

Kateryna Semenova¹

The Role of Public Administration Science in Increasing Civic Engagement in Ukraine

1. Introduction

It is hard to argue that e-participation tools are becoming increasingly popular among Ukrainians. This applies to its highest form – namely the involvement of citizens in decision-making. Increasing the interest of Ukrainians in participating in public administration at the general, regional and local levels is a priority for the development of e-democracy. However, it will be difficult for the state to implement such a strategy if it does not consider the process of involving citizens comprehensively, taking into account all the factors influencing it, and awareness of potential threats of political Internet communication in network wars in today's world. This article reviews the non-technological factors that affect the electronic participation of citizens. An attempt has been made to identify those indicators that will help the public administration system to look at the process of e-democracy from below to identify needs of the citizens and ways to increase motivation to use electronic tools. It is also proposed to improve the system of civic education as the main long-term goal of the state for effective cooperation with citizens in developing a common policy in the future. The main purpose of the ar-

¹ Postgraduate Student at the Department of Theory and Practice of Management, National Technical University of Ukraine "Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute", Christina_helwein@ukr.net, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1860-3179>.

ticle is to analyze the role of public administration science in the study of the influence of social factors on the process of engaging citizens in decision-making.

2. Theoretical and methodological principles of electronic participation

It is necessary to define what are the tools of e-participation and how they differ from other e-services provided by the state in the e-governance system. In general, it is believed that it includes e-government – the internal “kitchen” of public administration processes carried out through ICT, the basic level – the sites of government agencies, inter-agency exchange of documents, e-human resources management and more. With the advent of new technologies and increasing public interest in participating in public administration, the e-government system is complemented by e-democracy tools to ensure the right to participate and interact effectively.

The tools of e-democracy are not identical with any administrative services provided in the context of e-governance. The recommendations of the Council of Europe indicate the following areas of application of e-democracy as e-parliament, e-legislation, e-justice, e-mediation, e-environment, e-election, e-referendum, e-initiative, e-voting, e-consultation, e-petitioning, e-campaigning, e-polling and e-surveying; it makes use of e-participation, e-deliberation and e-forums². E-participation, accordingly, is a subsystem of e-democracy and one of its key tools, along with transparency, accountability and civic education³. Thus, the concept of e-participation is narrower than the concept of e-democracy, although

² Council of Europe (2009). Electronic democracy. Recommendation CM/Rec(2009) of the Committee of Ministers to member states on electronic democracy (e-democracy) Retrieved from: https://www.coe.int/t/dgap/goodgovernance/Activities/Key-Texts/Recommendations/Recommendation_CM_Rec2009_1_en_PDF.pdf.

³ Tomkova, J., Konashevych, O. (2016). Analitichni zapysky z efektyvnoho e-uriduвання. Vypusk 1. Zakonodavchi aspekty elektronnoi demokracji v Ukraini [Analytical Notes on Effective E-Government. Issue #1 Legislative Aspects of e-Democracy in Ukraine], Kyiv, Ukraine. Retrieved from: https://egap.in.ua/biblioteka/analitichni-zapysky-z-efektyvnoho-e-uriduвання-vypusk-1/?wpdmdl=8927&ind=lki-YtisSRZ6nc5e-DEG45pTAb780i-c41V76JOGb_VHzhWCDc9A1rFodShxWdJUk.

they are often used interchangeably. It is also possible to understand e-participation not only as a certain set of tools of e-democracy, but also as its dynamic aspect, if we define e-democracy as a certain system of public relations, as is done, for example, in the legislation of Ukraine⁴. That is, the state of development of e-democracy can be measured by the level of e-participation.

Some researchers divide the research field of e-democracy into two subareas such as eVoting and eParticipation, for example, Anne Mackintosh⁵ or Marianne Kneurer, who separates e-voting from engagement in decision-making processes, since these are functionally speaking different actions⁶. Like the aforementioned researchers, we do not include e-voting into e-participation concept. In our opinion, the conceptual basis of e-participation is participatory democracy, and therefore the tools of representative democracy, although implemented through ICT, do not meet the criteria for involving citizens in joint policy-making.

But e-participation itself is a heterogeneous phenomenon, according to the most common model, it is known to consist of stages of e-information, e-consultation and e-decision making. Macintosh also offers E-enabling, E-engaging, E-empowering scheme⁷. Therefore, in the practical implementation of electronic tools for involving citizens, chronologically

⁴ Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine (2017). Rozporiadzhennia Kabinetu Ministriv Ukrainy "Pro skhvalennia Kontseptsii rozvytku elektronnoi demokracji v Ukraini ta planu zakhodiv shchodo yii realizatsii" [Order of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine "On approval of the Concept of e-democracy development in Ukraine and the action plan for its implementation"]. Retrieved from: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/797-2017-%D1%80#Text>.

⁵ Macintosh, A. (2004). Characterizing e-participation in policy-making. Proceedings of the 37th Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences. Computer Society Press. Retrieved from: <https://www.computer.org/csdl/pds/api/csdl/proceedings/download-article/12OmNwoPttU/pdf>.

⁶ Kneurer, M. (2016). E-democracy: A new challenge for measuring democracy. *International Political Science Review*. 2016;37(5):666-678. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/310733789_E-democracy_A_new_challenge_for_measuring_democracy.

⁷ Macintosh, A. (2004). Characterizing e-participation in policy-making. Proceedings of the 37th Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences. Computer Society Press. Retrieved from: <https://www.computer.org/csdl/pds/api/csdl/proceedings/download-article/12OmNwoPttU/pdf>.

the government first introduce the information tools that provide people with relevant information about public affairs, ensure transparency in relations with citizens and prepare them for higher forms of e-participation. The next level of e-engagement is electronic consultations. At this stage, the government listens to the opinion of citizens, but the final decision still remains with the state authorities. People learn to discuss problems, communicate their point of view, and the government gets the opportunity to study public opinion and take it into account when implementing policy. And, of course, the highest form of e-participation is e-engagement or e-decision making. It is at this stage in the development of public relations that the latest technologies enable citizens to be full-fledged actors in politics and, together with governments, to create and implement the agenda. All three stages can coexist in society, but each lower one is the basis for the higher one, and the transition to a new level of interaction between government, citizens and other stakeholders is impossible without the full functioning of the lower levels.

Depending on the actors, e-participation tools can be classified differently. Sæbo and Rose include citizens, politicians, government institutions, and volunteer organizations⁸. Kassen has developed a more comprehensive model and divided key interest groups into traditional players, including the Government-Citizens-Business triad, and non-traditional players, including the NGOs – Journalists – Journalists – Independent Developers⁹. In e-Government Analytical Notes, communications in the e-participation system are divided into those from government to citizens (GtoC) or business (GtoB), from citizens to government (CtoB), from citizens to citizens (CtoC) and from business to business (BtoB)¹⁰. Some researchers do not attribute the last two groups

⁸ Sæbø, O., Rose, J., Skiftenesflak, L. (2008). The shape of eParticipation: Characterizing an emerging research area. *Government Information Quarterly*. 25, 400–428. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/222839683_The_Shape_of_Eparticipation_Characterizing_an_Emerging_Research_Area.

⁹ Kassen, M. (2020). E-participation actors: understanding roles, connections, partnerships, *Knowledge Management Research & Practice*, 18:1, 16–37. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/329326488_E-participation_actors_understanding_roles_connections_partnerships.

¹⁰ Tomkova, J., Khutkiy, D. (2017). *Analitychni Zapysky Z Efektyvnoho E-Uriaduvania*. Vypusk 2 Vtilennia E-Demokratii Spektr Instrumentiv Ta Varianty Vyboru [Analyti-

to the e-democracy system itself, so e-participation is often divided into two main groups – initiated by the government “top down” and initiated by citizens “bottom up”¹¹. Citizens-to-citizens communications often take place outside official channels (eg social networks, messengers), are informal and invisible to the authorities, but as will be shown below, they are the horizontal links between citizens or interest groups that explicitly or implicitly form the landscape of e-democracy. And while government-to-citizen or citizen-to-government communications are easy to investigate and evaluate, and therefore improve, through public governance, informal horizontal communications between citizens and their interest groups are largely invisible to the state. Thus, the analysis of relationships between citizens, the impact of civil society and informal communication are identified as important areas for further research on e-participation.

Some researchers divide all e-participation initiatives into individual and collective, depending on the type of activism that is the driving force behind the engagement process¹². But we propose to define the characteristic feature of e-participation tools of the highest level – ie involvement in decision-making – and their difference from other e-government services in the presence of group, collective, public interest, regardless of whether individual or group activity. This is the problem of motivating the population to use e-participation tools – because for successful ICT-mediated communication between governments and citizens, a well-developed IT infrastructure and overcoming technological challenges such as digital divide are not enough. The technology-orient-

cal Notes on Effective E-Government. Issue N°2: The Implementation of E-Democracy: A Range of Tools and Choices], Kyiv, Ukraine. Retrieved from: https://egap.in.ua/biblioteka/analitichni-zapysky-z-efetyvnoho-e-uriduвання-vypusk-1/?wpdmdl=8927&ind=I-ki-YtisSRZ6nc5eDEG45pTAB78Oi-c41V76JOgB_VHzhWCDc9A1rFodShxWdJUk.

¹¹ Porwol, L., Ojo, A., Breslin, J. (2013) On the Duality of E-Participation – Towards a Foundation for Citizen-Led Participation. In: Kő A., Leitner C., Leitold H., Prosser A. (eds) Technology-Enabled Innovation for Democracy, Government and Governance. EGOVIS/EDEM 2013. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol 8061. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg. Retrieved from: http://johnbreslin.org/files/publications/20130826_egov2013.pdf.

¹² Aichholzer, G., Allhutter, D. (2009). Online forms of political participation and their impact on democracy. Verlag d. Österr. Akad. d. Wiss. Retrieved from: <https://ecpr.eu/Filestore/PaperProposal/e27e56b4-fb6b-4c8b-980a-3b8357edd8e4.pdf>.

ed literature on e-participation often discusses the model of abstract citizen interaction with government through ICT, and the main incentive to engage is the availability and convenience of a particular tool. Most empirical models for evaluating e-participation in the scientific literature are based on the theory of acceptance of technology (TAM), or Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT)¹³. Such a technocratic approach is unable to explain the low interest of people in e-participation, taking into account all factors. The narrowness of the purely technological focus on the problem of e-participation is noted both by a number of scholars such as Prieto-Martin¹⁴ or Grönlund¹⁵ and in UN policy documents¹⁶.

Thus, returning to varying degrees of interest in e-services depending on individual or collective needs, we are convinced that for a multifaceted understanding of the e-participation process, it should not be considered as a purely «citizen-ICT-government» interaction. Our research focuses on the problem of encouraging people to participate in the system of e-democracy and the influence of social factors. This does not mean that we reject other points of view on the problem of e-participation, for example, the above-mentioned technological per-

¹³ Naranjo-Zolotov, M., Oliveira, T., Casteleyn, S. (2017). E-participation adoption models research in the last 17 years: A weight and meta-analytical review. *Computers in Human Behavior*. 81. 10.1016/j.chb.2017.12.031. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/322004714_E-participation_adoption_models_research_in_the_last_17_years_A_weight_and_meta-analytical_review.

¹⁴ Prieto-Martín, P. & de-Marcos, L. & Martínez, J. (2012). The e-(R)evolution will not be funded. An interdisciplinary and critical analysis of the developments and troubles of EU-funded eParticipation. *The European Journal of ePractice*. 15. 62–89. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/292977012_The_e-Revolution_will_not_be_funded_An_interdisciplinary_and_critical_analysis_of_the_developments_and_troubles_of_EU-funded_eParticipation

¹⁵ Grönlund, Å., (2011) Connecting eGovernment to Real Government – The Failure of the UN eParticipation Index. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol 6846. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, pp 26–37. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/221561311_Connecting_eGovernment_to_Real_Government_-_The_Failure_of_the_UN_eParticipation_Index.

¹⁶ 14. UN/David Le Blanc (2020). E-participation: A Quick Overview of Recent Qualitative Trends, UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs (DESA) Working Papers, No. 163, UN, New York. Retrieved from: https://www.un.org/esa/desa/papers/2020/wp163_2020.pdf.

spective, or a project perspective that considers e-participation from the point of view of project management. However, the influence of the social environment of a citizen who uses electronic services, his/her participation in formal and informal groups are hidden from researchers of public administration, they are too difficult to identify and assess, but they often play a leading role in the success or failure of a another public engagement initiative.

Summarizing the above, we can outline the limits of citizen involvement in decision-making using e-democracy tools in Ukraine as the subject of our study. Thus, it is the highest form of e-participation, which on the one hand is part of the general theory of political participation, on the other – is a tool and at the same time a dynamic aspect of e-democracy, which in turn is a subsystem of e-governance. E-decision-making, in our view, includes both a formal system of tools and communication between government and stakeholders, and horizontal links between individuals and their groups that are not moderated by the government. An example is the agitation for participatory budget projects – the main struggle in the competition for municipal budgeting takes place outside the official tools of e-participation, attracting votes through social networks, parent groups in messengers and more.

3. The impact of social factors on e-participation

Taking into account social and political factors is important in assessing the success of e-initiatives. At the legislative level and in expert circles, the problem of lack of awareness and interest in e-participation is identified as one of the key ones¹⁷. However, it is not enough to explain the low involvement of the citizens through ICT by technological factors alone. Inconvenience of services or digital divide are not, in author's opinion, the main factors that reduce people's motivation to make joint decisions with governments. But in order to comprehend all the versatility of the process, it is necessary to go beyond the model in which elec-

¹⁷ Tomkova, J. (2016), *eDemokratiia v Ukraini: Pohliady hromadian i kliuchovykh zatsikavlenykh storin* [eDemocracy in Ukraine: Citizens' & Key Stakeholders' Perspectives], Kyiv, Ukraine. Retrieved from: <http://egap.in.ua/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/UKRAINIAN-Report-Open-Mic.pdf>.

tronic participation is carried out by an abstract citizen, for whom only the form of technology becomes a mobilizing factor. Author believes that citizens who are members of formal or informal groups and are aware of their collective interests and needs have a significant motivation to join the highest form of interaction with the authorities.

The question of the relationship between civil society, namely associations, volunteer organizations, interest clubs, and political participation of citizens was considered by the classic of the theory of democratic participation and social capital R. Putnam, but he was mainly interested in membership in formal organizations. The realities of the Internet age have changed the priorities in the lives of citizens, and the level of formal involvement in public organizations is falling. However, many informal communities are taking their place, including social media and groups in messengers, which help people come together for interest.

Mentioning Putnam, author approaches a theory that can help understand the motivation of individuals and groups in the process of political participation, including through electronic tools. As mentioned above, author believes that citizens who are involved in certain groups, associations, formal or informal, that are part of civil society or the «third sector», have a higher motivation for e-participation. These can be, for example, international non-governmental organizations, which involve millions of people, as well as small networks like the community of residents or parents of one school's pupils, group of cycling activists or defenders of historical heritage from different parts of the city. The author agrees that social capital, in the sense of Putnam, ie «features of social life – networks, norms, and trust – that enable participants to act together more effectively to pursue shared objectives»¹⁸ has a significant impact on the civic engagement. That is, a person involved in social networks, who has experience of successful interaction with other individuals and groups in the realization of common interests, has a significant number of social ties, more likely to takes the opportunity to participate in policy making, including through online services. Although Putnam's theory is not perfect, it has been criticized for defining trust as

¹⁸ Putnam, R.D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon and Schuster. Retrieved from: <https://www.dacdb.com/Rotary/Accounts/6970/Downloads/4381/Bowling%20Alone%20Article.pdf>.

a consequence of social capital rather than a precondition¹⁹ its position on the relationship between participation in voluntary associations and socio-political development can help when creating a methodology for assessing e-participation, taking into account a wide range of factors.

Therefore, the impact of social capital should be included in building a model of interaction electronic participation actors. Measuring the level of social capital (individual and group) can answer some questions about the level of citizen involvement in decision-making and help in designing e-participation tools in the future. The work of such researchers as Jooho Lee, Soonhee Kim, Fabio Sabatini²⁰ is devoted to the connection between social capital and online participation. Lee and Kim analyzed data from a survey on e-participation in Seoul, the relationship of social capital components such as trust, strength of social ties and social norms with the use of e-participation tools. They came to the interesting conclusion that, although in general all three components of social capital correlate with the motivation of the citizen to be involved in cooperation with the government, strong social connections offline do not guarantee an increase in the use of e-services²¹.

As was mentioned above, an important problem of the development of e-democracy in Ukraine is the lack of motivation of Ukrainians to use e-participation tools. However, the presence of motivation of a citizen does not mean that he/she has the necessary knowledge to make decisions. And here a large amount of information, including open data services, which are supposedly a guarantee for the effective implementation of the right to participate in politics, can play a nasty joke, because a person simply drowns in information noise, not having the skills to transform this information into knowledge. Unfortunately,

¹⁹ Häuberer, J. (2011). Social Capital Theory. Towards a Methodological Foundation. Retrieved from: <http://ndl.ethernet.edu.et/bitstream/123456789/592/1/59.pdf>.

²⁰ Sabatini, F., Sarracino, F. (2014). "E-participation: social capital and the Internet," MPRA Paper 55722, University Library of Munich, Germany. Retrieved from: https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/55722/1/MPRA_paper_55722.pdf.

²¹ Lee J., Kim S. (2014). Active Citizen E-Participation in Local Governance: Do Individual Social Capital and E-Participation Management Matter?. Proceedings of the Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/262245436_Active_Citizen_E-Participation_in_Local_Governance_Do_Individual_Social_Capital_and_E-Participation_Management_Matter.

a large amount of data does not mean its quality. This is how the phenomenon of “clicktivism” is born, when with the availability of online e-participation services a person thoughtlessly supports any initiative, thus self-realization in the Internet space²².

4. The role of the public administration science in the study of e-democracy

We have already outlined that e-participation is not only about the pure use of online tools by the abstract citizen, it must be seen in the context of all the realities of social and political life, so that government, academics, the media and the public sector can more easily assess the success of certain initiatives, but also to predict further trends in democracy. It is one thing to explore the side of the e-participation process that is in the field of view of public administration: the institutionalization of the principles of e-democracy, the design of e-services, the life cycle of e-government projects. And quite another, to qualitatively assess the effectiveness of the introduction of such tools, their real impact on social development, motivation of citizens to use them and the level of skills of the population to effectively make public administration decisions. These dimensions of the functioning of the e-democracy system require careful analysis, the basis for which should be qualitative and quantitative empirical research.

To set and achieve long-term strategic goals for the development of a democratic society through civic engagement, the fundamental science of public administration must come to the aid of governments. The scientific and educational communities are important groups of stakeholders in the process of introducing e-participation tools, along with government institutions, civil society and the media. However, they are often overshadowed in the construction of the e-democracy landscape. The task of scholars should not only be to evaluate individual e-initiatives, but also to analyze the risks that exist in the system of participatory democracy in general, to find adequate answers to the challenges of

²² Berg, J. (2017). Digital democracy – studies of online political participation. Åbo Akademi University Press. Retrieved from: https://www.doria.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/147647/berg_janne.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y.

the era through scientific knowledge of objective reality. Public administration as a scientific field should be unbiased, independent of politicians and other groups of influence, using a multidisciplinary approach, combining theoretical and empirical developments in sociology, political science, communication theory, social philosophy and psychology, human resource management, decision-making theory, etc. to study electronic participation in all its manifestations, taking into account all the factors influencing this process, in order to develop, if not a general theory of e-democracy, then at least the formation of a knowledge base on which public sector organizations can effectively plan further growth of cooperation with citizens to ensure sustainable development of society.

Unlike sociology, considering the influence of social factors on the level of offline or online involvement of citizens in decision-making at all levels of government, public administration cannot stop only at the statement of certain patterns of social reality that have been identified as a result of quantitative or qualitative sociological research. The next task is to develop algorithms for influencing social processes in order to achieve the goals of social progress. Researchers should develop recommendations for public authorities on how to address existing issues in the field of public involvement in the short and long term. So, for example, using sociological methods, we have assessed the state of e-participation, for example, by adding to the classical quantitative indicators factors of trust, social ties, the state of civil society, media literacy and education. Whatever the outcome of the study, whatever trends in public opinion regarding joint action with the government we find, correcting the situation and minimizing social threats to the public administration system is much more difficult than addressing the legislative, technological or project shortcomings of e-participation initiatives. The government does not have direct administrative or economic tools to influence these processes, increasing citizens' motivation for democratic participation can be done through social engineering technologies, the so-called "soft power". However, encouraging Ukrainian citizens to participate electronically and, accordingly, increase their confidence in cooperation with state institutions must go hand in hand with reforms, primarily of the judiciary and law enforcement agencies, ensuring real rather than declarative transparency of public administration processes,

otherwise such campaigns risk becoming propaganda. The most common strategy for raising citizens' awareness of democratic processes is civic education, which must be implemented within both formal and non-formal education, combine theory and practice, and be pursued throughout life. It should teach citizens to think critically, interact with the authorities at all levels, work with different sources of information.

At the same time, author believes that full-fledged civic education is not just a set of certain practical skills that can facilitate the participation of the individual in the policy-making process. It must ensure the harmonization and connection of the goals of the individual, social groups, the state and society as a whole in order to achieve sustainable development. Therefore, civic education should begin with the study of the theoretical foundations of social and political life, so that every citizen grows as a fully developed individual, clearly understands the essence of the processes taking place in society, and could be a creator, not just a consumer. Given all the above factors, it becomes clear one of the main directions that should develop the science of public administration in the study of e-participation in the context of a variety of socio-political factors as one of the phenomena of the information society: scientists can help the government on theoretical, methodological, institutional and legislative formation of civic education.

5. Conclusion

In the course of the research presented in the article, it was found that e-participation, and especially its highest form of development – involving citizens in public administration decisions is not just a set of specific tools and initiatives, but a complex process influenced by many factors. It was suggested that more attention be paid to the social factors and conditions in which the formation of the e-democracy system takes place. For the successful implementation of e-participation tools, it is necessary to understand the social context of the interaction of citizens with the government through ICT. A promising but little-studied area from the point of view of public administration is the horizontal links between individual citizens and social groups, which accompany the vertical communications of citizens and the government and influence decision-making.

Analysis of these factors can help to better understand the problem of low motivation of citizens to use e-democracy technologies, because very often the problem lies not only in technological reasons, such as the inconvenience of specific e-participation tools. Categories of social capital theory, such as trust, participation in voluntary associations, etc., should be used to identify problems related to informal communications. Incorporating a set of questions related to the impact of social capital on motivation to work with government organizations into a questionnaire in empirical studies of e-participation can help identify the impact of deep, hidden from scientists social processes that shape the e-democracy landscape in a given country. In addition to the low interest of citizens in e-participation, significant problems in the study identified the inconsistency of the level of e-participation in the state of real democracy in countries, and hence the unrepresentativeness of the E-Participation Index and the development of e-democracy in conditions of information wars in modern society. To overcome the above challenges, fruitful cooperation of all stakeholders – government, civil society, business, media – is needed. However, the scientific community should also play a significant role in this process, in order to study the formation of the e-democracy system impartially and objectively. The task of public administration science aims not only to identify certain problems through quantitative and qualitative sociological research, but also to form a system of recommendations for public authorities to improve interaction with citizens. In the course of the research it is suggested to consider civic education as the main perspective direction of solving the problems analyzed above.

References

- Aichholzer, G., Allhutter, D. (2009). Online forms of political participation and their impact on democracy. Verlag d. Österr. Akad. d. Wiss. Retrieved from: <https://ecpr.eu/Filestore/PaperProposal/e27e56b4-fb6b-4c8b-980a-3b8357edd8e4.pdf>.
- Berg, J. (2017). Digital democracy – studies of online political participation. Åbo Akademi University Press. Retrieved from: https://www.doria.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/147647/berg_janne.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y.

- Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine (2017). Rozporiadzhennia Kabinetu Ministriv Ukrainy "Pro skhvalennia Kontseptsii rozvytku elektronnoi demokratii v Ukraini ta planu zakhodiv shchodo yii realizatsii" [Order of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine "On approval of the Concept of e-democracy development in Ukraine and the action plan for its implementation"]. Retrieved from: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/797-2017-%D1%80#Text>.
- Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine (2018). Rozporiadzhennia "Pro Skhvalennia Kontseptsii Rozvytku Hromadianskoi Osvity V Ukraini" [Order "On Approval of the Concept of Civic Education Development in Ukraine"]. Retrieved from: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/710-2018-%D1%80#Text>.
- Council of Europe (2009). Electronic democracy. Recommendation CM/Rec(2009) of the Committee of Ministers to member states on electronic democracy (e-democracy) Retrieved from: https://www.coe.int/t/dgap/goodgovernance/Activities/Key-Texts/Recommendations/Recommendation_CM_Rec2009_1_en_PDF.pdf.
- Grönlund, Å., (2011) Connecting eGovernment to Real Government – The Failure of the UN eParticipation Index. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol 6846. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, pp 26–37. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/221561311_Connecting_eGovernment_to_Real_Government_-_The_Failure_of_the_UN_eParticipation_Index.
- Häuberer, J. (2011). Social Capital Theory. Towards a Methodological Foundation. Retrieved from: <http://ndl.ethernet.edu.et/bitstream/123456789/592/1/59.pdf>.
- Kassen, M. (2020). E-participation actors: understanding roles, connections, partnerships, Knowledge Management Research & Practice, 18:1, 16–37. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/329326488_E-participation_actors_understanding_roles_connections_partnerships.
- Kneuer, M. (2016). E-democracy: A new challenge for measuring democracy. International Political Science Review. 2016;37(5):666-678. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/310733789_E-democracy_A_new_challenge_for_measuring_democracy.

- Lee J., Kim S. (2014). Active Citizen E-Participation in Local Governance: Do Individual Social Capital and E-Participation Management Matter?. Proceedings of the Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/262245436_Active_Citizen_E-Participation_in_Local_Governance_Do_Individual_Social_Capital_and_E-Participation_Management_Matter.
- Macintosh, A. (2004). Characterizing e-participation in policy-making. Proceedings of the 37th Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences. Computer Society Press. Retrieved from: <https://www.computer.org/csdl/pds/api/csdl/proceedings/download-article/12OmNwoPtU/pdf>.
- Naranjo-Zolotov, M., Oliveira, T., Casteleyn, S. (2017). E-participation adoption models research in the last 17 years: A weight and meta-analytical review. *Computers in Human Behavior*. 81. 10.1016/j.chb.2017.12.031. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/322004714_E-participation_adoption_models_research_in_the_last_17_years_A_weight_and_meta-analytical_review.
- Porwol, L., Ojo, A., Breslin, J. (2013) On the Duality of E-Participation – Towards a Foundation for Citizen-Led Participation. In: Kő A., Leitner C., Leitold H., Prosser A. (eds) *Technology-Enabled Innovation for Democracy, Government and Governance*. EGOVIS/EDEM 2013. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol 8061. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg. Retrieved from: http://johnbreslin.org/files/publications/20130826_egov2013.pdf.
- Prieto-Martín, P. & de-Marcos, L. & Martínez, J. (2012). The e-(R)evolution will not be funded. An interdisciplinary and critical analysis of the developments and troubles of EU-funded eParticipation. *The European Journal of ePractice*. 15. 62–89. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/292977012_The_e-Revolution_will_not_be_funded_An_interdisciplinary_and_critical_analysis_of_the_developments_and_troubles_of_EU-funded_eParticipation.
- Putnam, R.D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon and Schuster. Retrieved from: <https://www.dacdb.com/Rotary/Accounts/6970/Downloads/4381/Bowling%20Alone%20Article.pdf>.

- Sabatini, F., Sarracino, F. (2014). "E-participation: social capital and the Internet," MPRA Paper 55722, University Library of Munich, Germany. Retrieved from: https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/55722/1/MPRA_paper_55722.pdf.
- Sæbø, O., Rose, J., Skiftenesflak, L. (2008). The shape of eParticipation: Characterizing an emerging research area. *Government Information Quarterly*, 25, 400–428. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/222839683_The_Shape_of_Eparticipation_Characterizing_an_Emerging_Research_Area.
- Sanford, C. & Rose, J. (2007). Characterizing eParticipation. *International Journal of Information Management*, 27(6), 406–421. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/235721824_Characterizing_eParticipation.
- Tomkova, J. (2016). eDemokratiia v Ukraini: Pohliady hromadian i kliuchovykh zatsikavlenykh storin [eDemocracy in Ukraine: Citizens' & Key Stakeholders' Perspectives], Kyiv, Ukraine. Retrieved from: <http://egap.in.ua/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/UKRAINIAN-Report-Open-Mic.pdf>.
- Tomkova, J., Khutkiy, D. (2017). Analitichni Zapysky Z Efektyvnoho E-Uriaduvannia. Vypusk 2 Vtilennia E-Demokratii Spektr Instrumentiv Ta Varianty Vyboru [Analytical Notes on Effective E-Government. Issue №2: The Implementation of E-Democracy: A Range of Tools and Choices], Kyiv, Ukraine. Retrieved from: https://egap.in.ua/biblioteka/analitichni-zapysky-z-efetyvnoho-e-uriduvannia-vypusk-2/?wpdm_dl=8929&ind=H7zQG0Bj5iscmPWIE Mam2Rr20NtwKrnOvZvce26P Pn5-xprTHjJc1aajdRpb6ATJ.
- Tomkova, J., Konashevych, O. (2016). Analitichni zapysky z efektyvnoho e-uriduvannia. Vypusk 1. Zakonodavchi aspekty elektronnoi demokratii v Ukraini [Analytical Notes on Effective E-Government. Issue #1 Legislative Aspects of e-Democracy in Ukraine], Kyiv, Ukraine. Retrieved from: https://egap.in.ua/biblioteka/analitichni-zapysky-z-efetyvnoho-e-uriduvannia-vypusk-1/?wpdmdl=8927&ind=lki-YtisSRZ6nc5eDEG45pTAb78Oi-c41V76JOGB_VHzhWCDc9A1rFodShxWdJUK.
- UN/David Le Blanc (2020). E-participation: A Quick Overview of Recent Qualitative Trends, UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs

(DESA) Working Papers, No. 163, UN, New York. Retrieved from: https://www.un.org/esa/desa/papers/2020/wp163_2020.pdf.

Summary

The article considers the problems of scientific comprehension of electronic participation from the point of view of public administration. Attention is paid to the highest form of e-democracy, namely the involvement of citizens in decision-making through ICT. The theoretical and methodological bases of research of electronic participation are defined – its levels, models, directions are analyzed. It is proposed to consider the process of involving citizens not only from a purely technological perspective, but taking into account a wider range of factors. The influence of social factors on the process of public involvement is characterized. Insufficient motivation of the citizens to interact with the government is highlighted as one of the most important obstacles to the development of e-democracy. The leading role in overcoming the existing problems is given to the fundamental science of public administration, whose task is not only to study the features of separated tools of e-participation, but also to determine strategic priorities for involving citizens in decision-making for sustainable development. The main strategy for increasing the interest of citizens in cooperation with the authorities and improving their decision-making skills in the information society is the formation of an efficient system of civic education.

Keywords: e-participation, e-democracy, e-decision making, social capital, civic education