Burdiak V.
Professor, Ph.D., Chernivtsi
National University after Yuriy Fedkovych

Policy making and implementation process in Ukraine on the way to democracy

The analysis of democratization model, process of policy making and implementation in Ukraine has been carried out. Four stages of the process, namely political agenda building, policy formulation, its implementation and evaluation, which are closely interrelated, have been singled out. It has been proved that the policy making and implementation process is cyclic: the end of one stage is the beginning of another one. In Ukraine the processes of new political system and democratic political institutions formation require adequate approaches towards policy interpretation, elaboration and implementation.

Keywords: *Ukraine, the President, the Executive branch, the government, the development and implementation of policies, the political elite, the opposition, disorganization and disorientation of society.*

Процес вироблення і реалізації політики в Україні при переході до демократії

Здійснено аналіз моделі демократизації, процесу розробки і реалізації політики в Україні. Визначено чотири стадії цього процесу: вироблення політичного порядку денного, формування політики, її реалізація і оцінка, які тісно пов'язані між собою. Доведено, що процес вироблення і реалізації політики є циклічним: кінець однієї фази є початком наступної. В Україні процеси формування нової політичної системи і демократичних політичних інститутів вимагають адекватних підходів до розуміння, вироблення і реалізації політики.

Ключові слова: *Україна, Президент, виконавча влада, уряд, розробка і реалізація політики, політична еліта держави, опозиція, дезорганізація і дезорієнтація суспільства.*

Problem Statement and Relevance of the Study. In the context of transformation of the Ukrainian society, formation of new political system and establishment of democratic models of political institutions take place. The processes require adequate approaches towards policy

interpretation, elaboration and implementation. The character of changes in Ukraine during 1991-2015 can be defined as a social change, which has covered all spheres of social life and caused ruining of a socialist (authoritarian) political system. At the personal level the strategies of political reformation have led to people's disorientation within the system of conventional and new political values. At the level of political institutions activity, the Ukrainian society has faced some disorganization while accomplishing traditional functions, which caused uncertainty within new, democratic as to their functions and functionality, models and patterns of political activity and behavior. It has fully revealed in activity and expressions of a new political elite. The level of disorganization and disorientation of society depends on a number of factors, first of all on homogeneity and the level of public approving attitude towards their political leaders.

Research Methodology. We believe that among methodological approaches towards study of democratization in the current research, it is reasonable to apply the most important modern methods of distant evaluation, motivation theory by D. McClelland[1] and J. Atkinson[2], which is based on the conception of three types of motives for action: power, achievement, affiliation; the latest works by scholars, concerning difficulties in the process of policy formulation and state regulation during the period of democratization, uniqueness of changes in political culture in Ukraine[3] and the research itself[4]. While analyzing the influence of democratization on policy formulation the methods of comparativism, synergetics, conflict techniques and modeling have been applied. This is grounded on the study of policy formulation processes in Ukraine, on the basis of materials of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine and Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine, public speaking carried out by the country leaders, as a certain projection of a personality, which demonstrates peculiarities of his or her convictions. Not words, but images have been used as the units for the analysis. The methodology of qualitative content analysis of a political leader elaborated by D. Winter[5] has been used. The research is based on the materials which belong to the period of the political democratization process in Ukraine since 1991. Spontaneous speeches (interviews, press conferences, prepared speeches have not been included), standardized by the criteria of the document format in the MV program, have been used.

The aim of the paper is to prove that political leaders' behavior and activity are influenced by various types of the existing political culture (it is revealed in the policy making and implementation process in Ukraine in the context of democratization).

---

1. McClelland D.C. Motivational Configurations // In: C.P.Smith (ed.). Motivation and Personality: Handbook of Thematic Content Analysis. – New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992. – Pp. 87-99; McClelland D.C., Koestner R., Weinberger J. How Do Self-Attributed and Implicit Motives Differ? // Psychological Review. – 1989. – № 96. – Pp. 690-702.
2. Atkinson J., Feather N. A Theory of Achievement Motivation. – New York: Wiley and Sons, 1966. – 392 p.
3. Janda K., Berry J.M., Goldman J., Hula K.W. The Challenge of Democracy. – Boston-New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 2004. – 670 p.
4. Burdiak V., Rotar N. Political Culture of European Countries in the Context of Integration Process. – Chernivtsi: Ruta, 2004. – 328 p. (In Ukrainian)
5. Winter D.G. Manual for Scoring Motive Imagery in Running Text. (4th ed.). Unpublished Manuscript, Department of Psychology. – Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1994. – 229 p.

Findings and Discussions. In the Ukrainian society alongside with the communist patterns of political culture, other competitive types of political culture, in particular a western one, have been preserved and reproduced. After 1991 only partial renewal and expansion of the system of political values, which dominates in the West, have occurred, as mastering and perception of authoritarian type of political culture in Ukraine had deep character, that is why it becomes apparent in our current political leaders' behavior and activity.

T. Kuzio says that in Ukraine during L. Kuchma's presidency dominated neo-Soviet political culture that is why features, described by T. Carothers, require specification and addition. To prove this statement, the scholar stated ten factors: holding monopoly control by centrists (ruling parties); SDPU (u) – the analogue for the Communist Party of Ukraine of the Soviet times; attempts to coopt non-governmental institutions to corporate cooperation; non-tolerance towards opposition; disregard of legal rules; negative attitude towards mass media; the Security Service of Ukraine reverted to neo-Soviet methods of fighting opposition; principles of the USSR national policy (domination of the Russian language, celebration of the Soviet holidays) remained in force; anti-Americanism and anti-western rhetoric; appeals to integration into the Euro-Atlantic structures as a veil for flirtation with the West[6]. The researcher states that ruling political elites during L. Kuchma's presidency were separated, and the opposition became rather powerful and this affected establishing of the full-scale authoritarian regime in Ukraine.

In fact, after the euphoria period of 1991-1993 a new credibility gap to politics, new political institutions, certain elite groups and citizens has appeared. Survey data of 1991-1996 show the traumatism of post-communist changes (Sztompka P.[7]). The syndrome of credibility gap towards leaders is fixed in public conscience; passiveness and apathy; orientation on the present time and restriction of future vistas; undefined anxiety and fear, created by political rumors, myths, public emotional discussions, mobilization of civil movements (post-revolutionary conflictogenic events among the highest ruling ranks; Yu. Lutsenko's "Narodna Samooborona" (People's Self-Defense Political Party); President's vote of non-confidence to the government and Verkhovna Rada and declarations as to their dismissing; 2008-2009 gas problem etc.). That is why, as in previous surveys (as reported by the Institute of Politics in 2001 – 51.5% of citizens stated that the process of democratization was carried out in a wrong way; 32,2% emphasized that some aspects of the process did not meet their expectations; and only 6,6% said that the character of changes met their conception concerning such periods), so as in 2008-2013 an incredibly low rating of country leaders among people witnessed that most citizens, evaluating the process of democratization, did not have confidence in their leaders: President V. Yushchenko, Prime-Minister Yu. Tymoshenko, Head of the Verkhovna Rada, leaders of opposition, President V. Yanukovych etc.

---

[6]   Kuzio T. Ukraine after the Elections: Domestic and Foreign Policy Orientations in Kuchma's Second Term // Politics. – 2001. – № 21(3). – Pp. 168-177.

[7]   Sztompka P. Cultural Trauma in Post-Communist Society / P. Sztompka // Sotsis. – 2001. – № 2. – Pp. 3-12; Sztompka P. Social Change as a Trauma / P. Sztompka // Sotsis. – 2001. – № 1. – Pp. 6-16.

Thus, most Ukrainians were convinced of non-functionality of current policy and ruling officials, who formed and implemented it; of the fact that ruling officials' striving for power and realization of own political goals were much more important than implementation of any program, based on certain ideology. Some leaders, not so much politicians as statesmen, were made to declare political goals, without inner convictions in their appropriateness. Their ideological orientations were vague, problems with international community were in the focus, mainly in views, speeches and convictions, and fulfillment of obligations occurred according to the leftover principle. They were able (and it often happened so) to adjust their rhetoric to electorate's expectations, potentially cooperate with the representatives of various political parties aiming at achieving own interests, and this made their future political behavior unpredictable.

Detailed consideration of the model of policy formulation and implementation indicates four stages: political agenda building, policy formulation, its implementation and evaluation[8]. It means that there are four stages of political process development, which are closely interrelated. The process of policy formulation and implementation is cyclic: the end of one stage is the beginning of another one. Political agenda building is a stage of policy planning, at which political issues are determined in essence, i.e. political agenda building is a stage, where political issues are determined themselves. The Ukrainians faced most problems in their everyday life, but the state did not take any effective measures to solve them. Thus, problems of science, education, culture and health care financing during the years of independence have always caused anxiety and complaints in the society. Another instance is the problem of poverty among elderly people, pensioners, which appeared during the early 90s. At that time the loss of savings in the USSR Savings Bank happened, quantity of elderly people with absolutely law profits increased, and all these in conjunction with high inflation, created a political problem. So, when the state considered the possibility to take measures aimed at solving the problem, which had been ignored before, it was usually said that the problem was on the political agenda.

As a rule the process of transition of common social problems into the political category has many reasons. The new approach to the problem can be caused even by several factors. Thus, new events or their flow actualize issues and require their inclusion on the agenda. Very often it happens due to the scholars' and activists' efforts, aimed at attracting society's attention to the issues, undisclosed to people. The need to include certain problem on the agenda is predetermined by mass improvement in ideology and those who control the government. Agenda building can be settled by a new approach to the old issues and people's desire to review them in another perspective[9].

Policy formulation is a stage of policy elaboration and implementation, when official political offers are worked out and accepted (denied) by officials. Common instances of policy formulation are events introduced by the President or laws considered in the parliament. Administrative bodies

---

8   Winter, D. G. Toward a Science of Personality Psychology: David McClelland's Development of Empirically Derived TAT Measures // History of Psychology. – 1998. – №1. – Pp. 130-153.
9   Bosso C.J. The Contextual Bases of Problem Definition // The Politics of Problem Definition / Ed. D.A. Rochefort, R.W.Cobb. – Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1994. – P. 193.

also form their policies by their regulations and rules. Policy is formed by courts, when their decisions give new statutory interpretations.

Policy is not capable of self-realization. Its actualization is a stage, where it is implemented into life. When the parliament or the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine issues instructions, regulations, certain state bodies must implement these political decisions. Let us consider the regulation of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine "Draft Law of Ukraine on the Administrative and Territorial Division of Ukraine" July 15, 1997 as an example. It is known that government's measures aimed at implementation of the regulation have not succeeded. One of the authors R. P. Bezsmertnyi was even received with a scant courtesy by his home people who refused to listen to his explanations. The reason was that administrative bodies on the regional or local levels must have informed people, preparing them to the planned reforms, but the point was that in most regions local bodies themselves opposed that regulation and tried to do their best to slow down its realization on their levels.

In January 2008 the Government Program "Ukrainian Breakthrough: Public Administration Reform" was approved. In the second part of the Program "Modern European Country" the question was about the public administration reform (2.2), where "the main aim of the public administration reform is a step-by-step creation of a new model of public administration, which will ensure formation of Ukraine as a legal European state, with a high level of living conditions, social stability and democracy". In the context of reforms it was planned to reform the state and local bodies of executive power, administrative and territorial system and local government administration. In particular, the government committed itself to implement administrative and territorial reform, which "is based on the principles of decentralization and subsidiary liability and is carried out according to generally accepted European principles, included in the European Charter of Local Self-Government, consent to be bound was given by the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine. The important element of administrative and territorial reform is the strict delimitation of authority between local government administrations of various levels in accordance with the principle of subsidiary liability, not to admit double subordination and doubling of its functions and tasks". But this program was not implemented and it was doomed as the previous administrative and territorial reform. So, it is obvious that one of the most important problems at the stage of policy implementation is coordination of actions. After adoption of laws and new legislations by the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, not capital officials, but representatives of local authority, representatives of regional administrations are appointed to implement policies. Though, at the first sight policy implementation is merely a technical process, but in general it is a political one, which requires achievement of consensus, a large amount of mutual concessions and negotiations among various groups both within the government and beyond it.

Policy evaluation is the analysis of how successfully it functions. It is grounded on the approaches, elaborated by researchers, in particular on the analysis of "value – effectiveness" and

methods of statistical analysis of program implementation results. Evaluation of effectiveness can largely influence the decisions whether it is necessary to carry on, change, reduce or close the programs. The approach to evaluation of political decisions (is more or less cost-based), when various methods of achieving the same goal are directly compared and relative effectiveness of every approach is defined, is the most efficient one. At the same time, evaluation is a part of the policy making and implementation process, as it helps to reveal problems and claims, determined by the current policy.

In other words, policy evaluation ensures feedback with the results. Accentuating the problems which appear, policy evaluation influences political agenda building. That is how the circle is closed. The end of the process – the evaluation of the fact whether policy implementation has resulted in what has been expected at its formation, signifies the beginning of a new cycle of policy formulation and implementation.

The fact that the end of the policy making and implementation processes is at the same time its new beginning can be explained by the fact that the state, for many reasons, can consider the problem from different, sometimes even opposite angles. For a real understanding of this phenomenon the process of fragmentation is applied, i.e. treatment of the problem from various, sometimes alternative positions in the process of policy decision making. In the basis of fragmentation there are peculiarities of the state authority of Ukraine. Separation of powers ensures separation of authority between the branches of governmental power: central, regional and local.

These centres form the main constituent of pluralistic democracy. At the same time in every problematic sphere, there are many interested groups, who wish to influence the process of political decision making. Representatives of various organizations regularly correlate with each other and state officials. Constant interaction causes both conflicts and cooperation.

Policy making is held within different institutions of state administration. The participants of the process, who are the representatives of these institutions, do not patiently wait for their turn, while other institutions are working over political decisions. They try to influence the process of political decision making at any stage (for instance, intensification of the gas conflict with Russia in autumn 2008 and the desire of all concerned parties in Ukraine to solve these problems with the least losses for themselves).

Various individuals and organizations, which act in the certain spheres of politics, form groups with flexible and gentle ties, i.e. those "who are combined by competence in any sphere of political life and those who often interact with each other, form a problematic network"[10]. The boundaries of commission and membership in such a network are difficult/impossible to be clearly defined, but in general these systems include deputies to the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, officials in parliament committees, President's Secretariat, department officers, lawyers, lobbyists, consultants, councilors, scholars and PR specialists.

---

[10] Berry J.M. The Interest Group Society. 3rd ed. – New York: Longman, 1997. – Pp. 186-187.

The same can be observed in most modern countries. So, the amount of participants in problematic networks is rather high. This owes to the fact that in wide spheres of politics there are dozens or hundreds of just interest groups. Not all members of the problematic network are business partners. On the contrary, some of them are in the state of constant antagonism, others maintain good relations. However, the consolidating factor both among friends and among enemies within the problematic network is their competence as to the specific sphere of politics. Analyzing the process of policy making and implementation in the problematic spheres for a long time, we consider modern political communities to be rather open and to be problematic networks with significant internal conflicts.

Problematic networks are flexible communities and new interest groups can easily become their members. At the same time, to enter the community of activists and politicians, who influence the process of policy making and implementation in different spheres, one should overcome a substantial barrier, viz. barrier of mastering certain competence. Competence has always been rather important, but in modern world "now more than ever, the process of policy making and implementation concerning certain problem, is a sphere, a subject just to the experts' strength, who monitor this issue"[11].

Members of the problematic network use "common language" to communicate with each other. They can participate in negotiations and find compromises in the course of policy making and implementation processes, because they offer concrete, elaborated solutions for the urgent problems, appreciating the essence of politics, the way the mechanism works in Kyiv, and each other. One of the reasons, why the members of the problematic networks are so good at conceiving each other's needs and necessities, is that within a political community people often skip from one kind of activity to another. When some politicians resign the office, they nevertheless stay in the capital, and usually search for a job in the same or related sphere of politics. Network members' knowledge and experience are always much in demand, irrespective of the job they are going to perform. In spite of sharp criticism, practice, when a specialist who has worked for several years in the government and gained knowledge in the sphere of politics, consequently becomes a lobbyist, is rather common. A member of the problematic network who clearly understands other members' needs and necessities can easily swap jobs within the frames of a network.

However, the participants are obliged to adhere to ethic norms, established, for instance, by the Law of Ukraine on the Status of the People's Deputy of Ukraine (November 1992) and the Law of Ukraine on State Service (December 1993), with further supplements. Thus, in the last law, it is stated that a state officer is prohibited to participate in actions, which contradict the national interests of Ukraine, complicate the process of state bodies' functioning; carry out actions which may be qualified as taking advantages of official position for their own profit, and

---

[11] Berry J.M. Subgovernments, Issue Networks, and Political Conflict //Remaking American Politics / Ed. R.A. Harris, S.M. Milkis. – Boulder, Colo: Westview Press, 1989. – P. 249.

actions, which, according to the existing laws are qualified as corruptive; manifest jaundice or favor towards any enterprise, institution, body, civil community or an individual, contrary to the interests of the case; show bureaucracy, narrowness and localism[12]. But mass media display provoking examples, when officials do not pay much attention to this requirement, and some of them easily avoid it. Besides, nothing can prevent former officials from coordinating other lobbyists' functioning or using their own knowledge of how the government functions to the benefit of their own companies.

Summary and Conclusions. During many years political analysts have been describing democratization in Ukraine as a system, where various groups of electors actively cooperate with each other to influence the policy directions they are anxious about. The processes of policy making and implementation are considered faster, as in response to these groups than in response to majority's declaration of will. To a great extent this conception of democracy differs from the more traditional approach, according to which political processes represent the will of most people. This is a pluralistic approach, but not one based on the majority principles, to the system of the state authority. Problematic networks establish pluralistic democracy in different ways. These are open systems, which include a large range of interests. Complete control over the process of decision making is not given to a small group of players, but is carried out by all members. However, it does not guarantee that in the process of decision making all significant concerns will be represented, and that those who own the biggest financial resources will suffer losses. As a rule problematic networks provide access to the government of a state for various groups of interests, which are in opposition to each other, and in this way contribute to the achievement of the pluralistic ideal.

Those, who prefer democracy based on the majority principles, consider problematic networks as an obstacle for a normal way of state functioning. It is difficult for the society in general to control the results of political decisions because of complexity of modern problems. Though, problematic networks contribute to pluralism establishment, one should not forget that majority influence on the process of policy making and implementation is still rather significant. Public thought at large can become a prevailing power, when it refers to the actual problems, which are in the focus of attention. Elections reveal problems, which are widely discussed during the election campaigns as well. Problematic networks, however, contribute to establishment of pluralistic policy in those spheres, where influence, based on majority, is rather weak.

---

[12]   Law of Ukraine "On State Service" // The Official Bulletin of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine. – 1993. – № 52. – P. 5.