

УДК 32-057.4(4):316.653

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30970/PPS.2022.42.23>

## EXPERIENCE OF TRAINING EXPERTS IN THE FIELD OF DECISION- MAKING POLICY IN EASTERN EUROPEAN COUNTRIES



Co-funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union



*This research is fulfilled in framework of Jean Monnet educational module "State-in-ternational-public: European values and norms determining interdisciplinary university module (STIPENDIUM)" No 611217-EPP-1-2019-1-UAEPPJMO-MODULE with the support of the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union. This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication [communication] reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.*

**Olha Vyhovska**

*Borys Grinchenko Kyiv University,*

*Scientific Research Laboratory of Internationalization of Higher Education*

*18/2, Bulvarno-Kudriavska str., 04053, Kyiv, Ukraine*

The historical and philosophical origins of the problem of making political decisions from ancient times to the present are analyzed in this article. It has been determined that the main concepts within the decision-making theory were developed in the Western scientific and political discourse during the 20th and early 21st centuries.

It was found that in modern political science, the process of making political decisions is considered as a systemic multi-level complex activity of both political subjects and civil society. It was revealed that depending on the conditions in which the society is, the policy of making certain decisions has a cardinal difference. It was determined that in the conditions of sustainable development of society, we are talking about decisions regarding the implementation of the legislative process in the country, response to manifestations of civil initiative, functioning of political parties, etc. Accordingly, in crisis situations, especially during war and other social upheavals, decision-making policy is fundamentally different. It is aimed at overcoming a critical state of crisis in society, preserving state security, law and order, political and economic stability, eliminating sources of threats, etc.

It was revealed that the processes of further democratization of the political system in Ukraine directly depend on the success of solving the problem of political decision-making, especially after Ukraine received the status of a candidate for membership of the European Union despite the war of aggression launched by Russia against our country. In connection with this, the problem of training experts in the field of decision-making policy is being updated, especially in the countries of Eastern Europe, which includes Ukraine.

In this regard, it was established that the level of adequacy of the political decisions taken is determined not only by the competence of the authorities, but also by the wide involvement of the expert environment and mass media. The role of the institute of political experts in the formation of public opinion on decision-making processes has been revealed. It has been substantiated that the experience of training experts in the field of decision-making policy directly affects the processes of further democratization of the political system in Ukraine.

*Key words:* political decisions, decision-making theory, political experts, civil society, experience of training experts.

**Formulation of the problem.** In the third decade of the 21st century, Ukraine and its civil society is on the verge of existence both as an independent country and as a nation with a thousand-year history in the context of military, political, socio-economic, environmental and other challenges and threats. The date of February 24, 2022 had become a turning point not only in the history of Ukraine, but also the beginning of a civilizational break, which was marked by the heroic struggle of the Ukrainian people for European democratic values, for a new architecture not only on the European continent, but also in the world as a whole.

Making political decisions is an extremely important component of a holistic political process, and the policy of making certain decisions has a cardinal difference depending on the conditions (normal or crisis) in which the society is. If in the conditions of sustainable development of society there are decisions regarding the implementation of the legislative process in the country, responding to various manifestations of civil initiative, the functioning of various political parties, conducting election campaigns, etc., then in crisis situations, especially during war and other social upheavals, the policy of decision-making is fundamentally different. It is aimed at overcoming a critical state of crisis, which is connected with the survival of the country, the preservation of state security, law and order, political and economic stability, the elimination of the sources of various threats, etc.

The processes of further democratization of the political system in Ukraine directly depend on the success of solving the problem of making political decisions. This problem is especially acute today, when Ukraine has received the status of a candidate for membership of the European Union (EU), despite the war of aggression launched by Russia against our country, on June 23, 2022, by the decision of the European Council.

In this regard, the problem of training experts in the field of decision-making policy is extremely relevant, especially in Eastern European countries, which include Ukraine, and which, after the collapse of the USSR in 1991, are trying to get rid of dependence on the Soviet past by joining European values, making appropriate political decisions and implementing EU legislation, rules and regulations.

**Analysis of recent research and publications.** The problem of decision-making (management, political) has an ancient origin both in the Eastern (Confucius, Shang Yang) and in the Western philosophical tradition, starting from ancient times (Aristotle, Plato). It was Aristotle who first introduced the concept of "politics", laying the foundations of the theory of politics. During the further cultural-historical and social-political development of mankind from the Renaissance to the end of the 19th century, the specified problem has been studied in various aspects by philosophers, thinkers and famous political figures: J. Bodin, N. Machiavelli, T. Hobbes, J.-J. Rousseau, Ch. Montesquieu, H. Spencer, A. Saint-Simon, F. Nietzsche, Ch. Fourier and others.

In the 20th-21st centuries in Western political science (M. Weber, H. Lasswell, H. Simon, D. Easton, J. Anderson, A. Bodnar, W. Jenkins, B. Hogwood, L. Gunn and others), basic concepts within the framework of the decision-making theory were formed, different approaches were proposed, certain algorithms of the decision-making process and stages of their implementation were suggested.

Based on the achievements of western political science, the main provisions of the theory of decision-making in various aspects, models of functioning of political systems, etc. are considered in the works of domestic scientists (V. Abyzov, V. Andrushchenko, V. Bakumenko, V. Bebyk, V. Kremen, O. Kushlyk-Dyvulska, B. Kushlyk, V. Tertychka and others).

However, within the scope of consideration of the mentioned theory, in our opinion, the problem of training experts in the field of decision-making policy, in particular in Ukraine, needs to be singled out, therefore it has become the topic of our research.

**The goal of the article** – to substantiate the main provisions of the theory of decision-making and to analyze the experience of training experts in the field of decision-making policy on the example of Eastern European countries, in particular, Ukraine.

**Methodology of the study** has integral nature, using methods of theoretical analysis, synthesis, comparison, generalization, systematic and historical methods, etc.

**Main material.** The study of scientific works has proved that the specified problem has ancient historical origins and requires a more detailed consideration. At the beginning, we will consider the interpretation of the essence of the synonymous concepts "politics", "political science", "political decision" in order to clarify the logical and semantic connections between them. It is noted in reference sources that "politics" (translated from Greek – state activity) is "an activity whose purpose is to regulate relations between people to ensure a certain state of some social unit (social entity). ... Mostly, the term "politics" refers to activities aimed at large social entities whose borders coincide with state borders. Therefore, sometimes politics is defined based on the concept of the state or participation in state administration, seeking such participation and exerting influence on the state [13, p. 494]. The science that deals with the study of politics and the study of political processes is political science. It is noted in scientific and methodological works that "political science is a complex science that combines the study of the content, institutional and organizational forms of political activity and methods of interaction of participants in the political process" [8, p. 11].

The concept of "political decision" is interpreted as "the action of an informed subject of power to realize the goal, which involves optimizing the external and internal conditions of the functioning of this subject and determining the prospects for its development" [13, p. 485]. A feature of the political functioning of any state (community) is the process of making and implementing relevant political decisions, which are "woven into the fabric of political life as key points, the quality of which depends on the strength and effectiveness of the government, the success of its regulatory activities" [8, p. 101].

If we turn to historical sources, we can understand that the problem of decision-making has an ancient origin in both the Eastern and Western philosophical traditions, starting from ancient times. In the ancient treatises of Eastern philosophers – Confucius "Lun Yu" ("Conversations and judgments", 5th century BC) and Shang Yang "Shangjun shu" ("Book of Shangjun", 4th century BC) raised the issue of "good" and "rational" decisions. In particular, Shang Yang believed that law and order in the state can be achieved only through the adoption of correct laws, the establishment of trust between the government and the people, the functioning of proper communication, etc.

Ancient philosophers Plato (428-347 BC) and Aristotle (384-322 BC) also contributed to the understanding of the decision-making problem. Thus, Plato expressed his thoughts about the state, considered the types of state system, thought out the essence of correct laws, etc. in his works "Laws" and "The State". The philosopher believed that if the law is established in the interests of only a handful of people, then it is not about the state system, but about internal quarrels and disputes, which has nothing to do with justice. And, on the contrary, where the law is the lord over the ruler, and they are his slaves, the philosopher saw it as salvation for the state [7].

As with Plato, in Aristotle's system of views on the world, politics and ethics form a coherent "philosophy of human affairs", the subject of which is practical activity and behavior. Aristotle laid the foundations of the theory of politics, introducing the very term "politics" into scientific circulation. According to the definition of the philosopher, "politics is a civilized form of community that served to achieve the "common good" and "happy life" [9, p. 12]. In his work "Nicomachean Ethics", the philosopher substantiates his own concept of decision-making,

connecting the concept of justice with ideas about the state, in which law is a criterion of justice, a regulatory norm of political communication between people and states [2].

In the further cultural and historical development of mankind, the thinkers of the Renaissance paid attention to the study of the problem of decision-making: the French political thinker, the founder of the concept of state sovereignty – Jean Beaudin (1530–1596); Italian statesman and politician, whose thoughts on the balancing of the power of the state, the nobility and the people were transformed into the distribution and preservation of balance between the various branches of power – Niccolò Machiavelli (1469–1527). During the Age of Enlightenment and the New Age, this problem had been studied in the works of the English philosopher and political theorist Thomas Hobbes (1588–1679); French philosophers Charles Montesquieu (1689–1755), who highly valued the English constitution as a "mirror of freedom" and Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712–1778), who described an ideal state based on the principles of voluntary agreement and social agreement, and in which people enjoy all rights and freedoms.

During the 20th-beginning of the 21st centuries in the western scientific and political discourse (M. Weber, H. Lasswell, G. Simon, D. Easton, etc.), basic concepts had been formed within the framework of decision-making theory, various approaches had been proposed, according to which certain algorithms and phasing of the decision-making process had been suggested regarding their implementation. One of the first is *the concept of social action* of the German philosopher and sociologist Max Weber (1864–1920), one of the most influential authorities of social thought of the late 19th and early 20th centuries, the founder of "understanding sociology", which is aimed at consciousness, efficiency and rationality [4]. The philosopher formulated in his work "The Protestant Ethics and the Spirit of Capitalism" (1905) basic propositions about the nature of political power, about the relationship between politics and ethics, proposed a typology of political figures, etc., which is of scientific and practical interest to modern theorists of the political process.

American political scientist Harold Lasswell (1902–1978) used a functional approach to politics (politics as the management of society), applying the methods of psychoanalysis. The central topic in H. Lasswell's political theory had become the analysis of political decisions, which was formulated by a laconic definition: "Power is participation in decision-making". According to this, "decisions have been defined as a policy that allows certain sanctions (deprivation of something), then they will act as a planned process that determines the goals, price and practical steps to their implementation" [14, p. 312-313].

Herbert Simon (1916–2001), as a supporter of the bounded rationality model, believed that the decision-making process itself is a complex management action that includes three stages: 1) searching for reasons that explain the need to make a decision (searching for symptoms of a problem and reasons for its appearance, intelligence activity); 2) coming up with, developing and analyzing possible areas of activity ("project activity", i.e. preparation for decision-making, searching for alternatives); 3) choosing the appropriate line of activity (choosing an alternative from the existing ones and making a decision). As the scientist noted, it is necessary to choose the alternative that will lead to the most complete achievement of the set goal [16].

American political scientist David Easton (1917–2014) applied the general theory of systems to the analysis of political processes, thereby becoming the author of his own approach to the study of political systems. The scientist proposed *a systemic model* of the political sphere in his works "Political System" (1953), "Structure of Political Analysis" (1965), etc.: on the one hand, the political system is deeply connected with the social environment, therefore it must transform the requirements coming from it into appropriate solutions, on the other hand, the solutions of the political system are the source of the emergence of new requirements, forming

the effect of "feedback" and forming the cyclical nature of building such a model. D. Easton's model of the political system significantly enriched the categorical apparatus of political science, providing an opportunity to analyze political processes in dynamics [9, p. 55].

Taking into account H. Lasswell's functional approach, D. Easton's system-functional approach, H. Simon's theory of rationality to the study of political systems, we claim that political decision-making is not only an important element of political activity, a complex managerial action, but also one of the technologies for implementing political power in society. Proponents of the political-management approach to the theory of political decision-making (J. Anderson, A. Bodnar, W. Jenkins, B. Hogwood, L. Gunn, etc.) believe that the decision-making process is not just a simultaneous act, but a complex organizational management process, the effectiveness of which can be influenced by both objective factors of socio-economic reality and subjective points related to a person who is at the level of their acceptance. Timely political decisions that meet the real needs of society create favorable conditions for the optimal choice of political alternatives in the conditions of the complexity of modern political relations.

Let's consider the main provisions of the theory of decision-making, based on the achievements of Western political science. In modern political science, a political decision is considered as a relevant political action, which contains a certain procedurality: the emergence of a problematic situation that needs to be resolved; analysis of the problem and its processing by experts; formulation of the goal and means of achieving it; discussion and preparation of a draft decision; making a decision in accordance with the legislative procedure and the procedure for supervising the implementation of the decision. A political decision as a means of harmonizing public interests and a mechanism for realizing pressing needs of society appears in two guises: "for those who accept it, the decision is a *conscious choice of direction and course of action*, and for those to whom it is addressed, the decision is a *directive instruction* to be followed" [8, p. 101]. Since the political decision plays a significant role in the transformation of the demands of society or individual groups or individuals into the plane of management of these social processes or relations between groups of people or individuals, that is why it is an important object of political analysis. Examples of political decisions can be laws, by-laws, orders, resolutions, etc.

*The process of making political decisions* is a systemic multi-level complex activity of political subjects who are authorized by the relevant authorities (representative and non-representative) to perform certain functions. In the conditions of the existence of modern democratic states, the preparation of a political decision only by a subject of power is impossible, because it contradicts the very essence of a political decision – its maximum adequacy and closeness to social and political reality. In this regard, the level of adequacy of political decisions is determined not only by the competence of the authorities participating in their preparation, but also by the wide involvement of the expert environment and mass media in the discussion of this or that political decision.

It should be noted that the adoption of any political decision, especially of state importance, requires in-depth systematic research, a thorough analysis of the situation in order to obtain reliable information about this or that political problem that needs to be solved. That is why the demand of political decision-making centers for adequate and objective analytical information is constantly growing. Such information is accumulated in various centers and institutes, both state and non-state, in which professional analysts act as experts in search of optimal solutions.

Let's recall that *an expert* is a person who is a specialist in the relevant industry, has information about one or another problem, offers ways to solve it, but does not bear direct responsibility for the results of its solution. *A consultant* (analyst) is a specialist in the field of decision-making theory, who develops and models a decision-making project, organizes the work of experts,



etc. Currently, the Institute of Political Analysts and Experts, as one of the most active subjects of modern media policy, exerts a significant influence on the formation of public opinion in making political decisions.

Meanwhile, as practice shows, "there is a significant difference between the use of expert recommendations based on inevitably different views in decision-making, and allowing expert specialists to make political decisions themselves. Democratic theory advises against this. From the point of view of a democratically organized society, the best mechanism is when the knowledge, experience, ability to unbiased analysis and well-founded conclusions of specialists-experts are used, but decisions are made by politicians who are responsible for their actions before society [8, p. 505]. That is, to make a balanced, competent decision, politicians usually turn to the opinion of the expert environment, however, "it is politicians who are responsible for the content and effectiveness of decisions; therefore, they should accept them, choosing from the alternatives proposed by the experts" [8, p. 506].

In view of this, the importance of training experts in the field of decision-making policy is growing significantly, especially in countries with insufficiently developed democracy, for example, in Ukraine. The experience of training such experts proves that for the democratic development of this process, it is important to involve all social partners in it. The ways of practical implementation of such a course, its adequacy and acceptability for all participants of socio-political processes can be realized through the mechanisms of broad political discussion (scientific and practical conferences, "round tables", methodological seminars, parliamentary hearings, etc.), as well as through public civil discussions in mass media. It is important that in the course of such joint discussions with the participation of political experts and the public, both the strengths and weaknesses of the proposed decisions are revealed, which can positively influence the position of the authorities regarding the adoption of this or that decision.

The practical implementation of broad public involvement in decision-making in Ukraine is proposed in the Council of Europe Project "Strengthening public participation in the democratic decision-making process" [10], which is implemented by the Office of the Council of Europe in Ukraine. Among the main tasks for 2012–2022, it defines: promoting the effective implementation of the legal framework for mechanisms of public participation in the decision-making process based on EU standards and best global practices; strengthening the capacity of civil servants to involve the public and public organizations at the local, regional, and national levels; promoting dialogue between the authorities and society in the decision-making process, etc.

It should be noted that the problem posed is systemic and multifaceted, it requires further in-depth study and will be investigated in our next works.

**Conclusions.** Based on the comprehensive theoretical analysis, we have established:

– the study of the problem of decision-making (management, political) has a long historical origin, starting from ancient times and until its active study in the Western scientific and political discourse during the 20th-the first two decades of the 21st century, when the main concepts within the theory of decision-making were formed, various approaches were proposed, certain algorithms of the decision-making process were suggested, etc.;

– in modern political science, the process of making political decisions is considered as a systemic multi-level complex activity of political subjects who are authorized by the relevant authorities to perform certain functions, therefore the level of adequacy of political decisions is determined not only by the competence of the subjects of authority, but also by the wide involvement of the expert environment and mass media;

– the institute of political experts, as one of the most active subjects of modern media policy, influences the formation of public civil opinion in the adoption of political decisions,

therefore, the training of experts in the field of decision-making policy acquires significant importance, especially in countries with insufficiently developed democracy, in particular, in Ukraine;

– the experience of training such experts proves that for the democratic development of this process it is important to involve all social partners in it, since the success of the further democratization of the political system in Ukraine depends on this.

### References

1. Абизов В. С., Кремень В. Г. Політичні рішення: механізми прийняття. Київ : Либідь, 1995. 326 с.
2. Арістотель. Нікомахова етика / пер. В. Ставнюка. Київ : Аквілон-Плюс, 2002. 480 с.
3. Бакуменко В. Д. Формування державно-управлінських рішень: Проблеми теорії, методології, практики. Київ : Вид-во УАДУ, 2000. 328 с.
4. Бебик В. М. Політологія для політика і громадянина : монографія. Київ : МАУП, 2003. 424 с.
5. Вебер Макс. Соціологія. Загальноісторичні аналізи. Політика / Пер. з нім. Олександр Погорілий. Київ : Основи, 1998. 534 с.
6. Кушлик-Дивульська О. І., Кушлик Б. Р. Основи теорії прийняття рішень : навч. посіб. Київ, 2014. 94 с.
7. Платон. Держава / пер. з дав.-гр. Д. Коваль. Київ : Основи, 2000. 355 с.
8. Політологія. Кн. перша : Політика і суспільство. Кн. друга : Держава і політика / А. Колодій та ін. 2-е вид., перероб. та доп. Київ : Ельга, Ніка-Центр, 2003. 664 с.
9. Політологія: навчально-методичний посібник (у схемах і таблицях) / за наук. ред. проф. В. С. Бліхара. Львів : ПП «Арал», 2018. 540 с.
10. Проект Ради Європи про «Зміцнення громадської участі у демократичному процесі прийняття рішень в Україні». URL: [https://www.coe.int/uk/web/kyiv/promoting-civil-participation-in-democratic-decision-making-in-ukraine#%247092042%22:\[\]](https://www.coe.int/uk/web/kyiv/promoting-civil-participation-in-democratic-decision-making-in-ukraine#%247092042%22:[])
11. Тертичка В. Рішення політичне // Політична енциклопедія / Редкол.: Ю. Левенець (голова), Ю. Шаповал (заст.голови) та ін. Київ : Парламентське видавництво, 2012. С. 640–641.
12. Філософський енциклопедичний словник / за заг. ред. В. І. Шинкарука. Київ, 2002. 742 с.
13. Філософія політики : Короткий енциклопедичний словник / Авт.-упоряд. : Андрущенко В. П. та ін. Київ : Знання України, 2022. 670 с.
14. Anderson J. Public Policymaking: An Introduction. 2nd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1994. 322 p.
15. Augier M. Models of Herbert A. Simon // Perspectives on Science. Winter 2000. Vol. 8. Issue 4. P. 407–443.
16. Bodnar A. Decyzje polityczne. Elementy teorii. Warszawa, 1995. 51 s.
17. Jenkins W. Policy Analysis: a political and organizational perspective. New York : St. Martin's Press, 1978. 278 p.
18. Hogwood B., Gunn L. Policy Analysis for the Real World. Oxford, New York : Oxford University Press, 1984. 289 p.

## ДОСВІД ПІДГОТОВКИ ЕКСПЕРТІВ У СФЕРІ ПОЛІТИКИ ПРИЙНЯТТЯ РІШЕНЬ В КРАЇНАХ СХІДНОЇ ЄВРОПИ

**Ольга Виговська**

*Київський університет імені Бориса Грінченка,*

*Науково-дослідна лабораторія інтернаціоналізації вищої освіти*

*бул. Бульварно-Кудрявська, 18/2, 04053, м. Київ, Україна*

У статті проаналізовано історико-філософські витоки проблеми прийняття політичних рішень з античних часів й до сьогодення. Визначено, що основні концепції у межах теорії прийняття рішень були розроблені в західному науково-політологічному дискурсі протягом ХХ – початку ХХІ ст.

З'ясовано, що в сучасній політології процес прийняття політичних рішень розглядається як системна багаторівнева комплексна діяльність як політичних суб'єктів, так і громадянського суспільства. Розкрито, що в залежності від умов, в яких перебуває суспільство, політика прийняття тих чи інших рішень має кардинальну різницю. Визначено, що в умовах сталого розвитку суспільства йдеться про рішення щодо здійснення законодавчого процесу в країні, реагування на прояви громадянської ініціативи, функціонування політичних партій тощо. Відповідно в кризових ситуаціях, особливо під час війни та інших соціальних потрясінь, політика прийняття рішень принципово відрізняється. Вона спрямована на подолання критичного кризового стану в суспільстві, збереження безпеки держави, правопорядку, політичної та економічної стабільності, ліквідацію джерел виникнення тих чи інших загроз тощо.

Виявлено, що від успішності розв'язання проблеми прийняття політичних рішень безпосередньо залежать процеси подальшої демократизації політичної системи в Україні, особливо після отримання Україною статус кандидата в члени Європейського Союзу попри розв'язану росією загарбницьку війну проти нашої держави. У зв'язку з цим, актуалізується проблема підготовки експертів у сфері політики прийняття рішень, особливо в країнах Східної Європи, до яких належить і Україна.

Встановлено, що рівень адекватності прийнятих політичних рішень визначається не тільки компетентністю суб'єктів влади, а й широким залученням експертного середовища та ЗМІ. Розкрито роль інституту політичних експертів у формуванні суспільної громадської думки на процеси прийняття рішень. Обґрунтовано, що досвід підготовки експертів у сфері політики прийняття рішень безпосередньо впливає на процеси подальшої демократизації політичної системи в Україні.

*Ключові слова:* політичні рішення, теорія ухвалення рішень, політичні експерти, громадянське суспільство, досвід підготовки експертів.