



Society. Document. Communication

Journal homepage: <https://sdc-journal.com.ua/en>
Society. Document. Communication, Vol. 8, No. 3, 66-75

Article's History: Received: 25.07.2023 Revised: 15.10.2023 Accepted: 08.11.2023

UDC 327(73)

DOI: 10.69587/sdc/3.2023.66

USA Think Tanks: Strategy and informational influence in the globalized media space

Tetiana Klynina*

PhD in History, Associate Professor
National Aviation University
03058, 1 Liubomyr Huzar Ave., Kyiv, Ukraine
Senior Research Fellow
University of Texas at Austin (Texas, USA)
2515, TX 78712 Speedway Str., Texas, USA
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0334-9852>

Olena Isaikina

PhD in History, Associate Professor
National Aviation University
03058, 1 Liubomyr Huzar Ave., Kyiv, Ukraine
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6370-7546>

Abstract. US think tanks are key players in the global media space. They are playing an important role in shaping strategies and influencing global public opinion. The aim of the work is to highlight the strategic directions of activity of US think tanks and their trends. The basis of the methodology was the use of a system of general scientific methods and techniques of empirical knowledge: induction and deduction, analysis and synthesis, system and functional approaches, classification and systematization, observation and description, explanation and generalization. In the course of the conducted research, it was determined that the tendency to increase the number of analytical centers in the USA leads to an increase in competition for financial resources, and also leads to a change in the primary specialization: it becomes more and more narrow, leaving only a small number of analytical institutions multidisciplinary. It was also established that the demand for research by analytical centers is growing, so opportunities for cooperation in solving problems are constantly expanding. This is because information requests are becoming more complex and globalized. It was noted that, despite the official statement regarding impartiality and objectivity in matters of political consulting, today there is a noticeable trend of increasing political influence on the activities of think tanks. However, many think tanks, in addition to addressing socio-economic issues, have a relentless desire to engage in policy advocacy, which can lead to certain negative trends: the focus of their activities can change from professional analytics to the conductor of existing party policies. The practical value of the work lies in its use during the educational process by students of higher education who gain knowledge in the specialties of "Information Analytics", "Political Science", "International Relations", etc., as well as those who are interested in the place of the United States in the globalized world and its influence

Keywords: social and political influence; think tank; analytical center; United States of America; policy advocacy

Suggested Citation:

Klynina, T., & Isaikina, O. (2023). USA Think Tanks: Strategy and informational influence in the globalized media space. *Society. Document. Communication*, 8(3), 66-75. doi: 10.69587/sdc/3.2023.66.



Copyright © The Author(s). This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

*Corresponding author

Introduction

"Analytical institutes", "think tanks", "brain centers", and so on, constitute the main, but far from exhaustive list of what is encompassed in the understanding of the term "think tank". According to the Encyclopedia Britannica, a "think tank" is defined as an "institution, group, or corporation organized for interdisciplinary research with the objective of providing advice on various political issues and products by using specialized knowledge and networking" (Ladi, n.d.). The key point in this context is the understanding that analytical centers, for the purpose of "advice", direct their activities towards improving government policy rather than formulating it. This position is also demonstrated by the research of J. McGann (2017), which indicates that analytical centers in the USA play a crucial role in society and have significant influence on the process of formulating political recommendations on domestic and international issues. During the first decades of the 20th century, analytical centers were established with the aim of improving the decision-making process of governments. This led to the widespread perception of them as objective and politically neutral institutions specializing in the study and analysis of current political issues. The emergence of the information society necessitated the development of expert and effective solutions in the process of governance, which, in part, was achieved through the growth of research organizations capable of providing such solutions. Gradually, not only quantitative breakthroughs occurred, but also qualitative ones: the scale and impact of the activities of analytical centers at the regional, national, and global levels grew exponentially.

In the 2022-2023 a different trend is observed: attention is paid to marketing ideas, the struggle for information influence, strengthening of reputation indicators through advocacy of certain government officials, presidential candidates, congressmen, etc., as well as a shift in the landscape of the state's social fabric. The current influence of American "Think Tanks" is not limited to the political sphere alone, but extends to social, cultural, military, and other spheres. This is due to the fact that analytical centers are becoming increasingly prominent worldwide, and their functionality goes beyond the initial ideas. In such conditions, US analytical centers play a key role, serving as a reference point for others. Observing the analyses conducted by American analytical centers is important for understanding the reactions and actions of the USA to global events. The information obtained from these analytical centers, essentially, can assist other countries in adapting to US strategies and actions, which can have a significant impact not only on international relations, but also on the development of domestic political processes in individual states. Contemporary researchers argue that the USA has a vast and influential community of analytical centers and, thus, influence global discourses on important international political issues in various ways; they assess analytical

communities as components of the United States' global power, involved in the task of adjusting political reality through the entire cycle of analytical production: from problem analysis to decision implementation in the management system (Matviychuk & Khilko, 2023).

The existence of Think Tanks in various internal and external contexts and forms always prompts reflections on their nature, independence, and reliability. Many scholars point out the uniqueness of the role of analytical centers (Planells-Artigot *et al.*, 2021). They argue that despite a number of controversial issues regarding the essence of analytical centers as a socio-political phenomenon, brain centers perform a range of functions that make them unique in many ways. This uniqueness is ensured by the speed of response, action, and the thoroughness of conclusions supported by evidence-based data. The uniqueness of US brain centers is also defined by their multifunctional orientation: ranging from educational functions, informational-educational work, to intermediation between the academic community and politicians, serving as a platform for discussing urgent socio-political issues. Therefore, the purpose of the article is to analyze the plurality of conclusions regarding the nature and essence of US brain centers, as well as their strategic and informational role in the modern media space.

Literature Review

The academic community, since the emergence of analytical centers as institutions, continues to explore the role of these institutions in the life of the state and society. In the conditions of globalization and the formation of a multipolar world, discussions about the influence and significance of analytical centers only gain new dimensions and trends. Researcher W. Wallace (1994) argued that analytical centers are the generators of innovative ideas. Scholar J. McGann (2020) dedicated his research to defining the role of analytical centers specifically in foreign policy. According to their opinion, by being involved in the process of formulating the country's foreign policy course, analytical centers thereby determine the political agenda of the United States of America. In agreement with this point of view, it is worth adding that by defining the priorities of certain state management issues, analytical centers may promote their own interests or serve as lobbyists, advocating the interests of a particular individual, party, company (group of companies), or public figures (the latter being predominantly an exception rather than the rule). Thus, analytical centers are not entirely neutral and may perform different functions at different stages of their activities, as well as act as intermediaries between political governance and its consumers. "Think Tanks" gain significant popularity, especially during national and international crises, such as the full-scale Russian invasion of Ukraine (February, 2022) and the military actions of the Gaza Strip against Israel (October, 2023). Researcher

D. Abelson (2018), who studies the phenomenon of the growth of analytical centers, the activation of which falls on the second half of the 20th century and continues to the present day, asserts that analytical centers in the United States are an integral part of the political landscape, and no other country in the world has a similar experience to that of the United States, making this country somewhat unique and a model for others. In his opinion, it is the quality expertise conducted by analytical centers and their close connection with the political establishment that are the instruments (D. Abelson refers to them in his work as "attributes") that make analytical centers unique and distinguish them among other actors of socio-political changes. Balancing between the theory of elites and pluralistic theory, the researcher tries to find the key to understanding the influence of analytical centers and ultimately concludes that analytical centers have different priorities at different stages of the political cycle. According to researchers A. Salas-Porras & G. Murray (2017), analytical centers, which perform a socio-activist function, can not only contribute but also simultaneously hinder important social changes (although such action is not always deliberate). The authors emphasize the social activity of analytical centers, the purpose of which is to penetrate or join civil society and social movements. Therefore, among the most important strategies that analytical centers adhere to today, according to the author, is social activity aimed at effecting social change. Researchers focus on how analytical centers penetrate power structures, thereby controlling global resources. Thus, analytical centers are not only a tool for initiating certain political ideas and changes but can also be a mechanism, that is, used by elites or a particular interest group to create certain challenges for the authorities. However, the author also notes the "liminality" of the position held by analytical centers in the power structure system. This position means that analytical centers are supposed to be at the "border" between two parts, two entities (in this case, elites and authorities), but at the same time not being a part of either the first or the second part/entities. The researcher used this "liminality" to define analytical centers as independent and neutral organizations. Problem-oriented research by J. Pan (2021) is dedicated to analyzing the general laws and internal logic of the work of think tanks, revealing the methodology for studying the problem (from a systematic to a dialectical perspective). This mentioned scientific work focuses on characterizing the research questions in think tanks and reveals the general guiding rules and inherent logic of research in analytical centers. The author's work is more practical in nature, unlike other scientific work presented above, as his work directly provides appropriate methods to improve the validity and reliability of research results. Among the cohort of Ukrainian researchers, there are also scholars who work on analyzing the phenomenon of analytical centers both in Ukraine and beyond its borders (Petrenko, 2018;

Senchenko, 2021a; 2021b). Mostly, their focus is on the historical conditions and socio-political basis for the formation of analytical centers, the representation of Ukraine in the activities of think tanks in the United States, and the problem of the influence of analytical centers on shaping the foreign policy of this country. The understanding of the phenomenon of think tanks in the United States and the algorithm of their activities and influence are also in the scientific focus of Ukrainian researchers.

Materials and Methods

In conducting the research, a systematic set of general scientific methods was employed (including induction and deduction, analysis and synthesis, systemic and functional approaches, classification and systematization, observation and description, explanation and generalization). The methodological basis of the study was the application of analysis and synthesis, which allowed identifying trends and cause-and-effect relationships in the activities of analytical centers in the USA. The conceptual basis of the article is based on establishing the correlation between the activities of analytical centers and the social changes they may bring about. The article relies on the analysis of primary sources, represented by annual reports for the years 2015-2020 – "Global Go To Think Tank Index Report", provided by the Program on Think Tanks and Civil Societies of the University of Pennsylvania in the USA (Global Go To Think Tank Index Report, 2015; 2017; 2020). Such a chronological selection contributes to understanding the trends of analytical centers as a socio-political phenomenon. The application of the chronological method in this case led to the identification of development patterns of analytical centers in the USA. To study changes in the quantitative indicators of analytical centers in the USA over the period of their existence, the method of typological analysis was also applied. Normative legal documents of the Internal Revenue Service of the USA, which is a subdivision of the US Department of the Treasury (Internal Revenue Code), served as an important source for the study. The use of such documents allowed understanding how the financial and tax system of the USA affects the essence of the activities of analytical centers, determining their main motives and direction. Materials from the official websites of the largest analytical centers were used as sources for analyzing their activities and tracking changes regarding their previous roles, as well as studying the representational component of analytical centers in the socio-political life of the country. Analytical centers were selected using purposive sampling according to international recognition from the Global Go To Think Tank Report. The observation method was applied to collect data on changes in the primary function of analytical centers from their inception to the present, which allowed identifying transformations in their activities and future strategies. Literature necessary for writing the article and searching for relevant sources was selected

using the bibliographic method. The application of analytical-synthetic and comparative methods resulted in identifying trends in the realm of the defined problem; the content analysis method was used to identify internal trends and development opportunities of the analytical center as the object of study; inductive and deductive methods were employed for generalization and systematization of conclusions.

■ Results and Discussion

"Analytical centers" as an institution originated in the first decades of the 20th century in the United States of America (the first institution dates back to 1910). During World War II, the term "analytical center" was used to denote a secured room where representatives of defense and military planning could meet to discuss strategic issues.

The term "analytical center" or "think tank" gained widespread usage since the 1970th, when there arose a need for various types of political research in the United States (Medvetz, 2012; Plehwe, 2015). Prior to this period, most of these organizations were primarily considered institutes or centers for scientific research that contributed to the refinement (upon request and necessity) of the policy-making process (Salas-Porras & Giordano, 2022). Overall, during the period from 1945 to 1991, the definition of the term "analytical center" was mainly based on the analysis of US analytical centers and aimed to emphasize their nonpartisan, apolitical, and nongovernmental character. In the subsequent decades, there was a quantitative increase and territorial expansion of such institutions worldwide. However, one trend remained unchanged - American analytical centers constituted the vast majority of the total number. In percentage terms, on the territory of the USA, there were 20-25% (i.e., 1/5) of the total number of analytical centers in various years (Keudel & Carbou, 2021).

This trend persisted in subsequent years. According to the report on the global index of analytical centers for the year 2015, there were 6618 organizations worldwide, of which 1835 were in the USA. In 2017, the indicator of the total number of analytical centers in the world increased to over 7815 institutions, with 1872 in the USA. The year 2020 brought new impressive data: around 11,000 analytical centers worldwide, of which 2203 institutions are located in the USA. Such an increase in analytical centers worldwide and in the USA, in particular, allows us to conclude about the growing importance, status, and influence, especially in the realm of politics (Global Go To Think Tank Index Report, 2015; 2017; 2020).

Researcher D. Korotkov (2023) notes that the interpretation of the concept of "analytical center" is not static and raises certain questions. Institutions actively engaged in informational-analytical and political research strive to reach a consensus on what an analytical center is and what its main goals are. D. Abelson (2018) suggests applying the term "analytical center" only to large, financially capable organizations that engage in the study of

political, social, and economic issues. Investigating the appropriateness of using one definition or another for the concept of an analytical center is not the purpose of this article. However, it is relevant to emphasize that within the scope of this study, an "analytical center" is understood as an institution organized for interdisciplinary research aimed at providing advice on various political, social, and economic issues and products.

The definition of the essence of the concept of "analytical center" and the scope of its application are somewhat influenced by the existing tax system in the United States. Most analytical centers have the status of nonprofit organizations. Accordingly, nonprofit organizations are granted significant benefits, but also face many restrictions on political activity (Rudder & Main, 2023). Besides being nonprofit, these organizations must also be charitable, religious, educational, seek to prevent cruelty to animals or children, or provide similar public goods. These organizations are exempt from federal taxes, and, more importantly, contributions to them are not taxed for donors, whose names they are not required to disclose. However, nonprofit organizations are prohibited from engaging in "political campaign intervention". According to the Internal Revenue Code, this means, among other restrictions, that they cannot contribute funds to specific candidates or parties, nor can they directly lobby for certain election outcomes. Consequently, an "analytical center" cannot be an organization that simultaneously provides advice on various political, social, and economic issues and products; these spheres of activity must be delineated (Lalueza & Girona, 2016).

Most traditional analytical centers historically have distanced themselves from electoral and even legislative politics more than required by the limitations imposed by their tax classification. However, some analytical centers seek to directly influence the political process in the USA and advocate for a particular ideological or party viewpoint. Such organizations include the Heritage Foundation and the Center for American Progress. To be able to directly participate in electoral politics and advocate for certain legislative outcomes, organizations change their statutes and are classified as "social welfare organizations or public organizations", which are allowed, among other things, to contribute to political candidates provided their "primary purpose" is social welfare or public good (Social Welfare Organizations, n.d.). However, in this case, questions arise about understanding the concept of "public good" in the political sphere and what criteria should be applied to determine whether an analytical center is a social welfare organization. In this context, concerns about the masking of lobbying efforts by a particular corporation or individual under the guise of social welfare organization activity may also be raised.

As of today, the United States of America has a network of analytical centers exceeding 2,000 names (Global Go To Think Tank Index Report, 2020). It is unlikely that

any researcher could list them all, but each of them can highlight 5-7 institutions that are popular not only within the USA but also far beyond its borders. Among the most prominent ones are the Brookings Institution, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, the RAND Corporation, the American Enterprise Institute, the Heritage Foundation, the Hoover Institution, and others. These institutions occupy top positions in the Global Go To Think Tank Index Report. Today, all these analytical centers do not focus on narrow areas or individual issues but, on the contrary, seek to address a wide range of socio-political issues: from economics to foreign policy. Due to this diversification, we can observe a fairly wide range of functions performed by analytical centers: from assisting in the analysis of current situations in all spheres of life to mediating between the government and the public, helping to build trust in public officials (McGann & Shull, 2018).

The following brain centers are distinguished by dominant target areas of activity:

- ✓ Research-publishing;
- ✓ Lobbying;
- ✓ Legal defense;
- ✓ Cultural;
- ✓ Targeted (Godlyuk, 2011).

Almost all of them implement original research and educational programs aimed at educating and influencing policymakers and opinion leaders on a wide range of economic, social, political, environmental issues, and security problems. Additionally, they serve as a special tool for social control and thus participate in defining and representing certain goals and values of society. American analytical centers play an important role in disseminating information among policymakers, shaping the contours of public discourse, and functioning of the US government. They also become a constructive forum for information exchange among key stakeholders or a "neutral space" for conducting debates. Specifically, several American analytical centers, including the American Enterprise Institute, Hoover Institution, Heritage Foundation, and Brookings Institution, have actively participated in several presidential campaigns and the transitional periods that followed. Employees from these institutions provided advice to Donald Trump, Barack Obama, George Bush, and other presidential candidates during primaries they participated in and jointly made efforts to convey political recommendations to them and those in their administrations (Bohdanova, 2018).

In this context, the activity of the analytical center "The Niskanen Center" is illustrative, which defines its political position as "moderation" while emphasizing support for the principles of liberal democracy. In 2023, Time magazine outlined this analytical center as the "most interesting analytical center in American politics". As the author of the article, M. Ball (2023), notes, "The Niskanen Center with its roots in the libertarian right, is both the vanguard and the engine of this lowered

tendency. Working outside the party bunkers where most District of Columbia supporters gather, or between them, it gained a reputation on Capitol Hill for its unorthodox political ideas that can bridge the gap between left and right". "The Niskanen Center" does not hide its intentions regarding its activities and on its official website openly states that it "advances policy... shapes a new vision of American governance... engages government leaders, advocacy, and media as dominant factors in policy outcomes" (Niskanen Center, n.d.).

The analytical center's advocacy is supported by "working with a wide range of participants", whom they invite to cooperate on their own terms (specific conditions are not provided), and whom the center helps to unite in politics. Analyzing the activities and reports of the center for previous years, we see that among the "wide range of participants", special attention is paid to Senate committees, senators themselves, and congressmen. For example, in May 2023, the Senate Budget Committee invited the president of the analytical center, Ted Gayer, to express his opinion on the issue of fossil fuels (and subsidies for them) (Koval *et al.*, 2022). However, among the entire list of "wide range of participants", the name of Senator John Hickenlooper (Colorado) stands out. There is no direct reference to contact with the senator on the analytical center's official sources, but through the application of content analysis and statistical calculations, a "high" interest of the center in the activities of Senator John Hickenlooper was identified. Moreover, his name is not always mentioned in the context of Senate hearings but has other "political" connotations (for example, his name appears on the analytical center's website starting from 2017 and is mentioned in various political contexts, such as Trump's policies, the 2020 US elections, alternative to Joe Biden in the 2020 elections, etc.). Also notable is the linguistic form of expressions used by the center to present material mentioning Senator John Hickenlooper ("proud to endorse", "applauds"). Interestingly, the senator is the author/co-author of bills in the fields of emissions, workforce shortages, electricity, immigration, i.e., exactly those areas that "The Niskanen Center" promotes and supports. Furthermore, the senator is a member of the US Senate Committees on: Energy and Natural Resources; Health, Education, Labor and Pensions; Commerce, Science, and Transportation; Small Business and Entrepreneurship. Of course, it can be assumed that as a former geologist, the senator shares the values upheld by "The Niskanen Center". However, in this case, there is a significant influence of the institution on political and social events within the United States through "expertise and consultation" with Senator John Hickenlooper. Moreover, "The Niskanen Center" directly indicates that it is an "advocacy organization, founded to change state policy by directly participating in the policy development process" (Niskanen Center, n.d.).

It is worth noting that the tendency of "political influence" by analytical centers was not observed from

the very beginning of their establishment. For example, the Brookings Institution sought to adhere to the stated separation from the political process. An example of such distancing can be seen in the analysis and recommendations of the Brookings Institution regarding the Great Depression of the 1930s (Brookings's analysis..., 2016). The American Enterprise Institute, with a clear focus on promoting the interests of free enterprise, also distanced itself from government functioning. The situation changed after World War II, when new international realities required rapid response. The radical change in the country's foreign policy from isolationism to global leadership required the generation of new ideas, which analytical centers provided to the American government, becoming advocates of policy in a way. This trend continues to this day.

A new strategic point on the agenda of analytical centers in the 21st century has become the desire to influence public opinion to raise awareness of the public about socio-political issues. In this way, brain centers act as agents of social change (Providing solutions..., 2023). They effect social change in several ways: by developing economic and social policies, proposing powerful ideas to influence policymakers and public opinion, and prompting paradigm shifts through a combination of strategies. Additionally, they develop an ambitious research program and engage in social activism to penetrate or join civil society and social movements. The struggle to promote social change involves not only a diverse combination of strategies but also articulating networks and coalitions that cross countries and regions, connecting analytical centers with academic institutions, non-governmental organizations, and other civil society actors (Salas & Giordano, 2022).

The information-analytical products of brain centers also serve as a means of influencing public opinion and policy in general. Political reports, analytical notes on specific issues, books, analytical recommendations, expert reviews, and academic journals are traditional working products of American think tanks that can be used as templates for policy initiatives and recommendations for the US government and president. Some analytical centers seek to go beyond "traditional" methods of informing the public by leveraging the advantages of the digitalization process. Many analytical products (lectures, discussions, interviews) in the form of podcast recordings are created to be useful for policymakers and international politics in universities and high schools. The goal of such media strategies is to inform the public about the organization's views on current events and to highlight publications or key issues. Many analytical centers strive to develop niche programs, such as datasets, to fill gaps in existing academic research or government databases

Despite the significant intellectual potential of scholars at American universities, experts from analytical centers are recognized as more qualified. It is emphasized that analytical centers provide information that is more

attractive to government officials. Analytical centers specialize in creating research products that meet the needs and preferences of government policymakers and legislators, focusing on the institutional issues of their target audience. As a result, most organizations take pride in being "idea factories" for the government. Essentially, US analytical centers serve as sources of government expertise (providing recommendations), as sources of future personnel (appointing analytical center workers to managerial or advisory positions) (Senchenko, 2021a), as alternatives to university research (bridging the gap between academic science and government/society). US brain centers often become involved in the partisan dynamics prevailing in Washington. Some openly take a partisan or ideological position (Korotkov, 2023), while others, seeking to gain public trust, strive to remain independent and objective. In analytical centers, especially large ones, there is a wide variety of expert opinions. Among the most influential analytical centers, there is often a tendency to support close bipartisan ties.

The issue of the "influence" of analytical centers is dominant in the scientific literature directly dedicated to their activities. The rapid development of the "analytical center" as a phenomenon of socio-political phenomenon and its "information output" beyond the state in which it (i.e., the analytical center) operates raises questions about the influence of this institution. However, the complexity of answering this question lies precisely in the difficulty of interpreting the category of influence. This problem needs to be investigated directly through questions about how significant this influence is and whether it is democratically legitimate, whether it can be decisive at certain moments of the political process, and whether it can be measured. The consequences of the activities of analytical centers are difficult to assess (Misztal, 2012; Hernando *et al.*, 2018). Because brain centers may seek various types of influence (influencing public or elitist opinion, creating new policies, influencing the implementation of existing policies, providing the government with new officials); success (influence) can be assessed differently, depending on the specific criterion or standard by which the assessment is made. It is worth noting that at the beginning of the 21st century, scholars L. Jacobs & B. Page (2005) raised questions about whether actors really influence the decisions made by government officials on domestic and foreign policy issues and emphasized divergent views on this issue. They directly pointed out actors such as: groups of people organized around common interests; epistemological communities, as well as ordinary citizens. Considering the understanding of the epistemic community from the perspective of P. Haas's (1992) concept as "a network of professionals with recognized experience and competence in a particular field and authoritative claims to knowledge related to policy in this field or problem area", it is necessary to attribute analytical centers precisely to this community. Thus, from today's

perspective, the question of whether analytical centers influence the formation of ideas on socio-political issues in public administration should be answered positively. D. Abelson (2018) holds a similar view, pointing out the controversial and uncertain role (understood as influence) of analytical centers, but acknowledging them as actors of this influence.

The political establishment, public opinion, and practicing scholar-analysts generally agree that American think tanks have achieved particular success in influencing policy. The complexity of assessing the "impact effect" of analytical centers on the socio-political life of the United States and its citizens also lies in the different understandings of what influence is, as well as the imperfect methodological basis for assessing such influence. For example, scholar A. Longhini (2015) suggests considering the influence of analytical centers through a causal-political context. In her opinion, such influence is not a constant substance but can vary depending on the context. We agree with this approach because depending on the context (in this case, the political situation, foreign policy priorities, and existing social problems requiring solutions at the moment), the same object, event, or situation can have different meanings or interpretations. For example, an analytical center focusing on climate issues may have minimal influence on officials who are currently, for example, focused on counterterrorism efforts. Conversely, when climate change issues again become prominent, the influence of such an analytical center will be more significant. It is possible to hypothesize that the influence of an analytical center also directly depends on external political circumstances and the rules of the game on the international stage.

Renowned American researcher J.W. Kingdon & J.A. Thurber (2011), focusing on understanding the agenda-setting in US politics, noting the aspect of "unpredictability", argued that analytical centers cannot directly influence the final choice of American politicians. However, in their view, brain centers have wide opportunities to regulate the boundaries of respectable debates, which will have a good result – considering various alternatives. This should also be agreed upon because qualitative, structured, and comprehensive coverage of the problem can help shift the official's focus, allowing them to move beyond established beliefs and practices. The question of the possibility of measuring the informational influence of brain centers by quantitative mentions and citations in the media, the number of subscribers and likes on the official accounts of analytical centers on social networks, and the number of appearances in various committees of the US government is one of the most discussed options for assessing influence. J. McGann (2020) suggests understanding the influence of analytical centers by involving "usage indicators that measure the degree of media and government officials' references to analytical centers for information". Thus, the more various media refer to the conclusions of a

particular analytical center, the more likely and higher its influence. However, researchers A. Rich & R. Weaver (2000) argue that those analytical centers that are more ideologically conservative are cited much more often in the media than noticeably liberal ones, and the difference in budget resources of analytical centers is also the "cause of visibility in the media". The authors of the article suggest that mentioning certain information in the media with reference to an analytical center may only be the result of presenting an idea that is being discussed in society, rather than its public acceptance and recognition as a component of influence. Moreover, the pursuit of media mentions to achieve a certain influence indicator may have a reverse effect, and analytical centers will direct their research not to socially important topics but to those that attract more attention. In this case, the issue of symbiosis should also be considered: the media use analytical centers to inform about their activities or highlight their contribution in the form of articles, while analytical centers themselves use the media to spread their ideas. These relationships are often accompanied by problems, as some analytical centers have privileged access to the mass media, while others almost never have such opportunities.

Thus, emphasizing the difficulty of measuring the influence of an analytical center on the socio-political life of the state, it is recommended to take into account the system of criteria proposed by the authors of the article for the possible measurement of influence: the presence of the brain center in the Global Go To Think Tanks Index Report list; the correlation of this position over the last 3-5 years; the number of active (well-known) scholars in it and their percentage of the total number of analytical center employees; the number of publications and scientific achievements; the number of subscribers on social networks, visitors to their websites, and indicators of follower growth (decrease); ease of mention among the general population; diversity of the target audience targeted by their activities; quantitative and percentage ratio of the analytical center's offer to demand from politicians; the number of invitations to representatives of analytical centers for hearings in Congress, etc. This list is not exhaustive, but it can serve as a guideline for understanding the criteria for measuring influence indicators.

Conclusions

The increasing number of analytical centers worldwide is evidence that analytical centers and their products are in demand. The uniqueness of US analytical centers lies not so much in their quantitative superiority as in their qualitative dominance, which manifests itself in the degree of their active participation at various stages of political governance. In turn, the possibility of active participation is explained by the large number of available channels for influence. The fact of such "intervention" is not always due to financial capability and the presence of certain "hidden mechanisms". It is worth considering

the fragmentation and decentralization of the US political system, the weakness of the civil service, as well as the target audience for which this influence is intended. At the same time, US analytical centers have more opportunities, connections, and channels to significantly influence the process of state governance and the adoption/implementation of a particular political course. Of course, this mainly concerns the largest ones, such as the Brookings Institution, the Carnegie Endowment, the Heritage Foundation, and so on.

The question of the "influence" of analytical centers is one of the most problematic and is measured by the following approaches: 1) analytical centers are passive political players who engage in "assuring" elites of the fairness of their views; 2) analytical centers are influential mainly in crisis moments. Another problem faced by American think tanks is adhering to the boundary, from which it is very easy to transition from the field of political research to the realm of political propaganda. Another aspect of the existence and functioning of US analytical centers is their authority, popularity, and their ability/inability to establish a presence in the policymaking community.

The vast majority of analytical centers at the turn of the 20th and 21st centuries changed their status from non-ideological political advisors to policy advocacy, expanding the scope of their influence. Of course, they

are also active, to one degree or another, in the fields of economics, trade, social issues, taxation, budgeting, and other issues. In order to have the opportunity to be involved in influencing the aforementioned spheres of societal life, analytical centers define comprehensive public relations as one of the strategies of their activities for disseminating their work; another important point is the further development of communication strategy, as well as obtaining necessary stakeholders.

The historically formed predominance of research by analytical centers from the perspective of political science and public administration poses before the authors of the article the outlines of future research directions for academic analysis of the influence of think tanks on the healthcare planning system and climate change.

■ Acknowledgements

This research was made possible by a grant provided by the University of Texas at Austin (USA). Personal gratitude is expressed to Mary Neuburger, Chair of the Department of Slavic and Eurasian Studies at the University of Texas at Austin, and the administration of the Clements Center for National Security at the University of Texas at Austin.

■ Conflict of Interest

None.

■ References

- [1] Abelson, D. (2018). *Do think tanks matter?: Assessing the impact of public policy institutes*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- [2] Ball, M. (2023). *The most interesting think tank in American politics*. Retrieved from <https://time.com/6258610/niskanen-center-bipartisanship-think-tank-politics/>.
- [3] Bohdanova, T. (2018). Latin American policy of the D. Trump administration (2017-2018). *Eminak: Scientific Quarterly*, 2(22), 91-96.
- [4] Brookings's analysis and recommendations on the Great Depression of the 1930s. (2016). Retrieved from <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/brookings-great-depression/>.
- [5] Godlyuk, A. (2011). *Analytical institutes (think tanks) in US foreign policy*. *Problems of International Relations*, 2, 78-88.
- [6] Haas, P.M. (1992). Introduction: Epistemic communities and international policy coordination. *International Organization*, 46(1), 1-35. doi: 10.1017/S0020818300001442.
- [7] Hernando, M.G., Pautz, H., & Stone, D. (2018). Think tanks in 'hard times' – the Global Financial Crisis and economic advice. *Policy and Society*, 37(2), 125-139. doi: 10.1080/14494035.2018.1487181.
- [8] Jacobs, L.R., & Page, B.I. (2005). *Who influences U.S. foreign policy?* *The American Political Science Review*, 99(1), 107-123.
- [9] Keudel, O., & Carbou, O. (2021). Think tanks in a limited access order: The case of Ukraine. *East European Politics and Societies*, 35(3), 790-811. doi: 10.1177/0888325420937810.
- [10] Kingdon, J.W., & Thurber, J.A. (2011). *Agendas, alternatives, and public policies*. Boston: Longman.
- [11] Korotkov, D. (2023). *Think tanks as modern actors of world politics: Struggle in the space of international competition*. *International Relations, Public Communications and Regional Studies*, 1(15), 17-30.
- [12] Koval, N., Kulyk, V., Riabchuk, M., Zarembo, K., & Fakhurdinova, M. (2022). Morphological analysis of narratives of the Russian-Ukrainian conflict in western academia and think-tank community. *Problems of Post-Communism*, 69(2), 166-178. doi: 10.1080/10758216.2021.2009348.
- [13] Ladi, S. (n.d.). *Think tank*. Retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/topic/think-tank>.
- [14] Lalueza, F., & Girona, R. (2016). The impact of think tanks on mass media discourse regarding the economic crisis in Spain. *Public Relations Review*, 42(2), 271-278. doi: 10.1016/j.pubrev.2015.09.006.
- [15] Longhini, A. (2015). Institutionalization of foreign policy think tanks in Italy and in the UK: An explanatory framework. *Central European Journal of Public Policy*, 9(2), 96-108. doi: 10.1515/cejpp-2016-0014.

- [16] Matviychuk, A.V., & Khilko, M.I. (2023). Peculiarities of interaction between the state and non-governmental organizations: The experience of Poland and the USA. *Political Life*, 4(2023), 52-59. doi: [10.31558/2519-2949.2023.4.7](https://doi.org/10.31558/2519-2949.2023.4.7).
- [17] McGann, J. (2015). *Global go to think tank index report*. Retrieved from <https://repository.upenn.edu/server/api/core/bitstreams/c7ce4a8b-cf30-4039-a4c2-a847f025965b/content>.
- [18] McGann, J. (2017). *Global go to think tank index report*. Retrieved from <https://repository.upenn.edu/server/api/core/bitstreams/27b2bdfd-2f16-4cb6-a0b8-80e7c23e4b7b/content>.
- [19] McGann, J. (2020). *Global go to think tank index report*. Retrieved from <https://repository.upenn.edu/entities/publication/9f1730fa-da55-40bd-a1f4-1c2b2346b753>
- [20] Medvetz, T. (2012). *Think tanks in America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- [21] Misztal, B.A. (2012). Public intellectuals and think tanks: A free market in ideas? *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society*, 25, 127-141. doi: [10.1007/s10767-012-9126-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10767-012-9126-3).
- [22] Niskanen Center. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.niskanencenter.org/about/>.
- [23] Pan, J. (2021). *DIIS theory and methodology in think tanks*. Berlin: Springer.
- [24] Petrenko, I. (2018). "Thought factories" in the USA as a functional prototype of modern analytical centers. *Studia Politologica Ucraino-Polona*, 8, 205-213.
- [25] Planells-Artigot, E., Ortigosa-Blanch, A., & Martí-Sánchez, M. (2021). Bridging fields: A comparative study of the presence of think tanks. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 162, article number 120377. doi: [10.1016/j.techfore.2020.120377](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2020.120377).
- [26] Plehwe, D. (2015). The politics of policy think tanks: Organizing expertise, legitimacy and counter-expertise in policy networks. In *Handbook of critical policy studies* (pp. 358-379). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- [27] Providing solutions to the most daunting challenges. Annual Report. (2023). Retrieved from <https://www.niskanencenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/01/annual-report.pdf>.
- [28] Rich, A., & Weaver, R.K. (2000). Think tanks in the U.S. media. *Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics*, 5(4), 81-103. doi: [10.1177/1081180X00005004006](https://doi.org/10.1177/1081180X00005004006).
- [29] Rudder, A., & Main, K. (2023). 501(c)(3) Vs. 501(c)(4): Differences, pros and cons. Retrieved from <https://www.forbes.com/advisor/business/501c3-vs-501c4/>.
- [30] Ruser, A. (2018). What to think about think tanks: Towards a conceptual framework of strategic think tank behaviour. *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society*, 31, 179-192. doi: [10.1007/s10767-018-9278-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10767-018-9278-x).
- [31] Salas-Porras, A., & Giordano, V. (2022). Think tanks as agents of social change. In *The palgrave handbook of global social change* (pp. 1-17). London: Palgrave Macmillan. doi: [10.1007/978-3-030-87624-1_216-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-87624-1_216-1).
- [32] Salas-Porras, A., & Murray, G. (2017). Think Tanks and global politics: Key spaces in the structure of power. In *Think tanks and global politics* (pp. 1-23). London: Palgrave Macmillan. doi: [10.1057/978-1-137-56756-7_1](https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-56756-7_1).
- [33] Senchenko, M. (2021a). Information and analytical activities of "think tanks". *Bulletin of the Book Chamber*, 4, 24-31.
- [34] Senchenko, M. (2021b). The network of American foundations and "brain trusts". *Bulletin of the Book Chamber*, 5, 26-32.
- [35] Social Welfare Organizations. (n.d.) Retrieved from <https://www.irs.gov/charities-non-profits/other-non-profits/social-welfare-organizations>.
- [36] Wallace, W. (1994). Between two worlds: Think-tanks and foreign policy. In *Two worlds of international relations: Academics, practitioners and the trade in ideas*. London: Routledge. London: Routledge.

Аналітичні центри США: стратегія та інформаційний вплив в глобалізованому медіапросторі

Тетяна Клиніна

Кандидат історичних наук, доцент
Національний авіаційний університет
03058, просп. Любомира Гузара, 1, м. Київ, Україна
Старший науковий співробітник
Техаський університет в Остіні
2515, TX 78712, Speedway, м. Остін, США
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0334-9852>

Олена Ісайкіна

Кандидат історичних наук, доцент
Національний авіаційний університет
03058, просп. Любомира Гузара, 1, м. Київ, Україна
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6370-7546>

Анотація. Аналітичні центри США є ключовими гравцями у глобальному медіапросторі, та відіграють вагому роль у формуванні стратегій та впливу на глобальну громадську думку. Мета роботи полягає у висвітленні стратегічних напрямлень діяльності аналітичних центрів США та їх тенденцій. Основою методології дослідження стало використання системи загальнонаукових методів та прийомів емпіричного пізнання: індукції й дедукції, аналізу та синтезу, системного та функціонального підходів, класифікації та систематизації, спостереження та опису, пояснення та узагальнення. У ході проведеного дослідження було визначено, що тенденція до кількісного збільшення аналітичних центрів США призводить до зростання конкуренції за фінансові ресурси, а також веде до зміни першочергової спеціалізації: вона дедалі стає більш вузькою, залишаючи багатoproфільними лише невелику кількість аналітичних інституцій. Також було встановлено, що попит на дослідження аналітичних центрів зростає, тому можливості для співпраці у розв'язанні проблем постійно розширюються. Це пояснюється тим, що інформаційні запити стають все більш складними та глобалізованими. Було зазначено, що не дивлячись на офіційне ствердження щодо неупередженості та дотримання об'єктивності в питаннях політичного консультування, на сьогоднішній день помітною є тенденція щодо посилення політичних впливів на діяльність аналітичних центрів. Однак є очевидним, що багато аналітичних центрів окрім вирішення суспільно-економічних питань, мають невпинне бажання займатися адвокацією політики, що може призвести до певних негативних тенденцій: фокус їхньої діяльності може змінити вектор від професійної аналітики до провідника існуючих партійних політик. Практична цінність роботи полягає у її використанні під час навчального процесу здобувачами вищої освіти, які отримують знання за спеціальностями «Інформаційна аналітика», «Політологія», «Міжнародні відносини» тощо, а дослідниками ролі США та їх впливом у глобалізованому світі

Ключові слова: суспільно-політичний вплив; think tank; «мозковий центр»; Сполучені Штати Америки; адвокація політики