Kristina Baculakova
PhD (Economics), Lecturer, Faculty of International Relations,
University of Economics in Bratislava
1/b Dolnozemska cesta Str., Bratislava 5, 852 35, Slovak Republic
kristina.baculakova@euba.sk
ORCID ID: http://orcid.org/0000-0002-0143-7541

Lubica Harakalova
PhD (Economics), Lecturer, Faculty of International Relations,
University of Economics in Bratislava
1/b Dolnozemska cesta Str., Bratislava 5, 852 35, Slovak Republic
lubica.harakalova@euba.sk
ORCID ID: http://orcid.org/0000-0002-7138-2427

Creative industries in the EU: factors influencing employment

Abstract. *Introduction.* When analysing creative industries, it is not fully clear yet, which factors do influence this phenomenon, and thus how to support its development and functioning. The creative sector employs about 3.3% of the economically active population in the European Union. *The aim* of this research paper is to test the possible impact of five selected factors on the employment in the creative industries of the European Union. *Results.* The data represent 135 observations from 27 EU member states, drawn from the Eurostat database in the period of 2008-2012. Our final model confirmed a significant impact of public spending on science and research, employment in science and research and average wages in creative industries. Our model confirmed positive relationship between public spending on R&D and employment in creative industries. Hence, for every increase in expenditures on R&D by 1%, we may expect 0.014% increase in employment in creative industries.
Conclusions. Thus, the research confirms the importance of public support for science and research, as it seems that the development of science and research boosts the development of creative industries as well. This could also apply to a general increase in wages.
Keywords: Creative Industries; Employment; Creative Class; Creativity; Science and Research
JEL Classification: Z10; R11
DOI: https://doi.org/10.21003/ea.V164-09

Крістіна Бацулакова
кандидат економічних наук, викладач, Економічний університет у Братиславі, Братислава, Словацька Республіка
Любіца Ґаракалова
кандидат економічних наук, викладач, Економічний університет у Братиславі, Братислава, Словацька Республіка
Креативна економіка в ЄС: фактори, що впливають на зайнятість
Анотація. Досліджуючи питання, пов'язані з креативною економікою, мусимо визнати, що поки нез'ясованим є те, які чинники впливають на неї, а також невизначеним поки залишається, як саме можна підтримувати її розвиток та функціонування. Сьогодні в творчому секторі економіки працює близько 3,3% працездатного населення Європейського Союзу. Метою цього дослідження є перевірити, який вплив мають п'ять обраних факторів на креативну економіку Європейського Союзу. Інформація за період 2008–2012 років, необхідна для проведення дослідження, була отримана з баз даних Євростату. Розроблена авторами модель оцінки впливу зазначених факторів підтвердила значний вплив державних витрат на науку та наукові дослідження, зайнятість у сфері наукової діяльності, а також на рівень заробітної плати, яку отримують особи, що працюють у секторі креативної економіки. Було доведено важливість державної підтримки наукових досліджень, оскільки розвиток науки стимулює розвиток креативної економіки, що також позначається на загальному зростанні рівня заробітної плати.
Ключові слова: креативна економіка; зайнятість; креативний клас; творчість; наукові дослідження.

Кристина Бацулакова
кандидат экономических наук, преподаватель,
Экономический университет в Братиславе, Братислава, Словацкая Республика
Любица Гаракалова
кандидат экономических наук, преподаватель,
Экономический университет в Братиславе, Братислава, Словацкая Республика
Креативная экономика в ЕС: факторы, влияющие на занятость
Аннотация. Исследуя вопросы, связанные с креативной экономикой, следует признать, что пока невыясненным остается то, какие факторы влияют на нее, а также неопределенным является то, как именно можно поддерживать ее развитие и функционирование. Сегодня в секторе креативной экономики работает около 3,3% трудоспособного населения Европейского Союза. Целью данного исследования является проверить, какое влияние имеют пять избранных факторов на креативную экономику Европейского Союза. Информация за период 2008–2012 годов, необходимая для проведения исследования, была получена из баз данных Евростата. Разработанная авторами модель оценки влияния указанных факторов подтвердила значительное влияние государственных расходов на науку и научные исследования, занятость в сфере научной деятельности, а также на уровень заработной платы, которую получают лица, работающие в секторе креативной экономики. Была доказана важность государственной поддержки научных исследований, поскольку развитие науки стимулирует развитие креативной экономики, что также сказывается на общем росте уровня заработной платы.
Ключевые слова: креативная экономика; занятость; креативный класс; творчество; научные исследования.

1. Introduction

In recent years, more attention has been paid to the concept of creative economy. It is not a new concept; however it accurately describes the transformation of the economy and society in the 21st century. Along with further development, man ceases to focus on satisfying the primary needs. There is a room for the application of human creativity. Therefore, creative industries have become recognised at the European

level as well. According to the document of the Government of the Slovak Republic (2011), the creative economy «is a range of industries based on the use of intellectual creative activity in the field of art, culture and other sectors; it creates a wide exploitative chain extending from the creation of conditions for creative activity, through production and redesign of the results». Creative economy is represented by particular creative industries. The European Union (KEA, 2006) [15] divides creative economy into the cultural sector and the creative sector (see Table 1), which is subdivided into four categories:

- Core industries (arts - visual art, performing artists and heritage);
- Cultural industries (film, video, television, radio, music industry, video gaming sector, the book industry);
- Creative industries (design, architecture and advertising);
- Related industries (the production of computers, mobile phones, multimedia devices).

This division offers also resolves the question of how to differentiate between high culture and mass industry production of «creative goods». The art and high culture are essential and represent the core result of human creativity; on the other hand, creative industries refer also to mass production of goods, which resulted from original human ideas, but are mainly intended for practical use or entertainment (crafts, TV production, etc.).

People themselves represent the basis of the creative economy. They bring new ideas to the creative process. Creativity could become a factor for economic growth [19]. Although it is very difficult to grasp and measure creativity, this does not mean that it does not exist or that its economic activity has no effect. In fact, the opposite is true, because creativity drives innovation. Already Solow (1956) [21] stressed the parameter of the current level of technology; the theory of a new paradigm also includes new ideas and creativity in the growth model. The impact of creativity on economic growth is therefore undeniable. Often, creativity represents the first step towards innovation; on the other hand, it does not always lead directly to innovation.

With the development of creative industries, more and more people have become employed in the creative sectors. According to EY (2014) [7], creative sectors employed 3.3% of the economic active population in the EU. However, employment in the creative sectors has some specific characteristics, which we will discuss in the presented paper. The main aim of our article is to confirm the dependence of the employment in the creative industries in the European Union on selected factors. Two models were tested. The factors for the analysis were chosen according to the theory advanced by Florida and the research conducted by Kloudova and Zhang [10; 16]. Due to the lack of proof of the importance of the two variables in the first model, we have created a second model that tested the effect of the following three factors - the size of public spending on research and development, employment in science and research and average wages. We expect that our findings may outline the possibilities of supporting the development of creative industries in the EU.

1. Employment in creative industries in the EU and its specifics

According to EY (2014) [7], cultural and creative industries (CCIs) employ more than 7 million Europeans, which represents 3.3% of the workforce. According to the study of the European Expert Network on Culture (EENC), it is approximately 2% of the European workforce [22]. The biggest job makers are sectors such as performing arts, visual arts and music industry. Ernst & Young (EY) claims that creative industries represent the third largest employer in the EU. On the other hand, Stumpo declares that the workforce employed in cultural and creative industries represent only a smart part of total workforce in the European Union [22]. Both studies confirm the fact that CCIs can be save harbour in economic crises. Stumpo figured out that those who were employed in CCIs suffered less during the crisis, especially those persons who were self-employed. The fact is also that CCIs remained stable, or even grew, during the crisis years [7].

Tab. 1: **Definition of creative industries in the EU**

Cultural sector	Creative sector
Visual arts, performing artists, cultural heritage	Design, architecture, advertising
Film and video, television and radio, video games, music, books and press	Manufacture of computer, mp3 players, mobile phone market

Source: [15]

The employment in CCIs, as well as their development, is unevenly distributed in the European Union. We see several clusters of countries where CCIs dominate, if compared with other industries. The largest economies of the European Union, namely the economies of the United Kingdom, Germany and France hold the leading positions. Yet, favourable positions of smaller countries, such as Finland, Estonia, the Netherlands and the Czech Republic, are even more interesting in terms of research [2].

Table 2 shows the results of the analysis by Stumpo and Manchin [22]. Estonia has the highest employment rate in CCIs, while the highest participation in cultural life is observed in Finland. Public expenditures in culture are the highest in the Czech Republic.

In general, we can observe several specific characteristics of employment in CCIs:

- territorial diversity;
- a tendency to create clusters;
- small and medium enterprises;
- highly qualified employment;
- attractiveness for young people;
- relative resistance to crises;
- significant women's employment in CCIs;
- impact of other factors such as technologies, innovations and traditions.

Most of the employed in CCIs are self-employed persons or those working at small and medium enterprises. It is the opposite of the dominance of large corporations. The sufficient support for small and medium enterprises is the desired future of the EU and is also part of the Creative Europe programme. Creative industries are also very attractive to young people who search creativity, self-expression, development and non-conformance. It is thus considered that CCIs could be a possible solution for the unemployment problem of young people. Another interesting trend is that a greater proportion of the employed are women [22]. Long-term stability of such

Tab. 2: **Employment in CCIs in the EU**

EU country	Employment in CCIs	Public expenditures on culture
Austria	1.57	3.1
Belgium	1.48	2.4
Bulgaria	1.30	3.9
Croatia	1.50	5.1
Cyprus	1.29	3.7
Czech Republic	1.70	7.8
Denmark	2.43	4.1
Estonia	2.77	7.8
Finland	2.36	3.2
France	1.73	4.1
Germany	2.01	2,8
Greece	1.19	1.9
Hungary	1.71	6.3
Ireland	1.54	3.4
Italy	1.20	2.2
Latvia	n/a	7.6
Lithuania	n/a	4.1
Luxembourg	1.21	6.8
Malta	1.20	3.8
Netherlands	1.80	5.5
Poland	1.30	4.3
Portugal	1.04	3.2
Romania	0.70	2.8
Slovakia	0.87	2.6
Slovenia	2.26	6.6
Spain	1.27	2.7
Sweden	2.30	3.2
United Kingdom	2.12	3.4

Source: [22]

employment is another important fact. Mayerhofer, Peltz and Resch (2008) [20] analysed the sustainability of newly created jobs CCIs in Austria and the region of Vienna. According to this study, the software, multimedia and Internet sectors are most sustainable among the creative sectors. In general, the sustainability of newly created jobs was very high - over 74% after one year of activity and about 44% after three years.

As we consider most of these characteristics to be positive for the national economies, we decided to analyse which of the factors could positively boost the interest to work in creative industries.

2. Factors which influence creative economy; Richard Florida and creative class

Creative human capital is the core of the creative economy. A man with ideas enters the innovation process. Creativity can thus stimulate innovation in any economic activity. The contribution and role of creative people in the creative economy analysed R. Florida (2002) [10]. Florida created the concept of the creative class represented by the talented people. A creative person is not only an artist, but also a lawyer, an engineer, a comedian or a journalist. The creative class is a rapidly growing segment of the workforce which is educated, qualified and nonconformist. The creative class influences economic growth and corporate profits in the creative industries. Florida introduced a 3T index to measure the factors, which, according to him, influence the development and performance of the creative industries and help to build up creative cities. We applied his approach in our research.

Florida described talent, technology and tolerance. According to J. Howkins (2013) [14] talent is something we are born with, however Florida's view is more complex. He stressed the role of education, especially the role of higher education. He proved a positive correlation between higher education and employment in the creative industries in the USA [10]. Therefore, we choose this factor to be one of the most important in our tested model.

Another important factor is technology. Florida concretely describes the positive relation between the number of patents or patent applications and the creative class. It is understandable, since science and research is an essential part of Florida's concept of the creative class. Tolerance is a factor which seen to be the most controversial, especially in the conditions of the European Union. Florida examined the Gay index. It is very hard to measure this indicator in European countries because we can hardly find any relevant statistics.

Other important factors, which influence the performance and development of creative industries, are:
- high economic level of the country - the higher the level is, the more focus is put on creative activities, leisure time and culture;
- open social environment and the openness of the country to liberal thinking in particular, since conservative thinking does not create a favourable environment for the development of creative industries;
- generally available technologies - creative sectors are strongly linked to new technological solutions (e.g. video gaming, music industry, etc.). Therefore, available technologies enable spreading creative industries as well;
- public support of creative industries and usage of structural funds (case of Baltic countries);
- creative education - even though creative industry is not a new concept now, there is still a lack of information about this phenomenon.

Florida's research created a basis for choosing our model; however we combined it with the factors used in the study of Kloudova and Zhang (2011) [16].

3. The definition of creative industries in the model and its limits

The quantification of creative industries is very difficult. The problem occurs even with the definition of creative industries. The ambiguity of definitions has several reasons. As J. Kloudova (2009) [18] states, differences result from various perceptions of culture and art in different countries, and a different understanding of the concept of creativity. If creativity is understood as the process of bringing new ideas, opinions,

procedures, then it is substantive in each production sector. This is particularly the fact why we cannot include creative industries in the sectorial classification of industries (including the primary, secondary and tertiary sectors). According to Hartley (2004) [12], we can find products of creative industries in each of the mentioned sectors. It is an innovative idea in the knowledge economy that has become the bearer of progress and growth. The question that remains largely unanswered is the relationship and the boundaries between creativity and innovation. For purposes of the analysis, mainly because of the lack of statistical data, we abstracted from the use of the so called broader Florida's model. Kloudova and Zhang (2011) [16] also used sectors like sport, recreation, banking and insurance, education and healthcare in their analysis of the factors affecting the creative economy in China. These categories were not included in our study, as we intended to include only core sectors. Our goal was to use parameters as close to the definition of creative industries in the EU as possible. We used the data of Eurostat, NACE Rev. 2 (two-digit categorisation used since 2008). The application of this classification, although not quite closely matching the definition of creative industries, seemed the most appropriate compromise because of the lack of statistical data in all EU countries.

We included the following categories in the model:

J.58 - Publishing activities

J.59 - Motion picture, video and television programme production, sound recording and music publishing activities

J.60 - Programming and broadcasting activities

J.62 - Computer programming, consultancy and related activities

J.63 - Information service activities

M.73 - Advertising and market research

In addition to choosing the proper sectors, we also had to define the factors, which were to be analysed. For purposes of our analysis, we used 2 of 3T categories, namely technology and talent. Talent was represented by higher education, as Florida had put it in his study. Technology was represented by the expenditures on research and development and employment in research and technology. Other factors, namely GDP per capita and average wages were chosen based on the study of Kloudova and Zhang (2011) [16].

Table 3 represents a comparison of different approaches to creative industries.

4. Model

4.1. Hypotheses

To determine potential impact factors, we used several theoretical backgrounds. We understand creative economy as an economy bringing new, creative ideas, solutions and practices via using creativity. It can be expected that such an economy is mainly typical of developed countries, because people there do not focus their attention only on meeting the primary needs. Thus, GDP per capita was the first factor which we examined. Our first hypothesis was:

H1: Along with an increase in GDP per capita, employment in creative industries also grows.

When choosing other factors, we used Florida's research (2003) [9] and approach of Kloudova and Zhang (2011) [16]. Florida takes into account the factor of education, particularly higher education, for several reasons. Educational institutions carry out scientific research; they help to develop the region where they are located. These institutions also attract talented, innovative and entrepreneurial people to the region or city. University graduates are becoming key candidates for employment in creative industries. An important asset of higher educational institutions is also promotion of self-expression, open thinking and acceptance of new ideas. On this basis, we may suppose that creative industries will concentrate in places where higher educational institutes are located.

Thus, we created our next hypotheses:

H2: Along with the higher share of university graduates in total employment, employment in creative industries is bound to grow.

We decide to analyse the impact of the amount of money spent on research and development because we take into account the impact of educational institutions. However, it

should be noted that the data entered into the analysis related only to public, not private, expenditures on research and development across the EU.

H3: Along with an increase in spending on research and development, employment in creative industries also grows.

H4: Along with an increase in employment in science and research, employment in the creative industries also grows.

Wages was the last factor we chose for our analysis. This factor is one of the major, it has an impact on employment. Hence, we propose another hypothesis for our analysis:

H5: Along with an increase in average wages, employment in creative industries also grows.

4.2 Dependent variable

The dependent variable in this model is the employment in creative industries shown as a percentage of the employees in creative industries in relation to the total number of employees. To determine creative industries, we used the categories listed in Section 2.1. The data for the period of 2008-2012 were drawn from the Eurostat database for the 27 EU member states.

4.3 Independent variable

Based on the hypotheses, the independent variables in the model are: GDP per capita in Purchasing Power Standards (PPS), the share of university graduates in total employment, expenditures on R&D as a share of the total public expenditures and average monthly wages. All the data were drawn from the Eurostat database in order to maintain data consistency. We analysed two models. In the first model, we chose GDP per capita (PPS), the share of university graduates in total employment (%), expenditures on R&D (% of total public expenditures), employment in science and technology (%) and average monthly wages as predictors.

The equation of the model is:

$$y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2 + \beta_3 x_3 + \beta_4 x_4 + \beta_5 x_5 + \varepsilon \,, \qquad (1)$$

where y is the share of employees in creative industries relevant to total employment (%);

$x1$ is GDP per capita (PPS);

$x2$ is the share of university graduates in total employment (%);

$x3$ is expenditures on R&D (% of total public expenditures);

$x4$ is employment in science and research (%);

$x5$ is average monthly wages expressed as a proportion of average monthly earnings (%);

ε is the parameter of statistical error.

The results showed a significant effect of the three variables, namely $x3$ ($\beta3 = 0.017$; $p = < 0.001$);

$x4$ ($\beta4 = -0.0000779$; $p = 0.008$);

$x5$ ($\beta5 = 0.001$; $p = 0.01$);

the variables $x1$ ($\beta = 0.0000401$; $p = 0.913$);

$x2$ ($\beta = 0.000138$; $p = 0.149$) were not significant.

We decided to use the second model, where we excluded the variables $x1$ and $x2$. The equation of the model has the form:

$$y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2 + \beta_3 x_3 + \varepsilon \,, \qquad (2)$$

where y is the share of employees in creative industries in total employment (%);

Tab. 3: **Definition of creative industries - comparison of approaches**

Definition in our analysis	Florida's definition (2002)	Definition of Kloudova and Zhang (2011)	Definition of EU (2006)
Publishing activities	Business		Visual arts, performing artists, cultural heritage
Motion picture, video and television program production, sound recording and music publishing	Artists, designers, writers and musicians	Culture, sport and recreation	Film and video, television and radio, video games, music, books and press
Radio and television broadcasting	Scientists, engineers, technicians, innovators and researchers	Renting and business services	
Computer programming, consultancy and related services	Technicians	Transmission of information, computer services and software	Manufacture of computer, MP3 player, mobile phone market
Information services	Finance	Banking and insurance	
Advertising and market research	Health service	Scientific research and polytechnic services and geological survey	Design, architecture, advertising
	Legal service	Health care, social security and social care	
	Education	Education	

Source: Compiled by the authors

$x1$ is expenditures on R&D (% of total public expenditures);

$x2$ is employment in science and research (%);

$x3$ is average monthly wages expressed as a proportion of the average monthly earnings (%);

ε is the parameter of statistical error.

The summary output of the first model is shown in Table 4.

Tab. 4: **Summary output of the first model**

Multiple regression analysis					
Variable	Coefficient	Standardised coefficient	Standard error	t - statistics	P - value
Expenditure on R&D	0.014	0.434	0.002	5.596	< 0.001
Employment in science and research	-0.0000693	-0.246	< 0.001	-3.409	0.001
Average monthly wages	0.0000041	0.433	< 0.001	5.752	<0.001

R Square (R^2)	0.481
Adjusted R Square (R^2)	0.467
F- statistics	3/111
β_0	0.05

Source: Own processing

The results of the second model indicate a significant relationship between the variables $x1$, $x2$, and $x3$ and employment in the creative industries ($R^2 = 0.481$; $F_{(3, 111)} = 13.355$, $p < 0.001$). The variables $x1$, $x2$, $x3$ contribute to the explanation of about 46.7% of the variance in the employment in creative industries.

The equation of the model has the following form:

$$y = 0.05 + 0.014x_1 - 0.0000693x_2 + 0.0000041x_3. \qquad (3)$$

Expenditures on research and development

Our model confirmed statistical significance of the assumed hypothesis. The relationship between public spending on research and development and employment in creative industries is positive. For every increase in expenditures on R&D by 1%, we can expect an increase in employment in creative industries by 0.014%.

Employment in science and research

The model confirmed a negative correlation between employment in science and research and employment in creative industries. The fall in employment in science and research by 1% is followed by a 0.0000693% increase in employment in creative industries or vice versa. It can therefore be concluded that science and research takes potential employees out from creative industries. This is due to very similar characteristics of employees in both sectors (university educated, innovative, and open, intellectuals). Thus, these two sectors are competitors in terms of labour force.

Average wage

Along with an increase in the share of average wages in the average monthly income of 1%, an increase in employment in

creative industries by 0.0000041% can be expected. As to the other factors included in the first model (GDP per capita and the proportion of university graduates), ANOVA did not show any statistical significance.

Conclusions and discussion

Creative industries are now in the centre of attention of academicians and researchers due to their possible impact on economic growth. In this paper, we have investigated the influence of selected factors on the employment in the creative industries. When selecting the variables we used the theoretical materials advanced by Florida and Kloudova and set five basic hypotheses. The model confirmed the significance of the effect of the three factors - expenditures on research and development, employment in science and research and average wages. Although the factors such as expenditures on R&D and the value of average wages as a proportion of the average monthly earnings have shown positive statistical significance and therefore confirmed our hypotheses, the factor of employment in science and research and employment in creative industries have demonstrated a negative correlation, which is inconsistent with our hypothesis.

The obtained results may be justified by the difference between the concepts of creative industries. In our model, we used the definition given by the EU. However, Florida classifies scientists and researchers to be the employees of creative industries. Thus, if we apply his view, then the employment of scientists and researchers is the employment in creative industries. In this case, the relationship between the employment in science and research and the employment in creative industries is irrelevant. Hypothesis H4 was therefore not confirmed. From the first proposed model, we also excluded two factors, i.e. GDP per capita and the share of university educated employees in total employment. We decided to use the factor of GDP per capita based on the research conducted by Kloudova and Zhang (2011) [16], who used this factor when examining creative industries in different regions of China. Since the effect of this variable was not confirmed for China as a developing country, we tested the effect of the size of GDP per capita on employment in developed countries of the EU. Even in this case, the factor did not show any statistical significance.

The role of creative industries in various EU countries is significantly different. The limits of the model are mainly due to insufficient data. Information about creative industries has not yet been collected in all the member states at the same level; many measurements are missing. It is only possible to evaluate the development since 2008, since the time when the data categorisation NACE Rev. 2 has been available. Thus, the factors which may possibly impact the employment in creative industries were chosen according to the availability of data.

In practice, the results of the model could be applied in developing countries to support creative industries in the EU member states. The most significant finding considers the impact of expenditures on science and research on employment in creative industries. If we are currently talking about the knowledge economy and in the future we will talk about the creative economy, then one of the objectives of the EU should be a systematic support for the development of creative industries. One possible way of promoting such development is to increase the share of expenditures on research and development. Finally, the support for inclusive growth is one of the main pillars of the Europe 2020 strategy.

A great number of other factors impacts creative industries - from an adequate institutional environment, the support from the part of the government and the private sector to the appropriate legal environment, effective legal protection and effective solutions to the problem of piracy. However, there is no relevant statistical database. In addition, the data available are often too aggregated. Further, we find it necessary to create a consistent methodology for data collection in creative industries both for the EU and its individual member states.

References

1. Baculakova, K. (2013). *Creative cities and creative clusters.* Proceeding of PhD students and young researchers. Karvina: Silesian University Opava (in Slovak).
2. Baculakova, K., & Gress, M. (2015). Cluster analysis of creative industries in the EU. *Economic Annals-XXI, 9-10,* 15-18. Retrieved from http://soskin.info/en/ea/2015/9-10/contents_3.html
3. Bednar, P., Danko, L., & Grebenicek, P. (2013). Towards Creative Clusters: Mapping and Development of Creative Industries in Slovakia. *In: Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Geography and Geology,* 260-265.
4. DCMS (2007). *Creative Industries Economic Estimates Statistical Bulletin.* Retrieved from https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/78107/CreativeIndustriesEconomicEstimates2007.pdf
5. Department of Communications and the Arts of Australia (1994). *Creative nation: Commonwealth cultural policy.* Retrieved from http://apo.org.au/node/29704
6. European Commission (2010). *Cases by NACE code - J.* Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/competition/mergers/cases/index/by_nace_j_.html
7. EY (2014, December). *Creating Growth: Measuring cultural and creative markets in the EU.* Retrieved from http://www.ey.com/Publication/vwLUAssets/Measuring_cultural_and_creative_markets_in_the_EU/$FILE/Creating-Growth.pdf
8. Fisher, V. (2006). *Die «Creative Economy» - Kreative Berufe als Chance für die Wirtschaft.* GRIN Verlag (in German).
9. Florida, R. (2003). Cities and the Creative Class. *City & Community, 2*(1), 3-19. doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-6040.00034
10. Florida, R. (2002). *The Rise of the Creative Class. And How It's Transforming Work, Leisure, Community and Everyday Life.* (1st ed.). New York: Basic Books
11. Government of the Slovak republic (2011). *Background of the Concept of Support of Cultural and Creative Industry in the Slovak Republic.* Retrieved from http://www.rokovania.sk/Rokovanie.aspx/BodRokovaniaDetail?idMaterial=20575 (in Slovak)
12. Hartley, J. (2004). *Creative Industries.* Wiley: Wiley-Blackwell.
13. HKSAR, Central Policy Unit (2003). *Baseline Study on Hong Kong's Creative Industries.* Retrieved from http://www.cpu.gov.hk/doc/en/research_reports/baseline%20study(eng).pdf
14. Howkins, J. (2001). *The Creative Economy: How People Make Money From Ideas.* London: Penguin Books.
15. KEA (2006, October). *The Economy of Culture in Europe.* Retrieved from http://www.keanet.eu/ecoculture/studynew.pdf
16. Kloudova, J., & Zhang, J. (2011). Factors which influence creative economy in China *Creative and Knowledge Society: International Scientific Journal 1,* 5-19.
17. Kloudova, J. (2008). Factors of development of creative economy. *Proceedings of International Scientific Conference «Actual Problems in Economics and Enterpreneurship in the Context of EU».* Bratislava (in Slovak).
18. Kloudova, J. (2009). Creative economy and its measuring. *Ekonomický časopis (Economic Annals), 57*(3), 247-262 (in Slovak).
19. Kloudova, J., et al. (2010). *Creative economy: selected economic, legal, mass-media and information aspects.* EUROKODEX: Bratislava (in Czech).
20. Mayerhofer, P., Peltz, P., & Resch, A. (2008). *«Creative Industries» in Wien. Dynamik, Arbeitsplätze, Akteure.* Wien: Lit.
21. Solow, R. (1956). A Contribution to the Theory of Economic Growth, *The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 70*(1), 65-94. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/1884513
22. Stumpo, G., & Manchin, R. (2015). *The resilience of employment in the Culture and Creative Sectors (CCSs) during the crisis.* Retrieved from http://www.interarts.net/descargas/interarts2575.pdf
23. Thorsby, D. (2001). *Economics and Culture.* Cambridge: University press.