

DOI 10.31558/2519-2949.2024.4.9

УДК 342.8:004.7

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5640-2605>*Honcharuk-Cholach T., West Ukrainian National University*ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5864-4931>*Huryk M., West Ukrainian National University*ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0005-9040-0693>*Kovtun I., West Ukrainian National University*

ELECTORAL BEHAVIOUR AS A SPECIAL 'SLICE' OF POLITICAL BEHAVIOUR

The article deals with the main issues of political analysis of electoral behaviour in the system of the political behaviour of citizens. It is proved that many approaches to understanding political behaviour have yet to emerge to date. All seven approaches, which the authors of the publication focused on, are diverse, indicating the complex nature of political behaviour, uncertainty, and versatility. It is noted that there is no general methodology for studying electoral behaviour today. Sociologists, political scientists, and social psychologists offer their own methodological approaches, which differ significantly in terms of levels, content, and nature. In the article, the authors draw attention to three such methodological approaches: sociological, socio-psychological, and rational. They are different in their characteristics, but all agree that electoral behaviour is one of the forms of manifestation of political behaviour of individuals when they delegate their powers to the elected authorities and its peculiarity is that citizens participate in campaigning actions directly at elections. The authors prove that the three theoretical approaches to the study of electoral behaviour (sociological, socio-psychological, rational-instrumental) have their advantages and disadvantages, but they can be used to characterise electoral behaviour in full democracies, taking into account the changes that are taking place in them. The comparative analysis carried out in the article shows that in the system of political practices, a real paradigm for generalising the concept and modelling electoral behaviour can be found in the future. New approaches to the analysis and systematic explanation of the dynamics of the structure of electoral attitudes, forecasting electoral behaviour, and disclosure of technologies of influence on voters are scattered and still lack an empirical basis, but new research in this area could combine the existing knowledge on this issue and become the basis for synthesis and integration of new knowledge, which will help to solve the problem of disclosure of dynamic internal mechanisms of electoral behaviour and the possibilities of its forecasting

Keywords: *political participation, political engagement, political behaviour, political institution, electorate, elections, legitimisation*

Statement of the problem. Elections, from the point of view of political science, are a political institution that performs the functions of legitimising the existing regime, facilitates the delegation of power, and helps to mobilise the population. And the results of elections depend both on the leading figures of the electoral process – on the candidates and parties participating in them, and to no lesser extent, they depend on another figure of the electoral process, namely the voter and his or her electoral behaviour. Electoral behaviour is the most common type of political behaviour.

There is no need to argue that the stated problem is extremely relevant and quite complicated, especially given the realities of post-totalitarian countries, where even politicians as subjects (actors) of the political process are often not defined in their party preferences and ideological preferences, not to mention the 'average political subject'.

Analysis of recent research and publications. The scientific interest in the problems of electoral behaviour is associated with the practical needs of election candidates. This explains the fact that the first studies were aimed at the development of political technologies. Of particular interest were theories of electoral behaviour, which began to be developed quite thoroughly in the mid-twentieth century. Of particular research interest today are the works of foreign representatives of the behavioural and post-

behavioural trends (B. Berelson, H. Gaudet, P. Lazarsfeld, S. Lipset, W. McPhee, S. Roccan and others). The foundations of the socio-psychological theory of choice are revealed in the studies of E. Campbell, W. Miller, D. Stokes, F. Converse, etc. The studies of D. Buchanan, E. Downes, G. Tullock, M. Fiorina lay the foundations of a rational approach to voter decision-making.

R. Balaban, O. Vyshniak, V. Karasev, I. Kononov, S. Ryabov, O. Sushko, V. Shapoval, O. Yaremenko, and others have studied the problem of electoral behaviour from the perspective of political participation, political parties, elections and electoral systems in Ukraine. However, the electoral behaviour of citizens at the current stage of democracy development is not unambiguously predictable.

The purpose of the article C is to find out the peculiarities of modern models of electoral behaviour as a special type of political behaviour and the possibility of their application in domestic political science.

Presentation of the main research material. The process of interaction between society and politics is reflected in the specific steps of political figures. These actions play a crucial role in democratic societies, where political power exists for the people, and the principles of functioning and methods of organisation are based on the active participation of citizens. It is no coincidence that political participation in democratic countries is enshrined in the Constitution. In this case, all citizens have the right to vote, and society has approved the rights to various freedoms, such as freedom of the press, freedom of association, the right to hold demonstrations, strikes, etc. The concept of 'political participation' has certain normative dimensions.

Political participation of citizens in the life of a democratic society is the basis of the political order based on the principle of political equality of all citizens. This is manifested in the form of voting, where the principle of 'one person, one vote' is established.

Universal suffrage and the development of civil liberties have allowed citizens to enter into direct relations with political power based on the law, and have also provided for a slight progress towards the power field. The concept of political behaviour is important here.

Let us now focus on the approaches that exist within the framework of understanding political behaviour.

The first approach includes opinions according to which political behaviour is a set of all actions that take place in the political sphere and are divided by the degree of influence on the authorities (P. Blau). Here, the researcher emphasises that different participants in the political process enter it, competing with each other to receive greater rewards from politics. Political behaviour itself is seen as the result of rational decisions about what is more profitable for the individual.

The second approach – the situational one – explains political behaviour through several factors that influence the content of its actions. They are the physical, organic and social environment (R. Merton). Here, the scientist identifies different ways of adapting to the external environment (conformism, rituals, innovations). The most common is conformist adaptation, whereby an individual is deprived of any reaction to the political situation, and sees no gaps in the actions of the authorities, especially when the latter do not affect the interests of the individual.

Such behaviour contributes to the desired stability, and the authorities encourage such behaviour. Another ritualistic type of behaviour does not threaten the dominant regime through interaction with the authorities. Yet different type of innovative behaviour can stimulate change if it is necessary to improve the political situation. According to R. Merton, these are all ways to find a balance between the individual and society. At the same time, he emphasises that it is not society that is looking for them, but the individual. The individual is primarily concerned about his or her position in society. The task of modern developed social systems is to meet him, to facilitate the search for mutual understanding, a kind of 'consensus', to create favourable conditions of activity that would reduce to the minimum the possibility of social deviations in behaviour.

Another approach to understanding political behaviour focuses on the subjective intentions of a person, which are manifested in his or her actions (M. Weber). According to the thinker, they are understood as the behaviour of an individual that correlates with the behaviour of another. Based on the psychological criteria for classifying social actions, M. Weber distinguishes the following types:

- value-based – rational – determined by the belief in the value of any way of behaviour, regardless of the final result of the activity;
- affective – emotionally realised behaviour that arose through affects, which are determined directly by feelings and emotions;
- traditional – an action performed on the basis of traditions and customs.

In accordance with the proposed classification of action, M. Weber distinguishes types of linguistic order: legal, value-based – rational; affective; traditional.

The ideal type of social action is considered in terms of analysing the spiritual and psychological structure and motivation of human behaviour.

According to the authors of the conflict theory, three types of motivation (cooperative, individualistic, competitive) influence the formation of political behaviour (D. Sanderson). In his opinion, all events that destabilise the situation are considered as deviations from the system of specific 'normality', which differ from country to country, from one person to another. Under these events, Sanderson understood changes in the political regime, government and society, peaceful and violent challenges to the political system, i.e. various forms of internal conflict behaviour. The category of normality, the deviation from which leads to conflict, is related to the level of mass consciousness, which is manifested in the values prevailing at a given period.

Proponents of systemic analysis are convinced that the main motive for political behaviour is the preference for authoritative leaders who become a model for individuals (J. Blundel and others).

According to the theory of rational choice (A. Downs, R. Kari, D. Huada), an individual's behaviour is influenced by his or her desire for gain. According to this theory, people try to coordinate their actions in such a way as to achieve their individual goals. A person can choose an alternative, i.e. the option that will give the best result, but people's desire for self-interest can lead to a social problem when there is a conflict between personal and social rationality.

The theory of rational choice explains rational behaviour when an individual can choose and pursue his or her options. Each person acts based on his or her own life principles, which can be fulfilled by enjoying the result. But we should remember the truth that personal plans can harm society.

Proponents of the idea of the 'autonomous person' (A. Harz, O. Debarol, etc.) argue that individuals are often fundamentally incapable of analysing subjective motivations.

Thus, the diversity of approaches demonstrates the complex nature of political behaviour, its uncertainty and multifacetedness. However, it is worth noting that participation in political life requires interaction with other actors in the political process. To do this, one needs to understand and correctly assess their political behaviour, and the main principle here is to build one's behaviour per the principles and standards of a democratic society. In politics, one should not succumb to emotions. It requires a serious analysis of the political situation, a conscious and rational choice of means to achieve one's goal. Political behaviour should not go beyond the limits set by political and legal norms, and one should also keep in mind the norms of morality.

Electoral behaviour is the most common type of political behaviour. 'Electoral behaviour' is a form of manifestation of political behaviour of people, which is related to the exercise of their social functions as voters (delegation of powers). In a broader interpretation, the concept of 'electoral behaviour' includes not only the act of delegation (at the stage of voting), but also the decision-making process and social factors that influence the voting pattern.

In each country, the electoral behaviour of citizens can be characterised by certain features and is determined by the level of political culture of the society, the right to vote, status and property specifics of the electorate, mechanisms for the implementation of civil liberties, etc.

The main motive for participation in the political life of the state is the desire to influence the authorities, to give their assessment of their actions and results. The subjective perception that there is no causal link between the expression of will and the consequences for the authorities is the main motivation for avoiding participation in political life and the reason for the decline in voter turnout at polling stations.

In Ukraine, the electoral behaviour of the population is primarily a mechanism for changing the government and is represented by a set of actions and deeds of citizens related to the exercise of the right to hold local (local, regional self-government) or national elections (Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, President), as well as their participation in referendums.

As already mentioned, the first studies of electoral behaviour were aimed at the development of political technologies. For this reason, by the mid-twentieth century, American researchers had identified the following methodological approaches: sociological; socio-psychological; rational choice theory.

Let's try to dwell on each of these approaches to better understand electoral behaviour as a special 'slice' of political behaviour

The sociological approach (B. Berel, P. Lazarsfeld, S. Finkel, G. Almond and others) emphasised the influence of social group affiliation and voting results.

Supporters of the socio-psychological approach (D. Stokes, G. Lasswell, E. Campbell, etc.) considered the relationship between voters' political attitudes and party identification to be the subject of study.

Finally, the rational-instrumental school (M. Laver, M. Botrak, E. Downs, M. Fiorina and others) built mathematical models of political behaviour of voters based on the study of the impact of political information on electoral choice.

The sociological approach to electoral behaviour was initiated by A. Siegfried, who created the field of 'electoral geography'. According to him, the formation of political views of the population depends on some factors (historical, social, political, administrative formation of the country; religion; influence of external factors, etc.) The scientist, studying electoral behaviour during elections in France during the Third Republic, concluded that stable voter behaviour depends on natural and social conditions.

Siegfried's ideas were continued by his student F. Hogel, who placed the greatest emphasis on social and structural influences. The scientist compared the social structure of settlement types and political behaviour. He replaced the term 'electoral geography' with 'sociology of elections'.

But in the mid-50s, R. Aron began to criticise this school. In his opinion, voter behaviour is not reducible to each other, and the basis of political analysis and method is the interconnection of social and professional changes.

Another researcher of the same school, M. Dogan, who studied the electoral behaviour of French industrial workers, concluded that it is influenced by typical socio-economic zones (agrarian, industrial, mixed).

The principles of the 'ecological' school were also shared by the researcher R. Herberle, who, based on the statistical method, believed that human political behaviour is determined by the relationship between politics and the main socio-economic structures.

Thus, the 'ecological' approach has largely become an applied one, with a focus on statistical methods.

It is worth noting that the study of electoral behaviour was influenced by behaviourism, which was spreading from the United States around the world. G. Lazarsfeld's 'sociological' approach was the first serious method to use panel surveys of voters to find out the mechanism of electoral behaviour. This approach was used to analyse the US presidential election in the 1940s and marked the transition from analysing voting data to analysing individual data based on public opinion using the panel method.

All this allowed the scientist to divide voters by the degree of stability of electoral orientations, to determine the reasons for the influence of voters on their opinion; to correlate electoral orientations and behaviour with other indicators.

Another socio-psychological theory of electoral behaviour is based on the collection and analysis of information on the electoral behaviour of American voters, studied by scientists at the University of Michigan. It focused on individual psychological processes that influence political choices. The researchers of the Michigan Centre (F. Converse, D. Stokes, E. Campbell and others) paid special attention to the methods of polling, analysis of individual data, motivation and behaviour of voters.

Thus, according to the conclusions of the Michigan School, the choice of the electorate depends on: - party identification; - attitude to current events; - sympathy for the candidate.

It is worth noting that since the 40s of the twentieth century and up to now, the Michigan model of voting in the United States has been the most widespread, but today their attention is more focused on changes in political preferences, traditional behaviour, etc. The concept of 'intervening variables' was introduced here, which included

- voter identification with a particular party;
- orientation towards a particular candidate;
- position on controversial political issues.

According to Michigan researchers, the combination of these three indicators determines the reasons for electoral decisions.

In addition to the United States, the socio-psychological approach has been widely used in the study of electoral behaviour in Western Europe, where the term 'party identification' remains the most important to this day.

The most prominent English representatives of the Michigan School were R. Rose and J. McCapister, who, to explain the motives of the electorate's choice, considered the 'lifelong learning' model based on five categories, including: - juvenile socialisation; - education and religion; - socio-economic interests; - housing provision; - nationality; - belonging to a certain class; - political principles; - well-being; - race, etc.

In addition to the UK, the American school also had an impact on Germany. For example, German researcher H. Marcuse noted that a totalitarian society produces a one-dimensional person who looks like a puppet. Another representative of the same school, R. Schuletu, believed that the basis for political choice is voter awareness.

It is worth noting that the ‘socio-psychological’ methods paid most attention to the quality and frequency of surveys designed to identify electoral preferences.

Thus, today the most powerful in the field of electoral behaviour is the ‘American classical model’. Its representatives, S. Rosenstone and R. Wolfinger, argue that voter activity primarily depends on the motives and psychological characteristics of the individual, his or her previous political experience and political culture.

Another ‘attitudinal theory’ (G. Lasswell and A. Bentley) states that attitudes, motives and other psychological characteristics are of primary importance in determining voting behaviour.

Today, modern researchers are trying to combine the ‘sociological’ and ‘socio-psychological’ models of behaviour and, on this basis, build an integrative theory that would combine the positive features of both.

It should be noted that the above two theories have one common category of ‘solidarity’. The difference is that according to the former, a voter is in solidarity with the social group to which he or she belongs, while according to the latter, a voter is in solidarity with a political party. Also, the first approach pays great attention to socio-economic factors.

However, neither theory can explain changes in voting preferences. Many modern researchers explain this by the presence of interest in elections, which can be transformed into a group of indicators:

- meeting with a candidate;
- knowledge of the electoral law;
- sharing an election programme with friends, family, and colleagues;
- familiarity with the programmes and biographies of candidates;
- campaigning for or against a candidate;
- providing financial, moral, etc. support to a candidate.

It follows that electoral behaviour is one of the forms of political behaviour of individuals when they delegate their powers to the elected authorities. Its peculiarity is manifested when citizens take part in campaigning actions, directly at the elections.

Here we should distinguish between:

- the behaviour of the electorate;
- the voter’s own behaviour;

The behaviour of the electorate (at the polling station, in the electoral district, etc.) is a change in the number of votes cast compared to the previous voters, as well as a change in the number of absentees and those who cast invalid ballots.

The behaviour of the electorate is determined by the statistical method, when forecasts are made on the basis of accumulated statistical data of various social groups and demographic structures of individual regions.

Electoral behaviour is manifested in:

- elections of governing bodies of political and public organisations;
- elections of regional and local authorities;
- elections of public administration bodies.

Thus, the above three theoretical approaches to the study of electoral behaviour (sociological, socio-psychological, rational-instrumental) have their advantages and disadvantages, but they can be used to characterise electoral behaviour in full democracies, taking into account the changes that are taking place in them.

Conclusions. Thus, the analysis allows us to distinguish three main theoretical directions of the study of voters’ electoral behaviour in the modern political tradition: sociological, socio-psychological and rational.

New approaches to the analysis and systematic explanation of the dynamics of the structure of electoral attitudes, forecasting electorate behaviour and disclosure of technologies of influence on voters are scattered and still lack an empirical basis.

Therefore, interdisciplinary research on the problems of electoral behaviour, creation of a general theory that could combine existing knowledge on this issue and become the basis for synthesis and integration of new knowledge will help to solve the problem of revealing the dynamic internal mechanisms of electoral behaviour and the possibilities of its forecasting.

References:

1. Bul’benyuk S., Haponenko V. Rol’ malykh partyi u politychnomu protsesi v konteksti parlament-s’kykh vyboriv 2021 roku. Politychni partiyyi i vybory: ukrayins’ki ta svitovi praktyky: zb. st. i tez za rezul’tatamy mizhnarodnoyi naukovoyi konferentsiyi «Mali politychni partiyyi ta aktory u politychnomu protsesi na rehional’nomu ta lokal’nomu (subnatsional’nomu) rivnyakh: Ukrayina i svit. L’viv: LNU im. Ivana Franka, 2022. Vyp. 6. S.106–118.

2. Haponenko V. A. Demokratyzatsiya vyborchoho zakonodavstva: rekomendatsiyi YES ta stan yikh vykonannya. Adaptatsiya natsional'noho zakonodavstva vidpovidno do Uhody pro asotsiatsiyu z Yevropeys'kym Soyuzom: naukova monohrafiya. K.: Vydavnychyy tsentr «Kafedra», 2019. S. 195–203.
3. Haponenko V. A. Systema instytutsiynikh chynnykiv politychnoyi demokratyzatsiyi v Ukrayini: monohrafiya. Kyuyiv : KNEU, 2020. 311c.
4. Honcharuk-Cholach T. V. Intentsiyi doslidzhennya sotsial'noyi nerivnosti ta stratyfikatsiyi vid antychnosti do s'ohodennya. *Hileya: naukovyy visnyk*. 2020. Vyp. 157. S. 35-41.
5. Honcharuk-Cholach T., Huryk M., Dzhuhla N. Lokalizatsiya polityky v konteksti suchasnykh naukovykh doslidzhen'. *Hileya: naukovyy visnyk*. 2022. Vyp. 167-168. S. 48-52.
6. Honcharuk-Cholach T., Dzhuhla N. Politychna sotsiologiya: navchal'nyy posibnyk. Ternopil': TNEU «Ekonomichna dumka», 2018. 234 s.
7. Naumenko O. M. Vplyv vyborchoho protsesu na mekhanizmy inkorporatsiyi polityko-upravlins'koyi elity Ukrayiny. *Naukovyy chasopys Natsional'noho pedahohichnoho universytetu imeni M. P. Drahomanova. Seriya 22. Politychni nauky ta metodyka vykladannya sotsial'no-politychnykh dystsyplin*. Vypusk 29: zbirnyk naukovykh prats'. Kyuyiv: Vyd-vo NPU imeni M. P. Drahomanova, 2020. S. 129–137
8. Shynkarenko O. Marketynhovaya model' elektoral'noyi povedinky: sutnist' ta osnovni kharakterystyky. *Ukrayins'kyy sotsiologichnyy zhurnal*. 2013. № 1–2. S. 87–91

Бібліографічний список:

1. Бульбенюк С., Гапоненко В. Роль малих партій у політичному процесі у контексті парламентських виборів 2021 року. Політичні партії і вибори: українські та світові практики: зб. ст. і тез за результатами міжнародної наукової конференції «Малі політичні партії та актори у політичному процесі на регіональному та локальному (субнаціональному) рівнях: Україна і світ. Львів: ЛНУ ім. Івана Франка, 2022. Вип. 6. С.106–118.
2. Гапоненко В. А. Демократизація виборчого законодавства: рекомендації ЄС та стан їхнього виконання. Адаптація національного законодавства відповідно до Угоди про асоціацію з Європейським Союзом: наукова монографія. К.: Видавничий центр «Кафедра», 2019. С. 195–203.
3. Гапоненко В. А. Система інституційних чинників політичної демократизації в Україні: монографія. Київ : КНЕУ, 2020. 311с.
4. Гончарук-Чолач Т. В. Іntenції дослідження соціальної нерівності та стратифікації від античності до сьогодення. *Гілея: науковий вісник*. 2020. Вип. 157. С. 35-41.
5. Гончарук-Чолач Т., Гурик М., Джугла Н. Локалізація політики в контексті сучасних наукових досліджень. *Гілея: науковий вісник*. 2022. Вип. 167-168. С. 48-52.
6. Гончарук-Чолач Т., Джугла Н. Політична соціологія: навчальний посібник. Тернопіль: ТНЕУ «Економічна думка», 2018. 234 с.
7. Науменко О. М. Вплив виборчого процесу на механізми інкорпорації політико-управлінської еліти України. *Науковий часопис Національного педагогічного університету імені М. П. Драгоманова. Серія 22. Політичні науки та методика викладання соціально-політичних дисциплін*. Випуск 29: збірник наукових праць. Київ: Вид-во НПУ імені М. П. Драгоманова, 2020. С. 129–137
8. Шинкаренко О. Маркетингова модель електоральної поведінки: сутність та основні характеристики. *Український соціологічний журнал*. 2013. № 1–2. С. 87–91.

Гончарук-Чолач Т., Гурик М., Ковтун І. Електоральна поведінка як особливий «зріз» політичної поведінки

У статті розглянуто основні питання політологічного аналізу електоральної поведінки в системі політичної поведінки громадян. Доведено, що до сьогодні не склалося якогось одного підходу до розуміння політичної поведінки. Всі сім підходів, на яких акцентувалася увага авторами публікації, є різноманітними що свідчить про складний характер політичної поведінки, її невизначеність і багатогранність. Звернено увагу на те, що на сьогодні не існує також і загальної методології вивчення електоральної поведінки. Соціологи, політологи, соціальні психологи пропонують свої методологічні підходи, які суттєво відрізняються за рівнями, змістом і характером. У статті автори звернули увагу на три таких методологічних підходи як соціологічний, соціально-психологічний та раціональний. Вони різні за своїми характеристиками, але всі сходяться у тому, що електоральна поведінка це одна з форм прояву політичної поведінки індивідів, коли вони делегують обраній владі свої повноваження і її особливість полягає у тому, що громадяни беруть участь в акціях передвиборчої боротьби, безпосередньо на виборах. Авторами доведено, що три теоретичні підходи в дослідженні електоральної поведінки (соціологічний, соціально-психологічний, раціонально-інструментальний) мають свої переваги та недоліки, але за їх допомогою можна охарактеризувати електоральну поведінку в повних демократіях враховуючи ті зміни, які в них відбуваються. Порівняльний аналіз,

здійснений у статті свідчить, що в системі політичних практик у перспективі можна знайти реальну парадигму узагальнення поняття і моделювання електоральної поведінки. Нові підходи до аналізу та системного пояснення динаміки структури електоральних установок, прогнозування поведінки електорату та розкриття технологій впливу на виборців мають розрізнений характер та поки що недостатню емпіричну базу, однак нові дослідження в цій сфері могли б об'єднати вже існуючі знання з даного питання та стати базою для синтезу, інтеграції нових знань, що сприятиме вирішенню проблеми розкриття динамічних внутрішніх механізмів електоральної поведінки та можливостей її прогнозування.

Ключові слова: політична участь, політична поведінка, електоральна поведінка, політичний інститут, електорат, вибори, легітимізація