

QUT Digital Repository:
<http://eprints.qut.edu.au/>



Hartley, John and Montgomery, Lucy (2009) *Creative Industries come to China (MATE)*. Chinese Journal of Communication, 2(1). pp. 1-12.

© Copyright 2009 The Communication Research Centre, The Chinese University of Hong Kong

Creative industries come to China (MATE)

John Hartley and Lucy Montgomery

ARC Centre for Creative Industries & Innovation, Queensland University of Technology

This paper introduces the special issue “China: Internationalizing the Creative Industries”, describing the Australian Research Council funded “MATE” project which provides the conceptual background for the questions the issue explores. The MATE project began with the expectation that as China evolves from its status as a developing country with an emphasis on primary industries and manufacturing, to a mature, market-driven economy benefiting from high levels of international investment, it will become more actively engaged with the global “knowledge economy” and “information society”. In this context, developments in the “creative industries”, which are playing such an important role in developed economies, might reasonably be expected in China. Although China continues to be characterised by strong central-policy settings, as the domestic consumer market matures there is greater scope for consumer-led creative business development. The “MATE” project aimed to capture some of these changes as they began to gain momentum across a range of services: Media, Advertising, Tourism and Education. This special issue continues this theme with papers that explore the theoretical challenges, economic questions and implications, and practical instantiations of creative industries growth in China. All papers contained in this special issue have been peer-reviewed.

Keywords: Creative industries, China, knowledge economy, services, innovation, creative workforce

The concept of the “creative industries” is historical and evolving (Hartley, 2005; 2009). It is not susceptible to abstract definition. By some accounts, the lack of definitional precision is a conceptual weakness, arising from the origins of the term itself in economic and regional policy rather than in disciplinary analysis (Oakley, 2004). In other words, the politicians thought of it first, not the social scientists. Certainly, a lack of conceptual and even descriptive agreement, combined with poor baseline data and a tendency towards “boosterist” rhetoric, have bedevilled the development of the field. Thus, even though the term “creative industries” has taken hold strongly in regional and economic policy and across the education sector around the world, it remains theoretically messy. Furthermore it is strongly disputed among some scholarly activists, who see the idea of the creative industries as a further penetration of corporate capitalism into the cultural sphere, with dire implications for the conditions of labour in that already precarious sector (see Ross, 2004; Hesmondhalgh & Pratt, 2005; see also Deuze, 2007).

So an important question must be the most basic one – do the creative industries even exist, or does the term describe no more than the post hoc rationalisation of a bundle of incommensurable policy objectives? If they do exist, what historical forces, trends and conjunctures brought that about? And where are

they heading? We want to answer these questions in a challenging but practical way, not least because something close to home has been at stake in the answers. Queensland University of Technology (QUT) launched the world's first Creative Industries Faculty in July 2001, with co-author Hartley as foundation dean. The "MATE" project outlined in this paper and taken up in this special issue was an early and important part of a broader initiative. For the QUT vision was not simply to revamp its undergraduate courseware. It was an experiment in repurposing higher education and research in the humanities and creative arts more generally. The purpose was to connect the study and practice of creativity, media and imagination – in design, performance, production and writing – with contemporary economic, employment and intellectual trends. These included the challenge of globalization, the commercialization of culture, the growth of the knowledge economy, and the increasing importance of the services sector.

We wanted the new faculty to become a magnet for those who were entrepreneurial but not attracted to the organizational scale and management focus of industrial-era business; who were creatively talented but not interested in the subsidized arts sector; and who were technological adepts but not interested in a life in corporate IT. A university of technology, dedicated to serving industry, professions, and emergent markets, was just the right place to repurpose the arts in response to change and convergence among cultural, economic and technological values. In this ambitious endeavour, it was important to know what was going on in the 'real world' (QUT's marketing strapline), and not to continue inflexibly with traditions founded in academic disciplines inherited from the nineteenth century (Lee, 2003). Thus, along with the new Faculty, we launched a research centre dedicated to international excellence in the study of the creative industries. This included theoretical-historical work on the term itself (Hartley, 2005; 2006), empirical work to map and measure the extent and dynamics of the creative industries in Australia (Cunningham, 2006), and applied work to show how creative inputs may produce economic, social or human benefits in various services (Beattie, Cunningham, Jones & Zelenko, 2006). Most of this research was done with national competitive grant funding from the Australian Research Council. In 2003 QUT also won a Co-operative Research Centre in interaction design, to pursue commercialization research in creative computer/human interface applications. In 2004 we moved into a \$60m purpose-built Creative Industries Precinct, co-locating teaching, research and production with creative companies and a multimedia performance, screening and exhibition venue. In 2005 we won an ARC Centre of Excellence for Creative Industries and Innovation (of which co-author Hartley is research director), under whose aegis the research continues, not least in relation to China (Keane, 2007).

It was in this broader context that the "MATE" project, which forms the genesis of this special issue, was conceived. In particular we wanted to investigate the internationalization of the creative industries, both as a set of economic and cultural activities on the ground and as an organizing conceptual framework in policy and business strategy. We put ourselves to a rigorous test, by devising a research project that set out to look for the creative industries in a place where very few people had even heard the term at that point – China. The project sought to catch the process of formation of the creative industries sector (if that is what it was) in a country where it had not previously been looked for. Indeed the prevailing wisdom as China joined the World Trade Organisation (WTO) in 2001 was that it would remain a manufacturing economy characterised by low-cost labor and utilitarian fabrication of the designs of others (Jowell, 2005). Internally, the domestic consumer market was not well

developed, with services accounting for a much lower proportion of GDP than was the case for advanced economies (under half compared with over two thirds) (*People's Daily*, 2005). The presence of a strong command bureaucracy and centralized control over media and communications technologies suggested to many that China was not about to develop a thriving creative sector based on individual talent, artistic experimentation and untrammelled self-expression by millions of “consumer-citizens”. Instead, it was “well known” (i.e. endlessly repeated) that China’s “cultural industries” operated under the watchful eye of the party-state, that the most important “creative” media were massive state-owned enterprises like China Central Television (CCTV), Xinhua News Agency and the *People's Daily*, that entrepreneurial creativity went little further than endemic piratical copying, that the “Great Firewall of China” stopped international influences and collaborations at the gate, that talented “creatives” like the Fifth Generation filmmakers were better known outside than inside China, and that in any case most of China’s population was poor, rural, migrant or tied to sweatshop factory conditions that precluded consumption let alone creative productivity.

This apparently unprepossessing scenario was ideal for testing how the creative industries might develop. To place the creative industries in an international frame, comparing the policy and industry strategies of developed countries with those of China – the most important “developing” country after its admission to the WTO – was a significant conceptual advance and innovation not attempted before. The idea was not to employ a “cookie-cutter” or copy-cat approach, where ideas elaborated in London were mechanistically “applied” in Shanghai (Wang, 2004, p.12), but to show how China would harness both international influences and internal creative energies for economic and cultural development. Such an approach to internationalization would have lessons for other countries, including in the developed world. The key objective was to investigate how creativity, culture, services, knowledge and internationalization are *transformational* in post-WTO China.

We did not have the resources to undertake a full-scale mapping exercise to identify the scale and scope of the creative economy from China’s economic, employment and creative trends, so we focused on four selected service sectors, ranging from the most “creative” to the most rigid; from the most commercialized to the most “institutional”. These were: media; advertising; tourism; education (M, A, T, E). In each case we were looking for both government strategy and industry responses to the new knowledge economy, and to the adoption of creative *inputs* and mediated *content* in such services.

Right from the start, it was important to adopt an evolutionary rather than an equilibrium economic perspective, because clearly we were setting out to describe a process of adaptation to change, not a structure of existing components. We were looking for origination, adoption and retention, in which context existing thought on the subject of creativity (e.g. Caves 2000; Throsby, 2000) was not the evidential data from which we needed to work but if anything an impediment to clear understanding of the dynamics of change in a country that was itself a “complex open network” (Herrmann-Pillath, 2005).

Seeking to understand the creative industries as the generative edge of an evolutionary process rather than a “sector” of a static industrial structure was our first conceptual breakthrough, because it applies equally to the more familiar terrain where the concept originally arose, namely in the advanced economies of the West. Here too, the creative industries were characterized by dynamism, change, high failure rates, experimentation, unforeseen consequences, and rapid adaptation to rapid growth, both

in the period leading up to the dotcom bubble of the late 1990s and thereafter. When the NASDAQ crashed from 5000 points to 1300 after March 2000 (Chapman, 2003), mass extinctions of enterprises powered by venture-capital quickly followed. But this too was an evolutionary phase, from which the creative industries concept has emerged in somewhat different guise. It has evolved through three phases, from industry sector to whole-of-economy innovation agent, and thence, following the rise of user-created content, to whole-of-culture productivity (Hartley, 2009).

Thus, in both China and the West, understanding the creative industries is not a conceptual problem of definition. It is a historical problem of growth and change in the context of inter-sectoral convergence and historically contingent forces. The convergences and forces involved operate at different scales. At the strategic level, the creative industries emerge as a competitive international response to an American-led “winner-takes-all” approach to cultural exports (prosecuted with typical ruthless vigour through international agencies from WIPO to the WTO). They are part of the national competitive policy strategy of OECD countries which do not enjoy the global market dominance of Hollywood, Tin Pan Alley and other US-based “copyright industries”. This is perhaps why, compared to those in Europe, Australia, and Asia, US-based analysts have been slow to pick up on the term “creative industries” – it is a “counter-hegemonic” response to US cultural and semiotic universalism (Olson, 1999).

These international strategic forces converged with the exponential growth of information technology and its increasingly non-instrumental uses in the 1990s, coinciding with the economic boom of the Clinton Presidency and the Deng era in China. Computing power migrated out of specialist organizations (IBM) and on to every desk in every business (Microsoft), and thence migrated again out of organizations and into residences (Yahoo!, Hotmail, MySpace) and onto bodies (mobile devices). The investment boom in the 90s focused first on *infrastructure* (pipes, servers, PCs), then on *connectivity* (telcos, software, the internet). Only at that point was hypertext *content* a viable investment prospect. Early internet adopters included ‘traditional’ broadcasters, notably the BBC; and newspaper mastheads, notably *Guardian Unlimited*. Later, with the large-scale roll out of broadband, the internet was ready for the sharing of video content, a moment best marked by the launch of YouTube in 2005 (Burgess & Green, 2008). Despite a decade and more of internet surprises, it was only at this point that the real implications of the internet as a universal platform for individual creative productivity began to be felt. Established media-content providers saw it as both an opportunity for new business and distribution (retaining control of their traditional consumer market), and as a threat to existing business models (losing control to consumer-entrepreneurs). The development of the creative industries therefore coincided with the decisive integration of telecommunications, computing and media, which massively up-scaled both outlets and demand for content (expert and amateur), and the equally massive and global distribution of capability across different types of users, demographics and countries, offering “content creators” the chance to publish their creative work to the world (Jenkins, 2006).

It was at this point that the European-derived notion of content as “culture” collided with the US-derived notion of content as “information”. Both of these notions had long histories (Hartley, 2005). But when the initial creative industries “mapping” exercise was undertaken in 1998 by the British government (DCMS, 1998; 2001), the provenance of both culture and information took second place to the needs of business services. Thus a further convergence was discerned, among culture (seen

as creative outputs of firms), information (seen as “copyright” content in products and services), and economic development (of regions, cities, or countries). This is what came to be called the “new” economy (Leadbeater, 1997).

Internationalising creative industries: “MATE” and after

As mentioned above, the starting point for the “MATE” project, officially titled “Internationalizing creative industries: China, the WTO and the knowledge-based economy”, was an expectation that as China’s economy continued to develop and internationalize, it would become a more active participant in the “knowledge economy” and the “information society”. The expansion of China’s consumer economy would also result in greater need for consumer-led creative business development in service sectors such as the content and copyright industries and in the information, learning and entertainment sectors.

MATE aimed to capture some of these changes as they began to gain momentum in the years following WTO accession. At the same time it investigated some of the barriers and impediments to the growth of the creative economy, not least because lessons may be learnt from the Chinese experience that apply to the same sectors in other countries including in the West, where creativity and innovation also face challenges, ranging from lack of investment to consumer resistance.

In order to pursue these large-scale questions via real stories that encapsulated the issues in an interesting and practical way, we decided to concentrate on four areas that illustrated a range of different types of economic organization and cultural impact: Media, Advertising, Tourism, and Education. These areas represent a spectrum from the most market- and consumer-oriented of the content industries (media and advertising), through a classic service industry (tourism), to an area with a long tradition of state control, rote repetition rather than creative innovation, and strong institutionalization (education). Each might seem also to require a different kind of consumer agency too: media address a “*passive*” audience, advertising a *persuadable* one; tourism requires an *active* consumer; and education requires a *transformational* one. A reasonable hypothesis would be that creative inputs are more imperative, and more likely to flourish, in Media and Advertising (where they are the stock in trade) than in Tourism and Education. However, our research indicated that creativity was required across all four areas. Technological convergence and integration has drawn these previously distinct sectors much closer together. Therefore the project investigated the extent to which creativity is transforming the economic and cultural landscape as a whole.

Each of the four areas chosen for analysis is itself very diverse and large-scale, so to increase comparability across them and to limit the research data, two case studies were selected in each of the MATE areas to represent both “ends” of the market: one to sample an application in the “volume” or popular market with universal appeal (and domestic uptake), the other to sample high-end or niche markets (with international uptake). In each case the emphasis of the research was the extent to which changes in China from a developing to an international economy, and from state-direction to commercial markets, are being played out in practice.

Figure 1. MATE – Chinese creative industries in selected domains and markets

Domain	Universal Appeal/ domestic market	High-end appeal/ international market
Media (creative/content)	Football (soccer) coverage	Finance journalism
Advertising (creative/service)	Mobile phones marketing	Fashion/style magazines
Tourism (service/experience)	Olympic Games	Convention tourism/executive leadership education (CELAP) ¹
Education (state/institutional)	Broadcast/open learning	MBAs

In the event our research outputs did not match this rather neat typology. For instance popular interest in televised football waned after China was eliminated from the 2006 World Cup so the coverage was not as popular as we had expected! We did not complete the finance journalism or tourism case studies for various reasons. However the matrix model is presented here for methodological interest as it was both innovative and productive to seek a comparative analysis of creative services along various gradients: popular/high + domestic/international (market segment); passive/active/transformational (audience profile); and commercial/institutional (services). It made us look at education in a new way, for instance, concentrating on demand-led mediated education (the Shanghai TV University; see Donald’s paper in this issue) at the popular end; and on the mediated commercialization of internationally competitive MBAs at the high end (Flew, 2006).

In the West, arts and cultural policy have been based on scarcity, and view protection, universal access and public good as core concerns. Services policy on the other hand has been framed by a notion of abundance, and focuses on liberalization, competition, efficiency, and diversity. If these incommensurate approaches are now convergent (if not integrated), how do such changes work through in the context of the knowledge-based economy? And how does all this unfold in China, with its unique aesthetic, policy, cultural and economic traditions? We hoped that such questions would help us to understand the role of creativity, and also help to show how the creative industries are evolving more generally.

Another innovation at the heart of the MATE project was to test (to destruction if necessary) inherited distinctions in the cultural sphere that inhibit investment of human and social as well as economic resources in those aspects of creativity that can benefit from current trends in the “new knowledge economy”. It is not simply a matter of showing how “intangible” commodities like knowledge and creative content may enable the “rise” of a new class of creative entrepreneurs (Florida, 2002), but also how such innovators are poised to reform the economy more widely, to take creativity where it was not previously looked for (e.g. services and state-run institutions), and to benefit from the potential of “user-led” or consumer innovation.

The MATE project resulted in a substantial body of published research output, including a book by Michael Keane (2007), the translation of a relevant text into Chinese (Hartley, 2006a; 2006b), over a dozen chapters and an equal number of journal articles (e.g. Spurgeon, 2008; Flew, 2006; Keane, 2006; 2006a; Donald & Benewick, 2005; Montgomery & Keane, 2006; Montgomery & Fitzgerald 2006; Montgomery 2006; Keane & Hartley, 2006; Hartley, 2007), plus nearly thirty conference presentations internationally by team members. We also published a special issue of the *International Journal of Cultural Studies* (Keane & Hartley, 2006) on the creative industries in China. In June 2005 we mounted the first-ever creative industries conference in China, supported by the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, Renmin University, and Tsinghua University Science Park, and the Queensland

government Department of Education and the Arts. This forum was designed to attract policy-makers, creative professionals and business figures as well as academics. It was addressed by Madame Wu Qidi, vice-minister of Education in China, and by Senator the Hon. Rod Kemp, Minister for the Arts and Sport in Australia (see Keane & Hartley, 2006, for both presentations).

New research directions have been developed during the program. When we started the very concept of the creative industries was unfamiliar in China. Since then it has evolved, first to describe clusters of industries with creative outputs in specially designated cities or districts; then to creative inputs in services more generally; and more recently it has extended to cover creative human capital, attracting attention from central government as part of a shift to a creative economy model. At the same time, the project has identified the extent to which there is a “creative trade deficit” in China – more creative content is imported than exported – and we have been influential in putting this matter on the policy radar in China, as it evolves from a “made in China” (manufacturing) to a “created in China” (value-added services) model of innovation (Keane, 2007). All of these developments have opened up new research imperatives. The project has resulted in closer relationships with high-level Chinese partners and contributed to the further promotion of Australian-Chinese exchange. Australia is recognized in China at both government and academic levels as a leader in creative industries policy studies. According to Pang Weichen, “the development of creative industries in Australia mirrors the hunting habits of the Australian saltwater crocodile. From a weak position, and from initially being behind the game, it has succeeded beyond expectations”; and in this context QUT is dubbed the “leading crocodile” (Pang, 2006).

There is growing interest in creative industries research among cultural institutions and schools of management and design in China, as evidenced by the number of publications by elite research institutions,² and within the cultural policy community. Major investments in the creative industries are being made in the form of events such as the Shanghai International Creative Industries Week (SICIW, 2005) and the establishment of “creative industry zones” across the country (Sun, 2006; Keane, 2007). Interest in China’s creative industries is also growing internationally. In 2008 London’s Victoria & Albert Museum mounted a major exhibition: *China Design Now*, tracing developments in fashion, graphic design, architecture and urban consumer culture as drivers of a larger process of innovation, industrial development and “cultural rebirth” (Victoria and Albert Museum, 2008). The exhibition was accompanied by an international conference *Creative China: Visual Culture, Architecture and Design*, co-hosted by King’s College London, which brought together creative professionals and academics. Here too, the convergence among artistic talent, consumer culture and economic-cultural development has resulted in a new understanding of the internationalization of China’s creative industries, and a growing international appreciation of Chinese creative design and enterprise.

China: Internationalizing the creative industries, the papers

This special issue, then, continues in the spirit of the MATE project – exploring theoretical, economic and practical aspects of the growth of China’s creative economy, discussing the impacts of cultural-sector reforms, new technologies and increased opportunities for experimentation and user-driven innovation. It contains several papers by original participants in the MATE project: Hartley, Cunningham, Keane, Donald and Montgomery – and reports on some of the case-studies named in the MATE research, such as fashion-media and education. However, it also contains new

pieces of research, and we have endeavoured to include interesting work by scholars not associated with MATE, as well as work by MATE researchers undertaken independently of the original project. All papers contained in this special issue have gone through peer review by anonymous reviewers.

The special issue begins with a discussion of the theoretical challenges and developments in scholarship surrounding the very concept of “creative industries”. In “Creative industries: A globally contestable policy field,” Stuart Cunningham provides an overview of the problems presented by the creative industries “proposition”. As he acknowledges, media, cultural and communications studies have been highly critical of creative industries policy agendas. The fact that policy frameworks, rather than academic theory, have driven the debate has served to deepen the chasm between critics of the creative industries and those who support its agenda. According to Cunningham, the result has been a crude binary division between “acceptable criticality and a posture of neo-liberal capture” which prevents a more nuanced assessment of the diverse ways that governments, social movements and bureaucracies are engaging with commercialization of the cultural sphere.

Stephanie Hemelryk Donald responds to the original MATE research challenge with her paper “Education, class and adaptation in China’s world city”. She focuses on the experiences of management and staff at Shanghai Television University (SUTV) as they struggle to adapt to changing educational and economic conditions, and to meet the needs of a workforce under pressure to increase levels of flexibility, adaptability and creativity. Donald’s paper provides rare insight into the experiences of a non-elite higher education institution actively engaged in providing China’s workforce with skills needed to compete in a knowledge economy.

In “Space to grow: Copyright, cultural policy and commercially focussed music in China”, Lucy Montgomery explores the success of Chinese businesses in extracting income from music in an environment where established international labels struggle to function. The technological and legal environment within which China’s commercial music sector is developing differs dramatically from the conditions that allowed record-labels to dominate commercial music markets in the second half of the twentieth-century. The Chinese music industry’s development along side new technologies for copying and distribution may shed light on music industry trends internationally as digital technologies continue to impact on the industry.

In “The turn to self: From ‘big character posters’ to YouTube Videos”, Henry Siling Li reminds us that while digital technologies undoubtedly present new opportunities for user-created content, they also represent the continuation of analogue traditions of expression, satire and political critique.

John Hartley and Lucy Montgomery’s paper, “Fashion as consumer entrepreneurship: Emergent risk culture, social network markets and the launch of *Vogue* in China”, discusses a “decisive moment” in the growth of the fashion media in China: the launch of the Chinese edition of *Vogue* in 2005. *Vogue*’s role as both a beneficiary and driver of growing semiotic literacy among China’s urban consumers highlights the central role of information in the growth of “social network markets” and a consumer-driven economy (see also Li & Hartley 1998; Hartley 2001). As the authors point out, consumers armed with information about how to navigate the complex choices offered to them are finding opportunities to consume “entrepreneurially” – to maximize the status benefits associated with their purchases, to forge and express identities that express the values of “risk culture”, and thereby to explore the ways in which commercial offerings might be applied or adapted to their own needs and circumstances.

Michael Keane uses his paper, “Between the tangible and the intangible: China’s new development dilemma”, to draw attention to the importance of collaboration, communication and information-sharing in the growth of internationally competitive media industries. Keane connects developments in the animation industry to broader policy agendas, suggesting a “base-superstructure” model for understanding China’s media industry reform.

Finally, the issue concludes with Jason Potts’s paper “Do developing economies need creative industries? Some old theory about new China” – which makes a bold argument for greater focus on the evolutionary nature of economic growth in developing economies. Potts proposes a model of economic growth as a process of co-evolution, in which the creative industries play a key role in the development, selection and retention of new ideas, suggesting that creative industries are, in fact, vital to the growth of developing economies such as China’s.

Causation and change

Taken together, these papers show first of all that a “creative” approach to media, services and economic development offers a rich research vein for communications scholars. This approach has not been developed sufficiently to date, not least because communications research retains some twentieth-century epistemological and methodological settings. These have tended to confine discussion of cultural, political and economic questions to separate sub-disciplinary specialisms, or to retain a left-over Marxian causality that makes culture an effect of economy. Such habits of thought have tended to define cultural agency and multiple causation out of the equation before the analysis begins. In the media field this results in the familiar attention to questions of ownership and control – and control is rather an obsession of critical China-watchers – which has the unfortunate consequence of making human creativity a sort of neoliberal ruse to power. Given the transformative changes in China over recent decades, and noting that the “opening up” of the Deng era was caused by politics not the economy, a situation that remains the case even as the economy burgeons, it is clear that there is more to the equation than this. Creative agency, individual and entrepreneurial, is a driver of economic development, and some would argue of political change too, although possibly at a slower rate. To trace and to explain such changes, a more complex understanding of causation in the relations among culture, politics and economy is needed in communication science as a whole, not just in relation to China. This is what the MATE project and in turn the papers gathered here seek to initiate.

The second theme that these papers take forward is that of change itself. All of them are concerned with dynamic systems and historical transformation, rather than with the explication of structure or equilibrium. The original MATE project was designed to investigate change in the wake of China’s WTO accession in 2001 and the subsequent growth of the services and creative industries: its hypothesis was that the internationalization of the creative industries would prove transformative in China, encouraging the growth of individual talent, “content” innovation, and a shift from centrally planned command-and-control industries to a complex dynamic system growing via the self-organized interactions of myriad creative agents. All of the papers in this special issue confront the question of dynamic change more or less directly. However when we began the MATE project we did not have the benefit of a fully theorized evolutionary model of economic and cultural change. It is this that Jason Potts’s paper supplies, pointing the way for further research into creative communications in China as part of the evolutionary process of the growth of

knowledge.

References

- Beattie, D. Cunningham, S. Jones, R. & Zelenko, O. (2006). 'I use online so the counselors can't hear me crying': Creating design solutions for online counseling. *Media International Australia*, 118, 43-52.
- Burgess J. & Green, J. (2008). *YouTube: Online video and participatory culture*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Caves, R. (2000). *Creative industries: Contracts between art and commerce*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Centre for Cultural Policy Research. (2003, September). *Baseline study on Hong Kong's creative industries*. Retrieved August 20, 2008, from [http://www.info.gov.hk/cpu/english/papers/baseline%20study\(eng\).pdf](http://www.info.gov.hk/cpu/english/papers/baseline%20study(eng).pdf)
- Chapman, P. (2003, March 1). Banking on the financial sector. *Traders*. Retrieved August 20, 2008, from http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_hb5552/is_200303/ai_n23573517
- Cunningham, S. (2006). *What price a creative economy?* Sydney: Currency House Press.
- Department of Culture, Media and Sport. (1998). *Creative industries mapping document 1998*. Retrieved August 23, 2008, from http://www.culture.gov.uk/reference_library/publications/3109.aspx
- Department of Culture, Media and Sport. (2001). *Creative Industries Mapping Document 2001*. Retrieved August 20, 2008, from http://www.culture.gov.uk/reference_library/publications/4632.aspx
- Deuze, M. (2007). *Media work*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Donald, S., & Benewick, R. (2005). *The State of China Atlas: Mapping the World's Fastest Growing Economy*. Sydney: UNSW Press.
- Florida, R. (2002). *The rise of the creative class*. New York: Basic Books.
- Flew, T. (2006). The new middle class meets the creative class: The Masters of Business Administration (MBA) and creative innovation in 21st-century China. *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, 9(3), 419-429.
- Hartley, J. (2009). From the consciousness industry to creative industries: Consumer-created content, social network markets and the growth of knowledge. In J. Holt & A. Perren (Eds.), *Media industries: History, theory and methods* (pp. , 231-44). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hartley, J. (2006a). From creative industries to creative economy: Flying like a well-thrown bird? In Hartley, J. (Ed.), *Creative industries* (pp. 5-18). Beijing: Tsinghua University Press. (In Chinese)
- Hartley, J. (Ed.). (2006b). *Creative industries*. Beijing: Tsinghua University Press. (In Chinese)
- Hartley, J. (Ed.). (2005). *Creative industries*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hartley, J. (2001). From power to identity: popular journalism and postmodernity. In Ma, R., & Zhou, X. (Eds.), *21st century: Cultural consciousness and cross-cultural communication volume one* (pp. 233-56). Beijing: Peking University Press. (In Chinese)
- Herrmann-Pillath, C. (2005). *Culture, economic style and the nature of the Chinese economic system*. Retrieved August 23, 2008, from <http://www.bm.ust.hk/~ced/iea/Herrmann-Pillath%20CultureChina.pdf>
- Hesmondhalgh, D. & Pratt, A., (Eds.). (2005). *Special issue: The cultural industries*

- and cultural policy. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 11(1).
- Jenkins, H. (2006). *Convergence culture: Where old and new media collide*. New York: NYU Press.
- Jowell, T. (2005). *Tessa Jowell keynote speech to the Creative Economy conference, London*. Retrieved August 23, 2008, from http://www.culture.gov.uk/reference_library/minister_speeches/2097.aspx
- Keane, M. (2006). From made in China to created in China. *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 9(3), 285-296.
- Keane, M. (2006a). The 'diggi awards' an agent model for creative community building. *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, 9(3), 377-381.
- Keane, M. (2007). *Created in China: The great new leap forward*. London: Routledge.
- Keane, M., & Hartley, J. (Eds.). (2006). Creative industries and innovation in China [Special issue]. *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, 9(3).
- Leadbeater, C. (1997). *Living on thin air: The new economy*. Viking: London.
- Lee, R.E. (2003). *Life and times of cultural studies: The politics and transformation of the structures of knowledge*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Li, Z. & Hartley, J. (1998). A dialogue on the theory of 'popular reality'. *Modern Communications: Journal of the Beijing Broadcasting Institute*, 95(6), 46-51.
- Montgomery, L., & Keane, M. (2006). Learning to love the market: Copyright, creativity and China. In P. Thomas & J. Servaes (Eds.), *Communications, intellectual property and the public domain in the Asia-Pacific region: Contestations and consensus* (pp.130-149). New Delhi: Sage.
- Montgomery, L. (2006). Beijing bling: Creative details and consumer choices in contemporary China. An Interview with Huang Hung. *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, 9(3), 369-376.
- Montgomery, L., & Fitzgerald, B. (2006). Copyright and the creative industries in China. *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, 9(3), 407-418.
- Oakley, K. (2004). *Developing the evidence base for support of cultural & creative activities*. UK: South East England Cultural Consortium (SEEC) and South East England Development Agency (SEEDA).
- Olson, S.R. (1999). *Hollywood planet: Global media and the competitive advantage of narrative transparency*. New York: Routledge.
- Pang, W. (2006). Australian saltwater crocodile – Don't underestimate the power of creative industries. *Softpower*, (November), 40-41. (In Chinese)
- People's Daily (2005, December 21). China's GDP composition changes as share of services sector exceeds 40%. Retrieved August 23, 2008 from http://english.peopledaily.com.cn/200512/21/eng20051221_229602.html
- Ross, A. (2004). Are the Chinese losing China? In A. Ross (Ed.), *Low pay high profile: The global push for fair labor* (pp. 119-155). New York: The New Press.
- Spurgeon, C. (2008). Mobilizing the local: Advertising and cell phone industries in China. In C. Spurgeon, *Advertising and new media* (64-83). Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Throsby, D. (2000). *Economics and culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wang, J. (2004). The global reach of a new discourse: How far can "creative industries" travel? *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 7 (1), 9-19.
- Victoria and Albert Museum China Design Now. (n.d.). Retrieved August 19, 2008, from http://www.vam.ac.uk/vastatic/microsites/1636_chinadesignnow/the-exhibition

Notes

¹ CELAP is the China Executive Leadership Academy Pudong (<http://61.129.65.35/renda/node3284/node3285/userobject1ai35907.html>) a residential training facility for “high level leaders from government and top executives from the business community”. One of several CPC academies in different cities, CELAP specializes in economic development and innovation.

² For example *The Journal of Creative Industries* published by the Shanghai Academy of Social Sciences; *The Blue Book of China's Creative Industries*, published by the Beijing Science and Technology University; and *The Blue Book of China's Cultural Industries*, published by the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences. The University of Hong Kong's Centre for Cultural Policy Research has been actively involved in the Creative Industries policy debate since the early 2000s, releasing its *Baseline Study on Hong Kong's Creative Industries* in 2003 (CCPR, 2003).