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Abstract: The aim of the present chapter is to investigate the evolution of the creative economy, considering the rise of research on cultural and creative industries (CCIs). The study focuses on the main research themes (the creative city, the creative class, CCIs) that have emerged as the main pillars of creative economy research (CER) in local economic development studies.

Following a bibliometric approach, we analyse all publications collected from the ISI Web of Science database, starting from the seminal contribution of the Department of Culture, Media and Sport in 1998 and ending in 2016. Through the analysis of nearly 1600 publications produced over 19 years, we study the evolution of CER. Following this, we apply a co-citation analysis developed using social network analysis, thereby exploring the founders and disseminators of CCIs.
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1. Introduction

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

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

CCIs are increasingly recognised as a priority sector in emerging from actual financial and economic crises. Moreover, notwithstanding the fact that CCIs were originally mainly developed in Europe (Department of Culture, Media and Sport [DCMS], 1994), there has been increasing research interest in this field on the part of several scholars in Asia and developing countries all over the world (Yusuf and Nabeshima, 2005; Barrowclough and Kozul-Wright, 2008).

Recently, some sectors have grown intensively, and they are now at the centre of attention due to their potentiality for economic development and their use of digital technologies; these include the music, designer fashion and video game industries (Hracs et al., 2013; Banks and Cunningham, 2016). New trends also include increased interest in creative industries in education (Comunian and Faggian, 2014) and urban regeneration (Plaza and Haarich, 2015), as well as in the concept of creative tourism (Richards, 2014). There is also a significant amount of research on entrepreneurship in creative industries and so-called creative entrepreneurship (Henry, 2007; Shalley et al.,
Notwithstanding the relevance of these themes and the huge number of related publications, research around these topics is still fragmented and has not yet been sufficiently organised. Few contributions have attempted to analyse this stream of research by ordering and structuring the current literature (Flew and Cunningham, 2010; O’Connor, 2010). Most recent works have analysed research on the creative field in only a descriptive way, representing a first attempt to organise the huge range of literature on these themes (Chen and Chen, 2014).

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

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

- What are the main themes of creative economy research (CER)? Is research on CCIs the most relevant research topic?
- What are the most important works on CCIs that allowed this topic to be established, disseminated and affirmed in academic research? What shared knowledge and authors are the base of this research topic?
For this purpose, we collected and analysed the publications on CER over a period of 19 years (1998–2016). This longitudinal study is based on 1622 publications collected from the ISI Web of Science (WOS) database of publications, including academic works produced in the period from 1998 (the first year of publication of the Creative Industries Mapping Document – DCMS) to 2016.

2. Objectives and methodology: the bibliometric approach and social network analysis

To analyse the evolution of CER over time, we followed a bibliometric approach based on SNA (Scott and Carrington, 2011), which has recently emerged thanks to the availability of important databases such as WOS and Scopus. This approach, which has now become popular, has not yet been applied to creative research as a whole except in a few studies (Lazzeretti et al., 2017).

Concerning CER, the number of studies remains small. The only more general study is the work of Chuluunbaatar et al. (2013), which analyses the academic research on CCIs from the 1970s to 2013 and examines the most cited articles, authors and journals; however, this review does not include a co-citation analysis. In addition, Chen and Chen (2014) analyse contributions on creative industries studies in 2003–2012. They point out top cited articles, authors and journals, but they do not develop a co-citation analysis, and their results are mainly descriptive. In this work, we aim to contribute to filling the existing knowledge gap, providing a wider framework of the evolution of CER, focusing on the relevance of the research stream on CCIs and analysing the most important contributions that disseminate and establish research on CCIs.

2.1. Data collection

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

We began by selecting all publications on subjects related to the Social Sciences. After performing a keyword analysis, we collected approximately 2,750 contributions dated from 1998 to 2016. We then proceeded to skim the database by reading the abstracts of the articles (or the articles if necessary) to focus on the relationship between CER and local development, excluding contributions that do not involve a territorial dimension.

After this procedure, we obtained our final database containing 1,622 publications from 1998 to 2016. In this first search, the same article could be found through more than one search object.

2.2. **Methodological approach**

Our methodological approach follows the work developed by Lazzeretti et al. (2014; 2017), analysing the most cited authors (disseminators) and their backward citations (founders). After analysing the evolution of CER (4.1) and the journals that most publishing articles on CER (4.1), we consider the main CER research themes (4.3), pointing out the increasing relevance of the research on CCIs. Narrowing our focus to research on CCIS, we proceed with the analysis of the most important works on CCIs – defined as ‘disseminators’ (5.1) – and their backward citations (5.2). We collect from the WOS database disseminators’ backward citations to explore the theoretical basis on

---

1 The ISI database does not consider books not included in the ISI Book Citation Index or research reports (UNESCO and so on).

2 The aim was to find the papers omitted in WOS for mistake (not to use both sources) and we also verified that the most cited works (later on called disseminator) were the same using both databases.


4 We excluded contributions that do not involve the territory in the study, such as works on individual creativity, mainly from the fields of psychology, sociology and organisation studies. In addition, we left out works in managerial studies, cultural studies and cultural economics, which do not focus on the territory or the main economic/territorial units of analysis adopted by researchers in CER and local development (industry, cluster, districts, city, region and network).

5 For example, two articles that studied both the creative class and creative cities can be found in the two groups.
which CCI theory has been constructed (Garfield et al., 2016). We define these works as founders of CCI research, as in previous studies (Lazzeretti et al., 2014).

3. The rise of cultural and creative industries in CER

3.1. The evolution of CER

In Figure 1 is presented the evolution of CER publications and citations from 1998 to 2016. As can be seen from the figure, we start with extremely few contributions in the 1990s; in fact, CER is a phenomenon that has appeared in WOS journals since the early 2000s and has shown a huge growth from 2006/2007 onwards, with more than 60 contributions per year and more than 400 yearly citations. From 2015, it has reached a level of more than 200 contributions and around 3000 citations. As already highlighted in the literature, there is growing development in this research field, with consistent growth in the literature.

Figure 1: Evolution of CER: citations and contributions (1998-2016)

Source: our elaborations on WOS

3.2. Journals that publish articles on CER

Table 1 presents the journals that have published the articles collected from WOS. The most important is the International Journal of Cultural Policy, which records more than 80 articles, thereby confirming that the concept of CER is well inserted in the traditional

---

6 Per un approfondimento della ricerca sulla CER si veda Lazzeretti et al. (2017).
research on cultural studies and cultural economics. The second most relevant journal is *European Planning Studies*, which confirming the relevance of these themes in geography and planning, as well as for local development.

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

### Table 1: Most WOS publishing journals on CER.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Contributions</th>
<th>% Contributions</th>
<th>Total Citations</th>
<th>% Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CULTURAL POLICY</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUROPEAN PLANNING STUDIES</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN STUDIES</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>1822</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITIES</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING A</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>1079</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGIONAL STUDIES</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF URBAN AND REGIONAL RESEARCH</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1235</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDUSTRY AND INNOVATION</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOURNAL OF ARTS MANAGEMENT LAW AND SOCIETY</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIA INTERNATIONAL AUSTRALIA</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOURNAL OF ECONOMIC GEOGRAPHY</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1202</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOURNAL OF CULTURAL ECONOMICS</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CULTURAL STUDIES</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOFORUM</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOURNAL OF URBAN AFFAIRS</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECHNOLOGICAL FORECASTING AND SOCIAL CHANGE</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INNOVATION-MANAGEMENT POLICY &amp; PRACTICE</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOGRAFISKA ANNALER SERIES B-HUMAN GEOGRAPHY</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ARTS MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN GEOGRAPHY</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC GEOGRAPHY</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUROPEAN URBAN AND REGIONAL STUDIES</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

3.3. **The main topics/themes of CER: the rise of cultural and creative industries**

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

Other themes include the following: creative clusters, cultural clusters and districts and creative regions. Creative clusters, districts and networks represented only 6% of

---

contributions, while cultural clusters, districts and network did not reach 5%; creative regions represented the 9%. Finally, the topic of creative economy did not reach 6%.

These findings underscore that the creative class is not the subject with the highest interest over time, despite the initial emphasis given to the relevant contributions by Florida (e.g. 2002; 2005). In contrast, the themes of creative and cultural industries were evident the highest number of publications. The creative city was the second theme for number of publications, and it returned more results than the creative class; however, it did not constitute a homogeneous field, as it was mainly evoked in the contributions of a few specialist areas, such as urban planning and urban economics. Issues related to local development, such as cultural or creative districts and clusters or creative regions, remained marginal. Clusters and districts stood together with around 10% of contributions. Finally, we underline the evolutionary trends of the main research themes. Figure 2 illustrates the evolution of the publications over time. The themes related to cultural industries were most important due to the traditional contribution of cultural economics since 2008.

Research on the creative class grew during the initial phase but only experienced clear-cut development in the second half of the 2000s, and it has already shown a decrease in the last two years. Instead, creative industries have represented the main theme from 2007 onwards; beginning in 2009, there have been more than 50 contributions per year on this subject, increasing to more than 100 contributions from 2015.

The research theme on creative cities is an important developing theme that did not register a decline like that related to the creative class. Among the less relevant topics, only the creative region and creative clusters showed substantial development, but they only reached 20–30 contributions per year from 2010 to 2016.

Another rising theme is ‘creative entrepreneurship’, which registered around 60 articles in the database, with 53 out of 60 from 2010 onwards. Among the best-known

---

8 The contributions on the various topics of analysis involve some repetition, as a single contribution can have multiple objects of research.
contributions there are the works of Lee, Florida and Acs (2004), Scott (2004) and Mellander (2004).

**Figure 2:** The evolution of CER per topic (1998-2016)

---

4. **Founders and disseminators of cultural and creative industries**

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

4.1 **The disseminators of cultural and creative industries**

To identify some of the main characteristics of the academic community that deals with the CCIs, we selected the most cited articles through the keywords related to CCIs. These works can be considered the first proxy of shared knowledge of the scientific community. Through our analysis, we identified the main works (called *disseminators*)

---

9 Due to words limit, references resulted from the bibliometric analysis and cited in this section are not reporter in the bibliography, but can be found in the tables (2) and figures (4).
that contributed more than others to diffusing the research on CCIs across the different disciplines.

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

These 19 contributions received 1613 citations, around 25% of total citations on CER. Hence, they can be defined as the core of CCIs, considering that in the database including more than 1000 contributions on CCIs, fewer than 100 contributions received around 64% of total citations. In fact, more than 500 contributions received one citation or none at all.

Table 2 presents the top cited 19 disseminators of CCIs. According to the WOS database, the most relevant work, with around 140 citations, is that by Markusen and Schrock (2006) in Urban Studies, which considers the role of artists working in the creative industries and their contribution to the local economy.

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

\[10\] Taking into account only the most important contributions in terms of citations has its limitations. In fact older articles received more citations. We have tried to overcome this limit by analyzing per year rather than by absolute number of citations.
global video game networks, Leipzig’s media cluster and filmmaking in Bristol, respectively.

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

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

**Table 2:** The most cited 19 disseminators on CCIs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contributions</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Journals</th>
<th>Total citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Markusen, A; Schrock, G, 2006</td>
<td>The artistic dividend: Urban artistic specialisation and economic development implications</td>
<td>URBAN STUDIES</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pratt, AC., 2008</td>
<td>Creative cities: The cultural industries and the creative class</td>
<td>GEOGRAFISKA ANNALER SERIES B-HUMAN GEOGRAPHY</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pratt, AC, 2000</td>
<td>New media, the new economy and new spaces</td>
<td>GEOFORUM</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drake, G, 2003</td>
<td>‘This place gives me space’: place and creativity in the creative industries</td>
<td>GEOFORUM</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banks, M; Lovatt, A; O’Connor, J; Raffo, C, 2000</td>
<td>Risk and trust in the cultural industries</td>
<td>GEOFORUM</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potts, J; Cunningham, S; Hartley, J; Ormerod, P, 2008</td>
<td>Social network markets: a new definition of the creative industries</td>
<td>JOURNAL OF CULTURAL ECONOMICS</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathelt, H; Boggs, JS, 2003</td>
<td>Toward a reconceptualization of regional development paths: Is Leipzig's media cluster a continuation of or a rupture with the past?</td>
<td>ECONOMIC GEOGRAPHY</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeoh, BSA, 2005</td>
<td>The global cultural city? Spatial imagining and politics in the (multi) cultural marketplaces of Southeast Asia</td>
<td>URBAN STUDIES</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince, R, 2010</td>
<td>Policy transfer as policy assemblage: making policy for the creative industries in New Zealand</td>
<td>ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING A</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johns, J, 2006</td>
<td>Video games production networks: value capture, power relations and embeddedness</td>
<td>JOURNAL OF ECONOMIC GEOGRAPHY</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markusen, A; Wassail, GY H.; DeNatale, D; Cohen, R, 2008</td>
<td>Defining the creative economy: Industry and occupational approaches</td>
<td>ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT QUARTERLY</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson, C; Klocker, N, 2004</td>
<td>Academic publishing as ‘creative’ industry, and recent discourses of ‘creative economies’: some critical reflections</td>
<td>AREA</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pratt, AC., 2009</td>
<td>Urban Regeneration: From the Arts ‘Feel Good’ Factor to the Cultural Economy: A Case Study of Hoxton, London</td>
<td>URBAN STUDIES</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles, M, 2005</td>
<td>Interruptions: Testing the rhetoric of culturally led urban development</td>
<td>URBAN STUDIES</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bassett, K; Griffiths, R; Smith, I, 2002</td>
<td>Cultural industries, cultural clusters and the city: the example of natural history film-making in Bristol</td>
<td>GEOFORUM</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banks, J; Deuze, M, 2009</td>
<td>Co-creative labour</td>
<td>INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2. Analysis of the founders of cultural and creative industries

In this section, starting from the disseminators, we collect the backward citations of the 19 disseminators of CCIs from WOS. Moreover, we investigate the co-citation pattern of these backward citations through SNA (Scott and Carrington, 2011).11

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

In Figure 3, the overall network with 1104 nodes has been reduced to 69 nodes, comprising only those contributions that have at least two co-citations in common. The size of the nodes indicates the importance of the contribution defined by the total number of co-citations received (degree).

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

---

11 The matrix disseminators x founders (one-mode) has been then transformed into founders per founders (two mode), where a founder is linked to another founder if it is co-cited by a disseminator.
older works on cultural industries in the UK (Pratt, 1997) and NEFA (2000) or other countries (Power, 2002). Regarding the creative city, there are the well-known contributions of Landry and Bianchini (1995) and further works of O’Connor and Wynne (1996) and O’Connor (1998). Other research topics relate to the creative class and economic development themes such as, the well-known contributions of Peck (2005) and Florida (2005).

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

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

Finally, it is possible to identify the most important authors in the overall network by analysing those most cited by the disseminators. The author with the most contributions mentioned is Scott, who can be found in 31 studies quoted in 19 disseminators (2000;
Figure 3: Founders of CCIs research with at least 2 co-citations.

Source: our elaborations on WOS