

Svitlana Ovcharenko

*professor of the Department of Humanities and Socio-Political Sciences
of ORIPA NAPA under the President of Ukraine, Doctor of Sciences in Philosophy, Professor*

CULTURAL POLICY OF UKRAINE: GLOBAL

The article analyzes the problems related to the organization of monitoring the development of Ukrainian culture at the state level in accordance with the methodology of UNESCO, which follows from the assessment of the state of Ukrainian culture in the 2017 report «UNESCO Culture for Development Indicators: Ukraine's Analytical Brief»

Key words: cultural policy, Culture for Development Indicators Suite (CDIS), public management, UNESCO.

Світлана Овчаренко

*професор кафедри гуманітарних та соціально-політичних наук
ОРІДУ НАДУ при Президентові України, д.філос.н., професор*

КУЛЬТУРНА ПОЛІТИКА УКРАЇНИ: ГЛОБАЛЬНІ ВИМІРИ

Стаття аналізує проблеми, які стосуються організації моніторингу розвитку української культури на державному рівні за методикою ЮНЕСКО, що впливають з оцінки стану української культури у звіті 2017 року «Індикатори впливу культури на розвиток ЮНЕСКО. Короткий аналітичний огляд щодо України».

Ключові слова: культурна політика, система індикаторів впливу культури на розвиток (ІВКР), публічне управління, ЮНЕСКО.

Светлана Овчаренко

*професор кафедры гуманитарных и социально-политических наук
ОРИГУ НАГУ при Президенте Украины, д.филос.н., профессор*

КУЛЬТУРНА ПОЛІТИКА УКРАЇНИ: ГЛОБАЛЬНІ ІНДИКАТОРИ

Статья анализирует проблемы, связанные с организацией мониторинга развития украинской культуры на государственном уровне по методике ЮНЕСКО, которые обусловлены оценкой состояния украинской культуры в отчете 2017 года «Индикаторы влияния культуры на развитие ЮНЕСКО. Краткий аналитический обзор по Украине».

Ключевые слова: культурна політика, система індикаторів впливу культури на розвиток (ІВКР), публічне управління, ЮНЕСКО.

The sphere of public administration in Ukraine is becoming more and more involved in the participation of the state in all, without exception, leading areas of global cooperation. The sphere of cultural cooperation is not an exception. But until recently, the state's cultural policy was focused, rather, on the processes of national self-identification, rather than on the processes of co-dimensional global development. Such a national-protecting tendency was manifested in an attempt to focus mainly on research into the historical past, the opening of forgotten (or little-known) names of leading figures of Ukrainian culture of the past, work with archival materials and archaeological artifacts, support for the development of folk art centers and the revival of ethnic traditions. Such a basic direction of cultural policy, of course, did not rule out the existence of modern forms of culture and art, but this was not a leading idea of the development of Ukrainian culture during all times of independence. Without denying the importance of the revival of historical memory for Ukraine, which had to prove its cultural identity as a state, we would draw attention to a certain defeat of Ukrainian culture in its present day, both from the point of view of the citizens of Ukraine and in the eyes of the international community. Contemporary, avant-garde forms of culture and art, for the most part, existed (and continue to exist) with the support of private sympathies, as a personal

initiative by artists and art managers, which gives these practices the character of the underground, although throughout the world it has long been the mainstream of culture. Indicative in this regard is the situation with the Ukrainian cinema, which is difficult to develop as a private affair without relying on general institutional support of the state and without joining the world cinematic processes.

As an idea of cultural policy, the idea of developing contemporary cultural and art practices remained undeveloped for a long time, although it was not officially denied. Therefore, it is important to note the obvious fundamental turning point of the leading institutions that influence cultural policy, the purpose of disseminating contemporary cultural practices and the use of international indicators of the level of development of the cultural space of Ukraine. Let us pay attention to the gradual increase of the influence of two scientific and practical programs related to international cooperation in the field of culture: the «Forum of Cultural Industries», which is being implemented with the support of the EU [6] and the «Forum of Cultural Diplomacy», which supports the Kyiv office of the Kenan Institute [7], which are gaining popularity among policy makers of Ukrainian cultural policy and set the leading trends for an expert environment. It is on the involvement of Ukraine in the

© Овчаренко С. В., 2017.

world cultural process that our country's participation in the Creative Europe program is also oriented.

Постановка проблеми

In the framework of this general trend, the study «UNESCO Culture for Development Indicators: Ukraine's Analytical Brief» [1; 9], which was implemented with the support of the Eastern European Cooperation Program «Culture and Creativity» in 2017. This document is the first systematic practice of comprehension of the development of Ukrainian culture in world-wide dimensions and is a brief generalization of the "Ukrainian's Technical Report" according to the UNESCO criteria, which is presented only in English [10]. Monitoring the state of culture in Ukraine is an important step for Ukrainian cultural policy, since it aligns approaches to indicative measurement of the state of Ukrainian culture with international standards. However, the expert environment has not yet analyzed the data presented in this document in terms of tasks and prospects for the development of state cultural policy, in particular, in the process of delegation of responsibility for the state of culture in local communities as centers for the implementation of state cultural policy.

Мета

The purpose of this article is to analyze the data on monitoring the impact of culture on socio-economic development in Ukraine from the point of view of the practical activities of public authorities. The tasks stemming from this goal are the synthesis of positive and negative trends in Ukrainian culture, as well as the formation of recommendations for public authorities regarding the introduction of a system of continuous monitoring of the country's cultural development.

Вклад основного матеріалу

As noted in the report «UNESCO Culture for Development Indicators: Ukraine's Analytical Brief», Ukraine has for the first time performed monitoring of its own state of culture based on a methodology developed by the international community during 2009-2013 and was adopted in 2014 in 17 countries of the world. In March 2016, a study was launched and in March 2017 it was completed. This abbreviated version of the detailed analysis carried out with the participation of the Ukrainian Center for Cultural Studies promotes the main ideas of the monitoring report for all interested parties in the development of our country.

This document is for the first time introduced into circulation a new abbreviation for Ukraine - CDIS, which is read as indicators of cultural influence on development. It is important to pay attention to this, as this abbreviation should be understood not only for specialists in the field of cultural sector management, but also for specialists

in other spheres - economics, education, ecology, social policy, etc., as culture is understood by the modern international community as an extraordinary lever of influence on the political, social and economic processes taking place in the world and bringing the future closer.

In general, indicative areas (indicators), which examined culture as an integral part of the process of sustainable development, are defined in the document 7 and are divided into 22 specific indicators for which statistical measurements are carried out.

Since we have set our analysis to provide some recommendations for practitioners of public administration, we reduce these indicators and their explanations into a general table that clearly demonstrates the multivariate monitoring of cultural influence on public life.

Acquaintance with the statistical measures, which are given in the document «UNESCO Culture for Development Indicators: Ukraine's Analytical Brief» allows us to generalize both positive and negative aspects of the functioning of modern Ukrainian culture. So, based on the text of the document, we will first describe the positive, and then negative, aspects in the sequence given by the structure of the document.

The positive aspects of the overall political and state-management nature can be attributed to the recognition of the leading role of culture for the development of society in the «State Strategy for Regional Development for the period up to 2020» and the development of a «Long-term Strategy for the Development of Ukrainian Culture by 2025». The report also notes that culture is mentioned in the Strategy for Sustainable Development Ukraine-2020, in the Action Plan for Implementation of the National Strategy for Human Rights for the Period up to 2020, and the Strategy for Overcoming Poverty. The main positive of these documents is that culture as an industry is first conceived as an important component of the functioning of the state at the level of the highest governing bodies of the state.

The Ukraine's CDIS-based monitoring indicates, based on 2014 data, that the contribution of the Ukrainian cultural sector to GDP for that year was at least 4.04% higher than the contribution, for example, construction that was in the same year 2,67%. The following indicators are also provided for job creation - 444.9 thousand jobs in the main cultural activity, 128.5 thousand in the auxiliary and 101.9 thousand in the field of computer activities. On the whole, it makes up 3,17% of the total number of employed people. According to economic indicators, 15.6 thousand of employed people are engaged in cinematic activity, and the contribution of this activity to GDP makes up 1.1 billion hryvnia. The quality of domestic films has earned recognition at international film festivals - Cannes, Berlin, and Venice.

DIMENSION	CORE INDICATORS	DESCRIPTION
Economy	CONTRIBUTION OF CULTURAL ACTIVITIES TO GDP	• Percentage of the contribution of private and formal cultural activities to Gross Domestic Product
	CULTURAL EMPLOYMENT	• Percentage of people engaged in cultural occupations within the total employed population
	HOUSEHOLD EXPENDITURES ON CULTURE	• Percentage of household final consumption expenditures on cultural activities, goods and services set against total household consumption expenditures

MECHANISMS OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Education	<p>INCLUSIVE EDUCATION</p> <p>MULTILINGUAL EDUCATION</p> <p>ARTS EDUCATION</p> <p>PROFESSIONAL TRAINING IN THE CULTURAL SECTOR</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Index of average years of schooling of the population between the ages of 17 and 22, adjusted to reflect inequalities • Percentage of instructional hours dedicated to promoting multilingualism in relation to the total number of instructional hours dedicated to languages (grades 7-8) • Percentage of instructional hours dedicated to arts education in relation to the total number of instructional hours (grades 7-8) • Index of coherency and coverage of technical and vocational education and training (TVET) and tertiary education in the field of culture
Governance	<p>STANDARD-SETTING FRAMEWORK FOR CULTURE</p> <p>POLICY AND INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK FOR CULTURE</p> <p>DISTRIBUTION OF CULTURAL INFRASTRUCTURES</p> <p>CIVIL SOCIETY PARTICIPATION IN CULTURAL GOVERNANCE</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Index of development of the standard-setting framework for the protection and promotion of culture, cultural rights and cultural diversity • Index of development of the policy and institutional framework for the protection and promotion of the culture, cultural rights and cultural diversity • Distribution of selected cultural infrastructures relative to the distribution of the country's population in administrative divisions immediately below state level • Index of the promotion of the participation of cultural professionals and minorities in the formulation and implementation of cultural policies, measures and programmes that concern them
Social participation	<p>PARTICIPATION IN GOING-OUT CULTURAL ACTIVITIES</p> <p>PARTICIPATION IN IDENTITY-BUILDING</p> <p>CULTURAL ACTIVITIES TOLERANCE OF OTHER CULTURES</p> <p>INTERPERSONAL TRUST</p> <p>FREEDOM OF SELF-DETERMINATION</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of the population who have participated at least once in a going-out cultural activity in the last 12 months • Percentage of the population who have participated at least once in an identity-building cultural activity in the last 12 months • Degree of tolerance within a society towards people from different cultural backgrounds • Degree of interpersonal trust • Median score of perceived freedom of self-determination
Gender equality	<p>GENDER EQUALITY OBJECTIVE OUTPUTS</p> <p>PERCEPTION OF GENDER EQUALITY</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Index of the gaps between women and men in political, education and labour domains and in gender-equity legislative frameworks (objective outputs) • Degree of positive assessments of gender equality (subjective output)
Communication	<p>FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION</p> <p>ACCESS AND INTERNET USE</p> <p>DIVERSITY OF FICTIONAL CONTENT ON PUBLIC TELEVISION</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Index of print, broadcast, and internet-based freedom • Percentage of individuals using the internet • Ratio of annual broadcasting time of domestic television fiction programmes out of total annual broadcasting time of television fiction programmes on public free-to-air national TV channels
Heritage	HERITAGE SUSTAINABILITY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Registration and inscription • Transmission and mobilization of support • Protection, safeguarding and management

Indicators related to education in our country are always high enough because it inherited the fundamental ideas of the priority of education and the extensive infrastructure from the USSR. Interestingly, there is an indicator that refers to linguistic diversity as the implementation of constitutional law for national minorities and the implementation by Ukraine of the «Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural

Expressions.» According to the data provided in the report, in the first 2 years of studying at the school for the study of the official Ukrainian language 13.3% are given, while the international languages - 86.7%, which are defined as the first (40%) and the second (46, 7%) foreign languages (Russian language may be affected in this way, but there are no comments on this issue in the report). Also, the efforts of the state to provide education in the field of

Ukrainian and world literature and art in the framework of the curriculum of general secondary education - 12.5%, which is evaluated as a high indicator, are positively evaluated. In our country there are no problems with the number of educational institutions of different levels and different profiles, where you can get professional artistic education. In total, there are 75 of them in Ukraine, among them 11 higher educational institutions of state ownership, 57 communal forms of ownership and 7 closed technical specialized educational institutions.

Regarding the governance system of the cultural sector, a high level of legal standards, which is introduced in the state, is highline. Ukraine demonstrates the level of implementation of 95% of the world's leading political and managerial ideas in the field of culture, which is also a good platform for cultural development. The state also has an orderly vertical governance structure, which is represented by links from the ministry to local administrations. At the same time, an important point is the process of decentralization of cultural management, which allows local communities to make independent decisions about the cultural component of their lives. It is also positive that cultural activities and initiatives can be financed from budgets of different levels. It is noted that the existence of an extensive cultural infrastructure system, where even the smallest settlements have libraries or clubs, or both institutions at the same time, is noted. In total, there are 16,659 clubs, theaters, philharmonic, circuses, 16,418 libraries and 542 museums.

The national CDIS-report highlights the openness of cultural policy and the opportunity for the public to participate in discussing its priorities and principles. The level of community participation is estimated at 95% of the global level, while it is noted that both - national minorities and professionals, - as well as representatives of the local community, can speak. There is also a special national program for supporting national minorities, which is financed from the state budget, albeit with small sums.

An indicative positive moment of the general state of the cultural environment in Ukraine is the indicator of tolerance of the population, which is higher than the average for the countries of Eastern Europe. In Ukraine, this figure was 82.9% in 2011, and the average for Eastern Europe - 67.3%. The state of tolerance of our society was higher than in such countries as Georgia, Armenia or Azerbaijan. We also have a relatively high level of interpersonal trust, which is 23.1%, while the average for the countries of Eastern Europe is 14.4%.

In our country, there are a large number of objects that form a national cultural heritage, and we keep registries, the quality of which is estimated at 93% compared with global standards. This is a good indicator, but bearing in mind that our cultural policy in the last decades was mainly focused on maintaining and preserving the tradition, it cannot satisfy us.

Actually, from the analysis of the state of cultural heritage protection we can begin to state the negative features of our cultural policy. Thus, the IWRC report shows a low level of mobilization of cultural heritage in the general cultural life, which is estimated at only 70%. This indicator measures the level of awareness, knowledge of cultural heritage and the level of stimulation of measures to support the protection of cultural heritage.

Actually, this result coincides with the indicators of the contribution of various forms of cultural sector activity to

GDP if we look at a more detailed analysis of the indicative lines, as presented in the CDIS-report. In the general indicator, the contribution of the cultural sector at the level of 4.4% is only 0.02% of the contribution from the use of cultural and natural heritage (from the total contribution, which is counted as 100% for the cultural sphere). The possibilities of decorative-applied art (0.36%) and tour activities (artistic performances and celebrations - 1.28%) are also unused. The most powerful economic plans are the audiovisual and media sectors and services in the field of design. However, as the authors of the report themselves point out, most likely, all creative assets are exported, as the cost of domestic households for culture is too small.

The report shows that the share of men (52%) in the cultural sphere is higher than that of women (48%), but women produce the cultural product and men are more involved in the auxiliary sectors. But there are areas where gender disparities are striking in favor of women: librarians and related professions in the information sphere, library staff - 30: 1; sociologists, anthropologists and related professions - 13: 1; written and verbal interpreters and other linguists - 6: 1.

Interesting is the indicator of household expenses for cultural goods and services, which is calculated as the average for the country - 0,88% of final costs. Taking into account the related information about private art collections, ordering design services, prices for some touring concerts afforded to the most prosperous Ukrainians, one can conclude that there is a complete lack of cultural goods for the vast majority of citizens of the country. This is either true or the cost of the most wealthy for cultural needs is not taken into account in the report at all. However, it is obvious that the «average» for our socio-economic reality is meaningless. Also, let's draw attention to the fact that the price of certain cultural goods is called «economically insignificant» in the report because they are too small - it's about prices for visiting museums, libraries, theaters, services of non-profit organizations.

Summing up the economic aspects of the functioning of culture, the authors of the CDIS-report express their own views on the overall picture, which follows from the available statistical indicators. Their main idea is that Ukraine currently has no relevant data from the sphere of cultural development, which is connected, firstly, with the lack of calculations in the field of the non-profit sector of culture, and secondly, with a large share of shadow business in the sphere culture, and thirdly, the indirect and induced cultural influences, such as tourism, hotel business, etc., are not taken into account. Also, the disadvantage of the current state attitude towards culture is the underestimation of the sector as a source of jobs, and culture workers are not considered to be labor resources at all.

The report notes that in order to understand the cost of a household to culture, we need to use more detailed information that relates to the region, sex, education level, income level. Without such data, we cannot adequately assess the indicators of social participation in culture. In the section on the indicative sphere «Social Participation», almost all the figures are too general, which makes it impossible to really assess the state of social engagement of citizens in the cultural processes. For example, it is indicated that for 100 people, there were 35 visits to

museums, 13 theaters, 6 concerts and 25 cinemas. From these data, there can be no useful conclusion for public administration in the field of culture, no useful conclusion for the formation of policy priorities in the field of culture. Such data is based on the research of the State Statistics Service of Ukraine in 2015, which counted the number of tickets sold. The section of the analysis of social indicators for culture by the data of 2013 collected by the Institute of Sociology of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine continues, which shows that 47.7% of respondents never visited concerts of classical music and 47.3% - the Opera and Ballet Theater; 34.7% never visited art or photo exhibitions and 28.8% - folk music concerts. By comparing these data, we can obviously feel the limitations of our knowledge of the consumer of culture as a person who has his own artistic tastes, age and gender characteristics, a certain educational level, profession, place of residence (city, village). And, referring to data on participation in events on national identity, the authors of the CDIS-report themselves call them questionable.

However, in Ukraine, we already have a well-developed gender measurement system, since gender issues are cross-cutting for research of a different orientation. But, gender equality data are disappointing - 42.2%, and this figure is lower than the average for countries that have monitored CDIS - 61.2%. Please note that gender equality is a problem for all countries, but this does not justify us. The least women in our country are represented in politics and legislation, while in education we have practical equality. However, in Ukraine there is a general positive attitude towards the participation of women in production, politics, and in education, but this does not affect the real results of the implementation of this favorable position.

Actually, the same can be said about our obvious merits in the cultural sphere - an extensive infrastructure and high-quality legislation. With a well-developed infrastructure, we must state that it is mostly in unsatisfactory condition, technologically outdated and left to us by inheritance from the USSR. We did not build a new one. In our cultural legislation, all progressive international requirements are almost fully implemented, we have a clear administrative system, but many good legal norms and management ideas remain unfulfilled. Even this CDIS-report, as it becomes apparent from the final remarks, is not an official position of the state, but reflects only the opinion of the authors of the report, the names of which are indicated as its compilers.

Висновки

Thus, «UNESCO Culture for Development Indicators: Ukraine's Analytical Brief» is a progressive document for Ukrainian cultural policy, since it is the first attempt to systematically review the situation in the sphere of domestic culture on the basis of the international methodology. This document shows not only the strengths and weaknesses of the development of the cultural space of Ukraine, but also reveals the obvious shortcomings of the system of public administration in the field of culture. The main drawback is the lack of relevant data for making managerial decisions.

Also, this document demonstrates the lack of a single field of research on the state of culture in Ukraine. The data presented in the document is taken for different years - from 2011 to 2016. It is obvious that they do not fit into a single picture, since they were collected for a

different purpose and for other needs. Our knowledge of both economic and social factors in the development of culture in the country is disparate, uncoordinated. In most cases, the figures given are either outdated or reflect expert opinions, or only approximate to real ones.

However, a modern talk about cultural politics, the state of satisfaction of cultural needs of man, and the level of realization of cultural human rights is not possible without adequate monitoring of relevant processes. «UNESCO Culture for Development Indicators: Ukraine's Analytical Brief» became a document that revealed gaps in the field of culture and outlined the public administration tasks in this area - not only to introduce continuous monitoring of the above methodology, but also to develop additional indicators that reflect the unique processes that are characteristic of domestic culture, especially since it is welcomed by the general ideology of monitoring the influence of culture on development. The introduction of mandatory CDIS-monitoring is particularly important for each specific community and the leading social tasks of public authorities.

References.

1. Індикатори впливу культури на розвиток ЮНЕСКО. Короткий аналітичний огляд щодо України: URL https://www.culturepartnership.eu/upload/editor/2017/Policy%20Briefs/Abr-iv_C&C_photo_UA.pdf.
2. Культура і креативність: Програма ЄС та Східне партнерство: URL – <https://www.culturepartnership.eu/>
3. Креативна Європа: Національне бюро: URL – <http://creativeeurope.in.ua/>.
4. Креативна Україна: Міжнародний форум, Київ, 20 жовтня 2017: URL – <http://creativeukraine.org.ua/>.
5. Переформатування системи управління в галузі культури та європейський досвід інноваційного розвитку: оглядова довідка Інформаційного центру з питань культури та мистецтва: URL – http://www.nplu.org/storage/files/Infocentr/Tematich_ogliadi/2016/dos.pdf
6. Форум креативних індустрій/ Дніпро, 2017: Офіційний сайт URL – <http://cif.in.ua/>.
7. Форум культурної дипломатії/ Київ, 8 червня 2017: Сайт Київського офісу Інституту Кенана: URL – <https://kennankyiv.org/category/events/>.
8. UNESCO Culture for Development Indicators. Methodology Manual : URL – http://en.unesco.org/creativity/sites/creativity/files/cdis_methodology_manual.pdf.
9. «UNESCO Culture for Development Indicators: Ukraine's Analytical Brief»: URL – http://uckd.org/sites/default/files/170730%20CDIS%20Ukraine%20Analytical%20Report_0.pdf.
10. UNESCO Culture for Development Indicators. Ukraine's Technical Report: URL – <https://www.culturepartnership.eu/upload/editor/2017/2017/CDIS%20Ukraine%20Technical%20Report.pdf>.