

## СУСПІЛЬСТВА НОВОЇ СХІДНОЇ ЄВРОПИ: СОЦІОЛОГІЧНІ ПОРІВНЯННЯ

УДК 316.33

Y. Savelyev, Assoc. Prof.  
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Kyiv

### PARTICIPATION AND POLITICAL REGIMES IN CONTEMPORARY EUROPE: COMPARING NON-EU 'NEW EASTERN EUROPE' WITH 'OLD' AND 'RECENT' EU MEMBER STATES

*The paper attempts to provide a systematic view on different types of participation (political, civic and social) and compares trends and patterns of participation between clusters of European societies. Such clusters comprise, first, non-EU 'New Eastern Europe', second, other Central and Eastern European societies, which accessed the EU recently, third, Western European countries, which have been advanced and stable democracies for decades, fourth, Mediterranean EU members. We differentiate various contexts of participation including political opportunity structure and political regimes that is crucial for adequate comparison of participation patterns. The theories and measurement models, most of which were elaborated to explain patterns and factors of participation based on data from Western democracies, are critically examined in the context of 'New Eastern Europe' societies. Existing political opportunity structures as two dimensional political regimes are identified to show similarities and differences in patterns in participation in countries with various socio-economic conditions. Available indicators of level of democracy, political rights and civil liberties are employed to assess political regimes in European societies. The paper suggests research questions and hypotheses to explain peculiarities of participation in 'New Eastern Europe' countries.*

*Key words: civic participation, political participation, social participation, political regimes, political opportunity structure, 'New Eastern Europe'*

#### Rational and Theoretical framework

Participation displays social structure and culture of society as well as human agency. Various types of participation are a critical segment of contemporary societal processes, patterns of which characterize a particular society. Social agents also can manifest their interests and values via political and civic participation. On the other hand, social participation is directly related to levels of solidarity, cooperative behavior, social capital and trust in society.

The core problem of a study of participation in social science is finding factors that explain distinctions in trends and patterns of participation among manifold social groups and among different societies. Other important problem is to discover relationship between various forms of participation. Existing theories of participation and measurement models have been developed mostly based on data from Western democratic countries. In contrary fashion, a theory of a "post-honeymoon" decline was introduced especially for 'new democracies' (including Eastern European societies) after the transition to democracy [Inglehart, 2002].

Comparative cross-national research demonstrates different unique non-cumulative patterns of political participation for different countries [Verba, 1978]. It shows that individuals usually are specialized in one specific form of political participation. The European Social Survey (ESS) confirms non-cumulative feature of participation (political as well as civic) on individual level [Newton, 2007]. However, on a society level European countries "with a high rate of participation on any one measure are likely to have a similar rate on most of the other measures" [Newton, 2007: 227]. Also on individual level a 'direct and positive' relationship between social participation and political involvement was discovered in representative democracies [van Deth, 1997]. Besides, the ESS findings prove that there are distinct clusters of countries with a strong resemblance in patterns of participation [Newton, 2007]. These and other [Inglehart, 2002; Smith, 2009; Wallace, 2012] findings imply that advanced democratic societies have higher levels of participation of various types than less consolidated democracies. The latter includes non-EU 'New Eastern Europe' which is located on the periphery of the current European project and actually has been left between European Union and Russian Federation [Savelyev, 2011:

72]. However, when society is a unit of analysis, it is important to emphasize that participation rates are usually compared regardless societal and cultural contexts of participation such as institutional opportunities and political regimes that is vital for adequate comparison of participation patterns in societies, which are placed differently on a scale of development.

In this paper three basic types of participation are differentiated and comprised:

Political participation (conventional as well as protest behavior);

Civic (also named public or social) participation (including participation in voluntary associations);

Social participation (sociable activity beyond close relatives, work duties and voluntary organizations).

Defining civic participation is the most problematic. On the one hand, it is close to but still distinct from the social type, which means inter-personal sociable activities (usually the latter include visiting friends, sport and church activities, volunteer community work, assisting neighbors, etc.). In the US it is often equalized to volunteering and association membership [Putnam, 2000; Schofer, 2001]. As public it is considered to be "the process by which public concerns, needs, and values are incorporated into governmental and corporate decision making" [Creighton, 2005: 7]. Civic participation generates networks that accordingly enhance social participation. On the other hand, civic participation verges on the political one, for they both aimed at 'representing the collective interests' and influencing on decision-making. N.Burns, K.Schlozman and S.Verba understand political participation as "activity that has the intent or effect of influencing government action—either directly, by affecting the making or implementation of public policy, or indirectly, by influencing the selection of people who make those policies" [Burns, 2001].

Types of participation are measured using nominal and ordinal scales. Calculation of overall participation score on a country level requires standardization of each measure by subtracting its mean from the mean of the set of observed countries and dividing the residual by the standard deviation [Newton, 2007].

There are a variety of influential theories of participation which explain differently its mechanisms and trends [Almond, 1963; Lipset, 1967; Verba, 1978; Barnes, 1979; Putnam, 2002; Dalton, 2004; Newton, 2005; Куценко,

2006]. The differences in participation patterns among various social groups and between societies are predominately attributed to culture and a system of values [Almond, 1963; Inglehart, 2002; 2010] or to socio-economic status and the access to resources [Verba, 1995; Fuchs, 1995; Burns, 2001]. However, many theories have limitation for comparative research, for they lack external or contextual factors such as legal regime and political opportunities. Therefore, they are primarily applicable in the same institutional, cultural and political settings.

Based on research on advanced Western democracies R.Dalton, S.Scarrow and B.Cain came to conclusion about shift from 'old' (parties and voting) to 'new' (deliberative or consultative democracy, signing petitions, joining lobby groups, referenda and ballot) politics [Dalton, 2004]. P.Norris argues that while traditional forms of participation have become less popular in Western countries, there has been a rise of alternative ways of civic engagement. According to Norris, existing evidences rather point to "the evolution, transformation, and reinvention of civic engagement than to its premature death" [Norris, 2002: 4].

Likewise, as S.Barnes, M.Kaase et al. claimed earlier [Barnes, 1979], recent the ESS findings prove that "advanced democratic and affluent societies encourage, unconventional forms of protest activity, while the newer and less well-established democracies tend to discourage them" [Newton, 2007: 220-221]. In particular in Europe the patterns of participation have been discovered according to which "wealthy countries with effective and stable governments have high rates of all kinds of participation" and "countries with a strong third sector of charitable and humanitarian associations also tend to have a lot of helping behavior on the part of private individuals" [Newton, 2007: 228]. This implies a hypothesis that non-EU Eastern-European countries as 'new democracies' have more conventional participation rather than unconventional and protest behavior.

We suggest using a theory of political opportunity structure (POS) as a general approach to understand such differences and varieties of patterns of participation. The POS theory explains emergence, success (or failure), and impact of social movements as well as the difference in the action repertoires with an emphasis on external structural factors [Eisinger, 1973; Kitschelt, 1986; Tarrow, 1996; McAdam, 1996]. A focus on external and contextual factors is a significant advantage of the POS theory comparing to other frameworks. POS usually refers to institutional and structural features of a society that frame collective actions but can be extended to individual participation as well (social agency).

According to H.Kitschelt (1986), institutional differences between national states are crucial for social movements and participation. He introduced two dimensional POS matrix consisting of political input structures – degree of openness to societal demands; and political output structures – the capacity to implement policies. The first one can be open or closed; the second – can be either strong or weak [Kitschelt, 1986]. A specific configuration of these features is a political regime that prevails in each country. H.Kriesi et al. elaborated this model differentiating three elements: formal institutional structure; informal procedures and prevailing strategies; configuration of power [New Social Movements, 1995]. Thus, the concept of POS embraces the following aspects [New Social Movements, 1995; McAdam, 1996]:

- relative openness or closure of the institutionalized political system;
- configuration of power, presence of elite allies and alliance structures;
- informal strategies of political elites;

- the state's capacity and propensity for repression.

In this chapter we will identify types of existing POS as two dimensional political regimes in non-EU 'New Eastern European' societies comparing them to 'old' and 'resent EU member states to show similarities and differences in patterns in participation in countries with various socio-economic conditions. We would also suggest using available indicators of level of democracy, political rights and civil liberties to assess political regimes in European societies.

#### European divisions

Descriptive statistics from World Values Surveys (WVS) and the ESS show that most of Western European societies differ from Eastern European ones (including 'New Eastern Europe') in political participation rates excluding voting as well as in civic and social participation. Using data from round 2 of the ESS, M.L.Smith (2009) splits European societies into two groups namely Western and Central/Eastern Europe. If in the first set of countries 17% contacted a politician, government or local government official during the last 12 month, then in the second only 11% did (see fig.1). The same pattern is observed for all other measures: 6% worked in a political party or action group in Western democracies in contrast to 3% in Central and Eastern European societies; 20% worked in another organization or association in contrast to 6%; 10% wore or displayed a campaign badge/sticker while 5% did the same in Central and Eastern Europe; 28% in contrast to 13% signed a petition; 9% in contrast to 6% took part in a lawful public demonstration; 19% in contrast to 7% boycotted certain products [Smith, 2009].

Therefore, it can be claimed that West Europeans in general are more active in political and social life than their counterparts in Eastern part who are tend to be inert in defending their civil rights and liberties.

Available data support these conclusions in general. Nevertheless, we would argue that this is a simplified picture and there are several considerations that signify limitations of such an approach.

First of all, Western Europe is not homogeneous itself. K.Newton and J.R.Montero (2007) distinguish four clusters of countries with a strong resemblance in all types of participation: Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Finland, Austria, Switzerland and the Netherlands have participation rates above the average; Ireland and the United Kingdom, Belgium, Germany, France and Luxembourg have rates close to the average; Greece, Portugal, Italy and Spain have lower level of participation; 'at the bottom', according to Newton and Montero, there is a cluster of 'post-communist' countries (Poland, Hungary, Slovenia, Czech Republic) participation rates of which are below the average. Moreover, it is obvious that placing Eastern European societies 'at the bottom' of the set as a separate cluster is merely a value judgment, for there is no significant difference between Mediterranean countries and the post-socialist ones either in overall participation score or in any particular type of participation (see Fig. 2).

The average standardized overall participation score was -0.25 for Czech Republic, -0.38 for Spain, -0.39 for Slovenia, -0.52 for Italy, -0.72 for Portugal, -0.90 for Hungary, -0.98 for Greece and -1.02 for Poland, while the lowest score for a Western European country (0.11) was observed for France and the highest of 1.13 – for Austria and Norway [Newton, 2007: 222].


#### Political participation

Greece and Portugal had virtually identical values of political participation with Eastern European countries (see Fig. 3, 4). 14% in Greece and 6% in Portugal contacted a politician, government or local government official during the last 12 month (17% in Czech Republic, 11% in


Slovenia, 10 % in Hungary, 9% in Ukraine, 7% in Poland); 6% and 2% worked in a political party or action group (3% in Czech Republic, 3% in Slovenia, 1 % in Hungary, 4% in Ukraine, 3% in Poland); 5% and 3% worked in another organization or association (8% in Czech Republic, 2% in Slovenia, 2 % in Hungary, 2% in Ukraine, 4% in Poland); 3% and 5% signed a petition (14% in Czech Republic, 6%

in Slovenia, 6 % in Hungary, 9% in Ukraine, 2% in Poland); 5% and 2% boycotted certain products (7% in Czech Republic, 5% in Slovenia, 5 % in Hungary, 2% in Ukraine, 5% in Poland) [Smith, 2009].


From the same data one also can see that Ukraine does not much differ from its Eastern European EU members as well as from Portugal and Greece.




Source: Smith, 2009  
**Fig.1. Comparison of participation rates in Western and Central/Eastern Europe: ESS, round 2**



Source: Newton, 2007  
**Fig. 2. Average standardized overall participation score, ESS, round 2: selected Western and Central/Eastern European countries**



Source: Smith, 2009  
**Fig. 3. Percentage of respondents who boycotted certain products during the last 12 month, ESS, round 2: selected Western and Central/Eastern European countries**




Source: Smith, 2009

Fig. 4. Percentage of respondents who during the last 12 month contacted a politician, government or local government official. ESS, round 2: selected Western and Central/Eastern European countries

**Social participation**


Helping behavior as a form of social participation has a similar pattern (see Fig. 5). According to the ESS round 2 Ukraine had a low score of 3.82 (on a scale from 0 to 10). Nevertheless, Poland and Greece had even a lower value of 3.18 as well as Slovakia (3.73). Portugal with value of 3.94 and Hungary with 3.99 were close to this group, Czech Republic (4.15), Slovenia (4.36) and Spain (4.21) with better scores still differed significantly from the top helping behavior societies – Norway (5.99), Denmark (6.02) and Ireland (6.22) [Головаха, 2006].

Sociable activities (meeting socially) pattern differs partially from the previous one, for Portugal (5.89) and Spain (5.39) have higher scores than Eastern European societies (see Fig. 6). Nevertheless, Greece remains in the same cluster demonstrating the lowest observed value of 3.76. Besides, Germany (4.72) and Ireland (4.78) are close to Eastern Europe and even behind Slovakia (5.01). Ukraine (4.54) once again exceeds several of its EU neighbors: Hungary (3.82), Czech Republic (4.26) and Poland (4.30) [Golovakha, 2006].



Source: Golovakha, 2006

Fig. 5. Helping behavior score, ESS, round 2: selected Western and Central/Eastern European countries



Source: Golovakha, 2006

Fig. 6. Meeting socially score, ESS, round 2: selected Western and Central/Eastern European countries

### Civic participation

Recent research on civic participation (measured as participation in civil society voluntary organizations, WVS waves 3 and 5) confirms lower rates for Eastern Europe comparing to the core societies in Western and Northern Europe [Wallace, 2012]. However, the research also discovered diverse trends of civic participation: if between middle 1990s and 2005-08 there was a decline in participation in Romania and Spain (affected primarily by loss in church membership), a slight increase of civic participation was observed in Slovenia, Moldova and Ukraine.

According to the research, whilst in the USA civic participation in all sectors of civil society was shrinking significantly over decade, it was quite stable in Western Europe and even had a positive trend on a small scale in Eastern Europe [Wallace, 2012]. Notably, Western European societies were mainly losing support for labor unions and church organizations. Still, in some countries like Sweden religious organizations gained members.

The hypothesis that there was a difference in civic participation between new EU member states in Eastern Europe and their neighbors failed to be confirmed. C.Wallace, F.Pichler and C.Haerpfer revealed a phenomenon of 'state-sponsored civil society' that is typical for authoritarian regimes. On the other hand, certain Western and Eastern European countries, EU members as well as non-EU (Slovenia, Ukraine, Russia, Finland, Sweden and Switzerland) share the same trend of growth in civic participation in a segment related to labor market, economy and professional organizations. Although, according to the ESS data, the difference between Western and Eastern Europe remains very significant [Newton, 2007: 212].

### Determinants of participation and European divisions

Thus, rather than distinctly separate Western and Eastern European societies it would be more productive to distinguish three relatively homogeneous clusters of countries that differ on a scale of participation: above European average, close to the average, and below the average. This classification is similar to what Newton and Montero had suggested but overcomes artificial detachment of Eastern Europe. The latter constitutes a below average cluster together with Mediterranean countries, which, in fact, are more proper benchmark for comparisons of Eastern European societies by many indicators of development (Although most researches are tempted to do comparisons of 'New Eastern Europe' with less similar and more advanced Western European societies).

However, these clusters are formed on current participation rates and countries even within the same cluster may have adverse trends, as it was shown in the previous section, specific political cultures or institutional opportunity structures.

A set of factors that are associated with higher overall participation rates on a society level includes [Newton, 2007: 227]:

Rule of law (World Bank measure "of the extent to which agents have confidence in and abide by the rules of society" [WGI, 2011];

Government effectiveness (World Bank measure "of the quality of public services, the quality of the civil service and the degree of its independence from political pressures, the quality of policy formulation and implementation" [WGI, 2011];

National wealth (GDP per capita);

Political stability (World Bank measure "of the likelihood that the government will be destabilized or overthrown by unconstitutional or violent means" [WGI, 2011].

K.Newton and J.R.Montero conclude that rule of law is "the most dominant single factor" [Newton, 2007: 226]. It is a main predictor for social, civic and conventional political participation. Protest political participation has GDP per capita as the only predictor in their regression model.

Hence, common features of political and social development affect participation patterns as in case of post-socialist countries, in all of which political participation (especially elite-challenging) decreased significantly since change of regime [Inglehart, 2002]. Although M.L.Smith asserts that it is not possible to verify 'the direct effect of post-communist conditions' on a society level analysis, he found statistically significant (but 'not particularly strong') differences between Western democracies and Eastern Europe for individual level variables of social stratification (Fig. 7). According to his analysis, 'there is more inequality in political participation' in post-socialist societies comparing to Western Europe [Smith, 2009: 514]. Besides, N.Letki (2003) demonstrated a clear distinction of Eastern and Central Europe finding a weak relationship between political participation and trust in the region in the middle of 1990s. She also discovered that previous membership in the Communist party before 1989 was 'a very good predictor of conventional political participation' [Letki, 2003: 24].

On the other hand, national institutional opportunity structure has an impact as one can see in a case of East Germany. Despite post-socialist heritage, it has participation patterns that are closer to a western part of the country than to other Eastern European post-socialist states (see Fig. 7). Particularly this is noticeable in such activities as working in organization or association (20% in E. Germany, 21% in W. Germany, 8% in Czech Republic, 2% in Slovenia, 2 % in Hungary, 2% in Ukraine, 4% in Poland); signing a petition (33% in E. Germany, 32% in W. Germany, 14% in Czech Republic, 6% in Slovenia, 6 % in Hungary, 9% in Ukraine, 2% in Poland), and boycotts of certain products (16% in E. Germany, 23% in W. Germany, 7% in Czech Republic, 5% in Slovenia, 5 % in Hungary, 2% in Ukraine, 5% in Poland) [Smith, 2009].




Fig.7. Comparison of East Germany, West Germany and selected Central/Eastern European countries. Percentage of respondents who during the last 12 month signed a petition, ESS, round 2

It is important to emphasize that in contrast to social and civic participation political participation may be heavily influenced by situational context, which is a critical factor to modify a general pattern. Elections and political crises change normal participation rates dramatically. According to the ESS round 2, field work of which was run in 2005, there was 21.6% who participated in lawful public demonstration in Ukraine. That was the second highest value in Europe, whilst 8.5% in Germany, 5% in Greece, 3.5% in Portugal, 3.3% in Czech Republic, 1.6% in Slovenia, Hungary and Poland [Golovakha, 2006]. 13.3% of Ukrainians wore or displayed a campaign badge/sticker (the 4th rank in Europe). However, this rise in such activities was due to tense president elections that inflamed 'orange revolution' at the end of 2004. Likewise, Greece and Portugal, which were so

politically passive in Europe in the middle of 2000s, would appear in leading positions in 2011.

**Participation and political regimes**

Although K.Newton and J.R.Montero rejected indicator of democracy as a significant predictor for different types of participation, other important dimensions of political regime (rule of law, government effectiveness and political stability) were such predictors. Besides, in their regression model they used Freedom House democracy score that was not sensitive for the selected set of countries, for most of Western and Central/Eastern European societies had the same highest values of political rights score and minor differences in civil liberties score (Freedom House, 2005; 2011). In contrast, 'New Eastern Europe' countries, which were not included into analysis, were behind significantly (tab.1).

Table 1

**Political regimes in Europe: political input structures dimension**

Clusters of countries/Regimes	Free	Partly Free	Not Free
Western Europe – EU15 'old members'	All	-	-
Central/Eastern Europe – 'recent EU members'	All	-	-
'New Eastern Europe'	-	Armenia, Georgia, Moldova, Ukraine	Belarus

Source: Freedom House, 2005; 2011

In terms of POS theory, political input structures (openness to societal demands) are shaped by degree to which political institutions are democratic and responsive. On the other hand, government effectiveness accounts for political output structures (the capacity to implement policies).

If relying on Freedom House assessment, political input structures are similar in Western and Central/Eastern European societies that do not explain differences in patterns of participation among them. Conversely, 'New Eastern Europe' countries have more closed input political

structures but participation rates (according to data available) resemble ones in Eastern European and Mediterranean EU members. A solution that may be suggested is to apply more sensitive indicators of democracy and civil liberties. Although, as C.Wallace, F.Pichler and C.Haerpfer showed, there are forms of civic participation that may grow under authoritarian regimes and flawed democracy [Wallace, 2012].

Table 2

**Political regimes in Europe: political output structures dimension**

Clusters of countries/Regimes	High effectiveness mean WGI government effectiveness score ranging from -2.5 to 2.5	Medium effectiveness	Low effectiveness
Austria, Denmark, Finland, Norway, Sweden, the Netherlands, Ireland, Germany, France, UK	1.84		
Italy, Portugal, Spain, Greece		0.97	
Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Slovenia, Slovakia		0.97	
Armenia, Belarus, Georgia, Moldova, Ukraine			-0.59

Source: WGI, 2011

Concerning political output structures Western Europe and 'New Eastern Europe' are poles apart whilst recent EU members (Central/Eastern Europe) and Mediterranean EU states are virtually identical. This typology implies that relationship between political regimes and participation is likely to be non-linear. 'New Eastern Europe' societies, which are less democratic, have more closed political structures and far less effective governance, have similar levels of political, civic and social participation with Eastern European neighbors and countries of Southern Europe. Therefore, existing gap in participation patterns between 'New Eastern Europe' and advanced Western societies, which is highlighted in the literature, is not exclusively produced by special features of the region. A problem for future research is to elicit effects of political regime on participation along with other factors.

**References**

1. Головаха Є., Україна та Європа: результати міжнародного порівняльного соціологічного дослідження / Є.Головаха, А.Горбачик, Н.Паніна. – К.: Інститут соціології НАН України, 2006. – 142 с.
2. Куценко О.Д. Сохраняют ли значение классовые основания политического участия? / О.Д. Куценко // Социология: теория, методы, маркетинг. – 2006. – № 3. – С. 92 – 115.
3. Almond G.A. The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations / G.A. Almond, S.Verba. – Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1963.

4. Barnes S. Political Action: Mass Participation in Five Western Democracies / S.Barnes, M.Kaase, editors. – Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage, 1979.
5. Burns N. The private roots of public action: gender, equality, and political participation / N.Burns, K.L.Schlozman, S. Verba. – Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2001.
6. Creighton J. The public participation handbook: making better decisions through citizen involvement / J.Creighton. – San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2005.
7. Dalton R. Advanced Democracies and the New Politics / R.Dalton, S.Scarrow, B.Cain // Journal of Democracy. – 2004. – Vol. 15. – No. 1. – P. 124-138.
8. Eisinger P. The Conditions of Protest Behavior in American Cities / P.Eisinger // American Political Science Review. – 1973. – Vol. 67. – P. 11-28.
9. Freedom House. Freedom in the World. 2005. [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу до ресурсу: <http://www.freedomhouse.org/uploads/Chart33File36.pdf>
10. Freedom House. Freedom in the World. 2011. [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу до ресурсу: [http://www.freedomhouse.org/images/File/fiw/FIW\\_2011\\_Booklet.pdf](http://www.freedomhouse.org/images/File/fiw/FIW_2011_Booklet.pdf)
11. Fuchs D. Citizens and the State / Fuchs, D., Klingemann, H.-D. editors. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.
12. Inglehart R. Trends in Political Action: The Developmental Trend and the Post-Honeymoon Decline / R.Inglehart, G.Catterberg // International Journal of Comparative Sociology. – 2002. – Vol. 43 (3-5) – P. 300-316.
13. Inglehart R. Changing Mass Priorities. The Link between Modernization and Democracy / R.Inglehart, C.Welzel // Perspectives on Politics. – 2010. – Vol. 8. – No. 2. – P. 551-567.
14. Kitschelt H. Political Opportunity Structures and Political Protest: Anti-Nuclear Movements in Four Democracies / H. Kitschelt // British Journal of Political Science. – 1986. – Vol. 16. – P. 57-85.
15. Letki N. Explaining Political Participation in East-Central Europe: Social Capital, Democracy and the Communist Past [Електронний ресурс]

/ N.Letki. – Nuffield College Politics Working Paper 2003-W2, University of Oxford. – Режим доступу до ресурсу: [http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXT/CARETOPS/SOCDEV/Resources/Letki\\_political\\_participation.pdf](http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXT/CARETOPS/SOCDEV/Resources/Letki_political_participation.pdf)

16. Lipset S. M. Party Systems and Voter Alignments: Cross-national Perspectives / S. M. Lipset, S. Rokkan. – New York: The Free Press, 1967.

17. McAdam D. Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures and Cultural Framing / Doug McAdam, John McCarthy, and Mayer Zald editors. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

18. New Social Movements in Western Europe: a comparative analysis / [Hanspeter Kriesi, Ruud Koopmans, Jan Willem Duyvendak, and Marco G. Giugni]. – Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press, 1995. – 311 p.

19. Newton, K. Patterns of political and social participation in Europe / K. Newton, J. R. Montero // Measuring Attitudes Cross-Nationally: Lessons from the European Social Survey / Roger Jowell, Caroline Roberts, Rory Fitzgerald, Gillian Eva Editors. – London: Sage, 2007 – P. 205-238.

20. Newton K. Foundations of Comparative Politics: Democracies of the Modern World / K. Newton, Jan W. van Deth. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005. – 375 p.

21. Norris P. Democratic Phoenix: reinventing political activism / P. Norris. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

22. Putnam R. Democracies in Flux: The Evolution of Social Capital in Contemporary Society / R. Putnam editor. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

23. Savelyev Yu. European Integration and Trends of Development of Eastern European Borderland / Yuriy Savelyev // Наукові записки НаУКМА. – 2011. – Том 122: Соціологічні науки. – Київ, Національний університет "Києво-Могилянська Академія", 2011. – С. 71-79.

24. Schofer E. The Structural Contexts of Civic Engagement: Voluntary Association Membership in Comparative Perspective / E. Schofer, M. Fourcade-Gourinchas // American Sociological Review. – 2001. – Vol. 66. – No. 6. – P. 806-828

25. Smith M. L. The Inequality of Participation: Re-examining the Role of Social Stratification and Post-Communism on Political Participation in Europe / M.L. Smith // Sociologicky časopis/Czech Sociological Review. – 2009. – Vol. 45. – No. 3. P. 487-517.

26. Tarrow S. States and Opportunities: The Political Structuring of Social Movements / Sidney Tarrow // Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures and Cultural Framing / Do

27. ug McAdam, John McCarthy, and Mayer Zald editors. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996. – P. 41-62.

28. The Worldwide Governance Indicators (WGI) Methodology Paper. [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу до ресурсу: <http://www.govindicators.org>

29. van Deth, J. Private Groups and Public Life: Social Participation, Voluntary Associations and Political Involvement in representative democracies / J.W. van Deth editor. – London: Routledge, 1997.

30. Verba S. Participation and Political Equality. A Seven Nation Comparison / S. Verba, N. Nie, J.-O. Kim. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978.

31. Verba S. Voice and Equality. Civic Voluntarism in American Politics / S. Verba, K.L. Schlozman, H.E. Brady. – Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1995.

32. Wallace C. Changing patterns of civil society in Europe and America 1995-2005. Is Eastern Europe Different? / C. Wallace, F. Pichler, C. Haerpfer // East European Politics and Societies. – 2012. – Vol. 26 – No. 1. – P. 3-19.

33. WGI – Worldwide Governance Indicators Methodology Paper / [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу до ресурсу: <http://www.govindicators.org>

*The paper is prepared within the EVD-ReSET \ HESP project "European Visions and Divisions: Comparative Studies for Advances in Teaching Sociology" held by Faculty of Sociology of National Taras Shevchenko University of Kyiv in 2009 – 2012. The author is sincerely grateful to his scientific advisor professor O. Kutsenko, Open Society Institute's (OSI, Budapest) Higher Education Support Program / Regional Seminar for Excellence in Teaching (HESP/ReSET), Faculty of Sociology of National Taras Shevchenko University of Kyiv and the Dean A. Gorbachyk for a unique opportunity to participate in the project. The interpretations and opinions contained in the article are solely the author's own and do not necessarily express the views of either Open Society Institute's (OSI, Budapest), Higher Education Support Program / Regional Seminar for Excellence in Teaching (HESP/ReSET), Faculty of Sociology of National Taras Shevchenko University of Kyiv or other organizers and participants of the project.*

Надійшла до редколегії 11.09.12

Ю. Савельєв, канд. філос. наук, доц.  
Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка, Київ

### УЧАСТЬ І ПОЛІТИЧНІ РЕЖИМИ В СУЧАСНІЙ ЄВРОПІ: ПОРІВНЯННЯ КРАЇН "НОВОЇ СХІДНОЇ ЄВРОПИ" ЗІ "СТАРИМИ" ТА "НЕДАВНИМИ" КРАЇНАМИ-ЧЛЕНАМИ ЄС

*В статті пропонується систематичний огляд різних типів участі (політичної, громадянської і соціальної) і порівнюються тенденції і киталти участі між певними кластерами європейських суспільств. Такі кластери включають, по-перше, "нову східну Європу", що залишається за межами ЄС, по-друге, інші центрально/східноєвропейські суспільства, що не так давно приєдналися до ЄС, по-третє, західно-європейські країни, які були розвиненими і стабільними демократіями протягом десятиліть, по-четверте, середземноморські країни ЄС. В статті диференціюються різні контексти участі, зокрема, структура політичних можливостей і політичні режими, врахування яких є важливим для адекватного порівняння процесів участі. Теорії і підходи до вимірювання, які переважно були розроблені для пояснення особливостей і факторів участі на основі даних з західноєвропейських демократій, критично переосмислюються в контексті суспільств "нovoї східної Європи". Ідентифіковано існуючі структури політичних можливостей як двовимірних політичних режимів, які вказують на схожість і відмінність киталтів участі в суспільствах з різними соціально-економічними умовами. Використані наявні індикатори рівня демократії, політичних прав і громадянських свобод для оцінки політичних режимів в європейських суспільствах. Також пропонується дослідницькі питання і гіпотези для пояснення особливостей участі в "новій східній Європі".*

*Ключові слова: громадянська участь, політична участь, соціальна участь, політичні режими, структура політичних можливостей, "нова східна Європа"*

Ю. Савельєв, канд. філос. наук, доц.  
Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка, Київ

### УЧАСТИЕ И ПОЛИТИЧЕСКИЕ РЕЖИМЫ В СОВРЕМЕННОЙ ЕВРОПЕ: СРАВНЕНИЕ "НОВОЙ ВОСТОЧНОЙ ЕВРОПЫ" СО "СТАРЫМИ" И "НОВЫМИ" СТРАНАМИ-ЧЛЕНАМИ ЕС

*В статье предлагается систематический обзор разных типов участия (политического, гражданского и социального) и сравниваются тенденции и паттерны участия между различными кластерами европейских обществ. Такие кластеры включают, "новую восточную Европу", другие центрально/восточноевропейские общества, западноевропейские общества, средиземноморские страны ЕС. Дифференцируются различные контексты участия, в том числе, структура политических возможностей и политические режимы. Критически переосмысливаются теории и подходы к измерению участия, которые были преимущественно разработаны на данных западноевропейских демократий. Идентифицированы существующие структуры политических возможностей, которые указывают на сходство и различие паттернов участия в обществах с разными социально-экономическими условиями. Используются существующие индикаторы уровня демократии и гражданских свобод для оценки политических режимов в европейских обществах. Также предлагаются исследовательские вопросы для объяснения особенностей участия в "новой восточной Европе".*

*Ключевые слова: гражданское участие, политическое участие, социальное участие, политические режимы, структура политических возможностей, "новая восточная Европа"*