

## What Makes the City Creative – Comparison of Creative City's and Local Socio-economic Development's Factors

ANNA VAŇOVÁ, ANDREA MIŠKOVIČOVÁ

Faculty of Economics, Matej Bel University

Slovak Republic

anna.vanova@umb.sk, andrea.miskovicova@umb.sk

### Abstract

*These days, cities all over the world have to face many problems emerged from the globalization process, structural economic changes or changing demographic trends. These problems usually lead to outflow of quality human capital and investments from cities, slowing down of their growth, loss of competitiveness and deepening of interregional disparities. The relevant entities need to find such options and tools for solving these problems which usually require a change in approach to socio-economic development of cities. In the last decades, attention has been paid to the examination of the impact of creativity, innovations, holistic approach and lateral thinking in the context of local development and its strategies. This shift in thinking led to establishing the new approach to territorial development on local level – creative city. Based on the study of professional and scientific literature we are going to examine a creative city concept as a new form of approach to territorial development on local level, subsequently the various approaches to factors of creative city and finally compare them with traditional territorial socio-economic development's factors. In our research we will use the historical-logical method, content-casual analysis, synthesis, scientific abstraction and, more or less, methods of induction and deduction. The main contribution of this paper is to summarize important and relevant information about the creative city concept as a new tool of territorial socio-economic development on local level since it examines the factors which make the city creative. Mentioned factors will be supplemented by the findings from our previous marketing research on inhabitants and entrepreneurs segments. It will also help to develop the awareness of this concept since currently it does not receive much attention in academia or policy-making sphere.*

**Key words:** creativity, creative city, socio-economic development, local development, factors

**JEL Classification:** L80, O10, R10, Z19

### 1 Introduction

Creative city is usually considered a part of a wider creative economy. Similarly, the creative economy is a part of state, region or city's economy which is mostly oriented on support of human creativity, innovations and lateral thinking (as new progressive assets), and culture, art and symbolic value of certain territory. All these elements are embodied in so called creative industries which, basically, are the core of the whole creative economy. Based on the study of professional and scientific literature we believe that both, creative city and creative economy are complementary – they are mutually affected within their own success or success of a certain territory.

Because of its multidisciplinary character, it is not simple to define the creative city unambiguously. It impacts many aspects of life in a city and it is used by various entities for several purposes. However, its aim is to mobilize the potential of a certain place (neighbourhood, city, region, etc.) in order to ensure its prosperity and to create an attractive

place to work, study, visit, live and act in by applying a proper combination of endogenous and exogenous sources.

This is why we see a connection between creative city and the new place-based approach to territory development (currently promoted by European Union and its new Cohesion policy 2014-2020), oriented mostly on local potential and specifics of certain territory, efficiently and effectively supplemented by external sources. According to this we consider creative city very important these days. Therefore in this paper we are going to examine the creative city as a new approach to territorial development on local level, subsequently the various approaches to factors of creative city and finally compare them with traditional territorial socio-economic development's factors.

The main contribution of this paper is to summarize important and relevant information about the creative city concept and the factors which make the city creative. Mentioned factors will be supplemented by the results from our previous marketing research on representative sample of inhabitants (2011) and entrepreneurs (2013) from Banská Bystrica which will lead to conclusion either the city has or has not a potential to become a creative city. This paper is also part of a project VEGA 1/0680/14 Creative industries as a key source of the public sector's intangible assets in the context of innovation and smart growth.

## **2 Local Socio-economic Development in the Creative City Context**

Cities all over the world are competing on investments, quality human capital or various kinds of innovations which would help them to improve their positive image profits and development and economic growth. Currently, the key for cities anywhere is to offer diversity, authenticity and symbolic values (Romein, Trip, 2009), which are basic characteristics of a creative city.

Every city is consisted from spatial potential, very important for any kind of progress, which is usually divided into these categories: economic and technical (e.g. sectoral structure of the economy, hard and soft infrastructure); socio-demographic and cultural (all demographic indicators, social structure, culture, etc.); natural and geographic (environment, water, soil, mineral resources, etc.); urban potential. Potential of cities can be used as catalyst of local socio-economic development and its components are considered valuable localization factors – for new enterprises or inhabitants (Výrostová, 2010). Currently the spatial potential is supplemented with other groups such as innovative and creative potential of a city/territory which are becoming more and more important to foster by city's local government to promote the socio-economic development (Čapková, et al., 2011; Vaňová, 2006).

According to European Commission (2011) socio-economic development is irreplaceable part of sustainable development because it has a significant impact on the long-term welfare of the population of a particular area especially because, in addition to economic, involves the social and environmental aspects. It results in the creation of innovative and environmentally based economy that provides good conditions for life and work in a particular area.

In general there are various opinions on term development in professional and scientific literature. However, in each book, article or paper addressing the territory development issues we can meet the same knowledge - we cannot consider terms development and growth

synonyms. Development is a broader concept expressing the state of a particular territory, not only in quantity (related to growth - mainly economic), but also in the quality indicators.

Maier and Tödting (1998) claims about the development that, however, there exist some ideas about its content, this term is value-driven and therefore its essence need to be defined individually. Since is value-driven it is usually difficult to quantify the development of certain territory exactly.

We can conclude that the term development is difficult to define. In general we understand the territory development as the set of (inter)nationally comparable qualitative and quantitative indicators, representing the current and predicting the future state of specific area – city, region, state. We also consider development the path to creation such conditions for life, work and other various activities which will lead to improving quality of life for all segments of the territory by using the local potential primarily.

In the last few years is increasingly discussed the impact of the lowest territorial units – cities – on regional or state development. That is why we consider important to pay attention to the opportunities that cities currently have in managing and supporting the development, building on the well-known theories and practices.

## **2.1 From Traditional Development through the Quality of Life to the Creative City Factors**

Factors of local or regional development diverse according to type of examined territory – rural, urban or regional, or set development aims. They are also very variable – what was considered the most important development factor thirty years ago could appear in the end of the list today. The traditional territory development factors such as GDP, capital, degree of technological progress, quality human capital, economy structure, employment, etc., are these days supplemented with quality of life indicators and so called soft indicators of development embodied in the creative city concept.

These days is becoming more important to know city's potential, related to quality of life indicators, but also to know how to use it for achieving set development aims by using creativity, culture and cooperation as main tools of creative city. As Gertler (2004) pointed out the creative city should enhance the quality of life and development of the local economy with beneficial effects for the most of entities of a city, and not just for certain privileged groups (such as Florida's creative class). Therefore before we start with summarizing the evolution of the most important local development factors according to various approaches we are going to briefly explain what does the creative city mean.

The term creative city was first officially used in relation to promotion of territory development at an Australian conference named *Creative City* in 1988 (Landry, 2005; Makogon, Khadzhyov, 2010). Today, we can find various definitions of creative city in professional and scientific literature. Some authors define it through creative class (Clifton, Cooke, 2009; Chantelot, Pérès, Virol, 2011; Gordon, 2013), others through creative industry (Evans, 2009; Flew, 2010; Chapain, Comunian, 2010; Booyens, Molotja, Phiri, 2011). Baycan, Fusco Girard and Nijkamp (2011) summarized that the creative city is in general perceived as: core of arts and cultural infrastructure; place of the active creative economy; synonymous with a strong creative class; or as a place of supporting culture and creativity.

Based on extensive study of literature about the creative city we agree with mentioned summary. However, we think that the favorable development of the area through the implementation of the creative city concept need the active participation of all the city's stakeholders, including its citizens, and not just highlighting the importance of the creative class. Our opinion can be confirmed by UNCTAD (2010) which claims that creative city considers basically anyone with inventive and innovative ideas and thinking a bearer of creativity, not just artists or entities directly linked to the creative and cultural industries. However, in general we distinguish between two main approaches to creative city which can also be considered the main area of interest in local socio-economic development, according to Trip and Romein (2009):

1. Focus on the production milieu of a territory – support of cultural and creative industries and clusters of firms which are identified as innovation generators since they represent the place where innovative ideas and processes are born, transferred and implemented. The main aim is to make creative and cultural industries a natural part of the local economy. They usually have the character of micro, small and medium sized enterprises and are considered drivers of local economy. The main idea of this type of strategy is to meet the economic goals of a certain territory (Clifton, Cooke, 2009; Evans, 2009; Flew, 2010; Chapain, Comunian, 2010; Romein, Trip, 2009; Storper, 2010; Rivas, 2011; );

2. Focus on the consumption milieu of a territory – support of activities increasing the attractiveness of the city, not only for creative and talented people from other cities but also for local inhabitants, entrepreneurs, tourists, etc. This approach is also based on a controversial idea, well known in studies about a creative city and creative economy, that jobs follow people. It means that through an attractive environment a territory should be able to attract (creative) human capital, which will lead to attracting new entrepreneurs (not only from creative and cultural industries) from the outside of the region. This strategy is oriented on improving the indicators of quality of life in the city, such as culture, education, and its socio-economic environment (Florida, 2004; Trip, Romein, 2010; Gordon, 2013).

From mentioned above is obvious that cities need to focus on adequate and appropriate combination on endogenous and exogenous sources and factors to achieve set development aims. If a certain territory is able to identify, promote and apply these sources, it is likely to be competitive in the market of other territories, and therefore, able to attract more financial, technical and human capital, investments, jobs, etc. However, the creative city is built on an idea that the soft development factors matter more than traditional – hard – ones. As we are going to describe even the term *soft development factors* went through some changes in time and are consisted from more abstract elements than a decade ago.

This moves us to the main topic of the paper – which factors are those indicating the development of a certain city. The following table 1 represents the summary and comparison of mentioned traditional development, quality of life and creative city factors.

In professional and scientific literature we can find various opinions on the most relevant – traditional - factors of local or regional development. In addition to already mentioned factors (GDP, capital, degree of technological progress, etc.), Výrostová (2010) summarized and divided these into endogenous and exogenous group, as it is shown in following table 1.

Alternative to the traditional development factors are quality of life indicators. As Čapková (2004) pointed out, socio-economic development is strongly related to quality of life. It affects each area of life in city (neighborhood, region, ...) such as health, education, environment, social structure, housing which are all influenced by the local economy. Quality of life indicators reflect the fact that to measure human well-being the GDP, or others traditional economic development factors, is not enough in modern, globalized society. In the

following table 1 we summarized international quality of life indices with their factors and indicators according to European Union, Mercer Consulting Group and OECD.

Finally, the creative city factors shown in table 1 represent our summary of three approaches to creative city factors: Romeain' and Trip's (based on their extensive research in the field of creative city and their classification of production and consumption milieus); consulting group INTELI's (results of their qualitative research in small and medium-sized cities around the world in the field of soft development factors making the city creative); Landry' and Hyams' (they examined level of creativity in ten groups which indicators are very similar to those of quality of life).

**Tab. 1 Comparison of Traditional, Quality of Life and Creative City Development Factors**

Approach	Factors	Indicators
<b>Traditional Development Factors</b>	Endogenous	Potential of a city; Competitiveness; Innovation strategies; Clusters; Institutions; Public entities; Soft infrastructure; Way of communication and its channels; Image; Leisure time infrastructure; Green spaces
	Exogenous	Development degree of the whole country; Openness of the economy in relation to foreign countries; Economic and social policy; Direct foreign investments; Political system; Legal framework
<b>Quality of Life</b>	Political and Social Environment	Relationship with other countries; Internal stability; Crime; Law enforcement; The presence and integration of foreigners; Safety and trust; Limitations of personal freedom; Media and censorship; Voter turnout; Consultation of rulemaking
	Economic Environment	Job security; Personal earnings; Long-term unemployment rate; Employment rate; Currency exchange regulations; Banking services; Employment opportunities; Financial situation of household
	Education	Educational attainment; Student skills; Years in education; Number and availability of schools
	Health	Hospital services; Medical supplies; Life expectancy; Health care services
	Environment	Air quality; Noise level; Cleanliness; Green spaces; Fight against climate change; Water quality
	Public Services and Transport	Electricity; Water availability; Telephone; Mail; Public transport; Traffic congestion; Airport; Sports and cultural facilities; Streets and buildings; Public spaces; Availability of retail shops; City administrative services; Quality of support network
	Leisure Time	Variety of restaurants; Theatrical and musical performances; Cinemas; Sport and leisure activities
	Housing	Housing; Household appliances and furniture; Household maintenance and repair; Housing expenditure; Dwellings with basic facilities; Rooms per person
<b>Creative City</b>	Political and Public Framework	Political and public representatives with sense of purpose and ethics; Transparent and accessible political and public representatives to inhabitants; Light, lean, responsible, adaptable bureaucracy; Ability of citizens to interact with local bureaucracy; Level of decentralization of power, decision making or responsibilities; Support of voluntary and community sector; Quality work force in public institutions; Creating conditions rather than detail planning; Cooperation between local authorities, firms and interest groups; Strong sense of vision for the place; Inspiring leaders are present in the city; Formulated strategies are looking at the future in the broadest terms and see the planning process as continuous and intrinsic; The city works well, goals are achieved and things there happen; High standards of services; Benchmarking; Attributes such as reliability, punctuality, efficiency or accuracy are highly respected; Partnership; Ability to delegate authority
	Social Climate	Prevailing values and attitudes; Social tolerance; Openness towards diversity (e.g. gay and foreign-born population, subcultures); Openness of public, private and voluntary/community sectors; Understanding the differences; Community engagement; Trust relationships; Culture of participation; Neighbourliness and sociability; Social capital; Presence of civic associations; The city values learning and knowledge; Diversity of learning options; The city is fostering local talents
	Representation of a City	Image; Symbolic value of cultural heritage; Clear identity of a city; Citizens are self-confident in their attitudes, values, local production, cultural and other public facilities; A city offers a variety of experiences, choices and opportunities for people to express themselves; Variety of cultural spaces and access to them; Openness to cultural variety of a city; Environment rich on science, gastronomy, cultural life, attractions, parks, events, festivals, etc.
	Entrepreneurship, Exploration and Innovation	The city is business-friendly; Social recognition of entrepreneurs; Extensive support system for old and new entrepreneurs; Innovations and R&D opportunities; Significant role of creative industries is evident; Diverse pool of talented workers; Vocational training
	Communication, Connectivity and Networking	The city is well connected internally and externally; It is easy to get in the city; Walkability through the city; High quality public transport system; Good and quality traffic infrastructure; Knowledge of foreign languages; Presence of clusters, hubs, focal points and knowledge exchanges; Affordable spaces; Old industrial buildings; Authenticity; Face-to-face networks
	Built Environment	Diversity and size of buildings; Diverse, pedestrian-friendly public spaces; Authentic neighbourhoods; Condition and quality of hard and soft infrastructure; Ecological-friendly infrastructure; Health and social services; Quality schools
	Amenities	Cultural festivals; Outdoor sporting facilities; Parks; Education facilities; Specialist libraries; Specialist shops; Diversity of cafes and restaurants; Architectonic and archaeological heritage; intangible heritage; Accommodation facilities; Vibrant street life
	Liveability and Well-being	Quality of life factors; GDP; Offered services' standard; Crime; Safety; People like to live and work in the city

Source: own processing according to Rumpel, Slach, Koutský (2008); Romein, Trip (2009); Skokan (2009, In Výrostová, 2010); Výrostová (2010); INTELI (2011); Mercer LLC (2011); Landry, Hyams (2012); European Union (2013); OECD (2014)

As it is evident from the table 1 the traditional endogenous development factors are mostly consisted from soft factors which are usually those which effects on local or regional development cannot be measured easily and their impact is not as visible as in the case of hard development factors (Rumpel, Slach, Koutský, 2008). However, it is obvious that endogenous and exogenous factors are strongly influenced by each other. There is also visible the relationship between these and quality of life or creative city factors.

The table 1 also shows that creative city factors are based mostly on abstract or intangible characteristics of a city – relationships, attitudes, values, senses, etc., than on the tangible ones. They are also mostly based on primary qualitative research. Even Landry and Hyams use scoreboards with ten areas of interest which indicators should be rate by respondents from grade 1 as very bad to 10 as brilliant. Respondents can also put own comments into the scoreboard. Such index is considered relevant aid in knowing the (hidden) potential of a city, its problems or deficiencies and so helps it to improve itself for its current and future citizens, visitors or entrepreneurs.

Since there is no research on creative city factors in Slovakia, we are going to demonstrate the actual situation in what people consider important for improving living and working conditions in Banská Bystrica and its development according to two primary qualitative researches on quality of life factors and work environment in comparison to the theory of creative city factors shown in table 1. These researches are going to help us identify whether Banská Bystrica has or has not a potential to become a creative city as described in theory according to two primary segments in the city.

In our research ( with Juhászová, 2011) we assembled a group of 51 quality of life factors for Banská Bystrica (Slovakia) divided into 11 categories: culture; leisure time; housing; safety; environment; city's policy; public and private services in the city; education; healthcare; infrastructure; working environment. These factors represent results of our previous study of international quality of life indices (including Mercer's one).

We selected some of the quality of life factors as we indentified them in our research according to its importance for inhabitants of Banská Bystrica, to its similarity to mentioned QOL indices (European Union, Mercer, OECD) and to its relevance to creative city factors. These factors represent results of our research in two out of four importance categories – very important and important. The results of research are shown in next table 2.

**Tab. 2 Selection of The Most Important Quality of Life Factors according to Inhabitants of Banská Bystrica (2011)**

Factor	Importance According to Respondents (in %)	
	Very Important	Important
Water quality	78 %	22 %
Prices of daily consumer goods; Cleanliness of streets and public spaces; Job opportunities	76 %	14 – 22 %
Quality of healthcare	74 %	24 %
Air quality and cleanliness; Salary conditions;	66 %	18 – 32 %
Personal safety and security of personal property; Availability of medical facilities, doctors, pharmacies	64 %	28 – 36 %
Road maintenance	60 %	36 %
Quality of elementary schools	48 %	34 %
Quality of higher education	44 %	48 %
Quality of high schools	40 %	44 %

Interpersonal relationships	30 %	50 %
Image (of the city and region)	24 %	38 %
Shopping opportunities	22 %	60 %
Work and activities of local government	22 %	50 %
Cultural life	20 %	34 %
Quality of restaurants	12 %	40 %

Source: own processing according to Juhászová (2011)

The results show that inhabitants of Banská Bystrica consider the most important quality of life factors those from the environment category. On the other hand, factors from leisure time category are considered only less important, as well as the image of the city and region. This is a really interesting finding since in case of the creative city this category is one of those making the city really creative. We did not examine the importance of cooperation between public-private-community factor in our research at 2011, however in the recent process of creating new strategic documents for years 2014-2020 the inhabitants (as well as entrepreneurs) of Banská Bystrica identified this factor as the most important for further development of the city.

In our research on business environment in Banská Bystrica from 2013 we examined the conditions for business in the city in a representative sample of 103 respondents among local entrepreneurs. The following table 3 shows research results which are relevant to our previous study on the creative city.

**Tab. 3 Selected Results of the Business Environment Survey in Banská Bystrica (2013)**

Question Asked	The Most Common Answer	Highest Proportion of Responses (in %)
What helps to business development in Banská Bystrica?	Nothing at all	36 % out of 44 collected responses
What <i>would</i> help to business development in Banská Bystrica?	Improvement of traffic (mainly road) infrastructure	17 % out of 88 collected responses
	Tourism development	11 % out of 88 collected responses
	More job opportunities	8 % out of 88 collected responses
What are the main obstacles for business development in Banská Bystrica?	Lack of communication, interest about business in the city, flexibility, passivity from the local government	18 % out of 85 collected answers
	Bureaucracy	19 % out of 85 collected answers
	Corruption	12 % out of 85 collected answers
What do you miss the most for business development in Banská Bystrica?	Cooperation among all sectors in the city	14 % out of 51 collected answers

Source: own processing

When we look closer to our researches on inhabitants and entrepreneurs we could see that the road infrastructure is a really important factor of development or improving the quality of life in the city.

In a creative city the role of local government and its work, activities and communication with the citizens and entrepreneurs is considered very important. Unfortunately, according to local entrepreneurs the local government is characterized by the lack of interest about the situation in business environment in Banská Bystrica, as it is shown in table 3.



When asked what services would be helpful for entrepreneurs in Banská Bystrica the most often answer were support and development of cooperation. However, even this factor is not supported by local government and according to local entrepreneurs was considered less than satisfactory.

As we have shown the quality of life factors and their indicators diverse by segments examined. We consider important to adapt the theory of creative city factors on our conditions and identify and examine new development factors in all segments (or at least the two of them which we have already examined) acting in a city. These factors, according the theory, reflect the current demand on what city should offer or how it should look like to attract business, innovation, quality human capital and maintain local stakeholders.

However, as our researches shown, in Banská Bystrica we cannot talk about a creative city currently. In the segment of inhabitants we found out that factors as cultural life, quality of restaurants or interpersonal relationships, which belongs to the creative and cultural infrastructure of a city, are considered as less important to the local development. On the other hand, segment of entrepreneurs identified obstacles of transformation Banská Bystrica on a creative city in categories such as cooperation, bureaucracy, corruption, communication with the city, etc. We believe that by improving identified factors – in case of both examined segments - Banská Bystrica still have chance to promote its development through the creative city concept.

### **3 Conclusions**

Contemporary societal changes brought about a number of various problems which significantly affect the development of cities around the world as well as the decisions of competent authorities for a suitable method of resolving these problems. Today, attention is more often paid to new approaches to local socio-economic development and extension of traditional components of local potential and development factors with these new elements - openness, diversity, atmosphere, creativity, symbolic value of the city. One of the currently often used possibilities is the creative city concept representing the new soft development factors paradigm which leads to development of quality of life for all segments acting in city by primarily using and improving available local potential.

On the other hand we can see that creative city concept is a natural response on change of current social situation in different areas (economic, political, cultural, social, environmental, etc.) which reflects the increasingly individualistic society approach to solving the resulting (and other) problems. Such an approach is in scientific and professional literature considered unsustainable because every member of society pursues primarily their own needs, which will meet each priority. The authors are also agreed that contemporary society is characterized by overconsumption and waste which are (in)directly increased and supported by the new *creativity* paradigm. Kagan and Hahn (2011) see a parallel here in activities of creative class attraction when the local public officials focused on providing such services and infrastructure, which does not always reflect the needs and requirements of the local community.

According to mentioned authors a key element of sustainable creative city is the respect for local specifics and status of individual entities (public, private and voluntary/community sectors) working or involved in promoting local development as equal partners with a certain

degree of autonomy. They also emphasize that the representatives of the creative industries - creative human capital – should be seen as mediators and catalysts of the creative process, rather than its owners or exclusive agents.

We consider important to analyse city's potential through such new development factors, or quality of life factors of creative city. In the following table 4 we summarize the most important local development factors which represent the results of our study of a creative city.

**Table 4 Creative City Development Factors**

<b>Factor</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Common Indicators</b>
Social Environment	Openness; Tolerance; Understanding the differences; Support of voluntary and community sector; Integration of foreigners; Support of local talent; Family-friendly; Values; Attitudes; Community engagement; Interpersonal relationships; Social enterprises	<b>CREATIVITY</b>
Public sector	Communicative, open and educated employees of a city; Ability to delegate some amount of authority and responsibilities; Quality and diversity of public services; Quality of soft and hard infrastructure; Support of community engagement; Support of public-private-voluntary/community partnership; Professionalism; Structure of local budget; Bureaucracy; Corruption	
Economic Environment	Creative and cultural industries; Start-up friendly; New forms of enterprises (networks, clusters, hubs, incubators); Job opportunities; Level of unemployment; Salary conditions; Innovative milieu; GDP; R&D	<b>COOPERATION</b>
Amenities	Festivals; Events; Diversity of bars and restaurants; Third/meeting places; Appropriate conditions for pedestrian, cyclist and skaters; Cultural and sports facilities; Recreational opportunities	
Natural Environment	Cleanliness of local environment; Geographic potential; Level of noise and dust in a city; Number and quality of green spaces	<b>CULTURE</b>
Symbolic Environment	Image of a city; History; Authenticity; Sensual perception of a city; Branding of a city; Cultural heritage; Diversified, authentic and experimental offer; Clear identity of a city	
Built Environment	Housing conditions; Design of a city; Use of brownfields	

Source: own processing

These factors offer a wider look on the socio-economic situation and identify important elements of life according to various entities acting in the city. However, lesson learnt from researches on inhabitants and entrepreneurs of Banská Bystrica mentioned in this paper is the lack of willingness of respondents to cooperate in filling up questionnaires. If they did not trust their elected representatives' ability and willingness to make a change they would not want to participate on any research. Therefore we consider very important not only to start a research on (creative) city's development factors in Slovak cities but initiate the change based on its results and repeat such process in relevant period.

---

## References

- BAYCAN, T., GIRARD FUSCO, L., NIJKAMP, P. 2011. Creative and Sustainable Cities: A New Perspective. In: GIRARD FUSCO, L., BAYCAN, T., NIJKAMP, P. (eds.). *Sustainable City and Creativity. Promoting Creative Urban Initiatives*. Farnham :Ashgate Publishing Limited. pp. 3-12.
- BOOYENS, I., MOLOTJA, N., PHIRI, M. Z. 2011. *Creative Industries and Innovation: the Case of New Media Firms in Cape Town*. Cape Town: Centre for Science, Technology and Innovation Indicators, Human Science Research Council.
- ČAPKOVÁ, S. 2004. *Rozvoj miestnej ekonomiky*. Banská Bystrica: Univerzita Mateja Bela, Ekonomická fakulta v Banskej Bystrici.
- ČAPKOVÁ, S., et al. 2011. *Regionálny rozvoj a inovácie. Regional Development and Innovation*. Banská Bystrica: Univerzita Mateja Bela, Ekonomická fakulta.
- CHANTELOT, S., PÉRÈS, S., VIROL, S. 2011 *From Talent to Creative Cities: Toward a Conceptual Framework*. Barcelona: ERSACongress.
- CHAPAIN, C., COMUNIAN, R. 2010. Enabling or Inhibiting the Creative Economy: The Role of the Local and Regional Dimensions in England. In: *Regional Studies*. Vol. 44, No. 06, pp. 717-734.
- CLIFTON, N., COOKE, P. 2009. Creative Knowledge Workers and Location in Europe and North America: a Comparative Review. In: *Creative Industries Journal*. Vol. 2, No 1, pp. 73-89.
- EUROPEAN COMMISSION. 2011. *Sustainable Development in the European Union — 2011 Monitoring Report of the EU Sustainable Development Strategy*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- EUROPEAN UNION. 2013. *Quality of Life in Cities*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- EVANS, G. 2009. Creative Cities, Creative Spaces and Urban Policy. In *Urban Studies*. Vol. 46, No. 5-6, pp. 1003-1040.
- FLEW, T. 2010. Toward a Cultural Economic Geography of Creative Industries and Urban Development: Introduction to the Special Issue on Creative Industries and Urban Development. In: *The Information Society: An International Journal*. Vol. 26, No. 2, pp. 85-91.
- FLORIDA, R. 2004. *The Rise of the Creative Class. ...and How It's Transforming Work, Leisure, Community, & Everyday Life*. New York: Basic Books.
- GERTLER, M. S. 2004. *Creative Cities: What Are They For, How Do They Work, and How Do We Build Them?* Ottawa: Canadian Policy Research Networks Inc.
- GORDON, P. 2013. Thinking about Economy Growth: Cities, Networks, Creativity and Supply Chains for Ideas. In: *Annals of Regional Science*. Vol. 50, No. 3, pp. 667-684.
- HOSPERS, G. J. 2003. Creative Cities in Europe. Urban Competitiveness in the Knowledge Economy. In: *Intereconomics*. Vol. 38, No. 5, pp. 260-269.
- INTELI. 2011. *Creative-based Strategies in Small and Medium-sized Cities: Guidelines for Local Authorities*. Lisboa: INTELI.

- JUHÁSZOVÁ, M. 2011. *Faktory ovplyvňujúce spokojnosť obyvateľov so životom v meste (bachelor thesis)*. Banská Bystrica: Ekonomická fakulta Univerzity Mateja Bela.
- KAGAN S., HAHN, J. 2011. Creative Cities and (Un)Sustainability: From Creative Class to Sustainable Creative Cities. In *Culture and Local Governance / Culture et Gouvernance Locale*. Vol. 3, No. 1-2, pp. 11-27.
- LANDRY, CH. 2005. *Lineages of the Creative City*. Amsterdam: Netherlands Architecture Institute.
- LANDRY, CH. 2006. *The Art of City Making*. London: Earthscan.
- LANDRY, CH., HYAMS, J. 2012. *The Creative City Index: Measuring the Creative Pulse of Your City*. Gloucestershire: COMEDIA.
- MAIER, G., TÖDTLING, F. 1998. *Regionálna a urbanistická ekonomika 2*. Bratislava: ELITA.
- MAKOGON, Y., KHADZHYNOV, I. 2010. Research of Creative Role of City in Attraction of Globalizing Investment Flows. In: *Economics and Management*. Vol. 2010, No. 15, pp. 145-148.
- MERCER LLC. 2011. *Quality of Living. City Survey. Montreal, Canada*. New York: Mercer.
- OECD. 2014. *Better Life Index*. Paris: OECD Better Life Index.
- RIVAS, M. 2011. From Creative Industries to the Creative Place. Refreshing the Local Development Agenda in Small and Medium-sized Towns. In: *Redige*. Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 131-147.
- ROMEIN, A., TRIP, J. J. 2009. *Key Elements of Creative City Development: an Assessment of Local Policies in Amsterdam and Rotterdam*. Madrid: Universidad Rey Juan Carlos of Madrid.
- RUMPEL, P., SLACH, O., KOUTSKÝ, J. 2008. *Měkké faktory regionálního rozvoje*. Ostrava: Ostravská univerzita v Ostravě.
- STEWART, W. C., KUSKA, S. S. B. 2010. Developing and Sustaining Creative Cities: A Sustainability Tool for Designers, Planners, and Public Administrators. In: *International Journal of Sustainable Development*. Vol. 13, No. 1-2, pp. 6-16.
- STORPER, M. 2010. Why Does a City Grow? Specialisation, Human Capital or Institutions? In: *Urban Studies*. Vol. 47, No. 10, pp. 2027-2050.
- TRIP, J. J.; ROMEIN, A. 2010. *Creative City Policy: Bridging the Gap with Theory*. Vienna: Eighth European Urban and Regional Studies Conference.
- UNCTAD, 2010. *The Creative Economy Report 2010*. Geneva: United Nations Conference on Trade and Development.
- VAŇOVÁ, A. 2006. *Strategické marketingové plánovanie rozvoja územia*. Banská Bystrica: Univerzita Mateja Bela, Ekonomická fakulta v Banskej Bystrici.
- VÝROSTOVÁ, E. 2010. *Regionálna ekonomika a rozvoj*. Bratislava: Iura Edition.