1. The rise of cultural and creative industries in creative economy research: a bibliometric analysis

Luciana Lazzeretti, Francesco Capone and Niccolò Innocenti*

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Research on cultural and creative industries (CCIs) is of growing importance in the field of the creative economy (Jones et al. 2015; Potts 2016). Following the early contributions on creative cities or creative class (Landry 2000; Florida 2002), CCIs have come to represent an increasingly independent topic, with a shift in focus from ‘cultural industries’ to ‘cultural and creative industries’ (Cunningham 2002).

CCI research has become a regular theme in academic journals and conferences all over the world (Lazzeretti et al. 2017). Creative industries are more and more acknowledged as a driver for economic development and urban economic growth, as well as a source of innovation (De-Miguel-Molina et al. 2012; Lee and Rodríguez-Pose 2014). A relevant stream of research has also addressed the role of creative industries and clustering of CCIs for local and regional development (De-Miguel-Molina et al. 2012; Boix et al. 2014; Gong and Hassink 2017); this has culminated in the discussion of creative and cultural industries policy for European Union (EU) smart growth (Cooke and De Propris 2011).

CCIs are increasingly recognised as a priority sector emerging from actual financial and economic crises. Moreover, notwithstanding the fact that CCIs were originally mainly developed in Europe (DCMS 1998), there has been rising research interest in this field by several scholars in Asia and developing countries all over the world (Yusuf and Nabeshima 2005; Barrowclough and Kozul-Wright 2008).

Recently, some sectors have grown intensively and they are now at the

* Due to limited space, references of the bibliometric analysis between squared brackets are not reported in the reference section, but can be found in Table 1.2 and Figure 1.3.

centre of attention due to their potentiality for economic development and their use of digital technologies; these include the music, designer fashion and video game industries (Hracs et al. 2013; Banks and Cunningham 2016). New trends include increased interest in creative industries in education (Comunian and Faggian 2014) and urban regeneration (Plaza and Haarich 2015), as well as in the concept of creative tourism (Richards 2014). There is also a significant amount of research on entrepreneurship in creative industries and so-called creative entrepreneurship (Henry 2007; Shalley et al. 2015), as well as the role of CCIs for the geography of innovations and entrepreneurship (Florida et al. 2017).

Notwithstanding the relevance of these themes and the huge number of related publications, research around these topics is still fragmented and has not yet been sufficiently organised. Few contributions have attempted to analyse this stream of research by ordering and structuring the current literature (Flew and Cunningham 2010; O'Connor 2010). Most recent works have analysed research on the creative field in only a descriptive way, representing a first attempt to organise the huge range of literature on these themes (Chen and Chen 2014).

This chapter has a twofold objective. First, it aims to contribute to addressing the fragmentation in the literature on creative economy that was underlined by Jones et al. (2015) and Shalley et al. (2015). We analyse the evolution of academic research on the creative economy and local economic development, investigating the main research themes and pointing out the increasing relevance of the research on CCIs. The second objective is to contribute to the debate on the foundation of an economics of creative industries introduced by Caves (2000) and Potts (2011), the latter having also produced a first collection of works on its foundation (Potts 2016). In this regard, we analyse the research on CCIs and the local economic development approach, and we investigate the main contributions that have disseminated and developed these concepts over the years through a co-citation analysis (Guevara et al. 2016).

In this work, we attempt to address the following research questions:

What are the main themes of creative economy research (CER)? Is research on CCIs the most relevant research topic?

What are the most important works on CCIs that allowed this topic to be established, disseminated and affirmed in academic research? What shared knowledge and authors are the base of this research topic?

For this purpose, we collected and analysed the publications on CER over a period of 19 years (1998–2016). This longitudinal study is based on 1622 publications collected from the ISI Web of Science (WoS) database of

publications, including academic works produced in the period from 1998 (the first year of publication of DCMS 1998, *Creative Industries Mapping Document*) to 2016.

The work is structured as follows. After this introduction, Section 1.2 presents the state of the art of CER, addressing the main research themes. Section 1.3 illustrates the research design and methodology of this study. Section 1.4 presents the analysis and evolution of CER from 1998 to 2016, focusing on the rise of CCI research. Section 1.5 analyses the main roles of the founders and disseminators of the research on CCIs with a co-citation analysis and social network analysis (SNA). Some final remarks conclude the chapter.

1.2 THE MAIN PILLARS OF CREATIVE ECONOMY AND LOCAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH

CER has become a multidisciplinary research field with a strong theoretical and empirical basis and an extensive body of literature has been produced from many different perspectives (Berg and Hassink 2014). It is now well recognised that the creative economy is a successful paradigm that has made an important contribution to the studies on economic development and innovation (Bakhshi et al. 2008).

Adopting a chronological perspective to present the evolution of the research on the creative economy, the interest in cultural economics has developed with a rising number of works on the topic of creativity, cities and urban development, which created a space for the literature on the creative city (Landry and Bianchini 1995; Landry 2000; Evans 2009). Later, the work of Richard Florida (2002) received huge attention; this research emphasised the role of the creative class for the development of cities and places. Following Florida's reasoning, the urban environment needs the creative class to sustain development.

The term 'creative economy' was popularised in 2001 thanks to the work of Howkins, who studied 15 different industries in the fields of arts, research and technology. In his conception, the creative economy is a system where value generation is related to creative resources rather than to traditional economic resources and individual creativity is the leading source of value.

Several research studies have investigated the relationship between innovation and economic development using a local perspective (Branzanti 2015). Initially, these studies focused mainly on the creative class, creative industries and clusters/districts, and they involved many different disciplines, such as economic geography, regional sciences and local development, as

well as management studies. At first, Florida's contribution received wide recognition and visibility. His work was first developed in North America and Northern Europe (Florida and Tinagli 2004), but thereafter spread to other European countries and even to Asia, thereby achieving global diffusion (Mellander et al. 2013). However, to talk about the origins of CER, it is important to start from the cultural industries that became popular from the 1980s thanks to UNESCO, and that involve many fields, from art to movies, music and others. When we talk about cultural industries, we refer to the traditional cultural economics (Throsby 2001; Towse 2003) and to forms of cultural production characterised by a symbolic element.

In studies related to the creative economy, there has been a change of position, moving attention towards the creative industries. This shift began with the research of the Cultural Department in Australia in 1994 which was then followed and enriched by two contributions from the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) in the UK – the first at the beginning of the new millennium (DCMS 1998) and the second more than ten years later (DCMS 2013). This last work focused more on creative intensity in defining the creative industries.

In recent studies, the role of creative industries has also started to be considered for developing countries (Barrowclough and Kozul-Wright 2008; Kong and O'Connor 2009). Such research has followed new approaches specifically developed by UNDP-UNESCO (2013) for the countries of the global South.

Another approach deals with the intersection between themes of CCIs and local and regional development, which could be attributed mainly to the thriving contributions on cultural and creative clusters/districts (Cooke and Lazzeretti 2008), creative regions (Cooke and Schwartz 2007) and creative networks. This approach has mainly been applied in European countries.

A rising discussion exists concerning light and shadow; the possible existence of a 'dark side of creativity' is a topic that has not been debated enough. Glaeser (2005), in terms of regional studies, and Pratt (2008) have voiced some concerns about the role of the notion of the creative class as a causal mechanism in processes of urban regeneration. A recent argument related to the effect of financial crises on the creative sector and the consequent subverted debate that emerged (Pratt and Hutton 2013). According to Scott (2014), a large part of existing literature on creative cities represents the urban dynamics in a flawed way, leading towards regressive policy advocacy. Moreover, he sustains the strength of the concept of cognitive-cultural capitalism as a more robust theoretical framework in explaining contemporary urbanisation processes. In management studies, Cohendet et al. (2010) investigate the anatomy of the creative city in terms of an underground, middleground and upperground, while the sociologist Zukin (2010), in

her seminal work on the concept of the ‘naked city’, highlights the risks connected to the loss of authenticity of cities and the experience economy. Finally, Campbell (2014) describes a case study of Liverpool as a European capital city, defining the creative economy as an ‘imaginary success’.

The discussion is wide ranging and broadly differentiated from country to country. Observing the evolution of CER in Europe and worldwide alone, it is difficult to identify the exact phase in which each finds itself, namely, development, maturity or the beginning of a possible decline. Perspectives can vary according to the different areas and periods wherein the paradigm has spread, but at least in Europe, the defining issue is surely worth addressing due to its high priority (Power and Nielsén 2010).

In North America and Europe, the strategic role of the ‘creative economy’ slowed down after the economic and financial crisis of 2008 and the criticisms have become more detailed and deeper. At the same time, in emerging markets, such as Asia, the interest in the creative economy is growing and CCIs are emerging through the promotion of new museums designed by Archistar (De Beukelaer 2014; Hong et al. 2014).

In summary, most contributions can be grouped together into three main streams of research, as follows:

1. The first concerns the long tradition of cultural economics’ contribution to the cultural industries (Howkins 2001; Hesmondhalgh 2002), which evolved into a focus on CCIs originating with the DCMS (1998) report; this was rapidly popularised thanks to various works of public organisations and research centres (for example, UNCTAD 2008).
2. The second stream of research stems from the original concept of Florida on the creative class, with the buzz deriving from the concept of a creative class, growth and economic development (Stolarick and Florida 2006; Boschma and Fritsch 2009; Florida 2014).
3. The third stream addresses the creative city, starting from the seminal contributions of Landry (2000) and Landry and Bianchini (1995) and continuing in the more recent evolution of the concept (for example, Scott 2014).

1.3 OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY: THE BIBLIOMETRIC APPROACH AND SOCIAL NETWORK ANALYSIS

To analyse the evolution of CER over time, we followed a bibliometric approach based on SNA (Scott and Carrington 2011), which has recently

emerged thanks to the availability of important databases such as WoS and Scopus. This approach, which has now become popular, has not yet been applied to creative research as a whole except in a few studies (Lazzeretti et al. 2017).

Concerning CER, the number of studies remains small. The only more general study is the work of Chuluunbaatar et al. (2013), which analyses the academic research on CCIs from the 1970s to 2013 and examines the most cited articles, authors and journals; however, this review does not include a co-citation analysis. In addition, Chen and Chen (2014) analyse contributions on creative industries studies in 2003–12. They point out top-cited articles, authors and journals, but they do not develop a co-citation analysis and their results are mainly descriptive. In this work, we aim to contribute to filling the existing knowledge gap, providing a wider framework of the evolution of CER, focusing on the relevance of the research stream on CCIs and analysing the most important contributions that disseminate and establish research on CCIs.

1.3.1 Data Collection

Our data come from the ISI-Thomson Reuters WoS database. The choice of WoS as the data source was motivated by its widespread international use for rating the research output of scientists from every discipline. However, this database presents some limitations; it omits most of the contributions published in books or in languages other than English.¹ To improve the robustness and accuracy of our data and to avoid mistakes and errors, our results have also been compared and integrated with the results of a similar search of the Scopus database.²

We began by selecting all publications on subjects related to the Social Sciences. After performing a keyword analysis,³ we collected approximately 2750 contributions dated from 1998 to 2016. We then proceeded to skim the database by reading the abstracts of the articles (or the articles if necessary) to focus on the relationship between CER and local development, excluding contributions that do not involve a territorial dimension.⁴

After this procedure, we obtained our final database containing 1622 publications from 1998 to 2016. In this first search, the same article could be found through more than one search object.⁵

1.3.2 Methodological Approach

Our methodological approach follows the work developed by Lazzeretti et al. (2014, 2017), analysing the most cited authors (disseminators) and their backward citations (founders). After analysing the evolution of CER

(1.4.1) and the journals that published most articles on CER (1.4.2), we consider the main CER research themes (1.4.3), pointing out the increasing relevance of the research on CCIs. Narrowing our focus to research on CCIs, we proceed with the analysis of the most important works on CCIs – defined as ‘disseminators’ (1.5.1) – and their backward citations (1.5.2). We collect from the WoS database disseminators’ backward citations to explore the theoretical basis on which CCI theory has been constructed. We define these works as founders of CCI research, as in previous studies (Lazzeretti et al. 2014).

1.4 THE RISE OF CCIs IN CER

1.4.1 The Evolution of CER

Figure 1.1 presents the evolution of CER publications and citations from 1998 to 2016. As can be seen from the figure, we start with extremely few contributions in the late 1990s; in fact, CER⁶ is a phenomenon that has appeared in WoS journals since the early 2000s and has shown a huge increase from 2006–07 onwards, with more than 60 contributions per year and more than 400 yearly citations.

From 2015, it has reached a level of more than 200 contributions and around 3000 citations. As already highlighted in the literature, there is

Figure 1.1 The evolution of CER: citations and contributions, 1998–2016

growing development in this research field, with consistent growth in the literature.

1.4.2 Journals that Publish Articles on CER

Table 1.1 presents the journals that have published the articles collected from WoS. The most important is the *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, which records more than 80 articles, thereby confirming that the concept of CER is well inserted in the traditional research on cultural studies and cultural economics. The second most relevant journal is *European*

Table 1.1 The journals most publishing articles on CER using WoS

Journal	Contributions	Contributions (%)	Total citations	Citations (%)
<i>International Journal of Cultural Policy</i>	83	5.1	477	2.6
<i>European Planning Studies</i>	72	4.4	569	3.1
<i>Urban Studies</i>	53	3.3	1822	9.9
<i>Cities</i>	49	3.0	556	3.0
<i>Environment and Planning A</i>	43	2.7	1079	5.9
<i>Regional Studies</i>	43	2.7	1200	6.5
<i>International Journal of Urban and Regional Research</i>	33	2.0	1235	6.7
<i>Industry and Innovation</i>	26	1.6	313	1.7
<i>Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society</i>	24	1.5	101	0.5
<i>Media International Australia</i>	24	1.5	16	0.1
<i>Journal of Economic Geography</i>	23	1.4	1202	6.5
<i>Journal of Cultural Economics</i>	22	1.4	127	0.7
<i>International Journal of Cultural Studies</i>	20	1.2	106	0.6
<i>Geoforum</i>	17	1.0	667	3.6
<i>Journal of Urban Affairs</i>	17	1.0	429	2.3
<i>Technological Forecasting and Social Change</i>	17	1.0	52	0.3
<i>Innovation: Management, Policy & Practice</i>	16	1.0	147	0.8
<i>Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography</i>	15	0.9	399	2.2
<i>International Journal of Arts Management</i>	15	0.9	24	0.1
<i>Urban Geography</i>	15	0.9	68	0.4
<i>Economic Geography</i>	14	0.9	476	2.6
<i>European Urban and Regional Studies</i>	14	0.9	87	0.5

Source: Authors' elaborations on WoS database.

Planning Studies, confirming the relevance of these themes in geography and planning, as well as for local development.

The third journal is *Urban Studies*, which demonstrates that urban economics and urban planning constitute a field that welcomes contributions on creative cities and the creative class. This is further reflected in *Cities* and the *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*.

Another group of journals comprises those dealing with themes between geography and planning, such as *Environment and Planning A* or journals related to the regional sciences, with contributions on regional development and competitiveness, including *Regional Studies* and so on. One of the main strands concerns economic geography, with periodicals like *Journal of Economic Geography*, *Geoforum* and *Geografiska Annaler*. In addition, we found journals on management, innovation and local development, such as *Industry and Innovation*, which further underlines the multidisciplinary interest surrounding these issues.

It is noteworthy that since 2005, there has also been an increasing trend in publications on these issues in Asian and Chinese journals, indicating a progressive diffusion of these topics on a global level. There have been 43 relevant articles published in Asian journals since 2005, 40 of which appeared from 2009 onward; this phenomenon is probably undervalued here because the present study only considers journals included in the WoS database. A relevant example is the *International Journal of Cultural and Creative Industries* (<http://www.ijcci.net>). This journal is published by the Institute of Creative Industries Design of the National Cheng Kung University (Taiwan) and has an editorial committee of international experts on CER, but it is still in the process of entering the Scopus database.

1.4.3 The Main Topics/Themes of CER: The Rise of CCIs

The most important research theme regards CCIs, representing approximately 39 per cent of the contributions analysed; in fact, creative industries alone account for 23 per cent, whereas cultural industries only represent 16 per cent. This is followed by the theme of creative cities, at 21 per cent. The creative class stands at 12 per cent. These three pillars account for more than 70 per cent of all contributions.

Other themes include the following: creative clusters, cultural clusters and districts and creative regions. Creative clusters, districts and networks represented only 6 per cent of contributions, while cultural clusters, districts and networks did not reach 5 per cent; creative regions represented 9 per cent. Finally, the topic of creative economy did not reach 6 per cent.

These findings underscore that the creative class is not the subject with

Figure 1.2 The evolution of CER per topic, 1998–2016

the highest interest over time, despite the initial emphasis given to the relevant contributions by Florida [2002, 2005]. In contrast, the themes of creative and cultural industries had the highest number of publications. The creative city was the second theme for a number of publications and it returned more results than the creative class; however, it did not constitute a homogeneous field, as it was mainly evoked in the contributions of a few specialist areas, such as urban planning and urban economics. Issues related to local development, such as cultural or creative districts and clusters or creative regions, remained marginal. Clusters and districts stood together with around 10 per cent of contributions.

Finally, we underline the evolutionary trends of the main research themes. Figure 1.2 illustrates the evolution of the publications over time.⁷ The themes related to cultural industries were most important due to the traditional contribution of cultural economics since 2008.

Research on the creative class grew during the initial phase but only experienced clear-cut development in the second half of the 2000s and it has already shown a decrease in the last two years. Instead, creative industries have represented the main theme from 2007 onwards; beginning in 2009, there have been more than 50 contributions per year on this subject, increasing to more than a hundred contributions from 2015.

The research theme on creative cities is an important developing theme that did not register a decline like that related to the creative class. Among

the less relevant topics, only the creative region and creative clusters showed substantial development, but they only reached 20–30 contributions per year from 2010 to 2016.

Another rising theme is ‘creative entrepreneurship’, which registered around 60 articles in the database, with 53 out of 60 from 2010 onwards. Among the best-known contributions are the works of Lee, Florida and Acs [2004], Scott [2004] and Mellander [2004].

1.5 FOUNDERS AND DISSEMINATORS OF CCIs

This section focuses on the analysis of the literature on CCIs, since this was identified as the most relevant topic within the CER. The first subsection investigates the ‘disseminators’ of the research on CCIs, defined as the most important contributions based on the retrieved citations. The second subsection investigates disseminators’ backward citations to identify the ‘founders’ of the research on CCIs as the most cited works by disseminators.

1.5.1 The Disseminators of CCIs

To identify some of the main characteristics of the academic community that deals with the CCIs, we selected the most cited articles through the keywords related to CCIs. These works can be considered the first proxy of shared knowledge of the scientific community. Through our analysis, we identified the main works (called ‘disseminators’) that contributed more than others to diffusing the research on CCIs across the different disciplines.

In accordance with other works on bibliometric analysis (Lazzeretti et al. 2014), we selected the most relevant contributions, that is, those that have received at least four citations on average per year. The resulting 19 (out of 43 on CER; Lazzeretti et al. 2017) contributions are considered the ‘disseminators’ of CCIs.⁸

These 19 contributions received 1613 citations, around 25 per cent of total citations on CER. Hence, they can be defined as the core of CCIs, considering that in the database including more than a thousand contributions on CCIs, fewer than a hundred contributions received around 64 per cent of total citations. In fact, more than 500 contributions received one citation or none at all.

Table 1.2 presents the top-cited 19 disseminators of CCIs. According to the WoS database, the most relevant work, with around 140 citations, is that by Markusen and Schrock [2006] in *Urban Studies*, which considers

Table 1.2 The most cited 19 disseminators on CCIs

Contributions	Title	Journals	Total citations
Markusen and Schrock 2006	The artistic dividend: urban artistic specialisation and economic development implications	<i>Urban Studies</i>	137
Pratt 2008	Creative cities: the cultural industries and the creative class	<i>Geografiska Annaler Series B-Human Geography</i>	134
Pratt 2000	New media, the new economy and new spaces	<i>Geoforum</i>	131
Drake 2003	'This place gives me space': place and creativity in the creative industries	<i>Geoforum</i>	107
Banks et al. 2000	Risk and trust in the cultural industries	<i>Geoforum</i>	91
Potts et al. 2008	Social network markets: a new definition of the creative industries	<i>Journal of Cultural Economics</i>	83
Bathelt and Boggs 2003	Toward a reconceptualisation of regional development paths: is Leipzig's media cluster a continuation of or a rupture with the past?	<i>Economic Geography</i>	73
Yeoh 2005	The global cultural city? Spatial imagineering and politics in the (multi) cultural marketplaces of South-east Asia	<i>Urban Studies</i>	70
Prince 2010	Policy transfer as policy assemblage: making policy for the creative industries in New Zealand	<i>Environment and Planning A</i>	67
Johns 2006	Video games production networks: value capture, power relations and embeddedness	<i>Journal of Economic Geography</i>	66
Markusen et al. 2008	Defining the creative economy: industry and occupational approaches	<i>Economic Development Quarterly</i>	65
Gibson and Klocker 2004	Academic publishing as 'creative' industry, and recent discourses of 'creative economies': some critical reflections	<i>Area</i>	62

Table 1.2 (continued)

Contributions	Title	Journals	Total citations
Pratt 2009	Urban regeneration: from the arts ‘feel good’ factor to the cultural economy: a case study of Hoxton, London	<i>Urban Studies</i>	59
Miles 2005	Interruptions: testing the rhetoric of culturally led urban development	<i>Urban Studies</i>	59
Bassett et al. 2002	Cultural industries, cultural clusters and the city: the example of natural history film-making in Bristol	<i>Geoforum</i>	58
Banks and Deuze 2009	Co-creative labour	<i>International Journal of Cultural Studies</i>	54
Prince 2012	Policy transfer, consultants and the geographies of governance	<i>Progress in Human Geography</i>	53
Wenting 2008	Spinoff dynamics and the spatial formation of the fashion design industry, 1858–2005	<i>Journal of Economic Geography</i>	52
Waitt and Gibson 2009	Creative small cities: rethinking the creative economy in place	<i>Urban Studies</i>	49

Source: Authors’ elaboration.

the role of artists working in the creative industries and their contribution to the local economy.

In second and third place, we find works by Pratt [2008, 2000]; these do not only concern CCIs but also deal with many issues relevant to CER, such as the creative class and the creative city, thereby emphasising the transversality of the topic. Pratt is also included in the list thanks to his work in *Urban Studies* [2000], which is related to the cultural cluster. The topic of cultural or creative clusters could be found in the works of Drake [2003] and Bathelt and Boggs [2003], which were also identified as most relevant to CCIs. There is another strand of works about the definition of creative industries, as seen in Potts et al. [2008] and Markusen et al. (2008). A final remark about the most relevant works is that we identified studies referring generally to CCIs, such as Prince [2010] and Banks et al. [2000], as well as research on a specific category, as represented by Johns [2006], Bathelt and Boggs [2003] and Basset et al. [2002] on global

video game networks, Leipzig's media cluster and filmmaking in Bristol, respectively.

Among the most relevant authors, we identified Pratt, with three contributions, and Markusen, Banks, Prince and Gibson, all with two contributions. Of course, these are just the top 19 works and this analysis does not exhaust the view of the most important authors on CCIs.

The journals represented by the first 19 disseminators cover all journals with a territorial dimension, such as *Urban Studies*, *Geoforum*, *Journal of Economic Geography* and *Environment and Planning A*. There are only two works in cultural economics journals, namely, *Journal of Cultural Economics* and *International Journal of Cultural Studies*. This confirms both the interdisciplinarity of the theme and its relevance in subjects like economic geography and urban studies.

1.5.2 Analysis of the Founders of CCIs

In this section, starting from the disseminators, we collect the backward citations of the 19 disseminators of CCIs from WoS. Moreover, we investigate the co-citation pattern of these backward citations through SNA (Scott and Carrington 2011).⁹

In the network of the founders of CCIs, the nodes represent the publications, while the lines indicate that two publications have been co-cited jointly by disseminators. This helps us in identifying those works that are more commonly co-cited together. This clarifies that if a work is consistently co-cited with another work, it refers to the same theoretical background or knowledge.

In Figure 1.3, the overall network with 1104 nodes has been reduced to 69 nodes, comprising only those contributions that have at least two co-citations in common. The size of the nodes indicates the importance of the contribution defined by the total number of co-citations received (degree).

An interesting first result of the analysis is the presence of interdisciplinary contributions. These are not only evident for CCIs, but also for more general CER issues. Here, it is confirmed that the research stream on CCIs has developed thanks to the hype generated by contributions on creative class and creative cities. In the graph, as the most cited works, there are Florida's (2002) contributions on the 'rise of the creative class', as well as Landry's (2000) research on creative cities and Scott's [2000] work on the 'cultural economy of cities'. This last contribution illustrates that most of the starting knowledge base of CCIs originates from cultural economics and contributions like those of Hesmondhalgh (2002) and Zukin [1982, 1995] on the role of culture in cities, Pratt [2004] on 'cultural industries and

the production of culture' or older works on cultural industries in the UK [Pratt 1997] and NEFA [2000] or other countries [Power 2002].

Regarding the creative city, there are the well-known contributions of Landry and Bianchini (1995) and further works of O'Connor and Wynne [1996] and O'Connor [1998]. Other research topics relate to the creative class and economic development themes such as the well-known contributions of Peck [2005] and Florida [2005].

Specifically, concerning creative industries, there is the well-known contribution of the DCMS [1998, 2001], representing a seminal contribution to the mapping and definition of creative industries, as well as that of Potts [2008] on creative industries and innovation policy. This transition from cultural industries to creative industries is highlighted by Garnham [2005]. Moreover, Pratt (2008) presents the research background on cultural industries, creative classes and creative cities. A significant node is the contribution of Grabher [2001] on 'ecologies of creativity'. Finally, it is interesting to note that there are numerous contributions to local and regional development from which these studies originated, such as Porter [1995, 2000] on competitive advantage and clusters, Feser [2003] and Markusen [2004] and Gordon and McCann [2000] on industry clusters and regional development, and Grabher [1993] on industrial networks and the embedded firm.

Other contributions relate to the socioeconomic changes that have occurred over the period and point out how the research stream on CCIs has become part of a transformation in the overall socioeconomic environment, as highlighted by Lash and Urry's [1994] contribution on the economy of sign and space, Sassen's [1991] work on the global city, Castell's [1996] study on the role of networks in society, Nelson and Winter's [1982] work on an evolutionary theory of economic change, or Pine and Gilmore's [1999] research on the experience economy. This was also a result regarding a larger analysis on the founders of CER (Lazzeretti et al. 2017).

Finally, it is possible to identify the most important authors in the overall network by analysing those most cited by the disseminators. The author with the most contributions mentioned is Scott, who can be found in 31 studies quoted in 19 disseminators, followed by Pratt, with 29 contributions, Markusen with 25, Florida with 23, Bianchini with 14 on creative cities, Grabher with 17 and Zukin with 11.

1.6 CONCLUSIONS

This chapter had a twofold objective. First, it aimed to contribute to addressing the fragmentation of the literature on the creative economy, and second, to lay the foundation for an economics of creative industries.

Concerning the first objective, we analysed the evolution of academic research on the creative economy and local economic development and we pointed out the growing relevance of the research on CCIs. CCIs are not only the major topic in CER, but as shown by the analysis of recent publications, this trend has become even stronger in the last few years. In addition, the global trend of publications also underlines this phenomenon, showing a significant number of studies published in Asian journals or journals belonging to countries different from the traditional geographic areas in which the debate was born (the US, Europe and Australia).

CCIs are increasingly at the centre of extensive international research for several reasons: they are a priority sector for economic development and entrepreneurship and a strategic sector for overcoming the recent economic crisis, both for their capacity to create interconnections with the wider economy and their ability to generate innovations, both directly and indirectly. For these reasons, developing countries (for example, in South America, especially Brazil and so on) and Asian countries have focused research and policies on CCIs.

The results of this work strongly confirm the relevance of CCIs in the contemporary economy. This importance can only be expected to grow in the future. This last result supports the hypothesis originally stated by Caves (2000) concerning the foundation of creative industries' economics. He stresses that

creative goods and services, the process of their production and the preferences or taste of creative artist differ in substantial and systematic (if not universal) ways from their counterparts in the rest of the economy where creativity plays a lesser (if seldom negligible) role. This differences rest on the bedrock properties of these activities that distinguish them from other sectors of the economy and in some cases distinguish creative activities from one another. (p. 2)

In view of this relevance, our second objective was to carry out an in-depth study of the literature on CCIs and analyse authors and works that represent major topics and the basis for building shared knowledge in the CCI research community. In this regard, we analysed the research on CCIs and the local economic approach and we investigated the main contributions that have disseminated and established these concepts over the years through a co-citation analysis (Guevara et al. 2016). This allowed us to analyse the intellectual structure of the research on CCIs.

The internal structure of the co-cited contribution network showed how CCI research has emerged from the interconnection with all other CER topics, such as creative cities and the creative class. However, if this research field started from many of these subthemes, it has also been able

to branch off from them, emerging over time as an autonomous, self-sustaining topic for local development.

The internal structure of research was confirmed as fragmented. Nevertheless, if we focus on specific subthemes connected to CCIs, some of them have been declining while others have been rising over the last several years.

The creative city has seen a declining trend. This is likely due to some newly emerging paradigms in Europe, such as the concept of 'smart cities' and the connections with the policies of smart specialisation strategies developed by European communities (McCann and Ortega-Argilés 2013). The role of the creative city has become secondary and it is coming to be better characterised as a subcategory of the smart city.

The creative class concept is still important, but it has been criticised. In particular, criticism has been raised in relation to unsuccessful performance in terms of value and employment, which is mainly associated with the nature of temporary work of the creative economy. Creative workers are underpaid, particularly when considering their strategic role in innovation processes and their adaptive capacity in facing the recent economic crisis (for example, Pratt and Hutton 2013).

The theme of CCIs is more relevant than the other topics, but its heterogeneity and internal fragmentation continue to grow. This implies not only a specifying problem but also an issue in terms of policy.

What policies for CCIs will emerge in the future? This industry seems to be beyond the mainstream definitions of sectors and it runs the risk of receiving insufficient support from effective industrial policy and actions to sustain firms. Concerning this factor, other authors highlight the need for rethinking the role and effect of cultural policies in the future (Banks and Cunningham 2016).

In conclusion, this work allowed us to investigate, first, the literature on CER, and second, the theme of CCIs; thus, we confirmed the present interest in these two research topics. We want to conclude this work with the expectation that the interest in CCIs will continue to grow in the future and we want to maintain the hope that the creative sector as a whole can make an important contribution to the contemporary economy in overcoming the current financial crisis.

NOTES

1. The ISI database does not consider books not included in the ISI Book Citation Index or research reports (UNESCO and so on).
2. The aim was to find the papers omitted in WoS by mistake (not to use both sources) and

we also verified that the most cited works (later on called disseminators) were the same using both databases.

3. Using the search option at WoS, all publications whose topic contained the following terms were collected: 'creative class', 'creative industry', 'creative cluster', 'creative city', 'creative economy', 'creative networks', 'cultural industry', 'cultural cluster', 'cultural district', 'cultural network', 'creativity' and 'region', 'cluster', 'district' and 'city' (both singular and plural terms).
4. We excluded contributions that do not involve the territory in the study, such as works on individual creativity, mainly from the fields of psychology, sociology and organisation studies. In addition, we left out works in managerial studies, cultural studies and cultural economics, which do not focus on the territory or on the main economic-territorial units of analysis adopted by researchers in CER and local development (industry, cluster, district, city, region and network).
5. For example, two articles that studied both the creative class and creative cities can be found in the two groups.
6. For a more in depth research about CER see Lazzeretti et al. (2017).
7. The contributions on the various topics involve some repetition, as a single contribution can have multiple objects of research.
8. Taking into account only the most important contributions in terms of citations has its limitations. In fact, older articles received more citations. We have tried to overcome this limit by analysing per year rather than by absolute number of citations.
9. The matrix disseminators $\times$ founders (one mode) has been then transformed into founders per founders (two mode), where a founder is linked to another founder if it is co-cited by a disseminator.

REFERENCES

- Bakhshi, H., E. McVittie and J. Simmie (2008), *Creating Innovation: Do the Creative Industries Support Innovation in the Wider Economy?*, London: NESTA.
- Banks, J. and S. Cunningham (2016), 'Creative destruction in the Australian videogames industry', *Media International Australia*, **160** (1), 127–39.
- Barrowclough, D. and Z. Kozul-Wright (2008), *Creative Industries and Developing Countries. Voice, Choice and Economic Growth*, Abingdon: Routledge.
- Berg, S. and R. Hassink (2014), 'Creative industries from an evolutionary perspective: a critical literature review', *Geography Compass*, **8** (9), 653–64.
- Boix, R., F. Capone, L. De Propriis, L. Lazzeretti and D. Sanchez (2014), 'Comparing creative industries in Europe', *European Urban and Regional Studies*, **23** (4), 935–40.
- Boschma, R.A. and M. Fritsch (2009), 'Creative class and regional growth: empirical evidence from seven European countries', *Economic Geography*, **85** (4), 391–423.
- Branzanti, C. (2015), 'Creative clusters and district economies: towards a taxonomy to interpret the phenomenon', *European Planning Studies*, **23** (7), 1401–18.
- Campbell, P. (2014), 'Imaginary success? The contentious ascendance of creativity', *European Planning Studies*, **22** (5), 995–1009.
- Caves, R. (2000), *Creative Industries: Contracts between Art and Commerce*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Chen, C.Y. and J.J. Chen (2014), 'The intellectual structure of creative industries studies in 2003–2012: invisible Taiwan', *Journal of Economics, Business and Management*, **2** (1), 26–40.

- Chuluunbaatar, E., Ottavia, D. Luh and S. Kung (2013), 'The development of academic research in cultural and creative industries: a critical examination of current situations and future possibilities', *International Journal of Cultural and Creative Industries*, **1** (1), 4–15.
- Cohendet, P., D. Grandadama and L. Simon (2010), 'The anatomy of the creative city', *Industry and Innovation*, **17** (1), 91–111.
- Comunian, R. and A. Faggian (2014), 'Higher education, human capital, and the creative economy', *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, **32** (3), 381–3.
- Cooke, P. and L. De Propriis (2011), 'A policy agenda for EU smart growth: the role of creative and cultural industries', *Policy Studies*, **32** (4), 365–75.
- Cooke, P. and L. Lazzeretti (eds) (2008), *Creative Cities, Cultural Clusters and Local Economic Development*, Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Cooke, P. and D. Schwartz (2007), *Creative Regions: Technology, Culture and Knowledge Entrepreneurship*, London: Routledge.
- Cunningham, S.D. (2002), 'From cultural to creative industries: theory, industry, and policy implications', *Media International Australia incorporating Culture and Policy*, **102** (1), 54–65.
- DCMS (1998), *Creative Industries Mapping Document 1998*, London: Department for Culture, Media and Sport.
- DCMS (2013), *Classifying and Measuring the Creative Industries*, London: Department for Culture, Media and Sport.
- De Beukelaer, C. (2014), 'Creative industries in "developing" countries: questioning country classifications in the UNCTAD creative economy reports', *Cultural Trends*, **23** (4), 232–51.
- De-Miguel-Molina, B., J. Hervás-Oliver, R. Boix and N. De-Miguel-Molina (2012), 'The importance of creative industry agglomerations in explaining the wealth of European regions', *European Planning Studies*, **20** (8), 1263–80.
- Evans, G. (2009), 'Creative cities, creative spaces and urban policy', *Urban Studies*, **46** (5–6), 1003–40.
- Flew, T. and S.D. Cunningham (2010), 'Creative industries after the first decade of debate', *The Information Society*, **26** (2), 113–23.
- Florida, R. (2002), *The Rise of the Creative Class: and How it's Transforming Work, Leisure, Community and Everyday Life*, New York: Basic Books.
- Florida, R. (2014), 'The creative class and economic development', *Economic Development Quarterly*, **28** (3), 196–205.
- Florida, R. and I. Tinagli (2004), *Europe in the Creative Age*, London: Demos.
- Florida, R., P. Adler and C. Mellander (2017), 'The city as innovation machine', *Regional Studies*, **51** (1), 86–96.
- Glaeser, E. (2005), 'Review of Richard Florida "The Rise of the Creative Class"', *Regional Sciences and Urban Economics*, **35** (5), 593–6.
- Gong, H. and R. Hassink (2017), 'Exploring the clustering of creative industries', *European Planning Studies*, **25** (4), 583–600.
- Guevara, M.R., D. Hartmann, M. Aristarán, M. Mendoza and C.A. Hidalgo (2016), 'The research space: using career paths to predict the evolution of the research output of individuals, institutions, and nations', *Scientometrics*, **109** (3), 1695–709.
- Henry, C. (ed.) (2007), *Entrepreneurship in the Creative Industries: An International Perspective*, Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing.

- Hesmondhalgh, D. (2002), *The Cultural Industries*, London: Sage.
- Hong, J., W. Yu, X. Guo and D. Zhao (2014), 'Creative industries agglomeration, regional innovation and productivity growth in China', *Chinese Geographical Science*, **24** (2), 258–68.
- Howkins, J. (2001), *The Creative Economy: How People Make Money from Ideas*, London: Penguin.
- Hracs, B.J., D. Jakob and A. Hauge (2013), 'Standing out in the crowd: the rise of exclusivity-based strategies to compete in the contemporary marketplace for music and fashion', *Environment and Planning A*, **45** (5), 1144–61.
- Jones, C., M. Lorenzen and J. Sapsed (eds) (2015), *The Oxford Handbook of Creative Industries*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kong, L. and J. O'Connor (2009), *Creative Economies, Creative Cities. Asian-European Perspectives*, New York: Springer.
- Landry, C. (2000), *The Creative City: A Toolkit for Urban Innovators*, London: Earthscan.
- Landry, C. and F. Bianchini (1995), *The Creative City*, London: Demos.
- Lazzeretti, L., S. Sedita and A. Caloffi (2014), 'Founders and disseminators of cluster research', *Journal of Economic Geography*, **14** (1), 21–43.
- Lazzeretti, L., F. Capone and I. Innocenti (2017), 'Exploring the intellectual structure of creative economy research and local economic development. A co-citation analysis', *European Planning Studies*, **25** (10), 1693–713.
- Lee, N. and A. Rodríguez-Pose (2014), 'Creativity, cities, and innovation', *Environment and Planning A*, **46** (5), 1139–59.
- Markusen, A., G.H. Wassall, D. De Natale and R. Cohen (2008), 'Defining the creative economy: industry and occupational approaches', *Economic Development Quarterly*, **22** (1), 24–45.
- McCann, P. and R. Ortega-Argilés (2013), 'Smart specialization, regional growth and applications to European Union cohesion policy', *Regional Studies*, **49** (8), 1291–302.
- Mellander, C., R. Florida, B. Asheim and M. Gertler (2013), *The Creative Class Goes Global*, London: Routledge.
- O'Connor, J. (2010), *The Cultural and Creative Industries: A Literature Review*, London: Arts Council.
- Plaza, B. and S.N. Haarich (2015), 'The Guggenheim Museum Bilbao: between regional embeddedness and global networking', *European Planning Studies*, **23** (8), 1456–75.
- Potts, J. (2011), *Creative Industries and Economic Evolution*, Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Potts, J. (ed.) (2016), *The Economics of Creative Industries*, Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Power, D. and T. Nielsén (2010), *Priority Sector Report: Creative and Cultural Industries*, Europe INNOVA, European Cluster Observatory.
- Pratt, A.C. (2008), 'Creative cities: the cultural industries and the creative class', *Geografiska Annaler. Series B, Human Geography*, **90** (2), 107–17.
- Pratt, A.C. and T. Hutton (2013), 'Reconceptualising the relationship between the creative economy and the city: learning from the financial crisis', *Cities*, **33**, 86–95.
- Richards, G. (2014), 'Creativity and tourism in the city', *Current Issues in Tourism*, **17** (2), 119–44.
- Scott, A.J. (2014), 'Beyond the creative city: cognitive-cultural capitalism and the new urbanism', *Regional Studies*, **48** (4), 565–78.

- Scott, J. and P.J. Carrington (2011), *The Sage Handbook of Social Network Analysis*, London: Sage.
- Shalley, C.E., M.A. Hitt and J. Zhou (2015), *The Oxford Handbook of Creativity, Innovation, and Entrepreneurship*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Stolarick, K. and R. Florida (2006), 'Creativity, connections and innovation: a study of linkages in the Montréal Region', *Environment and Planning A*, **38** (10), 1799–817.
- Throsby, D. (2001), *Economics and Culture*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Towse, R. (ed.) (2003), *A Handbook of Cultural Economics*, Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- UNCTAD (2008), *Creative Economy Report 2008. The Challenge of Assessing Creative Economy*, Geneva: United Nations.
- UNDP-UNESCO (2013), *Creative Economy Report. Widening Local Development Pathways*, New York and Paris: UNDP and UNESCO.
- Yusuf, S. and K. Nabeshima (2005), 'Creative industries in East Asia', *Cities*, **22** (2), 109–22.
- Zukin, S. (2010), *Naked City: The Death and Life of Authentic Urban Places*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.