



DEVELOPING  
INCLUSIVE  
AND SUSTAINABLE  
CREATIVE ECONOMIES

# CURRENT STATE OF KNOWLEDGE ON THE CCI<sub>s</sub>

A Horizon 2020 project by:



UNIVERSITY  
OF TURKU



Co-funded by the Horizon 2020 programme  
of the European Union

## Measuring creative economies: a critical review of CCI

### D2.1 Current state of knowledge on the CCI

<b>Project Number:</b>	822314
<b>Project Name:</b>	Developing Inclusive and Sustainable Creative Economies
<b>Project Acronym:</b>	DISCE
<b>Deliverable Number:</b>	D2.1
<b>Deliverable Name:</b>	Current state of knowledge on the CCI (original)
<b>Work Package:</b>	WP2
<b>Responsible Partner:</b>	Gran Sasso Science Institute
<b>Authors:</b>	Alessandro Crociata and Valeria Pica
<b>Type:</b>	Report
<b>Due date:</b>	Original due date 30 June 2019, revised 31 May 2022
<b>Dissemination Level:</b>	Public

## Executive summary

*Developing Inclusive & Sustainable Creative Economies* (DISCE) is an interdisciplinary, mixed-methods project. The overarching research question for DISCE is: “what are inclusive and sustainable creative economies, and how can they be developed?” Each work package has a specific role to play in answering this question, and WP2 is tasked with considering issues of quantitative data. The approach of DISCE is to combine both conceptual and empirical inquiry. As part of the overall research design, WP2 has a specific role in helping to identify and analyse the range of data that is currently used in processes of modelling and analysing the creative economies as currently conceived across Europe. Notably, part of the specific approach of DISCE is to rethink what we mean by inclusivity and sustainability, and to ask what creative economies are. In this context, the role of WP2 is not only to analyse existing data within the frameworks of existing models of the creative economy, but to work closely with other work packages to identify and analyse new sources of data on the basis of DISCE’s reconceptualization of inclusive and sustainable creative economies. By moving from a critical review of existing models, WP2 will thereby work to develop new empirical approaches to map and measure creative economies across the EU via a referenced taxonomy of the cultural and creative industries (CCIs).

There are several interesting and important methodological challenges that WP2 faces in undertaking this work. One of these is the fragmentation of the definitions and the approaches with which the creative economies are currently analysed. A range of different taxonomies has been provided by different scholars, also influenced by different policy imperatives. Additionally, since DISCE specifically aims at rethinking inclusivity and sustainability in the context of creative economies, the main challenge is to operationalize such categories in a meaningful way. This involves identifying and analysing the relevant and usable data according to DISCE’s iterative approach. Within this research design, part of WP2’s role is not only to analyse currently available data for the creative economies in Europe, but also to assess the relevance and value of these data in relation to the overall DISCE research question.

Furthermore, playing these different roles, WP2 is working closely with other work packages to answer the DISCE research question, by helping to identify new approaches to quantitative data within an overall reconceptualization of inclusive and sustainable creative economies. The aim of this WP2 report is to review a series of influential models of the creative economy that have provided the basis for previous processes of measurement and mapping. Doing so, it will establish the context within which DISCE is developing its own conceptual and empirical assessments, including providing measurements relating to the inclusive and sustainable creative economy beyond these existing frameworks. The report concludes by suggesting a new, inclusive taxonomy of creative economies and discusses the implications this will have for the data collection in the EU in the future. The taxonomy also forms the basis for the Deliverable 2.2, which focuses on assessing and developing measures to capture the multifaceted contribution of creative economies in the EU.

This report responds to the objectives of the DISCE project offering an examination of the main categorisations at European level and a reworking of the basic concepts for the development of a new taxonomy.

Specifically, the D2.1 proposes:

- First, a comprehensive and robust examination of the literature of the sector, starting from the work of Adorno and Horkheimer, as the focal point of the attention paid to cultural economies in the immediate post-World War II period, but it lacks an all-encompassing consideration of the sector and evaluating industrially produced commercial entertainment negatively. Consequently, we have extended the examination of the transformations of the term use through the reflections of

European sociologists of the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s, from Baumol and Bowen up to the fundamental studies of Thorsby and then to the publication in 1998 of the Creative Industries Mapping Document in UK, which makes a substantial step forward in the knowledge of the sector. From there, the CCIs definitions and frameworks were analysed in order to broaden and share the common ground of knowledge and to be able to sample the main sector classifications.

- Secondly, an extension of the classifications and assessment models of CCIs to identify a number of different patterns or "logics" of production characteristic of different cultural industries as in the work of Miège. In particular, the 2000s saw a burgeoning interest in the topic and new proposals of classifications that could help a greater understanding of sector dynamics, building on the work initiated by the Department for Culture, Media & Sport (DCMS) in 1998. An analysis of the major taxonomies brought to light strengths and weaknesses that were useful for the reworking of so little or no used dimensions such as inclusiveness and sustainability. We proceeded with an analysis of the specificities of each model in order to perimeter the sector according to the specific characteristics of the DISCE projects and thus fill a gap.
- Thirdly, a new taxonomy of CCIs that combines together the UNCTAD classification structure with the composition of cultural, creative, and tourism industries identified by Santagata in 2009. The studies Santagata conducted were crucial in opening the debate on culture as tangible and intangible. The perimeter of the economy of culture is then articulated in three pillars - cultural heritage, tangible culture, media and new media. This choice implies a broad classification rationale. Actually, the new classification includes and extends the 4 macro areas (namely Heritage, Arts, Functional creations, Media) to 5 macro areas adding the Tangible culture section. It allows the rationalization of the sectors in a more coherent way by defining the economic importance of the cultural and creative industries and showing how the connection with other sectors represents an important contribution to the economy. The process leading to the definition of the new taxonomy has shifted the focus from material outputs to dematerialization. This has been an ongoing process in which the relative weight of the material components of a good is reduced. The shift has increased to role of the intellectual, tangible and intangible nature of cultural and creative offerings that require the protection of ideas and intellectual property that cannot be physically protected because once it is revealed it can be copied and reused by third parties. This opens up to further reflection on what inclusivity and sustainability can mean also in terms of work recognition to achieve higher standards for creative workers.

# Contents

Executive summary.....	2
Contents.....	4
1.1. A historical approach.....	5
1.2 Creativity as a driver for CCI.....	6
1.3 Cultural and creative industries.....	8
2. In depth description of formalised systems for mapping CCIs.....	11
2.1. Miège CCIs classification.....	12
2.2. NESTA's classification of CCIs.....	12
2.3. UNCTAD classification .....	14
2.4. The Throsby's Concentric Circles Model .....	16
2.5. The WIPO Model .....	17
2.6. UNESCO model in cultural statistics.....	18
2.7. KEA classification of cultural and creative sectors .....	18
2.8. ESSnet-Culture classification.....	19
2.9. Brief discussion on dominant models .....	20
3. Proposal for a new taxonomy of CCIs .....	24
3.1. The DISCE taxonomy .....	24
3.2. Main novelties in the new DISCE taxonomy .....	27
References.....	30

# List of Tables

Table 1 Alternative approaches to CCIs and related policy. ....	9
Table 2 NESTA's classification of CCIs .....	13
Table 3 UNCTAD classification of creative industries (UNCTAD, 2008) .....	14
Table 4 The creative industries sectors according to Flew .....	15
Table 5 Thorsby's model of the creative industries.....	17
Table 6 The Work Foundation model of CCIs (2007) .....	17
Table 7 KEA cultural and creative sectors' model .....	19
Table 8 CCIs sectors in the Framework of the European Union 2000-2011 .....	20
Table 9 Composition of cultural, creative and tourism industries by Santagata .....	21
Table 10 KEA updated CCIs classification.....	22
Table 11 DISCE proposed taxonomy on CCIs .....	25



# 1. Classifying the CCIs: Political standpoint

## 1.1. A historical approach

Taking a historical perspective on the literature, the seminal work of Adorno and Horkheimer (1947) introduced the term “the culture industry” to refer to industrially produced commercial entertainment such as broadcasting, film, publishing, recorded music, in opposition to the subsidised “arts” such as visual and performing arts, museums and galleries. The Frankfurt School writers were, of course, using the term “the culture industries” pejoratively by emphasising the new ideological functions that mass entertainment was playing within capitalistic systems of socio-economic relations. Contrastingly, during the 1980s, the term cultural industries was employed in the UK with quite a different political inflection: indicating the democratic possibilities for promoting forms of popular cultural production within progressive public policy (Garnham, 1987; Looseley, 2011; Street, 2011). Baumol and Bowen (1966) gave a major impetus to the analysis of CCIs with their analysis of the performing arts, and their research on the economic analysis of sectors that are part of the Cultural Industries carried out in the 1960s and 1970s. The study of Cultural Industries was then deepened and taken to another level of analysis by David Throsby (2008) while UNESCO started to use the expression Cultural Industries in the 1970s, recognising the role of the Cultural Industries in the world (Mattelart and Piemme, 1982).

In the 1970s, the terms expression and access to culture were used in the plural to reinforce the singularities of the different cultural sectors that comprise them by recognising their role as a framework for the creation. UNESCO aimed to fill the lack of existing standards in this area and, at the 1978 Paris Conference, decided to create a specific programme to study the function and contribution of cultural industries in the development of societies.

The result of this work was the 1982 publication of “Cultural Industries: A Challenge for the Future of Culture” (UNESCO, 1982). The text states that “a cultural industry exists when cultural goods and services are produced, reproduced, stored and disseminated according to industrial and commercial criteria, i.e. in series and applying an economic strategy, instead of pursuing an ultimate goal of cultural development” (UNESCO, 1982: 21). This approach emphasises the industrial and commercial aspect, which prevails over the cultural aspect of these sectors.

A key moment in the history of these terms is the work of the UK’s New Labour government. Following its victory in the general election of 1997, the Government created the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) and the first Creative Industries Mapping Document was written (DCMS, 1998). The Document provides the first definition - and the first measurement - of the creative industries, and identifies them as among the legitimate objects of national public policy. This document does not refer to cultural industries, but to creative industries identified as: “those industries which have their origin in individual creativity, skills and talent and which have a potential for wealth and job creation through the generation and exploitation of intellectual property” (DCMS, 1998: 3). Additionally, the document identifies the thirteen sub-sectors that make up the creative industries. These are: “advertising, architecture, the art and antiques market, crafts, design, designer fashion, film, interactive leisure software, music, the performing arts, publishing, software and television and radio” (DCMS, 1998: 3). The definition of the creative industries provided by the UK government has proven enormously influential at the international level.

Later on, an assessment by DCMS (2001) was made to examine the cultural industries in their specificity combining the creation, production and marketing of content that is cultural in nature, that is typically



protected by intellectual property rights and that can take the form of tangible and intangible goods and services (Burri, 2018).

In this way, the concept opens up to any organisation dedicated to the creation, production and distribution of cultural events, goods, products and services; incorporating intellectual property; and extending the term industry to include services and intangible goods, which in DISCE's view is of paramount importance and we will see why later.

In 2005, UNESCO redefined CCIs with one of the most widely used definitions of cultural industries, which identifies them as those activities that produce and distribute goods or services which, at the time they are created, are considered to have a specific attribute, use or purpose that embodies or conveys cultural expressions, irrespective of the commercial value they may have. In addition to the traditional arts sectors (performing and visual arts, or cultural heritage, including the public sector), it also includes film, DVD and video, television and radio, video games, new media, music, books and the press (UNESCO, 2005).

As one can see, 70 years have passed since the incipient analysis of the cultural industry. It is a concept that has evolved progressively in accordance with the socio-economic context, opening up from a strictly technical and mercantile perspective to include more strictly cultural elements and expanding to absorb new sectors. In fact, this extension has meant that the concept of the cultural industry has become a synonym for the public, the private and non-profit sector of culture and is used to refer to private enterprises in any sector, including the arts.

However, there have been a range of criticisms made of the DCMS definition (see Garnham, 2005; Galloway and Dunlop, 2007; Banks and O'Connor, 2009). As a matter of fact, this configuration has been adopted for pragmatic reasons, to lever more money out of the economic departments of state. "For many, indeed, the introduction of creative industries policy ideas is precisely about emphasising their economic importance" (O'Connor et al., 2009: 84).

However, in WP2, the definition of CCIs are processed by moving from the one used at EU level since 2012: architecture, archives and libraries, artistic crafts, audio-visual (including film, television, video games and multimedia), cultural heritage, design (including fashion design), festivals, music, performing and visual arts, publishing and radio. The terms 'cultural and creative sectors/CCS' and 'cultural and creative industries/CCIs' are used interchangeably by the European Commission and the European Parliament (EU, 2000). This said, a distinction exists between 'core cultural' sub-sectors (i.e. archives, heritage, museums, theatre), largely relying on public funding, and other sub-sectors with distinct value chains (i.e. video and film, music, visual arts, book and press, architecture) or an 'industrial' dimension (i.e. design, fashion, advertising, software and video games) and industries driven by creativity such as high-end industries (KEA, 2019a).

## 1.2 Creativity as a driver for CCIs

In the WP2 approach to the topic, culture is an input for creativity which, in turn, underpins social and economic innovation (Santagata, 2009) by stimulating research and investment in technology. Culture is also a source of competitive advantage for companies, enabling product differentiation through intangible added value in a market now full of products with similar technologies (KEA, 2009). John Hartley, calls it "the lever for social and economic change in the next century" (Hartley, 2005).

Furthermore, creativity is linked to the process of transforming ideas into creative products that caught the attention not only of economists, but also sociologists and urban planners who are concerned with culture, economic development and innovation (Lazzaretti, Capone, 2009). It is crucial to agree on the same definition

of creativity in order to be able to identify policies and practices that fall under the CCIIs. In fact, there is no unambiguous and commonly accepted definition on creativity because different perspectives lead to different definitions and, as a consequence of that, also of the creative industries. Just as there is no consensus on the classifications of the various sectors related to this field (this point will be examined later in Section 2).

In order to offer a common base of knowledge on the term and meaning of creativity, one can observe how it is influenced and nurtured by culture and art and is linked to people's ability to think imaginatively and metaphorically in order to break conventions and common ways of thinking, thus enabling the development of a new vision, a new idea or a new product and new experience. To bring out creativity, however, it also requires a social context that encourages it and an economy that invests in it (KEA, 2009). This process combines ideas, skills, knowledge, networks, and talent with technology and culture. Culture in this sense is used as a creative input for the development of new products (KEA, 2006).

Creativity according to art perspective is understood as the ability to create something new and original through imagination, judgement and taste. From an economic point of view, it also refers to innovation and represents a continuous and dynamic process combining elements of artistic creativity and economic and technological innovation (KEA, 2006), stimulated by human, social, cultural and institutional factors (KEA, 2009). In this perspective, creativity is both a source for innovation and the fertile ground to foster its development (CSES, 2010). Indeed, creative ideas are crucial not only in the initial phase but throughout the innovative process. From an economic point of view, innovation is defined as the creation and diffusion of new products, services or processes that, in the eyes of consumers, bring superior benefits (Saviolo and Testa, 2000). Moreover, innovation is considered the main process leading to economic growth in the long run. Three stages can be identified: the origin of an idea, its adoption or diffusion and its inclusion in the economic system (Hartley, 2013).

According to Harney (2010), creative industries can be also established by tracking the arts not through their own commodification, but through the commodification of those who produce them. He states that the arts move from the workshop to the workplace. Some of this movement is typical of the technological sector, namely where once one designed a plate in a workshop, today one designs a computer game in a workplace. Harney argued that this transformation most especially designates a new condition of labour, and new tools are only an aspect of this new condition (Harney, 2010).

The types of productivity reported in the creative industries represent another perspective in organising the CCIIs. In these terms, Florida (2003) defined creative workers as a new labour aristocracy that he calls the "creative class", ignoring the inherent precariousness of many of the creative jobs. Florida's work is nonetheless important in the way it makes the link to economic development, and especially gentrification explicit. In this way, Florida (2003) provides the broad view of the creative industries as an engine of the economy, as before he prophets of internet technology had privileged a new workplace and class formation within the emerging regime of accumulation. The emphasis on new forms of production as well as forms of investment, is perhaps more comprehensively analysed by Neil Smith in his book *New Urban Frontiers* (1996). He links not only the emergence of the creative industries, but also the new role of finance in powering this partnership and policing in enforcing it.

Florida's work is also anticipated by another body of scholarship emerging in the UK and Australia in the early 1990s on cultural policy. Scholars like Tony Bennett (1995) sought to counter the combination of accumulation by dispossession, new workforce discipline, and reinvestment by advocating a new science of cultural policy that would make a governmental virtue of this revanchism. In its critical registers, as for instance in the vast assemblage of analysis in the work of Toby Miller, cultural policy studies not only situated the emerging cultural industries within the larger scale of political economy but linked these industries



critically to the popular struggles and subjectivities stressed by cultural studies (see Miller, Yudice, 2002; Miller, 2006). Indeed Miller (2008) extended this critique in a fluent response to an article by Daniel Mato (2008). Mato reasserted the notion that all industries would benefit from examination through cultural studies, and that the term cultural industries risks restricting our analysis to only certain sectors. Miller countered by noting that Mato was right, and that indeed numerous cultural studies of industries cited by Mato had been carried out. But for Miller the question remains why we speak so confidently right now, at this moment in history, about something called cultural industries, and increasingly creative industries. For Miller, the answer has to do with the way cultural aspects of commodities can be recorded, but the way they can be marshalled by forces of management to sort populations and accomplish the complex differential inclusion of labour now required by global capitalism. Miller spots this new managerial class emerging from the humanities, eager to prove itself in this new factory (Harney, 2010).

### 1.3 Cultural and creative industries

Creative industries have become widely recognisable as a means of new socio-economic development in a post-industrial era since it directly affects the economic performances of nations in terms of GDP, occupation, import/export, provision of services, and so on. Within such a background, culture and creativity are attributes that boost new ideas producing money, markets, exchange, and countable inputs/outputs that are internalised in the flow of production and consumption (Hawkins, 2002). Such a kind of economy deals with the creation, dissemination, and consumption of products with a high symbolic value, in opposition to the purely utilitarian value. In the same token, the creative economy could potentially be the most powerful sources for new development pathways that encourage creativity and innovation in the pursuit of inclusive, equitable and sustainable growth and development (UNESCO, 2013).

It is noteworthy that the creative economy is an evolving context, as well as the definitions and terminology that are used in. This topic has sketched diverse forms in many different academic as well political settings and deals with the well-known issue of cultural and creative industries (CCIs) as a mirror to evaluate both the economic and non-economic outcomes of such systems. In this view CCIs are a multifaceted system that can vary significantly from one context to the next as well. There is currently no official and universally agreed conceptual definition of the creative economy and of the CCIs. On the contrary, a significant definitional debate has developed, and over the past twenty years, a plethora of closely related terms have been employed. These include the culture industry, the cultural industries, the creative industries, cultural-products industries, the creative economy, and the cultural economy, together forming an imprecise muddle (Boggs, 2009). Some scholars refer to all of these as CCIs while others see differences between them (see Jones et al., 2004).

As Justin O'Connor's historical overview of the discourse indicates (O'Connor, 2010), this range of related and competing terms is not neutral. They are embedded within political and policy debates, which is a relevant consideration on the consequences of a given definition of CCIs perimeter. Indeed, the consequences of any classification of what is or is not cultural and creative industries deserve attention as each classification defines the legal and budgetary scope of action for policy makers. Theoretical and methodological assumptions have clear consequences in the way those activities and the people behind them are treated consequently in terms of subsidies, policy support measures et similia.

David Hesmondhalgh stated in his essay on Cultural and creative industries (2008) that one of the most interesting reflections on the topic is made by the French sociologist Bernard Miège who introduced a collection by outlining the main limitations, from his perspective, of the culture industry idea: its failure to see how technological innovations had transformed artistic practice. According to Miège (2017), the

emphasis on markets and commodities rather than on culture as an industry, as a process of production with limitations and problems, is a kind of paradox. Furthermore, the implication in the term 'cultural industry' aimed at a unified field governed by a single process, rather than a complex set of industries competing for the same pool of disposable income from consumption, time, advertising revenue and labour. Moreover, the term 'cultural industries' is not just a label for a production sector, but an approach to cultural production based on the principles developed by Miège and previously considered by Nicholas Garnham (2005) as mainly related to political and ideological power.

Another characteristic of many cultural industries is the tendency of the cultural goods they produce not to be destroyed during use, but to act as what economists call public goods - goods in which the act of consumption by one individual does not reduce the possibility of consumption by others (Hesmondhalgh, 2007). According to Hesmondhalgh, this public good tendency creates particular problems for cultural producers on how to control the circulation of their goods. The focus on digitisation of content is a manifestation of this characteristic of cultural industries. To counteract these conditions, many CCI build a repertoire or a list of products, hoping that successes will cancel out inevitable failures, and, for their part, governments try to impose control on release programmes through copying restrictions (copyright law is crucial in this respect). In particular, the approach of the cultural industries has emphasised the importance of controlling the circulation - distribution and marketing of products over their creation (Hesmondhalgh, 2012). Hence, the discourse on copyright and intellectual property becomes crucial for the development of creative and cultural industries that can be truly sustainable and inclusive towards creative workers.

As CCIs present multidimensional frameworks (Crocata, 2009; Della Lucia, 2014), the classification and relevance of CCIs follow different paths depending on policy orientations and objectives. Over the years, definitions have not evolved one after the other, but are competing and different because each national cultural policy understands the production and consumption system differently (Throsby, 2015). It might therefore be interesting for the DISCE project to also investigate how alternative approaches to CCIs can lead to different policy orientations. Sacco and Crociata (2012) provided four configurations of the cultural (and creative) sector indicating alternative approaches involved in urban cultural planning (Table 1). These configurations of approaches provide a narrow classification of cultural and creative industries; the educational approach only considers the core of the arts (KEA, 2006) such as theatres, museums and so on. The economic configuration introduces the cultural industries, namely film and music industry, radio, publishing, while both the regenerative and progressive configuration expand the boundaries of CCIs' classification embracing new media, design and creative services.

**Table 1** Alternative approaches to CCIs and related policy.

Approach	Orientations	Goals
<b>Educational</b>	Culture as a source of spiritual cultivation and the social identification of individuals. Culture is a social merit (public) good. Consequently, urban policies in the cultural realm have a paternalistic character, aimed at maximizing the educational and civilizing function of the cultural sector. Typical of post-second-world-war reconstruction and associated with the consolidation of the modern welfare state.	Educating and civilizing local populations through exposure to high culture. Public expenditure focuses on the conservation of cultural heritage and cultural facilities such as theatres, libraries and museums, which are typically localized in the city core. At the same time, cultural activity within these facilities is publicly promoted and sustained, through

		grants aimed at maximizing accessibility by the general public.
<b>Economic</b>	Culture as a source of effective demand for the economy as a whole. Socioeconomic development causes an increasingly differentiated demand for cultural experiences and services, sustained by a parallel increase in the average willingness to pay by households. The development of full-fledged cultural districts within the city core becomes a possible engine of growth for the local economy, and cultural policies aim to stimulate their scale and attractiveness, also with regard to non-local audiences.	Strongly promoting local cultural assets and landmarks, building on the cultural identity of the city to enhance its attractiveness for non-local audiences. The city strategy is based on the maximization of (cultural) positional rents (as happens in many 'art cities'). A policy focus on strengthening cultural infrastructural capital is often overtaken by spending on ephemeral but highly visible and attractive events (blockbuster exhibitions, once-in-a-lifetime concerts etc).
<b>Regenerative</b>	Culture as a platform for the reconstruction of a compromised local identity. Facing the decline of the traditional local economic base and the implied social, economic and environmental tensions, the need to break new ground makes culture an attractive outside option from the status quo. Necessity to relocate the unemployed workforce, and to find new occupational opportunities for the young to avoid their flight to other territories. Necessity to fill the urban voids left by the downsizing or shutting down of traditional economic activities.	Restoration of large portions of the urban fabric and a change in the use for which they are intended. Attraction of firms, capital and people from outside the city through intense city marketing aimed at drastically improving the city's image and reputation. A policy focused on invigorating the vitality of the city's cultural scene through support for local creative communities or (often alternatively) through the attraction of opinion-forming external cultural players and through the careful design of 'culturally cosy' new settlements.
<b>Progressive</b>	Culture as a factor in the deep structural transformation of the local economy and society in the post-industrial context. Necessity to redefine the foundations of civic identity through participation in an increasingly fragmented society where the very idea of a common good and common community interests becomes a challenge. Cultural participation becomes a basic dimension of everyday civic life, and of knowledge-intensive production and social interaction. The cultural sector ceases to be an enclave of the local economy and becomes an open sector with a key cross-fertilizing function and very active exchanges with other productive sectors in terms of innovation practices, lifelong learning, organizational cohesion and so on.	Reaching out for a true synthesis of the symbolic, social and economic components of the structural adaptation of the local system to global competitive pressures. Culture as a platform for the production of collective wellbeing (investment in various forms of bonding and bridging social capital), collective orientation to the production and circulation of knowledge (investment in various forms of human and informational capital and of bridging social capital), and identity of place and sense of belonging (production of symbolic capital). A policy focus on long-term projects where the tangible and intangible components of cultural infrastructure are strategically linked through a widely shared long-term strategic perspective.

## 2. In depth description of formalised systems for mapping CCI

A key starting point for DISCE is the need for more conceptually robust descriptions of the sector, to capture not only its size and economic profile (in terms of conventional economic measures such as employment and Gross Value Added), but also its broader dynamics and social value in contemporary society. A central challenge for DISCE is to recognize a pivotal role to the creative work and develop a new approach such as this, whilst also providing a quantitative basis for an EU-wide comparative framework. The framework should be capable of dealing with the different characteristics and values of creative economies in Europe - not only narrowly economic value but also in terms of broader social value - whilst being also practical.

Some studies have analysed work in individual institutions or in particular cultural industries. This draws, to a greater or lesser degree, on some conception of cultural production more broadly. Until recently, however, few studies attempted an analysis of how creative work is managed and organised across different cultural industries. In critical sociology oriented towards analysis of the cultural industries as a particular form of capitalist accumulation, relatively little attention has been paid to creative work, with a couple of important exceptions which we shall discuss in due course. A recent surge of interest in the management and organisation of creative work has changed things. This has come about in part because of the increasing importance of the concept of the creative industries. The concept is a very different term from the cultural industries (Garnham, 2005), the more politically centrist connotations of the term creative industries have made it attractive to business and management studies. The focus on the sector by Howard Davis and Richard Scase's *Managing Creativity* (2001) provides a detailed examination of a number of different aspects of the various cultural industries, and allows for an empirical consideration of the characteristics of the work organisation in the sector. The analysis of creative work leads to a real gap between discussions of individual cultural industries and the dynamics of creativity in cultural industries as a whole (Hermondhalgh, Baker, 2006).

There are a few comprehensive sources (Eurostat and similar) that rely on data provided by countries, which typically have insufficient means to monitor CCIs, and cannot reach data harmonization because each of them may use different statistical systems. In addition, the categorization is hard as well: relevant sub-sectors may be lost within too broad categories or put into inadequate categories. The rationale behind a classification should support evidence-based decision making, allow comparisons over time, between policies, countries and regions, social groups and industries, and contribute to increased transparency and accountability (Eurostat, 2014). The European Commission supports these sectors by building on the work of Eurostat as part of the European Statistical System (ESS)-net Culture. At the same time, however, the EC addresses these issues by stimulating critical reflection towards further harmonisation of taxonomies and statistics on the cultural and creative sectors (EU, 2010). To better understand this process, a conceptual deepening is needed. The technological and information technology revolution, which has created new tools for producing and communicating culture, as well as new cultural activities, led to a process of semantic change from 'cultural' to 'creative' (Cicerchia, 2013). The traditional definition of 'cultural industries' evolved into the broader definition of 'creative industries' and then to the definition of 'cultural and creative industries' (CCI), a definition used by the European Union (EU), which considers the differences between the two types of activities. Cultural enterprises are associated with the more traditional sectors such as cultural heritage, visual and performing arts, publishing, music, film, radio, television, press and photography (Valentino, 2013), while creative enterprises also include the new sector of the digital economy such as software and computer services (Lazzaretti, Capone, 2009).

In this chapter, some classifications have been taking into consideration to help and sustain the criteria adopted to develop the WP2 new CCIs taxonomy and clarify the ratio that has led to the reconfiguration of the UNCTAD CCIs classification – meant as the reference model for the DISCE project – in terms of inclusivity and sustainability. The classifications analysed and described in the following paragraphs are dealing with definition (Miège), different categories division (NESTA, UNCTAD, Thorsby), the evolution in terms of cross-sectoriality (KEA 2006 and 2019).

## 2.1. Miège CCIs classification

Besides creative work, Miège's (1989) identification of a number of different patterns or "logics" of production characteristic of different cultural industries is still useful today and provides an indispensable basis for much subsequent work. He bridges the accounts that treat the media and cultural industries as an undifferentiated category and the empirical accounts that analyse individual industries. The latter implicitly or explicitly reject the idea that media and cultural industries share common characteristics. Miège identifies subcategories and offers the opportunity to identify shared dynamics without losing specificity. His account was intended to cover many different aspects of cultural industries including aspects relevant to the consideration of the organisation of creative work.

Miège organises the creative work into three logics of cultural production:

- the **publishing** logic (setting failures against hits in a catalogue of repertoire, as in the book, music and film industries)
- the **flow** logic (a continuous flow of products, and gaining of audience loyalty, as in radio, television and new media)
- the **written press** logic (regular consumption of a series of commodities, in newspapers and magazines)

Miège's attempt to categorise the creative industries is a heuristic device, which inevitably takes with it problems by bringing together so many heterogeneous elements from such a complex set of social processes. Miège's model can initially be understood as a way to provide a baseline for the consideration of historical change in the cultural and media industries by providing a basis for comparison between different sectors. Obviously, the sector has experienced and is experiencing profound changes due to the digitisation of creative products that has led to a radical change especially in digital distribution since its less impressive existence in the 1980s.

There is no single criterion to select the activities of CCIs, but rather a combination of them. Among the most widely used are creativity, symbolic use value and intellectual property. Nevertheless, activities may vary between classifications depending on the weight given to these criteria (Valentino, 2013).

## 2.2. NESTA's classification of CCIs

An alternative approach presented at European level is the classification of CCIs developed by NESTA (National Endowment for Science, Technology and the Arts) in 2006. Its proposal criticises and modifies the DCMS model - described in section 1.1 - because it considers it too broad and not specific enough.

**Table 2** NESTA's classification of CCIs

	<b>Services</b>	<b>Experiences</b>	<b>Originals</b>	<b>Content</b>
<b>Services</b>	P.R., Marketing, Architecture, Design, Ads, Post-production, Facilities	Cinema, Live music, Performing Arts	Cinema, Live music, Performing Arts	Cinema, Live music, Performing Arts
<b>Experiences</b>	Heritage & Tourism services, Exhibitions, Attractions (design & build)		Cinema, Live music, Performing Arts	Cinema, Live music, Performing Arts
<b>Originals</b>		Spectator sports, Visitors attractions, Galleries, Museums, Heritage		Cinema, Live music, Performing Arts
<b>Content</b>	Web/mobile development, Photography, TV & radio production, Games development, Contract publishing, Agents		Antiques, Designer-making, Crafts, Visual Arts	Online/mobile services, Publishing, TV/Radio broadcast/distribution, Games publishers, Film studios/distribution, Recorded music, Merchandise, Designer fashion

The NESTA model (Table 2) proposes a division of the creative industries into four distinct but intersecting categories: Services, Experiences, Originals, Content. Accordingly, the following combinations can be observed, resulting in six different category associations:

1. Creative service providers, which apply intellectual property (IP) to other activities and organisations: advertising agencies, design consultants, architecture, PR, agents, production facilities;
2. Creative content producers, who invest capital to produce IP and protect outputs that are distributed to consumers/viewers and who earn money through a mix of direct sales, advertising and subscriptions: theatre companies, publishers, video game developers, record and film companies, designers, TV and radio broadcasters, media companies
3. Providers of creative experiences, who sell consumers the right to attend a particular performance or activity: theatre companies, video game developers, record and film companies, fashion designers, television and radio broadcasters.
4. Providers of creative experiences, who sell consumers the right to attend a given performance or activity: theatre companies, organisers of musical performances, cultural, tourist and sporting events;
5. Providers of creative experiences, who sell consumers the right to attend a given show or activity: theatre companies, organisers of musical performances, artistic-cultural, tourist and sporting events
6. Producers of original creative works, engaged in the creation, processing or sale of material artefacts, the value of which derives from the perception of their cultural or creative value and their exclusivity and authenticity: visual arts and crafts, antiques, writing, design creations, photography.



The NESTA classification considers the commonality of the business model, value chain, market structures and end products of the enterprises within each group.

From this classification, a further distinction can be drawn between simple and complex creative goods. The former are those where the artist has a contract with a single company that promotes and distributes his creations. The latter, on the other hand, are more complex as there are more contracts in place with creative teams and production schedules are limited. In general, it can be observed that the original creative works sector corresponds to the supply of simple creative goods, while the creative content sector corresponds to companies engaged in the production of complex creative goods (NESTA, 2006).

It is then evident from our point of view that different elements of the same creative activity may belong to different segments of the creative industries. Taking music as an example, current music output may involve the production of a simple creative good, but its distribution is large-scale and part of the creative content sector. Live music events are also part of the creative experience services sector, and musicians use creative service providers for concert organisation, promotion and album publicity (NESTA, 2009).

### 2.3. UNCTAD classification

Creative Economy Reports published by two specialised bodies of the UN - UNESCO and UNCTAD - have contributed notably in pushing the CCIs to the global level (See De Beukealaer 2015; De Beukealaer and Spence 2019).

The UNCTAD classification (Table 3) provides a classification into four broad groups that are helpful for the sampling purposes:

- **Heritage** (including cultural sites and traditional cultural expressions)
- **Arts** (including performing and visual arts)
- **Media** (including publishing and audio-visuals)
- **Functional creations** (including new media, design and creative services).

**Table 3** UNCTAD classification of creative industries (UNCTAD, 2008)

Industries	Sectors
Heritage	CULTURAL SITES: Archaeological sites and museums, Libraries, Exhibitions  TRADITIONAL CULTURAL EXPRESSIONS: Arts & Crafts  Festivals & Celebrations
Arts	PERFORMING ARTS: Live music, Theatre, Dance, Opera  Circus & Puppetry  VISUAL ARTS: Painting, Sculpture, Photography & Antiques
Media	AUDIOVISUALS: Film, television, radio & other broadcasting

	PUBLISHING & PRINTED MEDIA: Books, Press & other publications
Functional creations	<p>NEW MEDIA: Software, Video games, Digitalized creative content,</p> <p>DESIGN: Interior, Graphic, Fashion, Jewellery &amp; Toys</p> <p>CREATIVE SERVICES: Architectural, Ads, Cultural &amp; Recreational</p>

The UNCTAD classification is layered in terms of three main pillars. Primarily, the CCI serve to promote the diversity of cultural expressions within the global circulation of cultural expressions. Secondly, CCIs are a driver of economic growth in terms of job opportunity and export diversification. Thirdly, CCIs are at the base of development pathways beyond economic terms focusing on the social and human aspects before economic aspects (OECD, 2005).

To make the research project feasible, but still allowing for a range of sectors to be covered in the case study countries selected in DISCE, the first classification suggested in the project work plan was the 2008 UNCTAD/UNESCO classification. This classification fits the main official EU statistics (i.e. EUROSTAT), as well as labour surveys, population censuses, household surveys and industrial surveys, when available in the different countries, but still has some critical issues. At the one hand, this model improves the statistical data, as well as quantitative and qualitative methods, enabling short-, medium- and long-term tracking of national and EU performance of CCIs. On the other hand, it does not properly allow the measurement of inclusivity and sustainability which led us to examine other models and suggest a new classification that is more feasible and coherent with the DISCE project objectives.

**Table 4** The creative industries sectors according to Flew

	Creative original works	Creative content	Creative experiences	Creative services
Advertising, graphic design and marketing				Application of time and intellectual property (IP) to other businesses
Architecture, visual arts and design	Visual arts and crafts			
Film, broadcasting (TV and radio) and entertainment software		Complex creative goods with IP		
Music composition, publishing and performance	Musical creations - simple creative goods	Distribution of music through record companies and agents	Live performances	
Performing arts			Live performances - complex creative goods	
Writing, publishing and printing	Writing - simple creative goods	Distribution of books and other works through publishers	Writing festivals	

So, to fully understand and measure the dynamics and performances that generate the CCIs for designing a sustainable and inclusive creative economy, it is therefore necessary to refer to a highly-harmonised approach as a suitable tool to point out CCIs contribution at European level.

Based on the UNCTAD classification of the creative industries, six classes can be identified according to the type of product (Flew, 2012), as it can be seen in Table 4 for each class it is specified which category they belong to or if they belong to more than one it is made explicit for which activity.

According to the 2008 UNCTAD classification, nine sectors can be identified within the creative industries, as shown in Table 3. For each one, moreover, it is specified to which of the four categories it belongs and, where possible, whether it is part of the simple or complex creative goods.

## 2.4. The Throsby's Concentric Circles Model

The classification proposed by Throsby (2008) is the Work Foundation's model of concentric circles (2007), which distinguishes cultural industries, which are more oriented towards cultural value, from creative industries, which are more inclined to commercial content. In particular, it distinguishes creative content from the industries that produce and distribute it on the basis of what is referred to as the "expressive value" of creative products and services, i.e. any dimension that, in a broad sense, is capable of extending cultural meaning and understanding (Richeri, 2009). The expressive value is composed of several elements: aesthetic, spiritual, social, historical, symbolic and authenticity value (Flew, 2012).

According to Throsby "the cultural cycle concept [...] enables the specification of product-, industry- and employment-based depictions of cultural production and extends the simple supply-chain model to include the consumption of cultural goods and services. It thus has the capacity to provide a comprehensive view of the structure of the cultural sector and its place in the economy" (Throsby, 2015: 62).

As depicted in the Table 5, the model identifies four circles, based on the different levels of expressive/cultural value:

- The core of creative arts (core), where outputs are copyrighted: performing and visual arts
- The core of the creative arts, where outputs are copyrighted: performing and visual arts, literature and music;
- Cultural enterprises, where the cultural content is less high than in the core activities: libraries, films and museums;
- Creative enterprises, where the expressive value is essential: publishing, sound recordings, services for the preservation and enhancement of cultural heritage, television and radio, video games;
- The rest of the economy (the outermost circle), i.e. enterprises which are functionally related to the previous ones and which exploit the expressive value generated by them, such as architecture, design, fashion and advertising.

**Table 5** Thorsby's model of the creative industries

Core creative Industries	Literature, Music, Performing Arts, Visual Arts
Other core creative industries	Film, Museums, Galleries, Libraries, Photography
Wider Cultural industries	Heritage services, Publishing and print media, Television and radio, Sound recording, Video and computer games
Related industries	Advertising, Architecture, Design, Fashion

According to Thorsby's model (Table 5), creative ideas originate in the two central circles (the core creative industries) and then spread concentrically (to related industries). As one moves from the centre to the outer circles, cultural content decreases and commercial content increases (Valentino et al., 2014), as can be seen in the Work Foundation's model (Table 6), designed on the basis of Thorsby's classification and ranging from the core creative industries to the rest of the economy.

**Table 6** The Work Foundation model of CCI's (2007)

Core creative fields	Commercial outputs possess a high degree of expressive value and invoke copyright protection
Cultural industries	Activities involve mass reproduction of expressive outputs. Outputs are based on copyright
Creative industries and activities	The use of expressive value is essential to the performance of these sectors
The rest of the economy	Manufacturing and service sectors benefit from and exploit the expressive outputs generated by the creative industries

## 2.5. The WIPO Model

The classification presented by WIPO (World Intellectual Property Organization) is a model referred to intellectual property (WIPO, 2003). It refers to those businesses that deal with copyright protected activities. The industry is divided into three classes based on the level of creativity embedded in the products or services provided by the firms and on the degree of importance of property rights in the total value of the asset (Valentino, 2013).

- The first class (the core copyright industries) includes those firms that produce goods that incorporate intellectual property: visual and graphic arts, publishing, film and video, music, advertising, software, entertainment, television and radio;
- The second includes those enterprises that distribute copyrighted goods and are dependent on the former: producers of recording equipment, electronics, musical instruments, photocopiers and photographic equipment;
- In the third are those enterprises that produce only partially copyrighted products: architecture and design firms, manufacturers of clothing, footwear, fashion, household goods and toys.

The approach is based on the fact that copyright is a strong incentive for economic growth. Protecting intellectual property stimulates creativity and innovation and encourages investment (KEA, 2006).

## 2.6. UNESCO model in cultural statistics

The model proposed by UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) is focusing on cultural statistics. The UNESCO statistical institute presented a classification of cultural activities to assess the economic impact of the CCI sector, namely enterprises, employment, and products (UNESCO 2009). The 2009 classification proposes seven categories:

- Cultural and natural heritage
- Entertainment and events (including production of musical instruments and recording equipment)
- Visual arts
- Crafts and design
- Publishing (books and printing)
- Audiovisual and interactive media
- Architecture and advertising (design and creative services).

To these classes are added the specific activities of education, sports, tourism and leisure (Valentino, 2013). This model is a benchmark for many countries, in particular it is applied in New Zealand, Australia and Canada (KEA, 2006).

## 2.7. KEA classification of cultural and creative sectors

The company KEA European Affairs, which works for the European Commission's Directorate-General for Education and Culture and is involved in advising and promoting activities in the fields of art, culture, sport, creativity and creative industries, undertook a study to distinguish between the cultural and creative sectors (KEA, 2006). The aim of the study was to create a shared European vision of the creative industries to facilitate the elaboration of policy measures that would develop a common European strategy for culture (Flew, 2012).

The KEA classification (Table 7) places the traditional arts in the centre, and goes outwards the cultural, creative and related industries. The difference between the two types of industries is that the former, the cultural industry, results only in cultural outputs, while the latter, the creative industry, has a mix of inputs, not only creative and its outputs are not primarily cultural (e.g. design, architecture, advertising) (Flew, 2012). For the creative sector, culture represents an input that provides added value in the production of non-cultural goods. Firms in the first three circles of the model have in common that their products are protected by copyright. Firms in the last circle, that of related industries, do not belong to the CCI sector because they do not use culture and creativity as production inputs (KEA, 2006), but depend on or are directly influenced by cultural and creative products as they produce and market media for the enjoyment of the latter (Santagata, 2009). Sports and database software are not included in this model (KEA, 2006).

**Table 7** KEA cultural and creative sectors' model

Core creative fields	Performing arts, User generated content, Visual arts, Heritage
Cultural industries	Books and press, Fashion design, TV and radio, Music, Video games, Luxury brands, Film and video
Creative industries and activities	Design, Architecture, Advertising
Related sectors	Education, Tourism, Software, Telecommunications, Consumer electronics, Industrial design

This approach was also followed by the European Commission's Green Paper of 2010, which defines cultural industries as those industries producing and distributing goods and services that, at the very moment they are developed, incorporate a specific cultural attribute, use or purpose, regardless of their value, while creative industries are those industries that use culture as an input and have a cultural dimension, although their outputs are mainly functional. The former includes the arts, media, film, music, video games and publishing; the latter include advertising, design, architecture and fashion (Flew, 2012).

This conception clashes with the thinking of two scholars, Cunningham and Hartley (2012), who argue in their works that the term 'creative industries' should replace that of cultural industries. This is because the creative industries bring together the creative and performing arts with the media and communication industries in the context of a digital knowledge-based economy, where very often consumers become co-creators, thanks to online content (Flew, 2012). The concept also incorporates creative content in the arts, media and design sectors and recognises the value of creative inputs in the new digital economy, called the 'New Economy', linked to growth and innovation trends (Cunningham, 2005).

## 2.8. ESSnet-Culture classification

A study on taxonomies to delineate the boundaries of CCI was proposed in May 2012 by ESSnet-Culture (European Statistical System Network on Culture, 2012) (Valentino, 2013), promoted by EUROSTAT (2000), to develop a common classification method needed to be able to compare statistics in the sector (Bacchini, 2013). Its final report confirms the name "Cultural and Creative Industries", (CCI), and identifies ten domains:

- Cultural Heritage (museums, historical sites, archaeological sites, intangible heritage)
- Archives
- Libraries
- Books and press
- Visual arts (plastic arts, photography, design)
- Performing arts (music, dance, dramatic arts, live performances)
- Audio-visual and multimedia products (film, radio, television, video, sound recordings, multimedia sound recordings, multimedia works, video games)
- Architecture
- Advertising
- Handicrafts.



According to ESSnet-Culture, all activities that fall into the above categories with the function of creation, production/publishing, dissemination/trade, conservation, education and administration/regulation are part of CCIs (Table 8). The boundaries of this taxonomy are relatively broad for the functions considered (Valentino, 2013).

**Table 8** CCIs sectors in the Framework of the European Union 2000-2011

LEG-CULTURE 1997-2000	ESSnet-CULTURE 2009-2011
<b>Eight spheres of reference:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Cultural heritage</li> <li>2. Archives</li> <li>3. Libraries</li> <li>4. Books and the press</li> <li>5. Plastic arts</li> <li>6. Architecture</li> <li>7. Performing arts</li> <li>8. Audio and audiovisual / multimedia</li> </ol>	<b>Ten cultural domains:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Heritage</li> <li>2. Archives</li> <li>3. Libraries</li> <li>4. Books and the press</li> <li>5. Performing arts</li> <li>6. Visual arts</li> <li>7. Architecture</li> <li>8. Audiovisual and multimedia</li> <li>9. Advertising</li> <li>10. Crafts</li> </ol>
<b>Six cultural functions:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Conservation</li> <li>2. Creation</li> <li>3. Production</li> <li>4. Dissemination</li> <li>5. Trade</li> <li>6. Training</li> </ol>	<b>Six cultural functions:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Creation</li> <li>2. Production and publishing</li> <li>3. Dissemination and trade</li> <li>4. Preservation</li> <li>5. Education</li> <li>6. Management / regulation</li> </ol>
	<b>Five dimensions</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Economy</li> <li>2. Employment</li> <li>3. Consumption</li> <li>4. Financing</li> <li>5. Practices and social participation</li> </ol>

## 2.9. Brief discussion on dominant models

The choice of one model over another also has a major impact on the measurement of the economic contribution of CCIs (Gordon, Beilby-Orrin, 2007; Santagata, 2009) and it is the reason for the high level of variation in statistical surveys. Indeed, it is difficult to find a definition for the sector that is internationally comparable (Valentino, 2013).

From a strictly statistical point of view, the European Union has laid the foundations for a European cultural statistics model to support the Member States in defining policies to promote the cultural sector. In this regard, LEG-Culture (Leadership Group on cultural statistics) was created in 1997 and then in 2009 the European Statistical System Network on Culture (ESSnet-Culture) under the coordination of the Department of Culture of Luxembourg. The main objectives of ESSnet-Culture are statistical cooperation between European countries in order to revise the European statistical framework created by LEG-Culture and improve the existing basic methodology developing a new culture of European statistics by defining indicators and variables allowing the description and study of the cultural sector in all its complexity.

However, it remains difficult to harmonise data on the creative sectors at European level because most of the usable data are those produced by the Member States themselves and somehow difficult to compare. As regards the treatment of CCIs in their statistical models, it is worth remembering that the LEG-Culture model included Architecture; the ESSnet model has Crafts and Advertising as new inclusions, in addition to the

management and regulatory function as also comprehended in the Santagata model (Table 9) which also includes Food and gastronomy and all the Tourism sector.

**Table 9** Composition of cultural, creative and tourism industries by Santagata

Industries	Sectors
<b>Heritage</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Museums and historical heritage</li> <li>2. Architecture</li> <li>3. Performing arts</li> <li>4. Contemporary arts and photography</li> </ol>
<b>Tangible culture</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fashion</li> <li>2. Food and gastronomy</li> <li>3. Industrial design &amp; artistic crafts</li> </ol>
<b>Media and new media</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Cinema &amp; audio visual</li> <li>2. TV &amp; radio</li> <li>3. Writing</li> <li>4. Software</li> <li>5. Ads &amp; communication</li> </ol>
<b>Tourism</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Accommodation</li> <li>2. Travel agencies &amp; tour operator</li> <li>3. Sport &amp; Leisure activities</li> </ol>

The ESSnet model highlighted two important issues: on the one hand, the assumption that there are no priorities among the domains, on the other hand, no one domain is more important than the others.

KEA proposed an updated version of its classification in 2019 (Table 10) that exemplifies how the growing innovation gap between technology and culture, digitization and new technology such as artificial intelligence, virtual and augmented reality, blockchain, 3D printing and big data can trigger innovation at all levels of the creative sectors. However, although there are plenty of innovative initiatives and start-ups in the creative and cultural sectors, very few of these reach a scale sufficient for them to have a bigger impact on society or the market. One can see a growing gap between technology and culture. Culture, and with it society, are struggling to catch up with the exponential speed of technological innovation. This innovation gap is not only relevant for the creative sectors; it is relevant for citizens, society and culture at large. Digitization and new technologies can have a big impact on the diversity of cultural activities and content. Depending on the framework the society sets, this impact can be negative or positive, therefore the need to address common challenges and identify opportunities in the face of digital technologies underpins their survival (KEA, 2012). Culture is one of Europe's biggest assets and society needs it to thrive in the digital age, for this reason Europe needs a more effective innovation strategy for culture (KEA, 2019b).

**Table 10** KEA updated CCI classification

A Europe fit for Digital Age	Internal market	Protecting our European Way of life	Innovation and Youth
New SME strategy	Creative Europe Media Intellectual property Audiovisual policy	Culture for Social cohesion	Future CCS
Revision of competition rules (mergers, State aid, antitrust)	Tourism and creative industries		Creative Europe cross-sector  Creative Europe Culture (Cultural heritage, Creative Industries, Cultural cooperation)

All the classification models considered so far at European level have provided relevant information on the concept of CCIs over time. It should be noted what are the main criticisms of these models to identify more corresponding items to the present day and why it is necessary to draw a new taxonomy.

First of all, manufacturing is not a cultural activity per se, but an industrial activity auxiliary to culture. Printing activities are also questionable: they are industrial activities for the primary production of cultural goods, but they are not really cultural activities per se. Meanwhile, it is impossible to statistically estimate the cultural part in these activities. Reproduction activities are not cultural activities per se and only the production of original material is considered a cultural activity.

Not all classifications consider the software industry a cultural sector although the economics of the sector are very important economically. The same goes for cultural tourism, moreover it is not an identifiable activity, but rather a grouping of different cultural experiences which makes it difficult to analyse.

The great absence from every model analysed so far are nature reserves, zoos or botanical gardens that are not considered cultural domains either. Even if nature and its sustainability have been fundamental for man over the centuries, the conservation of flora and fauna is far from being a cultural creation unless one considers historical gardens meant like heritage sites. These assumptions will be considered in the section 3 of this deliverable to design and justify items included in the new proposed taxonomy.

As stated before KEA European Affairs published on behalf of the European Commission the first official attempt to define the boundaries and quantify the importance of CCIs in EU countries (KEA, 2006). The economic size thus highlighted - more than 654 billion Euros of turnover, equal to 2.6% of GDP in 2003 (EU 15 countries) and 5.8 million employees in 2004, about 3.1% of total employment (EU 25 countries) - paved the way for a new look at the strategic role of these sectors for the development of 21st century economies. This is demonstrated by the wealth of international and national studies and research published since 2006. These contributions, which differ in scope, approach and geographical context, propose a similar pattern; either overtly, or in the background, they have policy objectives or implications. They first define the perimeter of the cultural and creative production system and then introduce metrics to measure its significance, typically economic. The framework outlined is, to date, still fragmented. For a variety of reasons, the perimeter is partly uncertain and has progressively expanded to include sectors with cultural and creative elements that are also distant or different from those traditionally defined as cultural. This is because the

perimeter affects the weight these sectors have in the economic system, measured by the same metrics - added value and employment (KEA, 2006) - with which other sectors are assessed. This fragmentation does not allow homogeneous comparisons of these industries - longitudinal and between different countries and areas within the same country - and is not very functional in defining and assessing the impact of sector policies (Della Lucia, Segre, 2017). The absence of specific, up-to-date and complete databases also contributes to these difficulties; the finest territorial scale remains the most penalised level of analysis.

All the examples identified and proposed in this chapter have shown how extremely varied and multifaceted the classification of CCIs is. In the analysis carried out so far, it seems important to emphasise once again that the models proposed are a part of the existing ones and that they are linked by the need to show a kind of evolution in the concept and approach to CCIs due mainly to the focus on intangibles over time. We have moved from the concept we started from (the UNCTAD model) to the model proposed by Santagata that opens up the intangibility of culture and the recognition of creative work also for digital workers. Again KEA (2019) emphasises the need to thrive in the digital age and the reflection on intellectual property of cultural and creative work becomes increasingly sensitive.

It is noteworthy that none of the classifications considered includes within its articulation a specific focus on sustainability and inclusivity, and from these considerations arises the need to develop a new taxonomy of CCIs that offers an opening to the central themes of DISCE, but also offers the possibility of including new domains and reconfiguring the domains used by UNCTAD, which, while very useful for data harmonisation, do not meet the needs of our research.

## 3. Proposal for a new taxonomy of CCI

### 3.1. The DISCE taxonomy

DISCE project aims to deliver potential impact in relation to reframing their understanding of inclusive and sustainable growth to encompass not only economic measures but also inclusivity, sustainability and cultural development measures that contribute to human flourishing.

In order to draw a new, comprehensive CCI taxonomy, suitable at EU level, we focus on the perimeter of CCI with strong policy implications of measuring and comparing CCI with other sectors. Actually, in post-industrial economies, the combination of knowledge economy (Powell, Snellman, 2004), experience economy (Pine and Gilmore, 1999) and digital economy (Rifkin, 2011; Zuboff and Maxmin, 2002) has led to the natural extension of the cultural industry to the creative sectors, but no classifications take properly into account the key elements of DISCE.

In order to suggest a new CCI taxonomy we combine together the UNCTAD classification structure with the composition of cultural and creative industries identified by Santagata (2009). The studies Santagata conducted (2009, 2012) were fundamental in opening the debate on culture as tangible and intangible (Throsby, 2001), as a dynamic and propulsive capital. The perimeter of the economy of culture is articulated in three pillars - cultural heritage, tangible culture, media and new media. This choice implies a broad classification logic. The three-pillar model is constructed according to the concentric circles model of Throsby (2008) and KEA (2006).

As a result of that, using Santagata's model in accordance with Thorsby and UNCTAD ones allows a further reflection and analysis on DISCE objectives: primarily, the CCI serve to promote the diversity of cultural expressions within the global circulation of cultural expressions; secondly, CCI are a driver of economic growth in terms of job opportunity and export diversification; thirdly, CCI are at the base of development pathways beyond economic terms focusing on the social and human aspects before the economic aspects.

In this sense, the intervention in cultural matters is functional to a European strengthening in terms of competitiveness (Sacco, 2011). And this first of all because of the greater European capacity in terms of intercultural dialogue and, therefore, of international relations. Secondly because, it is a functional action to improve the quality of the workforce and ultimately, competitiveness (Crocata et al., 2018). The basic datum of the reflection is the awareness that cultural and economic objectives must be pursued in synergy in order to build a competitive, inclusive and strong system at international level. This point is crucial. Underlying it is the awareness that a society based on innovation and inclusion must be a society in which culture plays a decisive role (Santagata, 2009). As the Communication on the European Agenda for Culture states, culture is the catalyst for creativity within the Lisbon Process (2000).

The DISCE new taxonomy, thus, includes and extends the 4 macro areas (namely Heritage, Arts, Functional creations, Media) to 5 industries adding the Tangible culture section (including visual arts and the shift of performing arts from heritage to a dedicated industry, due to its specificity in terms of organisational processes and intangibility) (Tamma, 2010). It allows the rationalisation of the sectors in a more coherent way defining the economic importance of the cultural and creative industries and showing how the connection with other sectors represents an important contribution to the economy. In addition, the new taxonomy considers HEIs as a cross-cutting and unifying element of the various CCI sectors, which represents an identifying and innovative aspect of this taxonomy.

**Table 11** DISCE proposed taxonomy on CCIs

Industries	Sectors	Higher Education Institutions
<b>Heritage</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. GLAM</li> <li>2. Heritage sites</li> <li>3. Architecture</li> <li>4. Botanical gardens</li> </ol>	
<b>Tangible culture</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Visual arts</li> <li>2. Fashion</li> <li>3. Art &amp; crafts</li> <li>4. Design &amp; Graphics</li> </ol>	
<b>Media</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Cinema &amp; Audio-visual production</li> <li>2. TV &amp; radio</li> <li>3. Press</li> <li>4. Publishing</li> </ol>	
<b>Performing Arts</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Opera, Theatre &amp; Dance</li> <li>2. Music industry</li> <li>3. Festivals</li> </ol>	
<b>Functional creations and new media</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Software &amp; Computer games</li> <li>2. Multimedia</li> <li>3. Digitalised creative content</li> <li>4. Ads</li> <li>5. Social Media</li> </ol>	

The new CCIs taxonomy extends the areas adding the ‘tangible culture’ sector and the higher educational institutions, related not only to the heritage area, which have become more and more relevant in the past two decades (Pica, 2012), but the CCIs as a whole. By doing this the new taxonomy does reconsider the connections among the sectors:

- **Heritage:** GLAM (Galleries, Libraries, Archives, Museums), heritage sites, architecture, botanical gardens
- **Tangible culture:** visual arts (including painting, sculpture and photography), arts and crafts, fashion, design and graphics
- **Media:** cinema, tv and radio, publishing, audio-visual production, press
- **Performing Arts:** including opera, theatre, and dance, music industry, festivals
- **Functional creations and new media:** software, computer games, multimedia, digitalised creative content, advertising and social media

Talking about the Heritage area, we refer to the GLAM sector following the indications of ICOM (2015) and in addition to heritage sites, we indicate also Botanical gardens and zoos because the new CCIs taxonomy aims to expand the reflection on CCIs to the environmental issues and challenges which comprehend a set of activities closely tied to cultural, social and economic sustainability.



The Performing Arts area includes music industry, opera, theatre, dance, festivals trying to rationalise and unify artistic expressions which are generally produced live and which require specific technical characteristics for their realisation and performance.

The new taxonomy still keeps the difference between Media and Functional creations, but adding to the latter the notion of New media connected to the branch of digitalised creative contents which needs a dedicated attention in relation to the intellectual property and the dematerialization of cultural and creative goods.

Eventually, the Tangible culture comprehends the expression of craftsmanship, fashion, design, and graphics - all seen as the transformation of creativity into finished works. A great element of recognition and sustainability is provided to industries operating in the sector by ensuring process of inclusion for those who respect criteria of environmental and production sustainability, compliance with production standards, promotion of the territory, and work ethics.

By unbundling some items in relation to Santagata's classification, it is possible to redefine the boundaries of the creative and cultural sectors and include some increasingly important areas such as GLAM and especially the whole sector of Tangible culture. In fact, here more than in the other sectors, it is evident how there is a mixture between the elements of each sector and how, with the change of technologies, taste and trends, the focus is shifting to a new direction. Actually, the KEA classification of cultural industries dated to 2019 significantly diverges from the one published in 2006 for the sorting of the sectors by highlighting the cross-sectoriality of CCIs, the new SME strategy applied to digital age and the need of a specific policy for intellectual property in relation to the media and new media sector.

The new DISCE taxonomy gives an updated perimeter of CCIs. This new perimeter allows for a comprehensive investigation of how CCIs relate to sustainable and inclusive growth. This issue is at the heart of DISCE (DISCE, 2019) and a key policy point for institutions. As said before, the EU Work Plan for Culture (2019-2022) acknowledges cultural heritage as a resource for sustainable and inclusive development. For UNESCO, CCIs could be a powerful driver for inclusive and sustainable development (UNESCO, 2013). There is established research showing that cultural and creative products can influence people's perception, beliefs and attitudes, stimulating openness, tolerance, environmentally sustainable behaviours (Crociani et al. 2015; Denti et al 2022; Vezzali et al 2014). The new taxonomy developed here allow to have an updated and comprehensive map of which elements to consider in designing an appropriate measure of CCIs that can be used to assess CCIs impact on sustainable and inclusive development.

Another aspect of CCIs that relates to sustainable and inclusive growth that has emerged in detailing the different CCIs sectors of the new taxonomy is inclusivity and non-discrimination of CCIs workers regarding their production. The growing relevance of dematerialization implies that more intangibles are produced within CCIs, some of which fail to be protected by exiting regulations on intellectual and creative work.

A final aspect that arose regards environmentally sustainable practices adopted by CCIs, which should be mapped to provide for a robust account of CCIs contribution to sustainable and inclusive growth.

As a result of that, the new DISCE CCIs taxonomy, proposed in WP2, highlights an evolution of UNCTAD, Thorsby, Santagata, and KEA classifications which did not include in their theoretical framework inclusivity and sustainability. The addition of the fifth macro area of tangible culture aims to reconfigure the areas and provide a broader and comprehensive classification that includes sectors, such as the creation of digital contents and intellectual property. The first is crucial to deepen the sectors of creation of digital contents and consequently of intellectual property because they represent the fundamental distinction between the previous classifications and the one proposed by the DISCE project. The creation of digital contents relates to the sustainability of the work done by digital creatives by extending participation in a system or activity to

as many people as possible. In fact, digital content is among the most easily counterfeited and lacks legal recognition, which also extends to the intellectual property including all those creative workers dealing with intangible or intellectual works. The issue of intellectual property is related both to sustainability and inclusivity because inclusivity could also renew our thinking about what intellectual property is, particularly when we seek to apply it to traditional knowledge and folklore. An intellectual property right that could be able to grant inclusive rights would better pay tribute to the collective and shared use (Dusollier, 2020). Furthermore, the creation of digital contents relates to the sustainability of the work done by digital creatives by extending participation in a system or activity to as many people as possible. In fact, digital content is among the most easily counterfeited and lacks legal recognition, which also extends to the intellectual property including all those creative workers dealing with intangible or intellectual works.

The process leading to the definition of the new taxonomy started from the analysis Santagata made on dematerialization seen as an ongoing process of reducing the relative weight of the material components of a good. When talking of creativity and creative economies, the intellectual, aesthetic and symbolic component is the dominant value (Santagata, 2007). One of the consequences of the increase in the intellectual, tangible and intangible component of goods is that it has become necessary to protect an idea, intellectual property that cannot be physically protected because once it is revealed it can be copied and reused by third parties. Legal protection has a cost and is imperfect in its application. Industrial secrecy is hardly applicable to cultural goods whose very nature consists of external communication and disclosure of their contents. The main forms of intellectual property are protected by different rights. Patents protect industrial inventions and technological innovations. Copyright protects intellectual works expressed in words, sounds and images. Resale rights protect paintings and contemporary works of art.

According to EPO (European Patent Office), intellectual property refers to the “creations of the mind or intellect. Intellectual property is divided into two categories: industrial property, which includes patents, trademarks, industrial designs, and copyright, which includes literary and artistic works such as novels, poems and plays, films, musical works, artistic works such as drawings, paintings, photographs and sculptures, and architectural designs” (2020).

So, the two broad categories - copyright and industrial property rights - cover the literary genre, novels, short stories and poems, films and architectural design, and works of visual art on the one side. Industrial property includes inventions protected by patents, individual and collective trademarks, industrial design, geographical indications in their variants, on the other side, all of them crossing the Media, Arts, Functional creations and New media, and Tangible culture areas. Consequently, all the manifestations of creativity are all elements referred to the heritage area as an expression of mankind. What is needed is an evolution of intellectual property rights not only linked to changes in market conditions, but specifically understood as a means by which creative workers can achieve standards of inclusivity and sustainability in their work.

### 3.2. Main novelties in the new DISCE taxonomy

The main novelties of the new taxonomy are both in terms of inclusivity and sustainability and refer both to the reorganisation and the entry of different sectors that were not included nor in the UNCTAD or in the Santagata models. For instance, the use of GLAM meant as a comprehensive definition of heritage sectors as commonly accepted by heritage organisations and professionals, who consider the cultural institutions as a whole and not anymore as independent entities.

Moreover, in the light of this new taxonomy, it appears that geography has a crucial role. The Heritage industry in the new taxonomy contains sectors such as heritage sites, GLAM and botanical gardens which are located somewhere and, most important, are available at very different scale across places.

At the same time, also industries such as Media, Functional Creations and New Media have a strong geographical pattern. Companies producing digital content display strong clustering, meaning that they tend to concentrate in some specific places. The same happens to Cinema and Audio-visual production, publishing and so on (Komorowski, 2017; Turkina et al., 2019). Higher Education institutions (HEI) are located in specific places and not in others. Also, depending on the place, they offer different menus of courses and they assign different importance to CCI related activities. Therefore, this new taxonomy opens for applications in the investigation of CCIs that embed a strong role for space.

Hereafter are the main considerations in relation to sustainability, tangible and intangible culture and digital creations that emerged from the analysis of the new DISCE taxonomy, understood as a systematisation of the CCI taxonomies considered in this study.

Firstly, according to the EU Work Plan for Culture (2019-2022), sustainability in cultural heritage is one of the five key priorities. In the Conclusions to the Work Plan, the EU Council states that “Cultural heritage is both the manifestation of cultural diversity passed down from previous generations and a resource for sustainable cultural, social, environmental and economic development in Europe. Conservation, preservation and safeguarding, research, educational activities and knowledge transfer, financing, participatory governance and contemporary interpretation are key areas that will benefit from a comprehensive strategic approach. During the European Year of Cultural Heritage 2018, a large number of diverse activities took place all across Europe. To ensure its legacy, follow-up measures and mainstreaming activities need to be developed, including an Action Plan for Cultural Heritage by the Commission. The work of the European Year’s national coordinators should be taken into account as well” (C460/13). So, on the one side, cultural educational activities are seen as a key to foster sustainability in terms of heritage knowledge and comprehension enabling processes of conservation and tuition (EU, 2012); on the other side, they are a vehicle to improve mutual understanding and strengthen multicultural inclusion as UNESCO highlights in the document released in 2021 where education is seen, together with culture, a strategic investment for inclusive and sustainable development. As a result of that, the sector of Cultural Educational Activities becomes one the most important for the new taxonomy because it merges together the key elements of the DISCE project.

Secondly, as observed before, no models analysed so far natural reserves, zoos or botanical gardens as they are not considered cultural domains either. Even if nature and its sustainability have been fundamental for humans over the centuries and historical gardens meant like heritage sites: Australia is one of the few countries that emphasises among its cultural domain also botanical gardens; it is important to stress this point since the definition and classification of CCIs not only reflect the various countries historical industrial bases, but more than that focuses on their future development policies (Leung, Kwan, Liou, 2018). In our discourse, the Botanical gardens sector represents an important element to move the attention towards sustainable development.

Thirdly, the Tangible culture is a relevant area that implies a substantial distinction between tangible and intangible culture, which is the main contribution of the Santagata model. In fact, the shift from a purely material work to a fundamentally immaterial one - linked more to digital creations - is emphasised and helps to understand how CCIs are changing their approach to creative work. This distinction raises a problem of recognition of work which, while for creative workers is more immediate due to the creations that their work makes concrete in fashion, design or graphics, for digital creative workers it is less structured and therefore serves to highlight inequalities. Furthermore, we have eliminated the whole tourism sector present in the Santagata model, as specified above, and with it the taste sector which is mainly related to food tourism. Tourism is not included in the DISCE taxonomy because we preferred to focus on the creative aspects and not on the correlation with dependent sectors such as tourism and the taste industry. In this way, the CCIs considered are directly and not indirectly related to the creation of cultural content.

Fourthly, higher education institutions are unifying elements of all creative and cultural sectors, forming the basis of the training of thought and practice necessary to ensure high standards of quality. They are also the venues for the interdisciplinary training that increasingly characterises the CCI; they also provide a broader and deeper understanding of the various sectors by enabling a cross-sectorality that was not emphasised in previous taxonomies (at least until KEA 2019). Having meant HEIs as unifying elements, it also highlights the innovativeness of the DISCE taxonomy by extending the horizon of education and training to all sectors and no longer exclusively to the traditional Heritage sector.

Finally, in the area of digital creations, mention must be made of the growing metaverse sector which is employing more and more digital creatives and requires joint work by graphic designers and creatives in the multimedia sector as well as in the arts with NFT (Binance, 2021) and fashion (Institute of Digital fashion, 2020). Digital industries working to develop the metaverse emphasise how it could be a reprieve from worker exploitation, prejudice, and discrimination, enhancing the potential for inclusiveness, even if the metaverse's potential effect on children and teenagers have also generated concern and this sector needs an in-depth analysis to observe the impact on the Functional creations and new media sector. Our suggestion is to deepen the knowledge of this immersive and universal world in further researches in order to observe and analyse the potential impact of augmented and virtual reality in the cultural and creative industries.



## References

- Bacchini, F. (2013), Le industrie culturali e creative: Confronti statistici europei, in *Economia della cultura*, n.3, il Mulino, Bologna, pp.289-296.
- Banks, M., O'Connor, J. (2009), After the creative industries. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 15(4), 365-373.
- Baumol, W.J., Bowen, W.G. (1966), *Performing Arts. The Economic Dilemma*. A study of Problems common to Theater, Opera, Music and Dance. New York, The Twentieth Century Fund.
- Bennett, T. (1995), *The Birth of the Museum: History, Theory, Politics*. London, Routledge.
- Binance (2021), <https://www.binance.com/en/blog/nft/why-nfts-are-the-keys-to-accessing-the-metaverse-421499824684903085>.
- Boggs, J. (2009), Cultural industries and the creative economy. Vague but useful concepts. *Geography Compass*, 3(4), 1483-1498.
- Burri, M. (2018), *Cultural Heritage and Intellectual Property*, in *The Oxford Handbook of International Cultural Heritage Law*, edited by Francesco Francioni and Ana Vrdoljak (Oxford University Press, 2020), pp. 459-482
- Cicerchia, A. (2013), *Europa: dalla cultura alla creatività e ritorno. Proposte e dilemmi politici*, in *Economia della cultura*, n.3, il Mulino, Bologna, pp.297-308.
- Crociata, A. (2009), *A Multidimensional Framework of Cultural Economics*, in *Global & Local Economic Review*, pp. 101-122. ISSN: 1722-4241.
- Crociata, A., Agovino, M., Sacco, P.L. (2015). Recycling waste: Does culture matter? *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics*, 55, 40-47
- Crociata, A., Agovino, M., Russo, A. and Quaglieri Domínguez, A. (2018), Creative workforce and economic development in pre-crisis Europe: Main trends and causality relationships. *International Regional Science Review*, 41(4), 448-479.
- CSES (2010), *Study on the Contribution of Culture to Local and Regional Development. Evidence from the Structural Funds*, European Commission, Brussels.
- Cunningham, S. (2005), "Creative Enterprises", in Hartley J. (ed.), *Creative Industries*, Blackwell Publishing, Oxford, pp.282-298.
- Cunningham, S., Hartley, J. (2012) et al., *Key Concepts in Creative Industries*, SAGE.
- Davis, H., Scase, R. (2001) *Managing Creativity: The Dynamics of Work and Organization.*, Open University Press.
- De Beukealaer, C. (2015), *Cultural Development: Learning from the Palimpsest of Practice*, Amsterdam: European Cultural Foundation.
- De Beukealaer, C., Spence, K. M. (2019), *Global Cultural Economy*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Della Lucia, M. (2014), La multidimensionalità dello sviluppo locale guidato dalla cultura. *Laboratori territoriali di sperimentazione. Mercati e competitività*, 4, 85-107.
- Della Lucia, M., Segre, G. (2017), Il perimetro delle industrie culturali, creative e turistiche: specializzazioni e implicazioni politiche in Italia. *Synergia Italian Journal of Management*, 35(104).
- Denti, D., Crociata A., Faggian, A. (2021) Knocking on Hell's Door: Dismantling Hate with Cultural Consumption. Utrecht University, *Human Geography and Planning*, 2021.

- Dusollier, S. (2020), "Intellectual Property and the Bundle-of-Rights Metaphor" in *Kritika, Essays in Intellectual property*, Edward Elgar, Volume 4.
- DCMS (1998), *Creative Industries Mapping Document*, United Kingdom.
- DCMS (2001), *The Creative Industries Mapping Document*, United Kingdom.
- EC (2000), Strategic framework for the EU's cultural policy.
- EC (2010), *Green Paper - Unlocking the potential of cultural and creative industries*.
- EC (2012), *Promoting cultural and creative sectors for growth and jobs in the EU*.
- EPO (2020), <https://www.epo.org/service-support/glossary.html#i>
- EUROSTAT (2000), *ESSnet-Culture final report*, European Commission.
- EUROSTAT (2014), *Towards a harmonised methodology for statistical indicators. Part 1: Indicator typologies and terminologies*. Collection: Manuals and guidelines. Publications Office of the European Union: Luxembourg.
- ESSNET-CULTURE (2012), *European Statistical System Network on Culture*. Final Report, ESSnet-Culture and Eurostat, Luxembourg.
- Flew T. (2012), *The creative industries: culture and policy*, Sage Publications, London.
- Florida, R. (2003), *The Rise of the Creative Class: And How It's Transforming Work, Leisure, Community and Everyday Life*, New York, Basic Books.
- Galloway, S. and 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.
- Garnham, N. (1987), *Concepts of Culture: Public Policy and the Cultural Industries*, in *Studies in Culture: An Introductory Reader*, ed. Ann Gray and Jim McGuigan. London: Arnold, 1997, 54-61.
- Garnham, N. (2005), *From cultural to creative industries*, in *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 11:1, 15-29.
- Gordon J.C., Beilby-Orrin H. (2007), *International Measurement of the Economic and Social Importance of Culture*, Statistics Directorate Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, Paris.
- Jones, P. et al. (2004), Creative Industries Economic contributions. Management challenges and support Initiatives. *Management Research News*, 27(11/12), 134-145.
- Harney, S. (2010), Creative industries debate: Unfinished business: Labour, management, and the creative industries, *Cultural Studies*, 24, (3), 431-444. Research Collection Lee Kong Chian School of Business.
- Hartley J., (2005), *Creative Industries*, Blackwell Publishing, Oxford.
- Hartley J., (2013), *Key concepts in creative industries*, Sage, Los Angeles.
- Hawkins, J. (2002). *The Creative Economy. How People Make Money from Ideas*, London: Penguin Books.
- Hesmondhalgh, D., Baker, S. (2006), A very complicated version of freedom': Conditions and experiences of creative labour in three cultural industries, *Poetics*, Vol.38 Issue 1, Pages 4-20.
- Hesmondhalgh, D. (2007), *The Cultural Industries*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, London, Sage.
- Hesmondhalgh, D. (2008), *Cultural and Creative Industries*, in Bennett T.; Frow J. (eds.) *The SAGE handbook of cultural analysis*. Sage Publications Ltd, pp. 552-569.
- Hesmondhalgh, D. (2012), *The Cultural Industries*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition, London, Sage.





- Horkheimer, M. and Adorno, T.W. (1947), *Dialectic of Enlightenment: Philosophical Fragments*. [https://monoskop.org/images/2/27/Horkheimer\\_Max\\_Adorno\\_Theodor\\_W\\_Dialectic\\_of\\_Enlightenment\\_Philosophical\\_Fragments.pdf](https://monoskop.org/images/2/27/Horkheimer_Max_Adorno_Theodor_W_Dialectic_of_Enlightenment_Philosophical_Fragments.pdf), [Accessed in October2019].
- ICOM (2015), *How can we achieve GLAM? Understanding and overcoming the challenges to integrating metadata across museums, archives, and libraries*, ICOM International Committee for Documentation.
- Institute of Digital Fashion (2020), <https://indd.adobe.com/view/3991a46d-a089-4278-a11e-64f1710d7cc2>
- KEA European Affairs (2006), *The Economy of Culture in Europe*, Bruxelles, Belgium: KEA for the European Commission.
- KEA European Affairs (2009), *The impact of culture on creativity*, Bruxelles, Belgium: KEA for the European Commission.
- KEA European Affairs (2012), *Measuring economic impact of CCI policies. How to justify investment in cultural and creative assets*, Bruxelles, Belgium: KEA for the European Commission.
- KEA European Affairs (2019a), *Impulse paper on the role of cultural and creative sectors in innovating European industry*, Bruxelles, Belgium: KEA for the European Commission.
- KEA European Affairs (2019b), *Culture and creative sectors in the European Union. Key future developments, challenges and opportunities*, Bruxelles, Belgium: KEA for the European Commission.
- Komorowski, M. (2017) A novel typology of media clusters, *European Planning Studies*, 25:8, 1334-1356, DOI: [10.1080/09654313.2017.1303823](https://doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2017.1303823)
- Lazzaretti, L., Capone F. (2009), Creative Industries in Italy mapping creative local systems. *Sinergie*, 27(79), 145-159.
- Leung, A.K.Y., Kwan, L.Y.Y., Liou, S. (2018), *Handbook for culture and creativity: basic processes and applied innovations*, Oxford University press.
- Looseley, D. (2011), Notions of popular culture in cultural policy: A comparative history of France and Britain. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 17(4), 365-379.
- Mato, D. (2008), All industries are cultural. *Cultural Studies*, pp. 1-18.
- Mattelart, A., Piemme, J.M. (1982), "Cultural industries: the origin of an idea", in *Cultural industries: a challenge for the future of culture*, UNESCO.
- Miège, B. (1989), *The Capitalization of Cultural Production*, New York, International General.
- Miège, B. (2017), *Les industries culturelles et creatives face à l'ordre de l'information et de la communication*, Presses universitaires de Grenoble.
- Miller, T. (2006), *Cultural Citizenship: Cosmopolitanism, Consumerism and Television in a Neoliberal Age*, Philadelphia, PA, Temple University Press.
- Miller, T. (2008), *From creative to cultural industries*, in *Cultural Studies*, pp. 1-12.
- Miller, T. & Yudice, G. (2002) *Cultural Policy*, London, Sage.
- NESTA (2006), *Creating growth. How the UK can develop world class creative businesses*, UK
- NESTA (2009), *Soft Innovation: Towards a more complete picture of innovative change. National Endowment for Science, Technology and the Arts*, UK.
- OECD (2005), *Culture and Local Development*, OECD, Paris.
- O'Connor J., Cunningham, S., and Janniste, L. (2009), *Arts and creative industries: a historical overview; and an Australian conversation*. Sydney: The Australia Council.



- O'Connor, J. (2010). *The Cultural and Creative Industries: A Literature Review*. Second Edition. Newcastle: Creativity, Culture and Education.
- Pica, V. (2012), La mediazione del patrimonio. Indagine sui servizi educativi dei musei nazionali italiani, Palombi.
- Pine, B.J., Gilmore, J.H. (1999), The experience economy: past, present and future, in *Handbook on the Experience Economy*.
- Powell, W., Snellman, K. (2004), The Knowledge Economy, *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 30:199-220.
- Richeri, G. (2009), *Il concetto di industrie creative*, in *Economia della Cultura* (1/2009), Il Mulino, Bologna.
- Rifkin, G. (2011) *The Third Industrial Revolution. How Lateral Power Is Transforming Energy, the Economy, and the World*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Sacco, P.L. (2011), *Culture 3.0: A new perspective for the EU 2014-2020 structural funds programming*, European Expert Network on Culture Brussels.
- Sacco, P.L., and Crociata, A. (2012), A Conceptual Regulatory Framework for the Design and Evaluation of Complex, Participative Cultural Planning Strategies. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 37(5), 1688-1706.
- Santagata, W. (2007), La fabbrica della cultura. Recuperare la creatività per aiutare lo sviluppo del Paese, Bologna, Il Mulino.
- Santagata, W. (2009), Libro bianco sulla creatività. Per un modello italiano di sviluppo, Università Bocconi Editore, Milano.
- Santagata, W. e Bertacchini E. (2012), *Economia creativa. Come misurarla?*, *Il Sole 24 ore*, 18 marzo.
- Saviolo, S., Testa, S. (2000), Le imprese del sistema moda. Il management al servizio della creatività, ETAS.
- Smith, N. (1996), *New Urban Frontiers: Gentrification and the Revanchist City*, New York, Routledge.
- Street, J. (2011), *The popular, the diverse and the excellent: political values and UK cultural policy*, in *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 17(4), 380-393.
- Tamma M. (2010), *Prodotti culturali e territori: l'immateriale che "vive" nella materialità*, in *Sinergie*, n. 82, pp. 27-46.
- The Work Foundation (2007), *Staying ahead: the economic performance of the UK's creative industries*, UK.
- Throsby, D. (2001), *Economics and Culture*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Throsby, D. (2008), Modelling the cultural industries. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 14(3), 217-232.
- Throsby, D. (2015), *The cultural industries as a sector of the economy*, Routledge Companion to the Cultural Industries. Routledge, London.
- Turkina, E., Oreshkin, B., Kali, R. (2019), Regional innovation clusters and firm innovation performance: an interactionist approach, *Regional Studies*, 53:8, 1193-1206, DOI: [10.1080/00343404.2019.1566697](https://doi.org/10.1080/00343404.2019.1566697)
- Valentino, P.A. (2013), *L'impresa culturale e creativa: verso una definizione condivisa*, in *Economia della cultura*, n.3, il Mulino, Bologna, pp.273-288.
- Valentino, P.A., Bacchini F., Valeri A. and Vani M. (2014), *L'arte di produrre Arte*. Italian design enterprises at work, Civita arte.
- Vezzali, L. et al. (2014) 'Improving intergroup relations with extended and vicarious forms of indirect contact', *European Review of Social Psychology*, 25(1), pp. 314–389. doi: 10.1080/10463283.2014.982948.
- UNDP/UNCTAD (2008), *Creative economy*. Report 2008, Geneva-New York: UNDP, UNCTAD.
- UNESCO (1982), *Cultural industries: A challenge for the future of culture*, UNESCO, Paris.



- UNESCO (2005), *International flows of selected cultural goods and services, 1994–2003. Defining and Capturing Global Cultural Trade*, UNESCO, Paris.
- UNESCO (2009), *Framework for Cultural Statistics*, UNESCO, Paris
- UNESCO (2013), *Creative Economy Report, Special Edition: Widening Local Development Pathways*, UNESCO, Paris.
- UNESCO (2021), *Culture & Education: A Strategic Investment for Inclusive and Sustainable Development*, UNESCO, Paris.
- UNESCO (2022), *Re-shaping policies for creativity: addressing culture as a global public good*, UNESCO, Paris.
- WIPO - World Intellectual Property Organization. (2003). *Guide on surveying the economic contribution of the copyright-based industries*. Geneva: World Intellectual Property Organization.
- Zuboff, S. and Maxmin, J. (2002) *The Support Economy. Why Corporations are Failing Individuals and the Next Episode of Capitalism*, New York: Penguin.

