

## **Transformation of subjects of public communication in innovative information space of modern Ukraine**

---

Valerii M. Dreshpak

Department of Public and Customs Administration,  
Faculty of Management,  
University of Customs and Finance,  
2/4 V. Vernadsky Str., Dnipro, 49000, Ukraine  
Email: prof11@ua.fm

**Abstract:** The article demonstrates the conditions and trends of the transformation of subjects of public communication in the Ukrainian information space. The main objective of the research is to find out the latest trends of the subject transformation of public communication in the information space of modern Ukraine under the influence of social, political and economic factors, which predetermine innovations of different nature. The object of research is the subjects of public communication (providers, operators and innovation objects). The study covers the period from 2000 to 2020. It theoretically demonstrates that innovations in the information space are factors of subject's transformation. At the same time, it lays the theoretical foundation for further empirical research of transformation trends of public communication subjects. The results of the study may be useful in developing a communicative policy of various organisations running in Ukraine.

**Keywords:** information space; public communication; subjects of communication; innovation; transformational processes; Ukraine.

**Reference** to this paper should be made as follows: Dreshpak, V.M. (2019) 'Transformation of subjects of public communication in innovative information space of modern Ukraine', *Int. J. Information Systems and Change Management*, Vol. 11, Nos. 3/4, pp.292–309.

**Biographical notes:** Valerii M. Dreshpak graduated from the Faculty of Philology of Dnipropetrovsk State University in 1992. He completed the Candidate Theses in public administration in 2005 at the Dnipropetrovsk Regional Institute of Public Administration of the National Academy of Public Administration under the President of Ukraine. He completed his theses for Doctor of Science in Public Administration in 2011 at Kharkov Regional Institute of Public Administration of the National Academy of Public Administration under the President of Ukraine. He is a Professor at the University of Customs and Finance (Dnipro, Ukraine). His research interests are public communications and state information policy.

---

### **1 Introduction**

One of the factors that determines the nature and methods of inter-subjective interaction in spaces (the sets of concepts, and relations among them, held by an information system) of different types is the degree of innovation of this space. Modern information space

appears to be the most expressive illustration of the impact of innovation on the common functioning of its subjects. In such innovation space subjects must change their functions and, accordingly, the structure. That is the framework that their subjectivity can be preserved. At the same time, not only the role of these subjects as ones of communication but also as subjects of innovative development should be transformed within the information space under the specified conditions. That is, subjects must not only properly 'embed' in a certain information space but also effectively manage changes in their internal and external environments, not only to adapt to innovations but also to generate and promote them. There is no simple universal formula for successful innovation because it is too complex to be pinned down in that way. Also, innovations are not random: they occur in relation to the past, present, and future conditions of subjects (Serrat, 2017).

The modern human is integrated into a communicative (or informational) culture of a new type, which is a networked structure, virtual in form and open by type. It is caused by new types and forms of social communication, which have developed as a result of intensive dynamics and the global scale of the development of information and communication technologies (ICT). These technical and technological innovations not only change related to the functioning of the subjects of a certain information space of organisational, managerial, economic but also social-cultural conditions.

Therefore, the subjects of communication in modern information space acquire the subjectivity of a new network, virtual and open type where innovation is basically its key feature. Taking this into account, technical, technological, political, legal, organisational and managerial, social-cultural innovations in the information space of modern Ukraine are unconditional and tangible factors of transformation in the area of public communications as one of the components of this space.

## **2 Literature review**

Despite the fact that the overall trends and individual factors of changes in the modern information space and its inherent system of public communication have already been considered by a number of researchers, in our opinion, the functioning of the subjects of this communication should be the subject of a separate study considering their role in innovation processes. Moreover, the public communication sphere in this context needs to be considered precisely because it now becomes a place for the formulation and solution of political, economic, social and administrative issues by interaction of different types, as well as performance (mastering) and broadcasting (rebroadcasting) of innovations of a different nature.

Previous studies concerned mostly the individual factors of such innovations. Thus, scientists are currently studying various aspects of the introduction of new ICT in the field of public communications, namely, common platforms for managing public affairs, the use of various inadequate platforms by consumers of the mass media, digital media as a means of public communication, innovative communication platforms as an 'interactive city' etc. (Ansel and Gash, 2018; Bimber, 2017; Diehl et al., 2019; Klinger et al., 2016). The elements of modernisation of the actual technologies of informational and communicative activities in the public sector, including the use of the mass media and the interaction of the subjects of public communication with the new media, the use of social

media in political communication campaigns, the introduction of network forms of communication as a sphere of public administration and to the field of power and public communications, the introduction of technologies crowdsourcing and others are also studied (Dimitrova and Matthes, 2018; Eshbaugh-Soha, 2016; Jensen, 2017; Lilleker and Koc-Michalska, 2017; Liu, 2016; Vysotska, 2016; Zhu, 2017).

The space for innovations in case of new forms and methods of implementation of civic engagement and participation of citizens in solving socially important problems is wide enough, which is revealed in the studies carried out on the example of different social environments, countries, and cultures (Ackland and Halpin, 2019; Khodus, 2014; Men and Muralidharan, 2016). That is, it is our understanding of the transboundary and intercultural impacts of social innovation in the modern world. Equally significant are legal, economic and social-cultural changes of the national Ukrainian system of mass communication and, in particular, public communication on certain aspects described by Bukhtatyy (2018) and Shevchenko (2016). Our research is based on the conclusions presented in the works of the mentioned authors, the laws of Ukraine, analytical materials of research organisations and materials of the United Nations. Also, this article proceeds with the results of previous scientific research of the author (Dreshpak, 2012), where information space is studied in comparison with other spaces of communicative activity.

At the same time, we are not aware of separate studies substantiating the theoretical and methodological foundations of the current study of innovative processes in the information space of Ukraine.

This space is developing dynamically, undergoing from the simultaneous influence of powerful both constructive and destructive factors, and as a whole can be considered as a model for democratic transit societies.

### **3 Methodology and research methods**

The research is based on the systematic approach, which allows us to consider the information space as a systemic phenomenon, and public communication as a system with its inherent structure and functions. We identify the notions of the information space concepts and public communication using the methods of theoretical and semantic analysis; structural and functional analysis and observation describe the structure and functions, distinguish the subjects of the system of public communication, and outline the positions of these subjects in the system of public communication and their role changes under the influence of innovations. The key results of the research are presented as a hypothesis of the author regarding the main trends of the transformation of the subjects of public communication in the information space of modern Ukraine and subject to further empirical testing.

The objective of the research is to find out the latest trends of the transformation of the subjects of public communication in the information space of modern Ukraine under the influence of a number of social-political and social-economic factors that lead to innovations of a different nature, namely: the introduction of new ICT that increase the degree of transparency and openness of the public authorities of Ukraine; modernisation of technologies of informational and communicative activity as a sphere of social, political, business activity; introduction of new forms and methods of implementation of civic engagement and participation of citizens in the independent decision of socially

significant issues; legal, economic and social-cultural changes of the national system of mass communication (in particular, the reform of state and municipal mass media).

## **4 Results**

### *4.1 Concept and characteristics of information space*

Communicative activity of any nature is implemented within the limits of a certain information space. Since this concept has different interpretations, we note that we generally understand the information space as a social environment in which processes and relationships are associated with the creation, dissemination, and use of information involving certain subjects, information infrastructure, and information resources. The researchers identify three scenarios of the information space construction: an individual and collaborative creation of the information space, as well as creation of the new information space on the basis of the existing spaces (Anikin et al., 2016).

The information space should be characterised not only by a certain structure but also by its length, therefore, such characteristics as the widespread distribution (for the global information space), or being under the jurisdiction of a particular state (for the national information space) or the limited area of a particular region (for the regional information space), etc.; may also be added depending on the scale of its description. At the same time, the key characteristic of the information space is that it has a social nature, and appropriate infrastructure and resources are created and formed primarily to provide communication as the basis of any social phenomenon. Thus, the basic system of relations in the information space is: 'subject – infrastructure – information'.

### *4.2 Structure of information space*

In our opinion, the 'subjects' of information space should include:

- public authorities
- business
- citizen groups (non-political: public, professional, creative organisations, religious organisations, etc., as well as political parties)
- individuals who create, disseminate and use the information on a professional or amateur basis: journalists
- employees of public authorities
- state and communal institutions (archives, libraries, etc.)
- business structures (media, IT, communications, publishing, broadcasting, etc.)
- citizens' associations, bloggers, ordinary citizens as participants in communication.

We consider the 'infrastructure' of the information space as a set of: organisations providing the creation, dissemination, use of information; information and telecommunications infrastructure; appropriately used ICT. The information (information resources) should include the following: individual documents and arrays of documents; databases and databanks; results of intellectual, creative activity (works).

### 4.3 *Innovations in the information space*

Innovations in the information space will be understood as changes based on the implementation of innovations of technical, technological, political-legal, organisational-managerial, social-cultural nature, and cause further transformations of the components of this space. Although all innovation involves change, not all change is innovative. Innovation entails the testing and translation of ideas into value-generating solutions, be they new products, services, or systems (Rubin and Abramson, 2018). Considering the structure of the information space described above, such innovations can be divided into the following ‘groups’:

- subjective (changes of the subjects of this space)
- infrastructural (changes related to technical means and technologies, as well as ways of organising and managing this space)
- resource (changes in the level of content, nature, and design of information circulating in this space).

Thus, an ‘innovative information space’ is the one in which its basic components, in particular, subjects, infrastructure, and information, have undergone changes over the current period as a result of innovations, which have significantly affected their characteristics and functioning.

### 4.4 *Concept of public communication*

In light of our research, we need to clarify the concept of ‘public communication’, in particular, given that there are different approaches to the nature of the public as a phenomenon. In particular, Solovyov defines this concept as “the exchange of opinions, the transmission of socially important information in the process of public communication of a person with a public status (officially approved or recognised by society) with an audience interested in such communication. Information transmitted during public communications acquires the public status and can be disseminated in the society with reference to the person who transmitted it, the circumstances, place and time of such communication” (Solovyov et al., 2018).

Bukhtaty, the author of thorough scientific research on this matter, noting that Ukrainian legislation still does not define the concept of ‘public communication’, in general, considered public communications as a special system of interaction between a democratic state, society and a citizen, with the aim to ensure that every citizen has an opportunity to manage public affairs. Considering the subject of his research, the author has defined the notion ‘function of public communications of the country’ as the process of mutual exchange of public information between subjects of power (state), citizens and civil society institutions, whose main purpose is to ensure the constitutional right of everyone to participate in the processes of formation and implementation of state policy in all spheres of public life (Bukhtatiy, 2018).

However, in our opinion, the concept of ‘public communication’ needs some substantive clarifications that would allow us to come up with a more comprehensive, unlike the above mentioned, the vision of this phenomenon. Thus, it is possible to exchange not only public information in the process of public communications, which according to the Law of Ukraine ‘On Access to Public Information’ is understood as

‘reflected and documented by any means and on any media, information received or created in the process of fulfilment of duties by power entities by the current legislation, or which is possessed by power entities, other administrators of public information specified by this Law’ (On access to public information of Ukraine: Law of Ukraine, 2013). Indeed, if you interpret it literally, a certain message addressed to the subject of authority only acquires the status of public information when it becomes a document. In the process of public communication subjects not only exchange documents that may, in particular, have access restrictions but also messages in other forms.

Beyond the definitions of public communication, there are other entities as well: administrators of public information. We need to clearly emphasise the need to cover the segment of direct communication between civil society subjects and other subjects in the formulation and implementation of public policy. In general, the mentioned approaches to some extent limit the scope of the relationship that may relate to public communication.

While interpreting this term we tend to understand it in terms of the positioning of public communications in the social communications system and their functional orientation. Unlike intersubjective communication, this type of communication should be targeted to a sufficiently wide heterogeneous audience, and its functional orientation is to ‘transmit information that affects the public interest, while assigning it public status’ (Shishkina, 1999). Such public status is associated not only with the openness of the broadcasting information, as it may relate to different social groups but also with the orientation of such communications to certain socially (public) interests. That is, in this case, we attach to the above vision of Solovyov as long as the subjectivity of public communications is broadened.

We suggest considering this concept in light of the public sphere of such communications, where the subjects are not only individuals with public status or public authorities but also their society, i.e. the public, which often remains only a passive participant in such communications, and the subject of these communicative exchanges are public (socially significant, non-private) issues.

Therefore, from our point of view, public communication as a whole is a process of social interaction by means of messaging on socially significant (public) phenomena, processes and relationships that belong to or may belong to the sphere of activity of public authorities and constitute or may be interesting to civil society. That is, public communication is not related to the private sphere except where private processes and relationships raise issues of public concern. This means that the scope of this communication applies not only to the public administration system itself but is also far beyond it, encompassing a social space that extends from the highest decision-makers in public affairs to anyone concerned, at least partially. That is, this communication involves both entities directly within the public power system and those who belong to the public and private sectors.

In our opinion, the purpose of public communication is also broader. Broadly speaking, this can be the prevention and/or resolution of conflicts in the public sphere, which should ultimately ensure a balanced functioning of society as a system. This way it forms a certain system of public communication, which is a subsystem of higher-order systems such as social communications, social and cultural, and it covers: subjects of relevant social interaction; communication necessary for its integrity (communication infrastructure); the processes of interaction of these entities with one another and with

other entities outside this system; relevant segment of information on socially relevant (public) issues.

#### 4.5 *Subsystems of the public communication system*

Good communication systems are an essential component of a participative, collaborative, and interdisciplinary work environment, and as such a positive environment noticeably contributes to subjects' individual and collective productivity (Uslu, 2018). The public communication system is in a state of dynamic interaction with other social systems (politics, economics, culture, law, government, etc.) and consists of a number of lower-level subsystems that create its structure. From the point of view of structural and functional approach within the public communication system we can distinguish the following four basic subsystems, which are inherent in social communication as a whole:

- 1 *social subsystem*: individuals and social groups, organisations that are subjects of communication interaction
- 2 *technological subsystem*: methods and techniques of creation, distribution, use of communications
- 3 *technical subsystem*: systems and means of creation, distribution, use of communications
- 4 *semiotic subsystem*: individual signs and sign systems that are considered as the form for message content and its carriers.

Considering the specifics of public communication, these subsystems will be different from similar subsystems, such as government or corporate communications. In particular, communication entities must function in the most open manner, technology and technical means should be accessible to a wide range of potential subjects of communication, and semiotic tools should be generally accepted and understood.

#### 4.6 *Functions of the public communication system*

The functions of the public communication system, in our view, are also somewhat broader than those described by Bukhtaty above. The main function of this system, from our point of view, has three interconnected components ensuring the following:

- 1 *the representation and legitimation* of public communication subjects as public ones entitled and capable of participating in socially significant processes and relationships (that is, the actual status of a public entity is acquired only in the process of public communication, not before it starts)
- 2 *balanced information exchanges* between the subjects of public communication
- 3 *mutual deliberate influence* of public sector entities on the basis of current legal regulations and values and traditions established in society.

In this way, a 'perfectly tuned' system of public communication will be able to provide: the formation of an atmosphere of respect and mutual trust between subjects of the public sphere, the achievement of consensus between them as a result of communicative

interaction in the form of a dialogue (polylog), coordinated change of attitude and/or behaviour of these subjects regarding socially significant (public) processes and relationships that have been the subject of communication.

From the point of view of this approach, it is necessary to clarify the actual 'set' of public communication entities. We have called the following subjects for the information space: public authorities, business, citizen groups and individuals who create, disseminate, and use information. This list is fair given the wide range of processes and relationships in the information space. But you should also take into account that the roles of different subjects of communication are reduced to three basic processes related to the creation, distribution, and use of messages in the process of communicative interaction:

- 1 'source'
- 2 'broadcaster'
- 3 'recipient'.

These roles at different stages of communication can be fulfilled by each of the subjects of information space, so the list of subjects of public communication should be refined taking into account the specificity of their activity (functioning in information and communication spaces of public administration).

#### *4.7 Key subjects of public communication*

In the very definition of the concept of public communication, we identify two key subjects: public authorities and civil society. However, at least two lower-order subjects must be named within each of them.

In particular, speaking of 'public authorities' one should separate politicians (elected persons or appointed on a political principle, determine the general direction of activity of public authorities, approve public policy, etc., in this regard, they are active communicators) and public officials (are politically impartial, they are mostly appointed by competition and exercise managerial authority in the context of a certain state policy, a certain sphere of activity, comparing to the politicians that are usually less active than communicators).

Speaking of 'civil society', it is advisable to conditionally distinguish public activists (take initiative on socially significant issues, form the basis of non-political associations of citizens, be active communicators) and ordinary citizens (act on the lines of initiatives of other citizens; most of them are passive participants of socially significant activities, and the majority of them are passive communicators). Besides these subjects, there are two more that represent media businesses in the structure of the information space and individuals who are professional public communicators. These are media owners (they hold information and communications infrastructure and can share it with other subjects) and journalists (create and distribute communication on a professional level). Rubtcova and Pavenkov (2019) note 'significant changes that characterise the characteristics of modern participants in media communication: a high level of education, a great need for information, considerable awareness, individualism and the demand for personalities, attitudes, distrust of the media and advertising, inconsistency, high mobility, spontaneity of decisions, physical and mental activity at work and leisure'.



Thus, in our opinion, the subjects of public communication should be the following:

- 1 politicians
- 2 public officials
- 3 community activists
- 4 ordinary citizens
- 5 media owners
- 6 journalists.

Such a list will be agreed with the subjects of the information space we have identified before and will allow us to have a deeper insight into the functioning of these subjects in terms of their roles in the field of public communication.

#### *4.8 Trends in the transformation of public subjects in Ukraine*

##### *4.8.1 Influence of ICT on information space of modern Ukraine*

Each of the public communication subjects is influenced by a number of factors that determine the current ways and forms of functioning, place in the information space, the degree of innovation, directions of transformation in the information space of modern Ukraine. Under conditions of globalisation and acquisition of the above-mentioned characteristics of networking, virtuality, openness by the national information space, such factors are peculiar not only for Ukrainian realities. Numerous researches in the field of social communications, public administration, other branches of social sciences testify to the worldwide changes of this kind.

##### *4.8.2 Increasing the degree of transparency and openness of public authorities of Ukraine*

Perhaps the most powerful factor at the moment is the introduction of new ICT, which increase the degree of transparency and openness of public authorities of Ukraine, create new communication opportunities for all these subjects, to some extent contribute to the information space being demonopolised and cause other conflicts. This technical and technological factor by nature has a clear 'social impact'. After all, according to Bimber, the digital media environment is changing the context of human activity, though it may not change the human as an individual. This changed context is about behaviour because it empowers action. This extension provides a range of structural opportunities for viable collective activities that include at least three paths: organisational tips, social tips, and self-recovery (Bimber, 2017). The number of people using these technologies is constantly increasing in Ukraine and around the world. For instance, 64% of those surveyed in Ukraine were regular internet users as of February 2019 (The Penetration of the Internet in Ukraine, 2019).

#### 4.8.3 Using communication platforms in the public sphere of Ukraine comparing with EU and USA

The modern global trend is also the use of diverse communication platforms for different types of activities in the public sphere. For example, the development of joint management platforms that, through a complex of communication tools and management technologies can achieve positive effects on feedback and joint management of socially significant projects in the field of creation, adaptation, and implementation of joint projects (Ansel and Gash, 2018). And multi-platform access to news has a significant impact on the characteristics of the subjects as the media recipients (Diehl et al., 2019).

At the same time, one should not forget the issue related to the heterogeneity of the growth of new ICT in both territorial and social dimensions. It does not bypass societies that are considered to be 'information-developed'. For example, an analysis of the state of interactive political online communication implemented by city governments and administrations in *Switzerland* found that more than 70% of the 159 cities in Switzerland offer at least one interactive tool; about a third of cities have high social networks activity. However, in the French-speaking part of Switzerland, more cities use social networks than in the German-speaking, whereas the Italian-speaking canton of Ticino is considered to be relatively backward as of this criterion according to the researchers (Klinger et al., 2016). The same heterogeneity is observed in Ukraine as of the degree of implementation and use of ICT in the field of public communications, particularly at the local level (The Penetration of the Internet in Ukraine, 2019).

The previously related factor is the factor of upgraded ICT as a sphere of social, political, business activity. The transformation of subjects in the public communication system in this aspect is associated with the active dissemination of socio-cultural innovations that lead to 'new forms and methods of social self-identification in the information space'. The point is that such forms and methods are largely virtual and in this situation, in particular, the transition between the status of the subject recipient and the subject source can be extremely easy and fast, even compared to the conditions that were in the information space of Ukraine in the 1990s – early 2000s, when the intensive saturation of this space with new media started.

The influence of this factor, among other things, is explained by the fact that one of the most important conditions for 'consumption' of the media today is the 'exemption from intermediary's, because with minimal application of knowledge, forces, and resources, almost anyone can now build their information system – set of hardware, software, data, and procedural components intended to provide the right data and information to the right person at the right time (Davis and Yen, 2018). The process of active expansion of the number of Internet users, associated with the dynamic development of network infrastructure and new mass communication technologies, provides a qualitatively new way of consumption, brings new opportunities for the consumer to access goods and services. Virtual consumption in this context appears as a process of assimilation of relevant information products as a result of active and creative individual choice of consumers (Vysotskaya, 2016). That is, metaphorically speaking, instead of complex 'information lunches' in the classical media, the subject recipient has the opportunity to use the 'buffet' of information by independently creating their information 'menu'.

Actually, in the described conditions, the system of public administration changes significantly, which determines the 'new roles of public servants in the relationship both among themselves and citizens'. In particular, the network approach and related technologies are becoming more widespread in management practice. For example, the concept of the 'Twilight' Network, described by Laura S. Jensen, presented as a network, structure, and behaviour that are both legal but also explicit and hidden (Jensen, 2017); it has real-life examples in the public administration of Ukraine. And Ling Zhu's well-founded conclusion that networking not only influences organisational performance but also shapes organisations' preferences for governmental decisions in social issues (Zhu, 2017) deserves further study and applied validation in Ukraine's public sphere. Taken together, the results of these studies, carried out on the *US* material, allow us to extrapolate the identified phenomena to the Ukrainian space and to predict the corresponding trends in the development of public communication.

In the plane of public engagement, this leads, among other things, to an 'avalanche of electoral communications'. Thus, non-traditional mass media (mass media) make greater use of election campaigns, as exemplified by the 2012 US election campaign, when online and cable television 'overcome' traditional channels such as newspapers and television networks (Eshbaugh-Soha, 2016). A similar situation is in Ukraine when the 2019 presidential election campaign was marked by the effective use of new media technologies. In the Ukrainian case, social networks and cinema 'overcame' traditionally politicised television, newspapers and outdoor advertising. That is, the change in communication technologies led to a radical update of the subjects – 'broadcasters', some of which were ignored by the recipients who received new, proven technologies in private and business communication.

The above-mentioned factors, caused by technical and technological innovations, are the basis for the development of the factor of the introduction of new implementation forms and methods of civic engagement and citizens' participation in independent solving of socially significant issues.

It should be noted that since 2014, the level of e-participation has been taken into account among the indicators of e-governance development in the *UN countries*. E-participation is defined as the process of engaging citizens through ICT to participate in political processes, decision-making in the provision of services, which in turn makes the process more active, inclusive and advisory. The 'e-participation index' is formed by evaluating the following indicators: e-information (experts assess the degree of availability of publicly relevant information on the internet); e-counselling (assessing the possibility of providing public consultations online), making electronic decisions (assessing the direct involvement of citizens in decision-making processes). An assessment is made on the availability of e-participation tools at the national level, using government portals to ensure that tasks are met according to each of these criteria. A survey of 2018 as a worldwide trend has found that more and more governments are encouraging citizens and businesses to collaborate, sharing ideas, and using feedback. The e-participation index has shown steady growth over four years, both on a global scale and in many individual countries. *Denmark, Finland* and the *Republic of Korea* have been recognised as the leaders of the e-participation rate in 2018. Ukraine, in this ranking, was ranked two years ago in the group of countries with a high index of electronic participation index (United Nations E-Government Surveys, 2018).

Citizens' accessibility to communication platforms and conditional anonymity of the internet, even after loud revelations and discussions about privacy in the network (Fuchs

and Trotter, 2017), are indeed contributing to the growth of both virtual and real civic engagement. As Placek demonstrates, examining the impact of online news on the democratic processes in *Central and Eastern Europe*, this form of information dissemination contributes to the consolidation of citizens who support democratic views. It has been found that internet users are more likely to trust democratic institutions than non-users. In such circumstances, the Internet better enables journalism to play its role as the watchdog of democracy by providing public control of political elites in countries with less media autonomy. The researcher also suggests that this is due to the increased activity of internet users, since they browse the web independently, search for news that they are interested in, unlike traditional media consumers. In this way, online media not only spread the news but also create and support an environment of interested citizens who can influence potential autocrats and, not to backtrack by pressure from the principles of political competition and civil liberties (Placek, 2018).

A survey of public participation policies conducted by young people in the *USA* has also shown that the influence of 'weak contacts' on large social networks contributes to increasing political activity. Different forms of online activity have been identified in different ways but ultimately encourage online and offline political activity (Kahne and Bowyer, 2018). The fact that digital technologies provide opportunities for participation in a wide range of community-oriented activities, each can contribute to deeper democratic participation, is evidenced by the research carried out by Darren G. Lilleker and Karolina Koc-Michalska on the example of *Great Britain* (Lilleker and Koc-Michalska, 2017). Besides this, Ukraine is not far behind the global democratic practice of broader citizen involvement in public policy-making. As exemplified by Robert Ackland and Darren R. Halpin in Scotland, expanding the scope of political consultation results in several transformations but they do not lead to the fragmentation of interest groups or the decline of central policymakers (Ackland and Halpin, 2019). The studies have also shown that the impact of using social networks on the formation of social-communicative and organisational-public relations may be similar today even in different countries and cultures in related social groups (for example, youth) (Men and Muralidharan, 2016).

The introduction of new forms and methods of civic engagement, as we noted above, is also essential for the formation of a new communicative culture in the public sphere. In this case, we will definitely agree with Khodus, who demonstrates that in a modern media culture, the subject is not only a passive observer, information collector and events represented by relevant interested agents but at the same time he actively reproduces himself in the form of 'conscious privacy', which allows a special way of experiencing private emotions 'alone with everyone'. According to the researcher, in this way, it raises the question of the inter-passive nature of such practice, when in the modern media space, the individual simultaneously manifests both passiveness and activity. In such circumstances, inter-passivity as 'activity through the other thing' becomes the determining principle of relation to the world (Khodus, 2014). It is important to note that this factor is perhaps the most powerful in changing the role of active 'default' subjects of the information space, namely: politicians, public activists, journalists. Remaining active in the communicative space, they can change the forms and methods of their activity and involvement in public affairs offline. For example, an online communication campaign about a particular electronic petition, during which a journalist or public

activist continues to be engaged in other daily stuff, can lead to more real change than let us say picketing.

#### *4.8.4 Reform of state and municipal media in Ukraine*

Finally, the transformation of public communication subjects in Ukraine was also significantly influenced by the legal, economic and social-cultural transformations in the national mass communication system, above all the reform of state and municipal media. It is said that the adoption of the Law of Ukraine ‘On Reformation and State and Municipal Print Media’ (2015), which aimed to limit the influence of the state on the media, create equal conditions for the media of various forms of ownership, increase the competitiveness of print media public authorities of the former influence on the municipal press and state-owned print media. However, the situation has not only political but also economic consequences so far. Some print media have ceased to be published at the time of the end of the denationalisation process, and some reformed publications are going through economic problems due to the loss of financing. Similar transformations are happening in the system of the former state broadcasting, based on which public television and radio were created. Actually, the development process of public service broadcasting in Ukraine was started back in 1997 but only in 2014 the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine adopted the Law of Ukraine ‘On Public Television and Radio Broadcasting of Ukraine’ (2014), and its implementation has acquired specific outlines. Today the relevant regulatory framework has been formed and the structure of the broadcaster has been reformed. However, in the current circumstances, public service broadcasting requires greater public and political support, as well as appropriate funding under the legislation, to be able to fulfil its tasks. At the same time, public authorities don’t currently influence the editorial policy of national public service broadcasting, which is positive for its audience.

The described processes encourage many public entities to deeper integration with social networks. However, such changes also lead to the need for a new self-identification of such an important subject of public communication as journalists. It is too early to speak of the urgency of such issues in Ukraine but the trends revealed by Diana Bossio and Avery E. Horton among American and Australian journalists indicate that the requirements for professional journalism should include a number of conditions for communication in social networks (Bossio and Horton, 2018). That is, even with the expansion of new communication networks and blurring off the lines between the roles of the subjects of communication, the distinction between professional and amateur communicators must be made.

#### *4.8.5 Semiotic innovations in the official discourse of the Ukrainian authorities*

The analysed factor is also connected with innovations in the semiotic space, which ‘imposes’ primarily on the subject components of the information space and determines the actual processes of social communication, including the communicative functions of the mutual understanding of the subjects, legitimation of the subject-source and social management of the subject-consumer. An example of such semiotic innovations is the appearance of primitive words and lexical phantoms in the official discourse of the Ukrainian authorities, based on which Shevchenko has identified three disturbing trends

in the functionality of Ukrainian politicians and public officials as subjects of political communication. In particular, the researcher concludes the following:

- 1 the dominance of lexical phantoms in the new edition of the political ‘news’ in Ukraine indicates that the power discourse has acquired a purely instrumental nature, which means that one that does not provide feedback, has the appearance of a purely monologic and ritualised message pointing to a return to authoritarian examples of the Soviet past
- 2 all messages made within the framework of the discourse have zero information load, that is, they are perceived as either simple information noise or bald-faced lies
- 3 such discourse completely loses any mobilisation potential, because no one hears or wants to hear its appeals, which in its turn indicates a tendency to lose confidence in the government and its actual delegitimisation (Shevchenko, 2016).

Such transformations, in fact, are always characteristic of revolutionary periods of social development. They are a response to general social-cultural transformations and are reflected in language as a tool of public communication. The visual segment of the semiotics of public communications undergoes no less profound transformations. Thus, in our opinion, the conclusions of Saar Alon-Barkat on the impact of symbolic communication on citizens’ trust in the authorities during public communications (Alon-Barkat, 2019) are quite acceptable also in the conditions of the modern Ukrainian information space.

While specifying the nature of the transformation of public communication subjects in the modern innovative information space of Ukraine, it should also be emphasised that in such space these subjects should also be considered from the performance of their functions according to:

- 1 innovation providers
- 2 innovation operators (users)
- 3 objects of innovation.

Also, according to our estimations, each group of subjects, both innovators (those who promote, accept, apply innovations) and counter-innovators (who resist and deliberately refuse to innovations) can be distinguished.

#### *4.8.6 General trends in the transformation of public information space in modern Ukraine according to the subjects as sources*

Considering the factors described above, the general trends in the transformation of public subjects can be defined in the following way.

‘Politicians’ are shifting towards the broadcaster without leaving the role of the source. This is most clearly observed by the creation of oligarchic media holdings, which can be incorporated not only by private non-Ukrainian but also by disconnected local media. Also, due to technological innovation, almost every politician, as an innovative provider, must be an active contributor to social networks to ensure a permanent presence in the electoral field. He remains a recipient in the public’s imagination, although, despite the intensification of populist trends, he generally does not fulfil this role because he has a minor electoral dependency.

'Public servants' lose their position as a broadcaster because of the reform of municipal and state media but remain a source of information and potentially considered by citizens as recipients. The development, greater accessibility, simplification of ICT lead to greater openness of public servants, growth of opportunities for feedback from citizens and strengthening of their role as recipients. They are operators and together with politicians they often act as innovation providers in the information space.

'Public activists' are finally becoming a source of information due to the processes of forming a real civic society, increasing the authority of public activists and the widespread introduction of new 'activating' communication technologies. Also, they reserve the role of a broadcaster of the ideas of ordinary, communicatively passive citizens through a significant impact on social networks. They mostly act as providers and operators of innovation in the information space.

'Ordinary citizens' are gradually 'drifting' to the role of information source with the development of new communication technologies but remain perhaps the only basic recipient in the system of public communication. They are now considered primarily as objects of innovation and are trying to transform into innovation operators through a variety of educational programs.

'Media owners' have virtually lost their monopoly as broadcasters with the development of social media, although they remain predominantly in this role-playing segment, mainly performing technical and technological functions. In the absence of conditions for economic independence, they almost lost the source role. Depending on the position in the market and their vision of prospects, they can be both providers and operators of innovations in the information space.

'Journalists' are almost ceasing to act as sources of information, yielding to politicians and public activists, and are now becoming predominantly a message repeater. Nowadays, copywriting is becoming a problem in the media space because it is technologically simpler and cheaper than the preparation of copyrighted materials. Also, journalists often yield to politicians and public activists in delivering source communication. National media journalists are mostly operators (sometimes providers) of innovations in the information space, while regional and local ones are operators and very often objects, in particular in situations of reforms.

Thus, the transformation of public communication subjects in modern Ukraine is driven by innovative processes in the national information space and global trends and leads to a significant change in the roles of these subjects in the social interaction system as a whole.

## **5 Conclusions**

Public communication is a process of social interaction through messages about socially significant (public) phenomena, processes, and relationships that belong to or may belong to the activity of public authorities and are or may be of interest to public society. Public communication takes place in a specific information space, which is a social environment that carries out processes and relationships connected with the creation, dissemination, and use of information involving certain entities, information infrastructure, and information resources. An information space is innovative, where changes are based on the implementation of innovations of technical, technological, political, legal, organisational, managerial, social-cultural nature, and cause further transformations of

the components of this space. In the information space, such innovations can be divided into subjective, infrastructure, and resource.

The subjects of public communication are: politicians; public officials; community activists; ordinary citizens; media owners; journalists. Their transformation in the innovative information space of modern Ukraine is conditioned by such social-political and social-economic factors as:

- introduction of new ICT that increase the degree of transparency and openness of public authorities of Ukraine
- modernisation of ICT as a sphere of social, political, and business activity
- introduction of new forms and methods of implementation of public activity and citizens' participation in independent solving of socially significant issues
- legal, economic and social-cultural changes of the national mass communication system (in particular, the reform of state and municipal mass media).

In the process of transformation of subjects' roles of public communication (source, broadcaster, recipient of messages) their functions as subjects of innovative information space have been changed, namely: providers of innovations; innovation operators (users); objects of innovation.

In this context, both the innovators (those who promote, receive, and use innovations) and counter-innovators (who resist and deliberately refuse innovations) can be singled out in the public communication environment.

In this manner, we have developed the theoretical basis for further empirical investigation of the trends of a transformation of public communication subjects (jointly or separately) in the innovative information space.

## References

- Ackland, R. and Halpin, D. (2019) 'Change or stability in the structure of interest group networks? Evidence from Scottish Public Policy Consultations', *Journal of Public Policy*, Vol. 39, No. 2, pp.267–29, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143814X18000065>.
- Alon-Barkat, S. (2019) 'Can government public communications elicit undue trust? Exploring the interaction between symbols and substantive information in communications', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, muz013, <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/muz013/5528239>.
- Anikin, A., Litovkin, D., Kultsova, M. and Sarkisova, E. (2016) 'Ontology-based collaborative development of domain information space for learning and scientific research', in Ngonga Ngomo, A.C. and Kremen, P. (Eds.): *Communications in Computer and Information Science*, Springer, Cham, pp.301–315.
- Ansel, C. and Gash, A. (2018) 'Collaborative platforms as a governance strategy', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, Vol. 28, No. 1, pp.16–32, <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mux030>.
- Bimber, B. (2017) 'Three prompts for collective action in the context of digital media', *Political Communication*, Vol. 34, No. 1, pp.6–20, <https://doi.org/10.1080/10584609.2016.1223772>.
- Bossio, D. and Horton, A. (2018) 'The identity dilemma: identity drivers and social media fatigue among journalists', *Popular Communication: The International Journal of Media and Culture*, Vol. 18, pp.248–262, <https://doi.org/10.1080/15405702.2018.1535658>.



- Bukhtaty, A. (2018) *Public Communications of a Democratic State: Monography*, Dnipro, Zhurfond.
- Davis, W.S. and Yen, D.C. (2018) *The Information SYSTEM consultant's Handbook: Systems Analysis and Design*, CRC Press, Boca Raton, London, New York.
- Diehl, T., Barnidge, M. and Gil de Zúñiga, H. (2019) 'Multi-platform news use and political participation across age groups: toward a valid metric of platform diversity and its effects', *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, Vol. 96, No. 2, pp.428–451, <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077699018783960>.
- Dimitrova, D. and Matthes, J. (2018) 'Social media in political campaigning around the world: theoretical and methodological challenges', *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, Vol. 95, No. 2, pp.333–342, <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077699018770437>.
- Dreshpak, V. (2012) 'Information, communicative, semiotic spaces of public administration: general, excellent and special', *Public administration: theory and practice: email sciences. specialized edition*, Vol. 2, No. 8. Available at: [http://dridu.dp.ua/zbirnik/2012-02\(8\)/12dvmsvo.pdf](http://dridu.dp.ua/zbirnik/2012-02(8)/12dvmsvo.pdf) (Accessed 06 July 2019).
- Eshbaugh-Soha, M. (2016) 'Presidential agenda-setting of traditional and nontraditional news media', *Political Communication*, Vol. 33, No. 1, pp.1–20, <https://doi.org/10.1080/10584609.2014.958261>.
- Fuchs, C. and Trottier, D. (2017) 'Internet surveillance after Snowden', *Journal of Information, Communication and Ethics in Society*, Vol. 15, No. 4, pp.412–444, <https://doi.org/10.1080/10584609.2016.1223772>.
- Jensen, L. (2017) 'The twentieth-century administrative state and networked governance', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, Vol. 27, No. 3, pp.468–484, <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/muw065>.
- Kahne, J. and Bowyer, B. (2018) 'The political significance of social media activity and social networks', *Political Communication*, Vol. 35, No. 3, pp.470–493, <https://doi.org/10.1080/10584609.2018.1426662>.
- Khodus, E. (2014) 'Interpassivity as a subjective effect of modern media culture: to the formulation of the problem', *Anthropological Dimensions of Philosophical Research*, No. 5, pp.7–14, <https://doi.org/10.1080/10584609.2018.1426662>.
- Klinger, U., Rösli, S. and Jarren, O. (2016) 'Interactive cities? Local political online communication in Switzerland', *Studies in Communication Sciences*, Vol. 16, No. 2, pp.141–147, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scoms.2016.11.001>.
- Lilleker, D.G. and Koc-Michalska, K. (2017) 'What drives political participation? Motivations and mobilization in a digital age', *Political Communication*, Vol. 34, No. 1, pp.21–43, <https://doi.org/10.1080/10584609.2016.1225235>.
- Liu, H.K. (2016) 'Bring in the crowd to reinventing government', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, Vol. 26, No. 1, pp.177–181, <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/muv015>.
- Men, L.-R. and Muralidharan, S. (2016) 'Understanding social media peer communication and organization–public relationships: evidence from China and the United States', *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, Vol. 94, No. 1, pp.81–101, <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077699016674187>.
- 'Monitoring the implementation of e-government tools in local governments/under total', Serenko, A.A. and Yaskevich, A.I. (Eds.): PO 'Podolsk Regional Development Agency', Vinnitsa, 2017.
- 'On Access to Public Information of Ukraine', Law of Ukraine of 14.05.2013, No. 224 – VII (2014), *Government Courier*, No. 10, Ministry of Justice of Ukraine.
- 'On Public Television and Radio Broadcasting of Ukraine', Law of Ukraine of 04.17.2014, No. 122 – VII' (2014), *Russian Justice*, No. 27, Article 904, Ministry of Justice of Ukraine.
- 'On Reformation and State and Municipal Print Media', Law of Ukraine of 12.24.2015, No. 917 – VIII' (2015), *Government Courier*, No. 245, Ministry of Justice of Ukraine.

- Placek, M. (2018) 'Can the internet aid democratic consolidation? Online news and legitimacy in Central and Eastern Europe', *International Journal of Communication*, Vol. 12, No. 12, pp.2810–2831.
- Rubin, G.D. and Abramson, R.G. (2018) 'Creating value through incremental innovation: managing culture, structure, and process', *Radiology*, Vol. 288, No. 2, pp.330–340, <https://doi.org/10.1148/radiol.2018171239>.
- Rubtcova, M. and Pavenkov, O. (2019) 'Media and communication subjects: personal and group characteristics', Paper presented at *The IIER – 591st International Conference on Social Science and Economics (ICSSE)*, 26–27 February 2019, New Delhi, India.
- Serrat, O. (2017) *Knowledge Solutions*, Springer, Singapore.
- Shevchenko, A. (2016) 'Words-phantoms in the propaganda discourse of the Ukrainian government', *Philosophical Thought*, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp.56–63.
- Shishkina, M. (1999) *Public Relations in the System of Social Management*, Publishing House St. Petersburg University, St. Petersburg.
- Solovyov, S., Kuybida V., Bilinska M. and Petroye O. (2018) *Public Communications, Public Administration: Terminological Dictionary*, NAPA, Kyiv.
- The Penetration of the Internet in Ukraine* [online] [https://inau.ua/sites/default/files/file/1903/dani\\_ustanovchych\\_doslidzhen\\_za\\_1-y\\_kvartal\\_2019\\_0.pdf](https://inau.ua/sites/default/files/file/1903/dani_ustanovchych_doslidzhen_za_1-y_kvartal_2019_0.pdf) (accessed 20 September 2019).
- United Nations E-Government Surveys (2018) 'Gearing e-government to support transformation towards sustainable and resilient societies', New York.
- Uslu, B. (2018) 'The components of communication systems in universities: their influence on academic work life', *Tertiary Education and Management*, Vol. 24, pp.34–48, <https://doi.org/10.1080/13583883.2017.1359662>.
- Vysotskaya, O. (2016) 'Mass media consumption in the context of postmodern values', *Philosophy and Political Science in the Context of Modern Culture*, Vol. 2, No. 11, pp.68–76.
- Zhu, L. (2017) 'Voices from the frontline: network participation and local support for national policy reforms', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, Vol. 27, No. 2, pp.284–300, <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/muw061>.