NETWORK LANDSCAPE OF CURRENT PUBLIC POLICY

Inna Valerievna Miroshnichenko[*]

Abstract: The purpose of this paper is to develop and operationalise the concept of a network landscape of public policy. This study makes a contribution to research on public policy by demonstrating new network features of the current public sphere and their potential in transforming institutional characteristics of public policy of today's states. Institutional characteristics of modern political spheres are formed under the influence of networkisation. Networkisation is brought about by the development of a network society. The concept of the network landscape was originally developed in a series of research projects in 2006 – 2014 in which the author participated. The network landscape is linked to the political sphere and reflects institutional and communicative features of network structures from different levels of public policy. The network landscape includes different types of nodes represented by network structures and network communities with various degrees of sustainability and various degrees of communicative connections. The author consistently argues that temporal diversity of network structures in the network landscape results from the heterogeneity and multiculturalism of the social sphere due to glocalisation. Different types of social networks produce particular types of social solidarity and social capital thus creating diffusion or integration in the civil life. The network landscape of public policy includes a range of landscape nodes making up a heterogeneous structure of the Russian society with a number of development vectors. Both pre-modern and quasi-modern networks have vantage points around which civil relations based on solidarity and common interests concentrate and develop. New relations form enclaves around every vantage point, and their potential development and integration into a society is only possible with deliberate government and society intervention aimed at forming an institutionalized system of civil partnership.

Keywords: Network communities, networkisation, network landscape of public policy, political sphere, network communication, pre-modern social networks, modern social networks, postmodern social networks.

INTRODUCTION

Giddens's recursive theory and his notion of reflexive modernity (Giddens 2004) provide an adequate interpretation of fast-changing contours of the political sphere of the current time. A proper study of spatial characteristics of public policy is hardly possible without reference to a broader social context. In spite of objective multiplicity the wholeness of a political subject is recurrently ascribed and maintained (Yadov 2002). Interconnected and interdependent social structures of the objective (in forms of the allocation of practices results, resources and mechanisms of their usage) are integrated with the subjective (in forms of legitimate schemas and explicit notions). The sphere of public policy is considered "an objective notion" which is "made up of legitimate practical schemas being components of the subjective" (Shmatko 2001).

The current dynamics of the institutionalization of global and local political spheres are largely dependent on serious public transformations changing institutional

[*]   Kuban State University, Russia, 350040, Krasnodar, Stavropolskaya str., 149

and sociocultural foundations of the current world. Recently, a considerable body of research has grown up around the issue of a new stage in the development of the current reality, a stage defined by nonlinear and network bodies and processes (Semenenko, Lapkin and Pantin 2014; Postmodernism: encyclopeadia, 2001; Prohorenko 2012). Fundamentals of the new social reality have been developed within the framework of a new interdisciplinary paradigm of social studies. Most of the research up to now metaphorically conceptualise the reflexivity of fast changing social reality in terms of "individualized society" by Bauman, " the society of risk" by Beck, "infomodernity" by Semenenko and Lapkin (Bauman 2001; Beck 1986; Castells 2010; Lapkin, and Semenenko, 2013; Semenenko and Lapkin, Pantin 2014). These metaphorical terms reflect the complexity and multiplicity of our current society developing in the era of technological revolution and information and communications technologies diffusion in all realms of our society. The notion of "network landscape" can capture the essence of a network aspect of the current political sphere.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND EMPIRICAL STUDIES

The formation of institutional fundamentals of network society has raised a new question of developing a new research paradigm to capture a complex and multidimensional nature of network society together with developing a set of reliable analytical tools. Current social philosophers propose the notion of postmodern scientific paradigm characterized by a number of aspects. Firstly, a single unified subject is rejected for the sake of a collective subject, meaning that, there are several cognitive actors interpreting a society with different dynamic characteristics and from different temporal and local points. Ontological monism and dualism are being replaced by ontological multidimentialism with multiple research options, interpretations and practices. Secondly, this type of paradigm is characterised by complex reflexivity including both the reflexivity of real, fast changing, and contradictory society and the reflexivity of individuals interpreting their created and used meanings. According to Beck, this provides a balance among several theoretical conceptualisations without giving any preference to a particular one, so that a number of theories complement each other (Beck 2007). Thirdly, the postmodern discourse produces a new methodologist with a new type of research identity, namely, an anthropological identity able to exist and conduct research in our open, multidimensional, networking and virtual reality; able to refocus their research discourse in emerging and changing circumstances (Genisaretski 1997).

A network methodology enables a researcher to capture the meaning of most complex and multidimensional events and processes of current public policy. The heuristic character of the network methodology is determined by its ability to produce a new type of knowledge by networking means of scientific convergence

and synchronization with other theories and its broad research potential enabling one to draw interdisciplinary theoretical conclusions.

The concept of network society as developed by Castells sets the terrain for the network methodology. According to Castells, the network society is a social structure resulting from the development of the informational ecosystem on the basis of knowledge and information accumulation. Open knowledge and information distribution transform and reconfigure social practices until they acquire new characteristics found in various social contexts worldwide (Castells 2010).

A break-through in network society studies is provided by the theory of a networking frontier (Morozova, Miroshnichenko, Ryabchenko, 2016). A networking frontier is a set of moving contours mapping the space of networks. It is also the overlapping discourse of past and present social and cultural practices. According to the frontier concept, the transformation of an information society into a network one originally involves building up a network of frontiers. As time goes on, the network of frontiers expands and overlaps, thus forming a new networking landscape.

Studies of the online sphere and its role in changing public policy both at global and local levels are an emerging field in the scholarship on public policy. The existence of this new field is brought about by the emergence of new on-line network structures and the interactive mechanism of network public administration (Hacker & Dijk Van, 2000; Miroshnichenko, 2016; Ryabchenko and Gnedash 2015).

Social constructivism enables one to discuss contemporary processes of social order institutionalisation in terms of the objectivation of subjective cognitive human frames. This makes public reality intersubjective. Bourdieu's ideas set the terrain for a framework which facilitates the conceptualization of political institutionalization of network communities in terms of social sphere characteristics and actions of particular individuals (Bourdieu 2005).

The typology of social networks developed by Rose (Rose 2002) serves as a basis for distinguishing network landscape nodes. According to his theory, it is possible to distinguish pre-modern, modern and anti-modern social networks. As this theory puts, different types of social networks produce different types of social solidarity and loyalty (social capital) invoking either the diffusion or the integration of social life (Rose 2002).

The theoretical basis for the concept of "networking landscape of public policy" was set by the author in 2006 – 2014 through a series of theoretical and empirical studies. The conceptual framework of the studies was part of a double reflexivity methodology. The latter includes the combination of a particular theoretical basis with a particular empirical approach within the context of a research group studying a particular issue as a team. As the studies developed, several particular aspects of the research were highlighted, double-checked, and developed further on. For the purposes of this study, several basic sociology research methods were used such

as: in-depth interviews, case studies, an interactive qualitative analysis of electronic resources, and online interactive data collection and analysis. The qualitative analysis was the major methodological instrument altogether.

The empirical database includes a number of different sources representing the objective reality of the public policy sphere such as:

(a) The results of sociology studies carried out in 2007 – 2012 by several research groups from the Institute of Economics of the Russian Academy of Sciences (RAS), the National Investment Council, the Centre for Politology and Political Sociology at the Institute of Sociology of RAS, the Russian Public Opinion Research Fund, and the Levada Centre;

(b) An integrated database of the transcripts of 80 in-depth interviews with respondents involved in different types of social networks and 40 case studies of social networks based on in-depth interviews, documents from printed and electronic mass media characterising different aspects of social networks;

(c) Several online crowdsourcing Russian and foreign platforms of different actors including government bodies, traditional non-profit public organisations, network non-profit public organisations and social networks.

NETWORKING LANDSCAPE AND EFFECTS OF PUBLIC POLICY NETWORKISATION: RESEARCH RESULTS

Contemporary practices of public policy and opportunities for their transfer and development occur within the context of a network landscape. The concept of network landscape enables one to assess new networking qualities of current public sphere and identify their role in transforming institutional characteristics of public policy in today's states.

The network landscape of public policy is a heterogeneous and dynamic structure including a range of networks in public policy. These networks are characterised by the presence of multiple self-organisational foundations and different temporal features thus providing the succession of stages in a political activity. The network landscape is connected to the political sphere and reflects institutional (formal and informal) and communicative (public and latent) characteristics of network objects from different levels of public policy.

The emergence and the development of different nodes in the network landscape structure are the result of network society penetration into public policy. The Internet with its web 2.0 and web 3.0 technologies is the major global cyber-network and functions as a basis for the emergence of a new global communication public sphere with radically new opportunities for communication. The public sphere is expanded by means of internetisation since the Internet performs a range of

functions from basic information transfer and communication to more advanced forms such as the formation of Internet society capable of generating, spreading and consuming particular content. The technical characteristics of the Internet such as non-hierarchical relations, free access and appeal to individual users facilitate the conception of a single communication society, or a network without any inner gaps (Apel 1997). The digital internet platform is open for changes providing penetration into the public sphere and drastic development of a network of political communication. *Network communication becomes an active source of new meanings and new relations in the political sphere*. However, *the network expansion of the public sphere* may have a negative impact on some groups of individuals by excluding them from a new system of public policy due to their limited access to the cyber space of the Internet. This sort of inequality can be tangible both at the global level and the level of particular regions and local communities defining boundaries within which individuals are able to produce their own public policy.

The global information and communication space of network society is open for individual and collective actors to set up their own autonomous social communities with their own virtual public spheres connected to the global public sphere. How individuals conceptualise their own social community in connection with the global public sphere by means of a critically reflexive activity of meanings production, can be well analysed by applying Foucault's concept of governmentality (Foucault 1991). This concept considers individuals' work on connecting to the global public sphere a critically reflexive activity (Walters and Haahr 2005). The duality of the critically reflexive activity leads to *the refeudalisation effect*, or the emergence of lords and servants in the context of public policy. Network lords are those individuals who actively construct their life world and their own position in the public sphere by producing, critically reflecting on and transferring their own meanings. Network servants are those individuals who only reproduce existing meanings by aligning with them. *Meanings, cognitive and narrative frames* developed by network lords and reproduced and spread by network servants *make up communicative power*. According to Beck (Beck 1986), a radically new phenomenon of "politics decay" is underway at present, meaning that traditional power of strong national states and centralised governments is being replaced by communicative power of various networks, groups of individuals and communities capable of creating dominant meanings.

The monopoly of states to set boundaries for an individual identity is subverted by the critically reflexive activity of meanings construction performed by individuals: in the public sphere, critically expanded by the Internet, individuals shape their norms and policies, decide what networks to join and what networks to set up. These processes inevitably change the existing power relations. In present societies, social energy and political influence are accumulated at the horizontal axis of

communication in the public sphere where different local communities constituted by still smaller communities and networks are based (Pokrovskij 2003).

Public spheres can be constructed both by socially active individuals and network authorities that deliberately design them. A topos structure of the current public sphere is a positive effect of the refeudalisation of the public sphere as it enables to seek solutions to local problems within a greater project implemented by unified actions of a network of socially active individuals. The topos structure functions as an intersubjective reality where ideas set boundaries for decisions taken. The topos structure often encourages so called solidarity networks which put forward autonomous solutions quite different from those offered by authorities. Public spheres can also be constructed via manipulation mechanisms and social and political engineering. In this case, mayors, PR, business and mass media leaders function as lords of public spheres, and they construct new public reality by network means of information creation and information transfer.

Social reflexivity and autonomy demonstrated by individuals in the process of public spheres construction produces *the effect of the network transformation of the civil society*. As a result, the state - civil society divide is deconstructed, and an underlying basis is defined. In this case, power is an underlying basis; power which has both political and apolitical characteristics. However, civil society also maintains its common characteristics such as state autonomy, state dependence, a range of institutionalised values and practices. According to Foucault, civil society is a society which is based on power relations rooted in the social sphere (Foucault 2006). Civil society is no longer conceptualised in terms of market and ownership relations (Lane 2012), rather it becomes an environment saturated with a number of self-sufficient networks with different forms of mutually beneficial connections. Human beings' ability to align themselves with real or imaginary communities or groups facilitates the process of self-identification, which is, in its turn, an underlying basis for mutually beneficial relationships. Thus, civil society is discussed in terms of a number of communities in which members are committed to each other. To illustrate this idea, Fukuyama cites a case of Yanki City, a community consisting of 17,000 members with 22,000 different mutually beneficial connections (Fukuyama 2008). Civil society is a result of the integration of symbolic, cognitive and structural forms of society on the basis of horizontal network connections in a particular national community providing the succession of different stages in the development of a state.

Networkisation seems to cause a crisis in the traditional system of political representation. The crisis results from dissatisfaction experienced by those new social groups and communities that have appeared in social and economic spheres of a particular society. What is more, it is possible to argue that a current public policy is characterized by the change of political representation patterns. This is caused by *the effect of network reverse adaptation of traditional political institutions*

and structures of a network civil society. On the one hand, traditionally hierarchical structures of political institutions begin to change their forms as it is almost impossible for them to function in an informationally dispersed environment with a number of power nodes. They operate similarly to network forms of power and network communication. Political leaders, political parties and political groups develop and implement their own political strategy of network policy. For example, in the 21st century, in present states, no political party can be an independent political actor beyond their network policy. Similarly, the network policy of parties' leadership can be viewed as a result of cooperation between information and communication technologies and a political impact on civil society. To increase their status or to achieve legitimacy, traditional political institutions either construct their own network structures or take over existing network structures in civil society. On the other hand, structures of network civil society take over traditional political institutions constructing hybrid forms of political representation, such as pirate political parties for example.

Non-intitutionalised political actors become actively involved in public policy by means of *the rhizome model*. In the communicative sphere of public policy there are rhizomatic (hidden and multiple, able to develop in a wide array of directions and form a map of connections) discursive networks of civil journalism (blogs, social online networks) which can become really powerful political actors under proper exogenous (local or global political events) and endogenous (resources for public actions) circumstances. The rhizome model of online communication is a beneficial environment for the conception of autonomous network communities (independent of authorities) which do not have access to traditional channels of public representation and political involvement. As reality shows, network political communities acquire their active status unexpectedly in the crisis or chaos of a political system. This facilitates much easier access to public policy resources and expands the sphere of national public policy all together. Pantin argues that a great number of empirical data (events) uphold a global tendency for the nonlinear rhizome model in politics (Pantin 2012). These events become turbulent and highly bifurcating with time. Arab revolutions with their explosive network dynamics based on closely interwoven Islamic, nationalistic, liberal-democratic and modern traditions illustrate quite well how these events can develop within the framework of the rhizome model. The rhizome structure leads to the conception of radically new political actors whose public activity is based on network techniques of group mobilization and political activity coordination.

Although the rhizome effect in politics is relatively new, its impact is rather substantial, for example, it broadens boundaries of "street" public policy. It is worth mentioning that the rhizome structure is beyond rupture. A rhizome can be broken when a political activity is limited or totally eradicated but it will come to existence again at some other point of the public sphere similar to a rhizome which

will start up on one of its lines or on a new line. It is important for governments to avoid or significantly limit any violent measures when dealing with the rhizome structure of public policy in order to avoid a counter-effect. *Governments have a twofold goal in such situations: on the one hand, network actors' need for political activity should be satisfied; on the other hand, their activity should be beneficial for a government.*

Non-linear development of network society determines the diversification of political practices and institutional forms and extends to the sphere of public governance. *The networkisation of public governance is* caused by multi-layered network changes in the multiplicity of public policy where power tools are randomly allocated among a wide array of individual and group political actors. Affected by networkisation, public governance also becomes multiple and multi-layered. It is worth mentioning that the networkisation of public governance is twofold. Moreover, there is a traditional form of public governance when incorporated network structures do not change means of communication between government bodies and civil society. In this case, public governance is performed by latent political bodies and communities achieving their own goals by identifying the meaning of political decisions. Networks in public governance can acquire different forms with respect to the institutional design of public policy, political and cultural traditions of a country. For example, in Southern Europe, public governance networks are formed on the basis of patron-client relations, which enable the construction of political and criminal compromises between political elites and criminal bodies creating incentives for corruption and grey lobbying. In Central and Eastern Europe, political networks are informal coalitions of old and new political elites attempting to control their political spheres (Mikhailova, 2011).

Eventually, there is some effect of new risks and dangers in public policy. Firstly, there is a danger for criminally marginalized groups to acquire more power due to an increase in a number of opportunities for a particular individual to become actively involved in public policy. For example, current transnational criminal groups have a network structure, and all their activities such as the enrollment of new members, the coordination of different branches, and propaganda have a network basis too. Secondly, opportunities for total information control pose another risk. Thirdly, network technologies may also be used as a tool to spin public opinion: an array of bots are employed to form political agenda; social networks trolling has become an economically beneficial activity. Finally, the author contends that the greatest danger is posed by dehumanisation of individuals' behaviour and perception. A current net culture is so engrossing that an ordinary social network user when witnessing a road accident does not rush to help casualties; instead, most people began to take pictures of the scene or video it to post it in their social network as soon as possible. Social networks are full of postings containing explicit photo or video material with violent scenes, real suicide attempts, and bullying of the elderly,

the weak or the teachers. These posts have a great number of likes and re-posts before they are deleted.

PUBLIC GOVERNANCE: NETWORKS VS HIERARCHY

Networkisation at the level of public governance leads to a governance crisis because hierarchically organised government bodies cannot react promptly to any urgent issues below. Complex issues can only be addressed by modular political organisations having strong connections with network structures. Rishar argues that modern forms of political structure are very similar to those of the industrial or even agricultural era (Rishar and Richard 2003). Traditional political hierarchies being too slow to react to our fast developing world yield their place to flexible and agile network structures. Thus, there appears a contradiction between the need of a new network society for non-hierarchical governance forms and the old political structure of present states.

A governance crisis is accompanied by a political administration mentality crisis. It results in the inability of national political leaders to face the consequences of their own policy. Metaphorically speaking, as Lapkin puts it, world politics captains are confused if their navigation systems function properly (Lapkin 2012). Another negative consequence of a governance crisis is a deliberate linearization of critical issues and the preservation of old but ineffective mechanisms of financial, political, and state governance.

Network governance is totally different from governance via networks. Firstly, it includes a hidden structural level. Secondly, it is based on team governance by involving a number of political actors in team work on solving critical political issues. The European Union is a bright example of network governance based on the principles of coordination and cooperation. Various network governance practices of the EU are characterized by interactivity in the setting up of public goals and democracy in the search for relevant solutions to complex and critical social issues within the EU (Transnational political sphere: new perspectives for international development 2010).

A state, a key driving force behind network governance, provides conditions for citizens to become involved in public policy by means of regulatory, financial and communicative instruments that inspire citizens to unite their knowledge and skills in order to tackle socially important issues. This kind of involvement is deemed possible when there are clear relations between different sectors of civil society (budget, state procurement order, local development funds, investment technologies) and invariant technologies of civil participation (negotiations, expertise). Thus, the communicative aspect of civil society becomes connected to its political and administrative aspect leading to serious limitations in the autonomy of a state.

Another important feature of network public governance is its simple design, and this enables different political actors to take part in public governance quite smoothly. A state functions as a moderator and a designer of networks by transforming public flurries into some real political governance activity.

To sum up, the aspects of networkisation described above provide the emergence of new network landscape nodes different with regards to their nature (discursive networks, social movements networks, political mobilisation networks, crowdsourcing networks) and their level of institutionalization (political parties, non-profit web2.0 organisations, expertise networks in public governance, electronic governance networks, state-designed networks aimed at shaping public policy and opinion at different levels). These networks exist in a single information and communication context of public policy integrated with an online environment. Their existence and proper performance are based on the mechanism of deep penetration into core and inner layers of social structures. By invoking changes at those inner layers, networks transform individual local actors into active participants of civil society, whose activity is based on new principles. These are the principle of a new knowledge-based society, the principle of a hybrid identity, and the principle of political multiplicity in public policy (Semenenko 2012). *As a result, it is possible to claim that a new political culture of reflexive participations is being formed at present; and the culture with blurred distinction between political and non-political aspects, invokes sub-political aspects.*

NETWORK LANDSCAPE IN HETEROGENEOUS SOCIAL SPHERE

The concept of network landscape is well applicable to the analysis of available network resources and the lifespan of traditional social networks in the situation of continuous transformation. For the purposes of the analysis, it is worth noting that the network landscape of public policy includes different landscape nodes (traditional society, modern, contemporary) represented by network structures and network communities with various sustainability characteristics and having multiple connections between each other in a particular socio-cultural context.

The temporal diversity of network structures is a result of the heterogeneity and multiplicity of the social sphere, both of which are affected by glocalisation. Glocalisation is temporal and spatial contraction leading to the presence of a number of contradictory local and global cultures in a particular social context (Jones 2006). Yadov argues that it is more relevant to use the term *glo-local-enclavisation* (Yadov 2002). The multiplicity of modern societies is a result of a symbiosis between the global culture of post-industrialised society, local cultures with their deeply-rooted traditions and new adopted global trends and enclaves (in Foucault's terms, *places without places* (Foucault 1984)) of the marginalised who lead a self-sufficient life independent of any communication context. Metaphorically speaking, there are islands of network society, and there are islands of archaic society coexisting in

the ocean of continuously changing traditional society with overlapping elements of modernity and archaism.

An agglomerate of different local communities differentiates a society by applying such criteria as value systems, life styles and strategies of civil activity. Civil society with its dynamism and a number of constituent institutionalised and non-institutionalised systems cannot have a rigid structure as civil projects participants are always new and different due to fast changes in society. As Migdal puts it, the main purpose of civil society is to produce the model of a community of citizens with common values and traditions providing a basis for state power exercise (Migdal 2001).

Socio-cultural features of a multicultural society are reflected in its network landscape and forms of social capital and are reproduced by particular network landscape nodes thus setting directions and limitations for the construction of an integrated civil society. Different types of social networks produce particular types of social solidarity and social capital thus creating diffusion or integration in civil life. Apart from contemporary network structures enabling citizens' participation in public policy, there are some other types of temporary social networks changing the nature of some network landscape nodes. To paraphrase Rose (Rose, R., 2002), they are pre-modern, modern and anti-modern social networks.

Social pre-modern networks are most common for countryside regions of Southern Europe, Russia, Asia, Latin America, and Africa with enclaves dominated by clan, *teip*, and ethnic groups. Social trust results from personal informal connections, neighboring and friendly relations between citizens in day-to-day situations. Pre-modern networks use traditional mass media tools setting the format of political events and boarders of publicity "in the system of routine collective myths reproduction subjective for ordinary clan members' perception and taken for granted by them" (Gudkov 2012.). Pre-modern networks invoke conformism, inertia and underdevelopment of potential civil activity. Pre-modern networks create closely-knit and homogenous closed communities. They, in their turn, create a fragmented non-civil society supported by symbolic political and military-security apparatus.

Modern networks are common to metropolises and large industrialised cities with their post-industrialised development. Modern networks come to existence where there is overpopulation, highly-developed information and communication infrastructure, and multiple systems of social interaction based on economic, cultural, and information multiplicity of group interests. To address their issues in a metropolis a particular individual has to deal with different groups of other individuals and construct relations based on institutionalised trust beyond their close ties. As Gibson's empirical study shows, modern social network participants have quite loose connections between each other and are able to embrace new values easily and support democratic processes and institutions wholeheartedly.

In particular, modern networks activate potential civil participation in authoritarian states where there are limits on public volition and political activity. The primary function of modern networks is to provide communication with new information; however, under critical circumstances, in transitory states in particular, modern networks facilitate the advancement of democratic values as citizens do not have much experience in democracy, and there are loose connections among them. Gibson puts: "In stable democratic societies loose connections do not have much effect on learning democracy skills as there is enough information available already" (Gibson 2000). Unlike pre-modern networks supporting cooperation within a particular group, modern networks, or civil participation networks, bridge social gaps and encourage cooperation across different social groups and with government bodies.

There are enclaves of postmodern social networks inside modern society in which participants are characterized by a high degree of social creativity based on knowledge and reflexive participation. New discursive communities with potentially high politisation are thus created. Such networks are a result of individual modernisation in the context of new identities formation at the global scale. Cultural globalization has opened up opportunities for the formation of new identities overcoming de-institutialisation, a traditional state-society division and social tensions (Grin 2011). In the late 2000s, there appeared some spontaneous social movements that spread over whole regions and countries in spite of their local origin. Postmodern networks articulate a new public appeal for citizenship (Civil society: theory and practice at the global level and in Russia: Proceeding of the panel discussion by People's Friendship University of Russia staff, 2009). Postmodern networks are brought to life by ordinary citizens when they have to deal with some particular issues and come up with their own solutions within the context of their particular needs and interests.

Pre-modern, modern and postmodern social networks are quite common in different countries. The proportion of these networks is different in different countries. In Russia there are specifically Russian networks replicating political and cultural patterns of the Soviet Union life (adaption to the command economy and repressive control over life) together with new symbolic networks typical of a new political regime (Gudkov 2012). Such networks mainly exist in industrialised cities with mixed-sector industry where more than one fourth of the country's population live. Multi-sector cities are a legacy of the Soviet Union territory-and sector-dependent economy. Their core sectors (mainly machine building and military industrialization plants) were not in the focus of large consolidating businesses as they required much investment to revive stagnating production and restructure welfare and social care systems. Their residents were not often well qualified, as a result, their standards of life were quite low (Zubarevich 2012). Many metropolises maintain pre-modern patterns of social personified solidarity characterized by a

low level of self-sufficiency and aversion to values of modernity. Such networks sustain their functions by upholding all regulations passed by the command economy government and capture citizens' trust by demonstrating loyalty during elections. Some researchers suggest using the term anti-modern to describe such networks. The author contends that the term is not really adequate as it does not capture the origin of such networks. They appeared as a result of industrialisation which was the core idea of the Soviet Union modernity. Thus, it is more relevant to use the term quasi-modern networks as it better reflects the origin of such networks.

The network landscape of public policy includes a range of landscape nodes making up a heterogeneous structure of the Russian society with a number of development vectors. Both pre-modern and quasi-modern networks have vantage points, around which civil relations based on solidarity and common interests concentrate and develop. New relations form kind of enclaves around every vantage point, and their potential development and integration into a society is only possible with deliberate government and society intervention aimed at forming an institutionalized system of civil partnership.

DISCUSSION

Further development and operationalisation of the term network landscape will obviously facilitate the development of network public policy, a key aspect of a new branch in politology. The concept of network landscape can be potentially used in comparative empirical studies to show that the multiplicity of public policy is determined by the array of network structures and network relations with powerful political actors having a different degree of influence and identifying key processes and outcomes of public policy.

CONCLUSION

The network landscape of the present public policy is a combination of various forms of networks ranging from traditional clan, ancestral, parochial and patron-client to new solidarity, discursive, civil movements networks. Such networks experience a continuous process of development, change and convergence. For example, terrorist organisations, which are based on the social capital of traditional communities, widely use modern network practices. They also become integrated into government bodies and form corruption networks, which makes them a far target for security forces. Global governance in the EU is another example of convergence of the new and the old when the European bureaucracy can often spin information and secretly become involved with lobbyists thus manipulating some public solutions.

Changes in network landscape can be defined by both some inner transformation of networks and communication within networks. The emergence of new network landscape nodes entails the diversification and complexity of a network because

temporally different nodes communicate, open up closed network structures, and get them involved in social benefits production and civil partnership.

The network landscape of public policy is characterised by a wide array of practices and frames determined by a particular network structure or the communication sphere. Network landscape nodes transform the political sphere, the activity of public policy actors and their stock of opportunities for participating in public decision-making. The network structuralisation of public policy enables one not only to identify and discuss discursive practices, decision frames and realisation channels in every particular case but also to highlight socially relevant conditions.

Acknowledgment

References

Apel, K.-O., (1997). Auseiandersetzungen in Erporobung des transzendentalpragmatischen Ansatzes. Frankfurt, pp. 340.

Bauman, Z., (2001). The Individualized Society. Cambridge: Polity Press, pp. 259.

Beck, U., 1986. Risikogesellschaft. Auf dem Weg in eineandere Moderne. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, pp. 189.

Beck, U., (2007). Cosmopolitan Version. Cambridge: Polity Press, pp. 150-165.

Bourdieu, P., (2005). Sotsialnoe prostranstvo: polya i praktiki. [Social sphere: fields and practices]. Moscow: Institute of experimental sociology, pp. 576.

Castells, M., (2010). The power of identity: The information age. (Economy, society, and culture). 2nd ed. UK: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 488.

Foucault, M. (1984). Of Other Spaces. Diacritics. Retrieved from http://foucault.info/documents/heteroTopia/foucault.heteroTopia.en.html [Last accessed on 2016 Oct 10].

Foucault, M., (1991). Governmentality. In The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality. Chicago, pp. 236.

Foucault, M. (2006). Intellektualy i vlast [Intellectuals and power]. Moscow: Praksis, pp. 384.

Fukuyama, F., (2008). Doverie: sotsialnye dobrodeteli i put k protsvetaniu [Trust: the Social Virues and the Creation of Prosperity]. Moscow: AST, pp. 730.

Genisaretski, O. I., (1997). Figury identichnosti metodologa [Figures of Methodologit's Identity]. Journal Vorposy Metodologii, 3-4. Retrieved from http://www.fondgp.ru/lib/chteniya/iii/2 [Last accessed on 2016 Oct 10].

Gibson, J.L., (2000). Social Networks, Civic Society, and the Prospects for Consolidating Russia's Democratic Transition. American Journal of Political Science, 1 (45): 65.

Giddens, A., (2004). Uskol'zauschi Mir: kak globlizatsia menyaet nashuzhizn'[Runaway world: How globalization is shaping our lives]. Moscow: Isdatelstvo "Ves' Mir', pp. 116.

Grazhdanskoe obschestvo: teoriya i sovremennay praktika v mirovom i rossiiskom izmereniakh: materialy kruglogo stola sotrudnikov RUDN. Civil society: theory and practice at the global level and in Russia: Proceeding of the panel discussion by People's Friendship University of Russia staff, 2009. Journal Vestnik RUDN. Seria Politologia, 4: 91.

Grin, S., (2011). Priroda nepodvizhnosti rossiiskogo obschestva [Reasons for the inertia of Russian society]. Pro et Contra Journal, 1: 9–10.

Gudkov, L., (2012). Sotsialny capital i ideologicheskie orientacii [Social capital and ideological directions]. Pro et Contra Journal, 2: 6-31.

Hacker, K. L. & Dijk, J. Van, (2000). Digital democracy. Issues of theory & practice. London: Sage publications, pp. 30-53.

Jones, A., (2006). Dictionary of Globalization. Oxford: Polity Press, pp. 3-18.

Lane, D., (2012). Grazdnaskoe obschestvo v stranakh ES: ideologia, instttuty I prodvizhenie demokrati [Civi society in the EU countries: ideology, institutions and democracy advancement]. Political Studies, 2: 99.

Lapkin, V. V., (2012). Kognitivnyi potentcial kontsepta nelineinogo razvitia [Alternativnyi kapitalism" ili alternative kapitalismu? Materialy zasedania kruglogo stola CESPI IMEMO RAN] Cognitive potential of the notion of non-linear development [Alternative capitalism" or an alternative to capitalism? Proceeding of the panel discussion at the Centre of Comparative Economic and Social-political studies of National Research University of World Economy and International Relations of Russian Academy of Science, October 2011]. Global Economy and International Relations, 7: 98.

Lapkin, V. V., Semenenko, I. S., (2013). "Chelovek politicheski" pered vyzovami "infomodernity". [Political Man" facing challenges of "infomodernity". Journal Politicheskie issledovania]. Political Studies, 6: 65–66.

Migdal, J., (2001). State in Society. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 190-203.

Mikhailova, O.V., (2011). Politicheskie seti: problema effektivnosti I demokratichnosti politicheskikh alyansov. [Political networks: the question of efficiency and democracy of political coalitions]. Journal Vestnik MGU. Seria 21: Upravlenie (gosudarstvo o obschestvo, 3: 47.

Miroshnichenko, I. V., (2016). Setevay publichanya politika I upravlenie: Monographia. [Network public policy and governance: Monograph]. Moscow: ARGAMAK-MEDIA, pp. 296.

Morozova, E. V., Miroshnichenko, I. V. and Ryabchenko, N. A., (2016). Frontir setevogo obschetva. [Network society frontier. Journal Mirovay ekonomika I mezhdunarodnye otnoshenia]. Global Economy and International Relations, 2 (60): 83-97.

Pantin, V.I., (2012). "Alternative capitalism" or an alternative to capitalism? Proceeding of the panel discussion at the Centre of Comparative Economic and Social-political studies of National Research University of World Economy and International Relations of Russian Academy of Science, October 2011. Global Economy and International Relations, 7: 97.

Pokrovskij, N.E., (2003). Critical issues of Sociology congress. Journal Sociology studies, 10: 3-7.

Postmodernism: encyclopeadia, (2001). Moscow: Knizhny Dom, pp. 665.

Prohorenko, I.L., (2012). O metodologicheskih problemah analiza sovremennyh politicheskih prostranstv. [Some methodological problems of the analysis of current political spheres]. Journal Political studies, 6: 70.

Rishar, ZH.-F., (2003). Dvadcat' let spustya. Global'nye problemy i sposoby ihresheniya. [Twenty years later. Urgent global problems and new global solutions]. Journal Russia in Global Politics, 2: 157.

Rose, R., (2002). Dostizhenie celej v kvazisovremennom obshchestve: social'nye seti v Rossii. [Achievement of aims in quasi-modern societies: social networks in Russia]. Journal Social Sciences and Modernity, 3: 23-38.

Ryabchenko, N. and Gnedash, A., (2015). Structure, types of users and the practices of online-social networks as a field of political practices. International Review of Management and Marketing Journal, 5: 115-120.

Semenenko I.S., Lapkin V.V. and Pantin V.I. (Eds.). (2014). Political changes in the global world: theoretical and methodological problems of analysis and prognosis. Moscow: IWEMO RAN, pp. 218.

Semenenko, I.S., (2012). "Chelovek politicheskij" pered al'ternativami obshchestvennyh transformacij: opyt pereosmysleniya individual'nogo izmereniya politiki. [Political man facing social transformation alternatives]. Journal Political studies, 5:16.

Shmatko, N.A., (2001). Fenomen publichnoj politiki. [Public Policy]. Journal Journal Sociology Studies, 7: 110.

Transnacional'noe politicheskoe prostranstvo: novye realii mezhdunarodnogo razvitiya, [Transnational political sphere: new perspectives for international development]. 2010. Moscow: IWEMORAN, pp. 229.

Walters, W. and Haahr, J., (2005). Governmentality and Political Studvies. European Political Science Journal, 3: 288-300.

Yadov, V.A., (2002). Nekotorye sociologicheskie osnovaniya dlya predvideniya budushchego rossijskogo obshchestva. [Some sociological bases for the future of Russian society. In Rossiya reformiruyushchayasya]. Russia under reforms. Moscow: Academia, pp. 354.

Zubarevich, N., (2012). Sovremennaya Rossiya: geografiya s arifmetikoj. \Current Russia: Georgraphy and Math. Journal Otechestvennye zapiski\Motherland Studies. Retrieved from http://www.strana-oz.ru/2012/1/sovremennaya-rossiya-geografiya-s-[Last accessed on 2016 Oct 10].