

UDC: 351.85

DOI: [https://doi.org/10.32689/2617-2224-2019-4\(19\)-15-25](https://doi.org/10.32689/2617-2224-2019-4(19)-15-25)

Babytska Svitlana Igorevna,

Applicant for a degree of Department of Political Science and Philosophy, Kharkiv regional institute of Public Administration of National academy for Public administration under the President of Ukraine, 61099, Kharkiv, Str. Marshala Rybalko, tel.: +38 050 0433850, e-mail: mbubliij@gmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0001-8537-915X

Бабицька Світлана Ігорівна,

здобувач кафедри політології та філософії, Харківський регіональний інститут державного управління Національної академії державного управління при Президентові України, 61099, м. Харків, вул. Маршала Рибалка, 51, тел. +38 050 0433850, e-mail: mbubliij@gmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0001-8537-915X

Бабицкая Светлана Игоревна,

соискатель кафедры политологии и философии, Харьковский региональный институт государственного управления Национальной академии государственного управления при Президенте Украины, 61099, г. Харьков, ул. Маршала Рибалко, 51, тел.: +38 050 0433850, e-mail: mbubliij@gmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0001-8537-915X



ESSENCE AND SPECIFICITY OF MODERN STATE CULTURAL POLICY

Annotation. The article deals with consideration the essence and specificity of modern state cultural policy. It is proved that cultural policy is an activity connected with the formation and coordination of social mechanisms and conditions of cultural activity of the population as a whole, and of all its groups, oriented on the development of creative, cultural and recreational needs as mechanisms of formation and harmonization of the conditions of cultural activity are allocated legal, economic and organizational conditions.

As a result of the generalization, it is determined that at present the function of the transmission of socio-cultural values is carried out by cultural institutions and mass media, with the latter doing it more effectively; institutions of culture and art have lost their monopoly in attracting people to the best cultural values; they have to share this role with private libraries, television, computer equipment

and the Internet; cultural-creative and other processes of active activity of the population to a large extent take place outside the institutions and organizations of the institutional system of culture.

The main bodies, implementing the cultural policy of the state, are cultural institutions. The latter are relatively clearly divided into state institutions, budget-bound for the fulfilment of the main tasks of the cultural policy of the state, formulated in the Constitution of Ukraine and other legal acts.

Non-state institutions dealing with the development of artistic activity are creative unions and associations, architectural, artistic and restoration workshops, film studios and film rental establishments. That is, the distinctive features of the subject of state governance of socio-cultural processes are as follows: the ability to influence state legal acts; financing of the tasks of cultural policy from the state budget; and solving the tasks of cultural policy through state legal and economic mechanisms only.

The function of state management of culture does not include the tasks of general socio-cultural regulation of people's lives, the formation of customs and traditions, direct artistic creativity, leadership activities of creative unions, etc. The management of culture at the state level should mainly model the mechanisms of the natural civilization process, act within framework of its social laws and only to stimulate the accelerated development of society in the direction in which it is itself objectively moving.

Keywords: culture, cultural policy, state, public administration, cultural institutions, social and cultural activities.

СУТНІСТЬ І СПЕЦИФІКА СУЧАСНОЇ ДЕРЖАВНОЇ КУЛЬТУРНОЇ ПОЛІТИКИ

Анотація. Розглянуто сутність і специфіку сучасної державної культурної політики. Доведено, що культурна політика — це діяльність, пов'язана з формуванням та узгодженням соціальних механізмів і умов культурної активності як населення загалом, так і всіх його груп, орієнтованих на розвиток творчих, культурних і рекреаційних потреб. Механізмами формування і узгодження умов культурної діяльності виокремлюють правовий, економічний та організаційний.

Визначено, що нині функцію соціокультурних цінностей виконують установи культури і засоби масової комунікації, причому другі це роблять ефективніше. Установи культури і мистецтва втратили свою монополію на залучення людини до кращих цінностей культури, цю роль їм доводиться ділити з особистими бібліотеками, телебаченням, комп'ютерною технікою та мережею Інтернет. Культуро-творчі та інші процеси активної діяльності населення значною мірою протікають поза установ і організацій інституційної системи культури.

Основними органами, що реалізують культурну політику держави, є культурні інститути. Останні порівняно чітко поділяються на державні інститути, бюджетно прив'язані до виконання основних завдань куль-

турної політики держави, сформульованих у Конституції України, інших правових актах.

Недержавними інститутами, що вирішують питання розвитку художньої діяльності, є творчі спілки та об'єднання, архітектурні, художні та реставраційні майстерні, кіностудії та кінопрокатні установи. Тобто, відмітними особливостями суб'єкта державного управління соціокультурними процесами є: можливість впливати через державні нормативно-правові акти; фінансування на вирішення завдань культурної політики з державного бюджету; вирішення завдань культурної політики тільки через державні правові та економічні механізми.

До функцій державного управління культурою не входять завдання загальної соціокультурної регуляції життя людей, формування звичаїв і традицій, безпосередньої художньої творчості, керівництво діяльністю творчих спілок та ін. Управління культурою на рівні держави має в основному моделювати механізми природного цивілізаційного процесу, діяти в межах його соціальних законів і лише стимулювати прискорений розвиток суспільства в тому напрямі, в якому воно саме по собі об'єктивно рухається.

Ключові слова: культура, культурна політика, держава, державне управління, установи культури, соціально-культурна діяльність.

СУЩНОСТЬ И СПЕЦИФИКА СОВРЕМЕННОЙ ГОСУДАРСТВЕННОЙ КУЛЬТУРНОЙ ПОЛИТИКИ

Аннотация. Рассмотрена сущность и специфика современной государственной культурной политики. Доказано, что культурная политика — это деятельность, связанная с формированием и согласованием социальных механизмов и условий культурной активности как населения в целом, так и всех его групп, ориентированных на развитие творческих, культурных и рекреационных потребностей. В качестве механизмов формирования и согласования условий культурной деятельности выделяются правовые, экономические и организационные.

Определено, что в настоящее время функцию социокультурных ценностей выполняют учреждения культуры и средства массовой коммуникации, причем вторые это делают эффективнее. Учреждения культуры и искусства утратили свою монополию на приобщение человека к лучшим ценностям культуры, эту роль им приходится делить с личными библиотеками, телевидением, компьютерной техникой и сетью Интернет. Культурно-творческие и другие процессы активной деятельности населения в значительной мере протекают вне учреждений и организаций институциональной системы культуры.

Основными органами, реализующими культурную политику государства, являются культурные институты. Последние сравнительно четко разделяются на государственные институты, бюджетно привязаны к выполнению основных задач культурной политики государства, сформулированных в Конституции, других правовых актах.

Негосударственными институтами, решающими вопросы развития художественной деятельности, являются творческие союзы и объединения, архитектурные, художественные и реставрационные мастерские, киностудии и кинопрокатные учреждения. То есть, отличительными особенностями субъекта государственного управления социокультурными процессами являются: возможность влиять с помощью государственных нормативно-правовых актов; финансирование на решение задач культурной политики из государственного бюджета; решение задач культурной политики только через государственные правовые и экономические механизмы.

В функции государственного управления культурой не входят задачи общей социокультурной регуляции жизни людей, формирование обычаев и традиций, непосредственное художественное творчество, руководство деятельностью творческих союзов и т. п. Управление культурой на уровне государства должно в основном моделировать механизмы естественного цивилизационного процесса, действовать в рамках его социальных законов и лишь стимулировать ускоренное развитие общества в том направлении, в котором оно само по себе объективно движется.

Ключевые слова: культура, культурная политика, государство, государственное управление, учреждения культуры, социально-культурная деятельность.

Problem statement. In the literature, domestic and foreign, the opinion is often expressed that the culture of less than other spheres of public life is subject to institutional ordering and public administration. More often than others, such opinion is expressed by the creators themselves of cultural values. Due to the special role of creativity in socio-cultural processes, culture, above all, is connected with the individual activity of artists and thinkers, writers and artists, which does not fit into attempts to regulate it.

The other side insistently emphasizes that the state plays an important role in the functioning and development of culture. Ensuring the general social functions of the state is the most important precondition of culture, without which society is manifested

in the power of spontaneous development, the actions of local forces and local interests. The state also acts as an important 'customer' and 'sponsor', supporting cultural activities financially or through the provision of privileges.

Yet the state is a special sphere of life of society, acting on its own laws and lives its interests. Neither the essence nor the dynamics of the state coincides directly with the dynamics of culture, between them the usual frictions and conflicts in which the state temporarily can take the upper hand, but, having its own potencies, culture is in most cases more durable.

Analysis of recent researches and publications. Theoretical foundations of state cultural policy are highlighted in the works of both foreign

and domestic scientists. The following scientists, namely: O. Butnyk [1], L. Vostriakov [2], Yu. Vdovenko [2], O. Hrytsenko [3], I. Ihyatcheyko [10], and A. Dehtiar [8], O. Dehtiar [8], A. Zaitseva [5], O. Kravchenko [9], O. Kopiiievska [7], V. Malimin [6], S. Ovcharenko [4] and others have made a significant contribution to the study of the peculiarities of the state's influence on the sphere of culture. However, despite numerous studies, the specifics of managerial relations in the field of culture and ways of improving the state cultural policy remain insufficiently highlighted.

Formulating the goals of the article. The purpose of this article is to determine the essence and specificity of contemporary state cultural policy and to provide suggestions for its improvement.

Presentation of the main research material. With the beginning of market and democratic reforms in Ukraine, the role of the state in the management of culture has dramatically made weaker, decentralization has become an unconscious consequence of the new cultural policy, and evidence of the economic and political weakness of the state and the faith of the reformers that the market itself will regulate everything. In the beginning of the 21st century, the contours of a new cultural policy based on the understanding of the need for decentralization of cultural management, the development of diversity and the open competition of different areas of cultural development, the transition from policy and administrative to indirect, democratic methods of governance began to emerge in Ukraine only.

Each of these controversial points of view has the right to exist, but this right is justified only in a concrete historical context. Truth, as always, lies in the middle. When the state is economically weakened, the support of culture is rather limited, and therefore, selective. Cultural management begins to be limited to the distribution of scanty budget funds, often based on political lobbyism, or even the utility or incompetence of an official.

That is, the effectiveness of public administration of culture is influenced not only by an objective factor, but also by a subjective one, so in management is the activity of the subject of management to ensure the optimal functioning and development of the system, the activities of, first of all, those people, who are competent and empowered to make decisions [1, p. 91].

Another area of the problems that the modern science of public administration began to develop relatively recently is a topic of cultural policy. This is largely due to the methodological lack of elaboration of many important for a unified understanding of the essence of this topic.

To date, the literature does not have a clear understanding of what is cultural policy. Despite the fact that the very concept of '*cultural policy*' is firmly in use, its specific content is still uncertain. Meanwhile, without defining the concept of '*cultural policy*', we will not be able to solve the problem of the mechanisms of its formation and implementation. An attempt to outline the boundaries of this concept was made by L. Vostriakov [2, p. 64], assuming the concept of '*politics*' as the sphere of human activity in which the

struggle for power takes place. When it comes to the struggle for the power of regional elites, attempts to preserve economic and political power in confronting the state elites in conditions of unification and centralization are rather complicated. The right is still subject to political expediency. The sphere of culture is perhaps the only area where political confrontation is not doomed to the mutual destruction of the parties.

In principle, politics is not all struggle for power, but one that is subject to certain norms and rules of the political game and adopted in this community. Distinctive feature of the political struggle is the desire to legitimize, that is, the provision of their claim to legitimate grounds and the acquisition of influence on state institutions of power [3, p. 15].

S. Ovcharenko considers cultural policy as a complex of measures for the artificial regulation of tendencies in the development of spiritual and value aspects of social life. Reflecting on the limits of state interference in the management of socio-cultural processes, the author proposes to first differentiate the state cultural policy and the operational management of current cultural creative processes as two different levels of strategy and tactics of management activities [4, p. 64].

Cultural policy is a set of scientifically grounded views and measures on comprehensive socio-cultural modernization of society and structural reforms throughout the system of cultural and creative institutions, as a system of new proportional principles of state and social components of social

and cultural life, as a set of measures for the timely establishment of scientific and educational provision of these principles, purposeful training for skilled regulation of socio-cultural processes of tomorrow, and most importantly as a meaningful adjustment of the overall content of national culture. Managing the current culture of creative processes is a set of operational actions to address the urgent existing problems of cultural and creative institutions, designed to provide enhanced reproduction of actual cultural forms within the financial resources, staffing, tools and technologies available to the state to date.

A. Zaitseva defines cultural policy as a line of behaviour and actions of the subject who has the ability to influence something [5, p. 34]. One way or another, this is the subject's activity in relation to culture, aimed at regulating the processes of production, storage, distribution and consumption of cultural property.

In our opinion, cultural policy is an activity associated with the formation and coordination of social mechanisms and the conditions of cultural activity, both for the population as a whole, and for all its groups, focused on the development of creative, cultural and recreational needs as mechanisms of formation and harmonization of the conditions of cultural activity are allocated legal, economic and organizational conditions.

A large number of works have appeared, fully or partially devoted to theoretical problems of cultural development [6], problems of the development of a new model for the regulation of cultural processes [7] summarizing

the research may highlight the following three important points:

(1) Currently, the functions of transmission of socio-cultural values are carried out by cultural institutions and mass media, with the latter doing it more effectively;

(2) Cultural and art institutions have lost their monopoly on attracting people to the best cultural values; they have to share this role with private libraries, television, computer equipment and the Internet network;

(3) Cultural-creative and other processes of active activity of the population to a large extent proceed outside institutions and organizations of the institutional system of culture.

Regarding the competences of state culture management, it is necessary to dwell on the peculiarities of object-subjective interaction in this sphere. From the standpoint of Sociocybernetics, which has constructed a formal model of this process, management is a special form of interaction of specifically organized, complex and connected with each other formations: controlling and controlled, which separately are not such. Management consists in the fact that the subject of his directed effects controls the state of the controlled object, induces him to change their parameters to achieve predetermined results of the subject. In turn, the object acts on the subject and contributes to the fulfilment of his role in the management process [8, p. 94].

In totalitarian social and political systems, the state as a sole subject of social control fully set the parameters of the necessary changes, determined the goals and nature of the results, necessary from the point of view of the

party-state elite. In a democratic society, as a self-governing system, the object of management does not passively perceive managerial influences, but actively influences itself on the subject of management, inducing, or even forcing, the adoption of the necessary object of the decision. The development and functioning of managerial relations in the field of culture has a special peculiarity, the conscious beginning causes here not only the purposefulness of the actions of the subject of control, but also the activity of the controlled object. The latter is not a passive '*perception*' of the managerial influence of the subject, but acts as an active, full participant in managerial processes, inducing and forcing the managerial components to make certain decisions [9, p. 103]. The more developed the social activity of creative workers, consumers of cultural values, the more insistent they are able to defend their interests and influence the adoption of managerial decisions concerning the financing of the cultural sphere, the right to use cultural monuments and taxation, etc. The more reason it is possible to talk about transforming management objects into subjects of cultural management. In the absence of such active actors in the field of culture, the process of implementing the program must be carried out with the direct participation and under the control of the state cultural management bodies [10].

In general, cultural management is the interaction of managers and managed entities aimed at regulating the implementation of cultural policy. Actually this process is the subject of science of public administration [11, p. 51].

The specificity of managerial relations in the sphere of culture determines the limits of state interference in socio-cultural processes. And, above all, the fact that in addition to state authorities, the subjects of management of culture include non-state institutions. It would be a mistake to limit understanding of the subject by only one state and its management bodies. An entity that implements cultural policy is primarily a society that is only corrected by state authorities. Being simultaneously the object and subject of cultural policy, society acts as a socio-cultural system, self-organizing and self-evolving, continuously adapting to the changing conditions of life (primarily the change in their cultural and value orientation, in many ways stimulating and changing utilitarian social needs, which are determined not least by considerations of social prestige, fashion and ideological values, etc.).

The main bodies implementing the cultural policy of the state are cultural institutions. The latter are relatively clearly divided into state institutions, budget-bound for the fulfilment of the main tasks of the cultural policy of the state, formulated in the Constitution of Ukraine, and other legal acts. For example, institutions dealing with issues of collecting and preserving cultural heritage are libraries, archives, diverse museums, state historical and cultural reserves, etc. Non-state institutions that deal with the development of artistic activities are creative unions and associations, architectural, artistic and restoration workshops, film studios and film rental establishments. In addition to state-owned, there were private theatres (dramatic and musical),

concert structures, circuses, as well as books publishing and booksellers. There were non-state secondary and higher educational establishments of the artistic profile, etc. in the regions of Ukraine. Not all listed cultural institutions are administratively subordinated to the Ministry of Culture of Ukraine and are centrally governed by it; in particular, architecture, cinema, literature and book publishing set are non-state structures. However, the states retained the right to license and control the activities of all non-governmental sector cultural institutions without exception.

The function of state management of culture does not include the tasks of general socio-cultural regulation of people's lives, the formation of customs and traditions, direct artistic creativity and leadership activities of creative unions, etc. The management of culture at the state level should mainly model the mechanisms of the natural civilization process, act within framework of its social laws and only to stimulate the accelerated development of society in the direction in which it is itself objectively moving. The experience of history shows that attempts to artificially change this natural direction of development, to impose a speculative model of its evolution on society, did not end with anything good for society. If management is a purposeful activity, who will take on the function of setting the goal for society? This was an attempt in domestic history, but the current Constitution of Ukraine prohibits the existence of state ideology.

Of course, the overwhelming part of the various processes of cultural life of society proceeds spontaneously,

subject only to the deeper laws of social self-organization of people in their collective life. At the same time, some components of this set process are subjected to reasonable and purposeful regulation, and stimulation of some tendencies and curtailment of others, etc., carried out from the standpoint of vision and understanding of the strategic ways in which this civilization moves. The set of these measures on the artificial regulation of tendencies in the development of spiritual and value aspects of social life and can be called '*cultural policy*'.

That is, the distinctive features of the subject of state governance of socio-cultural processes are: the ability to influence state legal acts; financing of the tasks of cultural policy from the state budget; solving the tasks of cultural policy only through state legal and economic mechanisms.

Often in practice, state support for culture is perceived only as an existing mechanism for budget financing of the branch. This definition is clearly not enough. Public administration provides for financing from the state budget only. Support is not limited to direct financing: the state can use other economic and legal mechanisms: privileges, taxes and creation of priority conditions for development, etc. It should be noted that financing of culture can be carried out not from state sources: at the expense of municipal budgets, extrabudgetary funds, sponsorship and other sources. But here too there should be a supervisory and controlling role of the state, regulatory and legal mechanisms.

In the first place, state support is required to ensure the preservation of the historical, cultural and natural heritage

of national and world significance, and the activities of those creative workers, who create new cultural models, study and preserve cultural traditions, and involve the next generations to high cultural values. This can be done on the basis of government orders.

Conclusions from this study and prospects for further exploration (research).

At all levels of cultural policy the main objective of public administration is to create conditions that stimulate socio-cultural activities of individuals, social groups, institutions, institutes of culture and leisure activities that contribute to the solution of social problems carriers that have different categories of the population. In this regard, the result of cultural policy is the intensity and quality of socio-cultural activities, its contribution to solving the problems of specific social groups, and the development of infrastructure serves as a means of improving cultural life.

Thus, state administration of culture in modern Ukraine is limited by the constitutional tasks of ensuring the freedom of citizens to participate in cultural life, preserving the diversity of the system of values accumulated by previous generations in a single Ukrainian culture, creating legal and economic conditions for the maintenance of the functioning and development of artistic life in the country.

The state does not substitute the activities of non-state actors for managing socio-cultural processes in the country, but creates the necessary conditions for their effective functioning in the interests of creating a modern, democratic, humane and prosperous society in Ukraine.

REFERENCES

1. Butnyk O. O. (2015). Derzhavne upravlinnia stanovlenniam ta rozvytkom kultury v Ukraini [State management of formation and development of culture in Ukraine]. *Naukovi rozvidky z derzhavnogo ta munitsypalnoho upravlinnia – The science of rozvidki from the state and municipality*, 1, 90–95 [in Ukrainian].
2. Vostryakov L. E. (2011). *Gosudarstvennaya kul'turnaya politika: ponyatiya i modeli* [State cultural policy: concepts and models]. Saint-Petersburg: SZI RAKhNiGS [In Russian].
3. Hrytsenko O. (2007). *Kulturna polityka v Ukraini. Analychnyi ohliad* [Cultural policy in Ukraine. Analytical review]. Kyiv: UTsKD [in Ukrainian].
4. Ovcharenko S. V. (2013). *Humanitarna ta kulturna polityka* [Humanitarian and cultural policy]. Odesa: ORIDU NADU [in Ukrainian].
5. Zaitseva A. V. (2014). Pravove rehuliuвання kulturnoi polityky v Ukraini [Legal regulation of cultural policy in Ukraine]. *Naukovyi visnyk Khersonskoho derzhavnogo universytetu – Scientific Herald of Kherson State University*, 1 (5), 30–36 [in Ukrainian].
6. Malimon V. I. (2008). Problemy derzhavnoi kulturnoi polityky v Ukraini na suchasnomu etapi rozvytku suspilstva [Problems of state cultural policy in Ukraine at the present stage of development of society]. *Universytetski naukovi zapysky – University Scientific Notes*, 4, 355–360 [in Ukrainian].
7. Kopievska O. R. (2013). Modeli sotsiokulturnykh transformatsii [Models of socio-cultural transformations]. *Kultura narodov Prychernomoria – Culture of the peoples of the Black Sea region*, 2 (65), 151–155 [in Ukrainian].
8. Dyehtyar A. O., Dyehtyar O. A. (2014). *Prynyattya derzhavno-upravlins'kykh rishen' u sotsial'niy sferi* [The adoption of the state-administrative decisions in the social sphere]. Kharkiv: S.A.M. [in Ukrainian].
9. Holovchenko M. F. (2013). *Kultura yak ob'ekt kulturnoi funktsii suchasnoi derzhavy* [Culture as an object of cultural function of the modern state]. *Naukovyi visnyk Mizhnarodnoho humanitarnoho universytetu. Yurysprudentsiia – Scientific Herald of the International Humanitarian University. Jurisprudence*, 6, 16–19 [in Ukrainian].
10. Ihnatcheyko I. H. (2013). Osoblyvosti realizatsii derzhavnoi polityky Ukrainy u sferi kultury: suchasnyi stan ta svitovi standarty [Features of realization of state policy in the sphere of culture: current status and global standards]. *Teoriia i praktyka pravoznavstva – Theory and practice of jurisprudence*, Retrieved from http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/tipp_2013116 [in Ukrainian].
11. Dyehtyar A. O., Dyehtyar O. A. (2014). *Prynyattya derzhavno-upravlins'kykh rishen' u sotsial'niy sferi* [The adoption of the state-administrative decisions in the social sphere]. Kharkiv: S.A.M. [in Ukrainian].

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

1. *Бутник О. О.* Державне управління становленням та розвитком культури в Україні / О. О. Бутник // *Наук. розвідки з держ. та муніципального управління*. 2015. Вип. 1. С. 90–95.
2. *Востряков Л. Е.* Государственная культурная политика: понятия и модели: монография / Л. Е. Востряков. СПб.: СЗИ РАХНиГС, 2011. 168 с.
3. *Культурна політика в Україні. Аналітичний огляд / за ред. О. Гриценка. К. : УЦКД, 2007. 160 с.*

4. *Овчаренко С. В.* Гуманітарна та культурна політика: навч. посіб. [Електронний ресурс] / С. В. Овчаренко. Одеса : ОРІДУ НАДУ, 2013. 152 с.
5. *Зайцева А. В.* Правове регулювання культурної політики в Україні / А. В. Зайцева // Наук. вісн. Херсонського держ. ун-ту. 2014. № 1 (5). С. 30–36.
6. *Малімон В. І.* Проблеми державної культурної політики в Україні на сучасному етапі розвитку суспільства / В. І. Малімон // Університетські наукові зап. 2008. № 4. С. 355–360.
7. *Копієвська О. Р.* Моделі соціокультурних трансформацій / О. Р. Копієвська // Культура народів Причорномор'я. 2013. № 2 (65). С. 151–155.
8. *Дегтяр А. О.* Прийняття державно-управлінських рішень у соціальній сфері : монографія / А. О. Дегтяр, О. А. Дегтяр. Харків : С.А.М., 2014. 252 с.
9. *Головченко М. Ф.* Культура як об'єкт культурної функції сучасної держави / М. Ф. Головченко // Наук. вісн. Міжнар. гуманітарного ун-ту. Юриспруденція. 2013. № 6. С. 16–19.
10. *Ігнатченко І. Г.* Особливості реалізації державної політики України у сфері культури: сучасний стан та світові стандарти [Електронний ресурс] / І. Г. Ігнатченко // Теорія і практика правознавства. 2013. Вип. 1. Режим доступу : http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/tipr_2013116
11. *Дегтяр А. О.* Прийняття державно-управлінських рішень у соціальній сфері : монографія / А. О. Дегтяр, О. А. Дегтяр. Харків : С.А.М., 2014. 252 с.