gastronomy-hierarchy and also the front-runner of the *Nordic Invasion* (Moskin 2011), thereby creating trends that trickle-down the hierarchy.

According to Claus Meyer this is no coincidence. It was a clear strategy of the New Nordic Cuisine to have a critically acclaimed restaurant as the front-runner, stating that it "[...] was definitely and consciously top-down!" (Appendix 1). It was therefore a conscious effort to implement the New Nordic Cuisine from the top of the hierarchy but only to ensure that the Manifesto would spread into lower levels of the hierarchy and thereby manifest itself into the daily lives of the Danish population. He had a clear strategy from the beginning by means of introducing the New Nordic Cuisine at top level stating that, "[...] in that sense, we have of course speculated in that sort of trickle-down-effect." (Appendix 1).
Claus Meyer’s strategy worked and the effect of the New Nordic Cuisine has reached many branches and now it is even visible on supermarkets shelves, with i.e. Danish bread manufacturer Kohberg offering "New Nordic" bread. These "New Nordic", products offered in supermarket do, however, not share much comparison to the likes of the food offered at Noma. In an article in the Danish newspaper 24timer Claus Meyer states, “If you think that Noma is synonymous with New Nordic Food, then you are way off. Noma is just the haute couture-version of the New Nordic Cuisine [...]” (Cuculiza 2010). Many restaurants have implemented the New Nordic Cuisine and some with success, but critic Niels Lillelund claims that there is a notable difference in quality, stating “[...] when it is not as exquisite, as it is at Noma, then it sometimes becomes a bit insipid, kind of boring basically”. (Appendix 2). In that sense it would appear that the level of quality and originality differs a lot in gastronomy. It would therefore be appropriate for some means for distinguishing original and creative production, from that which is merely imitation. In that sense, those that are truly original should be recognised for this.

Nevertheless, gastronomy is not recognised for its creative output to the like of creative industries, and thereby has not received critical acclaim for the intangible value of the products and services. There are critics that value gastronomy, and there are measures for success offered means of Michelin Stars and a list such as the one offered by S. Pellegrino. The problem, however, with these rating systems is that they offer a constellation that only allows restaurant to reach a certain level of a hierarchy; but what happens once they reach the top? Indeed, it could be argued that the lack of a more nuanced level of review and recognition would imply, that once restaurants reach the top there is nothing left to achieve. And since it was found that chefs always strive for perfection, then perhaps these barriers for success have become somewhat distorted.

Rasmus Kofoed stated, after winning the title as the world’s finest chef, that he would never enter into the Bocuse d’Or contest again, he had reached his goal (Finnedahl 2011). But why is that? After all, not many actors would end their career after winning an Academy Award. This may be due to fact that they win an Academy Award based on their performance in a movie, thus allowing them pursue the same with the next role they play. In the same manner, critics do not review the House of Chanel after fashion week, they review the collection...
showcased at fashion week; and in theatre, critics review a play, not the theatre. In that sense the means for improvement with a new collection or a new play are always present. But this would appear not to be the case in gastronomy. From the findings in this project, it would appear that restaurants are valued based on many of the same parameters as creative industries such as, aesthetics and presentation. The value and recognition system is, however, constellated in a manner that only allows restaurants to reach a certain level. It would appear that gastronomy needs a more nuanced system for recognition than the one offered by the existing.

Perhaps such a system could be offered if gastronomy was recognised in the definitions of creative industries.

6. CONCLUSION

The objectives of this project were to explore; why gastronomy is not considered a creative industry; and to explore how a structured approach to creativity influences creative performance.

From empirical and literature research on the field of creative industries, it became apparent that gastronomy was not included in the definitions presented. From the basic findings on the field of creative industries, it was assumed that gastronomy could be fall under the definition of a creative industry.

Creative industries value creative production, i.e. tangible products or services with intangible value. These products or services must to some extent be novel, original, or artistic; but the extent to which they are this, is determined by professional critics and stakeholders. It is concluded that the products or services have to be recognised as creative before they can fall under distinction of creative production.

It is concluded that some gastronomic outcome is novel, original and artistic. It is therefore concluded that the reason why gastronomy is not considered a creative industry is due to the lack of recognition of creative production.
It was found that creativity is a human ability; thereby it is concluded that it is an ability which can be cultivated through skills; formal and informal training and be motivated both intrinsically and extrinsically.

It was found that within gastronomy, skills and motivation are applied in a manner which induces creative performance. The application of this was through a structured process. This process implies that the craft of gastronomy must be mastered through means of skills. It is concluded that with guidelines such as the New Nordic Cuisine Manifesto, chefs found that the limitation of only using seasonal products set a clear task and a challenge that induced creative performance.
7. Bibliography


Christensen, Bent (2008): *Gastronomien I Danmark*. Copenhagen, Denmark: Lindhardt and Ringhof


Copenhagen Hospitality College http://www.hrs.dk/english.aspx


8. APPENDICES

Appendix 1

Appendix 2

Appendix 3

(Appendices are not included in this version)