

Original Paper


doi [10.15826/recon.2022.8.4.024](https://doi.org/10.15826/recon.2022.8.4.024)

UDC 330

JEL O14, P10, R58



Theoretical approaches to identifying creative industries

I.D. Turgel , V.V. Derbeneva, I.V. Baskakova, K.V. ChukavinaUral Federal University, Ekaterinburg, Russia;  i.d.turgel@urfu.ru

ABSTRACT

Relevance. The relevance of the study is determined by the growing importance of creative industries in the global economy, which necessitates the formation of common approaches to identifying and defining creative industries to make effective management decisions at the state level. The lack of a unified approach to defining the conceptual and methodological apparatus necessitates additional research on this topic.

Purpose of the study. The purpose of this study is to conduct a comparative analysis of approaches to identifying creative industries that have developed in the international and domestic academic community.

Data and methods. The study is based on the Scoping review method, which consists of a full analysis of the existing literature in the context of key concepts of a given area of research. The international bibliographic database Scopus was used to select publications for the review. To consider the national specifics of research, the sample was expanded to include articles from the Russian Science Citation Index (RSCI).

Results. The article reviews and summarizes the existing scientific approaches to identifying creative industries, highlights the main debatable issues of terminology in the field of the creative economy. Based on a comprehensive review of the approaches of international and domestic researchers, the article presents a system of criteria for identifying creative industries, which are differentiated by types of sources, specifics, and results. The application of this system of criteria will allow us to determine the boundaries of creative industries and distinguish creative industries from the general array of economic sectors.

Conclusion. Systematization of theoretical approaches to defining and identifying creative industries is a necessary condition for their further classification and evaluation. The proposed system of criteria is a synthesis of existing approaches, which makes it universal and suggests the possibility of its practical application for solving a wide range of tasks related to managerial decision-making in the field of creative economy development.

KEYWORDS

creative economy, creative industry, cultural industries, knowledge economy, copyright industries, creative clusters, intellectual property

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The research was supported by the Russian Science Foundation Grant No. 22-18-00679 <https://rscf.ru/project/22-18-00679/>

FOR CITATION

Turgel, I.D., Derbeneva, V.V., Baskakova, I.V., & Chukavina, K.V. (2022). Theoretical approaches to identifying creative industries. *R-economy*, 8(4), 310–326. doi: 10.15826/recon.2022.8.4.024

Теоретические подходы к выделению креативных индустрий

И.Д. Тургель , В.В. Дербенева, И.В. Баскакова, К.В. ЧукавинаУральский федеральный университет, Екатеринбург, Россия;  i.d.turgel@urfu.ru

АННОТАЦИЯ

Актуальность. Актуальность исследования определяется возрастающим значением креативных индустрий в мировой экономике, что вызывает необходимость формирования общих подходов к определению и выделению креативных индустрий для принятия эффективных управленческих решений на государственном уровне. Отсутствие единого подхода в определении понятийного и методологического аппарата обуславливает необходимость дополнительных исследований по данному вопросу.

Цель исследования. Целью данного исследования является проведение сравнительного анализа подходов к выделению совокупности креативных индустрий, сложившихся в международном и отечественном академическом сообществе.

КЛЮЧЕВЫЕ СЛОВА

креативная экономика, креативная индустрия, культурные индустрии, экономика знаний, индустрии авторского права, креативные кластеры, интеллектуальная собственность

Данные и методы. Исследование построено на основе метода Scoring review, подразумевающего полноценный анализ существующей литературы в разрезе ключевых концепций в рассматриваемой области исследований. С целью формирования выборки публикаций для обзора была использована международная библиографическая база данных Scopus. Для учета национальной специфики исследований выборка была расширена включением статей из Российского индекса научного цитирования (РИНЦ).

Результаты. В статье проведен обзор и обобщены существующие научные подходы к выделению креативных индустрий, освещены основные дискуссионные вопросы терминологии в сфере креативной экономики. На основе комплексного обзора подходов зарубежных и отечественных исследователей представлена система критериев выделения креативных индустрий, дифференцированная по видам источников, специфике и результатам. Применение данной системы критериев даст возможность определения границ креативных индустрий и выделения креативных индустрий из общего массива экономических отраслей.

Выводы. Систематизация существующих в теории точек зрения к определению и выделению креативных индустрий является необходимым условием для их дальнейшей классификации и оценки. Предложенная система критериев является синтезом существующих подходов, что делает ее универсальной и предполагает возможность ее практического применения для решения широкого спектра задач, связанных с принятием управленческих решений в сфере развития креативной экономики.

БЛАГОДАРНОСТИ

Исследование выполнено за счет гранта Российского научного фонда № 22-18-00679, <https://rscf.ru/project/22-18-00679/>

ДЛЯ ЦИТИРОВАНИЯ

Turgel, I.D., Derbeneva, V.V., Baskakova, I.V., & Chukavina, K.V. (2022). Theoretical approaches to identifying creative industries. *R-economy*, 8(4), 310–326. doi: 10.15826/recon.2022.8.4.024

识别创意产业的理论方法

图尔格尔✉, 杰尔贝内娃, 巴斯卡科娃, 楚卡维娜

乌拉尔联邦大学, 叶卡捷琳堡, 俄罗斯; ✉ i.d.turgel@urfu.ru

摘要

现实性: 创意产业在全球经济中日益增长的重要性决定了这项研究的现实意义。这就需要形成共同的方法来定义和选择创意产业, 以便在州一级进行有效的政府决策。由于在定义概念和方法论方面缺乏统一的方法, 有必要对这个问题进行更多的研究。

研究目标: 本研究的目的是对国际与国内学术界出现的一系列创意产业方法论进行比较分析。

数据与方法: 该研究以范围综述为基础, 需要从有关研究领域的关键概念方面对现有文献进行全面分析。由国际书目数据库Scopus来生成综述所用的出版物样本。考虑到本国研究的特殊性, 样本被扩大到包括俄罗斯科学引文索引(РИНЦ)的文章。

研究结果: 本文回顾并总结了目前学术界对创意产业的认定方法, 并强调了创意经济领域术语的主要争议性问题。本文在全面回顾国内外研究者方法的基础上, 提出了一套按来源类型、特殊性和结果进行区分的创意产业标准体系。这套标准体系的应用将有可能界定创意产业的边界, 并将创意产业从一般的经济部门中区分出来。

结论: 对现有的关于定义和识别创意产业的理论观点进行系统化, 是对其进一步分类和评估的前提。拟议的标准体系是现有方法的综合, 它具有普遍性, 且具有实际应用的可能性。该标准可以解决与创意经济发展领域的管理决策相关的广泛任务。

关键词

创意经济、创意产业、文化产业、知识经济、版权产业、创意集群、知识产权

致谢

该研究得到了俄罗斯科学基金会第 22-18-00679 号资助 <https://rscf.ru/project/22-18-00679/>

供引用

Turgel, I.D., Derbeneva, V.V., Baskakova, I.V., & Chukavina, K.V. (2022). Theoretical approaches to identifying creative industries. *R-economy*, 8(4), 310–326. doi: 10.15826/recon.2022.8.4.024

Introduction

Creative economy is a relatively new concept that entered the scientific and political discourse at the end of the 20th century. However, despite its novelty, this phenomenon is of great interest to scientists, experts, economists, politicians, and representatives of civil society (Durey, 2021).

High attention to this issue is caused by the following circumstances.

Firstly, creative industries are becoming more significant as a new driver of economic growth. The share of the creative sector in the economy is already quite noticeable and will grow significantly in the future. According to the World Intellec-

tual Property Organization, this sector accounts for 5.1% of global GDP and 5.3% of total employment. According to the UNESCO methodology, the share of creative industries in global GDP was about 3% in 2015. In 2020, the gross value added of the creative industries in Russia amounted to 2.7 trillion rubles. In terms of the share of creative industries in GDP (2.7% in 2020), Russia is still behind the leaders in this field – the United States and China, where the same indicator amounts to 4.2% and 4.3%, respectively¹.

Secondly, creative industries attract a highly educated, skilled workforce. Such workers are “qualified consumers” of material and spiritual goods, informal leaders of public opinion. Employment in the creative economy grew even at the peak of the pandemic (from 3.9 to 4.8 million people in 2017–2020²). In 2020, 4.7% of all employed people worked in creative professions, and 70% of them had higher education³.

Thirdly, the development of the creative economy is an important factor in overcoming social exclusion and inequality, and it contributes to urban and social revival (Tajtáková, M. & Olejárová, M., 2021). The creative economy is particularly important for enabling full and productive activity, creating decent jobs, stimulating entrepreneurship, promoting the formalization and development of micro-, small- and medium-sized enterprises (Borsekova et al., 2021), encouraging social inclusion (Mengi, O. & Guaralda, M., 2021). 61% of those employed in the creative industries of Russia work in small- and micro-businesses⁴. There are especially many creative businesses in the segment of individual entrepreneurs.

The growing attention given to the development of the creative economy is evidenced by the fact that the UN General Assembly declared 2021 the “International Year of the Creative Economy for Sustainable Development” (UN resolution A/RES/74/198 of December 19, 2019).

¹ Creativeization of the entire economy. News portal of the HSE Institute for Statistical Research and Economics of Knowledge (02.11.2021). Available at: <https://issek.hse.ru/news/525365722.html?ysclid=19a599akaj263104583>

² Effects of the corona crisis on the creative economy. News portal of the HSE Institute for Statistical Research and Economics of Knowledge (26.10.2021). Available at: <https://issek.hse.ru/news/522653516.html?ysclid=19a5fb017q717341535>

³ Creativeization of the entire economy. News portal of the HSE Institute for Statistical Research and Economics of Knowledge (02.11.2021). Available at: <https://issek.hse.ru/news/525365722.html?ysclid=19a599akaj263104583>

⁴ Ibid.

Meanwhile, despite the circumstances, many issues related to the development of the creative economy have not yet attracted the attention of scientists. There is no unity in understanding the composition of the creative industries included in the creative economy. Justification of decisions in economic policy is not always based on a fundamental science. The specificity of the composition of creative industries in countries with different types of socio-economic and political systems is underestimated.

The concept of creative industries entered academic discourse when the term “Creative Industries” was first used in the 1994 “Creative Nation of Australia” report. However, it received worldwide recognition four years later, in 1998, when the UK Department for Culture, Media and Sports (DCMS) published the Creative Industries Mapping Document. The DCMS report made the first scientific attempt to define creative industries. According to the DCMS definition, creative industries are all industries that require “creativity and talent that have the potential to enrich and create jobs through the use of their intellectual property”. This was followed by definitions proposed by the European Commission⁵, which defined creative industries as industries that use culture as an input, and by UNCTAD⁶, which focused on the creative aspect and considered creative industries as a set of creative economic activities. The ensuing formalization of the concept of creative industries has given impetus to the practical creation of a new cultural and creative environment (Maddah et al., 2021), which promotes the development of cities and the economic development of regions (Liang, S. & Wang, Q., 2020). However, the study of creative industries has remained an intellectual challenge.

According to Howkins (2001), an apologist for the creative economy, neither creativity nor economics are new, but the nature of their relationship and how they are linked to create special value and wealth is. Howkins uses the term “creative economy” broadly, and it includes fifteen creative industries: advertising, architecture, arts, crafts, design, fashion, film, music, performing arts, publishing, research and development, soft-

⁵ European Commission (2011). Priority Sector Report: Creative and Cultural Industries. The European Cluster Observatory, Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 43 p.

⁶ UNCTAD (2008). Creative Economy Report 2008, UNCTAD.

ware, toys and games (excluding video games), television, radio, and computer games.

Most researchers view creative industries as a key driver of economic growth, both nationally and globally (Lei, 2021). According to Muller et al. (2008), creative industries perform three roles. Firstly, creative industries are the main source of innovative ideas, thus contributing to the creation of new products and services. Secondly, creative industries offer services that can contribute to the innovation activities of other businesses and organizations inside and outside of creative industries. Thirdly, creative industries require adaptation and new technological developments, providing an innovative impetus for technology producers. In addition, creative industries are an important sector for economic growth and development not only in terms of creating jobs or expanding economic activity, but also due to their role in promoting economic evolution by contributing to behavioral, social, and institutional evolution (Potts, 2009). Culture as a shared value can influence efficiency, equity, or the setting of economic and social goals. These individual effects combine into collective outcomes and influence macroeconomic outcomes such as GDP, technology performance, employment, structural change, income, and welfare programs (Throsby, 2010).

It should be noted that studies aimed at identifying the contribution and impact of creative industries and creative employment on the regional economy demonstrate a growing interest in this area. According to Professor Florida (2004), who is known for the concept of the creative class and its role in “urban regeneration”, the interest stems from the fact that creativity is seen as a driver of growth and is associated with high levels of economic development. The works of Marco-Serrano et al. (2014), Stam et al. (2008), Snowball (2016), Eikhof & Haunschild (2007) establish that countries and regions with a significant concentration of the creative class have a competitive advantage, and that there is a causal relationship between GDP per capita and employment intensity in the creative industries.

John Howkins (2001) and Richard Florida (2003) also argue for the close relationship between creativity and innovation and productivity growth as a key driver of economic growth, competitiveness, as well as economic and social well-being. Howkins and Florida point out that creative industries have a strong innovative potential, they influence innovation processes and

knowledge-based growth in other areas of the economy, impacting value chains horizontally and vertically as suppliers and customers. Moreover, a broad interpretation of creativity led to Richard Florida’s theory (2002) of the emerging creative class – a group of professional, scientific, and artistic workers operating in conditions of economic, social, and cultural dynamism, especially in urban areas. The creative class is the main lever for the development of culture and civilization in the modern era (Florida, 2016).

Even though various aspects of the creative economy are widely covered in the scientific literature, a comprehensive understanding of the essence of creative industries has not yet been formed. This leads to a plurality of terminology and the existence of different approaches to identifying creative industries.

To identify the relevance of scientific topics and scientific gaps, we selected 34 review articles over 19 years based on a thematic sample from the Scopus database (see Methods and Data chapter), which also included publications with more than 100 citations ($n = 4$). There were also six articles with 1 citation and three articles that had not yet been cited, two of which were published in 2021. However, these publications were included in our review due to their recent release date, given that the age of the article has a significantly greater effect on the citation growth than its relevance (Raitskaya & Tikhonova, 2020). The most highly cited publication (415 citations as of July 21, 2022) is “Creativity and tourism. The state of the art” (Richards, 2011). The selected 34 publications were published in 28 journals, of which more than one publication was published in 6 journals. The most highly cited reviews appeared on the pages of *Annals of Tourism Research* and *Urban Studies*, which indicates the demand for urban and sectoral studies.

28 out of 34 review articles belong to the “Social Sciences” field: “Geography, Planning and Development” (17), “Urban Studies” (4), “Sociology and Political Science” (1), Social Sciences (miscellaneous) (6). The remaining 6 articles belong to the following scientific areas: “Business, Management and Accounting” – 4; “Economics, Econometrics and Finance” – 2. The revealed distribution confirms that a comprehensive study of creative industries in the scientific field is interdisciplinary in nature (which is reflected in the literature on urban planning, geography, economics, and cultural studies) and leads to the borrowing

of definitions without clear explanations (Chapain & Sagot-Duvaurox, 2021; Durey, 2021). This inconsistency is most clearly manifested when conducting regional studies (Correa-Quezada et al., 2018; Dunska & Marcinkevica, 2017; Agustina et al., 2020). In Russian literature, creativity is also considered in a cross-scientific context and is a subject of interest for psychology, sociology, cultural studies, economics, and political science (Matsko, 2021). In this regard, we can assume that the interdisciplinarity of the creative economy may be one of the main reasons for the terminological plurality, since this phenomenon is considered from different points of view depending on the scientific direction of research.

Review articles come from authors with affiliations at universities and research centers in

the following countries: UK (8); USA (4); Australia (4); Spain (3); Germany (2); Turkey (2); Singapore (2); Netherlands (1); Mexico (1); Argentina (1); France (2); Italy (1); Hungary (1); South Africa (1). A total of 14 countries are represented. There are no scientists with Russian affiliation and nationality among the authors. Therefore, the academic discourse of Russian authors on the topic of creative industries is not reflected in the international scientific community.

The analysis of thematic clusters shows that most review articles are on the topics of regional policy in the field of cultural industries and urban transformation in the context of the creative economy (Table 1). The least represented cluster in review articles is a theoretical block of articles aimed at understanding the essence of the creative

Table 1

Main thematic clusters of review articles on the creative economy

Cluster Title	Review Number	Content
Creative clusters Creative place-making	6	This cluster discloses the concept of creative placemaking within the framework of a creative city, analyzes the development strategy for creative placemaking, the creation of network organizations of creative and cultural industries. It studies the prerequisites for the emergence of creative clusters and the contribution of city districts with a different set of creative clusters to the processes of urban renewal.
Development of individual industries of the creative economy Creative industries	5	This cluster considers individual creative industries and their impact on the perception of cities. In particular, it studies the relationship between tourism and creativity, the rationale for the «creative turn» in tourism studies, with a focus on cultural tourism and non-material culture. It assesses the impact of large-scale entertainment events on the economic development of the city. It assesses how the presence of professional and creative classes is changing the economy and the retail landscape, using the example of a study of coffee shops.
Regional (city) policy in the field of cultural industries Cultural policies	7	This cluster covers the issues of urban cultural policy, cultural planning, and cultural neighborhood, and it studies models of progressive cultural districts. It studies the policy of urban regionalism in a comparative aspect. It considers issues of attracting creative employees in the territory and determines factors reflecting the most attractive territories for innovation.
Urban transformation	10	The cluster examines the transformation of the meaning of cities for people in connection with the development of creative industries, as well as the development of sectors of the creative economy in medium and small towns. In particular, it explores the revival of industrial territories due to their multifunctional use by representatives of creative industries; contradictions of social interactions concerning the use of the territories of the state/business/people of creative professions who are far from the economic exploitation of creativity; issues of innovative urban brand management strategies.
Modeling and measurement of creative industries	3	This cluster actively explores the impact of cultural and creative industries (in terms of social, economic, and environmental impact) on the development of regions. It shows that cultural industries improve the development of the regional and local economy. Research is driven by a lack of tools to evaluate the contribution of these innovations.
Theoretical understanding of creative industries Rethinking creative industries research	3	The articles focus on the definition of the term “cultural industry”, the measurement of cultural industries in an international context, as well as the identification of intercountry differences. There is a spatial dynamic that highlights the key importance of the development features of creative industries in cities. The cluster addresses the differences in understanding creative industries in the reports of international organizations and theoretical approaches. It considers the implications and limitations of some theoretical approaches to creative industries clustering in order to understand the geography and development of creative industries; it argues that existing literature treats these approaches “separately”, without recognizing the importance of other actors and forces.

Source: developed by the authors based on 34 review articles

economy. Review articles that attempt to systematize the criteria for classifying creative industries (Pererva, 2021) are based on an analysis of the totality of approaches of international organizations and the scientific community, which does not allow us to determine the contribution of scientists to this topic.

Russian authors began to include the creative economy in the academic discourse in 2007–2008. In early publications, the creative economy was considered in the context of the transition to a post-industrial economy and the importance of human capital as the main intellectual asset (Savina, 2008; Berezhnaya, 2008). At that time, the need to identify and classify creative industries was determined by the emerging Russian practice; the gaps in theory were often closed by the studies of international authors and the canonical approach of the international organizations DCMS, UNCTAD, and UNESCO. All of it was reflected in the practice-oriented approach to research at the time.

An analysis of the dynamics of Russian scientific publications reveals that researchers showed low interest in the topic of creative industries in 2008–2012 (approximately 20 articles per year in the RSCI database). A sharp increase in publications (70 articles per year) on the topic of the creative economy was observed in 2014, which can be explained by the introduction of creative industries at the legislative level⁷. Research of that period is characterized by an interest in the issues of legislative support for creative industries (Lavrinenko, 2015), as well as the development of certain types of creative industries in Russian regions (Shcherbakova, 2015; Demidov & Komarova, 2014). The demand for a solid theoretical basis necessitated research that offered original approaches to the definition of the terminological apparatus (Kuznetsova, 2022) and systematization of accumulated international experience (Khestanov, 2018).

Thus, at the moment, neither international nor Russian scientific literature has a consensus on the definition of creative industries, as well as the criteria for their evaluation and identification. There is also no standard methodology for measuring the impact of creative industries on the economy. According to Hui (2007), this means that the creative sector is a growing economic area

with a valuable contribution to the local economy and significant job creation potential. Therefore, the study of contradictions in the definitions of creative industries and criteria for their evaluation remains a topical issue. Theoretical clarity on this issue will contribute to the development of effective policies and the adoption of correct management decisions in the field of creative economy.

The need to “fill in” the resulting theoretical gap led us to formulating the purpose of our study and research objectives.

The purpose of the study is to conduct a comparative analysis of approaches to identifying the totality of creative industries that have developed in the international academic community. The authors base the research on the assumption that there is, firstly, a logical and meaningful continuity of research practices; secondly, the cross-country and interdisciplinary specificity of approaches to identifying creative industries.

Research objectives:

- to generalize and systematize approaches to defining the creative economy and identifying creative industries used in the economic policy development;
- to develop a system of criteria for identifying creative industries based on a review of established research practices;
- to substantiate the practical significance of theoretical approaches to identifying creative industries.

Methods and data

The study is based on the Scoping review method – a full analysis of the existing literature in the context of key concepts in the specific area of research for a certain period. Such reviews are used mainly for the purpose of summarizing previously obtained results in a certain subject area, identifying the types of existing research, clarifying terms and concepts, identifying key characteristics or factors associated with the concept, identifying gaps in existing research (Munn et al., 2018). A scoping review, unlike a systematic review, usually does not include criteria for assessing the quality of existing studies. A scoping review is often a precursor to a systematic review.

The international bibliographic database Scopus, which is published by Elsevier, was used to form a sample of publications for review at the first stage. All periodicals in Scopus are checked by the Content Selection & Advisory Board, the quality of publications is assessed by the h-index,

⁷ Fundamentals of the state cultural policy (approved by Decree of the President of the Russian Federation dated December 24, 2014 No. 808 “On approval of the Fundamentals of the state cultural policy”).

CiteScore, SCImagoJournalRank (SJR), Source Normalized Impact per Paper (SNIP). The articles in Scopus were selected on the basis of cross-requests for three groups of keywords: research subject, analyzed process, types of cities in the research focus (Table 2). The resulting database contains 843 articles published in 415 journals since 1998 (Table 2). Number of review articles – 34, articles – 556, books, book chapters – 237, conference papers – 9, editorials – 5.

To consider the national specifics of research, the sample was expanded to include articles from the Russian Science Citation Index (RSCI). RSCI is a national bibliographic database of scientific citations, which contains more than 12 million publications of Russian authors, as well as information on the citation of these publications from more than 6,000 Russian journals. Lists of publications in the RSCI database were formed based on the following keywords: Creative Industries, Creative sector; Creative economy; Cultural Industries, Cultural sector; Experience economy; Knowledge-based economy; Copyrights Industries, Copyright-Based Industries. The generated database contains 386 articles published in 239 journals since 2009.

Subsequently, the review procedure consisted of structuring concepts, approaches, and research methods based on the publications by international and Russian researchers.

The article is organized as follows. First, we examined the existing points of view on the pairs of concepts “cultural industries” and “creative industries”, “creative economy” and “creative industries”, on the basis of which we identified key approaches to these definitions. After that, we reviewed the approaches to identifying creative industries proposed in the scientific literature. Based on a comprehensive review, we systematized the criteria for classifying industries as creative industries. Finally, we substantiated the practical significance of theoretical approaches to identifying creative industries.

Results

Despite the fact that there are many publications devoted to the creative economy sector, a single concept of identifying creative/cultural industries has not yet been adopted. This is reflected in the numerous synonyms for the creative economy used in different countries: Creative Industries (sectors), Cultural Industries (sectors), Experience Economy, Orange Economy. Russian scientific literature is also characterized by terminological diversity. The following alternative definitions are used: “leisure industry” (Matsko, 2022), “entertainment industry” (Kamalov, 2021), “experience economy” (Kolodnyaya, 2022; Shchurina, 2022), “creative industries” (Gorbovsckaya, 2020), “knowledge economy” (Ovtsinova, 2018), but the most common terms are “creative economy” and “creative industries”.

The first point of interest is the lack of “theoretical clarity” in the definition of creative industries, one of the reasons for which is their complex structure and various approaches to their identification (Cunningham, 2002). Terminology lacks rigor, it is often inconsistent and “confusing” (Galloway & Dunlop, 2007). The lack of consensus in the definition is primarily due to the absence of a generally accepted system of criteria for identifying types of activities that classify industries as “cultural” and “creative”. Differentiation of definitions inevitably leads to different groupings of creative industries being enshrined in the regulatory documents of different countries, and even greater diversity in the scientific literature.

Scientific approaches to identifying creative industries

Cultural and creative industries

The terminological plurality of concepts in the field of creative economy does not always mean that the proposed terms are synonymous. In particular, even though some countries (Germany, Poland, Italy, New Zealand) and organizations (The World Bank) identify cultural industries

Table 2

Groups of keywords for article selection

Research subject	Processes	Types of cities
Creative economy Creative industries Creative city Creativity city criteria Creativity industries criteria Creativity criteria evaluation	Digital transformation Reindustrialization Urban policy Urban renewal Urban regeneration	Second tier city Secondary city Company town Resource town Industrial city

Source: compiled by the authors

(cultural sector) within “creative industries (creative sector)” at the level of regulatory documents (Zhuravleva & Tokarev, 2021), research opinions on this issue are divided. The terms “cultural industries” and “creative industries” are often used interchangeably. The works of Garnham (2005), as well as Galloway and Dunlop (2007), can be noted among the studies that analyze the transition from cultural to creative industries.

In 2002, Cunningham (2002) offered an explanation for the difference between cultural and creative industries. He argued that the latest phase of technological change, including the Internet and digitalization, had supplanted the old concept of cultural industries: while the “classic” cultural industries emerged from the technological advances of the early twentieth century, the creative industries are the product of the technological changes of the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries. Another explanation can be found in the work of Hesmondhalgh (2013), who points out that creative industries represent a natural evolution of cultural industries, and that both deal with “the specific dynamics of symbolic production and circulation, and the main difference between the two terms is a less clear understanding of the role of culture or creativity in contemporary economies and societies”.

An original approach was proposed by Zuev and Vasetsky (2010), who suggested that all industries are cultural industries, as they are a means of reproduction and consumption of culture. For example, clothing, furniture, workplace equipment, communication methods – everything is part of the culture, and everything is put on an industrial basis in one form or another.

The article by Miège (2018), which is the result of a 20-year theoretical search for combining creative and cultural industries into a single definition, concludes that the diversity of activities of the creative economy leads to diversity in legislative regulation, professional standards, and the logic of functioning, which does not allow these industries to be combined in one cluster. However, the author highlights similar elements of creative and cultural industries that can be observed in the content of the final product – namely, its creative component. According to Zaikin (2022), who also distinguishes these concepts, cultural industries offer predominantly “a mass product based on a single developed idea, which is then scaled up industrially. Creative industries are dominated by a more artisanal mode of production, and the

emergence and discussion of an idea can occur in a manner similar to cultural industries”.

Another pool of authors shares the broad understanding of creative industries without separating the cultural and creative components, justifying this with a common creative component (Amosova, 2022; Gambeeva, 2021; Bukata, 2018; Weinmeister & Ivanova, 2017). Thus, cultural and creative industries are united by a common criterion of the creative component in the process and as a result of their activity, which allows us to distinguish these industries from the general array of activities.

Creative economy and creative industries

The analysis of sources revealed two points of focus on the definition of terminological apparatus. The first group of authors follows a conceptual path, separating the creative economy from the traditional one, and focuses on a broader concept than “creative industries” – “creative economy”. The advantage of this approach is the ability not only to identify areas of activity related to creative industries, but also to theoretically comprehend and qualitatively describe the essence of creative product making, as well as to characterize the participating economic agents.

In particular, Gushchina (2022) defines the creative economy as “a type of economy that differs from the traditional economy in that the production process is not based on traditional types of resources, while the value of the product is increased due to the imagination and creativity of its creator”. Thus, the author emphasizes the lack of the need for production funds⁸. R. Cushing (2001) comes to a similar conclusion, introducing the broad term “creative capital” and claiming that the knowledge-intensive basis of the creative economy is built on a social rather than a material basis. Kovaleva (2022) considers the creative economy as an independent economic sector, highlighting its distinctive feature – creation of high value-added by evaluating the creative component of the creators’ work, which also correlates with previous positions. The definition of creative economy through value added is quite common (Baryshnikov, 2021), which indicates the authors’ intention to highlight its economic component. Thus, most studies use value added (as a percentage of gross domestic product) as

⁸ Note: this statement is debatable, since some generally recognized areas of CI, for example, software development, require a high level of technical equipment, which necessitates production funds.

the main indicator of the development of creative industries (Dunska & Marcinkevica, 2017). Russian studies also take into account the gross regional product⁹.

Several publications emphasize the knowledge component of the creative economy and call creative industries “cognitive” (Romanets & Danilidi, 2022). Thus, Sung (2015) defines the creative economy as “a policy that aims to generate new growth through economic operations that promote creativity, knowledge convergence, and advanced scientific technology based on coordinate learning, consequently creating new markets and new jobs”. A similar approach is presented in the article by Kuznetsova (2022), where the creative economy is considered from the point of view of the activity characteristics, which include basing activities on knowledge and cultural values, emphasizing the importance of the relationship between human creativity and ideas, knowledge, and technology. Thus, the creative economy is based on the unlimited potential of intellectual capital.

Approaching the definition through the term “creative industries” has its own characteristics and emphasizes the fact that the studied phenomenon is primarily a set of creative industries (Romanets, 2022). The advantage of this approach is the ability to determine the boundaries of the creative economy, and, therefore, to quantify its scale. Definitions of this type are often focused on the intellectual component of creative industries. Thus, Kazakova (2020) defines creative industries as a new “analytical definition of the industrial components of the economy, in which creativity is the source material, and content or intellectual property is the result”. Molchanov (2022) characterizes creative industries in a normative style, defining them as “areas of activity in which legal entities and individuals who own intellectual property are in a state of creative and cultural activity, producing goods and services that have economic value, contribute to the development of the individual and improve the quality of life”. Thus, this approach seems to be more practice-oriented, since it characterizes industries related to the creative economy.

Content analysis of the definitions of “creative industry” and “creative economy” shows that, in most cases, authors identify creative industries based on the following parameters: intellectual

and creative basis of activity, creation of high value-added due to the creative component, as well as the product of creative industries being considered an object of intellectual property.

Criteria for identifying creative industries

The objective basis of the problem of defining creative industries is the difficulty in understanding the essence of creativity, “because it requires many resources such as intellectual skills, knowledge, motivation, personality, thinking style and environment” (Sternberg, 2006). Creativity can manifest itself in an individual (Kaufman & Sternberg, 2013), in teams (Gilson, 2013) and in networks (Cattani et al., 2013). Creative people (teams, networks), as well as commercial firms that profit from the results of creative work, are usually attracted to territories that offer the best conditions for their coexistence and interaction. As a result, some cities have more creative people than others (Lorenzen & Andersen, 2009; Florida, 2002). Thus, creative industries involve not only individuals, firms, and cities, but also national and international state policies aimed at supporting and protecting national cultures and economic sectors (Bakhshi et al., 2013).

In practice, the lack of consensus on the definition of creative technologies creates difficulties in identifying specific activities that belong to the creative industries. This problem is aggravated by limited access to data, as well as difficulties in accurately calculating the share of each industry in the economy. There is no single approach to identifying companies that fall under the category of creative industries. When defining creative industries, researchers focus on the fact that in these industries, creativity is essentially an enterprise that manages creativity and intellectual property (Matheson, 2006). This approach allows us to include any industry in the creative industries. In this regard, the literature attempts to emphasize the criteria for classifying industries and activities as creative technologies.

In general, most definitions of cultural industries are based on a combination of 5 main criteria for classifying sectors of the economy as creative – creativity, intellectual property, symbolic meaning, use value, and joint goods (Galloway & Dunlop S., 2007):

- Creativity implies that creative industries are based on individual creativity. This principle is most clearly presented in the concept of the “creative class” by Florida (2002), where he formulates

⁹ Vlasova V.V., Gershman M.A., Gokhberg L.M. et al. Creative economy of Moscow in numbers (2021). NRU HSE. 108 p. Available at: <https://measurecreativity.hse.ru/>

the principle of 3T (technology, talent, tolerance). Florida argues that it is not technology per se that influences the world, but the concentration of human creativity in cities, since people are the main source of innovation.

- Intellectual Property represents an organizing principle for cultural industries. In this case, the sector of the economy is classified as a creative industry by its ability to generate intellectual property. This is the key factor in the works of adherents of the “knowledge” economy. Howkins (2002) argues that the term “creative industries” can be applied to any industry where “brain power is preponderant and where the outcome is intellectual property”. Studies by Russian scientists are increasingly asserting that knowledge (symbiosis of a machine and a person) and the creativity of human and artificial intelligence are the key driving force behind the creative economy (Danilchenko, 2019). However, the ability to create knowledge, not just possess it, comes to the fore, that is, the ability to form one’s own intellectual and creative resources (Melnikov, 2007). Accordingly, the consideration of this criterion allows us to contemplate not only individual creativity, but human creativity in general, including creativity in the business and scientific world.

- Symbolic “Goods” or “Symbolic Meaning”. This criterion can constitute the basis of cultural industries, since the creation or circulation of symbolic meaning is the defining concept of culture, and the economic value of goods derives from or reflects their cultural value. Thus, creative industries include all activities that are eligible for public funding as “art”. However, the understanding of what can be attributed to art in the era of global digital transformation is often ambiguous.

- Use Value. This criterion suggests that the prevalence of symbolic meaning over use value, or cultural value over functionality, is a necessary condition for cultural industries. Thus, the production of books, films, plays, music is part of the cultural industry, while activities such as fashion design, advertising, and architecture (which have symbolic content, but prioritize functionality) are not considered part of the cultural industry. This factor can be used as a criterion for distinguishing between cultural and creative industries.

- Joint Goods (according to Galloway and Dunlop). This criterion proposes to include not only industries that produce goods with symbolic meaning, but also industries where the pro-

portion of “core cultural goods” is lower than in creative arts. However, this criterion cannot be exhaustive, since it is quite difficult to determine the proportions of the cultural and functional components for many goods (for example, design and architecture).

Other scientific approaches that characterize creative industries deepen the basic criteria. Thus, Throsby (2001) notes that cultural industries have three main characteristics: “they involve some form of creativity in their production; they are concerned with the generation and communication of symbolic meaning; their output embodies, at least potentially, some form of intellectual property”. The criterion of symbolic meaning is explored in Throsby’s concentric circles model, in which creative ideas begin as sound, text, and image in the core creative arts, and these ideas and influences diffuse outward through a series of layers, or “concentric circles”. This model includes the following subgroups: core creative arts (literature, music, performing arts, visual arts), other core cultural industries (film, museums and libraries), wider cultural industries (heritage services, publishing, sound recording, television and radio, video and computer games) and related industries (advertising, architecture, design, fashion). The concentric circles model is the basis for the European classification of creative industries (Pererva, 2021).

In 2002, David Hesmondhalgh (2002) developed a model of symbolic texts that derives from the tradition of cultural studies. This approach focuses on culture and covers three sectors: core cultural industries (advertising, cinema, Internet, music, publishing, television and radio, video and computer games), peripheral cultural industries (creative arts), and borderline cultural industries (consumer electronics, fashion, software, sports). Core cultural industries, according to Hesmondhalgh, deal primarily with the industrial production and circulation of texts. Like the core cultural industries, “peripheral cultural industries are centrally concerned with the production of texts. But the reproduction of these symbols is based mainly on semi-industrial or non-industrial methods”. Borderline industries have common features with cultural industries but differ significantly from them. The symbolic nature of creative industries is mentioned in the works of Granham (2005) and Lampel et al. (2000). The authors consider the first dimension of creative indus-

tries to consist of semiotic codes, emphasizing the primacy of the “symbolic nature of creative goods”. These codes are used by artists to give meaning to their work and form an image that is interpreted by the audience. A similar approach to identifying creative industries is presented in the work of Zuev (2010), who defines creative industries as technologies whose basic purpose is the mass production and circulation of texts that carry social value (meanings, codes of conduct, lifestyles, etc.).

Creative economy is based on the capital of ideas, not on physical capital; it develops on the basis of information and communication technologies. Thus, one of the most important features of a creative economy is the use of information in the creation of its content, i.e. information load (Melnikov, 2007). An additional feature is the growing demand for constant interaction between the authors of a creative product and its consumers. Fill (2009) called this process engagement: the greatest effect of the creative economy is found not in the traditional creative industries, but in the application of skills, entrepreneurship, and business models, as well as in the creation of organizatio-

nal value, as in intellectual property management. This approach first appeared in 1997 in the work of fundamentalists M. Horkheimer and T. Adorno (1997), where the authors analytically proved that creative industries emerged due to the development of mass communication and globalization. Agreeing with this statement, Dronyuk et al. (2019) come to a new definition of creative industries, defining them as “unique economic sectors that are created through the spread of mass communication and globalism and are divided into two types: cultural and intellectual”.

The analysis of approaches to defining creative economy and distinguishing creative industries from the general array of activities allowed us to identify a system of criteria in terms of sources, specifics, and results of creative industries (Table 3).

Practical significance of theoretical approaches to identifying creative industries

The practical significance of research on creative economy and creative industries is difficult to overestimate, since it is the theorists who pull the “creative lever” to improve advanced sectors of the economy. The innovative component of

Table 3

Criteria System of Creative Industries

№	Criteria	Authors	Comments
1. Sources of creative industries			
1.1	Creativity (creative potential of the individual)	Florida (2002); Miège (2018); Amosova (2022); Gambееva (2021); Bukata (2018); Weinmeister & Ivanova (2017); Galloway & Dunlop S. (2007); Kazakova (2020); Kaufman & Sternberg (2013); Cattani et al., (2013); Gilson (2013)	Creativity can be defined as individual, in teams, in networks
1.2	Mass communication and globalism	Horkheimer & Adorno (1997); Dronyuk et al. (2019); Melnikov (2007); Fill (2009)	Development is based on information and communication technologies
1.3	Non-material basis of activities	R. Cushing (2001); Gushchina (2022), Zuev (2010)	Non-material basis is expressed in the low demand for traditional resources
2. Specifics of creative industries			
2.1	Prevalence of symbolic value of a creative product over its functionality	Galloway & Dunlop S. (2007); Throsby (2001); Hesmondhalgh (2013); Zuev (2010)	Symbolic value is transferred through the circulation of texts that carry social value
3. Result of creative industries			
3.1	New type of knowledge based on the creative component	Howkins (2002), Danilchenko (2019), Melnikov (2007); Sung (2015); Romanets & Danilidi (2022); Kuznetsova (2022)	Knowledge also acts as a symbiosis of human and artificial intelligence
3.2	High value-added due to the creative component of labor	Dunska & Marcinkevica (2017); Kovaleva (2022); Gushchina (2022); Baryshnikov (2021)	High value-added is an evaluative characteristic of human creativity
3.3	Intellectual property generation	Howkins (2002); Galloway & Dunlop S. (2007); Molchanov (2022); Kazakova (2020); Matheson (2006)	Intellectual property is the organizing principle

Source: developed by the authors based on the review of sources

activity is not only a condition for market success, but also a guarantee of the national economy competitiveness (Matsko, 2021). However, applied solidarity on the issue of creative industries has not yet been found in theory.

Measuring the exact size of creative (cultural) industries causes the most controversy among economists and experts (Howkins, 2002; Throsby, 2010). Adorno (2001) argues that the development and evaluation of cultural industries absorbs “serious art” and brings culture to uniformity and forced equivalence. He believes that the combination of economy and culture stimulates the creation and trade of cultural value, which contributes to the loss of the uniqueness and essence of cultural goods. Consequently, cultural goods should not be subject to classification and evaluation. However, most scientists focus on creative goods that allow scientists and policy makers to track creative processes (Hirsch, 2018). These goods, which artists use to generate new meanings and experiences, are evaluated as creative ones. However, the broad definition of creative technologies does not allow us to determine the extent to which these goods are the result of creative industries, and this, in turn, does not allow us to develop an appropriate set of policy responses. Consequently, the problem again rests with the lack of unity of criteria for identifying creative industries.

It is important to note that the main factors behind the extremely rapid growth of creative industries around the world are related to both technology and economics. The digital revolution and the economic environment in which this revolution took place have merged and created conditions for the growth and development of a new economy. The speed of technology development does not allow us to come to a single “correct” understanding of the set of creative industries for the productive development of this industry (Papushina, 2012). Therefore, theoretical approaches to defining and identifying creative industries must withstand the passage of time and be universal, which will allow us to identify them by specific economic decisions.

Thus, in order to find a practical reflection of the theory, we must have common theoretical positions that allow us to identify, classify, and evaluate creative industries. In this case, the policy in the field of creative economy has every chance of being successful and effective.

Conclusion

A comprehensive analysis of the existing theoretical base on the creative economy shows that terminological plurality and variety of approaches to identifying creative industries are one of the key problems in this scientific field. This is quite natural and can be explained by the interdisciplinarity of the studied phenomenon. However, pluralism of opinions generates different prerequisites for classifying creative industries, which, in turn, lead to significant discrepancies in strategic planning documents and regulations in different countries.

A review of scientific sources shows that the discussion about the unity of and difference between cultural and creative industries is partially resolved by identifying the general criterion of the creative component in the process and as a result of activities within these industries. Considering approaches to the definitions of “creative economy” and “creative industries” allowed us to contemplate this phenomenon in more detail. In the first case, a broad view of the creative economy allowed us to identify the knowledge component of the creative economy and highlight the criterion of high value-added due to the creative component of the creators’ labour. In the second case, the emphasis is most often placed on the intellectual component of creative industries.

The study also shows that most approaches to defining cultural industries are based on a certain combination of criteria, which, in turn, are the basis for classifying economic sectors as creative ones. The differences lie in the emphasis that the authors place in their approaches depending on the direction of research.

The presented system of criteria (Table 3) is a synthesis of points of view, which are accepted by the scientific community, on the essence of creative industries. It is important to note that all the identified criteria are reflected in both international and domestic studies. This allows us to forego focusing on the usual differences and focus on the unity in understanding the essence of creative industries. Moreover, this allows us to assume the existence of universal principles (expressed in the form of criteria) underlying the creative economy, despite cross-country differences and the interdisciplinarity of the studied phenomenon. The identified criteria do not contradict each other, which allows them not only to coexist, but to complement each other. The system of criteria based on the principle of sources-specifics-result allows us to determine

the boundaries of creative industries at key stages of creating a creative product.

Further research on the creative economy may include a review of approaches to identifying creative industries and their classification by international, expert, and consulting organizations, as well as an analysis of Russian legal documents

at the federal, regional, and local levels. The next stage of research may include a comparison of the results of studying theoretical and practical approaches, as well as the further development of recommendations for the authorities in order for them to make informed management decisions in the field of the creative economy.

References

- Adorno, T.W. (2001). The Culture Industry Reconsidered. In: J.M. Bernstein (Ed.) *Adorno: The Culture Industry: Selected essays on mass culture* (pp. 98–106). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Agustina, Y., Winarno, A., Pratikto, H., Narmadity, B.Sh., & Filianti, F. (2020). A Creative Economy Development Strategy: The Case of Trenggalek. Creative Network for Trenggalek Regency, Indonesia. *Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, 7(12), 1111–1122. <https://doi.org/10.13106/jafeb.2020.vol7.no12.1111>
- Bakhshi, H., Cunningham, S., & Mateos-Garcia, J. (2013). Public Policy for the Creative Industries. In C. Jones, M. Lorenzen, J. Sapsed (Eds) *Oxford Handbook of Creative Industries*. Forthcoming.
- Borseková, K., Vaňová, A., Šúrová, J., (...), Nevima, J., Martinát, S. (2021). The nexus between creative actors and regional development. *Land*, 10(3), 276. <https://doi.org/10.3390/land10030276>
- Cattani, G., Ferriani, S., & Colucci, M. (2013). Creativity in Social Networks: A Core-periphery Perspective. In C. Jones, M. Lorenzen, J. Sapsed (Eds). *Oxford Handbook of Creative Industries* (pp. 75–95). Forthcoming. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199603510.013.008>
- Chapain, C., & Sagot-Duvaurox, D. (2021). Cultural and creative clusters – a systematic literature review and a renewed research agenda. *Urban Research & Practice*, 13(3), 300–329. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17535069.2018.1545141>
- Correa-Quezada, R., Álvarez-García, J., Cruz del Río-Rama, M., & Maldonado-Erazo, C.P. (2018). Role of Creative Industries as a Regional Growth Factor. *Sustainability*, 10, 1649. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su10051649>
- Cunningham, S. (2002). From cultural to creative industries, theory, industry and policy implications. *Media International Australia incorporating Culture and Policy*, 102(1), 19–32. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1329878X0210200107>
- Cushing, R. (2001). *Creative capital, diversity and urban growth*. Texas, Austin: Unpublished manuscript, 2001. 89 p.
- Dronyuk, I., Moiseienko, I., & Greguš, J.ml. (2019). Analysis of Creative Industries Activities in European Union Countries. *Procedia Computer Science Volume*, 160(9), 479–484. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2019.11.061>
- Dunska, M., & Marcinkevica, A. (2017). Situation and Development Opportunities of Creative Industries Companies in Latvia. *European Research Studies Journal*, 20(3A), 96–114. <https://doi.org/10.35808/ersj/698>
- Durey, M.J. (2021). Seeing Through Adorno's Prism. *Geographische Zeitschrift*, 109(2-3), 126–143. <https://doi.org/10.25162/gz-2021-0010>
- Eikhof, D.R., & Haunschild, A. (2007). For art's sake! Artistic and economic logics in creative production. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 28(5), 523–538. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.462>
- Fill, C. (2009). *Marketing Communications: Interactivity, Communities*. Paperback Publisher.
- Florida, R. (2002). *The Rise of the Creative Class: And How It's Transforming Work, Leisure, Community and Everyday Life*. New York: BasicBooks.
- Florida, R. (2004). *Revenge of the Squelchers. The Next American City*. Available at: http://www.americancity.org/article.php?id_article=39
- Galloway, S., & Dunlop, S. (2007). A Critique of Definitions of the Cultural and Creative Industries in Public Policy. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 13(1), 17–31. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10286630701201657>

Gilson, L. (2013). Creativity in Teams: Processes and Outcomes in Creative Industries. In C. Jones, M. Lorenzen, J. Sapsed (Eds) *Oxford Handbook of Creative Industries*. Forthcoming. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199603510.013.009>

Granger, R. C., & Hamilton, C. (2010). Re-spatializing the creative industries: a relational examination of underground scenes, and professional and organizational lock-in. *Creative Industries Journal*, 3(1), 47–60. https://doi.org/10.1386/cij.3.1.47_1

Granham, N. (2005). From cultural to creative industries: An analysis of the implications of the 'creative industries' approach to arts and media policy in the United Kingdom. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 11(1), 15–29. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10286630500067606>

Hesmondhalgh, D. (2008). *Cultural and Creative Industries*. The SAGE Handbook of Cultural Analysis, Book chapter, pp. 552–569. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781848608443.n27>

Hesmondhalgh, D., & Pratt, A.C. (2005). Cultural industries and cultural policy. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 11(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10286630500067598>

Hesmondhalgh, D. (2013). *The Cultural Industries*. 3rd Edition, London: SAGE.

Hirsch, P.M. (2018). *Processing Fads and Fashions: An Organization-Set Analysis of Cultural Industry Systems*. Book chapter. The Sociology of Economic Life, 3rd Edition, pp/ 340–356.

Howkins, J. (2002). *Speech to the Inception Session, The Mayor's Commission on the Creative Industries*, London, Available at: <http://www.creativelondon.org.uk/upload/pdf/JohnHowkinstalk.pdf>

Howkins, J. (2001). *The creative economy: How people make money from ideas*. London: Penguin.

Hui, D. (2007). *The creative industries and entrepreneurship in East and Southeast Asia. Entrepreneurship in the Creative Industries. An International Perspective*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited, pp. 9–29.

Kaufman, J.C., & Sternberg, R.J. (2013). The Creative Mind. . In C. Jones, M. Lorenzen, J. Sapsed, (Eds), *Oxford Handbook of Creative Industries*. Forthcoming. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199603510.013.022>

Khestanov, R. (2018). Creative industries – Models of development. *Russian Sociological Review*, 17(3), 173–196. <https://doi.org/10.17323/1728-192X-2018-3-173-196>

Lampel, J., Lant, T., & Shamsie J. (2000). Balancing Act: Learning from Organizing Practices in Cultural Industries. *Organization Science*, 11, 263–269. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.11.3.263.12503>

Lei, Y. (2021). The Role of Cultural Creative Industries on the Revitalization of Resource-exhausted Cities – the Case of Tongling. *Journal of Urban Culture Research*, 23, 3–24. <https://doi.org/10.14456/jucr.2021.17>

Liang, S., & Wang, Q.(2020).Cultural and Creative Industries and Urban (Re)Development in China. *Journal of Planning Literature*, 35(1), 54–70. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0885412219898290>

Lorenzen, M., & Andersen, K.V. (2009). Centrality and Creativity: Does Richard Florida's Creative Class Offer New Insights Into Urban Hierarchy? *Economic Geography*, 85(4), 363–390.

Maddah, L., Arauzo-Carod, J.-M., & López, F.A.(2021). Detection of geographical clustering: cultural and creative industries in Barcelona. *European Planning Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2021.2020218>

Marco-Serrano, F; Rausell-Koster, P, & Abeledo-Sanchis, R. (2014). Economic development and the creative industries: A tale of causality. *Creative Industries Journal*, 7, 81–91; <https://doi.org/10.1080/17510694.2014.958383>

Martinaitytė, E., & Kregždaitė, R. (2015). The factors of creative industries development in nowadays stage. *Economics and Sociology*, 8(1), 56–71. <https://doi.org/10.14254/2071-789X.2015/8-1/5>

Matheson, B. (2006). A Culture of creativity: design education and the creative industries. *Journal of Management Development*, 25(1), 55–64. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02621710610637963>

Müller, K., Rammer, C., & Trübny, J. (2008). The role of Creative Industries in industrial innovation. *Innovation: Management, Policy and Practice*, 11(2), 148–168. <https://doi.org/10.5172/impp.11.2.148>

Munn, Z., Peters, M.D., Stern, C., Tufanaru, C., McArthur, A., & Aromataris, E. (2018). Systematic review or scoping review? Guidance for authors when choosing between a systematic or scoping review approach. *BMC medical research methodology*, 18(1), 1–7.

Pererva, I. (2021). Substantiating the Creative Industry Criteria. *Business Inform*, 1(516), 27–33. <https://doi.org/10.32983/2222-4459-2021-1-27-33>

- Potts, J. (2009). Why creative industries matter to economic evolution. *Economics of Innovation and New Technology*, 18(7-8), 663–673. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10438590802564592>
- Potts, J., & Cunningham, S. (2008). Four models of the creative industries. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 14(3), 233–247. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10286630802281780>
- Snowball, J. (2016). *Why Art and Culture Contribute more to an Economy than Growth and Jobs*. Available at: <http://theconversation.com/why-art-and-culture-contribute-more-to-an-economy-than-growthand-jobs-52224>
- Stam, E.; De Jong, J.P., & Marlet, G. (2008). Creative Industries in The Netherlands: Structure, development, innovativeness and effects on urban growth. *Geografiska Annaler Series B Human Geography*, 90(2), 119–132. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0467.2008.00282.x>
- Sternberg, R.J. (2006). The Nature of Creativity. *Creativity Research Journal*, 18(1), 87–98. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326934crj1801_10 (Retraction published 2020, *Creativity Research Journal*, 32[2], 200)
- Tajtáková, M., & Olejárová, M. (2021). Creative cities and knowledge management approach to culture-based urban regeneration in Slovakia: A model. *Communications – Scientific Letters of the University of Žilina*, 23(4), 25–37. <https://doi.org/10.26552/com.C.2021.4.G25-G37>
- Throsby, D. (2001). *Economics and culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 228 p.
- Amosova, A.I. (2022). Creative economy and its significance. *Business Education in the Knowledge Economy*, 2(22), 4–7.
- Baryshnikov, A.V., & Trepolskaya, D.S. (2021). Educational potential in the creative industries. *Economics and Management: Problems, Solutions*, 4(10), 51–62. <https://doi.org/10.36871/ek.up.p.r.2021.10.04.008>
- Berezhnaya, M.S. (2008). Development of tolerant consciousness of the individual in the socio-cultural space of education and art. *Philosophical Sciences*, 4, 58–68.
- Bukata, D.F., & Sidornya, A.A. (2018). Theoretical approaches to the study of trends and prospects for the development of creative industries. *Don's Young Researcher*, 2(11), 155–161.
- Weinmeister, A.V., & Ivanova, Yu.V. (2017). “Cultural industries” and “creative industries”: the boundaries of concepts. *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, 1(26), 38–48
- Gambeeva, Yu.N., & Smey, V.M. (2021). The role of creative industries in the socio-economic development of the territory. *Bulletin of Chelyabinsk State University*, 6(452), 89–96. <https://doi.org/10.47475/1994-2796-2021-10610>
- Gorbovskaya, L.S. (2020). Creative Industries in the New Reality of the Global Economy. *Student*, 2-3(88), 53–55.
- Gushchina, E.G., & Tarabanova, E.V. (2022). Creative industries: new opportunities for the development of Russian cities and regions. *Bulletin of the Volgograd State University. Economy*, 24(1), 91–104. <https://doi.org/10.15688/ek.jvolsu.2022.1.9>
- Danilchenko, A.V., & Kharitonovich, S.A. (2019). Knowledge economy in the context of post-industrial development of the Republic of Belarus. *Science and Technology News*, 1(48), 8–15.
- Demidov, A.A., & Komarova, I.I. (2014). Creative clusters for St. Petersburg. *Modern Productive Forces*, 4, 124–159.
- Zaikin, N.N. (2022). Analysis of exports of products of creative and cultural industries in Russia. *Creativity and Modernity*, 2(17), 75–82. <https://doi.org/10.37909/2542-1352-2022-2-2012>
- Zuev, S.E. (2010). Cultural industries in the context of globalization. Management consulting. *Current Issues of State and Municipal Management*, 1(37), 76–89.
- Kaverina, N.A., Gretchenko, A.I., & Gretchenko, A.A. (2019). Modern development of creative industries in Russia (experience of the capital and regions). *Bulletin of the Saratov State Socio-Economic University*, 1(75), 58–64.
- Kazakova, M.V. (2020). Cultural and creative industries: the boundaries of concepts. *Creative Economy*, 14(11), 2875–2898. <https://doi.org/10.18334/ce.14.11.111156>
- Kamalov, A.V. (2021). Trends and problems in the development of the entertainment industry in Russia. *The Scientific Heritage*, 58-4(58), 25–26. <https://doi.org/10.24412/9215-0365-2021-58-4-25-26>

Kovaleva, E.N. (2022). Creative sector of the Moscow economy: trends and directions of development. *Bulletin of the Russian State University for the Humanities. Series: Economy. Management. Law*, 1, 67–81. <https://doi.org/10.28995/2073-6304-2022-1-67-81>

Kolodnyaya, G.V. (2022). The Experience Economy: Development Potential in the Information Society. *Economy. Taxes. Law*, 15(2), 17–24. <https://doi.org/10.26794/1999-849X-2022-15-2-17-24>

Kuznetsova, N.V. (2022). The new paradigm of modernity is the creative economy. *Asia-Pacific Region: Economics, Politics, Law*, 24(1), 15–37. <https://doi.org/10.24866/1813-3274/2022-1/15-37>

Lavrinenko, A.S. (2015). Topical issues of state regulation of creative industries. *Issues of State and Municipal Management*, 4, 135–159.

Matsko, V.A. (2021). Interdisciplinary synthesis in the study of creative industries. *Bulletin of the St. Petersburg State Institute of Culture*, 4(49), 80–85. <https://doi.org/10.30725/2619-0303-2021-4-80-85>

Matsko, V.A. (2022). Creativity in the system of leisure concepts. *Bulletin of the St. Petersburg State Institute of Culture*, 1(50), 118–123. <https://doi.org/10.30725/2619-0303-2022-1-118-123>

Melnikov, O.N. (2007). The intellectual potential of the creative economy. *Creative Economy*, 5(5), 37–45. <https://doi.org/10.18334/ce.1.5.3566>

Molchanov, I.N. (2022). Creative Industries: Mechanisms for Human Development. *Economy. Taxes. Law*, 15(2), 52–62. <https://doi.org/10.26794/1999-849X-2022-15-2-52-62>

Miege, B. (2018). Creative industries: in search of concept stability. *Communications. Media. Design*, 3(4), 22–37.

Ovtsinova, V.D. (2018). Knowledge economy: concept, origin, prospects for development in Russia. *Science Alley*, 5(4), 493–500.

Romanets, I.I., & Danilidi, K.G. (2022). The development of a creative economy in the agenda of sustainable growth. *Economics: Yesterday, Today, Tomorrow*, 12(4A), 453–464. <https://doi.org/10.34670/AR.2022.22.21.010>

Romanov, D.M. (2017). Classification of creative industries in the Russian economy. *RISC: Resources, Information, Supply, Competition*, 3, 137–140.

Savina, M.V. (2008). The role of human capital in the formation of a creative economy. *Fundamental and Applied Research of the Cooperative Sector of the Economy*, 4, 32–36.

Florida, R. (2016). *Creative class: people who change the future*. Moscow: Mann, Ivanov and Ferber. 384 p.

Shcherbakova, E.V. (2015). Museum activity in the context of cultural practices: the experience of the city of Moscow and the regions. *In the World of Science and Art: Issues of Philology, Art Criticism and Cultural Studies*, 49, 9–16.

Shchurina, S.V. (2022). The experience economy as a way to respond to the challenges of the modern world. *Economy. Taxes. Law*, 15(2), 25–37. <https://doi.org/10.26794/1999-849X-2022-15-2-25-37>

Information about the authors

Irina D. Turgel – Doctor of Economics, Professor, Head of the Department of Theory, Methodology and Legal Support of State and Municipal Administration, Ural Federal University (620002, Russian Federation, Yekaterinburg, Mira st., 19); e-mail: i.d.turgel@urfu.ru

Valentina V. Derbeneva – Candidate of Economic Sciences, Associate Professor, Associate Professor of the Department of Theory, Methodology and Legal Support of State and Municipal Administration, Ural Federal University (620002, Russian Federation, Yekaterinburg, Mira st., 19); e-mail: v.v.derbeneva@urfu.ru

Irina V. Baskakova – Candidate of Economic Sciences, Associate Professor, Head of the Department of Economic Theory and Economic Policy, Ural Federal University (620002, Russian Federation, Yekaterinburg, Mira st., 19); e-mail: i.v.baskakova@urfu.ru

Kristina V. Chukavina – Director of the Center for Regional Economic Research, Senior Lecturer at the Department of Economics, Ural Federal University (620002, Russian Federation, Yekaterinburg, Mira st., 19); e-mail: k.v.chukavina@urfu.ru

ARTICLE INFO: received October 4, 2022; accepted November 15, 2022

Информация об авторах

Тургель Ирина Дмитриевна – главный редактор журнала R-Economy, доктор экономических наук, профессор, заведующая кафедрой теории, методологии и правового обеспечения государственного и муниципального управления, Уральский федеральный университет (620002, Россия, г. Екатеринбург, ул. Мира, 19); e-mail: i.d.turgel@urfu.ru

Дербенева Валентина Валерьевна – к.э.н., доцент, доцент кафедры теории, методологии и правового обеспечения государственного и муниципального управления, Уральский федеральный университет (620002, Россия, г. Екатеринбург, ул. Мира, 19); e-mail: v.v.derbeneva@urfu.ru

Баскакова Ирина Владимировна – кандидат экономических наук, доцент, заведующая кафедрой экономической теории и экономической политики, Уральский федеральный университет (620002, Россия, г. Екатеринбург, ул. Мира, 19); e-mail: i.v.baskakova@urfu.ru

Чукавина Кристина Владимировна – директор Центра региональных экономических исследований, старший преподаватель кафедры экономики, Уральский федеральный университет (620002, Россия, г. Екатеринбург, ул. Мира, 19); e-mail: k.v.chukavina@urfu.ru

ИНФОРМАЦИЯ О СТАТЬЕ: дата поступления 4 октября 2022 г.; дата принятия к печати 15 ноября 2022 г.

作者信息

图尔格尔·伊琳娜·德米特里耶芙娜 – 经济学全博士，教授，国家和城市治理理论、方法与法律支持系主任，乌拉尔联邦大学（邮编：620002，俄罗斯，叶卡捷琳堡，米拉大街19号）；邮箱：i.d.turgel@urfu.ru

杰尔贝内娃·瓦莲京娜·瓦列里耶夫娜 – 经济学博士，副教授，经济学全博士，教授，国家和城市治理理论、方法与法律支持系副教授，乌拉尔联邦大学（邮编：620002，俄罗斯，叶卡捷琳堡，米拉大街19号）；邮箱：v.v.derbeneva@urfu.ru

巴斯卡科娃·伊琳娜·弗拉基米罗芙娜 – 经济学博士，副教授，经济理论与经济政策系主任，乌拉尔联邦大学（邮编：620002，俄罗斯，叶卡捷琳堡，米拉大街19号）；邮箱：i.v.baskakova@urfu.ru

楚卡维娜·克里斯蒂娜·弗拉基米罗芙娜 – 区域经济研究中心主任，经济学系高级讲师，乌拉尔联邦大学（邮编：620002，俄罗斯，叶卡捷琳堡，米拉大街19号）；邮箱：k.v.chukavina@urfu.ru