

G.A. Naizabayeva<sup>1\*</sup>, V.M. Dianova<sup>2</sup>, G. Yessim<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Kazakhstan, Nur-Sultan

<sup>2</sup>Saint Petersburg State University, Russian, Saint Petersburg

\*e-mail: gnaizabayeva@mail.ru

## CULTURE AS AN IMPORTANT RESOURCE FOR URBAN CHANGE

The paper considers culture as an important resource through which various changes in the urban environment are carried out. The analysis of the cultural realities of European cities covered in the Cultural and Creative Cities Monitor framework (CCCM) shows the presence and attractiveness of cultural institutions and places (cultural diversity) in the urban environment, the feature of culture to create jobs and innovation (creative economy), and conditions conducive to the flourishing of cultural and creative processes (favorable environment). The study results show cultural and creative values are distributed differently in European cities, in this regard, local authorities are able to develop strategies taking into account specific features and conditions of each city. Particularly, it concludes that medium-sized cities cultural fund amount per capita exceeds the amount in large cities. Accordingly, the analysis carried out makes it possible to assess the level of development of urban culture at individual stages and determine its impact on the development of cities and population as a whole.

However, the following questions remain: what cultural heritage, economic variables or institutional factors can explain the marked differences between cities? How can culture influence the economic environment of a city and the well-being of people in different typologies of cities? How do changes in the urban structure contribute to the development of cultural institutions and events? Do urban dwellers have the same opportunities to access culture and develop cognitive and relational skills within and outside the urban environment? The answers to these questions may influence to the research outcomes in the field of culture, urban planning, comparative public policy, etc.

**Key words:** urban culture, cultural foundations, creative economy, cultural diversity, traditions and values.

Г.А. Найзабаева<sup>1\*</sup>, В.М. Дианова<sup>2</sup>, Г. Есім<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университеті, Қазақстан, Нұр-Сұлтан қ.

<sup>2</sup>Санкт-Петербург мемлекеттік университеті, Ресей, Санкт-Петербург қ.

\*e-mail: gnaizabayeva@mail.ru

### Мәдениет қала өзгерісінің маңызды ресурсы ретінде

Бұл жұмыстың мақсаты – мәдениетті қалалық қоршауда түрлі өзгерістер жүзеге асырылатын маңызды ресурс ретінде қарастыру. CCCM (The Cultural and Creative Cities Monitor – CCCM) аясында қамтылған Еуропа қалаларының мәдени шындықтарын талдау мысалында, қалалық мекемелерде мәдени мекемелер мен нысандардың (мәдени әртүрлілік) болуы мен тартымдылығы қоршаған орта, мәдениеттің жұмыс орындары мен инновацияларды құру қабілеті (шығармашылық экономика), сондай-ақ мәдени-шығармашылық процестердің (қолайлы орта) өркендеуіне қолайлы жағдайларды талдады. Нәтижелер көрсеткендей, мәдени және шығармашылық құндылықтар Еуропа қалаларында әр түрлі бөлінеді, осыған байланысты жергілікті билік белгілі бір жағдайларды ескере отырып, даму стратегиясын жасай алады. Атап айтқанда, орта қалаларда жан басына шаққандағы мәдени қорлардың мөлшері ірі қалалардан асып түседі деген қорытынды жасалды. Тиісінше, жүргізілген талдау қала мәдениетінің жекелеген кезеңдеріндегі даму деңгейін бағалауға және оның қалалардың дамуына және жалпы халыққа әсерін анықтауға мүмкіндік береді.

Алайда, келесі сұрақтар қалады: қандай мәдени мұра, экономикалық айнымалылар немесе институционалды факторлар қалалар арасындағы айқын айырмашылықтарды түсіндіре алады? Мәдениет қаланың экономикалық ортасына және әр түрлі типологиядағы адамдардың әлауқатына қалай әсер етуі мүмкін? Қалалық құрылымдағы өзгерістер мәдени мекемелер мен іс-шаралардың дамуына қалай ықпал етеді? Қала тұрғындарының мәдениетке қол жеткізу және қала ортасында және одан тыс жерлерде танымдық және қарым-қатынас дағдыларын дамыту мүмкіндігі бірдей ме? Тиісінше, осы сұрақтарға жауаптар мәдениет және қала құрылысы саласындағы зерттеулер, салыстырмалы мемлекеттік саясат және т.б.

**Түйін сөздер:** қалалық мәдениет, мәдени негіздер, шығармашылық экономика, мәдени әртүрлілік, дәстүрлер мен құндылықтар.

Г.А. Найзабаева<sup>1\*</sup>, В.М.Дианова<sup>2</sup>, Г. Есим<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Евразийский национальный университет им. Л. Н. Гумилева, Казахстан, г. Нур-Султан

<sup>2</sup>Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет, Россия, г. Санкт-Петербург

\*e-mail: gnaizabayeva@mail.ru

### Культура как важный ресурс городских изменений

Цель данной работы – рассмотреть культуру в качестве важного ресурса, посредством которого осуществляются различные изменения в городской среде. На примере анализа культурных реалий европейских городов, которые освещены в рамках CCCM (The Cultural and Creative Cities Monitor – CCCM), было рассмотрено наличие и привлекательность культурных заведений, и объектов (культурное разнообразие) в городской среде, способность культуры создавать рабочие места и инновации (креативная экономика), а также были проанализированы условия, способствующие процветанию культурных и творческих процессов (благоприятная среда). Результаты показывают, что культурные и творческие ценности по-разному распределены по европейским городам, в этой связи, местные власти получают возможность разрабатывать стратегии развития с учетом конкретных условий. В частности, был сделан вывод, что в средних по размеру городах размер культурных фондов на одного жителя превышает таковой в городах крупных. Соответственно, проводимый анализ дает возможность оценить уровень развития городской культуры на отдельно взятых этапах и определить ее влияние на развитие городов и населения в целом.

Вместе с тем, остаются открытыми следующие вопросы: какое культурное наследие, экономические переменные или институциональные факторы могут объяснить заметные различия между городами? Как культура может влиять на экономическую среду города и благосостояние людей в различных типологиях городов? Как изменения в городской структуре способствуют развитию культурных заведений и мероприятий? Имеют ли жители городов одинаковые возможности для доступа к культуре и развития когнитивных навыков и навыков взаимоотношений внутри и за пределами городской среды? Соответственно, ответы на указанные вопросы могут оказать влияние на решение вопросов в области исследований культуры и городского планирования, сравнительной государственной политики и пр.

**Ключевые слова:** городская культура, культурные фонды, креативная экономика, культурное разнообразие, традиции и ценности.

### Introduction

The significant increase of interests to culture as an important resource for urban change has been mentioned over the past two decades. A growing number of scientific publications were devoted to this issue as well as the interest from international organizations such as the United Nations, Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development and European Commission. The culture is argued to be an integral part of local identity, quality of life, and a competitive sector with broader implications and impact on tourism, creativity, innovation, urban growth, urban recovery, and well-being (Backman & Nilsson, 2016). Thus, culture has become a decisive political response to the needs for innovation and social cohesion at different spatial levels of political intervention. However, the practical implementation of culture-based development strategies remains a certain challenge. This is because culture has got multidimensional nature and it covers various areas of the economy, society, and people's

lives. Any cultural action requires an integrated policy approach supported by a broad analytical framework. This framework is expected to assist in measuring the diverse sets of cultural resources that may be mobilized for the development and their diverse impacts on economies and societies. Culture drives sustainable development, Throughout the past decade, statistics, indicators and data on the cultural sector, as well as operational activities have underscored that culture can be a powerful driver for development, with community-wide social, economic and environmental impacts. Of particular relevance is the cultural sector's contribution to the economy and poverty alleviation. Cultural heritage, cultural and creative industries, sustainable cultural tourism, and cultural infrastructure can serve as strategic tools for revenue generation, particularly in developing countries given their often-rich cultural heritage and substantial labour force (electronic resource).

The urban environment is indeed very diverse in every sense. Since culture unambiguously determines the city development level, the following

questions remain: Which urban contexts are more influenced by culture? Which of them recognizes culture as the engine of the creative economy? What conditions may help in realizing the “city-culture” relation in the best way? The absence of an appropriate measurement system is likely to add culture value for cities and communities which remains largely elusive, and budgets for culture are also gradually being reduced (Prior & Blessi, 2012).

The philosopher, scientist, and the largest representative of Eastern Peripatetics, al-Farabi must be mentioned here, and his work “Treatise on the views of the inhabitants of a virtuous city”. According to Farabi, “A virtuous city is like a perfect, healthy body, all organs of which help each other in order to preserve the life of a living being and make it the most complete. A virtuous city is the opposite of an ignorant city, an immoral city, a city of exchange, and a lost city. Likewise, individuals are opposite to him – representatives of these cities” (Grigoryan 1960: 265-280). In this way the lack of proper monitoring tools in this area is mainly based on two arguments. On the one hand, the difficulty of defining and differentiating culture taking into account the complexity of the cultural processes of production, consumption, and the heterogeneity of the players involved. On the other hand, the lack of suitable and comparable data. However, culture may still be viewed as a multifaceted urban phenomenon based on the use of available data which comes from both official statistics and experimental network sources.

This paper aims to consider culture as an important resource through which various changes in the urban environment are carried out.

### Research methodology

This paper provides a brief literature overview on the multifaceted relationship between culture and urban development. The comparative research method was applied to compare different examples of culture and urban development.

### Results

Culture is a phenomenon that mostly “happens” in urban areas. Since the Renaissance period, the best art works and most important intelligentsia communities have been closely associated with cities throughout the centuries. Therefore, not surprisingly, today the cultural heritage of most nations, especially in Europe, is concentrated in the urban environment.

Cities are indeed places where close human relationships are built, and culture is a phenomenon that tends to picture local features. Each city has its own culture reflecting both: partly its past heritage and projection in the world. (Astashova, 2020).

With the rapid increase of urban populations, managing urban sustainability has become one of the most important development challenges of the 21st century. As cities plan for a sustainable future, human resource development (HRD) professionals have the potential to facilitate collaboration across multiple organizations and at various scales (neighborhood, ward, city, metropolitan area) and to foster culture change that embraces ecological protection, economic development, and social equity. Although the role of HRD in crises management as a result of major environmental disasters is discussed in the literature, the field of HRD is in its infancy in examining its role and approaches in greening the society and addressing urban environmental challenges proactively. This conceptual article examines sustainability and urban sustainability and their linkage with HRD, discusses the emergent roles of HRD in crisis management, presents opportunities and challenges for Green HRD as a proactive process, and concludes with a call for the moral imperative for HRD in urban sustainability in implementing long-term change processes with a social justice and equity agenda. This part of the article informs local government agencies, nonprofit and for-profit organizations, community groups, and their HRD leaders involved in urban sustainability planning and implementation on approaches to building new adaptive capacity and fostering culture change through collaborative learning and leadership interventions (Benton-Short & Cseh, 2015).

In the context of increasing globalization, such a “root” character of culture has become even more relevant than in the past. Culture is an authentic form that contributes to the definition of a city as a unique environment with its own features. Thus, culture can help urban dwellers develop a sense of sedentary way of life, and help them achieve socially significant goals (Sleuwaegen & Boiardi, 2014). While the growth of urban centres has given millions of people access to what we call “progress”, social, demographic, economic, and political problems result when cities “become too big to be socially manageable and when such large cities distort the development of the surrounding countryside or even the whole society itself by drawing to themselves resources that are needed for more balanced growth nationwide”. As argued by Ernest Callenbach, this situation can be attributed to the rules of market-

driven society: on waste – goods are cheap and disposable; on costs – trust the market, everything has its monetary price; on population – go forth and multiply; on energy – always do the cheapest thing, no matter what the consequences; on happiness – focus on accumulating material possessions; on relationships with other species – only humans matter; and on the future – let the future worry about the future. Such rules guiding people's behaviour have led to a number of systemic problems (Nadarajah & Yamamoto, 2007).

During the post-industrial transition, culture is increasingly seen as a full-fledged economic sector influencing employment and wealth creation as well as innovation and urban competitiveness. The 'cultural value chain' actually intersects with many other urban functions: creative knowledge typical to art and culture; thus, drawing a significant impact on other information-intensive sectors of the economy like cultural tourism and consumer preferences in the field of various goods and services.

The idea that culture can have a significant impact on the aforementioned fields does not avoid the influence to other possible fields. Therefore, the questions of how it happens and what circumstances result it require attention. For instance, the United Nations has determined government support, private sector participation, collaboration with civil society, arts and culture education and training, media and communication capabilities enabling cities to use the most of cultural resources. Likewise, the World Economic Forum in 2016 identified five key drivers of the creative economy, namely proximity to academic, research and cultural centers, technological capabilities as well as successful entrepreneurs, effective laws and regulations, and attractive amenities (Charron, Dijkstra & Lapuente, 2014).

Scholars are actively debating how these factors might actually influence cultural and creative processes. For example, the presence of universities can be a crucial element for the generation of knowledge, attracting highly qualified specialists, stimulating innovation, and territorial development. In particular, leading-edge universities may help boost productivity and entrepreneurship.

The general "atmosphere of the place" is another crucial factor for generating ideas: art and creativity are argued to be more likely to thrive in societies which are open to different views and visions, where there is a high level of trust.

However, despite many points of views, the formulation of an effective urban policy agenda based on culture in European cities requires more comparable knowledge about cultural capital, creative

economy, and enabling factors that can be mobilized in the cultural environment (Amin & Thrift, 2007).

The comparative structure of cultural factors may function as a pillar useful for political and economic assessment of the city potential. Firstly, it may provide an opportunity to better understand the strategic alternatives and elements that have possibly influenced the urban experience. Secondly, the comparison results may serve as recommendations for a certain city by explaining what improvements that city needs compared to other similar cities or cities with "best practice". Finally, based on comparison results, city development policies are easily formulated in key areas such as creative workforce, cultural amenities, transport infrastructure, or governance.

Despite the fact that the existing statistical tools are certainly relevant as a starting point for analyzing the cultural realities of modern cities, they are not effective enough when it comes to understanding and reflecting the multidimensional nature of culture (Gun, 2012a). Since the mid-1970s, culture-related indicators have been the subject of in-depth research and much effort has been made to internationally harmonize cultural statistics. Interestingly, culture is also gradually being incorporated into broader measurement systems focused on innovation, territorial competitiveness, or sustainability. However, the urban dimension of culture remains largely "unexplored territory," not to mention the multi-country context.

## Discussion

The role of culture in creating vibrant and creative cities is undeniable. Although lively discussions on this topic exist, the concept of "creative city" remains highly controversial. In fact, it is originated from many different sources, ranging from a socially entrenched model of creativity to a production approach and a related concept of the creative class in which culture actually plays only a minor and instrumental role in attracting talent. This conceptual complexity has resulted in the increase of many diverse (and, sometimes, conflicting) uses and effects in urban settings, and it also complicated the practical application of the term and related metrics. In addition, it is not easy to construct an appropriate urban sample based on the repertoire of comparable works analyzed above, since the determination of unambiguous selection criteria is not common practice (Gun, 2012b).

It is also worth noting the following facts, such as, the Power of Culture in City Planning focuses

on human diversity, strengths, needs, and ways of living together in geographic communities. The book turns attention to the anthropological definition of culture, encouraging planners in both urban and cultural planning to focus on characteristics of humanity in all their variety. It calls for a paradigm shift, re-positioning city planners' "base maps" to start with a richer understanding of human cultures. Borrup argues for cultural master plans in parallel to transportation, housing, parks, and other specialized plans, while also changing the approach of city comprehensive planning to put people or "users" first rather than land "uses" as does the dominant practice (Borrup, 2020).

However, the willingness of cities to participate at different levels and different forms with their cultural resources and creative endeavors must be included in the process of considering the characteristics of creative cities in order to maintain social and economic health.

The willingness of creative cities to participate in a given process may be assessed in accordance with various criteria such as the presence of cultural values and events that have received international recognition (UNESCO World Heritage Sites, major international art fairs and Olympic Games). Nonetheless, such indicators are not always reliable due to their potentially "overlapping" geographic coverage (e.g., UNESCO sites may transcend city boundaries), and possibly restrictive (e.g., contemporary art), or dispersive (e.g., sports) thematic coverage.

We can agree that the most optimal criterion in this regard might be recognized as the presence of three comparable types of initiatives (European Capital of Culture – ECoC, UNESCO Creative City and international festivals). This criterion might be the most convincing indicator of cultural interaction (Scott, 1997).

Culture is essentially an urban phenomenon. However, research on culture and creativity is mainly concentrated in capitals and large metropolitan areas (Astashova, 2020). More recently, the interest of cultural researchers has shifted to the study of the cultural realities of small urban areas. While large cities tend to have a wider range of cultural resources, smaller cities also have high intellectual potential. Thus, small cities can have important advantages over larger ones which may include, among other things, a high quality of life, educational resources, and cultural values. Accordingly, high levels of "cultural brightness" as measured by the CCCM can be found in various typologies of cities which include but are not limited to European capitals and metropolitan areas.

Studies shows that in fifteen of the twenty-four European countries researched (63%) mostly medium-sized cities outperform capitals in terms of cultural vibrancy. For instance, very high indicators of Florence in this context are mainly due to the presence of a large number of museums, while Ghent, the creative city of UNESCO music, is in the leading position because of the large number of concert halls.

One of the options for determining the cultural development level of cities is the methodology for expressing the majority of indicators per capita. This approach is primarily intended to ensure comparability between cities, but its use suggests that the rate of cultural infrastructure per capita in small cities is higher than in large ones.

At the same time, it also confirms the multi-centric structure of Europe, especially strengthened by countries with decentralized systems of government. Some European countries are indeed highly polarized around the capital (e.g., Denmark, France, and Portugal), while others are quite multipolar (e.g., Belgium, Germany, Italy, and Spain), a tendency that is very strongly reflected in these results.

Researchers also highlight a strong empirical correlation between higher levels of density and concentration of creative industries. Creative industries tend to concentrate in space in order to take advantage of the agglomeration economy. The scholars note the location of a creative company next to competitors, among other advantages, increases its opportunities for trading and hiring highly qualified personnel. They also emphasized the population and level of economic development as well as the density of economic agents in the territory which determine the importance of the benefits that creative companies may obtain from their co-location, for example, intersectoral interaction, better access to utilities (cultural, institutional, and political), and foster knowledge sharing and innovation.

However, according to recent studies, we should also note that in comparison with small towns in the capital, nineteen out of twenty-four countries (almost 80%) receive the highest score in the Creative Economy in nineteen out of twenty-four countries (almost 80%) – with the exception of Austria, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, and Sweden. Cultural, historical, economic and methodological factors usually facilitate these processes. In Italy, for instance, the advantages of agglomeration have historically been found in Milan, which together with Rome (lagging only a few points) is a major center of the cultural and creative economy.

A closer look at the indicators underlying the creative economy area may better explain the results for Austria, the Netherlands, and Sweden.

While capital cities have a more balanced ranking across the board, winning cities stand out better on one metric which increases the overall score. In Sweden, for example, Umea earns the highest score (100) for the annual number of jobs created, largely due to the city's incredibly rapid growth over the past few decades. In the Netherlands, Eindhoven has the highest innovation score (100) compared to the capital Amsterdam, most likely due to its renowned and prolific high-tech and design-oriented environment.

In Austria, Linz ranks first due to a very high share of cultural and creative jobs per capita, but Vienna as a capital city registers the best job creation opportunities in the creative economy (Charron, Dijkstra, & Lapuente, 2014).

When it comes to openness and trust, the results can again be mixed. Thus, in big cities, there may indeed be a higher level of diversity and tolerance which is explained by the broader opportunities for personal contact. However, a higher level of general trust can be found in smaller cities due to a stronger sense of community. Previous studies, for example, have shown that the level of trust at the local level is inversely proportional to population density. Other studies have attempted to quantify the differences between urban and rural areas, and scholars have found that social capital within the local community is higher in rural areas.

The development of urban culture is also influenced by the relationship between the quality of governance and demographic variables such as the population size. On the one hand, the argument that smaller populations are more manageable goes back to Ancient Greece. The fact that the smaller Scandinavian countries are particularly renowned for good governance seems to fit well with this argument. However, researchers prove there is no conclusive evidence in the literature on this matter: for example, while some authors argue that better management practices are used in large US states (Scott, 1997), others do not find a relationship between size and corruption in a large sample of countries (Blessi, Grossi, Sacco, Pieretti, & Ferilli, 1997).

Finally, the transportation issues arise in capitals and major cities. These places are likely to have better air connections due to national policies and infrastructure investments centered around more densely populated areas.

However, a more polycentric pattern can be found in decentralized countries. The templates can

also depend on the vehicle types. For example, second-tier cities in Western Europe are usually well connected by roads and the railway, while connection between second-tier cities in Eastern Europe is well developed mainly by roads, and partly the railway.

In addition, in fourteen out of twenty-four countries (58%), non-capital cities outperform capital cities in "Favorable Environment". An analysis of the underlying indicators reveals different patterns of specialization. For instance, Milan is particularly good in terms of the number of high-quality universities (97,9/100), while Leuven outperforms in ICT Graduates (100), and also demonstrates exceptionally high indicators in terms of "Potential Accessibility of Roads" (94,5), and "Direct trains to other cities" per capita (90,7) (Scott, 1997).

Regarding "Cultural vibrancy", many cities tend to exceed the capital in multipolar countries such as Italy, Belgium, Germany, and the Netherlands. In Poland and Romania, the large number of cities surpassing the capital in this aspect are mainly explained by the good performance of different cities in the larger number of graduates in ICT, or Arts and Humanities.

In contrast, Spanish cities, despite the typical decentralized environment, which is well reflected in the results of the cultural vibration, only Barcelona performs better than others followed by Madrid. This result is mainly attributed to Barcelona's excellent performance in the University Rankings Average (100) also followed by a very good score in People's Trust (59,4), which in fact contradicts research that claims that in big cities the level of trust is lower than in small ones (Scott, 12).

Although the methodological problems always inherent in describing a complex concept such as culture, the data collected show that different sets of cultural resources and enabling factors can be mobilized for targeted investment efforts using different typologies of cities. While capitals and metropolitan areas dominate in performing the creative economy, the literature does provide examples of how policy measures can circumvent geographic determinism. In particular, under certain conditions, government policy may allow new economic centers to develop outside the capitals by embedding them in "network" relations (Scott, 12). As suggested by researchers, the structural context of small towns can be reshaped and transformed by creating urban networks dedicated to specific areas of activity (such as tourism, food, culture or education) and identifying new opportunities associated with specific niches of the global market.

## Conclusion

A number of examples show that culture is a powerful resource for urban development. If earlier culture was viewed as a purely costly field, now it is a resource for the territory development. What does this resource consist of? On the one hand, it is cultural heritage. On the other hand, it is a modern and relevant culture. In this sense, we may assume culture is our spine, it gives us confidence and stability, and not “a shield with which we close ourselves from reality”. Since we firmly feel our identity as a person living in a given territory, we will psychologically accept the changes much easier (Landry 2000).). The question lays what a cultural resource is (being noted as the main concept in the ideology of the city revival through culture). The resources of a given place are what distinguishes this place from others, what makes this place unique, unrepeatable, and distinctive. Having a basic infrastructure, residential buildings in the city, roads, water pipes and other demonstrate that we enter the market where we compete with other territories. Then, general infrastructure is almost the same everywhere, so the subject of competition becomes cultural differences (Landry 2000).

The Deputy Director-General of UNESCO for Culture Francesco Bandarin claims the urbanization process is rapidly gaining momentum around the world. According to forecasts, 41 megacities with a population of more than 10 million people will appear by 2030. Increased migration leads to an increase in cultural diversity in cities and towns, therefore it should be used as a sustainable source of creativity, innovation and inclusive development. As centers for cultural exchange and architectural heritage, cities are transforming public

spaces into venues for debate, creative expression, and social interaction. “Cities of the future must be human-centered, resilient, provide an urbanized and natural environment comfortable for life, build links between urban and rural areas, and develop public spaces. This requires the development of innovative and integrated policies that place culture at the heart of urban planning and renewal to ensure sustainable development and improve citizens’ quality of life”. (UNESCO 2016). Culture is a complex, multidimensional concept with important social, symbolic, and economic implications. Culture can refer to the traditions, beliefs and behavior of individuals, or to economic activities based on artistic creation, creative skills, and symbolic values. Culture is the key to achieving inclusive development, strengthening social ties and collaboration, and fostering creativity and innovation. While all of these elements are noteworthy, the CCCM focuses on the totality of the cultural provision and cultural participation of individuals, on the variables of the creative economy, and on the set of incentives – aspects that are rarely measured within a single system and in a multi-country context – in an effort to improve the measurement and understanding of the performance of cultural and creative cities across Europe. With regard to the “enabling environment”, more specific data on policies and foundations for culture, as well as on the “creative way” of urban governance, will provide a better understanding of the ability of local governments to develop cultural life and creative environments.

A diverse set of cultural resources and enabling factors can thus be mobilized in terms of cultural development not only by larger cities, but also by smaller cities throughout Europe.

## References

- Amin, A., & Thrift, N. (2007). Cultural-economy and cities // *Progress in Human Geography*, 31(2), 143-161.
- Асташова Н.Д. «Культура кризиса» и современный город. // *Вестн. Том. гос. ун-та.* – 2020. – №453.
- Backman, M., & Nilsson, P. (2016). The role of cultural heritage in attracting skilled individuals // *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 1-28.
- Benton-Short, L., & Cseh, M. (2015). Changing Cities, Changing Culture: The Challenges and Opportunities for HRD in Urban Sustainability. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 17(4), 460-472.
- Blessi, G., Grossi, E., Sacco P., Pieretti G., & Ferilli, G. (2016). The contribution of cultural participation to urban well-being. A comparative study in Bolzano/Bozen and Siracusa, Italy *Cities*, 50, 216-226.
- Borru, T. (2020). *The Power of Culture in City Planning*. Routledge. <https://www.routledge.com/The-Power-of-Culture-in-City-Planning/Borru/p/book/9780367223762>
- Charron, N., Dijkstra, L., & Lapuente, V. (2014). Regional governance matters: Quality of government within European Union member states. *Regional Studies*, 48(1), 68-90.
- Григорян, С. История философии Средней Азии и Ирана VII–XII вв. – М.: Издательство АН СССР, 1960.
- Гун Г.Е. Урбанистика и художественная культура города // *Вестник ЧГАКИ.* – 2012. – №1 (29).
- Гун Г.Е. Динамика городов и городской культуры // *Теория и практика общественного развития.* – 2012. – №12.

Лэндри Ч. Развитие городов через культуру (лекция)// Иваново, – 2000. <https://www.cultura.kh.ua/ru/materiali/2853-charlz-lendri-charles-landry-rozvitok-mist-cherez-kulturu-lektsija>

Nadarajah, M., & Yamamoto, A. T. (2007). *Urban crisis: Culture and the sustainability of cities*. United Nations University, part 1, 4.

Prior, J., & Blessi, G. (2012). Social capital, local communities and culture-led urban regeneration processes: The Sydney Olympic Park experience. *Cosmopolitan Civil Societies: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 4(3), 78-96.

Scott, A. (1997). The cultural economy of cities. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 21(2), 323-339.

Sleuwaegen, L., & Boiardi, P. (2014). Creativity and regional innovation: Evidence from EU regions. *Research Policy*, 43(9), 1508-1522.

UNESCO. (2012). Culture: A driver and an enabler of sustainable development. *Thematic Think Piece. UN System Task Team on the Post-2015 UN Development Agenda*. [https://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/pdf/Think%20Pieces/2\\_culture.pdf](https://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/pdf/Think%20Pieces/2_culture.pdf)

ЮНЕСКО. Культура лежит в основе благоустройства и обновления городов. – 2016.

<https://ru.unesco.org/news/kultura-lezhit-v-osnove-blagoustrojstva-i-obnovleniya-gorodov>

## References

Amin, A., & Thrift, N. (2007). Cultural-economy and cities. *Progress in Human Geography*, 31(2), 143-161.

Astashova N. (2020). “Kul'tura krizisa” i sovremennyj gorod. *Vestnik Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta*. – 453 s.

[Astashova N. (2020). “Culture of Crisis” and the Modern City. *Tomsk State University Journal*. – 453 p.] (in Russian)

Backman, M., & Nilsson, P. (2016). The role of cultural heritage in attracting skilled individuals. *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 1-28.

Benton-Short, L., & Cseh, M. (2015). Changing Cities, Changing Culture: The Challenges and Opportunities for HRD in Urban Sustainability. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 17(4), 460-472.

Blessi, G., Grossi, E., Sacco P., Pieretti G., & Ferilli, G. (2016). The contribution of cultural participation to urban well-being. A comparative study in Bolzano/Bozen and Siracusa, Italy *Cities*, 50, 216-226.

Borup, T. (2020). *The Power of Culture in City Planning*. Routledge. <https://www.routledge.com/The-Power-of-Culture-in-City-Planning/Borup/p/book/9780367223762>

Charron, N., Dijkstra, L., & Lapuente, V. (2014). Regional governance matters: Quality of government within European Union member states. *Regional Studies*, 48(1), 68-90.

Grigoryan S. (1960). *Istoriya filosofii Srednej Azii i Irana VII–XII vv.* – M: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSR. [Grigoryan S. (1960). *History of Philosophy of Central Asia and Iran VII-XII centuries.* – M: Publishing house of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR.] (in Russian)

Gun G. (2012a). Urbanistika i hudozhestvennaja kul'tura goroda. *Vestnik kul'tury i iskusstv*. №1(29). [Gun G. (2012a). Urban studies and artistic culture of the city. *Culture and Arts Herald*, 1(29).] (in Russian)

Gun G. (2012b). Dinamika gorodov i gorodskoj kul'tury. *Teoriya i praktika obshchestvennogo razvitiya*. №12. [Gun G. (2012b). Dynamics of cities and urban culture. *Theory and practice of social development*, 12.] (in Russian)

Landry, C. (2000). *Urban Development Through Culture (Lecture)*. Retrieved from <https://www.cultura.kh.ua/ru/materiali/2853-charlz-lendri-charles-landry-rozvitok-mist-cherez-kulturu-lektsija>

Nadarajah, M., & Yamamoto, A. T. (2007). *Urban crisis: Culture and the sustainability of cities*. United Nations University, part 1, 4.

Prior, J., & Blessi, G. (2012). Social capital, local communities and culture-led urban regeneration processes: The Sydney Olympic Park experience. *Cosmopolitan Civil Societies: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 4(3), 78-96.

Scott, A. (1997). The cultural economy of cities. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 21(2), 323-339.

Sleuwaegen, L., & Boiardi, P. (2014). Creativity and regional innovation: Evidence from EU regions. *Research Policy*, 43(9), 1508-1522.

UNESCO. (2012). Culture: A driver and an enabler of sustainable development. *Thematic Think Piece. UN System Task Team on the Post-2015 UN Development Agenda*. [https://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/pdf/Think%20Pieces/2\\_culture.pdf](https://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/pdf/Think%20Pieces/2_culture.pdf)

YUNESKO (2016). *Kul'tura lezhit v osnove blagoustrojstva i obnovleniya gorodov* [UNESCO (2016). Culture is at the heart of urban beautification and renewal]. <https://ru.unesco.org/news/kultura-lezhit-v-osnove-blagoustrojstva-i-obnovleniya-gorodov> (in Russian)