SÉRIE “Veřejná správa”

[https://doi.org/10.52058/2695-1592-2022-2\(9\)-7-18](https://doi.org/10.52058/2695-1592-2022-2(9)-7-18)

Yuri Kalnysh

*Doctor of Sciences in Public Administration, Professor, Professor of the
Department of Sociology, Dnipro National University.*

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9185-1094>

CONCEPTUAL FOUNDATIONS OF POLITICAL ANALYTICS IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Abstract. With the development of a democratic state in society, the problem of improving the effectiveness of public administration, in particular in its core area – political decision-making, is urgent. In our opinion, the basis for rationalizing this process is its analytical support. The article defines the characteristic features of the professional activity of political analyst in a modern democratic country and formulates theoretical foundations of political analytics in public administration. The application of these principles as a logical and ideological basis for political analysis of public policy should allow the analyst to have the greatest possible of the authorities and the public in the results of the analytical study, which can be effectively applied in any field of public policy. In order to formulate a clear procedure and effective technology for political analysis in public administration, it is necessary to determine the conceptual basis for its implementation. However, setting a conceptual basis in this case, unlike the natural sciences, is not dogmatic. Thus, none of the laws formulated by us is the basis for its unconditional adherence. And the innovation brought to court by the scientific community remains controversial, open to constructive criticism and correction.

Keywords: politics, public policy, public administration, political analysis, professional ethics.

Formulation of the problem. The first feature of political analytics is that everyone is engaged in it. In fact, people have long considered and made judgments about politics. Often, policies are based on these judgments. But, as Plato rightly remarked: "For some reason in the People's Assembly, when we need to consider the issue of trade, we listen to the merchants ..., the question of building public utensils - we invite the architect, and only politicians can speak for some reason ..." [1]. In fact,

this is the case – all conscious citizens are engaged in political analytics. We do this by watching the news on television, reading articles on political topics in the press, discussing the political realities of the state with friends and colleagues, etc. The only difference is the awareness with which people approach political analysis and the extent to which they possess analytical means of cognition. A professional analyst, of course, possesses such means very well and approaches this type of activity consciously, since – this is his professional activity, aimed, among other things, at earning his daily bread".

In this case, we have the right to speak about the professionalism of the analyst as a whole, and about the individual components of this professionalism, which are, first of all, professionalism itself and professional culture. Professional ethics, as we know, is a significant component of professional culture.

The urgency of introducing analytical research, methods and technologies into public administration at the present stage is due to the fact that they contribute to solving the following problems:

First, civil servants and officials of local governments who are involved in analytical activities need knowledge of the technologies of these activities and how to apply these skills. They need well-developed conceptual and methodological support for analytics, which they do not currently have. After all, existing ideas about what conceptual-methodical, information, technical and technological support of analytical work in state and local self-government bodies should be today are very vague and unspecified.

Secondly, in our view, the systematic development of state analytics must be seen as a sign of the achievement of the maturity of democratic statehood. On the agenda is the task of introducing a clear specialization in the work of civil servants, determining the content and algorithms of the activities of information and analytical units in the structures of state power.

Third, democracy, as a form of government, entered the era of cardinal reform in the late twentieth century, when humanity had accumulated a large number of variations in patterns of democratic development. The problem is to work out an optimal variant of national state formation, to make as few mistakes as possible in the historical position of the country in the world. In principle, it is not possible to solve this problem without the use of socio-philosophical and political-historical analytics.

Analysis of recent research and publications. Analytics is an extensive and complex system of knowledge, which includes: logic as a science of patterns and operations of correct thinking; methodology as a system of principles and techniques of cognitive activity; heuristics – a discipline whose purpose is to study the process of discovering new in science, technology and other areas of social life; as well as informatics – the science of information, ways of obtaining, accumulating, processing and transferring information.

Introducing the analytical component into modern government systems is not completely new to world science. As the results of the study of the history of political analytics have shown, attempts to conceptualize the logical and ideological base of political analytics have been made since ancient times. In particular, immersion in ancient political doctrines allows us to identify attempts to comprehend the conceptual foundations of political process analysis. First of all, these attempts were based on an awareness of a certain ideology of state power [1; 2; 3; 4; 5; 6; 7]. In the field of modern political science, well-known in this area are the developments of leading scientists [8; 9; 10].

However, the general lack of existing approaches to understanding analytical activity in public administration is the lack of a systematic and holistic understanding of the specifics in its various forms. In addition, there is a clear lack of conceptualization in analytical practice.

The purpose of the study, the results of which are presented in the article, is to determine the characteristics of the professional activity of a political scientist in a modern democracy and to formulate the theoretical foundations of political analysis in public administration.

Results and Discussion. It is well known that in the social sciences, unlike the natural sciences, even a lengthy and thorough study does not allow us to identify a stable scientific law that would necessarily and inevitably act, such as, for example, "the Law of Universal Attraction". In particular, in public administration, we can identify and formulate only stable patterns. One of these regularities, in our opinion, is the *Law of Proportions of the Power Relations* which states that in the system of public relations of the state in an organized society the share of the power relations does not change (Ideal condition - implies lack of connections with other state organized societies. The influence of other states or the ability to influence them should be taken into account to determine the proportion). In this case, it is said that in society a certain set of social relations - the most diverse - is carried out, from sexual marriage to state power. This population may change in proportion to the change in the number of subjects of the relationship. But in the aggregate of social relations, some share is occupied by power relations (private, public-private, public-government), and this share also changes in proportion to changes in the whole population. If a new subject of social relations emerges, for example, a new enterprise, the aggregate of relations of production and the market grows, but also a certain share of power relations arises (subordination within the enterprise, influence of the state on the enterprise, etc.).

The following pattern, which partly follows from the first, but does not boil down to it, is the *Law of Preservation of Power*, which states that in the state-organized society, when the share of state power changes, the share of other types of public power changes accordingly. The operation of this law means that if a state

loses some of its power (the same ideal condition applies – this law treats a separate state outside its contacts with other states), then that power will not disappear, but pass on to other entities of power relations. It will thus be transformed from state power into another type of public power.

From this law comes another conclusion - the redistribution of powers in the state as a whole will not affect the extent of its powers in society.

The conclusion that follows from the action of both laws of social power is formulated in the form of an *Axiom* – an unquestionable initial statement – in modern state-organized society state power exists objectively, that is, regardless of its medium.

Acceptance of this axiom means that modern democratic civil society does not in any way equate state power with a particular person, group of persons, party or other organization. Although history knows similar cases from ancient times to the present. True, since, as noted above, in history such an identification has repeatedly occurred, so we (solely for the purpose of theoretical analysis) make the assumption that in certain circumstances it is allowed to identify the state power with its subject (carrier) – legal entities, individuals or their groups, or the ruling elite as a whole. In any case, we will consider the state itself a material embodiment of state power.

The following set of assumptions (theorems) is proved on the basis of the laws and axioms formulated above:

Theorem 1 – to state power, as to every phenomenon of living matter or being, inherent in the functions of living organisms is conservation and multiplication. The formulation of this theorem is associated with the popularity of behaviorism in the early and mid-last century. Behaviorists argue [11] that every living organism has two of the aforementioned basic instincts that act independently of consciousness. We assume that since the state is made up of real living people and is the material embodiment of state power, so in state power itself (personified) is also a desire to preserve and multiply.

Theorem 2 – the real problems for state power are the phenomena of social existence (socially significant events) that are a threat to the preservation of state power or may affect the processes of its multiplication. This statement follows from the first theorem and implies that none of the social problems is perceived by the state government as such, unless it poses a threat to the existence and functioning of the state power itself. The acceptance of this theorem as one of the conceptual foundations of political analysis in public administration implies a certain content of the problem for political analysis. This problem is always a threat to the state government, or sometimes an opportunity to multiply it.

Theorem 3 – public authorities are exposed to political risk: in certain circumstances, they may sacrifice multiplication for their own preservation, or vice

versa – risk the preservation for their own multiplication¹. The risk aversion is also instinctively inherent in highly organized living organisms, in particular humans. It is the propensity to risk that allows the development of human civilization, make new discoveries, create others of all kinds of innovations. The risk appetite, in turn, allows the state to develop, and in most cases adequately respond to the demands of a developing society for the same reason. We point out that there may be circumstances where, despite the desire to multiply in society, the state may voluntarily transfer some of its power to other public relations entities in order to preserve another (usually larger) share and, in certain circumstances, to increase it. This is the case, for example, when a unitary state delegates some of its powers to local governments, without waiting for them to withdraw these powers from the state themselves, whether through a referendum or federalization, or even a revolution. In addition, political history knows many cases where the state, by contrast, by various means (not always democratic) seeks to increase its share of power in society. In each of these cases, the state risked even its very existence, threatening the resistance of those entities in which it sought power or freedom to seize. In view of the last statement, we formulate the following theorem.

Theorem 4 – the greatest threat to the state is its own citizens. Assuming that many levers of counteracting the aggression of one state against another have been produced in the modern civilization space, then the main potential for the expansion of the state's powers will fall to the domestic sphere – the society of one's own country. Even in ancient times in history, we have seen a variety of internal unrest in countries more often than wars between states. Dissatisfaction with the state is one of the most characteristic feelings of the citizen. Even in very prosperous countries by modern standards, we see a considerable number of dissatisfied citizens. Moreover, this dissatisfaction can arise in different sections of society, depending on the interests of which layers affect one or another aspect of public policy. This feeling is quite natural for humans. One will never enjoy the oppression of power, even if it is done in a civilized, democratic and humane way. Paradoxical in this case is the feeling of a patriot – a citizen who genuinely loves his country and respects the state, a citizen of a grateful state for his social status. He will strive for greater freedom and higher social status at the expense of the state. In this case, the citizen directs his dissatisfaction not at the state as such, but at specific subjects of state power – politicians or officials. After all, only the people in the fullness of their state sovereignty can destroy the state.

In modern society, the state cannot oppose its own citizens with a single physical force, in fact the physical force of the state consists of the same citizens. Even the ancient despotic states could not rely on force alone. State power in society

¹ At risk, we usually understand the need to make decisions under uncertainty [12].

must be legitimized by something other than power. The law and the social paradigm are much more supportive of the state. Law and the social paradigm determine one another and jointly influence the public consciousness, ensuring the power status of the state. However, it is precisely these forms of social relations that bind the state first. Accordingly, we formulate the following theorem.

Theorem 5 – limitations of state power in a democratic society advocate law and the social paradigm. A statement that at first sight does not require proof. But the formulation of this theorem gives us reason to believe that the greatest temptation for state power is to overstep the restrictions. Therefore, one of the roles of the analyst is to evaluate the governmental activity of the state in the context of a political situation that requires, promotes, assumes or denies the adherence of state authorities to all the requirements of law and social paradigm.

In the case of law, the state is able to make the necessary adjustments both in the content of state policy and public-administrative activity (with the aim of bringing them to the tenets of law), and in the legal system (in order to bring it into common denominator with promising state policy). Powers generally the state has.

As for the social paradigm, this system is far beyond the influence of the state. Therefore, the analyst's judgments should not go beyond the social paradigm, and in the case of a justified need to violate it – a clear assessment of the possible consequences of such actions by the subject of power and advice on the negative consequences should be given. Since all political processes have an ethical dimension, they directly or indirectly touch on the values of the social paradigm. In some policy areas, the ethical aspect is muted and in others it is pronounced. In modern politics, means cannot be separated from goals, and every political action has consequences that can be accessed on the basis of ethical considerations [13].

Valuable judgments are based on a regulatory calculation. In today's political argument, there are two main models of normative calculation – moral absolutism and consequentialism. Moral absolutism accepts values and adheres to them regardless of the consequences. Consequential ethical calculation does not recognize absolute moral principles; it evaluates the consequences of applying the moral principle in practice and accordingly judges them [14].

Political arguments aimed at agreeing or agreeing on a wide range of preferences are usually based on a consequential regulatory calculation. However, absolutist tendencies also have some place in the political debate.

For example, what about the actual application in the practice of public administration of the absolute, from the point of view of modern law and morality, the assertion that the state should always be open and truthful to society and citizens? Of course, honesty is the best feature of public policy, but if the open publication of one or another piece of information can actually harm the state and society as a whole – the law and the social paradigm suggest a consequential approach.

Theorem 6 – there is a limited range of events which, as a problem for the government, do not require proof: revolution or state mutiny, foreign military aggression, large-scale natural or man-made catastrophe, a pandemic of a deadly disease, a direct threat to the physical destruction of the subject of power.

We have already noted that the main problems for political analysis in public administration are threats to the existence and functioning of public power. Previous allegations have also shown that such threats existed and will always exist. But the magnitude and relevance of these threats may vary. As the biggest and undisputed threats, we propose to accept a limited range of events, the content of which is such that their threat to the state government does not require additional proof.

If the political analyst's news release states that a revolution is taking place in the country, then proving it requires not the fact of a threat to state power, but the fact of revolutionary events. This also applies to other cases – state insurgency and external aggression. After all, the course of these events proves the fact of their existence. Similarly, in the case of large-scale natural or man-made disasters and pandemics of fatal diseases, we understand events that directly threaten the physical existence of society and, accordingly, the state.

The last statement about the direct threat of physical destruction of the subject of authority follows from the assumption that in certain circumstances the subject of power may identify with the government itself. We understand that with the destruction of a subject, he or she will sooner or later be replaced by another and assume the appropriate authority. But the emphasis on the relevance of the latter event is precisely because of the inherent instinct of self-preservation for human nature. Referring to this instinct, the analyst can be as convincing as possible.

In general terms, we propose to accept the last theorem as one of the conceptual foundations of political analysis in public administration, also for reasons of technology analysis and problem formulation. If the analyst succeeds in bringing the problem to which he invites the subject of his attention to the signs of events listed in the list of indisputable threats, the proving of the urgency of this problem can be considered as finally completed and as convincing as possible.

Finally, we need to clarify a few more principles of political analysis technology in public administration, the use of which increases its effectiveness.

First of all, in order for political analysis not to turn into endless reasoning, it is advisable to limit the problem. The first of these constraints is space and time. The problem for political analysis only exists today. In the past, it becomes a cause, in the future, a consequence. Predicting problems is the subject of another component of political analytics – political forecasting. Another limitation for political analysis in public administration is the competence of public authorities. It should be noted that for political analysis there is no such restriction in the political system. The limits of the influence of the state in a democratic society are usually clearly defined, and

public policy, on the contrary, seeks to penetrate into all spheres of public relations, where it can manifest itself in the most unexpected way. Identifying the problem is the most difficult and important step in the implementation of the analytical project. Although the criteria and limitations of the problem for political analysis are quite clear, it is not always easy to identify the problem. The vision of the problem is subjective, because the problem exists for the government in general, and it is up to the individual to determine it. Therefore, a situation that may seem like a problem to an individual manager will not always be the same in the eyes of his colleagues. Much depends on the view of the situation as well as the subjective expectations. Therefore, it is very useful to organize the process of meeting expectations. Given that the problem for political analysis is always relevant, that is, it exists today.

Quality and approval are the main factors for evaluating the formulated project. If those who are hypothetically able to become an active agent in overcoming the problem have not been consulted, in the process of solving the problem it may be that there is no political will. It should be noted that in some cases, it is the lack of political will of a public authority that may cause or aggravate the problem. It is worth reiterating that the political problem is related to the process of acquisition and retention of state power by its subjects. The problem of modern professional political analytics seems to exist in three dimensions. It is both universal, local and situational. Resolving it means finding a socio-cultural niche for political analytics that would enable analysts, first, to make a living, and second, to do so in a relatively decent way. That is, there must be a demand for an analytical product and a taboo system that does not allow the servicing authority to become its slave.

The most important direction and method of activity of analysts in promoting the development of democratic institutions is to support the process of involving citizens and their associations in the decision-making and implementation of political and state decisions, as well as identifying and professionally lobbying the interests of the citizens and their important priorities for the ruling elite. This is the way the analytical and expert community can counteract many of the negative trends in public policy, while at the same time directing the adoption and implementation of more grounded social and other problems of the state, business and society. In this sense, it should always be remembered that a political analyst should not become a "gray cardinal" of politics. His function is quite different. The analysis can be very good, but it will not necessarily be used. It must be understood that politics is a reconciliation of interests. If we rationally, for the best reasons, have produced a result, we must consider that there are other categories of interests that the politician must somehow reconcile, balance, and so on. It is not for nothing that Americans, great masters of political analytics, have introduced in their professional language the term "feasibility", that is, it should be not only rational but also acceptable. You can come up with the most rational solution, but it will still be blocked.

In practice, this is sometimes the case, but ideally it should always be – some idea of reality is developed not in terms of the interests of the authorities, since the one who follows the power quickly devalues his own activity, inevitably saying only what the power already knows but wants to hear it again from the alleged specialist, and this soon becomes apparent. Such an idea that goes against inertia must be produced only by internal, independent interpretation, that is, the obvious or hidden private interest of the authorities is not included there as an end in itself. We emphasize – as an end in itself. But at the same time such an idea should turn into a product that the authorities will be ready to consume.

In other words, it is about translating the analytical semi-finished product into the language of power and, in particular, the inclusion of a component such as the interest of power in its composition. More precisely, it is not the abstract interest of abstract power, but the specific political interest of a particular political power that is in power.

In some sense, the analytical community must not only "sell" its product to the authorities, but also "buy" ways of using it. The common interest must act largely as a private interest, but with two differences. First, in keeping with the private interest of the authorities, it remains general unless it is misinterpreted. That is its essence, and the private interest of the analysts themselves is of no interest to anyone but themselves.

Secondly, not only goals but also means in this case are somewhat different. There is nothing for analysts to "bribe" the authorities, except for their own charisma and the power of low-budget technologies. However, "power interest" remains a very important component of the analytic product, its property, and not the shell at all.

Qualitative analytical developments will eventually be requested, but they must be promoted, lobbied and, first of all, developed (by fooling, to some extent, today's politicians) into the idea that public policy is very effective.

Today, the analytical community has the task of creating some framework that would reproduce sufficiently standard, sufficiently verified and sufficiently effective knowledge and procedures in the field of political analytics. I would like to emphasize once again that political analytics in its real meaning has nothing to do with the most common examples of political counseling today. These examples do not copy the strengths of marketing policy projects, which, in turn, do not always meet the level of demands placed on them by civil society. Political analytics is another area where we need to stop borrowing knowingly "substandard" knowledge.

The concept of political analytics is now, indeed, very ambiguous, multifaceted, but today we must outline our "platform" which will allow us to effectively, professionally and rationally solve emerging problems, without forgetting the ethical aspects.

It is the values of professional conduct that determine the "portrait" of a political analyst. But at the same time, such benchmarks depend little on the form of

government, the balance of power and the configuration of power. Moreover, the system of values of the government itself largely determines the professional parameters of political analytics. Because, as historical experience shows, no external circumstances or status commitments are capable of as steadily and permanently influencing decisions made in politics as their own internal beliefs and values, ideas of what is permissible and what is not permissible are inherent in who makes these decisions. The system of political values crystallizes and replicates patterns of political behavior itself.

One of the paradoxes of the current value system of the political elite in countries with transitional democracy is that the disdainful attitude towards law (as a leading governing value) is the striking spiritual solidarity of the upper echelon and the majority of society. The effect of the latter is all the more noticeable because the internal denial of the value of law is reinforced by the constant existence of double standards of responsibility, which have trained managers of different levels to avoid any real responsibility to society.

Among the priority mechanisms for establishing a constructive system of values of professional policy are [14]:

- rational balancing of socio-political interests;
- changing the paradigm of perceptions of politics as such.

Understanding politics as a technology to achieve socially-defined goals and, through defining the establishment of clear, understandable rules for each society's participation in government, a fundamental change in managerial culture, the very philosophy of public administration;

- development of social, in particular educational, mechanisms of "natural" allocation for the political activity of "better people";
- increasing the efficiency of the political education system of the whole population and, first of all, professional training of management personnel, etc.

These foundations should be, first and foremost, a feature of the widespread adoption of political analytics of the democratic model.

The new model of governance for social development must be based on the principles of transparency, under which I understand the right of every person to know where and by whom political decisions are made, what decisions are made, how much and what the state spends, because it is a vital pledge of open, legal and democratic society. The generally accepted logic of analytic research begins with the definition of object. This approach is also characteristic of political analytics. However, already at this stage, we face considerable differences in the definition of these starting points of the analysis. If for all areas of political analytics, as a field of scientific knowledge, the common object is the political system of society, and with the rest – the whole system of phenomena of social existence that can affect political

relations. That is, the subject of public policy analysis and political analysis is clearly different. In both cases, the subject of analysis is the problem. But, in the first case, it is a problem of public policy, is any socially significant problem, which is solved through the formation and implementation of public policy (government actions/omissions). As for political analysis, this kind of analytical activity in politics is often confused with the analysis of public policy, which is still not clearly defined at the conceptual level.

In the current scientific literature, we find only shy allusions to the fact that "the result of political analysis must be of considerable interest to public authorities" [9]. Instead, in the writings of historical predecessors [5; 6; 7] we find a clearer definition of the subject of their political analysis. In this case, it refers to the state of the state power, regardless of whether the state power is identified with its carrier, or considered abstractly. Thus, the main issue of political analysis is the question of "power". Unlike the analysis of state policy, the main issue is the content of the state's actions aimed at solving one or another socially significant problem. If the government adopts the initial premise that the only problem for political analysis can be the problem of state power, then the conceptual basis for such an analysis should be a series of assertions, based on which a further method of analysis will be based.

Conclusions. The above allows us to draw the following conclusions:

1. Political analysis for the needs of public administration has at all times been and remains a specific field of analyst's professional activity aimed at assisting the state in maintaining and increasing its power. In addition to perfect mastery of analytical technologies and considerable baggage of social knowledge, an important component of an analyst's professional activity is his high morals. In unclean hands, political analytics can easily turn into a powerful tool of despotism.

2. The modern political realities of a democratic society are changing the vision of the real role that a political analyst should play in the system of government. If for a totalitarian society of any model a characteristic feature is the closed system of political decision-making, then the role of the persons who by their advice help the ruling top of such a society to make the appropriate decision consists in secret consultation, and often in the shadow agreement of interests of different political parties. With democracy, openness of the political process and broad public participation in it, the role of the political analyst changes. Acting in the interests of state power, the analyst no longer has to assume the role of "gray cardinal". Now the advice of a political analyst becomes a mostly open document, in which the interests of the state government or its subjects are in harmony with the interests of the public. Thus, the advice of a political analyst becomes a public domain, and he becomes not so much a public official as a public servant.

3. In such circumstances, open consultation in the form of participation in public councils, or other public entities, with executive bodies becomes the main mechanism

of interaction between the political analyst and the political-management community; work as a political observer in the media; activities of non-governmental analytical structures; scientific work or, ultimately, public service in the analytical structures of public authorities (provided that this service is based on the principles of the modern European democratic administrative space).

4. The value foundations of modern political analytics in a democratic society are based, above all, on the political analyst's awareness of his professional calling to serve not the state power but the agreed interests of society as a whole. However, in today's context, such an orientation implies on the part of the political analyst the use of mechanisms of "manipulation" of the ruling consciousness of the political elite.

5. In order to formulate a clear procedure and effective technology for political analysis in public administration, it is necessary to determine the conceptual basis for its implementation. However, setting a conceptual basis in this case, unlike the natural sciences, is not dogmatic. Thus, none of the laws formulated by us is the basis for its unconditional adherence. And the innovation brought to court by the scientific community remains controversial, open to constructive criticism and correction.

References:

1. Plato. *The Statesman*. Cambridge University Press; First edition (April 28, 1995). 124 p.
2. Aristotle. *Politics - A Treatise on Government*. Book Jungle (January 11, 2007). 236 p.
3. The Holy Bible. Thomas Nelson. Larger Print edition (March 5, 2006). 1504 p.
4. The Holy Qur'an. *Wordsworth Classics of World Literature*. Paperback (11 Jun 1997) 275p.
5. *Machiavelli, Niccolo*. *The Prince: with Related Documents*. *Bedford Cultural Editions*. Bedford/St. Martin's; Second edition (April 15, 2016). 224 p.
6. *Hobbs, Thomas*. *Leviathan*. Create Space Independent Publishing Platform (June 29, 2011). 118 p.
7. Spinoza. *Theological-Political Treatise*. Hackett Publishing Company, Inc. (November 15t, 2001). 296 p.
8. Vedung, Evert. *Public Policy and Program Evaluation*. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. Vol. 44, No. 2 (Jun., 1999), pp. 433-436.
9. *Pal, Leslie A*. *Public Policy Analysis: An Introduction*. Toronto: Methuen, Stephen Brooks. 1987, 273 p.
10. Weiss, Carol.G. *Evaluation: Methods for Studying Programs and Policies*, Prentice Hall; 2nd edition (December 18, 1997). 384 p.
11. Pierce, W. David, Cheney, Carl D. *Behavior Analysis and Learning: 5th Edition*/ Psychology Press; 5 edition (March 18, 2013). 608 p.
12. Beck, U. *World at Risk*. Cambridge. Polity Press, (December 22, 2008). 240 p.
13. Neumann, John von, Morgenstern, Oscar. *Theory of Games and Economic Behavior*. Princeton University Press (March 1 2007). 739 p.
14. Weber, Max. *Politics as a Vocation*. Isha Books (2013). 52 p.
15. Vedung, Evert, 1997, *Public Policy and Program Evaluation*, 209-245, Piscataway, NJ and London: Transaction.