Culture 3.0: The impact of culture on social and economic development, & how to measure it
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From Culture 1.0 to Culture 3.0
Three regimes of cultural production

- The birth of modern cultural and creative industries (CCIs) has only been possible when certain technological conditions have materialized.
- This has only occurred at the transition between the XIX and the XX century (the ‘cultural’ industrial revolution).
- The industrial revolution proper has happened more than one century before.
- At the moment, we are entering a new ‘cultural’ revolution despite the previous one has not been properly absorbed yet.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phases</th>
<th>Types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Culture 0.1</td>
<td>Spontaneous, ephemeral popular culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture 0.2</td>
<td>Transmitted popular culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture 0.3</td>
<td>Ancient kingdoms commissioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture 0.4</td>
<td>Proto-patronage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture 1.0</td>
<td>Classical patronage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture 1.1</td>
<td>Strategic patronage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture 1.2</td>
<td>Public patronage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture 1.3</td>
<td>Cultural proto-industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture 2.0</td>
<td>Emerging cultural mass markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture 2.1</td>
<td>Mainstream cultural industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture 2.2</td>
<td>Counter-cultural industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture 2.3</td>
<td>Immersive culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture 3.0</td>
<td>Content communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The 1.0-2.0 transition

- Modern cultural markets are created by the concurrent emergence of a wave of technological innovation at the edge between XIX and XX century: modern printing, radio, music recording, photography, cinema
- The fact that for more than one century through the industrial revolution culture is not industrialized, however, creates a permanent frame of mind in Europe according to which culture is un-economic and needs to be subsidized anyway
- The high-brow stigma of patronage makes commercialization of culture problematic to many cultural players and to part of the audiences
The 2.0-3.0 transition

- We are now witnessing a new regime transition that is driven by two concurrent streams of innovation: digital content production + digital connectivity
- Standard digital suites provide people with semi-professional packages that are cheap and easy to learn; with a modest investment they can be upgraded at the professional level
- The same packages less than 2 decades ago would have been expensive, would have required bulky hardware and would have been difficult to use
- Contents can be distributed almost without mediators to highly segmented and profiled audiences by means of increasingly specialized social media
Culture 3.0: Communities of meaning and open platforms

- Blurred distinction between producers and users of content: cultural access and production of new contents are two phases of the same process
- Culture can be massively produced and distributed also outside market channels
- Economic and social value is produced not only through priced content, but also through generic participation
- Culture becomes increasingly a precondition of all kinds of economic value generation processes (‘culturalization’ of the economy)
- Culture is no longer an aspect of free time use but is entrenched in the fabric of daily life
Cultural ecologies: 
Culture 1-2-3.0 coexist

The articulation of the cultural and creative sub-sectors reflects the coexistence, stratification and hybridation of the various regimes:

Core (Culture 1.0): visual arts, performing arts, heritage

Cultural and creative industries (Culture 2.0): publishing, music, cinema, radio-tv, videogames, design, fashion, industry of taste, architecture, advertising

Open digital platforms and social media (Culture 3.0)
A changing cultural geography

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Culture 1.0</th>
<th>Culture 2.0</th>
<th>Culture 3.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Far East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highbrow vs. lowbrow</td>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>Anmoku no ryokai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatekeepers</td>
<td>Markets</td>
<td>Communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participation effects vs. turnover

• In a Culture 3.0 framework, the indirect economic and social effect of participation may be even larger than that of market-mediated circulation of cultural contents, but we have to learn to measure it.

• This requires a strongly interdisciplinary framework putting together economics, sociology, medicine, neuroscience, environmental science, and more.
Measuring the indirect effects of cultural production (and participation)

- Innovation
- Welfare
- Sustainability
- Social cohesion
- New entrepreneurship
- Soft power
- Local identity
- Knowledge economy
A research agenda for 2014-20: measuring the impact of cultural participation on...

**Innovation**
- Social relevance of new, unfamiliar ideas
- Opportunity for startup firms
- Propensity to entrepreneurial risk

**Wellbeing**
- Psychological general wellbeing
- Prevention and therapy effectiveness
- Welfare costs
A research agenda for 2014-20: measuring the impact of cultural participation on...

Social cohesion
• School attendance/performance
• Multicultural orientation vs. xenophobia
• Integration of disabled persons

Sustainability
• Effectiveness of waste recycling
• Socio-environmental responsibility
• Willingness to pay for greener economies and societies
## Innovation

### Ranking Innovation Scoreboard 2008 (UE15)
1. Sweden
2. Finland
3. Denmark
4. Germany
5. Netherlands
6. France
7. Austria
8. UK
9. Belgium
10. Luxemburg

(UE27 average)
11. Ireland
12. Spain
13. Italy
14. Portugal
15. Greece

### Ranking Active cultural participation Eurobarometer 2007 (UE15)
1. Sweden
2. Luxemburg
3. Finland
4. France
5. Denmark
6. Netherlands
7. Belgium
8. Germany
9. UK
10. Austria

(UE27 average)
11. Ireland
12. Italy
13. Spain
14. Greece
15. Portugal
Hierarchy of factors affecting psychological well-being

1 Diseases
2 Cultural participation
3 Income
4 Age
5 Education
6 Gender
7 Job
8 Geography
Classical music concerts
Towards a cultural welfare perspective?

The well-being impact of cultural participation is especially strong among the severely ill and the elderly.

Systematic cultural participation in these categories brings about substantial improvement in their quality of life.

At the same time, cultural participation significantly reduces hospitalization frequency and duration for chronic and acute pathologies.

The whole program could be financed through the consequential saving on general welfare costs.
Cultural access and waste recycling
Does culture improve recycling?

- The answer is yes: people with access to cultural experiences recycle more, no matter whether recycle bins are close to or far away from home: not only better capacity, but also better motivation.
- There is a statistically significant causal relationship from cultural attitudes to recycling habits.
- The same mechanisms are likely to work also for other forms of environmental responsibility (reduced use of pollutants, resort to ‘green’ mobility networks, etcetera).
- Does relatively poorer performance in recycling of MED countries relate to poor levels of cultural participation?
In a nutshell...

- Culture is not simply a large and important sector of the economy, it is a ‘social software’ that is badly needed to manage the complexity of contemporary regional societies and economies in all of its manifold implications.

- The **total indirect macroeconomic impact** of cultural participation is likely to be much bigger than the (already remarkable) direct one.

- Once we become able to measure the **indirect effects of culture** on the various dimensions (to ‘capitalize’ culture), it will be possible to bring cultural policy at the top ranks of the policy agenda.

- These effects are further strengthened by the growth of the cultural and creative industries, but only insofar as such growth is designed and understood in a Culture 3.0 perspective.
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