

Interconnections of Creative and Social Capital

KAROLINA LACYTĖ

Department of Philosophy and Cultural Studies, Faculty of Creative Industries, Vilnius Gediminas Technical University, 1 Trakų Street, 01132 Vilnius, Lithuania

Email: karolina.lacyte@stud.vilniustech.lt

The article examines social and creative capitals and their interconnections. Some authors observe similarities in them as well as areas where they complement each other. Other authors argue that social and creative capitals are still mutually exclusive and cannot be compared. The article analyses various aspects of social and creative capital, searches for similarities and differences between them, and reviews measurement methodologies and issues related to the reliability of measurement indices and criteria. All this is analysed in the context of the creative society.

Keywords: social capital, creative capital, creative class

INTRODUCTION

Nowadays creativity, creative people, creative cities, creative society and creative economy are more and more appreciated. These terms are common to most Western countries but both in Lithuania and in the other Baltic countries they are still making their way (Tafel-Viia et al. 2015). The current way of life requires creativity at every step and this leads to the fact that the creative and cultural sector receives a lot of public policy attention as well as relevant decisions by the European Union, which encourage states to allocate resources for increasing the creative class and the development of creative territories (Vitálišová et al. 2020).

There is a debate in the scientific literature focused on social and creative capitals. Social capital, as collective action, human relations, and trust among community members are contrasted with creative capital, the main idea of which is the ability of creative people to turn their ideas and creative capacity into a product that creates value. R. Putnam (1993), S. Uekusa et al. (2021), L. Ramaškienė and E. Šumskienė (2020), C. Aragón Amonarriz et al. (2019), and others talk on social capital. The research topics of the authors vary from the concept of social capital to research on social capital for the development of regional communities and the relations of members. Creative capital is analysed in works by R. Florida (2015), K. Szara and A. Mazurkiewicz (2018), A. Batabyal and P. Nijkamp (2019), and T. Kačerauskas (2014; 2019). Florida's (2015) creativity indices, which can measure the creative capital of cities, are constantly cited and simultaneously criticised. Also, other measurement methods can be observed in literature but there is no accepted unified way to measure creative capital.

This article examines the social and creative capitals. The aim of the work is to analyse the advantages and disadvantages of these two theories, and the measurement methods proposed by the authors. As already mentioned, there is a debate in the academic space regarding the relationship between social and creative capitals, these two capitals are opposed. The author of this article seeks to refute the idea expressed by Florida (2015) about social and creative capital eliminating each other, therefore, in the literature review, an attempt is made to substantiate the statement that social and creative capitals do not destroy each other but rather complement one another. The working hypotheses are presented below.

H1: Social and creative capitals do not destroy each other but rather complement one another and are related.

H2: The combination of social and creative capital is important for the economic and social well-being of the region.

THEORETICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF SOCIAL CAPITAL

The topic of social capital was already discussed at the end of the 19th century by famous sociologists of that time but only at the beginning of the 20th century was the concept of social capital formulated, which emphasises the well-being of the community that is achieved through the social communication of individuals and families that make up a social unit (Skačkauskienė, Bytautė 2012). P. Bourdieu (1986) defines social capital as the total possession of actual and potential resources that are covered by more or less institutionalised mutual relations. In the later definitions, as noted by I. Skačkauskienė and S. Bytautė (2012), more attention is paid to collective support provided to members of a group of people, giving the right to social capital in an economic, cultural, or symbolic sense.

According to Putnam (1993), social capital refers to the characteristics of social organisation, such as networks, norms, and trust that help members of society cooperate with each other and achieve mutual benefits. It is noted that communication networks are not inherited, nor are they a social given – Bourdieu (1986) argues that ‘networks’ are the result of endless efforts, and these efforts are necessary to create long-term or short-term relationships that create benefits. Kačerauskas (2019) observes that ‘the more diverse communities make up society, the greater the need to accumulate social capital’ (Kačerauskas 2019: 236). In other words, the differences between people help to create the most diverse connections, make acquaintances; therefore, it contributes to the growth of social capital.

When talking about social capital, many academics see various positive outcomes of this phenomenon. J. S. Coleman (2005) notes that social capital is significant for the state, fosters the strength of the family, helps to form new social skills, and encourages people to work for the common good. Social capital manifests itself in altruism, empathy, philanthropic ideas, trust and reliability (Ramaškienė, Šumskienė 2020; Putnam 2000), and the ability to explain differences in economic growth between regions helps to use social capital for regional development as a policy tool (Muringani et al. 2021).

It is argued that social capital can help solve various societal problems, such as lower levels of education, social inequality, and issues of lack of trust. J. Muringani et al. (2021) research findings suggest that strengthening both social and human capital promotes economic growth even in less developed regions, helping to compensate for lower levels of education (Muringani et al. 2021). Social business integrated into community activities can help solve integration problems of people with disabilities, employment issues of people suffering from

addictions, gaps in youth education, and reduce mutual alienation between communities (Ramaškienė, Šumskienė 2020). In this way, social capital is cultivated not only at the individual level but also at the community level.

Despite the fact that social capital has many advantages, it also has a negative side in some cases. As noted by Kačerauskas (2019) as well as Szara and Mazurkiewicz (2018), due to social capital in communities, such a phenomenon as suppression of individual creative aspirations can occur. The blocking of technological development is associated with too strong social ties (Kačerauskas 2019), contributing to stagnant economic activity and leading to negative consequences from an economic point of view (Gannon, Roberts 2020; Kačerauskas 2019). A specific problem is that social capital can be channelled into anti-social actions such as sectarianism, ethnocentrism, or corruption in institutions (Putnam 2000). Teenage drunkenness, discrimination of people and restrictions on personal freedom are noticeable (Strindlund et al. 2021). Such behaviour is encouraged by the strong social inequality and tension felt in the community, which influences crime (Uekusa et al. 2021). It has been observed that participation in certain groups increases social control by restricting one's freedoms and individual thinking becomes undesirable.

METHODS OF MEASURING SOCIAL CAPITAL

From a scientific perspective, social capital is problematic in that there is no unified accepted way of measuring it (Skačkauskienė, Bytautė 2012). In the literature, social capital is often considered at three levels: micro (individual), meso (individual and community) and macro (societal structures) (Carrillo Álvarez, Riera Romaní, 2017). Based on these levels, two-, three-, five-, or even six-dimensional models of social capital have been developed that include structural, relational and cognitive dimensions (Jeong et al. 2021). R. Harper's (2002) broader model of social capital has five dimensions: social participation; social networks and social support; reciprocity and trust; civic participation; and approach to the residential area. These research areas are complemented by questions that help to measure social capital in a multifaceted manner.

Putnam (2000) made a significant contribution to social capital research by proposing various indicators related to trust, political voting, and membership of associations. B. Gannon and J. Roberts (2020), as well as T. Engbers et al. (2017), used these indicators to develop their research questions, and they propose five domains of measuring social capital: trust in people and institutions, formal membership and participation in activities, altruism and political involvement, informal interactions, and shared norms (Engbers et al. 2017).

Although the authors who proposed social capital measurement methods sought to present a more effective methodology than was used before, it can be noted that the options proposed by Harper (2002), Putnam (2000) and Engbers et al. (2017) are all very similar. The methods of the mentioned authors include issues of trust in government, institutions and people as well as an important component of the methods – participation, involvement in activities, joining communities and organisations. It is these features that usually stand out in the definitions of social capital, thus the development of measurement methods cannot do without the criteria of trust and participation. The other dimensions of measuring social capital are more complementary to the aspects of participation and trust, so it would be difficult to single out a more effective measurement methodology due to the similarity of the methodologies.

MAIN ASPECTS OF CREATIVE CAPITAL

In recent decades, the creative industries have been recognised as an important area for the cultural and economic vitality of urban regions. The recognition of creative industries is not limited to economic aspects alone but is also closely related to lifestyle changes, including increased demand for leisure time and changes in the role of culture (Tafel-Viia et al. 2015). Highly educated people working in creative professions are one of the most important components that explain production efficiency (Batabyal, Nijkamp 2019); such people create added economic value through their creativity and form a creative class that proposes and implements creative ideas (Tafel-Viia et al. 2015).

The theory of the creative class can be associated with Florida (2015) who, assuming that creativity is the driving force of economic growth, argued that it is the creative class that has become dominant in society. In the scientific literature, the terms creative capital and creative class are juxtaposed, and it is proposed to recognise that creative class is a narrower definition of creative capital (Szara, Mazurkiewicz 2018). However, Florida's creative capital and creative class theories have been criticised by various scholars. Despite the fact that some members of the creative class have accumulated their creative capital through higher education, there are exceptions, as such members of the creative class (for example, artists) can have little or no education and possess creative capital, and are creative by nature (Batabyal, Beladi 2018). It is concluded that creative capital is at least partially the result of professional experience accumulation where creative individuals increase their creative capital by experimenting, applying practical knowledge and gaining new experiences (Batabyal, Beladi 2018).

Most of the literature mentions two main benefits of creative capital – economic and regional development. As noted by K. Vitálišová et al. (2020), with their new ideas and talent, the creative class contributes to the territorial development through the establishment of new companies and businesses. In the scientific literature, the term creative capital of the region is distinguished and means the presence of creative residents in the region, cultural diversity and economic benefits for the city or region (Rastvortseva, Korbankova 2021). There is also an observed positive relationship between creative class jobs – the employment growth and entrepreneurship at the regional level (Batabyal, Beladi 2015; Rastvortseva, Korbankova 2021). Emerging innovative businesses help to reduce overall unemployment, increase the employment of people in the regions, and at the same time improve the brand of the region.

Certain negative phenomena arising from creative capital and the creative class can also be observed. Strategies related to the development of creativity are criticised for the possibility of increasing social and cultural inequality. As L. Kong (2014) observes, there are scholars who believe that creative class strategies are not suitable for revitalising declining cities because they are designed to 'co-exist' with urban problems rather than solve them. Another important aspect is geographical segregation, manifested by the loss of rural areas, depopulation (Vitálišová et al. 2020). Vitálišová et al. (2020) notices the danger of the weakening of social relations, which is influenced by the worsening of class, gender and racial inequality mentioned by Batabyal and Nijkamp (2016) and distrust of others. Although many authors do not talk about the shortcomings of creative capital, it can be observed that there is a different assessment of creative capital.

CREATIVE CAPITAL AND INDEXES OF CREATIVITY

In the Lithuanian language, there are two words that are often confused – „kūrybiškumas“ and „kūrybingumas“ (both mean ‘creativity’ in English). As J. Barevičiūtė (2014) states, the first is more related to human thinking, emotions, behaviour, and solving problems in unforeseen situations, while the latter is determined by available talents and abilities. Both in practical activities and in the scientific context, the question arises as to how to measure the potential of cities for creativity, creative industries, innovations, and finally creativity itself, which is extremely necessary for the existence and development of cities. In his monograph, Florida (2015) proposed creativity indices that show the level of creativity of a city, region and country: high-tech index – it consists of the high-tech industry indicator multiplied by patents per capita and the annual average growth of the number of patents; the talent index, which includes the number of graduates from higher education; tolerance index – measures the percentage of people born in a foreign country; the gay index consists of the percentage of homosexual couples in the region; the bohemian index refers to places where artists gather. As can be seen, creativity indices are a set of various indicators that reflect the creativity of society or its part (Kačerauskas 2014). Nevertheless, it is important to pay attention to the fact that creativity is empirically difficult to measure, so there is a lot of debate about the quality of creativity indices.

Florida’s creativity indices have been critically evaluated by researchers. A. Suvorova (2021) notes that a significant problem of Florida and other indices is the issue of localisation of creative capital. The author claims that creative capital cannot be evenly distributed across the country or region. Kačerauskas (2018) draws attention to the lack of accuracy and validity of Florida’s creativity indices. Various researchers have noticed that the existing creativity indices lack important elements such as the urban environment, the government’s approach to the creative sector, and the involvement of local residents in the cultural and social life of the city. In their research, S. Rastvortseva and A. Korbankova (2021) included five criteria such as population, regional development, business environment, power (the influence of local government on the creative sector in the region), and brands, which were used to determine the distribution of creative capital. Similar criteria can be seen in the Creative Capital Index*, which allows evaluating the capitals and regions of various countries using official statistics, expert surveys and qualitative data. However, this list of indexes is not exhaustive. In his monograph, Kačerauskas (2014) offers other possible ways of measuring creativity, such as the emigration index, the index of sexual minorities, the suicide rate, etc. This only proves the ambiguous assessment of the creative class, creative capital, and the problematic nature of measuring creative capital due to the absence of a common assessment.

It has been observed that although Florida’s creativity indices are the most criticised, at the same time, they are the most used to evaluate various cities in the world. Of the analysed indices, it is creativity indices of Florida (2015) that stand out the most but also raise the most doubts about what and how it is measured and that reflects the creativity of cities. Today, the methodologies used by Rastvortseva and Korbankova (2021), Creative Capital Index, are increasingly being evaluated. They are very similar, and the data is based on specific statistics, so it is possible to assess their greater reliability. In summary, it can be said that creativity itself is difficult to measure, so creativity indices are often evaluated ambiguously. There is no proper way to measure creative capital, so it is important to take into account the different methods discussed by Kačerauskas (2014) – economic, communicative and social.

* Link to the Creative Capital Index website: <http://creativecapitalindex.com/methodology>

PROBLEMS OF COMPARING SOCIAL AND CREATIVE CAPITALS

Analysing scientific papers gives the impression that social and creative capitals are extremely contrasting. Florida (2015) expresses the idea that creative and social capitals are incompatible and even mutually exclusive. Another challenge in comparing them is the levels at which these different theories are developed and applied. Creative capital is mostly discussed as a phenomenon of cities and regions while social capital theory is often applied at the individual and small community level (Gannon, Roberts 2020; Villalonga-Olives, Kawachi 2015) as well as in organisations (Strindlund et al. 2021; Mayasari, Chandra 2020). Nevertheless, there are studies analysing the benefits of social capital at the regional scale (Fahmi 2019; Aragón Amonariz et al. 2019). All in all, there are various aspects in which these two capitals are similar.

The connection between social and creative capitals is also seen by Fahmi (2019), who believes that social capital can be used to create strong economic and social relationships in the fields of creative industries, as trust, acquaintances and gatherings of people are undoubtedly important in creative activities. In the creative society, the phenomenon of social creativity is observed, which is defined as 'daily, common, unplanned and collective creative actions of people' (Rezabeigisani, Aminzadeh 2020: 632). One gets the impression that creative and social capitals are compatible and complement each other but, according to Florida (2015), social and creative capitals are opposites and eliminate each other – the smaller the social capital, the more space there is for creative capital in society and vice versa.

Social and creative capitals are united by such common features as the ability to expand (both social and creative capital can increase), reliance on cooperation, people's independence, improved relationships, independence of people's creativity, and value created (Szara, Mazurkiewicz 2018). The authors also distinguish certain differences, such as high mobility of creative capital, individualism of creative capital, differences in values and impact assessment (Szara, Mazurkiewicz 2018). Another difference is that social capital determines a stable and established environment, while creative capital is inseparable from a vibrant environment (Kačerauskas 2019). Kačerauskas (2019) also notices other discrepancies between social and creative capitals: the level of openness of these capitals differs because social capital appears in a traditional and closed society while creative capital is a characteristic of a global and open society.

Certain similarities and differences can also be seen in the methodologies for measuring social and creative capital. Indices and methods for measuring social capital can be applied both to the study of individuals and the whole community or city. It would not be possible to measure a person's individual creative capital with creativity indices. Data collection for these two types of capital also differs: creativity indices are based on statistical data (for example, the number of patents, number of emigrants, etc.) while methods of measuring social capital include both statistical data and surveys of people as well as in-depth interviews. It was noticed that social and creative capital methods also have common aspects – the importance of government institutions, a favourable environment for capital growth, and people's involvement in activities (both creative and social).

It is increasingly being talked about that it is important to support creative and social capitals in regions due to perceived economic and social benefits. Nevertheless, creative capital has a significant impact on regional differences (Kerimoglu, Karahasan 2014). The economic and social inequality between cities and smaller settlements leads to the division of society, and, as Kong (2014) notes, there is no evidence that creative industries and creativity ensure social equality or the development of social capital, the inclusion of communities in local cultural life. In any case, the maintenance of social capital requires creative impulses,

and with each new creation and idea, the content of social capital also changes (Kačerauskas 2014), thus creative and social capitals are closely related and are aspects of each other.

CONCLUSIONS

Social capital in the context of a creative society means relationships between people, mutual trust, and gathering in communities with the same goal. The possession of a creative capital leads to new ideas, emerging new businesses, technologies, and at the same time economic development. Social and creative capitals are united by the fact that trust in cooperation and support from the environment are important for these types of capital. Both social and creative capital can contribute to the solution of social problems and be the driving force of economic growth. It is observed that both forms of capital can provide society with creativity and create a noticeable value thus the claims about the mutual elimination of social and creative capital seem unfounded. It is true that an excessive amount of social and creative capital can also have a negative influence – too much capital leads to the formation of gangs, small communities of people who behave immorally and criminally. Nevertheless, such phenomenon does not prove the contradiction between social and creative capitals, rather, they are only separate ‘side’ phenomena arising from too strong interpersonal ties between people and isolation from the environment.

Received 27 June 2022

Accepted 22 July 2022

References

1. Aragón Amonariz, C.; Iturrioz, C.; Narvaiza, L.; Parrilli, M. D. 2019. ‘The Role of Social Capital in Regional Innovation Systems: Creative Social Capital and its Institutionalization Process’, *Papers in Regional Science* 98(1): 35–51.
2. Barevičiūtė, J. 2014. „Pagrindiniai kūrybiškumo ir kūrybingumo aspektai šiuolaikiniuose humanitariniuose bei socialiniuose moksluose“, *Filosofija. Sociologija* 25(1): 19–28.
3. Batabyal, A. A.; Beladi, H. 2015. ‘The Importance of Creative Capital for Economic Growth in the Presence of Learning by Doing’, *Regional Science Policy and Practice* 7(4): 187–197.
4. Batabyal, A. A.; Nijkamp, P. 2016. ‘Creative Capital in Production, Inefficiency, and Inequality: A Theoretical Analysis’, *International Review of Economics and Finance* 45: 553–558.
5. Batabyal, A. A.; Beladi, H. 2018. ‘Artists, Engineers, and Aspects of Economic Growth in a Creative Region’, *Economic Modelling* 71: 214–219.
6. Batabyal, A. A.; Nijkamp, P. 2019. ‘Creative Capital, Information and Communication Technologies, and Economic Growth in Smart Cities’, *Economics of Innovation and New Technology* 28(2): 142–155.
7. Bourdieu, P. 1986. ‘The Forms of Capital’, in *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, ed. J. Richardson. Westport, CT: Greenwood, 241–258.
8. Carrillo Álvarez, E.; Riera Romani, J. 2017. ‘La Medición del Capital Social: Nuevas Perspectivas’, *Gaceta Sanitaria* 31(1): 57–61.
9. Coleman, J. S. 2005. *Socialinės teorijos pagrindai*. Vilnius: Margi raštai.
10. Engbers, T. A.; Thompson, M. F.; Slaper, T. F. 2017. ‘Theory and Measurement in Social Capital Research’, *Social Indicators Research* 132(2): 537–558.
11. Fahmi, F. Z. 2019. ‘Business Networks, Social Capital and the Economic Performance of Creative and Cultural Industries: The Case of Indonesia’, *Asia Pacific Viewpoint* 60(3): 370–385.
12. Florida, R. 2015. *Kūrybinės klasės iškilimas*. Vilnius: TECHNIKA.
13. Gannon, B.; Roberts, J. 2020. ‘Social Capital: Exploring the Theory and Empirical Divide’, *Empirical Economics* 58(3): 899–919.
14. Harper, R. 2002. *The Measurement of Social Capital in the United Kingdom*. National Statistics. Prieiga per internetą: <https://www.oecd.org/unitedkingdom/2382339.pdf> (accessed 06.07.2022).
15. Jeong, S. W.; Ha, S.; Lee, K. H. 2021. ‘How to Measure Social Capital in an Online Brand Community? A Comparison of Three Social Capital Scales’, *Journal of Business Research* 131: 652–663.
16. Kačerauskas, T. 2014. *Kūrybos visuomenė*. Vilnius: TECHNIKA.

17. Kačerauskas, T. 2018. 'Indices of Creative Economy: Critique of R. Florida's Creativity Indices', *Economics & Sociology* 11(4).
18. Kačerauskas, T. 2019. 'Creative and Social Capital: Concepts, Problems and Contradictions', *Sociologia* 51(3): 235–249.
19. Kerimoglu, E.; Karahasan, B. C. 2014. 'Location Patterns of Creative Capital and Regional Disparities in Spain', *Regional and Sectoral Economic Studies* 14(1).
20. Kong, L. 2014. 'From Cultural Industries to Creative Industries and Back? Towards Clarifying Theory and Rethinking Policy', *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies* 15(4): 593–607.
21. Mayasari, Y.; Chandra, T. 2020. 'Social Capital for Knowledge Management System of the Creative Industry', *Journal of Enterprising Communities* 14(4): 481–494.
22. Muringani, J.; Fitjar, R. D.; Rodríguez-Pose, A. 2021. 'Social Capital and Economic Growth in the Regions of Europe', *Environment and Planning A* 53(6): 1412–1434.
23. Putnam, R. D. 1993. 'The Prosperous Community', *The American Prospect* 4(13).
24. Putnam, R. D. 2000. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
25. Ramaškienė, L.; Šumskienė, E. 2020. 'The Impact of Social Business on the Development of Communities' Social Capital', *Socialinė teorija: empirija, politika ir praktika* 21: 66–85.
26. Rastvortseva, S.; Korbankova, A. 2021. 'Measuring the Creative Capital and its Development in the Regions of France', *Sovremennaya Evropa* 101(1): 74–85.
27. Rezabeigisani, R.; Aminzadeh, B. 2020. 'Social Creativity and Place (Re)production: Tarbiat Pedestrian Route in Tabriz, Iran', *Iconarp International Journal of Architecture and Planning* 8(2): 630–651.
28. Skačkauskienė, I.; Bytautė, S. 2012. 'Social Capital Definition and Measurement Problems', *Business: Theory and Practice* 13(3): 208–216.
29. Strindlund, L.; Abrandt Dahlgren, M.; Ståhl, C. 2021. 'When Cooperation Turns Ugly: Exploring the Dark Side of Social Capital', *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal* 17(5): 1–18.
30. Suvorova, A. 2021. 'Regional Imbalances in the Localization of Creative Capital', *E3S Web of Conferences*: 301: 1–9.
31. Szara, K.; Mazurkiewicz, A. 2018. 'The Role of Human, Social and Creative Capitals in Socio-Economic Development' in *Proceedings of the 2018 International Scientific Conference Economic Sciences for Agribusiness and Rural Economy*. Warsaw University of Life Sciences Press, 273–279.
32. Tafel-Viia, K.; Terk, E.; Lassur, S.; Viia, A. 2015. 'Creative Industries in the Capital Cities of the Baltic States: Are There Innovations in Urban Policy?', *Moravian Geographical Reports* 23(4): 47–58.
33. Uekusa, S.; Matthewman, S.; Lorenz, D. F. 2021. 'Conceptualising Disaster Social Capital: What it is, Why it Matters, and How it can be Enhanced', *Disasters* 46(1): 56–79.
34. Villalonga-Olives, E.; Kawachi, I. 2015. 'The Measurement of Social Capital', *Gaceta Sanitaria* 29(1): 62–64.
35. Vitálišová, K.; Vaňová, A.; Šúrová, J. 2020. 'How to Attract and Retain Creative Class', *NISPAcee Journal of Public Administration and Policy* 13(1): 245–266.

KAROLINA LACYTĖ

Kūrybinio ir socialinio kapitalo sąlytis

Santrauka

Straipsnyje nagrinėjamas socialinis ir kūrybinis kapitalai bei jų tarpusavio sąlytis. Vieni autoriai išvelgia socialinio ir kūrybinio kapitalo panašumų bei sričių, kuriose jie vienas kitą papildo. Kiti autoriai teigia, kad vis dėlto socialinis ir kūrybinis kapitalas vienas kitą naikina ir negali būti lyginami. Straipsnyje analizuojami įvairūs socialinio ir kūrybinio kapitalo aspektai, ieškoma šių kapitalų panašumų ir skirtumų, apžvelgiamos matavimo metodikos ir problemos, susijusios su matavimo indeksų ir kriterijų patikimumu. Visa tai analizuojama kūrybos visuomenės kontekste.

Raktažodžiai: socialinis kapitalas, kūrybinis kapitalas, kūrybinė klasė