

International Journal of Human Sciences Research

DIGITAL TRANSFORMATION MODELS IN INDUSTRIES CULTURAL AND CREATIVE 2013 – 2023

Nelson Javier Pulido Daza

Universidad de la Salle - Bogotá - Colombia

All content in this magazine is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution License. Attribution-Non-Commercial-Non-Derivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0).



INTRODUCTION

In the last decade, we have witnessed a profound revolution in the Cultural and Creative Industries, driven in large part by digital transformation. From the beginning of the decade, in 2010, to the present, these industries have experienced significant changes in their business models, creating a new landscape of opportunities and challenges. In this article, the evolution of these transformations will be explored, focusing on the types and models of Creative Industries; the transition from the Cultural to the Creative Industry and the models that have emerged in the last decade. A qualitative methodology will be used to delimit and analyze in detail the business models and contributions of digital transformation in these industries, unraveling the keys to their success in the digital era.

The creative industries, in the period from 2013 to 2023, have played a fundamental role in the global economy. This concept, which is linked to the knowledge-based economy, refers to those industries that merge the creation, production and marketing of intangible content of a cultural nature. These companies operate in a space where innovation and artistic expression merge to shape unique products and experiences that not only focus on the tangible, but extend to the immaterial sphere and their distinctive characteristic lies in their ability to generate value through creativity, originality and authenticity.

As a second point, the transformation of the Cultural Industry into a Creative Industry has been a metamorphosis marked by technological influence and the change in the way in which cultural content is produced and consumed. At its core, the Cultural Industry produced standard and big-budget cultural goods to satisfy homogeneous needs, that is, the generalized tastes of consumers in a market.

However, with technological intervention and the participation of a multiplicity of actors, these types of industries have been transformed into a more diversified and accessible Creative Industry. Technology has enabled the production and distribution of more personalized content, allowing a variety of creators and companies to enter the market, which in turn has led to the creation of a wide range of cultural and creative content.

Over the last decade, the Creative Industries have experienced significant impact, compounded by global events such as the COVID-19 pandemic. Quarantine and mobility restrictions have drastically transformed the dynamics of these industries. While some, such as streaming platforms, video games and telecommunications services, have thrived in this new environment, others, especially those related to tourism and live entertainment, have suffered serious consequences. The mass quarantine has exposed the vulnerability of supply chains in these areas and has highlighted the importance of digital adaptation and diversification of business models in the Creative Industries to maintain their relevance and sustainability in an ever-changing world.

This way, the last decade has witnessed the evolution of the CCI (Cultural and Creative Industries) as a vanguard economic force. These industries, by fusing creativity, technology and culture, have transcended traditional boundaries and opened new avenues of opportunity. The shift from the Cultural Industry to the Creative Industry has been driven by technology and diversified participation of actors, and over the last decade, these industries have faced both unprecedented challenges and opportunities, underscoring the need for constant adaptation and change. to ensure your long-term success in a constantly evolving environment.

TYPES AND MODELS OF CREATIVE INDUSTRIES

The Cultural and Creative Industries are differentiated by a procedure of social advancement in the economic and productive environment which will be defined later, however, the central nature of the commercialization of culture does have a common basis to define these concepts. At first we could say that CCIs are the product of the economic sector that encompasses activities related to the creation, production, distribution and marketing of products and services that have a high cultural and creative component “refers to those industries that combine the creation, the production and marketing of creative content that is intangible and cultural in nature” (Blanco-Valbuena et al., 2018, 16). In other words, these industries are characterized by their ability to generate value through creativity, originality and artistic expression.

ICCs comprise a diverse set of activities ranging from cinema, music, literature, visual and performing art, to video games, fashion, design, architecture and advertising. These industries are dedicated to the production and promotion of cultural and creative content, which can be tangible or intangible, and are often closely related to identity, cultural expression and entertainment. For example, the film industry, which includes film production, distribution in theaters and streaming platforms, as well as the sale of copyrights and related merchandise, is a clear example of a BCI. Similarly, music, with the composition, recording and distribution of songs and albums, is also part of this sector. Additionally, fashion and design, ranging from creating clothing and accessories to organizing runway shows and promoting brands beyond simple textile value, are examples of ICCs that influence culture and personal expression. These industries play an important role in

the global economy, generating employment, income and contributing to cultural diversity in developed and developing countries.

While CCIs have been intrinsically linked to the development of human societies throughout history, the term “Cultural and Creative Industries” itself emerged and became popular at the beginning of the 20th century. And although art and music to literature and theater, cultural and creative creation have been a fundamental part of the human experience immanent to any historiographic study, it was not until the 20th century, with the growing industrialization, the expansion of media and the mass commercialization of culture, that the academic term Cultural and Creative Industries was formulated to describe and analyze this constantly evolving phenomenon. The main difference between these factors, that is, cultural development and CCI, lies in the nature of creation and its integration into a properly capitalist model. This is because “they are considered an economic phenomenon, linked to public policies of economic growth and social development; and also a cultural phenomenon that incorporates the new values generated by the intellectually based knowledge/information society of capitalism.” (Gomes, 2018, 2). Such a revolution indicates that CCIs are the product of immaterial capital, not work as such, but the idea born of a fertile space for artistic production. This conceptualization has served as an important framework for understanding the intersection between creativity, culture, and economics in the modern world.

Although the industry can be seen exemplified in all human communities, the cultural gap driven after the globalization of the 20th century determined the regional powers from the integration of digital technologies, opening a considerable gap between the developed Western countries of those that still exist. in development. Even after the

pandemic, they found themselves with greater resistance to promoting and maintaining the CCI of each of them. (Betzler et al., 2021). This point, mentioned by the Swiss authors in their article *COVID-19 and the arts and cultural sectors: investigating countries' contextual factors and early policy measures* (2021), It is important as it demonstrates that the way in which different countries have addressed the pandemic crisis in their creative industries is directly related to key factors in their social economic development. In particular, it is mentioned that the intensity of state intervention, the economic situation prior to the pandemic and society's propensity for self-employment are fundamental elements in understanding the specific political measures adopted by each country.

In countries considered "first world," a greater capacity to implement support measures for creative industries is often observed. This is because they typically have strong government infrastructure, a stable economy, and a population with greater access to resources and financial support. These countries can implement policies that help cushion the impact of the pandemic on CCIs more effectively by mediating in-person participation of consumers through the use of ICT, adaptation of safe and immunized spaces, and through health and investment. to the health sector. It is curious how the apparently secondary relationship between CCIs and the Health Sector became related in recent years.

On the other hand, in countries with fewer resources and a higher proportion of self-employed workers, as in many developing countries, policies may be less effective due to budgetary and structural constraints. In these places, the creative industries are often more vulnerable to the economic consequences of the pandemic. These points are appropriate to understand the development of creative industries during the last decade. The disparity

in the way the pandemic affected CCIs in first world and developing countries highlights the importance of factors such as the capacity for state intervention, the economic situation and the labor structure in mitigating crises like the one we are experiencing. These findings highlight the need for global policies that consider these differences to protect and foster the resilience of creative industries around the world, but highlight the malleability of the term and how its conceptualization has been notable in recent times.

The development and recognition of Cultural and Creative Industries (CCI) is not only based on the promotion of cultural creation by countries, but is also intrinsically linked to technological advances and transformations in the way culture is produced, distributes and consumes. As Albornoz mentions, at the end of the seventies, when the concept of "cultural industries" emerged, the context had undergone a profound evolution.

"The development of new media is evident, with television being in the first rank, and the commercialization of culture is strongly accentuated." (Albornoz, 2011, 112). This period witnessed the development of new media, with open television at the forefront, and a marked emphasis on the commercialization of culture through audiovisual media. These technological advances played a crucial role in consolidating CCIs as a central element in the global economy. Television and radio programs, by being able to create content of interest (entertainment, news, sports, academic, cultural, etc.) allowed them to be massified and easily reproduced in any daily environment, they quickly became the Western cultural standard of the 20th century. driven by capitalist commercialization. Television, in particular, became a powerful medium for the dissemination of cultural and creative content on a mass level, reaching global audiences. This not only allowed the expansion of

culture on an unprecedented scale, but also opened new business opportunities in the entertainment industry. However, the seemingly modern forms of CCIs quickly ran into an inevitable reality, obsolescence. By the end of the 20th century, less than 100 years after its integration into the cultural field, the crisis of open television was already manifesting itself. For the last decade of the 20th century, in Colombia, it was mentioned that “In recent years the cultural industries of film and television are going through a contradictory situation: the insertion of their cultural production into the world market is implying their own cultural disintegration.” (Barber, 1992, 17-18). If for cinema, its fight for popularity was television, with the arrival of the Internet, the cultural colossus had to face live broadcasts, independent video search engines and, later, streaming services. Culture and its media advance within the ICC, which motivates its constant evolution.

The commercialization of CCIs increased as cultural content became commodities, and television played a central role in promoting cultural products for mass consumption. In this sense, technological evolution and the emergence of new media played a critical role in the consolidation of CCI as a phenomenon homogeneous with capitalism and globalization, marking a significant change in the way we understand the intersection of culture, creativity and the economy.

THE TRANSFORMATION OF THE CULTURAL INDUSTRY TO THE CREATIVE INDUSTRY

The Cultural and Creative Industries (CCI) represent a modern conceptualization of what was previously known as the “Cultural Industry”. This transformation in language and approach reflects an evolution in the understanding of how culture and creativity intertwine with the economy. The

original notion of the “Cultural Industry” emerged from the Enlightenment texts of the philosophers Horkheimer and Adorno and was popularized in the context of British state policies in the 20th century, with the aim of maintaining and consolidating the economic and cultural power of the Kingdom. United over its foreign competitors. At the time, this was a strategy of dominance that focused on the production and export of standardized cultural goods, such as books, music, and print media, which served as an extension of the economic and political might of the British Empire. Thus, the appearance of the political term “Cultural Industry” will become part of the philosophical dialectic of massification of cultural goods as an immaterial product, but precious for the capitalist system because “...this strategy of distinction will be widely shared, since, As UNCTAD vigorously states, creativity is a characteristic of every human being and all societies are equally endowed with it.” (Albornoz, 2011, 110). However, culture, as a product; As a visible entity, it is not enough to determine the burden of the means of dissemination, production and distribution of cultural goods. Although it may seem ironic, culture as a term is not capable of encompassing social culture, a void that creativity can fill.

The evolution towards the conceptualization of CCI is a modern phenomenon that seeks to encompass not only the material aspects of cultural production, but also the standardization of ideas, values and narratives in contemporary global society. This transition reflects the growing importance of creativity, innovation and cultural diversity in an increasingly interconnected world.

CCIs focus on the capacity of culture and creativity to not only generate economic wealth, but also to influence cultural identity, expression and diversity in a global context.

With the term Cultural Industries, “creatives find themselves isolated within a corporate organization in which their creativity is overwhelmed in the form of dependent labor.” (Rodríguez Torres, 2021, 76). In this sense, the inclusion of “Creativity” in the conceptualization reflects a significant shift towards a broader and contemporary understanding of how culture and creativity impact society and the economy in the 21st century.

The notable differences between Cultural Industries and Creative Industries lie not so much in the cultural products themselves, but in the approach and perspective from which they are approached. Cultural Industries focus on the production and distribution of established cultural goods and services, with an emphasis on the preservation and promotion of traditional culture. This approach often focuses on the externality of the cultural product, that is, its relationship with its context, its social, economic and political environment. It is a pragmatic and deterministic vision that considers cultural products as part of an ordered system of social and human synthesis.

In contrast, the Creative Industries embrace a more contemporary perspective and focus on originality and creativity. They focus on the generation of cultural products and services that challenge conventions and offer unique experiences. These industries internalize the cultural product, highlighting the authenticity, the creative individual and the aesthetics of the works. Here, the focus shifts from a deterministic vision to a more open and flexible one that celebrates diversity, innovation and individual expression. The above indicates that Creative Industries emerge as a response to the post-industrial model, and over time, their importance in knowledge-based economies has been constantly increasing. These not only

contribute to economic growth and job creation, but also play a fundamental role in the preservation and dissemination of cultural identity, an aspect of great relevance in cultural promotion.

Over the last decade, governments around the world have recognized this phenomenon and implemented specific cultural policies to encourage the development of Creative Industries, understanding their potential to enrich both the economy and culture in the post-industrial era (Rodríguez Torres, 2021).

Ultimately, these differences reflect an evolution in the way we understand the intersection of culture, creativity and economy in the contemporary world, taking authenticity as a pillar, which “is the truth content that every work of art carries, transmissible. from its material duration to its historical documentation” (Szpilbarg & Saferstein, 2014, 161). This suggests that CCIs are not only a response to technological and cultural changes, but also a reassessment of how we value and understand culture and creativity in today’s society. This approach can lead to a greater appreciation of authenticity, originality and diversity in cultural and creative production, which in turn influences the way people relate to and identify with cultural products.

The above may suggest that the radical differences between cultural industries and creative industries are not their products or objects of study, but rather their approach. It could be said that Cultural Industries are associated with the externality of the cultural product, that is, its context, its social, economic and political environment. That is, a pragmatic and deterministic vision of cultural products as belonging to an ordered system of social and human synthesis. On the other hand, Creative Industries internalize the cultural product based on its authenticity, the individual creator of the product and its

aesthetics.

Within a more technical conceptualization it is possible to see the ICC that “in essence, encompasses imitation and therefore has been limited to a pure style, (...), manifests its complete compliance with the social hierarchy.” (Rodríguez Torres, 2021, 76), but this makes the aesthetic definition waterproof by a series of economic, bureaucratic and political regulations external to the object of culture where “the aesthetic cruelty assumed at that moment threatens spiritual spaces from the day “They began to be collected and counteracted as culture.” (Ibid.). This new perspective of the CCI determines its position in the modern panorama, since contemporary ICT allowed the partial emancipation of products and producers with their political and tax social environment.

MODELS OF CREATIVE INDUSTRIES DURING THE LAST DECADE

In recent years, we have witnessed a significant transformation in the dynamics of production and distribution of cultural and mass content, driven by the emergence of content creators within international distribution platforms. This paradigm shift has challenged not only the general form of production and creation of cultural displays along with the quality and restraint of national media, but also the traditional conception of the state as the main manager, promoter and collector of cultural goods for subsequent taxation by its authors and consumers. Instead of relying heavily on institutional intermediaries, these new models have allowed creators to reach their audiences directly, removing barriers and filters in the process.

The phenomenon has generated a boom in cultural processes that can now flow without restrictions or censorship to the mass media

located in an audience that is only retained by the minimum security steps provided by websites. With the proliferation of the Internet and social networks, there has been a shift from democratization in the technical senses, that is, where the state provides the opportunity for citizen participation in culture and art; to cultural emancipation, since the creation and distribution of creative content is oriented from an individual creative impulse that does not require state bureaucratic models to promote and massify its product. In this sense, the definition of Coelho, Barbero and Fuentes has changed in favor of a direct independence from the social macro to the apparent individuality.

Regarding the organization of efforts to achieve democratization, there are three basic ways of doing cultural policy: one is intervention —as in France—, where everything is done from a centralized organization that defines the proposals as a kind of specialization by communities, from the country’s capital; Another is coordination – like in Great Britain –, where they try to determine how they can work together, and another is cooperation, in which you say: “look, we have this here and we can offer you this. Come, what we can do is cooperate so that you can do what you want.” (Coelho, T. et al., 2002, 122)

By 2002, these visions were valid as national states continued to regulate the guidelines of cultural and creative media, events, concerts, fairs, programs, etc. But with the entry of the new millennium it has been shown that new productions do not require any type of democratizing model, since their medium is completely detached from the scope of the state. The above is evident in platforms such as YouTube, blogs, podcast programs and social forums that have made room for a diversity of voices, forms and formats to carry out artistic expression. The change has been so drastic during the last decade of the marketing models of art or cultural projects,

they were not profitable until the entry of independent fundraising projects such as Kickstarter (2008) or Patreon (2013) and they only became widespread until half of the first decade of the 21st century thanks to the popularity obtained among content creators. This poses a second break with the traditional CCI process in which they not only lose their ties to the state; They stop being part of a mass production project to become a more independent one, but they also divert their monetary value through net, non-profit artistic production.

The first steps of the breakup were taken around 2010 when the aforementioned platforms began the second process of digital globalization, cultural globalization. However, in the face of ignorance of the commodification of content, works of mass entertainment were produced without the restriction of capital value.

This phenomenon is not only seen in the producers, but is even manifested by the companies that function as hosts of the products. These only began to use adds (advertised content) several years after their creation. The means of capital took time to adjust to the new technologies and, although they took time, they ended up participating in the commercial cycle of the CCIs.

This has opened up a broader spectrum of digital producers, from graphic designers to reviewers and other creators who have found a passionate and engaged audience online. This cultural and creative revolution has empowered individuals and questioned traditional authority in the cultural industry. Digital creators have become influential figures, capable of changing public opinion and shaping contemporary culture. While this transformation poses challenges in terms of regulation and intellectual property, it also opens new opportunities for expression, diversity and active participation in cultural

and mass creation, its conversion and development is easily understandable. But the rapid adaptation of digital media to contemporary CCIs remains surprising.

The transformation models were not only due to factors intrinsic to the technological order, but also to global health problems. The COVID-19 pandemic has left its mark as one of the main factors that affected the global economy during the 21st century. The devastating impact that the quarantine has had on various industries, mainly those related to tourism, entertainment and culture, further limited the state's reach to the means of production of the CCIs and increased the production of content on new digital platforms. But this panorama is not only seen in audiovisual content, but the hospitality, recreation and tourism sectors were also affected, the negative effects that have arisen as a result of the cancellation of trips, show tours, theater seasons, championships, exhibitions and fairs, among other cultural and entertainment events cannot be measured with certainty, but, since "the Creative Economy represents approximately 6% of the GDP and generates almost two million jobs." (Fráguas Nobre, 2020, 177), it is possible to get an idea of its magnitude. The suspension of sponsorships and the decrease in broadcasts of sporting events also added to the difficulties these industries faced.

This impact is not limited to a single sector, as it affects a wide range of cultural and creative activities, from fashion and design to visual arts, music, dance and multimedia production. The economic losses that have resulted from these cancellations and suspensions represent a significant blow, and are expected to have a lasting impact on the ability of these industries to recover. The last decade has presented, without a doubt, a panorama that is nothing more than curious, from the total development of the massification of

digital cultural products, until the onset of the financial crisis left by the pandemic, we have seen nothing but a less constant modification of the ICC which proposes a panorama of modification and changes both for the media and for the economic, documentary and theoretical theory of culture and the economy.

CONCLUSION

In the period from 2013 to 2023, the Cultural and Creative Industries (CCI) have gone through a profound evolution marked by technological influence and the change in the way in which cultural and creative content is produced, distributed and consumed. This transformation has been explored in three key aspects:

the types and models of Creative Industries, the transition from the Cultural to the Creative Industry and the models that have emerged in the last decade.

ICCs cover a wide spectrum of activities ranging from cinema, music and literature to video games, fashion and advertising. These industries are characterized by their ability to generate value through creativity, originality and artistic expression. However, over the last decade, there has been significant diversification in the production and distribution of cultural and creative content. Technology has allowed the personalization of content and has opened the doors to a multiplicity of creators and companies that compete in the market.

The COVID-19 pandemic has highlighted the vulnerability of certain segments of CCIs, especially those related to tourism and live entertainment. This has underlined the importance of digital adaptation and diversification of business models in these industries to ensure their sustainability in an ever-changing world. Likewise, the transition from the Cultural Industry to the Creative Industry has been a process marked

by the change in the way of production and consumption of cultural content. ICCs focus on the generation of cultural products that challenge conventions and offer unique experiences. Authenticity, originality and diversity have become key values in these industries. Unlike Cultural Industries, CCIs promote individual expression and creativity. This change is not limited to the technological sphere, but reflects a reassessment of how we value and understand culture and creativity in today's society. CCIs seek to go beyond the mass production of standardized cultural goods and focus on the promotion of authenticity and cultural diversity.

During the last decade, a profound transformation has been evident in the cultural and creative industries. The emergence of digital CCIs has contradicted the theoretical models of the democratization of culture for its emancipation and, apparently, these are changes that are still in process. Going forward, it is essential to address certain questions and challenges. How will the relationship between technology and CCI continue to evolve? What impact will artificial intelligence and virtual reality have on content creation? How will CCIs adapt to new economic and social realities?

Furthermore, the relationship between CCIs and governments is an important issue. How can government policies encourage the growth of CCIs without imposing restrictions on creativity and innovation? How can disparities in how different countries support these industries be addressed?

In conclusion, the Cultural and Creative Industries have undergone a significant transformation in the last decade. This change has been driven by technology, the democratization of culture and adaptation to circumstances such as the pandemic. As we move into the future, it will be crucial to continue exploring these transformations and

addressing the challenges and opportunities that arise in a constantly evolving world. CCIs will continue to play a fundamental role in the

global economy and in the way we understand culture and creativity in contemporary society.

REFERENCES

- Albornoz, L. (Ed.). (2011). *Poder, medios, cultura: una mirada crítica desde la economía política de la comunicación*. Unión Latina de Economía Política de la Información, la Comunicación y la Cultura.
- Barbero, M. (1992). *Televisión y melodrama: géneros y lecturas de la telenovela en Colombia* (S. Muñoz, Ed.). Tercer Mundo Editores.
- Betzler, D., Loots, E., Prokupek, M., & Grafenauer, P. (2021). COVID-19 and the arts and cultural sectors: investigating countries' contextual factors and early policy measures. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 27(6), 796-814. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10286632.2020.1842383>
- Blanco-Valbuena, C. E., Bernal Torres, C. A., Camacho, F., & Díaz-Olaya, M. (2018). Industrias Creativas y Culturales: Estudio desde el Enfoque de la Gestión del Conocimiento. *Información Tecnológica*, 29(3), 15-28. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4067/S0718-07642018000300015>
- Coelho, T., Martín-Barbero J., & Fuentes-Navarro R. (2002). La democratización de la cultura. *Renglones, revista del ITESO*, (51), 121-126. https://rei.iteso.mx/bitstream/handle/11117/413/51_16_democratizacion_cultura.pdf?sequence=2&isAllowed=y
- Fráguas Nobre, G. (2020). Las industrias creativas versus COVID-19. *Economía Creativa*, 13, 171-188. <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=8016128>
- Gomes, C. L. (2018). La Economía Creativa Y Las Industrias Culturales Y Creativas: ¿Una Alternativa Postcapitalista? *XV Coloquio Internacional de Geocrítica*, 1(1), 7-12. <https://www.ub.edu/geocrit/Sociedad-postcapitalista/ChristianneGomes.pdf>
- Rodríguez Torres, E. (2021). La industria cultural y su evolución a la industria creativa. *Revista Guatemalteca de Educación Superior*, 4(1), 72-82. <https://doi.org/10.46954/revistages.v4i1.55>
- Szpilbarg, D., & Saferstein, E. (2014). De la industria cultural a las industrias creativas: un análisis de la transformación del término y sus usos contemporáneos. *Estudios de Filosofía Práctica e Historia de las Ideas*, 16(2), 99-112. <http://www.scielo.org.ar/pdf/efphi/v16n2/v16n2a07.pdf>