

**ECONOMICS***Sociology*

**Nerijus Stasiulis,**  
*Vilnius Gediminas Technical  
University,  
Vilnius, Lithuania,  
E-mail: nerijus.stasiulis@vgtu.lt*

*Received:* December, 2016  
*1st Revision:* April, 2017  
*Accepted:* June, 2017

**DOI: 10.14254/2071-  
789X.2017/10-2/16**

***JEL Classification:*** Z13

***Keywords:*** Central and Eastern Europe, creative city, creative economy, creative environment, creative industries, creative society.

**Introduction**

The creative society is not a finished product but an emerging process. Researches aim to grasp the outline and specifics of this process by differentiating it from the previous romantic notion of creativity and the previous industrial notion of society. The highly individualistic notion of creativity is noted to become replaced with a communal understanding thereof so that now research should rather focus on the environmental factors and the communicative aspect of creativity. Hence, novel and timely conceptualization of the changing relationship between individuals and community, between individual creation and societal processes under the new wave of creativity and global technology is attempted. What shape does individual creation take in a mediated society? How do networks of creativity develop and work and what is the way they enhance creativity and economic development? Novel legal, ecological and economic issues also arise in this context and are treated by research.

The authors presented in this article base their analysis also on the conceptual network provided by globally renowned researchers. Among others, the notions of macro-, mezzo- and microenvironment, creative industries, creative identities, creative cities, economic properties

**THE IDEA OF THE CREATIVE  
SOCIETY AND THE DEVELOPMENT  
OF CREATIVE INDUSTRIES**

**ABSTRACT.** The article surveys the recent research on the idea of the creative society and the development of creative industries. Special attention is paid to the conceptual and factual developments that take place in regions of Central and Eastern Europe. Researchers evaluate the regions' situation in the context of global developments, suggest novel approaches to society and research practice and provide their recommendations. The relation between individual and communal aspects of creation emerges as a major problem. The tendency is to move from individualistic and elitist strategies of creation toward market-based practices and communal approaches based on the concepts of creative environment and networks of creation. Authors recommend that heads of institutions and researchers give up the overly romantic attitude toward creative activity, transcend the limits of individual perspective and move towards a cooperation among different fields of creativity.

and especially that of creative class are discussed (Mikalauskas, Kaspariene, 2016; Witkowska, 2016; Jureniene, Stonyte, 2016).

The latter notion is especially at issue because, despite it playing the guiding role in the development of the creative society, it is notoriously hard to define. How are the members of the creative class to be identified? Who is ex- or included from/in it? It is noticeable that people considered members of the class do not always consciously subscribe to it. At any rate, the nucleus of creators is of utmost importance for developing creative economies and societies both globally and locally. But the modes of development vary regionally.

Authors analyse the ways creative societies and economies take shape in regions of Central and Eastern Europe, research the obstacles to their formation and provide recommendations (Janda *et al.*, 2013; Becerra-Alonso *et al.*, 2016; Kondratiuk-Nierodzińska, 2016).

Polish and Lithuanian examples prevail in the research provided. Researchers find that among the main obstacles to the development on creative societies/economies is the lack of habits of communication. They note that regional authorities, cultural institutions, higher education, business environment and NGO's are not sufficiently involved and do not currently cooperate. Creating networks of communication among institutions and professionals as well as among citizens is considered crucial for boosting livelihood in neighbourhoods, cities, regions and states. Giving up isolation based on unique individual perspectives and moving towards communicability and communication of ideas, talents and abilities is key to both economic and existential success.

## **1. Data and Methodology**

### ***1.1. Data***

This article is to survey current research on the idea and development of the creative society with a special focus on the region of Central and Eastern Europe. The articles and journals invoked for this purpose are referenced at the end of this article.

For the purposes of analysis of the conceptual basis for the research as well as for the development of the creative society, we use the articles of leading scholars in Lithuanian research on creativity, the creative society and/or of co-founders of educational programs focused on creativity studies. This includes articles from 2012, 2014 and 2015.

For the purposes of analysis of the basic characteristics of the creative society, we survey the approaches taken up by authors in their articles from year 2011 and 2014. Generally, they take over more general approaches proposed by world-renowned theoreticians of the creative society and critique them with the intent of applying them to the study of the development of creativity in their specific regions.

For the purposes of analysis of the main obstacles to the development of creativity in the region of Central and Eastern Europe as well as coming up with a list of suggestions for promotion of that development, we survey articles on creativity authored by Polish and Lithuanian scholars in the years 2014-2016.

### ***1.2. Methodology***

We use comparison of methodological and conceptual approaches taken up by authors in different articles in order to single out the theoretical presuppositions of the creative society, to establish a conceptual framework on which both the development of the creative society and the research thereupon are based and, then, to bring to light the background for more specific scholarly research and practical development.

We used synthesis of different identifications and descriptions of the main features of the creative society provided in the articles in order to come up with a comprehensive list of those main characteristics.

On the basis of the acquired understanding how creative society functions we, then, move to more specific research focused on regions in Central and Eastern Europe (Poland, Lithuania, Czech Republic). We use comparison of particular characteristics at the regional level in order to indicate the obstacles for the formation of the creative society which are common to the whole region. We then sum up novel conceptual approaches and practical suggestions which arise as reactions to those obstacles.

## 2. The Main Tendencies and Problems

J. Černevičiūtė and R. Strazdas (2014) notice a tendency of moving toward a new conception of creativity which is defined as an everyday experience available to the many. This conception of creativity is to replace the narrower one which is based on the concept of *genius* as a singular and unique individual endowed with exceptional creative power (Strazdas, Černevičiūtė, 2016). This move consists in transforming the “mystic” force of genius, indicated in the abundance of elite individual’s creative products, into the governed system where creativity has to do with internal elements of the system and the social context. Hence, the authors indicate the importance of collective creativity as a positive micro-environmental factor for innovations.

As the authors investigate the impact of the environment on creativity, they distinguish between macro-environment, mezzo-environment and micro-environment. The term *macro-environment* indicates environment external to an organization: it can consist in a market, governmental policy, general scientific and technological development, a wider political and social system that can influence the work of that organization. Macro-environment is not as stable as cultural values and traditions and is more prone to change (Černevičiūtė, Strazdas, 2014, p. 117). But macro-environment also includes national culture defined in terms of traditions, values, symbols, heroes and rituals which shape the attitudes toward creativity within a nation and determine whether a particular culture will concentrate on separate creative individuals or on creativity as collective action taking place in groups.

*Mezzo-environment* (Černevičiūtė, Strazdas, 2014, pp. 117-118) denotes structure and climate/culture of an organization as well as cluster environment. In terms of structure, an organization may be centralized, decentralized or virtual, and a particular structure of a certain organization (alongside its physical space) shapes its values and beliefs which may in turn help or hinder its creativity and productivity. And the notion and existence of clusters indicate that success of an organization is not so much dependent on inside factors as on the location where its business takes place. Clusters form crucial connections across separate enterprises and the spread of technology, abilities, information, marketing and customers’ needs. Cluster is defined by interaction.

*Micro-environment* (Černevičiūtė, Strazdas, 2014, p. 119) has to do with teamwork as an exhibition of collective creativity. Teamwork is considered more suitable for collective creativity and innovations because it adapts better to the fast-changing and fragmented market, innovative products and flexible qualified labour market. Here ideas are born in the process of exchanging knowledge and in the relation among individuals and their works. Not only does each individual form the input of subsequent individuals but he also endows with new meaning the previous input. It is extremely important to note that solidarity among team members can, paradoxically, be enhanced by creating variety in the composition of the team, switching members between teams and including new members (Petrovic, 2015). Destroying usual accord among older team members may increase creative capacities.

T. Kačerauskas (2014a) emphasises that sociology of creation is a sociological approach which uses sociological tools in order to analyse creation in a society and social aspects of creation but tools themselves would be meaningless without a theoretical point of view. He presents his own understanding of the concepts of the creative society and deals with its problems.

The scholar (Kačerauskas, 2014b) notices that creation can be either individual or communal. What is more, creativity implies a creative interaction between society and individual or, in more general terms, a process of communication between or among creative subjects (be they individual or communal). The very concept of a community or society suggests a creative act whereby this society/community was established. In our time, the daily increase of knowledge is also an act of communal creativity. Thus society of knowledge is being replaced by society of creation. Creation and knowledge are intertwined but now creativity comes to the fore leaving knowledge in the background. The latter is still crucial as a basis for the exchange of ideas and creative communication but knowledge is acquired creatively and it is precisely the knowledge that has been appropriated creatively which is the most valuable. The mediated character of the creative society opens up unlimited possibilities for the creator but also threatens individuality which is indispensable for true creation.

Ž. Pečiulis (2015) takes up and develops Kačerauskas' (2014) theme of the opposition between the unitariness of creation and its production by edition, between its individual character and its mass circulation. He notices that this problem existed at least since Gutenberg; on the other hand, recently, in the epoch of the cinematographer, the very conception of creation has changed because now the copy cannot be distinguished from the original. The author disagrees with a skeptical view towards audiovisual media because it could only be substantiated using elitist criteria. But in the analysis of the industrial aspect of culture audiovisual media can serve as typical examples of mediated culture. Even though the standard format of a certain show is the same in different regions and countries, it is interpreted very differently in Chinese, British, Italian etc. production. These differences reflect different cultures, religions, and customs of these domains.

Kačerauskas (2012) also deals with some communicative, social and legal issues that arise in the creative economy based on technologies. Key aspects of the creative economy are the need for enterprise, obsession by consuming, fusion of labour and leisure, integrity of the activities and striving for individual autonomy and privacy. The copyright and patent right, thus, acquire a contradictory aspect in the creative economy because the creator's right to just reward restricts communication whereas patent right means private aspirations to privatize social property and nature.

Another important issue, raised by Kačerauskas (2015a), is that of creative ecology in the context of sustainable development. The author suggest treating the concept of creative ecology broadly – not only as a branch in an ecology of novelty but also as meta-discourse for all other discourses in the creative society because they all require creative niches for further (hopefully more rather than less sustainable development). Ecology became a problem after human creation invaded human and natural environment in a threatening manner and endangered the very basis for sustainable development.

The author analyses the relation between economy and technology. Firstly, economic relations can be treated as social technologies. Secondly, technology is the basis of creative industries to ensure economic growth. Thirdly, consumption which drives economy and requires ever new products requires technology. We can also speak about a “technocracy” which fuses technology and politics. Also, it is not technologies that, to use McLuhan's phrase, are extensions of man, but rather man who is an extension of technology. Ever newer technologies are key to the creative society and to the economy of creative consumption. Technologies are considered to be a catalyst of the creative economy. But the invasion of

technologies is also accompanied by certain technical illiteracy or simplification required by consumer need. Means of wireless technology of communication are perfect to tie people down to a system. But technologies can also serve the art of life which is the leading “technique” (Kačerauskas, 2015a, p. 866).

According to Kačerauskas (2015), the creative society is postmodern, i. e. eclectic, diverse and dynamic as well as critical and ironic towards its predecessors. Different cultural layers do not negate but supplement each other. It is also post-industrial. Not only factories but also offices are emptied while work and leisure are becoming confluent. Thus, an account of work becomes impossible and industry assumes unusual forms. The environment becomes mediated in a novel way which allows the minimal duration and the maximal content of any message. It produces a total market environment where economic and ethical values can be exchanged. The creative society is post-mediated in the sense that it is characterized by a diversity of both old and new media, by the commodification of economic and ethical values and by an existential resistance to these phenomena. But it is also post-capitalistic because here, beside economic and social capital, a new kind of capital – that of creative capital – is born which is aligned with a changing environment and dynamic phenomena. But creative capital is not to be distinguished from social capital because the latter entails the former.

### 3. The Main Characteristics

R. Levickaitė and R. Reimeris (2011) present a complex over-all picture of the creative economy as a *pentagon* comprised of five major angles – 1) creative industries (based on J. Howkins’ conception), 2) creative class (R. Florida), 3) economic properties (R. Caves), 4) creative identities (J. Hartley) and 5) creative cities (C. Landry). According to conception 1, the originality of creative industries consists in the novel manner of the relation between economics and creativity and their novel connection for the sake of creating welfare. Creative industries are divided into 15 sectors: advertising, architecture, art, crafts, design, designer fashion, film/video, music, performing arts, publishing, scientific research and technology, software, toys/games, TV/radio, computer games. J. Howkins evaluates each sector according to its contribution to national economy, its created value-added and its differences from traditional industries and business. Music and design are labelled unstable while architecture, art, scientific research and technologies are currently the growing industries. Some industries develop more rapidly than others because people are becoming ever more creative and technologies allow products to become more profitable.

Creative class (2) is composed of people working in science and engineering, architecture and design, education, music and entertainment. Their economic function is to generate new ideas, technologies and creative contents. The values of the creative class are individuality, meritocracy, diversity and openness. This class creates economic, social and cultural dynamism, especially in the city.

The creative class is the core of the creative society but it is notoriously hard to define. Kačerauskas (2014a) complains that the impossibility of distinguishing the creative class from other classes is the weakest link of R. Florida’s theory of the creative society because his proposed definition is too broad: it includes artists, musicians, painters, film makers, theatre people, writers, architects, designers as well as librarians, engineers, educators, entertainment organizers, managers, financiers, doctors and lawyers. Even though Florida distinguishes the active nucleus from creative professionals, the problem is far from solved because the relation between the two remains unclear as well as the relation among this class and other classes. How does one distinguish between the creative class and other classes if even those professionals that are supposed to be included in it do not consciously subscribe to the class?

Caves (3) – Levickaitė and Ramojus (2011, pp. 87, 88-89) continues – proposed to evaluate creative industries according to several economic properties: 1) reaction to a new product is difficult to foresee or to define, 2) artists will rather choose an activity which is less profitable but more fulfilling in terms of goal intrinsic to art itself, 3) the greater the variety of skills adapted to making a product, the better the result, 4) each product is a combination of various inputs, and their number is limitless, 5) skills do not vary greatly, but the differences in talent are immense, and talent is usually directly proportional to financial success, 6) some creative products are long-term and provide the possibility to profit from rent. Creative industries themselves are not considered unique but their sectors driven by creativity provide new ways of looking at business processes and at supply and demand of new products, and they also include both economic and social indices of the development of economies in different countries. Creative industries are flexible and able to cooperate with non-creative industries.

The idea (4) of creative identities is that they cannot be untangled from the complex of personal ideas, talent, experience and work complex. They are referred to as “do-it-yourself” citizenships and defined by vanishing borders between the creator, the vendor and the user of creative services. Whereas conception 5 (creative cities) asserts that the basic resource for the creative city is its people whose creativity (instead of location, natural resources and accessibility of the market) is what makes the city grow. Most cities are now living in their transitory periods caused by the vitality of renewed globalization. These transitions vary regionally. In regions like Asia, cities are developing whereas in Europe the old industry is waning and the value-added of cities does not depend on what is produced but on the intellectual capital applied to processes and services. Thus, the term *creative city* describes a city where various cultural activities are an indispensable part of both its economic and social functioning. Since 2004, UNESCO has been developing a network of creative cities the purpose of which is to facilitate the spread of cultural groups around the world: to exchange technical knowledge, experience, successful examples and to stimulate local economy and social development with the help of creative industries. The network began by focusing on elite arts (tradition) but then moved over to a more innovative and market-oriented approach, to the development of creative industries in city space (Zabielavičienė, 2015; Roszko-Wójtowicz, Białek, 2016).

#### **4. The Main Obstacles and Novel Approaches**

A. Klimczuk (2014) analyses barriers to the development of creative industries in a culturally diverse region. He bases his insights on a research on Podlaskie Voivodship, Poland, which is a region characterized by the highest level of cultural diversity and multiculturalism policy. His aim is to find out how to remove a number of barriers for creative industries that are, nonetheless, prevalent in the region. According to Klimczuk, one of the problems is that concepts of creative industries are generally lacking in the public discourse in the region in contrast to world trends (the author cites A. Klasik; Klimczuk, 2014, p. 147). The author indicates that creative industries are to be considered as such that treat cultural activity as a specific effort and outcome, emphasize creativity as the ability to permanently create new goods and services which have an economic value and have a variety of intellectual property forms. These industries are assumed to be shaped in cities making them attractive via entities and institutions that employ communications, media, art, music, advertising and architecture among others for that purpose and this is further reflected into an increase of employment, attracting investors and representatives of the creative class. In Podlaskie Voivodship, entities of the cultural sector are largely concentrated in its capital (Białystok) where nearly one fourth of the region’s population lives. In general, Podlaskie

Voivodship in terms of all types of cultural institution is below the national average of Poland (Klimczuk, 2014, p. 148; Kola-Bezka *et al.*, 2016). Even though entities representing creative industries exist in the region, their development receives little attention of either its public authorities or residents. No strategic approach to creative industries is offered by the authorities. The city is also in need of growth of entrepreneurship in the sphere of culture and a private impresario agency to create in the city a prestigious event recognized both nationally and internationally.

In general, Klimczuk concludes his research with several recommendations (Klimczuk, 2014, p. 151). He suggests taking up diagnostic and programming work for the construction of a regional model of a creative industry that would take into account local economic specialisation and relationship with the innovation system. According to him, a cross-sectoral cooperation is recommended as well as common diagnosis of local cultural resources in the context of supporting entrepreneurship. Regionals authorities, cultural institutions, higher education, business environment and NGO's should all be involved. Other suggestions include cross-sectoral meetings of experts for the promotion of culture, a system for monitoring the effect of promotional activities, joint projects rooted in local history, combining activities of local institutions as well as building a medialab centred on cooperation among scientists, artists, IT specialists and others. A policy of creative ageing in the region is also recommended. Cooperation among cultural, sport and commercial entities as well as local media is of utmost importance.

J. Lavrinec (2014) works on generating neighbourhoods and she combines practical results with theoretical research by employing the method of participatory research. The specific version of the method that this researcher is engaged in is community art projects. It is an arts-based approach which involves bodily and emotional experience on the part of neighbourhood dwellers and sensitivity toward everyday micro-processes as well as flexibility of metaphors on the part of the researcher. The aim is to develop space for the sake of action. The author notices that the very presence of a researcher in the neighbourhood serves a mobilizing force for it and leads towards experiencing togetherness and building networks of trust and mutual help. She brings an example of a community art initiative called "Street Mosaic Workshop" that took place in a wooden neighbourhood in Vilnius (Lithuania) named Šnipiškės. This initiative was developed by residents of the neighbourhood and researchers as well as art activists. For instance, an urban piece of furniture (a chest of drawers) was installed close to one of the most crowded streets in Vilnius whereby passers-by were given possibility to leave or find all kind of small items in the drawers. The action of taking and leaving things served as a form of indirect communication which later developed into direct interaction and into making new contacts among residents.

Hence, this research approach is oriented toward creating networks and sustainable communication situations. Also, by creating new points of interaction in a neighbourhood, arts-based projects help destigmatize it and deconstruct negative stereotypes surrounding it. Positive media buzz as well as attracting new visitors to the place is also beneficial for that purpose.

J. Černevičiūtė and V. Žilinskaitė-Vytienė (2009) also emphasize that creative industries view communication as creation and exchange of meanings. This view challenges the romantic approach to art which prevails in Lithuania and which does not promote interaction between art and market. The authors criticize the prevailing culture politics in Lithuania where art is first of all linked to artist's recognition among professionals as opposed to the possibility for art to become a social resource and an object of creative consumption for the wider public. The heads of art academies and of departments of art in institutions of higher education treat artistic calling as an unexplainable ability to view the world from a unique perspective and to express one's artistic powers. And young artists' (graduates of

Vilnius Academy of Art 2000-2004) creation is guided by their understanding of the value of art. This understanding is shaped by their environment (the tastes of their parents, school, contemporaries etc., other important artists). Also, the opinion of colleagues, and then the opinion of art critics were found important during survey. But the taste of the potential customer was only rarely mentioned by the young artists. Černevičiūtė and Žilinskaitė-Vytienė suggest that an artist should also seek to approach the public and address it in a more understandable manner of speaking. Otherwise, distance between an artist and his or her public will remain unbridged: ideally, the artist will not even care about the public as long as he has all the necessary (material) means for expressing his creativity. The authors notice that the longer students stay in academic institutions of art, the more they become entrenched in the romantic individualistic paradigm of art. The artist in Lithuania is generally alien to the market of the products of creative industries which is based on the laws of supply and demand. But the development of creative industries and global processes challenge the dominant view in Lithuania and gradually a more liberal and communicative approach is gaining ground. The authors recommend that one take place in communication processes rather than passively receive standards of artistic taste.

T. Mitkus and V. Nedzinskaitė-Mitkė (2016) analyse film industries of Central and Eastern Europe in terms of the impact of globalization on creative industries. They argue that the major obstacle to availing of the potential of creative industries to considerably contribute to national prosperity in terms of both culture and economy is the attitude which considers film art and film business incompatible. This attitude is prevalent in Central and Eastern Europe, therefore, film industry in this region is largely non-competitive and not commercially oriented. Historically, film industry here has been largely dependent on the public-subsidy. The local market is very small but even the simplest solutions (such as co-production) to increase movie theatre ticket sales are not used, thus, with the exception of Czech Republic and Poland, countries in this region still don't produce cinematic output attractive to their own nationals. Local film industries have to undertake necessary reforms if they want to compete successfully in the global film industry that has been created by globalization and digitalization processes. Otherwise, they risk failing to attract investment and losing their talent (employees). A number of fiscal and legal reforms are crucial but they can only be achieved if the individualistic approach is replaced by collective effort. Film art and film business must be viewed as complimentary forces that help national culture and economy grow. The authors suggest equating artistic value and commercial success.

E. Staniulytė (2016) seeks to discover the causes of the commercial cinema popularity in the context of creative industries. She employs both sociological and philosophical approaches for the purpose of determining the relation between the cinema industry and the culture of consumerism and of discovering the principles behind the rapid growth of the cinema industry. She suggests that commercial cinema achieves its popularity due to its capability to create needs, desires and longings and can even enforce meanings for the "subjects" to consume. She draws on the distinction between the society of makers and the society of consumers made by Z. Bauman. In the latter one as opposed to the former, needs are central and not things, skills are required for consuming and not for making a thing, rhythms are short-term and not long-term, memory is replaced by oblivion, and the need is implied by the promise to fulfil the need rather than vice versa. The author also understands going to the movies as an extension of work because it is a way of returning money and upholding the capitalist system. A permanent need for new films is a result of the desires upheld in the consumer society. The main task of mainstream film industry is filling the subject with radical experiences that are lacking in his or her monotonous daily routine. It can serve as a means to renew the consumer's attitude toward that routine.

E. Jaškūnienė (2015) goes back in time and researches the strategy of „creative industries“ in Soviet Lithuania. The author indicates the fact that, under conditions of directive economy, creativity was also taken in account. She provides a case study of Lithuanian package design in 1960-1970's with the intention to discover connections between Western theories of mass consumption culture and the research on the Soviet mass culture. Jaškūnienė notices that the design profession started forming during the Khrushchev Thaw. At this time, the competition between the USA and the USSR moved onto a new plane: it started to have to do with the products of everyday consumption which shaped the living space of people. Graphic design could not make up for the lack of necessary goods but artistic get-up was able to create additional value which was only available to the elite. The packages of these exceptional products were used to spread ideology and to covertly advertise economic change in the Soviet Union.

## Conclusion

The successful development of the creative society is linked to surrendering the romantic notion of creativity based on the individual and elitist perspective and moving towards creating and sustaining networks of communication among formal institutions, heads of the institutions, scientists and artists, businessmen and citizens in general. In the process the contradiction between unitariness and edition-character of creation is merged. Technology and politics, leisure and work also tend to be fused but researchers find that in the regions of Central and Eastern Europe people are slow to give up the romantic notion and isolationist habits. This state of affairs inhibits a successful development because communication-based creativity adapts much better in the context of fast-changing and fragmented market and constant innovation. The researchers generally recommend switching to market-based approaches, collaboration among different sectors of creativity and towards modes of creativity both attractive to the public and useful to the development of creativity-based economies.

## References

- Becerra-Alonso, D., Androniceanu, A., Georgescu, I. (2016). Sensitivity and vulnerability of European countries in time of crisis based on a new approach to data clustering and curvilinear analysis. *Administrativesi Management Public*, 27, 46-61.
- Černevičiūtė, J., Žilinskaitė V. (2009). Kūrybinių industrijų raida ir meno komunikacijos samprata Lietuvoje (The Development of Creative Industries and the Conception of Art Communication in Lithuania). *Filosofija. Sociologija*, 20(3), 203-212.
- Černevičiūtė, J., Strazdas, R. (2014). Kūrybingumo sampratų raida: nuo genijaus į kūrybines sistemas (Creativity Understandings, Evolution: from Genius to Creative Systems). *Santalka: Filosofija, Komunikacija*, 22(2), 145-152.
- Janda, K., Rausser, G., & Strielkowski, W. (2013). Determinants of Profitability of Polish Rural Micro-Enterprises at the Time of EU Accession. *Eastern European Countryside*, 19, 177-217. doi: <https://doi.org/10.2478/eec-2013-0009>
- Jaškūnienė, E. (2015). „Kūrybinių industrijų“ strategija sovietmečio Lietuvoje: masinio vartojimo produktų pakuotės (“Creative Industries” Strategies in Soviet Lithuania: Packages of Mass Consumption Goods). *Santalka: Filosofija, komunikacija*, 23(1), 13-21.
- Jureniene, V., Stonyte, A. A. (2016). Recreational Activities in Cultural Centres. *Transformations in Business & Economics*, 15(1/37), 244-253.
- Kačerauskas, T. (2012). Creative Economy and Technologies: Social, Legal and Communicative issues. *Journal of Business Economics and Management*, 13(1), 71-80.

- Kačerauskas, T. (2014). *Kūrybos visuomenė* (Creative Society). Vilnius: Technika.
- Kačerauskas, T. (2014a). Kūrybos visuomenė: tyrimo metodai ir problemos (Creative Society: Research Methods and Problems). *Logos*, 80, 6-15.
- Kačerauskas, T. (2014b). Kūrybos visuomenės terminai ir sampratos (The Terms and Concepts of Creative Society). *Logos*, 78, 6-18.
- Kačerauskas, T. (2015). Creative Society: Concepts and Problems. *Cultura – International Journal of Philosophy of Culture and Axiology*, 12(2), 27-44.
- Kačerauskas, T. (2015a). Technologies in Creative Economy and Creative Society. *Technological and Economic Development of Economy*, 21(6), 855-868.
- Klimczuk, A. (2014). Barriers to the Development of Creative industries in Culturally Diverse Region. *Santalka: Filosofija, Komunikacija*, 22(2), 145-152.
- Kola-Bezka, M., Czupich, M., & Ignasiak-Szulc, A. (2016). Smart Cities in Central and Eastern Europe: Viable future or Unfulfilled Dream. *Journal of International Studies*, 9(1), 76-87.
- Kondratiuk-Nierodzińska, M. (2016). New Knowledge Generation Capabilities and Economic Performance of Polish Regions. *Equilibrium. Quarterly Journal of Economics and Economic Policy*, 11(3), 451-471.
- Lavrinec, J. (2014). Community Art Initiatives as a Form of Participatory Research: the Case of Street Mosaic Workshop. *Creativity studies*, 7(1), 55-68.
- Levickaitė, R., Reimeris, R. (2011). Kūrybos ekonomikos penkiakampis (A Pentagon of Creative Economy). *Santalka: Filosofija, komunikacija*, 19(1), 83-91.
- Mikalauskas, R., Kaspariene, J (2016). Holistic Approach about Leisure Industry. *Transformations in Business & Economics*, 15(2B/38B), pp.723-740.
- Mitkus, T., Nedzinskaitė-Mitkė, V. (2016). The Impact of Globalization to Creative Industries: the Analysis of Film Industries of Central and Eastern Europe. *Creativity studies*, 9(1), 64-74.
- Pečiulis, Ž. (2015). Vienetiškumas ir tiražas – kūrybos visuomenės paradoksas (Paradoxes of the Creative Society), *Filosofija. Sociologija*, 26(1), 81-85.
- Roszko-Wójtowicz, E., Białek, J. A multivariate approach in measuring innovation performance (Multivariantni pristup u mjerenju inovacija) (2016). *Zbornik Radova Ekonomskog Fakultet au Rijeci*, 34(2), 443-479.
- Staniulytė, E. (2016). The Causes of the Commercial Cinema Popularity in the Context of Creative Industries. *Creativity studies*, 9(1), 75-86.
- Strazdas, R., Cerneviciute J. (2016). Continuous Improvement Model for Creative Industries Enterprises Development. *Transformations in Business & Economics*, 15(2/38), 46-60.
- Witkowska, D.(2016). Evaluation of the Individual Hedonic Art Price Indexes for the Polish Painters Representing the Auction Market in Poland. *Transformations in Business & Economics*, 15(2/38), 61-77.
- Zabielavičienė, I. (2015). Creativity components in the innovative activity. *Business: Theory and Practice/Verlas: Teorija ir Praktika*, 16(3), 334-344.