

Contribution of Civil Society to Holding Public Authorities Accountable: Emerging Tools for Engagement

Lidiia Moskvych¹, Ihor Kryvov², Liudmyla Dobroboh³,
Oksana Shevchyshyn⁴, Yurii Riaboshapka⁵

¹ Department of Criminal Procedure, Faculty of Prosecutor's Office,
Yaroslav Mudryi National Law University, Kharkiv, Ukraine.

² Department of Management and Business Administration,
Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University, Ivano-Frankivsk, Ukraine.

³ Department of Theory of State and Law, Educational and Scientific Institute of Law and Innovative Education,
Dnipro State University of Internal Affairs, Dnipro, Ukraine.

⁴ Department of Private Law, Institute of Lawmaking and Scientific-Legal Expertises of the National Academy of
Sciences of Ukraine, Kyiv, Ukraine.

⁵ Department of Public Administration, Interregional Academy of Personnel Management, Kyiv, Ukraine.

¹ Corresponding author: moskvichlida@gmail.com

© Author(s)

OIDA International Journal of Sustainable Development, Ontario International Development Agency, Canada.

ISSN 1923-6654 (print) ISSN 1923-6662 (online) www.oidaijsd.com

Also available at <https://www.ssm.com/index.cfm/en/oida-intl-journal-sustainable-dev/>

Abstract: The article raises the issue of improving the mechanisms of interaction between state institutions and civil society in the context of digitalisation. The technological basis of this process is created by social media, defined as a group of Internet applications built on the ideological and technological foundations of Web 2.0, which allow the sharing of user-generated content. It is substantiated that e-government has become an integral part of modern society, which strives for effective management and transparency of the state apparatus. The introduction of information technology into government processes ensures the availability of services for citizens and the business community, increasing the level of trust in government and developing and adapting existing models and tools of public participation. Therefore, e-government today is a qualitatively new level of government organisation, where the use of information and communication technologies allows for the development of new models of interaction between the state and citizens aimed at improving the quality of public administration by optimising intra- and interagency cooperation, ensuring high quality of public services, increasing the level of civic participation in public administration and democratisation of society in general. E-participation and the platforms through which it is implemented have become new forms and accountability instruments for public authorities. In particular, the article discusses the concepts of wiki-government, collaborative democracy, crowdsourcing technologies in the public sector and their respective tools.

Keywords: e-participation; citizen participation; public administration; platforms, e-government, collaborative democracy, crowdsourcing, wiki-government, civil society, public council of integrity; ethical council; council of international experts.

Introduction

One of the most important principles of modern public administration efficiency is publicity, which means active public involvement in developing, adopting, implementing, and monitoring government decisions to achieve a balance of interests. It is assumed that the development of channels of interaction with citizens allows for a more accurate understanding of society's needs and interests, taking them into account in government decisions. This reduces the risks of conflicts of interest and resistance to the implementation of decisions, thereby increasing the quality and effectiveness of the state's socio-economic policy.

Modern information technologies play an important role in implementing public administration. The emergence of Facebook, Instagram, and WhatsApp as new convenient ways of interaction between citizens [1] requires the appropriate development of communication channels between the state and citizens in public administration. Forming

a qualitatively new interaction system between the subject and the object of management characterises successful public administration reforms.

Today is the age of digital transformation. Digital transformation affects all areas of our lives and is not only related to work, education, consumption and entertainment. Digital transformation also affects the processes of political and civic participation, complementing traditional forms and tools of interaction between citizens and the government. Digital transformation is not limited to the widespread use, development, and integration of digital platforms, tools, and networks; it is a more global process. The main impact of the global network and previous stages of digitalisation is the transformation of existing skills and processes into digital form.

The use of new communication channels firmly established in society can significantly contribute to civic participation projects. The volume of information required for decision-making and the capabilities of communication technologies have made it necessary to improve the channels of interaction with society. The need for these changes is also dictated by shifts in society's outlook—citizens are no longer ready to be passive observers of public administration processes; they want to participate in them and are increasingly demanding transparency, accountability, and openness.

With the increasing availability of the Internet in general and mobile technologies in particular, electronic services have allowed us to respond to these requirements. It has become a modern indicator of the growth of public administration efficiency.

Efficiency is manifested in reducing the transaction costs of interaction and increasing the availability of information for citizens, increasing the convenience and quality of their participation in public decision-making (by providing timely access to the necessary information) [2].

Thus, digitalisation has significantly changed the role of civil society in public administration from engagement/interaction to e-participation of citizens in decision-making. E-participation tools (a set of methods and tools for communicative interaction between public authorities and citizens to take into account the opinions of citizens in public administration in decision-making) have become new tools for public authorities' accountability.

Literature review

Modern communication and information technologies play a crucial role in these processes, facilitating the creation of new models and practices that ensure interaction between citizens and different levels of government. Numerous digital platforms and communication and information technologies provide citizens with opportunities for active electronic participation and digital engagement in governance.

All modern research on civic participation projects can be divided into several groups.

A group of studies examined models of civic participation - the extent to which the state transfers decision-making powers to citizens due to a civic participation project. These studies distinguish several different models, ranging from imitation (lack of participation) to the real influence of citizens on decisions. This group includes studies on levels of participation by [3-10].

Some studies analyse the methods and procedures of civic participation. These studies form a classification and variety of combinations of methods of interaction between citizens and authorities in the decision-making process. These methods include, for example, the distribution of leaflets and newspapers, presentations, film production, surveys and consultations with citizens, brainstorming, and, in an advanced version, the formation of temporary and permanent working groups for effective decision-making and accountability, as well as the provision of guarantees and training. Such studies include [4] and [11-14].

The third group includes studies that develop hypotheses about the characteristics of ideal civic participation, introducing such parameters as its breadth and depth [15-16].

The fourth group of studies on public participation includes models that consider participation procedures through the prism of the types of interests of participants [17-19].

The fifth group includes studies that recommend general principles for forming rules for a civil participation project: representativeness, independence, early involvement, transparency, accessibility of information, interested public, comfort and convenience, etc. [20-22] and summarising studies by [23].

Finally, the sixth group of studies is devoted to the technological component of civic participation projects conducted with the help of modern information and communication technologies, such as electronic platforms and mobile

applications (see, for example, studies by Schossböck et al. [24], Hoepman [25], McNutt [26], Saldivar et al. [27], De Blasio and Viviani [28]).

Thus, today, there are sufficient theoretical models and recommendations for building civic participation projects. At the same time, a sufficient number of electronic civic participation platforms have emerged in practice for analysis.

However, current research has not identified a typology of modern instruments of public authorities' accountability to citizens in the context of digitalisation. The article aims to study and systematise the latest instruments of citizen participation in public administration in the new digital economy.

Civic participation and its specific form - e-participation - are manifestations of the development of civil society as the environment in which they function. At the same time, civil society is a phenomenon of social integration that arises based on the solidarity of independent individuals and compliance with established norms of social interaction. This definition is based on the research tradition of studying the public sphere and civil society, presented in Habermas's [29] and Alexander's [30] works. According to this conceptual line, civil society is a specific institutional environment providing civic engagement opportunities.

The research objectives are formulated as follows:

1. Describe the need to change the tools for engaging citizens in public administration in the digital age.
2. Formalise innovative technologies of civic participation and their respective tools.
3. Explore the typology of the latest e-participation tools.

Data Collection and Methods

A multiparadigmatic approach to the study of these problems has led to the choice of several theoretical frameworks. Conceptual studies of digital participation include Lasswell's communication model [31-32], Castells' theory of network society [33-34], Habermas' theory of multidimensional democracy [35-38].

Firstly, the classical model of communication by Laswell [31-32] defines the essential meaning of communication and determines the emergence of specific features of communication practices in different situations and spaces. Secondly, the theory of network society by Castells [34] explains the manifestations of communication behaviour in the digital age. Thirdly, the deliberative concept of Habermas [35-36] creates the preconditions for studying and considering citizen participation in the processes of governance in general and public administration in particular on the basis of communicative interaction. The description of the features of digital participation and its development is based on the approaches to the "participatory ladder" and "participatory space" proposed by Uphoff [39], Newell et al. [37], and Ledwith [38].

This approach is based on the idea that modern democracy should be based on several dimensions. Citizen participation in decision-making is one of these dimensions. Therefore, digital participation is a condition for the functioning of democracy in civil society, as the goal of communicative action is to reach a consensus between the participants in the interaction.

The next is participatory (co-management) theories and approaches to cooperation [40]. Co-management (participatory) is seen as actively involving the object of management in management practice and moving from traditional subject-object relations to subject-subject relations. The subject-subject nature of digital participation requires understanding the key principles, characteristics, reflections and tools that ensure interaction to increase its effectiveness.

The conclusions and provisions of the article are based on the results of international research:

- The UN E-Government Survey, which presents the e-participation index (EPI), which includes electronic information, e-hearing and citizen engagement in decision-making;
- WeAreSocial's annual report on the spread of social media demonstrates the creation of infrastructure and technical conditions for the development of digital participation.

The structure of the EPI includes the following components: e-information, e-consultation, and e-decision-making.

The study also used the EGDI, a composite index of digital government development calculated as the average of three independent component indices: Online Services Index (OSI, which includes EPI), Telecommunications Infrastructure Index (TII) and Human Capital Index (HCI). The five sub-indices of the OSI include service delivery, institutional framework supporting e-government development, content delivery, portal technology, and e-

participation. The e-Participation Index (EPI) is being developed as a complementary index to the UN e-Government Survey.

There are several categories of analysed websites that are dedicated to or actively use the concept of digital participation:

1. Government websites, websites of ministries or special government commissions. The main goals are to promote the ideas of open and digital government, civic participation, and participatory democracy through information.
2. Specialised websites created exclusively to develop digital citizen participation and engagement of different categories of the population in digital civic activity.
3. Educational websites that aim to increase the population's digital competence are a tool for increasing the level and effectiveness of civic participation.
4. Digital platforms are being developed to implement digital project opportunities and offer support services for civic initiatives.
5. Charities with a mission to address digital inequality and ensure equal access to digital technologies and, as a result, inclusive digital civic engagement.

Despite the differences in their underlying goals, many of these sites pay particular attention to clarifying their understanding and appreciation of digital participation in contemporary civic and political processes.

The study analysed websites related to digital participation in terms of their content. All the sites represent the experiences of the most advanced countries, corporations, organisations, and researchers in developing digital citizen participation. Traditional informal analysis was used, involving a holistic perception of the content and extracting information according to the research objectives. This method best meets the objectives of the formative stage of the study. Also, it allows us to determine the directions and boundaries of the debate on the new process of exercising public power.

To solve the tasks set, the author used generally accepted research methods, in particular theoretical generalisation and comparison, induction and deduction (in the process of revealing the characteristics of e-participation in the context of e-government, in the formulation of conclusions); synthesis (to assess the current state of functioning of e-governments in the world); statistical groupings (to determine the dynamics of e-participation development); descriptive method (to determine the typology of e-participation platforms).

Results

Accountability is a characteristic of the relationship between the authorities and those who have granted them such power, in which the latter should receive relevant information and, based on the application of standards, determine the degree of performance of functions by public authorities, establish appropriate sanctions for their non-performance/ poor performance. Thus, public authorities are obliged to publish relevant public information on their activities within the scope of their powers. The implementation of this is based on forming a favourable public opinion on the work of a particular public authority through the principles of transparency, participation, evaluation, appeal and response to complaints.

The social form of accountability characterises the interaction between the government and civil society. It is based on maximising citizens' involvement and participation in decision-making in formulating and implementing public policy at all levels and stages. It is aimed at strengthening the relationship between citizens and public authorities, enhancing the importance of public opinion, the effectiveness of administrative services, the realisation of human rights, and the fight against corruption.

Due to the rapid spread of information and communication technologies (ICTs), the principles and landscape of such interaction and participation have changed significantly and will change even more fundamentally over the next decade. For example, the issue of e-participation has already been officially enshrined in the documents and laws of the European Union, which guarantee equal participation of people in decision-making on a pan-European scale at all levels.

Since the end of the last century, citizen participation has become a mandatory attribute of public administration in democratic countries. The active development of information and communication technologies has led to new electronic forms of public participation. Using electronic platforms and mobile applications in these projects has expanded the opportunities for citizen participation in public administration. However, this has also led to increased state budget expenditures on such projects, which, in turn, has led to the actualisation of research on the effectiveness

and reference configurations of electronic platforms for public participation. Modern communication and information technologies play a crucial role in these processes, facilitating the creation of new models and practices that ensure interaction between citizens and different levels of government. Numerous digital platforms and communication and information technologies provide citizens with opportunities for active digital participation and engagement in governance.

E-government is a new form of organisation of public authorities' activities, which, through the widespread use of ICTs, provides a qualitatively new level of efficiency and convenience for organisations and citizens in obtaining public services and information on the results of public authorities' activities. Its communicative behaviour in the hybrid reality, related to its inclusion in social and political life, is also being studied internationally. One of the key ones is the UN's e-government study, which allows for identifying strengths and weaknesses in the field of e-government and adjusting policies and strategies to achieve the SDGs (Sustainable Development Goals). One indicator that characterises the level of citizen engagement in public administration is the Electronic Participation Index (EPI), which includes issues of electronic information, electronic hearings and citizen involvement in decision-making. As an integral part of e-government development, the survey regularly assesses governments' readiness to "ensure responsive, inclusive, representative decision-making at all levels", as envisaged in SDG target 16.7.

The e-participation sub-index is measured on a three-point scale that identifies progressive levels of engagement based on government policies, regulations and practices related to public participation in governance. The first level includes providing information on important aspects of public life, the second level involves the public in consultations on policy development and/or service delivery at various stages of the process, and the third level includes considering public opinion and involving people in decision-making.

Government portals and websites are assessed based on the following characteristics: Integration of participatory budgeting or similar mechanisms; availability of open government data in general and in six key sectors closely related to the SDGs (education, employment, environment, health, justice and social protection); evidence that people's voices are taken into account in discussions and decision-making processes related to policy formulation and adoption on issues affecting vulnerable groups; and availability of online consultations (through e-forums, e-surveys, e-polls, e-questions, e-responses).

The UN e-Government Survey has become an important source of data for assessing the progress of e-participation (Table 1).

Table 1. E-participation Index 2022-2024

Country	Rating	EPART 2024	Rating	EPART 2022
Ukraine	1	1.0000	46	0.8029
Japan	2	0.9863	14	0.9002
Denmark	2	0.9863	1	0.9717
Republic of Korea	4	0.9726	3	0.9529
Germany	4	0.9726	22	0.8770
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	4	0.9726	11	0.9138
Estonia	7	0.9589	8	0.9393
Iceland	7	0.9589	5	0.9410
Saudi Arabia	7	0.9589	13	0.9010
Singapore	7	0.9589	12	0.9133

Source: compiled by the author from the United Nations E-Government Knowledgebase (UN-EgovKB) [41]

Ukraine leads the ranking, having developed e-participation tools most dynamically. Japan and Denmark are also in the top three. Germany has significantly improved its citizen participation processes.

Countries with higher EGDI values usually have higher EPI values (part of the OSI). Table 2 shows the composite and component values of the EGDI for the countries leading the way in e-government development worldwide. All of these countries have very high EGDIs. Europe leads the way in e-government development, followed by Asia, the Americas, Oceania, and Africa.

Europe continues to be a leader in e-government, with most countries in the region falling into the group with very high EGDI.

Table 2. Countries leading in the development of e-government, 2022-2024 (index value)

Country	OSI	HCI	TII	EGDI (2024)	EGDI (2022)	Region
Denmark	0.9992	0.9584	0.9966	0.9847	0.9717	Europe
Estonia	0.9954	0.9497	0.9731	0.9727	0.9393	Europe
Singapore	0.9831	0.9362	0.9881	0.9691	0.9133	Asia
Republic of Korea	1.0000	0.9120	0.9917	0.9679	0.9529	Asia
Iceland	0.9076	0.9953	0.9983	0.9671	0.9410	Europe
Saudi Arabia	0.9899	0.9067	0.9841	0.9602	0.8539	Asia
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	0.9535	0.9450	0.9747	0.9577	0.9138	Europe
Australia	0.9222	1.0000	0.9509	0.9577	0.9405	Oceania
Finland	0.9097	0.9836	0.9791	0.9575	0.9533	Europe
Netherlands (Kingdom)	0.9212	0.9688	0.9715	0.9538	0.9384	Europe
United Arab Emirates	0.9163	0.9436	1.0000	0.9533	0.9010	Asia
Germany	0.9238	0.9672	0.9236	0.9382	0.8770	Europe
Japan	0.9427	0.9117	0.9509	0.9351	0.9002	Asia
Sweden	0.8836	0.9275	0.9868	0.9326	0.9410	Europe
Norway	0.9117	0.9175	0.9654	0.9315	0.8879	Europe
New Zealand	0.9453	0.9615	0.8728	0.9265	0.9432	Oceania
Spain	0.9054	0.8961	0.9603	0.9206	0.8842	Europe

Source: compiled by the author from the United Nations E-Government Knowledgebase [4143]

Europe leads the way in e-government development, but Asia is developing more dynamically than other regions [44]. Along with e-government, new citizen participation tools have emerged due to the development of social networks, platforms, and mobile applications. For example, the annual report of the analytical agency WeAreSocial1 indicates that social networks account for almost 95% of the share of Internet sites used by people around the world. Social networks perform a complex set of functions.

The latest GWI data shows that in 2024, Instagram will be the world's "favourite" social media platform: 16.5 per cent of internet users aged 16 to 64 choose this platform over others, twice as many as the 7.4 per cent who chose TikTok. *WhatsApp*, *Facebook*, and *WeChat* follow in terms of popularity.

Despite the increase in the number of people actively using the Internet, the share of those who do not have the capabilities (financial, technological, technical, infrastructural) to use these tools remains significant. However, this problem is being recognised at the state level, and national and regional programmes are being implemented to reduce digital inequality. Comprehensive accessibility is unusually associated with creating conditions that will level the manifestations of digital inequality and prevent the widening of the digital divide and the digital isolation of certain social groups.

Based on our analysis, we would like to highlight the opportunities and effects of the new participation tools.

1. Influence on the content, validity, quality and effectiveness of decisions made at different levels of government.
2. Strengthening public trust in government authorities. Prompt, accessible, and constructive feedback can serve as a basis for building trust. The higher the citizens' trust in the authorities and communication and information technologies, the greater their readiness for digital participation.
3. Increase the speed of transferring requests from citizens to the authorities. Today, technology makes it possible to transmit requests from citizens to the authorities in almost real-time. Several government agencies must respond to such requests within a shorter timeframe.
4. Expanding opportunities for joint activities, self-organisation and collective participation. However, this effect can also be destructive, which must be considered. The key principles are to create the conditions for expanding dialogue and partnership.
5. Increasing civic and socio-political activity of citizens, creating a culture of openness and transparency in the adoption and control of management decisions. Here, social media platforms and open discussion of issues are paramount.

The research results show that the possibility of personal initiative is an important factor in citizens' participation in public administration practices.

Since the Internet is the platform for e-participation, e-participation tools are special electronic services (platforms, websites, applications) allowing citizens to participate in public administration online.

The following definition of e-participation tools in public administration can be formulated based on the above theoretical provisions. They should be understood as technological solutions (applications for mobile devices, electronic services, programmes, etc.) that are used to involve citizens in public administration and consider public opinion when making socially important decisions.

E-participation tools are not identical to services that allow receiving public services in electronic form, even though the development of the former and latter results from the digitalisation of public administration. There is a significant, primarily functional, difference between them: e-participation tools are designed to create additional forms (methods) of interaction between governments and stakeholders to discuss socially important issues and make appropriate decisions. They are not aimed at providing individual services to citizens. The difference between the two Internet services is that e-participation can be carried out on third-party resources created by third parties (e.g., social networks). In contrast, e-government services are usually provided only on specially created websites maintained and controlled by public authorities.

Based on the classification basis of the electronic tool's purpose, we can distinguish between tools specifically designed for e-participation (e.g., e-civic participation platforms) and tools adapted/used by relevant actors (e.g., social media).

From the point of view of the legal provisions, e-participation tools can be divided into the following groups: those provided for by the current legislation and those not enshrined in positive law (but not contradicting it).

The classification of e-participation tools depending on their purpose is also of some practical importance. In this sense, we can name e-participation tools designed to discuss regulatory acts, receive feedback from the authorities on their work, monitor problems, and make decisions.

The study examined electronic civic participation platforms of various levels. Based on the analysis, the following types of platforms were identified:

1. Electronic platforms for engaging citizens in setting socio-economic priorities.
2. Electronic platforms in the form of public online receptions. This platform is a channel through which citizens file complaints about violations of their rights, report unlawful actions (inaction) of public authorities and housing and communal services, or apply for public services. It is possible to mix these two types within one platform.

Next, we conducted a comparative analysis of two ("pure") types of electronic platforms for public participation (Table 3).

Table 3. Comparative analysis of electronic platforms for public participation

Comparison criterion	Electronic platforms for engaging citizens in the process of setting socio-economic priorities	Electronic platforms in the form of online civic reception rooms
The entity that formulates the agenda (draft and issues for voting)	Executive authorities or citizens on a platform established by the government	Citizens (complaints, ordering public services)
Entity that makes and implements decisions	Executive authorities (decisions determine voting results/rating)	Executive authorities
Number of participants	Mass (citizens)	Single (filed a complaint/request) sometimes requires a reaction (assessment) from other citizens
The process of reviewing issues	Open decision based on voting results	When a complaint is closed, the sender receives a response and is not involved in its preparation/resolution, etc.
Topics of questions	Mainly socio-economic issues	Mainly, issues of individual rights (e.g. in the field of housing and communal services)
Question type	Mainly social development	Mostly solving individual problems

Source: provided by the author

Electronic platforms for public participation are institutions that regulate the rules of remote participation of citizens in public decision-making.

As modern research shows, e-participation projects often do not deliver the results for which they were designed, even in developed democracies. They are often at the level of symbolic public participation, according to Arnstein [3]; e-engagement and e-stimulation, according to Macintosh [45]; and consultation and e-information, according to Panopoulou et al. [23] – delegation practices are extremely rare [46]. In other words, at the present stage, most e-government initiatives to engage citizens in the public administration process are limited to the information flow from the authorities to citizens (G2C, G2B, G2G) [47] with a weak (co-creation of public goods projects) or absent reverse flow (C2G) that would delegate authority to them and allow citizens to also participate in shaping decision-making

processes [46] - in this sense, the predictions of many researchers about the e-democracy revolution or e-transformation have not yet come true [28], [48].

This is probably due to the relatively short history of these projects - the active use of new electronic technologies in public administration began no more than 30 years ago. In this sense, we expect a gradual development [49].

The organisational, cultural, and administrative barriers of traditional public administration institutions (pointed out in McNutt's [26] research in the last decade) have not yet been overcome, preventing the active use of new electronic technologies in public participation projects.

We will analyse the construction of e-civic participation platforms to identify reference configuration parameters.

1. These are mixed-type platforms—there are few platforms aimed only at identifying socio-economic priorities. This is probably due to the fact that new participatory technologies have been introduced relatively recently, and it is easier to attract popularity (audience) by opening an operational channel for receiving complaints and setting up effective mechanisms for processing and eliminating their causes.
2. The rules of participation are published on all electronic platforms, and they are primarily procedural (containing a short or medium description of the expected behaviour of citizens - steps to register and navigate the platform to submit a petition or participate in a survey).
3. As a rule, e-participation platforms are open to users - the possibility of feedback is presented in the form of all available communication channels: phone, fax, post, e-mail, visit the address. It is clear whether an appeal has been sent, to whom it has been sent, whether it has been received and when it will be answered, which, from the point of view of the rules of the game, may create some distrust in the platforms and, thus, increase the transaction costs of decision-making.
4. Platforms actively facilitate e-participation, providing support to citizens who are not usually active Internet users so that they can take advantage of all the opportunities for e-participation. In this way, officials fulfil their part of the contract by engaging as many interested citizens as possible and maximising the effectiveness of their decisions.
5. Platforms are one of the most important forms of decision-making and are usually systematically built into the hierarchy of public administration.
6. In the models of voting initiatives, citizens determine the vote or both options are provided (petitions and ideas—citizens, polls—officials). Thus, officials involve citizens in decision-making as part of their contractual obligations.
7. All platforms have some form of mechanisms for influencing the final decision. It is worth noting that the mechanisms of influence are often not described and are limited to indicating that the appeal/voting results will be considered/accounted for. At the same time, transparency, fairness and reliability of such procedures contribute to building public trust and choosing a valuable model of response to such rules, which increases the effectiveness of decisions and reduces transaction costs.
8. Most projects have published reports (archives of discussions, surveys, and other forms of participation). Many reports are quite complete and descriptive. Others are limited to describing the number of votes for or against. It should be noted that the availability of reports on projects is a form of feedback from officials in the e-participation institution, and their absence reduces public trust and leads to inflation of expectations, which worsens the institution's effectiveness and destroys it.
9. Almost all platforms have a methodology (criteria, metrics) for evaluating effectiveness. It is also worth noting that these metrics are often technological and, by and large, related to assessing the parameters of the created electronic tool, not the engagement project as a whole. However, even such assessments help the institution to conduct self-evaluation and improve, on the one hand, and on the other hand, it increases public confidence in the rules of the game and its outcome, which strengthens the institution and makes it more effective.

Thus, based on the analysis of well-known platforms, we will derive a reference model of the configuration of an electronic platform for civic participation used for socio-economic planning purposes, which has the following parameters:

1. Description of the type of platform (purpose) - first or mixed type.
2. Standardised uniform rules and operation conditions for all electronic platforms used in public administration in the country.
3. The rules of participation are published and procedural (they contain a short or medium description of the expected behaviour of citizens—steps to register and navigate the platform to submit petitions or participate in a survey).

4. Diversified feedback channels: telephone, fax, post, e-mail, and on-site visits.
5. Incentives for e-participation: Support citizens who are not usually active Internet users so that they can take advantage of all the opportunities for e-participation.
6. Integrating electronic platforms of public participation into the public administration system as a full-fledged mandatory channel of interaction with citizens is one of the most important forms of decision-making.
7. Mechanisms to enable citizens to propose their agenda for voting.
8. Transparency of the mechanism of influence of voting results on the final decision.
9. Detailed published reports on previous votes and decisions.
10. The performance evaluation methodology (criteria, metrics and methodologies) is officially adopted (published).

Currently, government agencies in developed countries actively use crowdsourcing as a modern way of interacting with citizens. Modern crowdsourcing models are based on using information and communication technologies and implementing projects on specialised websites on the Internet. This significantly expands the number of participants, increasing work efficiency and effectiveness. The transfer of a task traditionally entrusted to an employee or subcontractor to a broad community of Internet users in the form of an open request becomes, in fact, a form of open innovation.

A distinctive characteristic of crowdsourcing is the involvement of many non-professional experts in the decision-making process or any activity. Therefore, the main feature of crowdsourcing is using the intellectual potential of a large group of citizens to solve important problems.

Publicity of the dialogue through crowdsourcing or on electronic platforms created for interaction between citizens, organisations, and authorities becomes a very tangible incentive to take real action on issues raised by citizens. The level of ICT implementation in the activities of public authorities allows for integrating such services with electronic document management systems, which contributes to the promptness of response and the organisation of explicit internal control over responses to citizens' appeals.

Crowdsourcing technology offers various tools for interaction between the authorities and the public, the most complete classification of which was given by Saxton [50] (Table 4). The use of these crowdsourcing opportunities in public administration will be effective if the following conditions are met:

- prevent crowdsourcing from becoming a political campaign or a formal administrative procedure;
 - the existence of regulated and transparent mechanisms for taking proposals into account in the process of interaction between the authorities and citizens;
 - the authorities' readiness to engage in dialogue with civil society, which has already demonstrated its readiness to engage in dialogue with the authorities;
 - constant feedback from project participants and a high level of awareness of the results;
 - exclude from the scope of issues discussed in the project the topics and problems on which unpopular management decisions are already being implemented;
 - full responsibility of the authorities for the management decisions made and implemented as a result of crowdsourcing projects;
 - ensuring the uninterrupted operation of technical and information facilities;
 - a quantitatively and qualitatively validated representation of the composition of participants, their motivations, and the results of crowdsourcing;
 - availability of a scientifically based and adapted methodology for assessing the effectiveness of crowdsourcing projects in public administration;
- implementation of state and public control over the expenditure of budget funds on crowdsourcing projects.

Table 4. Possibilities of using crowdsourcing tools in public administration

Type of crowdsourcing	Application possibilities
The intermediary model	The project organisers are intermediaries between the content customer (government) and the task performers. This model is most often implemented to support innovation.
Production of media products by citizens	This type of project involves the creation of an online media product by community members, the content of which is evaluated by site visitors through voting
Co-development model	Within this model, the process is organised by decomposing the task of public authority into micro-tasks and further integrating individual completed tasks into the final product
Souvenir sales model	Under this model, electronic trading platforms are created where crowdsourcers post digital content (photos, videos, graphics, souvenirs with the symbols of a country, region, or city) that anyone can purchase
A model for designing souvenir products	Under this model, a trading platform is created where crowdsourcers present their product design options (T-shirt prints, interior design, etc.). The best are selected by voting, and their production is organised.
Decentralised social financing model	This model involves the creation of an online financial platform where borrowers and investors in socially important projects meet. Their anonymity is guaranteed, and interest rates are offered at a more favourable rate than commercial banks
The model of consumer report	In this type of project, crowdsourcers leave feedback on the work of a particular government agency or specialist.
A model for creating a knowledge base	This model involves creating a community portal with textual content in various areas of life. It is a practical step-by-step guide created by the residents of a given state.
Model of a joint research and development project	This model envisages the development of a unique web-based software application that allows community members to perform any task and thus contribute to the development of science and technology in the country

Source: compiled by the author

Recently, we have seen a huge variety of public crowdsourcing projects launched by various political actors to address a wide range of issues involving ordinary citizens and professional and non-professional expert groups. Some projects are related to solving national problems, some are aimed at solving the local community's problems, and some may have an international character. Based on the generalised experience, the most appropriate tools for implementing crowdsourcing technology in public administration can be identified, as shown in Table 5.

Next page

Table 5. Digital tools of crowdsourcing technology

Functionality of public administration	Examples of tools
Reform and public expertise	Government websites Platforms - Mi Senado and Active Citizen
Legislative and regulatory activities	Platforms - Jolitics.com, Demos X, Virtual Congress, e-Democracy Framapad and Etherpad, Pop Vox Open Ministry
Monitoring and evaluation	"I Paid a Bribe", "Not in my country" platform, CCDI application
Initiating social projects	"Centre for New Media and Civic Engagement (http://www.howto.gov/)
Working with big data	Creating operational maps in Google Maps about fires (USA) Mapping tools - Mapeo, FixMyStreet, Ushandi, CogniCity, Mapseed, ZmapujTo, Naturalist, Safecity, Harassmap, and Flu Near You
Surveys to collect citizens' votes	Platforms - PlaceSpeak, Participate.online, Participate 21, Open Town Hall, Polltix, Good Judgement, Stig, Dialogue, Monavis Citoyen, MetroQuest, PlaceToPlan, and Balancing Act
Generate ideas and discussions to build consensus or collective action	Platforms - Otakantaa, Make.org, Bogot'a Abierta, Ideascale, Discourse, Fiskkit, Bien Dit, Colab App, Insights, and Discuto Civicpower, ElectionBuddy, Vooter, Mieux voter, Swarm AI, Stanford PB, Mi Senado, Active Citizen, and ArcGIS CityEngine, as shown. Civicpower, ElectionBuddy, Vooter, Stanford PB, and Mieux voter
Analytical tools	Platforms - All Our Ideas Consider.it Local Voices Network Factiveverse
Co-financing	Platforms - CoBudget, Lar Ruche, Growfunding, Patronicity, Urbanpinion, and CoFonde

Source: based on Shin et al. [51]

Crowdsourcing technology can transform the entire governance system, increase its rationality and efficiency, and ensure public trust in government structures [52].

The problem of electronic participation of a wide range of citizens in developing routine government decisions remains unresolved, even though the level of ICT development is sufficient for this purpose. Given this, the analysis of the experience of practical implementation of the wiki-government and collaborative democracy model is particularly relevant.

Collaborative democracy is an innovative approach to using information technology to improve the performance of public authorities through the knowledge of groups of peer-to-peer experts who offer their services based on self-choice and work together in open networks. This approach is based on the above-described crowdsourcing technology - transferring certain functions to an indefinite number of people based on a public offer that does not involve legally binding agreements. However, unlike crowdsourcing, collaborative democracy requires stable coordinating structures that allow for the distribution of roles and tasks.

This approach combines the open participation of volunteers with centralised coordination of their work by government institutions.

The main idea of wiki-government [53] is to create electronic platforms for collaboration and involve a wide range of experts in developing government decisions. Within the framework of wiki-government, web 2.0 technologies (an integrated approach to the organisation, implementation and support of web resources, in which users are actively involved in the content and repeated verification of the material) are being merged with decision-making procedures in public authorities to improve the efficiency of the latter. As part of the practical implementation of the wiki strategy, the primary tool is the creation of a website where the ultimate goal is described in detail and divided into small tasks that can be performed by small groups of people, both experts and amateurs (this brings this approach closer to crowdsourcing).

Discussion

Increasing the importance of citizen participation in public administration is the subject of active scientific debate among many authors. Issues related to citizen satisfaction with the performance of public authorities are an important component of public policy in all countries that adhere to a particular model of democracy. It should be noted that the choice of a democratic process model affects the specifics of citizen engagement, including the choice of e-participation tools. The system of norms and traditions of a particular society also influences this. In this regard, the possibility of using e-participation methods and technologies in an authoritarian governance model is interesting and debatable.

Despite the relatively close attention to the subject, scholars do not cover issues related to the contradictions between the existing communication and information technologies of digital participation of the population and the limited possibilities for obtaining prompt, complete and comprehensive information relevant to the relevant management situation. However, the key problem lies in the contradiction between the high demand of the public for its opinion to be taken into account when making and implementing management decisions by public authorities and the low level of its political and civic engagement, manifested in sporadic spontaneous and unsystematic activity formats.

E-participation has a positive impact on civil society if it is organised regularly and involves active interaction [54]. At the same time, citizens' use of e-participation tools is voluntary. Therefore, they must be highly motivated to use them sustainably, with sufficient intensity and interest [55].

However, our research does not take into account that, despite governments' efforts, citizens sometimes remain inactive, preferring to spend their time on activities that interest them more [56] than managing the affairs of the state. As a result, resources dedicated to e-citizen participation often fail to achieve the expected goals and coverage levels [57]. Thus, encouraging citizens to engage in e-civic participation remains a pressing issue and requires further research.

Increasing citizens' interest in e-participation is possible, among other things, by introducing gamification elements on websites created by public authorities [56].

Another point that requires further research development is the emergence of digital citizenship through new networked politics that brings people together across national borders in new political regimes dedicated to supranational issues of the global order. This raises natural questions: How is it appropriate to distinguish networking from group activism? What are the promising new technologies for developing effective strategies for citizen communication?

The application of the proposed new tools for the e-participation of citizens in public administration is a targeted activity of public authorities to attract human capital (both general and specific) to solve the problems of socio-economic development of the country through the use and development of ICT (including the organisation of social networks in the Internet space and the creation of political innovations). Thus, it is not only about engaging citizens or groups of citizens but also about engaging human capital, the role of which is noted by Semenets-Orlova et al. [58-59].

Conclusion

Today, the solution of socially significant problems in the country can only be achieved through the joint efforts of the population and the authorities. To achieve common goals, it is necessary to build a dialogue, coordinate actions, and create conditions for partnerships between society and the government.

At the present stage of the socio-economic development of countries, the need to introduce new tools, methods, and mechanisms of public administration based on the broad involvement of citizens in the decision-making process at the state level has become apparent. Today, many countries worldwide, inspired by the rapid results of using information technologies in the real economy sector, seek to implement them actively in public administration. creating their typologies, common standards and rules of operation, as well as reference parameters recommended depending on the task to be solved and the level of use

Modern public administration searches for optimal interaction mechanisms with civil society in the virtual space [60]. Online communities have increased the influence of public opinion on the government agenda, including through social media, turning many citizens into influential policy actors. This is because, in the online environment, active citizens are less susceptible to state propaganda pressure, have access to various information sources and are content producers themselves, are more categorical and intolerant in their assessments, are more demanding of government institutions in terms of participation, and are easier to organise themselves.

The study by Shchokin et al. [61] demonstrate the problems of military-civilian cooperation in the field of state security and its possibilities in the context of current challenges and dangers. The authors prove the need to adhere to the principles of prioritizing military objectives in the interaction of the civilian and military sectors, while the latter should develop in the areas of optimizing institutional support, transferring NATO experience, and ensuring conditions for intensifying the achievement of goals.

Under these conditions, the best way to solve this problem is to create specialised platforms on the Internet, where the public and the authorities will organise a dialogue on the existence of problems and opportunities for their solution. Crowdsourcing feedback platforms can become one tool for creating effective interaction between citizens and the authorities.

References

1. Ellison, N.B., Steinfield, C. & Lampe, C. (2007). The Benefits of Facebook "Friends:" Social Capital and College Students' Use of Online Social Network Sites. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 4(12), 143-168. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2007.00367.x>
2. Pina, V., Torres, L. & Royo, S. (2017). Comparing Online with Offline Citizen Engagement for Climate Change: Findings from Austria, Germany and Spain. *Government Information Quarterly* 34(1), 26-36 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2016.08.009>
3. Arnstein, S. A. (1969). Ladder of Citizen Participation. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 4(35), 216-224. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01944366908977225>
4. Wilcox D. (1994). *The guide to effective participation*. Delta Press. <http://ourmuseum.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/The-Guide-to-Effective-Participation.pdf>
5. OECD (2001). Citizens as partners: OECD Handbook on information, consultation and public participation in policy-making. <http://www.internationalbudget.org/wp-content/uploads/Citizens-as-Partners-OECD-Handbook.pdf>
6. OECD (2020). *OECD Public Integrity Handbook*, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/ac8ed8e8-en>
7. OECD (2024). Citizens as partners: OECD Handbook on information, consultation and public participation in policy-making. OECD, 2001. <http://www.internationalbudget.org/wp-content/uploads/Citizens-as-Partners-OECD-Handbook.pdf>
8. IAP2. (2014). IAP2's Public Participation Spectrum. https://iap2.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/IAP2_Public_Participation_Spectrum.pdf
9. Cogan, A., Sharpe, S., & Hertzberg, J. (1986). Citizen participation. In So, F. S., Hand, I., & Madowell, B. D. (Eds.), *The Practice of State and Regional Planning. Municipal Management Series*. Chicago: American Planning Association, 283-305.
10. Wilcox D. (1994). *The guide to effective participation*. Delta Press. <http://ourmuseum.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/The-Guide-to-Effective-Participation.pdf>
11. Timney, M. (2011). Models of participation: measuring engagement and collaboration. In: C.S. King, ed. *Government is us 2.0* (86-100). Armonk, NY: ME Sharpe. <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9781315703978-13/models-citizen-participation-measuring-engagement-collaboration-mary-timney>

12. Villushynskiy, M., & Moskvyeh, L. (2019). The right of the public on publicly heard and open criminal proceedings in the context of preventing corruption and economic crime by judicial power. *Baltic Journal of Economic Studies* 5(4), 59-73 <https://doi.org/10.30525/2256-0742/2019-5-4-59-73>
13. Moskvyeh, L. (2018). Trust in the court: status and indicators. *Law of Ukraine* 3, 9-25.
14. Moskvyeh, L. M. (2018). Legal instruments for improving the authority of the court. *ScienceRise: Juridical Science* 1, 17-24. <http://jnas.nbuv.gov.ua/article/UJRN-0000985167>
15. Farrington, J., Bebbington, A., Lewis, D., Wellard, K., (1993). *Reluctant Partners: Non-governmental Organisations, the State and Sustainable Agricultural Development*. London: Routledge.
16. Cornwall, A. (2008). Unpacking "Participation": Models, meanings and practices *Community Development Journal* 43(3). 269-283. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cdj/bsn010>
17. White, S. (1996). Depoliticising development: the uses and abuses of participation. *Development in Practice* 6(1), 6-15. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4029350>
18. Treseder, P. (1997). *Empowering Children and Young People*. London: Children's Rights Office (Save the Children).
19. Pretty, J. (1995). Participatory learning for sustainable agriculture *World Development*, 23(8), 1247-1263. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-750X\(95\)00046-F](https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-750X(95)00046-F)
20. Joss, S. (1995). Evaluating consensus conferences: necessity or luxury? In: S. Joss, J. Durant, eds. *Public Participation in Science: Role of Consensus Conferences in Europe* (pp. 89-108). London: Science Museum.
21. Rowe, G., Frewer, L.J. (2000). Public participation methods: A framework for evaluation. *Science Technology & Human Values* 1(25). <https://doi.org/10.1177/016224390002500101>
22. Khotynska-Nor, O. et al. (2019). Role of Confidence and Supply Chain Strategy during Legitimization of Justice in Countries of Transitional Period *International journal of Supply Chain Management* 8 (6), 533-543. <https://doi.org/10.59160/ijscm.v8i6.4104>
23. Panopoulou, E., Tambouris, E., Tarabanis, K. (2014). Success factors in designing eParticipation initiatives. *Information and Organisation* 4(24), 195-213. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infoandorg.2014.08.001>
24. Schossböck, J., Sachs, M., Leitner, M. (2016). E-Participation Platform Features and Design Principles In: *CeDEM16: Proceedings of the International Conference for E-Democracy and Open Government* (May 18-20, 2016, Danube University Krems, Austria), Eds. P. Parycek, N. Edelmann. Krems: Donau-Universität Krems, 69-74.
25. Hoepman, J.-H. (2014). Privacy Design Strategies In: *ICT Systems Security and Privacy Protection*. In *29th IFIP TC 11 International Conference, SEC 2014, Marrakech, Morocco, June 2-4*. Springer, 446-459. (IFIP Advances in Information and Communication Technology, Vol. 428). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-55415-5_38
26. McNutt, K. (2014). Public engagement in the Web 2.0 era: Social collaborative technologies in a public sector context. *Canadian Public Administration* 1(57). 49-70. <https://doi.org/10.1111/capa.12058>
27. Saldivar, J., Parra, C., Alcaraz, M., Arteta, R., & Cernuzzi, L. (2018). Civic Technology for Social Innovation. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work* 28(1-2), 169-207. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10606-018-9311-7>
28. De Blasio, E., & Viviani, L. (2020). Platform Party between Digital Activism and Hyper-Leadership: The Reshaping of the Public Sphere. *Media and Communication* 8(4), 16-27. <https://doi.org/10.17645/mac.v8i4.3230>
29. Habermas, J. (1998). *The Inclusion of the Other: Studies in Political Theory*. MIT Press. <https://mitpress.mit.edu/9780262581868/the-inclusion-of-the-other/>
30. Alexander, J.C. (2006). *The Civil Sphere*. NEW YORK: Oxford University Press.
31. Lasswell, H. (1971). Economics, political science, and law. An introduction. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 184, 329-348. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.1971.tb41336.x>
32. Lasswell, H.D. (1946). Describing Effects of Communications. In: B.L. Smith, H.D. Lasswell, R.D. Casey, eds., *Propaganda, Communication and Public Opinion*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400878642-007>
33. Castells, M. (2004) *Informationalism, networks, and the net-work society: a theoretical blueprint, The network society: a cross-cultural perspective*, Cheltenham; Northampton, MA Elgar. <https://annenberg.usc.edu/sites/default/files/2015/04/28/Informationalism%2C%20Networks%20and%20the%20Network%20Society.pdf>
34. Castells, M. (2023). *The Power of communication*. VSHE Publishing House, 2023, 591 p.
35. Habermas, J. (2008). *Theory of communicative action*. In McCarthy, Trans., *Reason and Rationality of Sociability* (Vol. 1). Cambridge: Polity Press.

36. Habermas, J. (2023). *A new structural transformation of the public sphere and deliberative politics*. Polity. (Original work published 2022). <https://pid.uba.uva.nl/ark:/88238/b19942206325005131>
37. Newell, R., Picketts, I. and Dale, A. (2020). Community systems models and development scenarios for integrated planning: Lessons learned from participatory approach. *Community Development* 51(3), 261-282. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15575330.2020.1772334>
38. Ledwith, M. (2010). *Participatory practice: community-based action for transformative change*. Bristol, UK: Policy Press.
39. Uphoff, N. (1991). Fitting Projects to People. Cernea, M. (ed) *Putting People First: Sociological Variables in Rural Development* (2nd edition). New York: OUP.
40. Biegelbauer, P., & Hansen, J. (2011). Democratic theory and citizen participation: democratic models in the evaluation of public participation in science and technology *Science and Public Policy* 38(8), 589-597. <https://doi.org/10.3152/030234211X13092649606404>
41. United Nations E-Government Knowledge Base (UN-EgovKB). <https://publicadministration.un.org/egovkb/Data-Center>
42. United Nations e-Government Survey 2024. <https://desapublications.un.org/publications/un-e-government-survey-2024>
43. Digital 2024: global overview report, WeAreSocial. <https://datareportal.com/reports/digital-2024-global-overview-report>
44. Munoz, L., & Boliwar, M. (2018). *International E-Government development: Policy, implementation and best practice*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-63284-1>
45. Macintosh, A. (2004). Characterising E-participation in Policy-Making In: *Proceedings of the 37th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/hicss.2004.1265300>
46. Thiel, S.-K., & Lehner U. (2015). Exploring the effects of game elements in m-participation. In *British HCI 2015: British Human Computer Interaction Conference, Lincoln, Lincolnshire, UK*. New York, NY: ACM, 65-73. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2783446.2783587>
47. Kushchu, I., Kescu, M.H. (2003). From E-government to M-government: Facing the Inevitable: Facing the Inevitable In: *The 3rd European Conference on e-Government*. Dublin: Management Centre International Ltd, 253-260. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228606962_From_E-government_to_M-government_Facing_the_Inevitable
48. Berg, S. & Hofmann, J. (2021). Digital democracy. *Internet Policy Review*, 10(4). <https://doi.org/10.14763/2021.4.1612>
49. Obi, T., Ishmatova, D., Iwasaki, N. (2013). Promoting ICT innovations for ageing population. *Japan International Journal of Medical Informatics* 4(82). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2012.05.004>
50. Saxton, G. D., Oh, O. & Kishore, R. (2013). Rules of Crowdsourcing: Models, Issues, and Systems of Control. *Information Systems Management* 30(1), 2-20 <http://doi.org/10.1080/10580530.2013.739883>
51. Shin, B., Floch, J., Rask, M., Baeck, P., Edgar, C., Berdichevskaya, A., Mesure, P., & Branlat, M. (2024). A systematic analysis of digital tools for citizen participation. *Government Information Quarterly* 41(3). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2024.101954>
52. Taeihagh, A. (2017). Crowdsourcing: a new tool for policy-making. *Policy Sciences* 50, 629-647, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11077-017-9303-3>
53. Mansour, A. M. (2015). Wiki-Government as Coproduction of Public Policies and Services: A Feasibility Study for the United Arab Emirates. *Australian Journal of Sustainable Business and Society* 1. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/273860904>
54. Naranjo-Zolotov, M., Oliveira, T., Cruz-Jesus, F., Martins, J., Gonçalves, R., Brancet, F. (2019). Examining social capital and individual motivators to explain the adoption of online citizen participation. *Future Generation Computer Systems* 92, 302-311. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.future.2018.09.044>
55. Naranjo-Zolotov, M. Oliveira, T., Casteleyn, S., & Irani, Z. . (2019). Continuous use of e-participation: The role of the sense of virtual community. *Government Information Quarterly* 36(3), 536-545, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2019.05.009>
56. Hassan, L., & Hamari, J. (2020). Gameful civic engagement: A review of the literature on gamification of e-participation. *Government Information Quarterly* 37(3), 101461 (in press). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2020.101461>
57. Toots, M. (2019). Why E-participation systems fail: The case of Estonia's Osale.ee, *Government Information Quarterly* 36(3), 546-559, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2019.02.002>

58. Semenets-Orlova, I., Shevchuk, R., Plish, B., Grydiushko, I., & Maistrenko, K. (2022). Innovative approaches to development of human potential in modern public administration. *Economic Affairs (New Delhi)* 67(4), 915-926. <https://doi.org/10.46852/0424-2513.4s.2022.25>
59. Semenets-Orlova, I., Shevchuk, R., Plish, B., Moshnin, A., Chmyr, Y., & Poliuliakh, R. (2022). Human-centred approach in new development trends of value-oriented public administration: Potential of education. *Economic Affairs (New Delhi)*, 67(5), 899-906. <https://doi.org/10.46852/0424-2513.5.2022.25>
60. Ansell, C. & Miura, S. (2020). Can the power of platforms be harnessed for governance? *Public Administration* 98(1), 261-276. <https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.12636>
61. Shchokin, R., Soloviov, O., & Tantsiura, I. (2023). Strengthening Cooperation between the Civilian and Military Sectors In the Context of State Security: Benefits and Challenges. *Revista de Cercetare si Interventie Sociala*, 83, 155-170. <https://doi.org/10.33788/rcis.83.11>

