

## **THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF THE STUDY ON PUBLIC OPINION MANIPULATION TECHNOLOGIES**

### **Abstract**

The author argues that electoral process is particularly indicative of studies on political manipulation, because during this period all manipulative resources are mobilized, which encourages people to actively support certain forces. The mechanisms of political manipulation are constantly working, improving, so that at the right time they can be activated at full capacity helping to achieve the desired outcome. Manipulation is not limited to electoral practices. It can be successful provided it's total or full coverage, continuous and leaves no alternative and there are no large-scale contradictory manipulative actions.

*Keywords: electoral process, electoral practices, manipulation, political manipulation*

## **ТЕОРЕТИКО-МЕТОДОЛОГІЧНІ АСПЕКТИ ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯ ТЕХНОЛОГІЙ МАНІПУЛЮВАННЯ ГРОМАДСЬКОЮ ДУМКОЮ**

### **Анотація**

Виборчий процес особливо показовий для досліджень політичного маніпулювання, адже в цей період мобілізуються всі маніпулятивні ресурси, які спонукають населення до активної підтримки певних сил. Механізми політичного маніпулювання постійно діють, удосконалюються, щоб у потрібний час їх можна було включити на повну силу і досягти бажаного. Маніпулювання не обмежується лише виборчою практикою. Воно успішне за умови тотальності чи загального охоплення, безперервності і безальтернативності, відсутності масштабних та протилежних за напрямками маніпулятивних акцій.

*Ключові слова: електоральний процес, електоральні практики, маніпулювання, політичне маніпулювання*

Scientists believe that the most suitable element for manipulation in the political system is the electoral system. Parliamentary electoral systems and institutions are the governing structure of the modern democratic process. It is important to create an optimal electoral system for democratic

institutions, a balance of justice and efficiency, representation and controllability. Thus, choosing one specific electoral system is quite a responsibility. Authors of the multifactorial model P. Sniderman, J. Glasser and R. Griffith write that perhaps the question of “Who will govern and sit in Parliament?” is less important than the electoral process itself<sup>1</sup>. Therefore, it indicates that even the details of electoral mechanisms can determine whether the elections are fair, whether the democracy will survive at all.

The electoral process is particularly indicative of studies on political manipulation, because during this period all manipulative resources are mobilized, which encourages people to actively support certain forces. The mechanisms of political manipulation are constantly working, improving, so that at the right time they can be activated at full capacity helping to achieve the desired outcome. Manipulation is not limited to electoral practices. It can be successful provided it's total or full coverage, continuous and leaves no alternative and there are no large-scale contradictory manipulative actions.

The concept of “influence”, “manipulation”, “political manipulation”, “social manipulation” – lies in a process achieved by the interaction of two or more disorderly systems, which results in changes in the structure or state of at least one of these systems. “Influence” in political practice is interpreted as a process of asymmetric interaction between political actors and the general public, acting as one of the main components of the relations of power. In political practice, there are rational and irrational methods of influence, which are usually destructive. The purpose of negative information and psychological manipulations – lies in the hidden influence on individual and social actors to act to the detriment of their own interests for the sake of the interests of the individuals, groups and organizations that implement them.

The study of the factors influencing the choice of citizens in the electoral process started in the United States along with the active development of commercial marketing. Political marketing was originally a “subsidiary” direction of its commercial counterpart. It arose during the formation of political communications in the United States in the 20th century as a modern system of election campaign management on the basis of broad media involvement, intensive study and publication of the results of public opinion polls and use of political advertising.

In 1940 political scientist from the USA P. Lazarsfeld carried out one of the first researches of the factors influencing electoral choice of citizens. His attention was focused on the problem of the media influence (radio, television) on electoral behavior of Americans and he detected interesting patterns of public's attitude to the media, discovered the law of selectivity of their perception. The core principle of the law is that an average voters pay attention only to those information materials that correspond to their primary political views; that people – members of one social group, almost always vote identically. P. Lazarsfeld discovered the law of “opinion leaders”. He pointed out that mass voters perceive political information better if it is distributed not just by the media, but also by a popular personality – so called “opinion leader” – attractive repeater of the needed

---

<sup>1</sup> Information and Democratic Process. Chicago : University of Illinois Press, 1990. P. 120.

political propaganda – direct and indirect. Thus a concept of “two-stage communication” has been presented by P. Lazarsfeld and his associates B. Berelson, H. Godet and E. Katz.

In the 1950s marketing theory and practice, in the modern sense, had been quite widely included in American politics. Dwight D. Eisenhower was the first one from the politicians to understand the importance of improving the effectiveness of election campaigns through involving marketing experts who would develop strategy and tactics for the electoral struggle. A commercial marketer Rosser Reeves was a pioneer in this process. He used a regional segmentation of the US electorate and developed an effective communication strategy based on the principle of differentiation for each state; created separate commercials for them, taking into account the characteristics of their political subcultures. For the first time the principle of positioning was used by analogy with the principle of a unique offer in commercial marketing.

In the 1960s another American, Joseph Klapper, described a system of intermediary factors that determine the effect of mass communication: the willingness of the voter to accept the necessary information, its interpersonal dissemination, a person's connection to a social group with its norms, the influence of opinion leaders on the dissemination and evaluation of the information. These factors conclude the full political information assimilation process of a particular individual<sup>2</sup>. Thus, the problem of the factors influencing electoral behavior and choice of citizens has always occupied a prominent place among the problems of political science. Various scientists have offered their explanations, concepts that elaborated upon the choice mechanism of people, referred to the action of natural (controllable) and random (uncontrollable) factors.

At the same time, political scientists at the University of Michigan developed a concept of multi-scale factors – the “funnel of causality” model<sup>3</sup>. In the classical version of the theory, the following factors were emphasized: socio-economic and cultural conditions that cause socio-political conflicts; economic structure, social stratification, historical traditions, etc.; the level of social and group loyalty (class, regional) and value orientations that arise due to socio-economic and cultural divisions; the narrower part of the “funnel” is occupied by the factors that directly affect the voting – guidance on three components of the political process: candidates, political courses and group interests, which are formed through value orientation and group loyalty.

Supporters of the classical version believed that the determining factor of electoral choice for the voter is party identification, which plays a role of a filter for political information about candidates for the elected office, political programs and group interests. Scientists also recognize the action of external factors: actions of the government, opinions of one's friends and environment, media, the election campaign influence, certain political and economic conditions.

Given the time factor, scientists from Michigan described five groups of electoral choice factors<sup>4</sup>: socio-demographic and psychological factors; party identification; the personality of the

<sup>2</sup> Klapper J.T. *The Effects of Mass Communication*. Glencoe (Illinois): The Free Press, 1960. 302 p.

<sup>3</sup> *The American Voter* / C. Angus, Ph.E. Converse, W.E. Miller, D.E. Stokes. N.Y.: John Wiley & Sons, 1960. 576 p.

<sup>4</sup> Сартори Дж. Вертикальная демократия / Дж. Сартори // Полис. 1993. №2. С. 80-89.

candidate; the nature of the election campaign (the quality of political advertising, anti-advertising and “dirty” technologies); articulation of the troubles of the election campaign with friends and environment. Citizens vote rather out of habit, duty, ideological instructions than because of the detailed (economic) comparison and analysis of problem solving.

The political scientist from the US G. Sartori identified two main models: problem voting and party identification model. The first includes: problem advantage – problem perception – voice for the candidate/party standing closer to the problem. Weakly determined, “shaky” electorate with “floating votes” without a clear party preference usually gravitates toward this model. The model of party voting is based on stable ideological and political orientations that motivate citizens. It works in such a sequence: the self-inclusion to the left/right, progressive/conservative spectrum; certain party views; voting for the party with the voters identify themselves with<sup>5</sup>.

Recent studies by political scientists in a number of countries have shown a weakening in voters’ sense of party identification. Thus, in the study “Transformation of American voters” under the editorship of S. Verba, revealed a decrease in such traditional factors of voter behavior, such as status polarization, class consciousness and party inclination, mobilization ability of parties, the growth of party-independent mentality of the voters. For example, during the presidential elections in France in 1995, according to experts, there were fewer ideological and political models of voting and the influence of “Americanized” electoral technologies of TV democracy had increased.

In the 1980s, M. Shanks and V. Miller suggested their version of the factors influencing the electorate: established and acquired personal (demographic) traits (education, occupation, place of residence, communication); ideological advantages; party membership; evaluation of the actions of candidates; sympathy and antipathy to them. Scientists have proved that on these stages an electoral choice of a certain individual is born<sup>6</sup>.

In the multivariate model of P. Sniderman, J. Glasser and R. Griffith these factors are placed differently. The role of party identification is at the beginning of the causal sequence, the image of the candidate – at the end. There is also a new factor – assessment of the actions of the ruling person who was elected<sup>7</sup>. By the logic of influence, the factors of electoral behavior are placed as follows: ideological attitudes, partisanship, evaluation of the party’s actions, personal traits, evaluation of the ruling person, comparative assessment of the ruling person and the candidate, choice (decision during voting).

As a set of methods and systems of actions aimed at achieving a certain political result, using political technologies is a necessity in election campaigns. Quite often this situation is characterized by an aggressive form of influence. Therefore, scientists have long been investigating the role and importance of political technologies, political manipulation and the impact of political advertising.

<sup>5</sup> Sartori G. *The Theory of Democracy. Revisited.* Chatham (NY): Chatham House Publishers, 1987. P. 179.

<sup>6</sup> Shanks J.M. *Policy Direction and Performance Evaluations: Complementary Explanations of the Reagan Elections* / J.M. Shanks, W.E. Miller. *British Journal of Political Science.* 1990. Vol. 20. P. 143-235.

<sup>7</sup> *Information and Democratic Process.* Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1990. P. 121.

Western researchers (E. Sampson, M. Spillman, R. Fisher) point out the methods of building a positive image of the candidate. T. J. Colton developed an interpretative model of electoral culture; emphasized the factors that strongly influence the psychology of voters during voting: social characteristics of the electorate; voters' assessment of the current economic and political situation; party identification; positions on certain issues; retrospective assessment of the activities of the officials; assessment of personal qualities of leaders; prospective expectations of voters from political parties, candidates and the degree of their accordance with the election programs<sup>8</sup>.

Nowadays foreign scientists pay considerable attention to the theoretical and practical aspects of the demythologization of the electoral process, the symbolic nature of the myth, which were previously analyzed by G. Vico, F. Schelling, E. Cassirer, O. Losev. Scientists C. Jung, J. Campbell, C. Levi-Strauss developed a provision on a myth as a part of a collective unconscious. Semiological essence of the specific nature of mythological thought was developed by M. Lotman and B. Uspensky. O. Potebnya and V. Propp approached the myth as a work of art while assessing it. B. Malinowski investigated it as a set of rules and a tool for solving critical issues. Analysis of a political myth, as a popular phenomenon in modern society, was carried out by G. Sorel, T. Mann, R. Niebuhr, R. Bart, M. Eliade.

Instead, scientists of the USSR (V. Zhitenev, I. Mashchenko) investigated the influence of political campaigning and criticized bourgeois information business. Considerable attention is paid to the analysis of theoretical and methodological approaches to the study on technologies of manipulation of citizens' opinions by Ukrainian scientists.

After the emergence and institutionalization of electoral studies in modern political science, paradigms of electoral culture were formed: institutional, transitological and behavioral. In the last paradigm there are three main models of electoral behavior: sociological, socio-psychological and rational-instrumental. Each model has a highlighted key factor of influence on electoral choice: in the sociological model it is the social status of the individual, in socio-psychological – party identification, in rational-instrumental – rational choice of citizens.

The sociological theory of voting connects the choice of a citizen with macro-social variables and not with his individual features. This was justified by the American scientist S. M. Lipset and Norwegian researcher S. Rokkan. According to the authors, the differences between social groups provide a potential basis for political conflicts; create a problematic space of politics and a social base of parties at the same time. They identified several differences of this type (social divisions). The result of national revolutions is religious and separation between center and periphery. Divisions between owners and workers, between the city and the village appeared as a result of industrial revolution<sup>9</sup>. The variables here are the conflicts between different social groups (disputes between owners and employees, the tension between the city and the village, the center

<sup>8</sup> Colton T.J. *Transitional Citizens: Voters and What Influences Them in the New Russia*. Cambridge (Mass): Harvard Univ. Press, 2000. XI. 324 p.

<sup>9</sup> Липсет С., Роккан С. Структуры размежеваний, партийные системы и предпочтения избирателей. Предварительные замечания. *Политическая наука*. 2004. № 4. С. 210.

and the periphery, the state and the Church.) There is a close connection between social status and electoral behaviour, especially participation in elections.

Sociological and socio-psychological models of voting are quite close. They see voting as an act of solidarity with small groups: family, the Church community or with a large group – class, social stratum (lowest social strata, middle class and rich elite). But in any case, the electorate's choice is expressive.

The socio-psychological model has its own logic of reasoning. Under the influence of political socialization (at an early age in the family, at school, later in the armed forces, university), individuals have certain preferences in relation to certain political parties. This identification is often passed down from generation to generation. In the US, it is a quite common model when a father, son, grandson vote for the Republicans/Democrats. Of course, sometimes there are generational changes in values and the picture is broken. Thus, in the 1970s-1980s in Western Europe there was recorded a change of mood of voters towards new parties (environmental). At that time the phenomenon of political parties of “movemental type” had emerged, which borrowed the principles of organization and action from social movements as an effective form of activity and political participation. The “green” party of Germany was formed in the environmental movement of the country and has specific features that bring it closer to public associations: full openness and transparency of its internal life, the minimum apparatus of the party bureaucracy, the lack of centralization, permanent leader and fixed membership. The innovative structure provided the party with a positive result in electoral campaigns<sup>10</sup>.

In general, the shift in the mass consciousness in the direction of the party ecologists was associated with the so called post-materialistic social turn. But the socio-psychological model is based on the idea that the voters defines their preferences based on the solidarity with certain communities they relate to (family, Church, social group). It is worth considering that the socio-psychological model describes the practice of Western democracies. But this model is not quite adequate to the realities of the electoral process in post-Soviet democracies. After all, the primary party identification of voters in the post-Soviet space is still being formed. Parties in Ukraine, as equal participants in the election campaigns, have been operating since the end of the 20th century, but those are non-permanent entities, and people cannot clearly indicate their preferences.

In 2014, 38 political parties were registered in Ukraine; in 2015, the number of parties had increased to a record 79. In general, more parties have been registered in the last two years than in the previous ten. This was reported by the Director of Committee of voters of Ukraine O. Koshel. Before that, the biggest number of political parties created (24) was in 2005. In total, 316 political parties were registered in Ukraine in 2016<sup>11</sup>. In 2017, Ukraine remained one of the lead-

<sup>10</sup> Чорногор Я.О. Утворення партії Зелених та її роль у суспільно-політичному житті ФРН (1966-1993 рр.): автореф. дис....канд. іст. наук: 07.00.02. К.: НАН України. Ін-т укр. археографії та джерелознавства ім. М.С. Грушевського, 2005. 18 с.

<sup>11</sup> У 2015 році в країні з'явилися 79 нових політичних організацій. URL: <http://ua.korrespondent.net/ukraine/3619897-v-ukraini-zareiestruvaly-rekordnu-kilkist-partii>

ers in Eastern Europe in the number of officially registered political parties. O. Koshel noted that today “344 political parties are registered”<sup>12</sup>.

Only eight of all the political parties of Ukraine got into the Parliament, including those which are a part of the blocks<sup>13</sup>. Therefore, the real party system, which is known and voted for by the electorate, does not include more than 300 parties “on paper”, but about ten real parties, which is almost 30 times less than the nominal number. All the other parties – is an unnecessary ballast that misleads the voters<sup>14</sup>.

We can assume that the identification of voters in the new democracies is based on certain ideological prerequisites, on how individuals see the world around them. The relationship between the worldview attitudes and political actions – voting in the elections – is provided by political ideology. Moreover, ideology may not necessarily be formalized in the name of the party. It is enough for the leader of a political force to use certain ideologically colored rhetoric when addressing the voters, sending necessary messages expected by this category of electorate. Those voters who make up the electoral core of the subject of the election campaign are guided by this message. Thus, within the framework of the use of socio-psychological approach in Ukraine, we can say that political identification is not characterized by the party, but by ideology.

At the end of the 20th century, substantial changes occurred in the political sphere of the Western societies. Political parties started to get rid of the traditional class orientation and began appealing to all groups of the population. Political scientist from the US J. Lapalombara called this type of political parties a “catch all party” and then – “voters’ party”. Later, they were called the “universal party”. They have a pragmatic approach to ideology, expanding it to the nationwide level, looking for a common language with many, sometimes opposing social groups to attract more votes<sup>15</sup>. Therefore, this is the rate of “monster parties” to expand the electoral field through the party identification of voters.

Rational choice theory, in contrast, assumes that a voter is selfish, has rational, conscious approach to politics, so that the voting is purely instrumental in nature. Voters in this model, which is also called egocentric or economic, always associate voting with assessments of their financial status and prospects of its change depending on the possible results of the election campaign. This position of the voter is called “Aesop model”. The simplest variant can be described by the so called retrospective voting – when a voter encourages or punishes a party/candidate who is in power with his or her vote, depending on how their rule affects his or her well-being. The logic of building this model comes from the fact that the voters do not have enough knowledge about party platforms and prospects of benefits from a certain political force for themselves or for the country’s economic course, but at the same time voters clearly feel how he lived under the current

<sup>12</sup> КВУ нарахувавв Україні 344 політичних партії / URL: <https://www.ukrinform.ua/rubric-politics/2092432-kvu-narahunav-v-ukraini-344-politichnih-partii.html>

<sup>13</sup> Депутатські фракції і групи VIII скликання. URL: [http://w1.c1.rada.gov.ua/pls/site2/p\\_fractions](http://w1.c1.rada.gov.ua/pls/site2/p_fractions)

<sup>14</sup> Подішук І. О. Політичні партії як суб’єкти виборчого процесу. *Політичний менеджмент*. 2005. № 6. С. 48.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid.

government and vote “with their own wallet.” It is believed that the voter can assess not only their own economic condition, but also the welfare of the society as a whole. This is a “sociotropic” model. A perspective voting is also possible when the voter has an opportunity to estimate how his economic condition will be influenced by the success of this or that party or candidate on the elections.

The theory of “retrospective voting” contributed to the development of the concept of “economic voting”. Its authors found the dependence of electoral choice on the state of the economy. Proponents of this theory concluded that: 1) economic shifts explain about a third of changes in electoral behavior; 2) the voter reacts to a small number of macroeconomic indicators (unemployment level and inflation); 3) voters are “short-sighted”, which means their horizons are not wide, in terms of time measurement; 4) the voter reacts more to the past (retrospective voting) rather than expecting certain events in the future; 5) the sociotropy of voting is stronger than the egocentric one, although there are some national exceptions; 6) voters react more to the negative changes than to the positive ones<sup>16</sup>.

In a transitional society with an unsettled economy, the sociotropic model and the idea of prospective voting are not realistic, because they require too much effort from an average voter to collect and analytically process the necessary information about political forces and their representatives. Hardly a rational individual, who mainly thinks about surviving, will make an effort and spend time on political and economic analysis of election programs, history of political forces, biographies of their leaders and the effectiveness of their management. But the information about the state of one’s own wallet and the welfare of one’s family is known to every person. These theories have certain shortcomings, but in a complex they can explain features of technologies of psychological manipulation of consciousness of citizens in electoral process.

Since the mid-1980s political science has been leaning towards multi-paradigm approaches in explaining the political process. Scientists have been studying the electoral process as a multifactor phenomenon. P. Dunleavy developed a model of dominant ideology or radical model, which became an important contribution to the development of the theory of electoral culture<sup>17</sup>. The radicalism of this concept lies in its opposition to the model of party identification and in the assumption that, in fact, a citizen has no free choice in a secret ballot. Voting in elections reflects the position of the individual in the social hierarchy. But P. Dunleavy comes to the conclusion that the objective indicators of social position are of secondary importance, and subjective factors are more important. The social group subjectively assesses its position in the social hierarchy, being under a significant influence of mass media and pre-election party competition. Thus, representatives of the class of rich workers in England, the owners of their homes, can vote for both left and right. The media, which interpret their social interests in a particular situation, and political

<sup>16</sup> Мелешкина Е. Ю. Исследование электорального поведения: теоретические модели и проблемы их применения. *Политическая наука*. 2001. № 2. С. 207.

<sup>17</sup> Dunleavy P. *British Democracy at the Crossroads: Voting and Party Competition in the 1980-s*. London: Allen and Unwin, 1985. 252 p.



parties, which are desperately fighting for the right to defend and represent a group's social interests, have a certain influence on the choice.

The interpretation of group interests through the media forms a dominant ideology that may deviate from left-wing party orientation. Therefore, voters act instrumentally in defending group interests that seem real to them, although they have already been identified by the media parties. Such fine manipulative work leads to the fact that voters are certain that their position is not imposed, but arose from their own motivation. According to this model, electoral behavior and voting appear as an individual's reaction to the dominant ideological interpretation of the social division, which is the result of the individual's desire for self-realization, social control of power and social environment, ideological manipulation of the media, the situation of party competition.

The realities of the electoral process in post-communist societies are described by the modernized model of "social splits", which was developed by H. Kitschelt when analyzing the political systems of CEE democracies. He classified the splits in the space of these countries, which are crucial for their electoral process. Among the political splits, he identified the following: the conflict of redistribution as a manifestation of the classical economic split, which occurs in a form of the political division into left and right; the conflict of political principles as contraposition of instructions on the nature and control of public administration: the principles of collectivity and authoritarianism, individualism and liberalism; the conflict of the public, associated with the opposition of a universal understanding of citizenship based on ethnic, religious, linguistic and other factors<sup>18</sup>.

The model is quite important and allows us to trace the main lines of the splits in transforming societies, although it does not fully reveal the effect of subjective, irrational factors of behavior in new democracies.

Among the relatively new theoretical models, regulation of electoral choice should be mentioned. It is based on the idea of creating an equilibrium of electoral action. The latter postulates the state of balance between two factors that affect the electoral orientation: 1) the desire for material well-being, economic evaluation; 2) ideological identification as the basis of the party's image.

The determination of the first factor is carried out due to the special crisis state of modern Ukrainian society and generally reflects the interest of the vast majority of the world's population in improving their own well-being. Ideological identification takes place through communication channels. This is a real counterweight to the artificial formation of political activity, which is realized through the party's ability to implement economic policy and the ability to represent the ideology of society. As a means of their own actions political forces choose that resource which works in the specific conditions of choice. The richer the political subject, the more he or she focuses on the technologies of image creation. Ideally, it is advisable to combine both factors and thoroughly develop a targeted impact on different groups of voters. As the Nobel Prize laureates

<sup>18</sup> Kitschelt H. *European Party Systems: Continuity and Change*// *Developments in West European Politics*. London, 1997. P. 147.

F. Chris and J. Mono believe, 10% of the electorate is under purposeful influence from the outside, which should develop and direct 90% of the internal content.

In the late twentieth century a manipulative conception of political influence by V. Ricker became fairly widespread. The latest information technology offered to the actors of the political game to resort to attracting the votes in their favor, given that externally-oriented individuals in a mass society do not delve into the depths of their own soul, they enjoy things that surround them: cars, jewelry, clothing etc. And in politics: you should wrap the goods in a bright wrapper and profitably sell it to the consumer. The human psyche and consciousness act as a container in which you can put any content. The market determines the value of goods and the share of each in the social product. A political party is a product that should be turned into capital and placed profitably. The value of political actors is determined by demand and fashion design<sup>19</sup>. However, there are some difficulties.

First, there is an unstable share of the electorate among the active viewers of political programs on TV and the readership. Therefore, any recent model of influence can neutralize the effects of the previous one. Secondly, there is the effect of a “militant distancing” from the rich manipulative information. Psychologist O. Pavlov proves the opposite result of excessive repetition. But yet there is a possibility of improving the technology and getting a certain effect, as evidenced by the popularity and weight of the works on the topic, in particular W. Riker and his “Art of political manipulation”.

The “consumer model” of electoral behavior proposed by researcher H. Himmelweit is quite popular in the West. The main idea of her concept is that a citizen makes his or her political choice in almost the same way as he or she solves the problem of purchasing a particular product. Citizens who give their vote are looking for maximum compliance or minimum discrepancy between a number of their installations and party programs. “The habit of voting for a particular party is similar to a commitment to a particular store or firm, and the influence of reference groups is reminiscent of how the lifestyle of our friends and colleagues guides our preferences”<sup>20</sup>.

Western political scientists in many studies have found that in countries with a stable political system, in which voters really have a habit of voting for a certain party, the political consciousness of citizens is filled with certain “packages of ideas”. Thus, British attitudes on nuclear weapons correlated with their attitude to the nationalization of public transport and the health system, immigration and the death penalty.

Therefore, the nature of voting depends on a number of macro - and micro-issues. These include: the type of political regime and the political system of society, the degree of the electoral law and the electoral system development, the level of socio-economic development, the degree of stability of the social structure, the presence of a large middle class. In addition, socio-demographic parameters, such as age and gender, are very important. The social and professional affiliation of

---

<sup>19</sup> Старовойтенко Р. Імідж політичної партії як чинник секторального вибору: дис. ... канд. політ. наук : 23.00.02. К., 2003. С. 58.

<sup>20</sup> Himmelweit H. *How Votes Decide?* L.: Academic Press, 1981. P. 131.

the electorate, the level of its education and political culture determine the nature of the political participation of the population and its political orientations.

Thus, the examined directions of technologies of the phenomenon of manipulation and political manipulation helped to find out and argue that manipulation is a complex and versatile phenomenon that requires detailed scientific research. There are different approaches to the explanation of this phenomenon with an emphasis on the purpose of the manipulative actions, the means used in them, the relationship between the manipulator and the one who is being manipulated. The understanding of manipulation basically boils down to a hidden influence that should not be seen by the object of manipulation. The essence of political manipulation is clarified, which refers to the process of psychological influence on the performance of political choice. This process is of a hidden nature and forms the “illusion of choice” for the citizens, when the object of influence is convinced of their own conscious management of their thoughts, behavior, and choice. Political manipulation creates the appearance of democracy, when people, who have a natural right to make decisions, is not only being deceived or directly forced to certain actions, but certain actions of hidden control are carried out which turns citizens from a subject into an object of politics.

Several basic hypotheses explain the motives of the electorate voting in the elections: “sociological”, when voters show solidarity with their social group (class, ethnic, religious, neighbour, etc.); “socio-psychological”, when voters are guided by the usual political sympathies that run in the family, psychological attraction to a certain party, leader; “political-communicative”, in which voting is influenced by the election campaign, the media image of the politician and the party; “rational choice”, in which people vote/do not vote not as members of the group, but as individuals, guided by their own interest, calculation, benefit<sup>21</sup>.

The use of models depends on the type of electoral system. We believe that a significant factor in this process is the type of political culture.

### Список джерел

1. Депутатські фракції і групи VIII скликання. URL: [http://w1.c1.rada.gov.ua/pls/site2/p\\_fractions](http://w1.c1.rada.gov.ua/pls/site2/p_fractions)
2. КВУ нарахувавв Україні 344 політичних партії/ URL: <https://www.ukrinform.ua/rubric-politics/2092432-kvu-narahuvav-v-ukraini-344-politichnih-partii.html>
3. Липсет С., Роккан С. Структуры размежеваний, партийные системы и предпочтения избирателей. Предварительные замечания. *Политическая наука*. 2004. № 4. С. 204-234.
4. Мелешкина Е. Ю. Исследование электорального поведения: теоретические модели и проблемы их применения. *Политическая наука*. 2001. № 2. С. 190-211.
5. Морозова Е. Г. Политический рынок и политический маркетинг: концепции, модели, технологии. М.: Прогресс, 1999. 247 с.

<sup>21</sup> Морозова Е. Г. Политический рынок и политический маркетинг: концепции, модели, технологии. М.: Прогресс, 1999. С. 124.

6. Поліщук І. О. Політичні партії як суб'єкти виборчого процесу. *Політичний менеджмент*. 2005. № 6. С. 42-48.
7. Сартори Дж. Вертикальная демократия / Дж. Сартори // *Полис*.1993.№2. С. 80-89.
8. Старовойтенко Р. В. Імідж політичної партії як чинник секторального вибору : дис. ... канд. політ. наук : 23.00.02. К., 2003. 181 с.
9. У 2015 році в країні з'явилися 79 нових політичних організацій. URL:<http://ua.korrespondent.net/ukraine/3619897-v-ukraini-zareiestruvaly-rekordnu-killist-partii>
10. Чорногор Я.О. Утворення партії Зелених та її роль у суспільно-політичному житті ФРН (1966-1993 рр.): автореф. дис....канд. іст. наук: 07.00.02. К.: НАН України. Ін-т укр. археографії та джерелознавства ім. М.С. Грушевського, 2005. 18 с.
11. Colton T.J. *Transitional Citizens: Voters and What Influences Them in the New Russia*. Cambridge (Mass): Harvard Univ. Press, 2000. XI. 324 p.
12. Dunleavy P. *British Democracy at the Crossroads: Voting and Party Competition in the 1980-s*. London: Allen and Unwin, 1985. 252 p.
13. Himmelweit H., Fioramonti L. *How Votes Decide? L.* : Academic Press, 1981. 318 p.
14. *Information and Democratic Process*. Chicago : University of Illinois Press, 1990. 276 p.
15. Kitchelt H. *European Party Systems: Continuity and Change. Developments in West European Politics*. London, 1997. P. 143-160.
16. Klapper J.T. *The Effects of Mass Communication*. Glencoe (Illinois): The Free Press, 1960. 302 p.
17. Sartori G. *The Theory of Democracy. Revisited*. Chatham (N.Y.): Chatham House Publishers, 1987. P. 173-197.
18. Shanks J.M. *Policy Direction and Performance Evaluations: Complementary Explanations of the Reagan Elections* / J.M. Shanks, W. E. Miller. *British Journal of Political Science*. 1990. Vol. 20. P. 143-235.
19. *The American Voter* / C. Angus, Ph.E. Converse, W.E. Miller, D.E. Stokes. N.Y.: John Wiley & Sons, 1960. 576 p.

## References

1. Deputatski fraktsii i hrupy VIII sklykannia. URL:[http://w1.c1.rada.gov.ua/pls/site2/p\\_fractions](http://w1.c1.rada.gov.ua/pls/site2/p_fractions)
2. KVVU narakhuvav v Ukraini 344 politychnykh partii. URL: <https://www.ukrinform.ua/rubric-politics/2092432-kvu-narahuvav-v-ukraini-344-politichnih-partii.html>
3. Lypset S., Rokkan S. Struktury razmezhevanyi, partyinye systemyi predpochteniya izbyratelei. Predvartelnye zamechaniya. *Polytycheskaia nauka*. 2004. № 4. S. 204-234.
4. Meleshkyna E. Yu. Issledovaniye elektoralnohopovedeniya: teoreticheskiye modeli i problemy ikh pryumeneniya. *Polytycheskaia nauka*. 2001. № 2. S. 190-211.
5. Morozova E. G. *Politicheskiy rynek i politicheskiy marketing: kontseptsii, modeli, tehnologii*. M.: Progress, 1999. 247 s.

6. Polishchuk I. O. Politychni partii yak subiekty vyborchoho protsesu. *Politychnyi menedzhment*. 2005. № 6. S. 42-48.
7. Sartory Dzh. Vertykalnaia demokratsiia . *Pobys*.1993.№2. C. 80-89.
8. Starovoitenko R. Imidzh politychnoi partii yak chynnyk elektoralnoho vyboru:dys....kand. polit. nauk: 23.00.02. K., 2003. 181 s.
9. U 2015 rotsi v kraini zivylisia 79 novykh politychnykh orhanizatsii.URL:<http://ua.korrespondent.net/ukraine/3619897-v-ukraini-zareiestruvaly-rekordnu-killist-partii>
10. Chornohor Ya.O. Utvorennia partii Zelenykh ta ii rol u suspilno-politychnomu zhytti FRN (1966-1993 rr.): avtoref. dys....kand. ist. nauk: 07.00.02. K.: NAN Ukrainy. In-t ukr. arkhieohrafii ta dzhereloznavstva im. M.S. Hrushevskoho, 2005. 18 c.
11. Colton T.J. Transitional Citizens: Voters and What Influences Them in the New Russia. Cambridge (Mass): Harvard Univ. Press, 2000. XI. 324 p.
12. Dunleavy P. British Democracy at the Crossroads: Voting and Party Competition in the 1980-s. London: Allen and Unwin, 1985. 252 p.
13. Himmelweit H., Fioramonti L. How Votes Decide? L. : Academic Press, 1981. 318 p.
14. Information and Democratic Process. Chicago : University of Illinois Press, 1990. 276 p.
15. Kitchelt H. European Party Systems: Continuity and Change. *Developments in West European Politics*. London, 1997. P. 143-160.
16. Klapper J.T. The Effects of Mass Communication. Glencoe (Illinois): The Free Press, 1960. 302 p.
17. Sartori G. The Theory of Democracy. Revisited. Chatham (NY.): Chatham House Publishers, 1987. P. 173-197.
18. Shanks J.M. Policy Direction and Performance Evaluations: Complementary Explanations of the Reagan Elections / J.M. Shanks, W. E. Miller. *British Journal of Political Science*. 1990. Vol. 20. P. 143-235.
19. The American Voter / C. Angus, Ph.E. Converse, W.E. Miller, D.E. Stokes. N.Y.: John Wiley & Sons, 1960. 576p.