

## Theoretical Studies of Mass Culture as a Self-Developing System in the Context of the Tasks of Russia's Cultural Policy

Olga N. Astafyeva <sup>1\*</sup>, Irina G. Belyakova <sup>1</sup>, Natalia E. Sudakova <sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration (RANEPA), RUSSIA

Received 13 May 2017 • Revised 23 September 2017 • Accepted 3 October 2017

### ABSTRACT

The topicality of the problem lies in growing tension between the increasing attention to creativity and creative activities and the "neutral" attitude to the problems of developing support mechanisms. The purpose of the article is to justify the need for state support of mass culture and the sector of creative industries as special spheres of cultural creativity. The leading approach to the problem study is socio-cultural analysis showing stability of the general trend in the mass culture development on the way of "value massivization". Changes of business strategies for the development of some territories raises the question of coordination recognition of self- organization principles and management aimed at maintaining of free public development movement. The materials of the article can be useful for practitioners in the development of state cultural policy and for a wide range of researchers in the sphere of modern society in the context of socio-cultural changes.

**Keywords:** mass culture, creative industries, cultural industries, cultural policy, development of territories, city, cultural resources

### INTRODUCTION

One of the key topics of the era of the post-industrial economy is the study in Russia and abroad of the phenomenon of mass culture - a complex multifaceted phenomenon characterized by the orientation toward consumption by all people, regardless of their level of education and perception traditions, which forms mass consciousness and influences tastes, behavior patterns; included in commercial forms of functioning and open for replication. The totality of its spread and the activation of a number of segments (media, cinematography, advertising), convergence with the segment of creative (cultural) industries - entertainment, leisure, design, tourism, fashion, with their individual mass form of creation and consumption, initiate the emergence of new theoretical studies. Taking into account the powerful influence of the entire renewed system of mass culture on different spheres of life of modern society, the need for its comprehension in the mainstream of the tasks of Russia's cultural policy, in particular, the applied administrative level, is growing.

The purpose of this article is to identify the relationship between the state of theoretical studies of mass culture, the formation of discourse on the creative (cultural) industries in society and the guidelines of cultural policy to support the creative self-development of the cultural environment of Russian territories. The authors set themselves the tasks of theoretical substantiation of state support for mass culture as a special sphere of cultural creativity, which has its own audience, to which it has a serious influence. All its specialized areas are determined by social, cultural, aesthetic and other tasks, but are addressed to the broad masses, regardless of any levels or layers of its differentiation.

Among the research tasks is the actualization of the theme of creative (cultural) industries, defined by UNESCO as a special kind of activity based on an individual creative principle, skill and talent, i.e. intellectual property, thereby creating added value, additional jobs, overcoming the poverty of the sociocultural environment. Given that

---

© **Authors.** Terms and conditions of Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) apply.

\* **Correspondence:** Olga N. Astafyeva, *Scientific and Educational Centre "Civil Society and Social Communications" The Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration (RANEPA), Moscow, Russia.*

✉ [onastafieva@mail.ru](mailto:onastafieva@mail.ru)

in many Russian cities, despite the absence of the concept of the development of the sector of creative industries in the country, its representatives perform a number of significant socio-cultural functions (socialization and integration, identification and integration, education and upbringing), a positive social attitude to development in society creative industries. Thus, there is a growing need to develop and adopt such a document, as this will contribute to strengthening the creative resources of the territory and the emergence of new image components, saturating the diversity of socio-economic infrastructure of culture and creativity.

Forming a new relationship in the state to the development of creative industries and, accordingly, changing attitudes to popular culture in general and to the entrepreneurial segment is a step towards strengthening economic indicators and cultural development of the territories, as well as a way of preserving and developing creative capital.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

The dynamics of theoretical ideas about the essence of mass culture as a multifaceted phenomenon in Russia's social and humanitarian thought reflects a change in conceptual institutions and a re-emphasis of research interest in society and culture as interconnected whole systems in the context of modern changes. These sociocultural transformations of the globalizing world, with its intensively developing information and communication technologies and market mechanisms, the inclusion of supranational levels of government in national socio-political systems, generates the processes of free creative self-development determined by researchers as internal self-determinants of culture that are not free from equally strong influences, going "from the outside" [1].

The subject area we have identified - the interconnection of mass culture and cultural policy is least studied in the social and humanitarian thought of Russia, although it is a universally recognized fact of the newest history of culture. In this article, we will focus on the dual - theoretical and practical - nature of the concepts under discussion and their interaction, focusing on the phenomenon of creative (cultural) industries with a strong innovative potential.

Epochal changes in the production and consumption of culture actualize the stratum of studies of mass culture as a multifaceted phenomenon, discovered yet by representatives of the Frankfurt School, sociologists and philosophers of the twentieth century [2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11] from different points of view (consumption, free time, creativity, cultural industries, etc.).

The concepts of mass culture, developed for a long time and social and humanitarian thought in the Soviet period of Russian history, contributed to the persistence of prejudices about modern mass culture in society, as an alien phenomenon characteristic of the Euro-Atlantic civilization that destroys the identity and "cultural codes" of society. From the established behind this phenomenon of negative connotations and the epithet "bourgeois mass culture", Russian science refused after the 90s of the twentieth century. Equally, this was facilitated by a change in socio-political conditions, renewal of the research methodology, and new types and practices of mass culture that have become part of social reality.

In scientific research, ideas were introduced on the ontology and genesis of mass culture, based on the concepts of social stratification and the morphology of culture [12]. The mass culture in the works of O. N. Astafyeva is considered in the context of the trends of the globalizing world [13, 14]. N. B. Mankovskaya and K. E. Razlogov free ideas about the essence of mass culture from the rigid dichotomy of the mass and elite in postmodern culture [15, 16]. In this case, Razlogov K. E. argues that the spread of mass culture, even in those areas that for a long time do not support this cultural paradigm. In his opinion, "mass culture will be the leading cultural paradigm. All the rest will be perceived as subcultures". [17, p. 89]. However, we cannot omit recalling here the idea of P. Bychkov specifying this point of view that "mass culture is not so much cultural texts as the dominant component of modern culture" [18, p. 67] sometimes very discrete and mosaic. This allows to put the issue of referring the mass culture not to the texts of culture, but to its context.

To a greater or lesser degree, the ideas of the emergence of mass culture as a cultural phenomenon long before the emergence of the cultural industry of the twentieth century developed in the national culture and philosophy school. Interpreting and critically reinterpreting classical philosophical and sociological theories [19, 20, 21, 22, 23], the researchers asserted the existence in every national or ethnic culture of the prerequisites for future development and preservation of a peculiar mass culture. At the same time, it was stressed that the factors of socio-cultural dynamics (regional or ethnonational, technological, etc.) contribute to the flourishing of mass culture, creating "advantages" for its development in this or that country, specifically in the historical period. In this series there are studies of A. V. Kostina and A. Y. Flier, who set forth an understanding of mass culture in the conceptual framework of the typology of cultures [12]. The important clarifications in the notions of mass culture were made by I. V. Kondakov, who recognizes the previously noted difficulties in determining the ethno-national or regional origin of mass culture, emphasizes the possibility of enhancing the influence of a particular national culture on the development of mass culture in different cultural and historical epochs. Ideas about special forms of representation

of mass culture in pre-industrial, industrial and post-industrial societies allow the researcher to pay attention to the potential of a global spread of mass culture that absorbs national and regional specifics [24].

## METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

The purpose of this study is to substantiate the need for state support for mass culture and the sector of creative industries as special spheres of cultural creativity that perform a number of significant socio-cultural functions.

Objectives of the study:

1. To consider the dynamics of the conceptual framework for the study of mass culture in the context of the emergence of new actors.
2. To hide the nature of the contradictions associated with the need to actualize symbolic capital in the modern world in the context of uniqueness on the one hand, and with mechanisms for cultivating the universality and massivization of culture, on the other.
3. To conduct a system analysis of the factors that predetermine the need for a theoretical justification for the inclusion of creative (cultural) industries in the strategy of state and cultural policy.
4. Identify mechanisms for updating the understanding of the resource of creative and symbolic capital from the perspective of building new economic models of the present.
5. Use the shortcomings of the modern system of assessing the economic and sociocultural potential of creative (cultural) industries in Russia, the mechanisms for their emergence and overcoming.
6. Represent the main provisions aimed at restructuring the management system of socio-cultural development of Russia, due to the need to include creative industries in modern economic relations from the perspective of increasing the competitiveness of the territories.

The main methods of research are sociocultural and comparative analysis that show the stability of the general trend in the development of mass culture along the path of "massivization" of values, norms and meanings and identify the innovative orientation of creative industries to appeal to unique experience and practices, thus justifying the emergence of new hybrid formations.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The segment of creative (cultural) industries remains the least developed, since it is considered mainly within the framework of the theory of cultural capital. The presence of the most complex contradictions—the question of the primacy of the commercial or cultural principle, the insufficiently developed criteria for assessing economic and symbolic capital—led to the fact that in the discourse of cultural policy and in the documents that fix it, creative (cultural) industries are mentioned only in the context of the post-industrial paradigm. Moreover, in the concept of cultural policy as a system of purposeful influence on the state of the cultural environment and collective identity, on improving the quality of life in different territories of Russia, this evolving phenomenon is not given due attention.

In the studies of mass culture, the segment of creative (cultural) industries is least developed, since it is considered mainly in the conceptual framework of the study of cultural capital and its potential in socio-economic development.

Creativity as a backbone factor of creative industries development was considered in the works of Richard Florida, Charles Landry [25, 26] and others. Undoubtedly, the products of creative (creative) industries cannot be considered only within the framework of the concept of mass culture, since the results of exhibition and project activities in the field of promoting new works of art or technology (in painting, graphics, photography, etc.) executed highly professional and talented performers. The production and promotion of multimedia and video art, forms of contemporary and interactive art and design, may also be more in line with the searches and experiments of professionals.

What are the factors allowing us to raise the issue of the need for theoretical substantiation of proposals to include this phenomenon of modern culture in the sphere of the state's attention and recognize the importance of improving development programs and supporting creative industries into the strategy of the state cultural policy?

First, in the demand for research of a new type of society, in which modern types of communicative connections with different value dominants are formed (from friendly contacts to partner interaction and team project social groups), there is a growing need for individualization and diversification of consumption, creative self-realization [25].

Secondly, the absence of a detailed conceptual apparatus, the mechanical transfer of terminology from research into creative industries and the creative potential of foreign authors, without taking into account the specifics of

the sociocultural environment and trends in its development in Russia, which leads to unreasonable conclusions and superficial conclusions, but also inaccurate managerial decisions.

Thirdly, the inadequacy of the system of criteria for the evaluation and identification of various types of activities related to creative (cultural) industries. Starting in 2015, DCMS recognizes nine creative sectors: advertising and marketing, architecture, crafts, design (product, graphics and clothing design), films, television, video, radio and photography, IT (software and computer services), publishing, museums, galleries and libraries, music, performing and visual art [26]. Dedicated types-directions of creative activity not only in the presented, but also in other international classifications refer to different segments of economic and production activity in Russia.

Fourthly, in the absence of a toolkit for state support for creative entrepreneurship, which could be used to overcome the public attitudes towards this segment, mainly as a segment of a market economy. Thus, on the one hand, the specificity of the products and results of the activities of the creative (cultural) industries that participate in the production of the "public good", cultural services and the creative capital of the territories is ignored. Probably, it happens because some of them constitute a segment of the mass culture of society. On the other hand, traditional cultural institutions - museums and cultural organizations can be conditionally ranked in the field of creative industries, with some reservations, since they are not fully commercial enterprises.

The presence of the most complex contradictions-the question of the primacy of the commercial or cultural principle, the insufficiently developed criteria for assessing economic and symbolic capital-led to the fact that in the discourse of cultural policy and in the documents that fix it, creative (cultural) industries are mentioned only in the context of the post-industrial paradigm. While the understanding of creative industries in the context of the theme of renewal of the cultural environment of the territories allows to talk about a creative class that has a new quality - to take on "collective responsibility for the welfare of the community" [25, p. 65] which actually corresponds to the principles of the modern socio-cultural environment: openness and accessibility, comfort and safety. Accordingly, creative industries allow solving the problem of designing zones of active cultural space, creating places for recreation and recreation, free communication and intellectual leisure, i.e. which corresponds to the way of life of the modern person of the creative environment.

Theoretical development of the problems of the development of creative industries in Russia will expand the concept of cultural policy, understood as a system of targeted influence on the state of the cultural environment, collective identity and quality of life in different territories of Russia. In the "Fundamentals of the State Cultural Policy" and "Strategy of the State Cultural Policy of Russia for the period until 2030" the positive trends in overcoming the long-drawn-out situation of uncertainty and instability are outlined [28, 29].

On the one hand, there was a rejection of super-intensive, multi-vector changes, since a theoretical model of the semantic kernel of the renewed socio-cultural paradigm was presented. On the other hand, as for a number of parameters, its values and meanings are very slowly translated to the level of concrete practice. This concerns different areas of cultural activity, bringing to society various axiological guidelines and opportunities for realizing the creative potential of culture.

Participants in the sector of creative industries, claiming a middle position between economic and cultural-civilizational innovations, initiate unexpected trends, imparting impulses to the level of sociocultural processes that become the source of new cultural reference points of society today and are included in the formation of other semantic systems and fundamental conceptualizations, transforming a long time fixed axiological scales of national culture. Such are the clusters of creative industries or creative spaces in Moscow ("Flacon", "Art-play", etc.), in Ulyanovsk ("Quarter"), in Yekaterinburg (Art Factory), in the Moscow region (Kolomna Center for the Development of Cognitive tourism "City-Museum"), etc. The dynamics of changes in the cultural environment as a certain order in society is also set by private museum complexes that turn territories into city-museums (like the city of Myshkin), forming places of social attraction (the Chocolate Museum in St. Petersburg; museum "Russian samovar" of Kasimov city of Ryazan Region, Museum of happiness, Birch bark, the Museum of tales and legends in Novosibirsk). As a rule, the creation of a small museum can lead to the emergence of new creative industries and the emergence of "growth points" for future clusters involving NPOs, as it was in Ulyanovsk, how the loft "Mill", the space of Art El in Novosibirsk, was formed.

A separate direction that can solve the problems of creating jobs and developing the territory is creative activity (the artistic and creative workshop "Mikhailovskoye Lace" in the city of Ryazan, the studio of the author's ceramics "Art-Modern" of the Lyubertsy district of the Moscow region and many others). Theatrical, concert-performing, producer activities of the Arkhangelsk Jazz centers, the Arkhangelsk Youth Theater, allow to perform educational functions, organize international festivals ("International Days of Jazz Vladimir Rezitsky", "Arkhangelsk Blues Festival" and "Malina Jazz", International festival of street theaters in Arkhangelsk, decadence festival in St. Petersburg).

The existing confrontation between different types of creative activity and forms of artistic culture, on the one hand, and innovative proposals of cultural industries, which, according to D. Hazmondalsh, "closer to the center of economic activity" [30] leads to the fact that in determining the strategic objectives of Russia's cultural policy,

their importance is diminished. However, they are active participants in shaping the urban environment and preferences of cultural consumption, which affect the hierarchy of value priorities among Russian citizens. The researchers note the weakness of the state's cultural policy, insufficient attention to personal development of a person and the prospects for implementing positive goals and projects in its interests, reducing the readiness for various forms of highly specialized activities [31, 32]. While, under the conditions of the diversity of the existing and existing structural sublevels (traditional and innovative), various subcultures that provide unlimited opportunities for change and self-development of culture, capable of developing under certain managerial influences and a measure of self-restraint to preserve integrity. This is the aim of the instruments of cultural policy, which have their own specifics on its different "levels-contours":

on the general political, where strategic goals and the semantic imperatives of social development are built;

on the sectoral, where culture is represented as an institutional system;

on the mass, developing through the cultural activity of a wide range of people, ensuring the freedom of creative self-development of culture. The generated diversity is constrained by the regulations of the first and second level contour of cultural policy, ensuring the conflict-free coexistence of different social and ethnic strata [33].

We emphasize that at the present time, conceptual and instrumental updating of cultural policy and management practices is taking place at all three levels contours, however, the central issues regarding tradition and mass culture, as gravitating towards innovation of the culture layer, are not fully exhausted and remain relevant. There is a clear need for understanding new phenomena of modern culture, which have received special economic conditions for development - mass culture and creative industries, as well as in organizing research on the state of the cultural industries market in order to reveal the expectations and interests of consumers. Without marketing research, it is difficult for producers to establish a relationship with consumers and, moreover, to expand the number of participants in this segment. Without state support, it is difficult to implement applied development in the country - monitoring and sociological research of the results of updating mechanisms and content aspects of cultural policy, quantitative and qualitative measurements of the accessibility of the cultural environment, as indicators of the effectiveness of cultural policies that replace the previously existing hierarchy of values and meanings.

## CONCLUSION

As a result of the study the following conclusions were made for further comparative research of two phenomena of modern culture which gained specific conditions for development - mass culture and creative industries.

1. In the post-industrial economy and in the context of expanding trends in globalization the importance of a contradictory trend is growing: on the one hand, increasing attention to the cultural and creative component, symbolic capital and the uniqueness of its representation in all types of activities and products, at all levels of social life, which is supported in the dissemination of the concept of human potential and sustainable development ;on the other hand, the preservation of the features of universality and transnationality in the phenomena of mass culture, as well as the principles of accessibility and mass, a network approach to the dissemination of practices of creative industries, will cause a "neutral" (sometimes negative) attitude to problems arising from a weak legal framework and lack of mechanisms for supporting their development.
2. In the modern cultural and historical era, the creative economy demonstrates new approaches for the evaluation of creative and symbolic capital: the power of the universal principles of Hollywood cinema is being reduced; there has been rejection of general formulas and models of mass culture that distort the identity and interests of specific national cultures.

As the analysis of the emerging creative spaces and creative industries in Russia shows, the cultural environment of cities and towns is a resource that stimulates the creation of creative clusters that can change the quality of life and overcome regional differentiations in the subjects of the Russian Federation.

3. Ignoring the potential of the sector of creative industries for the socio-cultural development of Russia in the concepts of cultural policy indicates the lack of theoretical justification of creative capital and cultural capital in the system of ideas about the resources of human capital and indicators of the quality of life.
4. Changing the business strategies for the development of a number of territories that include cultural resources in the investment package of proposals and treating them in a series of competitive advantages, updates the issue of the need for organizational innovation and restructuring of the system of managing socio-cultural development, recognizing the interface between the principles of self-organization and management aimed at maintaining free the course of social development.

## REFERENCES

1. Kagan, M. S. (1996). *Philosophy of culture*. St. Petersburg: Metropolis Publishing.
2. Baudrillard, J. (1981). *Simulacres et simulation*. Paris: Galilee.
3. Baudrillard, J. (1998). *The Consumer Society: Myths and Structures*. London, England: Sage Publications Ltd.
4. Bell, D. (1999). *The Coming of Post-Industrial Society. A Venture in Social Forecasting*. New York: Basic Books.
5. Bell, D., & Presser, I. (1991). *Die kulturellen Widersprüche des Kapitalismus*. Frankfurt-a.M.; N.Y.: Campus Verl.
6. Castells, M. (1977). *The Urban Question: A Marxist Approach*. London: Edward Arnold Ltd.
7. McLuhan, M. (1964). *Os meios de comunicacao como extensoes do homem*. Sao Paulo: Cultrix.
8. McLuhan, M. (1994). *Understanding media. The Extensions of man*. USA, Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press Ltd.
9. Toffler, A. (1970). *Future Shock*. New York: Random House.
10. Toffler, A. (1981). *The Third Wave*. USA. N.Y.: Bantam books.
11. Waters, M., & Bell, D. (1996). *Key Sociologists*. London; N.Y.: Routledge.
12. Flier, A. Ya., & Kostina, A. V. (2011). *Culture between slavery of the conjuncture, slavery of custom and slavery status*. Moscow: Concord Publishing.
13. Astafieva, O. N. (2003). *Mass Culture*. *Global Studies: Encyclopedia*. Moscow: Dialogue, Raduga, 339-341, 541-546.
14. Astafieva, O. N., & Avanesova, G. A. (2015). Cultural Policy and National Culture: Prospects for the Strategic Vector of Russia's Development. *Yaroslavl Pedagogical Bulletin*, 5, 193-201.
15. Mankovskaya, N. B. (2000). *Aesthetics of Postmodernism*. Saint-Petersburg: Aleteiya publishing.
16. Razlogov, K. E. (1992). *Commerce and creativity: enemies or allies?* Moscow: Art publishing.
17. Razlogov, K. E. (2017). Cultural Revolution and Cultural Restoration. *Education and culture: the potential of interaction and resources of NGOs in the socio-cultural development of Russia's regions: theory and practice of socio-cultural development: Articles and materials of the III Cultural Forum of Russian Regions (Moscow - Volgograd - Novosibirsk - Ryazan - Syktyokar, February - September 2017)*. (2017). Moscow: Entrepreneur Lyadov K.V. publishing, 85-90.
18. Bychkov, P. G. (2014). *Socio-integration potential of the mass cult of post-industrial society* (PhD abstract). St. Petersburg.
19. Adorno, Th. W., & Walter, B. (2001). *The complete correspondence, 1928-1940*. Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard University Press.
20. Ortega y Gasset, J. (1931). *La rendicion de las provincias*. Madrid: Rev. de Occidente.
21. Adorno, Th. W., & Horkheimer, M. (1969). *Dialektik der Aufklärung. Philosophische Fragmente*. Germany, Frankfurt: S. Fischer.
22. Marcuse, H. (1991). *One-Dimensional Man. Studies in the ideology of advanced industrial society*. London and N.Y.: Beacon Press.
23. Micula, M. (2008). *Key Concepts in Culture Studies*. N.Y.: Palgrave MacMillan.
24. Kondakov, I. V. (2017). Eternal and transitory in mass culture (value orientations of cultural policy). *Education and culture: the potential of interaction and resources of NGOs in the socio-cultural development of Russia's regions: theory and practice of socio-cultural development: Articles and materials of the III Cultural Forum of Russian Regions (Moscow - Volgograd - Novosibirsk - Ryazan - Syktyokar, February - September 2017)*. Moscow: Entrepreneur Lyadov K.V. publ., 95-99.
25. Florida, R. (2002). *The Rise of Creative Class: and how it transforming work, leisure, community and everyday life*. N.Y.: Basic Books.
26. Landry, Ch. (2008). *The Creative City: A toolkit for Urban Innovators*. UK: Routledge publishing.
27. Creative Industries Mapping Document 2001. (2001). London, UK: Department of Culture, Media and Sport. Retrieved April 15, 2017, from: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/creative-industries-mapping-documents-2001>
28. Decree of the President of the Russian Federation of December 24, 2014. Order No. 808 "On the Basics of State Cultural Policy". (2014). Retrieved April 15, 2017, from: <http://base.garant.ru/70828330/>
29. Order of the Government of the Russian Federation of February 29, 2016 No. 326-r. "Strategy of the state cultural policy for the period up to 2030" (2016). Retrieved April 15, 2017, from: <http://bvdshi.muzkult.ru/img/upload/2699/documents/strategiya-kulturnoj-politiki.pdf>
30. Hesmondhalgh, D. (2008). *Cultural and creative industries*. London, England: Sage Publications Ltd.
31. Kostina, A. V. (2009). *National culture - ethnic culture - mass culture: "Balance of interests" in modern society*. Moscow: URSS.

32. Kostina, A. V. (2016). The Society of Consumption and the Value of Russian Civilization Knowledge. *Understanding Skill, 4*, 45-55.
33. Avanesova, G. A., & Astafieva, O. N. (2016). National culture and Russian politics in the Russian Empire and the USSR. *Socio-Humanitarian Knowledge, 1*, 56-74.

**<http://www.eurasianjournals.com>**