

ПОЛІТИЧНА ТЕОРІЯ ТА ПРАКТИКА ДЕМОКРАТІЇ

УДК 342.25:321.01

Panchenko T.
V.N. Karazin Kharkov National University

MEASURING OF REGIONAL DEMOCRACY IN NEW EUROPEAN DEMOCRACY STATES (ON EXAMPLE OF EASTERN PARTNERSHIP COUNTRIES) (PART I)

The paper proposed an evaluation instrument for measuring of regional democracy in new democracies and it is tested on example of six countries of Eastern Partnership. Index of regional democracy consists of seven indicators, which measure different aspects of subnational processes with focuses on regional tier. This part is represented three indicators – regional architecture, regional competence, administrative and political autonomy – and results of scoring for 6 countries.

Key words: regional democracy, comparative analysis, index, autonomy, region.

Панченко Т.В. ВИМІРЮВАННЯ РЕГІОНАЛЬНОЇ ДЕМОКРАТІЇ У НОВИХ ЄВРОПЕЙСЬКИХ ДЕМОКРАТИЧНИХ ДЕРЖАВАХ (НА ПРИКЛАДІ КРАЇН СХІДНОГО ПАРТНЕРСТВА)

Пропонується інструмент для вимірювання регіональної демократії в нових демократіях і тестується на прикладі шести країн Східного партнерства. Індекс регіональної демократії складається з семи показників, які вимірюють різні аспекти субнаціональних процесів з фокусом на регіональному рівні. Дана частина репрезентує три індикатори - регіональна архітектура, регіональна компетенція, адміністративна і політична автономія, а також результати підрахунку для 6 країн.

Ключові слова: регіональна демократія, порівняльний аналіз, індекс, автономія, регіон.

Панченко Т.В. ИЗМЕРЕНИЕ РЕГИОНАЛЬНОЙ ДЕМОКРАТИИ В НОВЫХ ЕВРОПЕЙСКИХ ДЕМОКРАТИЧЕСКИХ ГОСУДАРСТВАХ (НА ПРИМЕРЕ СТРАН ВОСТОЧОГО ПАРТНЕРСТВА)

Предлагается оценочный инструмент для измерения региональной демократии в новых демократиях и тестируется на примере шести стран Восточного партнерства. Индекс региональной демократии состоит из семи показателей, которые измеряют различные аспекты субнациональных процессов с фокусом на региональном уровне. Данная часть представляет три индикатора – региональная архитектура, региональная компетенция, административная и политическая автономия - и результаты подсчета для 6 стран.

Ключевые слова: региональная демократия, сравнительный анализ, индекс, автономия, регион.

Background

Transformation of state sovereignty and the establishment of multi-level governance in Europe lead to development of institutions of local and regional democracy. Administrative reforms, started in the second half of the 20th century in order to strengthen and improve democratic institutions, continued up to the 21 century under the influence of globalization and European Integration. The reforms, covering the majority of European countries, are seen as an attempt to give the regions a possibility for their self-growth and internal development, as a way of survival the modern nation-states and as a result of the intensification of integration processes and their transformation into competence of the regions.

Particularly, out of the 26 new democracies, which belong to Eastern Europe to some extent and are involved in different degree in Euro integration, the sub-government was established in 7 countries, was optimized in 8, was created and then eliminated in 4, planning regions were established in 9. Besides that almost all countries held local government reforms. However regional and local institutions of democracy which appeared in the result of the reforms are substantially different. This is especially true for Eastern Europe with the heritage of the communist past, political and socio-economic transformations. The most essential gap between reformer's intentions and results takes place in the Post-Soviet countries, where the reforms weren't accomplished or they didn't lead to real democratization.

Comparative study of newly created institutions of regional democracy in Eastern Europe is necessary to assess their capacity and perspectives. However this task is complicated by the fact that regional democracy is a concept which does not have clear definition in scientific literature as well as in international law. A phenomenon of regional democracy is arisen by activities the European international organizations. They connect the phenomenon with regional authorities: their democratic structure, competences and own resources, their relations with other authorities and citizens. Hence some scientific researches prove that regional democracy is not only democratic authorities. They take into account other factors, among them political and administrative culture, patterns of public participation. So development of an adequate instrument to measure regional democracy is a challenge that must be addressed in this research.

So in the article is proposed an evaluation instrument for measuring of regional democracy

first of all in new democracies and it is tested on example of six countries of Eastern Partnership.

Theoretical background for comparative research of institutes of regional democracy can be found in some research areas: studies on federalism and regionalism, that is mostly based on legal comparison as a method of analysis of governance in multi-layered systems; corporative public administration that takes into account organization structure of subnational ties, administrative culture and traditions; subnational corporative research on democracy, that concerns on subnational variations of democracy; measuring of decentralization at different levels of subnational authority in different countries and periods.

The main methodological tool of the research is a comparative method. Cross-national comparisons of regional democracy institutions are based on index construction through data conversion. It is proposed an index of regional democracy, for the construction of which also apply a secondary analysis of quantitative data of World Bank, corporative social surveys, electoral statistics.

Spatial frameworks of the research are countries, which belong (fully or partially) to Central and Eastern Europe and are involved to different extent in Euro integration as EU members, recognized and potential candidates and Eastern Partnership states. In the framework of this paper only Eastern Partnership states (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Moldova, and Ukraine) are considered as a test set for proposed evaluation instrument.

Regional democracy: the specifics of its identification, studying and measuring

A phenomenon of regional democracy is arisen by activities the European Committee on Local and Regional Democracy, the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of the Council of Europe and Assembly of European Regions. They have been interested in regions and regionalism since early 1990s; hence concept 'regional democracy' emerged much later. Neither 'The Declaration on Regionalism in Europe' (1996), nor the draft of European Charter of regional Self-Government (1997) used this concept.

This concept can be found in documents of Conferences of European ministers responsible for local and regional government, held in Helsinki (2002), Budapest (2005) and Valencia (2007). In 2008 there was an attempt to use concept 'regional democracy' in a title of a new Council of Europe convention 'European

Charter of Regional Democracy’. However the convention was not accepted, but its provisions became the base for Council of Europe Reference Framework on Regional Democracy (further Framework) [1], which was adapted in Utrecht. The Framework has two principal functions: to serve as a source of inspiration when countries decide to establish or reform their regional authorities; and to act as a body of principles on which the Congress can rely in monitoring regional democracy. The text stresses the principle of subsidiarity, the principle of social and territorial cohesion and the need for solidarity among the components of a sovereign state. For regional authorities, The Framework contains the criteria for regional democracy in four fields: regional architecture, regional bodies’ organization, financing, national and international relations. All these criteria concern, first of all, regional authorities. Briefly they indicate three autonomies of regional self-government – law, organizational and financial, which were defined early in European Charter of local self-government (1985) [2] and also allow regional authorities to participate in national and international decision-making.

Many of the Framework’s criteria of regional democracy are difficult to measure. So it is noteworthy to consider scientific attempts to measure capacity of regional authorities by using indexes of decentralization/regionalization. The indexes include different criteria and indicators of decentralization and regional autonomy and often assume measuring different levels of sub-national authority for certain period. For example, Kearney [3] measured assignment of fiscal, political, and administrative responsibilities to lower levels of government in 49 countries from 1960 to 1995. Lane and Ersson [4] measured territorial location of public decisions and their implementation at various levels of government in 18 European countries in the post-Second World War period. Woldendorp, Budge and Keman [5] measured centralization and autonomy of regional and local government in 37 countries in the post-Second World War period. Treisman [6] measured different types of decentralization (vertical, decision-making, appointment, electoral, fiscal and personnel) in 41 countries in the mid-1990s. Hooghe and Marks [7] measured regional autonomy in 14 West-European countries in 1950, 1970, 1990 and 2000. Arzaghi and Henderson [8] measured ‘institutional’ decentralization or effective federalism, which they construct by assessing fiscal, political, and administrative

responsibilities of subnational government, in 16 countries for five-year intervals between 1960-1995. Brancati [9] measured „political decentralization” as a vertical division of authority among subnational levels of government in 40 countries, for the years 1985-2000. Hooghe, Marks, Schakel [10] proposed the index of regional authority, which measure the capacity of all levels a sub-national government below the national level with an average population greater than 150,000 in 42 democracies over the period 1950–2006. The authors worked out noteworthy set of indicators, which were divided into two groups: self rule (institutional depth, policy scope, fiscal autonomy and representation) and shared rule (law making, executive control, fiscal control and constitutional reform). Some indicators of regional self-rule, fiscal, administrative and political decentralization can be suited for measuring of regional democracy.

Indeed, self-governing regional authority is a prerequisite for regional democracy; however, subnational comparative research on democracy showed that this condition is insufficient. They clearly demonstrate that sub-national democracy is not only democratic subnational authorities. Even the first generation of the research (1990-2000) noticed, „although decentralization was conventionally expected to improve local governance and, ultimately, democracy, by narrowing the gap between policymakers and citizens, subnational studies found that the consequences of decentralization depended on the nature of local- level informal institutions” [11, p. 5].

Loughlin, Aja, Hendriks, Bullmann and Lindstrom [12] in their research of subnational democracy in 15 EU countries considered some dimensions of subnational democracy: history, institutional expression and practices of democracy, challenge and opportunities for sub-national democracy. Important part of their analysis was study of role of parties, political network and presser groups, citizens’ attitude to subnational government and patterns of public participation. Similar criteria were taken into account in extension study of subnational democracy in twenty-seven member states of the EU, Norway and Switzerland by Hendriks, Lidstrom and Loughlin [13]. Some of them are taken into account in this research.

Comparative public administration also gives us additional features which are helpful in evaluation of quality of regional democracy. Among them is a differentiation of ‘hard’ and a ‘soft’ formation of regions; centralizing and decentralizing effect in case of transfer of

regional functions; political and administrative decentralization and deconcentration [14].

So analysis of recommendation of the Framework, indices of decentralization and literature on Sub-national corporative research on democracy and Corporative public administration is allowed to offer an instrument for measuring regional democracy. Index of regional democracy consists of 7 indicators; each of them ranges from 0 to 6, for a total of 42 points.

- Regional architecture (0-6)
- Regional Competence (0-6)
- Administrative and political autonomy (0-6)
- Fiscal autonomy (0-6)
- Representation (0-6)
- National and international relations (0-6)
- Participation (0-6)

Indicator 1: Regional architecture

Concept „regional architecture” is used in the Framework [1], covers a wide range of issues concerning regional structure, competence, relations. Here regional architecture is understood as a characteristic of regional structure and its formation.

First of all, what is a region for this research?

The region is considered as a „territorial entity situated between the local and national levels with a capacity for authoritative decision making” [10, p. 9]. This definition says nothing about the region as an economic, social or cultural entity. It also does not claim regional self-government which is involved in definition of the region in „Declaration of regionalism in Europe” (1996) [15]. It focuses only place in space (between state and municipality) and presence of authorities. However there is the vexed issue of the possible existence of more than one regional level in a country. Local government and national governments denote a lower and upper bounds within which there may be more than one intermediate level. How does one determine which level is the regional?

The region is often considered as the first administrative tier of subnational authority, the next level after national one. In particular this approach developed in the documents of the Council of Europe and Assembly of European Regions in 1990s as well as regional researches the same period.

Hooghe and Marks in their research of multi-level governance [7] considered the most authoritative level of regional government. Indeed there are countries where the first administrative tier has less capacity of

authoritative decision making then the lower intermediate level. Hooghe, Marks, Schakel in their comparative study [10] encompasses all levels of government below the national level with an average population greater than 150,000.

Only one level is chosen for more detailed analysis in order not to overload the measurement. It is considered in general the most authoritative level of regional government, although for some indicators are taken into account characteristics of all subnational tiers. So if the most authoritative level is at the same time as the first tier, it receives the highest score.

Size of region is an essential feature. A status of region in the Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics (NUTS) is taken into account, since it correlates with the population and determine the possibilities of the region as a subject of EU regional policy. There is no NUTS 1 among studied countries, so NUTS 2 receives the highest score.

Age of region is also important feature from point of view of administrative traditions and regional subcultures. If regions have long existed, it can be assumed that they developed regional identity, certain administrative traditions and political culture. Scale for measuring the age of a region is based on three chronological periods: regions were created „for ages”/„during last century”/ „by reforms”.

For a new-created region it is important to consider the features of their formation. The regional level is usually created by transforming the state territorial administration units or the NUTS statistical and planning regions into decentralised authorities or by merging local authorities of an inferior level [16]. For measuring of specific of regions’ formation is taken into account proposed by S. Kuhlmann and H. Wollmann criteria of „hard” and a „soft” formation of regions (the first case supposes the creation of new regional territorial entities while abolishing related previous structures, the second case supposes the creation of flexible, largely mono-functional regional cooperative forms in integrated spatial areas or in planning/grant-target regions that do not have the status of territorial bodies) and centralizing and decentralizing effect (the first - the transfer of regional functions „upwards” (bottom up), from county to regions, the second - the transfer „downwards” (top down), from a state authority to the region) [14]. These criteria and some additional features are base of scale for measuring.

Regional architecture (0-6)

- Place of regional tier in territorial structure of country (0-2):

- 0:** No regional tier in territorial structure;
- 1:** Regional tier is the most authoritative level of subnational government;
- 2:** Regional tier is the first and the most authoritative administrative tier of subnational authority.

- Size of most regions, their correspondence to NUTS (0-2):

- 0:** LAU 1,2 (less 150 000);
- 1:** NUTS 3 (150 000 – 800 000);
- 2:** NUTS 2 (800 000 – 3 million).

- Age of regions (0-2):

- 0:** Regional level was created by reforms 1990-2000;
- 1:** Regional level was created during last century;
- 2:** Regional level has existed for ages.

- Specific of regions' formation (only for countries that score 0 in previous measuring):

- 'hard' / 'soft' formation of regions (0-1):

- 1:** 'soft' formation of regions (the creation of flexible, largely mono-functional regional cooperative forms in integrated spatial areas);

0: 'hard' formation of regions (the creation of new regional territorial entities while abolishing related previous structures).

- transfer of competence bottom-up / top-down (0-1)

- 1:** transfer of competence top-down: central or upper level to regional or under level;
- 0:** transfer of competence bottom-up: from local or under level to regional or upper level.

Six Eastern Partnership countries have complicated territorial structures. Four of them have autonomies (Crimea is considered here still as an autonomy of Ukraine); some of entities are not controlled by states (Nagorno-Karabakh Republic in Azerbaijan, Transnistria in Moldova, Abkhazia and South Ossetia in Georgia). Also some of countries have capitals and cities with both statuses of municipality and region (Yerevan in Armenia, Tbilisi in Georgia, Kiev in Ukraine and three municipalities in Moldova). Thus here are not considered cities with special status and territorial entities, which de facto are independent states or occupied territories. Only subnational regions are considered, some of them are autonomies.

Table 1:

Regional architecture

Countries	Regions	place of region	size of region	age of region	specific of formation		score
					'hard' / 'soft'	bottom-up / top-down	
Armenia	12 regions	2	1	0	0	1	4
Azerbaijan	Nakhichevan	2	1	1	0	0	4
	65 districts	2	0	1	0	0	3
Belarus	6 voblasts	2	2	1	0	0	5
Georgia	Adjara	2	1	0	1	1	4
	9 regions	2	1	0	1	1	5
Moldova	Gagauzia	2	1	0	1	1	5
	32 rajons	2	0	0	1	0	3
Ukraine	Crimea	2	2	0	1	1	6
	24 oblasts	2	2	1	0	0	5

Results of scoring (see Table 1) demonstrate that all units are the first and the most authoritative administrative tier of subnational authority. However these units are different in size and age. In particular only regions of Belarus and Ukraine, which correspond to NUTS 2, are really large and populated ones. They were created in days of USSR and their territories saved without changes.

Most regions of Armenia, Georgia as well as autonomies of four countries, which correspond to NUTS 3, are middle-sized ones. Namely these regions were created or substantial transformed in 1990s. In particular,

they are new units in Armenia and Georgia, where they were created to transfer state functions 'downwards'. In Armenia they replaced soviet division into 37 rajons, in Georgia they were created as additional administrative tier. Moldavian autonomy formally known as the Autonomous Territorial Unit of Gagauzia is a new-created autonomy, whereas the Autonomous Republic of Adjara (Georgia), the Nakhchivan Autonomous Republic (Azerbaijan) and the Autonomous Republic of Crimea (Ukraine) had autonomous experience in the USSR. However, autonomous experience of two from them was interrupted:

from 1946 to 1991 Crimea was converted to oblast and lost the autonomous status; from 1991 to 2004 Adjara was not controlled by Georgia. So these autonomies also are considered here as new-created ones.

There are two countries whose intermediate territorial units are not regions according to the NUTS classification. In particular, only some districts of Azerbaijan (13 from 65) and none rajon of Moldova correspond to NUTS 3. These units generally were created in the days of the USSR. If in Azerbaijan they unchanged saved, but in Moldova their structure underwent significant changes. Firstly, 40 soviet rajons in 1999 were substituted by 9 counties, 2 autonomous territorial units and one municipality. Later, in 2003 counties were abolished and substituted by 32 rajons. In fact the former structure was returned to most areas.

Thereby none country has got maximal score in regional architecture.

Results of scoring are the following:

- Ukraine scores 6 for Crimea and 5 for oblasts (both correspond to NUTS 2).
- Georgia with new-created, middle-sized regions, Belarus which saved soviet administrative division into big oblasts and new-created autonomy of Moldova - 5.
- Armenia with new-created, middle-sized regions and middle-sized Nakhichevan - 4.
- Azerbaijan and Moldova with their districts - 3. Since these units are not regions, they are not analyzed further in most indicators.

Indicator 2: Regional competence

The Framework [1] considers regional competence as decision-making and administrative powers of regional authorities. It recommends competences in the following policy areas:

- Promotion the regional culture and defending region's cultural heritage, including regional languages;
- Cooperation with economic operators in the region;
- Help in adaptation of education and training facilities to employment development requirements in a region;
- Social welfare and public health, promoting social cohesion in the region;
- Balanced development of the territory;
- Protecting and enhancing natural resources and biodiversity.

Examples of the existing regions' powers take place in Appendix to article 3 of Declaration on regionalism in Europe. There following fields

are pointed: regional economic policy, regional planning, building and housing policy, telecommunications and transport infrastructures, energy and environment, agriculture and fisheries, education at all levels, universities and research, culture and media, public health, tourism, leisure and sport, police and public order [15, p. 4]. This declaration comprises exhaustive list of possible regional competences, which in practice implemented not in all federations. But list of recommended the Framework looks like such that more corresponds to reality.

Beside that a list of possible regional powers is available in scientific literature. In particular Hooghe L., Marks G., Arjan H. Schakel group regional policies into three areas: economic, cultural-educational, and welfare:

- Economic policy encompasses regional development, public utilities, transport including roads, environment, energy;
- Cultural-educational policy encompasses schools, universities, vocational training, libraries, sports and cultural centres;
- Welfare policy encompasses health, hospitals, social welfare (e.g. elderly homes, poor relief, social care), pensions, social housing [10, P. 24].

Such a division into three areas is taken as a basis, is clarified, taking into account documents of Council of Europe, Assembly European Regions and some available statistics of World Bank. In particular three World Bank's fiscal decentralization indicators, which characterize some sectoral aspects of decentralization (subnational government share of compensation of employees expenditure; subnational government share of health expenditures; subnational government share of education expenditures [17]) are chosen for analysis. It should be noticed that this data characterize all sub-national expenditure, so it should be used carefully. But these indicators are helpful because the legislation doesn't always reflect reality in many studied countries.

Thus indicators for measuring of regional competence are shown below. 0,5 is scored for each of the following characteristics.

Regional Competence (0-6)

- **economic policy (0-2):**
 - 0.5:** regional development; including partnership with economic operators in the region (1);
 - 0.5:** public utilities: water, electricity, natural gas, telephone and telegraph communication (2);
 - 0.5:** transport including roads (3);

0.5: protecting and enhancing natural resources and biodiversity (4).

- **cultural-educational policy (0-2) :**

0.5: schools, universities, vocational training, adaption of education and training facilities to employment development requirements in the region (5);

0.5: high level of subnational government share of educational expenditures (> 40% according to data of GFS) (6);

0.5: libraries, sports and cultural centres (7);

0.5: promoting regional culture and defending and enhancing the region's cultural heritage, including regional languages (8);

- **welfare policy (0-2):**

0.5: public health, hospitals (9);

0.5: high level of Subnational Government Share of Health Expenditures (>24% according to data of GFS) (10);

0.5: social welfare (e.g. elderly homes, poor relief, social care), pensions, social housing (11);

0.5: high level of subnational government share of compensation of employees expenditure (> 30% according to data of GFS) (12).

6,10 and 12 marks are based on secondary analysis of quantitative data of World Bank and GFS (% is defined on the base on the calculation of the average for the 26 countries).

Table 2:

Regional competence

Countries	Regions	economic policy				cultural-educational policy				welfare policy				score
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Armenia	12 regions	0.5	0	0.5	0.5	0.5	0	0.5	0	0.5	0	0.5	0	3.5
Azerbaijan	Nakhichevan	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0	0.5	0.5	0.5	0	0.5	0	4.5
	65 districts	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-		-		0
Belarus	6 voblasts	0.5	0	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	5.5
Georgia	Adjara	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0	0.5	0.5	0.5	0	0.5	0	4.5
	9 regions	0	0	0	0	0		0.5	0.5	0	0	0		1
Moldova	Gagauzia	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0	0.5	0.5	5.5
	32 rajons	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-		-		1
Ukraine	Crimea	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	6
	24 oblasts	0.5	0	0.5	0	0.5		0.5	0.5	0.5		0.5		5

Results of scoring (see Table 2) demonstrate that competence of regional authorities differ considerably. The largest volume of competencies is accumulated by autonomous republics. They have jurisdiction in all policy areas. Differentiation in ranking is caused by various indicators of sectoral decentralization, which characterizes all subnational expenditures of countries: Crimea scores 6 points, Gagauzia – 5.5, Adjara and Nakhichevan – 4.5.

The regional authorities of Ukraine and Belarus have also great competences in most policy areas (5.5 and 5 points). Their legislation is a heritage of Soviet-style government. Availability of wide closely-related jurisdictions of local and regional authorities and lining creates duplication and some interference in the affairs each other. Although the powers and duplicated, there are very few sources of an alternative policy options. Thus, their relationship (first of all in Belarus) is based mainly on the principle of subordination. Their ranking is also increased due to World Bank's indicators of sectoral decentralization.

The results of Armenia and Georgia, which created their regions in 1990s, deserve particular interest. Whereas regional authorities of Armenia implement central government's policy in all fields (4 points), Georgian authorities do it only in cultural policy (1 point).

Results of scoring are the following:

- Ukraine – 6 for Crimea; 5 – for region
- Belarus and Moldova for Gagauzia – 5.5;
- Georgia – 4.5 for Adjara and 1 for regions;
- Azerbaijan – 4.5 for Nakhichevan;
- Armenia – 3.5.

It should be noticed that the scope of competences of regional authorities says nothing about the nature of relations between the centre and regions; it only demonstrates spheres of responsibility of regional authorities. In some cases, for example in Armenia and in many areas in Ukraine, regional authority implements policy of central government.

Indicator 3: Administrative and political autonomy

Mentioned above provisions about regional competence of the Framework states „regional authorities shall have decision-making and administrative powers in the areas covered by their own competences” [1]. Decision-making power can be considered as political autonomy and administrative powers as administrative autonomy. „These powers should permit the adoption and implementation of policies specific to the region. Decision-making powers may include legislative powers” [1]. These statements can be interpreted as following: at least administrative autonomy is necessary requirement for regional democracy, political autonomy is desired requirement.

So it is taken into account degree of regional autonomy and character of relationship between regional and central government. In order to measure a degree of autonomy it is helpful indicator of institutional depth proposed Hooghe L., Marks G., Arjan H. Schakel. They definite institutional depth as „a continuous dimension ranging from no autonomy from the central government to complete autonomy” [10, P.21]. They distinguished four categories, which characterize specific of functioning general-purpose regional administration. Their scale is changed by using categories deconcentration, political and administrative decentralization [14, p. 128].

Relationship between the regional and central government are characterized by models of vertical and functional distribution of responsibilities.

Relationship between the regional and central government are characterized by models of vertical and functional distribution of responsibilities. Vertical division of responsibilities between the local and central government levels characterizes two models: ‘separationist’ and ‘integrationist’. Last one can be turn into ‘state centred integrationist model’ or ‘local administration centred integrationist model’. Functional distribution of administrative responsibilities is characterized by multi-purpose and single-purpose model [14, p. 27-29].

So indicator for measuring of regional competence is presented below.

Administrative and political autonomy (0-6)

Institutional Depth (0-3)

0: No functioning general-purpose regional administration;

1: Deconcentrated general-purpose, administration (the transfer of state functions from central state institutions to sub-national and local state or semi-state administrative units);

2: Administrative decentralized, general-purpose administration (state tasks are delegated to the elected regional assemblies, which formally have neither influence nor control over the conduct of such delegated tasks, and the state authorities exercise an administrative supervision over the regional activity);

3: Political decentralized, general-purpose administration (political decision-making powers and responsibilities are transferred along with the respective administrative functions, while a direct intervention by the state administration in the form of administrative supervision is ruled out).

Relationship between the regional and central government (0-3)

- Separationist model versus administrative integrated model (0-2)

0: State centred integrationist model (the state administration carries out the functions of the regional governments in addition to its own tasks);

1: Regional administration centred integrationist model (the regional governments perform ‘dual’ functions in carrying out their self-government tasks and the ones that the state has ‘delegated’ to them);

2: Separationist model (state and regional authorities execute their responsibilities separately and largely independently from one another);

- Multi-purpose model versus single purpose model (0-1)

1: The multi-purpose model (a horizontal, territory-related administrative organization, in which a region authority combines and executes all tasks relevant to the region in its own responsibility);

0: The single purpose model (a vertical, function-specific administrative organization, in which an area-oriented organizational structure exists from the state to the regional level, and the political responsibility lies outside of regional government).

Table 3:

Administrative and political autonomy

Countries	Regions	institutional depth	centre-region relationship		score
			separationist / integrated model	multi- / single purpose model	
Armenia	12 regions	1	0	0	1
Azerbaijan	Nakhichevan	2	2	1	5
	65 districts	0	0	0	0
Belarus	6 voblasts	2	1	0	3
Georgia	Adjara	2	1	1	4
	9 regions	1	0	0	1
Moldova	Gagauzia	3	2	1	6
	32 rajons	0	0	0	0
Ukraine	Crimea	2	1	1	4
	24 oblasts	2	1	0	3

Results of scoring (see Table 3) demonstrate significant differences in political and administrative autonomy of regions, first of all in their institutional depth. Political decentralized general-purpose administrations take place only in autonomous republic of Gagauzia. Nakhichevan, Adja and Crimea are rather examples of administrative decentralized general-purpose administrations, since the state authorities exercise an administrative supervision over the respective autonomous activity or take part in appointment of their executive. Administrative decentralized general-purpose administrations also were established in regions of Belarus and Ukraine. Regions of Armenia and Georgia as well as some districts of Azerbaijan have deconcentrated, general-purpose administration.

Relationship between the regional and central government are characterized by separationist model in autonomous republics of Azerbaijan and Moldova, whose executives are accountable to appropriate assemblies. Government of autonomy in Georgia shall be accountable to the President of Georgia and the

Supreme Council of the Autonomous Republic of Adjara, and regions of Ukraine and Belarus, whose executives are also accountable to the Presidents, are characterized by Regional administration centred integrationist model. Rest regions of Armenia, Georgia and some districts of Azerbaijan are characterized by state centred integrationist model.

Relationship between the regional and central government are characterized by the multi-purpose model in all autonomous republics. The single-purpose model is appropriated for regions of Ukraine, Belarus, Armenia, Georgia and some districts of Azerbaijan.

Results of scoring are the following:

- Gagauzia (Moldova) – 6;
- Nakhichevan (Azerbaijan)– 5;
- Adjara (Georgia) and Crimea (Ukraine) – 4;
- Regions of Belarus and Ukraine – 3;
- Territorial units of Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia – 1.

To be continued

REFERENCES

1. Council of Europe Reference Framework for Regional Democracy / Council of Europe Conference of Ministers responsible for Local and Regional Government, 16th Session, Utrecht, 2009.
2. European Charter of Local Self-Government. – Strasbourg, 1985.
3. Kearney C. Decentralization index / C. Kearney. – Henderson Faculty Paper, Brown University, Providence, RI, 1999.
4. Lane J. Politics and Society in Western Europe / J. Lane, S. Ersson. – 4th ed. – Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1999.
5. Woldendorp J. Party government in 48 democracies (1945-1998): Composition –Duration

- Personnel / Woldendorp J., Keman H., Budge I. – Dordrecht : Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2000.
6. Treisman D. Defining and measuring decentralization: a global perspective / D. Treisman. – Unpublished manuscript, 2002.
 7. Hooghe L. Multi-level Governance and European Integration / L. Hooghe, G. Marks. – Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, 2001.
 8. Arzaghi M. Why countries are fiscally decentralizing / M. Arzaghi, V. Henderson // Journal of Public Economics. – 2005. – N 89(7). – P. 1157-1189.
 9. Brancati D. Decentralization: fueling or dampening the flames of ethnic conflict and secessionism / D. Brancati // International Organization. – 2006. – N 60 (3). – P. 651-685.
 10. Hooghe L. The Rise of Regional Authority: A comparative study of 42 democracies (1950-2006) / Hooghe L., Marks G., Arjan H. Schakel. – Roulledge : London, 2010.
 11. Moncada E. Subnational Comporative Reseach of Democracy: taking Stock and Looking Forward / E. Moncada, R. Snyder // Comporative Democratization. – 2012. – Vol. 1, N 1. – P. 1-9.
 12. Loughlin J. Subnational Democracy in the European Union: Challenges and Opportunities / Loughlin J., Aja E., Bullman U. – Oxford University Press, 2004.
 13. The Oxford Handbook on Local and Regional Democracy / Loughlin J., Hendriks F., Lidström A. (eds.), Oxford, 2010.
 14. Kuhlmann S. Introduction to Comparative Public Administration: Administrative Systems and Reforms in Europe / S. Kuhlmann, H. Wollmann. – Edward Elgar (forthcoming), 2014.
 15. Declaration on regionalism in Europe /Assembly of European Regions, Basel, 1996.
 16. Hermenier H. The Quest for “Perfect territorial organization”: Comparison across Europe // Balancing democracy: identity and efficiency. Changes in local and regional structure in Europe, CCRE, Brussels, Paris, 2008. – P. 4-7.
 17. World Bank Fiscal decentralization indicators [XLS], 2012. – Available HTTP: <http://web.worldbank.org>

УДК 35.07+394::339.13.017:321.014

Работягова І.В.

Харківський національний
університет імені В.Н. Каразіна

ПРОТОПОЛІТИЧНА ДЕМОКРАТІЯ ЯК ХАРАКТЕРНА ДЛЯ ПОСТРАДЯНСЬКОГО ПРОСТОРУ СПЕЦИФІКА ПОЛІТИЧНИХ ІНСТИТУТІВ

Запропоновано концепт „протополітична демократія” як такий, що відображає превалювання неформалізованого політичного поля перед формалізованим, легальним. Визначені ключові неформалізовані механізми прийняття та реалізації владних рішень, що є традиційними, протополітичними ознаками сучасних суспільств. Визначено ступінь їх впливу на політичний процес пострадянських держав, зокрема України.

Ключові слова: політичний ринок, традиційні інститути, патрон-клієнтні відносини, дарообмін, слабоконкурентні політичні ринки, протополітична демократія.

Работягова И.В.

ПРОТОПОЛИТИЧЕСКАЯ ДЕМОКРАТИЯ КАК ХАРАКТЕРНАЯ ДЛЯ ПОСТСОВЕТСКОГО ПРОСТРАНСТВА СПЕЦИФИКА ПОЛИТИЧЕСКИХ ИНСТИТУТОВ

Предложен концепт „протополитическая демократия” как тот, который отображает превалирование неформализованного политического поля перед формализованным, легальным. Определены ключевые неформализованные механизмы принятия и реализации властных решений, которые являются традиционными, протополитическими признаками современных обществ. Определена степень их влияния на политический процесс постсоветских государств, в частности Украины.

Ключевые слова: политический рынок, традиционные институты, патрон-клиентные отношения, дарообмен, слабоконкурентные политические рынки, протополитическая демократия.