

фантазія. Віртуум – це поєднання природного досвіду (безпосереднього й опосередкованого) та різних поза-дослідних станів. Віртуум – це онтико-онтологічне середовище, що його створює людина, яка конструює глибинні або ерзац-сенси, це симулякрове середовище, духовно-трансцендентальний світ.

**Ключові слова:** сучасне знання, інноваційний простір, вергенція, цифрова цивілізація, цифровізація, "Smart-людина", "Smart-суспільство".

УДК 316.653 (045)

M. Abysova

## PUBLIC OPINION IN MANAGEMENT RELATIONS: COMMUNICATION ASPECT

National Aviation University;  
e-mail: mariia.abysova@npp.nau.edu.ua; ORCID: 0000-0002-6461-7769

**Abstract.** The article is devoted to identifying the conditions for the formation of public opinion on the democracy grounds within management relations. The degree of independence, manageability, and dialogicity (monologicity) of public opinion as a set of generally recognized and customary ideas, assessments, and judgments regarding socially significant phenomena, events, etc., is determined by the political regime and traditions of the state. Public opinion in a democratic society is a necessary system element of all-pervasive social communication, which must be taken into account in management activities. The model of deliberative democracy makes it possible to include alternative positions in the public discourse and seek consensus, instead of making decisions monologically. Despite the model of deliberative democracy affirms the inclusiveness, publicity, argumentative nature of public discussions, the requirement of acceptability of the result for all parties, the openness for further revision, etc., it has been criticized. The alternative model of meaningful dissensus instead of the consensus has been offered. The leading principle of dialogue in the formation of public opinion is emphasized. In case of rejection of dialogue, communicative democratic practices, forming public opinion, show similarities with the discursive features of non-democratic regimes: either by approving the majority's opinion in search of consensus, or by contributing to the growth of fundamentalism in the polyphony of dissensus.

**Keywords:** democracy, dialogue, communication, public opinion, social management.

### Introduction.

The effectiveness of management in social organizations of various types is primarily determined by the intensity, completeness, and quality of information circulating in the structure of the management process. The information richness of management activities contributes to both informed decision-making and successful implementation. Modern practice shows that subjects of management activities are increasingly turning to public opinion. They not only study the public opinion but also shape it to a certain extent. The global informatization of social space is the primary factor driving the increasing role of public opinion in modern society. The development of operational systems for receiving, storing, processing, and distributing information of different kinds leads to a qualitative transformation of the channels for the dissemination of public opinion, an expansion of the issues discussed, and a significant change in the structure of the opinion production. Therefore, in the current situation it is necessary to consider public opinion more attentively, which should become an effective mechanism for managers to improve their work and contribute to building a democratic society.

**The aim** of the study is to identify the conditions for the formation of public opinion during management decision-making in a democracy context.

To achieve this goal, it is necessary to perform the following research **tasks**:

- 1) clarify the characteristics of public opinion as a socio-political phenomenon;
- 2) to characterize the basic principles of forming public opinion to optimize management activities on the path to the development of democracy.

### Research methods.

The systemic approach is used to analyze public opinion as a system that includes some interconnected elements.

The activity approach is used to define social subjects in the role of bearers of public opinion and management activity. The result of the use of formational and civilizational approaches is the study of the process of formation and functioning of public opinion, depending on the nature of the relationship between the state and civil society.

### Research results.

The problems of the essence, formation, definition of the role, and place of public opinion in society's political and cultural life began to be thoroughly investigated only in the XIX century. However, the works for its scientific research have a centuries-old history and appear as early as Antiquity in the works of Protagoras and Aristotle.

Since Antiquity, scientists have been constantly interested in the problem of the relationship and mutual influence of power, management, and public opinion. Throughout history, two contrasting views on the role of public opinion have emerged. The first one, as espoused by Plato, sees public opinion as a tool for controlling and manipulating the masses. The second view, championed by Protagoras, views public opinion as a means of influencing and shaping government policies based on the will of the people. N. Machiavelli, J.-J. Rousseau, G. Hegel, and D. Salisbury raised the question of taking into account the sentiments of the masses in public administration. Issues of the formation and functioning of public opinion are being considered in classical (M. Weber, K. Marx, E. Durkheim, etc.), modern philosophy and science (G. Lebon, W. Lippmann, T. Luckman, N. Luhmann, S. Moscovici, P. Sorokin, G. Bloomer, P. Bourdieu, E. Giddens, R. Merton, E. Noel-Neumann, F. Allport, X. Ortega y Gasset, J. Habermas, A. Schutz and many others).

The concept of public opinion is quite ambiguous. Theoretical models of public opinion can be divided

into two main approaches to the content of this phenomenon: those that define public opinion based on the concept of social being and those that consider public opinion through the concept of social consciousness. Theoretical models of the first type represent that the features of public opinion formation are determined by social conditions and depend on groups of subjects. The main attention is paid to such characteristics of public opinion as the intensity of spread, stability, and conflict. Theoretical models of the second type are built on the premise that public opinion depends on the "zeitgeist." These theories consider existence as a product of public judgments, life positions of social subjects, and public opinion is investigated through the relationship between freedom of activity and the need for an order based on authority (Стариковська 2020, 40–41).

The following definition of public opinion as a set of generally recognized and customary ideas, assessments, and judgments regarding socially significant phenomena, events, personalities, problems, etc. (Розумний) is chosen to conduct the represented study. Analysis of the definitions of public opinion allows one to proceed from the fact that public opinion is connected with its material carrier, namely, masses of people (target groups), with their urgent needs and interests. Public opinion is closely tied to significant masses of people, their urgent needs, and interests. It is a crucial component of managing social processes, as it covers various spheres of public life and influences the activities of state and public institutions. The fact of the existence of public opinion highlights the importance of taking it into account as an important means of managing social processes to satisfy the needs and interests of the target groups.

Public opinion is always the attitude of its subject or bearer to a socially significant object. In turn, this relationship is not limited to one single form of manifestation; it can manifest itself as an exclusively spiritual phenomenon (evaluation); as a more or less expressed position (attitude); or as behavior (a practical act). In this regard, in the structure of public thought, there are three main components: rational, emotional, and volitional (Осипова та ін. 2003, 290).

When considering objects that fall under the umbrella of public opinion, it is important to note that they are not all equal. Based on their complexity, they can be divided into three categories – namely, objects-facts, objects-events, and objects-phenomena. These objects can belong to objective reality, social being, subjective reality, or social consciousness. The simplest object that can trigger a reaction from public opinion is a fact of reality, which is used to store and transmit certain information and can act as a stimulus for social activity. On the other hand, the most complex object of public opinion is a phenomenon or process (Осипова та ін. 2003, 288).

Individual and public opinion come together to form a person's opinion on an event. This opinion can exist independently without an exchange of views, although communication and information sharing are key factors in the development of public opinion. It is important to note that the exchange of opinions may not necessarily lead to a common consensus. If there

is no reason for unity, individuals may hold onto their respective opinions. Even in the absence of free speech, public opinion can still exist in an undeveloped form.

To understand the driving force behind the development of public opinion, it is necessary to examine the process of exchanging and selecting common and typical opinions from the mass of individual opinions. Since public opinion reflects a defined collective position, it arises from issues that arouse public interest. However, ascertaining this fact is not enough to consider the stages of the formation of public opinion. After all, there are many public interests, and public opinion in a certain period is formed only on a very limited number of problems. The public interest itself can take different forms, and only some of them can contribute to the development of public opinion from an undeveloped form to a developed one. Public interest is the ground that provides the possibility of the emergence of public opinion. Certain conditions are required for its occurrence. They arise when public interest (for objective reasons or due to subjective factors) becomes the focus of people's attention and acquires a high degree of relevance. The actualized public interest, which is the basis of the formation of public opinion, gives it certain properties. Scientists note that only that opinion can claim a public opinion, which stands out for its prevalence, intensity, and stability.

Public opinion regarding social subjects forms unconsciously and is expressed consciously through judgments. In his book "The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion," the modern American political scientist and sociologist J. Zaller tries to build a universal model of the formation and change of public opinion, the so-called RAS (Receive-Accept-Sample) Model (Zaller 1992, 58–61). Moreover, it comes from the 4 Axioms (the reception axiom; the resistance axiom; the accessibility axiom; the response axiom) of the Model: the limitations of human perception, and the limited time spent by people getting to know social events remote from them. Based on certain assumptions, it can be inferred that people who are more engaged cognitively are more likely to pay attention to and comprehend political messages related to a particular issue. As time passes, ideas associated with a certain judgment become less likely to be mobilized. During interviews, people tend to consider only those judgments that are fresh in their minds. When evaluating arguments, individuals tend to be critical of those that conflict with their political predispositions, but only if they have the necessary contextual information to understand the relationship between the arguments and their political predispositions (Dobrzynska and Blais 2008, 259–276).

The apogee in the development of public opinion simultaneously becomes the beginning of the last stage of its existence. The power of public opinion of people, realized in actions, leads to satisfaction of needs. Public interest, which causes a certain attitude toward life, loses its relevance and turns into a state of traditions, habits, norms, etc. (Іванов).

The level of independence of public opinion is determined mainly by the political regime and traditions of the state. In totalitarian and authoritarian states, public opinion management is imperative, straightforward, and has powerful mobilization potential. The method used by these governments to control the masses is known as propaganda. The center of classical propaganda is the cult of personality of the leader of the state. It is important to note that propaganda is only a method, and the system-forming, value-orienting, and goal-setting elements of totalitarian forms of public opinion management are ideologies.

Studies of public opinion conducted on behalf of such groups record the level of conformity of the collective object of targeted external influence and its readiness to support management decisions made by official structures. However, there is also latent public opinion, reflecting the real reaction of its subject to the social situation, which manifests itself rarely in the form of obvious collective behavioral acts. In this regard, the process of forming public opinion according to the criterion of controllability can be represented as free (uncontrollable) or unfree (controllable).

The formation of public opinion with the help of monologue information flows is built based on ignoring and subordination. The desire of an opinion holder to subordinate public opinion to the goals of a particular social group often leads to a distortion of the information flow of which it is the source. If someone presents their opinions without considering the perspective of the listener, they risk manipulating public opinion through intentional or unintentional distortion of information.

In democratic regimes, public opinion arises as a result of the civic activity of individuals and groups, managed dialogically. Democracy appears as a rational form of organizing public space, presupposing an achievable civil consensus. The special dependence of democracy on the progress of communication means lies in the fact that democracy, unlike authoritarian regimes, presupposes the active political participation of citizens.

In the opinion of researcher L. Konotop: "Economic and sociocultural development puts the problem of specificity and identification of the state to a new level of complexity [...] When elaborating a strategy for the development of a particular state, it is necessary to realize that there are many civilizations in the modern world, and therefore, it is impossible to isolate ourselves from global problems, try to solve them alone, or completely ignore them, or ignore the opinion of the world community" (Конотоп 2022, 13). To ensure such participation of citizens, interactive media opportunities are being used.

The study of public opinion is carried out by numerous means. Among them, there are:

- conducting sociological research and observations (surveys, questionnaires, focus groups, etc.);
- introduction of special sections in print and electronic mass media;
- conducting an express analysis of comments, reviews, interviews, and other materials in the mass

media to determine the position of various social groups;

- processing and summarizing comments and suggestions expressed in citizens' appeals, etc.

With the growing flow of informational (communicative) exchanges, power is not only de-hierarchized but also decentralized. There is a need for direct forms of political participation, which leads to the reduction of intermediary (representative) functions. In this sense, any working democracy depends especially on the transmission of information, in the process of communication.

As modern researcher T. Sukhodub writes: "...current society is characterized by a clash of opposite principles: monologism and dialogism, unity and pluralism, ideology and tradition, mythological (archaized) and problematic (critical) thinking. These opposing viewpoints highlight fundamentally different paths for sociocultural development. One path involves protection and general control, while the other involves dialogue and competitive creation of a common life world" (Суходуб 2021, 65). Therefore, the role of management relations is crucial in determining how to overcome socio-cultural contradictions. Administrative relations are a type of public relations that helps organize joint activities. They represent a system of mutual dependencies and responsibilities among people and institutions created to implement management functions.

When making decisions, democratic bodies of (state) management must take public opinion into account. As S. Ordenov rightly observes: "...law in the country is embodied not in the form of moral and religious norms or legislative acts, but in the implementation of law, which is integrated into the system of social relations. We consider it appropriate to emphasize that such a political and legal system, which corresponds to the concept of law, presupposes the presence of an established tradition of human rights and freedoms in society, which makes them effective subjects of a liberal community" (Орденюв 2019, 62). Adopted decisions (norms) are legitimate if and only if they are obtained in the course of public negotiations. It is believed that the proceduralism, which determines the order of decision-making, and its procedural character are no less important than the decision itself, and the legitimacy of the latter is ensured precisely by passing formal procedural rules. Negotiation (advisory, deliberative) democracy is a model of democracy in which negotiating practices and public discussions play a key role, with the help of which important problems for society are discussed and significant social and political decisions are made.

The model of negotiated democracy brought and established in modern democratic theory important values, such as inclusiveness, publicity, the argumentative character of public discussions, the requirement of acceptability of the result for all parties, the openness of the decisions made for further redefinition, etc. The model made it possible to include alternative positions in the public discourse and to seek consensus, instead of making decisions monologically, relying on the principle of the majority.

The model brought to the fore the importance of the public sphere for democracy as a space where ideally everyone should have access and where every voice would count. The main theorists of this model (D. Fishkin, J. Rawls, J. Habermas, and J. Cohen) are also united in the tradition of consensual theories, that is theories that put forward consensus as a normative ideal of modern democracy.

The normative ideal of social consensus found the most complete embodiment in the concept of communicative rationality of the late J. Habermas. Habermas assumes that the modern world is experiencing a crisis of communicative rationality. Communicative rationality in his understanding is the ability to express oneself, perceive the Other, and find a common language with the bearers of other points of view with the help of arguments (in opposition to force, manipulation, and authoritarian monologue). For the model of communicative rationality, it is not so much the satisfaction of a goal or pragmatic interest that is important, but the finding of intersubjective mutual understanding and the ability to consider other points of view. As a way out, Habermas offers the argumentation theory. Argumentation is a discursive exchange of reasoning in which participants try to persuade each other in the language of arguments, free from coercion and open to redefinition (Dews, n.d.).

The ethics of argumentative discourse, which J. Habermas develops as a normative model, is a way of separating subjectively true from what can claim intersubjectivity validity. In order to uphold the principles of ethical argumentation, it is important to recognize that no single perspective can be considered valid without a discussion involving all parties who are interested in finding a common solution and mutual understanding. This means that meaningful conclusions can only be reached through a collaborative process of argumentation.

### Discussion.

Walter Lippmann, discussing the possibility of inadequacy of public opinion, wrote: "Yet democracies, if we are to judge by the oldest and most powerful of them, have made a mystery out of public opinion. There have been skilled organizers of opinion who understood the mystery well enough to create majorities on election day. But these organizers have been regarded by political science as low fellows or as "problems," not as possessors of the most effective knowledge there was on how to create and operate public opinion" (Lippmann 2010, 254–255).

N. Luhmann, watching the "inadequacy" of public opinion, considers it an "artifact" (Luhmann 2000, 280). N. Luhmann emphasizes that the formation of public opinion is a process that cannot be clearly predicted. In particular, he writes that it is impossible to predict how other actors in the mass media system will react to this due to the fundamentally intransparency of the future. Contrary to all traditional expectations, publicity does not necessarily ensure accurate or reliable information, that is recognized as authenticity, let alone a rational sampling of it (Luhmann 2000, 285). To confirm this assumption, which has important methodological significance in the study of publicity

and public policy, the researcher introduces the definition of "lability of public opinion," to explain the unpredictability of it (Luhmann 2000, 286).

The works of recent decades criticize the consensual model and develop an alternative model of meaningful dissensus (differences, disagreements). These are the works of A. McIntyre, N. Fraser, I. M. Young, Sh. Muff and others. On the example of these works, it is shown that consensus is hardly achievable in the modern world due to the diversity of ethical, epistemological, and cultural attitudes. Therefore, it makes sense to build any form of political community on the principles of meaningful dissensus.

The object of Nancy Fraser's criticism is the liberal model of the bourgeois public sphere, which, contrary to the rhetoric of public access, was itself a form of generating inequality and was constituted through mechanisms of exclusion (Fraser 2021, 34–41). Analyzing the modern public sphere, Iris Marion Young singled out the mechanisms of active and passive exclusion from publicity. These are hidden mechanisms of suppression and manipulation in public practices, which formally do not contradict the norms of democratic procedures, but are one of the most powerful tools of political discrimination (Young 2002).

The criticism of the consensual model played a significant role in diversifying the public sphere. It led to the idea that there can be multiple public spheres, each with its unique characteristics such as communicative style, format, and composition of participants.

### Conclusions.

Summing up the above, it should be noted that public opinion is a manifestation of mass and group consciousness, which reflects the attitude of social communities to the phenomena of social life and each other. The possibility of a transparent, public speech of the population on topical problems of social life, and the influence of this position on the development of social and political relations, reflects the essence of public opinion as a specific social institute of democracy. Public opinion in a democratic society is a necessary systemic element of pervasive social communication, that management activities necessarily should take into account. Hence, democratic governance requires communicants to be able to shape democracy and live in its conditions. The formation of public opinion in terms of democracy is carried out in compliance with the leading principle of dialog. In the case of elimination of the dialogue, communicative democratic practices, while forming a public opinion, reveal a convergence with the discursive signs of anti- and non-democratic regimes. It happens either by approval of the majority opinion in search of consensus or the growth of fundamentalism in the polyphony of dissensus.

### Literature

1. Dews P. Communicative rationality. *Routledge encyclopedia of philosophy*. URL: <https://www.rep.routledge.com/articles/thematic/communicative-rationality/v-1> (дата звернення: 15.10.2023). DOI: 10.4324/9780415249126-N007-1
2. Dobrzynska A., Blais A. Testing zaller's reception and acceptance model in an intense election campaign. *Political behavior*. 2008. Vol. 30, no. 2. P. 259-76. DOI: 10.1007/s1109-007-9049-2

3. Fraser N. Rethinking the public sphere: a contribution to the critique of actually existing democracy. *Public space reader*. 2021. P. 34-41. URL: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351202558-6> (date of access: 01.11.2023).

4. Lippmann W. *Public opinion*. Create Space Independent Publishing Platform, 2011. 234 p.

5. Luhmann N. *Die Politik der Gesellschaft*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 2000. 444 s.

6. Young I. M. Inclusion and democracy; ed. by W. Kymlicka, D. Miller, A. Ryan. Oxford : *Oxford University Press*, 2002. 304 p.

7. Zaller J. The nature and origins of mass opinion : (*Cambridge Studies in Public Opinion and Political Psychology*). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992. 367 p. DOI:10.1017/CBO9780511818691

8. Конотоп Л. Г. Сучасна Україна в контексті міжцивілізаційних взаємовідносин. *Вісник Національного авіаційного університету*. 2022. № 2 (36). С. 10-15. (Серія «Філософія. Культурологія»). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18372/2412-2157.36.16963>

9. Орденів С. С. 2019. Трансформації права і правосвідомості в транзитивних суспільствах глобалізованого світу. *Вісник Національного авіаційного університету*. 2019. № 2(30). С. 61-68. (Серія: Філософія. Культурологія). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18372/2412-2157.30.14425>

10. Осипова Н., Водник Н., Клімова Г. *Соціологія : підручник*; ред. Н. Осипова. Київ: Юрінком Інтер, 2018.

11. Розумний М. Громадська думка. *Енциклопедія сучасної України*. URL: <https://esu.com.ua/article-31955>.

12. Соціологія масової комунікації. Київ: Ін-т журналістики. URL: <http://journalib.univ.kiev.ua/lectures/IvanovSMC.pdf> (дата звернення: 20.10.2023).

13. Стариковська О. О. Феномен громадської думки: взаємозв'язок держави і громадянського суспільства: дис. ... канд. філос. наук : 09.00.03. Запоріжжя, 2020. 222 с.

14. Суходуб Т. Д. Діалогічне мислення: становлення та розвиток. *Вісник Національного авіаційного університету*. 2021. № 2 (34). С. 60-66. (Серія: Філософія. Культурологія). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18372/2412-2157.34.16317>.

## References

1. Dews, Peter. n.d. "Communicative rationality." *In Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. <https://www.rep.routledge.com/articles/thematic/communicative-rationality/v-1>. DOI: 10.4324/9780415249126-N007-1

2. Dobrzynska, Agnieszka, and André Blais. 2008. "Testing Zaller's Reception and Acceptance Model in an Intense Election Campaign." *Political Behavior* 30, no. 2: 259–76. DOI: 10.1007/s11109-007-9049-2

3. Fraser, Nancy. 2021. "Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy." *In*

*Public Space Reader*, 34–41. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351202558-6>

4. Lippmann, Walter. 2011. *Public Opinion*. Create Space Independent Publishing Platform.

5. Luhmann, Niklas. 2000. *Die Politik der Gesellschaft*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.

6. Young, Iris Marion. 2002. Inclusion and Democracy, edited by Will Kymlicka, David Miller, and Alan Ryan. *Oxford University Press*.

7. Zaller, John. 1992. The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion (*Cambridge Studies in Public Opinion and Political Psychology*). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI:10.1017/CBO9780511818691

8. Ivanov, Valerii, ed. n.d. *Sotsiologhiia masovoi komunikatsii [Sociology of mass communication]*. Kyiv: Instytut zhurnalistyky. <http://journalib.univ.kiev.ua/lectures/IvanovSMC.pdf>.

9. Konotop, Liudmyla. 2022. "Suchasna Ukraina v konteksti mizhtsyvilizatsiinykh vzaiemovidnosyn" ["Modern Ukraine in the context of inter-civilization relations"]. *Visnyk Natsionalnoho aviatsiinoho universytetu. Seria: Filosofiia. Kulturologhiia, Proceedings of the National Aviation University. Series: Philosophy. Culturology* 2 (36): 10–15. <https://doi.org/10.18372/2412-2157.36.16963>

10. Ordenov, Serhii. 2019. "Transformatsii prava i pravovidnosti v tranzitivnykh suspilstvakh hlobalizovanoho svitu" ["Transformation of Law and Legal consciousness in transitive societies in globalized world"]. *Visnyk Natsionalnoho aviatsiinoho universytetu. Seria: Filosofiia. Kulturologhiia, Proceedings of the National Aviation University. Series: Philosophy. Culturology* 2 (30): 61–68. <https://doi.org/10.18372/2412-2157.30.14425>

11. Osypova, N., V. Vodnik, and H. Klimova, et al. 2003. *Sotsiologhiia [Sociology]*, edited by N. Osypova. Kyiv: Yurinkom Inter.

12. Rozumnyi, Maksym. "Hromadska dumka" ["Public opinion"]. *In Entsiklopediia suchasnoi Ukrainy, Encyclopedia of modern Ukraine*. <https://esu.com.ua/article-31955>

13. Starykovska, Olena. 2020. "Fenomen hromadskoi dumky: vzaiemozviazok derzhavy i hromadianskoho suspilstva: dissertation" ["The phenomenon of public opinion: the relationship between the state and civil society : dis. ... kand. filoz. nauk"]. PhD diss., Zaporizhzhia National University.

14. Sukhodub, Tetiana. 2021. "Dialohichne myslennia: stanovlennia ta rozvytok" ["Dialogical thinking: formation and development"]. *Visnyk Natsionalnoho aviatsiinoho universytetu. Seria: Filosofiia. Kulturologhiia, Proceedings of the National Aviation University. Series: Philosophy. Culturology* 2 (34): 60–66. <https://doi.org/10.18372/2412-2157.34.16317>

**М.А. Абисова**

## ГРОМАДСЬКА ДУМКА В СИСТЕМІ УПРАВЛІНСЬКИХ ВІДНОСИН: КОМУНІКАТИВНИЙ АСПЕКТ

**Вступ.** Суб'єкти управлінської діяльності звертаються до громадської думки, не тільки тією чи іншою мірою використовуючи її у своїй роботі, а й формуючи. Найважливішим чинником, що визначає підвищення ролі громадської думки у сучасному суспільстві, розширення сфери її прояву, виступає глобальна інформатизація соціального простору. **Метою статті** є виявлення умов формування громадської думки під час ухвалення управлінських рішень в умовах демократії. Для реалізації даної мети необхідно вирішити такі дослідницькі завдання: уточнити характеристики громадської думки як соціально-політичного феномену; схарактеризувати основні засади формування громадської думки для оптимізації управлінської діяльності на шляху розвитку демократії. **Методологія дослідження** містить: системний підхід; діяльнісний підхід; формаційний та цивілізаційний підходи для дослідження процесу формування та функціонування громадської думки. **Результати дослідження.** Громадська думка є ставленням її носія до соціально значущого об'єкта, сформованого на основі громадського інтересу. Це ставлення може виявлятися винятково як духовне явище (оцінка), позиція (установка) та поведінка (практичний акт). Ступінь самостійності, керованості, діалогічності (монологічності) громадської думки визначається політичним режимом та традиціями держави. Модель переговорної демократії утверджує інклюзивність, публічність, аргументативний характер публічних дискусій, вимогу прийнятності результату для всіх сторін, відкритості прийнятих рішень для подальшого перевизначення та ін. Модель переговорної демократії дає можливість залучати до публічного дискурсу альтернативні позиції та шукати консенсус, а не приймати рішення монологічно, спираючись на принцип більшості. Нормативний ідеал суспільного консенсусу знайшов повніше втілення в концепції комунікативної раціональності Ю. Габермаса. **Обговорення.** Роботи останніх десятиліть критикують консенсуальну модель і розробляють альтернативну модель значущого дисенсусу. **Висновки.** Можливість гласного, громадського висловлювання населення з актуальних проблем життя, вплив цієї позиції на розвиток суспільно-політичних відносин відбиває сутність громадської думки як особливого соціального інституту демократії. Формування громадської думки в умовах демократії здійснюється за дотримання провідного принципу діалогічності. У разі відмови від діалогу комунікативні демократичні практики, формуючи громадську думку, виявляють схожість із дискурсивними ознаками недемократичних режимів: затверджуючи думку більшості у пошуках консенсусу, або сприяючи зростанню фундаменталізму в поліфонії дисенсусу.

**Ключові слова:** демократія, діалог, комунікація, громадська думка, соціальне управління.