

UDC: 008:005.936.43

JEL Classification: Z1, L26, L38, L82

Received: 29/09/2020

Iryna Parkhomenko¹, Kateryna Berezovska²

¹ Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts, Kyiv, Ukraine

² European Parliament, Bruxelles, Belgium

The Concept of Cultural Product in the Context of Interdisciplinary Approach

Abstract: *Introduction.* Ukrainian sphere of culture needs clear and transparent support from Government during the pandemic. For this purpose all producers of cultural products must be identified in the structure of cultural and creative industries. *Purpose and methods.* The purpose of the article is to clarify the meaning of the concept of cultural product in the context of an interdisciplinary approach, given the interpretation of this concept in various fields of scientific knowledge and governmental-institutional practices at national and international levels, to develop recommendations for the use of the concept cultural product in legislative activity in Ukraine. The methodological basis of the study is the interdisciplinary, systematic and legal approaches. *Results.* The cultural product is the output of cultural industries. The sphere of culture defined as a set of cultural industries according to B. Miede, D. Throsby and EU Resolutions. Cultural industries are the main producers of cultural products (goods, services, events). Cultural product contains cultural value (M. Hutter, D. Throsby, B. Frey), which creates meaning and engages the consumer in cultural participation (P. Sacco). Cultural producers have different forms of ownership and act as cultural entrepreneurs, which produce for commercial purpose, not only for cultural purpose (music industry, tourism industry, festival industry etc). But the cultural production of meanings is the basis for cultural industries. *Conclusions.* Scientific novelty of the research results is to distinguish two approaches for the concept of cultural product: value based and legal based. The practical significance of the obtained results is in the possible use by the legislative and executive authorities of different levels for further improvement of legislation in the field of

culture, the development of a strategy for providing financial assistance to entrepreneurs in the field of culture during the pandemic.

Keywords: culture, cultural product, cultural and creative industries, cultural value.

1. Introduction

The problem formulation. Modern society is in a state of crisis and challenges caused by the pandemic. Mankind has faced problems in the functioning of economics, medicine systems, management at various levels, education and science, culture, and more. With the growing dynamics of threats to human life and health, governments are making unpopular decisions to stop businesses by various economic entities. Governments of countries with stable economies (like Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden, Austria, Belgium, and others) have developed financial compensation schemes for entrepreneurs in various fields. While there is no strategy and program to support small and medium-sized businesses in the days of COVID-19 in Ukraine.

The sphere of culture is one of the most affected in the world and Ukraine because the closure of cultural institutions and enterprises of various forms of ownership in most cases makes it impossible for their function. To consume a cultural product the potential consumer must be directly involved in it. Visitors come to the theater for a theatrical performance or visit a museum to see a new exhibition; others go to a concert of a favorite artist. The producer of a cultural product in the form of an event is the most vulnerable because the end consumer has lost the opportunity to have access to such a cultural product. Producers are deprived of the opportunity to receive income from cultural activities. Therefore, they need the development of government support programs.

Under normal circumstances, financially dependent cultural institutions of state or communal ownership can operate through direct subsidies from the budget, incomes from the sale of tickets for the event or admission, participation in grant competitions. Thus, the rights of citizens to culture are ensured. Currently, these institutions are closed to visitors, and grant competitions are mostly focused on the direct involvement of the visitor in the institution.

However, there is an even bigger problem for entrepreneurs whose activities are focused on the production of cultural products, for example, music, tourism, and event-industry. Usually, these industries did not apply for financial assistance from the state, because their cultural product is commercial, focused on mass sales. But they are forced to close if they do not receive financial assistance in a lockdown situation. The loss of small and medium-sized businesses in the market is negative for the country's economy because it is about paying taxes and filling the budget.

To provide such targeted financial assistance the government must have a clear model of the cultural industries (enterprises) that may need such assistance. We emphasize the concept of “cultural industries” and not “creative industries” as is defined in the Law of Ukraine “On Culture” (Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, 2010) in this research. It is important because we see concepts of both live music, theater, and video games and periodicals in the Government Resolution under V. Groysman of April 24, 2019 “On defining the types of economic activity that belong to the creative industries” (Kabinet Ministriv Ukrainy, 2019). Video game developers continue to operate because there are no obstacles for them during the pandemic. But we can't say the same about a theater or a touring artist. Therefore to understand which entities need financial support and implementation of the mechanism for the transparency of such assistance, the State must clearly develop a conceptual and categorical apparatus for economic activities in the field of culture and then use it to develop legislation. In particular, it is necessary to understand what a cultural product is and who can be its producer.

State study of the problem. The definition of the “cultural product” concept in the context of an interdisciplinary scientific approach required, first of all, to clarify the essence of such concepts as “culture”, “cultural industries”, “creative industries”, “cultural value”.

To do this we use the classical approach in defining culture as a system of values and beliefs inherent in a particular community, according to R. Williams (1960). The modern approach to the understanding of culture as a set of cultural industries (enterprises) and the economy, is developed following the provisions of The Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of cultural expressions (2005), European Commission “Green Paper. Unlocking the potential of cultural and creative industries” (2010), European Parliament “Resolution on the promotion of the European cultural and creative sectors as sources of economic growth and jobs” (2013) and British Government “The Creative Industries Mapping Document” (2001). The scientific approach to the logic of building models of cultural industries is reflected through the prism of scientific works by A. Huet et al. (1984), D. Hesmondhalgh (2013), D. Throsby (2001, 2008). The structure of the music industry is reflected according to M. Proskurina (2018).

Analysis of the functioning of the sphere of culture in Ukraine, its legislative regulation was carried out through the study of Laws of Ukraine: 1) Law of Ukraine “On Culture” (Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, 2010); 2) Law of Ukraine “On Export, Import and Return of Cultural Values” (Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, 1999). As well as the Government Resolution “On the Definition of Economic Activities that Belong to the Creative Industries” (Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine, 2019).

Scientific criticism of the cultural industry and mass production in the cultural and artistic sphere as a phenomenon in society is reflected in the works of M. Horkheimer, T. Adorno (1947) and W. Benjamin (1935). The formation of research in the economics of culture and their content are defined in the works of W. Baumol and W. Bowen (1966). The relationship between the functioning of culture and the economy from a historical perspective has been elucidated through the scientific work of P. Sacco (2011).

The specificity of a cultural product in its value component is determined in following the philosophical works of H. Rickert (1899) and M. Kagan (1997). An understanding of the cultural value of a cultural product based on the results of research by M. Hutter and B. Frey (2010) is analyzed. Researchers have concluded that cultural value determines the value of a cultural product (an artist's painting).

Unresolved issues. Ukraine has existed in the ideological dimension of the Soviet Union for a long time, where culture was understood as a tool for instilling party ideology. The concept of “cultural and creative industries” is foreign. To amend the Law of Ukraine “On Culture” in the part of creative industries, the legislator borrows the meaning of this concept from the British. We understand that these concepts are formed in European academic field and the discourse of the United States against the background of stable economic relations in the production and consumption of cultural products, the functioning of market relations in culture, the emergence of entrepreneurs in this field, but not just financially dependent institutions (opera, theater, ballet, etc.). These transformations do not take place by chance there. They are a part of a political strategy of the rationale of the right to culture and providing the access to a cultural product for every citizen. After all, a cultural product contains a cultural value that can form a variety of meanings.

Taking into account the functioning of the cultural sector as an economic one and due to the complex nature of the cultural product, there is a demand to build a model of cultural and creative industries in the European Union. It was necessary to understand who is the manufacturer and what product they create. A clear structure ensures the separation of economic activities in which producers carry out their activities. It becomes clear that there are different producers in the field of culture, including and entrepreneurs whose activities are aimed at commercial activities and mass sales of cultural products.

Looking at the British implementation experience there is a conceptual framework at the legislative level in Ukraine where the concept of “creative industries” is borrowed. There are no definitions of cultural production, producer, and cultural product yet. It is necessary to begin a scientific dialogue to clarify

the meaning of such concepts as “cultural product”, “cultural industries”, “cultural entrepreneurship” in the context of a pandemic and the need for the government to develop mechanisms of support for all economic entities, not just financially dependent cultural institutions.

2. Purpose and methods

The purpose of the article is to clarify the meaning of the concept of “cultural product” in the context of an interdisciplinary approach taking into account the interpretation of this concept in various fields of scientific knowledge and policies at national and international levels, to develop recommendations for the use of the term of “cultural product” in legislative activity in Ukraine.

Achieving this goal involves these problems:

- to determine the specificity of a cultural product through the cultural value that it contains;
- to trace the emergence and essence of the concept of “cultural industries” in European academic field and Policies of the EU and UNESCO Conventions;
- to identify producers, entrepreneurs of cultural products in the model of cultural industries.

The methodological basis of the study. The methodological basis of this study is the application of an interdisciplinary approach, which combines the scientific achievements of specialists in the field of cultural economics, management in the field of culture, media studies, philosophy, and cultural studies. The interdisciplinary approach allowed to distinguish the content of the concepts of “cultural product”, “cultural industries”, “creative industries” which are investigated in this article.

Besides the study used a systematic approach to elucidating the content of the above concepts, based on historical chronology from the emergence of the concept of “cultural industry” with the definition of scientific criticism to its acquisition of new meaning as cultural industries. The system approach is also used to consider the functioning of the cultural sphere in Ukraine, the separation of entities that are engaged in cultural production.

The legal approach concerned the elaboration of the Laws of Ukraine and the Government Resolution on the functioning of the cultural branch in Ukraine, as well as the study of the experience of legislative regulation of the cultural sphere in the European Union and on the international level in the UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of Cultural Expressions.

Research methods. We use general and special methods of scientific research in our work. Historical one helps to clarify the history of the concepts of “cultural industry” and “cultural industries” in the 20th century; compara-

tive method helps to recognize the relation to the content of the concepts of “cultural and creative industries” in the documents of the EU and the UNESCO Convention; the dialectical method is used for considering the functioning of the categories of culture and economy; epistemological method, analysis, and synthesis help to clarify the meaning of “cultural industries”, “creative industries”, “cultural product”; the axiological method is for the understanding of a cultural product that contains a cultural value.

Research information base. The information base of the study is based primarily on the researches of leading representatives of modern scientific thought in the field of cultural economics, management in the field of culture, media, and cultural industries. An important part of the research was the study of legislative regulation of culture in Ukraine and the European Union, as well as a reference to the activities of the International Organization of UNESCO. The transition from a scientific critique of the concept of “cultural industry” to a modern understanding of the meaning of this concept was considered in chronological order.

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Culture as a complex of cultural industries

To clarify the meaning of the term “cultural product” it is necessary to begin with the fact that such a product by its nature exists in opposition to the categories of culture and economy as spheres of human activity. Dialectics is manifested concerning the product of production: value, resource, producer. That means that we can distinguish two criteria of a cultural product that determine its specificity:

- 1) cultural industries (enterprises) that produce such a product;
- 2) cultural value, the bearer of which it is.

Therefore, to achieve the main goal of the study, it is necessary to consider the above criteria to formulate the definition of a cultural product in Ukrainian reality.

It should be noted that in the historical context the formation of the perception of the product of production by society in the field of culture has constantly supported the above dialectic through the prism of “high” and “low”, “elite” and “mass”. However, in the 60's of the 20th century in Western Europe (now the European Union) this perception has begun to transform. A field of research such as the economics of culture has emerged. First of all, the topic of scientific research was the financial dependence of various cultural institutions (theater, opera, ballet) (Baumol & Bowen, 1966). The scientists began to think about the specifics of the product produced by such institutions and

thought about the reasons it constantly needs subsidies. However, the same institutions carry out not only cultural activities, ensuring the right of everyone to culture, but also economic activities. At the same time, they have lacked financial resources for self-sufficiency (Baumol & Bowen, 1966).

We understand that the product of the production of these cultural institutions has no signs of conveyor production. Its fundamental value is authenticity and uniqueness. Theatrical performances will differ in the nuances of the artists' play, the directors' vision of the production, the scenery, and so on. Moreover, we can say that the same play, which is repeated every two weeks in the same theater, may also differ in these features. It should be understood that the viewer, joining the show, gets a unique in time and space product thanks to his presence.

Signs of conveyor production, serialization, and mass product in the cultural and artistic sphere have been the basis for scientific criticism for a long time, if we recall the meaning of the concept of “cultural industry” by *Max Horkheimer*, *Theodor Adorno* (1947) and *Walter Benjamin* (1935). Scientific criticism was based on the assertion of the negative impact of scientific and technological applications in the field of culture and art, and later in media. Scientists have emphasized the peculiarities of the cultural product (although they did not refer to it directly as to a “cultural product”). The peculiarity was in the plane of creation of meanings. The use of technical devices led to the instantaneous spread of meanings of different content (Horkheimer & Adorno, 1997), the loss of “auraticism” (Benjamin, 1996).

However, with the appearance of media such as radio, television, and later the Internet it became clear that the production of a product whose essence is information has gained an extraordinary scale. Besides the technical means allowed to record audio and video, create content on the Web, and monetize it instantly through the views of millions of viewers from around the world. For example, a product such as a song is currently objectified in special applications like Spotify or iTunes. The listener can purchase the right to access songs or music of favorite artists and performers with the application on the smartphone.

It turned out that the field of media production, which serially and mass-produced information content product has become an integral part of society in the 80's of the 20th century. The specificity of a media product was its ability to generate meanings that may differ depending on the practice of interpretation, but are in demand among viewers and listeners. At the same time *Bernard Miege*, a French scientist and media studies researcher, began to scientifically substantiate the thesis that the cultural sphere now functions as a complex of cultural industries with different logics of production (quote of

Huet et al., 1984). B. Miede attributed the information product of various media to the sphere of cultural production, taking into account its nature to create meaning. If we look closely at the logic he proposed, the distinction was based on the channels of distribution of the media product such as books, recordings, television programs, periodicals (quote of Huet et al., 1984). Of course, this logic of distribution has changed with the appearance of the Internet. However, the scientist went beyond the scientific critique of the “cultural industry” and he introduced the media as the model of cultural industries as branches of the production. The activities of the media industry mustn't be financially dependent, but it's self-sustaining and brings considerable profits to the owners. That means that we are talking about commercial activities.

In the modern scientific tradition of research in the economics of culture and cultural management in the European Union, as well as directly in the legislative practice, the models of cultural industries contain various activities in such areas of cultural production as art (theater, music, visual art, literature, cinema, folk crafts), media (television, radio, different periodicals, book publishing, new media), cultural heritage conservation practices and tourism (Throsby, 2001; European Commission, 2010). According to the EU Resolution “Green Paper. Unlocking the potential of cultural and creative industries”, these areas are united by the production of a product that contains a form of cultural expression (cultural value). Cultural production (activity) is carried out independently of the commercial component in the activities of organizations (European Commission, 2010). A detailed review and analysis of the concepts of “cultural and creative industries” in documents of EU and UK were previously conducted by the author of the study and covered in a scientific article (Parkhomenko, 2017).

It is important to note that outlined cultural industries can equally commercialize the product, even though the primary purpose of producing such a product was different: to create meaning through the cultural value contained in the product. If we take artistic paintings now taking into account the figure of the artist and the history of the canvas, the institution that represents the artist and his work, the cost of the painting can be extremely high. The field of music art functions as a full-fledged music industry, which has its own structure: musician and song are in the center, music publications, recording studios, booking (organization of live performances), marketing agencies are around (Proskurina, 2018, p.118). Resources of cultural and natural heritage are the basis for the tourism industry.

These examples emphasize the importance of the thesis about the potential for commercialization of the product of cultural industries. Looking at the outlined model of cultural industries, distinguishing the logic of its construction, and the evolution of the concept of “cultural industries” it should be

said that culture is considered in a broader context in countries with developed democracies, market relations, and sustainable economies. It is necessary to distinguish classical and modern approaches to understanding culture.

The classical approach considers the concept of “culture” as three-dimensional by its nature and integrates such components as values, beliefs, customs, traditions, orders. However, a distinctive feature of culture as a phenomenon is its collective origin. It means that values and orders must be generally accepted, and beliefs must be professed by all (Williams, 1960). Then a cultural tradition emerges, which the community preserves, reproduces in cultural practices (activities), and seeks to pass on to future generations. At the same time, cultural practices can be reproduced by community members unconsciously. For example, the cultural practice of community decision-making, based on the leveling of declarations of government institutions, which appeals to the traditions of the tribe.

If we are talking about the conscious imitation of cultural practice, then we should start with the fact that the reproduction of cultural practices and the creation of tradition in society requires a procedure for its materialization in specific objects. These can be various material objects that will have sacred significance for the community. And later they will acquire historical value with the emergence of special public institutions and documents that certify this historical value in the context of the state and the world. We are talking about artifacts, the interpretation of which required the conscious involvement of a community member in knowledge about its value. In other words, someone should be a bearer of knowledge about the value of the artifact in the community and tell others about it. However, such artifacts have a specific material form of expression. For example, a ritual bowl, flag, jewelry, books, musical instruments, etc. Cultural objects, such as the house where the famous figure lived, are protected due to their historical value in the process of institutionalizing the practice of preserving cultural heritage.

We should note that works of art also require interpretation of the content and acquire their significance in the context of knowledge about the painting, the artist's personal brand, and the establishment of a permanent relationship of the artist with art dealers in the art market. At the same time, the last point is crucial.

As we know, there are also cultural artifacts that have no material form of expression. These are folk songs, fairy tales, dances, music, crafts, technologies, etc. If a folk song or fairy tale may not require conscious comprehension by community members and are reproduced by them from an early age, then the technology of making a musical instrument requires the conscious involvement of an adult participant, his willingness to learn this type of activity.

An interesting example is also the ritual actions of community members, which were repeated from year to year turning into leisure practices.

Obviously cultural practices (activities) can acquire meaning in the context of the participant (consumer), involving him to acquire knowledge about the cultural object (consciously in the form of tangible and intangible expression). That means that they need a format of learning and transfer of knowledge from the carrier (teacher) to the student, who will be the manufacturer in the future. Other types of cultural practices such as a song, a story about the heroic deed of an ancestor, a ceremonial holiday, etc., can be assimilated unconsciously through constant reproduction and repetition.

The culture itself as a system of values inherent in a community exists because of the constant reproduction of these values by the bearers, members of the community both consciously and unconsciously in the process of group involvement. The objectification of cultural values occurs directly in tangible and intangible objects. Such objects will contain a cultural value. The last statement in the context of a community member should be considered in the definition that an object that contains cultural value is valuable (significant) for the community member because it contributes to his own self-identification through belonging to the community. In today's world with a stable political map, an important aspect of cultural reproduction is the territorial affiliation of the community. The representatives of different cultures can interpret other cultures focusing on the formed cultural regions. For example the cultures of African, Asian, European regions, etc.

Taking into account the above points, classical approach to understanding "culture" determines that the functioning of culture is possible through the acceptance of common values by its participants, which requires their constant reproduction through objectification in objects and practices (activities). These are products of the production of different cultures, which are inherent in certain communities, groups. The modern practice of preservation and protection of cultural heritage is an obvious example of such cultural production of values and meanings. At the same time, cultural products are objects of consumption in the community, because they directly meet the need for self-identification of the community and its representatives among others. However, it must be understood that historically this example of the production of cultural products has not always functioned as an economic reality. This is important for the understanding of the product of production as a result of the activities of enterprises (industries). The modern Italian scientist *Pier Sacco* (2011) has developed his own concept in this regard. He considers the functioning of cultural production as an economic reality, highlighting the following stages:

1. Pre-industrial period, the Renaissance and the nation state called “Culture 1.0”. The production of a product in the field of culture and arts is under the patronage of elites who are financially capable. Such patrons supporting the producer, for example, the artist, testified to their social status in society. During the formation of national states in Western Europe (now – the EU) in the 16-18th centuries, the role and duty of the patron is assumed by the State, which ensures the development of rules for the functioning of cultural production within specialized institutions. P. Sacco notes that it begins the formation of an understanding of culture in two definitions, as “low” or mass and “high” or elitist at the same period.

2. The industrial period “Culture 2.0”. Dates back to the 20th century when the development of technical means leads to mass production of cultural products. The scientific critique of *Max Horkheimer* and *Theodor Adorno* (1997), *Walter Benjamin* (1996) on the mass and seriality of the cultural product appears at this time. Scientists refer to the field of culture as a “cultural industry” in a negative connotation. *Pier Sacco* (2011) notes that this critique has slowed down the functioning of culture as an economic reality in Western Europe. The researcher gives the example of the United States, where the situation was different and there was a formation of the market in the field of culture, art, and media (30's of the 20th century). Such a market is worth talking about since the 60's of the 20th century in Western Europe when despite criticism of mass culture numerous enterprises (industries) began to carry out the production of cultural products. The culture begins to function as a set of industries in the 80's of the 20th century (Huet et al., 1984).

3. The period of development of digital technologies at the beginning of the 2000s. The production of cultural products is provided through the Internet, augmented, and virtual reality. Cultural access and cultural participation have already become characteristic features of this period. In other words, the consumer is guaranteed the right to culture continuously if he has such a conscious desire. Currently, the cultural institutions are actively interacting with visitors, involving them in virtual tours of the museum. A potential visitor from any country can join the consumption of a cultural product. Moreover, he can become a content creator, monetize own product, or can also be a co-author.

Thus, *Pier Sacco* (2011) is based on such components in his concept of the formation and functioning of culture as an economic reality: 1) the form of support for the producer of a cultural product; 2) mass production and expansion of the range of products through the development of technical means and the emergence of new technologies; 3) the functioning of culture as a complex of enterprises (industries) that carry out mass production of cultural products; 4) ensuring access to culture and realization of the right to culture for all

consumers equally. In general, the concept of P. Sacco is based on the understanding of the cultural sphere as a sector of the economy where businesses are carried out by organizations of various forms of ownership, as well as individual entrepreneurs. Accordingly, such organizations produce a cultural product that is the result of the production of these organizations.

The specificity of a cultural product is in its value component. The Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of cultural expressions (UNESCO, 2005) states that cultural communities and their members can create various forms of cultural expressions that are the result of their creative activities. These forms also contain cultural content which is a carrier of artistic, cultural or symbolic value, related to cultural identity one way or another. The Convention does not define a “cultural product”, but details the content of forms of cultural expression. Besides the Convention stipulates that industries that distribute cultural goods and services are cultural industries (UNESCO, 2005). In fact, cultural goods and services, as products of cultural industries, are forms of cultural self-expression of the community. It is also important to emphasize that the fundamental resource for the production of cultural products of different content is creativity as a personal and professional competence of an individual (employee). The same person is a member of the community and professes the values inherent in this community.

Thus the modern approach to understanding culture, which emerged in the 60's of the 20th century, defines it as a set of cultural industries (enterprises) that carry out economic and cultural activities at the same time.

3.2. The specifics of the cultural product

Culture is a profitable branch of the economy. The product of the production of these industries contains a cultural value that can create meaning. This is the meaning consumed by the viewer, listener, reader, visitor. The sphere of culture is the branch of production and consumption. The production of cultural industries can be profitable, and the enterprise or entrepreneur, in this case, is engaged in entrepreneurship in the field of culture. Moreover, cultural industries can be of various forms of ownership, including state-owned (Throsby, 2008). State cultural industries in Ukraine are various cultural institutions.

If we look at Ukrainian legislative practices, the Ukrainian legislation Law of Ukraine “On Culture” does not contain a definition of cultural industries, but there is a definition of “creative industries”, which is understood given the British governmental-institutional model (Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, 2010). Also, there is a tendency to preserve the tradition of interpreting the sphere of culture separately from “industries” in Ukrainian society. That means that

there is no understanding of culture as a complex of industries. But if we look at the considered model of cultural industries of EU, we understand that the Ukrainian approach makes it impossible to carry out commercial activities and make a profit in the field of culture and arts like theater, music, fine arts, literature, cinema, crafts.

However, the same functioning of the music industry in Ukraine with the main market players such as Mozgi Group or Secret Service destroys this logic. The music industry is a commercial sector of the economy, even if the Government does not define it like this. It should be understood that the delay in introducing the concept of cultural industries in the Law on Culture does not contribute to the transparency of doing business in this sector of the economy. Moreover, there are no mechanisms for providing targeted assistance to entrepreneurs in the field of culture in the context of the crisis caused by the pandemic, because it does not exist in the legislative field of Ukraine, same as creative entrepreneurs by the way.

Note that Policies of the EU and Great Britain distinguish cultural and creative industries, according to the product of production (European Commission, 2010). The main criterion of distinction is common to both – it's the product of production. Creative industries (enterprises) are aimed at creating a product that has, above all, a utilitarian (functional) purpose of production and serves to meet the primary (physiological) needs of the consumer. It is worth noting that the product of the IT and computer sector has, above all, a utilitarian purpose of consumption for the modern man. This is a service industry that is designed to simplify human existence. As for the cultural product, it is, first of all, about the cultural value, the carrier of which such product is.

Note that the concept of “cultural value” is ambiguous in the scientific community. As was already mentioned cultural values are treated as specific material objects in Ukrainian law. However in the modern European academic field cultural value is that contains the product of production (Throsby, 2001). That is cultural value is not identical to value in the economy.

The philosophical approach defines the essence of “value” through the category of meaning and significance (Kagan, 1997; Rickert, 1998). Significance is formed in the subject-object interaction, where the subject (consumer) determines the meaning of a particular object (product of production) in terms of significance. That means that if we continue to think about production and consumption the product of production will have some significance for the consumer.

For example, food produced for the consumer is valuable according to the sign of nutrition and satisfaction of hunger. If we are talking about a cultural product or a product produced by cultural industries, then there is no clear answer to the question “why this product is valuable to the consumer?”. Ho-

wever it is clear that the cultural product is not aimed at meeting the primary (physiological) needs, but there is a demand for it. The more massive is the cultural product, the greater is the demand for it. This is because the cultural value contained in the cultural product appeals to the personal beliefs, stories, experiences of the consumer. The meaning of a cultural product for the consumer is in strengthening or even refuting, or finding one's own "self" and one's own history. At the same time, there are other values of the community a member of which is a potential consumer. Therefore the cultural product appeals to the need for self-determination of the consumer and understanding of his place in the community.

Returning to the meaning of the concept of "cultural product" we can give another example. The music company carries out commercial activities for the production of songs. The musical product in the form of a recorded song is not aimed at meeting the primary (physiological) needs of potential consumers. Accordingly to A. Maslow's Pyramid of Needs, listening to music is not a primary need. However, this does not reduce the demand for music product. After all music as a cultural phenomenon is much more complex taking into account the various functions it performs. However, currently music production is an economic activity. If we talk about a musical product for mass consumption, the listener finds meaning in such works through specific archetypes learned throughout human history: love, joy, heroism, loss, and so on.

The basis of music production is music (sound) and words (text), which together are a song. Words (text) are essential information that is easiest to interpret from the viewer's point of view and form certain meanings for themselves. Music (sound) enhances the emotional component of the listener's experience. The artist (singer) is a singer and has his own personal and professional story. However, this does not deprive him of citizenship. He belongs to the community. Accordingly, the artist's audience identifies his own story (brand) with the meanings of his songs and the musical direction he represents. We understand that the more complex is the interpretation of the meaning of a musical (cultural) product, the less mass can be a song, musical direction, and even an artist. In this case, the artist can be popular in his niche and have a narrow circle of connoisseurs who can recognize such meanings because they have narrow knowledge. Thus the mass distribution and perception as a sign of the product of the production of cultural industries do not deprive such a product of the cultural value that it contains.

The audience of the artist perceives the product of their production as cultural or meaningful. Moreover, there is an identification of the artist with the territory where he performs. The latter thesis is important in the case of Ukraine that is at war. Achieving mass popularity in a country the artist gains

importance for the audience of this country, becoming a carrier of cultural values of their community. We understand that a commercialized cultural product with mass distribution and a large audience still exists in the categories of community identity. Therefore the territorial affiliation of the product of the production of cultural industries or cultural product also affects its value component. It may increase the price of the product or vice versa, as well as affect the popularity of the artist.

Thus the cultural product is the end product of the production of cultural industries, which are enterprises, institutions of various forms of ownership that carry out cultural and economic activities. Models of cultural industries combine different activities, but the product of their production primarily contains a cultural value, which determines the value of this product on the market (Hutter & Frey, 2010). A cultural product can also have different forms of realization such as a product (picture, film, book, etc.), service (archiving, portrait writing, organization of a cultural event, shooting a video, etc.), and events. The processes of operation and constant growth of the event-industry in the absence of a pandemic demonstrate that currently a variety of products are marketed through the event marketing tool. But the form of realization of a cultural product in the form of an event like a theatrical performance, a museum exposition, city fairs and holidays, is traditional for cultural production.

4. Conclusions

During the study of clarification of the meaning of the concept of “cultural product” in the context of an interdisciplinary approach, we suggest the following recommendations for the use of the concept of “cultural product” in the legislative activity of Ukraine.

1. There are two approaches to the definition of a cultural product:

1.1. A legal-based approach that is based on the separation of economic entities in the field of cultural production or cultural industries. It includes, first, cultural institutions or cultural institutions of the state, communal ownership; secondly, individual or legal entity entrepreneur of entrepreneurial activity – artists, dancers or book publishers, production centers, media of various content and significance, alternative theaters, etc. ; third, the activities of public organizations and charitable foundations in conducting of cultural activities;

1.2. A value-based approach that focuses on highlighting the specifics of a cultural product. A cultural product, as a result of the production of cultural industries, contains a cultural value that generates meaning in the interaction of the consumer with such a product. The product of the production of creative industries contains, first of all, the utilitarian (functional) purpose of consumption.

2. Distinguishing of the concepts of “cultural” and “creative industries” in the legislation of Ukraine and identifying the types of economic activities that should be attributed to them will identify the activities of entrepreneurs in the field of culture. Although these entrepreneurs set the goal of their activities as cultural production, but also carry out commercial activities for the sale of cultural products (goods, services, events). It is important to note that cultural entrepreneurs are taxpayers. Their appearance on the map of Ukrainian culture will contribute to the transparency of the functioning of this sphere in general. Cultural entrepreneurs given the specifics of the product of their production can receive targeted financial assistance as taxpayers in the field of culture in times of crisis.

3. The introduction of the concept of “cultural industries” and “cultural product” at the level of national legislation will help change the vector of perception of culture by Ukrainians as a secondary practice that is associated with the categories of “mass” and “elite”.

3.1. The modern sphere of culture functions as a complex of cultural industries of various forms of ownership, including state the product of which contains a cultural value, which creates meaning for the community. Thus the product of the production of cultural industries is a cultural product. The main resource for the production of a cultural product is the creative activity of a participant or members of the community. A cultural product, considering the specifics of production and consumption is subject to intellectual and copyright law.

3.2. Fixing of the various cultural entities in the field of culture at the legislative level, which in this study are defined as cultural industries, will help attract both consumers and producers to culture through job creation.

Scientific novelty of the research results. The scientific novelty of the study is the distinguishing of two approaches: legal-based and value-based, to clarify the content of cultural industries and the concept of “cultural product”, to further use in legislative practices in Ukraine.

The practical significance of the obtained results. The proposed recommendations can be used by legislative and executive authorities at various levels to further improve legislation in the field of culture, to develop a strategy for providing financial assistance to entrepreneurs in the field of culture during a pandemic. It will promote the formation of professional dialogue in the scientific branch on the functioning of the cultural sphere as a set of cultural industries and business activities in the field of culture.

Prospects for further scientific exploration in this direction. Further research in the field of cultural products can be the basis for the systematization of knowledge about copyright and intellectual property rights in the field of culture, the activities of individual cultural industries that make this sector of the economy. After all, it is the commercialized cultural production of such industries (eg, music, publishing, tourism) that brings the main income.

Acknowledgement

This publication is made following the complex scientific theme of the Department of Event Management and Leisure Industry of Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts: “Transformational processes of social culture in Ukraine” (Project # 0117V002887).

References:

- Aiello, L. (Ed.). (2014). *Handbook of Research on Management of Cultural Products: E-Relationships Marketing and Accessibility Perspectives*. Hershey, PA: IGI Global.
- Baumol, W. J., & Bowen, W. G. (1966). *Performing Arts – The Economic Dilemma: A Study of Problems Common to Theater, Opera, Music and Dance*. New York: Twentieth Century Fund.
- Benjamin, W. (1996). *Proizvedenie Iskusstva v Epokhu Ego Tekhnicheskoi Vospriizvodimosti [The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction]* (Trans. in Germ.). Moscow: Medium (in Russ.).
- Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine (2019, April 24). Rozporiadzhennia "Pro Zatverdzhennia Vydiv Ekonomichnoi Diialnosti, yaki Nalezhat do Kreatyvnykh Industrii" [A Resolution "On the Definition of Economic Activities that Belong to the Creative Industries"], Retrieved from <https://www.kmu.gov.ua/npas/pro-zatverdzhnoyi-diyalnosti-yaki-nalezhat-do-kreatyvnihi-industrii> (in Ukr.).
- Department for Digital, Culture, Media & Sport (2001, April 9). The Creative Industries Mapping Document, Retrieved from <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/creative-industries-mapping-documents-2001>.
- European Commission (2010, April 27). Green Paper – Unlocking the Potential of Cultural and Creative Industries, Retrieved from <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/ALL/?uri=CELEX:52010DC0183>.
- European Parliament (2013, September 12). Resolution on Promoting the European Cultural and Creative Sectors as Sources of Economic Growth and Jobs, Retrieved from <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=TA&reference=P7-TA-2013-0368&language=EN&ring=A7-2013-0248>.
- Hesmondhalgh, D. (2012). *The Cultural Industries*, 3rd ed. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Horkheimer, M., & Adorno, T. W. (1997). *Dialektika Prosveshcheniya. Filosofskie Fragmenty [Dialectics of Enlightenment. Philosophical Fragments]* (M. Kuznetsov, Trans. in Germ.). Moscow; St. Petersburg: Medium; Yuventa (in Russ.).
- Howkins, J. (2001). *The Creative Economy: How People Make Money from Ideas*. London: Allen Lane.
- Huet, A., Ion, J., Lefebvre, A., Miège, B., & Peron, R. (1984). *Capitalisme et Industries Culturelles [Capitalism and Cultural Industries]*, 2nd ed. Grenoble: PUG (in Fr.).

- Hutter, M., & Frey, B. S. (2010). On the Influence of Cultural Value on Economic Value. *Revue d'Économie Politique*, 120(1), 35-46, doi: 10.3917/redp.201.0035.
- Kagan, M. S. (1997). *Filosofskaya Teoriya Tsennosti [Philosophical Theory of Value]*. St. Petersburg: Petropolis (in Russ.).
- Klamer, A. (1996). *The Value of Culture: On the Relationship between Economics and Arts*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Parkhomenko, I. I. (2017). Poniattia "Kulturni" ta "Kreatyvni Industrii" v Zakhidnoievropeiskomu Naukovomu Dyskursi ta Uriadovo-Institutsiinykh Praktykakh Velykobrytanii ta Yevropeiskoho Soiuzu [The Concept of Cultural and Creative Industries in the European Academic Field And Policies of the Eu And Great Britain]. *Ukrainski Kulturolohichni Studii [Ukrainian Cultural Studies]*, 1(1), 74-78 (in Ukr.).
- Proskurina, M. O. (2018). *Orhanizatsiino-Ekonomichniy Mekhanizm Kulturnoi Industrii Ukrainy [Organizational and Economic Mechanism of the Cultural Industry of Ukraine]*. Kyiv: Natsionalna Akademiia Upravlinnia (in Ukr.).
- Rickert, H. (1998). *Nauki o Prirode i Nauki o Kul'ture [Natural Sciences and Cultural Sciences]* (A. F. Zotova, Trans. in Germ.). Moscow: Respublika (in Russ.).
- Sacco, P. L. (2011). *Culture 3.0: A New Perspective for the EU 2014-2020 Structural Funds Programming*. European Expert Network of Culture, Retrieved from <http://www.interarts.net/descargas/interarts2577.pdf>.
- Throsby, D. (2001). *Economics of Culture*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Throsby, D. (2008). The Concentric Circles Model of the Cultural Industries. *Cultural Trends*, 17(3), 147-164, doi: 10.1080/09548960802361951.
- UNESCO (2005, October 20). *The Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions*, Retrieved from <https://en.unesco.org/creativity/convention/texts>.
- Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine (1999, September 24). Zakon Ukrainy "Pro Vyvezennia, Vvezennia ta Povernennia Kulturnykh Tsinnosti" [A Law of Ukraine is "On Export, Import and Return of Cultural Values"], Retrieved from <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1068-14?lang=en#Text> (in Ukr.)
- Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine (2010, December 14). Zakon Ukrainy "Pro Kulturu" [A Law of Ukraine is "On Culture"], Retrieved from <http://zakon2.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2778-17> (in Ukr.)
- Williams, R. (1960). *Culture and Society: 1780-1950*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Information about the Authors:

Iryna Parkhomenko, Assoc. Professor, PhD, Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts, 36 Ye. Konovalets Str., Kyiv 01601, Ukraine; e-mail: ireneparkhomenko@gmail.com; orcid id: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8328-6774> (corresponding author)

Kateryna Berezovska, Expert, European Parliament, Bruxelles, Belgium; e-mail: kateintouch@gmail.com; orcid id: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8224-8282>