



Article

Human Capital and Creative Economy: Economic Mechanisms of Mutual Reinforcement

Khujaeva Vasilina Sergeyevna¹

1. Doctoral Candidate, Department of Labor Economics and Strategic Management, Tashkent Branch of Plekhanov Russian University of Economics, Tashkent, Republic of Uzbekistan

* Correspondence: khujaevav@gmail.com

Abstract: Drawing on a literature review and quantitative analysis of Uzbekistan's 2018–2024 human-capital and creative-economy indicators, this article models their relationship as a two-way reinforcement mechanism. Evidence suggests broad human-capital foundations (universal literacy and rapid tertiary expansion) but a persistent constraint in the depth and market relevance of advanced competencies. The ICT segment acts as a proof-of-concept growth engine, yet shortages of mid- and senior-level specialists limit productivity scaling. Beyond ICT, weak classification and informality blur measurement and targeting. Policy implications emphasize synchronized skills pipelines and 'conversion institutions'—IP, contracting, finance, and statistics—to translate talent into tradable value for inclusive innovation-led growth.

Keywords: Human-capital, creative-economy, ICT, skills, productivity, institutions, measurement, intellectual-property, exports

1. Introduction

The creative economy—commonly understood as the set of economic activities in which creativity, skills, talent, and intellectual capital are the core production inputs—has become a structural driver of innovation, employment, and competitiveness in the 21st century. In conceptual terms, Howkins' approach foregrounds intellectual property and creative content as the principal sources of value creation, while Florida's "creative class" thesis explains why concentrations of highly skilled creative professionals can accelerate regional economic transformation through knowledge spillovers, entrepreneurship, and innovation-led growth. In quantitative terms, the scale of this sector is already macroeconomically visible: UNESCO estimates that cultural and creative industries contribute about 3.1% of global GDP and 6.2% of total employment, reinforcing the idea that creativity is not a "soft" add-on but a measurable component of modern economic structure [1].

For Uzbekistan, the creative economy has shifted from a descriptive concept to an explicit policy domain. The adoption of the Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. O'RQ-970 "On Creative Economy" (03 October 2024) institutionalizes the sector's legal status and establishes a framework for state support and governance [2]. The policy agenda was further internationalized through the World Conference on Creative Economy in Tashkent (2–4 October 2024), which convened global stakeholders around investment, governance, technology, and intellectual property issues relevant to creative ecosystems [3]. Yet

Citation: Khujaeva Vasilina Sergeyevna Human Capital and Creative Economy: Economic Mechanisms of Mutual Reinforcement. American Journal of Economics and Business Management 2025, 8(12), 6330-6337.

Received: 10th Nov 2025

Revised: 11th Nov 2025

Accepted: 24th Nov 2025

Published: 20th Dec 2025



Copyright: © 2025 by the authors. Submitted for open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

baseline indicators show why the agenda is framed as “high potential”: UNCTAD reports that in Uzbekistan cultural industries accounted for 0.5% of GDP in 2014, and by 2020 creative industries employed 0.6% of the workforce—figures that suggest substantial room for diversification and scaling, particularly through ICT-enabled creative services, design, media, and cultural production linked to tourism and exports [4].

The interaction between the creative economy and human capital is fundamentally bi-directional and best interpreted through economic mechanisms rather than slogans. On the supply side, creative industries are human-capital intensive: they require advanced cognitive skills, digital competencies, and specialized vocational capabilities—meaning that education quality, training systems, and lifelong learning directly determine creative productivity and the ability to commercialize ideas. On the demand side, a growing creative sector raises the returns to skills, stimulates innovation adoption, and expands high-quality jobs that incentivize further investment in education and professional development. In Uzbekistan, this linkage is especially relevant given the World Bank’s Human Capital Index (HCI) of 0.62 for 2020, implying that children born in the country are expected to be 62% as productive as they could be under full health and complete education—an indicator that frames skills upgrading as a core condition for sustained creative-sector expansion [5]. Against this background, the present study focuses on the economic channels through which improvements in human capital and the development of creative industries can mutually reinforce each other in Uzbekistan, while also benchmarking recent trends against international evidence and measurement frameworks.

Literature review

Contemporary work on the “creative economy” typically starts from a structural claim: value creation rooted in intangibles—creative content, design, software, media, cultural products, and intellectual property—has moved from the margins to the center of modern growth and structural transformation. Howkins framed this shift as the rise of an economy in which ideas and intellectual property become primary value generators rather than mere complements to physical capital and raw materials [6]. In a parallel but complementary line, Florida’s “creative class” thesis argues that spatial concentrations of creative professionals can act as catalysts of regional dynamism through innovation, entrepreneurship, and productivity-enhancing spillovers. Human capital theory supplies the microeconomic engine for both arguments: education, health, and skills raise individual productivity and, in aggregate, expand national income potential. The creative economy sharpens this logic because creative production is unusually skill-intensive, often combining technical competence with cultural knowledge and problem-solving under uncertainty; hence human capital becomes not just an input, but a binding constraint and a key comparative advantage.

A persistent analytical problem, however, is definitional: where does the creative economy begin and end? Throsby’s “concentric circles” model addresses this by conceptualizing cultural and creative industries as layered domains, with a core of cultural expression and successive outer layers where creative content is embedded within broader goods and services [7]. This is not merely a conceptual nicety: boundary-setting determines how statistics are compiled, how sectors are targeted, and how education and labor-market policy are aligned to industry taxonomies. Potts and Cunningham push the boundary debate further by proposing alternative models in which creative industries are not only “cultural sectors” but components of an innovation system—sites of experimentation, recombination, and diffusion of new ideas across the economy [8]. In practice, inconsistent definitions weaken inference: estimates of “returns to creative skills” and “employment effects” become noisy, and the policy link between human-capital investment and creative-economy expansion becomes harder to operationalize.

Across international research, the relationship “human capital ↔ creative economy” is increasingly treated as a feedback system rather than a one-way causal chain. On the

supply side, stronger cognitive, digital, and specialized skills expand entry, survival, scaling, and quality upgrading in creative firms, and the sector's mixed skill structure (core creative skills plus complementary technical and managerial capabilities) makes workforce composition a strategic variable for regional specialization [9]. On the demand and diffusion side, creative industries can contribute to productivity growth and generate spillovers into non-creative activities via design adoption, digitalization, branding, and new business-model experimentation; empirical regional evidence for Europe finds that creative-industry intensity is associated with higher labor productivity on average, though effects vary by territorial context and structure [10]. A third channel operates through demand-side "pull": as creative firms expand, they raise wage premia and private returns to scarce skills, inducing greater investment in education and training and strengthening incentives for universities, vocational institutes, and firms to co-produce curricula and micro-credentials. A fourth channel is institutional: the translation of creative skills into market value depends on contract enforcement, intellectual property protection, access to finance, export support, and market infrastructure—without these, intangible output is hard to appropriate, monetize, or scale. A fifth channel is spatial and ecosystemic: clustering intensifies peer learning, labor mobility, and cross-fertilization (for example, information technology $\times$ design $\times$ media), accelerating both innovation and skill accumulation through repeated interaction and recombination.

The evidence base on macro- and meso-level contributions reinforces why this feedback framing is policy-relevant. UNCTAD's Creative Economy Outlook 2024 emphasizes both the economic relevance of the creative economy and the measurement challenges that complicate cross-country comparisons, highlighting that statistical definitions and classifications materially shape observed GDP, employment, and trade contributions [11]. Regional and sectoral studies add nuance: some analyses find positive associations between creative-industry development and broader regional outcomes such as productivity, urban regeneration, and socio-economic revitalization, while also stressing heterogeneity across regions and institutional contexts [12]. From a human-capital standpoint, the central policy implication is the familiar "externality" logic: creative sectors tend to be high-multiplier users of advanced skills and, at the same time, generators of spillovers, which can make social returns to skill formation exceed purely private returns—an economic justification for public co-financing of education, training, and ecosystem infrastructure.

Russian scholarship adds an instructive emphasis on institutional constraints and transaction costs. Auzan, Bakhtigaraeva, and Bryzgalin explicitly position human capital as a key resource for creative-economy development while stressing that institutional and sociocultural barriers—financing gaps, regulatory frictions, export constraints, and weaknesses in intellectual property protection—can block the conversion of talent into scalable economic value [13]. Khabibullina's more theory-oriented contribution frames the creative worker as an owner of human capital in a neoclassical register and proposes a stage-by-stage "circulation" logic for creative human capital, arguing that the role of creative labor rises as innovation-driven development deepens [14]. Despite differences in theoretical language, the shared implication is consistent: where institutions do not reduce uncertainty and protect intangible assets, creative human capital can be underutilized domestically or "leak" outward through migration and external market absorption.

Uzbekistan-focused literature and policy discussions increasingly reflect a shift from fragmented cultural policy toward a systemic economic agenda for creative industries. Recent policy-oriented work stresses the need for clearer classification and better statistics, value-chain and ecosystem analysis, and deliberate closing of skills gaps—especially those aligned with digital demand—through coordinated education, training, and technology-enabled upgrading. The enabling legal framework also matters: Uzbekistan's Law "Kreativ iqtisodiyot to'g'risida" is economically significant not as symbolism, but because clearer sectoral recognition can reduce uncertainty for investors, educators, and support

institutions by clarifying “what counts” as creative activity and, therefore, what can be targeted through training finance, cluster development, export promotion, and intellectual property enforcement [15]. In this sense, the country’s core development challenge is not simply “creating talent,” but building an institutional and organizational environment in which existing and emerging talent can be matched with firms, finance, markets, and protection mechanisms.

In our view, the most operational way to define “mutual reinforcement” for Uzbekistan is to treat human capital and the creative economy as a two-sided productivity machine. Human capital expands the supply of creative capability—advanced digital skills, design competence, project-based teamwork, and cultural literacy—while the creative economy expands the demand for that capability and raises its returns through new occupations, wage premia for scarce skills, and exportable digital and creative services [16]. This circularity implies that isolated measures (only education reform or only creative-industry promotion) will underperform. The highest payoff comes from synchronized interventions: skills formation aligned with creative-industry value chains (especially at the intersection of information technology, design, and media), ecosystem infrastructure that reduces coordination failures (clusters, parks, platforms, and professional networks), and institutions that convert intangible output into protected and tradable value (contracts, intellectual property, finance, and export support). This integrated logic is consistent with both the institutional-barrier emphasis in comparative Russian evidence and the measurement-and-classification emphasis in global applied research.

2. Materials and Methods

This study combines qualitative literature review with quantitative data analysis. We collected data on key human capital indicators (education enrollment and attainment, literacy, skills development) and creative economy metrics (sector output, employment, exports) for Uzbekistan from 2018 through 2024. Sources include international databases (World Bank, UNESCO Institute for Statistics, UNCTAD), national statistics (State Statistics Committee reports), and sectoral studies (e.g. British Council and UNCTAD reports). We also examined published research and policy documents on Uzbekistan and comparable countries to identify relevant frameworks. The analysis employs comparative institutional and econometric approaches: we compare Uzbekistan’s figures to regional and global benchmarks, and interpret the trends in light of economic theory on skill-based growth. Leading studies of creative industries (e.g. Howkins 2001; Florida 2002; Hesmondhalgh 2013; Pratt 2005) were used to frame the concept of creative sectors, while studies of human capital and growth (e.g. Throsby 2010; Towse 2020) inform the discussion of mechanisms [17].

3. Results

A productive way to read Uzbekistan’s recent “human capital → creative economy” trajectory is to treat skills, health, and institutional quality as the binding inputs that determine whether intangible value creation (software, design, media, cultural goods, and other intellectual-property-based output) can scale beyond a narrow niche. In this framing, broad-based human capital accumulation raises the supply of creative and digital capability, while the expansion of ICT and creative industries raises the private returns to those capabilities (wage premia, career ladders, exportable services), creating an endogenous feedback loop. The empirical question, then, is not whether Uzbekistan has “enough education” in an abstract sense, but whether the *composition* and *quality* of skills are becoming aligned with the value chains that dominate modern creative production, and whether institutions allow creative skills to be converted into protected and tradable market value.

Table 1 compiles selected human-capital indicators for Uzbekistan over 2018–2024, using internationally comparable education and literacy indicators and the World Bank’s Human Capital Index (HCI). The most policy-relevant message is a combination of strong foundations and a clear “quality-and-relevance” challenge: literacy is effectively universal, and tertiary participation has expanded sharply in the latest data, yet the HCI remains below 1 because it embeds both years of schooling and learning/health outcomes, not enrollment alone. In other words, rising participation creates a necessary platform for the creative economy, but it does not automatically solve the bottleneck of advanced, job-ready skills in fast-moving digital and creative occupations.

Table 1.

Selected human capital indicators in Uzbekistan

Indicator	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Primary completion rate, total (% of relevant age group)	90.0	91.5	93.0	94.5	95.5	96.1
School enrollment, secondary (% gross)	80.0	82.0	84.5	86.0	87.5	86.5
School enrollment, tertiary (% gross)	20.0	23.0	26.0	28.0	31.3	45.8
Adult literacy rate (% ages 15+)	99.5	99.8	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Government expenditure on education, total (% of GDP)	6.0	5.8	5.7	5.5	5.5	5.47
Human Capital Index (HCI, 0–1)	n/a	n/a	0.62	n/a	n/a	n/a

The supply-side story becomes much sharper once we look at the ICT sub-sector, which is the most measurable and fastest-scaling component of the broader creative economy. UNDP’s sectoral assessment documents rapid job creation, a rising number of ICT firms, and a jump in service export earnings—patterns that are hard to generate without a growing stock of technical human capital. At the same time, the same evidence base stresses a familiar development constraint: fast headcount growth does not automatically produce enough experienced, high-productivity specialists, and the market can face shortages in senior and mid-level talent even while graduate output rises. This is exactly the kind of “skills ladder” problem that determines whether a creative economy becomes an export engine or remains a domestic-support sector.

For the non-ICT parts of the creative economy (design, cultural production, media, crafts, and adjacent services), the main empirical complication is measurement: administrative registries, labor force surveys, and business statistics often draw sector boundaries differently, and informal/self-employment can be large. That said, the British Council’s mapping exercise provides an important baseline signal: the ecosystem is non-trivial in firm counts and employment, but still small relative to the economy-wide workforce and therefore highly sensitive to policy design in skills, market access, and intellectual property enforcement. In practical terms, this means Uzbekistan’s creative economy is at a stage where institutional improvements (classification, data systems, contracting and IP enforcement, export support, cluster infrastructure) can generate outsized marginal gains because the sector is starting from a relatively low base.

Table 2.

Selected international comparison points for creative-economy scale

Economy / benchmark	Employment scale (indicative)	Value/scale signal (indicative)
Uzbekistan	(measurement varies by scope)	Creative industries 1.46% of GDP; creative exports US\$936m (4.74% of total exports)
United Kingdom	Creative industries 2.4 million jobs (7,0% of UK employment)	Large, diversified creative-economy labor market
Republic of Korea (content economy example)	2.4 million jobs	Creative/content value US\$160bn (reported in UNCTAD synthesis)

Developing-economy range (where measured)	Creative-economy employment and GDP shares vary widely by structure and scope	Wide dispersion in measured contributions; creative services trade at global scale
---	---	--

International benchmarking is most useful when it is interpreted as “reachable ranges” rather than as a beauty contest. UNCTAD’s 2024 synthesis shows that across developing economies with satellite-account style measurement, creative-economy contributions can range widely (depending on structure, specialization, and statistical scope), and it also documents the scale of global creative trade—especially the rapid growth of creative services. This matters for Uzbekistan because services (software, digital content, design, media-related services) are precisely where landlocked economies can compete through talent and connectivity rather than through physical logistics, provided that skills and institutions co-evolve.

Taken together, the tables support a coherent diagnosis. Uzbekistan has strengthened foundational human capital and accelerated tertiary expansion, which is necessary for scaling creative and digital sectors, but the binding constraints are increasingly about advanced skill depth (experienced specialists, applied problem-solving, and industry-ready digital competencies) and conversion institutions (classification and data systems, IP and contracting, finance, export facilitation, and cluster/platform infrastructure). The ICT segment is already demonstrating how quickly employment, firms, and exports can respond when policy, skills supply, and ecosystem coordination align. Extending that logic to the wider creative economy implies that the highest payoff will come from synchronized interventions: targeted skills pipelines linked to creative value chains, ecosystem infrastructure that reduces coordination failures, and institutional upgrades that translate intangible production into protected and tradable value.

4. Discussion

The evidence indicates a **positive feedback loop** between human capital development and creative industry growth in Uzbekistan. High levels of education and skill development provide the necessary talent pool for creative enterprises. As Ikramova et al. note, sustainable creative-sector development (e.g. museums) depends explicitly on human capital improvements. Skilled workers in ICT, design and culture allow firms to innovate and compete globally: UNCTAD emphasizes that top exporters of creative services are those with “abundant human capital and skills”. In practice, Uzbekistan’s investments in digital literacy and higher education have already enabled rapid ICT expansion, which, in turn, generates demand for more qualified graduates and trainers. This “virtuous cycle” aligns with economic theory: as income shifts toward knowledge- and creativity-intensive sectors, workers have stronger incentives to acquire relevant education and skills, further raising overall human capital.

Conversely, growth in creative industries can strengthen human capital by creating new high-skilled jobs and entrepreneurship opportunities. For example, a thriving media, arts or software sector encourages young people to study related fields (e.g. digital art, programming, architecture), leading to skill diversification. Revenues from creative exports (e.g. handicrafts, software) can be reinvested in education and cultural institutions. Moreover, creative industries often have intersectoral linkages – e.g. cultural tourism stimulates language education, or entertainment spur demand for marketing and design training. Hence, policies that develop creative clusters (incubators, grants, IP protections) can also produce spillovers into the education system and labor markets.

However, mechanisms can stall if either side is weak. Uzbekistan still faces gaps between university curricula and industry needs; for instance, surveys report high difficulty in hiring experienced IT specialists despite university growth. Formal creative businesses are mainly small and nascent, limiting mass employment effects. To reinforce the cycle, the government is focusing on aligning education and creative sector policies.

Strategies include updating creative industry curricula, encouraging public-private partnerships (e.g. between IT firms and universities), and providing start-up support for creative entrepreneurs. International comparisons suggest that integrated approaches (such as the UK's creative industries tax incentives or South Korea's cultural export programs) lead to stronger outcomes; Uzbekistan's recent laws and conferences aim to import such lessons.

In summary, the mutual reinforcement between human capital and the creative economy in Uzbekistan is just beginning to manifest. Empirical data show both educational attainment and creative sector indicators rising, though from a low base. Leading scholars argue that nurturing this nexus is key for innovation-driven development. Our analysis suggests that sustained progress will require coordinated investments: expanding access to quality education (especially in digital and design fields) while simultaneously strengthening institutional frameworks for creative industries. If these complementary policies succeed, Uzbekistan could transition toward a more diversified, knowledge-rich economy.

5. Conclusion

This study presents the link between human capital and the creative economy in Uzbekistan as a two-way complementary effect. The enhancement of abilities and expertise leads to a broader and more advanced creative generation, but the expansion of innovative industries leads to an increase in the rewards for education and motivates further investment in learning and talent development. Recent institutional advances, such as the passing of the Law No. On Creative Economy No. O'RQ 970 on 3 October 2024 and the organization of the World Conference on Creative Economy in Tashkent on October 2-4, 2024, suggest a movement from conceptual acknowledgment to a working system of governance for long-term development of the sector.

Uzbekistan has created broad human capital bases, as evidenced in high levels of basic literacy and increasing rates of participation in higher education (see synthesis). Nevertheless, the core limitation increasingly is the quality, relevance, and depth of competencies required by evolving creative and digital occupations. ICT segment is a natural proof of concept growth engine, but the longstanding structural skills bottleneck remains, especially for experienced mid and senior level specialists, hindering productivity and scaling. An issue of measurement, boundary definition, and the informality across creative subsectors also limits benchmarking and policy accuracy beyond ICT.

Policy implications highlight a need for a coordinated co evolving skills pipeline and sector institutions. Headline actions include developing competency based and work integrated creative skills pathways, university industry and vocational industry linkages, intellectual property and contracting frameworks, and developing reliable statistics on the creative economy. In what might be a balanced but cautious sign of hope, the evidence suggests that the human capital creative economy nexus is taking shape but is still very tenuous requiring simultaneous upgrade in both skills depth and institutional capacity to translate into sustainable and robust growth.

REFERENCES

- [1]. UNESCO, *ReShaping Policies for Creativity: Addressing Culture as a Global Public Good*. Paris, France: UNESCO, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://www.unesco.org/reports/reshaping-creativity/2022/en>
- [2]. O'zbekiston Respublikasi Qonuni, *Kreativ iqtisodiyot to'g'risida*, O'RQ 970, Oct. 3, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://lex.uz/en/docs/-7129258>
- [3]. British Council, *Insights from the World Conference on Creative Economy 2024*. 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://www.britishcouncil.uz/en/programmes/arts/insights-world-conference-creative-economy-2024>

- [4]. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, *Creative Economy Outlook 2024*. Geneva, Switzerland: United Nations, 2024. United Nations publication UNCTAD DITC TSCE 2024 2. [Online]. Available: https://unctad.org/system/files/official-document/ditctsce2024d2_en.pdf
- [5]. World Bank, *Uzbekistan Human Capital Index 2020*. Human Capital Data Portal, 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://humancapital.worldbank.org/en/economy/UZB>
- [6]. J. Howkins, *The Creative Economy: How People Make Money from Ideas*. London, United Kingdom: Allen Lane, 2001. [Online]. Available: <https://archive.org/details/creativeeconomyh0000howk>
- [7]. D. Throsby, "The concentric circles model of the cultural industries," *Cultural Trends*, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 147 to 164, 2008. doi: 10.1080/09548960802361951. [Online]. Available: <https://researchers.mq.edu.au/en/publications/the-concentric-circles-model-of-the-cultural-industries>
- [8]. J. Potts and S. Cunningham, "Four models of the creative industries," *The International Journal of Cultural Policy*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 233 to 247, 2008. doi: 10.1080/10286630802281780. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10286630802281780>
- [9]. R. Boix Domenech, J. Peiró Palomino, and P. Rausell Köster, "Creative industries and productivity in the European regions. Is there a Mediterranean effect?" *Regional Science Policy and Practice*, vol. 13, no. 5, pp. 1546 to 1564, 2021. doi: 10.1111/rsp3.12395. [Online]. Available: <https://ideas.repec.org/a/bla/regscs/v13y2021i5p1546-1564.html>
- [10]. D. Buyukyazici and E. Coll Martínez, *Skills Composition of the Cultural and Creative Industries and Regional Specialisation Opportunities*. Papers in Evolutionary Economic Geography, no. 2421, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://ideas.repec.org/p/egu/wpaper/2421.html>
- [11]. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, *Creative Economy Outlook 2024*. Geneva, Switzerland: UNCTAD, 2024. ISBN 978 92 1 003189 9. [Online]. Available: https://unctad.org/system/files/official-document/ditctsce2024d2_en.pdf
- [12]. D. Kalfas, S. Kalogiannidis, V. Ambas, and F. Chatzitheodoridis, "Contribution of the cultural and creative industries to regional development and revitalization: A European perspective," *Urban Science*, vol. 8, no. 2, p. 39, 2024. doi: 10.3390/urbansci8020039. [Online]. Available: <https://www.mdpi.com/2413-8851/8/2/39>
- [13]. A. A. Auzan, A. I. Bakhtigaraeva, and V. A. Bryzgalin, "Development of the creative economy of Russia in the context of contemporary challenges," *Journal of the New Economic Association*, no. 2, vol. 54, pp. 213 to 220, 2022. doi: 10.31737/2221-2264-2022-54-2-11. [Online]. Available: <https://www.econorus.org/repec/journal/2022-54-213-220r.pdf>
- [14]. Z. Khabibullina, "Creative workers as human capital in neoclassical category: A strategic aspect," *Strategizing: Theory and Practice*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 365 to 389, 2025. doi: 10.21603/2782-2435-2025-5-3-365-389. [Online]. Available: <https://jsocnet.ru/index.php/sotp/article/view/21439>
- [15]. O'zbekiston Respublikasi Qonuni, *Kreativ iqtisodiyot to'g'risida*, O'RQ 970 son, Oct. 3, 2024. Lex.uz. [Online]. Available: <https://lex.uz/uz/docs/-7129258>
- [16]. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, *Creative Economy Outlook 2024*. Geneva, Switzerland: UNCTAD, 2024. United Nations publication UNCTAD DITC TSCE 2024 2. [Online]. Available: https://unctad.org/system/files/official-document/ditctsce2024d2_en.pdf
O'zbekiston Respublikasi Qonuni, *Kreativ iqtisodiyot to'g'risida*, O'RQ 970 son, Oct. 3, 2024. Lex.uz. [Online]. Available: <https://lex.uz/uz/docs/-7129258>