

UDC 323.2

DOI <https://doi.org/10.30970/PPS.2024.55.58>

## THE ROLE OF POLITICAL NETWORKS IN THE INTERACTION BETWEEN THE STATE AND CIVIL SOCIETY

**Lidiya Tikhonova**

*Kharkiv National University of Radio Electronics,  
Philosophy Department  
Nauky Ave, 14, 61166, Kharkiv, Ukraine  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3954-0250>*

**Anna Sereda**

*Kharkiv National University of Radio Electronics,  
Foreign Languages Department  
Nauky Ave, 14, 61166, Kharkiv, Ukraine  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1802-2174>*

The role of political networks in interaction between the state and civil society is considered in the article. It is noted that successful functioning of political system of a modern democratic society in the context of informatization and digitalization is possible only with effective interaction between government bodies and civil society institutions. The desire to consolidate society and resist its stratification is contributed to the emergence and development of political networks. In modern world, telecommunication systems make significant information resources and technologies publicly available, contribute to qualitative changes in both national and international political processes. The concept of a rational-bureaucratic type of nation state is being replaced by the concept of “coordinating state”. The term “governance” means an approach to understanding the role and functions of the state, in which relations between state and civil society are cooperative in nature and are based on equal statuses, horizontal connections and network structures. The network form of governance is one of the most important components of this process and is expressed not only in formation of a new methodology, but also in the formation of a new type of relations between individual states, groups of states and the entire world community. The processes of digitalization and informatization contribute not only to complication of socio-political communications, but also to differentiation of social groups and the entire society. The political network connects the state and civil society and is created for the purpose of exchanging resources and achieving a certain consensus. A detailed analysis of functioning of political networks allows not only to optimize many political processes, but it is also an effective obstacle to monopolization of political power.

*Key words:* state, civil society, governability, political networks, informatization, digitalization, “governance”.

**Introduction. Relevance of the problem.** Successful functioning of the political system of democratic society is possible only with effective interaction of government bodies with civil society institutions. The absence of effective mechanisms for interaction between political power and general public helps to restrain social dynamics, but can also lead to destructive changes in society. If the majority of citizens do not share the methods and means of achieving goals declared by the authorities, as well as the quantity and quality of resources allocated for these purposes, this can lead to a sharp stratification of both public policy sphere and society as a whole. Desire to consolidate society and resist its stratification contributed to the emergence and development of

political networks as an information space where government structures and civil society interact. In modern society, public policy sphere is significantly expanding, and recommendations of civil society have a significant impact on government decision-making.

The development of information and communication technologies is the main factor that quite often fundamentally influences the change of political processes in modern society. Information technologies themselves are neutral, but at the same time they can be used both for positive changes in the political process and for strengthening negative trends. The development of any technology affects the life of society, and development of digital technologies has radically changed the life of humanity. Along with digital technologies, new approaches to understanding the impact of the latest digital information technologies on socio-political life of society are also developing. One of such approaches can be considered the so-called “network approach”.

The problems of relationship, functioning and development of relations between state structures and civil society in democratic societies have been studied in sufficient details. However, more often this phenomenon is considered from the point of view of political science, law or international relations. Relations between state and civil society from the point of view of public administration have not been studied enough for now. This makes the topic of this study relevant.

**Purpose of the study.** The purpose of this study is to identify, analyze and specification relationship and interdependence of processes of globalization, informatization and governability in modern society.

**Main material and results.** Modern telecommunication systems make significant information resources and technologies publicly available, facilitate qualitative changes in both national and international political processes and gradually lead to transformation of political and legal nature of the state and its management functions. In recent decades, political science has been actively conceptualizing new models of public administration. The concept of rational-bureaucratic type of national state is being replaced by the concept of a “coordinating state”. The network form of governance is one of the most important aspects of this process and is expressed not only in the development of a new methodology, but also in the formation of a new type of relationship between government, business, social groups, public organizations, as well as between individual states, groups of states and the entire world community.

Political networks as a phenomenon have attracted the attention of researchers for quite some time. In second half of 20th century, the American scientist J. L. Freeman, studying various political processes, revealed the existence of certain management subsystems that are formed through the interaction of bureaucracy, politicians and interested groups of population [1]. In the late 80s of the twentieth century, scientists considered communication to be the main function of political networks, and the nature of political networks was usually explained by analyzing the behavior of main actors and motives of their behavior in the network. Indeed, interaction in the network brings certain benefits and advantages to both specific people and organizations. Such interaction expands access to information, knowledge, financial and legitimation resources, significantly reduces risks due to coordination and cooperation. All these advantages led to the fact that in the late 90s of twentieth century, networks began to be actively used in the public administration system.

In the context of digital information society, the network form interaction expands its area of influence many times over. This is facilitated by several factors at once. On the one hand, the system of information and digital technologies is actively developing, which meets new economic, social and organizational realities of the society of 21st century. On the other hand, society's demands for the activities of governing structures are increasing.

The relevance of network approach to public administration is stipulated by the fact that with the development of civil society, relations between different social groups are constantly becoming more complex. At the same time, researchers constantly note a decrease in trust in government bodies on the part of population and an increase in the level of public needs and expectations. In this situation, the expansion of network interactions between the government and society can help bring governing structures closer to the public and business in the interests of social progress.

The theory of political networks went through a period of formation and development at a time when the positions of new market management were strengthening in most countries of the world and a systemic approach to management was being established. This theory offers a qualitatively new approach to understanding the essence of political processes. Political networks themselves are presented as a new model of society management, the main component of which is conscious interaction of various actors in the process of developing and implementing political decisions based on the prevalence of public interests.

The emergence of network-type public structures has transformed the main tasks of public administration. At the end of 20th century, the term “governance” increasingly appears in scientific research. This concept has already developed into a theoretical concept that reflects increasing complexity of relationship between state and society and seeks to overcome the crisis of public administration and legitimacy of power in theory and practice. The famous British and American political scientist M. Bevir explains the essence of this concept as follows: “How does governance differ from government? In brief, governance has spread rapidly both because changing social theories have led people to see the world differently and because the world itself has changed. ... Governance refers, therefore, to all processes of governing, whether undertaken by a government, market, or network, whether over a family, tribe, formal or informal organization, or territory, and whether through laws, norms, power, or language. Governance differs from government in that it focuses less on the state and its institutions and more on social practices and activities” [2, p. 1].

In general, this concept reveals the essence of relationship between state and non-state institutions. Previously these relations were hierarchical subordinate in nature, but in “governance” system they have a cooperative nature and are based on equal statuses, horizontal connections and network structures.

At the end of 20th century, the theory of political networks began to be developed most actively. Such researchers as D. Marsh, R. A. W. Rhodes, F. Scharpf, P. Kenis, L. J. O’Toole, J. J. Richardson, A. G. Jordon, P. Sabatier and others came to conclusion that modern society is characterized by functional differentiation and partial autonomy of social subsystems. This leads to the fact that private actors who control significant resources can influence decision-making through a network mechanism. At the beginning of the 21st century, the famous sociologist M. Castells noted that “dominant functions and processes in the Information Age are increasingly organized around networks. Networks constitute the new social morphology of our societies, and the diffusion of networking logic substantially modifies the operation and outcomes in processes of production, experience, power, and culture. While the networking form of social organization has existed in other times and spaces, the new information technology paradigm provides the material basis for its pervasive expansion throughout the entire social structure” [3, p. 500].

Currently, the interest in concept of political networks is only growing, since the relevance of the problem of governability is constantly growing. This problem arose against the background of the crisis of state’s welfare (the state that plays a key role in protecting and

developing the economic and social well-being of its citizens). Such state did not cope with its responsibility for the implementation of declared social tasks. Today, interest in the problem of governability is dictated by the need to restrain the neoliberal policy of monetarism and overcome the crisis of self-organization based on market freedom. Governability based on participation is the result of network coordination of interaction, which creates the effect of cooperation, not competition. For a state that is focused on cooperation with civil society, this means that policy is built based on interests of citizens, not institutions. Interaction between state and citizens is based on a common understanding of values. A democratic state constantly strives to expand public platforms for cooperation and discussion of real needs of the population. This approach allows for governance to be performed through judgment rather than just through norms, and the full use of modern digital resources ensures the transparency of public policy governance as a whole.

The theory of political networks attempts to construct relationships between state administrative structures, public non-profit organizations, private entrepreneurs and business associations. Such public management networks can be formal and informal, as well as national, local, intergovernmental, etc. A political network is a model of public affairs management that connects the state and civil society. The structure of a political network is represented by complex of state and public organizations, individuals who represent certain common interests. It is created with the purpose of exchanging resources and achieving a certain consensus. Participants in a political network undertake to interact and recognize the resource dependence of all actors and their equality in making joint decisions. One of the founders of network analysis R. A. W. Rhodes believes that the main thing for a network existence is compliance with such rules as pragmatism, priority of national interests and decision-making through a discussion forum [4, 5].

The functionality of the network depends on the main tasks that are set which are quite complex and varied. These include: establishing information flows and forming stable information transmission channels; distributing functional responsibilities between network participants; forming norms and criteria for assessing the effectiveness of participants; creating a mechanism for exchanging resources, as well as establishing a system of formal and informal communications between network participants.

Modern researchers of network processes understand the term “political network” differently. But most often they highlight such key features of political network as targeted interaction of actors, a complex structure of their interaction, mutual interest of participants, horizontality of relations, absence of hierarchy and active exchange of economic, power, information resources. German researcher T. Börzel considers the most complete “common denominator definition of a policy network, as a set of relatively stable relationships which are of non-hierarchical and interdependent nature linking a variety of actors, who share common interests with regard to a policy and who exchange resources to pursue these shared interests acknowledging that co-operation is the best way to achieve common goals” [6, p. 254].

At present, there are many typologies of political networks. But the main question is about the effectiveness of network organization in the process of governing of society. T. Börzel offers a typology of political networks in accordance with the tasks they are capable of solving. She writes: “Two different ‘schools’ of policy networks can be identified in the field of public policy. The more prominent ‘interest intermediation school’ interprets policy networks as a generic term for different forms of relationships between interest groups and the state. The ‘governance school’, on the other hand, conceives policy networks as a specific form of governance, as a mechanism of mobilizing political resources in situations where these resources are widely dispersed between public and private actors” [6, p. 255].

The problems of political networks are increasingly studied by Ukrainian researchers K. Ivanchenko, V. Kovalevsky, S. Savoyskaya, S. Sytnyk, N. Vinnikova, V. Golka, O. Makukh, L. Malishenko, K. Boguslavskaya, I. Miroshnichenko, O. Molodtsov, O. Gotsur and others.

Most Ukrainian researchers believe that in public administration, a network should be understood as a stable pattern of coordinated actions and resource exchange that includes state and non-state actors at different levels, linked by vertical and horizontal mechanisms for achieving certain goals of public policy. Participants of such networks pursue certain goals, have opportunities and resources, and interact with each other in accordance with their intra-network roles. The role of a participant within a network is determined by the type and volume of resources that he or she brings. Political networks are inextricably linked with public policy. There is an opinion that public policy sphere was able to become the basis for development legislative and administrative decisions only thanks to political networks. Among various models of representing public interests, the political network has become the most effective, since it is aimed at involving the population in the decision-making process and uses a very specific type of resource – social capital [7]. Pre-network forms of organizing administrative actions attempted to simplify the process of management and interaction by minimizing the number of participants in the scheme by tightening subordination. The network model of political organization seeks to take into account the roles of many actors and associations and offers schemes for their effective interaction, enhancing their advantages in the political field.

In recent years, the study of such an aspect of functioning of political networks as political mobilization has become the most relevant. This phenomenon became widespread at the very beginning of 21st century and gradually turned into a significant factor in the modern political process. The famous Ukrainian political scientist V. O. Kovalevsky, noted that, thanks to various social networks and messengers, political mobilization remains an effective and influential form of protest communication both in the world as a whole and in Ukraine in particular [8]. The use of the latest information and digital technologies in the field of politics has a significant impact on the entire world, it practically overturns our established ideas about the possibilities and resources of political mobilization. The information society makes the life of ordinary citizens, and any public structures almost completely transparent.

The potential for the influence of network organizations on the government is quite large and has not yet been fully estimated. The network approach allows maintaining political power through the creation of organizational forms of its support, loyalty to the leveling of protests, as well as the study and monitoring of public opinion. Free access to the Internet increases in several times the danger of overthrow for authoritarian regimes, increasing the organizational power of mass protests. On the one hand, the importance of social networks in organizing protest movements should not be exaggerated. On the other hand, analyzing the activities of protest movements in different countries, we can conclude what influence modern means of communication have on the nature and structure of protest groups.

Attempts to implement network management in practice quite often pursue the goals of reducing budget costs and shifting the performance of public services to other actors. The transition from a system of distributing state resources to a system of exchanging resources between network participants makes this management model quite attractive. However, it should be taken into account, that network structures are better adapted in societies with a sufficient level of political culture and developed market relations, where objective needs for such transformations mature [9].

According to scientists, there is a delay in the formation of civil society in Ukraine and some lag in this area from world and European traditions. For example, in their article S. Kvitka

and V. Korsun wrote that one of the important factors of such a delay is the lag in the process of digital transformation of public administration. This delay leads to constant aggravations in the sphere of communication between the authorities and society, which, in turn, affects the role and place of organizations that, by analogy with similar foreign structures, can be attributed to civil society [10].

**Conclusions.** Mass informatization and digitalization of modern society contribute to the rapid spread of the latest forms and models of political communications, the effectiveness of which is several times higher than their traditional forms. In the process of digitalization and informatization, the modern world is changing rapidly. On the one hand, there is a differentiation of both individual social groups and the whole society. On the other hand, there is a multiple complication of socio-political communications. Virtualization and mediatization of the political process leads to the fact that an ordinary citizen, receiving easy and quick access to information and communications, is faced with multiple complication of social processes, information garbage and manipulation of public consciousness. A detailed analysis of functioning of political networks allows not only to optimize and unify many political processes, but it is also an effective obstacle to the monopolization of political power.

The network society, social structure of which is built around networks, already exists. Such a society has no analogues in history. Its history, positive and negative experience of using network practices in the field of socio-political relations, criticism or promotion by politicians and researchers are being formed right now.

The application of the concept of political networks to the analysis of public administration structures provides possibility of systematic understanding of their content, direction and development prospects in the modern political system. Political networks have already proven their effectiveness, but they still need to be studied and researched in various areas of activity.

### References

1. Freeman J. L., Stevens J. A Theoretical and Conceptual Reexamination of Subsystem Politics. *Public Policy and Administration*, 1987. Vol. 2, Is. 1. P. 9 – 24.
2. Bevir M. Governance: A very short introduction. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2012. 152 p.
3. Castells M. The Rise of the Network Society. Second edition with a new preface. A John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., Publication, 2010. 625 p.
4. Rhodes R. A. W. Understanding governance: Policy networks, governance, reflexivity and accountability. Philadelphia, US. Open University, 1997. 252 p.
5. Rhodes R. A. W. Understanding governance: Ten years on. *Organization studies*. Sage Publications. Vol. 28 Is. 8, 2007. P. 1243 – 1264.
6. Börzel T. A. Organizing Babylon – on the different conceptions of policy networks. *Public Administration*. 1998. Vol. 76. Is. 2. P. 253 – 273.
7. Іванченко К. О. Політична мережа як організаційний інструмент публічної політики. *Регіональні студії*. 2019. №17. С. 20 – 25.
8. Ковалевський В. О. Політичні мережі як ефективна форма політичних комунікацій сучасності. *Соціально-гуманітарний вісник*, 2021. Вип. 38. С. 69 – 71.
9. Ситник С. В. Мережева структура публічної політики та управління. *Державне управління: удосконалення та розвиток*. 2011. №5.
10. Квітка С., Корсун В. Механізми мережевого управління взаємодією публічної влади та громадянського суспільства. *Public administration aspects*. 2023. Том 11. №2. С. 81 – 87.



## **РОЛЬ ПОЛІТИЧНИХ МЕРЕЖ У ВЗАЄМОДІЇ ДЕРЖАВИ ТА ГРОМАДЯНСЬКОГО СУСПІЛЬСТВА**

**Лідія Тіхонова**

*Харківський національний університет радіоелектроніки,  
кафедра філософії  
пр. Науки, 14, 61166, м. Харків, Україна  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3954-0250>*

**Ганна Серeda**

*Харківський національний університет радіоелектроніки,  
кафедра іноземних мов  
пр. Науки, 14, 61166, м. Харків, Україна  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1802-2174>*

У статті розглядається роль політичних мереж у процесі взаємодії держави і громадянського суспільства. Зазначається, що успішне функціонування політичної системи сучасного демократичного суспільства в умовах інформатизації та цифровізації, можливе лише за ефективної взаємодії органів державної влади з інститутами громадянського суспільства. Стверджується, що саме бажання консолідувати суспільство та протистояти його розшаруванню сприяло виникненню та розвитку політичних мереж. У сучасному світі телекомунікаційні системи роблять загальнодоступними значні інформаційні ресурси та технології, що сприяють якісним змінам як національних, так і міжнародних політичних процесів. На зміну концепції раціонально-бюрократичного типу національної держави приходять концепції «держави координуючої». Термін “governance” означає такий підхід до розуміння ролі та функцій держави, при якому відносини між державою та громадянським суспільством мають характер співробітництва та засновані на рівних статусах, горизонтальних зв'язках та мережевих структурах. Мережева форма управління є однією з найважливіших складових цього процесу і виявляється не тільки у становленні нової методології, але і у формуванні нового типу відносин між окремими державами, групами держав та всім світовим співтовариством. Процеси цифровізації та інформатизації сприяють не тільки ускладненню соціально-політичних комунікацій, але й диференціації соціальних груп, та усього суспільства. Політична мережа пов'язує державу та громадянське суспільство і створюється з метою обміну ресурсами та досягнення певного консенсусу. Детальний аналіз функціонування політичних мереж дозволяє не лише оптимізувати багато політичних процесів, він є дієвою перешкодою на шляху монополізації політичної влади.

*Ключові слова:* держава, громадянське суспільство, керуваність, політичні мережі, інформатизація, цифровізація, “governance”.