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The European Union is paying increasing more attention to the creative sector, acknowledging the economic significance of the sphere and appreciating the social benefits of creative and cultural activities. Its latest innovation is the Cultural and Creative Cities Monitor (CCCM), which shows the creative vibrancy of 168 European cities, thus enabling a comparison and ranking in terms of different creative and cultural aspects. Győr has been included in this platform’s list besides Budapest, Pécs, and Szeged. In this study the creative position of Győr, in relation to similar mid-sized Central and Eastern European cities is examined, thus estimating the creative potential of Győr. The analysis enables us to observe the elements and indicators of a creative city that are used to measure and show creativity. Exploring the city’s strengths and weaknesses provides guidance as the CCCM annually renews its evaluation and changes the ranking. With conscious initiatives Győr may become more creative, both internationally and locally. Based on the CCCM scores Győr has numerous strengths: favourable geographic location, adequate amount of cultural offerings, strong economic potential, cultural vibrancy, and a high level of participation in cultural life. However, the city has weak features too, that require strengthening. The aim is for the cities to become more creative, but this requires analysis from the creative and cultural aspects. We offer an analysis that focuses on Hungarian cities, on our macro-region and on the creative and cultural elements of these cities.
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Introduction

Győr, the creative city: is this the future, a vision, or present-day reality? How can the creativity of a city be measured? What elements should be altered by the decision makers of a city if the goal is to enhance creativity? After all, what does a creative city mean? What indicators express a city’s level of creativity?

Researchers, international organisations and European Union institutions have been looking for answers to these questions for over two decades. Since the 1970s, people have recognized that answers should be given to the urban problems of declining industrial centres, and as a result, urban researchers tried to add culture as a new element to their analysis. Meanwhile political transition, economic and social transformation have taken place and the conditions of urbanisation changed fundamentally (Konecka-Szydłowska et al. 2018).

Subsequently, more elements for examination were added: creativity and later creative economy. In the 1990’s Western-European and North American cities, renewed by cultural development, have already been discussing these concepts; and by the turn of the century, the role of a new social class, the creative class in urban development has already been written about (Czirfusz 2013, Florida 2002). In the last decade, creative individuals came into focus as well, with regard to their embedding in the urban environment, the openness of the city, the exploration of their ways to connect to the city’s economic policy, and the supporting policies to alleviate their labour market dependency. These are in addition to shaping the creative vision in the minds of youths to exploit creativity as a potential skill (Tokatli 2011, Pratt 2008, 2011, Allen–Hollingworth 2013).

From the above-mentioned elements and mosaics, the ideal picture of a creative city can be constructed, that is, a city where the presence of the creative class is strongly felt, where the city’s policy offers artistic training, a supportive environment and cultural investment and development, and where economic enterprises are linked to the creative sector.

At the same time the independent creative city conglomerate formed from different elements is worth structuring, as different tools and aspects are needed to enhance their growth. This embodies 1) a culture-centred interpretation, which generally means that the creative and cultural activities in a city are focused on those that stimulate the emotional and spiritual well-being of the inhabitants and 2) an economy-centred interpretation, where the support and enhancement of creative enterprises in the local economy is the goal (Szemző–Tönkő 2015). This is how we can depict the pillars of a creative city: the pillars being cultural life, vibrancy, a creative economy, and its supporting background, environment, the goodwill coming from the city, and a supportive policy. This structure is followed by the CCCM platform, brought to life by the European Commission with the intent of measuring
and showing the creative colour and abilities of European cities. The pillars provide
guidance when examining creativity.

There are many studies that rank cities, regions. They use variations of indica-
tors. There are aspects related to these indicators, such as economic accounts, de-
mography, labour market, education, health, agriculture, business, tourism, science
and technology, transport, digital economy and society, poverty, crime, social con-
nections, social exclusion, governance, environment (Sungur–Zararci 2018). Nu-
merous studies have addressed the role of cities in the Hungarian economy
(Csomós 2015) as well as economic development, the role of big companies and the
importance of the local budget on economic economic sustaina bility (Czakó et al.

Our study fills this gap and follows the CCCM’s aspects and structure and exam-
ines Győr’s creative aspect using CCCM data. Besides listing the strengths and
weaknesses of its creative elements we subject Győr to an international comparison,
ranking it with other similar-sized cities from the Central-Eastern European’s mac-
ro-region to determine which creative elements the city is strong at and which ones
need enhancement.

Creative city concept

The ‘creative city’ as a concept is based on two factors. It builds, first of all on a
culture that nourishes the spirit and creates communities, and secondly on creativity
that helps in searching for new answers, directions, solutions, and new ‘colours’, (i.e.
new content). If the society builds on culture and creativity it can generate a high
degree of economic value and social welfare. Consequently, in these days culture
and creativity have increasingly become the focus of European decision-making (or
at least they get more attention). Such elements come to the fore to promote cultur-
al diversity, protect cultural heritage, and support cultural and creative industries,
with the clear objective of creating workplaces and enhancing economic growth
(European Commission 2018).

Then, the exploitation of culture and creativity as potential resources gets to ur-
ban context, as the relevant source of successful and competitive cities and regions.
Regionalization is increasing, which is one of the most spectacular processes of the
economy: the increase of the economic role of regions and cities (Lengyel–Szakálné
Kanó 2012). Regional or local resources have also become important due to the
conscious development of cities and regions. The most important capital-elements
of territorial capital are fixed capital, human capital, social capital, natural capital,
cultural capital, relational capital, and infrastructural capital (Kovács–Bodnár 2017,
Czakó 2015).
Several creative city models have been created, but the most dominant of them is the model of Florida, which fundamentally influences contemporary cultural policies. The Florida model follows a city and regional development concept that is based on the definitions of work, space, and creativity, emphasising the contribution of cultural services and creative experts to the urban and regional identity and livability, as well as responding to the need for creativity of successful and globally competitive post-industrial cities and regions (Byrne 2012).

Although the notion of creative city has been mentioned in the 1980s, however the concept became constant later, in the 1990s and 2000s. Originally cultural policies were tools that attempted to stop the decline of post-industrial cities, and after the recession of the 1970s, the interest increased in the role of culture in economic growth (Bianchini 1993). ‘The Creative City’, written by Landry, outlines a culture-centric theory, where a creative city is defined as a city in which primary sources and value-fund are the cultural resources that replace coal, steel, and gold. Meanwhile, Florida sees a creative city as a city that is able to attract a highly qualified workforce and creative professionals. The two trends have a basic similarity: the cultural values of cities attract talented people and knowledge-based workers, otherwise called the ‘creative class’ (Landry 2000, Florida 2005). Moreover, it has to be highlighted that a creative city uses creativity as a key element in issues concerning society, environment, and the economy. The creative city concept is popular in local governments; it is related to the framework of a knowledge economy, and within it, the definitions of innovation, growth, enterprise, and competition (Galloway–Dunlop 2007).

However, the ways by which cities realise the creative city concept vary in practice. In the concept adaptation, several cities only reach the step of developing ‘catchy’ slogans, through which they try to position and define themselves. In these cases, a comprehensive urban development concept that builds on cultural and creative resources is usually missing. Many cities have constructed creative city strategies that are predominantly economy-oriented and contain interventions that focus on economic development ideas. For example, large Dutch cities such as Amsterdam, Rotterdam, Hague, and Utrecht targeted the direct support of creative enterprises and the development of a creative business environment, while the soft factors of creative cities – culture, the social aspects, and tolerance – took a back seat (Kooijman–Romein 2007). Meanwhile, there are cities that identify themselves as absolute creative cities. A study from 2010 lists 60 self-professed creative cities (Karvounis 2010). There are cities generally considered less creative, although they have defined themselves as being so, like Sudbury in Canada, Milwaukee in the United States, Huddersfield in the United Kingdom, and Darwin in Australia. Moreover, the number of scientific works increased in the topic of creative city. Specifically, the number of citations associated with the term ‘creative city’ was moderate from 1990 until 2005 at below 200 per year. From 2005 on this number...
increased significantly, with citations per year growing above 800 starting from 2010 (Scott 2014).

The creative city concept offers cities an appealing vision, sending a message that creativity is a key element for achieving urban development objectives. For local economic development is an emphatic question that has been evaluated differently from time to time, which requires conscious intervention, which effectively unites the local resources. Creativity helps in this progress (Nagy-Molnár–Lendvay 2018). Nevertheless, cities have always been centres of creativity (Andersson 2011). Today, urban creativity is built into a new cognitive and cultural system of available social-economic relations. Urban policies on creativity also speed up gentrification processes that result in the exclusion of lower-income families from the downtown areas. Although the creative city theory puts great emphasis on diversity, tolerance, and political support, in reality only some gestures are taken in the direction of social inclusion and even less in the direction of fairer income redistribution. Based on discourses about creative cities, cities often launch incorrect programmes in the hope that these investments, as magnets, will attract creative people and lead to the growth of urban welfare. However, several examples proved that investments have been much higher than the expected increment because the decision makers placed too much hope on models like the one of the Guggenheim Museum in Bilbao (Scott 2014).

**Cultural and Creative Cities Monitor**

The European Union is initiating more and more intensive steps towards the creative and cultural sphere because it has realised that creative industries and cultural and creative services have become the most dynamically growing sector. With respect to innovation, growth and job creation it provides incentives for a new economic environment characterised by the development of information and communication technology, the necessity of digitalisation and diversification, the raison d’etre derived from the higher added value, knowledge-intensive activities and automation possibilities – as these demand the support of creativity and creative talent. From the European Capital of Culture (ECoC) initiative, through the Creative Europe Programme to the Creative Lenses/Trans Europe Halles programme, there are several initiatives that have helped the creative and cultural sphere to evolve.

The newest platform that helps achieve the above-mentioned goals is the CCCM, which concentrates on European cities and examines their creative abilities.

---

1 Trans Europe Halles is a European network of cultural centres initiated by European citizens and artists. It excels in revitalising European industrial buildings that are home to artistic and cultural activities. Until 2016 it has held together 90 multidisciplinary art centres and other cultural organisations in Europe (creative-lenses.eu/page/trans-europe-halles).

and character. Beside 27 EU member states it also includes cities from Norway and Switzerland, monitoring 168 cities. The CCCM list involves cities that have either been ECoC, have been awarded the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) title ‘Creative City’, or hosted at least two international festivals. CCCM provides pointers based on 29 indicators, one main index, three sub-indices and nine dimensions as the structure of its analytical method. Basically, it is an interactive online platform that is also a database; it evaluates cities on a point system in terms of various dimensions. The main index and sub-indices are point values that help compare the listed European cities in terms of their creative strength. Furthermore the cities are divided into groups according to their size in order to make more relevant comparisons. Finally, in its own publication it provides some analysis. In 2017, its first document was published, and it is committed to updating the data of the platform every second year thereafter.3

Looking at the CCCM methodology we can say that two of the nine dimensions evaluated using the 29 indicators merge into the sub-index of cultural vibrancy; three indices form the sub-index of creative economy; and the supportive environment sub-index is compiled from four other dimensions. The index category is the final indicator made from the sub-indices, and basically it quantifies the creative aspects of the examined cities into points, with a maximum of 100 points. The index value is generated by the three sub-indices with different weights. The cultural vibrancy and creative economy sub-indices are weighed 40% each and the supportive environment sub-index is weighed 20% when defining the final value. The indicators of the dimensions are from different sources. Besides Trip Advisor; Eurostat; Flash Eurobarometer 366; the ETER project; institutes that rank universities such as QS, Shanghai, Leiden, or the Times; the DG Region can also serve as a source.4

We believe that the above set of indicators do not satisfy the complete, detailed, and nuanced expression of the quality of creative cities. The set of indicators considered to be an obstacle, a bound track, and the variables defined by the professional apparatus behind the databases do not always meet the requirements in certain contexts (e.g. creative city). The advantage of databases is that we can access the same data of different cities for comparison purposes (and this is one of the reasons that such general indicators are created, as they can be collected in a standardised way from cities all over Europe and the world, for example at the Eurostat Urban Audit system).

This means that the data-pool does not fall under rules carved in stone. When it comes to analysing the creative nature of cities, there is room for forming unique, local indicators. The question is (which we have already asked in the introduction) what makes a city creative? For answering this we have to ask another question:

3 https://europapont.blog.hu/2017/10/09/cultural_creative_cities_monitor
who are the entities who can truly respond to this question? We believe that each city has to address its own creative people. It has to find the right way of communicating with its ‘creative class’ (the creatives) and allow them to formulate their own vision, their own creative city, through their own ‘creative spectacles’, and what they should look out for when defining the creative nature of their city. It is them who are capable of describing the creative nature of their city and with their unique perception feel its creative energies or identify the problematic areas that may have gaps. The result, possibly, is that in the databases (besides the quantitative data) there will be qualitative variables, segments, and elements from the perspective of those who are in direct contact with the city, know the city personally, and are interested in the city’s creative sphere.

Positions of creative cities in our macro-region with special regard to the city of Győr

Based on the data of CCCM we completed a quantitative analysis to obtain qualitative conclusions about the creative tinge of Győr, the strength of its creative elements and its potentials, which if uncovered can lead us to the path of transforming Győr into the cultural and creative city it can possibly be. The research project of CCCM also aims to determine the strengths and weaknesses of the chosen 168 European cities, thus making them comparable and placing the best ones at the top of the rankings for others to learn from.

Győr – as a creative city – can be ranked using CCCM’s indices, allowing a deeper analysis than the one just based on CCCM’s point system. This way it is possible to make comparisons within the macro-region and against other cities in terms of different dimensions, which can provide various answers to our questions. Moreover, we do not contrast Győr with all the 167 cities, as the creative and cultural values of cities are defined more in historical traces. Furthermore, the city’s size is a fundamental factor, as the urban environment of large cities and the adequacy of the cultural consumer base are among the criteria for evaluating a creative economy. Hence, we choose cities from Central Eastern Europe with a population between 100,000 and 250,000, the so-called category M5 cities, from the 168 cities identified by CCCM. The demarcation of Central Eastern Europe has an important role in the comparative analysis as this macro-region holds significant differences compared with Western European countries. The change of regimes that happened around the same time in this region meant that both political and economic changes occurred within a few decades, namely, the renewal of economic structure (the last two and half decades), the EU accessions and the influx of EU funds (starting a little bit more than a decade ago). The business environment of the ‘delicate’ industries of

5 Medium-sized cities.
the creative and cultural economy and the social environment necessary for creative mentality, creative freedom, openness and tolerance are very young in the said region, compared with that of the Western capitalist countries, where the cultural consumer society and the economic structural importance of the tertiary sector have long been present. As a result, it can be misleading to compare the creative potential of a Western, let us say a French city with a Central Eastern European city using similar criteria because their starting points and conditions on the difficult road to becoming a creative city are totally different.6

Figure 1 illustrates the geographical position and size of the examined cities. Kosice and Torun are the larger cities with a population of over 200,000; Maribor and Osijek are smaller cities with 100,000 inhabitants, and Győr, Pécs, Szeged, Baia Mare, Sibiu, Klaipeda, Plzen, Rijeka, and Split are similar medium-sized cities. Figure 1

**Middle-sized Central Eastern European cities monitored by CCCM, 2017**

The above cities are compared based on the creative index and sub-indices defined by CCCM, and the ranking is done with the help of Pareto-diagrams.

Figure 2 shows the points of the total credit index and ranks the cities according to these points. Based on the figure we can conclude that the creative colour and energy of these cities are roughly the same, and Győr occupies a position in the

---

6 However, it would be useful to reveal the greatness of the creative ‘barrage’ between the West and the East, but this is not the topic of this paper.
middle. It is ranked above the Hungarian cities Szeged and Pécs, which appear to be less creative based on the CCCM analysis system. Maribor is the most creative city and leads with 25 points, while Sibiu has good scores, too. It is important to note when looking at the result of these two cities that both have had the title of ECoC: Maribor in 2012 and Sibiu in 2007. Although Plzen, Pécs, and Kosice have also owned this title before, they are currently at the bottom of the list in this context. In Klaipeda, Split, and Plzen one can find the so called creative hub, which is where creative people gather, but the importance of this factor is not reflected in the rankings. On the Figure, from the Pareto line touching Győr we can intersect the point that cumulates the rate compared with the total result of points, and we can state that 60% of the points are owned by the cities ahead of Győr. With regard to Győr being middle-ranked (the eighth out of the 13 cities), this 60% can be considered positive, as the cities ahead of Győr do not exceed Győr remarkably with regard to their creative index. Thus, it is not an advantage that cannot be matched, and with little improvement it is possible to move up in the ranking.

In the following section we look at the composites of the main index, as the points of the sub-indices offer a possibility for deeper analysis.

Figure 3, based on the ‘cultural vibrancy’ sub-index, shows a different ranking.\(^7\) The index consists of the cultural venues and institutions (their quality) with their

\(^7\) We can state that the cumulative index can show the strength of the relations, but some cities can be stronger in some of the creative elements whilst being lower in rank in the main index list.
corresponding attendance and the appeal of the cultural event. CCCM describes the essence of these two pillars in its 2017 edition, stating that the cultural vibrancy of a city is significantly defined by the places and institutions that can be filled with cultural content that is imposing and appealing to the inhabitants and conveys creative energy. Participating in the cultural life of a city means meeting new people who enhance one’s mood and quality of life. The level of this type of participation also characterises a city’s capacity to attract local, national, and international crowd to its cultural events.

Figure 3

The ranking based on the CCCM sub-index of ‘cultural vibrancy’, 2017

With regard to cultural vibrancy Győr has moved up significantly in the rankings. Right after the leaders on the list (Klaipeda, Maribor, and Sibiu), we find Győr. Klaipeda leads this list, and Maribor is considered more vibrant than Sibiu. The first five cities up to Rijeka take 50% of the total points based on the Pareto line. This means that there are bigger and more significant differences between the cities with regard to the indicator, and that the first five cities on the list are hugely ahead, compared with the other cities in the same macro-region. Pécs and Szeged change places in this ranking compared with their places in the main index ranking. Pécs overtakes Szeged, while Szeged is significantly behind. Only Kosice is ranked worse, being once again ranked the lowest.

*While cultural life in the leading cities is very vibrant, further down the list it is quite stale. It is advisable for cities with lower points to learn from those ahead of them in the ranking. Cultural vibrancy in a city also affects many other processes. A grey, dull city can lag behind in terms of other aspects as well.*
The sub-indices pointing toward ‘cultural vibrancy’ are formed from the aggregated values of the two pillars, and these pillars have further building blocks. One of the pillars is cultural venues and institutions. The elements that are looked at are the presence of sights, museums, cinema places, concerts, events, theatre, and their function in cultural offerings. Figure 4 illustrates the points for the existing elements of the cultural offerings in a given city.

In this figure, the cities are in other order and do not reflect the earlier ranking. From the figure we can say that when looking at the building blocks of cultural offerings the cities show a more varied picture. Concerning sights, Klaipeda, Maribor, Baia Mare, Sibiu, Plzen, and Split score much higher than the rest of the cities. The ranking for the Hungarian towns is in the order of Szeged, Pécs, and Győr.

When evaluating the museums, Győr has relatively high points; Sibiu, Split, and Torun have very high points as well. Meanwhile, Rijeka leads due to its high-quality, thematic, and historic museums. Cinema places are not lacking in either of the cities, Klaipeda having outstanding ratings. Regarding concerts and events, Osijek, Baia Mare, and Pécs are the leaders, and Győr ranks right after these cities. With regard to theatres, Croatia leads again, and the theatres of Plzen and Maribor also have high scores.
The second set of elements that measure the cultural vibrancy of the examined cities is the appeal of cultural participation and cultural events. Based on Figure 5, we can see that this attribute is revealed through such aspects as the volume of guest nights, number of visits to the cinemas and museums, and the satisfaction of the inhabitants with the cultural offerings.\(^9\)

Regarding the first indicator (the grading of the volume of guest nights) Split, the second biggest city in Croatia, is ahead of the other cities. We have to note that the city is a transport hub and an important holiday destination due to its seaside. Putting the emphasis on Győr we can say that with regard to the other cities it has a good position, on the same level as Rijeka. Klaipeda, Maribor, and Sibiu have high points. Pécs, Plzen, Szeged, and Torun have moderate results, and Kosice, Baia Mare, and Osijek are at the bottom of the list. The number of museum visits is significant in Sibiu only; most probably relating to the Brukenthal Museum, which houses the richest fine art collection in Romania. Regarding this indicator, among the Hungarian cities only Pécs exceeds most of them. Visits to the cinema also show a varied picture, and the up-to-date offer of films has a more significant role than

\(^9\) The sources of the indicators are the Eurostat and within that the Urban Audit data system. Data on the satisfaction of the inhabitants concerning the cultural offerings are from the ‘Flash Eurobarometer 366’ (2013) survey, coordinated by the European Commission.
the cultural role of the actual city. Satisfaction with the cultural offerings is highest in Klaipeda, and Maribor, Győr, Sibiu, Torun, and Szeged are in the second group. Third in ranking are Osijek, Kosice, Baia Mare, Pécs, and Split. The inhabitants of Rijeka and Plzen are not satisfied with their city’s cultural potential.

When we talk about a creative city, we must also talk about its creative sector and its weight in the economic structure. The CCCM monitoring has also a sub-index on the analysis of the city’s creative economy, with dimensions such as creative and knowledge-based workplaces, intellectual capital and innovation, and generation of new workplaces in the creative sector. The CCCM itself states that creative, knowledge-based workers play an important role in the growth of the economy and the development of innovations. The indicator also embraces areas such as art, culture, entertainment, media and communication, and creative services like advertising and fashion. The dimension of intellectual capital and innovation explores to what extent the given city helps the development of innovation, how the cultural and creative sector is capable of adapting to the digital revolution, and whether the attitude of consumers using new technology and information-communication technology have any impact on the participants of the creative sector. The dimension of new workplaces in the creative sector examines how the cities capitalize on creative ideas and innovation to establish new workplaces and start new enterprises in the creative sector.

Figure 6

Ranking based on the CCCM’s ‘creative economy’ sub-index, 2017

![Graph showing the ranking of cities based on the CCCM’s ‘creative economy’ sub-index, 2017.](source)

For this question it might be worth examining the art cinemas in these cities.
Figure 6 depicts the ranking generated by the points received for the sub-index ‘creative economy’ in the examined cities. Regarding this index we can see a significant change in the ranking compared with that of the ‘cultural vibrancy’ sub-index. First, we can see that Maribor and Sibiu have held onto their elite ranking, indicating that it is not only cultural vibrancy that is present in these cities but also a strong creative economy. However, Klaipeda has fallen to the bottom of the list, ahead of only Osijek. Baia Mare, Torun, Rijeka, and Plzen are the ones in the lead, while the Hungarian cities take their positions one after the other. Szeged, Győr, and Pécs have nearly the same number of points, with Pécs getting the least. Kosice, too, does well in this respect, compared with its points in the main index and the first sub-index. Split, Klaipeda, and Osijek are at the bottom of the list. Cities with rankings ahead of Győr take 60% of the total points; while the remaining cities, including Győr, share the remaining 40% of the points. This means that they are not only behind in the ranking but also that their positions are obtained at a lower value. The cities ranked further down the list have a lot to work on developing their creative economy.

Based on Figure 7 we can examine the fundamental factors, the details of the sub-index, and the building blocks behind the ranking generated by the points received for the ‘creative economy’ sub-index. A detailed analysis reveals the specific elements of a creative economy and the indicators with which these are measured. The previously introduced dimensions (building blocks of the ‘creative economy’ sub-index) are creative and knowledge-based workers, intellectual capital and innovation, and the establishment of workplaces in the creative fields. Creative and knowledge-based workers are taken into account by CCCM from creative areas like the arts, culture, entertainment, media and communication, and other creative areas. In this respect, Maribor is in the lead, exceeding the points of the other cities. Plzen is close behind. The Hungarian cities also have good rankings: first Szeged, then Pécs, and finally, Győr. Consequently, we can state that in the examined macro-region the Hungarian cities do have creative workers. Rijeka, Kosice, Klaipeda, Baia Mare, and Split are very close to each other based on this indicator. Osijek, Sibiu, and Torun lag behind the others. Concerning intellectual capital and innovation, Sibiu, Torun, and Rijeka are the leaders. Next to them all the other cities are roughly on the same level. However, Győr has more significant values compared with the other cities. Looking at the components of this indicator we note that it takes into account the number of registered patents from the information and communication sector and registered community designs submitted to the Office for Harmonisation in the internal market.

Note that the figure showing the points of the building blocks of the sub-index does not reflect the ranking based on the ‘creative economy’ sub-index; instead, the cities are in alphabetical order. Moreover, besides the CCCM criteria that describe the creative economy, we can also take into account other indicators when examining the given cities’ creative economy.

Data are from the Eurostat Urban Audit and Regional Statistics database and do not represent absolute data but the points received.
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Figure 7

Building blocks of the ‘creative economy’ sub-index, 2017

- Creative & Knowledge-based workers
- Intellectual Property & Innovations
- New Jobs in Creative Fields

*Source:* Own compilation based on CCCM data.

‘New jobs’ is an indicator in the creative areas. In the previously listed creative activity areas it reflects the number of people employed by enterprises that have been set up in the reference year. Based on this indicator Sibiu and Baia Mare are in the lead. Torun is ranked high, and Maribor also has high values. However, after these cities the results for the remaining cities are moderate and similar in the figure.

Figure 8

Ranking based on the CCCM’s ‘enabling environment’ sub-index, 2017

*Source:* Own compilation based on CCCM data.

The ‘enabling environment’ sub-index relates to the tangible and visible tools and capital of cities that attract creative people to the city and inspire cultural and creative performance and activity. The ranking in Figure 8 shows yet another reordering. Győr has fallen back based on this indicator. Szeged and Pécs are ahead of Győr, with Szeged gaining significant advantage by taking third place in the ranking, with much higher points than the other two Hungarian cities. Maribor is the only city that has kept its good position with respect to this third sub-index. This is consistent with Maribor being regarded as the most creative city based on the main index. While Kosice has been ranked low so far, its supportive environment towards the creative sphere is considered more favourable. With regard to the sub-index ‘enabling environment’, Osijek is first in the ranking based on internal indicators (which we do not introduce here) and has very high points for openness towards foreigners, their integration, and the number of inhabitants born abroad. The field is more balanced with regard to this sub-index, as there are only small differences in the ranking between the cities.

In Figure 9 we can see that the building blocks of the sub-index ‘enabling environment’ are human capital and education, openness, tolerance and trust, accessibility, and government and regulations. Looking at Győr, we believe that it has low points based on the human capital and education indicators. Győr has the lowest
number of points among the cities examined as it is perceived to lack training in arts and humanities, and the number of its graduates in the field of information-communication technologies does not come near the numbers of the other cities. Győr's openness is average in this macro-region but its accessibility is excellent. Győr also has high points in local government. Only Maribor, Plzeň, and Toruń are ahead of Győr. Pécs has the same number of points as Győr for government and Szeged has a little bit less.

Finally, based on the points we can issue the ‘creative certificate’ for Győr, which highlights the less effective areas and the good and not so good elements of the city’s creative potential. The best aspect of the city is its accessibility, being positioned in the intersection point of three capital cities. Good transportation conditions provide significant potential, as the creative partners can create synergies through frequent interactions facilitated by the proximity. The other two strengths of the city in the examined context are the integration of foreigners and the quality of the local government. However, according to the numbers of the internal indicators (which are not detailed in this paper) the integration of foreigners in Győr is average in relation to the other cities. The criterion on the quality of the government and regulations is more nuanced. Here, the regulatory system is also evaluated. Besides the ideal impartiality and anti-corruption characteristics, it is also rated in terms of its quality, mechanism, and policies towards the creative sphere, where Győr has high points. Győr also has good points for ‘satisfaction with the cultural offerings’ and ‘tolerance towards foreigners’. Meanwhile, cultural vibrancy, cultural participation and attractiveness are the moderate features of Győr. It could benefit from having more international students in higher education and modernising existing and establishing new cultural venues and institutions. Concerning the creative economy, the city must plan and envisage setting up new workplaces, as well as renewing and rethinking its theatres and museums.

Finally, the elements below are the weakest features of the city, which need strengthening. Table 1 summarises these factors.

13 In the 1700’s, the university-level legal and teacher training in Győr’s higher education programmes dominantly focused on the technical and engineering field. The Technical College, founded in 1960, only started to widen its educational and research landscape in the 1990’s: teaching at the Faculty of Law was resumed, the Faculty of Economics was founded, and the Engineering Trainings became more varied. Training in the music and healthcare fields was also launched in this decade, and in the beginning of the 2000’s, the college became a university. As a result of recent restructuring, the Árpád Faculty, which deals with teacher training, training in tourism, and catering, has also become part of the university as the Faculty of Agrarian Sciences in Mosonmagyaróvár. In 2018, the Faculty of Arts was founded, which later can be a significant base for art, design, and creative training with an economic focus. This way, Győr can make up for the deficiencies identified by CCCM. The launch of training in the field of humanities is not among the medium-term plans.
Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements where Győr has the least number of points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community designs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist guest nights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual capital and innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplaces in the media and communication sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New enterprises in the media and communication sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population born abroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates in the field of Information and Communications Technology (ICT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitors of museums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT-patent registrations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human capital and education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates in the field of arts and humanities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factors where Győr has the least points can be considered areas of 'hiatus', but we have to treat this term with caution with regard to the elements listed in the above table. The quality and magnitude of these features can be evaluated subjectively and can also be evaluated in relation to the city’s policies, strategies, and traditions. The indicator ‘population born abroad’ is debatable, as it is normal that certain cultures do not learn always from one another; communities do not merge, and isolation is oftentimes more typical for cities. Thus, ‘population born abroad’ cannot be listed among the city’s creative energies because without interaction it is only the normal everyday life that characterises the members of this group. The low number of point for ‘sights’ may be due to the use of Trip Advisor as a source, which does not fully consider the available sights and values of each city. Győr should introduce its sights in detail on this platform. Concerning ‘tourist guest nights’, we believe that Győr is aware that tourists dominantly visit the city for one day, but the fact that Győr has doubled its number of tourist guest nights in the past decade is indisputable. Thus, the city needs to find and communicate a strategy to convince tourists that Győr is worth visiting for more than a day. In the field of media and communication it is the investment of private capital that counts the most, and the local government has little influence in this respect. The ICT sector is not a strategic direction for the diversification of Győr’s economic structure; thus, it is irrelevant even though CCCM considers the sector, the patents, and the graduates in this field to be...
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A creative element. In relation to the visitors of museums, it is noteworthy that the local historical museum of Győr was closed for renovation when the survey was conducted, which clearly had a negative effect on the number of visitors. Finally, with regard to human capital, education and art training, we can say that Győr and its university are committed to set up the Art Faculty as the eighth faculty of the university, which can address the said areas.

Partly as an answer to CCCM critics and partly in relation to the tender to win the title of ECoC 2023 the city has developed, and its general assembly unanimously accepted the Creative Strategy of Győr. The strategy and the ECoC tender anticipate several measures that will significantly improve Győr’s position in the CCCM and inspire the city to better use and develop its creative energy.

Conclusion

A conclusion can be drawn that Győr as a creative city is considered middle-ranking in relevant international comparisons. In Central and Eastern Europe, the city of Győr may take as examples the pioneering cities in the examined aspects. Specifically, Maribor, Sibiu, and Klaipėda are considered the best ones with regard to the sub-indices of creative index (main index) and cultural vibrancy. Moreover, it must be noted that Maribor and Sibiu were European Capitals of Culture, which must have contributed to their rankings. Furthermore, Baia Mare has an outstanding creative economy, and the supportive environment towards the creative sphere is also significant in the cities of Osijek and Szeged. It is clear that interest in the creative sphere and supportive policies has intensified in Europe as a whole, becoming strategic issues as the economy evolves with the increasing significance of a knowledge-based economy that builds on creativity, innovation, and activities with higher added value. Moreover, there is growing demand for cultural products, it is socially accepted to protect arts in an institutional framework, the cultural budgets of the cities show an increasing trend, and the visions and missions of cities to make culture prosper in urban circles have been drawn up in cultural strategies. The last step has been the European Commission’s establishment of the CCCM. With this system, compara-

14 We have to emphasise that in terms of development and cooperation, IT training appears promising and can later contribute and enhance the expansion of information-communication opportunities in Győr. The cooperation between Széchenyi István University, Egyetem and Huawei Technologies, Hungary has started in 2016, which aims to setup a Huawei academy and laboratory in the next five years to develop a university training programme in the telecommunication and information-communication fields, with a budget of HUF 100 million.

15 In addition, trends indicate that instead of permanent exhibitions, periodic ones attract more visitors. An exhibition in a gallery is capable of continuous renewal. It can follow trends and be flexible and modern, while permanent exhibitions of the local museums are rather ‘dusty’ and are not forced to renew and take initiatives. Museums very seldom attract cultural consumers, especially the small and medium-sized city museums or international and national non-prestigious museums.

16 The international panel of experts announced on 14 December 2018 the support of the proposal of Veszprém among the proposals of the cities from Hungary (ed.).
tive analyses can be carried out among cities, and the internal components of the creative elements of cities can also be examined more carefully. Thus, it can be understood what factors constitute a creative city.

Győr has all the potential to become a truly creative city and the ECoC. On the basis of the CCCM scores Győr has numerous strengths. Its favourable geographic location can trigger synergy in additional dimensions; it has an adequate amount of cultural offers; and the cultural vibrancy and participation in the cultural life of the city is increasing, which may follow from the strong economic potential of the city and the strengthening of the population’s purchasing power. The city plans to set up new cultural venues and institutions. The university in the city of Győr aims to increase the number of its foreign students, and the launch of the faculty of arts will be realised in the near future. The city, as a supportive environment, is generating beneficial processes towards the creative sphere. Győr’s intention to become an ECoC also demonstrates that the city is committed to culture. The description of Győr as an industrial city started to change. The new image of ‘Győr, the creative city’ is on the horizon. These processes have been supported by examinations based on the concept of territorial capital (Czakó–Dőry 2016, Rechnitzer 2016), as it has been established that cultural capital plays an increasingly important role in urban and business development.
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