

ON THE CURRENT SITUATION OF CREATIVE INDUSTRIES IN TURKEY

Erman M. DEMİR*

Received: 01.02.2022 - Accepted: 23.03.2022

Demir, E. M. (2022). On the current situation of creative industries in Turkey. *Etkileşim*, 9, 224-239. doi: 10.32739/etkilesim.2022.5.9.162

This study complies with research and publication ethics.

Abstract

The Creative Industries [CI] have become an increasingly popular political and academic discussion topic in the world over the past three decades. In Turkey, it is a concept that has come to the fore recently and is the subject of relatively few academic publications. Although it is noteworthy that the studies on the subject in Turkey have started to enrich, especially in the last five years, it is quite optimistic to say that a solid discussion ground has been established. In the field of public policy, there are many efforts that explicitly or implicitly refer to the idea of CI. On the other hand, it seems that CI are not defined as a holistic and coordinated policy area. In the light of the presumption that the potential changes created by CI, especially its social effects, are handled without questioning, it can be stated that the relations of unique cultural values to sectors have become complicated. This study is a compilation made in order to lay the groundwork for the realization of original studies on the creative sectors, to add dimension to the CI discussion and to draw attention to policymaking on this issue.

Keywords: creative industries, cultural industries, creative economy, Turkey.

*PhD/Researcher, Başkent University, Creative and Cultural Industries Research Center, medemir@baskent.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0002-7123-5742

TÜRKİYE'DE YARATICI ENDÜSTRİLERİN MEVCUT DURUMU ÜZERİNE

Erman M. DEMİR*

Gönderim Tarihi: 01.02.2022 - Kabul Tarihi: 23.03.2022

Demir, E. M. (2022). On the current situation of creative industries in Turkey. *Etkileşim*, 9, 224-239. doi: 10.32739/etkilesim.2022.5.9.162

Bu çalışma araştırma ve yayın etiğine uygun olarak gerçekleştirilmiştir.

Öz

Yaratıcı Endüstriler [YE] son otuz yıl içerisinde dünyada giderek yaygınlaşan politik ve akademik tartışma konusu haline gelmiştir. Türkiye'de ise yakın zamanda gündeme gelen ve nispeten daha az sayıda akademik yayına konu olan bir kavramdır. Özellikle son beş yıl içerisinde Türkiye'de konu üzerine çalışmaların zenginleşmeye başlaması dikkat çekse de, sağlam bir tartışma zemini tesis edildiğini söylemek için oldukça iyimser olmak gerekir. Kamu politikaları alanında ise YE düşüncesine açık ya da örtük olarak başvuran pek çok çalışma vardır. Buna karşın YE'nin bütüncül ve koordineli bir politika alanı olarak tanımlanmadığı görülmektedir. YE'nin toplumsal etkileri başta olmak üzere yarattığı potansiyel değişimleri sorgulanmadan ele alındığı ön kabulü ışığında, özgün kültürel üretimin sektörlerle ilişkilerinin karmaşıklaştığı ifade edilebilir. Bu çalışma, yaratıcı sektörlerle ilişkin özgün çalışmaların gerçekleştirilmesi için zemin hazırlamak, YE tartışmasına boyut kazandırmak ve bu konuda politika üretilmesine dikkat çekmek amaçlarıyla yapılan bir derlemedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: yaratıcı endüstriler, kültür endüstrileri, yaratıcı ekonomi, Türkiye.

*Doktor-Araştırmacı, Başkent Üniversitesi, Yaratıcı Kültür Endüstrileri Araştırma ve Uygulama Merkezi, medemir@baskent.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0002-7123-5742

Introduction

According to a widely accepted definition, Creative Industries [CI] is a framework concept consisting of industries that create employment and welfare on the basis of intellectual property by incorporating individual creativity and talent (DCMS¹, 2001: 9). In the last 30 years, political and academic discourse centered on the economic potential of CI has been rising (Flew, 2017; Florida, 2012; Hartley, 2005). The creative economy context, which is shaped around CI and includes creative and cultural products and copyrights, is seen as an important source of transformation (Howkins, 2002). Thus, in this context, instead of the importance given to material production in the past, the focus is on the production of cultural symbols led by ideas and creativity, and the economic value of non-material production, which emphasizes the commodity value of knowledge.

Policies for CI focus on the intersection of culture, arts, humanities and technological innovation. CI are considered to support innovation capacity through the creation of new products, supporting service/product production and marketing activities. In addition, the demand created by the creative industries is considered to be important for the development of new technologies, especially in the field of information and communication. In short, it is stated that CI, which is prone to diversity and innovation by nature, has a positive effect on innovation capacity (Müller et al, 2009).

As Rosso states, (2012: 5-7) an example of this approach is the European Union [EU] document *Creating an Innovative Europe*, where design, service sector and culture-based creativity (non-technological innovations) is defined as an important tool for Europe's competitive growth potential. Discussing the contribution of creativity and cultural production to the competitive capacity of innovation in the *EU's Material Innovation and Research in Creative Industries* report, it addresses the issues of increasing employment in the EU by finding new ways to increase cooperation and synergy between scientists, engineers and the CI.

The concept of innovation, which is closely related to economic development, is based on the abilities and ideas of the individual. Modern management researchers consider the individual as their primary unit of study, while invoking psychological theories to reveal the secrets of innovation and motivation. In this respect, the importance attributed to human capital in policies coincides with the approach of CI concept that focuses on individual potential. It can be counted as indicators of the importance of human capital development aspect of CI in policy documents, reports of international organizations and national strategies in the recent period (Hesmondhalgh and Baker, 2011).

Some researchers argue that CI have broader implications than their own existence and is therefore very attractive to policymakers and managers. CI

¹United Kingdom Department for Culture, Media & Sport.

set an example for all industries by providing a model of the type of worker required by flexible capitalism (Gill and Pratt, 2008). This form of work shapes young people's expectations by legitimizing the uncertainty and risks associated with informal employment practices or freelance work (Merkel, 2019). In other words, CI bring together the two conflicting dimensions of entrepreneurship: producing innovations and managing risks (Schumpeter, 2013), within the individual who takes responsibility for his/her career and job security in exchange for freedom (Banks, 2007).

Whether approached from a critical or mainstream perspective, the global developments in the last 30 years indicate that CI have rapidly increased their economic importance. It is obvious that this field, which is presented as a means of generating welfare for developing countries including Turkey, has attracted more attention in the recent period. In this study, policies and practical works on CI in Turkey are compiled and main approaches in research are questioned. The first purpose of this review is to give an idea about whether the necessary ground has been formed to assist the development of theoretical discussions on CI. For this purpose, it is briefly discussed how the objectives of the CI are included in political texts, sectoral and managerial practices. The second aim is to develop a better understanding of researchers' approaches to the CI as a research object. All this information aims to shed light on the characteristics of CI in Turkey as a research area, by presenting the general situation faced by researchers dealing with the subject. Additionally, due to the complexity of CI data in Turkey, and the scarcity of publications in English on this subject, this study provides a starting point for researchers of international comparative studies that also included Turkey in its sample.

One of the most important contributions of this study is that it tries to combine different institutions' CI efforts in a way that there can see the common points or differences, which has never been done before in Turkey. It is beyond the scope of this study to convey the theoretical debate in Turkey on CI, the creative economy or the cultural industries comprehensively.

This study aims to review strategic documents of governmental institutions and related papers of affiliate institutions referenced in these official documents. In accordance with the common CI policies in Western countries, the strategic documents of the Ministry of Culture and Tourism [MoCT] (*Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı*), Ministry of Industry and Technology [MoIT] (*Sanayi ve Teknoloji Bakanlığı*), and Ministry of Commerce [MoC] (*Ticaret Bakanlığı*) were examined; then, a keyword search was made in the reports and documents produced by the institutions affiliated with the ministry. In line with the aim of this study, academic papers, research or review articles, proceeding books and books are not included. Keywords for the selection of documents are identical to the keywords of this study. A total of 39 documents and reports are used for this study.

CI in Public Policies and Practices

It would be appropriate to start the evaluation of the CI by questioning how this relatively new concept for Turkey is included in policies. In this respect, development plans are important reference sources as basic documents that define economic and social development. When the first statements regarding CI are traced in policy documents, it is seen that the subject started to be mentioned in the early 2000s.

Development Plans are high-level economic policy documents prepared for 5-year periods. *Eighth Development Plan Intellectual Property Rights Specialization Commission* draws attention to the creation of a culture that values creativity and idea generation and the protection of intellectual property rights under the title of rewarding creativity and innovation (*Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı*² [DPT], 2007). In the aforementioned plan, the main purpose of the education system is expressed as raising “productive and creative information age people” (DPT, 2000: 82). While the same expression was preserved in the following development plan, in the *Tenth Development Plan*, under the title of education, the main objective was to raise “productive and happy individuals equipped with the basic knowledge and skills required by the information society” (*Kalkınma Bakanlığı*³ [KB], 2013: 31). The first of the goals listed in the same plan was determined as “Qualified People, Strong Society”, and the following lines emphasized the importance of “raising healthy individuals with high knowledge, skills and abilities regarding work and life in order to strengthen human capital” (KB, 2013: 29-30). From this point of view, the idea of associating human capital development with welfare in the background of CI policies (Hesmondhalgh, 2007) seems to have been included in the content of Turkey’s development plans approximately twenty years ago.

Although the way of thinking on which the concept is based could be traced in the plans, the concept of CI was not explicitly applied until the last development plan. For the first time, the expression of Creative Industries was included in the *Tenth Development Plan*. Under the *Urban Transformation and Housing* title of the plan, a policy limited to creative cities (Landry, 2008) is stated as “applications that support innovative and value-added sectors, creative industries, and high-tech and environmentally friendly production in urban transformation projects” (KB, 2013: 128). Also, under the title of *Art*, “the contribution of the culture industry to national income, exports and promotion of the country” (KB, 2013: 45) is mentioned. This situation, which is partially due to the classification logic of the plan, shows that the concept of CI is not comprehensively reflected in the plan. In addition, references to the idea of CI in terms of the creative intellectual capital, urban development and promoting the country are handled in a fragmented way.

Another important policy area related to the issue arises from the relation-

²State Planning Organization.

³Ministry of Development.

ship between copyright and the CI. Turkey has been a member of the World Intellectual Property Organization [WIPO] since 1976⁴. Today, the Ministry of Culture and Tourism (MoCT), General Directorate of Copyrights is the official institution responsible for the coordination of copyrights. Although the official institution responsible for the CI in Turkey has not been clearly identified yet, it seems useful to examine the plans and policies of MoCT due to its two international areas coordinated by the General Directorate of Copyrights: the target of developing CI in *The Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions* by UNESCO, and the activities carried out with WIPO.

In the *2010-2014 Strategic Plan* of the MoCT, the establishment of an effective copyright system at international standards is specified as the target. However, the plan does not refer to the concept of CI directly related to the emergence of copyrighted products. While the self-sufficient creative worker/artist image of the CI concept (Banks, 2007) is implicitly emphasized from time to time, it is predominantly mentioned about the preservation of culture and the promotion of the arts. In the strategic plan for the next period of *2015-2019*, the development and support of CI concerning copyright were counted among the strategic objectives (MoCT, n.d).

In the context of copyright, where legal regulations come to the fore, we can talk about an ecosystem consisting of legal professionals working in the field of intellectual property and rights holder artists, distributors or producers. With the contribution of Collecting Societies, the focus is on making and implementing legal regulations. In addition, some steps are being taken for copyrighted creative production works and therefore for CI. Efforts on CI so far by MoCT are summarized in the table below:

Table 1. Efforts on CI so far by MoCT

Year	Subject of Study/Report
2013	Project on Measuring the Contribution of Copyright-Based Industries to the Cultural Economy
2016	European Union twinning project named "Strengthening the Existing Copyright System for the Development of Creative and/or Cultural Industries"
2017	Turkey's participation in the UNESCO, The Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions, which includes the development of Cultural Industries
2019	Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions Focused on Supporting the Cultural Industries Consultation Meeting (two in March and October)

⁴Turkey became a WIPO member with the decision of the Council of Ministers dated 14 August 1975 and numbered 7/10540 which is published in 12 May 1976.

2019	Copyright Education Center cooperation protocol with 6 universities carrying out research and training activities in the fields of intellectual property, culture industry and cultural policies
2020	Culture Industries Support and Incentive Guide
2020	Report of Measuring the Impact of Culture Industries on the Turkish Economy
2021	Copyright Education Center cooperation protocol with 4 universities carrying out research and training activities in the fields of intellectual property, culture industry and cultural policies
2021	Creative Culture Industries Incubation Centers Report
2021	"Preparing Youth for Creative Economy: Incubation Centers and Entrepreneurship in the World and in Our Country" Panel
2021	"The Future Belongs to Youth" Cultural Industries Support Program

As seen above, the importance given to CI by the MoCT is increasing systematically, although it is expressed with different concepts, CI entrepreneurship is on the agenda. As can be seen in the following paragraphs, the development of enterprises and entrepreneurs in CI is also one of the priority issues in the projects coordinated by the Ministry of Industry and Technology (MoIT).

For the last ten years MoIT's activities on CI mainly focus on the gaming industry. These supports by the ministry, which increased with the effect of TOGED's⁵ lobbying efforts that explain the importance and future of the sector, ensured the worldwide success of the gaming industry in Turkey. KOSGEB⁶, a subsidiary of the MoIT, provides various incentives and supports to game industry entrepreneurs.

MoIT is the regulatory agency in Turkey for entrepreneurship, which is a very important aspect of CI. The process that started with the technology centers established by KOSGEB, an affiliate of the MoIT in the past, within the framework of university-industry cooperation, turns into the establishment of *Technology Development Zones* with the law enacted in 2001⁷. CI are not mentioned in this law and related regulation, which is the only place where entrepreneurship and incubators are defined in the legislation. Definitions in the legislation emphasize entrepreneurial activities focused on technological innovations. In this case, according to this legislation, it can be thought that CI are limited to the digital art, media and gaming sectors, where the internet and software areas intersect with creative content. In addition, creative employees other than software developers and designers cannot be supported in the MoIT incentive funds system, which guides entrepreneurs.

⁵ Turkish Game Developers Association (*Türkiye Oyun Geliştiricileri Derneği*, TOGED).

⁶ Small and Medium Enterprises Development Organization (*Küçük ve Orta Ölçekli Sanayi Geliştirme ve Destekleme İdaresi Başkanlığı*, KOSGEB).

⁷Technology Development Zones Law No. 4691.

In this context, design activities were included in the scope of support in the law⁸ enacted in relation to the R&D Reform Package published in the Official Gazette (*Resmî Gazete*) on February 26, 2016. Currently, 7,804 people are employed in 366 design centers within the body of private sector organizations within the scope of the support of design centers, which are closely related to the production of high value-added technological products by MoIT. The approach at this point is to associate the design, which is an important part of CI, with industrial activities as a unit of a particular company. It is not possible to develop design centers as structures that provide outsourcing services to companies, and to employ independent designers in this support system. Although the support of MoIT in the field of design is a positive factor for the development of CI, it can be argued that the way the support is given does not fully cover the flexibility and diversity dynamics of the creative economy. Instead, it encourages design activities to be carried out by an industry-specific, full-time team within the companies themselves.

MoIT is also the Contracting Authority for management of contracting and implementation of projects under Competitiveness and Innovation Sector Operational Programme [CISOP] (*Rekabet Edebilirlik ve Yenilik Sektörü Operasyonel Programı*). CISOP 2014-2020, which is co-financed by the EU from Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance (IPA), has a project call division for *Creative Industries* under the *Private Sector Development* action. Within the scope of the program, a call for *Creative Industries* was made in 2019. The projects announced in 2021, which were deemed appropriate to be supported by the applications made to this call, are listed in the table below:

Table 2. Projects appropriate for support

No.	Project & Owner
1	IDEA4ISTANBUL (Istanbul Industrial Design Center Project), İstanbul Chamber of Commerce
2	KHAS YEP Kadir Has University Creative Industries Platform, İstanbul
3	CREATE in İZMİR: Cultural and Creative Industries Entrepreneurship Center, İzmir Economy University
4	Emergence of Creative Industries and Transformation of Economy through Innovative Technologies: Games, Wearables and New Generation Film-making - ECIT, METU, Ankara
5	Developing Digitalization and Creativity Ecosystem in Kütahya, Kütahya Municipality

Another address for project support is development agencies affiliated with MoIT. The traces of CI concept can be seen in the regional plans of the agencies. CI were included in the 2014-2023 draft regional plans of the development agencies of Turkey's three big cities. İstanbul Kalkınma Ajansı⁹

⁸ Law No. 5746 on Supporting Research, Development and Design Activities.

⁹ İstanbul Development Agency.

[İSTKA], positions the theme of originality on creativity and innovation. In the plan, it is emphasized that the CI should be counted among the sectors with high competitive power and the share of employment and production should be increased (İSTKA, n.d). *Ankara Kalkınma Ajansı*¹⁰ [ANKARAKA] defines CI as an important potential in terms of achieving the high value-added economy in Ankara (ANKARAKA, n.d.). *İzmir Kalkınma Ajansı*¹¹ [İZKA] counts supporting all CI, primarily design, among its regional development goals (İZKA, n.d). Some examples of the projects and reports made by the agencies in this context are as follows:

Table 3. Examples of the projects and reports made by the agencies

Year	Subject
2010	İSTKA, Creative Industries Financial Support Program (Two separate sub-programs for businesses and non-profit institutions)
2012	İSTKA, Creative Industries Development Financial Support Program (For Businesses)
2013	İZKA, İzmir Cultural Economy and Cultural Infrastructure Inventory and İzmir Cultural Economy Development Strategy
2015	İSTKA, Creative Industries Development Financial Support Program (For Businesses)
2016	İSTKA, Innovative and Creative Istanbul Financial Support Program (For non-profit institutions)
2016	ANKARAKA, Digital Game Industry Report
2017	İSTKA supported report, Film Industry in Turkey
2017	İSTKA supported report, Situation Analysis of the Film Industry in Istanbul and Future of the Industry Analysis Report
2018	İSTKA, Innovative and Creative Istanbul Financial Support Program (For non-profit institutions)
2020	ANKARAKA, guided project, Establishment of Creative Industries Design and Training Center and Capacity Building of the Digital Game Industry in Ankara (ATOM) Project
2021	İSTKA, Creative Industries Financial Support Program (For non-profit institutions)
2021	İZKA, Analysis of Creative Industries in Turkey at the Level of İİBS-2 Regions: A Look at İzmir

These efforts of development agencies generally aim to create employment and welfare by CI, based on the potential of the region. Projects, dominated by an instrumental view of culture and creativity as key tools for the reconstruction of the post-industrial economy, are mostly based on international examples and reports (e.g. United Nations Conference on Trade and

¹⁰ Ankara Development Agency.

¹¹ İzmir Development Agency.

Development CI data). As an example, the following statement can be presented in the CI Financial Support Program document conducted by İSTKA in 2012: "Within the scope of the program, it is aimed to activate the relations between creativity, culture, economy and technology, product content, production, marketing and distribution mechanisms and to contribute to the development with creative industries."

The theoretical basis of the above-mentioned CI projects and reports is mainly taken from the international literature and reports, and academic studies in Turkey are rarely included. The most striking point is that the studies do not refer to previous reports or studies (content, target, result, etc.) in the same list. Generally, reference is made to the general objectives in the development plans mentioned above.

As can be seen, the agenda for CI in MoIT's mandate is quite diverse and rich. However, it should be remembered that the concept of CI is not included in the policy documents and legislation of the MoIT. Similarly, CI were not mentioned in MoIT's last four strategic plans (2013-2017, 2018-2022, 2019-2023 and 2020-2024).

The most recent development in this field among the public authorities is the Department of Cultural Services & Creative Industries, which was established in 2021 under the Ministry of Commerce, General Directorate of International Service Trade. This unit appears to aim to support and develop international commercial achievements in the fields of CI, including the digital arts. On the other hand, CI or related concepts are not included in the ministry's 2019-2023 strategic plan.

Some other international collaborations in the field of culture are closely related to the expectations that establish the relationship between prosperity and creativity. In this regard, it would be explanatory to focus on Turkey's contributions within the body of UNESCO, which attaches great importance to the creative economy. For example, the UNESCO creative cities network includes the cities of Gaziantep, Hatay, Istanbul and Kütahya (UNESCO, n.d). This network aims for cities to choose and develop themes to direct their talents and energies towards specific sectors of CI.

Sector initiatives are also discussed as a separate area related to public policies. The first professional organization initiative in this field was established in Istanbul in 2012 with the participation of 18 professional organizations. Creative Industries Council Association (*Yaratıcı Endüstriler Konseyi*) aims to bring together CI related to intellectual and industrial property by bringing together professional organizations that produce creative services and/or products and provide creative added value. In recent years, Union of Chambers and Commodity Exchanges of Turkey (*Türkiye Odalar ve Borsalar Birliği*) CI Assembly has accelerated its work. In the upcoming period, it is aimed to increase the visibility of the creative sectors with *Türkiye Kreatif Endüstriler Meclisi Ödülleri*

[TÜRKEM awards] (TOBB, 2021). Another example is the *Productivity in Creative Industries Congress* series, which was organized under the coordination of the Turkish Productivity Foundation (*Türkiye Verimlilik Vakfı*) with the aim of sustainable cultural development and fostering creative sectors that can compete with the world. The first of the congresses, which are planned to be held every three years, was held in Istanbul in 2018, and the second one was held in Ankara in 2021.

The British Council [BC] creative economy team nominates one country each year as a CI focus country. With reference to UNDP's Creative Economy report, BC determined Turkey, which is among the top three developing countries in creative services exports, as the focus country in 2014. This study aims to develop collaborations and new businesses in the field of creative economy between Turkey and the United Kingdom. In addition, capacity building studies were aimed to strengthen the relationship between technology, social development and economic welfare (BC, n.d). Since 2014, BC has organized the "Nesta Creative Entrepreneurship Program", which aims to create innovative business ideas in the fields of CI, four times in Turkey.

As seen above, policies and policy implementations in the CI field operate in a rich variety of applications. It can be stated that coordination is needed to ensure the efficiency of the resources spent and to establish the relationship between the works done.

Approaches to Creative Industries in Turkey

An important part of CI studies in Turkey are descriptive studies based on quantitative data. CI's studies focusing on economic size or contributions examine the creative sectors under different categories in official statistics, based on international taxonomies. In recent years, some inventory studies with the support of public institutions aim to provide data for measuring economic size and to make visible the employment and welfare creation potential of CI. In particular, these studies (Aksoy and Enlil, 2011; O. Demir, 2018; Öztürk, 2009; Ünsal, 2011), in which Istanbul stands out, mainly produce data on official statistics and make inferences on the regional structure and distribution of CI. In a previous study, the focus was on the CI cluster and it was stated that two important cities in this respect are Ankara and Istanbul (Lazzeretti et al, 2014). According to Demir's (2018) calculations, more than 46 thousand workplaces constituting 13.5% of the workplaces in the service sector in Istanbul are associated with CI. The author states that 15.6% of the total number of employees in Istanbul is related to CI.

As stated in the report titled "Creative economy outlook and country profiles: Trends in international trade in creative industries" published by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development [UNCTAD] in 2015, Turkey is one of the first five countries among developing countries in cre-

ative commodity exports along with China, Hong Kong, India and South Korea. In the world ranking, Turkey rose from 16th to 12th place with an increase of 12% between 2003 and 2012 (UNCTAD, 2015). Studies that reference these encouraging data analyze the economic size of the sector focusing on the value produced in relation to welfare.

The added value generated by CI in Turkey in 2011 is approximately 35.5 Billion TL, constituting 2.73% of the GDP. According to the employment figures of the same year, approximately 1.3 million people, which constitute 5.40% of more than 24 million employees in Turkey, work in the creative culture industries and related fields (Aktaş and Doğanay, 2014). In 2015, it was reported that the creative industries accounted for \$47.64 billion and 6.4% of the national income (Şen, 2017). The export figures of the creative industries in Turkey increased from \$3.3 billion in 2003 to \$9.9 billion in 2014 (UNCTAD, 2015). Other studies suggest different rates. According to the data in the current reports, CI is an important field with a potential for development, with a contribution to GDP approaching 1.5% and an employment rate exceeding 4% (WIPO, 2017) in Turkey. In the latest report prepared by MoCT, it is stated that the contribution rate to GDP is at the level of 2.88% (*Telif Hakları Genel Müdürlüğü*¹², 2020).

Economic data is generally evaluated in the light of international statistics and the value produced by other countries and interpreted as indicators of positive development potential. In this context, it is stated that although the CI are not yet at the desired level, they have the potential to play an important role in innovation and economic growth in Turkey, but their economic size is quite low compared to traditional sectors (Lazzeretti et al, 2018).

In recent years, in academic studies on CI in Turkey, the emphasis has been on introducing the concept (Esen and Atay, 2017) or revealing the CI potential in Turkey (O. Demir, 2018; Ertürk, 2011; Sümer and Şataf, 2018; Yardımcı, 2016). It can be stated that the creative economy is generally considered as the focus of employment and welfare in this approach, except that few studies, which can be given as examples related to the concepts of digital labor (Bulut, 2014) or creative labor (E. M. Demir, 2018) include critical theoretical discussion on CI. It can be stated that orthodox Marxist critics evaluate creative labor in the focus of exploitation and alienation (Kaya, 2016) and do not discuss the concept of CI other than using it as an analytical category.

It has been mentioned above that CI are not sufficiently included in the policy documents and strategy documents of public institutions. In the literature, the public's lack or need for a strategy for CI is often emphasized (Ada et al, 2018; Binark, 2019; E. M. Demir, 2014; Dervişoğlu, 2013; Kaymas, 2019; Lazzeretti et al, 2014).

Thus, creative industries research approaches in Turkey can be reduced

¹² Directorate General for Copyright.

to 3 main paths at the expense of losing some important details. The first is mainstream research based on statistics and regional studies derived from them, and the second is studies that address critical debates on CI through labor and work practices. Finally, there are studies that deal with CI at the level of cultural policies or strategies. Although there is no comprehensive literature summary due to the limitations of this study, it should be stated that the mentioned studies constitute an important part of the Turkish literature on CI and represent emerging approaches. In order to eliminate the lack of strategic integrity in official documents, it should be stated that there is a need for studies that deal with the issue in a multidimensional way and combine theoretical discussions (including critical approaches) and field research.

Conclusion

As the number of academic research on CI is increasing in Turkey, the components behind the creative economy and CI concept are used explicitly or implicitly in incentive mechanisms, reports and various policy documents. It is still too early to say that this situation, which is thought to arise from the weight of the relationship established between human capital and economic development in the context of the information society, in the global economic discourse, constitutes the original axis.

Although CI is a freely used concept in the policy area in Turkey, CI is far from turning into a policy area. It should be stated that in terms of Turkey's cultural policies or development goals, there is no comprehensive approach similar to China's (Keane, 2013) or South Korea's (Binark, 2019) holistic perspective, which designs CI as a tool to spread soft power to the world. Unlike countries such as the UK (Higgs et al, 2008), Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Taiwan, South Korea and Singapore (Flew, 2005) and China (Keane, 2013), which incorporate CI into their national innovation strategies, CI policies in Turkey seem to be less specific and less coordinated.

It can be stated that much more work is needed to establish an academic research ground where CI is discussed from different perspectives in the context of Turkey's cultural and economic ecosystem. In a digitizing world, global success stories derived from CI often obscure concerns about the exploitation of labor in developing countries, the weaknesses in the rights and conditions of low-wage labor, and the diversity of cultural expressions. For this reason, at the end of this study, which aims to summarize the current situation in Turkey, it should be stated that there is a need for studies that discuss the aforementioned risks accompanying the so-called benefits, in the face of the rapid adoption of the arguments based on the globalizing creativity discourse and new business models that come with digitalization in Turkey.

CI is neither a magic wand nor a Trojan horse. When considered in an objective manner, it is a political discourse that lays the groundwork for a rich discussion. Turkey's transformation in the context of the creative economy

requires a broad view that does not exclude (a) the intersection of technology and culture, (b) the relationship between industrial capital types and cultural and social capital, (c) the place of culture, art and creativity in the creative economy, and (d) the sociological changes accompanying CI concept.

References

- Ada, S., Özertan, G., Artemel, M. N., Işık, M. and Ateş, D. (2018). Kültürel miras ve kültürel ifadelerin çeşitliliği. *Kreatif Endüstrilerde Verimlilik Kongresi*. İstanbul, Turkey: Ankara Bilim Üniversitesi.
- Ankara Kalkınma Ajansı [ANKARAKA]. (n.d). *Ankara bölge planı 2014-2023*. https://www.ankaraka.org.tr/tr/ankara-bolge-planı-2014-2023_295.html. 20.05.2021.
- Aksoy, A. and Enlil, Z. (2011). *Kültür ekonomisi envanteri İstanbul 2010*. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Aktaş, R. and Doğanay, M. M. (2014). *Study on the economic contribution of copyright industries in Turkey*. Creative Industries Series. 8. Geneva: WIPO.
- Banks, M. (2007). *The politics of cultural work*. Palgrave.
- Binark, M. (2019). *Kültürel diplomasi ve Kore dalgası Hallyu: Güney Kore’de sinema endüstrisi k-dramlar ve k-pop*. Ankara: Siyasal Kitabevi.
- British Council. (n.d). *Creative industries focus country Turkey*. <https://www.britishcouncil.org.tr/en/programmes/arts/creative-industries-focus-country>. 14.10.2019.
- Department for Culture, Media & Sport [DCMS]. (2001). *Creative industries mapping document 2001*. London: Department for Culture, Media & Sport.
- Demir, E. M. (2014). Yaratıcı endüstriler. *İLEF Dergi*, 1(2), 87-107.
- (2018). Türkiye’de yaratıcı emek. *Moment Dergi*, 5(2), 174-194.
- Demir, O. (2018). Looking forward for İstanbul’s creative economy ecosystem. *Creative Industries Journal*, 11(1), 87-101.
- Dervişoğlu, G. (2013). *Yaratıcı endüstriler girişimi vizyon çalıştay çıktıları*. İstanbul: Reklamcılar Derneği.
- Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı [DPT]. (2000). *Sekizinci beş yıllık kalkınma planı 2001-2005*. Ankara: Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı.
- (2007). *Dokuzuncu beş yıllık kalkınma planı fikri haklar özel ihtisas komisyonu raporu*. Ankara: Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı.
- Ertürk, İ. (2011). Yaratıcı ekonomi. *10. Sanayi Kongresi: Dalgaları Yöneterek Geleceği Tasarlamak*, (101-104). İstanbul: İstanbul Sanayi Odası.
- Esen, Ü. B. and Atay, Ö. (2017). Ekonominin yeni yüzü: Yaratıcı ekonomi. *Sosyoekonomi*, 25(3).
- Flew, T. (2005). Creative economy. J. Hartley (ed.), *Creative industries* (344-360).

- Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- (2017). Cultural and creative industries. *Oxford Bibliographies*.
- Florida, R. (2012). *The rise of the creative class: Revisited*. Basic Books.
- Gill, R. and Pratt, A. (2008). Precarity and cultural work in the social factory? Immaterial labour, precariousness and cultural work. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 25(7-8), 1-30.
- Hartley, J. (2005). Creative industries. J. Hartley (ed.), *Creative industries* (1-40). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Hesmondhalgh, D. (2007). Creative labour as a basis for a critique of creative industries policy. G. Lovink and N. Rossiter (eds.), *My creativity reader* (61-69). Amsterdam: Institute of Network Cultures.
- Hesmondhalgh, D. and Baker, S. (2011). *Creative labour*. London: Routledge.
- Higgs, P., Cunningham, S. and Bakhshi, H. (2008). *Beyond the creative industries: Mapping the creative economy in the United Kingdom*. NESTA.
- Howkins, J. (2002). *The creative economy: How people make money from ideas*. London: Penguin.
- İstanbul Kalkınma Ajansı [İSTKA]. (n.d). *İstanbul bölge planı*. <https://www.istka.org.tr/planlama/istanbul-bolge-planı/>. 20.05.2021.
- (2012). *Tamamlanan projeler*. <https://www.İSTKA.org.tr/projeler/tamamlanan-projeler/>. 24.12.2021.
- İzmir Kalkınma Ajansı [İZKA]. (n.d). *Strateji ve analizler*. <https://izka.org.tr/strateji-ve-analizler/>. 20.05.2021.
- Kaymas, S. (2019). Is development possible without cultural policies? Rethinking creative industries and sustainable development in the case of Turkey. *Creative Industries Journal*, 1-21.
- Kalkınma Bakanlığı [KB]. (2013). *Onuncu beş yıllık kalkınma planı 2014-2018*. Ankara: Kalkınma Bakanlığı.
- Keane, M. (2013). *Creative industries in China: Arts, design and media*. Polity.
- Landry, C. (2008). *The creative city: A toolkit for urban innovators*. London: Earthscan.
- Lazzeretti, L., Capone, F. and Innocenti, N. (2018). The rise of cultural and creative industries in creative economy research: A bibliometric analysis. L. Lazzeretti and M. Vecco (eds.), *Creative industries and entrepreneurship: Paradigms in transition from a global perspective* (13-34). Massachusetts: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Lazzeretti, Luciana, Capone, F. and Seçilmiş, İ. E. (2014). Türkiye’de yaratıcı ve kültürel sektörlerin yapısı. *Maliye Dergisi*, 166(1), 195-220.
- Merkel, J. (2019). ‘Freelance isn’t free.’ Co-working as a critical urban practice to cope with informality in creative labour markets. *Urban Studies*, 56(3), 526-547.
- Ministry of Culture and Tourism [MoCT]/Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı. (n.d). *Strate-*

- jik planlar*. <http://sgb.kulturturizm.gov.tr/TR-139754/stratejik-plan.html>. 12.04.2021.
- Müller, K., Rammer, C. and Trüby, J. (2009). The role of creative industries in industrial innovation. *Innovation*, 11(2), 148-168.
- Öztürk, F. P. (2009). *İstanbul kent mekânında kültürel/yaratıcı endüstrilerin mekânsal dağılımı ve yer seçim kriterleri-beyoğlu örneği* (Unpublished master thesis). İstanbul Technical University: Graduate School.
- Rosso, L. (2012). *Materials research and innovation in the creative industries*. European Commission.
- Schumpeter, J. A. (2013). *Capitalism, socialism and democracy*. Routledge.
- Şen, F. (2017). *Türkiye’de kültür ekonomisinin boyutları*. İstanbul: Kaynak Yayınları.
- Sümer, B. and Şataf, C. (2018). Employment opportunities in cultural and creative industries in Turkey. *International conference on good local governance*. Turkey: İzmir.
- Telif Hakları Genel Müdürlüğü. (2020). *Kültür endüstrilerinin Türkiye ekonomisine katkısının ölçülmesi: Dünya Fikri Mülkiyet Örgütü (WIPO) metodolojisi bağlamında telif haklarına dayalı endüstriler*. Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Telif Hakları Genel Müdürlüğü.
- Türkiye Odalar ve Borsalar Birliği [TOBB]. (2021). *Creative industries council continues to come up with creative ideas*. <https://www.tobb.org.tr/Sayfalar/Eng/Detay.php?rid=11588&lst=Haberler>.
- United Nations Conference on Trade and Development [UNCTAD]. (2015). *Creative economy outlook and country profiles: Trends in international trade in creative industries*. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development.
- UNESCO. (n.d) *Creative cities network*. <https://www.unesco.org.tr/Pages/519/129/>. 12.05.2019.
- Ünsal, D. (2011). *İstanbul kültür ve sanat sektörü*. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- World Intellectual Property Organization [WIPO]. (2017). *How to make a living in creative industries*. Geneva: World Intellectual Property Organization.
- Yardımcı, A. (2016). İçerdiği faaliyet gruplarına göre Türkiye’deki yaratıcı endüstri üzerine bir çalışma. *Finans Politik & Ekonomik Yorumlar*, 53(613), 65-77.

Ethics committee approval: There is no need for ethics committee approval.

Conflict of interest: There are no conflicts of interest to declare.

Financial support: No funding was received for this study.

Etik Kurul Onayı: Etik kurul onayına ihtiyaç bulunmamaktadır.

Çıkar çatışması: Çıkar çatışması bulunmamaktadır.

Finansal destek: Finansal destek bulunmamaktadır.