

THE INFLUENCE OF CREATIVE INDUSTRIES ON THEIR CONTRIBUTION TO THE ECONOMY AND THE LEVEL OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF THE TERRITORY (THE CASE OF RUSSIA)

Cited as:

Eremeeva, E., Volkova, N., Khalilova, T., Yasnitskaya, Y., & Kurgaeva, Z. (2024). THE INFLUENCE OF CREATIVE INDUSTRIES ON THEIR CONTRIBUTION TO THE ECONOMY AND THE LEVEL OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF THE TERRITORY (THE CASE OF RUSSIA). *Revista Gestão & Tecnologia*, 24(2), 228-243

Ekaterina Eremeeva

Kazan Federal University, Russia
ORCID 0000-0002-6344-0885
E-mail: anka_2007_901@mail.ru

Natalya Volkova

Kazan Federal University, Russia
ORCID 0000-0002-2040-5748
E-mail: volk.nata2@list.ru

Tatiana Khalilova

Kazan Federal University, Russia
ORCID 0000-0002-8064-2286
E-mail: thalilova2004@mail.ru

Yana Yasnitskaya

Kazan Federal University, Russia
ORCID 0000-0001-8081-372X
E-mail: yayasnits@gmail.com

Zhanna Kurgaeva

Kazan National Research Technological University, Kazan, Russia
ORCID 0009-0002-9790-9677
E-mail: jkurgaeva@yandex.ru

Abstract

The article considers the development of creative industries in Russia and their contribution to the economy of Russia and its constituent entities. The study uses the methods of the analysis of statistical data, including the arithmetic mean and median value of the development of creative industries, the ranking of Russian regions, and the classification and comparison of regulations. Due to these methods, results are obtained on the development of creative industries in the Russian Federation and its individual regions. In terms of the development of creative industries, leaders and outsiders are identified. Based on the practice of these constituent entities of the Russian Federation, conclusions are drawn about the importance of developing creative industries for the economy of Russia and its regions, the relationship of creative industries with the level of socio-economic development of a particular territory, and the activities of government authorities aimed at supporting this sector of the economy.

Keywords: creative industries, cultural and creative industries, Russia, region, GDP, socio-economic development.

Editor Científico: José Edson Lara
Organização Comitê Científico
Double Blind Review pelo SEER/OJS
Recebido em 20.11.2023
Aprovado em 04.04.2024

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution – Non-Commercial 3.0 Brazil

INTRODUCTION

In today's rapidly changing, high-tech VUCA world, the concept of creative industries (creative and cultural industries, CI/CCI) is growing more relevant. According to P. Dharmani, S. Das, and S. Prashar (2021), the concept remains vague and understudied despite scientific interest in it. In relation to the commitment of states to CIs, the UK was one of the first to support CIs and their importance for the economy back in 1998 (Department for Digital, Culture, Media & Sport, 1998). The UK's Department for Culture, Media, and Sport originally defined CIs as activities that derive from human creativity, skills, and talents, which have the potential to create wealth and employment through the creation and exploitation of intellectual property. Other countries started talking about CIs later: for example, Eastern Europe in the early 2000s (Becuț, 2016) and Indonesia in 2007 (Maryunani & Mirzanti, 2015). The attention of the world community to CIs is confirmed by the activities of UNESCO (Mikic, 2012) and UNCTAD (UNCTAD and UNDP Special Unit for South-South Cooperation, 2008, pp. 12-13). They gave their own definition of CIs and outlined a list of industries related to this sector of the economy: creative industries include various knowledge-based activities, which have good income-generating potential and cover the design, manufacture, and delivery of tangible and intangible intellectual or artistic goods and services with creativity and intellectual capital as the main resources. In the scientific community, there is no unified approach to understanding CIs (Turgel et al., 2022), which leads to a discussion about what areas and industries belong to this sector of the economy (Zheng & Chan, 2014).

In Russian practice, the concept of CIs is also used but rarely. Currently, the Russian legal system gives the following definition: "CIs are areas of activity in which companies, organizations, associations, and individual entrepreneurs in the process of creative and cultural activity and disposal of intellectual property produce goods and provide services that have an economic value and contribute to the formation of a harmoniously developed personality and the better quality of life of Russian society" (President of the Russian Federation, 2014). Within the framework of this study, we used this interpretation since it is common to the Russian practice when collecting statistical data for further processing.

Currently, scholars are concerned with various aspects of the development of CIs: the impact of the coronavirus pandemic on this sector of the economy (Langevang et al., 2022), the relationship between digitalization and CIs (Zoel, 2012), the impact of CIs on gender inequality (Setyaningsih et al., 2012), etc. However, the key issue remains the contribution of CIs to the development of countries (Dronyuk et al., 2019; Zuhdi, 2012), regions (Klein et al., 2021;

Manioudis & Angelakis, 2023), cities (Becuț, 2016; Maryunani & Mirzanti, 2015; Rozentale & Lavanga, 2014; Wolniak & Jonek-Kowalska, 2022), and individual industries (Liu, 2021) and companies (Lucena-Giraldo et al., 2022). As the analysis of the corresponding literature shows, the greatest attention has been paid to the practices of individual cities, while the development of CIs at the national or regional levels and macroeconomic analysis of their contribution to the economy are considered less often.

Since the term “creative industries” is relatively new in Russian practice, there is still no general idea about the development of this sector of the economy and its impact on the general economic condition of the country and its regions. Thus, considering the relevance and understanding of certain aspects of CIs, we analyzed the development of CIs in Russia and studied their contribution to the economic development of the country and its constituent entities.

METHODS

The study is based on statistical data on the development of CIs in Russia presented in the “Atlas of Creative Industries of the Russian Federation” (Zhuravleva et al., 2021). The paper also uses regulatory legal acts presented in the electronic fund of legal and regulatory technical documents “Code” (Elektronnyi fond, n.d.) and information on the socio-economic development of Russian regions presented by the RIA Rating agency (RIA Rating, 2021). As already noted, CIs have become regarded as a separate sector of the economy in Russia relatively recently, therefore this article analyzes the most relevant statistical data available at the moment reflecting the situation as of 2020.

The scientific work utilizes four basic groups of data associated with the following indicators:

- Number of organizations that belong to CIs;
- Number of employees of these organizations;
- Revenue of these organizations;
- The contribution of these organizations to the country’s GDP and the gross regional product (GRP) of their regions.

Within the framework of this study, the first three indicators showed the development of CIs in Russia and its constituent entities. The indicator “Contribution of CI organizations to the country’s GDP and territory’s GRP” was used to evaluate the effectiveness of the development of this sector.

When considering these indicators, we used absolute values reflecting the overall development of CIs and calculated indicators that are relevant for studying the situation in Russian constituent entities and comparing them. When conducting the analysis, we applied the arithmetic mean, calculated according to the following formula:

$$X_{cp}X_{ay} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n X_i}{n} \quad (1)$$

where X_i is a separate indicator in a series; n is the number of indicators in a series; X_{av} is the calculated arithmetic mean of the indicator.

In addition, the analysis comprised one more calculated indicator – the median value. The comparison of the arithmetic mean and median value allowed us to draw a conclusion about the distribution and uniformity of CIs in Russian regions. This helped to evaluate the development of CIs in the Russian Federation. The study did not compare the indicators of Russia and other countries since the approaches to defining CIs and collecting statistical information have not been standardized; therefore they differ from each other and do not allow for an objective comparison.

To analyze the situation, we used data on the ranking of Russian regions according to selected indicators on the development of Cis (Zhuravleva et al., 2021). The constituent entities were ranked on a scale from 1 to 85 in accordance with the total number of Russian regions as of 2020. The regions were located on a scale in the descending order of each indicator, i.e. the region with the highest value was assigned the 1st position, while the territories with the lowest values were given the lowest rank of 85.

Based on the analysis of statistical data, a group of leaders among the regions of Russia with a high level of development of CIs and significant contribution to GRP was identified. In addition, we considered outsiders in terms of the development of CIs. Considering the situation in constituent entities of the Russian Federation, we made conclusions about the development of CIs and the prospects for their further improvement in the Russian Federation and its regions.

To interpret the results of the development of CIs in Russian regions, we conducted a comparative analysis of their strategic and program documents to determine whether there is a connection between the development of CIs and government policy measures. Data on the socio-economic development of constituent entities of the Russian Federation was used to identify the reasons for their differentiation in terms of the level of CIs.

RESULTS

Based on the results of the analysis and the described methodology, the following results were obtained.

Data on indicators of the development of creative industries in the Russian Federation are summarized and presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Information on the development of creative industries in Russia

	General value	Arithmetic mean	Median value
Number of organizations that can be classified as creative industries, thousand units	747.8	8.8	4.6
Ranking of the constituent entity of the Russian Federation with the closest indicator	-	17	43
Average number of employees of organizations that can be classified as CIs, thousand people	1,612.5	19.0	6.5
Ranking of the constituent entity of the Russian Federation with the closest indicator	-	15	43
Total revenue of organizations that can be classified as CIs, billion rubles	10,736.5	126.31	19.47
Ranking of the constituent entity of the Russian Federation with the closest indicator	-	9	43

The data presented in Table 1 clearly shows that the development of CIs in Russia remains at a relatively low level. A similar conclusion is based on the ratio of the arithmetic mean and median value. According to the ranking, the median value falls at rank 43, i.e., the middle of the sequence. The arithmetic mean of the indicators of the number of CI organizations and the number of employees of these organizations is much higher. The number of CI organizations is above the average only in 15 regions out of 85, while this indicator is below the average and significantly inferior to that of leading regions in other entities of the Russian Federation. The situation is approximately the same with the indicator “Average number of employees of organizations that can be classified as CIs”.

Regarding the revenue indicator of CI organizations, the situation is slightly worse. The gap between the median value and the arithmetic mean is even greater. The revenue indicator is above the average in only nine Russian regions out of 85. This fact might be indirect evidence that CI organizations, even in several leading regions, do not work as efficiently and do not bring the desired income.

To more accurately assess the development of CIs in individual regions, let us consider their ranking according to three indicators. The summarized results are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Ranking of Russian regions according to indicators of the development of CIs (No. 1-17)

Ranking	The regions ranked according to:		
	number of CI organizations	number of employees of CI organizations	revenue volume of CI organizations
1	Moscow	Moscow	Moscow
2	Saint Petersburg	Saint Petersburg	Saint Petersburg
3	Moscow Region	Moscow Region	Moscow Region
4	Krasnodar Territory	Tyumen Region	Sverdlovsk Region
5	Sverdlovsk Region	Nizhny Novgorod Region	Republic of Tatarstan
6	Novosibirsk Region	Sverdlovsk Region	Krasnodar Territory
7	Republic of Tatarstan	Republic of Tatarstan	Republic of Bashkortostan
8	Rostov Region	Republic of Bashkortostan	Novosibirsk Region
9	Samara Region	Krasnodar Territory	Samara Region
10	Chelyabinsk Region	Novosibirsk Region	Tyumen Region
11	Nizhny Novgorod Region	Samara Region	Nizhny Novgorod Region
12	Republic of Bashkortostan	Yamalo-Nenets Autonomous Region	Rostov Region
13	Perm Territory	Perm Territory	Chelyabinsk Region
14	Krasnoyarsk Territory	Rostov Region	Perm Territory
15	Irkutsk Region	Krasnoyarsk Territory	Krasnoyarsk Territory
16	Voronezh Region	Chelyabinsk Region	Yaroslavl Region
17	Stavropol Territory	Voronezh Region	Irkutsk Region

Table 2 presents only regions ranked from 1 to 17. After analyzing the average value of all indicators, it was found that the leading regions are positioned above 17.

From the data presented in Table 2, we conclude that the leading regions for the three indicators vary: some regions appear in all the listicles but occupy different positions; other regions are leaders only in certain indicators. Only three constituent entities of the Russian Federation have stable positions: the federal cities of Moscow and Saint Petersburg and the Moscow Region. They consistently hold the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd positions, respectively.

From the regions of the Russian Federation indicated in Table 2, we can select those subjects that are among the leaders in all the presented listicles. This list includes 15 regions, namely: Moscow, Saint Petersburg, Moscow Region, Sverdlovsk Region, Novosibirsk Region, Rostov Region, Chelyabinsk Region, Nizhny Novgorod Region, Samara Region, Tyumen Region, Republic of Bashkortostan, Republic of Tatarstan, Krasnodar Territory, Krasnoyarsk Territory and Perm Territory. This result suggests that despite some discrepancies in rankings for various indicators of the development of CIs, it is still possible to identify those regions of Russia in which this sector of the economy develops faster than in other constituent entities.

For a more objective analysis of the selected leading regions, we consider the indicator of the contribution of CIs to the country’s GDP and the region’s GRP. This indicator complements the analysis of CIs from the perspective of their significance and relevance for the economy of the region and the country. For the indicator assessing the contribution of CIs to the country’s GDP and the region’s GRP, the arithmetic mean and median value were also

calculated. Then we ranked the regions of the Russian Federation that were closest to them. Information on the contribution of CIs to Russia’s GDP and the GRP of its regions is presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Contribution of CIs to the GDP of Russia and the GRP of its constituent entities

	General value	Arithmetic mean	Median value
Contribution of organizations that can be classified as CIs to the GDP of the Russian Federation, %	4.98	2.77	2.2
Ranking of the constituent entity of the Russian Federation with the closest indicator of the contribution of CIs to GRP	6	32	43

From Table 3, we conclude that the contribution of CIs to Russia’s GDP is significantly higher than the arithmetic mean and median value of their contribution to the GRP of Russian regions. Thus, the contribution of CIs to GRP in percentage terms by seven regions out of 85 is greater than the contribution of CIs to the GDP of the country. Consequently, CIs and their development are truly feasible from an economic viewpoint only for six regions of Russia.

While comparing the arithmetic mean and median value of the contribution of CIs to the GRP of Russian regions, we can emphasize that the calculated values do not really differ from each other compared to the other indicators under consideration. This also confirms the fact that there are fewer leading regions for this indicator than for the others, and the spread of values in individual regions of the Russian Federation is not so significant. Upon this distribution, the modal value (most often found in the array) should not differ from the median value. In this case, it amounts to 1.9%, which corresponds to the ratio of the calculated values. This ratio of calculated indicators allows us to draw the following conclusion: for most regions, CIs are not growth points that ensure a major increase in the economy of a particular Russian region compared to the other constituent entities of the Russian Federation. In other words, most Russian regions cannot unlock the potential of CIs.

To describe the position of individual regions of Russia according to the indicator under consideration, we need to rank the contribution of CIs to the GRP of Russian regions. As in the case of the other indicators under study, we consider only regions positioned from 1 to 17 (Table 4).

Table 4. Ranking of Russian regions by the contribution of CIs to the GRP of constituent entities of the Russian Federation

Ranking	Constituent entity of the Russian Federation	Contribution to GRP, %	Ranking	Constituent entity of the Russian Federation	Contribution to GRP, %
1	Moscow	18.5	9	Republic of Bashkortostan	4.5
2	Saint Petersburg	12.6	10	Sevastopol	4.4
3	Tyumen Region	8.9	11	Samara Region	4.3
4	Kostroma Region	7.0	12	Kaliningrad Region	4.2
5	Novosibirsk Region	5.4	13	Republic of Tatarstan	4.1
6	Tomsk Region	5.2	14	Tula Region	3.8
	Russian Federation (GDP)	4.98	15	Sverdlovsk Region	3.7
7	Moscow Region	4.7	16	Nizhny Novgorod Region	3.7
8	Yaroslavl Region	4.7	17	Perm Territory	3.5

If we conduct a comparative analysis of this rating and the ratings for the other three indicators, we can draw some conclusions about leading regions in terms of the development of CIs. Firstly, the development of CIs can be considered high and effective only in four regions: Moscow, Saint Petersburg, and the Tyumen and Novosibirsk regions. In these regions, more organizations have already been created that can be classified as CIs. The number of employees of these organizations is also higher compared to the other constituent entities. In terms of revenue in CIs, these regions are ahead of most other territories of Russia, which suggests that their CIs are working more actively and productively. The most important thing is that they operate effectively, which allows them to make a relatively high contribution to the economy of the territory. The analysis of legal acts showed that the socio-economic development strategies of all these regions (Elektronnyi fond, n.d.) include an indication of CIs and their support. This conclusion can be regarded as an indirect confirmation that the attention of regional government authorities to CIs and their support may be relevant, both from the viewpoint of these industries and from the viewpoint of general economic development.

Secondly, the Yaroslavl, Tula, Tomsk, Kaliningrad, and Kostroma regions and the federal city of Sevastopol were not among the leaders in terms of CI development indicators. The Kostroma and Tomsk regions hold higher positions in terms of the contribution of CIs to the territory's GRP. However, there are few CI organizations, and their staff is not as large as in several other regions of the Russian Federation. The analysis of regulatory legal acts proved that their strategy for socio-economic development does not mention CIs. In relation to the Kostroma and Tomsk regions, the further development of CIs is important. A further increase in the number of CI organizations and their staff can make a more significant contribution to the economy of the territory compared to other regions of the Russian Federation. Thus, CIs can become growth points for these constituent entities of the Russian Federation, subject to

scaling and development. The development of CIs can be accelerated by support from regional authorities, as is the case with leading regions.

In relation to the Kaliningrad, Tula, and Yaroslavl regions and the federal city of Sevastopol, the contribution of CIs to the GRP of these regions is ahead of most other regions. However, its size is closer not to the indicators of the leading regions but to those of the other regions positioned below 17. Accordingly, it is difficult to include these regions in leaders and consider their experience as flagship.

Thirdly, we can identify a group of regions that are among the leaders in terms of the development of CIs but are somewhat inferior in terms of the contribution of CIs to their GRP. These are the Moscow Region, Sverdlovsk Region, Nizhny Novgorod Region, Samara Region, and Perm Territory, as well as the Republic of Tatarstan and the Republic of Bashkortostan. Although these regions cannot be classified as leaders, the development of CIs is a promising direction for them. Currently, there are a large number of organizations in this sector of the economy, but their work has not contributed to GRP yet. In this regard, a more significant vector for the development of CIs in these regions is not their scaling but rather increasing their efficiency. A possible solution could be government support measures for CIs. It can be assumed that government support for existing CI organizations will make their work more efficient and increase their contribution to the territory's GRP. Using the experience of these organizations will allow to develop the creative industries sector and to turn it into a growth point of the regional economy (for example, the Kostroma and Tomsk regions). In some regions (for example, Tatarstan and Bashkortostan), socio-economic development strategies address CIs. This confirms that regional authorities are aware of the potential of this sector of the economy and are interested in using it.

Fourthly, we can identify a group of regions that were leaders in terms of the development of CIs but did not have a high contribution to the territory's GRP. These are the Rostov, Chelyabinsk, Krasnodar, and Krasnoyarsk regions. The contribution of CIs to GRP in these regions is closer to the arithmetic mean and median value, i.e., closer to most other regions positioned in the middle or end of the ranking. It means that these regions did not learn to use the potential of CIs for their own economic development, despite the numerical superiority of CI organizations.

Such conclusions determine a list of Russian regions that can be considered the main territories for the development of CIs: the federal cities of Moscow and Saint Petersburg, the Novosibirsk, Tyumen, Moscow, Sverdlovsk, Nizhny Novgorod, Samara regions, the Perm Territory, the Republic of Tatarstan, and the Republic of Bashkortostan. There are only 10

regions out of 85. The Kostroma and Tomsk regions can be considered the most promising in terms of the future development of CIs if they are further scaled.

To analyze the development of CIs in Russia and its regions, we need to consider the worst experience in this area. This will help to reveal outsider regions in terms of the development of CIs. To compile a list of them, we need to refer to the ranking of CI development indicators. In this case, we will analyze those positions that are below the 17th rank, i.e., No. 69-85. The data are summarized in Table 5.

Table 5. Ranking of Russian regions according to individual indicators of the development of CIs (No. 69-85)

Ranking	Regions ranked according to:			
	number of CI organizations	number of employees of CI organizations	revenue volume of CI organizations	contribution of CIs to GRP
69	Pskov Region	Novgorod Region	Republic of Dagestan	Chukotka Autonomous Region
70	Mari El Republic	Pskov Region	Republic of Buryatia	Altai Republic
71	Yamalo-Nenets Autonomous Region	Republic of Dagestan	Novgorod Region	Yamalo-Nenets Autonomous Region
72	Kamchataka Territory	Republic of Khakassia	Oryol Region	Republic of Khakassia
73	Republic of Khakassia	Chechen Republic	Republic of Ingushetia	Kursk Region
74	Kabardino-Balkarian Republic	Republic of North Ossetia–Alania	Pskov Region	Republic of North Ossetia–Alania
75	Republic of North Ossetia–Alania	Magadan Region	Magadan Region	Republic of Mordovia
76	Republic of Adygea	Kabardino-Balkarian Republic	Chukotka Autonomous Region	Kabardino-Balkarian Republic
77	Karachay-Cherkess Republic	Kamchataka Territory	Kabardino-Balkarian Republic	Kamchataka Territory
78	Chechen Republic	Republic of Adygea	Republic of Khakassia	Republic of Adygea
79	Altai Republic	Altai Republic	Republic of North Ossetia–Alania	Republic of Kalmykia
80	Republic of Kalmykia	Republic of Tyva	Republic of Adygea	Republic of Tyva
81	Republic of Tyva	Karachay-Cherkess Republic	Altai Republic	Republic of Dagestan
82	Magadan Region	Chukotka Autonomous Region	Republic of Kalmykia	Chechen Republic
83	Republic of Ingushetia	Republic of Kalmykia	Karachay-Cherkess Republic	Karachay-Cherkess Republic
84	Jewish Autonomous Region	Republic of Ingushetia	Republic of Tyva	Republic of Ingushetia
85	Chukotka Autonomous Region	Jewish Autonomous Region	Jewish Autonomous Region	Jewish Autonomous Region

The data from Table 5 allows us to compile a list of outsider regions in terms of the development and performance of CIs: the Chukotka Autonomous Region, the Jewish Autonomous Region, the Republic of Tyva, the Republic of Ingushetia, the Republic of Khakassia, the Republic of Adygea, the Republic of North Ossetia-Alania, the Republic of

Kalmykia, the Altai Republic, the Karachay-Cherkess Republic, and the Kabardino-Balkarian Republic (11 regions in total). These regions are among the outsiders in all the considered rankings, in contrast to the other regions presented in Table 5. To identify the reasons behind this, we referred to the ranking of Russian regions by their socio-economic development at the end of 2020 (RIA Rating, 2021).

10 out of the 11 Russian regions hold the 10 lowest positions in the ranking in terms of their socio-economic development. The only exception is the Republic of Adygea. It occupies a higher position in the ranking of socio-economic development but is also mentioned in the second half of the ranking, i.e., it demonstrates indicators below the average among the constituent entities of the Russian Federation. These conclusions suggest that the general level of socio-economic development of the territory becomes the basis and necessary condition for the development of CIs. However, it is not a sufficient condition for the development of this sector of the economy. This is confirmed by two facts. Firstly, the practice of the leading regions has shown that an important condition for the effective development of CIs and increasing their contribution to their economy is the support of government authorities. Secondly, the leading regions in terms of the level of socio-economic development are as follows: the Moscow Region (the 4th position), Sverdlovsk Region (the 7th position), Krasnoyarsk Territory (the 9th position), and Krasnodar Region (the 10th position). Based on the analysis, these regions were included in the group with a high level of CIs but with a relatively small return on their development. What distinguishes them from regions with a significant contribution of CIs to the territory's GRP is the lack of attention to these sectors of the economy on the part of government authorities.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the analysis of statistical data on the development of creative industries in Russia, we came to the following conclusions.

1. The development of CIs in Russia remains at a relatively low level. This conclusion is based on a comparison of the average and median indicators of the development of CIs in the Russian Federation and its regions, and their contribution to the economy of the country and its individual territories. The analysis showed that only a small proportion of Russian regions have indicators above average in terms of the number of organizations in the CI sector, the number of their staff, and the volume of revenue, while the indicators of most regions are significantly inferior. The average indicators for the development of CIs are much higher than the median

ones. The relatively low development of CIs in Russia and its regions is confirmed by the rather low contribution of CIs to GRP, which is typical of most regions.

2. The comparative analysis of the development indicators of CIs in the constituent entities of the Russian Federation allows us to identify leaders and outsiders. The Kostroma and Tomsk regions are the most promising territories in terms of the future development of CIs. The development of CIs is most effective in Moscow, Saint Petersburg, and the Tyumen and Novosibirsk regions. The list of outsiders in terms of the development and efficiency of CIs includes only 11 regions out of 85.

3. The general socio-economic level of a territory lays the basis and becomes the necessary condition for the development of its CIs. However, it is not a sufficient condition for the development of this sector of the economy. Our conclusions suggest that CIs can be promising in terms of their potential contribution to the economy of the country and its regions. To achieve this effect, it is necessary to ensure favorable conditions for their scaling, first of all, a sufficient level of socio-economic development of the territory and support from government authorities. These conditions will improve the efficiency of CIs and increase their contribution to the economy of the territory.

REFERENCES

- Becuț, A. G. (2016). Dynamics of creative industries in a post-communist society. The development of creative sector in Romanian cities. *City, Culture and Society*, 7(2), 63-68.
- Department for Digital, Culture, Media & Sport. (1998). *Creative Industries Mapping Documents 1998*. London: DCMS. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/creative-industries-mapping-documents-1998> (accessed: August 15, 2023).
- Dharmani, P., Das, S., & Prashar, S. (2021). A bibliometric analysis of creative industries: Current trends and future directions. *Journal of Business Research*, 135, 252-267.
- Dronyuk, I., Moiseienko, I., & Greguš, J. (2019). Analysis of creative industries activities in European Union countries. *Procedia Computer Science*, 160, 479-484.
- Elektronnyi fond pravovykh i normativno-tekhnicheskikh dokumentov “Kodeks” [Electronic fund of legal and regulatory technical documents “Code”]. (n.d.). <https://docs.cntd.ru/document/> (accessed: August 15, 2023).
- Klein, M., Gerlitz, L., & Spsychalska-Wojtkiewicz, M. (2021). Cultural and creative industries as boost for innovation and sustainable development of companies in cross innovation process. *Procedia Computer Science*, 192, 4218-4226.
- Langevang, Th., Steedman, R., Alacovska, A., Resario, R., Kulu R. H., & Sanda, M.-A. (2022). ‘The show must go on!’: Hustling through the compounded precarity of COVID-19 in the creative industries. *Geoforum*, 136, 142-152.

- Liu, Zh. (2021). The impact of government policy on macro dynamic innovation of the creative industries: Studies of the UK's and China's animation sectors. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, 7(3), 168.
- Lucena-Giraldo, J., Rodríguez-Crespo, E., & Carlos Salazar-Elena, J. (2022). The creative response of energy-intensive industries to the Emissions Trading System in the European Union. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 373, 133700.
- Manioudis, M., & Angelakis, A. (2023). Creative economy and sustainable regional growth: Lessons from the implementation of entrepreneurial discovery process at the regional level. *Sustainability*, 15(9), 7681. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15097681>
- Maryunani, S. R., & Mirzanti, I. R. (2015). The development of entrepreneurship in creative industries with reference to bandung as a creative city. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 169, 387-394.
- Mikic, H. (2012). *Measuring the economic contribution of cultural industries. A review and assessment of current methodological approaches*. Montreal: UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS).
- President of the Russian Federation. (2014). Ukaz Prezidenta RF ot 24.12.2014 No. 808 “Ob utverzhdenii Osnov gosudarstvennoi kulturnoi politiki” [Decree of the President of the Russian Federation of December 24, 2014 No. 808 “On approval of the fundamentals of state cultural policy”]. <http://publication.pravo.gov.ru/document/0001201412250002?ysclid=lpicm81ns9747571041> (accessed: August 15, 2023).
- RIA Rating. (2021, May 31). Reiting sotsialno-ekonomicheskogo polozheniya regionov RF – 2021 [Rating of the socio-economic situation of regions of the Russian Federation – 2021]. <https://riarating.ru/infografika/20210531/630201353.html> (accessed: August 15, 2023).
- Rozentale, I., & Lavanga, M. (2014). The “universal” characteristics of creative industries revisited: The case of Riga. *City, Culture and Society*, 5(2), 55-64.
- Setyaningsih, S., Rucita, C.P, Hani, U., & Rachmania, I. N. (2012). Women empowerment through creative industry: A case study. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 4, 213-222.
- Turgel, I. D., Derbeneva, V. V., Baskakova, I. V., & Chukavina, K. V. (2022). Theoretical approaches to identifying creative industries. *R-economy*, 8(4), 310-326. <https://doi.org/10.15826/recon.2022.8.4.024>
- UNCTAD, & UNDP Special Unit for South-South Cooperation. (2008). *Creative economy report 2008: The challenge of assessing the creative economy: Towards informed policy-making*. Geneva: United Nations.
- Wolniak, R., & Jonek-Kowalska, I. (2022). The creative services sector in Polish cities. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, 8(1), 17.
- Zheng, J., & Chan, R. (2014). The impact of ‘creative industry clusters’ on cultural and creative industry development in Shanghai. *City, Culture and Society*, 5(1), 9-22.
- Zhuravleva, T., Tokareva, I., & Gai, O. (2021). *Atlas kreativnykh industrii* [Atlas of creative industries]. Moscow: Agentstvo strategicheskii initsiativ, 558 p.
- Zoel, H. (2012). The potential growth of creative industries in Province of Riau. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 65, 839-844.

Zuhdi, U. (2012). Analyzing the influence of creative industry sector to the national economic structural changes by decomposition analysis: The case of Indonesia. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 65, 980-985.