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Introduction

In constitutions of democratic countries it’s very often and even almost always stating that public administration is an exercise by the people on behalf and for the benefit of the people. However, in the course of the life of public, this principle has not always been successful to maintain, particularly in countries where there are still no strong moral customs and traditions of government, democracy is a new phenomenon and is at a stage of consolidation, and even in the consciousness of the public it has not even as of now taken place or been strengthening, in accordance of new principles of governing, appropriate behavior and mindset transformation, or it happens slowly in adapting of local peculiarities and conflicting to popular and national characteristics and various features strengthening for centuries, and conditioning by social institutions and relations operating for centuries, the attitude of people towards each other, relations, and social and psychological environment basing on that. Armenian republic is fighting also against such issues, whose self-consolidation, self-identification and self-recognition process often distorts the social consolidation, resulting in an incomplete perception and unconstructive attitude on new principles adopting by or in government. The issues resulting in complexity of consolidation of democracy and in importance of correct implementation of norms and rational principles of government and of their perceptions are many and are relating to many aspects basing on psychological description of a small nation of difficult history and because of difficult geopolitical position now living in difficult situation and as a result contradictions in behavior of public representatives. What does this mean? Consolidation and establishment of democracy and realization of necessary principles on macro-level will be incomplete as long as not polishing micro-level issues of national psychological traits and various characteristics of this situation in behavior of individuals and of groups and perceptions of state, civic norms and values, citizens attitude and believe as of. Almost always in everyday life of public, we are noticing displays of distorting culture and wrong perception of values when any level of any kind of privileges, positions and even instable social group representative
social role, have a relatively high level of financial and other resources, motivate people of manifestations of self-realization using position and resources to the best of their own, and even by breaking the rules. This explains why government-appointing officials often perceive their new social roles as leverage in pursuit of pressures and personal, group interests, when perceptions should really origin differentiations, limiting their own interests to serving the public interest. But a person who assumes role of leader, even informally, in his immediate study or work group, first of all is up trying to do what’s in his interests, cannot avoid such behavior while holding positions of real influence. Or another issue, by some members of the public, violations of state and humanitarian values, disrespect manifestations bring into people of the same type taking formal roles into violations of the respective norms and values as exercise new social roles.

The issues are universal, and for the purpose of resolving those peoples establish laws and restrictions for centuries. And what is the law in general, a unification of human-made adjustments which is made by the consciousness of our own shortcomings, which is meant to balance, resolve, or at least cover those shortcomings, that is, by putting its own shortcomings on a scale, the public is putting laws and regulations into another. Therefore, in order to regulate and hide its own shortcomings, or so that laws will be working, public needs to objectively measure, assess its weaknesses real weight and balance scales with stable and equivalent weight of law, as such fixing of disadvantages is centuries of an automatic process, and current reality makes it to take some steps to its limit.

The relevance of the study is conditioning by the current socio-political development in Armenia. In the context of political, managerial, and socio-economic crises and changes that are now taking place, the creation of civil society is becoming a rather urgent issue, not only as specific structure and procedure, but as a whole new quality of public life. But without civic culture education, it’s consolidation, establishment of institutional and normative capacities of attracting citizens in management and policy formation and realization process, their creation or
development, there can’t be a civil society nor its prospering or consolidation. In their turn, information technologies striving daily are activating interactions of individuals, state institutions and public, or their forms and innovative ways of working, changing the logic of interactions of state and civil society, and are simultaneously increasing transparency and efficiency of managing under increasing civil alertness.

The purpose of the research is identification and study of forms of the political and civic participation, public and state relations, institutional and legal procedures of cooperation, which would enhance legitimacy of government, citizens trust towards the government, so that more of transparent, accountable and effective now becomes public policy realization in Republic of Armenia.

The following issues are highlighting as relevant to the purpose of research: study of the current level of institutional opportunities for civil and political participation, its prospects, analysis of international experience and recommendations in comparison to Armenia, as well as along with institutionalization characterization, study of the cultural backgrounds of citizen participation - natures and levels of political and civic cultures. Overall, within the logic of this study we could develop objectives tree, where super goal of raising public confidence and state-society relations and cooperation, is deriving into objectives of development of institutional capacities and procedures, as well as rise of civic education and political culture, which are consequently deriving into following sub-objectives, which require solutions: institutionalization of political participation, participatory procedures in governance, civic education, upbringing of the bureaucracy civic culture by increasing information transparency skills, correct perceptions of office and administrative, ethical responsibility.

The object of the study is public participation in politics and governance as an important component of modern democracy. The subject of the study is the institutional possibilities of political and civic participation, engagement and control of the current Armenian community and peculiarities of the civic culture shaping it, in background of importance of civic upbringing.
Level of scientific study of the issue, review of literature on its sources.

Works on the phenomenon of citizen participation, interaction of the state and society have been very valuable and pivotal by classical representatives of public-political thought, such as Plato, Aristotle, Machiavelli, and in particular Habermas, H. Hegel, J. Locke and Jean-Jacques Rousseau, in his own Theory of Social Alliance, as well as Montesquieu, Marx and Weber. Considering distortions of roles in political positions and its perception as source of force, pressure, leverage and prestige, in an amount is explaining in such theories, such as power transmission and its circulation, one of which is theory of exchange of roles of lions and foxes in public by Parsons, elite and high-quality minority theories of management. Among contemporary authors and works, issue of citizen participation is mostly in literature by Western, in particular American authors, political scientists and sociologists, perhaps the most popular and authoritative of which are Verba, Almond, Dahl, and others, in particular of R. Aaron, Essay on Freedom: “There is no universal formula for freedom”, R. Abers, Learning Democratic Practice: Distributing Government Resources through Popular Participation in Porto Alegre, Brazil, Sh. Arnstein, A ladder of citizen participation, B. Barber, Civil Society: Beyond Rhetoric: A Framework of Political Understanding, M. Barnes, J. Newman, H. C. Sullivan, Power, participation and political renewal: Case studies in public participation, M. Castells, City, Class and Power and Theoretical propositions for an experimental study of urban social movements, A. Cornwall, Locating citizen participation, P. DeLeon, The Historical Roots of the Field, R. Eyerman, A. Jamison, Social Movements. A Cognitive Approach, K. Forichon, Considering Human Capital in a multidimensional analysis of Fragility, A. Fung, Deepening democracy: institutional innovations in empowered participatory governance, A. Haldane, Reweaving the social fabric after the crisis, D. Held, Models of Democracy, G. Hyden, Governance and Sustainable Livelihoods. Challenges and Opportunities, A. Kaufman, Human nature and participatory democracy, N. Kenneth, G. Heiko, Patterns of Participation: Political and Social Participation in 22 Nations, T. Kostelecký, Political Transformation in East-Central Europe: Are There General
their works they have been elaborating on the nature of political participation and its manifestations in various socio-political situations, and have been starting generalizations in means of their study. In Russian political literature number of authors are writing of public participation, whose works we have been using in this study, in particular A. Arato, *The concept of civil society: the rise, decline and recreation and directions for further research*, K. S. Gadzhiev, *Civil Society and the Rule of Law*, M. Sashkin, *Participative management in an ethical imperative*, B. Ya. Zambrowski, *On the question of the formation of a civil society and the rule of law*, V. S. Gorban, *Concept, theory and problems of forming a general concept of the effectiveness of legislation*, Yu. V. Irkhin, *Теория, методология и методики анализа инновационности "электроного правительства"*, В. Isaev, А. Turgaev, Е. Xrenov, *Политология: Хрестоматия*, В. А. Kostyakovski, *Государство правовое и социалистическое*, А. И. Kovler, В. В. Smirnov, *Демократия и участие в политике*. Критические очерки истории и теории, М. Р. Kholmskaya, *Политическое участие как объект исследования обзор отечественной литературы*, А. А. Oganesyan, *Политология*, В. Н. Chicherin, *Философия права*.

participation in Armenia, as are other international authors, in particular K. Fedorowicz, L. M. Freinkman, all of whose works I’m using in this study.

Overall on participation, its political manifestation, a large amount of comprehensive research has been and now is gathering in literature on classifications, structures, forms, variants, their effectiveness and citizens’ competence, both by encouraging civic engagement and by criticizing it, such as of Dahl's “question of the competence of the citizens”, which states that only competent guardians can deal with the management.

The issue of civic participation is in the field of scientific interpretations of representatives of various trends in modern politics: the theory of social movements, the concept of civil society, mobilization theory, the theory of collective action, the concept of social networks, the concept of social identity, protest concepts, so on.

As for civil culture, even authors such as Almond and Verba are viewing it as a modification or form of political culture, and citizens as participants and components of the political process, while I think that the scope for citizen participation is broader and includes public policy, which is not much on discussions by authors studying public participation, but which I have been now trying to pay particular attention of in the study and I urge further research to uphold the principle of the dichotomy of governance spoken by Goodnaw, Wilson, and others, and separate political participation from participation, involvement and control in policy management.

In order to distinguish various forms of top-down and bottom-up participation and participatory governing, I have been analyzing also works in Organizational behavior and leadership styles, in particular by T. Adorno, The authoritarian personality, I. Angermeier, The impact of participative management perceptions on customer service, medical errors, burnout and turnover intentions, M. Armstrong, Zarządzanie zasobami ludzkimi, J. Bennington, J. Heartley, From Transition to Transformation. The Strategic Management of Change in the Organization and Culture of Local Government in South Africa, K. Blanchard, Situational leadership II:
Yukl, *Leadership in organizations*, showing usability of such forms in public participation.

In study I have been using writings and ideas of such researchers as Philip Selznick’s co-optation theory, Leonard White’s provision on the establishment of governments, Herbert Simon’s limiting rationality, Robert Dahl’s guardians state and competence of citizens theories, as well as Chris Chesbrough’s Open Innovation concept. On questions of professionalism, commitment, accountability, awareness, having education and competent personal and professional qualities and literacy in policy implementation it is notable of consideration of Graham Allison’s theory about how public policy specialist institute transform into public policy analysts.

The study of political and civic participatory options of governing is of interest from the perspective of governance, political science, sociology and law. Studying opinions, however, brings impressions of civic and participatory cultures in government largely viewing as an instrument, instead I believe of it as a kind of decisive factor in economic and social development of modern society, as a unique dimension, currently functioning new and higher institutional level of relationships at which active state-society cooperation and co-management in their best interests is realizing, a necessity of philosophical understanding and conceptualization of which one can see in actual perceptions of civil culture.

Turning to the consideration of the main methodological directions in the study of public participation by western and post-communist researchers, it is necessary to make an explanation concerning the justification of the choice of research methods.

Each of methods corresponds to a certain approach, the idea of social reality and, consequently, the choice made by the researcher - to focus on a certain type of behavior. As of the methodological stage of the analysis of various aspects of civic participation in a situation of search, researchers face a number of questions: are as of there specific methods adequate to this problematic and traditional for this line of research? Should the scientific paradigm of civic participation have its own methods
or use the methods of the existing arsenal of social movements, theories of protest, etc. The main methodological problem for researchers, in particular A. Touraine is that the field of fundamental social relations and their cultural goals cannot be directly observing, by asking how can we move from the study of normative behavior to the study of forms of behavior that put norms in question?

**Theoretical-methodological basis** of the study is basing on resolutions, analytical methods and principles applying in management and political sciences, as well as relating sciences and disciplines in political sociology, state and law theory, political history, political psychology and political philosophy. The principles of objectivity, systematicity and historicity have been preserving during the analysis. Research methods such as sociological and expert surveys, content analysis of documents, and secondary analysis of studies were in using. The empirical basis of the study compiles by political-sociological research and publications of documents by programs subject in analysis.

Describing **public participation study methodology**, researchers pay attention to the multidisciplinary nature of its research which makes it possible to highlight many of its faces; pictures of civic participation.

Various researchers are proposing to study such poorly structuring complex objects as civil society, civic participation, using a system methodology. The main goal of the system methodology is to focus specific studies on: holistic perception of complex objects; identifying the diversity of relationships and connections in such an object and in its relationship with the environment; study of the mechanism of its changes. The system methodology was used by a number of scholars in applied research of social actors of civil society, which suggested the allocation of the following aspects: functional (functional connections between subject and organizational elements); structural (subordinate nature of relationships); dynamic (coordination character of connections).
In most of the works, researchers focus only on one of the selected aspects, these empirical studies can rather be attributed to the meso level of research into the issues of civic in public.

The **novelty** lies in accenting specifically on its object of study in conditions of systematic, dichotomic approach on that and in particular of incomplete study of civic participation, in stressing of its importance of distinguishing political and civic participation, and of guiding by it logic of building research work, thereby outlining aspects of that type of participation, as well as special attention was paid to the participatory government and civic culture as parallel in institutionalization of most important considerations in outlining public participation.

As of this, my main **hypothesis** is about public participation being a parallel process of top-down institutional opportunities and bottom-up civic activism in Armenia. This derives into my 2 **sub-hypotheses**: 1. Institutional opportunities of participation are a result of dual approach in strengthening laws and norms on participation and adapting policy of participatory governing by various projects or structures consolidating participation in Armenia, 2. Political culture of activism and civic upbringing result in development of social capital and capabilities of Armenian population in public participation.

According study objectives it consists of **4 chapters**. First Chapter, which consists of 3 sub-chapters, provides scientific descriptions of public participation and participatory government, as well as classifications of public participation, overall organizational, managerial, administrative and political usages of mechanisms of participation in governing, as well as participation and its role in now-days public administration. Second Chapter, which divides into 4 sub-chapters, tries to illustrate public participation and its institutes in Republic of Armenia, by showing first its historical roots in Armenian national ideology, its development in Armenia, especially in scopes of pivotal projects, such is Open Government Partnership, as well as shows reforms in promoting citizen participation, especially by use of information technologies in participation, concluding by illustrating Laws and Constitutional basis.
on participation in Armenia. In Chapter 3 of the work, which is dividing into 4 sub-chapters, study of civil culture is presenting as one of the most important factors contributing to the development of public participation while showing Civil Society as a Supplementary Capital in public participation and explaining importance in consolidation of citizen skills or social capital, concluding in analysis of its current state or inclusion of various interest groups, presenting of what constitutes modern Armenian citizen and public participation. In its turn, 4th chapter, which consists of 3 subchapters, presents analysis of international experience, in terms of political participation, in examples of the US States, European Union and Russia, presenting successful practices and recommendations for realization in Armenia, and evaluates experience in Armenia by studying international indexes and correlations into participation levels in Armenia and concludes with 2 experimental surveys to determine of perceptions of the object by public and staff in ministries of Republic.
Chapter 1

Theoretical bases for the study of public participation

1.1 Scientific descriptions of citizen participation and participatory government

According every kind of standards of scientific work, the initial research procedure for any research is the definition, conceptualization of the basic concepts used in the work. Currently there is no single, generally accepted definition of public or civic participation. The concept and phenomenon of “public/civic participation” is conceptualized by us through its definition within the framework of politics and the concept of citizens participation.

Citizen participation is first of all a process by which public organizations are involved in mutual relations and interaction with the state and other socio-political institutions; it is an instrumental activity through which citizens try to influence the power and management structures in such a way that they take the actions they want. Based on this definition, focusing on the functional aspect, it is important identifying the following levels of civic participation:

1. Civil administration.
2. Representation, delegation of authority.
3. Partnership.
5. Social and political marketing.
7. Real powers: the ability to influence decisions and control them.
8. "Symbolic" participation.\(^1\)

The key concept of public, civic participation is the concept of “citizen”, interpreted as a subject of social life, influencing the process of its changes. In the framework of civil society, understood as a communicative process, the concept of

“citizen” is revealed through the concept of “participation”, i.e. “civic participation”, i.e. through its activities in various public organizations and institutions.

On the other hand, view on participation by focusing on top-down perspectives and suggesting a new research on managing and guidance indicates, that its mostly in today’s conditions one of the key objectives of governing bodies should be the formation of a governing system, which will enable to adequately encourage participants in the decision-making process to guide participants in a significant scope of authority to achieve the objectives of the managed object and to reach the final result. This suggests us to use the term of participatory government, which stands for state institutions and efforts undertaken by such institutions to bring up conditions for the realization of citizen participation.

Participation can be qualified as political in the case when an individual, a group of people, a stratum, a class are involved in political-imperious relations, in the process of decision-making and management that are of a political nature, which is possible only within a socio-political community.

In political theory, the issue of strengthening the state and its ability of governing its citizens is covering up by a known theory of participatory democracy, which in C. Pateman’s words “is built round the central assertion that individuals and their institutions cannot be considered in isolation from one another.” Furthermore, author suggests: “The existence of representative institutions at national level is not sufficient for democracy, for maximum participation by all the people at that level socialization, or “social training,” for democracy must take place in other spheres in order that the necessary individual attitudes and psychological qualities can be developed. This development takes place through the process of participation itself.” Authors views and connotations of this theory closely interconnect with modern approaches of participatory management in different disciplines, such as public

---


management or political sciences, so we come up with an idea of presenting the reflections of such theories in politics and public administration so I’m introducing participatory governing models and focusing on participatory government as an important phenomenon for fostering public participation.

The first practices of citizen participation in public decision-making appear in different ancient world civilizations, though it wasn’t put in main laws of countries until after World War II. Later on in 60-ies and 70-ies public participation terms were widely put into the general agenda of western countries and became one of the core demands of mass protests. Originally, there are various approaches about necessities of participation in politics, and some of the authors, such as J.-J. Rousseau⁴, K. Marx⁵ and followers of their schools, believe, that participation in politics should be of a universal form. Specifically, some authors, such as L. Goodman, T. Heiden, F. Funon believe, that participation of citizens in “symbolic” politics, which is voting, is not enough, and request citizens’ obligatory participation in the process of decision-making. On the other hand, critics of such approach believe, that the only way of participation, which is available for citizens, is voting and participation in debates⁶.

It is fair to state, that participation of citizens in politics depends on the exact situation, the nature of the politics in the country itself, and on the citizen. The bottom-up view on participation helps us to understand, that it is necessary to put an extra work, abilities, some kind of material means and psychological conditions, in order to participate in politics, and so it is not always universal. That is why some of the people actively participate in politics, others don’t really show interest on processes, the rest has a strict point of view, they are neither active and passive, just neutral.

In the effective institutional construction of state or public management, individual officials and leaders play a vital role in the success of the appropriate system. However, their contribution can dramatically change depending on the

---

individual ability to govern people under conditions of ever-changing inner and outer environments.

Studying literature related to leadership styles it can be summarized that the majority of authors believe that leadership style of participatory government is the best in today's management relationships in leadership styles or management systems\(^7\).

One of the key influences, that form the nature and the direction of public participation, is the political culture of the nation and its leveling, which in its turn is shown in the perception and practices of democratic values and institutions. So, it can be stated, that the higher are the democratic values in social consciousness, the higher is the public participation, and so the higher is the civility of state-socium relations. And vice-versa, the lower is the recognition of the importance of democratic rights and freedoms, the bigger is the anticipation and alienation from politics.

Participation of the population in the public administration has been especially rapid in the mid-twentieth century, with the use of new methods and techniques. This circumstance requires the definition of the participation of the residents in contemporary conditions and with modern understanding. According to Roberts, "Participation of the population is a process by which members of the society (who do not hold any managerial positions) share the power of decision-making and public administration-related actions with dumb officials"\(^8\). Webler and Renn observe the participation of the residents as "exchanges of discussions organized between citizens, the private sector and other stakeholders to ensure communication processes that may relate to certain issues or decisions"\(^9\). Beierle and Crayford, however, determine the participation of the residents as "any developed system that can involve ordinary people or their representatives in managerial decision-making"\(^10\). And irrespective of

---


the fact that the level of participation of the population has always been fluctuating, it is obvious that at present these processes are considered as indivisible components of the modern governance system. The idea of residents' participation is somewhat similar to eating spinach. No one in principle is against it because it is useful\(^{11}\). Given this universal support for the idea of community involvement, one can argue that the main debate among theorists, policymakers and governing bodies is not related to the need for residents to participate, but also to the question of how best to benefit from this process\(^{12}\).

So, ideas of creation of a participatory government can also be viewed as a key way of managing democratization. The latter is a natural and irreversible process which is characteristic not only for organizations but also for the public administration system. The objective process of democratization at the level of public administration is conditioned by a number of factors. In their contemporary literature their relative importance may differ\(^{13}\), but in general, the factors are the same.

Observations show that the level of democratization, and in result of it the levels of social participation, was very low until the industrial revolution. And in this regard, empirical research suggests that economic development raises the possibilities of managing democratization in the given society. Growth in the level of public education also leads to gradual democratization of government. In this regard, the tendency of gradual leveling of knowledge between administrators and subjects of the administration contributes to the democratization of the government and increases involvement.

The modern process of democratization and participation is explained by some authors as well as the development of market economy. This theory relies on the fundamental idea that democracy and market economy are two different, but interrelated manifestations of freedom. The public administration system has been


formed in the Republic of Armenia in the recent past and is currently under
development. In this regard, there are still many problems that should be resolved
over time. In particular, it refers to the ongoing process of decentralization, the
improvement of the relationship between the state administration and local
government bodies, as well as a number of other issues.

Covering the methodological issues of studying citizens participation in various
approaches to the study of participatory styles of governing, it is advisable to single
out several levels of generalization, according to which the objects are:

1) at the macro level – participatory styles of governing as a complex state of
   “citizenship”, a system;
2) at the meso level - the institutions of citizen/public participation, the
   processes of interaction between the civilian sector and the state;
3) at the micro level - individuals, citizens, their community.

At the methodological macro level of studying civic participation, we, in one
way or another, are confronted with the problem of defining the concept of
“participatory styles of governing”. Delving into the conceptual history of using so
calling “citizens participation”, we start to turn into the consideration of the position
of this concept within the framework of the other concepts of researchers.

The determination of the methodological coordinates of the study of this
instrumental activity refers to the meso level of the above classification of the levels
of generalization, which incorporates micro-level issues. The focus of research is the
development of methodology and methods of research of public/civic participation,
on the basis of which the institutions, forms and structure of public/civic participation
are analyzed; impact factors, types, levels, types of participation, reasons for success
and failure of public associations, etc. The emphasis is also placed on the “civil” status
of public associations, which guarantees certain social and legal opportunities for
participation and performs a regulatory function in relation to the activities of public
associations.
As noted above, within the framework of the meso-level perspective, the interaction processes between the civilian sector and the state are investigating.

The concept of a participatory government is perhaps the least studied area of public administration in Armenia. At best, its associated functions are limited to information and awareness. On the other hand, most residents are also not ready to actively participate in the management of a particular public administration system. The reasons are numerous and varied - from legislative regulation to national cultural peculiarities. At the same time, simultaneous challenges of modern economic development and decentralization require the governing bodies on the one hand, on the other hand, to give them the opportunity to reconsider and re-evaluate the basic directions of their activities and further development of management units.

In fact, these changes are conditioned by many factors, and it is almost impossible to isolate the causes and consequences of their involvement. This interconnection suggests that more progressive approaches to governing of communities and their economies are not limited to the managerial thinking that dominated the control.

Looking at the phenomenon from the practical point of view, it can be argued that in current conditions the solution of government’s issues is possible only through the involvement of different stakeholders and building a network of contacts and cooperation, which should be the initiation of the governing bodies. The beneficiary field is very wide, as the relevant governing process can be related to many subjects and their groups.

The principal approach of participatory governments is the constant process of joint management of issues through these beneficiaries, as a result of which it will be possible to obtain certain targeted results from cooperation and to ensure positive synergies. In this regard, the concept of participatory government in the public administration system is considered as a wider problem than just the participation of local residents in management processes.

I share the position of authors who believe that basic management styles have three forms: authoritarian (administrative), participatory, liberal. At the same time it
is possible to allocate various subforms within the framework of these manifestations. So, depending on which management style the leader adheres to, there are many specific style management forms.

This style of leadership requires the formation of government system that can also lead to a relentless attitude toward work and a shared responsibility. Management theorists distinguish different management systems or guiding styles that can be used by relevant governors in managing citizens. These include, for example, autocracy, democratic, participatory, and liberal (or "laissez-faire") styles of leadership\textsuperscript{14}.

Therefore, it is necessary to discuss the concept of participatory government proposed by Rensis Likert in more detail, referring to the origin of the participatory government concept, its nature and peculiarities.

Likert uses the notion "system 4" to describe the essence of participatory government, which he represents as one of the management or leadership styles. Based on a series of research, Likert claims that organizations that use the participatory styles of governing are able to create the most positive outcomes. He explains this style of guiding in his well-known paper "Description of the organization's characteristics", which is also used as a unique measurement scale from single to participant. The scale consists of 4 sections: "system 1", as of exploitative authoritative, "system 2", benevolent, "system 3", consultant and "system 4" participant. The organization description was developed based on the insight and understanding of the participants with the following seven operational dimensions: leadership, motivation, communication, cooperation, decision-making, goal-setting and oversight. All this is generalized and summarized in order to determine the extent to which the organization's activities are participatory. The last of the four presented systems, Likert describes an upward and on-going free communication flow, the

decision-making process envisages a free exchange of ideas between managers and managed.\textsuperscript{15}

Likert’s participatory government system is based on the recognition of organizational functioning as one of the most important situational factors.

It is closely linked with the trust of the participants to the effective work of governors. According to Likert, in order to be able to effectively use the participatory government system in public organizations, the co-organizers should form an organizational atmosphere that will ensure the positive attitude of the participants towards the organization and its work. They need to create an organizational culture that develops the capabilities of individuals, ensuring the effectiveness of such styles.\textsuperscript{16}

Likert argues that such an atmosphere of participatory government is created at the expense of collaborative work, learning and support from a team that ultimately provides much better results than is possible for any other system of management. Such an atmosphere can create an atmosphere of confidence and willingness to share with their subordinates. Thus, the participatory style can be considered a unique strategic approach, within which people feel respected, including being in the most important decision-making process. This approach ultimately promotes and directs participants to the goals of the organization.\textsuperscript{17}

Recently, significant and continuing interest in the governance sector has been highlighted in the reforms aimed at "strengthening" governors. Johns and George define "strengthening" as a modern approach or system that deals with the human factors of the organization, providing the most active role in the whole process of governance for participants in different organizational structures.\textsuperscript{18}

From this point of view, it is criticizing the autocratic style of leadership because it devaluates the human factor in the process of achieving the goals of the

\textsuperscript{17} Burhanuddin, \textit{Participative management}, UA 2013, p. 41.
organization¹⁹. The participatory governance system has especially undergone significant competitiveness in the context of organizational and human values²⁰.

Not less important is the contrast between the educational and professional levels of managers and administrators in the past. In this respect, it is important to apply the participatory style that can provide a synergistic outcome in other equal conditions to achieve high efficiency of organizing management process. In particular, as many authors point out (Burhanuddin and Asland, August, Toioli, and Rowlinson), it is especially important for improving the work of all members of the organization²¹.

Participatory government as a key strategy for people’s "empowerment" is in line with both the modern management thinking and the requirements that are presented to modern organizations²². In other words, this approach to governance directly refers to the "strengthening" of all members of the organization so that they can effectively resist the "bursting environment"²³.

The study of these processes in this aspect allows for a kind of “dividing” line of analysis of the processes of citizen participation in political decision-making. On the one hand, it is the embodiment of the elements of direct democracy, through which citizens carry out direct political decisions through various forms of power will. On the other hand, it is the interaction of citizens and the state in the form of information and consultation.

It should be stated that participatory government model is already widely used especially in advanced management systems as a way to ensure that people are targeted. And its essence and nature, therefore, has been studied by various empirical studies²⁴. They indicate that participatory government model is positively linked to

long-term team outcomes. The same research shows that single-breeding styles can be effective only in certain situations. As Likert points out, those who apply participatory style are able to provide a favorable organizational atmosphere that results in increased efficiency of the managed object.

Indeed, the positive effect of participatory governments on the effectiveness of the relevant public policies is confirmed by many facts. A number of experimental studies have shown that participatory government improves public officials’ work, and also increases job satisfaction. Based on a variety of research based studies, some of the theorists have identified the impact of participatory governing on public officials’ behavior (Lashley, Yukon), which was expressed by the quality of the output or service provided, the degree of personnel flow, and so on.

At the same time, a number of other researches show that being a part of participatory government dramatically raises the likelihood of having a positive attitude toward work (Jones and George, Sashkin). It has also been discovered that independence, task clarity, sense of security, and level of satisfaction are the constant companion factors of participatory style of management. In other words, the impact of participatory management on the actual results is mediated by the formation of positive attitude towards work. And the latter, in its turn, leads to the improvement of the actual results of work. So participatory government is not just raising satisfaction of participating into decision-making processes by public participants, but also improves the satisfaction of public officials, which is important, as it is the linking object of the state and its citizens.

Thus, because of the impact of being a part of participatory government on these two factors (actual results of work and attitude towards work), research basically leads to two conceptual discoveries that are different from each other. Some researchers

---

define the approach that participatory governance has directly influenced the actual results. This approach is based on Angermeier and Likert. The other side finds that such a style of guidance only indirectly affects the actual results.

Nevertheless, Likert and Sashkin seem to think that the two issues of the issue are right. They argue that participatory governance has a strong and positive effect on the actual results of the work. However, their explanations suggest that this effect is not entirely straightforward because they address the factors such as independence, job security, job satisfaction and so on.

Participatory government can be seen as a manifestation of the current paradigm of management. Hermitage and Cabrera distinguish two reverse scrutiny, participatory governance and autocratic style. The autocratic style of governing is beneficial only in certain cases, especially when there is a need to apply strict control methods to provide results in a shorter timeframe, such as in armies or organizations without liberal ways of dealing with issues. The same can be true of the effective budget management of the managed object.

Nevertheless, in current sharp competition, governors have started to prefer the participatory approach by raising the results of their public activities, motivating and targeting participants, as well as involving them in such processes as targeting, decision-making, organizational changes, etc. Consequently, this approach is considered to be the most important condition for sustainable leadership in modern conditions. Burhanuddin conclusions that the key focus of participatory government is the use of human resources, their knowledge, skills, talent, ideas, and inner aspiration to ensure the maximum participation in public policies.


Touching upon the definition of participatory government it is necessary to state that although the term "participatory government" has been used extensively in recent times, theorists describe it differently. Particularly, Mohrman and Lawler find that participatory government is a broad concept in terms of the conceptual framework that it forms. It relates to change management that affects human, technical and economic factors that are the basis of a managed object. Other theorists use the concept of participatory government to describe various concepts, involvement, involvement of managed subjects, consultation, joint decision-making, power distribution, decentralization, democratic governance, partnerships, empowerment, etc.

However, Burhanuddin believes so that it is important to clearly define the concept of participatory government so that it is possible to avoid misunderstandings and confusion. In this regard, it is important to understand what kind of participation can take place at all. For example, heads of different groups may claim that they have provided "participation" through events such as workshops, discussions, consultation boards, and so on. Meanwhile, members of the group are often unable to adequately express their thoughts, opinions, or even communicate. Another example is when a governing entity periodically organizes meetings and pretends to listen to members of the group, but does not use that effect in making decisions.

All this forms "false", "unreal" participation, which has been criticized by many and leads to disappointment and anger in the band members. They are usually expressed by the loss of confidence in the change of their individual behavior. "False" participation can be characterized as a special role playing by leaders who aim to pretend to listen to group members, while in reality they do not. In this regard, Heller insists that the governors are trying to take part because it has become a famous
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legend. If they do not do it at the required level, then their position will be jeopardized.

There are several problems with the development of civic participation in the countries of traditional democracy. The American researcher and civic participation expert Sh. Arnstein points out that in reality civic participation is very often adjacent to symbolic and illusory forms of attracting citizens to solving social problems. And in developed democratic societies, the government seeks to get rid of citizens' control, to confuse their heads, to emasculate their activity, or at least to switch activity to secondary and minor problems.

Thus, the actual distraction of people from civic participation is carried out through manipulation, when, under the form of civic participation, power involves people in advisory committees, where they are carried out "educational" work and organized their support. Activists and leaders of civic groups can demonstratively be invited to committees so that the authorities have a reason to show society how democratic it is. In reality, these committees do not have any authority, and civic participation is virtually shamelessly replaced by “working with the public”. These committees, of course, are led by trusted people of power, they do not discuss real problems, and if there is some sort of discussion, no substantial information is provided to the committee members. Or, the authorities conduct preventive work in the field with groups of disgruntled people and with individual truth seekers. At the same time, its main goal is not to clarify the real problem and its joint solution with citizens, but to calm citizens, remove discontent, blur the conflict or eliminate its immediate causes.

Another character is the interaction of the authorities with citizens in the process of informing them, setting out in the press or in direct contacts of the problems that the authorities consider acute and urgent, and programs aimed at overcoming them. Undoubtedly, timely informing citizens about their rights, duties

and opportunities is an indispensable condition for responsible civic participation. However, it may be beneficial for the authorities to reduce civic participation to informing, leaving no conditions for feedback and for the development of dialogue. Carried away with technical details, empty reviews of various points of view, ideological debates with political opponents, discussion of minor topics and evasive answers to questions in essence, experienced politicians and officials, first of all, public relations specialists, turn public meetings into information transfer. In addition, information can be provided only at the last stage of the development of a program, which does not give people any opportunity, by joining it, to represent their interests in it.

Another thing is when citizens have the opportunity to act as consultants for some items of programs developed by the authorities. But consulting alone does not guarantee that the ideas and interests of citizens will be taken into account. If citizens cannot influence a program at the stage of its development and decision-making, participation remains only a demonstrative ritual, and citizens turn out to be statisticians, that is, they are not taken into account as genuine citizens. The inclusion of “representatives of the public” in some commissions and committees with real functions, for example, under local legislative authorities, can also have a certain positive meaning. However, having the majority of seats in these bodies, political elites can easily neutralize citizen participation in subsidiary commissions and committees, even when they are allowed to develop programs: decision-making remains for those in power (whether deputies or staff). Nevertheless, these are already, albeit weak, but real forms of civic participation.

Participatory government can be viewed as a separate type of management behavior or guiding style, but it may also be used with specific tasks or relationships. According to Yukl, participatory governance (or, in its turn, "participatory leadership") involves the efforts of the governor to encourage and promote participation in decision-making. Such a definition seems to limit the role of participatory governance in the decision-making process. This definition is also in line
with McCrimmon’s approach, but it also emphasizes the participation of teams in decision-making. At the same time, Sashkin uses a broader definition to describe participatory governance, considering it as a process in which participants are directly involved in targeting, decision-making, and organizational change. This definition is closely related to the understanding of Mohrman and Lawler’s participatory governance, in which it relates to the public officials or participants "strengthening" management process.

Within the framework of this study, participatory governance is widely perceived as an approach to managerial approach, in which managers systematically use the human resources of individuals or groups to ensure a positive outcome. This approach to government is intended to strengthen all of participants of managed institutions and to increase the results of the operation of a managed object through the gradual distribution of powers between managers and administrators.

As it is clear from the above discussion, the elements of participatory governance are in line with contemporary approaches to leadership, such as "parallel leadership" (D. Andrews, F. Crowther), "Distributed Leadership" (Duignan, Hargreaves), "Authentic Leadership" (Russell, Stone) "Serving Leadership" (Avolio), as well as" Transformation Leadership "(Saros, Santora). The generalized idea of all the above-mentioned approaches is a guiding style that promotes an atmosphere of participation by enabling all members of a managed object to contribute to the challenges facing them. Leaders share their vision and functions with everyone, recognize the need for self-expression, self-actualization and rights of individuals, as well as ensure sustainable development and improvement. Duignan and McPherson argue that

---
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such a change in the management paradigm is a necessity for modern institutions and optimizing population’s participation in policy or in politics⁴⁵.

Studying the works of different authors devoted to the characteristics of leadership styles, Burhanuddin conclusions that almost all modern classifications involve participatory style of leadership. Particularly, McCrimmon separates three main guiding styles - participatory, autocracy, and liberal⁴⁶. Leading participatory or democratic styles are based on the same theoretical assumptions that apply to other types of leadership-related modern research, such as "collaborative guidance" (Crowther) or "distributed leadership" (Duignan). In all the listed approaches it is assumed that subordinates should possess the appropriate talent, capacities, internal motivation. In this context, when administrators have all these factors or capabilities, administrators are not required to apply stringent control methods. Moreover, in this case there is no need to apply elements of a uniform approach, such as imposing tasks on effective performance of managed entities⁴⁷.

The participatory management style should not be confused with the liberal management style, which is characterized by the provision of complete freedom and lack of control over the actions of subordinates and the population in defining management goals, objectives, anarchy in developing and implementing management decisions, and refusal from central management.

The presented trend is also consistent with the McGregor's "Y" theory of human behavior. Participatory government as a theory involves the assumptions of the "Y" theory in terms of human nature and ways to motivate it⁴⁸.

D. McGregor convincingly proved that managers' assumptions about the nature of their subordinates determine the way (manner) of management, which, in turn, determines a certain reaction of employees to certain management decisions.

⁴⁷ Burhanuddin, *Participative management*, UA 2013, p. 36.
⁴⁸ Ibid., p. 36.
It is easy to see that an objective transition from the theory of "x" to the theory of "y" implies the development of new general principles for improving the management style. Consequently, it is necessary that the theory of "y" dominates in leadership style, then workers will take responsibility, work diligently and be motivated to do their work in the best possible way.

As a result of the study of professional literature it became clear that the elements of participatory governance in the public governance system are identified by the participatory governance at the organization level. Governing bodies of major global organizations start realizing that activities and results of their organizations are largely dependent on the effective allocation of powers, in which case it has in behalf of all of its participants, as of understanding Angermeier, no affects. The reason is that both now and, in the future, organizations will require leadership and management styles that will create favorable conditions for the promotion of all existing talents and capacities to succeed. It is also equally important in the public administration system when efforts are being made to effectively operate the public administration system. In this situation, governors gradually strive for a team-based team-management. Thus, participatory governance style is a strategic approach to effectively utilize human resources to succeed in a changing situation.

As a result of the above-mentioned theories, it can be concluded that participatory governance plays a significant role in increasing the effectiveness of a managed asset, contributing to the improvement of the actual results of policies and the formation of positive attitude towards policies. However, it is also common that the effectiveness of participatory governance depends on certain conditions. Theoreticians (Fidler, Miller-Monj), who developed situational theory for characterization of leadership styles, emphasize the role of situational factors that improving the outcome of participatory style. Situation factors refer to the context in

which the institution operates. They can reflect the peculiarities of the institution under the influence of the external environment\textsuperscript{52}.

The role of situational factors in the choice of particular mechanisms of governing has been revealed by various theoreticians. A number of studies have shown that very few rulers have managed to repeat their success in other areas of governance. When administrators are assigned to manage certain projects that differ from their previous experience, they often fail to have the same success in the short-term\textsuperscript{53}.

By making a transition to a study of the concept studied at the specific sectoral level of public administration, we want to take into consideration the concepts, elements, forms of participatory government.

The modern democratic society assumes the responsibility for the welfare of the society, the development of human potential, the provision of equal starting conditions for the economic activity of all citizens and the protection of the legal interests of all subjects. The state should be guided by a clear social orientation policy, and its main purpose is to ensure balanced, dynamic and sustainable development of the society.

In order to ensure the solution of these issues, each country, at a certain stage of development, creates an appropriate management of institutions. In the modern world, public administration is one of the most common systems of governance.

In modern conditions, civil society is one of the most important prerequisites for the establishment of a legal democratic state and the effectiveness of public administration. In this context, in every democratic country, the public and political organizations representing their interests form the basis of universal, equal, direct suffrage by secret ballot, forming state power and local government bodies, overseeing their activities. This gives the opportunity for state and social organizations to interact and cooperate creating opportunities for participatory government, which is the way
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of ensuring and in its best realizing direct democracy in modern indirect democratic organizations.

The immediate or direct democracy in the public administration system is carried out in a variety of forms and means of direct publicity. Such forms are the elections, assemblies, community meetings and other organizational forms through which organization of activities of the most important elements of the public administration system is ensured. In this regard, one can say that in the practice of public administration, the direct and representative forms of the people's power are closely intertwined by filling each other.

Participation is one of the democratic foundations of the public administration system. Certainly without the participation of the population it can not be considered as a rightful exercise of the right of management, as public administration is a right exercised with the participation of the governed entity (resident).

Participatory management is the most important component of participatory democracy. It involves the inclusion of wide community members in public management unit. Participatory government, first of all, emphasizes the involvement of people in governance that is out of traditional management processes. It means the introduction of such mechanisms that will encourage the direct involvement of citizens in decision-making processes in public administration units that have difficulties with participation for various reasons. They are especially vulnerable groups, representatives of national minorities and women\textsuperscript{54}.

Participation in politics, or participatory government means the formation of a new kind of relationship between citizens and the authorities. It involves formal and informal institutions and processes that provide for mutual communication and interaction between beneficiaries of government and their services. They are not only the official institutions of public administration, but also the institutions and

organizations (NGOs, foundations, etc.) that have a certain impact on public administration.

In this case, the authorities take policies and decisions not in an isolated manner, but in consultation with all those directly affected by their influence.

Participatory government applies only to the collective interests of the authorities and citizens. It does not include personal-interest-based or individual (even with respect to government) relationships. Important roles of participatory governance are groups of citizens with their specific interests. In this sense, it is very important that prior to the negotiations and cooperation between the public institutions and groups of citizens, there are clear groups and their demands.

From summarizing, it becomes clear that participatory governance opens up opportunities for civil society actors and civic movements. Through this, NGOs and other civil society actors submit their suggestions, programs and views to the authorities, demonstrate active activity and gain recognition.

Many modern representatives of the theory of liberal democracy adhere to similar views on the limits of possibilities of direct democracy. The main vulnerable trait of direct democracy is the fact that all citizens cannot immediately solve all problems. Many of them do not have enough time, interest, information and competence for this. In addition, in the course of direct debates on a particular issue, it is much more difficult to achieve consensus between the majority and minority than within the framework of an elected representative body.

Participatory governance in the multi-unit public administration system can fill in the capacity of the authorities to develop close ties between them and their advisory organizations, which, first of all, requires certain conditions. In addition, each party is required to comply with these requirements.

During the last decade, more and more significance is attached to the participation of citizens in the life of the public administration unit and the decision-making process by the governor. More and more citizens have begun to realize their right to interfere in decisions that directly affect their lives. Taking into account the
viewpoints of a wide range of public administration units, using participatory process increases the legitimacy and quality of decisions made by the investigated union, increasing confidence in the government. Being an important component of modern democracy, citizen participation contributes to the development of human and social capital, and hence, the strengthening of the public administration of socium\textsuperscript{55}.

Within the scope of this topic, government is a special element of public administration. The introduction of the European Charter on local governments states that "... the right of citizens to participate in the governance of state and local self-governance is classified as a common democratic principle for all Council of Europe member states." The Republic of Armenia has signed the Additional Protocol to the European Charter on local governments (# 207) on the right to participate in government affairs, reaffirming the commitment to promotion of both levels of democracy in the country. As individual components, two types of civic engagement can be distinguished: electoral participation (representative democracy) and direct participation (participatory democracy)\textsuperscript{56}.

The first is participation in the elections as a voter or candidate, and the second is direct participation in public life, i.e. participation of citizens in decision-making, policy making, implementation and evaluation\textsuperscript{57}.

The Republic of Armenia has signed and ratified a number of international instruments relating to the participation of citizens, including the Additional Protocol to the Council of Europe Charter of local governments, on the right to participate in local government affairs. According to the Constitution of the Republic of Armenia, the rights and obligations of the Council of Europe Charter (ratified 2001), the Vienna Convention (ratified 2005), the RA Law on International Treaties, are a mandatory

part of the obligations undertaken by the Republic of Armenia after their ratification. In addition, there are the recommendations of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe, which also relate to civil participation. Although they do not have a mandate, their performance may play a role in monitoring the CoE\textsuperscript{58}.

However, transition is a double challenge for participatory governments. So it is necessary to have, on the one hand, the ability to participate in the decision-making process (bottom-up), on the other hand, the power that has the will and ability to recognize the right of public administration not only to voice but also to say if relevant (top-down)\textsuperscript{59}.


1.2. Classifications, mechanisms of public participation in participatory government institutions

The participatory approach is very close to the "organization development" concept. The essence of the concept lies in the fact that the development of a managed object is possible through the development of a managed entity. And the development of a managed entity requires special methods. For the purpose of developing a governed entity in the public management system there are separate various rings of management, where governed subjects, citizens in small or large groups, discuss issues in the public governance system, look for joint ways to solve them, help one another implement the decisions.

This methodological apparatus of citizen participation, in my opinion, is acceptable for the conceptualization and operationalization of the concept of public, civic participation. The issue of civic participation is disclosed in this area as the participation of citizens in the work of various public associations, and public associations act, in turn, as a form of civic participation.

Thus, the main mechanism of ensuring the participation of citizens in the public administration system is to give them an opportunity to discuss the issues they are dealing with and to solve them in general. And since the work of smaller groups is based on a systematic basis, it actually acquires the nature of structural neoplasms, so interconnecting participants besides bringing up good results in practice provides a structured collection of ideas and proposals regarding the issues, various solution, or most important processes at different levels of resolutions.

This can be done through public inquiries or public hearings. All stakeholders are involved in these activities. The main purpose of these events is to discuss the problematic processes with stakeholders, to evaluate all the positive and negative trends, to say all the troublesome issues.

Such work permits a certain level of public administration system to understand the priorities of the existing conflict settlement.

Another mechanism for participatory governance is the practice of creating inter-agency commissions. The essence of those committees is that groups which formed from the citizens provide specific advice on the issues of the separate lines of public administration. Every citizen has his / her contribution to the overall result of the group.

The effectiveness of participatory governance depends largely on the correct use of its principles. If these principles are violated, then efficiency and sometimes the expediency of participatory government is lost. Thus, the basic principles of participatory governance are as follows:

- the voluntary nature of participation of citizens in government, inquiries or commissions,
- permanent help and assistance to the management of public administration, the provision of information necessary for the discussion,
- citizens' participation should be regulated, and there should also be a regulation of other forms of participation (proposals, participation in inter-parliamentary commissions, etc.),
- absence of any sanctions for ideas or suggestions,
- all the ideas that have been received have to be invested. Managing entity should contribute to Implementation,
- any achievement of civil participation must be of public nature; a citizen should know from what he / she has done and what direction he / she is valuing.

In a participatory structure, a citizen can refer to the governing body as well as bring the idea to a general discussion in order to understand the extent to which that idea is worthwhile, should it be accepted and should think again about its

---

implementation. The difference is that a mechanism has been created in the participatory structures for such discussions. Special groups work on a permanent basis and, therefore, any ideas can be discussed without any organizational difficulties.

Even if the principles of participation are implemented in a different way, then there is a certain rule and, by doing so, it is fairly easy to exercise citizenship in the public administration system⁶³.

Participatory approach also has its limitations. Most of the deficiencies refer to either incorrect or inadequate use of the principle of participation⁶⁴.

The testing of different forms of participatory management involves the following pre-requisites:

- The readiness of government institution to increase the degree of impact of the citizens on the solution of public administration management issues.
- an urgent need that can be manifested in three cases:
  a) the emergence of a crisis or a problem that needs immediate action,
  b) complete reorganization of the public management process,
  c) development of a new system for managing material and non-material resources based on participation in "quality" and participation in decision-making.

As already mentioned, government subjects in different levels of public administration prefer predominant style of governing, not allowing the ruling parties to participate in decision-making. In such systems upstream communication is in domination, and citizens' voices are not heard for governing bodies.

The participatory style of public administration can be described as “situational leadership”, which is defined and changed (for example, from coordinating actions and controlling to engaging in underlining goals) depending on the level of maturity of the working management group, activity and professionalism of management itself management. On the basis of how prepared civil servants are, as well as the population of functions, they are vested with a certain level of independence, responsibility and

participation in decision-making and social control. Participatory management system is also characterized by a vertical management authority, but going from top to bottom, and vice versa, from bottom to top. This implies the control of lower-level structures and individual representatives over the central management structures. The control subject here functions in the system of interaction and partnership with the controlled object. Management consists of the processes of objectivization of the subject and the subjectivization of an object regulated by democratic principles. Participatory management system is characterized by the fact that there are ample opportunities for career growth. At the same time, priority is given not to the formal parameters of work activity, but to the personal professional qualities and his ability to think creatively, develop and implement innovative developments.

However, as we have already seen, there is a change in the management paradigm, which is reflected in the unequivocal process of transition from the autocratic style of governance to participatory style in different aspects of the public administration system. These circles follow a philosophy of management that emphasizes, recognizes and values each individual member or participant in politics as well as the collective contribution of groups to the success of the public administration system. In this sense, governance gradually becomes more decentralized. Participatory management enables all members of the managed entity to obtain the necessary information and, on the basis of it, be involved in decision-making processes.

A strategy based on participatory governance is already guided by the logic-driven object to drive more productive work. However, in order for such a strategy to really work, a systematic approach should be made to this, which means that the participatory governance approach should be rooted in all elements of the operation of a managed object. It should not only be perceived as a general philosophy of management, but also to become an important component of management culture.
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At first glance, it may seem that participatory governance restricts the authority of politicians or the power of decision-making. However, in reality it clarifies and eases the work of managers, saving their efforts from often unnecessary administrative and supervisory activities. And in this context, participatory governance enables governors to get rid of some unnecessary work and dedicate their own efforts and time to the strategic development of the state.

The application of participatory government methods also enables civic participation to develop creative work and to increase satisfaction from it by linking the efforts of all members of a managed asset to community goals. At the same time, however, the use of participatory governing is associated with certain risks. In this regard, participatory governing practices should be designed and operated so as to suit the peculiarities of the system and prevent its operation.

In order to fully identify participatory governing, it is also necessary to consider the methods that can be applied within the framework of approach. Of course, they can have different manifestations depending on the governing system and the level of particular bodies, but the common logic allows us to identify some of the methods that will be further discussed in the public management system.

As the first and perhaps the most extensive method of public participation in participatory government, one can consider participation in decision-making. It is essentially the basis of participatory government. As Steven McShane says, participatory governance, in its nature, illustrates the extent to which the members of the managed entity can influence the organization and implementation of the working process. In order to achieve this, it is important to have an organizational culture and atmosphere that encourages staff involvement in the decision-making process.

According to Armstrong, the sense of belonging to the organization increases if they also have a sense of ownership, which is believed by politicians themselves as

---
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truly beneficiaries of a managed object. The sense of ownership by citizens is inevitably transformed into the decision-making process on new developments and changes in politics. They should be involved in the decision-making process, feel that their thoughts are taken into account and that they contribute to the final outcome. However, involvement in decision-making should not be absolute, and as McShane insists "should take into account the situational factors, including the structure of the decision, sources of information on the decision, the tendency to decide, as well as the risk of possible conflicts".

In fact, these situational factors serve dishonest criteria to estimate the degree of public participants involvement. And, of course, participation in decision-making should depend on the peculiarities of each situation. It is also important to note that the radical approach in this issue, when all the responsibility for decision making is put on public participants, is also not effective. This approach can suppress the overall philosophy of government, and in some cases also contradict the objectives of the managed object, leading to productivity decline, conflict and ultimately financial loss.

Among the participatory management methods, we can also measure or evaluate performance results. In general, performance management can be defined as a method of monitoring the actual results and potential of public participants, which is usually formal and carried out at intervals. These periodic observations should be carried out with full participation and should never be construed as a result of unilateral valuation activities by politicians or managers.

Approval of the standards of results, definition of quantifiable goals, as well as discussing evaluation should be joint and participatory initiatives. The whole process

---
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of output management requires a joint management and communication between managers and manageable73.

Schwind, Das and Wagar put forward a “360 degree” assessment of results, noting that it is irreplaceable, as the four-point assessment of the results of work involves the following stakeholders: manager, manageable, managed, subject to the same dimension, as well as manager or manageable subject at its own expense74.

Delegation and strengthening can also be included in the public participation methods. The application management experience of this method provides politicians, leaders, or governors of transferring part of their authority, responsibility and decision-making power to managers. A number of authors believe that within the scope of delegating responsibilities, those charged with governance should be given the development of rules for decision-making directly related to their own livelihood75.

The delegation can be viewed as a component of the participatory governance methodology, as it manages those who are governed by the decision-making process. However, there is some cautiousness in this process as the process of delegation is rather complicated and requires a systematic approach76.

Misuse of the delegation method or its improper use by managers as a result of this complexity can lead to the reduction of its value. That’s why Laurie J. Mullins gives the delegate’s character and emphasizes that the delegation is not an arbitrary distribution of work. It is not merely to set rules and pursue them, nor to carry out relevant tasks based on detailed instructions. In the context of the national
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government’s structural system, the delegation forms a management-managed special relationship\textsuperscript{77}.

Together with the delegation, the participatory government methodology can also include strengthening. The latter, according to McShane, is a process that requires leaders to trust the managed entities and are willing to bear the risks that may arise\textsuperscript{78}. In this, it is worth mentioning that strengthening itself is a risky initiative with possible positive or negative outcomes. However, the reversal of the benefits is, perhaps, the increase in the strength of self-esteem of managed entities and satisfies the innate need for their affiliation\textsuperscript{79}.

Among the possible ways of public participation, I also consider it necessary to identify self-directed or self-managed working teams. It is essentially a strategic element of participatory governance that is based on a deeper involvement of managed entities, in which case they have a significant impact on the procedural process of a managed object. According to Schwind, Das and Wagar, the definition of it is working teams without the officially designated managers, so they make decisions within them that are traditionally settled by administrators. Such teams composed by administrators traditionally decide on the nature, orientation, and timetable of the specific tasks involves\textsuperscript{80}.

The core of working teams is the involvement of citizens and society in the decision-making process in public administration. Working teams serve as a means of informing and enabling citizens to make decisions that are not isolated and coordinated with beneficiaries\textsuperscript{81}.

Here we find it important to address public debates that are considered as a prominent citizen participation. It refers to the public discussion arrangements,
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\textsuperscript{80} Ways in which participative management might operate within an organization 2011.

mainly referring to the norms established by domestic law. Public discussions are a requirement for a democratic and transparent legal process. The purpose of public discussions is to inform interested individuals and legal entities about legal acts, as well as to collect their opinions.

The importance of public discussions has been clearly understood even in ancient Rome, where the bill was written on a wooden board and was put in a public place. The citizens had to look and discuss the project for about 24 days\textsuperscript{82}.

The participatory style of government is manifesting not only in the activities of individual civil service officials, but also in the activities of politicians. However, these trends are observed only in the states where the subjects of management (to a greater or lesser extent) are also objects at the same time, since the “governed” influence the “governors”, control their activities and the subject-object relations are built on the principle: citizen-civil society is a state, unlike management in an authoritarian state, where object-subject relations are built: the state is a citizen.

There are similar or in certain ways different distinct terms like "public discussions", "social hearings" and "public hearings". These terms can easily be confused, but in legislation they usually substitute for each other.

Public discussions are carried out by the customer within the evaluation or assessment process and are regulated by the specific norms, and the procedure for their implementation is determined by the state or local governing bodies, which are usually individualized for each situation.

Historically, there are three main forms of public discussion.

1. Evaluation or Assessment - materials in libraries and through the recruitment of survey questionnaires,

2. Public hearings, in which are invited all interested persons and speeches by representatives of the client and other stakeholders,

\textsuperscript{82} В. Горбань, Понятия, теория и проблемы формирования общей концепции эффективности законодательства, М.: Юриспруденция (in Russian: V. S. Gorban, Concept, theory and problems of forming a general concept of the effectiveness of legislation, Moscow) 2009, p. 117.
3. Open Days, where everyone is invited, but there are no specific speakers, the participants of the event communicate with each other, give free issues.

Sometimes the first version is used in conjunction with the second or third versions.

Other types of public discussions, which are not regulated by relevant normative acts and laws, may also be included in the evaluation or assessment process. Below I want to discuss the procedure for public discussion and publicizing it to the layers of communities.

It should be underlined that public hearings are only one form of public discussion, which, in turn, is not widely known among layers of population. Any separate local government should have similar regulations on the procedure and process of public hearings on various local issues. The texts of the regulations may be found in the legal system in electronic form or on the official website of the state or local governments. Decision on the approval or rejection of these documents shall be made by state or local governing bodies, taking into account the public hearings and conclusions.

Typically, such information is printed in the newspaper and not on the first page. The customer is usually not interested in a broad discussion of the subject chosen, so the population is usually unaware of anything. For this reason, it is crucial to be consistent with the state, local media field where such statements are often published. But, in my practice there are few cases when I did learn of the upcoming hearings just because I was consistent in the media field. It turns out that even if the upcoming event is a serious threat to the region and human well-being, still only few people know about it. In such cases, government often provides information about planned discussions that involves mass media, television, and radio. It tries to make the public announcement not only to inform the public about the hearings but also to warn about the danger. In some cases of public hearings, government bodies call or send invitations by e-mail in order so that they can inform all of their customers, partner organizations and educational institutions, local public associations and invite
them to attend the event. In some cases, government works separately with experts and specialists to get acquainted and comment on the project’s material.

For the sake of hearing, its coordinators plan questions for participants, give some comments and distribute it to their supporters or in some cases even ask specialists to comment on the project’s justification. Based on the results of the hearings coordinators develop some written comments in writing and submit to non-linear realizers, as well as stakeholders, as well as try to provide with mass media.

Thus, the maximum number of people participating in public discussions or public hearings will be to develop and apply the most thought-out projects. At the same time, chances are that the project will be economically justified. And when the proposals are rejected by everyone, the customer will completely abandon the idea of implementing proposals.

Continuing the study of self-directed teams, let’s assume that members of the latter assume a considerable degree of sovereignty and responsibility to effectively implement and complete the process. Various experts and theoreticians of organizational behavior point out the dangers associated with the existence of such groups. One of the most important of these is the potential of the group to form a universal acceptance of norms and values, which can be contrary to the elements of the individual and group. The next danger is that self-helping teams may be exposed to non-formal groups in pursuit of psychological and social needs, which are not always the result of the logic of tasks to be carried out. Non-formal groups thus may be able to design individual sub-systems inside the public governance system, thus undermining the overall integrity and outcomes of the community. The self-directed teams actually show how working teams working in success in different countries are a brilliant example of how citizens participate in public management, focusing on the goals of universal benefit and well-being and how they make new ones finds success to get more freedom.

---
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At the same time, the theory of participatory democracy has a number of strengths and weaknesses. First, it focuses on the vulnerable moments of representative liberal democracy. Secondly, the positive side of the theory of participatory democracy is the idea of political mobilization of the maximum possible number of members of society based on their awareness of objectively existing public interests, as well as the idea of civic education with the wide use of modern technologies in the field of mass communication.

However, this theory is quite vulnerable to criticism, since it is impossible to establish effective and permanent institutions of direct democracy, both by virtue of the space-time parameters and subject-object relations. Even at the local level, not all cases of direct democracy is an effective method of decision making. In addition, at present, the very likelihood of the continued and successful functioning of participatory democracy within the framework of a nation-state is unrealistic. Exceptions may be only national referendums on the most fundamental issues related to matters of government.

It is inexplicable that the longer the times in which the rulers viewed themselves as exceptional creators of expertise and creativity, the longer they need to strive to contribute to all members of the public administration system, including citizens, and more effectively to the team workforce, so that the existing potential and capacities of the citizens can be utilized in favor of public interest, public development and other priorities.\(^{85}\)

Application of different public participation methods is especially necessary in the case of organizational changes. Successful implementation of organizational changes is a process that requires a clear-cut approach using a proper management style. In this sense, perhaps the best approach is participatory government to implement organizational changes. Campbell, Stonehouse and Houston in this regard consider it necessary to invite different stakeholders to contribute to the change.

---

\(^{85}\) Ways in which participative management might operate within an organization 2011.
process and make them participate in the implementation of those changes, as a result of which all participants will consider themselves the holders of those changes. McShane claims the same thing as being involved in the process of change, managed subjects have a sense of responsibility for its success and do not consider agents as ready for them. Mullins suggests that all members involved in the management of a managed asset are constantly informed about the ongoing initiatives and "encouraged" to have their own contribution so that the changes are made by them. Concluding, no can be said that effective implementation of any change requires a wide range of beneficiaries, including citizen support, involvement and targeted participation.

There are many differences between current governance and theorists on the interpretation of participatory governance. Some people perceive it as a strategy that harms more than promotes the goals of the public administration system, as it gives a lot of freedom to citizens. From time to time participatory governance is also discussed in the context of unnecessary "superpower management" of the public administration. However, such allegations focus on only certain restrictions or potential risks of public participation in participatory government, bypassing its huge benefits, which, in my opinion, are obviously dominated by the restrictions presented. I think that the negative assumptions and comments regarding public participation in participatory government are somewhat in contravention of the results of a large number of studies that are presented in this work that actually show that participatory governance has a positive impact on the attitude towards the public administration system and the actual results.

---
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1.3. **Participatory public administration or participation in modern understanding**

An unprecedented rapid process of changes in various sectors of the economy requires proper response by governance bodies. Under these conditions, it becomes evident that traditional approaches are no longer consistent with the ever-increasing growth of demand for both the private sector and local residents. In fact, these changes are conditioned by many factors, and it is almost impossible to view the reasons and consequences of their isolation. This interconnection implies more progressive approaches to the governance of public administration and changes in their economies, but not limited to managerial thinking based on predominant control. Looking at the phenomenon from the practical point of view, it can be argued that in today's conditions, the solution of current governance problems is possible only by the involvement of different stakeholders and building a network of contacts and cooperation between them, which should be initiated by the governing bodies. The beneficiaries' field is very wide, as the participatory approach to governance and the grouping of stakeholders will benefit from such governance approach as shown in Figure 1.3.1. Following the idea of participatory governance, it is important to understand what preconditions, if any, involve participatory governance as an integral part of the governments⁹¹.

In general, the decentralization tendency in all countries and in the governance system already assumes that there is a universal solidarity with the fact that the center is aware of the importance of transferring power and control to the lower circles⁹². Of course, sometimes this kind of awareness of the problem is limited to rhetoric, not leading⁹³ to the actual rescoping of additional powers to the governing bodies. In any of cases, participatory government may have more opportunities for development under the decentralization process. In this context, Pieterse refers to the

---

preconditions, the existence of which is necessary for effective participatory governance. As of first, it says, it is important to manifest political will by the governing bodies at the central, regional or local levels to ensure the participation in decision-making process. Second important point is that the existence of a suiting law and norms framework that regulates the process of involvement is essential, without which this process can turn into a chaotic and self-destructive tactic. In this respect, the central role is also clear-cut structures that make it clearer that benefits or damages can be met if the beneficiaries have a degree of involvement in government. So, in general, effective participatory governance is a complex and systematic process, its implementation can provide positive results to all involving parties, but on the other hand it is possible to provide the above-mentioned preconditions and so to implement consistently94.

As of it, analysis of modern works of participatory governing, testifies, in my opinion, to the unjustifiably expansive interpretation of the concept “institutions of public participation”. There are no clear criteria by which a particular institution should be qualified as an institution of public participation. So, in some cases, they include elections, a referendum, popular discussions of drafts of important state and territorial decisions and laws, petitions, popular initiatives, meetings (gatherings) of citizens at their place of residence, population polls; in others - elections of government bodies and officials, referendum, meetings (gatherings) of citizens at their place of residence, reports, early recall of deputies and elected officials, appeals, petitions of citizens and popular legislative initiative, institutions of meetings, rallies, processions, demonstrations and pickets or so.

Participatory governance in the public governance system identifies decision-making and, in general, a new direction for the whole process of governance, the formation of a comprehensive approach to development, linking stability, social justice, economic development and cultural freedom95.

The new social space structure reflect in the three-sectoral model, according to which the main subjects of social interaction are distinguished: state structures (conventionally referred to as 1 sector of public activity), business (2 sector) and non-governmental non-profit organizations (3 sector).

*Figure 1.3.1. Common Logic of Participatory Governance*

Of course, the group of beneficiaries presented in the chart can be added, consolidated, or contrasted, but the main stakeholder governance approach is the constant process of managing the issues of governance through those beneficiaries, which will result in achieving certain targeted results from collaboration and securing positive synergies.

The logic of participatory governance is also in line with the idea of "new public administration", the founders of which are American authors. Specifically, Michelle Lemay, describing this approach, mentions that the transition from the bureaucratic administration of public administration to the entrepreneurial organization, and incorporating the model of public choice in the decision-making

Source: Robert Nahapetyan.

54
field, has led to market-oriented decision-making. A number of authors referring to the idea of "new public administration", as conceptual provisions, distinguish decentralization, participation and teamwork (taking into account the involvement of different stakeholders in the governance process).

Participatory governance problem can be viewed in different dimensions. Generally, the scope of governing bodies' activities is shaped and depends on the central government of the given country. It is sufficient to state only the fact that the powers and functions of governing bodies are defined by law, therefore through the national executive and legislative bodies. This fact can be justified as a basis for governing bodies, which often simply passively anticipate when decentralization steps to implement higher levels of governance. So, it can not be justified, regardless of the level of decentralization of the public administration of the given country, governing bodies almost always in authority of enabling real public participation should want to find solutions of public provision of governance involvement elements within its capacities. However, it is important to understand how important the role of the state policy is for urban governance. So in Pieterse describing, the results of the international research show that if the governing bodies of higher levels want the decentralized units to succeed, they must ensure that public administration bodies are provided with the necessary resources, and then these bodies are accountable to the residents, this actually implies that public administration bodies can develop participatory governance through a “comprehensive policy of decentralization, which includes transferring part of powers from state governance bodies to local governments providing financial resources for their effective implementation”, so in addition, the state should also ensure as in contrary, “democratization measures are implementing” so that the local authorities continue its participatory governance on

97 For more information on these issues, see Yu. Suvaryan, V. Mirzoyan, Theory and History of Public Administration, Yerevan, Science 2014, pp. 48-53.
their bases. We can surely say that participatory governance has the greatest potential and value when the capacity of local units is sufficient to address common urban issues with all stakeholders. This is why, as international practice shows, participatory governance often provides the best result especially in major cities.

In the participatory governance one should inevitably consider the local governments dimension. In addition, depending on the structural features of the public administration system of the respective state and the particular unit, this dimension may include a range of subordinates that are governed independently at different levels of governance. It is clear that the local government bodies, in particular the board, must adopt appropriate decisions regarding the participation of beneficiaries in public service delivery, transparency in decision-making, citizen accountability, and more. Such decisions may be made by adopting appropriate procedures or by setting policy frameworks whose ultimate goal is common, i.e. governance on a participatory basis.

It should be noted that, besides the justifications for participatory governance, nearly all the approaches of modern theoreticians in the field also come to the idea of participatory governance. So, in particular, approaches of G. Hyden, P. McCarney and authors collaborating in revealing this Pieterse is summarizing, if local units participation in universal politics is basing on the nature, quality and purpose of the relationships that connect local governments, civil society and the private sector. These relationships, it says, link formalizing and structuring directions with non-formalities:

- The nature of the relationships relates to the depth and degree of involvement of various institutional areas (governance bodies, civil society, and the private sector),


Quality of relationships is related to such qualities as mutuality, trustworthiness, co-operation, and more. These qualities can only be improved at the expense of effective and effective mechanisms that provide targeted involvement of beneficiaries,

The purpose of the relationship assumes that the relationship is constantly intensified by the efforts made to achieve the common goals in a more effective way\textsuperscript{101}.

As already mentioned, the concept of participatory governance is based on the idea of dealing with governance issues as a result of cooperation with different stakeholders. However, in Pieterse claims, the traditional model of local governments often forces residents, as well as other beneficiaries, to deal with ineffective, non-responsive and artificially inflated local administrators, as in simultaneous discussions\textsuperscript{102}, this type of constraint is based mainly on their internal motives, but not in accordance with the needs and interests of the residents and other beneficiaries, so such hierarchical structures are particularly vulnerable to the lack of democracy, as in such cases the governance system is interconnected with the relationship between the authorities and the local elite, which ensures the influence of the governing bodies on the electorates\textsuperscript{103}. As author supports claims, the classic example of this is Brazil’s local governments during and after end of the 1985 dictatorship\textsuperscript{104}. It is clear that one of the favorable conditions for participatory governance development is the existence of a democratic political system. However, even in the case of a lack of formal democratic rules and procedures, it is possible to find strategies for planning and decision-making at the city level.

If we discuss the phenomenon of governance from a legal and political point of view, one can assert that participatory governance is the approach that ensures the stability and trust of the authorities. Due to the increasing number of joint decision-making mechanisms and accountability, the rating of governing bodies rises, which can have a positive impact on the future of the ruling political force.

Good governance, apart from all other conditions, should be participatory, transparent and accountable. It confirms and asserts that the political, social and economic priorities are based on the agreement reached within the society and that the voice of the poorest and most vulnerable sector is taken into account in the decision-making process on resource allocation\textsuperscript{105}.

The United Nations Human Settlements Program also emphasizes the importance of participation in governance, characterizing proper governance as a phenomenon that indicates how well the population, its agents as supports, identify and address the major social, economic, and environmental challenges that lie the basis of improving the quality of life of citizens. According to this structure, the governance of the city can be defined as an effective approach to urban issues by civil society actors, democratic bodies\textsuperscript{106}.

Studying participatory governance literature, it can be argued that often the fact that public order constraints effective procedures, it in particular requires that there are clearly defined and imposed enforcement procedures. That is why the development and application of policy, legislative norms, guidelines and other formal rules are essential for the actual operation of concepts and mechanisms. In particular, governing bodies should develop appropriate procedures for partnership with the private sector, ensuring community participation and working with other stakeholders. Participatory governance of policies and politics without clear rules cannot function effectively. The importance of such policies and politics is that they reduce uncertainty and governance stakeholders better understand their role in

\textsuperscript{106} UNCHS (Habitat) \textit{The Global Campaign for Good Urban Governance}, Draft 4A, Nairobi 2000.
participating. An existence of formal procedures is the basis by which the rights and responsibilities of each party are further clarified, which inevitably contributes to a governance partnership-based approach.

The effectiveness of one or another institution of public management, by improving unit performances, depends on a number of individual and organizational factors\textsuperscript{107}. Ken Blanchard also generalizes that the ability to respond to the changing environment depends on the ability of the management to maintain a certain level of growth\textsuperscript{108}. The situation can, in many cases, require strict control over the effectiveness of work, but this approach inevitably leads to the weakening of participant’s motivation. That’s why administrators should be ready to apply the style of leadership that creates a positive attitude towards their work, as well as their leaders, and ultimately encourage them to pursue higher results, which is necessary to succeed in gradually increasing competition. is a condition\textsuperscript{109}.

One of the necessary conditions for effective public administration in contemporary conditions is to ensure the participation of the public in the governance of public administration. As it is known, public business or services have the peculiarity that directly relates to everyday problems of the residents, and they immediately experience that impact in their daily lives. Therefore, residents of the public administration circles should have real participation in the governance. At the same time, smaller units of government can ensure the participation of citizens in decision-making. The greater the governance object (especially in the case of major urban communities), the more likely the interests of certain groups will predominate citizens.

Study of civic participation forms for the most part relies on methodological models that go back to concepts developed within the framework of the theory of collective action. The spectrum of problems associated with the understanding of

collective action has been particularly intensively studied in participatory solutions of governing. Moreover, collective actions are the main subject of Western politics in civic participation.

It can be stated that the introduction of a democratic model of social management of the organizational system forms the objective prerequisites for the transition to a predominantly participatory management style. The latter, in turn, determines the combination of scientific principles of leadership with maximum use of the initiative and creativity of subordinates and the population, the optimal transfer of managerial powers and functions, involvement of the population, individual public organizations, the media, social groups and associations.

Although residents' participation is a clear idea at first glance, Rosener notes that the seemingly simple phenomenon is actually a very complicated and intricate concept and the lack of knowledge about participation effectiveness is probably the result of the fact that few people realize its complexity\textsuperscript{110}. In this respect, we also encounter very diverse and distinct approaches to the participation of the population in literature\textsuperscript{111}. Additionally, one can notice that the main dimension within which the theoretical approaches on the effectiveness of the activity are differentiates is a unit of analysis that relates to the effectiveness of the engagement. In particular, the effectiveness approaches vary depending on which unit the effectiveness is viewed from the point of view of influence of individual inhabitants, the wider democratic system of governance, or the policy carry out un so\textsuperscript{112}.

An in-depth study of professional literature suggests that there are no authors who oppose the idea of community participation or consider it a negative process. One of the reasons for this phenomenon is that the participation of the residents, according to many authors, has a positive impact on individual citizens and citizens. Some authors find that the participation of the population is effective when it makes positive

changes in the consciousness and character of individual residents. It is interesting that this approach was originally established in Ancient Greece, but certainly at the level of public administration and not by local self-government. In particular, the Greek philosopher Aristotle considered that the active participation of citizens is one of the essential factors of being a "human being" in the state administration and is a necessary condition for achieving "eudemonism"\textsuperscript{113}. This approach was further developed by philosophers Rousseau, Jean-Jacques and John Stewart Mill, who summarized the role of the population in the development of human civil and ethical character\textsuperscript{114}. And political philosopher Arnold Kaufman, relying on the latest approach, notes that community participation has a potential for governance to increase the psychological and intellectual well-being of individuals and to strengthen their sense of personal and political roles\textsuperscript{115}.

Contemporary literature also paves the way for a number of positive changes that can occur when you participate in managing the individual. Particularly, Fung and Right note that governing bodies, which ensure the participation of the population, act as democracy schools where participants can develop and develop a large number of positive qualities in favor of individuals and, in general, the public\textsuperscript{116}. Public discussions on community issues can contribute to the development of the capacity of individuals, as well as the formation of public spirit and character\textsuperscript{117}.

It is also important to note that literature is also quite common in the view that the participation of the population can be considered effective if it leads to certain changes in policy and governance that improve the quality of public service delivery and link them with the needs and desires of the residents\textsuperscript{118}. Additionally, elected

\textsuperscript{117} Suvaryan, Public Administration: Theory And History 2014, p. 52.
officials and governing bodies often lack access to information for the proper solution of public issues, and the participation of the population in this regard ensures the necessary cooperation between the two parties, thus making it possible to provide quality public services\textsuperscript{119}. In many cases, the participant populates the relevant issues or introduces some of the priorities that do not correspond to the professional approach, but are closer to their own wishes, values, and preferences\textsuperscript{120}.

It should also be noted a number of special theories that refer to the study of actors of civic participation, such as various communicative theories. Most fully, in my opinion, this perspective is developed in particularistic approaches to the concepts of citizen participation.

It is necessary to develop the theoretical ideas of modern sociologists, who prove that the process of transition from an authoritarian style of government to a democratic one and from the latter to a participatory one is an objectively necessary condition for the development of a management system of various management systems regardless of the social structures in which these systems operate. The boundaries of the range of democratization determines the composition of top management, based on objective needs, strategic goals and objectives for the development of a managed social system. For each position, tasks, competencies and corresponding responsibilities should be defined. In this regard, it is important to find the best option for specific posts and the corresponding specific range of delegation of rights, powers, functions of these posts.

Generally, this managerial approach, when the decision-making process is decentralized and the subcontractors take part in it, has long shown its effectiveness and is currently being used successfully in different organizations. Role of democratic elements in governance is characteristic of the type of governance and the level of governance. This inevitable process is, first of all, conditioned by the natural course of humanity and society, as a result of which people's needs and mentality are
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gradually changed. Of course, the situation in the macro level is a bit different because we deal here with the people who are consuming the services but not the subordinates, but we must notice that the governance trick in this case also gives its fruits. And if we want to find out if the participation of the public administration members in the decision-making process is logical, we have to look at all the results we can expect from it (Figure 1.3.2)\textsuperscript{121}.

**Figure 1.3.2. Why involve residents in the decision-making process?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residents know very well what kind of public management system they want because the final consumers of the services are themselves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listening to the residents can group the most frequently asked desires, suggestions, and prioritize them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get acquainted with the existing problems that, with their urgency, may have been ignored by the governing body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make the professionals included in the budgeting process to be more accountable, responsible and aware of all existing issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get the residents’ approval and support towards the projects they are implementing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Robert Nahapetyan

In general, modern research in the field of population involvement requires more perceived perceptions of human nature and decision-making. This applies especially to major cities where the relationship between governing bodies and the population is somewhat disrupted, but at the same time new opportunities are created, given the resource potential of the major city. Moreover, innovations and attempts to increase the participation of the population in the decision-making process should take into account both institutional and institutional concepts as well as clear-cut concepts about the peculiarities of the citizens involved in the competitive process.

\textsuperscript{121} Suvaryan, *Public Administration: Theory And History* 2014, pp. 53-54.
Researchers have identified a number of key incentives that play a decisive role if a citizen is politically active and, if yes, how will his involvement be expressed? They include social and economic factors such as social class, education, career promotion, income level, as well as social integration factors such as age, country of origin, situation in the labor market and participation in the Internet. Interest is based on the sense of debt, the desire to have its investment, the calculation of benefits, the effectiveness of the alleged participation, and the pleasure expected from the participatory process. In other words, political participation can be explained both by resource factors and factors driven by stimuli122. Including residents in the decision-making process, governing bodies also contribute to the shaping of civil society in the public administration because citizens are "approaching" public governance issues and thus increasing their sense of civic responsibility. At the same time, they are able to realize the role of the individual in the process of managing public administration, since their point of view may even have a certain impact on the decisions made by the governing body123.

Participation of the residents in the decision-making process and the knowledge of public administration governance is also important in the sense that when residents are having problems and are not informed, they are basically the worst124.

Summary

In this Chapter I’m identifying scientific descriptions of public and civic participation. In order to understand key differences of different types of participation, I look on it in frames of top-down and bottom-up perspectives. Participatory governing is the term describing the way participation works top-down, while citizen participation is broadly understood as a bottom-up mechanism of participation. Among various types of participation are political and social

124 Ibid., p. 55.
participation which differ by respectively political and social objectives or goals in participation. Even as such terms were in use until 20th century, they are widely put in use after World War II, where participation itself grows rapidly and idea of participatory governing is supporting it. In order to understand how participatory governing influences on participation, I’m comparing participatory styles of governing in various types of organizations linking it to participation in public institutions.

In order to analyze participatory governing and how it creates top-down participation, I’m looking into it’s classifications and various mechanisms, like public hearings or debates, creating commissions, involving in decision-making, participation in evaluation of performance results, strengthening of participants and initiating working teams. By applying such tools in public participation it is likely to increase levels and capacities of participants in processes of public institutions.

Next, I’m considering participatory public administration and participation in nowadays understanding, trying to understand what are institutions of public participation and how such institutions are influencing on participation. In this context, I’m looking in logic of participatory governance in line with the idea of "new public administration", which is transition from the bureaucratic administration of public administration to the entrepreneurial organization, and incorporating the model of public choice in the decision-making field. After analyzing approaches of researchers on good governing in public administration, I’m noticing that in order to increase its effectiveness public participation is necessary. It this concludes that public participation increases not only performance of institutions, but also invests in capacities of residents and institutions of participation.
Chapter 2
Institutions of civic participation in Armenia

2.1 Participatory governance and public participation in Armenian national ideologies

During their historical development, Armenians also, just as any other nation, gave birth to their political thinking and various traditions of governing their lands and population. The complexity of political situation during different eras eventually lead to forming the political behavior of the Armenian nation and individual citizens.

In order to understand, what exactly looked like being an Armenian citizen and participating in politics of the country, was it possible or was it considered important, we shall look to the Armenian political literature from very first years of creating the Armenian alphabet up to the modern political thinkers, so we can find an answer on what was the participation and collective governance for Armenians in national ideologies and in practices.

The political thought and attitude on public participation in Armenian national thinking has always been controversial, and it has been modifying itself throughout centuries, but it is worth mentioning of how less studied is this field and how less we know of authors speaking on importance of collective governing and necessities of meritocratic participation in times, when other western or eastern authors, some of which even later, created similar works which did grab the attention of the world. The political philosophers in Armenia have been also active participants in politics, so their works present a value also in practical point of view, studying the issue from the inner participant approach on politics.

In 5th century Mesrop Mashtots creates the Armenian alphabet and becomes the first Armenian-writing scientist, and by realizing the need to unify South-Caucasian nations against assimilation plans of their common enemies, is believed to also create alphabets for Georgians and Caucasian Albanian, becoming also a talented
politician\textsuperscript{125}, according to H. Manandyan, whose actions were to wake up the political consciousness of neighboring nations. One of his famous works is “Հաճախապատում ճառք” (Hachaxapatum charq), were he justifies ideas of the freedom of will and underlines the importance of people being active and having an active role in this world\textsuperscript{126}.

After the loss of the statehood, the Christian religion and alphabet were only institutions holding Armenians as a nation, so the other author of 5\textsuperscript{th} century, Eznik Koghbatsi, in his work of “Եղծ աղանդոց” (Exc axandoc) stresses the importance of developing the intellectual capacities of population in order to protect it from the influences of foreign religions and languages, which were being forced by invaders. He believes such processes are not God’s will, but are results of actions or inactions of men and suggests not to surrender, to fight for being able of making choices, know which of their choices will bring up right results\textsuperscript{127}.

Another author of 5\textsuperscript{th} century, Pavstos Buzand, in his work “Hayoc patmutyun” (Armenian history) describes the crisis of the crown and capturing the King as a hostage by invaders, though believing that the only way of keeping the statehood is ensuring and stabilizing the central monarchy, still describes of how it is important that elites and famous dynasties took part in bringing back the kingdom and its power by uniting their political positions and keeping loyalties to their King\textsuperscript{128}.

One of most famous works of this period is also of an author of 5\textsuperscript{th} century, Movses Khorenatsi, who is the classic of the classics of Armenian historic and political scientists. In his work “Hayoc patmutyun” (Armenian history), he covers all of Armenian history from its birth up to his century, and is so universal, that a lot of things could be suitable in modern Armenia even if centuries did bring changes into its political institutions. Comparing political situation in different eras of Armenian history, author comes up with ideas supporting the strong central kingdom, but is against of absoluteness of monarchic power, and believes it is in state’s interest
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creating the best form of government – the one which is creating minimal obstacles for its socium. He also stresses ideas of governing institutions hearing voices of fair politicians, who still should follow orders and law\textsuperscript{129}.

Later on, during 10-14 centuries, several famous authors of their times did conduct research on politics and issues of feudal governing institutions, which was an inspiration for creating such works, as 12th century philosopher Mkhitar Gosh’s “Datastanagirk”. It is fundamental not only in its meaning and worthiness to Armenians, it is an important work for world politics and law. After it, starting from Commander of Armenian armies Smbat Gundstabl, who writes his own “Datastanagirk” on its basis, up to modern authors of Armenian laws and various versions of Constitutions of its neighbors too, philosophers or politicians do recognize importance of works of this period’s authors and in particular of “Datastanagirk” and base various parts of their works on such classic codexes. Continuing to put attention on the importance of an individual in the institutions of government, as in works of their ancestors, authors of 10-14 centuries also stress the importance of consolidation of all of the political powers and individuals\textsuperscript{130} staying close to the crown, believing, even if the monarchic power is important for the country, it should limit itself constitutionally by bringing a separation of law-making bodies in faces of theocratic institutions and on the other hand in prototypes of ministries or governing bodies, which were historically organized within famous dynasties. This would unify the feudal separation in the kingdom so that feuds were brought into the national common idea, and law would protect rights of commons from feudal abuses.

Another famous author, who writes on participation issues, is Nerses Lambronatsi. Being one of the influential figures of 12th century, he has left several important works, in which he speaks of the issues of individual freedom. He believes on behavior of an individual to have an independent character, which though from the external side can be under influence and it can limit his freedom, but internally it
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will stay free of outer influences. In Manucharyan’s opinion\textsuperscript{131}, by pointing out the inner behavior of an individual, the writer speaks of values, principles and abilities of individuals, as ways of their thinking, learning and living.

Author’s relevant point of view on participation in politics is seen in his reasoning of how important it is for the success of social-political processes having a leader with a right behavior. He advises leaders to “listen to smart ones’ points, as Roman politicians did, consulting on issues with ones knowing on topics, as if citizen’s mistakes can harm only him and his family, leader’s mistakes harm all of his nation and his kingdom”, thus bringing himself closer to the ideas of constitutional monarchy and necessities of collective or participatory governing\textsuperscript{132}.

During the next century, the works of Vahram Rabuni bring new values in political and social thought of Armenia. In particular, he writes, that God didn’t directly do creations of kingdoms, but only people with rights on the same level when it comes to govern the nature around, and so it was some of the people, who did proclaim as kings above others, this way of breaking the balance of rights of population, and so it’s the state’s duty to protect the rights\textsuperscript{133}. This idea is very relevant to Rousseau’s ideas of the natural state of socium, which was written only centuries later becoming an inspiration for popular revolutions\textsuperscript{134}.

Another iconic political writer of this century is Grigor Tatevatsi, the founder of the Tatev University, the oldest in Armenia, and one of the oldest ones in the world, which is also not very famous among other Universities found during this period in European states. In his works, the author refers to the social institutions as organisms, where every individual has its functions, and when functions are not of sufficient realization, it ruins a harmony in such institutions. The author stresses out, that the important issues relating to citizens will or must find their solutions in decision-making of majority of citizens. The narrower are scopes of decision-makers, further
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are officials going from their roots in socium\textsuperscript{135}. So this way he sees the necessities of interrelations by politicians and individuals.

During a very long time Armenian political thought was passive, until 18\textsuperscript{th} century, which was a century of new ideas and new inspirations of philosophers and writers in Armenia and its diaspora. Its sons were trying to find ways of waking up the population, and in particular, its youth and find ways of liberating Armenia and establishing a long centuries-old dream of their ancestors, a statehood. In this matter, almost all of the authors saw neighboring or leading world Christian states of having no doubts in helping Armenia in liberating it from violent invaders. The only author known to us, who saw the liberation of Armenia in only having hopes on its own abilities, is Movses Baghramyan. In his famous “New handbook”, writer suggests to build a state of law, in which its powers will be in “Constitutional limits”, and its governors will be in many situations “dependent on great councilors and various parliaments”, so governors and supporting councilors will not worry of making mistakes, as if any fail, others will help in raising up, so politics won’t ruin, resolving issues, until stability is back\textsuperscript{136}.

From 19\textsuperscript{th} century, political thought on strengthening capacities of Armenians and raising their participation in political and social issues is moving from individual writers’ level to an institutional level of political parties, which would unify communities with hopes and similar goals of gaining power in their own country and inspiring populations for revolution. When becoming independent, Armenians slowly would transform the idea of political participation in strengthening their government institutions, and with new scientific centers, as Universities and research units on politics, interest on participation idea stands up by researchers and scientists.

So during its history, Armenia went through many ups or downs, and issues of political activation of Armenians by participation in politics went through development of national political behavior, which was both fostering and slowing its
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participation on different times during different situations. The nature of the modern political participation of Armenians was developing from 1980's, when political perestroika results in establishment of new relationships of nations, states or individuals. It was an activation signal in politics of Armenia, struggling from that moment on to become an independent country and starting to protect Armenians in Artsakh, in a war with its invading neighbor.

So the situation in 1990's was a breaking point, when necessities of new kind of political participation was not only understood, but also was bringing nation’s most active and liberal scopes, citizens, out to political participation in massive protests, national committees, parties, institutions, which was becoming the basis of the new Armenia. By becoming an active and important participant of politics, citizens start influencing on public policies, so which in various cases was decision-making institutions.

Next decades were marked by a continuous creation, development and strengthening of political institutions, public policies, but participation of citizens wasn’t as active, as it was still developing. The more state institutions developed, the more was actual having support from citizens and bringing up ways of their activation. But as in most post-communist states, institutions create fake democratic values, hierarchic styles of relations, down the imaging of state institutions. This results in disappointment from state institutions, distrust on political changes, lack of support to government initiatives, and indifferent approaches of citizens in relations with issues other than relating to social conditions. There is actually an interconnection in distrust towards state institutions and ineffectiveness of their policies.

The low indicators of trust are results of low indicators of effectiveness of state initiatives, but on the other hand, it’s because of the lack of support from citizens, solving not reaching results. It is vital for public institutions to have any scales of interest and it is vital for citizens to bring up abilities in politics socializing in

---
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institutions. But still citizens in Armenia are in a situation, in which they are not sure, if their participation in state institutions will not result in their destabilization, and if their non participation will bring necessary changes. This is understood bringing law and order but not any necessities destroying institutions of it. Manucharyan believes, as if both of the approaches are in balancing interconnection, which is characterizing the nature of modern relations in post-communist politics139.

Concluding, it can be said, that public participation in Armenian national ideologies has been existing as long as was the political thought and works of different authors explaining in their words why is it in governments interest inspiring and allowing its citizens to work with it. Both institutions and socium understand this, but efforts in realizing it are still not working as it works in western countries. The state on its own lacks an introduction of participation mechanisms to its citizens, and on their side, citizens lack capacities of participating in such institutions. Even with its heritage of political thought, Armenian new statehood is still on its road on consolidating its institutions, and Armenian citizens are adapting in a new political situation. Their distrust towards one another is disappearing with each of their contacts, and is soon to bring a new understanding of their roles and relations in which not only state institutions, but layers of citizens, reasons of politics running, win both as in this situation their winnings are in ideological descriptions similar.

139 Ibid., p. 464.
2.2 Creation and development of public participation institutions in Armenia: 
reforms of Open Governance Partnership in public participation

The study focuses its attention on developing participatory government through increasing public participation in government institutions, and increasing public participation through developing participatory government institutions, thus looking to it as an interconnection which is influencing on both participants of development, government with its citizens. This is why it is important to dedicate this part of the work to the level of public participation in Armenian public institutions, opportunities of citizen control on state institutions, the reforms and situation on progress of Armenia in adopting or realizing principles of participatory governing and increasing public participation, to study several documents as bases of study in this field, such as Armenian first 4 programs in scopes of OGP, their drafts and rapports on realization, and study of public councils, working ad-hoc with executive state institutions, researching which joint forces have been spent within works of the center of development of democracy “Public network”, Counterpart International’s Armenia Office and US Agency on International Development.

By current reforms, Armenia has introduced a number of institutions and processes encouraging and strengthening interest in public participation, on which I shall speak in this chapter, parallelly introducing research and suggestions on increasing their efficiency and other intending programs or desirable initiatives, by us.

Starting with the study of institutions it is relevant to look on the international agreements from which instructions and suggestions deriving on creating institutions of public participation bring ideas on new reforms in participation relating institutions. It is hard establishing any kind of participation institution without inter-communal, inter-district and international cooperation. Studying the experience and success of the states or different communities in Europe and unique efforts of such institutions, in order to reach a significant consolidation of public participation principles, traditions and ways of sharing their experience, we can notice that
conservative states, their powers, are in compromises with socium over increasing its influence on state institutions not because it can raise the efficiency of politics and increase the trust of citizens, or pressures from citizens, desires from government to work in modern standards, its mostly international agreements which raises motivation in states, relating to others, mostly in pressures from countries with higher levels of development, or in cooperation with international institutions, states, communities which are realizing such reforms, or in hopes of cooperating with such institutions.

So, in order to raise the public participation, the international cooperation is stimulating in creation of programs, a successful initiation in which is the “Open Government Partnership”, leading to creation of ongoing programs of reforms in participant states. Creation of this partnership is dating back in 2011, an initiation of 8 countries, US, Brazil, Indonesia, Mexico, Norway, Philippines, South Africa and UK. As it is mentioning in its Information part in the official website, its goal is by actively involving citizens to reform the governing structures, influence on their efficiency and raise the transparency, trust and accountability in relations of institutions and socium. In Partnership’s initial Declaration of principles, it is stated, that its goal is increasing publicity of governors’ actions, increasing public participation in public administration and increasing transparencies and accountabilities of state institutions. Its description of missions and roles of Partnership indicates, that it supports in creation of global open governing idea, which is to bring power to citizens, satisfy their desires and raises ideals of open participatory government, appropriate in 21st century states.

The open government idea is interesting in the context of the evolution of political idea, as a next actual stage of institutionalization in it, as civic idea was once
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categorized as the latest evolution version of political idea by Almond and Verba. Considering the state institutions being appropriate in 21\textsuperscript{st} century ideals, it means if leaders of developed states signing this document are recognizing the necessities of increasing participatory governing and interest in citizens towards government institutions in conditions of the current information communities, and are realizing they are working in creating ways of satisfying interests. As once, in Leonard White’s words the complexity of public tasks taught states to transform providing such solutions from law-makers to groups of specialists, which later transform to current structures of government or its institutions as such, the same way now, by understanding of public information, competent interest, participation and control desires of citizens, states start creating open governing institutions, political values, traditions, consolidating existing ones, which brings into inserting deliberative or direct democratic institutions and in establishing relying ways increasing public participation.

Although I point out, that stimulus for reforms are initially moral or juridical sources of pressures by other countries and international institutions, such tendencies and realization by states often bring to creating programs of consulting natures and with voluntary participation, one of which is the Open Government Partnership. In Declaration it says, that its Principles are creating different criteria, which switch into preconditions of cooperation or supporting states, or to leveling the states, which raises the trust of participant states, their communities, institutions and specialists towards its Principles, understanding that trust is the basis of cooperation and its analysis. Relating to Principles, it particularly states, that participants are realizing the rights of all citizens on the same levels and with no discrimination to participate in

public decision-making and processes of creation of policies. It underlines, that public participation, and in particular, participation of women, increases the efficiency of institutions, which gain from citizens skills, ideas, and abilities of controlling, so the states intend to bring up higher indicators in transparent policy making, creating and using channels of public voices reaching government institutions and increasing public participation in scopes of institutions. Participants intend to protect NGO’s and institutions of citizen participation, in expressing voices freely, and raising their doubts on political issues, so they are creating mechanisms of cooperation of government, civic and business institutions145.

It states in Principles also about such issues, as access in information on governing, inserting criteria of norms of behavior in public spheres, access on new technologies and so on. As it says in Declaration, there are necessities of “introducing the civic and business institutions to politics in order to bring in effective styles of work and innovative approaches, with new technologies to bring power to people and encourage in transparency of institutions”, says in it146.

Armenia is also in this Partnership, it’s even already realizes reforms which envisages in the Action Programs in the field of development in electronic administration and its success in real and long-term results. The Action Plan is currently in realization, with a special focus on reforms designed to increase public participation and increase public oversight over the activities of state institutions.

In order to overcome the non-constructive mentality and behavior in the field of policy realization, the action plan was including suggestions, such as trainings of civil servants, in realization of which after 5 years around 400 individuals of various structures have been participating in training to improve public servants’ knowledge
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and skills on freedom of information, an open and accountable work with citizens, proper manner in developing and responding to necessities in access to information\textsuperscript{147}.

Another important achievement of the project is the establishment of the Committee of public behavior of Senior Officials in 2012, which aims to increase public confidence in public institutions operating in the country and to introduce a fair governance system by making public officials' actions more open and transparent by enhancing public confident assurance in their behavior\textsuperscript{148}. In promotion of transparency it is continuously introducing institutions of declaration of interests to the Committee, in which it conducts continuous declarations of income and property of officials and persons relating, and gradually expands the scope of data in publishing in its websites and in documents of institutions. The creation and continuous improvement of such institutions, the improvement of inspection mechanisms allow directly or indirectly to increase the level of transparency of the public service and to monitor the performance of officials in compliance with law restrictions\textsuperscript{149}.

It also plans to carry out the standardization of the content in official websites, which is a process, aiming in the provision of unanimous structure of websites, publication of necessary information and effective applicability of websites to target groups. The unanimous standardization criteria will also ensure the publication of mandatory disclosure information as requiring by the RA Law on Freedom of Information, such as the budget, budget execution reports, and the presentation of budget relating data in appropriate formats, which allows it a broader analysis. As for its progress in the realization of this provision, the Open Government Partnership website states the following: “The Ministry of Transport and Communication of the Republic of Armenia has developed a draft decision of the Government of the
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Republic of Armenia that sets standards for official websites of state agencies. At the same time, there are also certain requirements for state agencies (what mandatory content websites should have, how often should they be updated, etc.). The aforementioned government project has been developed with the support of a number of NGOs and has been discussed with technical experts. Questions raised by technical specialists are taken into account in the project under discussion. Currently, the Ministry of Transport and Communication of Armenia is studying the financial assessments of the project, which should generally be providing from the state budget”, says in it\(^\text{150}\).

Within the framework of the Open Government Partnership, the Republic of Armenia has also been elaborating an Action Plan, which includes 11 program provisions, 4 state agencies into 7 citizen institutions suggesting. In general, looking to its summary of the proposals for inclusion in the program, we can see 14 relevant suggestions that did not fit into the Open Government Partnership values of the program due to lack of transparency, accountability and public participation, technology or innovation or ambition. 18 relevant suggestions were qualifying as out of the authorities of the RA Government, as they imply provisions for drafting and adoption of new draft laws, as well as amendments to existing laws. Finally, the summary also presents 5 group suggestions made on the basis of the former 10 and four recalls, which were withdrawn by the authors largely because of the lack of relevance or foreseeability of another program\(^\text{151}\).

So, commitments undertaken by Armenia in the framework of the Open Government Partnership thus include specific program provisions which design to promote transparency, accountability and public participation in the country, thereby enhancing public confidence in public institutions. In general, transparency, accountability and public participation are categories that are highly interdependent, and the description of each clause clearly shows how a particular reform will improve


or enhance everyone or almost everyone realizing it. Taking into account this circumstance, however, we would consider the three program provisions which specifically are in envisage of development of the public participation component. These are Program Provisions No. 6. Community micro surveys program through the use of SMS technologies, No. 7. Ensuring state policies and law reforms through open, transparent, participatory and accountable process in improving working in Councils and Committees which generally attach into ministries, No. 8. Public awareness in law-making activities of state institutions, creating a single online platform and suggesting possibilities of subscribing under new projects and informing on decision-making in institutions.

Description of the program provisions for promoting public participation under the Open Government Partnership Second Action Plan in Armenia can be found in the project documentation\textsuperscript{152}.

The RA Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources, the RA Ministry of Health are also targeting transparency and awareness, confidence and citizen engagement in digitalization of studies in their fields of activity and creation of websites of inclusive description of it. Another institution, the RA Ministry of Education and Science is issuing its program provisions modifying the activity of boards attaching into public school institutions. In promoting the participation of civil society and citizen participation in local government bodies, and in the context of electronic approach in democracy ensuring also local accountability, it is 11\textsuperscript{th} Provision, which suggests the study to ensure the transparency of local government bodies, within which is to carry out creation or development of websites of large communities, its in addition establishing its electronic administration in states institutions\textsuperscript{153}.

Relating programs implementation process, the execution and schedule arising from the obligations, the Open Government Partnership Armenia website reports that in March 2015, expanding summit of Open Government Partnership Working Group,
the summary report on the results in realizing government’s action plan up to February 2015, was presenting digital documents on the implementation of the provisions relating to public participation. Data summary in documents is in the Open Government Partnership website, with new updates.\textsuperscript{154}

Some of these provisions are still in the stages of implementation and are almost anachronistic, given the anticipation in timing and the preliminary results. Their resulting implementation, I believe, will lead to substantial progress and inspiration for new achievements in the field of public participation.

As for other programs, I study the program including “Public network” Democracy Development Centers” Individual Entities Union of Armenia, Counterpart International Armenia Office and the US International Development Agency, "I am participating" Project\textsuperscript{155} is work in boards and advisory bodies in executive authority institutions in Armenia and in the other countries. In authors version, reason of forming advisory bodies is increasing the effectiveness of state structures through reforms, decision-making process, in cooperation with civil society organizations, hereafter referring to as CSO representatives.\textsuperscript{156}

The authors of the study note that although advisory bodies have been set up in Armenia for the same purpose as in foreign countries, in Armenia ofit they are mostly attached to heads of structures, ministers and not to the ministry, which do not have a clear working order, which is one of the provisions of the OGP program, and limitations are highly dependent on the Minister's discretion, so in activity advisory bodies appear to be non-productive in such situations. It is also noting that to measure the coefficient of usefulness in advisory bodies in ministries, programs of Counterpart International Armenia Office and the USAID funding to carrying out "Araza" NGO’s "Usability and efficiency enhancement in public participation in law-making process" program, which surveys out both representatives of state or citizen
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institutions on usefulness of advisory bodies, which estimates about 40%, which CSO representatives said is due to the shortcomings of the working order, and according to the representatives of state institutions, the low professional capacities of the CSO157.

The program examines in particular the experience and perspectives of public inclusions and participatory government in the executive power of the Republic of Armenia and notes that the executive branch, “…Starting since the Poverty Reduction Strategy Program (PRSP) development process, under international and domestic public influencing is introducing in public management process principles of civil society participation”, says in it158. This is a starting point for this study as it indicates the origin of the object of study in the governance and public policy of Armenian republic. It is also noting that it brings up three levels of public participation.

1st level - several dozen ad-hoc bodies, rounds, commissions to the Prime Minister, ministers and in local governments, whose aim is to ensure public participation in the decision-making process or discussion of public issues.

2nd level - outsourcing services in policy implementation process, involving non-governmental organizations.

3rd level - in policy realization control, CSO participation, it is through independent and participatory monitoring, in which institutional basis is still under realization159.

According to the authors of the study, the creation of institutions of public participation is a historical necessity and a challenge for democratic states, so it is necessary for the public and the state to cooperate and develop CSO capacities160. Relations between the state and socium can be built on various dimensions and logical links, law-making and even in constitution161, reasoning to the particularities and
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historical experience of the country and socium. Interaction mechanisms of consultation of states or public, is as study suggests, in advisory bodies, which is in councils or committees, commissions, boards\textsuperscript{162}.

Citizens’ and state institutions’ relations in recent past on designing roles to advisory bodies, in suggestions of programs authors and researchers abroad, work on such relations, with significant involving in some states in public decision-making, and often serving as if democratic deficit reduction, increasing trust in institutions through public participation\textsuperscript{163}.

The importance of incorporating research into the program and its scope in analysis is valuable not only because it explains the need and essence of public advice, but also because it raises issues arising during their organization and operation, such is, board’s effectiveness and issues of it relying on the will of ministers, and into which extent is inclusion in decision-making, issuings\textsuperscript{164}. This allows for obvious conclusions: until final decisions in Armenia are made by individuals with their own will and discretion, subjectivism and internal dissent will continue to dominate Armenian political and civic institutions and it will be the same in perceptions and overstatement of governors on roles under their own social status, so it results in roles of institutions creating an imitation of public participation staying formal. Thus, concluding, the states, their institutions need to provide advisory bodies a wider, significant powers, including industry professionals and individuals in their work and in realizing it to pay attention, react, discussing and voting each expression and interpretation of proposal, in result to present in draft decisions to ministry. This will boost, as H. Chesbrough informs, the level of ministries’ Open Innovation inflow\textsuperscript{165} or solving issues overlooking. Although, as it notes in the study, procedure in advisory board is not restricting in permanent inclusion of industry experts, as well as is not limiting inclusions of additional experts, specialists in solving singular issues either in
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short-term counseling\textsuperscript{166}. Generally, governments start coming up with open innovation standards in ministry institutions, and like many western ministries and state agencies in RA mobile surveys or communication with citizens can also be undertaken on institutions own initiatives\textsuperscript{167}. There is a clear need to sorting the order of CSOs and individuals joining such councils, the permissible number or percent, which should be substantially greater in the range of technical resources available, as well as the procedure for participation, the terms and conditions of rotation, the specific scope of competences. In this manner, the study underlines, that board composition and the quantity is determining by the Minister's discretion, the procedure does not define the terms for the change in the composition of the board, it automatically takes place in minister's changing, re-appointing and there is no mechanism in changing non - governmental organizations. As an exception it brings, Public Council of Ministry of Defense, the Charter of which is clearing out the Council's formation date, size, design principles, which is different from other boards and councils. The Council is composing of the 3-year periods, in addition to this, the Minister shall appoint a board of 15 members, 5 in 1\textsuperscript{st} phase, others by suggestions of 5 appointees, Council is forming, if the number of appointments is 2/3 of totals number\textsuperscript{168}.

The introductory part of the document mentions such councils in Armenia, or as it is calling, boards, the practicing of creating and applying which is with Armenian features. Such a qualification may require some clarification at first glance, but further analysis of the results of the research provides answers to all questions. Some of the ministries, having no statutory frequency of board meetings, have met only 1-3 times when those having such procedures, such as the Ministry of Education and Science, have been violating it, such as in period 2009-2014, instead of 45 sessions, only 8 inviting. As for the actual CSO inclusion in boards, in some ministries it is quite low,

\textsuperscript{167} http://toronto.mindmixer.com/topics/7211/growing-conversations-barriers (access: 18/01/2020).  
\textsuperscript{168} The institutions of participatory government in advisory bodies, local and international experience work http://www.ogp.am/u_files/file/research_participatory\%20governance.pdf (access: 18/01/2020), pp. 19-20.
which results in board meetings being similar to the internal consultations of the ministry with certain observers, such as the CSO 1 organization in the RA MES board, despite it is organizing number of other advisory bodies that are mainly of a professional and scientific nature, which is really interesting. Some ministries, such as the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Emergency Situations, the Ministry of Defense and the Ministry of Finance, do not include CSOs at all, although in the case of such structures, many issues cannot be publicly discussing and presenting to public institutions as a matter of strategic importance or states securing information\textsuperscript{169}.

As study notes, research methodology has also in plans to monitor the institution portals to determine whether the laws government sends to RA National Assembly sum in conclusions of the advisory bodies or not. Monitoring reveals, that the 63.2% of drafts in RA National Assembly comes from institutions of government, which annex normally conclusions by state institution’s expert. In the law on “Normative acts” it does not prohibit, but also not insists on institutions, its projects having also non-state institution expert’s evaluation, which can be given by an independent expert, which is both an individual or relevant institution\textsuperscript{170}.
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2.3 Reforms of IT, Electronic Administration in the promotion of citizen participation

Armenia’s "open government" idea came out in realization as a result of approaches in electronic administration (hereinafter: EA) and as a result of which ensuring electronic styles of participation.

In general, the EA aims to improve the basic functions of government by using the most up-to-date forms of information in telecommunication technologies.

Forms of information exchange and provision of services in modern society can be varying and sorting in main versions of distribution (see Figure 2.3.1).

**Figure 2.3.1. EA Services Distribution**: 

- Government to Government (G2G)
- Government to Public Servants (G2E)
- Government to Citizens (G2C)
- Government to Business (G2B)

Source: J. Moon, Monash University, Australia.

Government to government (G2G). Since that society is becoming more insisting, it is changing roles of states. In such a case, intergovernmental work and policy coordination are important. Ensuring a non-interrupting flow of information
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between government bodies becomes a necessary condition for enhancing the effectiveness of program management and policy coordination.

Government to public workers (G2E): This model assumes a paper documentation reduction, business - process automation resulting of time spending reductions in other to reach qualitatively new levels of work with other state institutions.

Government to citizens (G2C). These relationships have been undergoing institutional changes as society develops. In the context of state-citizen relations, the ideas of democracy and transparency have been of primary importance. Due to the changing demands of citizens, the public services providing by the government have also changed and the role and functions of the government have changed. Following this trend, the government must apply a strategy to meet the requirements, which is widening of opportunity to choose and services satisfying different kind of necessities.

This is probably the platform where public is participating in state governance and is showing its attitudes in relation to public policy or states institutions.

Government to Business (G2B). The traditional government was overseeing and intervening in the markets and business world. The job of government was focusing on managing, not serving the economy, companies or markets institutions. However, private sector development is becoming more important when it comes to the welfare of citizens. Government-company relationships have been changing and focusing more on enhancing the efficiency of public services rather than simply following bureaucratic principles.

The field of EA is still subject to scrutiny, and therefore it is difficult to give an accurate definition of electronic administration. Moreover, the EA deals with many and various spheres, so it is difficult to express in one sense what the EA really is. EA is describing differently by different international organizations, governments, scientists and others. In the narrow sense, the electronic administration is the creation and / or provision of services of institutions by IT means which simplifies and
improves interactions in relations of government and citizens (G2C), government and business (G2B), and government and other public agencies (G2G).\footnote{172}{Л. Мкртчян, "Формирование гражданского электронного правительства", Еривань, 2012, с. 41.}

Its formation process is dividing into several phases (See: Table 2.3.1.)\footnote{173}{Ю.В. Ирхин, "Теория, методология и методики анализа инновационности "электронного правительства", статья для проекта "Политическое в условиях инновационного развития России: теория, методология, методики", РГГУ, 2013.}

- Initial Presence,
- Advanced presence,
- Interactive presence,
- Operational presence,
- Network presence.

In 90s the concept of "electronic administration" was initially in implementation in the post-industrial countries of the West and Asia, and later in the stages of "operating online" and "online presences".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages</th>
<th>Stage Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Presence:</td>
<td>Access to basic information on the websites, links to other government institutions, directly to government departments and non-governmental organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced presence:</td>
<td>Increasing of the presence of the authorities in the network, which is measuring by websites documents (laws, instructions, so on.), current information, databases (statistical and other information), news section, &quot;electronic administration&quot; section, Frequently Asked Questions section, search, help, services, file uploads, and sitemaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive presence</td>
<td>For various services the appearances of loading and filling forms capability, in particular number, contact information, including it</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\footnote{174}{Ю.В. Ирхин, "Теория, методология и методики анализа инновационности "электронного правительства", статья для проекта "Политическое в условиях инновационного развития России: теория, методология, методики", РГГУ, 2013.}
| Operational presence | A two-way relationship between the population, government and business, which implies the use of the Internet for all kinds of transactions: paying taxes, duties, applying and receiving documents, paying for services through different institutions in it.

| Network Presence: | Existence of special tools and opportunities for citizens to engage in discussing and decision-making processes, web forms on leaving comments, networking with people, consulting forums on policy and government action, online inquiries, mailing or web form responses (indication periods in answer) and subscription for receiving information via mailing. |

Source: Ю.В. Ирхин, Теория, методология и методики анализа инновационности "электронного правительства", РГГУ, 2013.

UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs in 2018, June announces survey results ranking nations development of electronic administration.

The rating is compiled by EGDI (E-Government Development Index)\(^{175}\), it is an indicator of countries' readiness and ability so it brings information technology in public services.

Calculation of the E-Government Development Index is now widely in using worldwide. And so the index of online services is basing on a quadratic model of growth and builds on the state of the art of online presences. The model defines electronic administration 4 levels, providing the gradually increasing volumes or business in public solutions.

Table 2.3.2. Electronic Administration Indexes of Development in Leading States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plc</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Index</td>
<td>Plc</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Republic of Korea</td>
<td>0.9462</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>0.9193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>0.9103</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>0.9143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>0.9076</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Republic of Korea</td>
<td>0.8915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>0.8938</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>0.8828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>0.8897</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>0.8817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>0.8874</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>0.8704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>0.8748</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>0.8659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>0.8695</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>0.8653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>0.8644</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>0.8510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>0.8449</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>0.8456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>0.49997</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>0.5179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>0.0139</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


As we can see over last 6 years Armenia had a rise in Index but a slight drop in ranking keeping it steady from 2016.

So states realizing functioning governments recent reforms, now aiming and ensuring significant progress in transparency, accountability and effectiveness.

In 2008, as an imperative for the IT era, the Government of Armenia is launching an electronic administration realizing programs. In the Government of the Republic of Armenia, the electronic administration investment has been in lining with the standards from best international solutions. The introduction of the

---

electronic administration outlines a number of priority measures which should look into government and the people of Armenia\textsuperscript{178}.

- Introduction of Internet and multimedia technologies to schools and other levels of education
- Creating favorable conditions for cheaper Internet services, increasing their competitiveness, lowering prices, increasing consumer choice and developing e-commerce
- Ensure e-participation for people with disabilities, taking into account the needs of people with disabilities
- Online supporting services so that is easy accessing in online inclusions to government information, services and decision-making process\textsuperscript{179}.

In general, the use of electronic administration in public administration in the Republic of Armenia implies cost reduction and performance enhancement, efficient problem-solving by citizens, business promotion, accounting, voting, and similar.

A comprehensive study of the results of the electronic administration investment process shows that the major investment risks can be:

- Lack of equal opportunities for public access to the Internet due to different levels of compliance infrastructures, which raises the risk of disproportionate provision of electronic participation
- Issues of governing in Internet and Public Trust in Public administration
- National security threats and introducing limitations:
- Inequality or uncertainty about the costs and benefits of investing in electronic administration.

Information technology and the Internet rapid development can contribute to deepening state-society relationships. The Internet is more efficient, quick and

\textsuperscript{178} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{179} http://report.gov.am/tid (access: 18/01/2020).
convenient way to productiveness in activity of state institutions and realization of management using new technologies, and not surprising, that management in leading countries incorporates modern equipment.

In order to enhancing Armenia's state management efficiency, it's realizing various projects, which are expecting in carrying such reforms in states governing, in results of which in 2012 it was to excess states indicators, increasing levels in 2006 in Eastern Europe and the Baltic countries. However, it is financial global crisis which prevents full realization of public administration reforms indicating in sustainable development programs outlining main points. That is why the indicators characterizing the management have not been reaching their targets until now\textsuperscript{180}.

The government's reforms to the country's development in the years subsequent is in Armenian 2014 Prospective Development Program, showing values in main indicators of public administration (see Table 2.3.3.).

Table 2.3.3 Target values of key public management indicators for 2017, 2021 and 2025\textsuperscript{181}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management indicators</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Interest Indicators (Program Indicators 0-100)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil society participation in government formation, freedom of speech and press</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political stability</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Effectiveness</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{180} Republic of Armenia 2014-2025 Strategic Program of Prospective Development, p. 173.  
\textsuperscript{181} Republic of Armenia 2014-2025 Strategic Program of Prospective Development, p. 173.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of government stabilizing function</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule of Law</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring in Corruption</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Republic of Armenia 2014-2025 Strategic Program of Prospective Development.

As long-term values in indicators describing public administration in Armenia it takes into its consideration relevant indicators of OECD states in 2010. for. Indicators in 2021 are an important milestone on the road to that ultimate goal. There are exceptions only in rule of law and corruption control indicators. The targeting values are about 10 percent lower than the same indicators in OECD countries, given its distant connection, as well as supposing long time necessities in establishment of the rule of law.\(^{182}\)

In objectives of electronic administration, it is obvious to distinguish public awareness raising, proper presenting of institutions. It is interesting noting that www.e-gov.am portal has a number of drawbacks, including, for example, its lacking search instruments. Even if you know the number of the RA government decision, it is not possible to find it in this universal electronic administration information sourcing. In addition, there are many other shortcomings, for example, letters sent to the RA Government and its departments through the website are not official in nature and often stay non-answering.

Websites visitors are particularly interesting in the "Interactive Budget" section, but the numbers and information providing are very superficial. Citizens

\(^{182}\) Republic of Armenia 2014-2025 Strategic Program of Prospective Development, p. 175.
visits this section in about 100’s daily and wants to keep track of government spending in real situations. In the same time there is great interest in mailings section. 100s of citizens per day send their letters and applications. The role of Internet users is very important in the process of introducing electronic administration. The higher this indicator, the greater the likelihood of users of the electronic administration. Thus, in 2016 the number of internet users in Armenia is making 62%\textsuperscript{183}, increasing comparing to the previous years, and in 2017 is 64%\textsuperscript{184}.

Today, development and progress of realization in electronic administration in Armenia is in coordination of such institutions, as is Information Government Infrastructure Investment Office, or known as EKENG, introducing and realizing projects in electronic administration in promoting communication of individuals and enterprises in state institutions. It is obvious, that with introducing electronic administration its potential to significantly improving management, is in quality of states institutions serving citizens. Now individuals can access information of different kinds in institutions websites, their working hours, addresses even and numbers, various laws, and so on (agencies in ministries are updating usually their websites).

However, in order to ensure its realization and effectiveness, it is necessary first of all to establish a states’ initial framework of proper laws. Citizens know that personal information is confidential, not accessing by outsiders and is only using in accordance with the laws. Its underlining, citizens sureness that any information, in documents not prohibiting by laws is of standard-distributing.

Given the need for continuing development of the e-society in Armenia, states Government of the Republic of Armenia is approving on April 10, 2014 the 2014-2025 electronic administration Strategic Program, basing it on previous decisions of Government on approving the concept of IT development and e-society

formation. During it, according to 2013 December 24 roadmap for accession of the Republic of Armenia to the Customs Union and Common Economic Area, establishes and sums up Unions electronic information documentation national structuring\(^{185}\).

So to, establish electronic administration, what Republic of Armenia applies is.

1. Open Government principles implementing which is promotion of transparency of government, fighting corruption, improving government and modernizing public services for citizens and businesses.

The public sector owns and represents most of the state's public data. In the context of open governance, state, local government bodies should collaborate with enterprises, civil society and private IT organizations by 'combining' public data with new technologies and applications. This should improve the quality of public services and encourage citizen participation in decision-making and governance effectiveness. The re-use of public sector data should be ensuring its laws framework that takes into account such fundamental rights of citizens as access to information, the confidentiality and protection of personal data that must comply with the best international standards on public data.

2. Digitization of public service data. 2018 databases of public services offering to citizens and businesses electronically, along with traditional methods. Ministries and other public institutions list public services digitalization programs to including in sector strategies, its institutional development plans. In addition, its vital in assessing and eliminating laws barriers preventing using IT and electronic services in government work.

3. Public services and business process restructuring (reengineering). The process of electronic administration conversion does not only involve the digitization of public service databases, archives and documents. Public services is reviewing in a way that eliminates inefficient, fragmenting and outdating processes. Other processes and services uniting is providing maximum convenience, minimum costs and easy interaction between government and citizens.

\(^{185}\) Republic of Armenia 2014-2025 Strategic Program of Prospective Development, p. 175.
4. Modern means of providing public services. Almost half of Armenian citizens are already online and expect 24/7 online public services available via the internet and mobile, not interesting of where the institution responsible for providing the service is physically locating. So, it comes to possibility to use mobile electronic administration in Armenia, in using appropriate application.

5. So it also is interesting creating data centers, which are key ensuring its administration and security of citizens' personal data, protecting the continuity of IT resources and e-services. Uniting technology platform should provide data storage, archiving and recovery in real time in the absence of it\(^ {186}\).

Today, the effectiveness of electronic administration in the Republic of Armenia has not been in calculations, which makes it difficult to correctly identify and evaluate its future development directions. The digital division between the capital and the states of the Republic of Armenia is also significantly influencing nations electronic administration.

As for the electronic administration websites, here are some tools that do not work, which is to improving. Its mainly sections of the real estate cadastre, the National Gallery of Armenia, the electronic visa (e-visa). Currently, not actively using e-gov.am stands to a number of difficulties.

1. public does not have enough computer skills
2. if making mistakes it does not know it is noting

Some reforms need to be made in this solution.

- Establish an e-learning training center.
- Keep up to date with website features.
- If mistaking when using the instruments a special tool to solve it.

It is necessary to develop a law framework in line with international standards. It should be aiming into creating, operating, developing laws for electronic administration, ensuring ICT efficiency in the activities of public administration, realizing citizens' rights to access information resources and quality services, creating

law bases for protecting public and public interest, information security and data protection.

The EA expanding its public services and in underlining online public services it lowers starting services in providing information difference in timing and spacing. The development of investments of electronic administration will also be facilitating by the inclusions of international organizations in the process, which will enable studying it applying international best practice, if so.

Thus, open government specificness is availableness in anyone’s interests not looking to timing and spacing. Ensuring and synchronizing direct and open dialogue to citizen and the state so is bringing in citizens of the state and state institutions closer, lowering subjection factor. This is a citizen and state officials non-personal relationship with serious oversight and wide range of possibilities of citizens in tracking it. The electronic administration is very important is also in the fact, that this management is maximizing in reduction of the human face-to-face interaction factor, which contributes to clear implementation of tasks without any subjective intervention. This management is investment in the reduction of the corruption risks.

This brings to understanding, that the introduction of this management, partially solves issues relating to corruption, and why not even environment, as it much reduces the paper need. Basing on the fact, that electronic administration is supposing to be transparent and continuous control form administration, it will bring in citizens into trust in state officials, state management, which is very important for management process, this is the only guarantee of legitimating government. The process of introducing electronic administration in Armenia starts in 2008. Much work has already been done in the past 12 years, but there are many issues that require urgent solution. Thus, observations and analysis under this research purpose come to the following conclusions, which, in order to solve issues, is underlining requirements in the implementation of a series of changes. In particular.

1. As in first step introducing the EA, I recommend in the initial phase of the investment the introduction to mobile government, because of it essentially large
potential in Armenia, rather than any other component of EA, as in discussions of this chapter.

2. By weakest side of state institutions official websites, we can be considering their weak interaction, weak feedback and lack of interactive services. Such a low level of interactivity reveals a more global issue, which is the very little orientation of governing institutions to public service consumers. Satisfaction of the first-time visitors needs is very important for the management web-pages, because of their expectations still not final in formulations it what to expect. They need to minimize it time-consuming and mindless actions and implement such changes, as if citizens will be able to visit the site and quickly implement the necessary actions. In order to organizing this process first and foremost it is necessary providing in responsible services, in precising the structure in the management. In the same time, it is necessary to simplify the implementation process. Simplifying the implementation, is more likely, that the citizens will take advantage of the services. It is vital in implementing management efficiency increase, as if information of all its services that government is providing is available in a single source, as well as need more effectively in making its communication to its citizens and private organizations. The solution is proposition of the introduction of the concept of investment of a common portal for all sectors in management, the implementation of which may be becoming effective solution in state management activities, or at least in the design stage will identify gaps and necessary changes directions. Government agencies and institutions should be accountable in the information and EA such processes, which they are backing up. They clearly need to be able in dividing information types and EA into processes, so that each states department is responsible for designating site in providing for any sector of activity. Departments also need to work together, to uniting their websites and information flows.

3. It is vital to form an independent institution, which would be an advisory body and is responsible for the formulation of strategy of programs in the EA and in reaching proposing of goals which will become as engine leading ICT
application idea in social, economic and political spheres. The department’s main functions will be elaboration in proposing it standards, inclusions of information resources dealing in management activities and all levels of management, and wide-range discussions, monitoring the IT management projects implementation. The department should not be able to stand out as an IT project implementation client, providing wide range of powers in state budget funds in projects division. At the same time, the organization will have a certain frequency, which can be once a year, in presenting of the report on its activities in the Finance Ministry. Contributing to the success of the EA it also needs body responsible in information security, with clear functions and responsibilities. Under its jurisdiction need to be risk identification, standards development, disclosure of the best examples, advice provision and control of implementation. It is important to projects designing and implementing of clearly describing programs desiring outcome and so is the introduction of mechanisms of effectivity evaluation. ICT in programs provides too often in multiple using opportunity which being a single center gives the ability of the identification of potential benefits and applying it (for example, electronic single soft is summarizing documents all levels).

4. It is necessary to improve the toolkit of e-gov.am website’s search or other instruments as it is describing in this chapter. Government should track this and update it. Since its creation it hardly had serious updates, as expresses not elastic and not interacting structuring in information divisions.

5. It is necessary to have normal levels in development in infrastructure in the country before implementing any serious investment in the EA. Infrastructure development needs funds to provide technical support. Lack of adequate staff of technical specialists in this context is one of the most important issues. In addition, it is very important to carry out appropriate work to raise the level of electronic literacy of the population.

6. As an investment barrier in the EA its existing in administration and in majority of local government bodies a non-satisfactory condition in infrastructure and
technical equipment. Even so, it is not very possible or appropriate, if the communication process is carrying out through governmental structures. In such circumstances it is important to address the above issues and to provide a logistical basis for electronic administration.

7. Each national economy, including the Armenian, ICT investment return most obvious efficiency improvement up to the entire country within a closing digital document turnover investment (within the organization, companies, citizens and public authorities, government agencies) the implementation of which entails serious organizational and administrative changes within state bodies (for example, the idea of providing services through a single window).

8. Finances are just as important for state, local government bodies as for organizations. And as ICT is characterizing by the rapid tearing of technology and fix assets, is a need for further investment. It is necessary to accurately assess need or possibility of future investment in the initial phase of project implementation. The lack of financial resources is in priority in Armenia, and it is not only in means in budget but also its impact that EA is able in bringing in its economy.

9. It is important to improve the electronic administration law framework, in particular, to adopt "electronic administration" law.

10. Maintain a sufficient level of electronic security.

As part of this research continuation there is a necessity in different countries EA experiments introduction with analysis of the implementation of it, to disclose universal EA level, as well as accurately formulating EA effective investment of factors and conditions. It is actual in Armenia in relation to investment of EA its accumulation of foreign experience and study in possibilities of application, conditions and factors in Armenia.
2.4 Reforms in Constitution or Laws on participation institutions in Armenia

Examining the possibilities of exercising and engaging in power by citizens such as institutions of referendum or petition, inclusion and advocacy, it is also necessary to consider the existence and constitutional guarantees of public participation in the constitution by comparing it to both examples in Armenia and countries similar to Armenian political institutions and statecraft.

In comparison, the Armenian Constitution before its changes in 2015 did not contain articles on citizens' initiation of a referendum and it did not cover the procedure for signing petitions, which was clearly stating that a referendum can only be of call by the National Assembly and the President, though some communities at the local level did allow residents to initiate referendums, which was covering by local laws, and was not entrenching in the Constitution. Within the study I compare specific cases in new version of Constitution in Armenia with other states constitutions, through Google company’s Constitutions comparison conduction websites, making a comparison of such terms, as is citizens initiative, participation and control, receiving ideas of other countries' Constitutions, addition of which to Constitution of Armenia is more likely to add institutional characteristics in turnover of such terms as enforcing of laws and practicing it as constitutional guarantees of citizens institutions and of its standing in layers of political rights, is to advocacy and recognition in it.

Speaking about the constitutions and their guarantees of public participation, it is interesting to examine the new constitutional amendments in the Republic of Armenia and its packages of drafts. This project places big attention in the inclusion of citizens, as one of the most important steps towards enhancing efficiency of government, in scopes with other proposals of the study, which however, is non-relevant to this research.

Still, I consider it necessary to address its provisions in increasing public participation, the attempts in reservation of it in Constitution I’m considering as a necessary and important initiative, since near adoption of constitutional guarantees of
citizens' inclusion provides nothing more than protection of human rights and political freedoms. According to the concept of the constitutional amendments, the project was developing by the Commission on Constitutional Reforms under the Institute of the President. It states that realizing "democratic institutions’ still not satisfactory levels, low progress of political and constitutional institutions, shortcomings in the law policy or practices of law enforcement"\textsuperscript{187}, it forces to seek ways to solve such crisis through the implementation of the constitutional reform, which was attaching to the right argument, according to which the imperfection of politics, low progress in law-making and political institutions, not efficient operation of constitutional checks and balances, results in bringing such situations, that various Articles in old Constitution sound to as nothing but slogans, including following:

Article 3, part 3 - The state shall be limited by fundamental human and civil rights as a directly applicable right; Article 7, part 2 - Parties are formed freely and promote the formulation and expression of the political will of the people. Their activities may not contravene the Constitution and the laws, nor may their practice contravene the principles of democracy; part 3 - Parties shall ensure the openness of their financial activities; Article 8, part 2 - Freedom of economic activity and free economic competition is guaranteed in the Republic of Armenia; Article 14 - Human dignity shall be respect and protect by the state as an inviolable foundation of human rights and freedoms; Article 14.1 - All are equal before the law; Article 18, part 1 - Everyone shall be entitled to effective law remedies to protect its rights and freedoms before judicial as well as other public bodies; Article 27.1 - Everyone shall have the right to submit applications or proposals to the competent state and local government bodies and officials for the protection of private or public interest and to receive an appropriate response within reasonable times\textsuperscript{188}.

\textsuperscript{187} Draft Project on RA Constitution Reforms 2014, p. 23.
As to the specific constitutional steps taken towards the exercise of popular authority, a special section in the reform project is devoting to the most applicable and acceptable version of it - the referendum institutions.

Although, referendum as an institution has a substantial level of cognitive and financial constraints, nevertheless, from the point of view of direct or direct democracy it is still considering as effective norm of instrument of restraint and counterbalance to representation institutions. The project of Constitutional Reforms particularly notes that the referendum institutions of Armenia is prescribing by the Old Constitution, as an exclusive law method in Constitution adoption and of amendments to it, as well as an alternative in adoption of a law. It is also noting that developments in laws have led to an expansion in the components of the referendum, in particular, in Referendum Law in 2008, December 26, the following definition of the Referendum was amending: "The referendum is the direct practices of power by people in adopting a Constitution accepting or changing it, adopting laws, and revealing public opinion in state's important questions." But nevertheless, as stating in the reform draft, the role of the referendum, as an effective example of direct democracy, still lacking a highlighting. The role it has in the context of current prescribing in law and Constitution developments should be considering in balancing of branches of power and in most of it especially checking and balancing representative democratic institutions.189

As a result of Constitution’s reforms, Article 202 now states, that the right in initiating referendum on Constitution changes in most important its parts, belongs in lines with other institutions to 200000 citizens, in cases of other parts, initiatives signing 150000 citizens. Considering the citizen initiatives of referendums on laws, Article 204 states, that if National Assembly rejects a draft law, an initiation of 50000 citizens, which is up to its consideration, in providing circumstances, a referendum decides it, if 300000 citizens join adoption of law ideas. In contrary, direct

participation principles in local referendums or other kinds of resident participation in community relations are subjects of consideration in law\textsuperscript{190}.

As it is seen, the course of later policy focuses its attention on the reassessment in role of the referendum and its institutional establishment, which pushes one step in forward Armenian republic in promoting the development of it, and its upbringing constitutional, as well as civilian and political institutions. However, first of all, it is necessary to identify the issues that impede the functioning or development of the institution, through the identification and resolution of which it will be possible to effectively apply the benefits it provides.

The reform concept states in it “Initial task is maximizing use of counterbalancing influence in direct democracy in power realization. In particular, it should be directing to a representative government so it doesn’t carry unbalancing measures of possible failing impact of democratic processes.

This becoming a vital necessity in civil society development in parallel with state of law establishment. Some of urgent issues in Referendum:

a) clarifying the objects and subjects of the referendum;

b) describing state power bodies responsibilities and scopes of civilian initiative of the referendum;

c) law stipulation of institutional approaches of referendum\textsuperscript{191}.

In addition to identifying issues, it is vital to coming up also addressing its resolutions. Key conceptual approaches for the development of the referendum institutions can be as it is below:

1. Giving preferences to versions of identifying scopes of referendum, according which a referendum is calling to issues joining international organizations, which leads to partial restrictions of the sovereignty,

2. constitutionally fix the range of issues, which cannot result in call of referendums,

3. provide civilian initiative referendums,


\textsuperscript{191} Draft Project on RA Constitution Reforms 2014, p. 38.
4. creating the constitutional prerequisites for giving to civilian initiative referendum issues or bills National Assembly’s initial recommendations.

Ensuring country's stable constitutional developments, the essential and revolutionary importance is understanding the full use of all the possibilities of direct democratic potential and sensible roads harmonization of it with representative democratic potential. In this, taking into account new technological possibilities of the civil society of self-realization, constitutional reform’s realization brings up issues in raisings of productivities using public petition institutions.  

The term "public discussion" is defined in Article 2 of the RA Law on Normative Legal Acts, according to which "public discussion" means public awareness of the draft legal act defined by this law for public participation in the legal process, transparency and accountability of the process, as well as revealing public opinion, getting comments and suggestions on them, and summarizing them.

This statutory definition comes from the fact that public discussion pursues two main objectives: public awareness and public disclosure. This emphasis is important in the sense that the legislation should define the necessary procedures for the full and effective implementation of the two main objectives of the public discussion (raising awareness, learning notions), which I consider to be insufficient.

According to Article 3 of the RA Law on Normative Legal Acts, draft legislative acts are subject to public discussion, except for the draft law on ratification (joining) the international treaty. Drafts of other normative legal acts may be submitted to the public discussion on the initiative of initiator or drafter or the body that accepts the draft. From the above-mentioned article, it becomes clear that, except for cases provided by law, the draft legislative acts are subject to public discussion. The public discussion is organized by the body authorized to act or the member of the government.

193 RA Law on Normative Legal Acts, PSAN 2018.03.28, No. 23 (1381), Art .373.
Based on the requirement of the RA Law on Normative Legal Acts, the Government adopted a decision on the procedure for the organization and conduct of public discussions\(^1\). Decisions of the Government of the Republic of Armenia, drafted by the public administration bodies, are binding on the procedure established by the public discussion decision, except for draft decisions of the Government of the Republic of Armenia on declaring martial law and state of emergency.

Draft internal legal acts of the Government of the Republic of Armenia and drafts of internal legal acts to be adopted by the members of the Government of the Republic of Armenia shall also be subject to public discussion, except for confidentiality. Draft individual decisions of the Government of the Republic of Armenia developed by bodies of state government are subject to public discussion based on the recommendation of the Prime Minister of the Republic of Armenia. Public discussions of internal and individual acts are carried out according to the procedure established by the decision.

Ensuring public participation in the legal process pursues a number of goals:

- promote a constructive dialogue between the state and society in the law-making process;
- Listen to the opinions and suggestions of interested stakeholders in the relevant field;
- Consider the position of its recipients when drafting the draft legal act, ensuring the existence of a legal act containing practically applicable and complete regulation,
- Still at the stage of drafting a legal act to address public concerns that may further impede the practical application of the legal act, contributing to the effectiveness and ease of further implementation;
- Inform the public about the draft legal acts developed, clarify the nature of the proposed regulation, thereby guaranteeing the predictability of legal regulation\(^2\).


I find that in order to achieve the above objectives, it is important to pay attention to the ways of public discussion. It should be noted that the above-mentioned decision of the Government stipulates that the public discussion is mandatory in the official website of the body conducting the discussion and by publishing a unified website on the publication of draft legal acts issued by the Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Armenia (hereinafter referred to as a single website). In other words, it is clear from the article that the online mode is mandatory for public discussion.

I believe that the use of modern technology is positive, but I believe that public discussion methods need improvement. Thus,

1. In certain cases (in particular, when the transition from public relations to legal relations or when the substantive or entirely modified content of the existing legal act is publicly debated), the public discussion organizer should be provided with a properly furnished, online broadcasting and access to a large number of people in territories: Due to the above-mentioned online passive public discussions will be accompanied by the so-called "face to face" meeting-discussions.

2. In addition to the online passive public debate, it is also necessary to introduce an online public discussion model that will enable the interested person to follow the public discussion online, present his observations, and ask questions.

3. In addition to public broadcasts and public hearing, public discussions should be pursued from the point of view of the involvement of interested persons directly in the project. Otherwise, public discussion in terms of compliance with legal procedures will be flawless, and content is imperfect because the layers of society, the social groups directly affected by the new regulation will be neglected.

At the same time, pursuant to Article 1, paragraph 1, of the said law, "The operation of Chapters 2 and 3 of this Law does not apply to draft laws or resolutions of the National Assembly on the legislative initiative by the deputies or factions of the National Assembly, on the draft laws proposed by the law". Consequently, only the legislative draft laws submitted to the public are submitted to the public discussion,
and draft laws submitted by the Civil Initiative and MPs or factions by the Legislative Initiative are not submitted to public discussion, assessment and expertise.

Unlike the public discussion of draft laws submitted by the government, the National Assembly's statutory law provides for parliamentary hearings. The main purpose of parliamentary hearings is to exchange information, gain and deliver information among parliamentarians, executive authorities, experts and beneficiaries, to ensure the effective implementation of the legislative process, the adoption of fundamental laws and their proper application. Parliamentary hearings are an important part of the implementation of three parliamentary legislative, oversight and representative functions. Parliamentary hearings, which are based on representation functions, have always been the main instrument for ensuring public participation in parliamentary activities.

The National Assembly Rules of Procedure defines the parliamentary hearings, which, unlike public hearings, are not mandatory. In particular, parliamentary hearings may be convened by: 1) the Chairperson of the National Assembly; 2) Standing Committees; Ad-hoc Committees on the Standing Committee on the Draft Law on relevant fields issues; 3) The faction, in the matter of its own or the faction of the MP included in the faction. Hearings are convened by the decision of the National Assembly Speaker, as well as by a permanent, temporary or fractional committee. The faction may invite one hearing during each regular session. The day of the hearing should not coincide with the day of the National Assembly session. The record of the hearings is approved by the decision of the commission calling the hearings and posted on the official website of the National Assembly. Procedures for inviting, as well as summarizing the results, are set out in the Workbook.¹⁹⁶

The existing legislation regulates that the passing of parliamentary hearings is disproportionate and selective. I find that it is necessary to define a number of cases in which the conduct of parliamentary hearings will be mandatory by law.

¹⁹⁶ National Assembly Rules of Procedure 2017.01.25, No. 5 (1280), Art. 45.
In the post-soviet states, the principle of democracy was demonstrated in two dimensions, in the activities of representative bodies and in public discourse, where participants could contribute to the law-making process. The unprecedented development of the future years in the field of information technology and communication has created new ways and more opportunities for civil society participation, but the perception of the state as the only subject of lawmaking has led to a reduction in public interest and inclusion in the legal process, as a result of which these opportunities are almost not used.

Civil society participation initiatives at this stage and under conditions should emerge from the state. There is a need for new ways to address the problem of non-formal participation of civil society. The fact that socium is "consumer" of the results of law-making and is interested in their quality does not lead to active participation. We can also see it during some parliamentary hearings organized by the NA Standing Committees when representatives of dozens of non-governmental organizations and experts do not sound their opinions and comments on the proposed draft law.

In other countries, traditional public discussions are also used to form expert working groups, SMS-polling, suggestions and comments boxes, and actively use social networks (Facebook, Twitter, etc.). Of course, all of these ways are effective if they are accompanied by propaganda and PR participation by the state. Additionally, a lobbying process can play a major role in the recognition of the legitimate instrument of the legal process of the shadow economy, the "official" or so-called "public" lobbying, which will promote the social justification and legitimacy of the decisions.

The main issues facing the drafting body in public discussions are the disclosure of public opinion on the issues discussed, the receipt of information on alternative options, possible costs, benefits and possible risks and public participation in law enforcement activities. All interested individuals and legal entities can participate in public discussions. The duration of public discussions is at least 15 days. Public discussions are held by public authorities through the publication of a draft
regulatory act and justification of its adoption with the submission of interested parties. The results of the public discussion and relevant draft amended, normative legal act are also publicized. The law and normative act submitted to the Government, which is subject to public discussion, which has not been submitted to the public discussion, may be returned to the body representing it.

Thus, the draft legal act needs to be put in place for two important reasons for public discussion, first of all citizens will have the opportunity to present their comments and suggestions on the draft, and secondly, the citizen's legal awareness will definitely increase, as if the bill finally becomes law, people will be aware ‘of the law, which I think is another step towards effective legal settlement.

Summary

In this Chapter I’m looking in participatory governing and participation in Armenia. In order to understand that, I’m summarizing first it’s political literature and are extracting various ideas and works of Armenian classics on participation and popular support in governing, starting with authors of 5th century – golden age of Armenian history of literature, until works of modern Armenian authors. Studying in a chronological way relevant changes in Armenian national ideology, we see in it a central pattern where ideas of kings and rulers reaching to popular support or using it in order to strengthen their rules are amongst all classical writings.

So, next I research on current state of institutions of participation in Armenia, so that we can understand what has been or is realizing in Armenia on creation or consolidation of participatory governing and public participation. Such institutions government has been creating mostly as parts of reforms and programs in which one of most important ones is Open Government Partnership. This study discusses it’s Action Plans by Armenia and shows introductions of various projects on participation, electronic administration or others in Armenia.

Next, I’m concentrating on Armenia’s use of information technologies in it’s open government concept in promoting citizen participation on-line or e-
participation. Over recent 10 years, since introduction of electronic administration in Armenia, it has been improving it’s positions in rankings and realizing EA projects. Being one of the types of participation, electronic administration provides a universal platform of government – citizens interaction. Using such tools in governing can help solving various issues in states.

Finally, in order to sum up top-down participation in Armenia, I’m researching it’s Constitutional aspects ensuring civic and political participation, as citizen initiative right and other public participation instruments and are analyzing laws on public hearings and other norms on public participation, as parliaments rules of process or other laws.
Chapter 3.

Citizens taking part in participation institutions of Armenia

3.1 Origins of Importance of Studying Political and Civic Cultures to Increase Public Involvement

In the classical definition of civic participation as the power of the people, as the English political analyst D. Held rightly notes, the following questions inevitably arise regarding the combination of the concepts “people” and “people’s power”:

1. What should be understood by the word "people"?
2. How is the participation mechanism conceived?
3. What are the conditions for this participation?
4. What is the relevant area of democratic activity: does it cover only the political sphere or does it also include economy and interstate relations?
5. Is obedience necessary to the rule of the people?
6. What is the place of responsibility and the right to disagree?
7. Under what circumstances, if it is at all possible, does democracy entail a coercion mechanism in relation to those representatives of the people who find themselves outside the limits of legitimate government?
8. What should be the mechanism of coercion in relation to those who avoid participation in the "rule of the people" or deliberately do not participate in it?\textsuperscript{197}

If we turn to the political thought of antiquity, the Renaissance, the Enlightenment and the early bourgeois revolutions, the political doctrines of the XIX century, political sociology and political science, we see that many of the above eternal philosophical questions are repeated again and again in each historical era at a qualitatively different level. These ideas, affecting the essence of democracy, were developed both in comparison with the reality of the corresponding historical period of time, and with accumulated historical experience.

\textsuperscript{197} D. Held, \textit{Models of Democracy}, London. 1987, p. 3.
Therefore, civic participation is not a static phenomenon, but a phenomenon that is in a constant process of development, movement, self-renewal and self-reproduction.

As of political behavior of a citizen, fundamental impact on it have not only their views and beliefs, political preferences and antipathies, but also very often subconscious stereotypes and habits, which are creating in influence of surrounding social space of it and so transmit from generation to generation. Therefore, analyzing the current state of political processes in Armenia and trying to predict their further development, we are constantly confronted with the problem of political culture, that is, the collective set of political norms, rules, principles and customs that severely restrict the possibilities of public activity and ordinary citizens, both in policy development and in concrete actions. Political culture is the foundation on which the real building of politics is built, and if the idea clashes with the political culture of society and contradicts the totality of its constituents' perceptions as well as expectations, it is immediately not recognizing by mass or reducing during implementation in size. Understanding the peculiarities of political culture is therefore important not only from a scientific but also a political point of view, because through their possession and literate attitude researchers and politicians can easily prevent and overcome many critical situations. Political culture complexity, its multi-level and multi-functional factor will assume analyzing it observe and be as of guided by some basic methodological principles, which, for example, it observing it an organic and complete system, which in turn can be considered as the basis for comprehensive and direct the development of the individual and ensures and emphasizes the political culture creational nature of political practice, which forms inter-connections in cultural elements and source of development activity itself. Political culture, for its part, is an integral part of the culture of people and society and is linked to the activity of social strata and classes in the social and political arena, the struggles of groups to attain state power, and its implementation. Social and economic factors determine political activity and the political culture associated with
it, revealing the interrelations of social communities within the struggle for state power.

In general, citizen participation in the public administration process historically has two main forms: direct participation through meetings, assemblies, councils, voting, and indirect participation through parties or independent deputies representing their interests in parliament. Although this are participation forms of classical typology, however, I want to notice the fact that there are also civil society organizations emerging in expert or inclusive nature, individual or collective accession of which is though considering direct participation, however, from the perspective of civil society and population it continues to have an indirect nature, representing the interests of socium in specific control and inclusion cases or examples. This is precisely the essence of a deliberative democracy, which embodies the best features of direct and indirect democracies, and a vivid example is Switzerland having a high-level democracy and civil culture. Why do we need to study the historical typology of forms of governance by the public, first and foremost because we see the evolution of civic culture and the evolution of public engagement and its competence at various stages of governance, and we are able to draw appropriate conclusions at the current level of our state and society, about it having a particular kind and characteristics, as well as exactly revealing norm development tracks.

Civic culture essence lies in social relations and institutions implementation and development, through this means providing with civil society's stability. In its turn, civic culture establishment and improvement contributors are upbringing of civic education and experience accumulation in participation. Examining of transition experiences in post-socialist countries through papers of authors, such Tomas Kostelecký, research comes to the conclusion, that during independence or years after it, low indicators in political and civil activism and interest, confidence in election is reasonable as if having absence of electoral and in political participation or experience
having it actually not a lot. After studying the second, third and fourth generation of the elections in these countries it is clear as in each and next election, residents are showing non-consciously more emotional and active participation, rising their political consciousness, starting to understand more in importance of their vote, and is acting of more consistent in finalizing results and fulfilling promises in electoral raising. Such statistics is allowing us to assume and come to the opinion, that political culture is political consciousness and activism of dynamic display, and political literacy, education, and of consciousness basing on it, as complex and continuous process, development chain and natural, logical sequence, in their nature associate of individual development and education learning-knowledge-skills-capacities principle, and is proving importance of civic education, as of most important idea in formation process civic socium thus prove it objective truth, that in education and upbringing process most important component is it practical kind of training and experience accumulation knowing an exchange or own achievements and self-realizing. Civic culture is nothing but citizens', its specific roles of actors, position and cooperation, interaction and relationship synthesis, and of personal development as known to humanity and practically having effective indicators, so is applicable principles create chance in order to make an argument, saying civic culture can be forming up in conscious and deliberate action, in ways of education and upbringing.

This topics importance, actuality and of having little exploration of it, motivates and promotes of to deepen importance and understanding of study in order to attract youngsters in organizing practical and interactive civic education and in order to managing media impact on adults, as public is moving more the deeper to information dimension and it becomes a decisive factor in periodic formation of public opinion and civil society behavior and activities. Current experience of civic education can also now show that its potential is still not completely using an example of western countries, which encourage and develop this institute and as results record

high performance of civic engagement not only due or not to their law and political opportunities, but also for citizens own desires and basing on it is own initiative, showing now positive changes in this process of direct correlation contra civic activity and inclusion sort-out.

In a developed and effective form, civic participation is manifested at the level of open partnership between the authorities and citizens, the effective representation of the interests of citizens in government bodies, and productive civilian control over power. In these cases, we can say that political power is decentralized and redistributed in the process of negotiations between citizens and the government. The latter goes on to share the prerogatives of development and decision-making, and therefore, responsibility. On the basis of the interaction of politicians and citizens, joint political commissions, working groups, groups for resolving conflicts can be created. But such interaction (and even more effective interaction) is possible only under the condition that the citizens themselves act not as individual “members of the public”, but as united in groups of civil initiative, civil (public) organizations with sufficient intellectual, technical and financial basing.

For example, as evidenced by the American experience developed in this regard, even low-influence public organizations always have at least the minimum number of exempt managers (coordinators), organizers, a lawyer who can adequately represent the organization in a courtroom, city council or state legislature.

In any case, the division of power, that is, its dispersal, occurs due to the fact that citizens themselves take the responsibility of power, and not power, is divided by powers.

A productive dialogue between civic associations and the authorities in an advanced form may lead citizens to seek the right to participate in decision-making on matters of public importance. However, only those who truly uphold significant public and civil interests, who enter into a dialogue with the government, armed with all the information on the subject of interest and citizens, and the authority to the question of who has a draft agreed and realistic solution, can obtain this right. Then a
productive union of state initiatives and civic participation can really happen. It is clear that the institutionalization of the latter requires preliminary legislative initiatives coming from below, aimed at legitimizing citizen participation (as independent experts, representatives of public organizations or various communities) in various sociopolitical processes.

So, civic participation is especially important when solving issues in particular natures, which politicians and government officials quite often approach to consider, not having detailed information and not feeling conflicts “from the inside,” based on “higher” state interests. Moreover, special attention is required for matters whose decision making, as a rule, always has unpredictable or hardly predictable long-term consequences. Since they concern each citizen separately, their successful solution urgently requires the active involvement of citizens and the target association of citizens for their solution.
3.2 Civil Society "Supplementary Capital" in the Context of public participation

Some aspects of the theory of civil society have become a subject of debate since the early days of political thought. It has become a subject of discussion not only in political science, but also in philosophy, sociology, economics, law, and other sciences.

Civil society is a key concept of political theory. It is a sphere of civic voluntary associations that is independent of the state and the "political society" created by parties. It is the domain of activities of free citizens and is closely related to civic values, responsibilities and social obligations. Throughout history, the concept of civil society has been fruitful for theorists when it comes to state-of-the-nation relations, but it has also inspired civil movements to fight civil rights and legitimacy.

Civil society is a consequence of the development of human society, the essential condition of which is the emergence and formation of citizens, on the basis of private ownership, economic, social, legal and political independence. And the most important thing here is that the priority is the development of the individual's personality and the equality of the rights system.

Civil society is a special sphere of society, independent of the state and corresponding to it. It is a complete system in which manifestations of the freedoms and ideas of individuals are displayed in different ways and diversity. These different sides are also manifested in the institutions of state power, in their functions and in the structural spheres. If the state body is a political order then it is the sphere of formation of civil society, social-political, spiritual-cultural preconditions, from which the political order, the state proceeds.

The civil society functioning testifies to the universal orientation of the democratic content of state and state institutions. That's why it is in civil society that the realization and satisfaction of possible freedoms and needs are possible. The civil society system includes a whole set of self-organized and self-governing public institutions that operates with the other elements of the society's system of human
rights and freedoms. As civil society institutions, non-governmental organizations, trade unions, private mass media, non-partisan parties, as well as other public associations, which meet these requirements, act as civil society institutions.

The concept of "civil society" was first used in European languages in the 16th century, but as a social science category only in the 18th century.

In terms of the concept of civil society, a number of analysts say that the notion of "civil society" and "civilized society" is quite close, because the terms "civilized" and "civilized" literally mean governance, citizenship, state, and civil society. Thus, civil society is a civilized society, as well as civic society.

In the modern era, civil society institutions have a pivotal role in all aspects of public life, largely due to the quality of democracy, political and civil culture, political stability, and the degree of public administration.

In the civil society system, besides the institutions, relations, values and norms are also included. They are civilized-minded if they contribute to the creation and development of a human being as a "homo civilicus" of civilized living conditions. That is why the institutional axis of civil society in relation to the spheres of social life is a viable alternative and multiculturalism.

As of proliferation of the term "civic participation" in the political science and sociological literature is largely due to the newly emerging interest in the discussion about the nature of the phenomenon and the content of the concept of civil society. In nowadays literature, this concept has received the greatest distribution in publications devoted to the analysis of methods of public participation in solving problems, such as health, the environment, school and pre-school education, employment, etc.199

Currently, there is no single, generally accepted definition of civil society; therefore, there is no single definition of civic participation within this concept. There

---

are various approaches to the definition, composition, elements, functions of civil society.

In the analysis of the definition of "civil society" it is customary to single out the theoretical and practical levels. In accordance with each of these levels, researchers isolate the theoretical, analytical and normative parameters of the concept of civil society. The first value is used as a theoretical category for analyzing and explaining the phenomena of social reality. In this sense, civil society is an aggregated concept denoting a specific set of social communications and social connections, social institutions and social values, the main objects of which are: a citizen with his rights and civil (not political and not government) organizations, associations, associations, public movements and civil institutions. According to the second normative parameter, unlike the theoretical and analytical one, the concept of civil society has primarily the status of a normative concept, which contributes to the motivation and mobilization of citizens and other social actors for the development of forms of civic participation.

The practical level of the definition of civil society is revealed in various studies of both theoretical and analytical nature (about nature, supports, features, stages of the formation of civil society in post-communist country; applicability of the concept, etc.) and the normative character. Proponents of the normative direction tend to use different activist concepts in the study of civic participation, use of the methodological apparatus of the theory of social movements, building typologies, analyzing functions, motivations, the resource and legal basis of civic participation, etc.

The definition of civil society as a theoretical category distinguishes two traditions shared by the majority of researchers - the socio-democratic and liberal. Proceeding from the first, civil society is recognized as the basis of all politics, here traditionally a desire for justice and equality is developed. The state with its power relations should be involved in ensuring the functioning of civil institutions in order to guarantee their democratic governance, restraining the market. According to the
social democratic model, the state regulates strictly defined sectors of the economy and protects the most disadvantaged segments of the population.

Another line of development of the concept of civil society — the liberal tradition — transfers the center of gravity to the self-regulating function of civil society. The functions of the state are reduced to ensuring the rights of the individual, legal assistance and minimal social assistance to the population. In the modern interpretation, the definition of civil society within this tradition is formulated as a social structure and “a state of a special type in which the fundamental rights and freedoms of the individual are legally secured and politically protected”.

The isolation of social democratic and liberal traditions is not the only recognized classification of approaches to the definition of civil society within the framework of classical western research. C. Taylor breeds two traditions in the understanding of civil society, corresponding to the political theories of J. Locke and C. Montesquieu\(^\text{200}\). C. Taylor calls these directions in the first letters of the names of their founders — L- and M- traditions.

The L-tradition, dating back to John Locke, understands civil society as a certain stage in the development of society as opposed to an “uncivilized” society. This tradition is considered Anglo-American: the founders of liberalism A. Smith, A. Ferguson, T. Payne and others are called as its main representatives.

In the framework of M-tradition, civil society is understood as “a set of independent associations of citizens mediating the relationship between the individual and the state”. A representative of this tradition is also A. de Tocqueville. In his work “Democracy in America” he pays great attention to voluntary associations of citizens opposing the state and protecting civil liberties from it\(^\text{201}\). This tradition includes the widespread interpretation of civil society as “the sphere of society — the sphere of non-state relations, structures and institutions”.

The M-tradition also includes the work of Antonio Gramsci, in which he defined the totality of civil society institutions as a kind of “second” or “reserve” state capable of guaranteeing the integrity of society even in conditions of a catastrophic national crisis, example of Solidarity\textsuperscript{202} rising in Poland\textsuperscript{203}.

It is worth noting that the presented views of C. Taylor can today be adopted outside the juxtaposition of these two traditions, since, by and large, both J. Locke and Ch. Montesquieu view civil society as an aggregate of economic interactions of free actors. The question raised by Ch. Montesquieu, about the form and role of the state in civil society, does not contradict the position of J. Locke.

In the modern debate about civil society, theoretical traditions have practically ceased to be opposed to each other as opposed, since different researchers turn their attention to different elements. For example, on the one hand, civil society is viewed as an aggregate of non-state institutions, on the other, as a society of autonomous individuals who have both civil rights and freedoms.

Modern discussion about civil society and, accordingly, civic participation can also be divided into two discussion fields:

- In political science, civil society is usually understood as a non-state type of social relations of individuals in the sphere of private interests. On this basis, through the interaction of their interests, individuals come to understand their common interest as citizens of a state and are included in various forms of civic participation.

- Other interpretations are moving away from the private sphere, and there is a civil society between the political (or state) and industrial spheres, which forms an intermediate environment between them. The most common forms of civic participation within this concept are associations, associations of interests (professional, creative, cultural, educational, confessional, household, etc.), connected


not so much by vertical, hierarchical dependencies, as horizontally-network relationships.

The mediating level between the government and the private sphere is introduced by J. Habermas\textsuperscript{204}. At this level, he has a non-political public sphere in which autonomous citizens actively express their opinions on socially important problems and thereby influence their decision. Civic participation at this level operates in two directions: on the one hand, the subjects are discussing government decisions and plans, thus integrating them into the system of identifications and moral and practical orientations of activity. On the other hand, citizens, thus, formulate their claims and needs, problems and suggestions for their solution and address them as requirements for the state. The public sphere here is a symbolic place of connection between the aspects of the social integration of subjects in society as individuals with their interests, desires and passions on the one hand, and opposing development and organization of political institutions as subjects of the external world on the other.

For us, it is important to consider the concept of the public sphere at the normative level: how are of guarantees in the public in such ways ensuring liberal and normative elements of civic participation.

In the opinion of many analysts (J. Sattor, J. Habermas, A. Arato, and others), the initial notions about "civil society" were already fixed in Plato's Laws, Aristotle's Politeia and Cicero's "societas civilis" concepts. For example, Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, considered art and civilian forms of government as an ideal and fair state, historically quite feasible. Plato is owned by the following popular mind: "I see the collapse of the states where the law has no power and is under someone's control. And where the law is the ruler of the rulers... I see the salvation of the state and all the benefits"\textsuperscript{205}.

According to classics civil society, civic co-existence, society and the state acted as synonymic concepts. This approach has also been maintained by T. Hobbs, J. Locke, B. Spinoza, Ch. L. Montesquieu and J. J. Rousseau's "Social Alliance", as well as

\begin{footnotes}
\end{footnotes}
I. Kant’s "Global Civil Situation" theory, which distinguished "natural" and "civil" situations, civil society was identified by the state or political society.

It should be noted that the issues of civil society formation were more coordinated by Hegel. According to him, the unification of individual persons in civil society is the ultimate goal, the purpose of which is to lead a global life. According to him, civil society acts as a stratification between the family and the state. For this reason, "if the state is represented as a unity of different people, which is merely a common thing, then a certain civil society is taken into account."\(^{206}\)

In the Hegelian opinion, the structural system of civil society consists of the following elements:

1. Requirements system;
2. maintaining freedom and property through justice;
3. police and corporation.

According to him, justice in civil society becomes a supreme goal, as "good" laws lead to development and free property becomes the necessary condition for this development. That is why he views justice, laws, police and corporations not in the state, but in the civil society system. Civil society must protect its member, its rights, and the individual, in its turn, to the rights of civil society. He gave the following definition of civil society: "The civil society is a united body that is based on the universality of their needs, by providing legal structures to protect people's security and property, and their private and shared interests through external discipline."

The issues of civil society in the history of Russian political thought were more systematically reflected in the B. N. Chicherin, B. A. Kostyakovski and others.

For example, according to Chicherin, the essence of civil society is the entirety of relative self-sustaining civic unions. By saying this he is including family, religious organizations, private companies, public clubs, and so on.\(^{207}\)

---

There is also a unique position on the formation of civil society prerequisites Kostyakovski. In his opinion, civil society can become a reality in a legal or constitutional state. On the one hand, "the most important institution of the popular representation is the legal state", and on the other hand "the rule of law is the supreme form of statehood" and here only "the power is connected with the people."  

We can draw parallels on this to K. Marx who thinks civil society is more broadly understood than the nation and the state. In his opinion, the expression "civil society" emerged in the eighteenth century, when the property relations had already been liberated from the ancient and medieval society. Due to the release of private property from the public, the state has itself been allied with and outside the civil society. And the productive forces, classes, and private property forming the civil society constitute the necessary preconditions for the further development of public relations and the formation of a transcendental society.

On the basis of this, one can give a definition of civil society: it is one of the highest levels of society's development, with a set of self-governing public institutions and relationships that operate with other elements of the system of society, puts a leader (with its rights, freedoms and responsibilities).

Public self-governance, public opinion formation is carried out through a civil society mechanism. It is the whole of social groups, unions, and public associations, where self-governance is exercised.

It should be noted that the civil society system reflects:

1. Interrelationships between citizens, society and state institutions
2. Mechanisms for Citizens' Rights and Obligations Implementation
3. The structure of public institutions, forms and methods of organizing, as well as their role in organizing citizens' activities and political life, the economic, legal and political basis of the system of public relations.

---

208 Б. А. Кистяковский, Государство правовое и социалистическое, “Вопросы философии” 1990, № 6, pp. 141-159.
http://library.nlu.edu.ua/POLN_TEXT/KOMPLEKS/KURS_1/kurs/10/20_1.htm#_ftn1 (access: 18/01/2020).
In professional literature, they distinguish between different constituent elements in the structure of civil society, which, in turn, have a particular focus and clarity on the research of civil society.

In modern conditions, a comprehensive study of the elements of civil society emerging in nation-states becomes quite actual and urgent. Because even under the conditions of non-democratic political regimes, civil society constituents acquire certain specific mechanisms of formation.

In the civil society system, various political scientists distinguish a number of elements, which in their turn give rise to certain disagreements. Civil society includes political parties and clubs, lobbying organizations, public-political organizations and movements, charities, business associations, cultural and scientific organizations, independent mass-media, church and family.

A. Arato also touched upon the notion of civil society. He distinguished economically, politically and civil societies who had special operations and elements. He incorporated civic associations and movements into the civil society system and, on the other hand, removed political parties from the civil society system. He thinks that part of the political parties (the mass and pure party bodies) act in civil society, and the "parliamentary parties" in state systems.

Taking into consideration the national peculiarities of the current social development, some thinkers also highlight the existence and functioning of religious institutions in the system of civil society elements. In the civil society system it is inadmissible to have a dominant ideology, but sometimes the balanced civil society mechanisms can operate in similar systems. Moreover, different organizations have different meanings for each society. Thus, for example, in the Eastern European and post-Communist countries, various civil movements and associations were crucial to the pre-establishment of civil society. Among the constituent elements of the civil society...

---

society system, understood are especially organizations that are based and whose activities are targeted on the so-called "objective groups".

Trade unions, religious organizations, etc. are among such organizations, or different charities, funds, whose activities are targeted at "objective groups". For example, national minorities, pensioners, the disabled, students, youth, etc. Such organizations and institutions are of crucial importance not only in the civil society system, but also in the process of establishing a social and legal state. These organizations, as opposed to other elements of civil society, also have a well-defined social base. So trade unions belong to a number of civil society organizations that have "partners-opponents". At the same time, it should be noted that such relationships are necessary for the strengthening and development of the social structure in the civil society, which, in its turn, is the result of the creation of "objective groups".

As for the elements that make up the civil society, it should be borne in mind that there are certain sub-levels of self-affirmation of those elements. First of all, it is important to take into account the fact that self-governance, self-organization and public activity are not yet sufficient for civil society actors. For the latter, the existence or the necessity of forming the social base and "objective groups" is the criterion. That is, organizations that do not contain the above parameters can not be considered as subjects of civil society. It acts as a criterion for civil society and non-civil society entities. Here the problem is in the bilateral development of relations between the state and civil society.

Thus, subjects forming a civil society system can be divided into two big groups. The first one includes the entities that have "naturally" and in the second, the relatively stable "objective groups" and the clearly marked social foundation formed as a result of "acquired" or activity.

The forms and ways of civil society and state interrelations are diverse and varied and differ from each other by their organizational mechanisms. The study of the country's peculiarities in professional literature is related to the study of the characteristics of civil society and the study of the characteristics of civil society with
the study of the peculiarities of the state. Investigations and multifaceted studies of these issues are important for disclosing the peculiarities of both civil society and the state and state institutions. They are the main elements of a society's overall system and are the result of the organization and development of public relations and are only possible if there are certain economic, social, political and legal conditions. Just as the peculiarities of civil society definitely condition the forms of the state, the state also sets out the forms of civil society.

Due to the active work of the elements of the political system, there are prerequisites for the formation of a civil society in a certain historical period. The prerequisites for this prerequisite are the legal recognition and guarantee of human rights by the state. The state and civil society should not contradict one another, as conditions at a certain level of self-organization of the society are created for the formation of a social, legal state. Naturally, society's self-governance exists thanks to the state and civil society, because the "modern representational state" is shaped by the latter's operation.

So the nature of the relationship between the state and civil society expresses not only the legal and social protection of the individual in the given society, but also the degree of civil society development, its democratic identity and its diversity.

According A. Oganesyan, civil society is a "human society formed and developing in the democratic countries that is a network of non-governmental organizations (unions, organizations, associations, unions, centers, clubs, funds) voluntarily formed in all spheres of society's life, and a non-state relationship"[^210].

Even under totalitarian, monarchic regimes, there may be elements of civil society formation preconditions. However, the lack of necessary conditions that ensure the independence of these elements from the state power, the right to self-organization and self-employment deprives the public of the opportunity to be civilians. Here, it is important to be aware of the fact that every person knows exactly what limits he is protected from outside interference, and in what cases the state can

influence its implementation. Because both the totality and the "sovereignty... are incompatible with civil society and therefore can not be a form of civilian government"\textsuperscript{211}.

As some researchers find, the problem of the foundation of civil society is not only the state, but also the issues of the functioning and establishment of democratic mechanisms of other elements of the political system. At the same time, the establishment of civil society is the formation of institutions of self-organization and self-development, which is essential for ensuring a dignified and prosperous life of citizens. In contemporary conditions, democratic processes in different spheres of public life create certain prerequisites for the development of government institutions.

At the same time, the stages of the pre-formation of civil society also include certain elements of the formation of a legal, social state. socium shapes not only mechanisms for controlling the activities of state but also it undertakes principles on which the state can and must act.

It also envisages the reconstruction and democratization of political system and regime, public relations, as well as all sub-levels of the state apparatus and social-political structures. One should also note the fact that sometimes the state is not a political institution at that stage in the process of forming democratic institutions.

In terms of civil society formation and balanced functioning, the established state institutions are needed. Otherwise, these processes can be disastrous for both institutions simultaneously. In the case of each specific clause, civil society is characterized by unique principles and regularities that are still contradictory and varied. It is no coincidence that the regularities of the formation of civil society in professional literature and all forms of social activism are linked to the mechanisms of universal will, representation and implementation.

With civil society, the citizens are forming a unique field of activity and relationships in which they form the institutions, objective reasons, opportunities,

goals and mechanisms of functioning. As civil society is forming a unique social space in which people are independent of the state and other elements of the political system, so one another. In the process of state and civil society relationships, the political, economic, legal framework and overall behavior of citizens, social groups, are highlighted, giving a clear direction to the entire society, making the axis of political life.

Thus, in relation to the system of civil society and state relations, the following theoretically possible approaches are separated by different political scientists:

• Substitute, where one of them is the primary, from which the other is derived
• Dualistic, here they act in a twisted way
• Transparent or convergent where they act together in an isolated form
• Dialectics, here they are interdependent on one another and are in mutual dependence.

One should also take into account the fact that the dialectical unity of the state and civil society is a necessity at the initial stage of the formation of civil society. Because, on the one hand, for the civil society, the state is the basis of development, and on the other hand, the formation of the supreme form of state existence, the rule of law, becomes urgent for developed civil society. According to which all citizens are guaranteed a minimum level of civilized existence, which, in turn, provides the full range of civil rights for all members of society.

It is important to note that the change of the social structures causes first of all the change of the content and form of political institutions. Under such conditions, the authorities of the state are in the same way with the members of the society so that the position of each person does not contradict his legal consciousness and his human dignity.

According to a number of political analysts, sometimes there may be an etiquette that can lead to a slowdown in the process of weakening or forming a civil society. According to them, all this is sometimes conditioned by the expansion of the state’s social operations, which in some cases is not the case at all. It is noteworthy
that the expansion of legal and social operations of the modern state, as well as the
expansion of influence spheres, are not an end in itself for all spheres of social life.
Because, as defined by a number of conservatives and liberals, modern
representational state depends of a certain level of civil society development.
Naturally, the activation of public institutions and the democratization of public life
expands both on the basis of the self-governing mechanisms of the civil society system
and the social functions of the state power. The discrepancy between these two
processes results in weakening of public order. For example, in the former USSR, at a
certain level of reconstruction processes, when public confidence diminished against
the government’s administrative institutions, and the process of expanding the social
functions of the Councils slowed, democracy in the majority of the people was
unilaterally identified with liberalization.

Obviously, the expansion of the social functions of the state should not be
regarded as a weakening. In the process of interaction between the state and civil
society, a functional mechanism is formed, where civil society controversies are
mediated by state problems, but on the contrary, they mediate these issues directly
reflecting the functioning of the state and its institutions, creating the necessity of
relevant legislation. The policy carried out by the state authorities and its structures
gives an opportunity to identify the main issues on which the direction of the state
institution are of.

Under modern conditions of globalization, the transition from the "state-
center” model to the "society-center” model takes place in the unified system of state
and non-state institutions where the power operates not only from top to bottom, but
also from bottom to top. In other words, the main problem is the improvement of the
quantitative and qualitative aspects of the relationship between the state and civil
society, as well as the improvement of the so-called convergence and governance
mechanisms. However, it should be noted that the formation of public institutions is
still insufficient for the development of self-governance mechanisms and the
formation of civil society. Its shaping is a more complicated process. If the role of the
state’s functions is to strengthen political stability and to ensure constitutional provision of public relations, it is the guarantee of civil society, social justice, accountability and civil rights.

The basis of every democratic society is the idea that those directly affected by public decisions have the right to participate in the decision-making process. In a real democratic society, it is common for the public to determine where he wants to go, and the role of publicly elected representatives and their staff in bringing the public to that target. The term "citizen participation" confirms that every citizen has the right to vote in public administration (including local government), and the government’s (central or local) obligation is to educate citizens, educate and engage in public planning, and involvement in various decision-making and implementation processes opportunities. Citizens' participation is a process through which they have a certain impact on public decision-making that directly affects their lives.

*Figure 3.2.1. Types of citizen participation*

Citizens' participation may be:

- **Active** when citizens collaborate with the staff of their own Public Administration Unit to influence public decisions.
- **Passive** when citizens simply attend public meetings to get information on new public administration unit programs or to participate in the elections.

Source: Robert Nahapetyan
Participatory capacities, in particular, are also useful for reaching a consensus on achieving public governance.

Thus, in the democratic theory, civil society has become a powerful analytical concept, as well as a fuss that inspired public figures to seek more democracy. In recent years, the concept of civil society has been seen as a significant revival thanks to the change of the former Communist regime in Central and Eastern Europe. That is why humanity is convinced that democratization requires a strong and stable civil society to empower citizens to express their concerns and participate in political life.

Formation of civil society is historically associated with the emergence of state, state power and structure, as well as with other elements of the political system of the society through which civil and civic activities are carried out. It is also conditioned by the political consciousness and culture of the society, the mechanisms of implementation of political culture, as well as the national mentality and everything connected with the adoption and application of civil and public decisions.

*Figure 3.2.2. Functions of civil society*

In summary, the following functions of civil society can be distinguished:

- **Provides for the protection of the main spheres of society on the basis of law**
- **Civil society associations build and develop public institution governing mechanisms**
- **It is considered to be a very important and powerful lever in the system of "counterbalances and restraints", protecting the activities of citizens and their associations from the illegal interference of the state and, at the same time, contributes to the formation and development of democratic institutions of the state**
- **Civil society institutions and organizations are called to ensure the equal participation of individuals in state and public affairs**

Source: Robert Nahapetyan
Civil society exercises sanctions against the state, which makes it possible for individuals to maintain social norms. It creates special structures on which all social life is based.

If the state power is legally and socially limited in a developed civil society system, the boundaries of the political power operating in an undeveloped civil society are infinite, comprehensive and in some ways uncertain. In the civil society, institutions of the social state have a special place and role of its own. That is to say, not only about the legal protection of people, but also about social, economic, moral and psychological protection.

Civil society development stands as a freedom and as a necessity. Freedom is a necessity, and the need for freedom. In R. Aaron’s words, "free society" is a society where "most people have some freedom, but none of them has total freedom to be omnipotent"\textsuperscript{212}.

3.3 Citizen skills, interests – capabilities of citizens (social capital)

The Evolution of Civic Consciousness: Political Culture

Classifications

It is clear that the option of full communicative agreement between a citizen and the state seems ideal. In reality, in each individual case, the level of consent may be higher or lower depending on the cultural and historical characteristics of a particular society.

These processes are fundamental to the definition of "civil society" in the opinion of researchers, who understands it as a certain type of communication process between the state and the citizen\(^{213}\). In a society where there is an intersubjective discourse of a citizen and a state, on the basis of a wide representation of social interests, a basis arises for developing a common value system for all citizens and a context is generated within which it becomes possible to resolve social conflicts arising in society by coordinating efforts on a compromise basis. According to A. Giddens, a gradual increase in communicative discourse is one of the important characteristics of modernity. From the point of view of E. Wallerstein, the evolutionary changes in the world, the emergence and institutionalization of global communication testifies to the systematic advancement of humanity in the direction of a global civil society.

These features, according researchers, reflecting in the three-dimensional concept of “civic culture”, characterized, on the one hand, as a form of realization of civil society, and on the other, as a way of action of a citizen in society.

First, it is the socio-cultural foundations of citizenship and civic culture. Defining empirical indicators of civic culture research, the following groups of indicators are distinguished:

1. Civil duties: level of activity and forms of participation.

2. A sense of civic competence: does a person have influence on decisions of the government, city or district authorities, etc.; What methods does a citizen use to influence power? What is in this case a driving belt - friends, a political party, an informal organization, legal bodies, courts, elections - and determines the degree of legitimization of administrative and political institutions.

3. Civil society and personality research: the communication process implies that its main participants are able to perceive each other's messages, to find compromise solutions to the problems arising during the dialogue. The lack of a type of person capable of such a dialogue indicates a violation of normal discourse between a citizen and a state.

4. Civic consciousness: attention to events in the country; assessment of government performance; the possession of information and the presence of one's own opinion (studies have shown that the higher the level of civic culture in society, the closer the connection between the level of awareness and having one's own opinion).

The third and fourth group of indicators in this classification refers to the micro level of research of civic participation within the framework of the concept of civil society, the object of which is an individual, citizen, civil society. A necessary condition for the formation and development of civic participation is the existence of a certain type of personality. It is characterized, on the one hand, by a high level of individual autonomy in relation to society in general and to state power in particular (many authors define such a person as self-valuable and self-sufficient). On the other hand, this type of personality is characterized by the ability to interact constructively with other individuals for the sake of common goals, interests, values, as well as the ability to subordinate their private interests and ways of achieving them to the common good, as expressed in legal norms. For the formation of this type of social subjects, certain institutional prerequisites are necessary, first and foremost a minimum of democratic rights and freedoms that make both autonomy of the
individual and the self-organization of citizens possible and legitimate in order to uphold common interests and goals.

In political behavior (culture) rank it is most frequently adopted being lead by G. Almond and S. Verba “The Civil Culture and Sustainability of Democracy”\(^{214}\) theory some of the research combinations of which have had a significant impact on the formulation of this study\(^{215}\). As a culture types disclosure criteria they have taken the person’s interests of political life or values and behavior patterns, various aspects, or entirely, which describe the state government and citizens relationships and so on. They singled out a total of three types of clean, as well as three kinds of hidden or secret political cultures. Many authors agree with their rank, some not, but in this research framework it is important to consider study object societies within ranking of these authors either of such logic and of such observation.

Their so-called pure types of the political culture include those classified as patriarchal or capricious, subjective or obedience, and finally any activist or participatory political cultures.

First of all, patriarchal political culture according authors’ opinion is typical of those societies, where virtually it’s absent of the knowledge of the state and its values, example of which may be African sociums, standard tribes, and clearly is typical of it, as that they do not have a specific and specialized political roles, where local leaders and shamans do not have or express sentiment for central government, their relationship is not covered by any rules. Such a political culture can be preserved in well advanced industrialized countries as well due to fact, that worldview of majority of their citizens is limited in attachment with their districts, towns. So of its part, subjective political culture, in Almond and Verba, is culture as of dependence and lower identification, which is specific to such societies, where it is known what is political institutions, organizations and so on, but where political power is describing


\(^{215}\) Although the questionnaires are not published, the questions are generally presented in a document containing the combinations: The Five Nation Study Codebook, 129 pages.
of a top - down - driven political norms in form, as of whole, which naturally need to be realizing, to which need to be subjecting, of having in expectations of welfare or punishment. Such a political culture has of place in such societies, where citizens enjoy of fairly low political activism, and so of generally has a passive character. As of activist political culture, the authors believe it is characterized by prevailing political discoursing over direction of citizen, and, naturally, by citizens' active participation in of political structures functioning. And such is political culture there, where instructions, orders of top are accompanied by a bottom-up interest of citizen toward political decision-making and approval processes. Although of this classification, the authors believe that in practice, this pure species in the mixed form. In real circumstances, patriarchal and subjective political cultures co-exist due to the patriarchal-subjective kind of socium, so it belong in these species, and accordingly, patriarchal and activist political cultures exist, as of patriarchal-activist type of socium, and the subjective and activist political cultures exist, as of subjective-activist type of socium, on the example of post-Soviet states, which is marked by civil society activity displays but nevertheless in political mentality still it kind of exists as in perception and desire of importance of the Soviet paternalistic care, of ox government direction, power resolution. Although this classification is not the only one in it kind, but exposure of socium's political culture and its component sub-culture, and of therefore, expected behavior measuring of socium due for transition process onto next level of prospect, is important to identifying with this classification proposed types, with and because of measures of modern Armenian political culture, society members and political institutions behavior characteristics outline within impartial analysis, it is possible of identification and compilations of general description, identification of it with any kind of such classification is also possible, and that way we can predict the behavior of experimental developments, compare progress with other societies of characteristics and make appropriate assumptions, conclusions into political culture.

Political culture differentiation in Armenia now arrange a need for Armenian kind of political culture in-depth analysis and its typological identification, need for
which is of following a number of reasons. So first, public opinion keep on until now as if Armenian public political culture as such is having a unitary kind, which is especially relevant in time of the administrative – command political kind structuring. In addition to this, in conditions of the sharp differentiation and even of it polarization of population, related to transition to market system, changes in socio-economic structure, replacement of public property with private ownership, original accumulation of capital and other issues, subcultures in the social strata start of it arise and spread, whose continuous fighting of rights and interests implementation threatens to not only society’s progress, but also its normal functioning. Finally, certain mismatch and hole noticeable into sequence of generational political cultures. Existence of such factors in Armenia actually brings necessity of scientific analysis of the types of political cultures, and based on this distinction, thorough study of their behavior, motives and analysis of conflict situations, non-compliances mitigation options, methods and international experience. It is important in not only perception of political culture and its essence, exploring of its development trends, but also up-follows from goal in maintaining political stability. Although the problem is very important and urgent, my position is to leave it to politicians and social policy analysts discretion, and subject drift to concentrate of political culture maturation and its level increasing issues.

Herfried Myunkler considers one of the important qualities of a person, determining the possibility of achieving the goals set - the presence of habitual competence. Habitual competence means having the ability, skills, and internal attitudes necessary to ensure that knowledge about the structure of the political system and actually existing ways to solve emerging problems is complemented by appropriate practical activity, so that knowledge turns into a desire for concrete actions.

Overall, at present, the level of political culture in Armenia and its constituent social commonalities now considers to be quite low, although there have been some positive developments in terms of civil society consolidation and initial self-
awareness. The culture of political decision-making, the exercise of the functions of state power, and the resolution of regularly occurring political and social conflicts remain low. Administrative relationship culture, as well as adequate and timely response capabilities of governors and of governed in changes taking place in economic, social, political and spiritual aspects of life are also in need of improvement. The political culture of relationships between parties, organizations, movements, and others also needs to be developed, as even in the present circumstances, even political debate turns into a process of personal insults and labeling, account clearing and mutual down-taking arena, a gladiatorial struggle through which mass media is not left idle and inactive, using all their creative potential, dramatically presenting the reality as much as possible and encouraging the heroes of their material continue to behave in such a way, while distracting the public, those same organizations and their own selves from real, important issues or sensible ways of addressing so that can be achieved through constructive discussion and collaboration. Speaking of Armenia and its media, we see the issue of increasing their political and ethical culture, which, however, is only possible with all increasing of public political culture same time or afterwards, as Armenia and its mass media is a characterizing mirror of socium, and it development and maturity level is directly proportional into level of development of socium, it subcultures. What all this shows us, in such situation of political culture, talking about formation or maturation of civil society and the rule of law still stay in the air and can not be turned into concrete actions and steps sr.

In politics, there are two known personality studies in relation to civil society, which deserve the name of classical ones. The first is the study of T. Adorno "Authoritarian Personality"\textsuperscript{216}. In accordance with the concept of this study, the orientation of a person towards the type of managerial communication is laid at a young age, in a family. The second study, the study of D. Riesman, has other conceptual foundations. Here the author focuses on the three main types of personality that are present in society and determine its civilian communication. The

\textsuperscript{216} T. Adorno, \textit{The authoritarian personality}, Harper 1950.
first type is “externally oriented”. This is a type typical of a traditional society in which external coercion, be it coercion by a tribe or a state, plays a very significant role. The second type is “internally oriented” or, as Riesman writes, a person with a gyrocompass inside. He is characterized by certain values, a certain type of perception of the world around him, which remain unchanged throughout his life. This type is more consistent with developed civil communication, but at the same time it is static, incapable of spontaneous dialogue, modification of the language of discourse. The third type is most adapted to a developed civic culture, a type capable of changing, perceiving new values. Riesman describes him as a “radar personality”.

Despite differences in concepts, both authors use approximately the same set of empirical indicators. This kit includes:

- level of tolerance;
- the level of xenophobia (revealed through attitudes towards national and other minorities);
- attitudes to political action (preferred mode of action, etc.).

One of the ideologies of a democratic society is the notion that it is a society of active, loyal citizens, supporting the existing political system, having the right and political means to influence its functioning and political decision-making. In general, this ideas certainly reflect reality. However, one thing is that citizens have the right to actually participate in political processes in society, and another is to what extent they want to exercise this right and, more importantly, feel competent to use it.

Numerous case studies with convincing consistency show that the majority of citizens are content with the consciousness that they can influence political decisions, x no lot of participants really to have an solution. no x polling data alone an indicator of citizens' political consciousness, and the degree of civic participation is not the result of only a conscious decision. So, those who feel more root in society and the local community and less likely to vote with weak social or local identification, young people, the unemployed, unskilled workers, and poorly educated vote. Older people, family, having a job, attending church (this applies to countries with developed
religious traditions, that is, where religion occupies a significant place in the daily lives of people) are more likely to participate in elections.

But at the same time, those who have more opposition moods and who are overwhelmed with the determination to change the existing state of affairs are more likely to take part in the voting.

According to D. McAdam, the first studies of public participation focused on two main and interrelated issues: 1) conditions generating collective action, 2) psychological and socio-structural factors of participation in civic activism. To this day, these issues are relevant, but at the same time and controversial. Moreover, the very concept of activism (civic, political), denoting the name of a new branch of politics knowledge, is defined by many authors in the context of collective action and through collective action, while remaining controversial and debatable217.

A more “philosophical” European scientific tradition seeks to conceptualize public participation as a theoretical construct218, in which political explanation, as well as theoretical tradition, play a central role.

By operationalizing the concept of activism (civic activism, political activism), there are several levels of its definition. The result is either a hierarchical model or a description of the diversity of organizational forms depending on the context. R. Eyerman distinguishes such planes as: collective behavior, institution, new civic activism, resource mobilization, intellectual context, political and cultural context, interpretation context219.

From the point of view of A. Touraine, it is impossible to define an object called activism without first choosing a general way of analyzing social life, with the help of which a certain category of facts could be established.

There are empirical studies of social conflicts, but often it is not clear what they are actually talking about. What does not prevent some of them from having more value in terms of the description of certain events.

A. Touraine identifies three main elements of social life, which he considers as the basis for defining the phenomenon of civic activism:

- a subject taken in distance from organized practice;
- historicity, that is, a set of cultural patterns (cognitive, economic, ethical) and the place of the central social conflict;
- activism struggling to give a social form to the named cultural models.

Among the selected elements, the main role in the transformation process belongs to activism, when independent collective actors radically transform the existing social system, established rules, norms, and social organization. According to A. Touraine, in activism of collective conflict activity is aimed at establishing social control over cultural models and historicity. So should not mean any force of change, or any type of collective action, but is intended to mean truly social conflicts, that is, those who question public control over the models of creating relationships between a specific social whole that can be named for reasons of convenience of society and its environment. The aforementioned activism is a new concept in relation to everything that could be called “social forces”, etc.220 This definition allows you to isolate from other types of collective action. First of all, some collective actions can be seen as expressions of crisis, growth or decline, disorganization or diversification of the social system. In the same way, collective actions can be viewed as the pressure of a social group in order to enter a system of political decisions in order to gain influence or, on the contrary, have the opportunity to resist the system. Another, rather opposite point of view is defended by N. Smelser, who believes that society produces itself, generates in this particular situation 221.

---

Since the 1960s, the study of civic activeness has been incorporated into politics, as a special field that seemed to have little relevance to the broader issues of theory and history\textsuperscript{222}. A society that turned to a social system free of ideology put civic activism outside of history, interest groups, and social democratic unions that were replaced by activism in many countries. School was not ready for a new wave of civic activeness that began in the late 1950s and continue to this day.

The sixties and seventies (for the former socialist countries of Eastern Europe, the eighties) were the time of the emergence of new activism, unusual forms of social and political mobilization (party - unions, party - "network", party - "anti-party", etc.) development of an alternative sector of the economy (entrepreneurship without the goal of making a profit, self-help associations, etc.), developing ethical norms with their subsequent legislative design, etc. These processes, which are a reflection of the new reality or a social space, a new concept of relations between representatives of authorities and equalistic structures become of control in a certain way in it’s law.

The third sector was one of the main, and in many concepts and the only one, the referent of citizens.

The activities of public associations are considered in the context of the study of the institutions of social interaction and social partnership. Moreover, the distinctive features of the modern initial stage of the formation of a civil society in post-communist countries are the activities of initiative, self-governing associations of citizens, which are aimed at solving common problems and protecting common interests not related to the conquest of power. Mass campaigns and speeches of citizens, the activities of parties, three-sided commissions, meetings and other institutions are investigating as sort of institutions of function representation of interests. The totality of such institutions is considered as a system of direct, non-mediated election links between interest groups and authorities. At the same time, scientists show that their main purpose is not to make government decisions by

citizens, but to exert influence on government bodies and officials, ensuring the representation of the interests of various social groups at the state level.

Analyzing the current trends in the definition of civil society, B. Barber in his work “Civil Society: Beyond Rhetoric: A framework of political understanding” identifies three models. And only in one of these models (in the three-sector one) does he single out such a phenomenon and concept as “civic participation”.

1 model. The prospect of a free market: civil society as a synonym for the private sector (two-cell model).

According to B. Barber, this is the most banal understanding of civil society, which represents it as a synonym for the private market. In principle, the structure of this model comes from the understanding of social space as a kind of two-cell entity: a concept that divides this model into two sectors - public and private. They constantly compete with each other, and, in fact, are rather difficult to combine, and the public sector extols over the private, i.e. is dominant in relation to the state and government institutions. The second sector is dominant in everything else: from an individual to social organizations, from economic corporations to public associations. Studying this perspective, there is a feeling that the public sector relies mainly on power, strength, while the private sector relies on freedom and, consequently, on individuality, and this, as a result, leads to the thesis that any growth, any increase in one sector invariably leads to decline, exhaustion in another. More power - less freedom, more private - less public. And vice versa. According to the dichotomy of freedom and power, private and public, this classically liberal model allows for the existence of civil society only in the private sector. In my opinion this model limits understandings of public and shows only as contradictions of two sectors.

2 model. Communitarian perspective: civil society as a synonym for community (two cell model).

---

The communitarian perspective does not ignore the two-cell framework that the first model offers. Supporters of this model do not deny the division of social space into two sectors opposing each other. Because they recognize that people are woven into various communities and are connected to each other by obligations that presuppose and condition their individuality, communitarianists see society not just as a game space for people and their voluntary organizations, but as a complex of promiscuous social relationships that bind people in families, clans, community, hierarchy. Communitarianists recognize that most associations are prescribed rather than voluntary. If the main actor of the civil society of the liberal model is a consumer endowed with rights, then in the communitarian model is a member of a community who feels connected with similar origins, blood and traditions. In my opinion, even as it still recognizes contradictions of sectors, it still shows community as how public works, but still lacks relations of liberal kind.

3 model. Civil society as the third, intermediate dominant between the government and the market (three-cell model).

What was common in the previous concepts was that they both divide the social space into two cells: public and private. The three cell model of Barber does not simply constitute two cells — public and private, but separates a third one from them: a civil cell, which includes social communities that are built simultaneously on a membership basis (ie, hierarchy) and on an egalitarian (voluntary) basis. This third sector does not include organizations such as the church or national associations. Without being private, the third sector incorporates the principles of egalitarianism and non-exclusivity from the public sector, and from the private sector the voluntariness and sovereignty of the individual. According to Barber, a new social cell is being formed, which is a synthesis of the first two, and only in such a cell can true forms of civic participation, in which active and responsible actors are involving. In my opinion, by showing relations of sectors, this model separates civic sector, which ideally shows it on similar levels but can't show civicness in 2 sectors.
The dominant of a particular model in research reflects the process of rethinking the role of civil society at the moment. The third model, highlighted by Barber, became relevant after the Second World War. It received a significant impetus at the turn of the 60s – 70s. when social protest activism became particularly active: strike campaigns, anti-war activism, “youth riot” activism, the formation of “countercultural” flows, etc.

The key point in this three-sector model, in the opinion of modern researchers, is the relationship between the state (1 sector) and non-governmental, public organizations (3 sectors). Despite this recognition of the role of non-governmental organizations in defining civil society, it should be noted that the main criticism of Western researchers focused on the concept of civil society focused on the representation of civil society as a set of non-governmental organizations and their key role realized through civil participation.

So, T. Carothers considers it a delusion to put forward the thesis that non-governmental organizations are the core of civil society. In his opinion, this is not obvious. At the core of existing enthusiasm for civil society is in many respects the admiration and enthusiasm for non-governmental organizations, in particular, such as public interest groups. However, it would be a mistake to equate NGOs and civil society. In the right sense, civil society is a broader concept, encompassing all organizations and associations that exist outside the state, including political parties and the market. It includes a whole range of organizations that political analysts traditionally call interest groups - not only non-governmental organizations, but also trade unions, professional associations, ethnic associations, religious organizations, student unions, cultural organizations, sports clubs. Non-governmental organizations do play an important and growing role in developed and developing countries. However, in many countries, NGOs have been supplanted by more traditional institutions of civil society. Another weak feature of NGOs in new democracies is

dependence on foreign investors, providing them with funds that they cannot count
on at home.

The strongest accusation addressed to the activities of NGOs is the accusation
of diverging the content of the slogan about the independence of NGOs - “Civil society
does not take money from the government - and the real state of affairs. When civil
society institutions in a dictatorship stand for freedom, a key element of their political
honesty is complete independence from government. In countries with a democratic
regime operates a completely different system of rules. Many manifestations of civic
participation are funded by the government. In Western Europe, for example, there
is widespread government support for civic participation, including the activities of
groups that challenge the government, for example, environmental protection
organizations, unions of the struggle for human rights. The study, Comparative
Analysis of the Nonprofit Sector, sponsored by Johns-Hopkins University, showed
that the government is almost twice as big a source of income for American non-profit
organizations than private contributions, despite the existence of numerous funds and
funding programs in America\textsuperscript{225}.

So in spite all criticisms, the level of trust in representatives of public non-
governmental organizations for a long time remains quite high. For example, in the
eyear 1980s, according to the data of the German Institute for Applied Social Research
(INFAS), in public opinion, civil initiatives aimed at preserving the environment were
much more credible than government actions of this kind\textsuperscript{226}. And according to a study
in France, non-governmental organizations believe five times more than the
government, and nine times more than the media\textsuperscript{227}. Such indicators speak for
themselves. Half of the polled citizens in the USA, Great Britain, Germany and


\textsuperscript{226} H. Zillessen, \textit{Citizens’ Participation in Decision-Making Processes in Energy and Environmental Policy},
współczesność}, Część III, Warszawa 1999 docplayer.pl/5222930-Ewa-les-dzialalnoscdobroczynna-w-
europeie-i-ameryce-tradycje-i wspolczescnosc-czesc-iii.html, pp. 12-16.

\textsuperscript{227} E. Leś, \textit{Działalność dobroczynna w Europie i Ameryce: Tradycje i współczesność}, Część III, Warszawa
1999, pp. 10-12.
Australia said that they were more inclined to trust non-governmental organizations than their authorities, only 11% firmly supported the latter’s correctness.

Researchers point out that the popularity of public non-governmental organizations is due to successful compensation from civic participation to the ineffectiveness of the representation system in ensuring the realization of common interests and access to the influence of citizens on the political process. Political parties are less able to perform the function of representing the public interest. This is due to the fact that political parties have actually merged with interest groups, on the one hand, and with various state power structures, on the other.

Methodological areas of studying various forms of civic participation (institutional, non-institutional, mobilization, collective) are most developed in the field of studying civic activism. Their methodological apparatus enables us to proceed to the operationalization of the concept of civic participation within the framework of the theories of civic activism, allows us to evaluate the dynamics of the internal processes of a separate public association, as well as to determine the features of the network matrix of relations with the external environment and the mechanisms for building these relations.

A comparative analysis of the main theoretical models of collective action presented in classical research was carried out by Ch. Tilly. In his opinion, the Weberian tradition is close to the modern paradigmatics of research of civic actions. M. Weber considers organizations and beliefs that reflect interests as factors of a “non-routine” collective action, and organizations and interests, which in turn are determined by beliefs, are factors of a “routine” action. Such a presentation is different from the tradition dating back to D.S. Mills, who considers collective action as a set of individual actions related to individual interests. According researchers, these differences determine the initial positions within which modern researchers of collective action work and from which they repel each other.

The main result of classical research, according to one of the main theorists and methodologists of the study of civic active, A. Touraine, is that it leaves very little
room for the idea of collective (social) action: "... The more people talk about society, the less they speak about its actors, as the latter are perceived simply as carriers of the attributes inherent in the place they occupy in the social system". A. Touraine advocates the idea that the concept of society should be excluded from the analysis of social life. But at the same time it is considered possible and necessary to describe another type of analysis, in the center of which is the idea of social action. The central point of this idea is the separation of the actor from the system, and moving the focus to consider their interdependence: “... If classical research brought together culture, social organization and evolution to form the large cultural, social and historical ensembles that it called societies we will strive to separate them from each other, in order to create a problem space where research can fit”.

Analyzing traditions, various approaches in study, R. Eyerman identifies three fields in the context structure that define the problem and subject areas of these approaches.

- Intellectual context.
- Political and cultural context.
- Activism as cognitive practices.

Consider the problematics of each of these fields in more detail, while conducting an analysis of the concepts relied upon by R. Eyerman.

1. Intellectual context.

The starting point for understanding the difference between approaches of activism is recognition that three dominant schools have taken root in different intellectual traditions based on different levels of practices of civic activism. Particularists focusing on individual motivation and socialization relate to the actor level, in which viewed as associations of individuals, where interest is focused on individual actions and reactions. School resource mobilization focuses on the group level of organizations and teams, where individuals are treated as depersonalized units in decision-making situations. Theorists turn to the macro level of analysis, where

movements are viewed as historical actors, ingrained social forces expressing long-term trends.

In the discussion about the role of collective action, civic participation in the development and transformation of society, particularists advocate the point of view that it is engine of social change and put forward a number of problematic issues that need to be considering:

- How is it possible to unite subjects, their concentration and organization into collective actions that can question the central forms of social domination and thus become real?

- How can defensive reactions turn, passing through intermediate levels of collective action, through a level of social organization or a level of decision-making?

It starts deny the possibility for the state to interfere in public (private) life, at the same time that it disputes social relations and the way resources are appropriated, is controlled by a specific team that feels threatened and tries to protect its identity or its interests. M. Castells believes its formed when defensive functions are complementing by offensive ones, calls into question the method of building society’s relations with the environment, forms of social influence and, consequently, production mechanisms of social and cultural practices. It can be said that research occurs outside the defensive functions of restoring any element of the social order, but fits into the framework of studying the factors of change, at least to the extent that they are institutionalized mechanisms.

M. Castells formulated some general orientations undergo structural transformation. According to it, is arise through the connection:

(1) a special type of structural combination,

(2) a special type of organization. 

---


The basis of such a compound, an alloy for Ch. Tilly, is the following principal components, which are the basis of collective action:

1) own resources, and their use by the organization to achieve
2) common goals\(^{231}\).

Collective action is often accompanied by derivative requirements for other organizations. They arise because the members of the organization believe that they:

1) need resources controlled by another organization to achieve a collective goal;
2) have rights to these resources.

Thus, the scope of collective actions in a certain period and in a certain place is mainly a function of: 1) mobilization; 2) influence in relation to other organizations; 3) sanctions measures applied to such actions; and 4) the reasonableness with which these requirements are imposed on other organizations.

As opposed to collective behaviorism, the theory of resource mobilization had as its starting point an analysis of the organization, not the individual. Thus, the central issue is not the question of why individuals join, whether their intentions as participants are rational or irrational, but rather the question of the effectiveness of the resources used by the organization to achieve its goals. In other words, not who are the actors, or what motivates them, and which are more successful. Success here is defined as a function of how well defined organizational goals are and how effectively resources are used — people, finances, ideas — in mobilizing support as well as establishing institutions express as of goals of civic activism.

In accordance with the “mobilization model”, Ch. Tilly collective action is the result of factors such as 1) the structure of political opportunities and 2) barriers to the realization of interests, 3) the behavior of the authorities and 4) mobilization, the success of which is ensured by the presence of 5) organizations, 6) awareness of interests, 7) interaction with various counterparties. Collective action, mobilization

and opportunities are the main categories of the historical and sociological approach of Ch. Tilly232. The merit of this author is the enrichment of the conceptual arsenal in the study of collective actions, the introduction of new concepts into the scientific circulation, in particular the concept of “repertoire of collective actions”.

The most successful collective actions are described by Ch. Tilly as developing from 1) organizations to 2) mobilization, 3) understanding common interests and 4) achieving concrete opportunities to act collectively233.

Civic actions in this interpretation are a means of mobilizing group resources in the case when people do not have institutional means to express their interests or when their needs are repressed. The extent to which people can express their interests under the conditions of the existing system determines the methods of their actions, up to and including open confrontation with the authorities.

Lobbying is a common resource mobilization mechanism. Traditionally, this phenomenon has been investigated within the framework of corporatism234. This concept considers lobbying as actions carried out by interest groups, which are institutional structures (business, trade union, religious, ethnic, cultural, etc.). These groups, without claiming political power, try to influence it, mediating in ensuring the specific interests of their members.

American scientists G. Almond and B. Powell distinguish four types of interest groups235:

1. spontaneous, i.e. spontaneously organized, often protest-oriented (manifestations, etc.);
2. institutional, i.e. Formal organizations, in addition to expressing interests, are endowed with other functions (party, assembly, administration);
3. non-associative, i.e. informal, non-permanent and non-violent, formed on the basis of kinship, religion, etc. (religious sect, student group);

233 Ibid., p.16.
235 Ibid., pp. 71-78.
4. associative, i.e. voluntary organizations specializing in the expression of interests (trade unions, groups of business people, ethnic and religious associations).

Another important point in the concept of resource mobilization is the separation between the concept of action and “organization of activism”, and an attempt to identify for each action a particular sector, sometimes called the industry, within which various organizations coexist\textsuperscript{236}.

A somewhat different focus on the study put by the English researcher C. Pickvance, emphasizing the “form of organization” of\textsuperscript{237}. According to C. Pickvance, organization is the wrong starting point for the study of civic activism. But this does not mean that we should ignore specific manifestations of activism in the form of organization, or as the American author R. Ash called them, the “activism of organizations”. The starting point of the study is the study of the "core" of the organization, which determines the structural determination of motion\textsuperscript{238}.

The third dominant school, the intellectual tradition singled out by R. Eyerman in the intellectual context of studying in accordance with different levels of the practice of activism, is the theory of new activism. Many of the recent research discussions about the conceptualization of activism were determined by their attitude to the "new" and "old" activism. Some researchers argue that new ones differ from old ones in their classless specificity\textsuperscript{239}. This means that new activism in our time do not strive for political results as well as for "cultural" or sociocultural changes\textsuperscript{240}. From another point of view, we are entering a new mode of production, which, while awakening new social conflicts, gives rise to new activism, expanding and diversifying public space.

It should also be noted the emergence of the new term “public anti-actions”, emphasizing the closed nature of associations. The anti-action is designed to protect the community and its consensus against external influence. The fact that in some circumstances can open up, as a civic activism, in other circumstances, can be closed in the form of anti-actions, such as, for example, as action of community protection.

Close to this direction, the concept of “community” was conceptualized. Many of the problems in defining various concepts are caused by estimated-loaded ideas, for example, about the “warmth” of the community spirit, etc. The concept of “community” is categorized within the framework of the three main areas coming from the traditions of North America and Britain, as follows:\textsuperscript{241} 1) the community as an institution of solidarity, 2) the community as a “primary” interaction; 3) the community as an institutionally special group.

2. Political and cultural context.

Different directions in approaches of activism are also determined by factors of differences in the political structure of different countries, the societal context, and the role played by activism in this context. For example, in the early 40’s, T. Parsons wrote an essay entitled “Sociological Aspects of Fascist Movements,”\textsuperscript{242} in which he explains the rational basis of events taking place in Europe and the Far East. He aspires to build his explanation politically correctly, referring to the classical theories of M. Weber and E. Durkheim.

Further, in the 1960s, in his symbolic-interactionist perspective, Blumer draws attention to the emergence of new forms in “adaptive behavior”, a problem-containing and learning orientation potentially represented in spontaneous collective behavior. Similarly to the innovative manner of symbolic interactionism, Smelser’s Theory of Collective Behavior was based on a structurally functionalist position regarding the creative role of notion\textsuperscript{243}. Smelser explains the structural-functional approach of activism, identifying six conditions that influence their appearance and

development: “structural conduciveness”, the qualities of individual societies to
develop various possibilities for protest; “Structural stress” ("structural strains"),
current causes of discontent; “Generalized beliefs”, the role of ideologies and
ideologues in shaping protests, accepted by actors; “Accelerating, mobilizing factors”
(“precipitating factors”) that incite protest; “Leadership and communication”,
direction and coordination; and finally, the “action of social control”.

Developing the structural-functionalist tradition, J. Cohen in the early 80s
summarized the following assumptions244:

1. There are two separate types of actions: institutional-conventional and
non-institutional-collective.

2. Non-institutional-collective is an action that is carried out not in accordance with existing social norms, but due to an uncertain and unstructured situation.

3. These situations are understood as a failure in the activities of social control bodies, or in the adequacy of regulatory integration caused by structural changes.

4. As a result of structural stress - discontent, frustration and aggression lead individuals to participate in collective actions, activism.

5. Noninstitutional and collective behavior develops in accordance with the “life cycle”: from spontaneous unorganized action to the formation of civic activism.

6. The emergence and growth of civic activism in this cycle occurs through spontaneous processes of communication: distribution, (infection), rumors, etc..

Differences in approaches are due and closely related to the operationalization of the concept of activism. For the "particularists" and for most of the researchers involved in the mobilization of resources, civic activism is shown in as empirically. In fact, according to R. Eyerman, it is rarely defined comprehensively, rather, in each

individual study is studied as a specific empirical phenomenon. For particularists, the study of civic activism starts with the consideration of the actor, and thus the definition is made on the basis of a specific study. For the school of resource mobilization, civic activism is defined in operational terms: civic activism is dissolved in specific mobilization and recruiting mechanisms that are analyzed. In one of the articles by C. Taylor, based on the results of the study, he writes: “What we call activism actually consists of a series of requirements for the power holders. There is no pronounced political position in the definition of this social category”245.

In this cognitive approach, civic activism is considered as a product of knowledge, in a procedural focus. Using the term “cognitive practice,” R. Eyerman emphasizes the creative role of cognition in individual and collective actions246.

He sees cognitive practice as a transforming group of individuals into civic activism, and as giving special meaning and consciousness its. His approach focuses on the process of articulating the identity of activism (cognitive practice), on the actors involved in this process (activism intellectuals), and on the context of articulation (political culture and institutions).

Turning to the current trends in research, it is important to note that the approach of most modern researchers is selective. They are not trying to explain all aspects of their actions or to pretend that their conceptualization is applicable for all cases of manifestation of this activity. M. Diani describes civic activism as “rounds of informal interactions of a multitude of individuals, groups or organizations, basing on collective identity they share in political or cultural conflict”. Diani draws attention to the fact that the term “collective identity” in the understanding of the developers of this paradigm is synonymous with the term “solidarity”247.

The concept of “collective identity” introduced A. Melucci into this theoretical direction248. He defines this concept as the process of “constructing” a system of

actions. “Collective identity is a consistent and shared definition created by several individuals or groups related to the orientation of the action and the field of possibilities and limitations in which this action takes place”\textsuperscript{249}. According to Melucci, collective identity includes: 1) a cognitive definition of goals, means and fields of action, 2) a network of active relations between actors, 3) an interaction process, and 4) a learning process. Melucci believes that the use of the concept of collective identity in the study of civic activism allows: 1) to include the social field (context) in the understanding of activism, which gives the dynamics of the concept of activism, includes the interaction of actors in it; 2) gives an idea of civic activism as a subsystem of the social arena; 3) introducing different levels in the construction of collective identity, allows you to see civic activism as a system of action, determine the social field in which conflict arises, and explain how different groups take part in it; 4) to include in the consideration of motion components arising in different historical periods; 5) recognize the multilevel social action and include in it means (meanings) taken from the past. In my opinion, collective identity is what brings public into civic activism and residents become citizens, community becomes socium.

Analyzing a fairly wide range of approaches to the study of collective action, civic activism, I consider it necessary to turn to one of the new theoretical directions in research - the concept of "social capital", which opens up broad methodological opportunities for analyzing civic participation.

The idea of "social capital" was finally conceptualized by J. Coleman in 1990 in his fundamental work, The Foundations of Social Theory. According to his thoughts, “social capital” is the potential of mutual trust and mutual assistance, purposefully formed in interpersonal space.

One of the promoters of the theory of "social capital" is R. Putnam, according which by analogy with physical and human capital embodied in tools and training, which increase individual productivity, “social capital ”is contained in such elements

\textsuperscript{249} Ibid., p. 44.
of social organization as social networks, social norms and trust, creating conditions for coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit.

The volume of “social capital” is usually measured by two indicators: an index of trust and membership in public associations (in the USA both of these indicators are recorded - according to polls and statistics - for about half a century). And it was in the process of measuring them that Putnam discovered a clear downward trend in “social capital” in America over the last quarter of a century.

In contrast to monetary capital, “social capital” only increases as it is spent, because the more intensive the practice of cooperation and mutual assistance is, the stronger and more effective the network of solidarity and the greater the mass of mutual trust. R. Putnam stresses that "social capital" is the "vital lymph of civil society".

At the methodological stage of the analysis of civic participation of search, researchers face the fundamental question: should the paradigm of civic participation have their own methods, or use the existing methods of research of civic activism, protest theories, mobilization theories, etc. In this work, the concept and phenomenon of “civic participation” is conceptualized through its definition within research of civic activism and the concept of civil society.

Covering the methodological issues of research, I consider approaches to the study of civil society, and define the study it as a subject of one of the levels (meso-level) of this concept of civic participation. I compare this level with one of the levels of research within research of civic activism, which I consider the most appropriate for the study of civic participation. This level (also meso level) corresponds to the problems of school resource mobilization, focusing at the group level of organizations and groups.
3.4 Analysis of the current state of civil culture in Armenia and analysis of institutional engagement in the process of ensuring a rise of participatory governing/public participation

In fact, the political culture of today’s Armenian society is rather complex, dynamic and contradictory, as it contains sub-cultures of different social strata or various socium groups, and this is not accidental, as Armenian society is now at a turning point of development and undergoing a similar developmental period, as in other post-Soviet countries in transition process, although, of course, none of them repeat another track, however the basic phenomena and features allow us to make similar conclusions and put into comparison experience of those countries. The perceptions, views and beliefs that have been around for decades are changing, as a result of which reason is often replaced by myths, rationals and irrationals. Creating new parties, new leaders are born from within, there are movements to try to win back people who were disappointed of party phenomena after the collapse of the Soviet Union and who lost faith in those of functions. It is a reassessment of political values or a succession of attempts and steps to distort the existing value system or build a new one based on such interpretation of reality, which often rejects even real gains, thereby affecting public opinion and reinforcing and justifying a lack of trust in the political system and low level of socium - state cooperation. Naturally, against this backdrop, populism flourishes, with people's emotional management practices using various information tools. Guiding or managing people who have lost their understanding or become relatively non alert to reality pursue certain political and economic interests, but to a large extent nothing changes in their political and economic satisfaction and only undermines the stability of the state and politic, and the multifaceted information confuses people and push away out it from management process and effective cooperation with political institutions, instead waiting for changing. The predominance of emotional elements in the rational and political consciousness of society gives rise to appropriate action. Among it are carrying out by
certain groups of the population anarchic behaviors, which, despite of various political activists which believe in civil disobedience demonstration of policy, but very often differs from that as if acceptable and of democratic nature struggle instrument, the examples of it which in Armenia are, in particular, example of actions against the rise in the price of transport, it is manifested in various ways: hostile attitude and behavior of towards state power, its propaganda, refusal not only to obey but also to debate and co-operate with public authorities, through the simultaneous creation of drastic actions, various unions, associations, units, committees, etc. in place of government agencies, attempts to overthrow government bodies replacing by bodies of crowd, increasing destructive acts by various groups, failing to find a place in the class distribution, or having a big power and of following strict goals, usually on behalf of the nation and its flag. Such processes, such as clashes of contradicting political subcultures, formation and separation, or as Armenian history often brings it of using term of dichotomy, threaten the loss of national ideals, values and goals, overriding private interests over national interests. This does not mean that individual and group rights and interests should not be upheld or violated. The indicator of the whole meaning, purpose, and effectiveness of the state as an institution is, in essence, the harmonization of the interests of individual groups and even individuals, and the creation and maintenance of an atmosphere of public alliance, and the democratic state is generally defined as the authority and the exercise of majority power, a set of relationships that takes into account and protects the rights and interests of all minorities, because without its people the essence will be imperfect. It is therefore necessary to introduce and refine the commonly used, time-stamped, as well as new, promising innovative tools to implement this function, to make sure that people's anticipated responses due to the current level of political culture are also taken into account, as of their decisions are being made and are often accepted, only afterwards awaiting a wave of response, support or protest from civil society, which sometimes results in those decisions being revoked or reversed in compromising changes when it is possible of making agreements in advance, conducting real discussions and public
involvement in decision formulation process or experiment, although some of chances in slowdown, of course, when it can be, and attempts in quality increases do not affect its chronology. By maturing the political culture in this way and moving from protestive political culture into a pure or as close as possible version of the active political participation formulated by Verba and Almond, we will be able to reduce political tensions by, on the one hand, raising the level of political consciousness of the population and thus the quality of civil society, and on the other hand, we will be able to raise the level of legitimacy of state power and based on trust build cooperation and solidarity.

Both the government and the citizens should be sought for constructive ways of communication, in order to exclude appearance in non-constructive and undermining state basis, not welcoming, but in modern socium typical culture phenomena, which has a number of reasons. One of it is broadcasting in some mass media means, especially and particularly television and radio, as well as in a fairly large spread of the internet social networks, news, analytics sites and blogs, of which people which have a big access, carrying out activities of outgoing to population information of various specially designed, consciousness impacting, playing in emotions, creating hostilities and behaviors of destructive character, very often representing an overcoloring or chosen parts of reality, in conditions of which within socium groups of difficult situation it is forming a mindset of desired direction. Besides that, another phenomena of mass-media as in many discussions, is connecting to exhibition and distribution of programs, materials and filming through frequencies in entertainment containing inferior quality and degenerate ideologies, advocating violence, hooliganism, antisocial life and stubbornness, with slang expressions and curses, which undermines of national education centuries-long shaping, traditions and values, whilst freedom of speech inspires pseudo-political figures and forces to ideological or no ideological propaganda, advertising, and of displaying and promoting not competent and not literate and not correct of political, diplomatic, ethical or so
point of view behavior, which forms political not culturalism, brings up aggression and insult of government and the political system, the state and political structures.

In current conditions, one of Armenian socium's most important issues is of it kind, education of political culture. In order to exercise it correct, of is too important to all members of socium to, especially political parties, non-government organizations, social movements leaders, as well as different levels of political figures, understand as of it is impossible to progress public life in all sectors without increase of level in general, up-to political culture, or its components.

For political culture and its levels rise its too important, first of all, to form in all leaders of political organizations, political leaders, all the members of socium, true understanding of the nature, functions, all components of political systems, so of political power in general, and in particular power of state, of rights, freedoms and duties. In addition to that, it is important shape in of appropriate behavior skills. And it should not be forgotten in of simple fact, that government does not create culture, but only provides the necessary conditions for its development, external security and internal order and rule, personal and social freedom. And so of it culture is result of its own nation's creative energy and vital force, which is formed by individual persons and private and collective associations small, but tireless and friendly efforts of through various activities undertaken.

To realize political culture formation and development process is crucial to genuinely democratize public lifestyle and simultaneous of rights defense and awareness it is preaching tolerance and respect for others' rights, rights following-up duties, public concessions and compromising. Thus, political culture education is relating both priority involved in policy individuals and groups, but also the rest of the members of socium. But is not that right that people need to have in example of first their representatives, their management and leadership, their opinion shaping figures, whose image in socium builds of their attitude to these figures, their representing political force and programs, and whole political system and state structuring, public power. Forming a legal system of continental or Romanesque styles
and inhabiting enough lessons of it, Soviet, and then the post-Soviet democracy, can
be said to have been in adoption of certain features of Continental ancient political
systems, avoiding of which are of good or bad, however, research can notice a
characteristic, that attitude of population, as a special status and authority in this
political system, of state or any other position, not too far from human character traits,
is combining with an oriental character lines with and is raising undesirable
perceptions of positions, as power sources. This is the cause, why of almost all post-
SR countries and not only, such is a principle struggle is prospering, so it transforms
from political competition to struggling for position or control. This will need to
fundamentally change in socium or attitude and expectations of politicians, in terms
of reconsideration, restrictions or improving of the role, functions, weight and force
no of positions. As public managers, it is known by classical theorist like of Leonard
White, as how alongside aggravation of socium and its problems committees of
professionals was established, which start to be calling governments as such. The
important thing here is of it consisting of or having specialists, that appear not random
there, but to lead, represent and meet the needs of socium in their respective areas
and in order to control facilitation or so state operations. Distortion on the role of
political positions and their considering as source of force, leveraging pressure or
prestige, in some of amount is explainable or understandable due to such theories, as
power transmission and its circulation, elite, high-quality minority management,
which have a big role in political elite, enabling of strength and reputation, and people
perceive such wording in direct dictionary sense. Although improving such image is
also an important and instructive step in education of political culture as a factor for
all nations having such issues and around and for all democratic political systems in
order to acting of effectivity, however, this work has a lot of focus on issue of it
transformation in public policy process, because it is a sector, where the efficiency is
directly dependent on professionalism, commitment, accountability, awareness,

p. 22.
educative and competence own and professional characteristics and literacy. It is interesting to observe in terms of this approach Graham Allison researcher theory about how public policy specialist institution transform to public policy analyst. As part of his work, he is once again reaffirming Beryl Radin\textsuperscript{251} and Peter Deleon\textsuperscript{252} concurring assertions, clearly prove and substantiate the abrupt shifting of the scientific focus from public administration, concentrating it on public policy, which has been a response to the imperatives of the modernization of the profession of public administrator is of time and intelligence, and which is another evolutionary link which pass science of public administration.\textsuperscript{253}

Armenia has a lack of formal rules, for ex. laws limiting of influence of lobbying groups on decision making, while on opposite side we find a lot of informal rules, hidden or half-hidden ways of decision making, which is important to understand why is taking place and if it is important and suiting it country or if it is left by one of the ruling ideologies of its times. Influence of private interests on public life, in this aspect its not in some ways new to see for Armenia. In privatization process, which occurs in all kinds of states, the crucial part is that how will privatization occur, if it will be a similar to western countries distribution of public resources, or a control over public field by private individuals. Privatization is a necessity in normal development of countries, but the wrong way of using it or wrong timing, like in any of transforming states, can bring us the results we have – struggle for resources, which will grant access for power, which in its turn, will give room for collection of more resources.

If we want to classify the formal and non-formal sources of ideas, which influence on institutions, all institutional theories suggest us to look for actors – interest groups, working for or contra reforms on participation institutions. In his

\textsuperscript{251} B. Radin, \textit{Beyond Machiavelli: Policy Analysis Comes of Age}, p. 24 (http://books.google.am/books?id=EkSGOKiMcy0C) (access: 18/01/2020).


work called „Growth Challenges and Government Policies in Armenia” Lev Freinkman gives the following classification of interest groups:

“With respect to restructuring, Armenia, like many other countries in a similar situation, has three major interest groups:

• Established interest groups that benefit from the status quo. In Armenia, they are represented (but not limited to) by: (a) managers of successful enterprises (some of them recent start-ups and first movers), linked to the military establishment, who do not want to broaden competition; (b) public sector employees, who enjoy administrative controls.

• Latent interest groups - not-yet-organized groups, which would get a larger share of potential reform benefits. In Armenia, these are currently managers/owners of new businesses (spin-offs, start-ups, FDI) and their current and potential employees (high-skilled human capital);

• The government as an independent entity with an ability to undertake a reform agenda.

In Armenia, the Government is very heterogeneous (complicated balance of pro-reform and maintain-status-quo factions) and has a limited capacity to design/implement reforms in the business environment. Until very recently, a longer-term agenda to improve the investment climate has been on the periphery of the Government’s reform effort. De facto influence of incumbent interest groups was much stronger than of latent interest groups.”254

In order to understand the roles that the key institutions, organizations, individuals play in participation policy in Armenia it is necessary for researchers to classify them in 3 various groups:

1. Decision centers, 2. Alternative/Oppositional decision centers, 3. Anti or Non-decision centers.

---

In the first group we should include the ruling coalition parties in various periods of politics. As such, until Revolution ruling coalition was consisting of Republican Party, Prosperous Armenia, and Armenian Revolutionary Federation parties, ruling by obtaining majority of votes in Parliament. After Revolution, former Way Out coalition of opposition parties on basis of Civil Contract party unites in new My Step coalition which is ruling by obtaining in 2018 majority of votes in Parliament.

Second group should include those of opposition parties, with the ones proclaiming own selves of being parties of alternative orientation. Until Revolution opposition parties were uniting in various coalitions, like Way Out coalition, now Parliamentary oppositions are Prosperous Armenia, Bright Armenia and Armenian Revolutionary Federation parties, Republican Party could not pass into Parliament by 2018 votes.

We should include also individual business players with some of former first-group-insiders, oligarchs excluded from power sources but still using some connections, usually with outside players, maintaining in some sense neutral independence or social weight keeping them in potential political processes or in some cases, participation in changing coalitions.

Usually parties in this group organized by or connected with individual business or political players or oligarchs, who get support from various interest groups.

Non-decision centers include various radicals or opposition or civil society organizations, collectives or individual activists of environmental or other causes.

International organizations with their representations in Armenia can be considered also among alternative or sometimes indirectly in the non-decision centers, because often it is through their grants or regulations that do certain decisions get realized. These organizations usually are either western institutions, investments or groups, which fight for western integration, reforms under their standards, or democratic consolidation, or it’s the institutions, backed by Russia, which tend to keep Armenia integrating in Eurasian area or support the status quo in its relations with
former Soviet Union countries. Such groups often represent old figures or institutions, which faced reconstruction during the transition while keeping the traditional orientation in cooperation.

These groups clash their interests in daily campaigns or political procedures, which does not allow Armenia anyhow out of the stagnation it faces, so the solution, which can lead to institutional development is to limit the influence of forces trying to conquer or control the whole power, creating cooperation sustainable institutions.

Its understandable, in such cases public interests or moral and normative values, which in this case I will equal with each other, are not or did not develop historically as of primary importance for elites. As none of the layers of public brings up competences or policies for protecting public interests, who presides country open, if public on its own does not realize, form or express in any way interests of its own, for distributors or allocators of power resources to consider public interests.

**Summary**

This Chapter is analyzing citizen participation as a bottom-up process, where citizens are pushing state institutions by participating in public policy creation. In this aspect, it is important to research on political and civic culture which dominates in states, depending on which certain types of political and civic activism can be shown in public.

In this context, civil society can be a capital which can ensure and protect participation by residents and non-governmental organizations. I’m analyzing various descriptions of it, from classics to modern authors, western or post-communist. By using it’s potential, public can increase it’s influence on state while institutions of state can use it in order to strengthen it’s power with political communication.

Next I’m working on classifying citizen capabilities as an engine of participation. Discussing various political cultures we can see ones providing environments of participatory political activity. We can see in activist political styles civic and political participation being a successful form of state-public relations, vastly
promoting growth in capabilities of citizens and known as highest level of political leadership because of this factor. This is what helps in uniting such skills in what’s known in literature a social capital, which shows residents abilities or experience or values, in political and social, civic relations.

So, next I’m summarizing with showing the aspects of political and civic cultures in nowadays politics in Armenia, classifying natural and artificial activism, participation of interest groups and struggle of political parties shaping civic and political participation.
Chapter 4. Successful reforms of participation and indexes describing correlation to participation

4.1 Introducing Successful Practices of Political Participation and Public Engagement

Western Successful Practices of Public Participation:

Such models are varied, but among the most common and acceptable examples are citizens right to a final decision of referendum, formation of representative bodies through elections, which of indirect participation character is left out of this study, recall officials, elected representatives, formation by citizens of parties, interest groups, NGOs and associations and freedom to operate, as creation of public councils and forums under the institutions of government and the expression of views, recommendations and demands on particular issues through the civil initiative. Of course, as an attribute of power can also act of protest and civil disobedience, strikes or demonstrations, no-confidence motion through elected representatives of executives or use of other means of legitimate and legal pressure, but such practice is defined as an element of the "non-decision making" center and applies mainly when ineffective are incorporation of citizens to decision-making center - institutions of power, or alternative decision-making centers - opposition and the civil society organizations, decision-making transparency and legitimate behavior by centers, mechanisms of involving citizens interests and actions aimed at increasing trust. Public administration professionals should first of all be interested in integrating citizens into government decision-making centers and alternative decision-making centers operating in the same field, to avoid crisis decision-making and implementation, and can study technology through which state can handle operation and maintenance of stability in using of non-decision-making centers.

Focusing on rights of constructive exercise of power by citizens as a decision-making center and as subject up to indirect use of power, I should first of all speak of the two most common and interlinking institutions of public participation, referendum and petition or citizen initiative in all of it. And I will reveal the nature
of these phenomena in the example of the United States, the largest country exporting and proposing participatory values and institutions, as well as referring to the European Union’s experience in instituting initiative of citizens. According to the US State legislators national conference site, the initiative process is, where citizens have the right to circumvent their national legislation in particular its offering and authoring counterpart statutes, and for some states in general of proposing constitutional changes to agenda. At the moment, in United States initiative process is allowed in 24 states\(^{255}\).

Direct governing as a political institution no longer exists and remains here and there only on the periphery of representative one — local self-government. From about 300 BC. until 1800 A.D. democracies all over the world were very rare; those that existed were short-lived and weak. The attitude to direct governing as exclusively to a rudiment, to a kind of "underdeveloped" democracy existed during most of the 19th and 20th centuries, and only from the 70s of the 20th century did it starting to change gradually. Nowadays, it is more widely believed that direct governing is a more democratic form of government than representative one, but it is suitable only for small states or municipalities.

It is the number of civic groups that is of paramount importance for the implementation of direct governing. Thus, Aristotle in the treatise Politics considered the ideal number of the civilian population of the polis to be one thousand citizens. Of course, with women, children, non-citizens and slaves, the population of such a policy could increase to five to seven thousand, which is fully consistent.

In the United States in many small towns once or twice a year all residents become participants in a general gathering where all the issues of city government and financing are decided by vote. Various states of direct democracy are used in many states whenever there is a need to approve or reject some private action or program (for example, a plan to reduce taxes or overhaul the city’s water supply network) or

---

to remove a previously elected official in charge before his official term expires. (realization of the right of withdrawal), or when it is necessary to adopt some kind of decree, legislation or even an amendment to the Constitution (the right of initiative). A similar practice of direct democracy at the local level exists in several countries.

In some of the countries of Central Eastern Europe, in particular in Poland and Slovakia, there is a broad approach in issues of public participation. Poland, for example, as a country with deep public participation traditions, increases its citizens capabilities through motivating in their inclusion in state institutions, there is even a special term in the literature, which is obywatelskosc. Translating it to English as citizenship still does not give it a full meaning, as it sounds in Polish. It is the ability of citizens to be such in practicing of roles in public participation. It stands in the core of laws on this topic, but still Constitution only states preconditions for it, leaving it to acts256 as if deriving from it to form it’s institutions.

So in this, Polish Constitution is issuing number of Articles in this behalf, establishing bases for public participation. Article 125, in this manner, indicates the State Referendum procedures, which only by a law on State Referendums257 adds a citizen signatories institutions, which in case of 500000 signatories, gives to Sejm its project of State Referendum for consideration, in its turn, Article 170 promotes Local Referendum initiatives, leaving it to the law on Local Referendums258 to form its institution in stating, that the 10% of citizens with rights to vote in towns or districts, and 5% of citizens with rights to vote in states can initiate Local Referendums259.

The Slovak Republic’s Constitution, for example, contains various Articles, No. 93-100, on the Referendum Institute and clearly describes the procedure. A group of

350,000 citizens have the right to petition the President to adopt an initiative order on holding a referendum within the prescribing period.⁴⁶⁰

In general, there are two types of initiative: direct and indirect. As of direct process all or proposals, which are in line with the initiative’s criteria, enters voting agenda. In case of indirect process, proposals are sent to Congress, which verifies on question of recommendations entering Agenda. Vote on proposals is put out of Legislative appropriate responses, in some states it is carried out in a rejection of the case or when the legislator offers one other option, and even of some states legislators failure of providing any responding. In some states, the legislative body may offer a rival initiative, with proposing compliant solutions, which also appears in the vote on initial proposal. As States realizing an indirect process, site offers Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Nevada and Ohio, and Utah, and Washington authors of offers can choose of direct or indirect methods.⁴⁶¹

And although looking into various initiatives voting agenda entry we can find two identical standards in the States, in this process still there are as of general steps, which typical of all states, they are initial drafting of offering petition with relevant officials, package inspection of requiring standards compliance, some states even offering formalizing in according law and language, for which many states and countries offer appropriate specialized institutions or officials free advice as of authors if necessary of question. Writing title and content on voting agenda follows this step, after which petition is put in act, in order to gather registered voters required number of signatures, which is usually including certain percentage amount of voters as result of preceding general election. Finally, petition results provided to State Election Committee officials, who must approve signatures of substance and quantity.⁴⁶² I believe that this experience of American States' initiatives process is quite instructive for Armenia, because by stating in law and protecting rights of initiatives presented

⁴⁶² Ibid.
by citizens, there will be a necessity for Armenia of encouraging or even creating professionals, officials and officers database, which will be responsible of providing advice on compliance of law, also in literate writing of these initiatives and initiating citizen-institute in dialogue as if even long before starting initiative process and creating ability of technically and contextually improving and enhancing an initiative.

As mentioned above, civil initiatives, as exercise of as bottom-up power and citizens involvement institutionalization has accumulated experience of the EU Institute, as European Citizens’ Initiative, introducing which in 2012 has revolutionized the life of a progressive European society and enabled people to bypass complex and multilevel governance structures, call on the European Commission to act on any issue within its jurisdiction, securing it is support of a large mass of citizens of the Union, including 1 million signatures of citizens from 7 or more countries for whom the minimum and necessary quantities are specified by population. I believe that this will also have a positive impact on the institutionalization and implementation of initiatives by citizens in Member States, and the successes achieved in their own countries will be used to address common problems at the supranational level.

Given the diminishing confidence of citizens in government, such civic integration is a positive factor for changing people’s attitudes of institutions and sustaining their legitimacy and as a result is a substantial increase as in efficiency of resulting in process of governance. According Vice President of European Commission in Interinstitutional Relations and Foresight Maroš Šefčovič “crisis has put into tension faith of citizens in their political leaders, making it all very important of European civil initiative, which is putting citizens directly into law processing seat for purpose of is success”.

---

Although this institution is to first add 500 million population's trust in EU administration and overcoming EU democratic deficit, however it faces certain criticisms by eurosceptics, which particularly is evident when many initiatives overcoming threshold of signatures and having public attention, as of bureaucrats even are not into conducting of considering or discussing it in appropriating, as a decision-making body are easily being able of refusing, and concerns and real examples of it raising very many important and useful initiatives as of not being in Commission's powers are withdrawn from agenda, although characterization is similar for most initiative procedures, such as in Armenia process of developing OGP projects not including important recommendations for program draft, taking into account their existing references of making legislation changes, implementation of which, as mentioned, is outside of initiating process organizing and encouraging organization governments authority. Both for first and second cases to an extent we can agree with it of critics opinion and insist that in real interest of initiatives and innovations, powers branches can and must shape in more flexible mechanisms for relationship, in order of European Commission or RA government to direct such initiatives more efficiently, respectively of consideration of national governments of the member countries of Union, transnational organizations, as well as initiatives of passing draft laws, amendments by law-making bodies, supranational and national parliaments. Despite described limitation of European Civil Initiative, it is complemented by another European institutional procedure promoting public participation, such as applying as signatures by citizens to European Parliament or Ombudsman on EU issues.

The newly emerging European Civic Initiative sometimes also raises concerns among European officials, and many of so do not trust, which is natural, as citizen involvement and increased oversight may mean reducing or attempting of restricting bureaucrats and elected officials power. However, as the European Parliament's ex

---

265 European Commission’s DG’s for Communication and for Justice, Did you know? 10 EU rights at a glance, Luxembourg 2014, p. 4.
President Martin Schulz says, "such direct involvement of citizens is not threat to their work as representatives, but more adds of dialog quality and intensity"\textsuperscript{266}. This also reflects in a fair view of former Greek Deputy Foreign Minister and Representative of Presidency of the EU Council, Dimitris Kourkoulas, according to which "there is need not to say, that the European Citizens' Initiative role is not replacement of normal democratic process, its purpose is to make it more complete by using the innovative tools available in our era, so it is very important in this process to be careful not to underestimate support for established institutions and practices of democracy"\textsuperscript{267}

As for the real problems of Initiative Institute, in Maroš Šefčovič opinion, "principal ones, which must be addressed when looking to and realizing examples of such, refer to the online recruitment platforms, which include the software maintenance complexity, organization and costs relating hosting and certification"\textsuperscript{268}. There is widespread wisdom in politics: you are only deprived of political freedom when other people are preventing you from achieving any of goal. The lack of the ability achieving of that goal does not mean the absence of political freedom. Therefore, there are opportunities, for democracy and continued development of its institutions provides it, it is only necessary to improve the methods and tools and establishing of dialogue properly inform citizens.

Studying Initiative Institute and ensuring of usefulness and necessity applying of it within scopes of administrative arrangements and adopting laws, however, we are faced with a procedural issues solving necessity and finding arising questions answers and in connection with it we can look back in modern home of democracy and find initiative procedures in culminations, applicable, acceptable and popular models, or otherwise analyze how decisions are made as a result of the initiatives taken.

\textsuperscript{267} Same, p. 10.
\textsuperscript{268} Same, p. 8.
The website of the National Conference of State Legislators states: after collecting enough signatures and proving their authenticity, the initiative usually goes to the people's voting agenda to collect the votes of the majority of the residents, and in states with an indirect process, it is sent to approving, which, as a result of its rejection and especially its insufficient reasoning and discussion, is again put to a popular vote, even in some states at the request of proposing\textsuperscript{269}. This particularly is only effective as a result of the fact that lawmakers are unable to circumvent the structural considerations and discussions on this issue, as they are not the final body that can reason to realizing feasibility of this initiative, but can make realistic proposals and arguments for its non-acceptance or in favor of improving so.

As for voting, in order to avoid unnecessary expenses related to it, in terms of voter lists and census, calculations and composition of constituencies, I think it will be enough to use the data and lists preserved as a result of the previous national elections.

In general, the phenomenon of the Institute of Popular Voting and its essential role in democratic governance is quite interesting to maintain its true democracy. Democratic constitutions and systems of government place a special emphasis on the institution of popular voting or referendum in order to legitimize and justify the most important decisions of fundamental importance and overall power of action, as of people are accepting as exercising or practicing of power, as a parent and a delegating authority, so right to make decisions of such importance is given to the people as such, as a collective entity or whole, by whose collective will the state and whole of its structures are creating, the institutions, is of exercise and is of govern this power, which work for the benefit of the people, have is right to narrow issues, leaving the most important ones to the expression of will of populous.

In general, the referendum institute is used in two main types or manifestations: legislative and popular. In the case of a legislative referendum, the

legislature submits important legislative initiatives to citizens for approval, such as constitutional amendments, accession to international conventions and organizations limiting state power, or sometimes even tax changes and bond arrangements. Unlike civic initiatives, legislative referendum initiatives are often less controversial and more likely to be adopted or received by many citizens. Its effectiveness is also evidenced by the fact that the institute of legislative referendum is applied in all 50 states of the United States and in virtually all democracies, as enshrined in the Constitution. The popular referendum, in its turn, is quite similar to the Civic Initiative, as it is the result of receiving or collecting petition or signature within both that popular voting is held, but the difference between these two processes is due to the fact that within initiative a group of citizens sharing interest is showing initiative of the new law or regulatory standards, and collecting enough signatures, is in role of initiator, right of which in some of countries still only reserves for formal institutions of government, as some modern democracies have been quite skillful, citizens are for example engaging in questions of initiatives and has results of accumulations of positive in experience, in a way or with available opportunity promoting civil cultures of own population. In the case of a referendum, citizens express agreement or disagreement of a law adopting on which they collect necessary number of signatures to including law in a popular vote of citizens. Usually, after the adoption of law it has a 90-day period of sign to carry out as of necessary quantity and of authenticity verification, so law still is not coming into use until the citizens approve of that law in popular vote, where if is rejecting the law it is removed from use\textsuperscript{270}. This mechanism in appealing law of citizens enables on drafting and initial kits of proper implementation of public discussions in order ensure of public interest, accounting needs of various interest groups, as well as states and countries with flexible management model will enable legislators to review of problematic provisions of laws and as including of amended version in agenda, involving citizens proposals and

annotations of original form. The People’s Referendum Institute is currently used by 24 US states, the majority of which also carry out the civic initiative. I believe in Armenia use of such an approach will have a positive impact on the emerging civil society and government institutions in the process of easing tension and contribute to increasing people’s civic culture, because today we see movements initiated by groups of citizens in case of disagreement with the law, but they mainly are of non-constructive, demonstrative and non-decision-making centers nature, accompanied by civil disobedience and strikes, protests, instead of which we can only integrate those centers in the system of governance and legislation and enable citizens express in respect of their dissatisfaction and of their disagreement through institutional processes, so that parliament or government withdraw or amend laws or decisions not in a such civil confrontation, but on contrary, in institutional civilized way.

In addition to these two types of referendum, there is in fact a third, very rarely used form, an advisory referendum, whereby legislators, or even sometimes governors and heads of government, can hold a popular vote to clarify the public’s opinion on a particular issue. The results of the consultative referendum, however, are not mandatory for implementation. An example of it is referendum initiative in state of Rhode Island of 2002, where the governor put in voting agenda Question 5, through which he was trying to find out residents’ opinions about amending Constitution and equal state’s three branches of power. Although the majority of voters voted in favor of the initiative, it was purely advisory and so not obliging governor or lawmakers to follow that decision\(^\text{271}\).

Despite the fact that the referendum institute is one of the most widespread and almost classically perceived tools for citizens to exercise or engage in power, the idea of its effectiveness is quite controversial. Some theorists and political analysts, as of given the current low level of political culture in many countries, question the use of the institute of referendum in general, underlining most examples show that people

---

are driven by emotions, which can also be described by operating in the spotlight, the effect of Mayo, or Hawthorne, relating discovery from studies in 1930s of the same name by Elton Mayo, who found factors in modification by behavior of objects from idea of participating in study.\textsuperscript{272} In addition, ordinary citizens are often subjecting to various influences and appeals, deeply unaware of the nature of the problem, simply satisfied with the title and brief explanation. Similar arguments have been made in the work of many political theorists, such as in Dahl critique of democracy, which states that the majority is in fact incompetent\textsuperscript{273} in terms of both professional and collective characteristics, and \textit{unable to} make effective kind of decisions\textsuperscript{274}, therefore, such a right should be reserved for guardianship group, a qualified minority. However attractive it may sound to be managed by a competent group of aristocrats and intellectuals, it is nevertheless quite clear that in so such group would not be able to bypass its own interests, whose influence over the common interests would be paramount.

Another example of direct exercise of power by citizens is the institution of recall of which citizens can initiate an officials replacement or removal process, although at first sight is like an impeachment process, but in reality is different from it, because if impeachment is purely a legal process where, for example, on the basis of clear allegations which is made by the lower house, the Senate acts as a judge and decides on the dismissal, on contrary it is not necessary to have clear charges in case of recalling or withdrawing, and very often the replacement or removal of an official may have political grounds or be caused by the loss of public confidence and be carried out by popular vote or by the election of a new official at once.\textsuperscript{275} The institute operates in about or so two dozen provinces at state level, and in about or so three dozen provinces at local level, and a well-known example of this is 2003 California

\textsuperscript{273} Р. Даль, Демократия и ее критики, trans. М.В. Ильян, Москва: «Российская политическая энциклопедия» (РОССПЭН) 2003, p. 190.
Governor Gray Davis withdrawal and replacement by Arnold Schwarzenegger, or 2012 recall process against of governor of Wisconsin, which he nonetheless overcame and could stay in position of governor\textsuperscript{276}. In order to illustrate the differences between recall and impeachment, the website also refers to 1988 Arizona state governor as other example, of whom, although he was in initiation of recall process, however, he was taken out from office, by initiations of the lower house of the state of through impeachment process before even his other election was held and so couldn’t stay in position\textsuperscript{277}.

Proponents of officials withdraw by citizens argue of it provides a way for citizens to exercise control over elected officials who do not best represent the interests of their constituents, or who are irresponsible or incompetent in carrying out their functions. Proponents of this view find that the elected representative is an agent, a servant, rather than a director, again addressing need for citizens and officials to properly perceive their own social position and act as suits in roles of representative, and of proper conduct of public kind servants or so. Opponents of such an idea argue reversal can lead to abuse of democracy, that the choice of substitute diminishes the independence of elected officials and so prevents from electing good officials and allowing of hold office until next election, and so it may lead by financial interest groups to abuses\textsuperscript{278} of some sort.

Another common and effective example of popular power, political involvement of citizens and, in particular, public control is creating and formulating public councils, chambers, forums and other similar platforms, formal inclusion in process, or providing political and administrative weight, which ensures of increasing trust and legitimacy of structures, public involvement and interest, as well as effective in realization or a quick and operative solution of issues, which is through it active cooperation of the state and civil society, or as it is called, through co-government,

\textsuperscript{276} Ibid.
for the establishment of which both state institutions and civil society institutions and
even ordinary citizens should be of interest. I believe that such an effective experience
exists in the form of public councils and of All-Russian National Front in Russia in
recent years, which is especially instructive in Armenia as of such fact that after
collapse of the Soviet system, continuous cooperation and RA policy of adopting
Russian experience in some issues, many such political and civic cultures have been
formed in Armenia, so civic and political participation, it's from top to bottom
institutionalization, which encourages of Armenia and almost all other former Soviet
states, has a positive kind of as effect on the establishment of cooperation between the
government and civil society and reduction of distance in it as well as of identifying
and resolving real issues.

Key questions in this manner is if this institutionalization and incorporation of
such is an experience is really capable in transitional political culture and economy of
a country as Armenia having a positive impact on increasing the legitimacy of the
government and reducing social or domestic tensions, and if it is similar to Selznick's
mechanism of co-optation, the effectiveness of which can be measured by the example
of small institutions, or more similar to the models of Western participativeness,
University of Berkeley's open innovation of professor Henry Chesbrow in private and
public organizations. Open innovation concept Chesbrow proposed in 2003 in “Open
Innovation: The New Imperative for Creating and Profiting from Technology”,
according which open innovation is the use of targeted flows of knowledge into and
out of an organization, respectively, to accelerate internal innovation processes and
enhance external use of innovations279.

According of Philip Selznick's co-optation theory, an organization's
management, in order to enhance its own legitimacy and ease of process in of
management and by having of desired path, applies a co-optation mechanism,
especially its indirect nature, to create informal leaders within organization or

279 Open Innovation Research, http://corporateinnovation.berkeley.edu/open-innovation-research (access:
18/01/2020).
consolidating leaders and by using theirs to guide whole group of organizations\textsuperscript{280} and if we follow this theory and so try to move it from a private or public organization to a state as an ultrastructure, then we can see that theoretically and even exemplarily it can be said that practically such a method is so tool in public engagement and normalizing its relations with the state, as it involves engaging with public figures and representatives of large groups, negotiating with them, and taking into account their interests which is up to truly create atmosphere of co-optating harmony which is for citizens are in lead by opportunities in engagement of countries in today's information society, therefore the government itself is in this cases interesting in attracting citizens and winning over and leading, which even if we try to describe as of developing political power resulting of evolving a characteristic feature of political psychology and name it an example Selznick syndrome it will stay of claim in logical chain of thinking and as a new term in politics will push political psychologists of more in-depth studies or with proving in increasing of public involving one of various motives of undertaking actions of states, which as a new term may be adopting new political theorists. For its part, open innovation theory argues that in order to increase the effectiveness of management, any organization, if it does not follow the nature of its creation to work in a closed system, must engage an active and an open, flexible of flow of ideas and innovations in organizations.

On what or which theory can explain citizens and institutions behavior in adopting kind of procedures, we can discover by examining of perceptions in all stakeholders, understanding of their interests and expectations of activism with regard to which, first of all, it is necessary to clarify kind of political culture in country and how people perceive such changes, what goals this or that group can pursue when such reforms are implemented or canceled, and what goals we want to achieve in general, how it will achieves. Various chapters of study try to give Armenia and its realizing model of political systems characterization of politics and political culture

and carry out analysis, which means I will be able of finding answers of these questions, and before it I shall turn to specific procedures in study of Russian organizations, trying to compare with RA on possibilities and expediency of the application.

The expediency of applying the Russian experience of public oversight in Armenia

First of all, it’s very important starting with the fact that the involvement of civil society in the governance process and its control by citizens in Russia is enshrined in the Law on Public Oversight, which I consider to be an important guarantee for putting public participation from slogan on a real legal basis. The law[281] developed by the Public Chamber of the Russian Federation within 2 years and entered into force in 2014 in August. Its main advantage and reason for creation trying to have a collection of separate elements of public oversight in country and it’s norm laws into a single legal document so thus more significant role and institutional character. The law also regulates the issue of who are the subjects of public scrutiny. First of all, public chambers of Russia and its districts, both at the federal level, as well as the public councils of the districts, as well as the ministries and overseas bodies of federal and district level. These norms of law derive from Article 32 of the Constitution of the Russian Federation, according to which the citizens of the country have the right, directly or indirectly, to participate in the management and administration of the affairs of the federation and its states. By the way, though with the newly created constitutional comparison tool[283] I also can find no norms that regulate the right of citizens to initiate or refer a referendum, as in the Constitutions of most post-communist Republics, however, Article 33 of the Constitution of the Russian Federation reserves the right for citizens to individually or collectively appeal of public administration and local government bodies.

---

So that Public Councils role does not become of mere formality, or instead of promoting corruption elimination of councils not to be engaging in corrupt processes of Simulation and Control imitations, it is and essential are experts, should include trade unions and industrial communities, as well as other interested parties, public representatives who clearly know their business so that cannot be misleading by numbers or documents falsifications, as implication of their involvement lies in the analysis of those documents and figures, which can transform the results of that analysis into constructive suggestions and advice and bring it to the attention of public.\textsuperscript{284} In certain sectors, in various branches, absence of relevant specialists or associations can be problematic, which is natural, and state itself must implement special policies of facilitates their creation and unhindered operation, as existence such analytical centers and specialists outside government, ministry and inside it, because of clever policy of involving analysts and specialists very often in management, is first of all in states interests, because is about of monitoring if operation is effective or a comprehensive and pluralistic analysis.\textsuperscript{285}

It will have a positive impact on citizens' perceptions of transparency and opportunities to influence governance processes, and will be another indicator of the level of democracy so on. Despite its overall positive significance, such idea also has shortcomings, such is attempts of use such councils of tools to promote the interests of certain groups or formal procedures for self - actualization by public opinion manipulators, and so thus adoption of such law in Armenia will promote in adoption of relevant acts and norms through which this will be regulating, as well as on the basis of precedents and as a result in accumulation of experience, all existing conflicting points and professional standards for council membership will be clarified, educational or applicational or, including proportionally other concerned citizens and journalists, as well as clarifying the scope of their competence and influence.


\textsuperscript{285} Ibid.
So foundations of civil society organizations and communities are having at heart of scientific communities and of their historical kind of progressing so it allows us to conclude that in order to increase the effectiveness of CSOs, it is necessary to encourage of preservation and importance of their science character on the engagement of experts in organizations and of analysis on defining approaches and activity orders.

A Public Oversight Association has also been established within the Public Chamber of Russia, which can also have NGO, public participation in oversight and its effective implementation, as well as in listening to populous voices, contributing to the improvement of the process.

Any right granted to the public and to the citizen must be guaranteed and balanced by certain obligations, in this case controlled by the object. The main obligations set out in this Russian law for controlled objects are the following:

1. review the documents prepared as a result of the public oversight, and take into account their advice, recommendations and conclusions.

2. provide public oversight subjects with their activities relating public interest.

3. In terms of bureaucratic procedures are one of the most important provision: as a result in public control prepared summarizing document in basing on including recommendations an evaluation will be made of the effectiveness of the entity's activities and as evaluation now will force operators to reckon with public opinion and contribute as a result of control as of newly created document, to instead of declarative nature being of decisive factors to some extent, important role of understanding which is to help overcome the risk of irresponsibility from local authorities up to national departments and state io agencies. The validity of such a provision may also be attributed of the fact that when conducting investigations under

286 Реализация закона «Об общественном контроле в Российской Федерации», http://www.nsgrf.com/1/175 (access: 18/01/2020).
administrative liability, it is usually clear that the decisive factor is financial and administrative sanctions of increasing administrative responsibility.

There is a need to develop reforms in the field of civic engagement and to rapidly contribute to their implementation and accumulation of experience, and if points need to be adjusted or modified in the course of time, entities with the right to legislative initiative will be able to come forward with corrective initiatives.

As for parliamentary representation, there is also necessity to improve representation of public interests, quite instructive example of which is commonly used in a number of foreign countries extra freedom of expression of non-parliamentary political parties in parliament: as a party representing the interests of a small segment of the population that failed to overcome the threshold of inclusion in the parliament; it also represents the citizens of country whose opinion as a minority, must presents and submits to knowledge of the majority. In this regard, a non-parliamentary political council has been set up in the Russian Federation, where members of parliament, led by the speaker of the parliament, meet regularly with representatives of those parties and hold or exchange of opinions and including of agenda in suggestions and of discussions information, presenting issues.

Speaking of parliamentary representation as indirect citizen participation and parties as possibility of direct involvement of citizens within that representation and its democratics nature, it should if noting, however, institute of parties actually has a much greater potential for public participation than the legislation currently in force and some liberalization can contribute to their democratic development.

For example, as parties in the political culture of Armenia, in my assumption, similar to a lot of post-communist countries are at the core of political culture, I find it very useful to implement reforms within the framework of legislative regulation and to enable people to self-organize within small political parties and to address or voice local issues. This may also be an impetus for more serious local issues for parties operating at the national level, as otherwise the population will opt for local parties. As a result, the community benefits both by providing greater opportunities for civic
engagement and by encouraging engagement, and by focusing on and competing with the central forces to gain citizens’ trust. To this end, a positive step would be the amendment of Article 9 (1-2) of the Law on Parties, the current content of which is as follows: “The party shall have separate subdivisions in at least 1/3 of the marzes of the Republic of Armenia, including in Yerevan. In addition to the aforementioned subdivisions, the party shall have rights establish other structural subdivisions in the manner prescribed by this Law and its Charter”\textsuperscript{287}. This will help raise competition in the field for issues that can only be regulated by the state.

Or by such logic may start creating not local parties, as citizens’ trust in parties is gradually falling, but unions and organizations, functioning public committees, with informal structures and forms in engagement where citizens can present their opinions, suggestions and complaints, and which will co-ordinate the superior central organization, and will ensure of provision of public opinion to power so distancing in reducing and starting co-governing\textsuperscript{288}. What about process in establishing of public opinion, instead of bringing it in crisis situations to alternative forms in expression, logic of top down reforms can lead of bottom-up public opinion continuous flow investments of institutional mechanisms, providing of feedback implementations and of dynamic applications\textsuperscript{289}.

Resulting of cooperation of civic society and of state Russian Federation establishes structure of federal level, the Russian National Front, in which organizes and broadcasts on television and online of forums during which president personally responds to questions of civil society representatives and journalists, as well as gives of so necessary instructions for solution of uncovering cases, irrespecting subsequent course of which is recording through special sections on the site and shows work done and answers indicating on the questions receiving.

This initiative allows in raise questions about reasoning to hold one of the central streets of the city lighting up, re-calling for adopted amendments of law in

\textsuperscript{287} «Կուսակցությունների մասին» ՀՀ օրենք, ՀՀՊՏ 2016.12.30/95(1275).1 Հոդ.1228.7.
\textsuperscript{288} K. Fedorowicz, Transformacja ustrojowa w Armenii w latach 1991 – 2016, Poznań 2017, pp. 120-126.
\textsuperscript{289} Ibid., pp. 120-126.
advertising ban on broadcast or television industry and limits compromising cut in favor of the government and the cable companies. This is a forum where stakeholders can effectively raise all concerns, complaints and suggestions, and reach compromise solutions - a useful tool for legitimizing power and enhancing public-states relationships and cooperating and building of trust. The creation of such an institute may also be a tool for more far-reaching purposes, such as promoting national ideology and behavior and engaging of public in its dissemination and encouraging constructive debate in order to reach a nation-wide decision or to obtain legitimate public consent and support in so. Scholars of structural and neo-classical realism quite clearly point out, as Kenneth Waltz believes, states in even acting in international affairs successful, needs the constructive and unambiguous support of the public, as one is guiding by law basis, omitting acts with inconsistencies, but another is in addition relying on the support and having in back working with or in you a force or a powerful army, which will further increase your share of the international and intranational platforms and in country thanks to a simple truth - even constitutions are changed in terms of continuous normatives resources, but human relations and of trust stay same powerful resource that is available in all other human resources and is higher of it because creating/ is-running/ updating or has capabilities of.

The forum is attended by more than thousand people, including members of government, public and public figures, business and expert of communities. As president of federation notes, the All-Russian National Front has become a real example of civic activism.

Russian experience in terms of mobilization and active involvement of public figures, I believe, is quite instructive for Armenia in terms of resolution of currently facing social obstacles of or, and solving in political tensions accumulating. In political developments the opposition parties organizing “offices of nationwide movement”, and are now enabling of politics parties, organizers, to involve citizens and providing opportunity to all inhabitants approach offices and express of their opinions, complaints and suggestions through which persons not directly engaging of
administration or politics can be source or the same policy adjustment or development of new programs or projects and initiator of discussion as of forces directly involving in administration or politics. Although I have to state that in Armenian political reality this is more about the goal of uniting people around their political movement, which the initiators of the idea also point out, it is quite understandable that civic participation is viewed primarily not as a solution to problems but in terms of the use of force of populi. However, I believe that observation of this example is quite instructive from a scientific research point of view, and its proper application and adoption by the state authorities can equally and effectively solve the problems existing of legitimacy and bring all forces within the framework of these structures to the field of public co-operation and reduce political tensions, and really solve social problems or at least show of in a formal and state level. I believe there is a need to create a nationwide council under the direct patronage of the President's Institute and its arbitration board, as in the Russian Federation, parallely creating offices or to establish open and citizen-specific departments in each ministry area, with 1 windows as is of possible in each area, as well as an electronic application system. A reform program to provide free e-mail to each citizen can also serve to regulate the relationship between the state and the citizen and communication of states vs socium. Although there are now Public Councils and Councils of Aldermen at local level whose activities cannot be described as ineffective or non-participatory, non-proactive, there is still a need to evolutionally and explicitly institutionalize existing structures, to provide of greater roles and of greater participation, more possibilities as well as a large broadcast. Realizing of online on raising issues and addressing of recommendations will not only directly increase the legitimacy of the government and its relationship or cooperation or trust with the people, but also public's interest in politics, and of greater consideration by all institutions of resolving issues, avoiding of debates on national level. It will also help of to form national democratic values, unity and reintegration for the sake of overcoming the social crisis and the proper establishment of civil sociums. The solidarity of the political environment and unity
of the state and citizens in their attitudes of social policy will lead to the increase of the state’s weight and success in resolutions as of area evolving of economic or other area of questions.

However, it is necessary to build and maintain trust in the network of such structures, to empower it with principles of independence from other structures, but with accountability of in public, so that it does not become merely a political technology or instrument providing the legitimacy of power, but rather a platform where direct power-community dialogue and of discussion of issues will be not mediated, but of direct manner. This does not mean replacing representation at parliamentary or local level with a system of direct representation mechanisms, as modern democracies are not ready for such a sharp transition and overall it will retrograde efficiency, at all it only emphasizes needs in effective of functioning of its institutions and is intending to complement their all of efforts showing it public interests and of proceeding accordingly and starting off.

Summing, functions of the modern state are constantly expanding, problems awaiting resolution are being raised and new challenges are of consideration in government. In this case, consolidation of populous and state and joint use of mobilization of forces are needed to ensure efficiency and of flexibility of management and solve problems. It is concerning both with the public in order to ensure its own well-being and with the state’s ability raise or maintain its legitimacy and ability effectively of holding its stability or so.
4.2 Correlation of Public Participation Level to Changes in Indexes in Armenia

In order for researchers to understand developments in public participation in a specific country, we should find and have comparison of its indexes and correlating rankings which country has been showing in recent years. In such way we can see which aspects have an indirect or direct connection with public participation and what is its dynamics over certain times frames. I’m comparing indexes and ranks from various international organizations, trying to find connections with public participation changes.

In this study I’m using indexes of Varieties of Democracy, Bertelsmann Transformation Index, UN E-Participation Index, The Economist Intelligence Unit’s Democracy Index, The Freedom House Indexes, Corruption Perception Index, Worldwide Governance Indexes, Social Progress Index, Human Development Index, World Press Freedom Index, Intellectual Property Rights Index, Global Competitiveness Index, Global Talent Competitiveness Index, Global Innovation Index, and various polls by International Republican Institute and Caucasus Research Resource Center, selection of which is conditioning by authority and reliability of such indexes and relevance and correlation into level of public participation.

One of the recent indexes showing such changes is the project “Varieties of Democracy”, which 2020 report is about autocratization in contradiction to development process in some countries. It compares various indexes in different countries, like LDI (Liberal Democracy Index and so on) coming up with a ranking according indexes study. It’s reports show downgrading trends in some of the western states, such as US or others, as can be seen in Figure 4.2.1 below – countries with significant and substantial autocratization, in comparison to countries, such as Armenia, with significant and substantial democratization. According it’s reports, “there are 22 countries showing positive development over the last ten years but almost all of them have fairly small populations such as Armenia with three million,
The Gambia with two million, Georgia with 10 million, Tunisia with 11 million, Ecuador with 16 million, and so on.\(^{290}\)

In its chapter of “Rays of Hope”, report shows world progress in maintaining liberalism, saying that Armenia, The Gambia, Sri Lanka, and Tunisia are cases exhibiting the biggest democratic gains. And continues, “in Armenia, pro-democracy activists can now similarly harvest the fruits of their peaceful protests in celebrating that a democratically elected government has been in power for a full year in 2019”\(^{291}\).

This report compares also indexes of countries with 10 year rankings showing the progress or downgrading of countries statistics.


\(^{291}\) Ibid., p. 23.
Above is country score list in LDI in comparison of 2009 to 2019 statistics.

As we can see in above rankings, Armenia is in Top 20-30% of countries, showing great changes since 2009 statistics (in grey) into 2019 statistics (in green).

This brings us to next table which shows changes within 2009-2019 showing raises of countries in Close and Electoral Autocracies into Electoral and Liberal Democracies. Armenia is shown in EA list – Electoral Autocracy with possibility of belonging to higher levels.

Table 4.2.1 Regimes of the World 2009-2019

Source: V-Dem Democracy report 2020\textsuperscript{292}.

\textsuperscript{292} Ibid., p. 24.
In line with comparisons of various indexes, reports also show rankings according components of this study – LDI (Liberal Democracy Index), EDI (Electoral Democracy Index), LCI (Liberal Component Index), ECI (Egalitarian Component Index), PCI (Participatory Component Index) and DCI (Deliberative Component Index).

In Table 4.2.3 below we can see comparisons of above indexes showing changes in scores within last 10 years. In almost all indexes Armenia shows statistically significant levels of progress in comparison to 2009, bringing up into Top 40–60 countries of rankings. One of most important indexes in scopes of this study is PCI (Participatory Component Index), which shows that Armenia has a progress in correlation to other indexes with 0.052 points, resulting into index of 0.597, which is a substantial result in comparison to other countries in rankings.

Table 4.2.2 Country scores for the Liberal Democracy Index (LDI) and all components indices

Source: V-Dem Democracy report 2020

Ibid., p. 24.
Another index showing country’s progress in transformation is BTI or Bertelsmann Transformation Index. In 2020 Country Report it brings interesting figures about Armenia’s recent changes in transformation and it’s various components. Particularly, according BTI, Armenia’s score in Political Transformation status is 7.10, which is 34 in ranking out of 137 countries. As a sub-component, Political Participation shows score of 8.3. 

Source: V-Dem Democracy report 2020

Ibid., p. 24.

This report argues as if 2018 Revolution in Armenia is key to it’s success in Political Transformation. In particular, it says that protests of 250,000 citizens in 2018 put pressure on the parliamentary majority to elect Pashinyan as prime minister days after former President Sargsyan resigns under public pressure and so it brings new phase of state-building and development. This is how it shows Armenia in it’s country dashboard:

---

296 Ibid., p. 1.
In Figures below it shows developments in sub-components of Political Transformation in 2006-2020. As we can see, it shows substantial scores in recent years in sub-components of Political Participation and Rule of Law, as well as ups and downs in performance and commitments to institutions, interest groups and social capital, and slight declines in quality of public administration and as of trust in political actors.

Source: BTI Country Dashboard: Armenia

Figure 4.2.4 Transformation Status in Armenia
The BTI combines text analysis and numerical assessments. The score for each question is provided below its respective title. The scale ranges from 1 (worst) to 10 (best).

Transformation Status

I. Political Transformation

1 | Stateness
- Monopoly on the use of force
- State identity
- No interference of religious dogmas
- Basic administration

2 | Political Participation
- Free and fair elections
- Effective power to govern
- Association / assembly rights
- Freedom of expression

3 | Rule of Law
- Separation of powers
- Independent judiciary
- Prosecution of office abuse
- Civil rights

4 | Stability of Democratic Institutions
- Performance of democratic institutions
- Commitment to democratic institutions

5 | Political and Social Integration
- Party system
- Interest groups
- Approval of democracy
- Social capital

Source: BTI Transformation Status: Armenia

Other sub-components of Transformation according BTI show relatively less scores in Armenia but can correlate with scores in Political Transformation and components of other countries neighboring Armenia, as in Figure 4.2.5.

Figure 4.2.5 Transformation Components in Armenia

---
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In comparison to other post-USSR countries, Armenia shows it’s position as a leader in BTI comparison tool, showing it’s Status Index increase of 0.98 in last 10 years. It is shown in Figure 4.2.6.

During 2010-2020, according BTI report, Armenia had a significant rise in Political Participation, bringing up it’s scores from flaw participation level among autocratic countries into sound participation level in democratic countries. These changes can be results of inputting participation institutions in Armenia starting 2012.

---

300 Ibid.
The next index which describes electronic participation and/or governance levels is UN E-Participation Index. It is an assessment of mechanisms of participation of governments and is calculating on basis of scores on 3 components in UN E-Participation surveys - “e-information”, “e-consultation” and “e-decision making”, and uses such formula in order to bring up it’s E-Participation Index:

\[
\text{E-participation Index of Country } x = \frac{(\text{E-participation score of country } x - \text{lowest e-participation score})}{\text{Range of total score values for all countries}}
\]

According UN E-Participation 2020 Ranking, Armenia is currently on 57 place, with score of 0.750 points, which is higher in comparison to world average –

\[\text{Source: BTI Status: Armenia}\]

\[\text{Ibid.}\]

\[\text{P. Rivière, 5 Indices & Frameworks to Evaluate E-participation, https://www.citizenlab.co/blog/e-government/5-ways-to-measure-evaluate-e-participation, (access: 13/12/2020).}\]
0.567, Asia average - 0.629, and Western Asia average - 0.662 (where it classifies Armenia). It shows that participation index of Armenia is in line and higher in comparison to most of countries in it’s area and in Asia.

As we can see in Figure 4.2.8 Armenia had a substantial increase in ranking from 2018 to 2020, which brought it’s position in to 2014 ranking. As we can see in previous chapters, Armenia had an introduction to Electronic Participation in 2011, which can explain how it could increase position after continuous drop since 2010 significantly up to 2014, afterwards having a slow drawback to 2018, when revolution had a positive influence on increasing public and civic participation.

Figure 4.2.8 E-Participation Index

Source: UN E-Participation: Armenia\textsuperscript{304}

In comparison to it UN has also a 2 year ranking of EA or E-Governance Index, which shows government’s capabilities of participation\textsuperscript{305} and also shows similar patterns in ranking, but relatively constant position and historic high not in 2020 but in 2014 – increasing slowly up to 2014, dropping lower and staying on similar position


until 2020 and afterwards slightly increasing to 68 place in ranking with 0.713 points, which is higher in comparison to world, Asia and Western Asia averages. It shows that in comparison to actual level of E-Participation, having similar trajectories of index shifts as in introduction of framework in EA, it reaches it’s maximum score in 2020 vs 2014.

*Figure 4.2.9 E-Government Development Index*

Source: UN E-Government Development: Armenia

UN brings also rankings of Online Service Index, Telecommunication Infrastructure Index and Human Capital Index as sub-components, with respectively 0.700, 0.653, 0.787 points in Armenia, showing substantial development from 2018 to 2020. It shows sub-component levels of calculations of UN indexes in EA of Armenia. Even with such tools, E-Participation Index has it’s critics, who are saying, that it measures opportunities given by national governments on web-platforms, but can mislead researchers, as authoritarian leaders can also issue such tools, but it can have no influence on quality of governments.

---


It is fair to say, that such indexes show capabilities of governments in participation, but in order to measure quality of participation and understand it’s correlation top governments, we can study other example of The Economist Intelligence Unit’s Democracy Index. In it’s 2019 ranking showing overall decline in world statistics, it shows that Armenia is on 86 place with a score of 5.54, when in 2018 it had 4.79, and was in consideration of “Winners”\(^{308}\), even as it stays in group of “Hybrid” states (it was out only in 2016, but afterwards stays in this group), with other countries of it’s area (according authors it’s Eastern Europe), it still was ranking 103 in world and was still not surpassing in scores to other countries of it’s area, which surpasses now in 2019, moving up.\(^{309}\) It is interesting to see comparison of levels from 2006, which shows that score is on similar levels across 10 years, and it only starts raising in 2017, significantly increasing as a result of Revolution.


This index consists of 5 components – Electoral process and pluralism, Functioning of government, Political participation, Political culture, Civil liberties. And in Table 4.2.4 we can see it's 2019 scores for Armenia.

Table 4.2.4 The Economist Intelligence Unit’s Democracy Index 2019: Armenia’s results

Source: The Economist

[Image: Figure 4.2.10 The Economist Intelligence Unit’s Democracy Index
167 countries scores from 0 to 10, bases on 60 indicators]

---
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One of the indexes showing the level of democracy and freedom in country is The Freedom House ranking, which shows 3 scores countries receive on basis of Global Freedom Scores, Internet Freedom Scores and Democracy Scores.

In Global Freedom Scores, in its annual Freedom in the World report, Freedom House looks in “Individual freedoms—ranging from the right to vote to freedom of expression and equality before the law—can be affected by state or nonstate actors” which shows “people’s access to political rights and civil liberties in 210 countries and territories”312. Armenia has a score of 53 (out of 100), which is a Partly Free result. It shows that the score of Political Rights is 21 (out of 40) and Civil Liberties 32 (out of 60). It’s a high score in comparison to others in overall score, in sub-components, and shows that Armenia is improving its positions. By such scores it’s bypassing it’s most of post-communist counterparts and is on an average level of ranking. Interestingly, ranking shows not only countries with official recognition, but also countries and other territories struggling for recognitions. One of such countries is the second Armenian republic – Artsakh Republic or officially known as Nagorno-Karabakh Republic, which still struggles for international recognition in spite of war and aggression by Azerbaijani-Turkish-jihadist union313 (multiple reports of western news organizations like Reuters314 and the BBC315, Radio Free Europe / Radio Liberty316, as well as newspapers like The Guardian317 and The Independent, The Times318, Foreign

317 B. McKernan, Syrian rebel fighters prepare to deploy to Azerbaijan is a sign of Turkey’s ambition, “The Guardian”, October 5 2020.
Policy, The Washington Post, The Wall Street Journal, The Arab News and other western, Russian and Armenian newspapers confirming Turkey deploying fighters of various terrorist organizations from Syria, Libya, Pakistan and Afghanistan, constantly fighting in conflicts in those countries and serving interests of Turkey), which brought it to a war on September 27 2020, resulting major loss in territories of Artsakh Republic. The ranking shows it’s scores of 34 as Partly Free, and scores in Political Rights is 13 and Civil Liberties 21. Thus it’s bypassing most of post-communist countries, such is Russia with score of 20, even countries which are still trying to conquer it – Turkey with score of 32, Azerbaijan with score of 10, and it bypasses most of other countries or territories struggling for recognition, such Transnistria with score of 22.

![Table 4.2.5 Global Freedom Scores: Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh (Artsakh)](image)

Source: The Freedom House

It is particularly interesting to look in sub-rankings of this report. In Political Rights area it differentiates 3 sub-groups, where each of these sub-groups answers questions with rankings on particular matters. The first sub-group is Electoral Process, which scores the question “Was the current head of government or other chief national authority elected through free and fair elections?” in 2 (out of 4). Similarly, question “Were the current national legislative representatives elected through free

---

and fair elections?" also receives 2 points and question “Are the electoral laws and framework fair, and are they implemented impartially by the relevant election management bodies?” also receives 2 points. This is somewhat understandable in consideration of the Revolution which brought current party in to power, but considering that the parliamentary elections after Revolution are according all international organizations one of most transparent and fair in the history of modern Armenia, it’s still rating Armenia on an average score in all questions323.

The next sub-group of questions it shows is Political Pluralism and Participation, which is dynamic in Armenia in recent 2,5 years.

In first 2 questions – “Do the people have the right to organize in different political parties or other competitive political groupings of their choice, and is the system free of undue obstacles to the rise and fall of these competing parties or groupings?” and “Is there a realistic opportunity for the opposition to increase its support or gain power through elections?” it scores rather 3 (out of 4), considering dynamic changes of trust and apathy – lowering trust and raising apathy while previous party in power, raising trust and lowering apathy with Revolution and slowly dropping trust and bringing apathy in nearly 3 years of power of new ruling party. Next 2 questions – “Are the people’s political choices free from domination by forces that are external to the political sphere, or by political forces that employ extra political means?”, “Do various segments of the population (including ethnic, religious, gender, LGBT, and other relevant groups) have full political rights and electoral opportunities?” receive scores of 2 points, which shows that political skills in correlations to political opportunities or mechanisms raising participation are still on average stages in Armenia324.

Next sub-group is actually very interesting in terms of capacity building in participation, as it creates or discourages opportunities of participation. It’s Functioning of Government, which answers 3 questions. First – “Do the freely elected

324 Ibid.
head of government and national legislative representatives determine the policies of the government?” scores 2 (out of 4). In comparison to 2019 it improves with 1 point, as a result of Revolution, but still shows the influence of various interest groups participating in policymaking process in Armenia. In next question – “Are safeguards against official corruption strong and effective?” Armenia scores 1 point, because even as ruling party struggles to fight corruption, it still flaws in doing so, though corruption perception improves in Armenia, but it still scores changes in Armenia low in order to show significant victories. Next question is “Does the government operate with openness and transparency?” scoring 2 points, as even if ruling party’s declaring that as it’s official policy, it still fails to fulfill drastic changes in various areas or examples in result of it’s lack of sociopolitical skills.\(^{325}\)

In Civil Liberties area it differentiates 4 sub-groups. Freedom of Expression and Belief sub-groups relates to following questions – “Are there free and independent media?” in correlation to “Are individuals free to practice and express their religious faith or nonbelief in public and private?” and “Is there academic freedom, and is the educational system free from extensive political indoctrination?” where in all Armenia scores 2 (out of 4), while in question “Are individuals free to express their personal views on political or other sensitive topics without fear of surveillance or retribution?” it scores 3 points, showing that public is debating on such discussions without fear, still government pressures security councils and agencies or courts in order to fight opposing parties in it’s overall fight against corruption or news falsification.\(^{326}\)

Next sub-group actually shows comparatively high results, Associational and Organizational Rights answers 3 questions – “Is there freedom of assembly?” where Armenia scores 3 (out of 4), relating to a very substantial number of public protests in Armenia since 2014 mostly having a sociopolitical or civic character, and “Is there freedom for nongovernmental organizations, particularly those that are engaged in

\(^{325}\) Ibid.  
\(^{326}\) Ibid.
human rights– and governance-related work?” which Armenia scores 3 points, and which shows increase since 2019 with 1 point, as NGO’s have less outside interference in activities and have very high participation in governing. In question “Is there freedom for trade unions and similar professional or labor organizations?” Armenia scores 2 points, as even law protects worker rights, in practice it has limits and is not in various organization working.327

In sup-group Rule of Law Armenia has rather poor scores, in questions “Is there an independent judiciary?” and “Does due process prevail in civil and criminal matters?” Armenia scores 1 (out of 4), because of certain political pressures Armenia’s judiciary branch of power is facing from governing parties, and after Revolution it became severe, in order to ensure it’s prosecution of previous elites as chasing corruption in power branches, there were cases of criminal decisions and arrests selectively charging various high-ranking officials of previous party, accompanying with pressures on judges both by law enforcing agencies and previous high-ranking officials with connections to judges. As a result there was a conflict of government against Constitutional Court, where ruling party was accusing Constitutional Court Head of usurping it’s power and being in corruption ties with former politicians. Government had it’s own candidate on this position and eventually law was sent to Parliament to update various paragraphs and impeaching and replacing Head of Constitutional Court. In comparison, questions “Is there protection from the illegitimate use of physical force and freedom from war and insurgencies?” and “Do laws, policies, and practices guarantee equal treatment of various segments of the population?” receive scores of 2 points, as Armenia improves in treating prisoners and convicts with less abuse and having a big pressure of civic activists and organizations in ensuring kind and fair relation of law enforcing agencies.328

Finally, in sub-group Personal Autonomy and Individual Rights it answers 4 questions. In question “Do individuals enjoy freedom of movement, including the

327 Ibid.
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ability to change their place of residence, employment, or education?” Armenia scores 3 (out of 4), explaining it having only limits of bribery in order to study in universities or work in organizations. In other 3 questions Armenia scores 2 points, in “Are individuals able to exercise the right to own property and establish private businesses without undue interference from state or nonstate actors?” as it provides unfair advantages of those in connection to governing officials or party, even after Revolution, one of the aims of which was to protect the citizens from that, and in “Do individuals enjoy personal social freedoms, including choice of marriage partner and size of family, protection from domestic violence, and control over appearance?”, “Do individuals enjoy equality of opportunity and freedom from economic exploitation?” both of questions showing Armenia’s conflict of traditions to modernization and high numbers of informal workers and policy of controlling activities.329

In it’s ranking of Internet Freedom Scores, in annual Freedom on the Net report, Freedom House ranks “level of internet freedom in 65 countries around the world”330. Accordingly, 3 sub-scores of violations, users and access are vital in order to understand the opportunities in countries to practice and encourage using of E-Participation, which can be higher only if levels of liberties in that area are high. According ranking, Armenia scores 75 (out of 100) which it considers as Free, and Armenia is on 12th place in overall ranking. In sub-scores it scores following: Obstacles to Access – 20 (out of 25), Limits on Content – 28 (out of 35), Violations of User Rights -27 (out of 40). Interestingly, Artsakh Republic is not in this ranking.

Table 4.2.6 Internet Freedom Scores: Top countries

329 Ibid.
According ranking, in 2019-2020 in Armenia no cases are shown of government blocking social media and websites, restricting networks or arresting users. It also shows no cases of pro-government commentators, but especially after recent war with Azerbaijan and anti-Pashinyan protests, and in times of Revolution by Pashinyan, ruling party and opposition accuse each other of supporting, creating armies of fake users and controlling social media sources in order to influence on public opinion.\(^{332}\)

---

\(^{331}\) Ibid.

In its annual Nations in Transit report, Freedom House shows the level of democratic governance in nearly 30 countries of Central Europe to Central Asia, “…incorporating separate ratings on national and local governance, electoral process, independent media, civil society, judicial framework and independence, and corruption.”

In this ranking, Armenia is the only country with a status of Semi-Consolidated Authoritarian Regime, it has scores too high in comparison to Consolidated Authoritarian Regimes and just bites of points less than Transitional or Hybrid Regimes. Armenia’s scores 33 (out of 100) points, increasing from 32 points since 2019, in which Democracy Percentage is 33.33 (out of 100) %, Democracy Score is 3.00 (out of 7.00). Interestingly, Artsakh Republic is also not in this list.

Table 4.2.7 Democracy Scores: from Authoritarian into Hybrid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Total Score and Status</th>
<th>Democracy Percentage</th>
<th>Democracy Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>35 Transitional or Hybrid Regime</td>
<td>35.12</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>33 Semi-Consolidated Authoritarian Regime</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>16 Consolidated Authoritarian Regime</td>
<td>16.07</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>7 Consolidated Authoritarian Regime</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>7 Consolidated Authoritarian Regime</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>5 Consolidated Authoritarian Regime</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>3 Consolidated Authoritarian Regime</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The Freedom House

Such Scores and Percentages are a combination of 7 sub-scores and respective conversion into percentages:

---

334 Ibid.
1. National Democratic Governance, in which “considers the democratic character of the governmental system; and the independence, effectiveness, and accountability of the legislative and executive branches.” Armenia scores 2.50 (out of 7.00).

2. Electoral Process, in which “examines national executive and legislative elections, the electoral framework, the functioning of multiparty systems, and popular participation in the political process.” Armenia scores 3.25 (out of 7.00). There was an increase of 0.25 since 2019 as per conducting transparent and fair elections in Armenia after Revolution.

3. Civil Society, in which “assesses the organizational capacity and financial sustainability of the civic sector; the legal and political environment in which it operates; the functioning of trade unions; interest group participation in the policy process; and the threat posed by antidemocratic extremist groups.” Armenia scores 4.50 (out of 7.00).

4. Independent Media, in which “examines the current state of press freedom, including libel laws, harassment of journalists, and editorial independence; the operation of a financially viable and independent private press; and the functioning of the public media.” Armenia scores 3.00 (out of 7.00).

5. Local Democratic Governance, in which “considers the decentralization of power; the responsibilities, election, and capacity of local governmental bodies; and the transparency and accountability of local authorities.” Armenia scores 2.25 (out of 7.00).

6. Judicial Framework and Independence, in which “assesses constitutional and human rights protections, judicial independence, the status of ethnic minority rights, guarantees of equality before the law, treatment of suspects and prisoners, and compliance with judicial decisions.” Armenia scores 2.50 (out of 7.00).

7. Corruption, in which “looks at public perceptions of corruption, the business interests of top policymakers, laws on financial disclosure and conflict of interest, and the efficacy of anticorruption initiatives.” Armenia scores 3.00 (out of 7.00). There
was an increase of 0.25 since 2019 as per prosecution in high-level corruption cases after Revolution in 2018.335

Comparing to this, another organization – Transparency International is measuring corruption perception in countries, which is by Corruption Perception Index, known as CPI. In 2019 Armenia’s score is 42 (out of 100), and so it’s on 77 place in world, raising by 28.

*Figure 4.2.11 Corruption Perception Index: Armenia*

This data is of 2012-2019. Data of 1995-2011 is of exclusion because our methodology was different.

Source: Transparency International 336

It is showing that during 2012-2018 Armenia’s score was having changes from 34 to 37, and only after Revolution corruption perception in Armenia raising into 42. In order to calculate country’s score it is using data of up to 10 sources (in order to understand CPI in Armenia it’s using 6).

*Table 4.2.8 Corruption Perceptions Index 2019: Armenia*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we can see it’s sources in CPI calculation in Armenia are Bertelsmann Foundation Transformation Index, Freedom House Nations in Transit Ratings, Global Insight Country Risk Ratings, PRS International Country Risk Guide, Varieties of Democracy Project, World Economic Forum EOS, some of which I’m also covering in this Chapter.

On basis of various rankings, World Bank calculates it’s Worldwide Governance Indicators, showing the ability of governments and it’s efficiency in various aspects of governing. It shows following indicators: Voice and Accountability, Political Stability and Absence of Violence, Government Effectiveness, Regulatory Quality, Rule of Law, Control of Corruption.

In Figures below we can see recent 20 years of development in these indicators:

Source: Transparency International

---

Ibid.
As we can see in Armenia Voice and Accountability indicator has been lowering steadily until 2009, when after Serzh Sargsyan’s presidency we can notice a slow rise, rapidly increasing after 2018 Revolution. Meanwhile Political Stability is raising and lowering during what appears of elections and after election stagnations – key points are 2003 (drop after high indicator), 2009 (rapid changes), 2012 (series of drops), 2017 (stabilization). Government Effectiveness increases rapidly in 2000 and maintains it’s stability with little changes until 2012 when it drops significantly.

Source: World Bank
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leading to stabilization with no changes during Revolution. Regulatory Quality and Rule of Law shows steady rise over 20 years, showing only few disruptions and stabilizations of what it looks as election years and afterwards. Corruption Control shows slow rise only having 2 rapid increases in 2003 and especially in 2017.

In Tables below we can see statistics of 2019 and comparison of levels of these indicators in 2019:

Table 4.2.9 Worldwide Governance Indicators 2019: Armenia, Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Sources</th>
<th>Governance (-2.5 to +2.5)</th>
<th>Percentile Rank</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voice and Accountability</td>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>47.70</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Stability and Absence</td>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-0.51</td>
<td>27.62</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Effectiveness</td>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Quality</td>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>63.46</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule of Law</td>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>49.04</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of Corruption</td>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: World Bank\textsuperscript{339}

Table 4.2.10 Worldwide Governance Indicators 2019: Armenia, Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Percentile Rank (0 to 100)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voice and Accountability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Stability and Absence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule of Law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of Corruption</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: World Bank\textsuperscript{340}

As we can see number of sources World Bank uses in Armenia is around 6-12. And according ranking, Voice and Accountability, Government Effectiveness, Rule


\textsuperscript{340} Ibid.
of Law, Control of Corruption receive nearly 50% scores, while Political Stability and Absence of Violence only 28% and Regulatory Quality 64%.

Below is a list of sources that World Bank is using for 2019 indicators:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Accountability</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Regulatory Quality</th>
<th>Rule of Law</th>
<th>Corruption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>Bertelsmann Transformation Index</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Congo Research Institute for Human Rights</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economist Intelligence Unit</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freedom House</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gallup World Poll</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heritage Foundation Index of Economic</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IFAD Rural Sector Performance Assessment</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IHS Market World Economic Service</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IER Country Security Risk Ratings</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional Profiles Database</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Risk Services International Co.</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reporters Without Borders Press Freedom</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>US State Department Trafficking in Pir.</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Varieties of Democracy Project</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>World Bank Country Policy and Institute</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>World Economic Forum Global Compet.</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: World Bank

Some of those sources I study separately in Chapter 4.2.

Most of the above indexes shows institutional opportunities for participation which government creates, thus showing us approximate level of participatory governing. But in order to understand full potential of participation in country, we should understand also population’s potential or their social capital.

One of the rankings showing development of Social Capital is the Social Progress Index, summary of it’s 2020 ranking is in Tables below.
As we can see overall score in Armenia is 76 (out of 100) in 2020, which is ranking Armenia 50th (out of 163), or as per ranking – overperforming result. Access of population using E-Participation platforms is 80, which is 54th in ranking, and it’s a performance according expectations, and is a near result to rights and liberties, where by scoring 80 Armenia is 69th in ranking. According ranking, Armenia is overperforming in Basic Education, scoring 93 and 36th in ranking, and performing according expectations in Higher Education, scoring 63 and 56th in ranking. Overall, Opportunity for Social Progress in Armenia scores 63, and 58th in ranking.

Another Index showing the ranking of human capital is the Human Development Indicators by UNDP. It’s calculating Human Development Index on basis of various indexes and currently is 0.776 in Armenia (world average 0.737) which is ranking Armenia 81 in world.

Source: 2020 Social Progress Index

---

As we can see, it’s steadily raising in Armenia since it’s independence, staying on a similar level since 2009.

Almost all components are higher in comparison to world average scores.

As parts of various interesting indicators UNDP is using in calculations are - Government expenditure on education and Knowledge Economy Indexes. Armenia’s 2020 Government expenditure on education is 2.7% (of GDP), which has been steadily dropping and raising from 2010 (highest score in last 2 decades – 3.2%).

In World Bank’s Knowledge Economy Index (shows the ability of country to use knowledge in economic and social development) according latest rankings in 2012, Armenia is on 71 place in world, scoring 5.08 (out of 10), and 4.84 in KI – Knowledge Index (shows the ability of country to create, introduce and share it), while in European Bank’s 2018 ranking it scores 4.51 out of 10 and is on 21 place in nearly 40 economies (European Bank countries average is 4.67).

Source: UNDP

Figure 4.2.13 Human Development Indicators 2020: Armenia

World Bank Knowledge Economy Index 2012, EBRD Knowledge Economy Index 2018.
In general, Human Capital Index shows cumulations of knowledge, abilities and skills in humans. Developments in human capital enable social progress which inevitably leads into rise of public participation.

In this question it is important to understand differences of terms human capital and social capital, which are 2 of 5 forms of capital in Sustainable Livelihood Approach (human, social, natural, physical and financial) which international organizations use in order to understand well-being and progress in populations of world countries. According SLA, Human capital is a “property of individuals: it consists of the knowledge, skills and health that people accumulate over their lives, that improves their well-being and supports their ability to realise their potential.” Aside from its intrinsic value as an asset, it is a prerequisite needed to make use of any other form of capital. As such, it plays a foundational role in helping people to build sustainable livelihoods. Social capital “consists of “networks together with shared norms, values and understandings that facilitate co-operation within or among groups”. Social capital supports and strengthens societies. Although it is rarely assigned a monetary value, people tend to value social capital greatly – and rely heavily on it as a resource for their lives and livelihoods. Social capital impacts directly on the accrual of other forms of capital by improving the efficacy of economic relationships and by granting equal access to resources and public goods.”

Influence of institutional environment on social progress.

---

349 DFID, Sustainable Livelihoods Guidance Sheets, United Kingdom Department for International Development (DFID), London 1999.
351 DFID, Sustainable Livelihoods Guidance Sheets, United Kingdom Department for International Development (DFID), London 1999.
Inclusiveness of progress assumes various institutional changes. In this context it is important not just having effective institutions at particular moment, but changes of those in time and adaption on new opportunities. In order to understand dynamic changes of institutions from points of view of progress, we should do comparisons of indexes showing institutional environment and sociopolitical progress. Such indexes showing development of institutions are Corruption Perception Index, World Press Freedom Index, Rule of Law, Intellectual Property Rights Index and so on.\textsuperscript{356}

World Press Freedom Index - Statistical data is taken from Reporters without borders international organization. Index is calculating on basis of 7 pillars:

1. Pluralism
2. Media independence
3. Environment and self-censorship
4. Legislative framework
5. Transparency
6. Infrastructure
7. Abuses and acts of violence against journalists and media\textsuperscript{357}

According it’s ranking, Armenia is 61 (out of 180) in world since 2019, it has been slowly dropping to 80 until 2018 and now is up and on similar level in 2020 with score of nearly 28 points (best result – 7.84).\textsuperscript{358}

Rule of Law and other indicators showing development of institutions are shown in World Bank Governance Indicators or other indicators - Intellectual Property Rights Index, Global Competitiveness Index, Global Talent Competitiveness Index and Global Innovation Index.

According 2020 Intellectual Property Rights Index, Armenia’s IPRI score increased by 0.22 to 5.032 placing it 16 (out of 25) in Central Eastern Europe and Central Asia and 83 (out of 129) in world ranking. Armenia’s classification by IMF is CIS group and by World Bank as Upper middle income country. Armenia’s Legal and

\textsuperscript{356} Է. Թաղարյան, Տնտեսական աճի կայունության ինստիտուցիոնալ հիմնախնդիրները Հայաստանի Հանրապետության երկրագետության հիմնական զարգացման երկրագետական ծրագրերը, ՀՊՏՀ, Երևան 2018, pp. 76-77.
Political Sub-index in 2020 is increasing by 0.433 to 4.656 with scores of 4.929 (60 in world) in Judicial Independence, 4.7 (70 in world) in Rule of Law, 4.695 in Political Stability (85 in world), and 4.302 in Control of Corruption (75 in world).\footnote{359} Influence of institutional environment on technological factor

In order to understand institutional environment and its influence on technological factor we should analyze periodic publication by World Economic Forum – Global Competitiveness Index and it’s 12 main components.\footnote{360}

It’s interesting to look into changes of concepts how Indexes and Sub-Indexes are calculating. In 2017 report it shows that GCI consists of following.

- Basic requirements sub-index, key for factor-driven economies: 1. Institutions, 2. Infrastructure, 3. Macroeconomic environment, 4. Health and primary education
- Innovation and sophistication factors sub-index, key for innovation-driven economies: 11. Business sophistication, 12. Innovation\footnote{361}.

In 2019 report, it presents a new approach, where sub-indexes are shown in different labels, which we can see in Table 4.2.13. In GCI 2019, Armenia’s ranking is 69 (out of 141), improving it’s position since 2018 from 70.

Below we can see scores in 2019 that Armenia has in all 12 components and it’s ranking in comparison to world averages:

\footnote{361} Ibid.
Source: Global Competitiveness Index\textsuperscript{362}

It is particularly interesting comparing results of sub-indexes. GCI uses indicators, which shows its relation to political institutions and human capital level. Such indicators are in below summary, concentrating mostly on Institutions (number 1), which actually relates in terms of scores to human skills (number 6) and average of innovation scores:

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|}
\hline
Index Component & Value & Score & Rank/141 & Best Performer \\
\hline
1st pillar: Institutions 0–100 & - & 56.2 & 62 & Finland \\
Social capital 0–100 & - & 43.0 & 129 & New Zealand \\
Checks and balances 0–100 & - & 55.4 & 46 & Finland \\
Budget transparency 0–100 (best) & n/a & 53.1 & n/a & Multiple (2) \\
Judicial independence 1–7 (best) & 4.0 & 49.3 & 67 & Finland \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Score 1</th>
<th>Score 2</th>
<th>Score 3</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency of legal framework in challenging regulations 1–7 (best)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom of the press 0–100 (worst)</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public-sector performance 0–100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burden of government regulation 1–7 (best)</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency of legal framework in settling disputes 1–7 (best)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Participation 0–1 (best)</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Multiple (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency 0–100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate governance 0–100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of auditing and accounting standards 1–7 (best)</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict of interest regulation 0–10 (best)</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shareholder governance 0–10 (best)</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future orientation of government 0–100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government adaptability 0–100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government ensuring policy stability 1–7 (best)</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government's responsiveness to change 1–7 (best)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal framework's adaptability to digital business models 1–7 (best)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government long-term vision 1–7 (best)</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to sustainability 0–100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd pillar: Infrastructure 0–100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd pillar: ICT adoption 0–100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Korea, Rep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th pillar: Macroeconomic stability 0–100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Multiple (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human capital 0–100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillar</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th pillar: Health 0–100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Multiple (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th pillar: Skills 0–100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markets 0–100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th pillar: Product market 0–100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Hong Kong SAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th pillar: Labour market 0–100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th pillar: Financial system 0–100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Hong Kong SAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th pillar: Market size 0–100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation ecosystem 0–100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th pillar: Business dynamism 0–100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th pillar: Innovation capability 0–100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Global Competitiveness Index

In sub-indexes above we can see Social Capital, where Armenia scores 43, and is 129 in world, in relation to overall human capital, and can suppose it shows us the lack of social skills, training, participation in Armenia. It shows that performance in public sector is above average in terms of rankings. Government adaptability is also above average, which creates opportunities for participatory governing and openness in relations with citizens, ensuring active public participation.

It is interesting to show comparison of sub-indexes describing quality of institutions (property rights protection, independence of courts, corporative culture and so on) with level of innovation (quality of research and scientific centers, investments in such works, connection of higher education facilities and industry and so on), which can show that sub-indexes describing quality of institutions independently from development levels of countries are exceeding innovation sub-indexes, which comes to prove us, that innovations, and consequently technological changes are outcomes from productive institutional environment of states in ranking. Besides, qualitative superiority of institutions in countries over innovation levels is a “locomotive” which “pulls and raises” innovative potential and influences

---

363 Ibid.
on social capital. There is an interesting ranking of International Business School (INSEAD), “Adecco Group” and “Human Capital Leadership” institution, which show Global Talent Competitiveness Index – an indicator showing the levels of inclusion of “brains” and how appealing is a country for professionals.\textsuperscript{364} GTCI Index varies in 0-100, closer the indicator is to 100, the more are efficient institutions in countries and are appealing in involving “brains” and vice-versa, closer it is to 0, less it is appealing. Logically, more appealing are countries with high levels of progress, for example Switzerland (81.26), Singapore (78.48), UK (72.27), US (79.09) and so on, and less it is appealing as countries have less levels of progress. In comparison, Armenia scores 43.52 (raising to 43.48 in 2014, steady 42.84 in 2017, dropping to 40 in 2018 and raising to 43.52 in 2020).\textsuperscript{365}

![Figure 4.2.15 GTCI Historical Comparison: Armenia](https://gtcistudy.com/the-gtci-index/#gtci-country-view)

Source: GTCI\textsuperscript{366}

\textsuperscript{364} Է. Թաղարյան, Տնտեսական աճի կայունության ապահովման ինստիտուցիոնալ հիմնախնդիրները Հայաստանի Հանրապետության տարածքում, ՀՊՏՀ, Երևան 2018, էջ 94.


So in 2020 Index Armenia’s ranking is 60, with below scores in key indicators:

Source: GTCI

In Tables 4.2.14 we can see indicators GTCI is using in its 6 components, which are closest in terms of influencing on social capital and innovations in participation.

Source: GTCI

---

Another interesting Index in showing the connection of institutions and innovation is Global Innovation Index. In 2020 ranking Armenia is 61 among the 131 economies according innovation capabilities. It includes 80 indicators, showing innovations both inputs and outputs.

Below we can see rankings in 2018, 2019 and 2020, where Armenia shows little progress in all indexes:

---

Source: GTCI

---


Output sub-index is higher in Armenia in comparison to input sub-index, it means Armenia produces more innovation outputs relative to its level of innovation investments.\textsuperscript{371}

In order to show relations of innovation and progress, we can look into below chart, which is showing relationship of income level (GDP per capita) and innovation performance indicators. As we can see in chart, Armenia is performing above expectations in accordance of it’s level of development.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
 & GII & Innovation inputs & Innovation outputs \\
\hline
2020 & 61 & 83 & 47 \\
2019 & 64 & 85 & 50 \\
2018 & 68 & 94 & 50 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Global Innovation Index, Rankings of Armenia}
\end{table}

Source: Global Innovation Index\textsuperscript{370}

\textsuperscript{370} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{371} Ibid.
According to the 2020 Global Innovation Index report, Armenia has high scores in four GII pillars: Institutions – 64.3 (which includes Political institutions), Market
sophistication – 46.9, Knowledge & technology outputs – 28.5 and Creative outputs – 25.8, which are above average for the upper middle-income group. Conversely, Armenia scores below average for its income group in three pillars: Human capital and research – 20.5, Infrastructure – 34.4 (which includes E-Participation) and Business sophistication – 24.6\textsuperscript{373}.

As we can see in below chart Armenia performs best in Knowledge & technology outputs and its weakest performance is in Human capital & research. It is fascinating, as with weak capital and input Armenia still comes up with high output and rankings.

*Figure 4.2.18 Overview of Armenia’s rankings in 7 Global Innovation Index areas*

Source: Global Innovation Index\textsuperscript{374}

Below we can see summary of strengths and weaknesses of Armenia in various indicators of Global Innovation Index.

*Table 4.2.16 Global Innovation Index, Armenia’s strengths and weaknesses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GII strengths for Armenia are found in five of the seven GII pillars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Institutions (64 in ranking): the indicator Ease of starting a business (10 in ranking) is a strength.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{373} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{374} Ibid.
- Human capital & research (94 in ranking): the indicator Pupil–teacher ratio (11 in ranking) is a strength.

- Market sophistication (68 in ranking): the indicator Intensity of local competition (36 in ranking) is a strength.

- Knowledge & technology outputs (45 in ranking): reveals strengths in the sub-pillar Knowledge creation (37 in ranking) and in the indicators Patents by origin (29 in ranking), Scientific & technical articles (18 in ranking), Growth rate of GDP per worker (1 in ranking) and ICT services exports (14 in ranking).

- Creative outputs (56 in ranking): has strengths in the indicators Trademarks by origin (14 in ranking), National feature films (12 in ranking) and Wikipedia edits (7 in ranking).

**Weaknesses**

GII weaknesses for Armenia are found in six of the seven GII pillars.

- Human capital & research (94 in ranking): has weaknesses in the indicators Expenditure on education (105 in ranking), Graduates in science & engineering (96 in ranking), Global R&D companies (42 in ranking) and QS university ranking (77 in ranking).

- Infrastructure (90 in ranking): the indicator ISO 14001 environmental certificates (126 in ranking) is a weakness.

- Market sophistication (68 in ranking): the indicator Domestic market scale (118 in ranking) is a weakness.

- Business sophistication (69 in ranking): the indicator Firms offering formal training (84 in ranking) is a weakness.

- Knowledge & technology outputs (45 in ranking): displays weaknesses in the indicators ISO 9001 quality certificates (110 in ranking) and High- & medium-high-tech manufacturing (100 in ranking).

- Creative outputs (56 in ranking): the indicator Global brand value (80 in ranking) is a weakness.
From above we can understand, that strong innovation level relates to political institutions showing strong indicators, but still lacks high indicators in capabilities in individual level and usage of tools of participation.

In order to understand how above indexes relate and show influence on public participation in Armenia, we can look into polls by International Republican Institute and Caucasus Research Resource Center.

In it’s poll of Armenian residents in September-October 2019, IRI shows that citizen’s believing of that they can influence on decisions made in country, only 16% agree, while 39% say they probably agree in October 2019. Interestingly, numbers are low for those saying they agree since May 2019 (20%), and Oct 2018(31%) and even lower from August 2018 poll which was after Revolution (22%), while numbers of those saying they probably agree stay in areas of 40-41% in 2018 and in 2019 lower into 33% in May 2019 and rise into 39% in October 2019.\footnote{International Republican Institute’s (IRI) Center for Insights in Survey Research, Public Opinion Survey: Residents of Armenia, Sep-Oct 2019 https://www.iri.org/sites/default/files/wysiwyg/iri_poll_armenia_september-october_2019.pdf, (access: 20/12/2020), p.17.}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure.png}
\caption{Do you believe that people like you can influence decisions made in your country? Historical comparison}
\end{figure}

\footnote{Ibid.}
Apparently, people are confident rather in towns (19%), than in villages (14%) and in capital (16%). Also, people in their 18-20’s (21%) are confident in comparison to people in 30-40’s (18%) and 50+ (12%).

Considering inclusion of different groups in population, poll shows opinions of people if youth, people with disabilities and women should participate in decision making. According results, 64% of people find it very important for youth in order to participate in decision making, and 28% considering it nearly important, and 54% of people find it very important for people with disabilities and women participating, and 37%, 38% considering it nearly important.

Source: International Republican Institute’s (IRI) Center for Insights in Survey Research

Figure 4.2.20 Do you believe that people like you can influence decisions made in your country? Comparison by residences/ages

Source: International Republican Institute’s (IRI) Center for Insights in Survey Research

---

377 Ibid.
378 Ibid., p. 18.
379 Ibid.
380 Ibid., p. 23.
We can assume by such numbers that in order to develop in Armenia human and social capital, capabilities of citizens to participate, it’s not enough strengthening institutions and providing participation opportunities, but also encouraging and raising awareness on importance of including various groups in decision making so those people want to and learn how it is involving in public policies/politics.

Figure 4.2.21 How important is it that all members of our country’s adult population, including women, youth, and people with disabilities, are included in political decision making?

Source: International Republican Institute’s (IRI) Center for Insights in Survey Research

Another interesting chart is showing the level of trust towards public institutions. People favor President’s office on 82%, Prime Minister’s office 76%, Government, Ministers, Parliament 63%, Local authorities 55%, CSO’s 52%, Governors 49%, Parties 42% and so on. This is comparing to GCI Index where we can see slow rise in public trust towards politicians and increase of accountability and quality of public institutions.

---

381 Ibid.
It is interesting to compare IRI’s poll responses on trust towards public institutions in comparisons to CRRC Caucasus Barometer of 2020, where President is still in leading (3rd) having 35% of full trust and, government 27%, local government 13%, and NGO’s, Courts and Parties below 4%.384

Source: International Republican Institute’s (IRI) Center for Insights in Survey Research383

In particular we can see shifts in trust towards Parliament, government in comparison to results starting 2008. Respondents fully trusting parliament show 26% in 2008, which was dropping until 12% in 2017 and raising up to 39% in 2019. Even as interest in Parliamentary elections in 2018 was low (49% turnout in comparison to 60% in 2017), we can explain high confidence on fairness and anti-corruption character of post-Revolution elections.

As per government, in 2008 number of respondents trusting it is 42%, which was slowly dropping to 20% in 2017 and raising up to 71% in 2019.

Source: Caucasus Research Resource Center (CRRC)\(^{385}\)

\(^{385}\) Ibid.
On question about interest in politics in IRI poll, we can see it’s dropping since 2018, where high interest in October shows 40%, and in 2019 it drops to 30% in May recently showing 19% in October.\(^\text{388}\)

\(^{386}\) Ibid.

\(^{387}\) Ibid.

It is interesting to see charts on how in different groups respondents show their interest in politics. In October 2018 poll, where interest was higher in comparison to 2019, we can see similar levels of interest (43%) amongst youth of 18-29 and 30-49, and lower interest (36%) in ages of 50+. Respectively, in capital city and in villages interest is similar (39%), and in cities or towns it’s higher (44%).

Source: International Republican Institute’s (IRI) Center for Insights in Survey Research

---

389 Ibid.

In order to understand what was the level of civic activism in Revolution of 2018, we can look into chart from 2018 August poll where 43% said they did participate in protests.\textsuperscript{392}

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{chart.png}
\caption{How much interest do you have in politics? (Respondents given a 10-point scale, where 10 “very much interested” and 1 “not at all interested”; disaggregated by age and settlement size)}
\end{figure}

Source: International Republican Institute’s (IRI) Center for Insights in Survey Research\textsuperscript{391}

\textsuperscript{391} Ibid.

On question would they participate again in protests, participants of 2018 protests said they would, 23% for any reason, 64% in favor and 8% against particular issues, while 2% said they don’t want to. From those not participating in 2018 protests 4% said that they would participate in protests for any reason, 21% in favor and 10% against particular issues, while 55% said they don’t want to participate in any protests. So we clearly see in both questions that majority in 2018 protests participants would participate in new protests while non-participant majority still not. That could explain why Pashinyan supporters can easily have squares full in protests and anti-Pashinyan alliances even when after second Karabakh War there is a huge public pressure on Pashinyan to resign, still don’t fill squares which leaves impressions that public supports government while public opinion shows lack of support.\(^{394}\)

\(^{393}\) Ibid.
\(^{394}\) Ibid., pp. 22, 23.
Figure 4.2.29 If yes, would you participate in new street demonstrations if they were called for again? (Participants: N=520)

Source: International Republican Institute’s (IRI) Center for Insights in Survey Research

Figure 4.2.29 If no, would you participate in new street demonstrations if they were called for? (Those who did not participate: N=620)

Source: International Republican Institute’s (IRI) Center for Insights in Survey Research

---

395 Ibid.
396 Ibid.
4.3 Analysis of the results of the surveys among the population and the Ministry staff

In addition of secondary study of various indexes and surveys, I have also been surveying local adult population and youth in 2 surveys – before and after Revolution. In both surveys, in February-March 2018 and March-April 2020, 200 respondents took part in each of surveys, in which the same questionnaire was in use and participants were chosen on a random basis over face-to-face poll and using Google Forms.

The purpose of this small and experimental research study is to measure the breadth of the 6 pre-identified categories, their perceptions by respondents, and show the interrelationships of such categories. Therefore, before starting the research I have identified the following issues:

• measure citizens' perceptions of civic engagement or show what they understand of their own involvement or necessities of it, that is, measure their level of civic consciousness according to their own perceptions and evaluations;
• measure the level of interest in governing processes;
• measure of transparency and openness in public policy basing on study of level in respondents' awareness on their own assessment;
• measure participation opportunities or governing openness;
• measure satisfaction level or confidence;
• measure the level of participation or engagement;

I have therefore identified 6 study categories or dependent variables - perceptions; interest; confidence; transparency/openness; awareness; institutional capacity; involvement.

There are also independent variables: gender, age, profession.
Overall, 94 males and 106 females took part in both surveys, which is representative according Armenian National Statistics office, aged 17-52, with many specialties, which we can group into the following categories: Public Administration and Political Science - PA / PS; International Relations and Other Humanities - IR / other; Information Technology, Communication & Languages & Other Related Sciences - IT / Commun / other; Business and related sciences - Business. A total of 200 citizens, including some non-Armenian speakers, took part in both surveys, so the surveys were in English, allowing to respond to any language and if necessary, having auto-translations into Armenian and Russian.

In order to measure the level of citizens' perceptions of the object of study and relevance on it's importance, I ask a question if public participation and involvement are among the most important values of democratic governance systems.

As we can see, only 64.5% of respondents in 2018 said they consider citizen participation to be crucial for the effective functioning and development of democratic governance systems, which can be considered lower than expecting in the context of recently actively encouraging civic participation and raising interest and provides a basis of forming an opinion on the certain lack of effectiveness of the current processes of increasing civic consciousness and underlining the necessity for its continuous and more intensive as comparing to now realizations. What’s very interesting, after Revolution 71% of respondents say it’s one of most important attributes and basis.
Within the same category, I ask another question, what is the most important factor affecting public participation and its level.

*Figure 4.3.3 What is the main factor influencing on the level of public participation?*

Source: Robert Nahapetyan.

By combining two options within the same logic - maturity of civil culture and citizen consolidation, as well as the level of political literacy or awareness of the public as one homogeneous and unified variant - we get more than half of respondents, about 64% in 2018 and 67% in 2020, comparing to the other two, of which the opportunities for participation creating by the state and its structures respectively, which is no less important in parallel with civic culture however, is showing only 21-23% votes and 12-13% for social and economic issues.

In order to measure the transparency of government and the awareness of citizens, I identify next two questions: 1. How you would rate your awareness of public policies, government decisions and law-making processes? 2. How you would describe the transparency and openness of government or public administration?

*Figure 4.3.4. Awareness*

*Figure 4.3.5 Transparency, Openness*
As we can see, the citizens, more than half of respondents (57.5-60%), assess awareness as average, and 27.5-30%, even higher level, on the other hand, in parallel, we see the transparency and openness in their opinions, where 37% in 2018 and 22% in 2020 rate governments as non-transparent and 52.5-60% (respectively 2018 and 2020) as partly open. Only 11% of respondents in 2018 and 18% in 2020 voting government is open, which are low results. However, an interesting parallel can be the fact that citizens who assess their awareness as normal are generally dissatisfied with the level of government transparency, from which we can draw another possible conclusion in favor of the statement that awareness = transparency + interest * activities, which means, in conditions of limits to transparency of governments, however, people try to keep in control due to their own interest and persistent queries for information, which speaks of their activity, which is using to raise awareness and receiving information satisfaction. This speaks to 4 categories of the study at once: awareness, interest, transparency/openness and trust/satisfaction.

In terms of trust and satisfaction, the following two questions try to measure their levels: 1. Please assess your national government's efforts in the implementation of public policy; 2. How would you assess of general competence of your national government members and officials?
As we can see, 41% in 2018 and 30.5% in 2020 are considering government's efforts insufficient and 47% in 2018 and 56% in 2020 assess it as normal, while the competence of government members and officials is very low or 42.5% in both 2018 and 2020 and somewhat low or 47.5% in 2018 and 50% in 2020 respectively. Answers of very high satisfaction and according expectations receive 12% in 2018 and 13.5% in 2020 and 10% in 2018 and 7.5% in 2020. This means that the overall level of trust in governance is the same, and low, if we compare government as such as itself a symbol of the governance system and also individual efforts of government members and officials. This may indicate that there is a stereotypical approach to governance in the majority of the population, and that is typical of almost all peoples.

I use now following two questions to measure citizen engagement and their activity levels: 1. Do you consider yourself an active citizen of society? 2. Have you ever participated in the policy formation process?

Source: Robert Nahapetyan.

As we can see, votes split in almost equal in activity evaluation, and experience is available in practical participation in only 31% of respondents in 2018 and raising up 39% in 2020, which shows that half of citizens considering their selves active either in any way practically can’t realize activity as in lack of institutional capacity or
because of low awareness or staying active are not interesting in and engaging in public policy programs. There are also respondents who consider their selves partially active, or indicate that they participate in the work of international organizations interesting in public policy, or do not consider their selves active but are actively interesting of developments in public administration, or even working as journalist consider their selves to be opinion makers.

By asking question of What is the best way for citizens to make a public policy proposal?, I also want to see citizens' views and perceptions of participation.

Figure 4.3.10 What's the best way for initiating a public policy suggestion by citizens?

Source: Robert Nahapetyan.

Advocacy and interest groups gathers the majority of the vote in 2018 - 42%, but is the second in 2020 – 37%, switching in places or following by cooperation of public and elective and appointing representatives and officials in local or state level - 37% in 2018 and 44% in 2020, and afterwards it is 20% in 2018 and 17% in 2020 of involving in public discussions. It's interesting that among other answers, which is less than 1% in both surveys, according one of the citizens in 2018, if elective representatives are competent, engaging in own business and is sufficient freedom for development in economic area, it’s not necessary for citizens to seek cooperation with the state, while according another - It’s impossible in Armenia because of grant–eating nature of most Armenian people, and in 2020 one of respondents claims - media noise. One of outlining following questions is: Do you consider that there is a need to raise the current level of citizen engagement or should the policy be left to professionals in current frameworks of public and civic cooperation?
The overwhelming majority, 82% in 2018 and 89% in 2020, think that cooperation with citizens should be enhancing or improving, and only 18% in 2018 and 11% in 2020 think it is working successfully at present. There are also opinions that if participation is a government issue, then there is no civic initiative at all, so only strong frameworks of laws is necessary and can enable cooperation, or opinions that civil society has not so far finish forming when considering both Armenian and European states, as well as claims that before any of these steps are not taken, a rigorous policy is necessary to contain and control non-competences and corruption.

Source: Robert Nahapetyan.

By answering on the question of possibility of your influence on government’s decision if necessary, a rather interesting picture is providing when comparing the two independent parts of the question with each other: citizens’ ability to influence decisions at the state and local levels.

Figure 4.3.11 Do you consider that there is a need to increase the existing level of citizen involvement or should we leave the policy implementation to professionals in the current state of cooperation with citizens?

Figure 4.3.12 Please rate the possibility of your influence on government’s decision (state – in blue vs local – in green) 2018 survey
As we can see, the rule is that citizens at the local level find their selves closer to the authorities in power and influence decisions more readily than when characterizing state-level decisions, where there is only 1 vote in 2018 and 3 votes in 2020 on always possible options, and of more than half of the respondents in 2018, or 51.5%, and almost half in 2020, or 42%, find it rather impossible to influence state-level decisions when the majority of respondents describing decisions on local level either is seeing possibility in influencing depending on nature of the decisions, or even is believing it to be very likely by 25% in 2018 and 27.5% in 2020.

In order to assessing approaches and perceptions of public participation among various Ministry staff, as well as assessing institutional procedures for citizen engagement and opportunities available, I also conduct an expert survey in 2018 and 2020 among 8 institutions staff: Ministry of Defense, Ministry of Education, Science, Culture and Sport, Ministry of Environment, Ministry of Economy, Ministry of High-Tech Industry, Ministry of Justice, Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs, Ministry of Territorial Administration and Infrastructure, and identifying following categories/variables of the study: attitude/perceptions; institutional procedures; councils; open government partnership; governing distance and increasing engagement. I present the results and analysis of study:

Age composition: 25-66; Specialties: builder, engineers, lawyers, economists, foreign language and literature specialist-translators and even an aikido sport.

Source: Robert Nahapetyan.
The following question I ask so to determine the level of perceptions of the Ministry staff on public participation and attitude of it: Do you believe, if public should control work of ministries?

*Figure 4.3.15 Should public control work of ministries?*

Source: Robert Nahapetyan.

Opinions are almost equal in 2018, a slightest advantage being of to the opinion that the ministry's work is professional and specific it should not or cannot be effectively controlling by the public. It is generally agreeable on the fact that population lacks sufficient competence and resources to oversee the activities of the ministries, for which these special structures, normal as administration are creating, but on the other hand, in order to continuously improve their performance, increase transparency and increase efficiency, citizens aware of the sector and representing population are organizing special groups ministries should cooperating and interest of groups should not hinder by pressures normal courses of business. Perhaps the pressures and existing and expressing non-confident attitude of the population, I believe, very often makes Ministry workers psychologically even so to separating of the values of dialogues and cooperation with citizens and continuous formation of civic participation process.

So following two questions I ask about the category of institutional procedures for citizen involvement and participation within the Ministry: 1. Does Ministry have working Mechanisms of citizen expression of suggestions, complaints and concerns?;
2. During this work did you receive citizen proposals and projects, which you have been working on?

*Figure 4.3.16 Does Ministry have working Mechanisms of citizen expression of suggestions, complaints and concerns vs. During this work did you receive citizen proposals and projects, which you have been working on – 2018 survey*

2018

- no, 6, 35%
- yes, 34, 85%

*Figure 4.3.17 Does Ministry have working Mechanisms of citizen expression of suggestions, complaints and concerns vs. During this work did you receive citizen proposals and projects, which you have been working on – 2020 survey*

2020

- no, 12, 30%
- yes, 28, 70%

Source: Robert Nahapetyan.

As we can see, until Revolution 85% of respondents said there are working mechanisms of participation while only 52% had such civic proposals, and after Revolution 95% believes such ways of civic participation exist and 70% had experience as such. This is an indicator of raising public participation and investing civic mechanisms so that citizens can participate and submit in proposals.

In the framework of the study, speaking about public councils and experience of their investing in the republic, I consider it necessary to include the following two questions relating to their existence and operation: 1. Do Ministries have working public councils?; 2. Do you believe current agenda and/or organization of such councils is efficient?
As we can see, only half of the respondents in 2018 are aware of public boards in comparison to 2020, when 80% of respondents know about it, which suggests that either public boards are available, but their work is not open, inclusive, or effective enough so that all staff can know about it’s work or respondents through their work do not relate to the activities of public boards, as reporting by some well-aware staff of the Ministry, and effectiveness has been positively expressing and evaluating by almost half of the staff, 45% in 2018 and by 75% in 2020, comparing to and basing on the fact that an equal number of other respondents are unaware of its operations and effectiveness in 2018, while number of workers unaware lowers by half in 2020. This is an indicator that after Revolution, transparency and openness of public boards have been improving, in comparison to issues I have been covering in previous chapters, and it’s effectiveness has been increasing because of objective changes in operations making boards working instead of being symbolic. So 10% in 2018 and 5% in 2020 say they are ineffective, which means that either in respondents approach public boards
are not necessary at all, taking into account results of one of original first questions on representatives perceptions and attitude of public participation, or public boards are necessary but upon improving.

Another important project I’m observing in the study is the Open Government Partnership and projects ready and presenting in partnership on framework and in order to find out awareness of the staff, their attitude on OGP, I ask 2 questions: 1. Is Ministry part of realization and/or development process of programs under Open Government Partnership? 2. Did reforms in electronic administration, aiming on raise in electronic exchange of documents and raise in transparency and accountability, promote increasing of Ministry work efficiency and control?

*Figure 4.3.20 Is Ministry part of realization and/or development process of programs under OGP? vs. Did reforms in electronic administration promote increasing of Ministry work efficiency and control? – 2018 survey*

![2018 Survey](image)

*Figure 4.3.21 Is Ministry part of realization and/or development process of programs under OGP? vs. Did reforms in electronic administration promote increasing of Ministry work efficiency and control? – 2020 survey*

![2020 Survey](image)

Source: Robert Nahapetyan.

Since e-governance reforms are also a part of the Open Government Partnership program, and in current phases ministries in Armenia also are in proposals
on improving works of Public Boards, summing up numbers of answers no and not
sureness, we receive amount of staff not having awareness in program or connections
of reforms and program, and so in 2018 its 65%, while in 2020 it’s even higher, 70%,
having no answers of no, which, however, cannot be relating as poor results in the
program or ministry, as on specific results in e-government and basis of its most
important innovations in electronic exchange of documents, not only vast majority of
respondents is familiar, but 80% in 2019, and 90% in 2020 have positive assessments
on the reforms improving control of jobs and efficiency of operations.

To measure public officials perceptions and attitudes on distances of
governing, I ask 2 questions: 1. Is there a separation or gap within state administration
institutions and public? 2. Is it necessary to increase levels of public participation?

Source: Robert Nahapetyan.
Opinions are again equal in 2018, only slight is advantage of favoring separation, in comparison to 2020 becoming vastly low, and are quite contradictory, and we do not even know if the respondents answering questions have a sense of loyalty or, on the contrary, disappointment, both of which may be influencing by misconceptions if one is expressing his opinion on such queries, even if it’s anonymous. This disparate picture of opinions can be comparing again with the answers on the first question, where the votes were also equal when considering if public participation and oversight is necessary, with the slightest difference in favor of no oversight, dropping later by half. So therefore, almost same number of people who find that there is a separation in state in relation to public also find that it is necessary to have or increase control, and vice versa, from which we can assume and prove again as if increasing public involvement can reduce in government distance and confidence obstacles but elimination or reduction, however, are also unambiguous, since recognizing that there is distancing does not indicate if such distancing is necessary or not. Therefore, to measure the totality of public servants perceptions on this issue, I ask other question, where the simple majority, or 62% in 2018, indicate that it is necessary to increase public participation, which is 40% in 2020, and summing up both questions we can see if until Revolution respondents saw larger separation, voting more on increasing participation, after Revolution, respondents see less separation, so voting less on increasing participation, and we can probably assume it is necessary to reduce or eliminate of distancing to integrate government and citizens. For comparison purposes, we should note on survey in participation respectively 82% and 89% of voters believe in increasing participation, which means that in this question both survey objects are almost unanimous.

**Summary**

In this Chapter I’m showing various experiences of western and post-communist countries in public participation and are extracting suggestions for Armenia. We can see institutions of citizen initiative, recall in US or EU, and institutes
of All-Russian National Front in Russia, operating as best practices in public participation we can apply in Armenia in order to boost participation.

I also study changes in participation level in Armenia correlating it with various indexes, in comparison to other countries in world and it’s sub-groups. Among such indexes I particularly am using indexes of Varieties of Democracy, Bertelsmann Transformation Index, UN E-Participation Index, The Economist Intelligence Unit’s Democracy Index, The Freedom House Indexes, Corruption Perception Index, Worldwide Governance Indexes, Social Progress Index, Human Development Index, World Press Freedom Index, Intellectual Property Rights Index, Global Competitiveness Index, Global Talent Competitiveness Index, Global Innovation Index, and various polls by International Republican Institute and Caucasus Research Resource Center, giving us full-pictures of Armenia’s position in various areas overlapping with participation results.

Finally, by conducting my own surveys in 2018 and 2020, until Revolution and after, in forms of both citizen and expert surveys, first in Armenian population and second in Ministries staff, I’m receiving results which are similar in some ways comparing with results by various international organizations, which are IRI and CRRC, researching public participation.
Conclusion

The issue of public participation in advanced democracies is viewing as modern society’s most important features, the ideological base of its concept is the idea that the process of adapting political and administrative decisions without the involvement of citizens is impossible to bring authorities and power structures legitimacy, as well as it is difficult sustaining civil society self-realization.

For modern democratic model best and most characteristic is the type of inclusion, which is characterizing by combining bottom-up autonomous participation and top-down consolidation or mobilization in public and engagement, or so depending on its political, social, and cultural uniqueness. A historical feature of the political culture is that Armenian society predominates mostly by procedures of top-down political and civic engagement, in which situation it is probably realistic ensuring of possibility in public self-organizing and also bottom-up participation, so which some of the reforms are now focusing on.

The current political and civic participation in Armenia is of irregular and non-structurizing character. Interaction of the government and of the public occurs only at crisis, critical points when the necessity for substantial change in some institutions shows up or matures, and political elite have or start to turn on to the populace for support of their new or transforming institutions and rules of the game and for a certain level of legitimacy, an example is a stressing of necessity by authorities of consolidation by population on new drafts of its norms. Another important and fundamental point of political and civil communication is the conducting of elections, but in ranges of that and other critical points, the issue of alienation and expulsion of population or its masses in relation or from authorities and various parties, movements is again aggravating. Such gap in political and civic interaction representatives of public or its groups are often changing by non-constructive behavior and protesting struggling, instead of which communication should be brought in civilizing and efficient ways into constructive or cooperative field, by expressing same ideas by not building social and political tense atmosphere.
Reducing the distance of citizens and of government structures is more or less possible only during elections when all the power of the state machine is directing at increasing population cohesion or mobilization. Despite this fact, various essential issues in social level, in particular crisis of civil identification and low level of civic maturity, dissemination and promotion of antisocial and individual-centric behavior and raising of distrust to power institutions in situations of underdevelopment in political and civic participation are resulting in massive political mobilization limitations, as a result in periods of certain activity, as indicating by nowadays many political scientists and political analysts, usually is following periods of apathy. Under such circumstances, and especially because Armenia is not yet fully ready for active political and civic activity, for the protection of its interests and even effective social protest, the ruling entity in its subjectivity will stay the external compensation and will replace the non-subjectivity of society or its still weak and new manifestations.

In the framework of the study it became clear that in order to increase the involvement of citizens in the field of governance in the Republic of Armenia in the coming years, it is envisaging of creation and realization of such initiatives:

- Micro surveys mechanism in some communities in the form of SMS messages;
- New standards for improving the work of councils and committees;
- A common online platform where government drafts will be reflecting in advance, citizens will be able subscribe to it and provide comments, opinions and suggestions as needed.

- Also to develop websites for large communities and so on.

Such reforms, possibilities of developing such, I consider a progressive phenomenon: it is commendable that such programs are being in developments and I hope so that their implementation will be effective and continuous.

In this research I’m introducing a hypothesis: public participation a parallel process of top-down institutional opportunities and bottom-up civic activism in Armenia, and 2 sub-hypotheses: 1. Institutional opportunities of participation are a result of dual approach in strengthening laws and norms on participation and adapting
policy of participatory governing by various projects or structures consolidating participation in Armenia, 2. Political culture of activism and civic upbringing result in development of social capital and capabilities of Armenian population in public participation. Basing on above conclusions and on research I have been conducting on each of any sub-hypotheses and on main hypothesis, I can confirm above hypotheses and state my opinion, that this dichotomic process is what’s constituting public participation, and both top-down and bottom-up directions of public participation are in a parallel consolidation in Armenia. And what’s more important, in my opinion, only with proper development of all of above creates possibilities in consolidating ideas and institutions of public participation.

As for my own proposals, as a result of the study of international experience in increasing public participation in governance and combining my own ideas, I could group the recommendations in the form of a 3-tier, which includes the creation and enhancement of quarters and platforms of state-citizen dialogues on lower level, on middle level – initiation of Councils under ministries and other State Agencies by professional standards and on higher level - national forum creation, which I have been looking into in the context of the work, as well as in other important suggestions in below points:

1. Encourage and institutionalize top-down civil and political mobilization of public participation that will positively impact the establishment of government-civil society partnerships and reduce the gap in both, as well as identify and resolve real problems.

2. First, in meso-level, create and encourage of involvement by civil society representative experts in Public councils and Boards under government structures. It is also important to continuously create councils attaching into all of governance structures and formally incorporate into legislative processes, giving political and managerial weight, ensuring increasing legitimacy and trust, public involvement and interest, as well as effectiveness in identification of issues and rapid and operative solution through active co-operation or co-governing of the state and civil society,
consolidation of which must be interesting of to both state structures or civil society institutes and even ordinary, normal citizens. It is important to consider a number of points:

In order for the role of such Public councils not to become simply formal, the councils should be made up of professionals, involving representatives of trade unions and sectoral communities, as well as other stakeholders, representatives of the public who can transform the results of the analysis into constructive suggestions and advice, and present into general public attention. In certain sectors or fields, the absence of relevant specialists or associations can be problematic, which is natural, and in which direction the state itself should pursue a specific policy, promoting their creation and non-hindering activity. The availability of such analytical centers and specialists, due to smart human resources policies and correct appointments, is primarily in the interests of the state, as it is about monitoring its effective operation or multilateral and pluralistic analysis.

In order to increase the effectiveness of public oversight through the work of the councils, it is also important to evaluate of performance in relevant structures on the basis of the recommendations containing in the preparing summary document, to make management entities reconcile with public opinion and promote of document creating in result of oversight, instead of being a purely declarative nature, in a way being of decisive factor, thus understanding in important role of which will help overcome of issue in irresponsibility, due to the use of helpful institution, such is financial and administrative sanctions.

3. Parallel into Councils, on micro level, create a state-society dialogue and consultation providing platforms, delivering the opinion of the citizens and not as an opposition, but through the support and cooperation of the ruling process. This means setting up offices that seek to engage citizens and so give all residents who wish to come to those offices and express opinions, complaints and suggestions so that those who are not directly involving in politics can be source of those same policies, new programs, projects, or initiating discussions of it directly from forces involving in
politics. Or in general, why only people should come to the state, and not the other way around? It would be welcoming to organize mobile information points, leaflets, tables in shops, libraries, parks and entrances in buildings, and elsewhere where citizens will be able of acquainting with the programs being in implementation and leave their comments and suggestions, which I believe will be a convenient option for participation.

4. Concerning the macro level, I consider it important to create a pan-national forum for coordinating the activities of all above institutions and ensuring of integration and consolidation of civil society and state in a sophisticated manner of Russian practicing, where hundreds of citizens, government members, state officials or public figures, representatives of businesses and expert communities can participate and in which during forums organizing and broadcasting on television and online head of state can personally respond to civil society and journalist questions, complaints and suggestions, as well as can call out necessary instructions on compromise solutions of specific issues, which further process will be reflecting through special sections of the forum website and it will show realization of work and indicators on questions receiving responses. A very good basis for such a forum can be Armenia’s current Public Council institute, which can coordinate the work of the forum and institutionalization of the issues raising, their placement and follow-up on the site, as well as of involvement and coordination of forum participants.

Formation of political cultures of answering citizen questions live can be a useful tool for power legitimization and strengthening state-society relations and communication or increasing trust.

5. In order to make top-down mobilization more complete, it is also important that full collection of certain parts of civil control and laws or norms regulating such can be integrating into one normative or law document, which will give public control more weighty and institutional role.

Adoption of such a law will promote the adoption of relevant by-laws and norms through which they will already be regulating, as well as basing on precedents
and conclusions drawn by experience accumulation, all existing conflict points, and will clarify professional criteria for membership of councils - educational and applying standards, including proportionally also other citizens and journalists interesting, also clarifying the scope of their rights and influence.

As of creating, encouraging of engaging in opportunities of bottom-up voluntary participation:

6. Since in Armenia also political parties are in the center of political culture, I believe it quite useful to initiating legislative reforms in scopes of laws and norms on party creation and enable local people to organize in small political parties and engage in solving local issues or voicing such issues out. This may also be an impetus for more serious attention on local issues by parties operating at national level, as otherwise the population will opt for local parties. A positive step in this regard would be to amend Article 9 (1-2) of the Law on Parties.

Another positive step would be the right of non-parliamentary parties to express opinions in parliament. A council of non-parliamentary parties could be set up, where parliamentarians, led by the speaker of the parliament, would meet regularly with representatives of those parties and be able conducting an effective and useful exchange of views and incorporate their suggestions, information, and presenting issues into the agenda by initiatives of discussion.

7. Encourage and legislate the institute of civic initiatives, adapt Constitution to provide for a certain number of citizens the right to initiate a legislative initiative and referendum, as well as to initiate a recall process. To solve issues of competence in most important positions and so to dispel mistrust by citizens certain legal procedures may be initiating, which would provide opportunities of government positions not to just be appointing by representatives and of team-mates of parliament representatives, but instead can be a concurring procedure by independent experts, and candidates of most qualifications will be selecting. And with respect to electing officials, it is necessary to introduce a recall institution.
8. For consolidation of initiative institution, database of specialist-officials and public servants may also be establishing, who will be responsible for advising on the legal compliance and legally literate wording of these initiatives, as well as ensuring a citizen-institute dialogue even long before the initiation process is initiating, creating an opportunity of initiative to improving and consolidating technically and substantially.

As part of the study, the analysis of the phenomenon of public participation, its role and its relation to the formation of civil culture made it possible to come to an understanding of its essence, of the opportunities providing, being necessary for its conscious and purposeful development and consolidation. The importance and application of citizen engagement is objectively conditioning by a particular level of social and political thought, such as co-governance through CS, which in turn results in citizens understanding of their political and civic wants, and in increase of overall consistency on its realization, basically into increase in interest on government and policy and searching or creating institutional opportunities to satisfy it. The idea of civil oversight, their involvement and participation continues its evolutionary consolidation and institutionalization in new ways or manifestations, which in its turn strives to be consistent with the objective and necessary public development and satisfaction in objectives of civil society. The political and civic maturity of the people or the increase of literacy is essential in order to reach this. And search for and application of effective and various methods will be on the focus of management and policy theorists and practitioners for quite some time.

Civic interaction skills and habits represent certain knowledge, so they can be shaping or developing through education. From this point of view, civic education is nothing more of a unity of participants of public and abilities, so it can in turn be shaping or developing through conscious, purposeful actions, that is, civic education or upbringing. Civic education as of this angle has a vast great potential and can be a very useful tool for relationship healing, but its potential is still not being in use properly, there are only practical, often informal signs similar to civic education, and
so rest of the theory of civic education or so it’s models are not very effective, because are not forming personal attitudes and civil interaction skills. It may be useful to establish youth councils in management, as is spread abroad, which will help the flow of young people's ideas into the field of management, and so develop their practical knowledge of civic engagement and relevant skills. In ensuring continuity of civic education and upbringing of adults, best institutional platforms are of mass media, especially online versions, which is due to the information society formation. Currently, their activities require quality regulation and of financial independence, but what methods are of most useful and effective as of regulation will show the international experience on which a separate specializing study is necessary to conduct so.
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Distinguished participant of the research survey on this very actual topic, we want to express our thanks for your willingness to cooperate with us in this important mission of ours. Questionnaire will take a few minutes of your time but your anonymous enthusiastic answers may have a long and important influence on developing the civic culture in our societies. Survey is conducted in English due to and in a compromise with the wide geography of our participants and researching colleagues.

Notes:
- used terms of 'government' or 'government officials' in this survey regard or stand for all the levels of governance in your states, including local self-governments.
- feel free to fill in our text boxes in your preferred languages.

* For automatic translation into Russian - [http://goo.gl/6dxa9i](http://goo.gl/6dxa9i); beforehand sorry for possible mistakes in interpretation, thanks.

**Occupation / Field of studies** *

**Age** *

**Gender** *

- M
- F

1. Do you agree that civic participation and involvement is one of the core values of the system of governance in democracies *

Or how well do you imagine its importance in terms of democratic values? from 1-3, where 1 is the lowest and 3 is the highest option

Disagree / not so connected
2. What is the main factor influencing on the level of public participation? *
   - Opportunities created by the state and its institutions
   - Society's level of political literacy or awareness
   - Civic culture maturity level and consolidation of citizens
   - Social-economic issues
3. How would you evaluate the level of your awareness on public policy implementations, government decisions, lawmaking processes *
   - Unaware / Insufficient
   - 1
   - 2
   - 3
   - Very high / Well-informed
4. How would you describe your government's / public administration's transparency and openness? *
   - non-transparent
   - 1
   - 2
   - 3
   - Open governance
5. Please rate your government's efforts in public policy *
   - Non-satisfied
   - 1
   - 2
   - 3
   - very satisfied
6. How would you rate the general competence of your government officials? *
   - Underline the actual level of your trust in regards of their professional abilities
   - very low
   - 1
   - 2
   - 3
   - as requires
7. Do you consider yourself as publicly active citizen? *
Have you been involved in any kind of activities of community organizations, councils or political parties?
- yes
- no
Other:

8. Have you ever participated in policy development process? *
- yes
- no

9. What’s the best way for initiating a public policy suggestion by citizens? *
- organizing interest groups
- engaging in public debates
- cooperating with the elected and appointed officials in the local or state level
  Other:

10. Do you think there is a need to increase the existing level of citizen involvement or should we leave the policy implementation to professionals in the current state of cooperation with citizens? *
    Do residents need more freedom and opportunity for participating in development of public policy programs and their implementation?
- Current form successfully functions
- Cooperation of state with civil society shall be increased or face improvements
  Other:

11. Please rate the possibility of your influence on government’s decision, if needed
    1-Impossible 2-Almost impossible 3-depends 4-Most likely possible 5-Always possible
    On a state level ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
    On a local level ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

12. If you won’t agree with the government’s decision, and it influences you, what are your / how do you imagine your actions?

Special box of comments: ideas on improving civic culture or involving citizens
Appendix 2

Questionnaire of Surveys within Ministry staff in Armenia

Institutional form

In this questionnaire, when we say ministry, we also mean other institutions, councils, state structures and public policy subjects.

Gender

- F
- M

Age

Field/Ministry

1. Do you believe, if public should control work of ministries? *
   - yes
   - no

2. Does Ministry have working Mechanisms of citizen expression of suggestions, complaints and concerns? *
   - yes
   - no

3. During this work did you receive citizen proposals and projects, which you have been working on? *
   - yes
   - no

4. Do Ministries have working public councils? *
   - yes
   - no
   - I don’t know

5. Do you believe current agenda and/or organization of such councils is efficient? *
   - yes
   - no
   - I don’t know
6. Is Ministry part of realization and/or development process of programs under Open Government Partnership? *
   - yes
   - no
   - I don’t know

7. Did reforms in electronic administration promote increasing of Ministry work efficiency and control? *
   - yes
   - no

8. Is there a separation or gap within state administration institutions and public? *
   - yes
   - no

9. Is it necessary to increase public participation? *
   - yes
   - no