Main challenges and issues of Cultural policy

Akram Khosravi
Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State
University, Tbilisi, Georgia
Email: akram.khosravi@tsu.ge

2023

Akram Khosravi

Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi state university, Georgia

Main challenges and issues of Cultural policy

ABSTRACT

Every social, economic, political, and government policy nowadays has significant cultural repercussions; as a result, every policy and social policy is a form of cultural policy. The development of cultural policies not only faces challenges from a practical standpoint but also faces obstacles from a theoretical perspective. Given that culture is the domain of sentiments, emotions, values, and the origin of mankind, some theorists contend that, unlike social and economic areas, culture cannot be planned for or regulated. Several strategies are used by this field to oppose the options and methods. According to this theory, increasing government involvement in cultural matters causes people's behavior to become increasingly politicized.

Definition of the term – cultural policy

Policy on culture is changing. Cultural policies have traditionally concentrated on providing financial aid to the arts, and cultural heritage plus organizations such as museums and galleries. In recent years the investment in creative industries around the world has grown as a source of innovation and economic dynamism (Throsby, 2010).

Cultural Policy is that states and other institutions anticipate and implement cultural affairs, which means "the ways and means of intellectual activity, in particular artistic" (Policies on culture aim at addressing and promoting the cultural dimension of European integration through relevant legislation and government funding. These strategies promote the development of cultural activities, education or research carried out by private providers, NGOs, and individual EU- based initiatives in the fields of cinema and multimedia, broadcasting, music, and crafts (Michael and Schindler, 2013).

Cultural policy is emerging as an increasingly important component of government policy development at national and international levels. Cultural policy aspects that are currently included in government policy agendas include the prospects for creative industries as dynamic sources of innovation, growth, and structural change in the so-called new economy. The role of

arts and culture, in creating jobs and generating income in cities, in particular, those affected by industrial decline. The right means by which governments can support the arts of creation and performance; legal and economic questions concerning the regulation of intellectual property in cultural goods and services; and public/private partnership opportunities to preserve cultural heritage (David Throsby, 2010). Critical Cultural Policy Surveys is a reader's subject and an anthology of key themes and articles that, according to the authors, are crucial for the traditional development or other historical expressions of a field of study (Adrienne Scullion, 2005).

The aim of the cultural policy is, to form a society that considers creativity by maintaining and improving the national identity of a country, researching, storing, and transferring cultural memory, and creating favorable conditions for the development of an essential, multifaceted cultural space (Riigikogu, 2015).

The relationship between language and culture has been of interest to philosophers, specialists, and linguists since the age of adolescence. Speculation about language and communication of language and discourse thought and culture, for those interested in various fields of human sciences, are familiar with the topics.

It might be said that Language and culture are tied together as one is the second part of the other. Civilization comes through a culture of all human behaviors and it can most be shown by language.

What is Cultural policy?

As a concept, Policy points to the "regularizing features of politics" that include the coordination of acts and standards and improving the inclusion and separation of activities (Palonen, 2003). The short definition of policy is when the concrete, regularizing element of organizing things and acts are indicated by policy, 'culture' as a conceptual concept must be reified in some sense to analyze it on the same level (Pyykkonen and others, 2009). Cultural policy is articulated through fundamental rights such as cultural rights, which are composed of financial, social, and educational priorities. In the 19th and beginning of the 20th centuries, cultural policy highlighted the social function of art, culture, and cultural legacy along with public education and knowledge. After World War II, the emphasis was placed on art progression and cultural organizations, as well as on opportunities for citizens to participate in culture. Current cultural policy is the result of a long development (Mukaan, 2009).

Cultural policies are intended to address and promote the cultural dimension of European integration through appropriate legislation and public financing. These strategies concentrate on the growth of cultural activities, education, or research by private businesses, NGOs, and individual EU (Schindler and Michael, 2013).

Some researchers believe that "cultural policy" is "a site for the production of cultural citizens, with cultural industries providing not only a range of representations about themselves and others but also a series of rationales for particular types of behavior (Lewis and Miller, 2003).

The cultural policy describes as "cultural politics", which extends its remit to cover the functioning of the marketplace, usually in terms of admonition. In many cases, it also mentions the increasingly vigorous claims of "cultural civil society" Furthermore, a great deal of "cultural theory" often proves itself in terms so abstruse and convoluted that it is hermetic to the political audience (Yudhishthir Raj, 2009).

Cultural policy is firmly linked to several other national policy areas, including education, economic, social, environmental, employment, integration, regional, tourism, and foreign policy (Riigikogu, 2015). Cultural policy is especially important to these factors, as one of its objectives is to promote particular identities and, therefore, to shape fully socialized, compliant people, who share common tastes and functions (McGuigan 2004; Miller and Yudice, 2004). Of course, among the interests of the government, the mobilization of people for suitable reasons is inappropriate — and the avoidance of unsuitable ones (Lewis and Miller, 2003).

Policymakers meet three further interconnected trials, each requiring a logical response. Firstly, the challenge of a transversal approach involves different agents (public authorities at different levels of government; the private sector; civil society) and different areas of action such as tourism, education, the environment, foreign affairs, and labor, among others. Secondly, the need to develop conceptual tools that address strategic long-term issues, in other words, to provide the information needed for some indicative planning of future policies, particularly as regards the organization of cultural production and consumption. Thirdly, the need for new public participation infrastructures to sustain sufficient momentum in favor of this holistic approach, in other words, a more open and democratic form of decision–making (Pratt, 2005).

Cultural policy has developed in interaction with international actors. The international conventions and treaties on culture are mainly concerned with the promotion of human and cultural rights, the diversity of cultural heritage and expressions, as well as copyrights (Grahn-

Laasonen, 2017).

The development of cultural policy issues as an idea of activity starts with creative thoughts, created by methods for material and rhetorical works on, causing about complete qualified items. Social speeches have a specific status in the emblematic translation of reasonable exercises. Descriptive contraptions are utilized to define how important encounters are recorded in social activities to get part to imaginative acts of people, in social communications, and in political conversations which depend on how governmental issues of culture as a specific subject are defined. The circle of culture has been ordinarily confined to expressions of the human experience in the social approach discourse, similarly as the political area has been limited to the institutional strategy system. As a concerning social approach, the job of this structure is to facilitate open organization and to save the equalization of framework-based requests in the field of human expressions (Ahponen & Kanga, 2004).

Cultural policies evolved naturally from sources such as philosophy and history, faith, and courts but were brought to their conceptualization after the Second World War. The consequences of destabilized social relationships and the realities of inhumanities brought to light the need to recognize and control cultural policy growth and mutual understanding. During the 21st century, however, the cultural field in modern times drastically diversified: urbanization, mass media, communications, globalization, technological development, new visions of arts, and new forms of art demanded new solutions and approaches to the traditionally perceived definition of Arts and Education (Gajic, 2011).

The twentieth-century concept of cultural policy was targeted upon a comparatively slim theory of culture-referring to practices that are principally approximately communication, meaningful change, and pleasure. Cultural studies start with the opposite attitude when seeing regular expressions as the maximum significant material for cultural practices, which are materialized in different forms of popular culture (Foucault, 2000).

Cultural policy has developed in interaction with global performers. The universal conventions and treaties on subculture are mainly involved with the merchandising of human and cultural rights, and the variety of cultural heritage and expressions, as well as copyrights (Grahn-Laasonen, 2017). Policymakers meet three further interconnected trials, each requiring a logical response. Firstly, the challenge of a transversal approach involves different agents (public authorities at different levels of government; the private sector; civil society) and different areas

of action such as tourism, education, the environment, foreign affairs, and labor, among others. Secondly, the need to develop conceptual tools that address strategic long-term issues, in other words, to provide the information needed for some indicative planning of future policies, particularly as regards the organization of cultural production and consumption. Thirdly, the need for new public participation infrastructures to sustain sufficient momentum in favor of this holistic approach, in other words, a more open and democratic form of decision–making (Pratt, 2005).

The general goal of cultural policy in the field of culture and cultural development is macro-social indicators such as population index, social participation, political welfare, health education, and social harm are all a type of cultural policy. In essence, enhancing cultural strategies to achieve desired ends, such as participation, heritage, and cultural identity, is what cultural policy-making is all about. We have short-term and long-term planning to achieve these goals.

The objective of cultural policy

The objective of cultural policy is to create a society that values creativity by preserving and improving national identity; studying, storing, and conveying cultural memory, and fostering conditions for developing a lively, open, and versatile cultural space and participation in culture (Riigikogu, 2014).

The principles of shaping and realizing the cultural policy

The state promotes cultural growth and increases the accessibility of diverse cultural events for both creators and participants.

It must be considered while arranging the field of education that to secure a new generation of cultural participants, it is critical to begin amassing culture-related information and abilities at a young age.

Higher education in culture must be based on the needs of the job market and demographic change, as well as being internationally competitive.

The state must ensure that persons with special needs have better possibilities to participate in culture by taking their needs into account while creating and upgrading cultural infrastructure and by supporting initiatives and programs that involve people with special needs (Riigikogu, 2014).

Priorities in specific areas: Culture can be implemented more efficiently in some specific areas.

As just namely is mentioned here, each can be explained deeply in later research areas. Architecture. Design. Performing arts. Filmmaking. Music. Literature and publishing. Visual arts. Cultural journalism and media. Cultural diversity. Heritage conservation. Museums. Libraries. Folk culture (Riigikogu, 2014).

Strategies and framework of cultural policy

Strategies in the field of cultural policy arrangements have been affected by endeavors to keep up harmony among single and comprehensive methodologies. Most of the cultural policy strategy has been comprehensive in the sense that the field of formal cultural policy has been extended by including new types of activities and areas in the field of publicly subsidized and therefore officially supported art. By exclusive strategies, we mean definitions that utilize subjective criteria to figure out what sort of "craftsmanship" or "culture" doesn't merit open help and is along these lines left without the aptitude presented regard. In comparison, inclusive methods are used to carry younger "species" into the cultural domain. In the current situation, we can see multiple sub-fields within the region with different intentions regarding cultural politics (Ahponen & Kanga, 2004).

Cultural politics issues additionally include the social aspect because social exercises cannot be associated with society without being directed by affiliations, associations, and organizations. Cultural organizations have been significant entities in the organization of the way cultural activities are conducted by public means (Ahponen & Kanga, 2004).

Cultural priorities in all nations around the world include improving cultural identity, maintaining cultural heritage, increasing cultural engagement, and facilitating international cultural cooperation. What is certain is that culture isn't equal everywhere, and there are great differences and similarities between different countries ' cultures, that's why there are different types of cultural policies that might be adopted by every user to achieve the objectives. As a result, the way of life is considered to consist of many complicated parts, several of which might be emphasized in the classroom, while others are not. Moreover, this lack of a standard definition leads to a department of subculture in terms of pleasant arts, history, and geography that doesn't express the full scope of features included inside the subculture (Moeller, 2012).

The formation of the EU Commission with a cultural agenda indicated that the EU should not only be concerned with the economy; as the EU grew, new issues emerged and became increasingly diversified in all fields. The goal of economics was replaced with other issues, one of

them being culture. According to the European Agenda for Culture, the culture has found a place in the EU's transversal politics within the action plan and strategic objectives.

The overall purpose of cultural policy is to assist society in progress to a point where its citizens recognize civilization and culture and strive to preserve and extend it to help society progress to a better life and spiritual perfection by being aware of the culture of other countries.

Conclusion

By studying through other researchers' theories, my research attitude is that Education, economic, social, environmental, employment, integration, regional, tourist, media, language policy, and international policy are all intertwined with the cultural policy, in addition, to providing information for some preliminary policy planning, especially in the domain of cultural production and consumption must be implemented which is close to Riigikogu's idea and Pratt that he has come up to the same conclusion.

The following is a list of the results of the survey conducted by the Psychological Association. Firstly, cultural policy-making is a complex and multi-layered matter. Nowadays, under the political and economic conditions and the expansion of communication and information technologies, it is no longer possible to claim that cultural actions are guided and controlled by a single institution. Regardless of the motivation or goal behind cultural policies, the second argument is that creating cultural policies is a contemporary phenomenon. These regulations mix a distinctive quality with social modernity. In other words, cultural politics employ contemporary means and modern rationale to forward their objectives.

Refererences

Aslin R N, Saffran J R, Newport E L. (1998), *Psychol* Sci 9.

Bateni M. R. (2006) - "Linguistics: Speech Perception", 2006.

Carroll D. (2008) - *Psychology of Language*. 5th ed, Thomson, 2008.

Field J. (2003) - Psycholinguistics; a Resource Book for Students. Routledge, 2003.

Jusczyk P W. (1997) - The Discovery of Spoken Language. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Narcissians E. (2006) - "Bilingualism and mother tongue", 2006.

Nordquist, R. (2020) - "What Is Psycholinguistics?" Thought Co, Aug. 28, 2020, thoughtco.com/psycholinguistics-1691700.

Olumi E. (2020) - Globalization, International Migration and Languages. 2020.

Polinsky M., Scontras G. (2019) - Understanding heritage languages University of Maryland . University of California, Irvine, 2019.

Pulvermüller F. (2007) - "Word Processing in the Brain as Revealed by Neurophysiological Imaging": *The Oxford Handbook of Psycholinguistics*. Edited by M. Gareth Gaskell. Oxford University Press, 2007.

Rothman J. (2009) - Understanding the nature and outcomes of early bilingualism: Romance languages as heritage languages. International Journal of Bilingualism 13 (2), 155–163.

Saffran J R, Aslin R N, Newport E L. (1996), Science 274:1926–1928, pmid: 8943209. https://p.dw.com/p/A7QW

Saffran J. R. Griepentrog G J. (2001) - Dev Psychol, pmid: 11206435, 2001.

United Nations (2012) - Archived from the original on 6 December 2012. Retrieved 21 Feb 2009. "*International Mother Language Day - 21 February*".

Unsworth S. (2015), Amount of exposure as a proxy for dominance in bilingual language acquisition. In C. Silva-Corvalán and J. Treffers-Daller (Eds.), *Language dominance in bilinguals: Issues of measurement and operationalization,* pp. 156–173. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.

Unsworth S. (2016) - Quantity and quality of language input in bilingual language development. In E. Nicoladis and S. Montanari (Eds.), *Lifespanper- spectives on bilingualism*, pp. 136–196. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2016.

Unsworth, S. (in press). Quantifying language experience in HL development. In M. Schmid and B. Köpke (Eds.), The Oxford handbook of first language attrition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Valdés, G. (2000) - Introduction. In Spanish for Native Speakers, Volume I, New York: Harcourt College, 2000.