

УДК 321.64

Khyzhnyak I. A.*

**DECISION – MAKERS ON THE SPOTLIGHT:
EFFECTS OF INFORMATIONAL PRESS AND PUBLIC COVERAGE
ON PERCEPTIONS OF POLITICAL PR IN
THE USA, RUSSIA AND UKRAINE**

Стаття містить в собі означену структуру феномену прийняття рішень. В ній конкретно визначені парадигми розробки політично заангажованих моделей впливу при прийнятті рішень, що формують певні типи суспільної свідомості, артикулюються різні способи і методи їх застосування в інформаційному просторі США, Росії і України.

Ключові слова: парадигмальна складова прийняття рішень, інформаційний порядок денний, реальні виміри прийняття рішень, прямий і зворотній зв'язок віртуальності і реальності, тренди моделювання реального життя, пострадянський тип свідомості, представницька демократія, спін-докторинг.

The article tackles the conceptual approaches that outline the basic structure of decision-making mechanism. The author dwells upon defining key paradigms that identify certain types of politically engaged public perceptions milieus. The latter constitute three basic dimensions of multiple-levelled manufacture of decision-making. The subject matter of study articulates modes of decision-making techniques and their application in the USA, Russian and Ukrainian informational media.

Key words: decision-making paradigm, informational agenda, real dimension of decision-making, direct and reverse connection of virtuality and reality, trends of real life modeling, postsoviet type of consciousness, representative democracy, spin doctoring.

В статтє содержится очерченная структура феномена принятия решений. В ней, конкретно определены парадигмы разработки политически ангажированных моделей воздействия на принятие решений, формирующих определённые типы общественного сознания, артикулируются различные способы и методы их применения в информационном пространстве США, России и Украины.

Ключевые слова: парадигмальная составляющая принятия решений, информационная повестка дня, реальные измерения принятия решений, прямая и обратная связь виртуальности и реальности, тренды моделирования реальной жизни, постсоветский тип сознания, представительская демократия, спин-докторинг.

* doctor Habil., professor (world history, international relations); doctor Habil., professor (political sciences), academician of Ukrainian academy of political sciences, chairman of the international information department at «Ukraine» International University of Human Development.

Actuality of the Study. *Taking decisions* articulates its importance in various fields. It accumulates the highest levels of state bureaucracy as well as stimulates, as an example, the desire of every woman in sense of her marriage options. This study explains why *taking decision* calls into question the difference between itself as a phenomenon and its counterpart *decision-making* and also why political establishment institutions promote the latter as an instrument to carry through their goals for political re-arranging informational milieus. The state officials search for proper *decision-making* paradigm encompasses the following cycles:

- doctoring or endeavour monitoring;
- situation analysis and defining required mobilization resources to support it;
- situation development prognosis and its dependence on possible application;
- choosing key variants of managerial influences upon situation development and their analysis;
- individual or expert evaluation of preferable choice;
- the final *decision-making* responsibilities of state officials or institutions.

Source base for the Study. The major sources of information were in monographies and scientific articles written by the Ukrainian specialists of the foregoing field: Bortko G. N., Dubov D. V., Ozhevan O. A., Gnatyuk S. L., Shapoval O. V., Zgurovsky M. Z. Despite active framework and discussions inherent in this body of literature certain moments of informational continuity were encountered in the Russian publications by Fedorchenko S., Kuzmenko A., Sosnin O. K., Belyantzev A. Though basic statements of informational freedom strategy require more profound studies. Examination of potent concepts in public coverage effects performed by Western scholars Stokman B., Claes H. de Vrees, Grattan M, Stockwell S., Masuda Y. conceptualize more carefully the pluralistic nature of informational milieus.

The research agenda may be expressed as follows:

- to represent major comprehensive effort to conceptualize basic «**Three Dimensions**» of decision-making **paradigm**;
- to assert cognitive and sense instruments in revealing public coverage patterns;
- to lay emphasis on improving our apprehension of certain models of informational milieus control.

The Argument of the Study. This argument goes that the application of decision-making is one of the most contradictory, finally unpredicted and negative force that grinds down the substance of democracy. At present each country manages and moulds the language and images of the channels of political communication in their own ways. It requires special scrutiny in revealing and manufacturing *differently phased (i.e. simultaneously applied) digital paradigms* to perform *multileveled models of decision-making*. The above mentioned items effect the audience of consumption in economic, political, social and political fields. So they deserve special ways of introduction and opprobrium.

The first politically engaged **paradigm** of decision-making is compartmentalized in particular form of «**informational agenda**». It becomes dominated as an effective tool of manufacture of consent in the audience of citizens. It also articulates a notion of «*political democracy*» as a peculiar function of protection in conformity with «elaborated procedure» for adequate operational experience and theoretical understanding in order to communicate effectively. But nowadays *decision-making* obviously plays fast and loose with the truth and comes dominant either in Russia or in Ukraine. Concerns also are justified when *decision-making* becomes nothing but a negative device to deprive the audience of citizens off their constitutional rights to participate in running the state. And thence when used systematically it effectively becomes a hidden instrument of mature aims impose that intersects with authorities' political interests.

Practical application of *decision-making* in the manufacture of consent embraces *three major stages of realities or dimensions*. **The first dimension** functions in our every day life. Whereas **the second reality** includes direct participation of media advisers and producers that constitute separate *conventional cells of decision-making paradigm* to ensure greater regulation of permanent political campaign. And if the techniques and technologies of **the first reality dimension** is composed of special institutions and certain groups of political media advisers that have an anonymous status, their counterparts from **the second reality** have become obviously **stage-managed**. Though there emerge certain changes in their manufacturing character. Those who customary worked under shadowy conditions of relative unostentious manner now have been changing their preferences into apparent public appearances. There happen numerous occasions over cases of risen interest to **the direct and reverse** connections of **virtuality and reality** that is carrying on at the present moment in the both postsoviet countries. Developments in former soviet radio and telecommunications that functioned effectively and were being a sort of propaganda, nowadays are becoming concrete trends for **constructing models of real life**. This may be distinguished as «a syndrom of political media advisers». Media uncovered and because of it publicly unknown masters of spin doctoring [1; 2; 3; 4] from Moscow Sergeitsev and Polyakov by names turned out to be in opposition to the foregoing trend. Their terms of employment undoubtedly were not transparent. Earlier they anonymously worked out a public image of Yanukovitch during presidential campaign in Ukraine in 2004. Later they were analogously engaged in thorough mastering the image of «the politician of coming future» for one of the prominent public figures of today's Ukrainian political scene Yatsenyuk by name in 2006. At present they actively position themselves as producers for Hollywood block-buster dedicated to the historically known and propagandistically engaged «Death soccer match» in Kyiv during World War II. Thus the innovative techniques and technologies of deliberate revealing of the events connected with modern developments in *media manufacturing* are taking place. All this follows *the recognized formula*: to informationally turn out **artificial backgrounding of reality into its substitute media replica**. The latter will evidently be attained visible prospects on the home front for future.

In the English-speaking countries this method has been analogically applied in the mode of spin doctoring [2]. Bill Clinton has expressed himself as a master of spin and his skills were apparent when his wife, Hillary's campaign for New York senator was faltering in the aftermath of the Monica Lewinsky affair. Hillary's campaign people were in turmoil as women voters began to question Hillary's values. Bill dispassionately read the polling data and said to Hillary «Women want to know why you stayed with me». Hillary responded «Yes, I've been wondering that myself». Unembarrassed, Bill had the answer: «Because you're a sticker. That's what people need to know: you're a sticker. You stick at things you care about» [5]. The spin was applied, Hillary's campaign rhetoric shifted subtly, women voters were reassured that she would stick by them and she was elected to the US senate. The search for the persuasive path through any arguments is often criticized as a modern malady but, as will be discussed below, rhetoric has been around as long as democracy, since the ancient Greeks at least when it was codified by Aristotle [6].

The third Dimension has marked a new shift in computer and **digital culture**. Here the special emphasis is laid on peculiar understanding of modern postsoviet models of life. There is emergence of the new structure of *mythological milieu*. More than 60% of population in Russia and Ukraine are still mature adherents for the Soviet model of social consciousness. Technically this sort of *decision-making paradigm* is a premediated backgrounding and interpretation supplied by media advisers to the press and television to put politicians pronouncements in a

favourable context and ensure that the message that they (the politicians) are trying to get across, actually appears in the media. In other words there emerges apparent transformation of Soviet model of thinking common for both states into its modern *quasi replica*. This facilitates the «*new – old*» **agenda** that develops and places the stories in the media for political advantage of pseudo social prosperity, free medicine and education, cheap public utilities and municipal services etc. All that **aims at perpetuation of false prosoviet types** of social consciousness which now actually **are very difficult to be overcome**.

Decision-making deserves special scrutiny in the sense of to see it not as part of the problem but as a necessary part of *its screening solution*. Here the term «*the soft power*» may be attributed to *alleged absence of censorship*. This corrosive influence makes politicians do seek to subtly orchestrate the symbolic spectacle of another picking up necessary «**informational agenda**» to imperceptibly hide its effective influence. It normally sets the terms of political debates and strives the rapid adjust their policies to any changes in public sentiment.

Events in Bolotnaya square that happened in Moscow in 2012 as well as Khodorkovskiy's and Pussy Riot's cases along with Magnitskiy's list, women's Feminine movements, failure of numerous reforms in Ukraine and Razvazhaev's unexpected abduction in Kyiv etc. may serve as unresisted examples of special delivery in mass media. They deal with deliberate symbiosis of exquisite campaign for proper *decision-making* to ensure that the *governments key political messages* reach the citizenry. And finally they fully match Governments' imposed «**informational agenda**» of the two brothers nations.

The year 2012 was a presidential elections one for the USA and Russia. Whereas the same year witnessed the elections to the institute of legislative power – the Supreme Council (Verkhovna Rada) in Ukraine. And here we have noticeably drawn on basic differences between electorate systems and their publicity coverage in the USA, Russia and especially in Ukraine. They have comprehensively effected *decision-making paradigm* on the both sides across the Atlantic Ocean. Public perceptions of political PR as well as motivations and credibility in the USA are unreservedly concentrated *on the beliefs in existing state political system of division of powers*. And *the basic emphasis is laid on elit's economic and political responsibilities and interests being irreversible*. Due to that *sacred notion every electorate campaign* in this superpower **never turns out into frustrative revolutionary changes**.

In contrast to the USA as a New World's presiding nation Russia and especially Ukraine are clearly featured with the notorious post soviet *social covenants* which serve the basis for the corresponding *public agreements*. The pointed modus operandi yields fairly framing the story in terms, of issue substance for **new informational technologies construction in mythological milieu**. It has been fraught with setting up the priorities that favour **informational techniques of discontented personality**. The latter requires permanent unconditional observance. The repercussions of all that on the Russian and Ukrainian homefronts were notably confirmed at the time of countries' electorate campaign in 2012. Studies have signalled that both countries' authorities are not prone to commonly apply so-called «generic» strategy of evolution to the *traditional democracy*. It bears resemblance of distinctive variety of *representative democracy*. Within the period of postsoviet historic developments **an inferiority complex of each of the presidents** in the foregoing states invariably follows the pattern of **manually handled parliament** for the sake of their **personal tranquillity**. *Peoples' employed presidents* are **the only discreet figures to define** what **version** of state ruling **fully conforms to the state Constitution**. The latter automatically leads to the treatment of the parliaments' destinating decisions as «a faculty of need-less accommodations». Thus this is the way to turning Russia and Ukraine into the countries **not with highly developed democracy but into the environment for time-serving political expedience** [7].

This notably distinguishes opponents' natural reaction to dictated or in other words «committed from above» informational technologies for final *decision-making*. Today's Russian recalcitrants Garry Kasparov and Ksenia Sobchak estimated correspondingly presidential campaign in Russia in 2012 as «special operation to return Putin to the Kremlin» or «lohotron» (political hanky-panky or underhand dealing) at people's wide public scale [4]. Echoing the previous former Singapore president remarked his own understanding of the sense of «publicity coverage» during election campaign bearing in mind Ukrainian electoral strategy «If people in material sense are permanently fed up with hazel-nuts they will behave accordingly similar to monkies» [8].

Conclusion. Manufacturing of *decision-making* by means of the techniques and technologies **do present significant problems for democracy**. In the current situation where this «generic» strategy is also abused, there clearly needs to be reform so that *decision-making* is subject to the sort of **check and balances** which exist for other parts of the democratic system. So the further research may be confirmed by wisdom of Goethe's, German poet and dramatist, prophetic words: «To be a merited person means always having to admit accomplishments of others» [9].

References

1. Stockman B. The influence of spin doctors on political communication. [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: http://www.agnesbrunneel.be/bentxi/project%20spin_final.pdf.
2. Stockwell S. The spin doctors: Government media advisers. [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: http://www.98.griffith.edu.au/dspace/bitstream/handle/10072/18525/45136_1.pdf?sequence=1.
3. Кривошеїн В. Місце і роль спін-технологій у процесі легітимації політичної влади. [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: http://www.nbu.gov.ua/portal/Soc_Gum/borysfen/2011_4/pdf/14-15.pdf.
4. Федорченко С. Н. PR-технология спин-докторинга. // Электронный журнал «Вестник Московского государственного обласного университета». [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: http://vestnik-mgou.ru/vipuski/2011_4/stati/pdf/fedorchenko.pdf.
5. Grawend M. Bill and (Mostly) Hillary's excellent new adventures // Sydney Morning Herald. – 2005. – 11 June. – P. 21.
6. Aristotle, The Art of Rhetoric. – Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1991.
7. Ukraine and the European Union. No half-time oranges for Victor // The Economist. – 2012. – May 5th – 11th. – P. 32
8. Asian Welfare States. New cradles to grave // The Economist. – 2012. – September 8th – 14th. – P. 20-22.
9. Werke W., Abt. 1-4, Weimar, 1887-1919 (Abt. 1 – Poetische Werke, 55 Bde).