

Nataliia Karpchuk*

ORCID: 0000-0002-9998-9538

Bohdan Yuskiv**

ORCID: 0000-0001-7621-5954

POLITICAL COMMUNICATION DISCORD BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT AND THE CITIZENS: THE CASE OF UKRAINE

ABSTRACT

Political communication is a major factor in the democratisation of power relations, since the latter are based on public policy, ensuring a constant interconnection between political actors at all levels. Through political communication, it is possible to overcome the tensions that stymie the democratisation of society. The article is a critical examination of the present-day communication interaction between the citizens and the government of Ukraine. The term developed here to describe this phenomenon is the *communication discord* between the citizens and the government provoked by the heterogeneity of interests and goals of society and factors associated with the activity of the government. Communication policy of the government is aimed at involving citizens in the decision-making process while communication activity of the citizens is oriented on the formation of public opinion, the exchange of ideas and arguments and, later on, on the influence on the government and the decision-making process. The distinction of these two communication processes is also facilitated by the tendency of mediatisation of communications in the modern world, related to technical development, the Internet and social media. What is researched in the present paper are the models of the communication interaction between the government and society. Furthermore, special attention is paid to the potential of social media in the political communication of the Ukraine's Government and the citizens. Finally, recommendations to improve the the political communication of the Ukraine's Government are developed.

Keywords: state authority, civil society, communication policy, communication discord model, decision-making process

* Lesya Ukrainka Eastern European National University, (Luts'k, Ukraine), e-mail: karpchuknata@gmail.com

* Lviv Polytechnic National University, (Lviv, Ukraine), e-mail: yuskivb@ukr.net

1. INTRODUCTION

Political communication as a type of interaction between people, social communities and institutions allows of the exchange of information and social experience in the context of political reality; it is carried out by actors of politics in the process of struggle for power or its implementation. In his work *Communication Power*, M. Castells (Castells, 2009) examines power through the prism of communication and observes that the effective exercise of power does not require physical force, violence and coercion that destroy interaction between people; it requires communication that promotes the creation of social institutions and the adoption of important decisions. The effectiveness of power depends directly on the means of information exchange, establishment and maintenance of permanent links between its actors, since it is impossible to imagine power without indirect forms of communication and special means of communication between different media, and between the government and society.

Current research in political communication is based on three models of interaction between media and politics by D. C. Hallin and P. Mancini (Hallin & Mancini, 2004), who, after four theories of the press by F. T. Siebert, Th. B. Peterson, and W. Schramm (Siebert, Peterson & Schramm, 1956), and their critique by F. Webster (Webster, 1995), became best known for the development of public communications in democratic societies. Political functions of mass media in countries with different political regimes were defined and summarized by a German researcher G. Stromeyer (Stromeyer, 2004), who believed openness to be one of the main functions of political communication. D. J. Lellecker (Lellecker, 2006) analyzed over 50 concepts, theories, strategies and activities related to political communication in public policy and public administration.

The approaches to the notion of political communication represent two perspectives: 1) the position of the state authority – political communication is treated as the process of transmission, exchange of information, which structures political activity and gives it new meaning, shapes public opinion and contributes to political socialization of citizens, taking into account their needs and interests, and 2) the position of citizens – political communication is understood as interaction between policy makers through the exchange of information in the process of power struggle or its exercise; they are related to the deliberate transmission and selective reception of information without which the political process is impossible. These two types of approaches demonstrate different types of visions of political communication, namely, the government intends to influence the citizens while the citizens expect equal exchange of information. Such a dichotomy lays the groundwork for the authors' elaboration on the "government – citizens" interaction.

In this context we see it necessary to introduce the concept of *communication discord*, defined as the "lack of agreement or harmony (as between persons, things, or ideas)" (Merriam-Webster Dictionary, 2019); "the strife and tension that arises when two sides disagree on something" (Vocabulary.com. Dictionary, 2019), which can provoke a conflict. In the article, we put forward the *hypothesis* that although communication is oriented towards the harmonization of relations, however, in the real communication interaction of the government and the citizens there is a discord.

To some extent the mentioned discrepancies can be explained in terms of N. Luhmann's (Luhmann, 1981) concept of improbability of communication: 1) it is unbelievable that one individual understands, in principle, what the other means by autonomy and the individualization of their consciousness; 2) communication is unlikely to reach more people than those

involved in a particular situation; 3) the likelihood of communication success: even if the communication is clear, it does not mean that it will be accepted. Successful communication depends on the perceiver's selective content of communication as a prerequisite for his/her behavior.

The *goal* of the article is to analyze the models of the political communication interaction between the government and the citizens of Ukraine and to prove the existence of communication discord.

2. METHODOLOGY

In the research, the authors have employed an interactive approach to understanding the nature and essence of communication, which enables to analyse communication as a two-(multi) vector process, in which particular attention is drawn to the expectations and reactions of communication participants as well as to the realisation of their communicative intentions. Within the framework of the interactive approach, the theory of communicative action by J. Habermas (Habermas, 1996), who scientifically elaborated on the role of communication in the modern political process, is the methodological basis of the study. In particular, the scholar stresses that the process of open discussion and the equal exchange of arguments on fundamentally important social problems is a way to build a democratic, civilized society characterised by the expansion of social equality and freedom and the democratisation of the state, the creation of an open communication space between the authority and the public; the discussion should be based on the exchange of arguments, and whether they lead to just compromises depends essentially on the conditions of maintaining the discussion process, and they should be assessed from the standpoint of morality.

The sources of the analysis are represented by 1) foreign and domestic scientific publications, including theses, monographs, professional papers, reports, applied studies, documents, etc., concerning the theoretical basis of communication policy; 2) official documents of the national government in the field of development and implementation of communication policy; 3) official information from the sites of authority bodies and of non-governmental organisations.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

In the information and communication space the behaviour of a government can be of three types: 1) autarkic – associated with the 'closure' of the national information space, the total ban or the curtailment of the rights of citizens to use information of foreign origin and the one perceived as hostile; 2) active – the government tries to establish a certain control (various degrees of rigidity) for the media through counter-propaganda, actively promoting the dissemination of information which reflects the opinion of the national governing elite beyond the borders of the state; 3) liberal – based on the principles of non-interference in the communication process, recognition of the right of citizens to receive information from any sources, and the promotion of the free circulation of information. The efficiency of the authority depends directly on the means of information exchange, the establishment and maintenance of constant relations among its actors, because it is impossible to imagine the power

without mediated forms of communication and special means of communication between different bodies of authority as well as between the government and society. Special means of information transmission which ensure unity of will, integrity, a single direction of actions of individuals provide a direct contact with citizens (Pipchenko, 2014:46).

3.1. THE COMMUNICATION POLICY OF THE GOVERNMENT

The long-lasting impact on the target audience to create a favourable attitude to the provided information and the source of information is ensured by the communication policy. In this research, the authors treat the communication policy of a government as a set of principles and measures aimed at the objective and unbiased dissemination of information about the activities and policy of the governmental structures, the establishment of transparent relations between governmental institutions and civil society and business, attending to the needs and requirements of citizens and attracting them to the processes of making important decisions.

In general, the communication policy of the government has two directions: 1) an internal communication policy is oriented to the citizens of the state and is aimed at their involvement in the process of making important decisions; 2) external communication policy is oriented to the leadership of other states as well as to international/regional organizations and to the public of other states in order to promote the national interests of the state.

Both internal and external communication and communication policies should be based on certain principles. For instance, the EU documents define the basic principles of the EU communication and communication policy. We believe that such principles should be the basis for effective communication policy of a democratic government; namely, the rights to information and freedom of expression, which are the cornerstone of any communication policy and are enshrined in national constitutions and relevant regulatory documents. Furthermore, all citizens should have the right to receive information of public interest in their languages and through preferred channels. Additionally, everyone should be assisted in developing skills for accessing and using information. What is more, the communication policy must respect all points of view of all citizens during public discussions. Eventually, citizens should have the right to express their points of view, to be heard and to engage in a dialogue with decision-makers (Commission of the European Communities, 2006).

At the practical level, the interaction between the government and the society can be carried out by the following communication policy models:

Table 1. Government's communication policy models (Sungurov, 2009)

Model	Characteristic
gardener's model	provides for the adoption of an appropriate regulatory framework for the development of civil society institutions
partnership model	implies a parity of interaction between government and the public when the state authorities avoid any forms to govern the civil society, they cooperate with the society in a dialogue creating the so-called 'negotiation platforms'

architect's model	implies an active role for the public in creating new institutional structures of state authorities
paternalistic model	provides some autonomy of civic organizations while supporting certain political forces or individual candidates in the relevant electoral process, providing them with some institutional and financial assistance
"model of drive belts"	characterises the domination of the authorities' interests over the interests of civil society
model of ignoring	is realised when there is a lack of any forms of interaction between the state authorities and the public
model of public disobedience and struggle against the enemy	characterises certain confrontational relations within the society when state authorities resort to total control over the activities of civil society institutions seeing them as a major danger to the authorities' activities; in response to this, citizens are forced to resort to appropriate protest actions (rallies, pickets, protests)

For the democratic states, the gardener's model, the partnership model, and the architect's model are the most productive.

The gardener's model is being implemented in Ukraine as well. Thus, in November 2010, the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine promulgated the Resolution No. 996 "On Ensuring Public Participation in the Formation and Implementation of State Policy" (Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, 2010), which emphasises what follows: public consultations are held with the aim of involving citizens in the governance of state affairs, providing them with free access to information on the activities of executive bodies, and ensuring publicity, openness and transparency of these bodies. Consultations with the public should facilitate the establishment of a systematic dialogue between the executive authorities and the public, the improvement of the quality of making decisions on important issues of state and public life taking into account public opinion, the creation of conditions for the participation of citizens in the decision- drafting. Public consultations are held on issues related to the socio-economic development of the state, the realisation and protection of the rights and freedoms of citizens, the satisfaction of their political, economic, social, cultural and other interests. The results of public consultations are taken into account by the executive bodies when making a final decision or in their further work. The document is of utmost importance as it stipulates that the authorities are obliged to consult with the citizens of Ukraine.

The partnership model. In Ukraine there is a government site "Civil Society and the Authority" (Civil Society and the Authority, 2008) which provides interactive forms of communication with both individual citizens and representatives of civil society organisations. In particular, it is possible to take part in the discussion of drafts of normative acts. One can submit suggestions and comments to each project, get acquainted with different points of view, learn about the projects that have been discussed.

In 2011, Ukraine joined the international initiative "Open Government Partnership" (Open Government Partnership, 2011) the main directions of which were the following: to promote the activities of civil society institutions, their participation in the formation and implementation of state policy; to provide access to public information; to prevent

and counteract corruption; to improve the quality of administrative and social services; to introduce e-government technologies; to develop e-democracy.

On July 2, 2015, the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine (Supreme Council) adopted amendments to the Law “On Citizens’ Appeal regarding e-appeal and e-petition” (UNIAN, 2015). The law introduced a mechanism for submitting appeals in electronic form as well as a new tool for addressing the President of Ukraine and the Verkhovna Rada, the Cabinet of Ministers as well as local self-government bodies as an electronic petition. E-petitions are filed through the official websites of the relevant authorities or the websites of the public organisations.

The architect’s model. The Revolution of Dignity in Ukraine (November 2013 – February 2014) demonstrated the strengthening of the role of civil society in building the state and protecting the European integration course of Ukraine. The increase in the political activity of citizens and civil society institutions showed their desire to have legitimate mechanisms for the protection of their rights and freedoms, for the impact on the actions of state authorities, and the prosecution of officials who use power for their own respective benefits rather than for meeting public needs. Despite some communication problems at the national level, successful e-participation projects initiated by the public are gradually being developed and implemented in Ukraine. For instance, the Open City Initiative (Open City, 2016), launched by East Europe Foundation in 2013, aims to provide effective electronic interaction between local authorities, communities and businesses while addressing community-related issues. The Initiative has already been implemented in 15 Ukrainian cities. The project created a geoinformation web resource, where users could identify and describe specific problems of their communities. Their messages are sent to the appropriate city council office. Users are able to track the status of their messages and the steps taken to fix the problem. Partners of the Eastern Europe Foundation – public organisations from pilot cities – can establish effective cooperation with local authorities, and are able to moderate the work of the resource in their region, to inform and educate citizens on the use of the system, and to coordinate local initiatives aimed at solving problems owing to self-organisation of citizens.

At the end of 2013 and during 2014 in Ukraine there was a surge of social activity and the demand for new mechanisms and forms of democratic control over the activity of the authorities. A great number of online projects have been developed aimed at promoting self-organisation of like-minded people, combining efforts to solve the topical problems of modern Ukrainian society, initiating questions for consideration, preparing, discussing and submitting proposals concerning the decisions of state authorities and local self-government. Representatives of the public sector create their resources and actively use Facebook and Twitter.

To study the interaction level of local authorities and citizens, we have analysed the sites of Ukraine’s regional centres’ city councils and found out some interesting features. In general, all the sites aim to inform as fully as possible about their activities, to offer a large number of legal documents (being of little interest to ordinary citizens). City councils present general plans for city development but do not provide citizens with an opportunity to influence these plans. Furthermore, city councils talk a lot about public discussions, which are held only at definite addresses in the city and at a certain time. Unfortunately, there are almost no e-consultations. Most sites contain information on procurement plans and articles of expenditure of the local budget. However, citizens are deprived of the opportunity to advise on cost

priorities. Reports on processing requests for information are submitted. In the vast majority of sites an interactive site survey is run to improve the efficiency of the site.

However, Ukraine also implemented a *model of public disobedience and struggle against the enemy*. In November 2013, the euro integration course of Ukraine's domestic and foreign policy was in jeopardy. The Order of the Government on "the issues of the conclusion of the Association Agreement between Ukraine, on the one hand, and the European Union, the European Atomic Energy Community and their Member Countries, on the other hand" (Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine, 2013) of November 21, 2013, caused a wave of protests. On November 28, 2013, at the 3rd EU Eastern Partnership Summit in Vilnius, the then-President of Ukraine Viktor Yanukovich did not sign the Association Agreement between Ukraine and the EU. The official version of the government discussed the economic risks associated with the reduction of trade with Ukraine's eastern neighbours and the "forced pause" in the European integration. Communication failures of the authorities (ignoring communication with citizens, belated explanations of the advantages and disadvantages of the European integration, the adoption of a number of laws aimed at narrowing the constitutional rights and freedoms of citizens) led to a mass explosion – the Revolution of Dignity.

3.2. THE MODEL OF SOCIETY'S COMMUNICATION: THE COMMUNICATION DISCORD MODEL

From the perspective of the role played by the participants in the communication process, in all the models described above, the government dominates because even in the partnership model or the architect's model, it is the government and its institutions that create communication platforms with the "call" to the society to be involved; in general, the government is imposing key topics for discussion which are important for it at a certain stage of its development. The communication of the government is permanent, homogeneous and implemented through many interconnection channels introduced and controlled by the state authorities (conferences, seminars, press conferences, briefings, brochures, leaflets, electronic newsletters, direct telephone lines, special events, projects, programs, e-petitions, referendums). To impose its communication, to underline its efficiency, the government develops a communication policy. In other words, the government and its institutions always need communication and develop the communication policy. It also emphasises the establishment of subject-subject relations with citizens. However, at a practical level, the government carries out communication precisely for the sake of communication, being not too concerned about the effectiveness of the messages and feedback; that is, the subject-object model of relations is realised.

Unlike the homogenous governmental structures, another participant in the political communication process – the society – is represented by various groups, communities, associations, etc., i.e., it is heterogeneous. Each member of the society has his/her problems and interests which form interests and problems of the local level; therefore, the interest of the society in communication with the government is not constant, it may be absent or belated, and arises only in the case of a certain, oftentimes an urgent need (during the election period or under the influence of some spontaneous needs or threats; say, to civil rights, from the authority's side). Consequently, the interests of the government and the interests of society in communication rarely intersect.

Communication policy of the government is aimed at involving citizens in the decision-making process. Communication activity of the society is oriented on the formation of public opinion, the exchange of ideas and arguments and, later on, on the influence on the government and the decision-making process. In the Ukrainian society, citizens are not equal partners in communicating with the government (this much has been established since the Soviet era) and rely entirely on the authority, that is, the society is dominated by such an understanding of the “authority – citizens” relations, as is evidenced by what follows: “The authority must provide me with ...”. (Unlike a western society dominated by individualism, where citizens rely on themselves (“I have to provide myself with... ”)). It is rather the position of a consumer, not a subordinate who is not interested in a truly permanent two-way communication with the authority.

Thus, *in actu*, we can observe the following model of communication between society and the government: the government develops its communication (usually long-term) policy with a clearly defined purpose and desired influence on the society; the processes of self-organisation of the society, based on its heterogeneous goals and interests, provoke challenges for the communication policy of the government. The reaction of the society to the government’s communication policy may be conscious (consent, support, further participation in communication activities, disagreement, criticism, ignoring) or unconscious, spontaneous (“explosion” in the society as the result of the dissemination of unpopular messages, protest voting in referenda etc.). It is difficult for the government to respond effectively to all goals of the society, so a communication discord is formed; and the greater delay of government’s response to new challenges and transformation of its communication is, the more obvious the probability of a conflict in the relations between the society and the government becomes.

In our opinion, the very existence of discord is caused by the fact that the process of mutual communication is clearly divided into two communication processes – 1) the implementation of the communication policy of the government and 2) the communication policy of the society. Furthermore, it must be stated that the interaction of the society and the government takes place as the interconnection of both of these processes. The differences between the goals and essence of the policies are the primary reason for the said division.

The differentiation of these two processes, both independent and relatively autonomous, is also connected with the ways and means of communication in modern society. Each policy represents a set of definite (coordinated and uncoordinated) actions, and in order to execute them, subjects make certain efforts as well they use resources and time, based on their capabilities and potential. To a large extent, modern societies use (though not exclusively) media to overcome time and/or spatial barriers, that is, they use mediated communications which involve traditional mass media (press, television, radio, films), telecommunication media (telephone, Internet), and multimedia (CD ROM, various kinds of video, virtual reality). The modern process of using media is called “mediated quasi-interactions”. New media (social networks) particularly revolutionise mediated interactions oftentimes even replacing direct interaction. As T. Goban-Klass (Goban-Klass, 2011:182) writes, face-to-face communication is a type of interface-to-interface communication. In this communication, the participants are focused not on direct communication with other people, but on the development and/or selection of content that is aimed at a clearly defined audience. Moreover, such interactions are deliberately created as a one-way monologue rather than dialogue. In fact, new media-mediated relations are created within the society and between the society and the state

authorities, i.e., it is all labelled as the medial (“mediated”) society. Cyberspace in the form of the Internet is a new agora, stage and arena, which does not have a clear division between actors and spectators; so, in a sense, they are all active participants in the communication process. The acceleration, “the culture of impatience” become more and more conspicuous. A modern person, to cope with new requirements or to take advantage of the various huge offers, develops the ability to perform many actions in parallel and simultaneously perform many different roles (Goban-Klass, 2011:184). This is how communication takes place on the part of the state authorities concerning the society, both within the society itself and on the part of society towards the government.

However, communication discord is provoked not only by the heterogeneity of interests and goals of the society, but also by factors associated with the government’s activity; namely, the communication interaction between the government and the society is arranged around information drives interesting to the media only and on topics important to the authorities; certain events reported are not strategic, and therefore the public does not consider them to be an information occasion. The lack of effective and creative communication technologies in the activities of the state authorities leads to the dissemination of rumors that in the future hinder the effective provision of truthful and efficient information. Furthermore, we can witness the absence of clear coordination of the communication interaction between the structural units of the state authorities in the field of strategic communication. There is also insufficient involvement of highly professional specialists for the implementation of special communication measures. Finally, we can observe the deficiency of methods for evaluating content analysis, diagnosis and public opinion on the support/rejection of the projects implementation (Romanenko, 2014).

3.3. WAYS TO DECREASE THE POLITICAL COMMUNICATION DISCORD

Certainly, it is not possible to completely avoid communication discord, but one should strive to reduce its negative consequences. Since society consists of various groups, movements, organisations that develop their communications independently of each other, the communication policy of the society is a synergetically formed “flow” of diverse, shifted in time spontaneous communication actions that cannot be fixed anywhere. Nor can they be joined by some general plan, and therefore the implementation of these actions cannot be governed. In these conditions one can only speak of general *recommendations for particular groups/movements/organisations* regarding their effective influence on the state authorities and their communication policy, in particular:

- communication should always be a part of a general activity strategy;
- communication should not be limited to the spokespersons’ responsibility, it is necessary to involve all members of groups / movements / organizations and other leaders;
- it is necessary to communicate ideas and suggestions to the audience to enhance the understanding of the future and to put forward the possible solutions to current problems;
- consumers of information (citizens, business) should always be informed because the effectiveness of communication, and the whole process of implementation of decisions also depend on their awareness;
- the opinion of the general public should be constantly studied since it is citizens’ ideas, their aspirations and proposals that should be the cornerstone of any policy;

- national mass media must be constantly involved as their support has a significant impact on citizens' attitudes towards decisions having been made or decisions that are only being developed;
- key messages should be addressed to citizens in a form accessible to them without bureaucratic jargon and in the language they prefer and by priority channels;
- the main actors must have a clear idea of how to act, which messages to pass and how to coordinate their messages with similar messages of the other civil society organisations on the same issues. If the messages are disseminated in different directions, the overall impact level will be low. However, in this aspect, it is important not to conceal the diversity of thoughts, but to look for interconnections between them. One should choose the most successful (both traditional and newest) channels of communication with the audience (Lubetkin, 2011);
- press secretaries and leaders of groups/movements/organisations etc. and leaders must undergo training in effective communication.

Possible guidelines for the government:

- to communicate on topics that are primarily of interest to the society rather than to the authorities;
- to monitor the problems and needs of the society and to take them as the basis for the communication;
- communication with the society should never be just “communication for the sake of communication”, all government's communications must always accompany or be accompanied by real acts that are necessary to society.

Modern Ukrainian Government, especially the Prime Minister O. Honcharuk, are criticised for the lack of systematic communication with media. Just to illustrate, Cabinet sessions are held without journalists; the communication with Parliament is rather poor. However, the positive moment is that the Prime Minister's intends to support efficient two-way communication with the ministers and ministries (Kravets, 2019). In September 2019, the Prime Minister of Ukraine, O. Honcharuk, launched his own blog “Cup of the Premier”. Videos were scheduled to be released every Sunday. The Prime Minister's goal was to inform citizens about everything that had happened the previous week. He also promised to read and respond to comments, questions under published posts on social networks. However, in October this initiative seemed to come to an end.

CONCLUSIONS

So, in modern democratic societies communication plays a vital role in harmonizing and reconciling relations between the state authority and the public, but it is not an equal type of interaction. The most popular models of the government's communication interaction and society have been analysed. It is empirically shown that in these models the government plays the role of the communication subject, while society is assigned the role of the object of the communication influence. However, *in actu*, it is the society with its heterogeneous, spontaneous interests and requirements that influence the government and its communication policy. The interests of the state authorities and the interests of the society in communication rarely coincide as the government is constantly developing its communication while

society enters this interaction in emergency cases only. Consequently, the communication discord emerges being provoked by the existence of two communication processes – the communication policy of the government and the communication policy of the society. The interaction of the society and the government takes place as the interconnection of both of these processes which are predetermined by the tendency of communication mediation related to the development of the Internet. This vision is the basis of the proposed model of the communication discord of interaction between society and the government. To reduce the negative impact of communication discord, general recommendations for certain groups/movements/organisations representing the public interests, as well as for the government, have been suggested.

REFERENCES

- Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine. (2013). *The government has issued a decree to suspend the process of preparation for the conclusion of the Association Agreement with the EU*. Retrieved August 12, 2019, from http://old.kmu.gov.ua/kmu/control/uk/publish/article?art_id=246864953&cat_id=248439752. (in Ukrainian)
- Castells, M. (2009). *Communication Power*. New York: Oxford University Press Inc.
- Civil Society and the Authority. (2008). *Secretariat of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine*. Retrieved June 10, 2019, from <http://civic.kmu.gov.ua>. (in Ukrainian)
- Commission of the European Communities. (2006). *White Paper on a European Communication Policy*. Retrieved August 20, 2019, from http://europa.eu/documents/comm/white_papers/pdf/com2006_35_en.pdf.
- Goban-Klas, T. (2011). *Wartki nurtu mediów. Ku nowym formom społecznego życia informacji. Pisma z lat 2000–2011*. Krakow: TA/WPN Universitas.
- Habermas, J. (1996). *Between facts and norms: Contributions to a discourse theory of law and democracy*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hallin, D. C., & Mancini, P. (2004). *Comparing Media Systems: Three Models of Media and Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kravets, R. (2019, November 6). How the Goncharuk government works. Who is whose minister, closed Cabinet session and rotation threats. *Ukrayins'ka pravda*. Retrieved December 26, 2019, from <https://www.pravda.com.ua/articles/2019/11/6/7231108/> (in Ukrainian)
- Lelleker, D. J. (2014). *Political Communication and Cognition*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lubetkin, M. (2011). *Civil Society and the Need to Communicate with Impact*. Retrieved August 8, 2019, from <https://www.civicus.org/index.php/media-resources/news/1375-civil-society-and-the-need-to-communicate-with-impact>.
- Luhmann, N. (1981). The improbability of communication. *International Social Science Journal*, 1, Vol. XXXIII, 122–133.
- Merriam-Webster Dictionary. (2019). *Definition of discord*. Retrieved November 10, 2019, from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/discord>.
- Open City. (2016). Strengthening Citizens' Participation in a Local Community Development. *East Europe Foundation*. Retrieved July 17, 2019, from <http://eef.org.ua/programi/efektivne-upravlinnya-ta-gromadyansk/vidkryte-misto/>. (in Ukrainian)

- Open Government Partnership. (2011). *Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine*. Retrieved July 17, 2019, from <https://www.kmu.gov.ua/ua/gromadskosti/gromadyanske-suspilstvo-i-vlada/partnerstvo-vidkritij-uryad>. (in Ukrainian)
- Pipchenko, N. (2014). *Social Media in the Structure of Foreign Policy of Leading International Actors*. Kyiv: Tsentr Vilnoyi Presy. (in Ukrainian)
- Romanenko, Ye. (2014). Models of the Communication Policy of a State and Instruments Support of the Interaction of the State Authority Bodies and the Public Democratic governance. *Academic papers collection, Issue 14 "Democratic Governannce"*. Retrived July 16, 2019, from http://lvivacademy.com/vidavnitstvo_1/visnyk14/fail/romanenko.pdf. (in Ukrainian)
- Siebert, F.T., Peterson, Th.B., & Schramm, W. (1956). *Four Theories of the Press: The Authoritarian, Libertarian, Social Responsibility, and Soviet Communist Concepts of What the Press Should Be and Do*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Stromeyer, G. (2008). *Politics and the Media*. Kyiv: Kyiv-Mohyla Academy Publishing House. (in Ukrainian)
- Sungurov, A. (2009). *Models of Interaction of State Authority Bodies and Civil Society Structures: Russian Experience*. Retrieved August 12, 2019, from https://www.civisbook.ru/files/File/Sungurov_modeli.pdf. (in Russian)
- UNIAN. (2015). Rada introduced electronic petitions for citizens' appeals. Retrived July 17, 2019, from <http://www.unian.ua/politics/1096102-rada-vvela-elektronni-petitsiji-dlya-zvernen-gromadyan.html>. (in Ukrainian)
- Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine. (2010). On Ensuring Public Participation in the Formation and Implementation of State Policy.. Retrieved August 12, 2019, from <https://zakon4.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/996-2010-%D0%BF>. (in Ukrainian)
- Vocabulary.com. Dictionary. (2019). *Discord*. Retrieved November 10, 2019, from <https://www.vocabulary.com/dictionary/discord>.
- Webster, F. (1995). *Theories of the Information Society*. New York: Routledge.