

MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

DOI <https://doi.org/10.51647/kelm.2021.5.2.12>

KOMUNIKACJA W PRZESTRZENI PUBLICZNEJ INTERNETU: NAJWAŻNIEJSZE CECHY

Volodymyr Servetnyk

aspirant Międzyregionalnej Akademii Zarządzania Personelem (Kijów, Ukraina)

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-7231-0927

e-mail: Servetnyk_Volodymyr@gmail.com

Adnotacja. Ustalono, że spośród wszystkich technologii dostępnych obecnie dla specjalistów we współpracy z władzami, technologie internetowe są najmniej badane, chociaż zmniejszenie odległości między podmiotami komunikacji GR a władzą zapewnia szerokie możliwości budowania jakościowo nowych relacji między nimi.

Przeanalizowano badania nad problemem komunikacji GR w publicznej przestrzeni Internetu w interdyscyplinarnym wymiarze międzynarodowych ekspertów, takich jak J. Habermas, H. Arendt, D. Walton, D. Buniu, J. Baudrillard, A.D. Krivonosov, D.N. Pieskov, S.V. Tykhonova.

Stwierdzono, że w Internecie (a także poza nim), oprócz jednośc sfery publicznej, o której mówi Habermas, istnieją „platformy” specjalnie zorganizowane do komunikacji publicznej – strony internetowe, które są oddzielnymi segmentami przestrzeni publicznej.

Ujawniono praktyczny przykład, który pokazuje jeden ze sposobów monitorowania opinii publicznej i stanowiska zainteresowanych stron w przygotowaniu kampanii lobbingowych w UE. Uzasadniono, że model komunikacji GR pozwolił nam zidentyfikować potencjalne słabości w komunikacji z władzą.

Słowa kluczowe: komunikacja GR, komunikacja PR, lobbing, potencjał GR.

COMMUNICATION IN THE PUBLIC SPACE OF THE INTERNET: BASIC CHARACTERISTICS

Volodymyr Servetnyk

Postgraduate Student

Interregional Academy of Personnel Management (Kyiv, Ukraine)

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-7231-0927

e-mail: Servetnyk_Volodymyr@gmail.com

Abstract. It was determined that of all the technologies available to specialists in interaction with authorities today, Internet technologies are the least studied, although the reduction in the distance between the subjects of GR-communication and the authorities provides ample opportunities for building qualitatively new relations between them.

The researched of the problems of GR-communications in the public space of the Internet in the interdisciplinary dimension of such international experts as Y. Habermas, H. Arendt, D. Volton, D. Bunyu, J. Baudrillard, A.D. Krivonosov, D. N. Peskov, S. V. Tikhonova.

It is noted, that on the Internet (as well as outside it), in addition to the unity of the public sphere, about which Habermas speaks, there are “platforms” specially organized for public communications – sites that are separate segments of the public space.

Practical examples are revealed case which demonstrates one of the ways to monitor public opinion and the positions of stakeholders in the preparation of lobbying campaigns in the EU.

It has been substantiated that the GR-communications model allowed us to identify potential weaknesses in communications with the authorities.

Key words: GR-communications, PR-communications, lobbying, GR-potential.

КОМУНІКАЦІЯ В ПУБЛІЧНОМУ ПРОСТОРИ ІНТЕРНЕТУ: ОСНОВНІ ХАРАКТЕРИСТИКИ

Володимир Серветник

аспірант

Міжрегіональної академії управління персоналом (Київ, Україна)

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-7231-0927

e-mail: Servetnyk_Volodymyr@gmail.com

Анотація. У статті визначено, що з усіх технологій, доступних сьогодні фахівцям у взаємодії з органами влади, Інтернет-технології є найменш вивченими, хоча скорочення відстані між суб'єктами GR-комунікації та владою дає широкі можливості для побудови якісно нових відносин між ними.

Проаналізовано дослідження проблеми GR-комунікацій в публічному просторі Інтернету в міждисциплінарному вимірі таких міжнародних експертів, як Ю. Хабермас, Х. Арентт, Д. Волтон, Д. Буню, Дж. Бодрійяр, А.Д. Кривоносов, Д.Н. Песков, С.В. Тихонова.

Зазначено, що в Інтернеті (а також поза ним), крім єдності публічної сфери, про яку говорить Ю. Хабермас, існують «платформи», спеціально організовані для публічних комунікацій, – сайти, які є окремими сегментами громадського простору.

Розкрито практичний приклад, який демонструє один зі способів моніторингу громадської думки та позиції зацікавлених сторін у підготовці лобістських кампаній у ЄС. Обґрунтовано, що модель комунікації GR дала змогу нам виявити потенційні слабкі місця в спілкуванні з владою.

Ключові слова: GR-комунікації, PR-комунікації, лобіювання, GR-потенціал.

Introduction. Of all the technologies available to specialists in interaction with authorities today, Internet technologies are the least studied, although the reduction in the distance between the subjects of GR-communication and the authorities provides ample opportunities for building qualitatively new relations between them. The practice of their application remains theoretically meaningless, despite the consistently high, but more often independent interests in GR-communications and online communications.

Research problematics of the GR-communications in the public space of the Internet, in an interdisciplinary dimension, engaged in many international experts.

Purpose of the article: to allocate the basic characteristics of communication in the public space of the internet.

Exposition of the main material. The established goals of our research and the chosen approach predetermine a particularly close study of the features of the electronic channel in the GR-communication model. Regarding it, it should be noted: the social system as a whole is complicated by non-communicative technologies that appeared along with the Network and thanks to it; on the contrary, the complication of the social system, entailing its instability, caused the need for the emergence of new ways of increasing coherence. The emergence of online communications, solving on new principles the main task – ensuring the connectivity of an increasingly complex social system, can be called a systemic response to the growing instability: “The emergence of mediated communication in the Web 2.0 format fundamentally changed the public media system, which is no longer can be described as a set of hierarchically organized social institutions of intermediaries” (Shuklin, 2014).

Before discussing the specifics of the public space on the Internet, which provides the possibility of its use for solving GR problems (GR-potential), it is necessary to define the concept of public space.

The phenomenon of the public sphere has been rethought more than once, the authors-researchers write about the existence of many approaches to its definition. If initially the “historian of the public sphere” Y. Habermas (Tikhonova, 2016) designated it not as space, but as “a set of social actions/processes that have the status of public in bourgeois society” (Tolmacheva, 2014), then the definition in sociological dictionaries already sounds like “Sphere of public life, in the framework of which can unfold to discuss matters of public interest, leading to the formation of an informed public opinion” (Tolstykh, 2007).

Contemporary Russian researchers define the public sphere as “a virtual space in which socially significant topics are singled out and discussed and public opinion is formed” (Tulchinsky, 2012). Consideration of the public sphere as “a kind of accumulator and repeater of ideas of the public” (Turonok, 2001), the main result and product of which is a formed public opinion and a system of social values, is typical for most theorists. In this regard, scholars rightfully recognize the public sphere as the “sphere of dwelling of public relations” (Webster, 2004).

Despite the fact that we consider GR as a type of PR, the question of whether the public sphere will be a habitat for relations with the state is debatable. The answer to it depends on whose approach we are guided by: J. Habermas, like H. Arendt, speaks of the existence of private and public spheres – this approach has become traditional and fundamental for many researchers. However, some scientists recognize this interpretation as “horizontal”, opposing it to the “vertical, evolutionary” approach of D. Volton, who singles out the general, public and political sphere. Taking this approach, GR should be classified as a public space, in contrast to the traditional lobbying that exists in the political space. In this case, the defining features of the spheres are: the presence of commercial exchanges in a common space, the possibility of discussion, discussion, taking a certain position or opposition – for the public space, the function of making decisions – for the political one.

In the context of studying GR, at first glance, D. Volton's approach seems to be closer, but in the context of studying the Internet space, we cannot refuse the private sphere, which “Drops out” if we demarcate the boundaries by the method of D. Volton. Therefore, it seems appropriate to consider in more detail the properties of the public sphere, its functions, the conditions for the emergence of the subject space for the most accurate explication of the definition of public space for this work.

First of all, it should be said that for the formation of a public space it is not enough to have freedom of speech; for its existence, independent individuals are needed, “capable of forming their own opinion about something and able to publicly present their own judgment in a certain way” (Semenets-Orlova, 2015). Thus, the conditions for the emergence of the public sphere determine its subject space: the public sphere is formed by civil society (“a network of associations, organizations and movements that derive their goals and values from public debate”), which can be called the main subject of the public sphere. J. Habermas mentions three types of its participants, which can be conditionally designated as:

1. Public actors, for whom the public sphere is a resource for gaining influence and recognition.
2. Representatives of civil society who are able to defend certain collective interests by creating and broadcasting socially significant topics within the public sphere.

3. Information intermediaries responsible for the selection and control of topics circulating in the public sphere, and actors acting within it.

Among the functions of the public sphere, it is customary to distinguish: the articulation of public interests, public control of the activities of the authorities, influence on the formation of state policy, political education.

Based on this, we conclude that the classical approach, which assumes the presence of public and private space, is appropriate for this work. The independent political sphere, outlined by D. Volton, is rather a target, an end point for a specialist in interaction with authorities, but the implementation of GR takes place directly in the public space.

The boundaries separating public from private space are shifting along with changes in society. In this regard, we are forced to consider how public and private spaces are changing as the Internet penetrates into all spheres of public life (Fesler, Kettle, 1997).

Talking about the influence of the Web on the concept of the public sphere, it is impossible to bring any unanimous conclusion or generally accepted approach: even the debates of scientists about the positive or negative impact of Internet communications on political activity and civic participation have not been resolved to this day. For example, the judgment of the weakening of the full two-way communication can be found in D. Bunyu claiming that the recipient is increasingly becoming only the recipient of the message is for the reason of rapid modernization of the communication means. The results of empirical studies only confirm the changes in the nature of interaction in public spaces and in information exchange that have occurred as a result of the development of the Internet; but, for example, the impact of online communities on public engagement is still poorly understood.

In the context of studying the public space on the Internet, the definition of the public sphere given by J. Habermas in 2006 deserves special attention: "Imagine the public sphere as an intermediary system of communication between formally organized and informal, face-to-face discussions in arenas located above, and at the very bottom of the political system" (Fesler, Kettle, 1997). The horizontal, decentralized structure of the Network is precisely an intermediary communication system: a space in which the media and mass media are located, a sphere capable of connecting the opinions of the "upper arenas" and the voices coming from "below". The subject matter and *significance* of these opinions separates the public space of the Internet from the private space of the Internet. In the public space, public communications are carried out, "aimed at the transmission of information affecting public interest, while giving it a public status [...] publicity is associated with such characteristics of a social phenomenon as a connection with any community of people, considered as a whole; realization of common interests; common knowledge". Thus, public interests are articulated in the public space: "where everyone pursues or realizes private interests, public space does not arise". In the private space of the Internet, non-public communications are carried out, "which deal with information that does not have a public status".

Thus, for the public space on the Internet, a certain characteristic of the content of the information presented is necessary – it must have public significance, and the characteristic of access to information – it must be publicly available. At the same time, on the Internet (as well as outside it), in addition to the unity of the public sphere, about which Habermas speaks, there are "platforms" specially organized for public communications – sites that are separate segments of the public space. Such sites are created to discuss socially significant issues, accumulate public initiatives. We will devote a separate paragraph of the second chapter to their consideration.

However, in addition to "pure" cases of public (for example, on *chang e. Org*) and private (for example, in personal correspondence about events of personal life) communications, a significant part of communications on the Internet are difficult to determine, borderline and cross-border cases.

Under the GR of commercial companies, the GR subject represents private interests, however, entering into communication with a government representative, he gives his interests a generally significant character, because his goal is to achieve certain consequences in the public sphere. The private interest of the subject is built into the system of realizing public interests. Therefore, even if communication is carried out through private channels, there is no sign of public awareness, such communication should be recognized as communication of a potentially public nature. Mimicry of this kind of communication as personal is considered unethical for a GR- specialist and illegal for a civil servant. An example is case, where an intern at the consulting company Interel sent a written request to stakeholders about certain characteristics of a tobacco product. Referring to them on Facebook, he did not specify the place of his work and did not substantiate the purpose of the request, indicating that he needed the information for his own research. When the identity of the reporter was revealed, the addressee of the message – Madame Berteletti Kemp (director of the Smoke Free Partnership) – suggested that the research was in fact carried out for an actual or potential Interel client.

The presented case demonstrates one of the ways to monitor public opinion and the positions of stakeholders in the preparation of lobbying campaigns in the EU. Interest is hidden, goals are latent: the collection of information is disguised as research for personal purposes. This is the problematic of the situation: if the result of lobbying is of a public nature, it is logical to assume that correspondence in a private, private space should be in some sense public in nature, subject to a code or other established norms and rules.

The Smoke Free Partnership found the trainee's actions inappropriate, and Interel's behavior violated professional ethics, as a result of which they prepared a complaint and the case was reviewed by a professional EPACA (European Public Affairs Consultancies' Association), which did not recognize the use of Facebook in business as inappropriate. Purposes, but accused the defendant of using the company's public name for private purposes. This case once again shows that the existence of the Internet is relevant and potentially public spaces raises the question of the need to develop generally accepted rules: "citizens should receive new communication channels that allow

them to participate in the development of the very rules of the game that determine the relationship between them and the state, and to exercise control over their observance”.

The spaces we have allocated on the Internet are similar to those that exist outside the Internet. And the situation with the crossing of the border between the private and the public, given as an example, could have happened during traditional correspondence, and even during personal meetings. However, so far this kind of transboundary has not become the subject of special research. Probably, its actualization is associated with the peculiarities of Internet communications, which intensify, exacerbate and make more visible a number of processes and phenomena. Researchers have described such features:

- multidirectional and multilevel;
- interactivity and dialogicality;
- anonymity, physical lack of representation;
- time deformation;
- playful character;
- the possibility of permanent fixation of communication.

All these features of Internet communications are also important for GR practices, which is clearly seen in our example. The advantages of the electronic channel for achieving the goals of GR can be highlighted:

1. High speed of interaction of audience segments with each other and with the subject of GR (due to such factors as multidirectionality, availability of contacts, non-traditional chronological organization).

2. Ample opportunities for accurate segmentation of the target audience (available due to the multidirectional network, the absence of territorial restrictions and even physical lack of representation – anonymity allows individuals to occupy a position on the Internet that they can hide in life).

3. Clarity of feedback (provided by all analyzed properties). Here, we should also mention the rich possibilities of its assessment and analytics, available due to the above properties, as well as the technical characteristics of the modern Internet space and the digital environment as a whole.

Relatively low cost of communications. Most social actors in modern post- and even industrial societies have access to the Internet. According to the UN specialized agency, the International Telecommunication Union, in 2013 39% of the world's population was connected to the Internet, in 2015 – 43%. The once existing financial constraints are rapidly losing their significance: from 2008 to 2013, prices for providing access to the global network in the world fell by 82%, while the rate of decline is the same for both developed and developing countries. Although in the latter, the cost of relevant services is still relatively high – 30% of the average monthly income per capita. Thus, companies and public organizations, regardless of their profile, level of development and almost regardless of the availability of financial resources, have the opportunity to use online communications in their activities.

However, we consider it necessary to dwell in more detail on the simulative nature of communications provoked by the Internet.

The Internet environment gives rise to two heterogeneous, but at the same time technologically connected spaces. The first is an analogue of the physical, fundamentally the same communication processes take place inside it, adjusted for quantitative indicators. Accordingly, messages that are understandable and effective in traditional media can exist and have their impact.

The second space can be called a simulation space: it is characterized by the absence of reference to real communicants and the presence of simulation messages (“industrial slaughter of seals is evil”, “no corruption”, etc.). Using the terminology of J. Baudrillard, we speak of “substitution, the replacement of the real by the signs of the real”. In this work, we will conventionally call simulation messages simulations, according to the classification of J. Baudrillard, these would be “simulacra of the 1st order – reflections of basic reality”. In simulation, “instead of creating communication, information exhausts itself in staging communication; instead of producing meaning, it exhausts its strength in staging meaning”.

It should be noted here that A. D. Krivonosov wrote about the symbolism of the public sphere in web communications, and D.N. Peskov reflected on the relevance of analyzing Internet processes through the prism of the concept of simulacra, referring to the fact that postmodernism is “the only from political and philosophical currents, which quite adequately describes both political reality and political virtuality”. He also argues that the Internet is characterized by a paradoxical situation, which J. Baudrillard called “the precession of simulacra” – the precedence of simulacra or models to real events. Naumov, in turn, connects the fact that “power actions are more and more reduced precisely to actions with symbolic constructions” with the speed and level of development of semiotic technologies. The researcher equates public space with the spheres of power and government, speaking about the possibilities of forming and closing gaps of the “problem – solution” type. An analogy can be drawn with what we have designated in this work as simulations. Fundamentally, he especially emphasized the fact that for the implementation of mechanisms, both technologies for finding gaps in the current state of affairs, that is, identifying real problems, and technologies for semiotic creating a gap can be used. In advertising theory, a similar technique is defined as a false USP (unique selling proposition) and the artificial formation of a non-existent need; and in GR practice, these are unethical technologies, such as, for example, greenwashing (Huizinga, 1997).

Simulations, in turn, generate actors who simulate their positions on simulation messages (slaughtering seals or corruption). In the case of a high level of involvement, actors can unite into groups and try to translate simulacres back into referents (living seals, facts of corruption), and online discussions around simulations into actions, movements, documents held outside the Internet by real people. Immediately we should mention the dissatisfaction

of the authorities with the ability of business to clearly convey information about problems in the industry through direct contact (Advocacy and Lobbying...). If the interaction that is not burdened by electronic means is already fraught with certain difficulties, then it can be assumed that converting messages into electronic ones and their subsequent conversion back will require new additional skills.

The simulation field does not arise from black holes: it is generated by the referents, symbols and interests existing in reality, and public interests are always more simulative than private ones. This is actively used in the so-called “black” marketing and propaganda. But at the same time simulation space – autopoietic system with inherent her nonlinear character development – lives according to different laws, and both propagandists and “myth makers” of black marketing are faced with the fact that the simulation field in most cases does not generate changes in the behavior of real people, but only new actors that do not convert into political decisions, but are limited to the creation of simulation groups of opponents of industrial slaughtering of seals. This is natural, since the development and implementation of Internet technologies in themselves does not lead to some previously known positive result – they, “being extensions of ourselves, depend on us in their interaction and evolution” (Bennis Wai Yip So, 2007).

The arguments of S.V. Tikhonova about the socialization of the Internet, to which we have already referred in the work, are also interconnected with the phenomenon considered in this section. She argues that the process of socialization of the Internet is opposed to the process of virtualization of society – the expansion of Internet communications into real social structures, the replacement of real social phenomena with their virtual counterparts, during which social identities mutate into the order of simulation (Berg, 2012). Studying the activities of GR – actors on the Web, we find exactly these processes, and, in addition, we see their relatively low efficiency and complexity associated with the need to convert referents into simulacra and vice versa: “dialect problems become the main ones for those who organize these transitions: so, for any unit responsible for communication technologies, the main difficulty is not creating an informational occasion or accessing the necessary mass media, the question of how to set up an understanding of an employee of an organization is much more complicated, how “Retrain” him to speak not in an internal language, understandable in a given organization, but in a different language of public space for him; and it is even more difficult to make these transitions for employees automatic and self-regulating, that is, to supplement the internal positions of employees with external positions, for example, newsmakers or experts” (O’Malley, 2006). S.V. Tikhonova suggests that “the communicative strategies of the actors of electronic network communication are determined by the intermediary channel not only at the operational, but also at the normative-value level”. “The use of a specific channel requires the existence of rules governing its use, including “rules for choosing a code for interpreting a message, establishing and terminating contact, teleology”; and the more complex the channel used, the more specific the prescribed norms and schemes of its use will be (Tikhonova, 2016).

But if you take it as a basis for the hypothesis that gradually specific alternative, subcultural norms and values of an Internet channel will be supplanted by the norms and values in traditional social systems in order, then these processes of socialization experts on GR would have to respond proactively and use in their goals, and instead of anonymous operating with virtual images, to engage in the formation and strengthening of “real, living, personalized social ties” (Bowen, 2000). It appears that “Simplifying the use of [the channel], bringing it closer to ease with “Natural” communication reduces the demand for specialized communication schemes, updating the normative value systems of “natural” social roles” (Buckley, 2014). Perhaps the strategy proposed by the researcher would really make it possible to smooth out the alternative nature of the public space of the Internet and enrich it in terms of new forms of social control.

We are not supporters of the radical position “The Internet itself is meaningless, it is rather a simulacrum, a concept without a subject” (Buurma, 2001). But, nevertheless, they tend to argue that the presence of simulations in the public space of the Internet cannot be denied. And they, together with the gaming nature inherent in the Internet environment, form a factor that blocks the development of Internet GR. The fundamental principles of any game are form, agreement and rules, because “it is the pattern of the game that gives it significance for our inner life, and not at all the composition of the players or the outcome of the game” (Clarification of Terms, 2016).

Today, the global nature of the public space of the Web has really made it possible for a larger number of users, regardless of their initial skills, to create and broadcast simulations, to select and unite like-minded actors; but at the stage of transferring the simulation back to the referent, even the presence of special professional skills does not guarantee a successful solution to the problem, since the *rules of the game* have not been formed and approved at the moment. While they are not there, there is neither determinism, nor a linear sequence – only the processes already described in “Simulacra and simulations”: “if we consider the full cycle of any action or event [...] in a field frustrated by simulation, then each action here ends with the end of the cycle, scattering in all directions and becoming acceptable to all”. Simulation for a public space is acceptable only with clearly and publicly defined boundaries – the rights and obligations of actors, since the risk of misleading the public by simulating reality in virtual space is too high. As long as in Russia there is the concept of a “semi-official profile” (while US law “strictly separates the election accounts of politicians and official accounts tied to government positions”) (Communicating with Your Regulatory Officials...), and as long as the communication participants are not disqualified from the game for simulation of solving problem (Hargie, Dickson & Tourish, 1999), since there are no rules according to which a red card is issued for this, we can observe a relatively low efficiency of GR- communications in the public space of the Internet.

From the above, it follows that GR on the Internet is difficult for two reasons: at the input you need to turn the representative into a simulation, and at the output you need to do the opposite. This reasoning is confirmed by the practice of GR-communications, carried out by non-profit organizations and associations.

Until the rules of interaction are approved, three further development scenarios can be assumed:

1. Continuing to use the Web with a rejection of the perception of the online space as a legitimate area for decision-making. The scenario “we play on the Web and do not solve” is realized if the rules and norms of interaction are not determined, – “the game assumes mutual play or interaction, there must be mutual exchange or dialogue between two or more individuals and groups” (Community and Local Government Relations: Georgia Tech. Government & Community Relations, 2019).

2. Full use of electronic resources and web technologies for solving joint tasks facing the state – government, business and society (Kane, Fichman & Gallagher, 2009).

The scenario “on the web, playing, we decide everything” is realized if the rules and norms of interaction are approved and recognized – it is the recognition of the rules by the participants that will make it possible to fully realize the GR potential of the Internet.

3. Partial reference to the Internet as a means of GR. The “live, use, and sometimes solve” scenario is relevant now and will exist as long as there are social institutions that have the power to make decisions, but do not recognize the importance of establishing the “rules of the game”.

Thus, despite the transparency and openness of the Web, in fact, Internet communications are implemented in different fields: both in the public space and in the private space, there is also a potentially borderline public space (Community Relations Consulting & Tools, Performance Leadership Institute, Inc., 2019).

Conclusion. Summing up the results the following should be repeated. We have defined GR-communications as a type of PR-communications of non-state actors aimed at interacting with authorities, the purpose of which is to create a favorable environment for the functioning of these subjects. The GR-communications model allowed us to identify potential weaknesses in communications with the authorities. We designated the public space of the Internet as a virtual space where socially significant topics can be discussed and public opinion formed. In the public space of the Internet, mass media and mass media operate, and users who have access to it have the opportunity to articulate public interests and exercise public control over the activities of the authorities.

It is obvious that the qualitative characteristics of the public space of the Internet, which we have considered, give opportunities to optimize their activities for both business and non-profit entities and government bodies. A number of typical GR problems can be solved more or less successfully using the Internet. It is obvious that the Internet can be useful in direct contact with government authorities, in organizing interaction between government bodies, public organizations, the general public and representatives of the business community, in creating coalitions and mobilizing public opinion, etc. The consequence of the continuous development of the Network is the emergence of fundamentally new ways of interaction between individuals, authorities, business structures and non-profit institutions, one of which is GR-communications.

At the same time, the simulation space, which is an integral part of the public space of the Internet, also creates significant risks for GR communications. It is possible to minimize the risk by establishing generally accepted rules for Internet communications.

Bibliography:

1. Баклі С. Стратегії та підходи Fdvocacy: Огляд. *АПС*. 2014. URL: http://www.apc.org/en/node/9456#Case_studies.
2. Бенніс Вай Іп Со. Політичний маркетинг: Відновлення теорії та практика. *Огляд державного управління Китаю*. 2007. Т. 16. № 1. С. 1–34. URL: http://tao.wordpedia.com/show_pdf.ashx?sess=ml2xgj45vescm5njvkatj45&file_name=J000000313_16-1_1-34&file_type=r.
3. Берг К.Т. Етика лобіювання: перевірка етичних рамок адвокатури у зв'язках з громадськістю. *Етика ЗМІ: Вивчення питань медіа-моралі*. 2012. Вип. 27. Вип. 2. С. 97–14.
4. Боуен С.А. Теорія управління етичними питаннями: Внесок кантійської деонтології в етику зв'язків з громадськістю та прийняття рішень : дис. ... доктор. PhD. Університет Меріленду, Коледж-Парк, 2000. С. 78.
5. Буурма Х. Маркетинг державної політики: маркетинговий обмін у державному секторі. *Європейський журнал маркетингу*. Вип. 35. №. 11/12. С. 1287–1302. URL: <http://www.emeraldinsight.com/journals.htm?articleid=853763>.
6. Вебстер Ф. Теорії інформаційного суспільства. Москва : Aspect Press, 2004. 400 с.
7. Відносини громади та місцевого самоврядування. *Georgia Tech. Відносини уряду та громад*. URL: <http://www.gov.gatech.edu/community/>.
8. Відносини з громадою 2.0 / Д.К. Кейн, Р.Г. Фічман, Дж. Галлогер, Дж. Глейзер. *Harvard Business Review*, 2009. URL: [http://hbr.org/2009/11/community-relations-20/ ar/1](http://hbr.org/2009/11/community-relations-20/).
9. Консультації та інструменти з питань відносин із громадою. *Performance Leadership Institute, Inc.* URL: <http://pli.us.com/services/community-relations-consulting-tools/>.
10. О'Маллі Б. 10 правил громадських справ. *Тиждень блогу FPRA (Асоціація зв'язків з громадськістю Флориди)*. 2006. 180 с. URL: http://bobomalley.newsvine.com/_news/2009/09/17/3282389-the-10-rules-of-public-Affairs.
11. Пропаганда та лобізм. *TACSO*. URL: http://www.tacso.org/knowhow/advocacylobbying/default.aspx?id=27&template_id=73&langTag=en-US&pageIndex=1.
12. Семенець-Орлова І. Державне управління освітніми змінами: наукові категорії, методологія та основні проблеми, що визначаються на основі досвіду України та США. *Університетські наукові записки*. 2015. № 1 (53). С. 302–310.
13. Спілкування з вашими регуляторними посадовими особами. *SIOMA*. URL: http://www.cioma.com/CIOMA2/GR/Regulatory_Letters.aspx.
14. Тихонова С. Соціальні мережі: проблеми соціалізації Інтернету. *Поліс. Політичні дослідження*. 2016. № 3. Р. 138–152. URL: <https://doi.org/10.17976/jpps/2016.03.11>.
15. Толмачова І.В. Кризис лоббизма. *Бизнес в России*. 2014. № 11. С. 78–79. URL: <https://businessofrussia.com/assets/issues/156-166/11-2014.pdf>.

16. Толстих П.А. GR-Практикум по лоббизму в России. Москва : Alpina Business Books, 2007. 379 с.
17. Тульчинский Г.Л. Корпоративные социальные инвестиции и социальное партнерство: технологии и оценка эффективности : учебное пособие. Санкт-Петербург : Отдел оперативной полиграфии НИУ ВШЭ, 2012. 236 с.
18. Туронок С.Г. Интернет та політичний процес. *Суспільні науки та сучасність*. 2001. № 2. С. 51–63.
19. Уточнення термінів. *Рада управління титаніями*. 2016. URL: <http://issuemanagement.org/learnmore/clarification-offterms/>.
20. Феслер Дж., Кетл Д.Ф. Прийняття рішень. *Державна служба. Рішення та контроль (зарубіжний досвід)*. 1997. № 1 (18). С. 28.
21. Харгі О., Діксон Д., Туріш Д. Комунікація в управлінні. Видавнича компанія Гоувер, 1999. 348 с.
22. Хейзинга Й. Homo Ludens : статьи по истории культуры / пер., сост. и вступ. ст. Д.В. Сильвестрова ; коммент. Д.Э. Харитоновича. Москва : Прогресс-Традиция, 1997. 416 с.
23. Шуклин Г. США отдаёт контроль над корневой зоной DNS. *All posts in a row/Habr*. URL: <https://habr.com/en/post/113048/>.

References:

1. Buckley, S. (2014) Fdvocacy Strategies and Approaches Overview: APC, [in English], http://www.apc.org/en/node/9456#Case_studies.
2. Bennis Wai Yip So. (2007) Policy Marketing: Theory Rebuilding and Practice. *The Chinese Public Administration Review*. Vol.16, № 1. P. 1–34. URL: http://tao.wordpress.com/show_pdf.ashx?sess=ml2xgj45vescm5njvxkatj45&file_name=J000000313_16-1_1-34&file_type=r [in English].
3. Berg, K. T. (2012) The Ethics of Lobbying: Testing an Ethical Framework for Advocacy in Public Relation. *Journal of Mass Media Ethics: Exploring Questions of Media Morality*, Vol. 27, iss. 2., Pp. 97–14 [in English].
4. Bowen, S. A. (2000) A theory of ethical issues management: Contributions of Kantian deontology to public relations' ethics and decision-making: Ph.D. dissertation: University of Maryland, College Park, MD. p. 78 [in English].
5. Buurma, H. (2001), Public policy marketing: marketing exchange in the public sector, *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 35 No. 11/12, pp. 1287-1302. [in English]. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EUM000000006483>.
6. Webster, F. (2004) *Teorii informacionnogo obshhestva* [Theories of the Information Society]. Moscow: Aspect Press. P. 400 [in Russian].
7. Community and Local Government Relations: Georgia Tech. Government & Community Relations (2019) <http://www.gov.gatech.edu/community/>.
8. Community Relations Consulting & Tools, Performance Leadership Institute, Inc., (2019) [in English]. <http://pli.us.com/services/community-relations-consulting-tools/>.
9. O'Malley, B. (2006) The 10 Rules of Public Affairs. FPRA (Florida Public Relations Association) Blog Week, P.180 [in English]. http://bobomalley.newsvine.com/_news/2009/09/17/3282389-the-10-rules-of-public-affairs.
10. Propaganda i lobbizm. [Advocacy and Lobbying]: TACSO http://www.tacso.org/knowhow/advocacylobbying/default.aspx?id=27&template_id=73&langTag=en-US&pageIndex=1 [in English].
11. Semenets-Orlova I. (2015) Derzhavne upravlinnia osvithimiy zminamy: naukovi katehorii, metodolohiia ta osnovni problemy, shcho vyznachaiutsia na osnovi dosvidu Ukrainy ta SShA. [Public Administration of Educational Change: Scientific Categories, Methodology, and the Main Problematics Determined on the Basis of Experience of Ukraine and the USA], *Universytetski naukovy zapysky* Vol. 1 (53), P. 302–310 [in Ukrainian].
12. Communicating with Your Regulatory Officials: SIOMA, [in English]. http://www.cioma.com/SIOMA2/GR/Regulatory_Letters.aspx.
13. Tikhonova, S. V. (2016). Social'nye seti: problemy socializacii Interneta. [Social Networks: Problems of Internet Socialization] *Polis. Politicheskie issledovaniya*. No. (3), P. 138–152. <https://doi.org/10.17976/jpps/2016.03.11> [in Russian].
14. Tolmacheva, I. V. (2014). Kriza lobbizma. [Crisis of lobbying] *Biznes v Rossii*, No. (11) <http://businessofrussia.com/nov-2014/companiesmarkets/item/899-crisis.html> [in Russian].
15. Tolstykh, P. A. (2007) GR-Praktikum po lobbizmu v Rossii. [GR-workshop on lobbying in Russia]. Moscow : Alpina Business Books, P. 379 [in Russian].
16. Tulchinsky, G. L. (2012) Korporativnye social'nye investicii i social'noe partnerstvo: tehnologii i ochenka jeffektivnosti: ucheb. posobie [Corporate social investments and social partnership: technologies and performance evaluation: study. allowance]. St. Petersburg.: NRU HSE [in Russian].
17. Turonok, S. G. (2001). Internet and political process. [Internet ta politychnyi protses] *Suspilni nauky ta suchasnist*. No (2), P. 51–63 [in Russian].
18. Shuklin, G (2014) SShA otdaet kontrol nad kornevoi zonoj DNS [USA gives control over the DNS root zone] *All posts in a row/Habr*: URL: <https://habr.com/en/post/113048/> [in Russian].
19. Clarification of Terms (2016), Issue Management Council, [in English]. <http://issuemanagement.org/learnmore/clarification-offterms/>.
20. Fesler, J, Kettle, F (1997). Decision-making. Public service. Decisions and control (foreign experience), Issue 1 (18). P. 28 [in English].
21. Hargie, Owen, Dickson David &. Tourish Dennis (1999) *Communication in Management*, Gower Publishing Company, 348 p. [in English].
22. Huizinga, J. (1997) Homo Ludens: Stat'i po istorii kul'tury. [Homo Ludens: articles on the history of culture.] Moscow: Progress-Tradition, 416 p. [in Russian].
23. Kane, Gerald C., Fichman, Robert G.& Gallagher John (2009) *Community Relations 2.0* and John Glaser: Harvard Business Review [in English]. <http://hbr.org/2009/11/community-relations-20/ar/1>.