

Evhen Horoshilov

Candidate of Technical Sciences, Deputy Director of the Department –
Head of the Culture Department of the Humanitarian Policy Department of the
Dnipro City Council

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0002-4388-0864>

DIGITALISATION OF LOCAL GOVERNANCE IN THE CULTURAL SPHERE AS A FACTOR IN ENHANCING COMMUNITY CAPACITY

Digitalisation of local governance is gradually changing the organisation of the cultural sphere of territorial communities. However, the introduction of electronic services, digital registers, web resources or online communication channels does not automatically result in increased governance capacity. The relevant public administration problem is to determine the conditions under which digital instruments cease to operate as isolated technological solutions and begin to influence the ability of local self-government bodies to make evidence-based decisions, coordinate cultural networks, ensure access to cultural services, interact with residents and maintain the functioning of cultural institutions under resource and security constraints. Digitalisation is proposed to be considered not as an independent result of modernisation but as a resource whose governance value emerges through the integration of data, decision-making processes, cultural services, communication and organisational procedures. The concept of digital governance capacity in the cultural sphere is substantiated as the ability of a local governance system to use digital data, instruments and interaction channels to transform information into management decisions, maintain the accessibility of cultural services, coordinate relevant actors and adapt the cultural network to environmental changes. It is established that the decisive factor is not the level of technological saturation of a community in itself but the extent to which digital solutions are embedded in the everyday governance cycle. A mechanism is proposed whereby structured data on cultural assets, resources, services and community needs are used in decision-making; managerial decisions are reflected in the organisation and delivery of cultural services; digital channels provide feedback from users; and the information obtained is incorporated into the next planning cycle. Particular attention is paid to the limitations of digitalisation associated with digital inequality, fragmentation of information systems, insufficient competencies, cybersecurity risks and the reproduction of inefficient administrative procedures in digital form. The scientific novelty lies in distinguishing between the digitalisation of cultural governance and the digital governance capacity of a community and in identifying the managerial conditions required for the transition from the former to the latter. The practical value of the findings lies in the possibility of applying the proposed mechanism to assess local digital projects, organise the activities of cultural governance units, integrate cultural

institutions into community digital ecosystems and formulate local digital transformation programmes.

Keywords: digitalisation, territorial community, culture, local self-government, governance capacity, digital governance, cultural services, public administration.