



<https://doi.org/10.5559/di.34.3.01>

THE CONTRIBUTION OF CULTURAL AND CREATIVE INDUSTRIES TO THE COUNTY'S ECONOMY: A CASE OF TWO TOURISM REGIONS IN CROATIA

Tanja BROZ, Ivana RAŠIĆ
The Institute of Economics, Zagreb, Croatia

UDK: 338.483.12(497.57+497.581.2)"2017/2022":008
338.48-61(497.57+497.581.2)"2017/2022":008
330.552(497.57+497.581.2)"2017/2022":008

Original scientific paper

Received: July 26, 2024

The objective of the paper is to analyse the characteristics of cultural and creative industries (CCI) in two Croatian counties – the Istria and Šibenik-Knin Counties, as well as to assess their contribution to the county and national economy. Given that an important part of the CCI sector consists of public cultural activities directly financed from public funds, an analysis of public allocations for culture from the state and local budgets is also conducted. Besides analysing the characteristics and contribution of CCIs, we also investigate the impact of CCIs on the economic development of the two counties in question by employing fixed-effects regression for the period 2017–2022. The results indicate that CCIs are an important part of the economy of both counties, where the contribution of CCIs in Istria County is stronger than in Šibenik-Knin County. The main factor through which CCIs have a significant and positive impact on the economic development in both counties is the gross added value of CCIs per capita. The results also show that other factors such as tourist arrivals (for Istria County) and public expenditure for culture (for Šibenik-Knin County) play significant roles in their respective county models.

Keywords: cultural and creative industries, regions, COVID-19, contribution to GDP



Tanja Broz, The Institute of Economics, Zagreb,
Trg J. F. Kennedyja 7, 10000 Zagreb, Croatia.
E-mail: tbroz@eizg.hr

INTRODUCTION

In recent times, cultural and creative industries (CCIs) have been recognised as a catalyst of economic growth and a key sector in the emerging knowledge-driven economy (Kalfas et al., 2024; Potts et al., 2008). CCIs include a number of subsectors, such as New media, Museums and galleries, Libraries, Music, Performing arts, Visual arts, Design, Architecture, Film, Photography, and Publishing. They invent, produce and distribute goods and services that are based on intellectual capital and creativity (UNCTAD, 2010). At the European Union level, CCIs are recognised as a sector with great potential to promote smart, sustainable and inclusive growth in all EU regions and cities (Mickov, 2023; Komorowski & Lewis, 2023; Štreimikienė & Kačerauskas, 2020). CCIs contribute directly to jobs, economic growth and external trade. According to Ernst & Young (2021), CCIs account for 4.4% of GDP in the European Union in terms of turnover, with annual revenues of EUR 643 billion and a total added value of EUR 253 billion. Moreover, the sector stimulates innovation across the wider economy by intersecting with technology, tourism, and education. CCIs are also one of Europe's growing and significant job providers, employing more than 7.7 million people, which is 3.8% of the total employment (Eurostat, 2023). Beyond their direct economic contribution, CCIs also play an important role in fostering cultural diversity and social cohesion. They contribute to strengthening local identities, which is increasingly important in the context of globalisation (Kalfas et al., 2024). As the EU continues to support sustainable development, the cultural sector is seen as an important driver of both economic resilience and community wellbeing.

The goal of this paper is to analyse the characteristics of CCIs in two Croatian tourism regions, where these tourism-oriented geographical units correspond to the administrative boundaries of Istria County and Šibenik-Knin County, as well as assess its contribution to the economies of the mentioned counties and Croatian economy. Our focus is directed towards these counties due to the strong link between the CCIs and the tourism system in Croatia, highlighting them as interesting cases for research. In addition, Istria County has a strong multicultural identity, while its tangible and intangible heritage makes it a hub for cultural industries, especially in tourism, gastronomy, design, and crafts. On the other hand, Šibenik-Knin County has two UNESCO sites (Cathedral of St James and St Nicholas Fortress) and traditions in crafts, giving it material for creative expression. Also, the goal is to analyse public allocations for culture from the state and local budgets, given that an important part of the CCI sector in Croatia involves pub-

lic cultural activities where its regular activities are directly financed from public funds. Since our sample includes COVID-19 pre-pandemic data, as well as pandemic data for 2020 and the pandemic recovery period of 2021, we are able to shed some light on the impact of the pandemic on the contribution of CCIs to the national economy. Besides analysing the characteristics and contribution of CCIs, we also investigate the impact of CCIs on the economic development of the two observed counties by employing fixed-effects regression for the period 2017–2022.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Nowadays, it is well known that a discussion on CCIs starts with the seminal work on cultural industries of Adorno and Horkheimer (Horkheimer & Adorno, [1947], 2002). Even though the CCIs have had their ups and downs since that time, in terms of terminology, coverage, and their contribution to the overall economy, the impact of CCIs cannot be neglected. For that reason, it is not surprising that an increasing number of researchers address different topics on CCIs.

In addition to those scholars who are devoted solely to researching CCIs, many others from different fields, such as cultural economics (Sneha & Kavitha, 2024), economic geography, regional, local and urban development (Florida & Gabe, 2024; Crociata et al., 2025), have been interested in studying the cultural and creative economy. Among the various topics represented in literature on CCIs, the spatial and cluster patterns of CCIs and their role in local and regional development are present (Boal-San Miguel & Herrero-Prieto, 2020; De Propriis et al., 2009), as well as the relationship between CCIs and tourism (Arcos-Pumarola et al., 2023; Richards, 2014). For all those fields it is important to have insights into the characteristics and importance of CCIs for the national economy.

Innovation and creativity have long been acknowledged as a driving force of modern economies (Stojčić et al., 2018). Empirical evidence indicates that companies and regions that embrace innovation and creative capacities experience stronger income growth and enhanced economic stability (Rodrigues-Ferreira et al., 2023).

However, accurately quantifying the economic contribution of CCIs remains a challenge, primarily due to their substantial spillover effects, as well as their deep integration with local innovation systems and regional development (Seaman, 2020; Lazzaretti, 2012). Still, the impacts that CCIs could deliver to the economy have been addressed in the literature. In addition to frequently used traditional methods, such as input-output analysis and multipliers (Throsby, 2008), the impact of creative industries on the economy is often estimated using econometric models (Boix & Peiró, 2017). Boix Domenech et

al. (2022) assessed the link between CCIs and per capita income in 78 developed and developing countries in 5 continents, in 275 European regions and in 518 municipalities. They showed that CCIs have a positive impact on the wealth of countries, regions and municipalities and are a powerful resource for improving the wellbeing of richer and poorer places. Boix and Soler (2017) also identified the positive impact of creative service activities on regional labour productivity (measured by GDP per employee) for 250 NUTS2 regions in 24 EU Member States.

Despite the contribution of CCIs in national economies, CCIs are often not evenly spatially distributed. The results of empirical research primarily indicate that creative industries tend to cluster in large urban agglomerations (Windén & Carvalho, 2016). This is because larger urban agglomerations provide dense networks for knowledge exchange, rich cultural heritage, proximity to innovation institutions and strong agglomeration economies (Liu et al., 2025; Chica & Marmolejo Duarte, 2021). All of that enhances productivity, creativity, and competitive advantage.

A survey of the literature helped us choose counties for the research. Since Croatia heavily relies on tourism, we decided to compare two specific tourism regions. Moreover, we also wanted to choose counties with cities in which there is a large cultural heritage concentration and various business activities, but also counties with relatively easily accessible rural areas with less congestion and a more relaxed lifestyle. For that reason, we chose Istria County and Šibenik-Knin County for our research. Istria County represents a successful region with a rich cultural heritage, strong tourism system and a growing creative economy shaped by its multicultural identity. As such, it aligns with typologies of smaller cities with concentrated cultural heritage and strong tourism (Cooke & Lazzarretti, 2008; Escalona-Orcao et al., 2016). On the other hand, Šibenik-Knin County is a more emerging creative economy, where CCIs are increasingly intertwined with cultural tourism and regional development efforts but face more structural and developmental challenges compared to core urban centres. By selecting Istria County and Šibenik-Knin County, this research contributes to a more comprehensive understanding of CCI spatial dynamics outside the dominant large urban agglomerations (e.g. Zagreb, which is the capital of Croatia). Also, it allows for testing whether the positive economic contributions of CCIs identified in other empirical studies (e.g. Boix Domenech et al., 2022; Marco-Serrano et al., 2014) are adapted in regions characterised by cultural richness, tourism dependence and diverse development trajectories.

Even though one might argue that we could have chosen other counties for the research, the point is that we also wanted to choose counties that differ in some aspects other than cultural imprint. Hence, economic development was chosen as a category to show the differences in the counties of interest. More on both counties can be found in the next section.

STYLISTED FACTS ABOUT ISTRIA COUNTY AND ŠIBENIK-KNIN COUNTY

Both counties, Istria County and Šibenik-Knin County, are situated in the coastal region of Croatia and characterised by a rich cultural heritage and developed tourism. Hence, it can be assumed that these are the main reasons why CCIs have developed in these counties. Both counties are characterised by high specialisation in retail, tourism and transport sectors and by a higher quality of human resources as measured by the percentage of tertiary educated people (Table 1). Nonetheless, differences in development between them exist, justifying the research of the selected counties. While Istria County is one of the most developed counties in Croatia, Šibenik-Knin County is a less developed coastal county (measured by GDP per capita).

TABLE 1
Key socioeconomic
indicators for Istria
County and Šibenik-
Knin County (2021)

	Šibenik-Knin County		Istria County	
	Total Šibenik-Knin County	Comparison with Croatia	Total Istria County	Comparison with Croatia
Population	96,624	2.48%	195,794	5.04%
Territory (km ²)	2,969	5.25%	2,814	4.97%
GDP p.c. (euro)	12,190	82.3 (Croatia = 100)	16,317	110.2 (Croatia) =100)
Registered unemployment rate	14.5%	154.3 (Croatia = 100)	6.8%	72.3 (Croatia = 100)
Highly educated people (20-65)*	19.44%	133.4 (Croatia =100)	22.5%	154.4 (Croatia =100)
Tourist overnight stays (in mil.)	4.4	6.3%	21.7	30.9%
Wholesale and retail trade, transportation, storage, accommodation and food service activities, % of GDP	23.9%	22.8%	33.3%	22.8%
Number of enterprises	2,727	1.9%	11,785	8.2%
Number of crafts	2,109	3.1%	7,572	11.3%
Number of professionals	417	2.3%	923	5.1%

Note: *Proportion of the 25–64-year-old age group of the population with a higher education according to the 2011 Census. Source: Croatian Bureau of Statistics and FINA.

According to the estimations for 2021, the average GDP per capita in Istria County amounted to EUR 16,317 and was the second highest among all Croatian counties (10.2% more than the national average) (Croatian Bureau of Statistics, 2022). With regard to tourism, Istria is traditionally the most visited tourism region in the country, with more than 21 million overnight stays in 2021 (Table 1). Istria County accounted that year for 31% of all overnight stays in Croatia.

On the other hand, the GDP per capita of Šibenik-Knin County is EUR 12,190 (2021), or 17.7% below the national average. Although tourism development is important for the economy of Šibenik-Knin County, the territorial distribution of revenues from tourism is not balanced, favouring coastal to inland territories. In 2021, Šibenik-Knin County recorded 4.4 million overnight stays, accounting for 6.3% of all overnight stays in Croatia (Table 1).

METHODOLOGY

In Croatia, the use of the term *creative industries* increased, especially after 2015 when the first Mapping of Croatian Creative and Cultural Industries was published (Rašić Bakarić et al., 2015). According to the document, the CCIs in Croatia comprise 12 sectors: Advertising and marketing; Publishing; IT, software, games and new media; Electronic media; Museums, galleries and libraries; Music and performing arts; Architecture; Design; Visual arts; Film; Traditional arts and crafts, and Photography. The CCI sector in Croatia comprises artists, the public sector (public institutions providing cultural services), the private sector (cultural and creative enterprises) and the non-profit sector (art associations, associations of musicians, cultural-artistic societies). CCIs account for 3.4% of GDP (2021)¹ and 3.0% of the total number of employees, whereas creative companies make up 5.7% of the total number of business entities in Croatia (Rašić Bakarić et al., 2015).

The aim of the paper is to examine the features of business entities in the CCI sector and assess the economic contribution of the CCI sector in Istria County and Šibenik-Knin County with respect to the economies of the counties and national economy. Furthermore, the public financing of cultural activities was analysed as well as their impact on the county's economic development.

As mentioned above, due to the strong link between CCIs and the tourism system in Croatia, this research focuses on the tourism regions of the country, with the aim of noting how this part of Croatia has developed CCIs and how the COVID-19 pandemic influenced it. Finally, we investigated the impact of

CCIs on the economic development of the two counties in question. We included the COVID-19 pandemic period in the analysis due to the fact that we do have data for this period. Also, since this was an extraordinary event, we were interested in analysing how the pandemic influenced the economic contribution of CCIs, especially since this sector was heavily hit by the event. Hence, this research reveals the economic contribution of CCIs in two counties in Croatia, but also shows how this contribution behaved during the difficult pandemic time. Since CCIs were strongly hit by the pandemic, it is no surprise that the literature already offers contributions regarding this topic (e.g. Lyons, 2023; Florida & Seman, 2020). Our effort will complement existing research, especially on the regional level.

The identification of the basic features of the sector also requires assessing the structure of business entities in CCIs according to the legal form, size and the number of persons employed, and an assessment of the structure of the business entities according to subsectors of CCIs.

The assessment of the economic contribution and impact of CCIs

The assessment of the economic contribution of CCIs is based on two approaches. The first approach measures the contribution of the business (entrepreneurial) part of the sector to the county's economy, where the data includes the financial statements of entrepreneurs, i.e., the company sector, while budget beneficiaries (national and public establishments and institutions) and non-profit organisations are not included. Given that craftsmen and self-employed persons are not required to submit financial statements, it was not possible to assess their economic contribution in terms of total income and gross value added. Since crafts and professionals account for 44.6% of the total number of business entities in Istria County and 52.8% of the total number of business entities in Šibenik-Knin County, these estimates may understate the sector's actual contributions. In contrast, the second approach assesses the contribution of the entire cultural and creative sector (public, non-profit and private part of the sector) to the total gross domestic product of the national economy.

The assessment of the economic contribution of CCIs – the business (entrepreneurial) part of the sector

The economic contribution of the business (entrepreneurial) part of the sector was assessed for the period 2017-2021 based on the following indicators: the share of gross value added (GVA) in the total GVA of the entrepreneurial sector of the county economy, GVA per person employed, the share of

total revenues of the sector in the total revenues of entrepreneurs in the county and the share of exports from the sector in total exports by entrepreneurs in the county. GVA was estimated in current prices as the difference between the gross product (the sales revenue increased by the revenue from endowments, the amount of state aid and subsidies) and the value of intermediate consumption. The economic contribution was also measured based on the share of business entities active in the CCI sector in the total number of business entities in the county. Given that the database of the Financial Agency (FINA) does not contain data on crafts and self-employed persons when determining the number of business entities in the CCI sector, the database was complemented with data from the Croatian Pension Insurance Institute (HZMO).

The assessment of the economic contribution of CCIs – the entire CCI sector

Data from the Croatian Bureau of Statistics was used to estimate the share of the entire CCI sector in the total GDP of the county economy (the public, non-profit and private part of the sector). The calculation is based on the methodology of the United Nations System of National Accounts – SNA 2008 and the European System of National Accounts - ESA 2010, and was performed on the basis of available statistical data for the period 2017–2020, according to the National Classification of Activities 2007 (NKD 2007) in current prices. This assessment was based on data obtained from regional national accounts, as well as the data on the estimated GVA of the business part of the sector. Unlike the data for the entrepreneurial sector which covers the period up to 2021, data for the entire CCI sector was available only until 2020, which means that it does not capture the 2021 recovery period and consequently limits the completeness of the pandemic impact assessment of the total CCI sector.

Public financing assessment

The public financing of culture is measured based on the share of allocations for culture in the total expenditure of the county budget and the budget of cities and municipalities in the territory of a particular county. The data from the Ministry of Finance on the realisation of the budget according to functional classification were used. The calculation is based on the Eurostat methodology, according to which public expenditures for culture are considered to be expenditures for two groups within class 08 – Recreation, culture and entertainment, more precisely expenditures for group 08.2 – Cul-

tural services and expenditures for the group and 08.3 – Broadcasting and publishing services. The share of expenditures in total budget expenditures is calculated. The calculations refer to 2019 and 2020.

Estimation of the impact of CCIs on the county's economic development

To estimate the impact of CCIs on the county's economic development, a panel regression model with fixed effects is employed (Baltagi, 2005). The basic argument for using panel analysis is the lack of a longer time series for sample units. Choosing a panel technique ensures the use of variation in the time dimension to obtain more efficient estimators from a smaller number of observations. This technique somewhat circumvents the problems of missing variables (omitted variable bias) as well as problems of heterogeneity, and panel analysis results in more precise estimations (Verbeek, 2000).

For this research, one balanced data panel was formed for 11 municipalities in Šibenik-Knin County (out of 20 municipalities), and one balanced data panel was formed for 37 municipalities in Istria County (out of 41 municipalities).² The depth of the panel data is six years from the period 2017–2022. Therefore, the economic data of two Croatian counties were considered when selecting the dependent variable, including three indicators: total GDP, GDP per capita and annual GDP growth rate. Given the large differences in population among the counties in question, the variable GDP per capita was chosen as a dependent variable. Relevant factors of CCIs are selected as the main explanatory variables. First, gross value added from CCIs per capita is selected as an explanatory variable, as it is an important measure of the scale and development of CCIs. In addition, following the 3T theory of Florida (2002) and previous literature, talent, technology, and tolerance are recognised as key factors. Accordingly, the number of people employed in CCIs is selected as a second explanatory variable. In addition, the county's public expenditures on culture per capita are selected as a relevant influential factor. Given that tourism is an important economic sector in both counties, along with their rich cultural heritage, the number of tourist arrivals is used as a proxy of tourism demand. Using the Hausman test to select between random and fixed effects models, it was established that the fixed effects panel least squares was most suited for this analysis.

The analysis was based on relevant data obtained from regional national accounts (Croatian Bureau of Statistics) and data obtained from the FINA database.

The model is set as follows:

$$y_{it} = \alpha_i + \beta_1 x_{1,it} + \beta_2 x_{2,it-1} + \beta_3 x_{3,it} + \beta_4 x_{4,it} + \varepsilon_{it}$$

where:

y_{it} – dependent variable – a county's GDP per capita

x_1 – gross value added per capita of CCIs

x_2 – number of persons employed in CCIs

x_3 – public expenditure on culture per capita

x_4 – tourist arrivals

α_i – constant term

i – municipality ($i = 1, \dots, 11$ in the case of Šibenik-Knin County); ($i = 1, \dots, 37$ in the case of Istria County)

t – year ($t = 1, \dots, 6$).

PRESENTATION OF RESULTS

First, we will present results from the assessment of the economic contribution of the CCI sector using the first approach (contribution of the business (entrepreneurial) part of the CCI sector to the county economy). The creative economy in Istria County is an important economic factor with about 931 entrepreneurs (515 companies,³ 350 craftsmen and 65 professionals),⁴ i.e., 4.6% of all enterprises at the county level (Table 2). They employ 1,223 workers (2.4% of persons employed in the County), generating a turnover of almost EUR 68.8 million (1.4% of total revenue generated by the county's entrepreneurial sector) and a GVA of EUR 28 million (2.3% of the total GVA generated by the entrepreneurial sector at the county level) in 2021. The Istrian creative sector accounts for 5.6% of creative business entities in Croatia and 3.7% of total jobs in national CCIs in 2021. Compared to the structure of the entire economy of Istria County, CCIs are characterised by an above-average share of independent workers (7% compared to 4.5% across the entire county economy), as well as an above-average share of craftsmen (39% compared to 37% at the level of Istria County). This sector is also characterised by an above-average representation of craftsmen compared to the national sector (39% vs 34%).

The analysis of the structure of the CCI sector of Istria County by subsectors shows that more than 60% of business entities in that sector are registered in four different sub-sectors: Advertising (19%), Architecture (15.1%), Design (14.6%), and Computer programs, games and new media (11.6%). The least number of businesses (only one) was from the subsector of Museums, galleries and libraries, which is understandable given that this sub-sector mainly belongs to the public sector.

Even though smaller, the importance of the entrepreneurial part of the creative sector for the economy of Šibenik-Knin County should not be neglected either. The CCIs in Šibenik-Knin County comprise 212 entrepreneurs (100 companies, 101

craftsmen and 11 professionals), i.e., 4 % of all enterprises at the county level in 2021 (Table 3). CCIs employ 266 workers (2.1 % of the county's employed persons) and generate a turnover of EUR 9.7 million (0.9% of total revenue generated by the county's entrepreneurial sector) and a GVA of EUR 4.2 million (1.5% of the total GVA generated by the entrepreneurial sector at the county level).

	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	<u>2020</u> 2019	<u>2021</u> 2020	2017– 2021
Enterprises <i>of the entire county economy</i>	742 4.5%	763 4.4%	818 4.6%	872 4.8%	931 4.6%	6.6% 0.2 ppt	6.8% -0.2 ppt	25.5% 0.1 ppt
Employees <i>of the entire county economy</i>	1,110 2.2%	1,366 2.5%	1,218 2.2%	1,152 2.3%	1,223 2.4%	-5.4% 0.1 ppt	6.2% 0.1 ppt	10.2% 0.2 ppt
GVA, mio euros <i>of the entire county economy</i>	24.2 2.1%	27.5 2.1%	28.4 2.1%	24.8 2.6%	28.0 2.3%	-12.7% -0.5 ppt	12.9% -0.3 ppt	15.7% 0.2 ppt
GVA per employee, euros <i>the entire county economy = 100</i>	21,793 97.4	20,144 87.4	23,277 92.6	21,486 91.4	22,869 87.1	-7.7%	6.4%	4.9%
Total turnover, mio euros <i>of the entire county economy</i>	61.3 1.4%	69.2 1.5%	75.4 1.6%	57.9 1.5%	68.8 1.4%	-23.2% -0.1 ppt	18.8 -0.1 ppt	12.2% 0 ppt
Export, mio euros <i>of the entire county economy</i>	14.2 1.0%	19.4 1.3%	26.4 1.7%	18.1 1.8%	23.1 1.7%	-31.4% 0.1 ppt	27.6% -0.1 ppt	62.7% 0.7 ppt

Note: ppt – percentage points (difference).

TABLE 2

Data on the number of enterprises, employment, GVA, total turnover and exports by enterprises in the Istria County from the cultural and creative industries, 2017–2021

For comparison purposes, business entities in the CCIs at the national level accounted for 7.3% of all entrepreneurs (16,632 of all 229,401 business entities), 2.6% of total revenue, 3.4% of total employment and 5.0% of total GVA generated by the business sector. The contribution of the creative sector of Šibenik-Knin County is significantly lower than in Istria County, 1.3% of all creative business entities in Croatia and 0.8% of all jobs regarding national entrepreneurial CCIs in 2021.

The cultural and creative sector of Šibenik-Knin County is characterised by only an above-average share of craftsmen (48% compared to 40% in the county economy). It is also marked by an above-average representation of craftsmen compared to national figures, i.e., 48% and 34%, respectively. It seems that locals working in the CCI sector in Šibenik-Knin county are more likely to set upcrafts than their counterparts in other parts of the country.

The structure of the CCI sector of Šibenik-Knin County by sub-sectors is similar to Istria County, indicating that more than half of the business entities in CCIs are registered in one of the following: Advertising (19%), Architecture (16.5%), Design (11.3%) and Computer programs, games and new media (11.3%). The fewest number of businesses (only one) are recorded in the sub-sector Film and electronic media.⁵

	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	<u>2020</u> 2019	<u>2021</u> 2020	2017– 2021
Enterprises <i>of the entire county economy</i>	165 3.6%	177 3.7%	188 3.8%	205 4.0%	212 4.0%	9% 0.2 ppt	3.4% 0 ppt	28.5% 0.4 ppt
Employees <i>of the entire county economy</i>	228 1.9%	246 1.9%	263 2.0%	239 1.9%	266 2.1%	-9.1% -0.1 ppt	11.3% 0.2 ppt	16.7% 0.2 ppt
GVA, mio euros <i>of the entire county economy</i>	3.0 1.4%	3.6 1.8%	4.7 1.7%	4.0 1.9%	4.2 1.5%	-14.9% 0.2 ppt	4.6% -0.4 ppt	40.9% 0.1 ppt
GVA per employee, euros <i>the entire county economy = 100</i>	13.1 58.7	14.6 63.5	17.7 70.5	16.9 71.8	15.9 60.4	-4.7%	-5.0%	21.4%
Total turnover, mio euros <i>of the entire county economy</i>	8.3 0.9%	8.6 0.9%	10.2 0.9%	8.7 0.9%	9.7 0.9%	-15% 0 ppt	12.6% 0 ppt	18.1% 0 ppt
Export, mio euros <i>of the entire county economy</i>	0.674 0.4%	1.1 0.7%	1.8 1.0%	2.1 1.6%	2.0 1.1%	17.8% 0.6 ppt	-6% -0.5 ppt	193.5% 0.7 ppt

Note: ppt – percentage points (difference).

TABLE 3
Data on the number of enterprises, employment, GVA, total turnover and exports by enterprises in Šibenik-Knin County from the cultural and creative industries, 2017–2021

The main areas in Istria and Šibenik-Knin where CCIs operate are in urban areas. Of all creative businesses in Istrian County, around 40% are situated in the biggest city, Pula, followed by 14% in Poreč, 7% in Umag, Rovinj and Labin, whereas in Šibenik-Knin County, as much as 70% of all creative businesses are situated in the biggest city, Šibenik (which is at the same time the capital of the county), followed by Vodice (10%), Murter-Kornati (6%) and Drniš (5%).

There has been a rising trend of entrepreneurial activity within the CCIs in both counties over the period 2017–2021 (Tables 2 and 3). Aside from an increase in the number of entrepreneurs, also observed was an increase in total income, employment, gross value added and exports.

An interesting task is to evaluate the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the creative industries, especially as the CCIs were among the first sectors to cease their activities, but also the last to reopen. The COVID-19 and lockdowns severely affected the CCIs, and yet not all entities and all regions were equally impacted.

When comparing the business results of the CCIs in the prepandemic 2019 year with the results of 2020 (the actual COVID-19 pandemic year), the negative trends are easily noticeable (Tables 2 and 3). Although the number of business entities active in the CCIs of Istria County increased by 6.6% year-on-year in 2020, there seemed to have been a significant decrease in the number of employees (-5.4%), gross value added (-12.7%), total turnover (-23.2%) and exports (-31.4%). In particular, some sub-sectors of the CCIs in Istria County recorded significant losses in terms of total turnover, e.g., Mu-

sis (-44.4%), Advertising (-41.5%), Design (-32.8%), Electronic media (-23.3%) and Film (-22.9%). Once again, these results point to the vulnerability of the cultural and creative sector in the recent crisis. Nevertheless, with the opening of the economy and mitigation of measures, the results indicate a recovery in 2021. The largest growth was recorded in exports (27.6%), followed by total revenues at 18.8% and GVA with a growth of 12.9%. When comparing 2021 to 2020, the CCI sector in Istria County shows an increase of 6.8% in the number of business entities and a 6.2% increase in the number of employees, whereas labour productivity achieved a growth of 6.4%. Hence, it is comforting to observe that despite the severe crisis, entities in the CCI sector in Istria County managed to recover within a year. It might be argued that a relatively successful tourism season particularly helped in the process.

As far as Šibenik-Knin County is concerned, COVID-19 also had a negative effect, but a bit less harsh than in Istria County. There seems to have been a significant decrease in the number of employees (-9.1%), gross value added (-14.9%) and total turnover (-15%). In particular, the subsectors of the CCIs have recorded significant losses in total turnover, e.g., Visual arts (-90.4%), Design (-67.7%), Music (-59.4%), Film (-57.4%), and Publishing (-33.1%). On the other hand, Computer programming and games, as well as Advertising, recorded growth in total turnover by 41.3% and 27.7%, respectively, which should not come as a surprise because these sectors were not exposed to measures related to closures of entertainment venues and forbidding mass gathering, meaning that workers were easily able to work from home (or from other locations). Also, positive developments are reflected in the number of business entities and exports. The number of business entities active in the CCI sector increased in 2020 by 9%, which could be related to repositioning in the sector and the desire to utilise the pandemic to make necessary changes. Unlike Istria County, exports increased in Šibenik-Knin County by 17.8% due to Computer programming and games within the CCIs. Like Istria County, the results also indicate a recovery in 2021, which saw the largest annual growth of total turnover (12.6%), followed by employment gains at 11.3% and an increase in GVA by 4.6%.

Now we will present the results from the second methodological approach (contribution of the entire CCI sector (public, non-profit and private part of the sector) to the total gross domestic product of the county economy). As far as Istria County is concerned, the contribution of the CCI sector to the economy of Istria County has been significant but still slightly lower than the contribution of the CCI sector to the national economy, that is, it has been 2.3% as opposed to the national

3.1% of GDP (Table 4) in the pre-pandemic year of 2019. In the case of Šibenik-Knin County, the contribution of the CCI sector to the GDP of the county in question was also 2.3% in 2019. However, it should be clear that the national average continues to remain higher than in the counties in question due to the strong influence of Zagreb – the capital of Croatia, a city that, in all other economic segments as well, is the most important economic force in Croatia. Measured by gross value added (GVA), the share of the CCI sector of Istria County in the total national CCI sector was 5.0%, while the contribution of the CCI sector of Šibenik-Knin County to the total national CCI sector was smaller, i.e., 1.7% (the GVA of the CCIs in Croatia amounted to 1,549.7 million euros in 2019).

The data for 2020 indicate a strong year-on-year decline in GVA of the CCI sector in both counties. Istria County recorded a stronger decline by as much as 35%, while the GVA of the CCI sector in Šibenik-Knin County saw a decrease of 20%. As a result of the stronger decline in GVA of the CCI sector than the decline in the total GDP in both counties, the share of the sector in the GDP in 2020 also decreased. In Istria County, the CCI sector accounted for 1.9% of GDP in 2020, whereas it accounted for more than 2% of GDP in the previous years, while in Šibenik-Knin County, it accounted for 2% of GDP (Table 4). It seems that the COVID-19 restriction measures indeed had more of a negative effect on the CCIs than on the rest of the economy.

Also, it is interesting to note that in Istria County, the public part of the CCI sector accounts for 44.1% of the GVA of the total CCI sector, while in Šibenik-Knin County, the public part of the CCI sector accounts for 79.8% of the total GVA of the CCI sector (2021), indicating the reason why Šibenik-Knin County has a similar share of the CCIs in terms of GVA in the county's GDP compared to the Istrian share (while only the entrepreneurial share in Šibenik-Knin county is much smaller than that of Istria County).

TABLE 4
Estimated GVA of
CCIs (in euros, current
prices) and the contri-
bution of the CCI
sector to total GVA for
Istria County, Šibenik-
Knin County and the
Republic of Croatia,
2017–2021

	Istria County		Šibenik-Knin County		Croatia	
	GVA, in 000 euros	% GDP	GVA, in 000 euros	% GDP	GVA, mio euros	% GDP
2017	65,563.8	2.1	22,988.9	2.3	1.245,8	2.5
2018	72,111.2	2.3	22,870.2	2.2	1.352,8	2.6
2019	77,292.2	2.3	25,897.8	2.3	1.549,7	3.1
2020	50,110.7	1.9	20,788.2	2.0	1.538,6	3.0
2021	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	1.979,9	3.4

The next part of the research is related to public financing of CCIs. In terms of the usual indicators of public financing of cultural activities, the proportion of public expendi-

tures devoted to cultural activities in the total annual local budgets and the share of public expenditures for culture in the GDP should be investigated. Cultural activities in both counties are financed from county budgets, city budgets, municipality or state budgets or through private investments and sponsorships.

When it comes to Istria County, EUR 22.8 million or 4.5% was allocated for culture from the total local budgets (budgets of local self-government units and the county budget in total was EUR 511.2 million) in 2019. The following year, in 2020, these expenditures decreased by 50.4%, amounting in total to EUR 11.3 million, and the share in the total local budget (amounting to EUR 425.7 million) fell by 1.8 percentage points (to 2.7%). On average, culture-related expenditure amounted to 108.5 euros per inhabitant in Istria County in 2019, whereas a year later, it was 53.7 euros per inhabitant.

Negative developments were also recorded in Šibenik-Knin County. In 2019, EUR 8.2 million (or 4.2%) were allocated for culture from the total local budgets amounting to EUR 192.7 million. A year later, these expenditures were reduced by 32.1%. Consequently, the relative share of culture in total local government expenditure decreased by 1.4 percentage points in 2020 compared to 2019 (from 4.2% to 2.8%). In 2019, the expenditure on culture amounted, on average, to 82.6 euros per inhabitant in Šibenik-Knin County, and a year later, it was 24 euros less per inhabitant.

In terms of the proportion of public expenditures devoted to cultural activities in the GDP of the counties, culture accounted for 0.68% of Istria's GDP and 0.73% of Šibenik-Knin County's GDP in 2019. In 2020, public cultural expenditures fell to 0.6% of the Istrian GDP and 0.4% of the Šibenik-Knin County's GDP. Hence, besides COVID-19 restriction measures, which had a negative effect on CCIs, a drop in public expenditures designated for cultural activities also had an important negative impact on the GVA and GDP in CCIs in both counties.

Despite negative developments during the COVID-19 pandemic and the fact that data for the post-pandemic period are still not available at the county level, anecdotal evidence indicates the recovery of the share allocated for culture from local budgets. Also, despite a significant drop in funds designated for culture during the pandemic, it seems that a significant proportion of revenues for culture in both counties comes from public sources.

Finally, the results for the panel fixed effect models, which estimate the impacts of CCIs on a county's GDP per capita, are given in Table 5.

Variable	Istria County 2017–2022	Šibenik-Knin County 2017–2022
Constant	13,629.75	15,187.9
<i>p</i> -value	0.000	0.000
GVA CCCi p.c. (GVA)	3.859241**	5.401682*
<i>p</i> -value	0.031	0.000
Employment CCI (EMP)	4.847679	17.91613
<i>p</i> -value	0.630	0.406
PubExpCul p.c. (CUL)	0.0723017	29.49617*
<i>p</i> -value	0.604	0.000
Tourist arrivals (TUR)	0.010969*	-0.002978
<i>p</i> -value	0.000	0.930
Observations	218	65
Number of municipalities	37	11
F-stat/Wald test	12.43	168.9
<i>R</i> ² within	0.2193	0.3652
Hausman test (Chi-square)	41.86*	15.86*
	<i>P</i> = 0.003	<i>P</i> = 0.000

Note: **p* < 0.01, *p* < 0.05**

TABLE 5
Regression results for
Istria County (Model 1)
and Šibenik-Knin
County (Model 2)

Model 1, which was estimated for Istria County, shows that the variables exerting a positive and significant effect on GDP per capita over the observed period are the gross value added per capita of CCIs (*p* < 0.05) and tourist arrivals (*p* < 0.01). In the case of Model 2, which was estimated for Šibenik-Knin County, the GVA per capita of CCIs also has a significant impact on the county's GDP per capita (*p* < 0.01). However, in this model, public expenditures for culture have a significant impact on the Šibenik-Knin County's GDP (*p* < 0.01), while tourist arrivals are not shown as relevant. Hence, it seems that the CCIs can accelerate the economic development of a county. This aspect is especially true for Šibenik-Knin County, where not only do GVA of CCIs have a positive impact on the county's GDP, but also public expenditures for culture. It is not surprising that public expenditures on culture could have a positive effect since the previous results showed that those expenditures are a relevant source of revenue for entities in CCIs. Hence, the results obtained for Šibenik-Knin County show that putting more effort into supporting the CCIs is what further stimulates the economic development of the region.

On the other hand, even though Šibenik-Knin County is a tourism region, tourist arrivals in the county do not have a statistically significant impact on GDP per capita, unlike in Istria County. However, this should not come as a surprise given that tourism is much stronger in Istria County than in Šibenik-Knin County. Hence, it could be concluded that sup-

porting cultural activities as well as tourism (in the case of Istria County) could accelerate the development of a county. Still, it has to be acknowledged that R^2 values in both models are relatively low (0.2193 for Istria County and 0.3652 for Šibenik-Knin County). However, low R^2 in panel fixed effects models can be attributed to the nature of the data and the model's focus on within-group variation while absorbing between variance, which implies that a large portion of variance that could have boosted R^2 is removed by fixed effects.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In this paper, we analysed the characteristics and the contribution of CCIs in two tourism regions in Croatia. Even though they are both tourist counties located on the Adriatic coast, there are distinct differences in some aspects between them. Besides the fact that Istria County is more economically developed than Šibenik-Knin County, the creative sector in Istria County is also larger than that in Šibenik-Knin County. Still, given that Istria County is a more developed tourism region, understandably, it creates more value in the creative sector. These findings are consistent with previous empirical studies indicating how regions with higher concentrations of CCIs are typically characterised by higher levels of economic development (Power, 2011). Furthermore, in line with the findings from the literature showing that creative industries tend to cluster in urban areas (Windén & Carvalho, 2016) and tourism centres that attract visitors (Escalona-Orcao et al., 2016), this study shows that the largest concentrations of CCIs in both counties are major urban and tourist areas. Of all creative businesses in Istria County, more than 60% are situated in the biggest cities, while in the case of Šibenik-Knin County, as much as 91% of all creative businesses are situated in the four biggest cities.

Despite the important presence of CCIs in both counties, entities in CCIs have suffered severely from restrictive measures instigated to combat the COVID-19 pandemic and the drop in public expenditures for culture. Still, it seems that Istria County was hit harder by the pandemic, confirming the results from Broz and Rašić (2024) obtained from the survey of entities within CCIs. However, a favourable tourism season in 2021 led to a recovery in both counties. GVA increased in both counties, and Istria County reached almost pre-pandemic levels. Turnover, including the number of employees and enterprises, also increased.

In general, based on the conducted empirical analysis, it can be concluded that the development of CCIs has a positive impact on the economic development of both observed counties. Among the relevant factors in the CCIs, the per capita gross added value of CCIs has a significant positive impact on the counties' GDPs per capita. Thereby, the impact was higher in the

case of the less-developed Šibenik-Knin county. This outcome is consistent with the findings of other authors who claim that the impact of CCIs tends to be positive and economically significant for developing places and even for some less developed areas (Kalfa set al., 2024). On the other hand, tourist arrivals are only important for Istria County, even though Šibenik-Knin County is also a tourism region. This could be explained with a much stronger tourism system in Istria County than in Šibenik-Knin County. Furthermore, public expenditures for culture have a significant positive effect on the development of GDP per capita only in the case of Šibenik-Knin County. This result shows that supportive public policies significantly increase the contribution of the creative sector to economic growth. Based on these results, it could be concluded that, on average, policies based on an increase in the share of CCIs make a positive contribution to the GDP per capita of a region and provide a complementary or alternative instrument in the development processes of regions.

However, this study has several limitations, which can be addressed in future research. The key limitation is the short time period (2017–2022) and for calculating GVA even shorter (2017–2021). The second limitation refers to the fact that in assessing the economic contribution of creative industries in the observed counties, it was not possible to include small business entities (small crafts and independent workers) in both assessments. Furthermore, due to the specific characteristics of the selected two counties, the generalisability of the findings may be limited. Leveraging the high replicability of our study could allow us to compare the case of these two counties with other NUTS3 regions in Croatia and the EU27. This approach can be applied in future research while emphasising interregional differentiation and characteristics. While this study provides valuable findings, future research could explore specific subsectors within CCIs in more detail. In addition, longer periods of time and wider spatial coverage could also provide insight into the dynamic development of the relationship between CCIs and economic growth over time.

NOTES

¹ According to the authors' estimates.

² Municipalities with active business entities in the CCIs during at least two years of the observed period.

³ These are entrepreneurs recorded by FINA, a company that collects financial records of all entrepreneurs in Croatia.

⁴ Data on craftsmen and professionals were collected from the Croatian Pension Insurance Institute.

⁵ We have to repeat here again that these numbers are underestimated, as only entities recorded by FINA were included.

REFERENCES

- Arcos-Pumarola, J., Paquin, A. G., & Sitges, M. H. (2023). The use of intangible heritage and creative industries as a tourism asset in the UNESCO creative cities network. *Heliyon*, 9(1), e13106. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e13106>
- Baltagi, B. H. (2005). *Econometric analysis of panel data*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Boal-San Miguel, I., & Herrero-Prieto, L. C. (2020). A spatial-temporal analysis of cultural and creative industries with micro-geographic disaggregation. *Sustainability*, 12(16), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12166376>
- Boix, R., & Peiró, J. (2017). Industrias de servicios creativos y productividad del trabajo en las regiones de la Unión Europea (Creative services industries and labor productivity in the regions of the European Union). In M. Valdivia & J. R. Cuadrado (Eds.), *La economía de las actividades creativas: Una perspectiva desde España y México (The economy of creative activities: A perspective from Spain and Mexico)* (pp. 357–380). Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México and Universidad de Alcalá de Henares.
- Boix, R., & Soler, V. (2017). Creative service industries and regional productivity. *Papers in Regional Science*, 96(2), 261–279. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pirs.12187>
- Boix Domenech, R., De Miguel Molina, B., & Köster, P. R. (2022) The impact of cultural and creative industries on the wealth of countries, regions and municipalities. *European Planning Studies*, 30(9), 1777–1797. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2021.1909540>
- Broz, T., & Rašić, I. (2024). *The COVID-19 pandemic and adaptations in creative and cultural industries: A case of two Croatian counties*. Manuscript.
- Chica, J. E., & Marmolejo Duarte, C. (2021). Knowledge economy's externalities and urban growth: An analysis of the functional dynamics and location patterns of knowledge-based industries in the metropolitan Barcelona. *archiDOCT*, 17(9 (1)), 1–9.
- Cooke, P., & Lazzaretti, L. (2008). *Creative cities, cultural clusters and local economic development*. Edward Elgar Publishing Limited. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781847209948>
- Croatian Bureau of Statistics (2022). *Gross domestic product – review by counties*. DZS.
- Crociata, A., Pinate, A. C., & Urso, G. (2025). The cultural and creative economy in Italy: Spatial patterns in peripheral areas. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 32(1), 53–75. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09697764231222221>
- De Propriis, L., Chapain, C., Cooke, P., MacNeill, S., & Mateos-Garcia, J. (2009). *The geography of creativity*. NESTA.
- Ernst & Young (2021). *Rebuilding Europe: The cultural and creative economy before and after the COVID-19 crisis*. https://www.rebuilding-europe.eu/_files/ugd/4b2ba2_1ca8a0803d8b4ced9d2b683db60c18ae.pdf
- Escalona-Orcao, A. I., Escalano-Utrilla, S., SaezPerez, L. A., & Sanchez-Valverde-Garcia, B. (2016). The location of creative clusters in non-metropolitan areas: A methodological proposition. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 45, 112–122. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2016.03.007>

- Eurostat (2023). *Cultural employment in the EU grew by 4.5% in 2022*. <https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/products-eurostat-news/w/ddn-20230824-1>
- Florida, R. (2002). *The rise of creative Class*. Basic Books.
- Florida, R. D., & Gabe, T. (2024). Assessing the rise and geography of the creative economy. In *Handbook of Creativity Assessment* (pp. 215–233). Edward Elgar Publishing Limited. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781839102158.00022>
- Florida, R., & Seman, M. (2020). *Lost art: Measuring COVID-19's devastating impact on America's creative economy*. Metropolitan Policy Program, Brookings.
- Horkheimer, M., & Adorno, T. W. ([1947] 2002). *Dialectic of enlightenment. Philosophical fragments*. Stanford University Press.
- Kalfas, D., Kalogiannidis, S., Ambas, V., & Chatzitheodoridis, F. (2024). Contribution of the cultural and creative industries to regional development and revitalization: A European perspective. *Urban Science*, 8(2), 39. <https://doi.org/10.3390/urbansci8020039>
- Komorowski, M., & Lewis, J. (2023). The creative and cultural industries towards sustainability and recovery. *Sustainability*, 15(13), 9923. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15139923>
- Lazzaretti, L. (2012). Cultural and creative industries: An introduction in creative industries and innovation in Europe. In L. Lazzaretti (Ed.), *Concepts, measures and comparative case studies* (pp. 1–20). Routledge.
- Liu, Z., Xu, D., & Wang, X. (2025). Spatial agglomeration characteristics and impact factors of the cultural and creative industries in Harbin. *International Journal of Geo-Information*, 14(4), 158. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijgi14040158>
- Lyons, M. S. (2023). The economic impact of COVID-19 on the creative industries: A sub-regional input-output approach. *Letters in Spatial and Resource Sciences*, 16, 4. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12076-023-00329-9>
- Marco-Serrano, F., Rausell-Koster, P., & Abeledo-Sanchis, R. (2014). Economic development and the creative industries: A tale of causality. *Creative Industries Journal*, 7(2), 81–91. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17510694.2014.958383>
- Mickov, B. (2023). *The cultural sector and sustainable economic development: Innovation and the creative economy in European cities*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003336648>
- Potts, J., Cunningham, S., Hartley, J., & Ormerod, P. (2008). Social network markets: A new definition of the creative industries. *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 32(3), 167–185. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10824-008-9066-y>
- Power, D. (2011). *Priority sector report: Creative and cultural industries*. Europe INNOVA Paper No. 16.
- Rašić Bakarić, I., Bačić, K., & Božić, Lj. (2015). *Mapiranje kreativnih i kulturnih industrija u Republici Hrvatskoj (Mapping of creative and cultural industries in the Republic of Croatia)*. Ekonomski institut u Zagrebu.
- Richards, G. (2014). Creativity and tourism in the city. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 17(2), 119–144. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2013.783794>

Rodrigues-Ferreira, A., Afonso, H., Mello, J. A., & Amaral, R. (2023). Creative economy and the quintuple helix innovation model: A critical factors study in the context of regional development. *Creativity Studies*, 16(1), 158–177. <https://doi.org/10.3846/cs.2023.15709>

Seaman, B. A. (2020). *Economic impact of the arts*. In *A handbook of cultural economics* (pp. 241–253). Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781788975803.00033>

Sneha, V., & Kavitha, R. (2024). Exploring the economy of creativity and culture in the light of Industry 5.0: A systematic literature review of the setup of creative industries. *Journal of Strategy and Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JSMA-05-2023-0095>

Stojčić, N., Hashi, I., & Orlić, E. (2018). Creativity, innovation effectiveness and productive efficiency in the UK. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 21(4), 564–580. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJIM-11-2017-0166>

Štreimikienė, D., & Kačerauskas, T. (2020). The creative economy and sustainable development: The Baltic States. *Sustainable Development*, 28(6), 1632–1641. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.2111>

Throsby, D. (2008). Modelling the cultural industries. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 14(3), 217–232. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10286630802281772>

UNCTAD (2010). *Creative Economy Report 2010. Creative Economy: A Feasible Development Option*. UNCTAD.

Verbeek, M. (2000). *A guide to modern econometrics*. John Wiley&Sons.

Winden, W. van, & Carvalho, L. (2016). Urbanize or perish? Assessing the urbanization of knowledge locations in Europe. *Journal of Urban Technology*, 23(1), 53–70. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10630732.2015.1090194>

Doprinos kulturnih i kreativnih industrija gospodarstvu županije: studija slučaja dviju turističkih regija u Hrvatskoj

Tanja BROZ, Ivana RAŠIĆ
Ekonomski institut, Zagreb, Hrvatska

Cilj je rada analizirati osnovna obilježja kulturnih i kreativnih industrija u dvjema hrvatskim županijama – Istarskoj i Šibensko-kninskoj – kao i procijeniti njihov doprinos županijskom i nacionalnom gospodarstvu. S obzirom na to da prevladavajući dio sektora kulture čine aktivnosti koje se izravno financiraju iz javnih sredstava, provedena je i analiza javnih izdvajanja za kulturu iz državnoga i lokalnih proračuna. Osim analize obilježja i doprinosa kulturnih i kreativnih industrija, ispituju se i čimbenici utjecaja kulturnih i kreativnih industrija na gospodarski razvoj dviju promatranih županija primjenom panel-modela s fiksnim efektima od 2017. do 2022.

DRUŠ. ISTRAŽ. ZAGREB
GOD. 34 (2025), BR. 3,
STR. 285-306

BROZ, T., RAŠIĆ, I.:
THE CONTRIBUTION...

godine. Rezultati upućuju na to da su kulturne i kreativne industrije važan dio gospodarstva obiju županija, pri čemu je njihov doprinos u Istarskoj županiji veći nego u Šibensko-kninskoj županiji. Glavni čimbenik kojim kulturne i kreativne industrije značajno i pozitivno utječu na gospodarski razvoj u obje županije jest bruto dodana vrijednost kulturnih i kreativnih industrija po stanovniku. Rezultati isto tako pokazuju da i drugi čimbenici, kao što su dolasci turista (za Istarsku županiju) i javni izdaci za kulturu (za Šibensko-kninsku županiju), imaju značajnu ulogu u ocijenjenim modelima.

Ključne riječi: kulturne i kreativne industrije, regije, COVID-19, doprinos BDP-u



Međunarodna licenca / International License:
Imenovanje-Nekomercijalno / Attribution-NonCommercial