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ДЕМОКРАТИЧНІ КОНЦЕПЦІЇ ТА ЇХ ЗВ'ЯЗОК З БРЕНДОМ КРАЇНИ НА МІЖНАРОДНІЙ АРЕНІ ЧЕРЕЗ ІНДЕКСИ ДЕМОКРАТІЇ

Анотація. За допомогою інструментів політичного маркетингу в демократичних політичних системах забезпечується привернення уваги та підтримки виборців до політичних кандидатів, партій, програм, законопроєктів чи окремих проблем системи. У політичній науці досі триває дискусія про те, чи можна поставити знак рівності між маркетинговими інструментами бізнесу та маркетинговими інструментами, які використовуються в політичних процесах. Тим не менш, політичний маркетинг використовує інструменти брендингу не лише всередині країни, а й має на меті створити бажаний імідж країни на міжнародній арені. Брендинг країни може включати різний набір факторів та атрибутів, але він також тісно пов’язаний зі специфічними рисами політичної системи.

У сучасному світі бренд країни тісно пов’язаний з питанням оцінки політичного режиму та ставлення до нього як «дружнього» чи «ворожого». Чим більше політичний режим вважається дружнім, тим краще він впливає на сприйняття бренду країни на міжнародній арені. Для західного суспільства політичні режими з ознаками демократії мають дружні характеристики. Але сьогодні існує ряд різних концепцій демократії. Ці концепції лежать в основі оцінки політичних режимів як демократичних чи не повністю демократичних, і, відповідно, це також може вплинути на бренд країни на міжнародній арені.

Як один із найбільш дійсних і широко використовуваних інструментів для оцінки демократії, індекси демократії використовують різні теоретичні концепції як основу для вимірювання. Індекси використовують різні фактори, різні шкали вимірювання, різні характеристики демократії, щоб визначити, наскільки ефективна демократія в тому чи іншому випадку. Проблема в тому, що вибір теоретичної концепції також визначає кінцевий результат. І кінцевий результат оцінки демократії в кожному конкретному випадку також може вплинути на те, як бренд країни сприймається зовні.
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DEMOCRATIC CONCEPTS AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP WITH THE COUNTRY BRAND IN THE INTERNATIONAL AREA THROUGH DEMOCRACY INDICES

Abstract. With the help of political marketing tools in democratic political systems, it is ensured that the attention and support of voters is attracted to political candidates, parties, programs, bills, or individual problems of the system. In political science, there is still a discussion about whether it is possible to put an equal sign between the marketing tools of business and the marketing tools that are used in political processes. Nevertheless, political marketing uses branding tools not only within the country but also it aims at creating preferable image of the country in the international arena. Country branding may include different set of factors and attributes, but it is also closely related to the specific features of a political system.

In the modern world, country branding is closely related to the issue of assessing the political regime and treating it as "friendly" or "hostile". The more a political regime is considered friendly, the better it affects the perception of a country's brand in the international arena. For Western society, political regimes with the characteristics of democracy have friendly characteristics. But today there are a number of different concepts of democracy. These concepts underlie the assessment of political regimes as democratic or not fully democratic, and, accordingly, this can also affect the brand of the country in the international arena.

As one of the most valid and widely used tools for assessing democracy, democracy indices use various theoretical concepts as a basis for measurement. Indices use different factors, different scales of measurement, different characteristics of democracy in order to determine how effective democracy is in this or that case. The problem is that the choice of a theoretical concept also determines the final result. And the final result of the assessment of democracy in each specific case can also influence how the brand of the country is perceived outside.
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Formulation of the problem. Calling a country "partially free" is not the same as calling it a "hybrid regime." Without delving into the context, the observer would react to the fact that the country is not in the group of "democracies". This will directly affect the image of the country in the information space.

Measuring the political regime, in particular democracy, is a difficult task. However, various indices that measure the effectiveness of democracy can affect the
image of the state in the information space. In today's world, democracy is defined primarily through the rule of law, freedom of the individual and the press, free rotation of government, political pluralism, freedom of political participation and transparency of procedures that ensure the effectiveness of the entire system. [1]

There are many theories and concepts, each puts at the top of a democratic system some specific factors that determine effectiveness of democracy. If with democracies the set of basic factors is more or less clear, with autocracies the situation is more complicated. Autocracies differ from each other, sometimes radically. It is even more difficult to assess the so-called hybrid political regimes, combining both democratic and non-democratic characteristics in different proportions. A huge amount of research in political science is devoted to the problem of defining political regimes, assessing their effectiveness and the specific approaches to democratic concepts. While it is necessary for the theory, dealing with political regimes, it is also necessary for the definition of the country brand based on the political regime features, such as democracy.

Analysis of the recent research and publications. As P. Feldwick points out, a brand is a set of associations in the minds of consumers. [2] Different approaches to defining the essence of a brand indicate that a brand is a means of identification, and attitude to the product, and image in the mind, and a set of associations, and added value. All these approaches indicate that the brand affects psychological and social categories, and therefore can be applied not only to goods from a marketing point of view, but also to "goods" that are elements of the political system, or even integrated political regimes such as democracy.

From the point of view of D. Marsh and P. Fawcett, country branding in the field of politics primarily deals with the development of political institutions and elements of the political system, which in turn strengthens democracy, improves it as the system of government and as a result the country brand is seen as a democratic one. [3]

According to S. Jensen, the use of branding for national segmentation in the international arena began after the Cold War. [4] Thanks to this tool, the ideologies on which the history of international relations of the twentieth century was based, have been replaced by national brands. Such a shift from ideologies to national brands was the result of a shift to a market economy in the wake of democratization in the late twentieth century.

Peter Van Ham points out that in today's world, not only companies, but also cities, regions, countries and entire continents are paying attention to marketing tools to promote and build a brand. A brand for a modern country is a competitive advantage not only in the economy, but also in international relations. [5]

The article aims at considering the problem of ambiguity of views on the nature and features of democracy through indices of democracy. Uncertainty about the theoretical dimensions of democracy can affect how a democratic concept is promoted as a specific brand with all its special characteristics.
Presenting main material. The measurement of democracies, based on specific factors, with specific scales and valid results, will allow researchers to determine exactly where and how trends of democratization or autocratization are developing in the world. Various indices are now used to measure democracies. [6] These indices differ from each other both in the concept of democracy on which the methodology is based and in the set of factors identified to assess the effectiveness of the political regime. Indices use different scales of measurement, they present the results of the analysis differently and draw different conclusions about the development of the country's democratic trend, depending on the concept of democracy from which they are based. But they are related by the fact that the indices are based on expert judgment. That is, the results of the analysis will be affected in one way or another by a subjective factor. If political science cannot decompose the theoretical concept of democracy into an unambiguous framework that would not be revised depending on the approach, it cannot present a tool for assessing the effectiveness of democracy, devoid of subjective influence. A similar principle works in the opposite direction: the results of the assessment of political regimes within different indices can affect the image of the country in the information space and the way it is perceived by experts in various fields. But if you look at one country, represented in different indices, it becomes clear: a person who does not delve into the methodology of the index, cannot get an accurate result of the assessment.

If we consider the problem of the impact of democracy indices on the image of the state in the information space, it is worth mentioning again the problem of finding a tool that would provide generalized and valid data on political regimes around the world. [7] These data should be based on a specific methodology using a single assessment scale based on a common concept. The indices provide an opportunity to show the global picture of the development of democracies and non-democracies in the world over a long period of time. Based on the indices, it is possible to conclude how countries are developing, how effectively their managerial political teams are working, how political culture is changing, political participation is changing, how civil liberties and attitudes towards the press are developing. But it is worth remembering that apart from the indices, there is no common, accessible to all and relatively valid tool for assessing the political regimes of the world. [6] Among other things, the results of indices will be involved in the formation of the country's image in the information space, as the only way to mathematically assess the development trends of democracies and non-democracies in the world. A natural question arises: does the assessment of trends in democratization and autocratization in the world reflect the subjective component of the methodology of democracy indices? And if this is true, then the expert method provokes a vicious circle, where the subjective factor affects the formation of the image of the country in the information space, and the image itself subsequently affects the subjective perception of processes within the country. In addition, the fact remains that the observer reads the results of the analysis of the effectiveness of political regimes superficially, without delving into
the specifics of the chosen concept of democracy, not understanding on what criteria and on what principle the verdict is made. Thus, indices, unwillingly, offer an affordable tool for manipulating public opinion in order to form a certain attitude to the processes in a given state.

The spread of factors assessing democracies and non-democracies in the three most popular indices suggests that the problem of credible assessments of political regimes remains unresolved. [8]

Take, for example, The Economist Democracy Index, Freedom House's Freedom In the World, and the Polity IV project. These indices are widely used in analytical work and research on the development of democratic trends, as they allow us to assess democratization and autocratization in the world not in words but in relentless numbers. [9]

The Economist Democracy Index prefers to look at democracy through five main factors: the electoral process and pluralism, civil liberties, the functioning of government, political participation and political culture. Depending on the number of final points, the country falls into one of 4 groups of political regimes - full democracies, democracies with disabilities, hybrid political regimes and authoritarian regimes. [8]

The Freedom In the World Index has embraced the concept of liberal democracy in its entirety, assessing countries in two major categories: political rights and civil liberties. Within this index, depending on the final scores, a country can be in one of three groups - free, partially free and non-free countries. Moreover, Freedom In the World distinguishes between liberal democracy, which is related to free countries, and electoral democracy, which may or may not be liberal. Thus, if a country belongs to electoral democracies, but does not fall into the category of liberal, it may be in a group of countries partially free. If a country belongs to liberal democracies, it is always electoral and belongs to the group of free countries. Here we see a radically different approach to both the very concept of democracy and the factors of evaluating effectiveness. [8]

For the Polity IV project, the set of democratization factors in general is reduced to several components, focused on the rotation of managerial staff in government, political competition and the specifics of the work of political institutions. As a result of the assessment, countries fall into one of three broad groups of political regimes - democracy, autocracy and anocracy (in other words - hybrid regimes that combine elements of democracies and autocracies). [8]

So, if a country is not fully democratic, that is, has a number of characteristics of a democratic regime, but also some features that may throw it out of the group of fully effective democracies, the country may fall into the group of "democracies with disabilities" and the group of “hybrid regimes”, "Partially non-free countries" or "anocracies" depending on the index.

If we consider the problem of the impact of democracy indices on the image of the state in the information space, it is worth mentioning again the problem of finding
a tool that would provide generalized and valid data on political regimes around the world. These data should be based on a specific methodology using a single assessment scale based on a common concept. The indices provide an opportunity to show the global picture of the development of democracies and non-democracies in the world over a long period of time. Based on the indices, it is possible to conclude how countries are developing, how effectively their managerial political teams are working, how political culture is changing, political participation is changing, how civil liberties and attitudes towards the press are developing. But it is worth remembering that apart from the indices, there is no common, accessible to all and relatively valid tool for assessing the political regimes of the world. [9]

The spread of factors assessing democracies and non-democracies in the three abovementioned indices suggests that the problem of credible assessments of political regimes remains unresolved. If we note that in international relations there is also an aspect of competition, we can assume that in the field of international relations tools for separation, identification and branding of the state may also include tools used for similar purposes in marketing. In this regard, S. Jensen does not define the state brand as an additional asset created separately in addition to other state assets. State branding gives it a competitive advantage in the international arena, including in international economic relations. [4]

Thus, political branding can be used locally and globally. The local dimension is determined by the branding of political programs, development strategies, platforms and ideas, individual elements of the political system, including government departments, parties, politicians, as well as within the country (communities, towns, cities, etc.). The global dimension determines the brand of the state as a whole, which is a holistic system that includes elements of the local dimension and the brand of the political regime.

In this regard, Peter Van Ham points out that in today's environment, not only companies but also cities, regions, countries and entire continents are paying attention to marketing tools to promote and build a brand. A brand for a modern country is a competitive advantage not only in the economy, but also in international relations. [10] It is difficult for a country without a brand to attract economic and political attention in the international arena, and therefore the brand is a necessary and mandatory component of any country's strategic assets. In this case, according to Van Ham, it is possible to compare the brand of the country with the brand of the product.

As in the situation with the product, the country's brand depends on whether the "buyer" is satisfied with what he "buys". To help with this comes the dimension of "friendly brand", which is defined as a brand that meets customer expectations. If we translate this characteristic into the language of political science, the "friendship" of the country's brand is determined by the political aspect. A friendly brand is an ally, an ally or a country you can trust. [10] It is the view of countries as "friendly" and "hostile" in terms of the brand of these countries, ie the whole set of associations, images, symbols, values associated with the country in consciousness (perception), determines the attitude to countries and priorities in interaction with them.
The transition from the geopolitical domination of the politics of power to the postmodern domination of symbols also affects public policy and international relations, - underlines Van Ham. As a result, power policy becomes less effective, it gives way to other tools of influence and struggle of actors in the international arena. [10]

Democracies differ from non-democracies by a specific set of characteristics that determine the features of the institutional-functional and sociological dimensions of the political system of a particular state. Democracy itself as a political regime is based on a significant number of theoretical models that determine the basic characteristics necessary to distinguish democracy from other types of political regime. [9] To date, there is no consensus in political science as to which characteristics are universal for defining all democracies in the world. Thus, real examples of democracies in the world differ in different sets of characteristics, and hence in different practical embodiments of the theoretical model of democracy.

Democracy indices use different methodologies as a basis for measuring political regimes. Within the chosen methodology, each of the indices selects a specific concept (model) of democracy with its basic characteristics that define democracy as a separate type of political regime. Thus, depending on the chosen theoretical concept, which underlies the methodology of the index, the specific characteristics (factors) of measuring democracy are determined.

Thus, democracy indices (measurement and ratio) are a tool that not only allows you to work with political regimes in the field of politics, but also allows you to audit the brand of democracy. Brand capital determines the additional advantages and benefits, including competitive, through the provision of intangible assets that add value to the brand and commitment to it.

Conclusions. There are many different conceptions of democracy, determined by their set of characteristics of this political regime. Concepts of democracy underlie various tools for assessing the effectiveness of the world's political systems, based on a completely different set of factors.

Democracy indices, as a widely used tool for measuring the effectiveness of political regimes, are based on various democratic concepts. Accordingly, the results of the assessment of political and public administration characteristics within different political regimes in the world will differ significantly.

Today, it can be assumed that the success of public administration, the characteristics of the political system and the political regime as a whole can serve as an attribute of the brand of a country. A good brand helps a country to rebuild its position not only in the economy but also in international relations. But the peculiarities of the use of different concepts of democracy in different assessments of the effectiveness of political regimes can also affect the formation of the country's brand in the international arena. Thus, the theoretical concepts of democracy and their specifics are indirectly related to the peculiarities of rebuilding the country's brand through various tools for measuring and evaluating political regimes.
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