Natalia Khoma[*]

TECHNOLOGIES OF POLITICAL (SOCIO-POLITICAL) CROWDSOURCING AND CROWDFUNDING: WORLD EXPERIENCE AND STEPS TOWARDS IMPLEMENTATION IN UKRAINE

Abstract: Technologies of political (socio-political) crowdsourcing and crowdfunding are analysed as modern approaches to make political dialogue and provide transparency of authorities. Justification for their use in socio-political sphere is being argued. Reasons that validate the use of crowdsourcing and crowdfunding in policy as well as global and Ukrainian experience of their application are studied. The factors that affect the success of crowdsourcing and crowdfunding projects in political terms are identified.

Keywords: socio-political (political) crowdsourcing; socio-political (political) crowdfunding; political investing; public; information and communication technologies.

INTRODUCTION

Within the recent years, the search for new effective technologies of public interaction at all levels from the global to the local one takes place in political science. "From the model of *co-operation* we turn to the model of *co-creation*. Exchange of ideas and views to achieve the best results comes in the foreground" [Levin, 2012, p. 36]. The leading trend is intensification of political discourse through its virtualization and the use of new information and communication technologies.

---

[*] Ivan Franko National University of Lviv Institute of Philosophy, Department of Theory and History of Political Science; khoma.nata@gmail.com

The term "political (socio-political) crowdsourcing" and "political (socio-political) crowdfunding" are new concepts of political science. Their development has just begun. The difficulty in understanding of their essence lies in: 1) the lack of research unity in interpretation of basic concepts – crowdsourcing, crowdfunding; 2) the conceptual novelty of thel phenomena of socio-political crowdsourcing and their varieties; 3) still negligible empirical base to explore practice of crowdsourcing and crowdfunding mechanisms, especially in Ukrainian politics.

At the same time, current political process is open to new technological mechanisms – organizational and financial one. The political practice of the recent years shows the commitment to the crowdsourcing and crowdfunding mechanisms, which, having started as a business mechanism, broadened the scope into the socio-political sphere. The importance of the study of the possibility of using use crowdsourcing and crowdfunding in politics is caused by the continual growth of the role of public participation in politics, and, consequently, the need to clarify the modern mechanisms of organization and activation of community in its involvement in the political processes. The study of possibilities of crowdsourcing and crowdfunding application in politics is commenced to clarify new approaches, which help to solve the problem of the lack of human and financial resources for the implementation of socially important projects.

POLITICAL (SOCIO-POLITICAL) CROWDSOURCING

Crowdsourcing today is increasingly used as a new method of public involvement in into the political process. It is one of mutual interpersonal formats. Crowdsourcing means attracting human capacity for joint decision on the certain issues or projects implementation. Thanks to crowdsourcing, specific work is implemented with joint efforts; planned idea is implemented by ordinary people – volunteers and and those who take interest in it.

Crowdsourcing means: 1) "use of collective intelligence and work of volunteers for a variety of useful purposes, including commercial one" [Долгин, 2010, p. 39]; 2) "problems transfer to significant, often anonymous, amount of individuals – human crowd" (the Internet community) and involving of their assets, resources, knowledge or experience" [Hemer, 2011, p. 8]. So, crowdsourcing is a common intellectual work of a large number of people unfamiliar to each other on a common task in the network environment. This is a new method of obtaining needed services, ideas or information by reference to the large number of different groups, often through the Internet.

Crowdsourcing can be considered as a new format of the socio-political dialogue. Its key features are: 1) the lack of payment (occasionally – minimal remuneration) for the executable function; 2) a significant number of volunteer performers in the project; 3) use of virtual networks that enable optimization of expenses for information search, collecting and processing, and allow to divide work into a number of components that unite a whole resembling mosaic. Certainly, crowdsourcing would not be possible without the Internet – just through a network, people can coordinate their actions, discuss ways to solve problems and voluntarily join the communities. Internet is used to create instruments that can adjust government policies. For example, "Arab Spring" motivated many activists and ordinary Internet users to the primary use of Twitter and Facebook to schedule the protest acts and spread revolutionary appeals against establishment of Egypt, Yemen and Libya.

Crowdsourcing in Ukraine just begins to root, having started with social projects like public acts of cleaning the city. In Ukraine, crowdsourcing is not yet amply exemplified in actions, but the relevant experience is rapidly acquired. For example: 1) ElectUA – project of monitoring violations during the parliamentary elections of 2012 as apolitical initiative to draw public attention to the transparency of voting. The project was aimed to attract volunteers to pinpoint the instances of violation of the proper procedures during the parliamentary elections and visualization of the data on the virtual map; 2) "Chancellery hundred" as a volunteer project that arose during the events on the Maidan in winter 2014 and restored documents which the deposed regime tried to destroy; then documents of runaway oligarchs were started to be recovered and published.

The reasons for which crowdsourcing is appropriate to be applied to politics, are the following:

1) generation of a large number of new ideas (crowdsourcing provides much more insight, derived from ordinary Internet users. Getting new ideas allows for hoping for better proposals);
2) selected ideas will be more closely related to the community of followers (personal ideas will be useful to the target audience because it offers relevant data);
3) open methodology creates transparent and democratic system (users can see where certain ideas come from, which will help to increase their involvement and makes an additional support for the policy that is carried out).

Political crowdsourcing is useful and technologically justified in many socio-political dimensions – from designing the state constitution the implementation of local projects. This provides still small, but slowly accumulating by international practice experience of such a practice of open cooperation.

We select several successful crowdsourcing campaigns in politics.

1. Iceland, 2012. This is an interesting country to study experience of crowdsourcing in political practice for at least two reasons: 1) it is the only state in which crowdsourcing technology has already been successfully applied to the development of the constitution; 2) crowdsourcing has become one of the ways out from the political crisis that was the result of the hottest economic downturn of the country in 2008 [Курочкин, 2013, p. 80].
2. Finland, 2012, launched crowdsourcing platform. Open Ministry was designed to create new bills by the public. If the bill, proposed by a citizen, gathers more than 50 thousand signatures, it is subject to parliamentary voting
3. The USA. Citizens do not publish their own bills, but they can communicate with the politicians using resource PopVox, where the bills, proposed in Congress, are placed on separate pages, giving voters the opportunity to leave their comments. This resource helps to establish communication between politicians and voters.

Modern politicians are trying to find new ways of interacting with potential voters and the public in general. The main areas in which the use of crowdsourcing is justified to attract attention and promote political campaigns are the following:

1. *Creation of political profile.* examples: 1) the President of the USA, Barack Obama, cooperated with Artworks by creation crowdsourcing posters dedicated to increase working places; posters of three finalists were signed by the head of the state, designed for sale to raise funds for the further advancement of the project; 2) a candidate to become a deputy of the Australian Parliament in 2013 K. Rudd worked

with crowdsourcing platform DesignCrowd to create some design of a pre-election slogan and a T-shirt. He selected the winner from more than four hundred drafts and really used the chosen idea for his campaign.

2. *Providing power to people.* Examples: 1) even in "pre-crowdsourcing era" the first Australian prime-minister, E. Barton, in 1901 initiated an international competition to create a sketch of the Australian national flag; competition received more than 30 thousand proposals; 2) In 2010, the Government of India created design of the new Indian rupee using crowdsourcing. There were suggested more than 8 thousand drafts from participants from all over the country; the project has attracted global attention and rupee became a recognizable symbol in the world.

3. *Aid to people in the crisis regions.* Examples: 1) In South African Republic there was operating an crowdsourcing site Agang South Africa to help to rebuild the country that gained independence in 1994; the aim was to increase public influence on the election results; 2) a number of projects today (such as projects of the organization Italian coalition for civil rights and freedoms (Cild) and Chicas Ponderosas), that are aimed at finding ways to help those19 million people that in 2014 became refugees because of wars or persecutions) and the number of which increased sharply in 2015 (Syrians, Iraqis and Eritrean etc.).

4. *Bills development.* The examples are the already mentioned experience of Finland and Ireland. Iceland has became a political example of crowdsourcing in development of constitution draft. Its implementation passed through a number of steps: 1) Constitutional Committee of Iceland provides the public with an extensive report (700 pages) about the state of constitutional law in the country and prospects for its improvement; 2) at general elections there were elected 25 members of the Constitutional Assembly (non-partisan representatives from different regions of Iceland) – a special authority set up to design and improve the draft of the new constitution of the country [Gylfason 2012, p. 106-122]; 3) every week members of Constitutional Assembly placed on a special Internet portal new legislative proposals, which have come from citizens using Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, etc. All Assembly meeting were also broadcast on the Internet and were open for online citizen participation [Курочкин, 2013, p. 80].

Structures of the different levels, from global to local, come with crowdsourcing projects. Thus, the UN in 2015 implemented the project "Beyond 2015" – a global initiative that aims to attract young people to solve social problems and inform the world political leaders of what should be their priorities. Crowdsourcing model allowed young people from more than 80 countries to share ideas, discuss vital issues and their possible solutions. For three months period crowdsourcing project has collected over a thousand unique ideas and received more than 27 thousand responses and comments; Internet community, which was embraced with this project, makes more than 16 million people from around the world.

With crowdsourcing in many cities around the world there are implemented projects codenamed "smart city" (eng. *Smart City*). Today we are talking not just about expanding the range of electronic services but about merging them into a system of "smart city", which organizes management thanks to initiatives of the public, generated ideas, namely social and political crowdsourcing. Crowdsourcing allows for actively promoting policies of open municipal government, through various portals, on which public proposals are accumu-

lated. In the "smart city" every interested resident is not only a consumer of services but also the member of the decision-making to improve the quality of life. The availability of modern electronic services does not ensure public involvement in solving problems; instead the focused crowdsourcing practices are aimed at generating collective idea.

Successful implementation of crowdsourcing projects in politics depends on several factors, including:

– *how clearly the ultimate goal and planned incremental movement to it are defined*. Crowdsourcing project should clearly declare its goal, the way to achieve it and the role of project participants. Clear focus on the citizens as the main participants is required. At the beginning of the project implementation it is important to understand what the result will be: ideas, knowledge or experience;
– *communication quality after project launch*. Crowdsourcing does not happen automatically once put into Network, but information about the political project is necessary to be spread in all possible ways. Political crowdsourcing does not always attract attention; patience and perseverance in making interest and involvement of participants are required;
– *simple technological solution* of crowdsourcing project, making it accessible to ordinary users (simple user interface);
– *further permanent project management*: moderating debates, questions, responses etc. And, in addition, specific additional tasks, such as: deleting abusive comments, "reflection" on trolling attacks; all this are integral characteristics of Internet conversations on political subjects;
– *right determination of the project duration*, as crowdsourcing is not a permanent project on promoting certain political objectives. If there is known that one can join the project within the outlined time (e.g. several weeks), it encourages people to get involved. However, there exist long-term projects – such as several months signatures collected for a petition. If the project is a long-term one, periodic publication of interim results of the project is necessary;
– regular *offline activities serving as* the project support. This format of communication that helps to spread information about the project is an opportunity for participants to meet up with the organizers;
– constant *analysis and monitoring of the project* during its implementation, and analysis of results after its completion. The results of the analysis, which testify to the effectiveness of crowdsourcing campaigns, are certainly necessary to be published online for review by all interested participants and the public.

Of course, there are a number of obstacles on the way to sustainability practices of political crowdsourcing:

– *digital isolation* of rather significant number of adults as political actors. Although the number of people integrated in the Network is growing, to organization of crowdsourcing projects there is advisable to add such opportunities to participate in the project that do not require the mandatory use of the Internet, namely, the offline events;
– *crowdsourcing is not the equivalent of democracy*, opinion of the participant of any political crowd-project is not, as a rule, the majority opinion. But crowdsourcing can be seen as part of democracy, for example, using the method of survey. The importance

of crowdsourcing for citizens is that it becomes a new tool for socio-political activity and lobbying of socio-political interest of society;

– *crowdsourcing does not change the opinion of experts*. However, depending on the topic, public opinion can be equated to an expert opinion, though it can be minor;

– *political crowdsourcing requires technical and human resources*. However, not all crowdsourcing projects always require presence of the new technical solutions as there are a lot of software and free tools like Twitter or Facebook;

– *the problem of attracting participants*. Usually citizens learn about crowdsourcing and get involved in it not unexpectedly. As political crowdsourcing is new and unfamiliar process for most of them, it is necessary to pay special attention to work with the community and promotion of crowdsourcing opportunities;

– socio-political crowdsourcing is facing a difficult challenge: how to integrate the views of people into the final decision – whether the proposal of the bill, or the strategy of the country (region, city). There is a danger that crowdsourcing will only become a policy tool to attract attention. That is, crowdsourcing may stop performing its function and stop motivating people so that unfortuntely people's involvement in the future might possibly decrease.

Particular importance of crowdsourcing technology lies in forming active political community and ensuring the transparency of political decision-making. Crowdsourcing allows not only achieving a high degree of public participation in the development of certain projects, but also creating a sense of national unity. Free participation of citizens in the development and policy making allows for avoiding pressure of the interest groups that usually have privileged position in the legislative process.

POLITICAL (SOCIO-POLITICAL) CROWDFUNDING

Among the definitions of crowdfunding there is its interpretation as a process of uniting the resources, especially financial, for implementation of a specific project. We define it as voluntary collective cooperation of unspecified range of people who unite material or nonmaterial resources, typically using the Internet-platforms, for socio-political support (or a purely political) projects, initiated by individual or collective political actors. If we try to define crowdfunding through legislation, we are faced with the problem of legal gaps – particularly in the Ukrainian legislation the concept of "crowdfunding" (or national synonyms) is missing. And this is despite the functioning of many crowdfunding platforms.

When we talk about crowdfunding, first of all we separate thousands of socially useful projects, creative products that come to the market thanks to donations from the public, who believed in initiatives of social usefulness, which needs support to be implemented. That is, in the public mind there exists perception of crowdfunding as an economic mechanism – a "crowd funding".

Socio-political crowdfunding enables the transformation of "social capital, accumulated in social networks, into the financial one" [Котенко, 2014, p. 141].

Political crowdfunding is one of the innovative social technologies. Its important feature is lack of traditional intermediaries in financing: investor cooperates directly with the recipient. The uniqueness of crowdfunding is that this funding instrument, using Internet

technologies, allows for the quick acquisition of small investments from a large number of people to support the project.

Rate of political crowdfunding, as an effective tool of capital involving, increases. Thanks to the rapid development of information technology, new attractive financing opportunities became available for the policy investors. Funding is provided through Internet platforms. Examples include the following sources: *kickstarter.com, indiegogo.com, seedrs.com, boomstarter.ru, crowdcube.com, smartmarket. net, EquityNet.com,* betterplace.org, respekt.net and others. The rapid development of national financing is provided with the social networks (Twitter, Facebook, "VKontakte" etc.), which can, rather quickly promote attracting investments into specific projects.

In a situation a given politician (Ukrainian in particular) is often rightly accused of dishonet funding sources and further dependance on the "political patrons" – oligarchs, crowdfunding has the potential to become an alternative format of political projects financing.

The Russian politician Ilia Ponomaryov (the only member of the State Duma of the Russian Federation, who voted against Crimea annexing to Russia) expressed an opinion that "worldwide crowdfunding starts from policy". Undoubtedly, his words make sense. For example, "March of millions" in Russia gathered over 2 million RUB with crowdfunding. We support the approach on according to which policy should begin with crowdfunding, and not vice versa [Голембіовська, 2015]: virtuous politics has to start with crowdfunding, which will become a proper marker of the fact whether the public supports specific political initiative and is ready to contribute to its implementation.

In business, we can speak of at least three types of crowdfunding, depending on the remuneration, offered to the investor: 1) free or conditionally free of charge; 2) conditionally returned; 3) certainly returned (private investment). When talking about the political (socio-political) crowdfunding, political crowdfunding can be divided into types by at least three criteria: 1) *by financing sphere*: electoral, anti-corruption etc.; 2) *by nature of donations*: financial (cash), social (non-cash); 3) *by reward offered to crowd-investor*: free (conditionally free of charge) – provides possible gratitude by the recipient, marking the investor (donor), for example, on the site, in speeches to the voters, opportunity to participate in activities initiated by the political party; conditionally returned – suggests that in future there will be performed some exchange for the investor's support, for example, lobbying for the interests of the investor, inclusion of him or his representatives into the electoral list, etc.

Generally, all types of political crowdfunding are directly related to information and communication revolution. In particular, social (non-cash) political crowdfunding works primarily in social networks. Nobody spends funds to support activist, but makes it known with likes and reposts. With this technology a number of contemporary figures, such as Italian politician Beppe Grillo, become Facebook "stars", and then politicians and prominent figures.

In the countries with developed democracy crowdfunding has demonstrated effectiveness in the political sphere as it combines attracting financing and conducting a campaign. An appeal to entire groups of voters by making crowdfunding create a community of people is inspired by the same promise that seeks to support political project financially.

Money has always played an important role in designing policies, but today more than 90% of candidates in the West win the election thanks to attracting more funds. With electoral crowdfunding the voters can collect more than 80% of the campaign budget.

Crowdfunding helps to avoid excessive costs of launching the campaign, such as huge bills for rent, telephone calls, travel, etc.

Organisation of crowdfunding campaign is nearly free of charge and political leaders get a list of investors who supported them as a project. This database can be used during the subsequent campaigns. Obviously, sponsors of political campaigns are likely to vote for the sponsored political force and, in addition, will share information about it within their environment.

Since 2007 political crowdfunding has helped Barack Obama to collect 16.1 billion dollars [Швальц, 2007]. In particular, in 2008 the strategy of the presidential election of Barack Obama was based on the use of his own website to attract funding; Obama's campaign collected more than 750 million dollars from the multiple retail investors (average investment was $ 86 per person) [Швальц, 2007]. This strategy has received public attention and was repeatedly resorted to by other players of the political arena.

During the presidential campaign (2012) candidates have already actively used mobile payment platforms though not as much as during current campaign 2016. Barack Obama included online payment platform Square into instruments in his election campaign in January 2012, and earlier, in August 2011, the Republican Party has distributed more than five thousand readers of Square during the National Congress. The exact figure of the accepted donations was not invoked, but there existed comments that using Square to receive donations by Republicans and Democrats was successful [Шерман, 2015].

During the presidential campaign of 2016 in the US many ways were used to collect donations. For example, to collect donations all US presidential candidates, from H. Clinton and B. Sanders to R. Paul and M. Rubio, use online payment platform Stripe. The presidential campaign of 2016 shows a high level of candidates' involvement in modern technologies. H.Clinton campaign, according to «Forbes» as of August 2015, has already received donations more than $ 20 million through Stripe [Шерман, 2015].

Organization "The Center for Public Integrity" conducted a study the results of which show in which countries organizers of crowdfunding fundraising campaigns for Barack Obama received diplomatic posts. The results of the project have shown a significant correlation between high finance and the most desired positions in the diplomatic corps; diplomatic posts are received not only by the diplomats but organizers of campaigns of collecting funds. This practice is not unique to Barack Obama; it has existed around for decades.

History of crowdfunding in the USA and Western European countries confirms the theory of solidarity. Public financing was developed here through projects that did not offer the investors packages or shares in any of the enterprises or any future payment of introduced shares. Instead, investors were given awards, often in the form of the final product or reference and public thanks [Котенко, 2014, p. 141].

In the West, where the tradition of political patronage (political investment) is strong, one can see modification of political crowdfunding: now more and more "small" sponsors are involved in the financing of large undertakings. The potential of the Internet community today is obvious and powerful political players have to reckon with it.

To illustrate the use of crowdfunding method at the post-soviet area there can be invoked a campaign of collecting means for the project "RosPil" (http://rospil.info/) of O. Navalny, fundraising by Moscow Helsinki Group, fundraising to support "Pussy Riot" and others. The trend of supporting the organizers of, at first, protests, such as "March of Discordants" (Russian Federation) became more clear. Under the pressure of authorities there always arise

such mechanisms of political struggle that cannot be controlled by the authorities. Opposition began to use political crowdfunding (its online format) to finance their projects. For example, O. Navalny organized "RosPil" to combat abuse in the sphere of public purchases; collected funds were spent on the services provided by the lawyers and on the server itself. O. Navalny was supported by a number of active Internet users with the users with opposite political beliefs. Meanwhile, the lagging nature of Russian political culture that is not adapted to innovative mechanisms of political cooperation is underlined by the researcher O. Sokolov [2014, p. 36]. He argues: 78% of funds in support of punk band "Pussy Riot" was collected not in Russia, but abroad.

At present, socio-political crowdfunding in Ukraine is only beginning to develop. The potential of fundraising mechanism is not adequately exploited. Among domestic crowdfunding platforms are to be noted the following: "Spilnokosht" (https://biggggidea.com/); "Ukrainian Philanthropic Marketplace" (https://ubb.org.ua/); «Na-Starte» (http://na-starte.com/ua/); «JQ Star» (http://jqstar.com/). One of the research objectives is to study their practices to determine whether these platforms implemented the political projects and how successful they were. It looks like the absence of political projects themselves is clearly seen at all the crowdfunding platforms. Let's analyze this thesis using the example of two major Ukrainian crowd-platforms:

– *platform "Spilnokosht"* highlights such project-groups as "Media", "Human Rights", "Professional Journey", "Children", "Transport", "City" and many others. To draw attention to the projects, supported by the public, the project assumes there will be Urban Studies, support of camps, summer schools for teens, cultural projects and support of separate creative teams etc. There are no politically oriented projects; close to the socio-political topics can be considered support of public radio and television, programs of adaptation of internally displaced persons, "Sh.Fest – Taras Shevchenko Festival" (popularization of T.Shevchenko), integration camp "Big Game for TEENS" (for teens from different regions of Ukraine to master leadership skills) and similar (social rather than political) projects;

– *platform "Ukrainian Philanthropic Marketplace"* has no political projects, instead there are singled out projects "Help UA" (restoration of schools in the ATO area, rehabilitation of soldiers, etc.), "Health" (patients support), "Education" (books for schools of Donbass, furniture for rural schools, school uniforms for children of immigrants, organizing so called "scientific picnics", support of children with mental, emotional and behavioural disorders, inclusive education), "Environment and Animals" (aid for animal shelters), "Our Town" (lunch for children from poor families), "Like home..." (food and hygiene for evacuees from the ATO area, care of orphans, children from boarding schools etc.).

Instead, in Ukrainian political practice there are the examples of electoral crowdfunding. Thus, O. Bogomolets collected funds as a candidate for the post of the President of Ukraine: "My only sponsor is the Ukrainian people. Money for pledge was collected by volunteers and ordinary citizens" [Богомолець, 2014]. Fundraising on pledge to the Central Election Committee (2.5 million UAH) was completed in two days. From 08.04 to 21.04.2014 Election fund collected 181 495 UAH. One of the candidates for president of Ukraine A. Grytsenko used crowdfunding practice at the election in 2014; cost amounted to 8 million UAH. With crowdfunding Ukrainian political party "Democratic Alliance" is functioning.

It seems that in Ukraine attitude to national funding policy is still quite sceptical. Firstly, the public has doubts whether fundraising is not one more fraud, whether the collected funds will be used to implement the declared goal. Absence of legislation becomes a significant "negative" factor, because the citizen, as a political investor, needs effective protection against the financial crimes.

If you analyse such subjects of national policy as political parties, at present they appear to be attractive objects of political investment. Traditional parties cannot rely on ordinary participants in online crowdfunding – active users of social networks who are eager to support, anti-government protest initiatives.

Over the past two years of Ukrainian history we have seen many examples of collective financing such as the army, volunteer battalions, treating soldiers etc. It is notable, that this technology is effective, and therefore the question of policy-testing, namely to nominate candidates "from the bottom", to support their campaign and then delegate the voting power to them. So the politician, to be really from *public*, should be nominated by people; and not only to be promoted but also to be financed [Горобець, 2015] (primaries, donations, charitable contributions, etc.). Otherwise, we cannot demand independence of the candidate as the campaign will certainly be financed from some "oligarchic pockets" or by the candidate, who is an oligarch himself.

In this way competition of politicians as the project, their struggle-presentation for the national funding is made possible. We assume that this is a civilized transparent way to win the most reasonable political projects. Each crowdfunding project, particularly political one (when every politician is under the "anti-corruption eye"), should be based on ensuring complete transparency at every stage of fundraising, opportunities for free access (if not of all the public, then at least donors and authorized regulatory agencies) to monitor incomes and expenses.

Research on of political crowdfunding brings us to a number of issues, including: 1) whether political crowdfunding is to be considered a fundraising exclusively through specialized Internet platform. Ukrainians remember well the variety of ways of accumulating resources (money, medicine, food, fuel, etc.) in support of Euromaidan; how resources are still collected to finance the needs of the army today, etc.; 2) whether political crowdfunding should be materialized in its form as support can be shown not only in cash; at least we already mentioned non-material (social) crowdfunding.

However, it should be noted that methods of financing Euromaidan and army in fact cannot be considered crowdfunding technology in its classic sense because of the violation of the basic principles of crowdfunding: goal – rather abstract, no clear required amount, process transparency – more fragmented. In this case we rather deal with charity, but such measures can be considered a successful start of crowdfunding implementation in Ukraine.

Unfortunately, the culture of mass patronage, in particular socio-political one, has not acquired permanent bases, among Ukrainians and there was not formed stable middle class, which is the driving force of dedicated support of any creative endeavours. To our mind, popularity of crowdfunding is directly correlated with the size of the middle class. Use of political crowdfunding is still a prerogative of business entities. Political actors of the system itself nearly do not use this mechanism of communication with their political supporters.

CONCLUSION

At the time, technology of socio-political crowdsourcing and crowdfunding in Ukrainian format is quite unusual and unresolved with regulatory instruments, but considering positive global practice, they have the potential to become the norm of promoting political ideas at all levels. Citizens want to exert influence on politics and many of them are ready to use digital tools for this. Technologies of political crowdsourcing and crowdfunding create new opportunities for civic activity. This is a truly revolutionary approach to achieve the goal – to build a community in which everyone can be heard.

Application of these technologies in the political sphere is a global technological trend by which transparency of state bodies, public involvement in the process of political communication and work on socially significant tasks, which really can improve the quality of life of the citizens, are all improved. New technologies can enable truly democratic policy implementation at all levels.

Difficulties in implementing of such proven with international practice experience in Ukrainian environment is complicated by the fact that crowdsourcing and crowdfunding philosophy is based on mutual responsibility, social participation and a solid belief that everyone can change something in this world, and joint efforts approximate the achievement of the goal. Real practice of political crowdsourcing and crowdfunding is directly correlated, in our opinion, with indicators of social funds – both the individual and collective ones.

REFERENCES

Голембіовська А. (2015). *Сучасні тенденції української політики. Частина 2. Політичний краудфандинг* [online] http://blogs.korrespondent.net/blog/politics/3525247/ [accessed 07.12.2015].

Горобец В. (2015). *Краудфандинг политиков* [online] http://dou.ua/lenta/columns/political-crowdfunding/ [accessed 05.12.2015].

Долгин А. (2010). *Манифест новой экономики. Вторая невидимая рука рынка*. Москва.

Котенко Д. А. (2014). Краудфандинг – инновационный инструмент инвестирования. *Закон*, 5.

Курочкин А. В. (2013). Краудсорсинг как новый метод политического управления в условиях сетевого общества. *Исторические, философские, политические и юридические науки, культурология и искусствоведение. Вопросы теории и практики*, 9-1 (35).

Левина Е. А. (2012). Применение технологий краудсорсинга в социально-политическом диалоге. *Проблемный анализ и государственно-управленческое проектирование*, 5 (25).

Богомолець О. (2014). *«Передвиборча кампанія кандидатів у президенти має бути абсолютно прозорою!»* [online] http://bogomolets.com/ua/news/372-olga-bogomolets-peredviborcha-kampaniya-kandidativ-u-prezidenti-mae-buti-absolyutno-prozoroyu [accessed 09.09.2014].

Соколов А. В. (2014). Особенности возникновения политического краудфандинга в российской политической практике. *Вестник Российского университета дружбы народов. Серия: Политология*, 2.

Швальц В. (2007). *Политический краудфандинг помог Бараку Обаме собрать $16,1 млрд с 2007 года* [online] http://crowdsourcing.ru/article/politicheskij_ kraudfanding_ pomog_baraku_obame_sobrat_161_mlrd_s_2007_goda [accessed 08.12.2015].

Швальц В. *Почему политики все чаще обращаются к краудфандингу* [online] http://crowdsourcing.ru/article/politicheskij_kraudfanding_pomog_baraku_oba-me_sobrat_161_mlrd_s_2007_goda.

Шерман А. *Краудфандинг, политика и Stripe* [online] http://futurebanking.ru/ post/2932 [accessed 29.11.2015]

Gylfason T. (2012). Constitutions: Financial Crisis Can Lead to Change. *Challenge*, 55 (5).

Hemer J. (2011). *A snapshot on crowdfunding*. [in:] *The Open Access Publication Server of the ZBW*. Karlsruhe.