

UDC: 008:[304.4:316.422](477)

JEL Classification: O31, C41, N34

Received: 22/02/2021

Tetiana Kozyntseva¹, Andrii Synakh¹, Irina Dulebova²

¹ Sumy State University, Sumy, Ukraine

² Comenius University in Bratislava, Bratislava, Slovakia

Innovative Potential of Modern Cultural Strategies: Ukrainian Context

Abstract: *Introduction.* The creative and cultural industries have made significant adjustments to the modern world economic processes, which provokes an increased interest in the cultural sphere in general and in the cultural strategy in particular. *Purpose and methods.* The purpose of the article is to identify the innovative potential of culture in modern conditions and its implementation ways through cultural strategies and creative industries, both in the universal and in the Ukrainian context. The methodological basis of the study was the systemic-structural method, the method of formal-logical research, analysis, the comparative method, the system-thought-activity methodology, and the deconstructive approach. *Results.* An integrated approach to culture allows considering it as an open space for the interaction of people, ethnic groups, nations that are the subjects of economic, political, and cultural innovation. Cultural development is represented through vertical-horizontal interactions between cultural strategy, cultural policy, and creative industries. *Conclusions.* The Ukrainian State is currently rethinking the role of culture in general and cultural strategy in particular, facing the problem of forming an integral Ukrainian-oriented space. The new approach to the structure of culture includes not institutions, but the creators and consumers of the cultural product, who initiate a single cultural space creation. That allows identifying the innovative potential of culture and cultural strategy. Ukraine's innovative cultural strategy and its implementation through cultural policy and creative industries can serve both to consolidate society and to solve economic problems.

Keywords: culture, cultural policy, cultural strategy, innovation potential of culture, innovation potential of cultural strategy, creative and cultural industries.

1. Introduction

The problem formulation. The innovative potential of modern cultural strategies is the result of new foundations formation for building a world where the scheme of relations between states through the prism of European centrism ceased to work. Statements about the end of the “Wilsonian era” (Cooley & Nexon, 2021), built on the liberal world order, are starting to sound more and more active. The inclusion in the world political process of such major players as the USA, Japan, India, China indicates the need to find new grounds for international cooperation.

The Fourth Industrial Revolution is changing the economic and technological picture of the world. In the economic sphere, the concept of creative economy (“creative industries”) is formed. “In the post-industrial society, culture becomes a strategic priority of the modern economy of developed countries precisely because in the last decades it has been able to transform into a powerful industry of cultural services” (Davymuka & Fedulova, 2017, p. 54).

Of course, we will not ignore the introduction of new technologies into our daily lives that not only improve the quality of our lives but also form a new human being – a person of the screen culture with elements of clip thinking (Girenok, 2016), change the communication ways and form. Information expansion changes the approach to verification, which in turn, is setting new relativistic, anti-traditional approaches to the formation of its information and, subsequently, cultural space. The phenomenon of novelty as a mainstream makes it impossible to adequately analyze the situation and regulate the development of the process from a long-term perspective.

In a democratic society, political elites dependent on electoral sympathies tend to make populist decisions with tactical rather than strategic potential. These convulsive, chaotic policy decisions do not create a space for critical thinking, innovation breakthroughs, or creativity. In this regard, the role of a critically thinking civil society should be strengthened.

The process of globalization has affected the formation of a single “cultural ecumene”: “cultural interactions and influences have a bearing on the whole human community” (Sztompka, 1996). This does not mean, however, that we have a homogeneous cultural system, since, along with the unification of culture (mass culture), there is also its atomization (the preservation of its cultural, ethnic identity remains a pressing issue). Moreover, migration processes are shaping a new cultural space, which requires the creation of new strategies, not only for the individual state but also for the world as a whole. That is why scholars speak of the phenomenon of glocalization (Robertson, 1994), and that must also be taken into account in building a cultural strategy.

The post-modern situation (Lyotard, 2013), aimed at abandoning meta-narratives, which provide a common paradigm and established binary opposition, influences new collage cultural practices formation.

Ukraine is also affected by all the above factors, which are exacerbated by the aggression of the Russian Federation, both informationally and physically. Our country must rapidly modernize the military, economic and cultural spheres with long-term goals. And the cultural strategy of the country, in this case, is by no means secondary. “It is necessary to convey to the target audience the message that culture is an important factor in the recovery of the national economy, in particular, its innovative potential. Statesmen must realize that cultural policy is as important a component of modernization as economic policy” (Valevskyi, 2013).

State study of the problem. A cultural strategy consideration requires the researcher to define the concept of culture. And here, we are faced with discrepancies in interpretations and approaches, which is associated with the extremely wide semantic loads of this category. Some present culture as a combination of material and spiritual achievements of humanity (Marxist tradition), which leads, among other things, to the separation of culture and civilization (Spengler, 2006), where culture is defined as the spiritual component, and civilization has technological and material characteristics. Other researchers have shifted the responsibility for the definition to the readers (Matarasso & Landry, 1999), but at the same time have also created major cultural policy dilemmas. Similar differences can be found in the identification of ways in which culture interacts with politics, economics: from asserting the absolute dependence and subsidiarity of the cultural sphere concerning economics and politics to the constitution of not only its independent value but also a priority about other human activity forms (Putnam, 1996).

Cultural policy, its objectives, and implementation features were the scientific interest subject of both foreign and domestic researchers (Matarasso & Landry, 1999; Valevskyi, 2013; Davymuka & Fedulova, 2017). With the active introduction of creative industries into the world economy, scientists, politicians, and practitioners have faced the challenges of creating new aesthetics, the interaction of cultural and creative industries policies (Pratt, 2005), and the creation of an experience economy (Pine & Gilmore, 2005). In this context, research is being intensified on the development of both inter-state and intra-state cultural strategies, including Ukrainian cultural strategies (Valevskyi, 2013; Matarasso & Landry, 1999; Pasisnychenko, 2012; Verderame, 2017; Bohutskyi et al., 2007).

Cultural strategies and their innovative potential are considered both as an object through the modern technologies use (Davymuka & Fedulova, 2017) and as a subject through the possibility of deconstructing economics, politics, education, military affairs, etc. (Williams, 2012).

Unresolved issues. The founder and executive chairman of the World Economic Forum in Davos, Klaus Schwab, argues that the 4.0 industry has changed the nature of human-state relations. “The distinction between war and peace, military and peaceful, and even violence and nonviolence (think about cyberwarfare) is becoming unpleasantly blurred” (Schwab, 2016). The dilemma between inclusion in the global economy and politics and a focus on national interests has changed the global development vector. Inter-state and intra-state conflicts are gradually shifting from direct aggressive forms to hybrid wars, information wars, and manipulation using Internet technologies. Thus, it is necessary to look for new grounds for the formation of the modern world order. “Culture in its rich diversity is a source, asset, and inspiration for development. It is the fourth “dimension” or “pillar” of development, together with social, economic, and environmental considerations, as discussed during the Earth Summit (Johannesburg, 2002). Despite this, today it is the most neglected dimension in strategies” (A New Cultural Policy, 2011).

Moreover, there has been little success in establishing universal peace through law and the international judicial system. Consequently, formal means are no longer able, despite modernization, to solve global problems, and finally, the moment comes when it is necessary to turn to the conscious choice of people when peaceful coexistence and polylog are becoming not so much possible as necessary means of building a new world order. It would seem that the ready answer may be an appeal to culture, but cultures are not homogeneous, the holistic principle does not work, and the center and periphery are no longer so unambiguous. What Ulf Gunnars called the “creolization” (hybridization) of the culture took place (Sztompka, 1996). And if there is a need to build a dialogue between cultures, what is the basis for dialogue – universality or uniqueness of culture? And to what extent can a national culture be considered autochthonous if it is no longer tied to a place?

The creation and implementation of cultural strategies face the problem of regulating cultural strategy and cultural policy among themselves. Quite often, cultural policy is formed to the detriment of strategic goals and objectives. In addition, there is a contradiction in the formation of a cultural strategy between its innovative potential (the permanent status of the novelty phenomenon) on the one hand and its long-term focus.

A technological breakthrough in the late 20th and early 21st centuries, which dramatically increased its pace due to the COVID-19, not only provided new opportunities for digitalization, which “is rated as an approach that offers a wide range of opportunities, as a rich set of marketing tools and as a way of visualization and concomitant internationalization” (Davymuka & Fedulova, 2017, p. 56), but also brought culture to new challenges (for example, new forms of communication with cultural product consumers).

The state of postmodern, democratic processes development, including the post-Soviet space, dictates new forms of interaction between an individual, society, and power through the network principles of communication, where the vertical of power and the horizontal, presented by civil society and the individual, are connected.

Despite the innovative potential of culture, which is becoming the mainstream of modern world politics, the attitude towards the cultural sphere as a secondary one is dominant, including the contemporary Ukrainian realities. This is also reflected in the financial indicator such as the percentage of contributions for culture, for example, 0.5% in 2017 (Ministry of Finance of Ukraine, 2017), 0.64% in 2018 (Ministry of Finance of Ukraine, 2018).

2. Purpose and methods

The purpose and research tasks. The purpose of the article is to identify, based on a comprehensive approach, the innovative potential of culture in modern conditions and ways of its realization through cultural strategies and creative industries, both in the universal and Ukrainian context.

Because of this purpose, we see the following tasks:

- undertake a formal-logical analysis of approaches to the concept of “culture”;
- consider culture as a complex open system in the interconnection of its structural elements;
- explore the potential and features of a cultural strategy which is presented as inter-national;
- carry out a comparative analysis of the cultural strategies of Georgia, Estonia, and Ukraine;
- identify the interaction specifics and the conditions for the implementation of inter-ethnic and national cultural strategies and identify the innovative potential of this interaction.

Methodology and methods. The methodological basis of the study is a deconstructive approach. To achieve the goal and its specific objectives, we consider it advisable to refer to the following methods: a system-structural method, a method of formal-logical research, analysis, a comparative method, and a system-thought-activity methodology.

A deconstructive approach through the rejection of metanarratives allows us to constitute the instability of reality in the cultural symbols instability and, in the equalization of opposite elements, create a space of new meanings. A new view of culture forms non-trivial approaches, both to culture analysis and to practical recommendations for its implementation. Formal-logical methods, namely, synthesis, analysis, abstraction: are aimed at working like the basic definitions and a typology of basic concepts and concepts concerning culture and cultural strategies, both in general and in individual countries. The system-structure method allows one to look at culture as an integral system and identify in this system the specifics of interaction between its elements. Attempts to divide culture into parts and then bring all parts together do not allow identifying non-additive features of given integrity, and therefore make it impossible to build an adequate cultural strategy. The comparative method will be used to identify both universal and unique features of the cultural strategies of Georgia, Estonia, and Ukraine. The system-thought-activity methodology allows for the multiplication of the objects of research, both the activities and thinking of the researcher and the participant in cultural processes, and the cultural process itself, which in turn allows for the assimilation and consideration of different points of view and, by bringing them together, using them as a basis for cultural strategy.

Information base. The information base consisted of the works of philosophers, cultural scientists, anthropologists, economists, sociologists, managers, as well as documents and projects of the Ministries of Culture of Estonia, Georgia, the Ministry of Culture and Information Policy of Ukraine, documents of the United Nations (United Nations Development Program, 2016; UNESCO, 2011), regulatory and statistical data of state bodies of Ukraine, analytical Internet-resource.

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Deconstruction of the concept of “culture”

Of all the approaches to the analysis of culture that exist at the moment, we will focus on several, corresponding to the interests and tasks of our research: 1) culture as a collection of the parts of the cultural whole; 2) culture as the

system and structural integrity; 3) the essentialist approach; 4) the constructivist approach.

As for the consideration of culture through a set of parts, which, among other things, is presented in the Law of Ukraine on Culture (Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, 2010): “Culture is the totality of the material and spiritual heritage of a certain human community (ethnos, nation), accumulated, consolidated and enriched over a long period, transmitted from generation to generation, including all types of art, cultural heritage, cultural values, science, education and reflects the level of development of this community” (art. 1, section 1), it remains in trend until today. Moreover, this approach can be represented not only through the allocation of such parts as material and spiritual culture, but also mass and elite culture, the culture of proletariat and bourgeois, etc. Trying to reduce individual qualities or properties to an entire does not give us the idea of culture as integrity. That is, apart from the non-additive features that are inherent to integrity and not only impossible for the reduction but also impossible for objectification. We are faced with functional inflation of the use of this definition. The sum of the parts is not reduced to the whole if the whole is dynamic, complex. Furthermore, culture ambivalence is limited only to consumers, not viewing consumers as creators of a cultural product.

A systems-based structural approach presents a view of the system as defined local integrity, which may exist through internal recharge, internal changes. Culture is considered as a whole, which makes it possible to analyze how it functions and to isolate its essential characteristics from the perspective of the phenomenological approach, within the culture itself, on the other hand, this approach presents culture as closed integrity that is taken out of context concerning different cultures. When such an approach was adopted, it was justified and based on the realistic conditions of culture existence in the 19th and early 20th centuries, because the formation and strengthening of national states took place. This explains the interest in the specifics of the culture of the ethnic group dominating in this state, its traditions, language, and historical past. In modern society, however, when it comes to the global nature of migration, the intermingling of cultures, the emergence of new traditions, and multiculturalism. It is difficult to isolate the system as a separate entity and view it only through its uniqueness, excluding interaction with other systems. Therefore, in this situation, the segmentation inherent in modern society, represented both individually, culturally, and religiously, is creating new flows of interaction and new forms of dialogue. At the same time, new value systems associated with this community are being established, and we can speak of the emergence of new cultural flows that form a common space of culture.

Therefore, it makes sense to complement the system-structure approach with the possibilities of system-thought-activity methodology (Shchedrovitskii, 2014), which takes into account this moment of fixation both unique and universal. Each culture enters the world cultural process, not by its uniqueness, but thanks to universal forms, that is the basis for what is called international law, universal human values or, as in the case of the European Union as a political and economic consolidation, European values. An identity issue and interaction can be resolved through unique forms, and in this sense, a cultural strategy should be built in a completely different way. On the one hand, we must turn to the structure or framework of culture as a system through the fundamental elements selection that make up this framework. On the other hand, consider the system itself as open through interaction with other systems. However, until now, when considering the structure, not its elements (the stable connection of which ensures the system stability) are distinguished, but parts of the system. As structural elements of culture, such fragments as cultural monuments, tourism, education, art are presented. But the structural elements are the people who make up this integrity, as culture consumers and cultural product creators. In this regard, the state efforts, including through cultural strategy, should be aimed at creating a space for the free and transparent interaction between cultural actors in the process of creating, selling, and consuming a cultural product. Concerning the openness of the system itself, we can simultaneously fix both the tradition and the dominance of culture through isolation within our boundaries and its liminality at the moment of contact with other cultures, which provokes culture to self-development and self-identification.

The essentialist approach refers to the consideration of culture through the place or territory to which the subject of the cultural process is linked, which is complemented by traditional economic norms, a system of values, language, religion, etc. Considering the implementation of this approach to the European Union, two types of essentialism are distinguished: the first variant is the particular “concept of the invention of traditions”, where Europeans are considered as a single nation. The second variant is universal – European cultural identity is considered as the highest distinct civilization (Verderame, 2017). Both of these approaches demonstrate the attachment of culture to the place, physical and social space that, in their view, determines the identity and specificity of culture. “However, the attempt to replace “traditional values” with which long centuries of formation of cultural differences of Europe are connected does not make the latter less essentialist in their content. The calls of theorists, on the one hand, to overcome Eurocentrism and the contradictions of national states in the articulation of European identity, relying on cosmopolitan orde-

ring through international law, and on the other hand, again the propaganda and priority of the values of “indigenous” Europe, seem to us contradictory” (Pasisnychenko, 2012, p. 42). There are many comments and complaints about this approach in the scientific discourse (Gupta & Ferguson, 1997; Appadurai, 1988). In particular, this concept “binds” people to a particular area and deprives them of the possibility of self-identification outside it, explaining the necessity of preserving traditions. In this case, the culture loses its dynamism, development, is preserved, and begins to collapse as a whole. On the other hand, this approach does not consider the current situation with the movement of peoples, migration processes, multiculturalism and polyculturalism, relations between the autochthonous population and representatives of other cultures. In addition, the autochthonous population viability is also determined by interethnic marriages, which also provokes the question of what kind of culture and what traditions determine the existence of these individual households, etc. Representatives of the essentialist approach consider cultures as chess figures on the board, which can make moves only on a given trajectory and only on this chessboard.

Modern anthropology has empirically come to the idea of abandoning the essentialist concept of culture, which is viewed as integrity, as a single system, isolated from other systems, and confined to a particular territory. In addition, new technologies have changed attitudes to space by combining real and virtual space, creating social space in virtual form, etc., which also makes it hard to develop an appropriate cultural strategy in this way.

The constructivist approach presents culture as “a social construct created by people in the course of understanding and rethinking their actions, relationships, and environmental realities, including the material world. Culture appears to be a continuous process characterized by dynamics and variability. Individuals in this process act not as objects but as subjects actively participating in the formation, discussion, preservation, or, conversely, transformation of cultural practices, roles, norms, values, etc. As a process of comprehending the surrounding reality, culture also includes the comprehension of the geographical place to which individuals refer themselves” (Tyurikova, 2013, p. 68). There are also several remarks to this approach, primarily related to the assertion of the permanent dynamism or processuality of culture. No matter how we criticize the essentialist approach, it reflects one important feature inherent in culture – this is the presence of constitutive features as a guarantee of the preservation of the traditions in culture. Culture contains an element of conservatism through those objects, ideas, and values that have been established and consolidated

in certain uncodified forms of cultural identification – folklore, ritualism, customs, linguistic features, etc.

Thus, we believe it is quite natural not to choose any one of these approaches but to implement the practice of deconstruction and make it possible, through each of the approaches, to identify those common elements and characteristics of culture that define it today. That is, to identify its structural elements, to consider it as a complex system that has the characteristics of both isolation and openness and which is both dynamic and static.

This new integrated approach is, to some extent, presented in the UNESCO Report “A New Cultural Policy Agenda for Development and Mutual Understanding”. We will focus on some aspects of this agenda, which includes the following components:

1) “Culture is about ways of being, knowing and relating to others; it is through a culture that we give meaning to our lives and develop a sense of who we are” (UNESCO, 2011). Culture is not regarded as a material values list; rather, these values only mediate a person's attitude to himself, his understanding of the world, and ways of self-identification and self-presentation. These are various forms and ways of mastering the world, and therefore how adequately we can solve the problems that are provoked by the ambivalence of culture depends on it, including the success of democratic processes.

2) “Culture is a source of creativity, imagination, and innovation. It is a driving force for new and sustainable designs for life and an asset for economic development” (UNESCO, 2011). In this sense, culture is twofold: on the one hand, it seeks to preserve the traditional forms of existence, description, and understanding of the world and man; on the other, it cannot be preserved unless efforts are directed not only at its reproduction but also at its potential, where the bifurcation points emerge, beyond which it is impossible to develop and maintain the system. Attempts to preserve culture lead to its demise – it is not without reason that in the 20th century, there is a whole cycle of works devoted to the insularity of culture on itself, its cyclicity, the absence of filiation of ideas and meanings, impossibility of interaction between different cultures, etc. (Toynbee, 2003; Spengler, 2006). In this sense, culture can be seen as a whole self-sufficient system, aimed primarily at reproducing itself – hence the idea of isolationism, cultural exclusivity, etc. However, thanks to definite processes in the economy and politics, we are talking about trade with other countries, political interests’ realization, international cooperation. Culture seems to go beyond its exclusiveness. It means that any culture, like any state, entering international processes is obliged to find compromises, which are based, first of all, on single, common for all interaction forms (such as international law norms, democratic principles of functioning).

Thus, interstate, intercultural interaction at the first stages of its implementation is based not on innovations but established principles, interaction forms, thus, in modern conditions based on universal values (for example, common human, common European, common Christian, etc. values). And the innovative potential of culture lies in the single intercultural space creation, where interactions between cultures do not create a set of diverse cultural practices but create a usual space with new meanings. And where is the uniqueness and originality of each culture here? And it manifests itself precisely in the fact that in this space, each culture creates points of bifurcation, which are a potential ready for actualization through contact with other meanings (for example, through national film production, through fashion, music, etc.).

3.2.Cultural strategies innovative potential

“Culture is a source of creativity, imagination, and innovation. It is a driving force for new and sustainable designs for life and an asset for economic development. Therefore, cultural goods and services as vectors of identity, values, and meaning, must not be treated as mere commodities or consumer goods in the face of present-day intense economic and technological change” (UNESCO, 2011). This perception of culture is the ideological basis for the successful functioning of creative industries, the income from which in 2016 amounted to “535.9 billion euros, which is 4.2% of the total GDP of European countries” (Kreativnaya industriya segodnya, 2016).

“In the end, it all comes down to people and values. We need to shape a future that works for all of us by putting people first and empowering them” (Schwab, 2016). In developing a new world order, humanity must find the basis for a new humanism. This is a strategic objective on a global scale. On that basis, each state and alliance of states must formulate a strategy that will regard the human being as the supreme value.

Thus, an integrated approach to culture allows us to consider it as an open space of interaction between people, ethnic groups, nations, and innovation subjects in the economic, political, and ecological spheres. The cultural sphere vertical development can be represented through ideology and the interaction subjects. Through ideology – culture is realized in cultural strategy, cultural strategy can present itself through cultural policy, and cultural policy through creative industries. The state dominates this vertical. However, in an industry of 4.0, the goals and objectives verticality can only be partly justified. That is why in the EU’s cultural strategy, we see the intersection of vertical and horizontal, where horizontal is represented by the interaction between the

state, social organizations, individuals, both at the level of creating a cultural strategy and at the level of its implementation in a specific cultural policy. This horizontal is ensured by a real level of social democratization. Thus, the strategy requires long-term sustainability and innovation. “A strategy is a sequence of actions aimed at achieving predetermined long-term goals and solving current tasks that are in the process of obtaining them under the external environment influence while taking advantage of existing opportunities. The strategy takes into account changes in the external environment that may affect the level of the achievement of the objectives and provide an early and adequate response to them using all available resources” (Lomonosov, 2011, p. 158).

So, as soon as we are moving towards the European Union, which is fixed in the Constitution of Ukraine (1996), the object of our study is the cultural strategy of the European Union, “that focuses on advancing cultural cooperation with partner countries across three main strands: supporting culture as an engine for sustainable social and economic development; promoting culture and intercultural dialogue for peaceful inter-community relations; reinforcing cooperation on cultural heritage” (European Commission, 2016).

The European Commission has published a joint appeal to the European Parliament and the Council of the European Union “Towards an EU strategy for international cultural relations”. “Guiding principles for EU action: 1) promote cultural diversity and respect for human rights; 2) foster mutual respect and inter-cultural dialogue; 3) ensure respect for complementarity and subsidiarity; 4) encourage a cross-cutting approach to culture; 5) promote culture through existing frameworks for cooperation”. The EU uses a variety of geographic frameworks for cooperation and thematic programs for the development of international relations in the field of culture. For example, “Creative Europe Program”, “European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights”, etc. (European Commission, 2016).

So, the cultural strategy of the European Union is based on a cultural space formation, where the interaction subjects are not only members of the European Union, and, thus not only new traditions are formed within the boundaries of this association, but a system open for cooperation is being formed. This makes it possible to mainstream innovative potentials through new actors. Also, this cultural strategy is aimed at forming the structure of the cultural system by providing channels of communication between the elements (individual cultures).

What is a cultural strategy for? First of all, for the implementation of the identification and self-identification process of the cultural whole through the cultural process subjects interaction. Moreover, a cultural strategy creates

the opportunity to strengthen these links to any integrity, whether defined territorially or virtually. In this way, the cultural strategy creates interaction channels between the disparate actors of culture, singling them out as parts of the system which, as a result of the strengthening of these links, form the structures of the cultural whole as a system and itself as the structural elements. The structure, on the other hand, constitutes the framework of culture and makes it possible to solve intercultural problems beyond the limits of power narratives.

We see the following principles of building a cultural strategy: 1) the intersection of vertical and horizontal, both when discussing and when drawing up a cultural strategy; 2) refusal to incorporate concerning the cultural and economic spheres; 3) using both the “problem tree” principle and the rhizome principle; 4) refusal to set specific tasks in the field of culture – the cultural strategy should be aimed at creating space for the implementation of the cultural, creative potential of both an individual and a nation through economic, technological, social tools; 5) the totality of dominant social practices can lead to the destruction of otherness, singularity, therefore, it is necessary to create opportunities for marginal social and cultural practices to realize themselves not only as opposition but also as an alternative.

The innovative potential of cultural strategies is presented by various areas of government activity: in the economy, creative industries not only bring real income but also provide jobs through self-employment. In the political sphere, this is the construction of a polyphonic space for the interaction of different cultures within the state; expansion of the cultural space through identification at different levels – world, European, at the level of an individual state; creating space for the unity of the country through the promotion of cultural and intercultural practices.

The digitalization process, including in the cultural sphere, has influenced the networking nature of the cultural strategy, which has increased its innovative potential, namely: 1) when forming a cultural strategy, the following are included at the level of discussion: the state, civil society, creative groups, and individual citizens; 2) the creation of a cultural product and its distribution also occurs on a network basis through the distribution of a cultural product on various Internet platforms; 3) the “radical empiricism” (Boltanski & Chiapello, 2011, p. 264) of networking in the cultural sphere can be stabilized by a strategy of building informal ties focused on long-term goals. Traditional cultures arise in societies that exist within certain boundaries; they are attached to this space and reproduce themselves through direct contacts and in the same time interval. In contrast, modern cultures cross any specific time and space framework and, thanks to modern technologies in the communication and transport field, “tear space and time”.

Developing a cultural strategy is a process, not a result; in this sense, making decisions process, discussions at various levels is crucial, which solves the problem of building effective communication between different social groups, civic organizations, authorities, etc. “Finally, who should be involved in the process of developing a cultural strategy? According to the well-known maxim, at least two groups of people should be involved in this process: those who should be involved and those who want it. The more people involved in this process, the more legitimate it will be. Active stakeholder support will not allow new governments and administrations to simply reject a strategy that promotes sustainable development and stability in the areas of culture and creativity” (Siil, nd).

Thus, cultural strategy forms the goal and thus sets the vector of movement for cultural policy. A cultural policy can be modified, changing priorities according to time while maintaining a goal-oriented approach. Practical implementation at the present stage of cultural policy is presented through creative and cultural industries (CCI).

3.3. The cultural strategy of Ukraine: challenges and prospects

To determine the specifics of building a cultural strategy in modern Ukraine, let us turn for comparison to the experience of Estonia and Georgia. Both countries withdrew from the Soviet Union, both declared their course to the European Union, Estonia has been a member of the European Union since 2004, and Georgia has experienced aggression from the Russian Federation. We will conduct a comparative analysis of the cultural strategies of Georgia, Estonia, and Ukraine by the following indicators: 1) cultural strategy goal; 2) the main provisions of the cultural policy; 3) income from creative industries.

The objective of the cultural policy (Estonia) “is to form a society that values creativity by maintaining and improving the national identity of Estonia, researching, storing, and transferring cultural memory, and creating favorable conditions for the development of a vital, open, and versatile cultural space and for participating in culture” (Klemen, 2021).

The cultural strategy goal (Georgia) is the creation of “a common, fruitful and creative climate for the development of the society”, where is formed “the contemporary model of the collaboration between government and society, based on public involvement, transparency, and equal partnership. This is the method where the process might be even more important than the document, and it lays the ground to a new, different environment where the decision-making methodology is completely changed; where each participant is equal in its rights and responsibilities; where the document has no particular author,

as it is the product of the society of the country and the objective of this common effort is the well-being of each citizen of the country” (Ministry of Culture and Monuments Protection of Georgia, nd.).

The purpose of the cultural strategy (Ukraine) “is to create conditions for promoting creative activity of citizens and the formation of civil society of European level in Ukraine, which provides for the implementation of political, civil, economic, social and cultural rights of citizens, assimilation and use of new knowledge and technologies, preservation of invaluable cultural and spiritual heritage. The strategy identifies the main areas of activity that should bring the sphere of culture and creativity from the periphery of socio-political interests, providing it with a leading place in the socio-economic development of Ukraine” (Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine, 2016).

Thus, in all states, the aim of the cultural strategy is not to impose an authoritative narrative on the cultural sphere. In Estonia and Georgia, the purpose is to create a single cultural space, a single environment open to all cultural actors. It is through such a public system that innovative breakthroughs are possible. Concerning Ukraine’s cultural strategy, we believe there is a cognitive blur, which consists of transferring the tasks of cultural policy to the sphere of intensions of cultural strategy. The cultural strategy should be aimed at shaping the goal, and the aim can only be the subjects of the cultural process – society, creative class, cultural space, etc. Technological conditions, marketing efforts, and the regulatory framework within which a cultural strategy can be implemented are, in fact, a list of tasks that cultural policies are intended to formulate.

Consequently, the success of a cultural strategy depends both on an accurately formulated goal and on the formulation and implementation of cultural policies. While a cultural strategy defines a long-term purpose, cultural policy is a specific objectives list and steps to achieve the objective.

The main provisions of the Estonian cultural policy are based “on the constitutional aim of ensuring the preservation of the Estonian nation, language, and culture. This objective is viewed as the harmony between the preservation and continuation of culture on the one hand and the innovativeness and openness of culture on the other hand” (Estonian Ministry of Culture, 2016).

The main objectives of cultural policy in Georgia are:

- 1) openness of culture;
- 2) understanding the value of culture through education and research programs;
- 3) transparency in funding;
- 4) affirming the importance of culture in the sustainability of the State and society, including as a source of innovation;
- 5) creating a market for high-quality cultural services (Turmanidze, nd.).

The main provisions of cultural policy in Ukraine are as follows: “As a matter of priority, the state creates conditions for the development of the culture of the Ukrainian nation, indigenous peoples and national minorities of Ukraine; preservation, reproduction, and protection of the historical environment; aesthetic education of citizens, especially children, and youth; expansion of rural cultural infrastructure; protection, promotion, and support of cultural diversity as one of the most important factors of sustainable development of the state” (Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, 2010).

It should be noted that the main features of cultural policy are currently being clarified. But until these changes are legislated, we turn to an analysis of what is available. And, in this case, it is possible to record the difference between cultural strategy and cultural policy towards Ukraine. These discrepancies are represented not so much by a description of the conditions, by the mechanisms' clarification that can ensure the implementation of cultural policies, but by a listing of the objects targeted by unknown mechanisms. Moreover, the state is the sole subject of cultural policy, which equally does not contribute to single cultural space creation, an open cultural system that makes it difficult to promote innovation. “The implementation of the Strategy should provide, on the one hand, the formation of an integrated national cultural space filled with a competitive cultural product, on the other hand – the preservation of cultural heritage as a resource for consolidation and spiritual progress of society” (Valevskyi, 2013).

The “creative industries” concept, thanks to the development of technologies, entered the modern lexicon in the 90-es years of the 20th century. In the documents of the European Union, it is customary to use the concept of “creative and cultural industries (CCI)”. “Creative industries are developing effectively and fit into the traditional economy, for example, they now account for 7% of the world’s gross domestic product, with an annual growth rate of 10%. This area is growing faster than production and the market for services. It provides jobs for 8.3 million EU citizens, which makes it an effective economic model for self-employment” (Davymuka & Fedulova, 2017, p. 11).

Creative and cultural industries (CCI) are rapidly entering the world economy, transforming it into an impressive economy that is becoming the fourth economic supply along with raw materials, goods, and services (Pine & Gilmore, 2005).

In Estonia, 5% of the population is engaged in creative industries; 11.4% of companies are the creative business (Yuzych, 2015). The cultural sector in Georgia accounts for 3 percent of GDP. “Globally, Ukraine has great potential for developing creative industries. Thus, according to the Global Creativity Index, Ukraine ranks forty-fifth out of 139 countries. The Creativity Index

measures countries by three key indicators: technology, talent, and tolerance” (Valevskyi, 2018). “It is estimated that in 2017, out of 16.4 million working citizens in Ukraine, about 470 thousand people (2.8%) were involved in the creative economy. They brought the country about 105 billion hryvnias, which is about 4.4% of GDP” (Valevskyi, 2018).

The cultural policy of Ukraine lags behind practice, the country receives income from creative industries, and the concept of “creative industries” in the “Law on Culture” appears only in 2018, the “creative product” concept – in 2020 (Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, 2010).

Thus, we can observe a significant gap between cultural strategy, cultural policy, and the CCI. We can state the absence of both the vertical in the organization of the cultural space through modern management technologies (in this case, the state does not fulfill its function), and the horizontal, presented by the lack of effective communication between the state, civil society, and the creators of the cultural product.

However, there has been a recent effort on the part of the Ministry of Culture and Information Policy, both in understanding the role of culture and the need to create innovative cultural space through concrete steps. Speaking on March 10, 2021, at the opening of the second day of the All-Ukrainian Forum “Ukraine 30. Culture. Media. Tourism” the Minister of Culture and Information Policy, Alexander Tkachenko, stated that culture “creates social innovation, unites communities, eliminates indifference and fear for good and self-fulfillment. MCIP will work to ensure that the ecosystem of culture and creative industries create sustainable opportunities, resilient networks and alternative models of interaction, and already in 2025 the weight, authority, and influence of culture in Ukraine became unconditional” (Ministry of Culture and Information Policy of Ukraine, 2021). And, soon, we will be able to see how the words do not diverge from the deed because, in 2021-2023, it is planned to launch national projects of digital transformation in the sphere of culture and tourism – e-Heritage, e-Art, e-Tourism, e-Book. This can be a powerful push to create a single cultural space open to innovation and inclusion of both producers and consumers of the cultural product.

Terry Sandell, Head of the EU-Eastern Partnership Culture and Creativity Programme, among the problems faced by the Eastern Partnership countries, including Ukraine, named the following:

- 1) an outdated understanding of culture that is based on 19th-century concepts and does not reflect present-day realities;
- 2) problems with the formation of state cultural policy associated with a lack of marketing management skills;

3) information vacuum concerning cultural and creative industries (Priorities of cultural and creative development in Ukraine, 2015).

Of course, these problems are serious obstacles to the implementation of cultural policy, but they are mainly related to the role and functions of power institutions. It is therefore necessary to clarify the following:

1) the state can and should introduce and ensure transparent and understandable mechanisms for the functioning of cultural and creative industries in a democratic legal framework, creating equal opportunities for all cultural actors;

2) a priori, the formation and implementation of cultural policies should not be confined to State institutions. As long as such practices continue, we will not be able to create a single cultural space where both the State and the citizen have an equal interest in cultural activities;

3) it is necessary to engage in advocacy for the role of culture and creative industries, demonstrating their innovative potential both at the national, regional, and individual levels.

There are, of course, a considerable number of problems and challenges for Ukraine today. The predominant challenge, however, lies in building our national meanings, which can consolidate society mentally. And in this process, the role of culture and an adequately articulated cultural strategy, with unvalued innovative potential, becomes a priority.

4. Conclusions

So, analyzing the innovative potential of cultural strategies in both the global and Ukrainian contexts, we have come to the following conclusions:

1. An integrated approach to culture makes it possible to view it as an open space for interaction between people, ethnic groups, and nations that are the subjects of economic, political, and environmental innovation. The innovation potential of culture lies in the complex system creation in which cultural actors are the building blocks, whose interactions do not create a set of diverse cultural practices but create a single space, permanently initiating new meanings.

2. The innovation potential of culture lies in the equal interaction of vertical and horizontal linkages. The vertical through state institutions represents information and legal support. In addition, a cultural ideology is being developed at the national level through a cultural strategy and its concretization in cultural policy. However, in the industry context 4.0, the vertical setting of goals and targets can only be partially justified. That is why we see in the European Union's cultural strategy the intersection of verticals and horizons, where the horizontal is represented by the interaction between the state, social organizations, individuals, as in the creation of a cultural strategy and its implementation in specific cultural policies.

3. A cultural strategy is necessary for both identification and self-identification of the cultural whole, for the creation of the elements of culture as a system, and the establishment of links between these elements. The structure of culture as a system forms its framework and makes it possible to solve intercultural problems. The main principles of building a cultural strategy are refusal to incorporate – concerning the cultural sphere and the economic sphere; refusal from setting specific tasks in the field of culture – a cultural strategy should be aimed at creating a space for the realization of the cultural, creative potential of both an individual and a nation through economic, technological, social instruments; leveling the totality of dominant cultural practices to the opposition and alternative cultural industries.

4. The cultural policies innovation potential is represented by the various State activities: in the economy, creative industries not only generate real income but also provide jobs through self-employment. In the political sphere – the construction of a polyphonic space for the interaction of different cultures within the state; the expansion of cultural space through identification at different levels – world, European and at the level of a single state; creating a space for national unity through the promotion of cultural and intercultural practices.

5. The process of digitalization, including in the cultural sphere, has influenced the networking nature of the cultural strategy, enhancing its innovative potential by limiting the power narrative, creating a multiplicity of ties and flows of interaction, information transparency in decision-making, implementation of cultural projects and the customization of cultural products.

6. A comparative analysis of cultural strategies and policies in Estonia, Georgia, and Ukraine identified problems in the cultural sphere management of Ukraine. The gap between cultural strategy, cultural policy, cultural and creative industries, both in theory and practice, has been identified; vertical dominance in the discussion and formulation of cultural strategy and cultural policy; insufficient attention to the economic potential of the cultural sector. We believe that these problems have arisen as a result of irrelevant approaches and understanding of culture in general and cultural strategy in particular. To overcome the current situation, we consider it appropriate to refer to the experience of European countries and to place it in the specific Ukrainian context.

The scientific novelty. The scientific novelty of the study is presented by a new approach to the structure of culture, which includes not institutions of different ranks, but two main elements: creators and consumers of the cultural product, which in the process of both creation and consumption intersect, initiating the constitution of a single cultural space. It is through this approach to the concept and phenomenon that we can identify the innovative potential of both culture itself and cultural strategies in today's realities. A properly

formulated cultural strategy of Ukraine and its implementation through cultural policy and the development of creative industries in difficult political, economic, and cultural conditions can serve both to consolidate society and to solve economic problems.

The significance of the study. The practical significance of the results is the creation of a new modern approach to the content of culture, presentation of the innovative potential of culture and cultural strategy, innovative opportunities of creative industries. In addition, a comparative analysis of cultural strategies and cultural policies revealed both problems in Ukraine's cultural policy and ways of addressing them.

Prospects for further research. The prospects for further research on this topic are seen in the mechanisms' development for the analysis of the cultural system and the specific cultural strategies formation, both nationally and regionally, and their implementation into the real cultural space.

Acknowledgement

This publication was prepared under the scientific research theme of the Department of Psychology, Political Science and Socio-Cultural Technologies of the Sumy State University in the context of the topic "Interdisciplinary Research of the Modern Society Development Aspects" (Project No. 01164007770).

References:

- Appadurai, A. (1988). Putting Hierarchy in Its Place. *Cultural Anthropology*, 3(1), 36-49, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1525/can.1988.3.1.02a00040>.
- Bohutskyi, Yu. P., Andrushchenko, V. P., Bezvershuk, Zh. O., & Novokhatko, L. M. (2007). *Ukrainska Kultura v Yevropeiskomu Konteksti [Ukrainian Culture in the European Context]*. Kyiv: Znannia (in Ukr.).
- Boltanski, L., & Chiapello, E. (2011). *Novyi Duh Kapitalizma [The New Spirit of Capitalism]* (Trans. in Fr.). Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie (in Russ.).
- Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine (2016, February 1). *Pro Skhvalennia Dovhostrokovoi Stratehii Rozvytku Ukrainiskoi Kultury – Stratehii Reform [On Approval of the Long-Term Strategy of Development of the Ukrainian Culture – Strategy of Reforms]*, Retrieved from <https://www.kmu.gov.ua/npas/248862610> (in Ukr.).
- Cooley, A., & Nexon, D. H. (2021, March 26). *The Illiberal Tide: Why the International Order Is Tilting Toward Autocracy*, Retrieved from <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/united-states/2021-03-26/illiberal-tide>.
- Davymuka, S. A., & Fedulova, L. I. (2017). *Kreatyvnyi Sektor Ekonomiky: Dosvid ta Napriamy Rozbudovy [Creative Sector of the Economy: Experience and Directions of Development]*. Lviv: Instytut rehionalnykh doslidzhen imeni M. I. Dolishnoho NAN Ukrainy (in Ukr.).

- Estonian Ministry of Culture (2016). *Estonia 2016 Report*. Paris: UNESCO, Retrieved from <https://en.unesco.org/creativity/governance/periodic-reports/2016/estonia>.
- European Commission (2016). *Towards an EU Strategy for International Cultural Relations*. Brussels: European Commission, Retrieved from <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52016JC0029&from=EN>.
- Girenok, F. I. (2016). *Klipovoe Soznanie [Clip Consciousness]*. Moscow: Prospekt (in Russ.).
- Gupta, A., & Ferguson, J. (1997). Culture, Power, Place: Ethnography at the End of an Era. *Culture, Power, Place: Exploration in Critical Anthropology*. London; Durham: Duke University Press, 1-29.
- Klemen, A. (2021, February, 23). *The General Principles of the Cultural Policy Up to 2020*, Retrieved from <https://naple.eu/mdocs-posts/the-general-principles-of-the-cultural-policy-up-to-2020/>.
- Kreativnaya Industriya Segodnya [The Creative Industry Today] (2016). *Think Creative, Spring*, 2-3, Retrieved from https://canon.a.bigcontent.io/v1/static/636899603128963291MK_think_guides_03_ru (in Russ.)
- Lomonosov, D. A. (2011). Sutnist Poniattia "Stratehiia" ta Yoho Vidminnosti vid Taktyky y Operatyvnykh Dii [Conception of the Strategy and Its Differences from the Tactics and Operational Actions]. *Ekonomichni Innovatsii [Economic Innovations]*, 45, 156-160 (in Ukr.).
- Lyotard, J.-F. (2013). *Sostoyanie Postmoderna [Postmodern State]* (Trans. in Fr.). St. Petersburg: Aleteiya (in Russ.).
- Matarasso, F., & Landry, Ch. (1999). *Balancing Act: Twenty-One Strategic Dilemmas in Cultural Policy*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.
- Ministry of Culture and Information Policy of Ukraine (2021, March 10). *Oleksandr Tkachenko Vidkryv Druhyi Den Forumu "Ukraina 30. Kultura. Media. Turyzm" [Oleksandr Tkachenko Opened the Second Day of the Forum "Ukraine 30. Culture. Media. Tourism"]*, Retrieved from <https://mkip.gov.ua/news/5138.html> (in Ukr.)
- Ministry of Culture and Monuments Protection of Georgia (n.d.). *7 Key Moments from Georgian Cultural Strategy Development Process*, Retrieved from <https://www.culturepartnership.eu/en/article/7-important-details-culture>.
- Ministry of Finance of Ukraine (2017). *Vydatky Derzhavnoho Biudzhetu Ukrainy v 2017 r. [Expenditures of the State Budget of Ukraine in 2017]*, Retrieved from <https://index.minfin.com.ua/ua/finance/budget/gov/expense/2017/> (in Ukr.)
- Ministry of Finance of Ukraine (2018). *Vydatky Derzhavnoho Biudzhetu Ukrainy v 2018 r. [Expenditures of the State Budget of Ukraine in 2018]*, Retrieved from <https://index.minfin.com.ua/ua/finance/budget/gov/expense/2018/> (in Ukr.)

- Pasisnychenko, A. V. (2012). Formuvannia Yevropeiskoi Identychnosti: mizh Kulturnym Esentsializmom ta Sotsialnym Konstruktivizmom [Formation of European Identity: between Cultural Essentialism and Social Constructivism]. *Visnyk Kharkivskoho Natsionalnoho Universytetu imeni V. N. Karazina. Seriya "Sotsiologichni Doslidzhennia Suchasnoho Suspilstva: Metodolohiia, Teoriia, Metody"* [Visnyk of V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University. Series "Sociological Studies of Contemporary Society: Methodology, Theory, Methods"], 29, 38-43 (in Ukr.).
- Pine, B. J., & Gilmore, J. H. (2005). *Ekonomika Vpechatlenii: Rabota – Eto Teatr, a Kazhdyi Biznes – Stseni* [The Experience Economy: Work Is Theater and Every Business a Stage] (Trans. in Eng.). Moscow: Williams (in Russ.).
- Pratt, A. C. (2005). Cultural Industries and Public Policy: An Oxymoron? *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 11(1), 31-44, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10286630500067739>.
- Priorytety Razvitiya Kul'turnykh i Kreativnykh Industrii v Ukraine [Priorities of Development of Cultural and Creative Industries in Ukraine] (2015). Retrieved from <https://www.culturepartnership.eu/article/otkritaya-sessiya-prioryteti-razvitiya-kuljturnih-i-kreativnih-industrii--pres> (in Russ.).
- Putnam, R. (1996). *Chtbody Demokratiya Srobotala: Grazhdanskie Traditsii v Sovremennoi Italii* [Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy] (Trans. in Eng.). Moscow: Ad Marginem (in Russ.).
- Robertson, R. (1994). Globalisation or Glocalisation? *The Journal of International Communication*, 1(1), 33-52, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13216597.1994.9751780>.
- Schwab, K. (2016, January 14). The Fourth Industrial Revolution: What It Means, How to Respond, Retrieved from <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2016/01/the-fourth-industrial-revolution-what-it-means-and-how-to-respond/>.
- Shchedrovitskii, G. (2014). *Orgupravlencheskoe Myshlenie: Ideologiya, Metodologiya, Tekhnologiya* [Organizational Thinking: Ideology, Methodology, Technology]. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Studii Artemiya Lebedeva (in Russ.).
- Siiil, R. (2017). *Kurs zi Stvorennia Kulturnoi Stratehii* [Course on Creating a Cultural Strategy], Retrieved from <https://www.culturepartnership.eu/ua/publishing/cultural-strategy/lecture-11-1> (in Ukr.).
- Spengler, O. (2006). *Zakat Evropy. Ocherki Morfologii Mirovoi Istorii: Geshtal't i Deistvitel'nost'* [Sunset of Europe. Essays on the Morphology of World History: Gestalt and Reality] (Trans. in Germ.). Moscow: Eksmo (in Russ.).
- Sztompka, P. (1996). *Sotsiologiya Sotsial'nykh Izmenenii* [The Sociology of Social Change] (Trans. in Eng.). Moscow: Aspekt Press (in Russ.).
- Toynbee, A. J. (2003). *Tsivilizatsiya pered Sudom Istorii* [Civilization before the Judgment of History] (Trans. in Eng.). Moscow: Airis-press (in Russ.).
- Turmanidze, S. (n.d.). *5 Lessons Learnt from Consultations on Georgia's Culture Strategy 2025*, Retrieved from <https://www.culturepartnership.eu/en/article/5-lessons-learnt-from-consultations-on-georgias-culture-strategy-2025>.

- Tyurikova, I. I. (2013). Kontsepty "Kul'tura" i "Mesto" v Essentsialistskoi i Konstruktivistskoi Paradigmakh Etnokul'turnykh Issledovaniu [The Concepts of "Culture" and "Place" in Essentialist and Constructivist Paradigms of Ethnocultural Studies]. *Vestnik Severnogo (Arkticheskogo) Federal'nogo Universiteta. Seriya "Gumanitarnye i Sotsial'nye Nauki" [Vestnik of Northern (Arctic) Federal University. Series "Humanitarian and Social Sciences"]*, 1, 65-69 (in Russ.).
- UNESCO (2011). *A New Cultural Policy Agenda for Development and Mutual Understanding: Key Arguments for a Strong Commitment to Cultural Diversity and Intercultural Dialogue*. Paris: UNESCO, Retrieved from <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000214747>.
- United Nations Development Programme (2016). *Human Development Report 2016*. Washington: Communications Development Incorporated, Retrieved from http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/2016_human_development_report.pdf.
- Valevskiy, O. L. (2013). *Aktualni Problemy Formuvannia Derzhavnoi Kulturnoi Polityky [Actual Problems of Formation of the State Cultural Policy]*, Retrieved from <http://old2.niss.gov.ua/articles/1429/> (in Ukr.).
- Valevskiy, O. L. (2018). *Aktualni Problemy Realizatsii Derzhavnoi Polityky u Sferi Rozvytku Kreatyvnykh i Kulturnykh Industrii [Current Problems of Implementation of the State Policy in the Sphere of Development of Creative and Cultural Industries]*, Retrieved from http://old2.niss.gov.ua/content/articles/files/111AZ_Walevskiy_-07092018-0b9aa.pdf (in Ukr.).
- Verderame, D. (2017). Strategies for a Cultural Europe Framing and Representing the Europe-Culture Nexus in a Local Context. *Politique Européenne*, 56(2), 54-77, doi: <https://doi.org/10.3917/poeu.056.0054>.
- Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine (1996, June 28). *Konstytutsiia Ukrainy [The Constitution of Ukraine]*, Retrieved from <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/254%D0%BA/96-%D0%B2%D1%80#Text> (in Ukr.).
- Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine (2010, December 14). *Zakon Ukrainy "Pro Kulturu" [Law of Ukraine "On Culture"]*, Retrieved from <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2778-17#Text> (in Ukr.).
- Williams, R. (2012). *Bazis i Nadstroika v Marksistskoi Teorii Kul'tury [Base and Superstructure in Marxist Cultural Theory]* (Trans. in Eng.). *Logos [The Logos]*, 1(85), 136-156 (in Russ.).
- Yuzych, M. (2015, September 28). *Ukrainskaya Ekonomika kak Startup [Ukrainian Economy as a Startup]*. *Den [Day]*, Retrieved from <https://m.day.kyiv.ua/ru/article/ekonomika/ukrainskaya-ekonomika-kak-startup> (in Russ.).

Information about the Authors:

Tetiana Kozyntseva, Assoc. Professor, PhD, Sumy State University, 2, Rimsky-Korsakov St., Sumy 40007, Ukraine; e-mail: tatakozyntseva@gmail.com; orcid id: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5853-5732> (corresponding author)

Andrii Synakh, Assoc. Professor, PhD, Sumy State University, Sumy, Ukraine; e-mail: adam-leviafun@i.ua; orcid id: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8699-3781>

Irina Dulebova, Assoc. Professor, PhD, Comenius University in Bratislava, Bratislava, Slovakia; e-mail: irina.dulebova@uniba.sk; orcid id: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8916-1617>