

DOI : 10.14746/pped.2016.7.10  
УДК 329.39:35.072.22](477)=111

**Volodymyr Beglytsia,**  
*Doctor of Sciences in Public Administration,  
Petro Mohyla Black Sea National University, Mykolayiv. Ukraine*

**CORRUPTION RISKS FOR INTERACTION OF POLITICAL  
ELITE INSTITUTE WITH DEMOCRATIC CITIZENSHIP  
INSTITUTE IN UKRAINE**

It is defined in this article the dependence of the ruling political and administrative elites evolution on the citizenship democratic institute establishment in Ukraine in the absence of systemic response to human resources challenge of time in modern conditions of internal and external testing of Ukrainian national statehood, and also in the absence of systemic response to political corruption risks. The attention is focused on favorable factors for the political elite selection in modern Ukraine: the formation of political nation, one of elements of which is the democratic citizenship institute; positive experience of successful countries; military aggression in the east of the country, which "pushes" the existing elite to establishment of the broad public cooperation in realization of reforms and meritocratic selection of political and administrative staffing.

**Keywords:** political elite; democratic citizenship institute; meritocratic selection of political and administrative elite; corruption risks; rent orientation of political and administrative elite.

**Behlyca W. Ryzyka korupcyjne w zakresie interakcji pomiędzy instytucją elity politycznej oraz instytucją obywatelstwa demokratycznego na Ukrainie**

W artykule określa się zależność ewolucji elity polityczno-administracyjnej od kształtowania się demokratycznej instytucji obywatelstwa na Ukrainie, w warunkach braku systemowej odpowiedzi na aktualne wyzwania kadrowe, na etapie współczesnych trudności wewnętrznych i zewnętrznych, których doświadcza ukraińska państwowość narodowa, a także ryzyk korupcyjnych o charakterze politycznym. Uwaga została skupiona na czynnikach sprzyjających selekcji elity politycznej współczesnej Ukrainy: formowaniu narodu politycznego, jednym z elementów którego jest instytucja obywatelstwa demokratycznego; pozytywnym doświadczeniu krajów, które odniosły sukces; militarnej agresji na wschodzie kraju, która „popycha” istniejącą elitę ku stworzeniu szerokiego porozumienia społecznego na rzecz realizacji reform oraz ku merytokracyjnej selekcji kadr politycznych i administracyjnych.

**Słowa kluczowe:** elita polityczna, instytucja obywatelstwa demokratycznego, merytokratyczna selekcja kadr polityczno-administracyjnych

**Беглиця В.П. Корупційні ризики у взаємодії інституту політичної еліти з інститутом демократичної громадянськості в Україні**

У статті визначається залежність еволюції правлячих політико-управлінських еліт від становлення демократичного інституту громадянськості в Україні в умовах відсутності системної відповіді на кадровий виклик часу на етапі сучасних внутрішніх і зовнішніх випробувань української національної державності, а також корупційним ризикам політичного характеру. Акцентується увага на сприятливих факторах селекції політичної еліти в сучасній Україні: формуванні політичної нації, одним із елементів якої є інститут демократичної громадянськості, позитивний досвід успішних країн, військова агресія на сході країни, яка «підштовхує» діючу еліту до створення широкої суспільної співпраці у проведенні реформ та проведення меритократичного відбору політико-управлінського кадрового забезпечення.

**Ключові слова:** політична еліта, інститут демократичної громадянськості, меритократичний відбір політико-управлінської еліти, корупційні ризики, рентоорієнтованість політико-управлінської еліти.

**Беглиця В.П. Коррупционные риски во взаимодействии института политической элиты с институтом демократической гражданской ответственности в Украине**

В статье определяется зависимость эволюции политико-управленческой элиты от становления демократического института гражданской ответственности в Украине в условиях отсутствия системного ответа на кадровый вызов времени на этапе современных внутренних и внешних испытаний украинской национальной государственности, а также коррупционным рискам политического характера. Акцентируется внимание на факторах содействия селекции политической элиты в современной Украине: формировании политической нации, одним из элементов которой является институт демократической государственности, позитивный опыт успешных стран, военная агрессия на востоке страны, которая «подталкивает» действующую элиту к созданию широкого общественного сотрудничества в ходе проведения реформ и проведения меритократического отбора политико-управленческого кадрового отбора.

**Ключевые слова:** политическая элита, институт демократической гражданской ответственности, меритократический отбор политико-управленческой элиты.

## **Introduction**

In modern conditions of internal and external testing of Ukrainian society the role of political and administrative elite, as an important political institute of the dynamic society development is to ensure efficiency of the security, social, economic, technological, social and psychological processes.

The complexity of the political elite dynamics in Ukraine stems from the fact that currently there is no systematic response to human resources challenge of time. This is one of reasons for the growth of social and political tension in the society. This assertion can be confirmed by the public statement of the government technical representative Aivaras Abromavicius of February 3, 2016. The politician stated that he decided to resign in order not to be “a folding screen for blatant corruption or controlled puppet for those who wants to control state money in the manner of the old government” (Ukrains'ka pravda, 2016). The Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine reacted to this event by adopting a Resolution “On approval of ethical conduct rules for civil servants” N 65 of February 11, published on the government portal on the 1st of March 2016. This Resolution requires the civil servants to refrain from criticizing in public state authorities and their officials (Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine. 2016).

This fact confirms the existence of serious issue of personnel reserve formation and selection of the ruling political and administrative elite. At this time, especially after the Dignity Revolution 2013-2014, the democratization of public administration and local government facilitates the great increase of Ukrainian society attention to morality of power and all its components, to the ethical behavior of public servants in particular.

Relevance of this study is determined by the absence of systemic response to human resources challenge of time in modern conditions of internal and external testing of Ukrainian national statehood.

The main objective of this study is to establish corruption risks in interdependence with formation of the ruling political and administrative elites and citizenship institute in Ukraine in conditions of democratic values transit.

## **Analysis of recent research**

A great number of researchers, whose works were used as the basis for authors' scientific researches, were engaged in the field of political elite studying. But a lot of political elite issues are still poorly researched in the interdependence on citizenship institute in Ukraine. Theoretical problems of origins, formation of elite, its development, political elitesation issues were considered by such famous ancient scholars as Aristotle and Plato. Among medieval scholars John Locke, N. Machiavelli, John Milton should be mentioned. William Hamilton, Thomas Jefferson, Friedrich Nietzsche continued scientific researches in

this field. It is appropriate to note that the scientific discourse in its initial stage concerned elite notion justification, formulation of historical origins and development mostly.

Scientific researches of sociologists Robert Michels, G. Mosck, V. Pareto allowed elitism to be organized into the separate branch of scientific research in the turn of the XIXth and XXth centuries. Such prominent sociologists as Max Weber (theory of democratic elitism), M. Berdyaev (value theory of elites) and Schumpeter conducted elites studying at that period too. Such scholars as W. Burnham and W. Mills were exploring of the power structure changes and the new elite genesis issues. It is needed to be mentioned the other founders of the elitism scientific theory, namely C. Lindblom, P. Schmitter and others.

Significant number of well-known Ukrainian scientists, namely V. Andrushchenko, V. Bebyk, E. Golovakha, O. Dergachov, L. Kochubey, B. Kukhta, O. Kutsenko, M. Mykhalchenko, E. Ostrenko, V. Poltorak, M. Shulga were exploring various components of the political elite formation process in Ukraine. This scholars paid an attention to different areas of this subject in their studies.

However, a lot of issues of elites formation process Ukrainian currently are poorly studied in relations with citizenship institute and corruption risks in this area. Research of interdependence of the political and administrative elite evolution and citizenship institute is based on the principles of system and structural-functional analysis, which makes it possible to study capitally “ruling political elite” notion, to formulate its main characteristics and structural elements, to define the stages of institutionalization, formation and modern development.

## **Results**

### **Characteristics institute political elite**

The term “elite” is derived from the French word “elite” – the best, chosen, selected. Since the XVII century it became used to name the people who are selected, primarily the highest nobility. According to the Oxford Dictionary of 1823 with term “elite” the higher social strata of society in England was called. However, the term “elite” was not widespread in the social sciences until the late XIX century – early XX century (Rosenfeld et al. 2001, 118).

Significant number of works devoted to the issues of political elites’ formation and functioning were published during the XX century. Studying these issues has become one of the leading areas of modern political science studies, but there are ongoing debates on the definition of “political elite” notion. It belongs to the most controversial categories of political science, which is caused by variety of approaches to the meaning of this term determining. It is also caused by the interpretations multiplicity of categories adjacent to this term, which results in the fact that these categories can be identified with political elite notion. As

the famous Russian elitologist H. Ashyn mentioned, hence all those who are involved in the elites study intuitively understand what this term means, but then the differences appear inevitably and the range of ideas and opinions, which are absolutely opposite very often, appears to (Ashyn 2004, 176).

L. Kochubey suggests that such ambiguity of the concept is very understandable at the current stage of both the society and political theory development, because due to the ‘approximation’ of the ‘elite’ notion it is used there where theory deepening and knowledge specification are needed currently (Kochubey, 2008).

This indicates the need to analyze current research approaches to the definition of meaning of “political elite” notion; to reveal the unity and contradiction of this approaches essential content; and to define the measures of semantic interrelation of this concept with others, which are the most widespread in the present scientific community, with elitologic categories, which will give an opportunity to study out more clearly the meaning of the studied term.

One of the political elitology scholars O. Haman-Holutvina determines that three main approaches to the interpretation of the term “political elite” were developed in scientific literature: a positional approach sets the degree of particular person political influence, taking into account the position in the system of government (according to this approach the elite includes, above all, members of government, parliament, etc.); reputational approach is based on detection of the politician rating through expert assessments; the approach which is mainly based on the selection of persons who make strategic decisions (Haman-Holutvina 2000, 98), in other words it can be called the conceptual approach (Kryukov 2004, 49).

The latter approach is identical to the functional approach. In its broadest interpretation functional approach is based on analysis of functions which are performed by the elites in the social and political system (Mandzij 2009, 346). According to it the political elite can be defined as a social group that exercises power, ensures conservation and restoration of political values and political system in general, works to meet the needs and interests of certain social groups or of the whole nation, enjoys certain advantages of its social status (Kolodiy 1999).

In general, such an understanding of the political elite supporters refer to it persons who are directly engaged in political decision-making and organization of this decisions implementation regardless of their official place in the social hierarchy.

Noteworthy O. Kryukov arguments who claims that in the present conditions there are several approaches to the definition of “elite” notion among

scientists: evaluative (axiological), institutional, structural and functional approaches (Kryukov 2010).

There is a necessity to reveal the meaning and to characterize in more details these concepts. Let's start with evaluative approach. Its supporters consider spiritual aristocratism, merits, personal superiority (culture, education, morality, will, physical condition) of one people over others as the defining feature of the political elite (Afonin et al. 2007, 138). Within axiological approach elite is interpreted as rather narrow group of people who take on themselves responsibility for the formation and supporting of fundamental values and responsible position in the area of its competence (Lavrenko 2000, 55).

This definition is identical in its meaning to reputational approach, because "reputational elite understanding ...admits the inclusion to it people with a high reputation in various fields. Herewith very often the authority, intelligence, moral reputation of the person, which ultimately results in his or her high rating in public opinion, are backbone factors here" (Soloviev 2000, 160). According to its criteria "among the two ministers in the same government, one can be recognized the elite representative, and another one will remain just a 'minister'" (Herbut 2011).

In its pure form this approach was followed by Jose Ortega y Gasset who attributed to the elite those people who are endowed with intellectual and moral superiority, a sense of responsibility (Obushnyy 2006).

It should be emphasized that although the axiological approach to the interpretation of the political elite notion seems somewhat idealistic, but it is still an essential part of modern understanding of the term "political elite". In fact, according to F. Rudych, "managerial elite, if it seeks to play the role of the political class (in other words, the political elite auth.), it is designed to have a political culture, scilicet it should know professionally the laws of social and political government, to be able to apply professionally this knowledge in its sphere, to build the relationships with colleagues professionally. Herewith it should bear legal and moral responsibility for the situation in the field, which it controls" (Rosenfeld et al. 2001, 11).

M. Shulga agrees with this statement, arguing that the political elite is socially active group of people which produces and defends consistently certain philosophical and ideological values, which has specific political goal and social project of its implementation, which also has broad public support and great amount of supporters, which is able to organize those supporters, to raise them and to lead them to perform specific political actions, thus influencing the decision of the ruling elite (Shipunov 2007).

Institutional approach to defining elites is prevalent in modern Western

sociology. According to it the elite is interpreted as the group of individuals who hold leadership positions in influential social institutions – governmental, economic, military, cultural ones (Kryukov 2010). Within this concept, political elite is considered as heterogeneous, internally differentiated group, within which it is possible to distinguish the highest elite – people who directly influence the decision-making process or take government decisions themselves, and middle elite – people who ‘serve’ higher elite (political scientists, expert scientist etc.) (Dmytrenko 2005).

It should be noted that the institutional and positional approaches are related to each other as the whole and its part because, if according to the first approach political elite consists of people who hold the ruling positions in all the influential social institutions, then according to the second approach political elite consists of people who hold the ruling positions only in public and target-political institutions. Because even for a broad interpretation of the political elite, within the latter approach, researchers describe its structure as follows: “higher elite, which includes leading political leaders and those who holds high positions in legislative, executive and judicial branches of power; the middle elite is formed from a large number of elected officials: parliamentarians, senators, deputies, mayors, leaders of various political parties and sociopolitical movements; administrative elite consists of the highest segment of state officials (officiary) who holds senior positions in ministries, departments and other public administration bodies” (Kulchytskyi 2001, 4).

It should be mentioned that not all researchers refer bureaucratic elite to the political one. Thus, according to M. Weber, political sphere shouldn’t be an arena for professional activities of the real official. He claimed that officials should rule only and they should do this objectively; in those cases, of course, when it doesn’t come to the questions of a vital importance for the ruling order. On the contrary, to be the political leader, scilicet the ruling statesman, is exclusively the personal responsibility (Dzerkalo tyznja 2014).

According to this researcher point of view, the official is brought on discipline, but not on initiative and struggle, therefore he is not able to ensure state development and to perform true political functions professionally (Ostrenko 2008). In M. Weber’s conception politician, unlike the official, obtains leadership qualities. French researcher P. Bourdieu also supports this idea. He noted that there is nonrandom structural commonality between the apparatus and certain category of people (Bebyk 2003, 96).

The most influential representatives of the structural and functional approach became H. Lasswell and S. Lipset, who claimed that high status in authorities system should be the main feature of the elite. According to this ap-

proach, political elite consists of individuals who hold key command positions in the most important institutions and organizations of society (economic, political, military). These individuals perform the most important ruling functions and have determinant influence on the development and making of the most important decisions for the society (Rebkalo et al. 2003, 6-18). This approach consists of institutional and functional understanding of the “political elite” notion.

Currently, with transition from soviet to modern society, the changing processes of the systemic characteristics of political life and political institutions functions take place in Ukraine. Therefore, according to the authors of the study, the issues of political elites and democratic citizenship institute incipience are interrelated. This interconnection can be considered not only on a theoretical level in the certain scholars’ writings, but also in specific examples of political practice directly.

During all the independence period Ukrainian state political elites violated the Basic Law of the State, questioned the rule of law, did prefer making decisions in the political context but not based on measured, conventional, expedient procedures for administrative decisions making. Corruption and the absolute power of oligarchs were blasting the democratic political system of the state. As a result, after the change of power in revolutionary way the state has lost its monopoly on the coercion application, and absolute control over the population and territory. Since the beginning of the conflict in Crimea and on the East, defense of the territory independence assumed, first of all, citizens of the state.

### **Democratic citizenship in Ukraine**

Institute for Citizenship is defined as a political practice, purposeful activities of political subjects, which has approved its results at national and regional levels. These results are represented by collective citizenship to ensure functioning of stable political system in Ukraine. Thus, according to V. Tsyh, “‘citizen’s sign of quality’ is ‘citizenship’. ‘Citizen’ is a formal status of a person, which provides this person endowment with certain set of rights and duties, and ‘citizenship’ is an individual sign of quality which indicates whether this individual adheres its duties, uses the granted rights and how does he use them, and to what extent” (Tsyh 2002, 104).

According to V. Horbatenko definition, “citizenship is the willingness and ability of the man and citizen to participate actively in public and state affairs, which is based on a deep understanding of its rights and duties; it is the antithesis of apolitical behavior, absenteeism, social and political indifference concepts, and it is a synonym of social and political activism and patriotism concepts” (Shemshuchenko et al. 2004, 122).

Hence, citizenship in policy appears in the form of purposeful activities of citizens’ as political actors, who are institutionalizing democracy in accordance



with their own interests in order to control to use the resources and power. Moreover, citizenship appears as a political institute which determines the nature of modern democratization.

In modern political science and institutional methodology, the category of “institute” has different interpretations: “collective action to manage individual things and to establish patterns of interaction in society”, “limits, established by political actors that structure political, economic and social mutual understanding in society”. It is also believed that everyone, “who is involved in political life in one way or another, directly or indirectly” can be the subject of policy (Shlyahun 2002, 35).

Based on the previous “institute” definition, we can distinguish the key citizenship signs of subjects who make it to be a political institute:

1) citizen, who is involved in subject-subject political interrelations, has a political identity and political rights;

2) voter, who acts rationally according to its political motivations and patterns of political behavior, at whom strategies and tactics of the election process are directed;

3) member of the local community who has the right “to resolve solely the local issues”;

4) member of the Electoral Commission, who provides an electoral process and acts in measures of regulatory legislation;

5) the candidate for being a deputy who has passive suffrage to be elected to representative bodies at different levels;

6) rights activist, who asserts for renewal of affected people violated rights, following legal, moral and ethical standards and laws;

7) social activist who has credibility among other citizens, represents a generalized public opinion on various political events and reveals actively its position within certain actions defined by the law;

8) blogger who, using electronic means of communication, expresses his assessment of the current events, including political ones, identifying and offers his suggestions for resolving problems;

9) journalist who covers events impartially, in particular the political events in mass media, an editorial policy of which is aimed at reproductive reflection of reality;

10) volunteer who except performing of duties for the core activities, also provides necessary services for other citizens or public authorities for free;

11) volunteer who on his own initiative offers his services in resolving important issues, including national security defense and so on (Yaroshenko 2015).

Thus, the level of citizenship development, scilicet the ability and willingness of man and citizen to participate initiatively in problematic issues of society and state on the grounds of raising deep awareness of their rights and duties, and also their interests, determines the change in the functioning of the political elite institute. The following determinants of it can be identified:

- level of population political competence, where the most important factor of its formation is the population political education;
- the degree of civil society development, which is caused by such factor as the degree of local government development ;
- the degree of the law influence on social and political processes in the country;
- clearness in differentiation of private law and public law spheres, of political and economic activities;
- level of society structuring; the degree of modern social traditions development, this degree is largely determined by the level of state paternalism both in present stage of the country's being and in its historical past;
- state of society values and regulatory system;
- quantity of the middle class, which, according to Ukrainian scientists K. Bohomaz and N. Sorokina, “is the main social bearer of public relations, an agent and guarantor of their preservation and reproduction in any society” (Bohomaz and Sorokina 2006). This role of middle class is ensured by economic, psychological and cultural independence of its members.

Sensational program of national reforms is announced in modern Ukraine. However, the problem is that one of the basic conditions, scilicet effective institutes which are the key to economic growth, almost are not provided in the modern Ukraine. Effective institutes are first of all the sign of capable state and a rational bureaucracy which differs from bureaucracy.

A large number of official instructions, which are often contradictory, question their implementation. There is a reason to believe that the civil servants will also questionably implement regulation “On approval of ethical conduct rules for public officials” adopted by the government on February 11, number 65. This regulation defines requirements: public officials must adhere to the following principles: service the state and society; decent behavior; virtue; loyalty; political neutrality; transparency and accountability; integrity. Serving the state involves formation of the state positive image. Decent behavior involves debarment an actions, even out of the public service, which could affect the public service interests or the reputation of a civil servant. According to officials, loyalty provides:

1) integrity in implementation of decisions of the Parliament, the President, the Cabinet of Ministers and the state body for which the civil servant works, regardless of his own beliefs and political views;

2) refraining from any form of public criticism of government bodies and their officials;

3) the correct attitude to heads and employees of the public authority while implementation of their duties.

In addition, public servants are demand: to prevent the influence of political interests on their actions and decisions, to refuse the public demonstration of political views and preferences, to avoid using political parties symbols etc. Ethical behavior also provides the priority of citizens' common good over personal or corporate interests, the inadmissibility of the state property use for personal goals; preventing conflict of interest, no giving benefits to someone. Integrity also contains "non-disclosure and non-use of information that has become known while implementing his duties by the public official, and after the termination of his public service including, except the cases prescribed by law". According to the rules, the information on the civil servants activities should be open and accessible, except the cases prescribed by the Constitution and laws. The recording of telephone conversations and personal meetings with political parties representatives, MPs, business entities or their authorized persons, and also providing the information about such a conversations and meetings, are expected to be fulfilled for civil servants of the I and II category. Civil servants take "disciplinary responsibility according to the law", for these rules violation, but the regulation doesn't specify what kind of the responsibility it should be. It states in the preface to the document that the basis for this act was taken "model of guaranteeing the maximum transparency of public authorities" introduced in Poland (Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine 2016).

Doubts regarding compliance by the existing political and administrative elite of the activity regulation model adopted by the government are based on the understanding that meritocratic principle of personnel management is displaced by quota principle, and low wages are compensated by so-called rent orientation of elites. Having an additional income requires limiting an access to economic and political activity, and also limiting competitive relations in a market economy.

Ukrainian elite is not ready yet to give up additional ways of enrichment, therefore it doesn't want to get involved in the implementation of successful reforms. The elections with open lists, lustration system, privileges abolition, refusal from informal conspiracies, open competitive procedures of bidding and appointments would have to be the first steps of the new leadership in overcoming the gap between government and society (Matsiyevskyy 2015).

### **Political corruption**

Persons or their associations which take part in the political processes, seek to get the authority to make and implement administrative decisions can be considered as subjects of political corruption. Representatives of the legislative and the judicial power, executive bodies etc. can be distinguished among those subjects. In addition, those persons who don't take part in the political processes directly but because of their own powers have an ability to influence them, or using different mechanisms influence participants of political society life indirectly, can be mention among other subjects of political corruption.

Scholars conventionally divided subjects of political corruption into the following groups:

1) principals – person authorized to make political decisions; these people get money or services for making decisions, they act as political cover (political parties, deputies of all levels, heads of central authorities, judges, etc.);

2) state agents – persons authorized to perform functions of executive power or local governance; these people make administrative decisions for money or services;

3) clients – business groups and oligarchs that are customers of the necessary decisions, invest politicians and political parties in order to get some dividends from this; they actually are bribers, who supports the functioning of corrupt schemes;

4) mediators – persons who have an opportunity to engage in corruption schemes, to support making necessary decisions by using personal relations, have experience of using their own situation for beneficial purposes and using influential patrons; to some extent dishonest voters who sell their votes in the elections can be referred to this group (Hrushko 2015).

Overcoming corruption risks is possible only if all the groups of political corruption subjects interact actively. The political elite, government officials and citizens must pay considerable attention to joint efforts in overcoming the phenomenon of corruption. The participation of citizens in making political and administrative decisions, functioning through the forms of direct participation established by law, and activities of public organizations concerning overseeing public authorities functioning are the basis for providing the democratic principle of checks and balances. The necessary prerequisite for this is to ensure transparency and openness of government bodies, free access to administrative information, participation in the preparation and making decision.

The need to adopt rules which ensure the process of interaction of political elite, public authorities and citizenship in the making of modern communicative policy concerning issues of preventing and counteracting corruption has

appeared in modern conditions. In fact, the authorities and society face the common objectives:

- restoring the trust to political elite and government officials;
- creating the conditions of corruption inadmissibility in society at all levels;
- providing access to information and active participation of public in political life.

In modern terms the public administration and local government should pay attention to the consequences of their activities. There is a need for responsibility for government actions, social harmony and prosperity (Babenko and Lazarenko 2015).

The public anti-corruption expertise plays significant role in active interaction regarding corruption risks overcoming. In fact, it is the only means of public control to prevent and expose corruptogenic risks. Readiness of the authorities to implement anti-corruption policies depends on response of authority subjects to conducting the expertise by the public.

According to official statistics independent public expertise are much more effective than the state expertise concerning corruption risks. Moreover, unlike the government anti-corruption expertise executants, active NGOs do not always have the possibility to provide a general examination of legal documents and their drafts. Thereafter public activities are aimed primarily at analysis of those important for the state and society legal documents which may become sources of corruption schemes because of their specificity, particularly in such areas as taxation and economic relations regulation; licensing system changes; tender procedures conducting; regulation of authorities powers (particularly powers of force); promoting citizens participation in state governance etc., draft laws, current laws. Reasons for the difference in effectiveness of state and public anti-corruption expertise are that the methodologies for its implementation are different. Public anti-corruption expertise can be also conducted by professional scientists, experts in their sphere. Obviously, the reason mentioned above lies in the unwillingness of the authorities to reveal corruptogenic factors where necessary. For the same reason, and also because of the existing gaps in the legal framework, authority subjects tend to ignore the results of public anti-corruption expertise (Novikov 2015).

### **Conclusions**

Thus, the only source of positive changes in the country for now is society. Ukrainian society is transforming into political nation by ‘paying’ exorbitant social price for the European integration choice in 2013-2014 (Yaroshenko 2014). Success of the political nation formation in modern Ukrainian conditions, which depend on the citizenship of all the people, society individualization that would

appear in ideological and organizational models of revolutionary nature, has become more obvious. These models are manifested in such modern processes as: national statehood defense, involvement in the processes of the major areas of life self-organization and reformation. The manifestation of personality citizenship criterion, which is the part of actual political nation, is becoming more widespread:

- correlation of one’s own life and public values;
- defending human and civil rights;
- careful attitude to the values of the citizens;
- interest in economic, social and political, cultural life of homeland;
- desire to work for the interest of the country and within its borders;
- correlation of personal and common social goals;
- identification of the citizen with society.

So, the institute of democratic citizenship as a component of the Ukrainian political nation faces the following urgent objectives nowadays:

- meritocratic principle of selection for political and administrative positions, scilicet an appointment on the basis of professional features, but not on the political or other conditions;
- consistent moral recovery of society and renewal of trust in laws, state, renewed power;
- solidarity of citizens, joint formulation of powers separation principles;
- critical assessment of the government officials activities effects and conducting the real struggle against corruption;
- adaptation to the democratic all-European standards that are in compliance with human rights and freedoms;
- objective determination of the state historical experience considering awareness of the serious consequences of the political elites rivalry and ideals betrayal.

## References

1. Afonin, E., V. Lisnychy and O. Radchenko (ed.). 2007. Political parties as the subject of political and administrative elite formation in the process of political modernization [Politychni partii yak subject formuvannya polityko-upravlinskoi elity v portsesi politychnoi modernizatsii]. – Kharkiv: “Master”.
2. Ashyn, H.K. 2004. Course of history of elitology [Kurs istorii elitologii]. Moscow.
3. Babenko, K.A. and S.J. Lazarenko. 2015. “Corruption in the system of high education: essence, reasons and consequences” [Koruptsiia v systemi vyshchoi osvity: sutnist, prychny ta naslidky]. Derzhavne upravlinnya: udosko-

nalennya ta rozvytok 2. Available at <http://www.dy.nayka.com.ua/?op=1&z=812> (last accessed 15 April 2016).

4. Bebyk, V.M. 2003 *Politology for politician and citizen* [Politologiya dlya polityka i gromadyanyna]. Kyiv: MAUP.

5. Bohomaz, K. and N. Sorokina. 2006. "Regional elites in processes of state creation and formation of social and cultural mark of society" [Regionalni elity v protsesi derzhavotvorenniya ta formuvannya sotsiokulturnyh orientyryv suspilstva]. *Elity i cyvilizacijni procesy formuvannja nacij* 2, 31-39.

6. Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine. 2016. Resolution "On approval of ethical conduct rules for civil servants" on 11.02.2016 N 65. Available at <http://www.kmu.gov.ua/control/ru/cardnpd?docid=248839311> (last accessed 18 April 2016).

7. Dmytrenko, M. 2005. "Features of modern political culture: problems of definition" [Osoblyvosti suchasnoi politychnoi kultury: problema vyznachen-nya] *Politycnyj menedzment* 5, 134-138.

8. Dzerkalo tyznja. 2014. "In new Council – the highest quantity of women for independence history" [U novij Radi – najbil'sha kil'kist' zhinok za istoriju nezalezhnosti]. Available at [http://zn.ua/POLITICS/v-novoy-rade-samoe-bolshoe-chislo-zhenschin-za-istoriyu-nezavisimosti-158659\\_.html](http://zn.ua/POLITICS/v-novoy-rade-samoe-bolshoe-chislo-zhenschin-za-istoriyu-nezavisimosti-158659_.html) (last accessed 15 April 2016).

9. Haman-Holutvina, O.V. 2000. "Determination of main conceptions of elitology" [Opredelenie osnovnyh ponyatii elitologii]. *Polis* 3, 97-103.

10. Herbut, N. 2011. "Representation of women in parliament: European experience and Ukrainian reality" [Predstavnytstvo zhinok u parlamenti: evropeiskii dosvid ta ukrainski realii]. *Naukovi zapysky Instytutu politycnyx i etnonacional'nyx doslidzen' im. I. F. Kurasa* 4 (54), 208-218.

11. Hrushko, O. 2015. "Political corruption as a form of searching rent and its administrative limitation". Proceedings of III International scientific and practical internet-conference Anticrisis management of Ukrainian economy: new challenges. Kyiv National Economic University named after Vadym Hetman", 15-17 December, 286–287.

12. Kochubey, L.O. 2008. "'Political elite' and 'political class': classical and modern approaches to definition of the notions ["Politychna elita" i "politychyi klas": klasychni ta suchasni pidhody do vyznachennya ponyat]. *Politycnyj menedzment Special issue*, P. 24-31.

13. Kolodiy, A. 1999. "Concerning the issue of political regime in Ukraine" [Do pytannya pro politychnyi rezhym v Ukraini]. *Sucasnist'* 7-8, 84-96.

14. Kryukov, O.I. 2004. "The main approaches to the definition of the elite concept in social and political thought of the twentieth century" [Osnovni pid-

hody do vyznachennya kompetentsii elity v suspilno-politychniy dumtsi XX st.]. Aktual'ni problemy derzhavnogo upravlinnja 4, 48-59.

15. Kryukov, O.I. 2010. "System of powers democratic modernization in the context of political and administrative elite activity" [Demokratychna modernizatsiya systemy vlady v konteksti diyalnosti politico-upravlinskoj elity]. Available at [http://www.nbu.gov.ua/portal/Soc\\_Gum/Apdu/2010\\_2/doc/1/01.pdf](http://www.nbu.gov.ua/portal/Soc_Gum/Apdu/2010_2/doc/1/01.pdf) (last accessed 18 April 2016).

16. Kulchyt'skyi, S. 2001. "Political elite in the Soviet and independent Ukraine" [Politychna elita v radyanskyi i nezalezhnyi Ukraini]. The Day August 11, 4.

17. Lavrenko, O. 2000. "Transformation of society and the concept of 'elites circulation'". Proceedings of all-Ukrainian scientific and practical conference Ukrainian elite and its role in the state building. Kyiv, 19 May, 53-59.

18. Mandzij, L. 2009. Politychna elita: istoriya ta teoriya [Political elite: History and Theory]. Lviv: Publishing center of Ivan Franko National University of Lviv

19. Matsiyevskyy, Y. 2015. "Institutional trap for Ukraine" [Instytutsi-jna pastka dlya Ukrainy]. Available at [http://zaxid.net/news/showNews.do?institutsiyana\\_pastka\\_dlya\\_ukrayini&objectId=1362175](http://zaxid.net/news/showNews.do?institutsiyana_pastka_dlya_ukrayini&objectId=1362175) (last accessed 18 April 2016).

20. Novikov, O.O. 2015. "Anti-corruption public expertise features of regulatory legal acts in Ukraine" [Osoblyvosti gromadskoi antykopuptsijnoi ekspertyzy normatyvno-pravovyh aktiv v Ukraini]. Derzhavne upravlinnya: udoskonalennya ta rozvytok 10. Available at <http://www.dy.nayka.com.ua/?op=1&z=913> (last accessed 23 April 2016).

21. Obushnyy, M.I. 2006. "Political parties in the formation of national elites" [Politychni partii u formuvanni natsionalnyh elit]. Elity i cyvilizacijni procesy formuvannja nacij 2, 143-146.

22. Ostrenko, E. 2008. "The problem of correlation of the political elite and the political class" [Problema spivvidnoshennya politychnoi elity ta politychnogo klasu]. Osvita rehionu 1-2. Available at <http://social-science.com.ua/article/10> (last accessed 12 April 2016).

23. Rebkalo, V., M. Piren and V. Tertychka. 2003. Modern administrative elite in Ukraine: quality characteristics, ways and methods of preparation [Suchasna upravlinska elita v Ukraini: yakisni kharakterystyky, shlyahy ta metody pidgotovky]. Kyiv: NAPA publishing house.

24. Rosenfeld, Y., L. Herasina, N. Osypova, M. Panov, O. Sahan and O. Stavyska. 2001. Political Science [Politologiya]. Kharkiv: The Law.

25. Shemshuchenko, Y., V. Babkin and V. Horbatenko (ed.). 2004. Political Science Encyclopedic Dictionary [Politologichnyy entsyklopedychnyy slovnyk], 2nd ed. Kyiv: Genesis.



26. Shipunov, G.M. 2007. "Hybrid political regimes as a phenomenon of post-Soviet countries social and political transformation (on the example of Ukraine, Russia and Belarus)" Proceedings of Conference The development of democracy and democratic education in Ukraine. Kyiv, 206-212.

27. Shlyahun, P. 2002. Political science (theory and history of political science) [Politologiya (teoriya ta istoriya politychnoi nauky)]. Kyiv: Lybid.

28. Soloviev, A. 2000. Political Science: political theory, political technologies [Politologiya: politicheskaya teoriya, politicheskie tehnologii]. Moscow: Aspect Press.

29. Tsvyh, V.F. 2002. Trade unions in civil society: theory, methodology, practice [Profspilky u gromadyanskomu suspilstvi: teoriya, metodologiya, praktyka]. Kyiv: PPC "Kyiv University".

30. Ukrains'ka pravda. 2016. "Abromavicius declared about resignation. One of the reasons – Kononenko" [Abromavychus zaiaviv pro vidstavku. Odnaz prychnyn - Kononenko]. Available at <http://www.pravda.com.ua/news/2016/02/3/7097676> (last accessed 10 April 2016).

31. Yaroshenko, V.N. 2014. "The Role of Moral Default in Political Nation Forming Process in Ukraine (end of 2013 – beginning of 2014 years)". European journal of transformation studies 2(1), 47-56.

32. Yaroshenko, V.N. 2015. "The establishment of the democratic citizenship institute in Ukraine, taking into account the symbolic component" [Stanovlennya instytutu demokratychnoi gromadyanskosti v Ukraini z vrahuvannyam symvolichnoi skladovoi]. Studia Politologica Ucraino-Polona 5, 122-133.