

Tikhomirov S.A., candidate of culturology, associate professor, vice-rector for research, professor of the department of art history at the Russian university of traditional art crafts, 191186, Saint-Petersburg, Griboyedov canal embankment, 2, lit. A, e-mail: nauka_vshni@mail.ru

Trends in the development of traditional art crafts in the late 1950s–1980s and their scientific analysis

Abstract. The article analyzes the trends in the development of traditional art crafts, which, starting from the late 1950s, began to have a significant aesthetic and functional impact on the appearance of the object-spatial environment. The strengthening of the status of traditional art crafts led to a more complex morphology of artistic culture as a whole. The ongoing processes have received fairly extensive scholarly analysis: traditional art crafts have begun to be actively studied theoretically and prospectively from the perspective of their development prospects. The Research Institute of Art Industry, which effectively oversaw the development of traditional art crafts, actively pursued experimental-creative and design-technological areas of scientific activity in addition to historical and theoretical ones. Intensive historical and cultural transformations and equally intensive scientific support for the development of traditional art crafts.

Keywords: traditional art crafts, local industry, the Research Institute of Art Industry, research activities, experimental and creative activities, design and technological activities, morphology of art, object-spatial environment, aesthetics.

In the 1950s, traditional art crafts were intended to provide for the post-war daily life of Soviet citizens [13]. “Large-scale state industry was focused on strategic sectors” [23, p. 124], while local industry – under whose jurisdiction the traditional art crafts fell – was supposed to fill the everyday life of the Soviet citizen with aesthetic and functional objects capable of creating a comfortable object-spatial living environment. The scale of housing construction (N.S. Khrushchev’s 1961 speech cites data on the construction of 4,600,000 apartments in cities and urban-type settlements, as well as 1,400,000 houses in rural areas [4, p. 4]), coupled with the growth in population welfare, dictated the need to saturate new homes with items of a high artistic level. Moreover, the object-spatial environment for the Soviet person in the second half of the 20th century was not created by itself but was designed taking into account certain aesthetic benchmarks.

The key guideline for Soviet artistic culture becomes the aesthetics of traditional art crafts, in which decorative design is in harmony with the functional purpose of the object [4, p. 12].

Types of applied art, to which traditional art crafts also belong, initially held a low position in the official artistic hierarchy. However, the morphology of art became more complex in the second half of the 20th century.

In the 1950s, the problem of the status of applied art as a whole began to be discussed “at closed meetings of the Union of Artists’ departments, on the pages of magazines and was reflected in Khrushchev’s program for expanding the production of high-quality consumer goods”. Art critics and philosophers actively joined the discussion, debating issues of form, content and the aesthetics of applied art, as well as the relationship between the utilitarian and the artistic principles [4; 5; 17], which significantly strengthened the place and role of applied arts within the system of art as a whole.

Experts note the successes achieved by the applied arts, including traditional art crafts, in the late 1950s. One of the articles analyzing the state of decorative art presented at the All-Union Art Exhibition for the 40th anniversary of the October Revolution contained the following conclusion: “The exhibition demonstrates a significant growth in the artistic quality of works of decorative art and... will undoubtedly help artists and masters of folk crafts to reach even greater heights in creating contemporary works of decorative art that are genuinely national in form and socialist in content” [20]. The conclusion drawn by N. Cherny in the aforementioned article appears exceptionally important from the perspective of setting aesthetic priorities: genuine works of traditional art crafts are created based on “the artistic traditions of the peoples of the USSR” and are imbued with correct socialist content.

At the same time, there has been a re-evaluation of the path that traditional art crafts traversed in the 1930s–40s and partly in the 1950s. In particular, “the pursuit of external pomp, ostentatious grandeur” [4, p. 5], the transfer of easel art principles to applied arts, as well as insufficient attention to mass-produced items were identified as erroneous. D.E. Lavrov, analyzing works of Palekh and Fedoskino lacquer miniatures from this period, notes attempts to return to the “pure origins” of Soviet art [9]: “stylized ‘works of the past’ with agitational images... were characterized by deliberate naivety, simplicity of form and angularity of depicted characters, which was intended to show revolutionary transformations (primarily in rural areas) through fresh, naive, surprised eyes, although, of course, it was more likely ‘simplicity of mind’ than ‘simplicity of heart’” [9]. A similar trend is observed in Kubachi jewelry-making in the 1960s, where previously almost mandatory depictions of Red Square and portraits of state leaders disappear from the ornamentation of pieces [10].

The development of traditional culture was actively encouraged in the Soviet republics, which resulted in an increased interest in traditional art crafts. As Yu.B. Karpova notes, artists engaged in, while “advocating for the right to reject the principle of representationality” [6], were not supposed to fall into formalism or technicism. The solution to this dilemma was the artists’ turn to folk ornament forms and various types of traditional art crafts, which were conceptualized as one example of the most harmonious reconciliation of form and content in a work of art; as a kind of encyclopedia of forms, techniques, visual solutions and methods of working with material from which contemporary artists were meant to draw inspiration when creating their own works.

Thus, the status of traditional art crafts as an exemplary and aesthetically model type of art is elevated. On the one hand, objects of traditional art crafts fill and accompany the daily life of the Soviet person. On the other hand, in jewelry art, artistic ceramics and artistic glass, etc., works appear in which the aesthetic function is not in equilibrium but prevails over the utilitarian one. The “disappearance of utilitarian character” as an artistic symptom is connected to the fact that some utilitarian items began to be created faster and cheaper by industrial means (e.g., tableware), whereas works of traditional art crafts more often become interior decorations or exhibition exhibits.

In the second half of the 20th century, works of traditional art crafts become “legitimate” and fairly common objects for display at exhibitions, which leads to a strengthening of their aesthetic function as opposed to utilitarian one. For example, starting from the 1970s, in Mstyora lacquer miniature painting, a new form of work emerges – the interior panel (a vivid example is V.F. Nekosov’s work “Rites and festivities of the Soviet village”, 1983–1986). Here it should be clarified that the emergence of panels in lacquer miniature painting is not a transfer of easel-art principles into miniature art, but rather the beginning of several works of traditional art crafts functioning according to the laws of easel art (the panel as a painting).

The morphology of applied art became more complex also through the further differentiation of its types, including those of traditional art crafts. Thus, for instance, researchers note the emergence of two trends in national jewelry art: traditional ornamental and modern plastic [15]. The former was characterized by a turn to traditional techniques of artistic metalworking, the reproduction of ornaments and individual motifs (this is partly explained by a new wave of interest in archaeological finds and traditional jewelry techniques). The latter direction is associated with the appearance of designer jewelry, art objects genetically related to jewelry art but ontologically being small-scale sculptures, works of technical aesthetics (e.g., the jewelry works of F.A. Kuznetsov). In other words, a second branch appears in the development of domestic jewelry art, connected with technical aesthetics (the Soviet counterpart of the term “design”).

Similar trends can be observed in the artistic processing of glass, which can be seen in person at the permanent exhibition of the Museum of Art Glass (St. Petersburg), where the dynamics of artists’ creative search from 1960 to the late 1980s is documented.

It should be noted that saturating the daily life of a Soviet citizen with works of traditional art crafts is an example of constructing cultural elitism. This demonstrates that residents of not only large cities but also small towns and urban-type settlements were capable of possessing good aesthetic taste. The presence of such art crafts became one of the markers of prosperity and the hosts’ interest in art [3]. It is no coincidence that such objects were displayed on the glass shelves of sideboards (servants), which served as a kind of “museum display case” and “family shrine” [7]. Thus, for instance, since the 1960s, works of Tobolsk bone carving art have been created without stands – their role is performed by polished wooden surfaces of bookshelves, sideboards, etc., where these works – essentially small-scale sculptures – were meant to be placed [1]. A trend towards “the synthesis of the

object-spatial environment, the measure of which has become a person” is observed [15].

The intensive development of applied arts, including traditional art crafts, leads to the emergence of ambiguous scholarly opinions regarding their evolutionary paths. Thus, N.V. Voronov positively assessed the transfer of artistic traditions to other regions: for instance, regarding Khokhloma painting, which in the late Soviet period was mastered not only in Lipetsk and Tula regions but even in Bashkiria, he predicted the emergence of household items created according to specific individual orders, etc. [2] Attempts to establish new art crafts are observed: thus, “the archive of Lipetsk region contains information on the organization and activities of an art craft established in the seventies of the last century, which had two directions: wood painting based on Khokhloma techniques and lacquer miniature painting, whose origins lay with the masters of Kholuy” [12].

A logical response to the aforementioned historical-cultural changes becomes the necessity for their theoretical conceptualization. For example, at the 1st All-Union Congress of Soviet artists (1957), the problem of insufficient theoretical understanding of traditional art crafts by art scholarship was voiced [19, p. 170]. M.S. Kagan adheres to a similar position, noting that “the processes unfolded in the sphere of artistic practice have provided rich material for generalizations”, yet “the theoretical study of applied art has so far been limited to separate journal articles and fragmentary references to it in monographs” [4, p. 6]. There is a proclaimed need for work on terminology and its substantive content, criteria for evaluating works and reflection on the aesthetic principles embodied in the pieces [15], and more broadly – on creating a “theory of applied art”.

A theoretical distinction is being drawn between a work of traditional art crafts and an industrial sample. V.P. Tolstoy notes that the beauty of industrial products lies in “geometrically flawless precision and cleanliness of lines and surfaces, homogeneity of texture and the complete identity of the model and every mass-produced item” [21, p. 11]. At the same time, the industrial specimen – which serves as a standard for replication – is considered by V.P. Tolstoy to be artistically equivalent to a unique one-off piece of traditional art crafts regarding its artistic merit. For evaluating artistic works that are objects, the researcher “proposes applying unified criteria: a high degree of object-based imagery, quality of material and execution, integrity of form-building and coloristic solution, and compositional unity” [21, p. 39].

Thus, “industrial art” is understood as “the aggregate totality of industrial items created through the method of artistic design” while in characterizing traditional art crafts, “traditional methods of handwork by the applied artist are noted” [21, p. 11]. At the same time, related features are identified, consisting in a “deep understanding of the specifics... of the material and technology, the expediency of forms in which aesthetic and functional traits are organically connected”, alienness to “the principle of mere decorating, the external application of ornamentation onto any practically utilitarian object” [21, p. 11], as well as in the collectivity of creation.

In other words, the change in the morphology of art determines a new cycle of theoretical demarcation between the artist of traditional art crafts and the specialist in the field of decorative-applied art (the artistic designer, the specialist in technical aesthetics – the designer).

At the institutional level, a difference is also recorded between these two types of art: traditional art crafts were supervised by the Scientific research institute of the art industry, while the creation of industrial specimens was handled by the All-Union scientific research institute of technical aesthetics (1962), which was de facto responsible for the design of Soviet industrial products. Specialized periodicals on the development of the aesthetics of applied art works appear (“Decorative art of the USSR”, since 1957; “Technical aesthetics”, since 1964).

In 1966, the Scientific research institute of the art industry was entrusted with the functions of the leading institution responsible for conducting “scientific research, experimental-creative and design-engineering work in the field of art crafts production” [22, p. 79]. By the mid-20th century, the Institute already possessed a well-developed organizational structure, which included “the Academic council, the Research sector and eight experimental laboratories” [23, p. 124], as well as a museum, an art and science library, an experimental-production workshop and the “Art crafts” exhibition store.

The intensive scholarly conceptualization of traditional art crafts was driven not only by purely theoretical interest but also by production-related reasons: “The underestimation of the specifics of decorative art, insufficient understanding of its goals and an inability to take into account its means and master them lead to the fact that in a number of branches of state artistic industry and some folk art crafts, artists and craftsmen often resort to copying well-known easel works, images of popular monuments and architectural structures for decorating items. Colored reproductions, photographs and postcards serve as material for these works. It is often believed that any depiction of a major work of easel or monumental art on any object already undoubtedly adorns this object and makes it artistic. Depicting easel or monumental works on everyday objects is possible only on the condition of their good execution quality with the indispensable consideration of all the features of decorative art” [18].

Accordingly, the Scientific research institute of the art industry conducted practice-oriented research aimed at providing real methodological assistance to artels and enterprises of folk art crafts.

The Institute organized field trips by specialists to the regions, during which the state of various types of traditional art crafts was documented, along with profile artels and enterprises. The artistic-stylistic and technical-technological features of creating works were described and masters and artists of traditional art crafts were identified. Based on the data obtained, institute employees developed product designs, drawings of items and carried out quality control and expertise of the created works [16].

The outcome of such activities could even be the revival of specific types of traditional art crafts: a vivid example here is the study of Nizhny Tagil decorative painting and the renewal of the almost lost technique of two-color free-hand

painting, with the direct participation of the Scientific research institute of the art industry staff (for more details, see the article by O.V. Fedotova “Preservation of intangible cultural heritage: the role of V.A. Baradulin in the study, preservation and development of decorative painting (on the occasion of the 90th anniversary of the researcher)” in this issue of the journal).

The professionalism of the expeditions was ensured by the fact that they involved not only art scholars but also photographers and artists who possessed a high level of professional training [23, p. 125], collecting and documenting visual materials for reports. At the museum affiliated with the Scientific research institute of the art industry, works collected during these expeditions were exhibited regularly.

The Scientific research institute of the art industry established regional branches – for example, the Makhachkala branch, which was created to support the development of traditional art crafts in the North Caucasus. Researchers note that despite the small number of staff members and insufficient level of professional experience, the branch specialists nevertheless rather actively studied the historical traditions of regional art crafts, antique carpets in mosques, held conferences, published academic literature and assisted masters and artists in developing product ranges demanded by the market [10; 11].

Simultaneously, a process of museification of art crafts was underway: according to Decree No. 428 of the Council of Ministers of the USSR dated June 2, 1965, union and republican authorities were obliged to systematically allocate and transfer samples of products and various models free of charge to museums for exhibition, “showing the development of science, technical progress and achievements of communist construction”. As N.M. Shabalina notes, such contributions are a valuable source for studying the artistic productions of the second half of the 20th century.

The acquisition of contemporary unique jewelry pieces was carried out by the State Historical Museum. It also made its collections [15] accessible to masters and artists from centers of jewelry art, which serves as an example of the intensification of the process of rethinking artistic heritage by contemporary artists.

At the same time, staff members of the Scientific research institute of the art industry assisted masters and artists of traditional art crafts in fulfilling orders for museums and other state institutions [1].

In the second half of the 20th century, a widespread reorganization of cooperative crafts took place, which had reached a very high level of development (for instance, “craftsmen produced 40% of furniture, more than 30% of all knitwear and almost all children’s toys”) [14]. This occurred because, in terms of output volume and product quality, technical equipment and worker qualifications, the handicraft-cooperative production had approached industrial standards [21]. In the 1960s, virtually all traditional art crafts were placed on an industrial footing: in places where artels had previously operated, production plant operations began to function [8, p. 18].

At the enterprises of folk art crafts, their own “museums” – in fact, assortment offices serving as collections of reference historical and contemporary items –

effectively emerge. Reference samples accumulate the artistic-imaginative and artistic-technological achievements of a specific type of art craft; they embody its essence and specificity firsthand.

The creation of experimental workshops and laboratories at folk art craft enterprises becomes common practice. A.J. Magomedov notes that employees “working in such departments were paid personal salaries; their work was evaluated not by the volume of output but by the quality, by the results of creative efforts” [10] when creating unique pieces, which received expert evaluation at the organization’s Art council. If a sample presented by a creative team was approved by the Art council, master copiers would make copies from it. An author could also present his/her original work to the Art council: if approved, the folk art craft enterprise could purchase it for the museum / assortment sample office [12].

Experimental works of traditional art crafts often had exhibition significance, embodying unique artistic-technological solutions. In a number of art forms (artistic ceramics, glass art, jewelry art), these searches caused a “drift” from utilitarian function towards “pure artistry”.

Exhibitions of traditional art crafts became widespread in the second half of the 20th century, attracting viewers’ interest. A curious outcome of the artistic-technological activity involved in creating items within experimental workshops and laboratories was the discussions of the 1970s, aimed at reducing the gap between the artistic quality of exhibition pieces and the quality of goods mass-produced by specialized enterprises.

To conclude, it should be emphasized that the new surge of interest in traditional art crafts – which aesthetically and functionally constructed the object-spatial environment – and the increasing complexity of artistic culture morphology in the second half of the 20th century changed the approach to creating works of traditional art crafts. It ceased to be an amateur creative pursuit associated with personal “fascination of masters with forms taken from industrial design products, simple copying of historical forms, amateur interpretations of ornamental compositions, pictorial motifs, portraits” [10]; the development of product form and decoration received scientific justification for the first time. Traditional art crafts became the focus of Soviet science, not only from the perspective of history and practice but also theoretical research, which prepared the groundwork for a new stage in the development of professional education in this field.

References

1. Valov A. A. Tobol'skaya reznaya kost' / A. A. Valov. – Sverdlovsk : Sredne-Ural'skoe knizhnoe izdatel'stvo, 1987. – 200 s. – Tekst : neposredstvenny`j.
2. Voronov N. V. Iskusstvo predmetnogo mira / N. V. Voronov. – Leningrad : Xudozhnik RSFSR, 1975. – 52 s. – Tekst : neposredstvenny`j.
3. Gerasimova E. Yu. Obshhestvo remonta / E. Yu. Gerasimova, S. A. Chujkina. – Tekst : e`lektronny`j // Neprikosnovenny`j zapas. – 2004. – № 2 (34). – URL: [https://www.academia.edu/19097217/Gerasimova\\_E\\_Chujkina\\_S\\_Obshhestvo\\_remonta\\_Neprikosnovenny`j_zapas_34_2_2004_](https://www.academia.edu/19097217/Gerasimova_E_Chujkina_S_Obshhestvo_remonta_Neprikosnovenny_j_zapas_34_2_2004_) (data obrashheniya: 16.09.2026).

4. Kagan M. S. O prikladnom iskusstve. Nekotory'e voprosy` teorii / M. S. Kagan. – Leningrad : Xudozhnik RSFSR, 1961. –160 s. – Tekst : neposredstvenny`j.

5. Kagan M. S. E`stetika i prikladnoe iskusstvo / M. S. Kagan. – Tekst : e`lektronny`j // Dekorativnoe iskusstvo SSSR. – Moskva, 1958. – № 1. – S. 37-40. – URL: <https://science.totalarch.com/magazine/deco-art/dekorativnoe-iskusstvo-sssr-1958-01.pdf> (data obrashheniya: 16.09.2026).

6. Karpova Yu. B. «Xolodil`nik s ornamentom»: k probleme «nacional`noj formy`» v sovetskom prikladnom iskusstve i promy`shlennom dizajne v poslestalinskij period / Yu. B. Karpova. – Tekst : e`lektronny`j // Neprikosnovenny`j zapas. – 2011. – № 4 (78). – URL: <https://magazines.gorky.media/nz/2011/4/holodilnik-s-ornamentom-k-probleme-naczionalnoj-formy-v-sovetskom-prikladnom-iskusstve-i-promyshlennom-dizajne-v-poslestalinskij-period.html> (data obrashheniya: 16.09.2026).

7. Katriona K. Making a home on the Neva: domestic space, memory, and local Identity in Leningrad and St. Petersburg, 1957-present / K. Katriona. – Tekst : e`lektronny`j // Laboratorium. Zhurnal social`ny`x issledovanij. 2011. – № 3. – S. 53-96. – URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/making-a-home-on-the-neva-domestic-space-memory-and-local-identity-in-leningrad-and-st-petersburg-1957-present> (data obrashheniya: 12.07.2026).

8. Kordonskij S. G. Arxaicheskie e`konomicheskie instituty`: raspredelenny`e manufaktury` v maly`x gorodax Rossii / S. G. Kordonskij, Yu. M. Plyusnin. – Tekst : e`lektronny`j // Mir Rossii. Sociologiya. E`tnologiya. – 2018. – № 4 (27). – S. 6-30. – URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/arhaicheskie-ekonomicheskie-instituty-raspredelennye-manufaktury-v-malyh-gorodah-rossii> (data obrashheniya: 16.09.2026).

9. Lavrov D. E. Politicheskaya agitaciya v russkoj lakovoj miniatyure pozdnego sovetskogo perioda (1960-e – 1980-e gody`) / D. E. Lavrov. – Tekst : e`lektronny`j // Novoe iskusstvoznanie. – 2019. – № 1. – S. 53-56. – DOI 10.24411/2658-3437-2019-11009. – URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/politicheskaya-agitatsiya-v-russkoy-lakovoy-miniatyure-pozdnego-sovetskogo-perioda-1960-e-1980-e-gody> (data obrashheniya: 16.09.2026).

10. Magomedov A. D. Novatorskie poiski masterov yuvelirny`x promy`slov sovetskogo Dagestana k stoletiyu so dnya rozhdeniya narodnogo xudozhnika RSFSR Rasula Alixanova (1922–2000) / A. D. Magomedov. – Tekst : neposredstvenny`j // Sovremennoe iskusstvo Dagestana : tendencii, problemy` i puti razvitiya : sbornik statej / sost. i otv. red. E`, B. Abdullaeva. – Maxachkala : ALEF, 2022. – S. 98-115. – DOI 10.33580/9785002120703.

11. Magomedov A. D. Tradicionny`e promy`sly` Dagestana i NII xudozhestvennoj promy`shlennosti / A. D. Magomedov. – Tekst : neposredstvenny`j // Vestnik Instituta yazy`ka, literatury` i iskusstva im. G. Czadasy`. – 2021. – № 26. – S. 68-76. – DOI 10.31029/vestiyali26/10. – EDN: LNKDJI.

12. Mal'ceva O. I. Istoriya sozdaniya lakovoj miniatyury` «Lipeczk» (problemy` krizisa shkoly` i proizvodstva) / O.I. Mal'ceva. – Tekst : e`lektronny`j // Vestnik Ady`gejskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya 2: Filologiya i iskusstvovedenie. – 2021. – № 2 (277). – S. 202-208. – DOI 10.53598 / 2410-3489-2021-2-277-202-208. – URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/istoriya-sozdaniya-lakovoy-miniatyury-lipetsk-problemy-krizisa-shkoly-i-proizvodstva> (data obrashheniya: 16.09.2026).

13. Musina R. R. Teoriya i praktika otechestvennoj xudozhestvennoj promy`shlennosti: yavlenie, neravnoe sebe / R. R. Musina – Tekst : neposredstvenny`j // Dekorativnoe iskusstvo i predmetno-prostranstvennaya sreda. Vestnik MGXPU im. S. G. Stroganova. – Moskva, 2019. – № 2-2. – S. 29-40. – EDN: YYGVSK.

14. Pavlov A. B. Fenomenologicheskoe opisanie sovremennoj promy`slovoj deyatel`nosti / A. B. Pavlov, S. S. Selev. – Tekst : e`lektronny`j // Universum: obshchestvenny`e nauki. – 2015. – № 3 (13). – [14 s.]. – URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/fenomenologicheskoe-opisanie-sovremennoy-promyslovoy-deyatelnosti> (data obrashheniya: 16.09.2026).

15. Perfil`eva I. Yu. Russkoe yuvelirnoe iskusstvo vtoroj poloviny` XX v. (osnovny`e xudozhestvenny`e tendencii i napravleniya) : special`nost` 17.00.04 «Izobrazitel`noe i dekorativno-prikladnoe iskusstvo i arhitektura» : avtoreferat dissertacii na soiskanie uchenogo zvaniya kandidata iskusstvovedeniya / Perfil`eva Irina Yur`evna // NII teorii i istorii izobrazitel`ny`x iskusstv. – Moskva, 2000. – 252 s. – URL: <https://viewer.rsl.ru/ru/rsl01000296611?page=4&rotate=0&theme=white> (data obrashheniya: 16.09.2026). – Tekst : e`lektronny`j.

16. Polonnikova N. V. Narodny`e xudozhestvenny`e promy`sly` Urala po materialam GARF (issledovanie gosudarstvenny`m muzeem-zapovednikom «Czaricyno» sovremennogo sostoyaniya narodny`x xudozhestvenny`x promy`slov i otrasli v celom) / N. V. Polonnikova. – Tekst : neposredstvenny`j // Goroxovskie chteniya : materialy` pyatnadcatoj Vserossijskoj nauchnoj konferencii / redaktory`-sostaviteli: V. G. Demakov, I. N. Kozy`reva. – Chelyabinsk, 2024. – S. 160-168.

17. Salty`kov A. Voprosy` razvitiya dekorativno-prikladnogo iskusstva / A. Salty`kov. – Tekst : neposredstvenny`j // Iskusstvo. – 1955. – № 2. – S. 30-34.

18. Usanova A. L. Teoriya i praktika predmetnogo tvorchestva v SSSR 1930–1950-x gg. / A. L. Usanova. – Tekst : e`lektronny`j // Izvestiya Altajskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. – 2015. – № 3 (87). – S. 147-149. – DOI 10.14258/izvasu(2015)3.1-27. – EDN: TZVLET. – URL: https://elibrary.ru/download/elibrary_23754720_98557717.pdf (data obrashheniya: 10.09.2026).

19. Usanova A. L. Konceptii narodnosti iskusstva v otechestvennom iskusstvoznanii konca XIX – nachala XXI veka / A. L. Usanova, Yu. V. Kiryushina, S. M. Budkeev. – Tekst : e`lektronny`j // Vestnik Kemerovskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta kul`tury` i iskusstv. – 2021. – № 54. – S. 167-172. – URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/kontseptsii-narodnosti-iskusstva-v-otchestvennom-iskusstvoznanii-kontsa-hh-nachala-hh1-veka/viewer> (data obrashheniya: 11.09.2026).

20. Cherny`j N. Dekorativnoe iskusstvo na Vsesoyuznoj xudozhestvennoj vy`stavke / N. Cherny`j. – Tekst : e`lektronny`j // Dekorativnoe iskusstvo SSSR. – 1958. – № 1. – S. 1-8. – URL: <https://science.totalarch.com/magazine/deco-art/dekorativnoe-iskusstvo-sssr-1958-01.pdf> (data obrashheniya: 16.09.2026).

21. Shabalina N. M. Xudozhestvennaya promy`shlennost` Yuzhnogo Urala v kontekste industrial`noj kul`tury` XX veka : monografiya / N. M. Shabalina. – Chelyabinsk : Izdatel`stvo Yuzhno-Ural`skogo gosudarstvennogo gumanitarno-pedagogicheskogo universiteta, 2019. – 244 s. – Tekst : neposredstvenny`j.

22. Shabalina N. M. E`ksperimental`ny`e tvorcheskie laboratorii xudozhestvennoj promy`shlennosti Yuzhnogo Urala v usloviyax industrial`noj kul`tury` XX veka / N. M. Shabalina. – Tekst : neposredstvenny`j // Nauchnoe mnenie. – Sankt-Peterburg, 2014. – № 5. – S. 78-82.

23. Shheglova T. K. Izuchenie tyurkoyazy`chnogo naseleniya yuga zapadnoj Sibiri sotrudnikami nauchno-issledovatel`skogo instituta xudozhestvennoj promy`shlennosti (NIIXP) v 1950–1970-e gody` / T. K. Shheglova, A.V. Ry`kov. – Tekst : e`lektronny`j // Vestnik Evrazijskogo nacional`nogo universiteta imeni L. N. Gumileva. Seriya: Istoricheskie nauki. Filosofiya. Religiovedenie. – Astana, 2021. – № 4 (137). – S. 123-140. – DOI 10.32523/2616-7255-2021-137-4-123-140. – URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/izuchenie-tyurkoyazychnogo-naseleniya-yuga-zapadnoy-sibiri-sotrudnikami-nauchno-issledovatel'skogo-instituta-hudozhestvennoy/viewer> (data obrashheniya: 15.09.2026).