DOI: 10.35539/LTNC.2022.0046.A.N.I.Z.A.H.36.51

A framework for exploring cultural and creative industries in regional contexts: the role of cultural intermediaries

Annette Naudin, Ieva Zemīte,
Agnese Hermane

This research is funded by the Ministry of Culture, Republic of Latvia, project "Cultural Capital as a Resource for the Sustainable Development of Latvia," project No. VPP-KM-LKRVA-2020/1-0003

Keywords: cultural and creative industries ecosystem, cultural intermediaries, cultural policy, cultural entrepreneurs, regional development

Introduction

The overarching goal of this article is to contribute methodological frameworks for identifying Latvia's cultural and creative ecosystem and its key actors. The authors reiterate the significance of the cultural and creative industries (CCI) and the complexities of defining and analyzing the CCI. The main research question of the article is to ask: what concepts need to be considered when researching Latvia's CCIs ecosystem? This leads to the following questions: 1)What are the characteristics of regional, national and global perspectives of CCI and how that might help in the exploration of regional CCI in Latvia; 2)Who are the key actors and what are their roles in CCI ecosystems? In exploring these questions the authors propose some theoretical frameworks and concepts for understanding CCI in Latvia.

In the first part of this article, the authors re-assess definitions of the so-called 'creative industries' to clarify what has become a confusing term for researchers and policymakers alike (Hesmondhalgh and Pratt 2005; Chapain, Clifton, Comunian 2014; Dobreva, Ivanov 2020). For the purposes of this article, the authors use the term 'cultural and creative industries' (CCI) which, as explained below, encompass the relevant debates and meanings. Then, the authors reflect on the CCI in regional contexts: ideas of 'locality' and place-making in small towns and regions. Finally, attention is drawn to the role of cultural intermediaries, which are described as entrepreneurial professionals working as part of the CCI, facilitating relationships, shaping and contributing to local cultural and creative 'ecosystems' (Neelands et al. 2015). By emphasizing the position and role of actors engaged in intermediation, this article argues that it is important to highlight local social interactions and tasks, which are sometimes hidden or perceived to be inconsequential by policymakers, CCI practitioners, and scholars alike. To begin this discussion the authors review key scholarly debates for defining the CCI.

Challenges in defining the cultural and creative industries

The last 20 years have seen an explosion of research into the CCI and cultural policy, across academic disciplines ranging from urban geography and sociology to management and business studies. The rise of the so-called 'creative industries' in contemporary cultural policy

has caused confusion by conflating social, cultural, and economic policies, with an emphasis on the latter (Hesmondhalgh 2008), but also by bundling together sectors which do not necessarily share the same core characteristics (Kong 2014). In this first section, the authors outline the challenges for academic research exploring the sector and suggest that despite these arguments being well rehearsed in some disciplines, there is value in re-examining what the authors, as researchers and for policymaking, mean by 'cultural' and 'creative' industries. The historical development of both terms and the differences between them are summarized below, focusing predominantly on a European context (Caust 2003; Hesmondhalgh, Pratt 2005; Galloway, Dunlop 2007; Kong 2014) which, the authors acknowledge, does not capture global perspectives of CCI research and practice.

The term 'creative industries' is perceived as a British political innovation of the 1990s (O'Connor 2007; British Council 2010), although the concept of the 'creative industry' emerged also in Australia around the same time (Commonwealth of Australia 1994). Putting together the spheres that in political discourse were traditionally perceived separately (e.g. culture, arts, media, IT) was an attempt to change the debate about the value of arts and culture (British Council 2010), and re-brand culture (Galloway, Dunlop 2007: 17). By changing the language, the use of words to describe the arts as an industry, politicians were able to make the economic case for the arts (Caust 2003:54). According to Caust, *language is a powerful tool for re-invention of a world order where formerly valued ideals have disappeared and new ones given precedence* (Caust 2003:56). For instance, the sector is also referred to as the *creative industry, cultural industries, content industries, content-based industries, copyright industries, copyright-protected industries, creative business sector, creative entrepreneurship, experience industry, the creative and digital industries, cultural or cognitive-cultural economy*, or as a specific field within the *creative economy*, and in Latin American countries, the field is also called the 'orange economy.' The different labels reflect the analytical and ideological approach in which the field is studied and can be debated. Since any of these terms are widely used in cultural policy circles, its interpretation and use by actors across creative fields might be determined by political motivations or freely interpreted and changeable depending on the activities of cultural operators. In some environments, identifying with the CCI sector is thought to be a means of securing greater investment and political support (United Nations Development Programme, 2013). In that context, one of the main discussions is whether to make a distinction between 'cultural industries' and 'creative industries' or use the combination of both.

Defining the concept of CCI is partly hidden in the complexity of the terms 'culture' and 'creativity' (Galloway, Dunlop 2007; Pratt 2014) which can be interpreted as encompassing both broad and narrow definitions of each term. Often, the cultural sector is subsumed in a more economically driven 'creative industries' agenda and there is a risk of being lost amongst more commercially driven activities (Galloway, Dunlop 2007: 17; Caust 2003). According to Galloway and Dunlop most definitions of cultural industries include combinations of five main criteria: creativity, intellectual property, symbolic meaning, use value, and methods of production. They argue that two factors define the distinctiveness of cultural products: the political/ideological and the economic. These factors differentiate cultural

goods from the wider set of creative industries and have important consequences for public policy towards the cultural industries: 1) symbolic ideas and freedom of expression; 2) market failure in the market for culture. Recognition of these two distinctive characteristics of culture help to separate the cultural industries and what is often described as the 'arts' from the wider notion of creative industries (Galloway, Dunlop 2007: 18–27). The use of the term 'creative industries' by governments and policymakers tends to emphasize the generation of creative content, the creative value chain, intellectual property, and copyright; commercialization; wealth and job creation; et cetera. The ambiguous concept of 'creativity' augments the problem by suggesting many different sectors who perceive themselves as 'creative' could be part of the creative industries and new cultural and creative activities are emerging adding further complexities for those measuring the sector (Cunningham 2009). Hesmondhalgh rejects the label 'creative industries,' arguing that the term 'cultural industries' is part of an important theoretical tradition which seeks to demonstrate 'contradiction and complexity.' According to him 'creative industries' appears to accommodate neoliberalism, in comparison with critical discourses associated with the cultural industries approach (Hesmondhalgh 2008).

At the EU level of policymaking, a clear distinction between the 'cultural' and 'creative' industries is articulated in the *Green Paper — Unlocking the potential of cultural and creative industries* (2010). The paper argues that the 'cultural industries' produce and distribute goods that embody or convey cultural expressions, irrespective of the commercial value they may have and besides the traditional arts sectors (performing arts, visual arts, cultural heritage — including the public sector). Such industries include film, DVD and video, television, radio, video games, new media, music, books, and press — whereas 'creative industries' are those industries which use culture as an input and have a cultural dimension, although their outputs are mainly functional, and include architecture and design, which integrate creative elements into wider processes, as well as sub-sectors such as graphic design, fashion design, and advertising (European Commission 2010: 5–6). Parallel to the discussion of sub-sectors, CCI discourse includes such aspects as cultural tourism, city branding, the motion of creative cities and creative quarters, major events, creative work, creative class and creative professionals, co-working, etc. Furthermore, scholarly research suggests that an understanding of 'culture' might encompass 'a whole way of life, as observed by Raymond Williams (1958). It is important to also acknowledge an anthropological sense, that for many people culture is reflected in aspects of everyday life (Oakley et al, 2018). Indeed, this is helpful when exploring the fluidity of language associated with the CCI in a regional context, where local players might collapse these meanings.

The Regulation of the Creative Europe Programme (2014- 2020) provides an example at EU levels, in which this discussion is resolved by using the concept of *cultural and creative sectors* — these include:

> *...all sectors whose activities are based on cultural values and/or artistic and other creative expressions, whether those activities are market- or non-market-oriented, whatever the type of structure that carries them out, and irrespective of how that structure is financed.*

> *Those activities include the development, the creation, the production, the dissemination and the preservation of goods and services, which embody cultural, artistic or other creative expressions, as well as related functions such as education or management. The cultural and creative sectors include inter alia architecture, archives, libraries and museums, artistic crafts, audio-visual (including film, television, video games and multimedia), tangible and intangible cultural heritage, design, festivals, music, literature, performing arts, publishing, radio and visual arts* (The European Parliament and the Council of the European Union 2013).

Building on the challenges of defining the sector, EU policy document *The New Agenda For Culture* (2018) introduces the concept of the 'ecosystem,' demonstrating the significance of connections and relationships across the CCI. According to *The New Agenda for Culture* (2018), ecosystems play a role in attracting new markets and new audiences, strengthening links and cooperation (European Commission 2018). Within that ecosystem, the authors are interested in actors which can be defined as 'cultural entrepreneurs,' their role and contribution in regional environments. Again, it is difficult to find an agreed-upon definition of cultural entrepreneurs, but scholars suggest that the notion of a cultural entrepreneur depicts a mode of work which embraces autonomy, flexibility, and connections across networks through freelance or small-business practices. Cultural entrepreneurs might be involved in CCI work as project managers, fundraisers, and in marketing CCI activities (Naudin 2018). However, the characteristics of a cultural entrepreneur encompass some ambiguity, reflecting a broad involvement in social and cultural activities (Anheir, Raj Isar 2018).

For the purpose of this article the authors refer to CCI as arts, culture, and creativity-based business / entrepreneurial activities that play a significant role in regional development in terms of social and economic impact. In a regional context, the authors emphasize the role of locally driven CCI products, services, and experiences with the potential to impact communities and reflect local narratives.

The cultural and creative industries in regional settings

Agreeing on a shared understanding of the CCI was always going to be a difficult task, considering different international contexts, histories, and political priorities, but acknowledging this challenge is an important aspect of developing research capacity and methodologies relevant to Latvia's context. Although, as Kong states, t*he 'creative turn', with its shift in focus to the creative industries, creative economy, creative labour and developing creative cities, has been welcomed with enthusiasm by policymakers at municipal and national levels in many countries* (Kong 2014: 3), a critical re-evaluation of CCI developments in regional settings is necessary to draw attention to the specificity of localized CCI activities and the role of key players.

Policymakers have argued that the integration of culture and creativity in local and regional development strategies can promote creative ecosystems and multidisciplinary environments, encouraging cultural and creative crossovers at the local and regional level (The Council of the European Union 2015). According to KEA: *Cultural and creative expressions and products are deeply rooted in the territories where they have been created — echoing, incorporating, and being inspired by local symbols, traditions, knowledge, materials and practices — they become crucial, powerful site-specific resources for territorial development* (KEA PPMI 2019: 17). Consequently, cultural and creative sectors contribute to the economic development of territories, increasing territorial attractiveness, and can be used to achieve specific social and economic goals, as explored by scholars such as Throsby (2001), Laundry (2001), and Florida (2002). On the political agenda, the link between culture and local development was strongly established by the UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions, stressing the significance of local developments in various aspects of CCI developments (UNESCO 2013). Although it should be acknowledged that interpretations of CCI in metropolitan areas have a tendency of transferring 'urban-centric' creative economy policies and practices to rural locations. Policy to support cultural activity and enterprises in non-urban contexts continues to be fractured and remains underdeveloped compared to its urban counterpart (Cruickshank 2016). These subtle differences and contextual understandings are a challenge for CCI research, which draws on wide-ranging academic literature, and for scholars undertaking empirical studies. There are also historical contexts which determine the relationship between policy and local CCI ecosystems or the lack of policy intervention.

State funding for culture and related industries is not new. The use of the term CCI is more actively used and adopted in countries with a tradition of state support for culture and less widespread in countries where cultural life is mainly market-determined, such as the USA (Galloway, Dunlop 2007; Moore 2014). State-level support was equally important to the management of cultural sectors as part of the Cold War, when communist authorities in Eastern Europe developed a range of state interventions through unions and other organizations to foster specific cultural production (Rindzeviciute 2021). After the fall of the Soviet Union, cultural policy in Eastern European countries had to respond to a complex set of rationales partly linked to the idea of state transformation and state-building, but also to shifts in contemporary culture and the rise of entrepreneurial activities (Rindzeviciute 2021). This environment creates fertile ground for highly localized engagements with cultural and creative activities, which sometimes operate outside or regardless of national government initiatives but which all potentially contribute to the CCI ecosystem.

Although the locations of CCI studies range from the Arctic (Petrov 2016) to tropical Australia (Kerrigan, Hutchinson 2016), rural communities in South Dakota, USA (Gallagher, Ehlman 2019), rural territories of Europe (Mahon, McGrath, O'Laoire 2018), and cities of China (Liang, Wang 2020), the common understanding of the importance of CCI is mainly linked to urban or national contexts. This is an arduous task due to *huge heteroscedasticity*

among cities in each respective region and country (Liang, Wang 2020: 55), leading to an oversimplification of the nature of CCI and the roles of cultural and creative actors. Yet, the shift in emphasis towards the creative economy has made the race for talent, space, and attention a more common feature of regional development. At the same time, CCI are unevenly distributed across regional spaces, national and international, mainly due to their production networks (Daubeuf et al. 2020) which tend to cluster in large urban spaces such as capital cities. To discover the driving forces behind CCI developments, policymakers and scholars have focused on connectivity, knowledge spillovers, and multiplier effects, stimulating not only consumption but also production, as well as the production of creative experiences, creative spaces, and new niche markets (Collins, Mahon, Murtagh 2018; Selada, Cunha, Tomaz 2012; Van Heur 2010).

At a regional level, inclusivity has been indicated as one of the main characteristics of creativity in small towns and rural areas. Local stories, place-based identity, and local symbolic capital are specific strategies for adding value to products and services (Van Heur 2010). Local activities using their geography and heritage value (Collins 2018) foster CCI developments, as such development is closely linked to a shared sense of place where community is as important as the individual (Kerrigan, Hutchinson 2016). At the same time CCIs have been recognized as important contributors to innovation, socio-economic growth, sustainability, and smart regional transformation (Gerlitz, Prause 2021). In that sense, creativity has been an important tool to manage the leveraging of local attributes and resources for export and for new forms of consumption and production (Collins, Mahon, Murtagh 2018). Other contributions include the sharing of tacit knowledge and open innovation (Selada, Cunha, Tomaz 2012). Importantly, the opportunities for participation (community pursuits, social regeneration) attracts other CCI workers to the region, driving the regeneration of local areas and regional branding (Collins, Mahon, Murtagh 2018). Entrepreneurship may be the mechanism which fosters knowledge and talent spillover from cultural and creative actors into the local economy. However, studies have shown that there may be tensions between newcomer-creatives and local communities (Oakley, Ward 2018), possibly resulting in 'bubbles' with little potential for broader interaction and the exchange of skills, ideas, and other resources. Other contested issues may be newcomer-exacerbated challenges to local identity. In some cases, newcomers pose a threat to the ideas of community-building and local identity, while in others they expand experiences by contributing new approaches and ways of living (Bell, Jayne 2006).

National or EU investment to achieve regional economic growth tends to omit the significance of individual actors and of both social and cultural perspectives, which encourage the CCI to thrive in less easily defined ecosystems (Neelands et al. 2014). As Lee et al. (2014) suggest, there is a danger that a focus on innovation, competitiveness, and economic benefits overshadows the social value of cultural development. Given the well-documented informality of networks across the CCI sector, there is a need to draw attention to the nature of social interactions, the characteristics of key players, and these players' potential impact on local CCI developments and ecosystems.

The conceptualized role of local facilitators, also known as cultural intermediaries

If social interactions are perceived to be of importance to CCI ecosystems, specifically for an analysis of regional developments, how can this relational role be defined? Social network theories indicate the complexities of connections in the sector (Mould, Joel 2010), demonstrating the links between actors. However, this tends to omit the social nature of those relationships and the qualities which shape them, significantly, the role of individuals who facilitate these connections. This article draws attention to this role, described as that of a facilitator or cultural intermediary, and argues that methodologies for measuring the social and economic impact of Latvia's cultural ecosystems need to take them into account. Often acting as gatekeepers and mediating between the economy and producers of cultural and creative products, cultural intermediaries bring a specific dynamic to shaping CCI developments (Maguire, Matthews 2012).

The point of reference for a definition of this actor is Pierre Bourdieu's concept of the cultural intermediary and his influential work in field analysis that helps us understand the role of key individuals in society. Contemporary sociologists Savage and Silva (2013) argue that a close analysis of Bourdieu's concept of 'fields' allows for a more dynamic understanding of the relationship between structures and agents, with a focus on how agents integrate and simultaneously shape the field in which they are involved. These concepts can be deployed to analyze the role of cultural intermediaries in the development of regional CCI, by revealing their interactions and position within or between key players. As distinct from national or global perspectives, this highlights the specificity of local geographical characteristics, such as how actors might collectively share a passion for local heritage or an interest in shaping activities taking place within local social and physical spaces (Nettleton 2013).

A Bourdieusian understanding of cultural intermediaries emphasizes the connection between taste and cultural goods, as well as the role of the intermediary in constructing a personal lifestyle to act authoritatively, relying on his/her cultural and social capital to 'sell' cultural goods (Maguire, Matthews 2014). As tastemakers, cultural intermediaries draw on their cultural, social, and symbolic capital to act as gatekeepers by favoring certain products, services, or experiences over others. The position of cultural intermediaries in a milieu, as a local player, is demonstrated through their actions between institutions, such as policy organizations or governments, and local actors such as CCI micro-entrepreneurs, freelancers, or communities engaged in CCI activities. While Bourdieu's conceptual framework is often deployed to demonstrate competition within fields and the resulting inequalities (Patel 2019), this understanding can lead to a critique and an oversimplification of the role of cultural intermediaries. It suggests less opportunities for agency and more subtle outcomes derived from their entrepreneurial endeavours or the potential for subversive strategies (Adkins 2004).

The authors argue that sharing some characteristics with the cultural entrepreneur (Naudin 2018; 2021), cultural intermediaries are motivated by their passion for the CCI and their

position within and commitment to the local community. Their role suggests an engagement in a variety of activities including marketing, branding, and lifestyle, but also combining *a set of social and ethical duties and responsibilities* (Lewis 2014: 141). Ethical and moral positions inform the cultural intermediaries' decision-making, reinforcing their powerful place within social networks and relationships (Naudin 2021) in ways which have the potential to benefit the CCI ecosystem. A critique might interrogate where this authority is located and what that means in terms of the outcomes of their actions. For instance, there is room for nepotism or favoring some CCI activities or individuals over others.

In their study of Manchester's CCI, O'Connor and Gu describe the challenges associated with the cultural intermediaries' being part of culture-led regeneration. As the authors state, issues of local voice and representation can be achieved through cultural intermediaries whose role can be that of 'translators.' In the example described by O'Connor and Gu, intermediation takes place between public sector bodies and different elements of the local CCI, and there are plenty of opportunities for developments to be 'lost in translation' given the complexity of local relationships, histories, and cultural traditions. Despite the problems presented in their study, cultural intermediaries appear to bring together both economic and sociocultural concerns, allowing for a wider set of values to be considered as part of CCI developments. In this instance, it becomes apparent that creative clusters develop beyond a purely economic logic or a simplistic relationship between cultural producers and institutions in the form of local authority support. Instead, everyday practices, negotiations, and expertise derived by an appreciation of the locality, a form of symbolic capital, enables intermediaries to gain legitimacy amongst key local players (O'Connor, Gu 2010). By being involved in a variety of cultural projects, fundraising, and marketing activities, intermediaries can both restrict and broaden local CCI activities (Maguire, Matthews 2014). Indeed, in discussing reflexivity and alternative positions for the CCI, Banks (2007) suggests that cultural intermediaries demonstrate an ability to be oppositional and to be experimental in their approach. Instead of being perceived as market-driven and competitive, cultural intermediaries can be political, moral, and ethical, broadening cultural taste and opportunities for the CCI and their audiences. As Naudin's research (2021) demonstrates, their role as translators between groups, institutions, and policymakers can address important gaps in equal access to public funding and to local CCI communities. Cultural intermediaries can demonstrate an understanding of communities in which they themselves are often embedded, exploring local narratives, priorities, and CCI developments.

In an attempt to further understand the character and role of intermediaries, the authors suggest that the attributes of cultural entrepreneurs (Bilton 2006; Katre 2015; Klamer 2011; Naudin 2018) might offer helpful insights. This might be achieved by acknowledging that the notion of the cultural entrepreneur is itself broadly an academic concept and merely an attempt to engage critically with cultural and artistic activities which draw on entrepreneurial or business practices. The authors identify two vital attributes associated with the idea of the cultural entrepreneur which help us conceptualize the contemporary cultural and creative industry intermediary (CCII). Firstly, the idea of connections, networks, and being socially embedded as an aspect of both cultural and entrepreneurial development. It

is acknowledged that despite the proliferation of literature, which refers to the entrepreneur as a lone genius (Naudin 2018), cultural entrepreneurs do not operate in a vacuum but respond to their context, whether that be markets, audiences, funding opportunities, or their relationship to other cultural producers. Within this environment, moral and ethical perspectives, specifically in relation to others in a locality, can be a significant motivating factor for transforming entrepreneurial activities (Banks 2006) into more socially engaged activities. Secondly, authors identify an optimistic ambition to balance sociocultural values with economic sustainability, even if that proves difficult over time. Entrepreneurial success is not guaranteed, but there is an attempt to create sustainable models through a variety of means that might include public funds, philanthropy, or commercial success through flexible and innovative practices. The entrepreneurial ecosystem takes into consideration not only the individual characteristics of the entrepreneurs, but also the context, the environment, and the social features where the phenomenon occurs (Stam 2015; Alvedalen, Boschma, 2017). The territory, traditions, and culture is part of that ecosystem. Stam (2015) defines entrepreneurial ecosystem as a set of interdependent actors and factors coordinated in such a way that they enable productive entrepreneurship. This leads to the concept of creative entrepreneurship: a concentration of creative activities in the ecosystem, which claims to enhance the dynamic evolution of creative interactions and evolutionary networks of collaboration between entities (Paraskevi 2011; Comunian 2010). Cultural intermediaries appear to embody these characteristics, as they operate across cultural ecosystems and engage in entrepreneurial processes: connecting actors, shaping tastes, translating agendas, and mediating between agents and institutions.

Conclusion

While scholars have analyzed CCI companies, creative cities, and cultural policies, there are significant gaps in the understanding of those whose activities are on the margins of CCI development, particularly in regional contexts. This article argues that in building methodologies for understanding Latvia's cultural and creative ecosystem, it is important to note three key factors: 1) understanding the complexities of defining the CCI; 2) differentiating between regional CCI activities and national or global perspectives; and 3) identifying and defining key local players whose position is significant in shaping CCI developments. This article contributes to debates which seek to investigate the challenge with definitions for policymakers and scholars by highlighting underpinning arguments and concepts. In doing so, the authors draw attention to the potential significance of cultural intermediaries, who share attributes with cultural entrepreneurs through their connectivity and relational role. In order to explore the dynamics which shape regional CCI ecosystems, scholars might investigate the role of local CCII and their entrepreneurial actions within communities.

Discussing CCI developments in regional settings and drawing attention to the specificity of localized CCI activities, the authors have identified three key dimensions: 1) cultural (local

stories, identity of the place, symbolic capital, connectivity, knowledge spillovers); 2) social (communities, social interactions, social inclusion, social regeneration); and 3) economic (locally produced, narrative laden, authentic, but export oriented, new niche markets, open innovation, multiplier effects).

Research findings show that in order to act as gatekeepers and mediators within cultural, social, and economic dimensions, CCII brings a specific dynamic to foster CCI development. CCII are motivated by their passion for the CCI, their position within the wider local community, and a mission to translate the complexity of local relationships, histories, and cultural traditions. CCII operate in a wide entrepreneurial ecosystem, broadening cultural taste and opportunities for the CCI and their audiences by everyday practices, negotiations, and expertise. They are involved in a variety of cultural projects, fundraising, and marketing activities, being translators between groups, institutions, and policymakers.

As scholarly literature shows, definitions of the CCIs are complex and highly contextual, leading us to suggest three key issues for future research. Firstly, definitions are framed by political, academic, or practice-based perspectives which are not always fully revealed and can be implicit (for instance, implicit in understandings of sub-sectors of the CCIs). Secondly, when exploring the potential benefits and impact of the CCI, the focus can be economic, social, and cultural or any of these elements combined, which can be helpful for policymakers but difficult for researchers to unpack. Finally, it is important to acknowledge that the role of the CCII might be best described as revealing tensions, highly localized ecosystems, and opportunities for development.

Adkins, L. (2004). Feminism, Bourdieu and After. *The Sociological Review,* No. 52 (2), pp. 3–18. Available: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-954X.2005.00521.x [Accessed 2.07.2021.].

Alvedalen, J., Boschma, R. (2017). A critical review of entrepreneurial ecosystems research: towards a future research agenda. *European Planning Studies*, No. 25(6), pp. 887–903. Available: https://doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2017.1299694 [Accessed 16.06.2021.].

Anheir, H.K., Ray Isar, Y. (eds.). (2008). *Cultures and Globalization: The Cultural Economy*. London: Sage.

Banks, M. and O'Connor, J. (2009). Introduction: After the Creative Industries. *International Journal of Cultural Policy,* No. 15(4), pp. 365–375. Available: https://doi.org/10.1080/10286630902989027 [Accessed 14.06.2021.].

Banks, M. (2006). Moral Economy and Cultural Work. *Sociology,* No. 40(3), pp. 455–472. Available: https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038506063669 [Accessed 14.07.2021.].

Banks, M. (2007). *The Politics of Cultural Work*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan

Bell, D., Jayne, M. (eds.) (2006). *Small Cities: urban experience beyond the metropolis*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Bilton, C. (2006). Management and Creativity: From the Creative Industries to Creative Management. Malden, MA: Wiley–Blackwell.

Bilton, C. and Leary, R. (2002). What can managers do for creativity? Brokering creativity in the creative industries. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, No. 8(1), pp. 49–64. Available: https://doi.org/10.1080/10286630290032431 [Accessed 31.07.2021.].

British Council (2010). *Mapping the Creative Industries: A Toolkit.* Available: https://creativeconomy.britishcouncil.org/media/uploads/files/English_mapping_the_creative_industries_a_toolkit_2-2.pdf [Accessed 27.07.2021.].

Caust, J. (2003). Putting the "art" back into arts policy making: How arts policy has been "captured" by the economists and the marketers. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, No. 9(1), pp. 51–63. Available: https://doi.org/10.1080/10286630320000897 23 [Accessed 01.08.2021.].

Chapain, C. and Comunian, R. (2010). Enabling and inhibiting the creative economy: The role of the local and regional dimensions in England. *Regional Studies*, No. 44(6), pp. 717–734. Available: https://doi.org/10.1080/00343400903107728 [Accessed 04.07.2021.].

Chapain, C.; Comunian, R. Clifton, N. (2014) Creative industries and creative Policies: A European Perspective? *City, Culture and Society,* No. 5(2), pp. 51–53. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ccs.2014.05.009 [Accessed 08.07.2021.].

Collins, P., Mahon, M., Murtagh, A. (2018). Creative industries and the creative economy of the West of Ireland: evidence of sustainable change? *Creative Industries Journal,* No. 11(1), pp. 70–86. Available: https://doi.org/10.1080/17510694.2018.1434359 [Accessed 16.07.2021.].

Comunian, R. (2010). Rethinking the creative city: the role of complexity, networks and interactions in the urban creative economy. *Urban Studies*, No. 48(6), pp. 1157–1179. Available: https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098010370626 [Accessed 09.07.2021.].

Cruickshank, J. (2016). Is culture-led redevelopment relevant for rural planners? The risk of adopting urban theories in rural settings. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, No. 24 (3), pp. 331–349. Available: https://doi.org/10.1080/10286632.2016.1178732 [Accessed 10.07.2021.].

Cunningham, St. (2009). Creative Industries as a Globally Contestable Policy Field. *Chinese Journal of Communication*, No. 2(1), pp. 13–24. Available: https://doi.org/10.1080/17544750802638814 [Accessed 07.07.2021.].

Commonwealth of Australia (1994). Creative Nation. Canberra: ACT.

Daubeuf, C., Pratt, A., Airaghi, E. and Pletosu, T. (2020). Enumerating the role of incentives in CCI production chains. CICERONE publication. Available: https://cicerone-project.eu/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/D3.2-Enumeratingthe-role-of-incentives-in-CCI-production-chains.pdf [Accessed 16.07.2021.].

De Peuter, G., Cohen, N. (2015). Emerging Labour Politics in Creative Industries. Oakley, K. and O'Connor, J. (eds.). *The Routledge Companion to the Cultural Industries*. New York: Routledge, pp. 305–318.

Dobreva, N., Ivanov Hristov S. (2020). Cultural Entrepreneurship: A Review of Literature. *Tourism & Management Studies,* No. 16(4), pp. 23–34. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3824265 [Accessed 22.11.2021.].

European Commission (2010). *Green Paper — Unlocking the potential of cultural and creative industries.* Available: https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/1cb6f484-074b-4913-87b3-344ccf020eef/language-en [Accessed 27.06.2021.].

European Commission (2018). *A New European Agenda for Culture*. Available: https://ec.europa.eu/culture/document/new-european-agenda-culture-swd2018-267-final [Accessed 27.06.2021.].

Florida, R. (2002). *The Rise of the Creative Class. And How It's Transforming Work, Leisure and Everyday Life*. Basic Books.

Gallagher K., Ehlman, M.P. (2019). Arts at the Intersection: Cross-Sector Collaboration and Creative Placemaking in Rapid City. *Public Performance & Management Review*, No. 42(6), pp. 1333–1350. Available: https://doi.org/10.1080/15309576.2019.1601113 [Accessed 1.06.2021.].

Galloway S.; Dunlop St. (2007). A critique of definitions of the cultural and creative industries in public policy. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, No. 13(1), pp. 17–31. Available: https://doi.org/10.1080/10286630701201657 [Accessed 13.06.2021.].

Gerlitz, L. Prause G. K., (2021). Cultural and Creative Industries as Innovation and Sustainable Transition Brokers in the Baltic Sea Region: A Strong Tribute to Sustainable Macro-Regional Development. *Sustainability*, No. 13(17), 9742. Available: https://doi.org/10.3390/su13179742 [Accessed 29.11.2021.].

Hesmondhalgh, D. (2008). Cultural and Creative Industries. Bennett, T. and Frow, J. (eds.). *The Sage Handbook of Cultural Analysis.* London and Los Angeles: Sage, pp. 552–569.

Hesmondhalgh, D., Barker S. (2010). A very complicated version of freedom: Conditions and experiences of creative labour in three cultural industries. *Poetics,* No. 38(1), pp. 4–20. Available: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2009.10.001 [Accessed 17.06.2021.].

Hesmondhalgh, D., Pratt, A.C. (2005). Cultural industries and cultural policy. *International journal of cultural policy*, No. 11(1), pp. 1–13. Available: https://doi.org/10.1080/10286630500067598 [Accessed 14.06.2021.].

Katre, A. (2015). Cultural Entrepreneurship: How are Intentions to be a Cultural Entrepreneur Formed? *Business Creativity and the Creative Economy,* No. 1(1), pp. 31–40. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.18536/bcce.2015.07.1.1.05 [Accessed 29.06.2021.].

KEA, PPMI (2019). Research for CULT Committee — Culture and creative sectors in the European Union-key future developments, challenges and opportunities. European Parliament, Policy Department for Structural and Cohesion Policies, Brussels. Available: https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2019/629203/IPOL_STU(2019)629203_EN.pdf [Accessed 1.07.2021.].

Kerrigan, S., Hutchinson S. (2016). Regional Creative Industries: transforming the Steel City into a Creative City in Newcastle, Australia. *Creative Industries Journa*l, No. 9(2), pp. 116–129. Available: https://doi.org/10.1080/17510694.2016.1206357 [Accessed 4.07.2021.].

Klamer, A. (2011). Cultural entrepreneurship. *The Review of Austrian Economics*, No. 24, pp. 141–156. Available: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11138-011-0144-6 [Accessed 14.07.2021.].

Landry, C. (2001). *The creative city is a toolkit for urban innovators.* London: Earthscan.

Lee, D., Hesmondhalgh D., Oakley K. and Nisbett, M. (2014). Regional creative industries policy-making under New Labour. *Cultural Trends*, No. 23(4), pp. 217–231. Available: https://doi.org/10.1080/09548963.2014.912044 [Accessed 16.07.2021.].

Liang, S, Wang, Q. (2020). Cultural and Creative Industries and Urban (Re)Development in China. *Journal of Planning Literature,* No. 35(1), pp. 54–70. Available: https://doi.org/10.1177/0885412219898290 [Accessed 16.07.2021].

Maguire, J. and Matthews, J. (eds.) (2014). *The Cultural Intermediaries Reader.* London: Sage.

Mahon, M., McGrath, B., O'Laoire, L.L. (2018). The transformative potential of the arts and culture in sustaining rural futures. *Journal of Rural Studies,* No. 63, pp. 214–216. Available: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2018.09.016 [Accessed 16.07.2021.].

More I. (2014). Cultural and Creative Industries concept — a historical perspective. *Procedia — Social and Behavioral Sciences,* No. 110, pp. 738–746. Available: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.12.918 [Accessed 29.06.2021.].

Naudin, A. (2018). *Cultural Entrepreneurship: The cultural worker's experience of Entrepreneurship*. London: Routledge.

Naudin, A. (2021). Cultural Entrepreneurship: Barriers and challenges for ethnic and immigrant communities. Horvath, I. and Dechamp, G. (eds.). *L'entrepreneuriat dans les secteurs de l'art et de la culture*, Editions EMS.

Neelands, J., Belfiore, E., Firth, C., Hart, N., Perrin, L., Brock, S., Goldway, D., and Woddis J. (2015). *Enriching Britain: Culture, creativity and growth. Warwick: The Warwick Commission Report on the Future of Cultural Value.* Available: https://warwick.ac.uk/research/warwickcommission/futureculture/finalreport/warwick_commission_final_report.pdf [Accessed 20.06.2021.].

Oakley, K. (2006). Include Us Out: Economic development and social policy in the creative industries. *Cultural Trends*, No. 15(4), pp. 255–273. Available: https://doi.org/10.1080/09548960600922335 [Accessed 21.06.2021.].

Oakley, K., Ward, J. (2018). The art of the good life: culture and sustainable prosperity. *Cultural Trends*, No. 27(1), pp. 4–17. Available: https://doi.org/10.1080/09548963.2018.1415408 [Accessed 21.06.2021.].

O'Connor, J. (2007). *The Creative Industries: Culture and Policy. A report for Creative Partnerships. Arts Council England*. Available at: https://www.academia.edu/7055842/The_Cultural_and_Creative_Industries_A_Review_of_the_Literature [Accessed 22.06.2021.].

O'Connor, J., Xin G. (2010). Developing a Creative Cluster in a Postindustrial City: CIDS and Manchester. *The Information Society*, No. 26(2), pp. 124–136. Available: https://doi.org/10.1080/01972240903562787 [Accessed 2.07.2021.].

Paraskevi, T. (2011). Emergent creative ecosystems: key elements for urban renewal strategies. Yigitcanlar T., Fachinelli A. (eds.). *4th Knowledge Cities World Summit Proceedings*. Brazil: Bento Gonhalves, pp. 363–370.

Petrov, A. (2016). Exploring the Arctic's "other economies": knowledge, creativity and the new frontier. *The Polar Journal*, No. 6(1), pp. 51–68. Available: https://doi.org/10.1080/2154896X.2016.1171007 [Accessed 8.07.2021.].

Pratt, A.C. (2014). *Cities: The cultural dimension. Government Office for Science, Department of Business, Innovation and Skills.* Available: https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/6280/1/14-821-cities-cultural-dimension.pdf Accessed 1.08.2021.].

Rindzeviciute, E. (2021). Transforming cultural policy in Eastern Europe: the endless frontier. *International Cultural Policy*, No. 27(2), pp. 149–162. Available: https://doi.org/10.1080/10286632.2021.1873972 [Accessed 2.08.2021.].

Selada, C., Cunha, I., Tomaz, E. (2012). Creative-based strategies in small and medium-sized cities: Key dimensions of analysis. *Quaestiones Geographicae,* No. 31(4), pp. 43–51. Available: https://doi.org/10.2478/v10117-012-0034-4 [Accessed 31.07.2021.].

Selwood, S. (2002). The politics of data collection: Gathering, analysing and using data about the subsidised cultural sector in England. *Cultural Trends*, No. 12(47), pp. 13–84. Available: https://doi.org/10.1080/09548960209390330 [Accessed 02.08.2021.].

Stam, E. (2015). Entrepreneurial Ecosystems and Regional Policy: A Sympathetic Critique. *European Planning Studies*, No. 23(9), pp. 1759–1769. Available: https://doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2015.1061484 [Accessed 25.06.2021.].

The European Parliament and the Council of the European Union (2013). Regulation (EU) No 1295/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 December 2013 establishing the Creative Europe Programme (2014 to 2020). *Official Journal of the European Union*. Available: https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A32013R1295 [Accessed 2.08.2021.].

Throsby, D. (2001). *Economics and culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

UNESCO (2015). *Basic Texts. 2015 Edition of the 2005 Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions*. Available: https://en.unesco.org/creativity/sites/creativity/files/convention2005_basictext_en.pdf#page=17 [Accessed 2.08.2021.].

United Nations Development Programme (2013). *Creative Economy Report. Widening Local Development pathways*. Available: http://www.unesco.org/culture/pdf/creative-economy-report-2013.pdf [Accessed 31.07.2021.]

Van Heur, B. (2010). Small cities and the geographical bias of creative industries research and policy. *Journal of Policy Research in Tourism, Leisure and Events*, No. 2(2), pp. 189–192. Available: https://doi.org / 10.1080/19407963.2010.482281 [Accessed 4.07.2021.].

Kultūras un radošo industriju reģionālā konteksta teorētiskais ietvars: starpnieku loma

Anete Nodēna (*Annette Naudin*),
Ieva Zemīte, Agnese Hermane

Atslēgvārdi: kultūras un radošās industrijas, kultūras starpnieki, kultūrpolitika

Raksta mērķis ir sniegt ieguldījumu jaunu zinātnisku atziņu tapšanā par kultūras un radošo nozaru darbību un izaugsmi reģionālā kontekstā. Vispirms tiek pārvērtētas radošo industriju definīcijas, secinot, ka radošo industriju jēdziens kļuvis samērā mulsinošs gan pētniekiem, gan politikas veidotājiem (Chapain, Clifton, Comunian 2014; Hesmondhalgh and Pratt 2005). Rakstā lietotais termins "kultūras un radošās industrijas" visprecīzāk atspoguļo aplūkojamās jomas specifiku. Pēc tam tiek analizētas kultūras un radošās industrijas reģionālā kontekstā – diskutējot par "vietas ideju" un vietu veidošanos mazpilsētās un reģionos. Visbeidzot, uzmanība tiek pievērsta starpniekiem, kuri raksturoti kā uzņēmējdarbības profesionāļi, kas darbojas kā kultūras un radošo industriju daļa, veicinot attiecības, veidojot un stiprinot vietējās kultūras un radošās "ekosistēmas" (Neeland et al. 2015). Noslēgumā tiek secināts, ka identificēt nozīmīgākos vietējos dalībniekus, kuriem ir būtiska loma kultūras un radošo industriju attīstībā un kuri palīdz politikas veidotājiem saskatīt un novērtēt dažādās vietējās un nacionālās tradīcijas, var būt izšķirošs priekšnosacījums atbilstošas vietējās politikas izveidē, valsts un nozares sadarbības sekmēšanā.