

PRACTICAL ASPECTS OF SOCIO-CULTURAL MANAGEMENT

Socio-Cultural Management Journal

Volume 4 (2021), Number 2, pp. 143-156

doi: <https://doi.org/10.31866/2709-846x.2.2021.246759>

p-ISSN 2709-846X, e-ISSN 2709-9571

Original Research Article

© N. Mohylevska, 2021

UDC: 316.7:32]:061.1ЄC"20"

JEL Classification: L88, M38, Z18

Received: 23/09/2021

Nataliia Mohylevska

Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts, Kyiv, Ukraine

European Cultural Policy of Organization of the 21st Century Socio-Cultural Sphere

Abstract: *Introduction.* The last two decades are signed with culture meaning increase as one of the strategic priorities of the social and economic development of the EU related to the consolidation of common cultural space, management of socio-cultural activities, and development of “European citizens” identity under cross-cultural dialogue. Currently, the critical enabler of this cultural policy is special programmes. The application of the main principles of these programmes in real has been the key instrument of the European regional policy for last years. *Purpose and methods.* The purpose of the article is to cover the main tendencies and areas of concern of the European cultural policy based on comparative analysis of the cultural programme of the second generation. In the course of the research, the author has used the comparative, sociological, structural and functional, activity and situational-critical methods, with the help of which the features of the functioning of the above programmes were characterised. *Results.* Today the EU cultural policy implementation is via the prolonged “Creative Europe Programme 2021-2027” which, in comparison with other cultural programmes, is more structured and differs in an integrated approach to the organisation of the socio-cultural sphere, has incorporated all the implemented cultural and media programmes over the previous 20 years. *Conclusions.* In the article, there is the first analysis of the difference between the selected programmes in the context of verifying the thesis about the continuity of the programme's principles of the EU cultural policy at the present stage, as well as the objective trend of turning cultural policy into one of the main directions of European domestic policy for the development of the socio-cultural sphere.

Keywords: EU, cultural policy, cultural programme, cultural space, management of socio-cultural activities, comparative analysis.

1. Introduction

The problem formulation. Today the European Union (hereinafter referred to as the EU) still has a strong interest, as it has since its founding, in removing barriers between member states and in actively cooperating with them, including in the field of culture. Moreover, this interest has only grown over time, and the recognition that the socio-cultural sphere is an integral part of pan-European and national policy has deepened. Brussels realises that without cultural exchange between EU members, integration processes are slowed down and deformed, affecting competitiveness, innovative and creative potential development, and consequently, European-wide welfare (Belyaeva, 2012, p. 7).

The Consolidated version of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union laid the first serious steps towards settling EU cultural policy in the 1980s, underpinning economic and political cooperation. These include the decision to create European Transnational Cultural Routes (Cultural policy of the EU), the establishment of an annual European Capital of Culture, the agreement on special conditions for young people attending museums and cultural events, and the signing of the Maastricht Treaty in 1992, which established the preservation and promotion of the cultural diversity and identity of the member states as the main objective of the Cultural Policy of the EU.

During the 1990s, the European regional cultural policy was based on three main programmes, namely, ARIANE, KALEIDOSCOPE and RAPHAEL, subsequently merged to form Culture 2000, initially for 2000-2004 and later extended for 2005-2006. Among the key goals of this programme were preserving and enhancing European cultural heritage, supporting transnational cultural cooperation between the regions and institutions of the EU Member States, with a budget of €236.5 million. After this programme reached its full deadline, it was succeeded by the €400 million Culture 2007-2013 and the €1.46 billion Creative Europe Programme 2014-2020, which has significantly increased its funding to €1.46 billion (Bruell, 2013). The latter programmes and the practical implementation of their main provisions have proved to be key instruments of the EU regional cultural policy over the last 15 years, influencing the current situation in this area. Therefore, they become a relevant area of research within the framework of the latest EU globalisation trends and Ukraine's Euro-integration course, where cultural policy is also an important reference point in organising the socio-cultural sphere.

State study of the problem. An analysis of the literature (programmatic and academic) on this subject convinces us that, for many reasons, the cultural policy of the EU is a controversial and ambiguous issue that requires a comprehensive approach to its solution. For member states and more autonomous

regional authorities, culture is a susceptible policy area that is crucial for their national identity. Most researchers dealing with this subject do not perceive culture as a 'peripheral area' of politics, as evidenced by the ever-growing number of references in various official documents and statements by EU politicians, who firmly state that culture is an important element of the EU process.

Various aspects of the formation and development of the EU cultural policy in the new millennium appear in the works of such authors as L. Bache and S. George (2006), who reveal the historical and theoretical context, and the institutional foundations of European policy at the present stage; P. Dewey (2008) offers in her article an 'analytical compass' to assist researchers and practitioners trying to navigate the maze of the European cultural policy, and also analyses the EU's transnational cultural policymaking processes; C. Gordon, R. Fisher and D. Klaić (2007). analyses the European Commission Communication "The European Agenda for a Globalising Culture in the World"; H. E. Näss (2010) examines in detail the background and content of the cultural programme 2007-2013, with a particular focus on the issue of intercultural dialogue, which is certainly reflected in the organisation of the socio-cultural sphere; D. Helly and G. Galeazzi (2016) in their information note looks at culture in the context of EU development policy; K. Mattocks (2017) explores the Cultural policy of the EU in terms of its management, and seeks to argue that the study of cultural policy can benefit from a more thorough institutional analysis; T. Lähdesmäki and K. Mäkinen (2019) suggests looking at the cultural policy through European meanings and values that organise the socio-cultural sphere in the right direction for the EU.

Unresolved issues. While reviewing existing studies on the cultural policy of the EU, it is important to note that much of what has happened over the past decade actually has deeper origins in the history of the European cultural policy. Such a thesis confirms the fact that the development of the cultural policy of the EU is a slow but continuous process, characterised rather by gradual changes and careful adjustments than by sudden changes. It is not enough to treat the policy as if it exists in a vacuum to understand how it has evolved over the past 10-15 years. To comprehend the latest developments in the cultural policy of the EU, in our opinion, it is necessary to reconstruct its advancement and continuity on the example of such basic programme documents as "Culture 2007-2013" and "Creative Europe 2014-2020", which allows the researcher to reveal not only the motives of current political trends and events in the cultural space of Europe but also the priorities and logic of the European cultural policy in the organisation of the socio-cultural sphere of the 21st century.

It is important to note that none of those mentioned above problematic issues has been adequately covered within the Ukrainian cultural discourse.

2. Purpose and methods

The purpose and research tasks. The purpose of the article is to reveal the main trends and problematic aspects of the cultural policy of the EU in organising the socio-cultural sphere in the 21st century, based on a comparative analysis of second-generation cultural programmes.

Research objectives:

- analyse the main directions of the “Culture 2007-2013” programme, pointing out the problematic issues related to the organisation of the socio-cultural sphere;
- reveal the background to the emergence of the Creative Europe Programme;
- consider the main directions of the “Creative Europe 2014-2020” programme extended to 2027 and the prospects for the organisation of the socio-cultural sphere.

Methodology and methods. The methodological basis of the study is an interdisciplinary approach involving the examination of the European cultural policy through the prism of different sciences: cultural studies, political science, sociology, psychology, economics, and management of social and cultural activities. It makes it possible to examine European cultural policy as a multifaceted phenomenon, identify the interconnections and interdependencies between its components, and suggest ways of implementing it in the EU member states.

In carrying out the study, we applied the comparative method to analyse the European Cultural Programmes 2007-2013 and 2014-2020, their objectives and directions; the structural-functional method, which identifies differences in the normative parts of programmes, thereby revealing the linkage between them; the sociological method, which reveals the mutual influence of the cultural policy and social and cultural environment in Europe; the activity-based method allows us to analyse the process of preparing and implementing decisions at the level of EU supranational structures, culminating in the approval of these programmes and the embodiment of an objective trend, namely, the strengthening of supranational approaches in solving integration tasks; the critical and situational method, the appropriateness of which lies in the need to analyse the contradictions and difficulties in the implementation of the cultural policy of the EU.

Information base. The information base for this study was provided by the programmes themselves and by legal instruments (Culture 2007-2013 and Creative Europe 2014-2020, European Parliament and Council decisions, European Commission working papers, etc.), internet resources, academic sources, and the author's observations.

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Main areas of the Culture Programme 2007-2013 related to the organisation of the socio-cultural sphere

On 14 July 2004, the European Commission published its proposal for a new programme to replace Culture 2000. After a long process that was significantly delayed due to the problematic negotiations on the EU financial prospects for 2007-2013, the European Parliament and Council finally took up the issue, which resulted in the new Culture 2007-2013 programme that entered into force on 28 December 2006. The general objective of the programme, as stated in the decision, is “to extend the cultural territory of Europeans on the basis of common cultural heritage by promoting cultural cooperation between creators, cultural players and cultural institutions of the countries participating in the Programme to foster the emergence of a European citizenship” (European Union, 2006). In addition, the programme presents three specific objectives: enhancing the mobility of artists and other professionals in the process of organising the socio-cultural sphere, promoting the circulation of works of art, and supporting intercultural dialogue and exchange.

The programme is available to all cultural sectors and all categories of cultural workers from all Member States as well as third countries. It consists of three separate but interlinked activities.

The first covers most of the activities previously carried out under the Culture 2000 programme and provided financial support for various cultural activities (multi-year cooperation projects lasting from 3 to 5 years involving partners from at least six countries; supporting sectoral and cross-sectoral cooperation, with a particular focus on innovative and/or experimental projects; support for special large-scale events, e.g., European Conference on Optical Communication (ECOC), etc.). Such campaigns should “resonate with the peoples of Europe and enhance their sense of belonging to the same community, make them aware of the cultural diversity of the Member States, and promote intercultural and international dialogue”, together with raising the profile of the socio-cultural sphere within the EU and beyond its borders, which promotes “a global awareness of the richness and diversity of European culture” (European Union, 2006).

The second direction of the programme makes up the largest part of its assistance to organisations operating at the European level in the cultural sector. Under this area, multi-annual grants are awarded to organisations that promote European cultural cooperation or pursue common European interests in this area. This form of support aims to provide an opportunity for European organisations involved in the ongoing promotion of culture, to act as cultural ambassadors

who have considerable experience in organising the socio-cultural sphere and are committed to sharing this experience (Commission of the European Communities, 2004). It is noted that they should complement the activities of the first direction, thus promoting European cultural cooperation outside the project.

The third direction supports the provision of analysis and information on cultural cooperation. It provides funding for Cultural Contact Points, which are responsible for promoting and disseminating practical information about the programme at the national level, for various cultural cooperation studios, and for developing the European cultural policy. This direction aims to remove practical obstacles to cooperation, thus creating an enabling environment for the latter (Commission of the European Communities, 2004).

Overall, this cultural programme was designed to go beyond the 2000 project and offer “a coherent, comprehensive and inclusive instrument to promote multilateral cultural cooperation in Europe, which pays tribute to its complexity” (Commission of the European Communities, 2004). It abolishes the sectoral approach, recognised as counterproductive, which allows cultural agents to propose cross-sectoral projects and promotes integrated multidisciplinary projects in the organisation of the socio-cultural sphere. In addition, the programme pays more attention to the development of long-term projects and those implemented in parallel by several countries to enhance the image of the EU beyond its borders.

The content and objectives of the programme are also slightly different from Culture 2000. All participants in the discussion agreed on two points: firstly, that the new programme is primarily needed to stimulate cooperation through support for projects and exchanges, as was the case with Culture 2000, and therefore there is no point in abandoning the main directions, and secondly, the eight objectives were considered too ambitious, especially given the limited financial resources, and also, as general experience shows, ambiguous enough to be used in the application process. To deal with this problem, the Commission has reduced the number of objectives to three: to facilitate the transnational mobility of players in the organisational of the socio-cultural sphere, encourage the transnational circulation of art and other cultural and artistic products, and promote intercultural dialogue. The first two replace the second specific objective of Culture 2000, omitting the focus on youth and disadvantaged groups and cultural diversity, while the third objective of the new programme has replaced the goals of promoting cultural dialogue and mutual learning in Europe and promoting intercultural dialogue and mutual exchange with non-European countries.

3.2. The background to the Creative Europe Programme

The Culture 2007-2013 programme was controversially welcomed by the cultural sector, causing much resentment over the level of funding as well as the lack of additional opportunities for activities of smaller organisations. In terms of the changes made to the objectives, there was particular dissatisfaction with the removal of explicit references to heritage conservation from the objectives, arguing that the three objectives were only relevant to cultural creation and therefore creating doubt among many cultural players as to whether their sector was eligible to participate in the programme. The reduction in objectives was also criticised by the European Arts and Heritage Forum (EFAH) (European Forum for the Arts and Heritage (EFAH)), which highlighted that the Commission had apparently fallen into the trap of “narrowing objectives to the EU’s obvious area of competence, mobility” (European Commission, 2004). Although EFAH agrees with the programme’s intention to focus on the mobility of artists, it points out that this should not be a goal. Regarding the third objective, support for intercultural dialogue and exchange, the forum concluded that this is “too diffuse and therefore potentially overarching a proposal” (European Commission, 2004). Intercultural dialogue means nothing and commits no one to anything.

Furthermore, EFAH noted that the programme is not about a clear choice of objectives. Instead, the Commission’s proposal refers to a range of objectives. The socio-cultural sphere should be a tool, such as citizenship, belonging, identity, external visibility, international cultural influence, inclusion, integration, and equality. EFAH is particularly critical of the fact that the programme looks more like an EU public relations tool than a cultural policy tool (Service Centre for International Cultural Activities, 2004). The German cross-cultural programme also expressed concern that the new objectives are formulated in such general terms and in such a misleading way that only “European added value” is thereby provided. The objectives seem to be less about cultural cooperation or exchange and more about cultural exports (Gray, 2007, p. 211).

The general attitude of the cultural players towards Culture Programme 2007-2013 is a better version of Culture 2000, and most organisations were satisfied with the reduced objectives, which seems to have given more clarity to the programme. However, it can be concluded that it does not stray too far from the previous document in both objectives and approach.

Following the expiry of Culture 2007-2013 on 19 November 2013, the European Parliament approved, and the European Council adopted a new Creative Europe Programme 2014-2020 document on 3 December the same year, coming into force on 1 January 2014 (European Union, 2013). 650 MEPs voted for it. In November 2020, the Programme was extended for another seven years

(2021-2027), and its budget increased to €2.44 billion. It invests in activities aimed at strengthening cultural diversity and the socio-cultural sphere as a whole and responding to the needs and challenges of the cultural and creative sectors, driven by the challenges of the times.

Key objectives of the Creative Europe Programme:

(a) protection, development, and promotion of the cultural and linguistic diversity of Europe and its cultural heritage;

(b) strengthening the competitiveness and economic potential of the European cultural and creative sectors, particularly the audio-visual sector.

Innovation should contribute to the recovery of these sectors, reinforcing their efforts to become more inclusive, digitised, and environmentally sustainable.

The example of the Creative Europe Programme shows how the succession mechanism works in part because it incorporates previous EU cultural and media programmes which have been running for more than 20 years. Currently, these areas function as subprogrammes within it, with the Culture subprogramme supporting the performing and visual arts and the Media sub-programme providing funding for the film and audio-visual sector. Other activities include European Capitals of Culture, the European Heritage Label, European Heritage Days, the Re-Imagine Europe project initiated by Sonic Acts and co-funded by Creative Europe. In contrast to the previous programme, a cross-sectoral dimension is being introduced that supports political cooperation, international activities, and a new financial guarantee mechanism that has been in place since 2016 (Rosser, 2014).

The Programme provides funding for 250,000 artists and cultural activists, 2,000 cinemas, 800 films, and 4,500 artistic translations (European Commission, n.d.). In fact, during 2014-2020, projects were supported by sectors in the following percentages (without Culture and Media subprogrammes data for 2020): literature 37.80%, performative arts 33.26%, cultural heritage 11.99%, visual arts 8.53%, design and applied arts 2.48%, architecture 1.19%, and other sectors 4.75% (Creative Europe Ukraine, n.d.).

3.3. Key areas of the Creative Europe 2014-2020 programme and perspectives on the organisation of the social and cultural sector

To better understand the features and benefits of this latest cultural programme, including the organisation of the socio-cultural sphere, we will try to uncover cases in its key areas (*Table 1*).

We can see that the EU is implementing the Creative Europe Programme, aimed at helping certain sectors of creative clusters in 2021-2027, where support is provided to such segments of the socio-cultural sphere as music, architecture, publishing, and cultural heritage protection.

Table 1. Main directions of the Creative Europe Programme 2014-2020 and 2021-2027

Programme sections	Programme features
CULTURE	(a) Supports a wide range of cultural and creative sectors (architecture, cultural heritage, design, literature and publishing, music, performing arts). (b) Encourages cooperation and exchange between cultural organisations and artists in Europe and beyond: promotes artistic creativity and innovation; supports the promotion and distribution of European content in Europe and beyond; helps artists find opportunities to create and perform abroad; stimulates digital and environmental "breakthroughs" in the European cultural and creative sector
MEDIA	(c) Supports the European film and audio-visual industry in the development, distribution, and promotion of European works, considering the current digital environment. (d) Encourages cooperation within the audio-visual industry value chain and at the EU level to scale up enterprises and European content, nurtures talent worldwide, and engages with audiences of all ages, especially the younger generation. (e) A new programme structure with 4 clusters: content cluster (creation and production of high-quality content that forms the basis of the European audio-visual industry); business cluster (promotes business innovation); audience cluster (combine European audio-visual works with their audiences); political support (promotion of European audio-visual policy through dialogue, data exchange, consultation, promotion, and information activities)
INTER-SECTION	(f) Aimed at strengthening cooperation between different cultural and creative sectors to help them solve common problems and find new and innovative solutions. It is achieved through political cooperation as well as services such as the Creative Europe office and the Creative Innovation Lab. For the first time, funding was offered to the media sector to promote media literacy. Through Creative Innovation Lab shares, Creative Europe aims to encourage innovative approaches to creating access, disseminating and promoting content in the cultural, creative, etc., sectors that must take account of the digital transition and encompass both market and non-market dimensions

Source: developed on the basis of (Creative Europe desks...)

The development and implementation of such programmes aimed at the development of creative clusters not only in European countries but also in Ukraine is an important factor that will allow them to take a separate place among the drivers of the creative industry in our country.

I would like to note an important detail regarding the management of socio-cultural activities, or rather the difference in approaches between the

US and the EU, which is finally fixed in the latest programme of the second generation. The approach typical of the vast majority of American Scientists assumes the universal nature of management functions, which are equally effectively applied in the field of business, public administration, and the non-profit sector, which includes a significant part of cultural and artistic facilities, including those dealing with heritage issues. That is, the management of organisations of socio-cultural activity within the framework of this approach is the sphere of empirical application of the universal principles of the general theory of management and is based on a fundamental understanding of the latter, as “a set of functions aimed at the effective and efficient use of the organisation's resources and the implementation of its basic goals” (Griffin, 2000, p. 5). However, Charles (Chuck) Suber' (2002) concept is equally important in this approach, “dynamics of culture as a business” (p. 13), by which he understands the synergistic relations between key players in the culture and art market, the active forces of the external and internal environment that influence culture and its creators, being simultaneously and under their influence.

Analysing “cultural dynamics” in the same categories as “business dynamics”, thus, Ch. Suber (2002) emphasises the identity of understanding the nature of business as a whole and the management of socio-cultural activities. Therefore, his approach is quite closely related to the universalist theory of management functions and has become widely popular among US cultural managers, for most of whom the most important qualities that contribute to the success of a manager of socio-cultural activities are managerial experience, financial planning, tact, grace, and style.

Creative Europe Programme has features of a different approach to understanding the nature and functions of managing socio-cultural activities, based on the idea of the uniqueness of cultural and artistic production and the contradiction between the creator and the system of market relations. Still, if we take a closer look at the European cultural policy in this regard, it excludes strict determination of the activities of cultural and artistic institutions and events from the business approach because this negatively affects the quality and content of artistic creativity. The classics of socio-cultural management in the second approach focused more on the harmonious relationship between work, creativity and people's needs in the field of culture and art in order to achieve a rich and dynamic cultural life, which was characteristic of most Western European countries, and also became widespread in countries that once belonged to the so-called “Eastern Bloc”.

So, suppose the European vector of cultural policy assumed a significant role and presence of the state apparatus in the management of the culture and art sector through the system of distribution of funding, as we see on the example of programmes of both generations. In that case, the American vector

is characterised by the opposite situation: the state distances itself from financing cultural and art institutions. But since the beginning of the 21st century, the EU has formed many new sources of funding that are alternative to budget, and the growth rate of budget allocations to support culture and art in European countries has slowed significantly, which has led to a shortage of funds in the industry. At the same time, the task of creating a “favourable cultural image” of the territory of each of the member countries is of particular importance for the EU authorities. Therefore the concept of “cultural tourism” is becoming popular, which is based on the idea of attracting cultural and artistic objects for tourists, which stimulates the development of local economies. It could not but affect the increased interest of European cultural managers in business strategies and business education. Still, in the United States at this time, the trend of funding culture from federal agencies, States art agencies and local art agencies is gradually increasing. Therefore, we can confidently say that the vector of EU cultural policy in the organisation of the socio-cultural sphere at the level of specific institutions gradually borrows the achievements of American business concepts in this area. However, in the United States, the market pressure on the organisation of socio-cultural activities continues to be much more challenging than in European countries. Despite these borrowings, in the EU continues, there is a different system of financing culture and art with significant budget support on the example of the programmes under consideration, including organising the socio-cultural sphere.

4. Conclusions

The study suggests that the EU's cultural policy in terms of organising the socio-cultural sphere has been implemented through various programmes and projects, mainly of the first and second generation:

1. If the first generation of cultural programmes (ARIANE, RAPHAEL, and KALEIDOSCOPE) was designed to strengthen and develop the international partnership, hold numerous cultural events at the European level, and expand public access to cultural heritage, then the EU programme Culture 2013-2017, as its predecessor and successor, appears to be more structured and has a comprehensive approach to the organisation of the socio-cultural sphere. Its main goal is to support initiatives and projects to develop, preserve, and disseminate cultural diversity and heritage of European countries. An important aspect is the financing of long-term projects and activities within the framework of transnational and regional cooperation in the context of strengthening intercultural dialogue, increasing cross-border mobility, and encouraging the transnational circulation of cultural products and experts. Along with the expansion of the European cultural space, this cultural programme has contributed to the formation of a system of information and data dissemination, the development of political analytics, and the mechanism for organising the socio-cultural sphere.

2. As for the Creative Europe Programme, which was extended for 2021-2027, its unique feature includes cultural and media programmes implemented over the previous 20 years. This indicates that Culture 2007-2013 is a subprogramme of the Creative Europe, which seeks to correct the shortcomings and observations concerning its predecessor (in particular, when it came to the “declarativeness” of key principles of intercultural dialogue and the lack of a clear choice of goals), and that the continuity of the EU's cultural policy is being implemented in this way.

3. If we continue to define the special features of the latter programme, we need to point out new cross-sectoral areas aimed at supporting the policy of cooperation, cross-measures, and new financial guarantees as early as 2016, as well as expanding the geopolitical context of its implementation (the programme involves not only the EU member states but also countries participating in the European Neighbourhood Policy, such as Iceland, Norway, Albania, Macedonia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia, Montenegro, Georgia, Moldova, Israel, and Ukraine). The priority goals are to protect, develop and promote the cultural and linguistic diversity of Europe, its cultural heritage, and, secondly, to strengthen the competitiveness and economic potential of the European cultural and creative sectors, particularly the audio-visual sector. The difference between the programmes in terms of funding, as well as in the emergence of new directions and options, only confirms the thesis of strengthening and expanding the zone of implementation of the programme principles of the EU cultural policy in the socio-cultural sphere at the beginning of the 21st century.

The scientific novelty. For the first time, the article provides a comparative analysis of the above-mentioned second generation cultural programmes to identify not only the difference between them but also to confirm the thesis about the continuity of the programme principles of the EU cultural policy in the organisation of the socio-cultural sphere at the present stage. The objective tendencies of cultural policy transformation over the last two decades as one of the key directions of European domestic policy are considered. This is evidenced by the expansion of geography and millions of new Europeans involved, as well as the constant efforts of Brussels to find the best solution to the issue of national identity while maintaining the historically established multiculturalism of the EU member states.

The significance of the study. The theoretical and practical significance of the work is that its conclusions and scientific provisions can be productive for further culturological research in the field of cultural policy and the organisation of the socio-cultural sphere. The materials can be used both as a methodological basis for drawing up training programmes in the direction of management of socio-cultural activities and the process of professional training of public employees, managers in the field of culture, and teachers of cultural studies.

Prospects for further research. In the view of the above, a comprehensive analysis of the cooperation between the EU and Ukraine under the Creative Europe Programme 2021-2027 remains relevant with the view to find out the prospects and consequences for the organisation of the socio-cultural sphere and the creative industry of our country in the 21st century.

Acknowledgement

This publication has been made in accordance with the theme of the Research Institute of the Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts within the theme: “Formation of the Modern Paradigm of Management of Socio-Cultural Activity in the Context of Civilization Development” (Project #0118U100544).

References:

- Bache, I., & George, S. (2006). *Politics in the European Union*, 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Belyaeva, E. E. (2012). *Kulturnaya integratsiya kak osnovnaya strategiya kulturnoy politiki Evropeyskogo Soyuza [Cultural integration as the main strategy of cultural policy of the European Union]*. Moscow: Prometej (in Rus.).
- Bruell, C. (2013). Creative Europe 2014–2020: A new programme – a new cultural policy as well? *Culture and Foreign Policy*, 2nd. Stuttgart: Culture and Foreign Policy.
- Creative Europe Ukraine (n.d.). “*Creative Europe*” 2014-2020 in numbers: *online report*, Retrieved from <https://creativeeurope.in.ua/report> (in Ukr.).
- Rosser, M. (2014). Creative Europe Desk UK to be delivered through new partnership between the BFI and the British Council. *Screen Daily*, Retrieved from <https://www.screendaily.com/news/creative-europe-launches-in-uk/5065897.article>.
- Commission of the European Communities (2004). *Commission Staff Working Paper New Cultural Programme (2007-2013)*. Brussels: Council of the European Union, Retrieved from <https://data.consilium.europa.eu/doc/document/ST-11572-2004-ADD-1/en/pdf>.
- Dewey, P. (2008). Transnational cultural policymaking in the European Union. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, 38(2), 99-120, doi: <https://doi.org/10.3200/JAML.38.2.99-120>.
- European Commission. (n.d.). *Creative Europe Desks*, Retrieved from <https://ec.europa.eu/culture/resources/creative-europe-desks>.
- European Commission (2004, July 14). *The Culture 2007 programme*. Brussels: European Forum for the Arts and Heritage, Retrieved from <https://www.yumpu.com/en/document/view/51997628/european-forum-for-the-arts-and-heritage>.

- European Union (2006). Decision No 1855/2006/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council: establishing the Culture Programme (2007 to 2013). *Official Journal of the European Union*, 372, 1-11, Retrieved from <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legalcontent/EN/TXT/?uri=celex%3A32006D1855>.
- European Union (2013). Regulation (EU) No 1295/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 December 2013 establishing the Creative Europe Programme (2014 to 2020) and repealing Decisions No 1718/2006/EC, No 1855/2006/EC and No 1041/2009/EC Text with EEA relevance. *Official Journal of the European Union*, 347, 221-237.
- Gordon, C., Fisher, R., & Klaic, D. (2007). *Analysis of the Commission communication "a European agenda for culture in a globalising world"*. Brussels: European Parliament.
- Gray, C. (2007). Commodification and instrumentality in cultural policy. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 13(2), 203-215. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10286630701342899>.
- Griffin, R. W. (2000). *Fundamentals of Management: Core Concepts and Applications*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Helly, D., Galeazzi, G. (2016). Culture in EU development policies and external action: Reframing the discussion. *Briefing Note*, 92. Maastricht: ECDPM, Retrieved from <https://ecdpm.org/wp-content/uploads/BN-92-Culture-EU-Development-Policies-External-Action-ECDPM-2016.pdf>.
- Lähdesmäki, T. & Mäkinen, K., Zhu Y. (Eds.). (2019). The "European Significance" of Heritage: Politics of Scale in EU Heritage Policy Discourse. *Politics of Scale*. New York: Berghahn's Books, 36-49, doi: <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv12pnsx.7>.
- Mattocks, K. (2017). Uniting the Nations of Europe? Exploring the European Union's Cultural Policy Agenda. *The Routledge Handbook of Global Cultural Policy* (V. Durrer, T. Miller, & D. O'Brian, Eds.). London: Routledge, 397-413, doi: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315718408>.
- Näss, H. E. (2010). The Ambiguities of Intercultural Dialogue: Critical Perspectives on the European Union's New Agenda for Culture. *Journal of Intercultural Communication*, 23, 1404-1634.
- Suber, C. (Ed). (2002). *Dictionary for Artists, Performers, Managers and Entrepreneurs*, 3rd ed. Chicago: IL Arts, Entertainment & Media Management Dept., Columbia College Chicago.
- Service Centre for International Cultural Activities (2004). *Conference Report Artists on the Move*, 7-8 October. Rotterdam.

Information about the Author:

Natalia Mohylevska, People's Artist of Ukraine, Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts, 36, Ye. Konovalts St., Kyiv 01601, Ukraine; e-mail: mogylevskanataliia@ukr.net; orcid id: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7102-2114>