

## IMPROVING THE ORGANIZATIONAL AND ECONOMIC MECHANISMS OF CREATIVE INDUSTRIES: THE CASE OF MUSEUM MANAGEMENT IN UZBEKISTAN

Author: Kamola Ikramova,  
PhD, Tashkent State University of Economics  
Email: kamola.ikramova@ya.ru  
Contact: +998 931716090

### Abstract

This study examines approaches to improving the organizational and economic mechanisms of creative industries with a specific focus on museum management in Uzbekistan. As cultural institutions increasingly contribute to economic development and social cohesion, their governance and financing systems require modernization aligned with global creative economy trends. The research employs a comparative and institutional methodology, integrating theoretical frameworks of the creative economy, cultural management, and public-private partnership models. Empirical insights are drawn from the experiences of the United Kingdom, South Korea, the United States, France, and Uzbekistan. The findings reveal that sustainable museum development depends on diversified funding, digital transformation, human capital development, and integration with the broader creative ecosystem. The study proposes strategic recommendations for Uzbekistan to strengthen institutional frameworks, enhance managerial autonomy, and attract private investment while safeguarding cultural identity. The results contribute to a deeper understanding of how creative industry mechanisms can serve as engines of innovation, employment, and cultural diplomacy in emerging economies.

**Keywords:** Creative industries, museum management, organizational mechanisms, cultural economy, digital transformation, Uzbekistan.

### Introduction

The creative economy has emerged as a vital driver of innovation, employment, and sustainable growth in the 21st century. According to UNESCO (2023), cultural and creative sectors account for approximately 3.1 percent of global GDP and 6.2 percent of employment worldwide. Museums, as integral components of these sectors, serve dual functions: preserving cultural heritage and generating socio-economic value through education, tourism, and creative entrepreneurship.

In Uzbekistan, the creative industry is gaining strategic importance. The 2024 Law “On Creative Economy” institutionalized this sector as a national development priority, emphasizing innovation, entrepreneurship, and cultural export. As noted by Khamidova (2022), the creative economy in Uzbekistan represents both an opportunity and a challenge — it requires structural modernization and the establishment of coherent management frameworks. Yet, despite progress, the organizational and economic mechanisms of museums remain underdeveloped.



Challenges include limited financial autonomy, outdated management structures, and insufficient digital integration (Ibragimova, 2020; Mirzaeva, 2023). Addressing these issues is crucial for aligning the sector with international best practices and unlocking its economic potential.

The purpose of this study is to analyze the theoretical foundations, global trends, and local conditions shaping museum management in Uzbekistan and to propose practical recommendations for improving its organizational and economic mechanisms.

### Theoretical Background

The concept of the creative economy was first popularized by Howkins (2001), who defined it as economic activity derived from individual creativity, skill, and talent with the potential for wealth and job creation through intellectual property. Similarly, Florida (2002) emphasized the role of the “creative class” as a catalyst for urban and economic transformation.

Within this framework, cultural institutions—particularly museums—act as platforms where creativity intersects with economics. According to Pratt (2005) and Hesmondhalgh (2013), organizational and economic mechanisms in the creative industries consist of the institutional structures, management systems, and financial instruments that enable effective utilization of resources.

In Uzbekistan, these mechanisms are still evolving. As Ruzikulov and Karimova (2021) note, the transformation of cultural institutions requires the integration of market principles and digital innovation while maintaining state support. The modernization of management processes should therefore balance autonomy with accountability.

UNCTAD (2021) categorizes museums among the “heritage and arts” industries, where cultural production contributes to identity, innovation, and international exchange. Towse (2020) and Throsby (2010) argue that museums increasingly function as hybrid enterprises that combine cultural and economic value creation.

In the Uzbek context, Ibragimova (2020) and Mirzaeva (2023) highlight that museums are beginning to operate as creative hubs connecting education, tourism, and innovation. However, institutional inertia and limited funding remain constraints. Abdurakhmanova and Rakhimov (2021) emphasize that developing a creative ecosystem around museums could stimulate entrepreneurship, particularly among young professionals.

International experiences show that the sustainability of museums depends on adaptive governance, diversified financing, and active stakeholder participation (Bakhshi & McVittie, 2009; Klammer, 2017). Comparative insights from the UK, South Korea, and the US reveal the effectiveness of hybrid management systems and strategic partnerships (DCMS, 2024; MCST, 2024; AAM, 2024).

### Methodology

This research employs a comparative institutional analysis, combining qualitative and descriptive methods. Primary data were derived from policy documents, UNESCO and OECD reports, and national legislation of Uzbekistan. Secondary data include peer-reviewed studies on museum governance, creative industry economics, and digital innovation.



The methodology includes three stages:

1. Conceptual analysis – defining the structure and functions of organizational and economic mechanisms in museums;
2. Comparative evaluation – analyzing governance and financing models of museums in the UK, South Korea, the USA, France, and Uzbekistan;
3. Synthesis and recommendations – formulating a model for improving Uzbekistan’s museum management mechanisms in line with international best practices.

The analysis draws on the systemic, institutional, and human capital approaches, ensuring that both structural and behavioral aspects of management are considered.

## Results

### International Comparative Analysis

Table 1. Comparative Analysis of Organizational and Economic Mechanisms in Museum Management

Country	Institutional Model	Funding Structure	Management Autonomy	Digital Transformation	Integration with Creative Economy
United Kingdom	Hybrid public-private governance with Boards of Trustees	Government grants + sponsorships + commercial revenue	High – autonomous boards accountable to DCMS	Advanced digital archives, virtual exhibitions, audience analytics	Strong – museums central to creative economy policy
South Korea	State-led with corporate partnerships	State budget + CSR funding + ticketing	Moderate – semi-autonomous under MCST supervision	Extensive use of AR/VR, digital learning platforms	Integrated with tourism, education, and innovation sectors
United States	Predominantly non-profit, privately governed	Endowments + donations + grants + commercial services	Very high – independent boards and fundraising	Leading in digital access and open-data initiatives	Core component of the national creative economy
France	Centralized but reforming toward autonomy	Public subsidies + visitor revenue + foundations	Moderate – autonomy within Ministry of Culture guidelines	Growing focus on digital curation, audience diversification	High – museums key to cultural diplomacy
Uzbekistan	State-centered, limited PPPs	State budget + minor ticketing income	Low – hierarchical structure under Ministry of Culture	Emerging digital initiatives, limited capacity	Developing – integration at early stage

Source: Author’s synthesis based on UNESCO (2023), DCMS (2024), MCST (2024), AAM (2024), OECD (2023), and Uzbekistan Law on Creative Economy (2024).

The analysis shows that in developed economies, museums enjoy higher institutional autonomy and financial diversity, which encourages innovation. In contrast, Uzbekistan’s museums remain largely state-dependent.

As Sharipova (2019) and Nasriddinov (2020) indicate, the absence of flexible management tools and private sector participation limits their sustainability.

Key differences include:

- Institutional frameworks: Developed countries have hybrid governance systems ensuring accountability and innovation, while Uzbekistan retains centralized control.
- Funding systems: International museums employ mixed financing, while Uzbekistan relies on state budgets (Abdurakhmanova & Rakhimov, 2021).
- Digitalization: Developed countries have integrated digital technologies extensively; Uzbekistan’s initiatives are nascent (Ruzikulov & Karimova, 2021).

- Human capital: Skills development and leadership training are prioritized abroad but remain insufficient locally.
- Creative integration: Museums abroad act as hubs linking education, innovation, and entrepreneurship (Yuldasheva & Abdullaeva, 2022).

## Discussion

The improvement of Uzbekistan's creative industries requires systemic reforms in museum governance. Institutional autonomy, diversified funding, and digital transformation are key levers.

The establishment of a National Creative Industries Agency could coordinate cultural policy, facilitate PPPs, and attract international investment. This approach aligns with recommendations by the OECD (2023) and findings by Mirzaeva (2023), who argues that coherent institutional design is essential for efficiency.

Khamidova (2022) stresses that Uzbekistan's policy reforms must move beyond declarations toward measurable outcomes, ensuring museums operate with strategic and financial independence while maintaining accountability.

Museums should adopt multi-channel financing models combining public support, commercial activities, and philanthropy. British and American examples show the importance of endowments and trust-based management (DCMS, 2024; AAM, 2024).

In Uzbekistan, public-private partnership mechanisms are at an early stage. Sharipova (2019) proposes encouraging corporate sponsorship, while Ziyodova (2023) highlights the role of cultural entrepreneurship in resource diversification.

As Throsby (2010) observed, human creativity is both a resource and an outcome of cultural production. For Uzbekistan, Yuldasheva and Abdullaeva (2022) suggest establishing capacity-building programs in partnership with global institutions such as ICOM and the British Museum. This will help transition from administrative management to participatory leadership models that encourage innovation and accountability.

Digital technologies redefine how museums engage with audiences and generate revenue. Mirzaeva (2023) and Ruzikulov & Karimova (2021) emphasize that digital platforms enhance both accessibility and sustainability. Uzbekistan can benefit from adopting models such as South Korea's Smart Culture Strategy (MCST, 2024), integrating AR/VR and digital learning to expand outreach.

Museums must function as creative hubs linking art, technology, and entrepreneurship. In France, institutions like the Centre Pompidou illustrate how cultural spaces can drive innovation. Similarly, Abdurakhmanova and Rakhimov (2021) underline that museums in Uzbekistan can play a pivotal role in creative clusters, contributing to regional development and tourism.

## Conclusion

Museums are vital nodes within the creative industries, merging cultural heritage with innovation. This study demonstrates that the effectiveness of their organizational and economic mechanisms depends on five interlinked dimensions: institutional autonomy, financial



diversification, digital transformation, human capital, and integration within the creative ecosystem.

For Uzbekistan, this implies:

- Strengthening legal and institutional frameworks to expand managerial independence;
- Promoting diversified financing through PPPs and cultural entrepreneurship;
- Investing in human capital through leadership and digital skills training;
- Accelerating digital transformation and open-access initiatives;

Positioning museums as creative and educational hubs within the national economy.

Implementing these measures will enhance the competitiveness and sustainability of Uzbekistan's museum sector and contribute to the growth of the national creative economy.

## References

1. AAM – American Alliance of Museums. (2024). Museums as Engines of Economic Growth. Washington, DC: AAM Press.
2. Abdurakhmanova, G., & Rakhimov, Z. (2021). Development of Creative Economy in Uzbekistan: Institutional and Economic Perspectives. *Journal of Economics and Innovation Research*, 5(2), 45–57.
3. Bakhshi, H., & McVittie, E. (2009). Creative Supply Chain: Business Models for the Creative Economy. Nesta Report.
4. DCMS – UK Department for Digital, Culture, Media & Sport. (2024). Creative Industries Sector Deal Progress Report. London: UK Government.
5. Florida, R. (2002). *The Rise of the Creative Class: Revisited*. New York: Basic Books.
6. Hesmondhalgh, D. (2013). *The Cultural Industries* (3rd ed.). London: SAGE Publications.
7. Howkins, J. (2001). *The Creative Economy: How People Make Money from Ideas*. London: Penguin.
8. Ibragimova, N. (2020). Transformation of the Museum Sphere in the Context of the Creative Economy in Uzbekistan. *Central Asian Journal of Cultural Studies*, 3(1), 77–89.
9. Khamidova, M. (2022). State Policy for the Development of Creative Industries in Uzbekistan. *Economic Review of Central Asia*, 6(4), 112–125.
10. Klammer, A. (2017). *Doing the Right Thing: Values and the Economy of the Cultural Sector*. London: UCL Press.
11. MCST – Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism of Korea. (2024). *Smart Culture Strategy 2024–2030*. Seoul: MCST Publications.
12. Mirzaeva, D. (2023). Institutional Reforms and the Role of Museums in Uzbekistan's Creative Industry. *Scientific Bulletin of Culture and Art Management*, 2(3), 54–68.
13. Nasriddinov, B. (2020). Innovative Mechanisms in the Management of Cultural Heritage in Uzbekistan. *Journal of Economics and Management Research*, 8(2), 98–110.
14. OECD. (2023). *Cultural and Creative Sectors: Policy Frameworks for Sustainable Growth*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
15. Pratt, A. C. (2005). Cultural Industries and Public Policy: An Oxymoron? *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 11(1), 31–44.





- 
- 
16. Ruzikulov, A., & Karimova, S. (2021). Digitalization and Economic Efficiency in Cultural Institutions of Uzbekistan. *Uzbek Journal of Innovation and Development*, 5(1), 33–47.
  17. Sharipova, L. (2019). Public–Private Partnership in the Development of Museums in Uzbekistan. *Economy and Culture Journal*, 2(4), 101–114.
  18. Throsby, D. (2010). *The Economics of Cultural Policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
  19. Towse, R. (2020). *A Textbook of Cultural Economics* (3rd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
  20. UNCTAD. (2021). *Creative Economy Outlook: Trends in International Trade in Creative Industries*. Geneva: United Nations Publication.
  21. UNESCO. (2023). *Re|Shaping Policies for Creativity 2023*. Paris: UNESCO Publishing.
  22. Uzbekistan Law on Creative Economy. (2024). National Legislative Database of the Republic of Uzbekistan. Tashkent.
  23. Yuldasheva, G., & Abdullaeva, M. (2022). Management Models of Museums in the Context of Uzbekistan’s Creative Economy. *International Journal of Cultural Policy and Economics*, 4(2), 79–92.
  24. Ziyodova, F. (2023). Strategic Approaches to Cultural Entrepreneurship in Uzbekistan. *Asian Economic Review*, 11(3), 130–144.

