

DOI 10.31558/2519-2949.2020.2.5

УДК 321.7:323.1:323.396

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5769-7345>

*Prymush M. V., Vasyl Stus Donetsk National University*

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1637-175X>

*Okunovska Yu. V., Vasyl Stus Donetsk National University*

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3336-7952>

*Hyzhko A. P., Vasyl Stus Donetsk National University*

## POLITICAL ELITE IN THE INSTITUTIONAL ENVIRONMENT

*This paper is a study of the subject-matter and features of the institutionalization of the elite in the process of modernization of the political system. It is proved that the functioning of the institutional environment takes place at the macro and micro levels. In this context, the article studies the degree of coherence of the institutional environment and its dependence on the consent of all the subjects to respect the rules and norms that ensure social and political order. The study reveals a set of legitimate rules of interaction and competitive political practices that form the basis of the institutional environment (functioning of the elite). It describes the communication processes that form such interactions in the institutional environment.*

*It is concluded that clear rules and procedures of lobbying allow balancing the interests of public groups and political elites on the basis of compromise solutions. Accordingly, lobbying ensures a pluralism of legitimate opportunities for public participation in the development and adoption of political decisions, provides publicity to the process and activities of state authorities. Authors grounded that a set of legitimate rules of interaction and competitive political practices form the basis of the institutional environment of elite functioning. A holistic understanding of the rules of interaction and practices helps to determine the procedure of the elite institution in the political modernization processes, the dynamism of which is provided by the optimal choice of political technologies. Also, communication processes shape specific types of interaction in the institutional environment, facilitating feedback, optimal distribution of resources, and the use of political system capabilities to optimize modernization changes. The elite institute, forming and controlling communication processes, ensures the involvement of public initiative in the practical implementation of modernization projects on the basis of partnership and mutual responsibility.*

**Key words:** *institutional environment, modernization, political elite, political system, political practice, communication.*

Political elite, according to its inherent functions, plays a leading role in the political system, since it embodies the subjectivity of actions at the institutional level of its functioning. Implementation of functions is carried out within the established hierarchical structure. It is characterized by a sufficiently high level of resistance to internal and external influences and has resources to adapt to changes. Accordingly, the need for its study as a political institution that passes specific stages of institutionalization, determines the rules and procedures of interaction aimed at the implementation of various (including modernization) projects, changing the dynamics of functioning of the political system, arises.

In modern political science institutional and neo-institutional approaches reveal the principle of understanding the political institution. Representatives of the first approach (H. Spencer, M. Weber, Th. Veblen, J. Habermas, etc.) focus on the following essential characteristics of the concept under study: a formalized organizational structure; implementation of specific functions in the political sphere; legitimacy and compliance of political practices with dominant values; statutory system that regulates interaction of citizens, determining their positions in the political space. As a consequence, a political institution consists of two components: 1) a historically established and positionally structured model of interaction; 2) an organizational structure that contributes to the implementation of the functions

of a particular institution and its legitimization. However, the problem of interaction between formal and informal institutions, as well as the influence of sociocultural factors on the functioning of political institutions, remained unresolved.

Representatives of the neo-institutional approach (J. March, J. Olsen, S. Huntington, E. Ostrom) sought to overcome a certain limitation of the views of classical institutionalism. In their opinion, the following can be attributed to the substantive characteristics of the political institution: 1) organizational structure, including formal and informal interactions; 2) system of norms and symbols that define the framework of positioning and interaction; 3) influence of informal associations (pressure groups, clans) on the functioning. Consequently, the institute is viewed through the prism of the influence of sociocultural, formal and informal factors that determine its specific framework, as well as through the norms and values system of professional requirements as for the implementation of political activity, that make it fairly predictable for the majority [15, p. 166].

Due to the diversity of its directions, neo-institutional approach makes it possible to explore the following aspects of the process of institutionalization of political elites:

1) rules of conduct and interaction, approved among the political elite, in accordance with the traditions of political development and aimed at the creation of future projects (normative neo-institutionalism – J. March, J. Olsen);

2) role of an individual (political leader) in making certain decisions, choosing the technologies of activities and analysis of moral or regulatory constraints that can be faced (rational choice theory within neo-institutionalism – E. Ostrom, K. Shepsle, D. North);

3) influence of the dominant traditions in the political system, formal and informal interactions on the functioning of the elite, its strategic decision-making (historical neo-institutionalism – P. Hall, S. Steinmo, K. Thelen);

4) features of the legitimization of the elite institution and the model of interaction with society (sociological approach in neo-institutionalism – E. Immergut, Ph. Selznick)

According to J. March and J. Olsen a political institute is "...a relatively stable set of rules and organized practices embodied in structures of values and resources that are unchanged in relation to individuals, their specific preferences, expectations and changing external conditions [10, p. 83]. The key parameter of political institutions is the ability to change over time under the influence of external and internal factors. Neo-institutionalism, exploring the place of a particular institution in the political system, focuses on the concepts of "subject", "resources", "strategy". The subject is considered through the prism of the ability to carry out conscious activities and making strategically important political decisions due to the influence resources. They are material and spiritual goods that are activated in the struggle for power or influence. Strategies are the forms of interaction between subjects (political actors) in relation to competitors or political system as a whole. Their quantitative and qualitative content is determined by the main characteristics of the subjects, available resource base and peculiarities of the political situation.

According to A. Lijphart and F. Scharpf, institutions represent the main determinant that outlines the essence of efficient policy and awareness of specific political actors (elite-counter-elite) regarding goal-setting, which is formed under the influence of the institutional environment.

B. Peters defined the role of institutions in the political sphere as follows "... the new institutionalism insists on the existence of an autonomous role of political institutions. The state not only feels the influence of society, but itself affects it. Political democracy depends not only on economic and social conditions, but also on the design of political institutions. The bureaucratic agency, the legislative committee and the court of appeal are not only arenas for the rivalry of social forces, but they also represent a set of standard working procedures, structures that define and protect interests. They are political actors by right [20, p. 19].

According to S. Patrushev in modern political science, the following common understanding of the political institution has been formed: 1) political integrity of formal and informal principles, norms, rules that define and regulate human activity in the political field; 2) political organization of subjects or structures; 3) stable type of political conduct, expressed in a certain system of collective action, procedure, mechanism. The activity of the political institution is connected with the definition of rules and norms of interaction, it forms the institutional environment. Within it, formal rules (regulations, laws) and informal norms (customs, traditions) guide people's behavior, giving it determinate and unforeseen characteristics. At the same time, since the implementation of the functions of the institute takes place through organizational structures, their formation and determination of the rules of interaction is carried out on the basis of institutional consent. The implementation of the agreed programme of action, which corresponds to the needs of a particular political space, takes place in the course of institutional practice [9, p. 10].

Thus, the elite political institution can be considered as a stable set of procedures and practices of interaction, characterized by structural and regulatory order, focus on the conquest of power, implementation of political governance on the basis of available resources.

The institutional environment of elite functioning is formed in the political system, namely, the opportunities and limitations of the individual and group interaction, which is implemented according to the existing constitutional procedure and the rights and obligations defined by it. In general, the institutional environment can be structured as follows: 1) institutions of the highest order (political elite), defining strategic directions of development of the political system; 2) institutions of the first order (political and legal norms, different types of capital), aimed at formation of an effective communicative space of interaction; 3) institutions of the second order (public authorities, non-governmental organizations), reflecting the specific organisation in which they operate. The functioning of the institutional environment takes place at the macro level (definition of rules and norms of interaction, legislative framework, level of legitimacy) and at the micro level (choice of technologies for optimization of political activity and interaction). The existing features of political and socio-economic development, existing institutions are factors of influence on the processes of political and managerial decisions and the choice of technologies of activity. At the same time, the forms of individual political activity of the elite, interest groups or individual citizens, as well as the degree of formalization of their organizational formations influence the functioning of the institutional environment.

The degree of coherence of the institutional environment depends on the consent of all the subjects to respect the rules and norms that ensure social and political integration. It is about the formation of a macro level of trust and understanding regarding the recognition of rights and performance of duties at the level of specific individuals. The emphasis is shifting to informal links, which are also quite structured and ensure coordination of interaction, although they may not fully comply with universal norms and principles. Systemic integration occurs in the process of political self-organization of segments of society on the basis of universally recognized values and norms. They coordinate interactions and influence the regulation of conflicts between the subjects of the microenvironment, forming a corresponding level of their autonomy in the conditions of the established macro-order, which is recognized as legitimate [7, pp. 38-42].

From this perspective, we can talk about the formation of a kind of socio-political order within the institutional environment. It can be considered as the ability of power structures to exercise effective governance, ensuring public safety and stability. The order can be interpreted as follows: 1) as a set of certain qualities of the system, that set the parameters of its functioning; 2) as a system structural integrity, which ensures the relationship of elements; 3) as an institutional order, that is, the predictability and consistency of the existing socio-political reality. The synthesis of approaches to understanding the essence of the social order makes it possible to distinguish its characteristic features:

1. presence of norms that are based on universally recognized social values and are able to be assimilated at the level of mass consciousness;

2. ability of subjects, due to the available resources and position, to form "rules of conduct", necessary for mutually beneficial cooperation and reduction of the level of uncertainty of the political system;

3. interaction and information exchange allow the subjects to form an understanding of actions amenable to algorithmization and consolidation in the form of institutional practices;

4. institutional practices are very dynamic, as they indicate the relevance of action in a particular political situation, and therefore can be modified under the influence of circumstances or subjects;

5. dynamism of the socio-political order is conditioned by changes or transformations under the influence of "new practices" that tend to institutionalize [7, pp. 23-34].

At the same time, under the influence of political situation or actions of individual actors, the socio-political order can acquire uncertainty, which is associated with a low level of organization and functioning of the institutional environment. The situation of uncertainty is characterized by the fact that the subjects of political interaction are not able to find a compromise on the rules and procedures of activities that are constantly changing. Under such conditions, informal interactions and practices become dominant, which increase the risks when making effective political and managerial decisions. Long-term situational uncertainty can provoke a systemic crisis, during which competition in the struggle for the possession and redistribution of power resources increases, resulting in new institutional practices.

This issue indicates the existence of institutional risks in modernization processes, that is, the probability of occurrence of certain undesirable events under the influence of specific factors or actors. The low level of development of the institutional environment hinders the processes of socio-economic and

political development, as well as hinders the implementation of modernization reforms in practice. It is possible to distinguish the following factors of restraint of development of the institutional environment: 1) institutional uncertainty; 2) institutional traps; 3) irrationality of functioning of institutes. In the first case, it is a question of the inability of the subjects of interaction to find compromise versions of norms, rules or procedures that would satisfy their interests. Under such conditions, the institutional environment is dominated by political practices of a temporary nature, that are constantly changing and reducing the effectiveness of decisions. There is a causal relationship between institutional uncertainty and risk. It means that uncertainty of interaction complicates possibility of forecasting of expediency and consequences of certain decisions, and therefore there are risks to the activity of the subject contradicting its interests. It should be noted that modernization processes can provoke situational uncertainty, since they involve a structural and substantive transformation of the political system, and therefore require new rules, procedures of activity and interaction [7, p. 42].

The second case is about the functioning of inefficient institutions or their assembly, which lead to distortion of the conditions of socio-political reality, contributing to the inefficiency of the development of the same modernization processes or reduction of the effective influence of the political elite on them. In this context, it is advisable to recall the phenomenon of double institutionalization, which was inherent in the processes of modernization of the post-soviet states. According to Ye. Holovakha and N. Panina, it has the following characteristics: 1) high level of traditional legitimacy in the public mind, even with the loss of institution legality; 2) using the informal rules of the game rather than those institutionalized and legalized; 3) ambivalence and demoralization of society in terms of change is manifested in the consent to live by "old rules" that admit the existence of traditional norms or interactions that do not meet the needs of newly institutional environment, but provide a certain level of stability [3, p. 37].

The processes of institutionalization of the political elite can be an example of such a situation. The institutional environment of the modernizing elite is formed in the conditions of modernization. It is aimed at carrying out reforms, and therefore requires new rules and models of interaction. At the same time, the status-role structure of the elite institute remains overloaded with representatives of the "old elite" who seek to maintain their positions in the new environment, without changing the rules of the game, but increasing their own privileges. Under such conditions, the opinion on the need to preserve traditional models of interaction that minimize the risks of instability provoked by attempts to reform is formed in the mass consciousness. Hence, the consent of society to a kind of inaction of the elite and fear of any changes. Accordingly, in the new institutional environment, there are traditional models of behavior and interaction that do not meet the needs of political reality, block the possibility of radical renewal of the elite, its further institutionalization in order to implement effective reform.

The third case means the absence of certain institutions or their failure to legitimize new rules or procedures. Consequently, restrictions of interaction or practices are formed in the institutional environment. As a result, the pace of reform decreases, the strategies of their practical implementation change. This situation affects the activity of the political elite as a subject of initiating of modernization reforms. The absence of legitimate rules of interaction reduces its resource potential, makes incomplete the processes of institutionalization, directing the main vector of activity not to achieve the public wealth, but to the constant struggle for the preservation of its own positions and privileges.

Overall, the institutional environment can be regarded as a set of rules, norms and patterns of interaction among subjects on the basis of common values, respective of national cultural development trends, contributing to a conversion in the political system. Accordingly, a certain model of interaction is formed which affects the dynamics of modernization processes. This is achieved by algorithmizing the activities of the subject and object, resulting in the possibility of analyzing the current political situation and optimization by selecting effective political technologies. The dynamic functioning of the interaction model is caused by the following processes: 1) presence of motivation to carry out activities; 2) high level of communicative interaction; 3) structuring of interaction processes in order to algorithmize them.

Motivation processes are associated with the actualization of motives necessary for interaction. In the context of modernization processes, the motive of an elite institution can consist in carrying out certain reforms to legitimize the status, increase the level of institutionalization, and for public groups, to obtain new standards of life and social protection. Communication processes provide the dynamics of the bilateral cooperation, determining its direction and shape. The structuring processes form and arrange the rules and norms of communicative interaction, according to the positions in the political space, giving them a more predictable character [18].

The political elite, by virtue of its functions and the degree of institutionalization, influences the formation of the institutional environment, since it determines the rules of the game in a particular political system, on the basis of which the choice of models of political activity is carried out. This is manifested in the following. Firstly, the elite, having the appropriate resource potential, is able to offer civil society status-role models of political behavior that correspond to a specific political situation and fixed rules and norms. Thus, the implementation of modernization reforms requires representatives of the elite to develop certain reform projects that meet the needs of society and can be implemented in the current political reality. The developed model of activity should correspond to the generally recognized regulatory framework that regulates interaction, since non-compliance can lead to the application of sanctions.

Secondly, the political elite to a certain extent can act as a carrier of knowledge, values, ideas about possible ways or methods of modernization of political reality. Consequently, the political system develops a kind of national model of modernization, which corresponds to the peculiarities of the political system and the standards of political activity established within it. Thirdly, the development of the elite institution creates conditions for internal competition for the right to represent the interests of specific groups of the public and the possibility of choosing an effective alternative to modernization. This allows the most active groups of the public to assess the quality of modernization reforms, their compliance with the leading values.

The process of defining and legitimizing the rules of the game in the institutional environment depend on the following factors: 1) conflict nature of the interaction, as actors seek to maximize individual benefit; 2) increase in the informativeness of the political space that actualizes analytical and advisory support to the choice of means and methods of activities; 3) structure, peculiarities of political situation which requires the exclusive analytical approaches for the rationalization of choice; 4) selection of effective alternatives.

Therefore, in the conditions of modernization of the political system, the elite institution can be characterized by a high level of conflict of interests in relation to the content and foundations of the functioning of the institutional environment. The stability of its functioning will be determined by the ability to search for compromise models of behavior, the definition of socially significant development strategies and the search for a balance between available resources and technologies for their practical implementation. The processes of globalization and informatization, the further professionalization of the realm of politics require the reinforcement of the choice of alternatives by analytical activities and advisory support. This makes it possible to form the rules of interaction in the political space that ensure the effectiveness of the functions of the "in-out" of the system as a whole, thereby providing it with an appropriate level of stability and modernization.

Forming the institutional environment of activity, the political elite seeks to consolidate its own status, which allows access to the influence resources. Such activity can occur in the presence of certain restrictions of action (the need for a coalition with the opposition, the situation of conflict, etc.), which implies the expectation of a more favorable situation of decision-making. Thus, situational analysis, a high level of motivation and responsibility form the basis for the formation of the rules of the game in the political system. The following forms of political interaction, characteristic of the elite in the process of modernization, can be outlined:

1. cooperation, that is common action, stipulated by the desire to achieve mutually beneficial goals and interests;
2. competition, which implies a high level of competitiveness of subjects for obtaining certain advantages relative to the distribution of privileges or resources;
3. coalition, that is the formation of a high level of cohesion as for the achievement of relevant goals and the mobilization of resources;
4. pacts, that is the development of a common strategy to ensure the stability of the political situation;

The effectiveness of political cooperation in the conditions of modernization changes depends primarily on the high level of institutional competence of the political elite, which implies the existence of generally recognized clear rules and procedures of making political and managerial decisions.

Competition as a form of political interaction contributes to the increase of the level of competitiveness and professionalism of the elite in the processes of forming of the modernization transformation models and communication of the corresponding advantages to the most active groups of the public in order to attract their potential to optimize annual implementation.

The first case entails the generally recognized rules and procedures of competition in elite circles, which allow us to find a balance between our own interests and public ones. This is manifested in the prevention of excessive polarization between the elite and other groups of society. The second case refers to

the forms of public control over the activities of the political elite, allowing to identify the contradictions of modernization development, to predict the dynamics of influence on the functioning of political system, contributing to the development of effective alternatives. The main forms of public control include the conduct of sociological or statistical research, public hearings, examination of the activities of the authorities.

According to H. Zelenko, the dynamics of the elite's implementation of the functions of the leading subject of modernization is determined by the dominant form of interaction – coalition or pact. The coalition provides for the arrangement of political forces basing on approximately the same value-ideological platforms. In the states of Western Europe, they are more stable entities, because there are very clear political and ideological ideas about the principles of domestic and foreign policy, only certain differences may arise regarding the technology of their implementation. In the states of Central and Eastern Europe, coalitions are less stable, which is explained by the high level of differentiation of public interests. The advantage of this type of interaction is the strengthening of the processes of structuring of both the political elite and society, which increases the level of dynamics of modernization transformations and involvement of citizens. The disadvantage is the emergence of situational crises in decision-making, for example, no government formation or the incapacity of the Parliament [8, p. 253-265].

In this context, we can recall William Riker, who believed that coalitions are the form of interaction of elites, which provides not only a minimum benefit to each subject, but also satisfies its desire to get more in the end. He identified several prerequisites for the formation of coalitions: the presence of two or more members; the amount of wins, losses of its members equals zero, and the ratio of risks and opportunities of getting the advantages motivate the creation of a coalition; information capacity, that is, ideas about the rules of the game; rationality of the choice of alternatives [21].

The pact involves, first of all, situational agreements with political actors in relation to specific issues that are relevant in the context of modernization development. At the same time, there is a danger of concluding behind-the-scenes agreements, but this can be prevented through the formation of public rules of the pact, which can be controlled by the public [8, p. 253-256].

The institutional environment of the functioning of the political elite is characterized by the presence of various political practices. They reflect certain constructs of socio-political situations, behaviors, political technologies, as well as specific decision-making algorithms. According to the content of practices they are divided into physical (ensuring the material existence of the political entities), cultural and informational (promoting formation of cultural and informational dimension of activities), environmental (aimed at implementing the changes of the political space). According to the nature of their activities, they are divided into interaction practices (cooperative activities of subjects), counteraction practices (competitive activities of subjects) and single-action practices (impact on a certain object) [22].

Political practices may include the following types of activity: spontaneous play, plan, project conception. Spontaneous play is characterized by search actions on the tactics of establishing interaction with other subjects, and with that the overriding objective is to study the state, reaction to the proposed ideas. This type of activity is a kind of background of possible strategic actions of the political elite. Plan is a conscious action of representatives of the elite institution, aimed at imposing on others the ideas of their own worldview. This type of activity involves the study of the potential subject of interaction, its features, as well as the focus on persuasion or coercion to the proper perception of the proposed images or actions [12]. Project conception is aimed at the formation of a certain image of the political future and the procedure for its implementation within defined spatiotemporal frames, according to the given resources, which is aimed at obtaining or strengthening the positions of power [13].

A significant number of political practices are the result of differentiation processes covering an elite institution and the whole interaction within the political system. Since the institutional environment is characterized by a high level of conflict, the activities of certain elite may experience some restrictions. Consequently, appear conditions for the creation of new ways of interaction, different from the existing ones. This allows to modify and update the "interaction space". It consists of the following elements: 1) a set of positions and resources of the subjects of the current political situation; 2) a set of rules of conduct and means of activity. Accordingly, political actors tend to compete for the formation of an "interaction space", feeling the need for certain resources, privileges, means and methods of activity [7, pp. 62-66].

Thus, in the process of modernization of the political system, an appropriate space of interaction is created, in which specific rules of conduct are reproduced and communication between the subjects is carried out. It should be noted that these interactions occur at internal and external levels of functioning

of elite institute. They influence the definition of goals and objectives of modernization activities, acting as a kind of institutional practices of the political elite. The implementation of transformations in the political system is accompanied by the initiation of certain modernization projects based on a new vision of the political situation and activity algorithms. Established procedure of modernization activity allows the political elite to define the types of interaction, creating conditions for institutionalization and legitimization of the produced projects in the mass consciousness. At the same time, different elite groups can compete with each other for the choice of alternative models of modernization and their further implementation in practice. The level of competition will be determined by the activity of the subjects of interaction, as well as the relevance of the proposed changes for society and the political system as a whole.

Therefore, we can speak about formation of public policy within the institutional environment, that is, the sphere of interaction between the elite and society in the processes of modernization of the political system. Public policy provides for the reconciliation of public interests in the course of modernization activities on the basis of effective cooperation of the elite, public organizations, professional experts regarding the actualization and resolving of socially significant problems. Under such conditions, the content and methods of public policy implementation are constantly updated in accordance with current challenges. It is particularly important to ensure the effectiveness of the feedback mechanism, which contributes to the adequacy of the response of the authorities to the trends in the development of socio-political processes, increasing the level of involvement of citizens in decision-making.

Structural elements of public policy are: 1) economic, associated with the production of public goods, redistribution of income to meet the needs; 2) social, that is, the presence of public and state social services to ensure social needs; 3) civil and political, that is, an extensive structure of active associations of citizens; 4) socio-cultural, that is, the original institutions of restitution and preservation of spiritual values and cultural codes of society. These components should determine the essence and content of modernization projects initiated by the political elite, as they contribute to the transfer of strategic decision-making processes in the sphere of public policy. They become available for discussions and debates in order to choose an effective alternative [1]

The success of the elite institute in the field of public policy is determined by the processes of communication flows management. This is due to the fact that modern processes of globalization significantly affect the functioning of political systems, as a result of the formation of a single information space, increased role of communicative processes in making social and political decisions, emergence of new political actors and technologies of struggle for power.

The constant improvement of information technology and growth of opportunities for obtaining new knowledge increase the involvement of civil society in information and communication interaction, affecting the growth of political activity. The presence of an effective communication strategy contributes to the balance of the structural elements of political system, strengthens interaction between the political elite and civil society.

It should be noted that the emergence of an environment is influenced by two vectors – "conflict-solidarity" and "legitimacy-illegitimacy". Conflict characterizes the presence of differences in terms of goals and ways to achieve them, and solidarity focuses on the coherence of the positions of the subjects of communication. According to the first vector and the degree of conflict the following forms of communicative interaction can be defined: 1) appeal in the form of petitions, proposals, complaints; 2) protests in the form of rallies, demonstrations; 3) threats in verbal and non-verbal form.

The second vector focuses on the complementary ideas of the legality of the actions of the political elite and the consent of society regarding their content. The state of legitimacy of the communicative space is quite dynamic. It is constantly changing, the indicators of which are public opinion and the level of trust in the activities of the authorities. The main indicators of legitimacy can be considered as commonly accepted values, attitudes, rules of conduct, contributing to the justification of the actions of specific actors through: 1) public justification of the relevance of the dominant values and norms, their role in achieving the public good; 2) solidarity in regard to socially responsible interests and needs; 3) premeditated algorithm of activities to achieve respective goals [4].

Consequently, the need for effective management of communication processes becomes urgent in the political system, because it will contribute to the introduction of meaningful political and managerial decisions aimed at revealing its potential in order to optimize modernization transformations. This process involves clear goals and procedures (creating information, promoting, receiving feedback, eliminating noise) of the activity. Its effectiveness is determined by the level of circulation of information flows and types of communicative interaction.

There are three levels of information circulation in the political system (semantic, technological, influential). The semantic level determines the possibility of communication with the help of conventional sign forms that allow you to preserve the content of the information presented and the adequacy of its interpretation. The political elite, forming national development strategies, should use such forms of communication that facilitate understanding of the content of the message by society and allow for feedback. Irrelevance of semantic structures to the type of communication of elite and society can cause emergence of so-called communication vacuum that reduces level of legitimacy of the made decisions and provokes crisis situations [17].

The technological level of communication implies the presence of specific technologies (information, advertising, PR) and channels for the dissemination of necessary information. According to G. Pushkareva there are four main types of political communication used by political elite: official (information has an institutionalized nature, since it keeps track of the adoption of specific political decisions and brings their content to the citizens); personal (information is provided by a specific representative of the political elite, reflecting personal attitude to political events or their evaluation); indirect (information comes not from political institutions or subjects, but from the media, think tanks); anonymous (information has a low level of reliability) [19, p. 45-54].

The influential level determines the degree of the so-called spiritual influence of information on the minds of people, and therefore involves the use of the necessary political symbols, myths, ideologies. It is important for the political elite to take into account the conditions of the functioning of the political system, traditions, stereotypes, which are appreciated in the collective consciousness. Accordingly, the modernization transformations of the political system defined in certain programs and slogans must correspond to the peculiarities of political consciousness. In general, these levels characterize the conditions of effective interaction between the elite and society within information and communication processes that affect dynamics of modernization transformations [17].

We can distinguish two types ("society-authorities" and "authorities-society") of communicative interaction in the political system, affecting the feedback, strengthening the effectiveness of modernization reforms. The first type means the formation of public opinion and implementation of public lobbying. Public opinion acts as a kind of expression of basic social values and norms, providing legitimization of power relations, mobilization of political activity. Taking into account the dynamics of public opinion allows the elite to determine the urgent problems of society and to make political decisions in order to solve them. At the same time, it uses the capabilities of the political system in order to timely react and assess the effectiveness of their implementation in practice. This indicates the presence of public control over the activities of the elite, which increases the level of its responsibility, legitimacy of decisions, positively affecting the stability of the political system.

In general, there are the following modes of interaction between the authorities and public opinion: suppression of public opinion by the authorities; ignoring of the public opinion; paternalism of the authorities in relation to public opinion; partnership; pressure of public opinion on the authorities; dictate of public opinion. In the course of modernization reforms, the most optimal mode is the mode of partnership, since it ensures the realization of the potential of public opinion in relation to the solution of state-specific problems. It can be achieved due to the presence of: 1) high level of democracy of the electoral process and legislation that provide access to evaluation and prolongation of the elite institute activities; 2) statutory mechanisms for the implementation of the socio-political functions; 3) extensive system of channels for expressing public opinion; 4) open discussion between the government and public opinion about controversial issues; 5) dynamics of the response of authorities to public appeals; 6) effective actions; 7) extensive system of methods and channels for public opinion research [5, p. 62].

The partnership mode contributes to the formation of democratic political institutions and consolidation of legal guarantees of citizens' involvement in activities based on the needs of public opinion. The main conditions for its implementation include: the rule of law; compliance of political decisions with the established procedure and access to information; efficiency; focus on consensus-compromise forms of interaction; effectiveness and efficiency, which is manifested by a high level of satisfaction of public needs [2, p. 35].

Therefore, providing by the elite institution with the necessary conditions for the partnership in the process of modernization of the political system contributes to: 1) legitimization of the initiated modernization project; 2) creation of awareness about the strategy and tactics of political modernization activities; 3) taking into account public evaluation in the political decision-making processes and making

adjustments, if necessary; 4) monitoring the activities of power actors and structures by the public; 5) providing advisory recommendations on optimization of political modernization activities [5, p. 68-71].

Public lobbying is aimed at organizing the interaction of public groups with authorities, commercial, non-profit organizations to actualize and address their own interests and needs. Its main directions include: 1) articulation and aggregation of citizens' interests at different levels of government; 2) formation and submission of public requests to central and local authorities; 3) attraction of investments for the needs of regional development.

Clear rules and procedures of lobbying allow balancing the interests of public groups and political elites on the basis of compromise solutions. Accordingly, lobbying ensures a pluralism of legitimate opportunities for public participation in the development and adoption of political decisions, provides publicity to the process and activities of state authorities. It can be considered as a kind of feedback channel, which actualizes the problems of the functioning of the political system, public demand and specific directions of modernization, as well as determines the agreed procedure for the development of political activity aimed at achieving the goals and objectives of the modernization project [16].

In the context of processes of modernization of the political system, active lobbying activity allows groups of the public to be included in the procedure of its implementation or adoption of specific political decisions.

The type of interaction "authorities-society" involves the use of PR-technology and application of resources for consultative interaction, in other words, the use of information and organizational PR-technologies. Information technologies focus on the use of the resource potential of the media to monitor public sentiment, actualization of problems, the solution of which is within the competence of specific political actors. Organizational PR-technologies focus on the respect of the organization procedure and carrying out special PR-events. They increase the level of public trust in the activities of the political elite, outlining intentions and actions to meet current needs. These technologies contribute to the establishment of purposeful interaction with the public, the actualization of the elite's proposed values, ideas, symbols, programs that determine the content of their activities.

The use of two-step flow of communication technology of P. Lazarsfeld allows concretizing the interests of public groups, increasing the level of political activity in modernization transformations. It focuses on finding "opinion leaders" for a particular group of the public. Thanks to their own authority and an established system of personal communication, they easily convey the necessary information, prompting action. Consequently, PR-technologies activate the public awareness of the proposed development programs, opportunities for active inclusion in activities for the implementation of modernization reforms of the political system.

To increase trust and mobilize public activity the elite institution should apply resources of consultative approach. For example, to promote the establishment of temporary advisory and expert commissions and think tanks. Their activities should focus on identifying current problems and finding compromise ways to solve them. Awareness-raising among groups of the public is quite effective. Such activities include the preparation of key messages on certain decisions of the political elite. They specify the following information: the reasons for the decision, its importance to the public, possible negative consequences and ways to minimize them, the forecast of the future after implementation. For example, in the UK, representatives of public authorities carry out special explanatory campaigns to reveal the motives for making a political decision and its relevance in the context of state development strategies [11, p.111-115].

The experience of democratic development of foreign countries shows the relevance of public consultations. The European Union has defined the general principles of public consultations: clear content of consultative session, information sharing about the event, system of feedback. Public discussions can be initiated by the political elite in direct (public civil discussion) and indirect (public opinion research) forms [11, p. 59-69].

In general, in the modern conditions of political reality, the communication processes between authorities and society in the political system acquire a decentralized network form. The implementation of political communication takes place at the following levels: 1) individual-personal (on websites, personal pages, blogs of political leaders); 2) group, that is, on the available resources of the blogosphere; 3) institutional (on the websites and portals of the main institutions of power). Accordingly, the main characteristics of this communicative space are: 1) real-time mode, which means that it is possible to quickly obtain the necessary information; 2) virtualization, that is, direct face-to-face contact, for example, using a teleconference; 3) commodification, that is, formation of the image characteristics of the subject [4]. It is important to take them into account in order to optimize modernization processes.

We can agree with the opinion of M. Holovatyi that an effective dialogue between authorities and society is possible with the help of socialization of communities, increasing their involvement in the political process through strengthening of informative and competence components, formation of practical skills to defend their own interests and join the collective solution of social and political problems [6]. However, the lack of interest from the elite in the harmonious development of civil society increases the risks of a passive-negative influence on modernization processes, which is manifested in lack of motivation for personal or group participation in the political modernization activities; the contradictions of value orientations (tradition dominates innovation) and interests (achieving success is associated with illegitimate funds, and self-actualization with the expectation of state support). Consequently, there is a decrease in the dynamics of modernization transformations, due to the low level of legitimacy of the elite institution, social solidarity and lack of opportunities for self-realization of the individual. This is evidence of the predominance of the model of passive adaptation to the conditions of political reality in the structure of value system and life strategies of society, which does not contribute to the implementation of the goals and objectives in relation to achievement of the public good [14].

In view of the above we can draw the following conclusions. Firstly, a set of legitimate rules of interaction and competitive political practices form the basis of the institutional environment of elite functioning. A holistic understanding of the rules of interaction and practices helps to determine the procedure of the elite institution in the political modernization processes, the dynamism of which is provided by the optimal choice of political technologies.

Secondly, communication processes shape specific types of interaction in the institutional environment, facilitating feedback, optimal distribution of resources, and the use of political system capabilities to optimize modernization changes. The elite institute, forming and controlling communication processes, ensures the involvement of public initiative in the practical implementation of modernization projects on the basis of partnership and mutual responsibility.

#### References:

1. Babosova E. Kotseptualizatsiya ponyatiya «publichnaya politika». 2013. URL: <http://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/kontseptualizatsiya-ponyatiya-publichnaya-politika.pdf> (accessed 25.11.2016).
2. Teleshun S. O., Reiterovych I. V., Sytnyk S. V. et al. *Vzaiemodiia derzhavy i suspilstva v protsesakh publichnoi polityky: nauk. rozrobka/avt. kol.* Kyiv: NADU, 2013. p. 44.
3. Golovakha E., Panina N. Osnovnyye etapy i tendentsii transformatsii ukrainskogo obshchestva: ot perestroyki do «oranzhevoy revolyutsii». *Sociology: theory, methods, marketing*. 2006. No. 3, pp. 32-51.
4. Gerasimova E., Chernyayeva T. Formy i rezhimy vzaimodeystviya vlasti i obshchestva v usloviyakh politicheskoy modernizatsii Rossii. 2012. URL: <http://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/formy-i-rezhimy-vzaimodeystviya-vlasti-i-obshchestva-v-usloviyah-politicheskoy-modernizatsii-rossii> (accessed 04.08.2015)
5. Gavra D. P. Obshchestvennoye mneniye i vlast: rezhimy i mekhanizmy vzaimodeystviya. *Journal of sociology and social anthropology*, 1998. vol. 1, No. 4, pp. 53-77.
6. Holovatyi M. Dialoh mizh vladoiu i suspilstvom – vazhlyva zasada formuvannia ukrainskoi derzhavnosti. *Political management*. 2011. No.5, pp. 19-24.
7. *Grazhdane i politicheskiye praktiki v sovremennoy Rossii: vosproizvodstvo i transformatsiya institutsionalnogo poryadka* / Editorial board: Patrushev S. (executive editor), Ayvazova S., Panov P. Moscow: RAPN; ROSSPEN, 2011. 318 p.
8. Zelenko H. I. Koalitsiia chy paktuvannia: modeli vzaiemodii politychnykh elit na postsotsialistychnomu prostori. *Elites and civilizational processes of formation of nations*. Kyiv: TOV UVPK "EksOb", 2006. Vol. 2, pp. 253-265.
9. *Institutsionalnaya politologiya: sovremennyy institutsionalizm Ipoliticheskaya transformatsiya Rossii* / Edited by S. Patrushev. Moscow, ISP RUN, 2006. 600 p.
10. Kokorkhoyeva D. Sovremennyye issledovaniya institutov politicheskoy vlasti (sravnitel'nyy analiz teorii). *Belgorod State University Scientific Bulletin. HistorySerie. Politicalscience*. 2010. No. 4, ed. 14, pp. 208-217.
11. *Komunikatsiia: demokratychni standarty v roboti orhaniv derzhavnoi vlady* / Edited by O. Dniprenko. Kyiv: TOVКиїв: TOB "Vistka", 2008. 164 p.
12. Lurye S., Kazaryan L. Mirovaya politika i eye prognosticheskiye indykatory. *Polis*. 2012. No 2. pp. 85-97.
13. Mitrokhina T. N. Politicheskyy proyekt kak kategoriya politicheskoy nauki. 2015. URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/politicheskyy-proekt-kak-kategoriya-politicheskoy-nauki>(accessed 16.12.2015).
14. Materialy kruhloho stolu «Hromadianske suspilstvo v 2018-mu: novi vyklyky, novi zavdannia» (do 25-richchia Fondu «Demokratychni initsiatyvy» imeni Ilka Kucheriva) 6 bereznia 2018 roku. URL: <http://dif.org.ua/uploads/pdf/13963398165a9eef1b022177.77359526.pdf> (accessed 27.04.2018).
15. Nort D. Instytuty, protsesy ta funktsionuvannia ekonomiky. Kyiv: Osnovy, 2000. 230 p.
16. Nisnevich Yu. Informatsionno-kommunikatsionnaya stabilizatsiya politicheskoy sistemy. 2006. URL: <http://elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=9913771> (accessed 22.01.2017)

17. Ostapenko M. Politychna komunikatsiia: teoretychni aspekty doslidzhennia. *Political management*. 2012. No. 3, pp. 135-144.
18. Pushkareva G. V. *Politicheskii menedzhment*. URL: <http://uchebnik – online.com/133/1209.html> (accessed 05.10.2016)
19. *Politicheskoye obespecheniye biznesa* / Edited by Yu. Konoplin. Moscow: MAI Publishing house, 1995. pp. 45-54.
20. Riker W. *The theory of political coalitions*. New Haven; CT/London: Institute for Advanced Studies, 2000. 18 p.
21. Rybakov A., Studnikov P. Kategoriya «politicheskii institut» v sovremennoy politicheskoy nauke. *Topical issues of social sciences: sociology, political science, philosophy, history: collected articles on the materials of international research-to-practice conference, February 18, 2015*. Novosibirsk: SibAk, 2015. pp. 18-27.
22. Skopin A., Klimov A., Zaytsev D. Aktornyy podhod v sovremennykh sotsial'nykh naukakh: ekonomiki, sotsiologii i politologii. URL: <https://www.hse.ru/data/2012/12/16/1300987726/Скопих%20А.Ю.,%20Климов%20А.И.,%20Зайцев%20Д.Г.%20Ак..в%20современных%20социальных%20науках.pdf> (accessed: 12.09.2016).

### Бібліографічний список:

1. Бабосова Є. Коцептуалізація поняття «публічна політика». URL: <http://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/kontseptualizatsiya-ponyatiya-publichnaya-politika.pdf> (Дата звернення: 25.11.2016)
2. Взаємодія держави і суспільства в процесах публічної політики : наук. розробка/авт. кол. : С. О. Телешун, І. В. Рейтерович, С. В. Ситник та ін. Київ : НАДУ, 2013. 44 с.
3. Головаха Е., Паніна Н. Основные этапы и тенденции трансформации украинского общества : от перестройки до «оранжевой революции». *Социология : теория, методы, маркетинг*. 2006. №3. С. 32-51.
4. Герасимова Е., Черняева Т. Формы и режимы взаимодействия власти и общества в условиях политической модернизации России. URL: <http://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/formy-i-rezhimy-vzaimodeystviva-vlasti-i-obschestva-v-uslovivah-politicheskoy-modernizatsii-rossii> (Дата звернення: 04.08.2015)
5. Гавра Д. П. Общественное мнение и власть: режимы и механизмы взаимодействия. *Журнал социологии и социальной антропологии*. 1998. Том 1. №4. С. 53-77.
6. Головатий М. Діалог між владою і суспільством – важлива засада формування української державності. *Політичний менеджмент*. 2011. №5. С. 19-24.
7. Граждане и политические практики в современной России: воспроизводство и трансформация институционального порядка / ред. колл. : С. Патрушев (отв. ред. ), С. Айвазова, П. Панов. Москва : РАН; РОССПЭН, 2011. 318 с.
8. Зеленько Г. І. Коаліція чи пактування: моделі взаємодії політичних еліт на постсоціалістичному просторі. *Еліти і цивілізаційні процеси формування нації*. Київ: ТОВ УВПК «ЕксОб», 2006. Т. 2. С. 253-265.
9. Институциональная политология: современный институционализм и политическая трансформация России / под. ред. С. Патрушева. Москва: ИСП РАН, 2006. 600 с.
10. Кокорхоева Д. Современные исследования институтов политической власти (сравнительный анализ теорий). *Научные ведомости Белгородского государственного университета. Сер. История. Политология*. 2010. №4. Вып. 14. С. 208-2017.
11. Комунікація : демократичні стандарти в роботі органів державної влади / за. ред.. О. Дніпренко. Київ: ТОВ «Вістка», 2008. 164 с.
12. Лурье С., Казарян Л. Мировая политика и её прогностические индикаторы. *Полис*. 2012. №2. С. 85-97.
13. Митрохина Т. Н. Политический проект как категория политической науки. URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/politicheskii-proekt-kak-kategoriya-politicheskoy-nauki> (Дата звернення: 16.12.2015)
14. Матеріали круглого столу «Громадянське суспільство в 2018-му: нові виклики, нові завдання» (до 25-річчя Фонду «Демократичні ініціативи» імені Ілька Кучеріва) 6 березня 2018 року. URL: <http://dif.org.ua/uploads/pdf/13963398165a9eeflb022177.77359526.pdf> (дата звернення: 27.04.2018).
15. Норт Д. Институти, процеси та функціонування економіки. Київ: Основи, 2000. 230 с.
16. Нисневич Ю. Информационно-коммуникационная стабилизация политической системы. URL: <http://elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=9913771> (дата звернення: 22.01.2017)
17. Остапенко М. Політична комунікація: теоретичні аспекти дослідження. *Політичний менеджмент*. 2012. №3. С. 135-144.
18. Пушкарёва Г. В. Политический менеджмент. URL: <http://uchebnik-online.com/133/1209.html> (дата звернення: 05.10.2016)
19. Политическое обеспечение бизнеса / под ред. Ю. Коноплина. Москва: Изд-во МАИ, 1995. С. 45-54.
20. Рыбаков А., Студников П. Категория «политический институт» в современной политической науке. *Актуальные вопросы общественных наук: социология, политология, философия, история: сб. ст. по матер. междунар. науч.-практ. конф. 18 лютого 2015*. Новосибирск: СибАК, 2015. С. 18-27.
21. Riker W. *The theory of political coalitions*. New Haven; CT/London : Institute for Advanced Studies, 2000. 18 p.

22. Скопин А., Климов А., Зайцев Д. Акторный поход в современных социальных науках: экономики, социологии и политологии. URL: <https://www.hse.ru/data/2012/12/16/1300987726/Скопин%20А.Ю.,%20Климов%20А.И.,%20Зайцев%20Д.Г.%20Ак.в%20современных%20социальных%20науках.pdf> (дата обращения: 12.09.2016)

**Примуш М. В., Окуньовська Ю. В., Гижко А. П. Політична еліта в інституційному середовищі**

*Стаття є дослідженням змісту та особливостей інституціоналізації еліти в процесі модернізації політичної системи. Доведено, що функціонування інституційного середовища відбувається на макро- та мікрорівні. У цьому контексті стаття вивчає ступінь узгодженості інституційного середовища та його залежність від згоди всіх суб'єктів на дотримання правил та норм, що забезпечують суспільний та політичний порядок. Дослідження розкриває сукупність законних правил взаємодії та конкурентних політичних практик, які складають основу інституційного середовища (функціонування еліти). Він описує комунікаційні процеси, які формують таку взаємодію в інституційному середовищі. Зроблено висновок, що чіткі правила та процедури лобіювання дозволяють збалансувати інтереси громадських груп та політичних еліт на основі компромісних рішень. Відповідно, лобіювання забезпечує плюралізм реалізації можливостей участі громадськості у розробці та прийнятті політичних рішень, забезпечує публічність процесу та діяльності органів державної влади. Автори обґрунтовували, що сукупність законних правил взаємодії та конкурентних політичних практик є основою інституційного середовища функціонування еліти. Цілісне розуміння правил взаємодії та практики допомагає визначити процедуру елітного інституту в процесах політичної модернізації, динамічність яких забезпечується оптимальним вибором політичних технологій. Також комунікаційні процеси формують конкретні типи взаємодії в інституційному середовищі, полегаючи зворотний зв'язок, оптимальний розподіл ресурсів та використання можливостей політичної системи для оптимізації модернізаційних змін. Елітний інститут, формуючи та контролюючи комунікаційні процеси, забезпечує залучення громадської ініціативи до практичної реалізації проектів модернізації на основі партнерства та взаємної відповідальності.*

**Ключові слова:** інституційне середовище, модернізація, політична еліта, політична система, політична практика, комунікація.