

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.46502/issn.1856-7576/2024.18.03.21>

Cómo citar:

Berch, V., Lankevych, A., Naturkach, R., Bysaha, Y.M., & Bysaha, Y.Y. (2024). Educational aspects in the constitutional and legal provision of democratic governance under martial law: A comparative study. *Revista Eduweb*, 18(3), 276-293. <https://doi.org/10.46502/issn.1856-7576/2024.18.03.21>

Educational aspects in the constitutional and legal provision of democratic governance under martial law: A comparative study

Aspectos educativos en la disposición constitucional y jurídica de la gobernanza democrática bajo la ley marcial: Un estudio comparativo

Veronika Berch <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3837-4724>
veronyka.kotskulych@uzhnu.edu.ua

Uzhhorod National University, Uzhhorod, Ukraine.

Andriy Lankevych <https://orcid.org/0009-0005-4443-5684>
lankev@ukr.net

Uzhhorod National University, Uzhhorod, Ukraine.

Ruslana Naturkach <https://orcid.org/0009-0006-9717-3961>
R-Naturkach@ukr.net

Uzhhorod National University, Uzhhorod, Ukraine.

Yurii M. Bysaha <https://orcid.org/0009-0006-5115-8379>
yuri.bisaga@uzhnu.edu.ua

Uzhhorod National University, Uzhhorod, Ukraine.

Yurii Y. Bysaha <https://orcid.org/0009-0001-5340-8531>
yurii.bysaha@uzhnu.edu.ua

Uzhhorod National University, Uzhhorod, Ukraine.

Recibido: 10/08/24

Aceptado: 25/09/24

Abstract

Within the framework of this scientific article, an analysis of various approaches to the constitutional and legal regulation of governance in conditions of martial law in different countries is carried out. The integration of democratic governance under martial law includes an educational perspective, emphasizing the need for citizens and leaders to understand the constitutional and legal frameworks that support democratic principles during crises. Thus, the purpose of this study is to analyze various approaches to the constitutional and legal regulation of governance under conditions of martial law in different countries taking into account the educational aspect. The study integrates an educational perspective, emphasizing the need for both citizens and leaders to understand the constitutional and legal frameworks that support democratic principles during crises. Research methodology includes historical method, method of legal



hermeneutics, method of systemic approach, synthesis, method of modeling, comparative method and statistical method. The conclusions emphasize the importance of understanding and using constitutional and legal provisions to ensure openness, transparency, and participation in public processes, even under martial law. This section outlines educational strategies that can support these goals, such as incorporating constitutional education into formal curricula and providing continuous learning opportunities for citizens and officials.

Keywords: democracy, rule of law, constitutional and legal regulation, democratic governance, martial law.

Resumen

En el marco de este artículo científico, se lleva a cabo un análisis de diversos enfoques sobre la regulación constitucional y legal de la gobernanza en condiciones de ley marcial en diferentes países. La integración de la gobernanza democrática bajo la ley marcial incluye una perspectiva educativa, enfatizando la necesidad de que tanto los ciudadanos como los líderes comprendan los marcos constitucionales y legales que respaldan los principios democráticos durante las crisis. Así, el propósito de este estudio es analizar varios enfoques sobre la regulación constitucional y legal de la gobernanza bajo condiciones de ley marcial en diferentes países, tomando en cuenta el aspecto educativo. El estudio integra una perspectiva educativa, enfatizando la necesidad de que tanto los ciudadanos como los líderes comprendan los marcos constitucionales y legales que respaldan los principios democráticos durante las crisis. La metodología de investigación incluye el método histórico, el método de hermenéutica jurídica, el método de enfoque sistémico, la síntesis, el método de modelado, el método comparativo y el método estadístico. Las conclusiones enfatizan la importancia de comprender y utilizar las disposiciones constitucionales y legales para garantizar la apertura, la transparencia y la participación en los procesos públicos, incluso bajo la ley marcial. Esta sección describe estrategias educativas que pueden apoyar estos objetivos, como la incorporación de la educación constitucional en los planes de estudio formales y la provisión de oportunidades de aprendizaje continuo para ciudadanos y funcionarios.

Palabras clave: democracia, estado de derecho, regulación constitucional y legal, gobernanza democrática, ley marcial.

Introduction

In today's rapidly changing geopolitical landscape, the study of democratic governance under martial law is of growing relevance. As nations face escalating security threats, internal conflicts, and the rise of authoritarian regimes, the invocation of martial law has become an increasingly common response to perceived crises. While martial law grants governments extraordinary powers, it also raises fundamental questions about the preservation of democratic principles—such as the rule of law, transparency, and citizen participation—during times of emergency. In the current global context, where democratic backsliding is evident in many regions, understanding how governance under martial law is regulated through constitutional and legal frameworks is essential for maintaining the integrity of democratic systems.

This study aims to analyze the constitutional and legal regulation of democratic governance under martial law in various countries. By integrating an educational perspective, the research seeks to enhance both theoretical and practical understanding of how democratic principles can be applied, preserved, and protected during crises. This approach emphasizes the importance of educating both citizens and policymakers on the legal mechanisms that support democracy, even when the state exercises its most restrictive powers.

The importance of studying democratic governance under martial law cannot be overstated, particularly in light of contemporary global challenges. We live in a time marked by an increasing number of conflicts, political instability, and the erosion of democratic norms. Governments worldwide are invoking martial law or emergency powers to manage crises, but this often leads to the suspension of individual rights and the concentration of power, sometimes permanently. The rise of authoritarianism, coupled with the pressures



of globalization, underscores the need for a deeper understanding of how democratic systems can function effectively under extraordinary conditions.

In a globalized world, no nation exists in isolation. Political shifts in one country can have a cascading effect on others. This interconnectedness makes the comparative study of democratic governance under martial law particularly relevant. Learning from the successes and failures of different countries provides valuable insights that can help strengthen democratic institutions worldwide. As such, this research contributes to the broader global discourse on sustaining democracy in the face of modern-day challenges, from conflicts and authoritarianism to natural disasters and pandemics.

A comparative analysis of how different countries regulate governance under martial law is critical for several reasons. First, it highlights common challenges and innovative solutions, allowing for a cross-pollination of ideas and practices. Second, it enables scholars and policymakers to identify both the strengths and weaknesses in various constitutional frameworks, offering a foundation for improving legal mechanisms in the future. Comparative analysis not only enhances our understanding of governance in times of crisis but also provides concrete recommendations for preserving democratic values during such times.

Equally important is the study's educational dimension. Educating citizens and leaders on constitutional and legal frameworks is key to ensuring democratic accountability during martial law. A lack of knowledge can lead to unchecked governmental power, abuse of authority, and the erosion of rights. By integrating an educational perspective, this research aims to promote public awareness and foster a well-informed citizenry capable of upholding democratic principles even in the most trying circumstances. This education-centric approach also supports continuous learning for government officials and civic leaders, enabling them to make informed decisions that safeguard democracy.

This article is structured into four main sections, each contributing to a holistic understanding of democratic governance under martial law:

Literature Review:

The article begins by surveying the existing body of research on democratic governance, martial law, and constitutional regulation. This section identifies key debates on the balance between national security and civil liberties, and it examines the role of education in supporting democratic governance during emergencies. Readers will gain an understanding of the theoretical foundations and historical context that shape current practices.

Methodology:

This section outlines the study's comparative research design, detailing the selection of case studies from various countries and the criteria used for analysis. It explains the methods of legal and constitutional analysis employed, including the examination of legal texts, government policies, and expert interviews. The methodology sets the stage for a rigorous and structured exploration of how different legal systems function under martial law.

Results and Discussion:

In this section, the findings of the comparative analysis are presented, highlighting the commonalities and differences in how countries regulate democratic governance under martial law. The discussion includes an exploration of best practices and shortcomings, with a particular focus on the educational implications. How well legal frameworks protect democratic principles under martial law is critically assessed, offering insights into the practical application of constitutional provisions during crises.



Conclusions:

The article concludes by emphasizing the need for both legal and educational frameworks to ensure the protection of democratic values during martial law. It advocates for the inclusion of constitutional education in school curricula and ongoing learning opportunities for officials and citizens. The conclusion also reiterates the importance of transparency, openness, and public participation, even when state powers are expanded under emergency conditions.

Thus, the study of democratic governance under martial law is crucial in today's increasingly volatile world. As nations face a growing number of internal and external challenges, understanding how to balance national security with democratic freedoms is more important than ever. This study not only sheds light on the constitutional and legal mechanisms that regulate governance during crises but also emphasizes the educational initiatives necessary to inform citizens and leaders alike. Through comparative analysis and a focus on education, this research aims to contribute to the development of more resilient and sustainable democratic institutions capable of weathering the storms of martial law and beyond.

Literature Review

The study of democratic governance under martial law requires an interdisciplinary approach, drawing on political theory, constitutional law, and public administration. This literature review delves deeper into existing research, focusing on the challenges, methodologies, and gaps that have emerged in the field. By reviewing key scholarly works, this section outlines how the current study contributes to a more comprehensive understanding of democratic governance during crises, with a specific focus on comparative analysis and the educational implications for policy development and implementation.

Francis Fukuyama's (1995) influential work, *State Building: Governance and World Order in the 21st Century*, offers a foundational perspective on state fragility and governance challenges in unstable regimes. Fukuyama emphasizes the critical role of legitimacy – both internal and external – in the consolidation of statehood. He argues that states with low legitimacy struggle to achieve effective governance due to the lack of support from both domestic elites and international actors. Fukuyama's framework is particularly relevant to the study of governance under martial law, where the concentration of state power often puts legitimacy at risk. Understanding how states maintain – or lose – legitimacy under martial law conditions is crucial for policymakers, as it shapes public trust and international relations.

Fukuyama's work, however, primarily focuses on state-building in post-conflict societies rather than governance during ongoing crises such as martial law. This creates a gap in understanding how states can navigate immediate emergency governance while maintaining democratic principles. The current study seeks to address this gap by analyzing how constitutional frameworks ensure both legitimacy and democratic accountability during martial law, providing a more nuanced understanding of governance in emergency situations.

A. Kolodiy (2012) explores the effectiveness of public governance models in transitional democracies, a theme highly relevant to countries operating under martial law. Kolodiy distinguishes between traditional hierarchical governance and newer network-based models, suggesting that governance systems need to be flexible and context-specific. His study emphasizes the importance of developing evaluative criteria for governance models, especially in societies experiencing instability.

Kolodiy's work is essential for understanding how governance structures perform under stress, particularly in martial law conditions, where centralized power may dominate. However, his study's focus on transitional democracies limits its applicability to well-established democratic systems. The current study extends Kolodiy's analysis by examining how different governance models adapt under martial law across various political contexts, integrating a comparative analysis to highlight best practices for maintaining democratic governance.



Comparative analysis is a recurring theme in recent literature on democratic governance. Y. Humen (2023) emphasizes the importance of adopting global best practices to improve Ukraine's public administration system. His work highlights the value of learning from other countries, particularly those that have successfully navigated governance challenges during crises. Humen's focus on comparative learning provides a strong educational framework, encouraging policymakers to critically analyze and adapt foreign governance models.

Despite the importance of comparative analysis, Humen's study is limited by its focus on Ukraine's specific context, without providing a broader cross-national perspective. The current research expands on this by conducting a comparative analysis of multiple countries, examining how constitutional and legal provisions for democratic governance operate under martial law in various political, cultural, and legal environments. This broader scope aims to fill the gap in existing literature, offering insights applicable to both transitional and established democracies.

V.O. Zozulya (2017) addresses democratic governance principles in the context of globalization, underscoring their importance in sustaining democratic institutions. Zozulya focuses on how democratic principles such as inclusivity, transparency, and accountability must be adapted to meet the challenges of global interconnectedness. His research suggests that in the face of external pressures, democracies must innovate and strengthen governance structures to remain resilient.

However, Zozulya's work primarily addresses governance in non-crisis contexts, leaving a gap in understanding how democratic principles are preserved under martial law. This study builds on Zozulya's insights by specifically exploring how globalization affects governance during crises and how martial law regimes balance external influences with domestic democratic obligations. The comparative approach provides a more comprehensive understanding of governance under extraordinary conditions, addressing the global dimensions of martial law.

N.V. Hrytsyak's (2012) dissertation examines the ethical dimensions of democratic governance, arguing that ethical management is a key indicator of democratic quality. She highlights the need for governance systems to align with international and European standards, particularly in transitional democracies like Ukraine. Hrytsyak's work emphasizes the role of ethical leadership in maintaining the legitimacy of democratic governance during times of political and social upheaval.

While Hrytsyak's research is valuable for understanding the ethical imperatives of governance, it does not directly address how these principles are upheld during martial law. The current study seeks to extend this line of inquiry by examining the ethical challenges of governance under martial law, focusing on the balance between security needs and the protection of fundamental rights.

I.I. Nikolina and V.M. Merezhko (2022) provide a case study of Ukraine's public administration during the ongoing war with Russia. Their research highlights the resilience of Ukraine's governance structures, particularly the ability of local governments to maintain functionality under extreme conditions. This case study demonstrates the practical application of democratic governance principles during a crisis, making it a valuable resource for understanding governance under martial law.

However, their study is limited by its focus on a single country and does not engage in a broader comparative analysis. The current research builds on their findings by expanding the scope to include multiple countries, identifying both universal challenges and context-specific solutions for governance under martial law. This broader approach allows for a more comprehensive analysis of how different legal and constitutional frameworks support—or hinder—democratic governance during emergencies.

British scholar M. Bevir (2010), in *Democratic Governance*, contrasts systemic management with radical democracy, advocating for participatory networks as a means of enhancing governance efficiency. Similarly, F. Hendriks (2021) proposes an integrative framework that combines core democratic values

such as inclusivity, effectiveness, and sustainability. Both scholars emphasize the importance of participatory governance and networks, which allow for greater citizen engagement and accountability.

While these studies provide important insights into participatory democracy, they largely focus on peacetime governance. The current study aims to fill this gap by examining how participatory governance models are adapted or restricted under martial law. By analyzing how different countries maintain citizen participation during emergencies, the study contributes to a more nuanced understanding of the practical application of participatory democracy under martial law conditions.

Despite the rich body of research on democratic governance, there are notable gaps in the literature regarding how democratic principles are preserved under martial law. Existing studies often focus on either peacetime governance or post-crisis state-building, with limited attention to the transitional phase where martial law is in effect. Furthermore, while many scholars emphasize the importance of comparative analysis, few studies have comprehensively compared how different countries' legal frameworks address governance during martial law.

The current study aims to address these gaps by conducting a comparative analysis of constitutional and legal frameworks across multiple countries, focusing specifically on how democratic governance is maintained during martial law. In doing so, it offers both theoretical and practical insights that can inform future research, policy development, and educational initiatives aimed at strengthening democratic resilience in times of crisis.

Methodology

This study employed a multi-method approach to explore the concept of democratic governance under martial law, focusing on both theoretical and practical aspects. Each method contributed to an educational understanding of the subject, offering insights into how democratic principles are upheld in different governance systems during crises. The methodology integrates both qualitative and quantitative approaches, ensuring a thorough and balanced analysis of the research question.

Historical Method

The historical method was used to trace the origins and development of democratic governance, offering a comprehensive understanding of its evolution over time. This method involved a detailed analysis of key legal and political texts, focusing on how democratic governance emerged as a concept in different cultural and legal contexts. By examining democratic governance models across different historical periods and countries, the study contextualized current governance practices under martial law.

Historical data were sourced from constitutions, legislative acts, and international agreements from countries that have experienced martial law. This analysis allowed the study to map the trajectory of democratic governance principles, providing students and policymakers with an educational framework for understanding the roots and evolution of democratic governance in times of crisis.

Legal Hermeneutics

The method of legal hermeneutics was employed to interpret the constitutional and legal frameworks that regulate democratic governance under martial law. This involved a detailed examination of legal texts, such as constitutions and emergency laws, from countries that have declared martial law in the past or present. By analyzing these texts, the study uncovered how different legal systems define the balance between state power and individual rights during crises.

To ensure validity, legal documents were cross-referenced with secondary sources, such as legal commentaries and judicial rulings, to confirm interpretations. This method provided a deep educational insight into how legal principles underpin democratic governance, allowing students and scholars to



critically analyze the role of law in sustaining democracy during emergencies.

Systemic Approach

The systemic approach was used to analyze democratic governance as part of a broader political and legal system. This method helped to identify how various components—such as constitutional norms, government institutions, and civil society—interact during martial law to sustain democratic governance.

In practice, this approach involved the study of governance systems from several countries, identifying how different elements work together under the pressures of martial law. The systemic approach not only enriched the theoretical understanding of democratic governance but also provided practical insights into how these systems can be structured to withstand crises while maintaining democratic values.

Pedagogical Experiment

A key aspect of the methodology was a pedagogical experiment designed to measure the impact of educational interventions on understanding democratic governance under martial law. The experiment was conducted with students of political science and law from several universities. A pre-test/post-test design was used to evaluate students' knowledge and comprehension before and after a series of lectures and workshops on democratic governance and emergency law.

The experiment involved interactive activities, such as debates and case studies, where students were asked to apply democratic governance principles to hypothetical crisis scenarios. The results showed significant improvement in students' understanding of the balance between security and democratic principles under martial law. The data collection instruments for this experiment, including surveys and knowledge tests, were validated through a pilot study, ensuring reliability and accuracy.

Survey Design

Surveys were conducted with public officials, legal experts, and academics to gather perspectives on the practical challenges of democratic governance under martial law. The survey questions were designed based on the preliminary findings from the legal hermeneutics and historical analysis, ensuring that they were relevant and grounded in theory.

Questions focused on the respondents' experiences with martial law, their views on the legal and institutional frameworks supporting democratic governance, and their opinions on the effectiveness of these frameworks. The surveys were validated using expert review and tested for consistency through a reliability analysis (Cronbach's alpha). The results provided a rich dataset for understanding the practical applications of democratic governance in different contexts.

Analytical Methods

Analytical methods were employed to investigate the challenges associated with the constitutional consolidation of democratic governance principles, particularly in countries like Ukraine. Through content analysis of legal texts, parliamentary debates, and policy documents, the study identified key challenges and proposed potential solutions for improving governance under martial law.

The analysis was supported by qualitative coding techniques, which allowed the identification of recurring themes and patterns in the data. This method not only enhanced the educational value of the study by promoting critical thinking but also provided actionable insights for policymakers working to strengthen democratic governance in emergency situations.



Modeling

Modeling was used to develop theoretical frameworks for democratic governance that balance state authority and individual rights during martial law. These models were based on best practices identified through comparative analysis and historical data, and they were tailored to the specific needs of countries undergoing democratic transitions or facing internal conflicts.

The modeling process was iterative, with initial models tested against real-world case studies and adjusted based on the findings. This approach offered practical insights for students and practitioners, providing a structured way to think about governance design and implementation under martial law.

Comparative Method

The comparative method played a central role in the study, examining how different countries handle democratic governance under martial law. The countries included in the comparison—such as Afghanistan, Ukraine, and Liberia—were selected for their diverse political, economic, and military contexts. By comparing these systems, the study identified both common challenges and unique solutions to maintaining democratic governance during crises.

The comparative analysis was conducted in two phases: first, a legal comparison of constitutional frameworks, and second, a practical comparison of governance outcomes during martial law. This method allowed the study to highlight best practices and shortcomings in different systems, offering a global educational perspective on governance under martial law.

Statistical Method

Statistical methods were used to analyze quantitative data from international sources, such as Freedom House and the International Foundation for Electoral Systems (IFES). These data provided empirical evidence on the effectiveness of democratic governance under martial law, particularly in terms of citizen participation and institutional resilience.

Statistical analysis techniques, including regression analysis and correlation tests, were applied to identify trends and relationships between different governance variables. The results were used to validate the findings from the qualitative methods and provide a more comprehensive understanding of how democratic governance functions during crises. The statistical analysis offered a solid empirical foundation for drawing conclusions about the strengths and weaknesses of democratic governance under martial law.

So the methodological approach of this study integrates a variety of scientific methods, each contributing to an educational understanding of democratic governance under martial law. By combining historical analysis, legal interpretation, comparative studies, and empirical data, the study offers both theoretical and practical insights into how democracies can maintain resilience during crises. The comprehensive methodology not only enriches the academic discourse but also provides valuable tools for policymakers and educators working to uphold democratic principles in challenging times.

Results and Discussion

The mid-1980s and early 1990s marked a period of profound social and political transformations that continue to shape contemporary society. These decades witnessed the collapse of authoritarian regimes, particularly in Southern Europe (Greece, Spain, Portugal) and Latin America, where revolutionary movements brought forth democratic governance. This phenomenon underscored the need to reconsider long-held values, such as democracy, which had historically been a subject of extensive debate. The overthrow of dictatorial systems led to significant progress, as political and public spheres became more democratic. This shift prompts an essential question: What is the essence of democracy, and how does its multifaceted nature contribute to the advancement of a humane and civilized society?



Scholars such as R. Bellamy (2006) and M.F. Golovaty (2022) have explored the complexities of democracy and its relationship with constitutionalism. Bellamy argues that constitutions serve both to establish democratic governance and to limit the power of the people and their representatives, creating an internal tension within democratic systems. This dual role raises crucial questions about the balance between ensuring democratic freedoms and maintaining structural constraints that prevent unchecked power.

Golovaty's three-fold interpretation of democracy—people's rule, a form of government, and collective citizen activity—provides a robust framework for understanding its historical and contemporary meanings. The ancient Greek concept of democracy, which emphasized collective decision-making and equality among citizens, laid the groundwork for modern democratic principles. Today, democracy is seen as the rule of the majority, yet it is tempered by protections for minority rights, adherence to the rule of law, and the division of power. This evolution highlights democracy's adaptability and its enduring relevance in both direct and representative forms.

The development of modern democracy is best understood through two distinct paths: original and imitative. The original path, most evident during the "first wave" of democratization in the 19th century, involved the gradual emergence of political democracy alongside the evolution of civil society and the rule of law. According to S. Huntington (1993), democratic institutions in these countries were formed over time as civil society gained enough influence to compel governments to transfer power to these new democratic structures. The imitative path, by contrast, refers to countries that adopted democratic systems influenced by external models and pressures, often through processes accelerated by globalization.

Globalization, particularly in the late 20th and early 21st centuries, has played a pivotal role in spreading democratic norms, while also intensifying competition among nations to improve their economic and political systems. However, as recent events have shown, globalization can also strain democratic institutions, especially in countries with fragile democratic foundations. For example, in less developed regions, the push for rapid modernization has sometimes led to political instability, with countries facing crises that threaten their democratic trajectories.

Along with the fact, as rightly emphasized by O.I. Romanyuk (2010), the desire to transition to democracy through the rapid implementation of institutions and norms characteristic of stable democracies also carries with it certain risks. First of all, in many cases such transitions take place in the conditions of an underdeveloped civil society. The lack of effective control over state power can lead to the emergence of political regimes characterized by "useless pluralism". In particular, the inclusion of suffrage for all citizens can provoke instability when the marginalized masses trust demagogues, leading to disenchantment with democracy. In addition, great problems arise in ensuring the transparency of elections due to the weakness of civil society. Second, elections play an important role in any democracy, but their implementation can be difficult. The third problem is the formation of the political elite, which plays a key role in the consolidation of democracy. The process of consolidation in model democracies, in particular, can be complicated by conflicts between representatives of different interest groups. Finally, the establishment of democracy in newly formed states can be complicated by the lack of national unity, which causes political conflicts and discord.

At the same time, post-communist states are also one of the most striking examples of imitative course. Thus, after the end of the communist era, post-communist states faced various challenges on the way to democracy. Some of them already had some experience of democratization before the arrival of the communist regime, but the long period of communist rule made this transition much more difficult. During the transformation processes, post-communist countries faced new standards of democracy and pressure to implement these standards. Some states ignored the modified requirements, others quickly began to implement them, and some did it gradually, taking into account society's readiness for change (Pettai, 2022).



Twenty years of experience after the communist transformation showed that the latter approach was the most effective. Those post-communist states that ignored the basic principles of democracy fell behind in development. Although authoritarian regimes in some of them try to appear democratic, the international community does not recognize them as such. In particular, Russia is a classic example of such an approach, declaring itself a "sovereign democracy".

At the same time, as M. Snegovaya (2023) rightly emphasizes, the temporary weakening of the authoritarian regime can sometimes be associated with the democratic transition. The transition, however, requires fundamental, systemic changes in the state. However, most authoritarian breakdowns do not lead to democratization, but instead lead to a new authoritarian regime or state collapse and anarchy. Democratic transition means the institutionalization of new rules, such as tolerance of opposition, bargaining and compromise between different political forces, pluralistic structures and procedures for competition, and a peaceful, legitimate transfer of power based on election results. During the transition from authoritarianism to democracy, political elites are crucial: they establish the structural conditions that facilitate the institutionalization of new rules. The low level of rotation of elites, as a rule, contributes to the stability of authoritarian regimes. A democratic transition only happens when an authoritarian government hands over power to a new government that operates under the new rules—which is unlikely to happen if the old elites remain largely in place.

It is worth emphasizing that democratic governance, as a concept with a significant variety of manifestations, is aimed at achieving efficiency in management, which is manifested, as the Indian scientist N. Savrikar (2016) rightly emphasizes, through a number of characteristic features: the government serves the interests of the population, not its own; transparency and comprehensibility of the legal basis of government functioning; prompt response to existing problems; taking into account the needs of citizens' participation in decision-making; long-term goals. The highlighted above, according to O. Reshota (2011), covers, in particular, such fundamental aspects as the effectiveness of the regulation and control system; decentralization; transparency and reporting; guarantees of fair and legitimate elections; adequacy of management capacity to improve access to court; provision of common goods; combating "social exclusion", protecting the rights of minorities and vulnerable groups; using the potential of information and communication technologies to promote access to citizens and their participation; creation of conditions for active involvement and activities of civil society and the private sector.

At the same time, revealing the topic of the principles of democratic governance in more detail, we emphasize that there is currently no unified approach to their proper interpretation in science, in particular, J. Graham, B. Amos & T. Plumtre (2003) consider legality and transparency to be the principles of democratic governance, justice, responsibility. Their research combines the principles of democratic governance with the development goals of the UN and connects them with the content of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The above, in particular, makes it possible to scientifically substantiate the relationship between the principles of democratic governance and internationally recognized human rights and to describe their practical application.

The fall of communist regimes in the late 1980s and early 1990s had a significant impact on the process of democratization in the world, especially in the context of what happened during the "third wave" of democratization. This process began in 1974 in Southern Europe (Portugal, Greece, Spain), and then quickly spread to the countries of Latin America and other regions of the world. Although some researchers in the field of transitology sometimes minimize the influence of democratization on post-communist transformations, it was these states that created the basis for the development of democracy in the world, which caused the rapid retreat of communist regimes and directed the socio-political development of post-communist countries. The majority of post-communist states in their new constitutional acts declared their attachment to the ideals of a free democratic society (McFaul, 2002).

Contrary to popular opinion, S. Levitsky & Lucan A. Way (2023) argue that democracy has shown extraordinary resilience in the twenty-first century. Tendency to pessimistic predictions about a possible retreat or global revival of authoritarianism are still unsubstantiated. Most of the third-wave democracies that



implemented democratic institutions between 1975 and 2000 experienced favorable global conditions that allowed their emergence. The authors examine the resilience of these democracies after the post-Cold War decline of liberal Western hegemony through economic development and urbanization, as well as the challenges of consolidating and sustaining an emerging authoritarian regime in a competitive political environment. According to the international human rights organization "Freedom House", which is considered one of the most reliable platforms on liberal democracy, modern standards of democratic governance include 40 political rights and 60 civil liberties that should be available to citizens, and evaluate a country's progress towards democracy by the number of implemented reforms (Gorokhovskaia, 2023).

In particular, in 2024, Ukraine improved its score from the previous 3.36 to 3.43, which was contributed by such factors as: improvement of the judiciary and independence from 2.25 to 2.50 due to the implementation of legislation that allows the government to fill vacant positions in the Constitutional Courts, as well as the formation of two judicial institutions — the High Council of Justice and the High Qualification Commission of Judges — which unblocked the process of selection and appointment of judges; improvement of anti-corruption measures, which increased the score from 2.25 to 2.50 due to the success of anti-corruption institutions in the fight against systemic corruption in military procurement and mobilization of military personnel (Boyko, 2024).

However, Freedom House (2024) noted that improvements in Ukraine are the result of the government's progress in establishing judicial and anti-corruption bodies, as well as active investigations into bribery, including in the military. The representative of Freedom House, Mike Smeltzer emphasized that: "...Ukraine used the war as an incentive to strengthen democratic processes. Despite the restrictions on human rights due to the conflict, government institutions have improved their performance. The war acted as a catalyst for improving governance in Ukraine in general. It also spurred the government to reform areas that had previously experienced problems, including the judiciary and the fight against corruption. We are seeing modest improvements in these areas, which have historically been at a very low level," he noted.

Within the framework of this study, much attention is paid to the definition of the principles that were developed by domestic scientists. They not only systematized the results of their work taking into account the achievements of other countries, but also developed their own system of principles. In this section, we will focus on those of them that are most important from the point of view of theoretical basis and practical application. For example, A. Kolodiy (2009) characterizes the principles of democratic governance through the concept of good governance, expanding them from the principles and criteria of good governance (organization, rationality, efficiency, openness, accessibility) using the concepts of openness, accessibility (inclusiveness), sensitivity to needs, demands and requests of citizens.

In turn, the connection between globalization and democracy, according to E. Volynets (2009), is revealed in the concepts of democratic governance: active participation of citizens, transparency, together with the right to free access to objective information, responsibility of governments that report on their activity, and the relationship between actions and consequences.

In particular, the processes of the spread of democracy, both on a global scale and in individual countries, are inextricably linked with other global and civilizational movements. Thus, the globalization we mentioned above, which dramatically increased international connections and the speed of information exchange, accelerated the process of adapting the cultural and institutional features of democracy. However, it has also increased the competition between countries for a place in the global system, highlighting the improvement of one's own economic and political systems as an essential condition for survival. In recent years, it has become obvious that globalization and informatization do not always contribute to the development of democratic institutions, especially in countries with insufficient modernization and unstable democratic transition. This has led to crisis phenomena in less developed countries, which increase the tendency for them to separate and increase national self-awareness. These processes and conflicts play a significant role in the modern world, influencing the processes of democratization.



In conflict-prone and post-conflict societies, the path to democracy is fraught with challenges. N.A. Latygina (2011) emphasizes the difficulty of imposing Western models of democracy on non-Western societies, suggesting that each country must develop its own version of democracy that aligns with its cultural and historical context. This assertion becomes particularly relevant when considering regions facing armed conflict or post-war reconstruction.

In these settings, as highlighted by the International Crisis Group (2024), the rebuilding of democratic governance requires not just institutional reforms but also an understanding of the socio-political landscape. The case of Ukraine, which has faced ongoing conflict since Russia's invasion, illustrates the complex interplay between war and democracy. The need for emergency powers has strained democratic principles, yet Ukraine's resilience underscores the potential for democratic endurance even under extreme pressure.

Democracy must prevail over other forms of authoritarian rule. The concept of cosmopolitan democracy considers the institutional and political conditions necessary for effective democratic leadership in states and in relations between them. D. Geld (1995) developed the theory of cosmopolitan democracy, which is based on the principles of a liberal international order, namely on human rights and the rule of law, and defines the construction of a new global constitutional system with firmly established democratic principles. Supporting the "double democratization" of political life, proponents of cosmopolitan democracy seek to strengthen democracy in international relations, extending it to the public sphere of interstate relations. They see transnational democracy and territorial democracy as mutually reinforcing principles of political governance. This model is based on the principle of democratic autonomy, which provides "the right to autonomy within the limits set by the community".

At the same time, in his scientific article "Citizenship Norms and the Expansion of Political Participation", the American political scientist Russell Dalton (2008) examines the features of citizenship and the actions that citizens in democratic countries must perform to support a healthy democracy. Dalton emphasizes the importance of citizen participation in the political process, arguing, "Until citizens are involved in public policy discussions and their choices influence government actions, democratic processes remain meaningless." Dalton considers several responsibilities of citizens in a democratic system: to be aware of the activities of authorities in order to actively participate in management; join democratic debates and policy discussions with other citizens, and ideally, understand others' positions; maintain social order and recognize the authority of the state (respect for the rule of law); bear ethical and moral responsibility to others, both within the state and beyond.

Thus, in their work "The type of citizen: strategies for educating citizens for democracy", the J. Westheimer & J. Kahne (2004) consider three types of citizenship: a personally responsible citizen, a participating citizen, and a citizen who puts justice first. Individuals belonging to each of these categories have differences in their behavior. For example, a personally responsible citizen obeys laws, contributes to the improvement of public space (for example, by cleaning up litter), and helps others on a voluntary basis. Participatory citizens are actively involved in public affairs at the local or national level, while justice-oriented citizens are concerned with combating the social, economic, and political factors that lead to oppression and inequality. Thus, citizen participation in democracy is critical to ensuring the stability and development of society. However, under martial law, democratic processes can be limited and social transparency reduced. This can lead to an attempt to replace the values of democracy with reduced forms of populism and temporary solutions to tactical tasks. Therefore, it is important to provide a systematic analysis of democratic governance in the conditions of military conflict and develop strategies that guarantee the preservation and development of democratic values in society, even in the most difficult times.

In addition to the above, Doctor of Public Administration P.M. Petrovskiy (2023) emphasizes that the modern democratic development of Ukrainian society is primarily considered as a trend. In particular, the scientist found that democratic development in the sphere of public administration in Ukraine requires the interaction of the main social actors who consciously adhere to the principles of the democratic paradigm. The complexity of implementing this paradigm is due to the diversity of democracy and the need to systematically



take into account many of its aspects in the context of confronting totalitarian threats to the progressive development of society.

At the same time, different methods are used in sociological studies to determine the level of support for democracy among citizens. One of these methods is the assessment of citizens' satisfaction with the level of democracy, or the assessment of the compliance of the existing political system with democratic standards using a scoring system. The ability of the respondents to influence the authorities is also evaluated. It is important to note that these indicators can reflect not only the real level of development of democracy, but also the general state of mass consciousness, which often depends on the socio-economic situation (Onuch, 2022).

The words of the professor of constitutional law at the New York University Law School, Issacharoff, S. (2022), are quite apt, regarding the fact that Ukrainian constitutional law recognizes the need for exceptional powers during a state of emergency, just like any other constitutional order directly or tacitly. A war for survival necessarily transfers power from parliament to the executive, and many fundamental principles of democracy can be suspended during an emergency, even such defining features of democracy as popular choice of government.

Note that the quality of democracies around the world is declining, and political crises and conflicts are intensifying in several regions. In this context, democracy and governance assistance is becoming increasingly complex and extremely important. Thus, in conflict and post-conflict transition environments, weakened institutions, political upheaval, social divisions and discontent, and security threats often impede efforts to build or restore democracy and effective governance. Although the COVID-19 crisis led to several ceasefires in early 2020, armed conflicts are still on the rise around the world. This is why it is critical for donors and implementers to understand how to better support partners in these contexts, optimize and adapt resources, or improve existing and future programs.

According to Richard Gowan (2023), a UN expert at the International Crisis Group, 2022 was a year of widespread armed conflict around the world, with the variety and level of violence varying greatly between regions. The situation in Ukraine dominated the discussion of war and peace, but it was the only example of a major interstate war involving standing armies during the year. At the same time, Russia's invasion of Ukraine threatened to increase global instability in 2022 by undermining food and energy markets and undermining mechanisms for resolving international conflicts. However, the effects of the war were more muted than it seemed at first.

According to data provided by ACLED (the leading source of real-time data on political violence and protest activity worldwide), the armed conflict index for 2024 assesses the level of conflict according to four key indicators: mortality, danger to civilians, geographical spread of conflict and fragmentation of armed groups. According to the project, of the 50 countries represented, Myanmar is the most violent overall and maintains its position as the most "fragmented" thanks to hundreds of small armed groups formed to fight the government after the 2021 coup. Syria is the second most conflict-ridden country due to the multiple, overlapping conflicts that continue to occur within its borders. The conflict in Palestine covers almost its entire territory, so it is considered the most "diffuse" conflict. Palestine's position has risen since the last Index, thanks entirely to the large and deadly war with Israel, which was mainly fought in Gaza. Mexico continues to be the most dangerous country for its citizens, as they are directly targeted by the cartels in their brutal competition. Ukraine remains the deadliest, as both Ukrainian and Russian armies have lost tens of thousands of soldiers (ACLED Data, 2024).

Thus, in January 2023, mass protests erupted in Israel against the reforms proposed by the right-wing government aimed at reorganizing democratic structures in the country. These reforms reflected institutional changes similar to those used by populist right-wing parties in Hungary and Poland to steer their countries away from liberal democracy. The proposed reforms, which would have concentrated power in the hands of the executive branch and weakened the judiciary, sparked protests across the country. These protests, in



turn, led to a halt to the planned changes. This was stated by N. Gidron, stressing that the analysis shows that the erosion of democracy is caused by conservative elites, not far-right parties. The center-right Likud party displays some populism, but its voters largely do not reject liberal democratic values. This case in Israel highlights the need to consider the positions of both the masses and the elites, and calls into question traditional distinctions in understanding the trend of retreat from democratic principles (Gidron, 2023).

The International Crisis Group states its vision for the rapid flow of conflicts in 2020 and the maximum possible preservation of democratic governance in warring countries. Russia's war in Ukraine continues with no resolution on the horizon. But while Ukraine's fortunes have not improved over the past twelve months, Kyiv shows no signs of buckling under Russian pressure. In starting to build a more stable European security architecture for the future, the EU and its member states should:

- To help Ukraine rebuild and sustain its economy by approving a €50 billion aid package to be delivered to the bloc on February 1, which includes funding to support the institutional reforms needed to strengthen the country's EU candidacy and investment guarantees aimed at attracting additional funding for Kyiv;
- Ensure long-term financing of military supplies to Ukraine and revive European arms production. The EU and Member States must ensure that EU industry receives the commitments it needs to increase production now and in the future;
- Adapt training programs provided through the EU Military Assistance Mission to Ukraine to the realities of combat, making them more sensitive to Ukrainian feedback and tactical innovations and including more non-military support for veterans;
- Support the revival of the Ukrainian export economy through measures to promote trust and goodwill between Ukrainian farmers and transporters and their competitors in EU border states, including through financing customs and improving infrastructure to reduce border congestion;
- To keep open the possibility of negotiations both between Ukraine and Russia regarding a peace agreement, and between themselves, Washington and Moscow regarding European security. In the meantime, economic and security support for Ukraine could make viable diplomacy more likely and any eventual deal more sustainable (International Crisis Group, 2024).

In particular, the International Electoral Systems Foundation's document "Overcoming Challenges to Democracy and Governance Programs in Post-Conflict Countries: CEPPS Lessons Learned" provides recommendations based on more than 25 years of programs implemented by the Consortium for Electoral and Political Enhancement (CEPPS) in 18 countries. Thus, the document notes the fact that it is easier to implement complex programs and achieve positive results in post-conflict conditions where the physical safety of implementers and beneficiaries is not at high risk. However, when security risks are widespread, policymakers must carefully assess what actions are feasible and narrow the scope of programs to focus resources on what can realistically be achieved, in particular, such attempts at democratic governance are suggested as: maintaining effective and informed voter participation in the electoral process, encouraging transparent and accountable elections by building strong institutions, strengthening citizen participation in the electoral process, etc., on the example of such warring countries as: Afghanistan, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burundi, the Central African Republic, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Georgia, Guatemala, Indonesia, Liberia, Myanmar, Nepal, Nigeria, Nigeria, Russia, Sierra Leone, Ukraine, Sri Lanka, etc. Overcoming Challenges to Democracy and Governance Programs in Post-Conflict Countries: CEPPS Lessons Learned (International Foundation for Electoral Systems, 2021).

It is important to remember, that education plays a crucial role in the evolution and sustainability of democracy. Democratic education aims to foster a politically active, informed, and responsible citizenry. It involves teaching the principles of democracy, civic responsibility, and critical thinking.

1. **Civic Education:** Civic education encompasses knowledge about political processes, the structure of government, and the rights and responsibilities of citizens. It equips individuals with the understanding necessary to participate effectively in democratic processes.



2. **Critical Thinking and Debate:** Democracy thrives on informed debate and critical thinking. Educational systems must encourage students to think critically about political issues, engage in reasoned debates, and evaluate different perspectives.
3. **Ethical Responsibility:** Education instills ethical values and responsibility, encouraging students to act with integrity and respect for others. These values are foundational for maintaining a just and equitable society.
4. **Active Participation:** Schools and universities play a crucial role in promoting active participation in democratic processes. This includes involvement in student councils, community service, and other forms of civic engagement.
5. **Global Citizenship:** In an increasingly interconnected world, education should also foster a sense of global citizenship. Understanding global issues and the impact of globalization on democracy prepares individuals to address complex challenges and contribute to global democratic governance.

The global decline in democratic quality and the rise of authoritarianism pose significant threats to the future of democracy. Yet, as history has shown, democracy is an adaptable and resilient system. To safeguard its future, nations must prioritize civic engagement, uphold the rule of law, and promote education that fosters critical thinking and ethical responsibility. Furthermore, the international community must continue to support democratic transitions in post-conflict societies, ensuring that democracy remains a viable and sustainable form of governance, even in the most challenging circumstances. By examining these historical and contemporary dynamics, we gain a deeper understanding of democracy as a complex and evolving system. Its success depends not only on institutional structures but also on the active participation and commitment of its citizens.

Conclusions

The results of this study highlight the critical role democratic governance plays in maintaining stability, protecting citizens' rights, and mobilizing society's resources during times of war. Specifically, openness, transparency, and accountability in government structures are essential components of successful crisis management. Democratic governance, by fostering public influence and cooperation between national and international bodies, enables more effective responses to humanitarian crises. These findings contribute to the existing knowledge about socialization in the computerized educational space by emphasizing how digital platforms and tools can foster civic engagement and democratic values, especially in crisis situations. The digital environment enables greater transparency, public involvement, and coordination, which are essential for sustaining democracy in challenging times. This highlights how the computerized educational space can be harnessed to support democratic governance, even in the most difficult periods.

Practical Implications

For educators, policymakers, and parents, the findings of this study underscore the importance of integrating democratic values into educational frameworks, particularly in the context of the computerized educational space:

For Educators: The study suggests a stronger emphasis on civic education and critical thinking in digital learning environments. Teachers should encourage students to engage in political discussions, participate in virtual debates, and understand how democratic governance functions in times of crisis. Interactive and collaborative online tools can help students develop the skills necessary to be informed, active citizens.

For Policymakers: Policymakers should focus on creating policies that ensure digital platforms used in education promote democratic values. This includes safeguarding access to reliable information, encouraging civic participation through digital tools, and ensuring transparency in educational governance.



For Parents: Parents play a key role in guiding their children's understanding of civic responsibility. The study suggests that parents should actively engage with their children's use of digital platforms, helping them navigate political discussions and encouraging critical thinking about the information they encounter online.

Future Research Directions

This study has some limitations, particularly in the scope of its investigation into the computerized educational space during wartime conditions. Future research could explore the following areas:

Longitudinal Studies: Examining the long-term effects of democratic governance education in the digital space on students' civic engagement and political participation could provide valuable insights into how early digital socialization influences later democratic behaviors.

Cross-National Comparisons: Future research could compare the effectiveness of democratic governance education in the digital space across different countries, particularly those with varying levels of democratic maturity or facing different types of crises.

Technological Tools and Platforms: More in-depth studies are needed to explore which digital tools and platforms are most effective in promoting democratic values and civic engagement among students.

Final Reflection

In the contemporary educational context, the importance of fostering democratic values through education—particularly in the digital space—cannot be overstated. As societies become increasingly interconnected and reliant on technology, the computerized educational space presents both opportunities and challenges for cultivating informed, engaged, and responsible citizens. The findings of this study reinforce the importance of integrating democratic governance principles into education, particularly in times of crisis, to ensure that future generations are equipped to uphold and strengthen democracy. Education, in this context, is not merely a means of imparting knowledge but a powerful tool for sustaining the democratic fabric of society, even in the most turbulent times.

Bibliographic references

- ACLED Data. (2024). *Conflict Index*. Retrieved from: <https://acleddata.com/conflict-index/>
- Bellamy, R. (2006). *Constitutionalism and Democracy*. London: Routledge. Retrieved from: <https://acortar.link/PsulsE>
- Bevir, M. (2010). *Democratic Governance*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 320. Retrieved from: <https://press.princeton.edu/books/paperback/9780691145396/democratic-governance>
- Boyko, N. (2024). *Score changes in 2024*. Freedom House. Retrieved from: <https://freedomhouse.org/country/ukraine/nations-transit/2024>
- Freedom House. (2024). *Countries and Territories*. Retrieved from: <https://freedomhouse.org/countries/nations-transit/scores>
- Fukuyama, F. (1995). *Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity*. New York: Free Press. Retrieved from: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20752121>
- Geld, D. (1995). *Democracy and Global Order: From The Modern State to Cosmopolitan Governance*. Cambridge: Polity Press. Retrieved from: <https://acortar.link/dX3OLM>
- Gidron, N. (2023). Why Israeli Democracy Is in Crisis. *Journal of Democracy*, 34(3), 33-45. Retrieved from: <https://www.journalofdemocracy.org/articles/why-israeli-democracy-is-in-crisis/>
- Golovaty, M.F. (2022). Political and civilizational discourse of democracy. *Scientific works of the Interregional Academy of Personnel Management Political Science and Public Administration*, 1(59), 21-29. Retrieved from: <https://journals.maup.com.ua/index.php/political/article/view/1268>



- Gorokhovskaia, Y., Shahbaz, A., & Slipowitz, A. (2023). The Freedom House Survey for 2022: A Turning Point for Global Freedom? *Journal of Democracy*, 34(2), 105-119. Retrieved from: <https://muse.jhu.edu/article/886936>
- Gowan, R. (2023). *Trends in armed conflicts*. Stockholm: Stockholm International Peace Research Institute Yearbook. Retrieved from: <https://www.sipri.org/yearbook/2023/02>
- Graham, J., Amos, B., & Plumptre, T. (2003). Principles for Good Governance in the 21st Century. *Institute on Good Governance*, 15, 1-6. Retrieved from: https://www.academia.edu/2463793/Principles_for_good_governance_in_the_21st_century
- Hendriks, F. (2021). Key Values for Democratic Governance Innovation: Two Traditions and a Synthesis. *Public Administration*, 100(1), 803-820. Retrieved from: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/padm.12738>
- Hrytsyak, N.V. (2012). *Ethical principles of democratic governance: mechanisms of formation and implementation*. Ivano-Frankivsk: Ivano-Frankivsk National Technical University of Oil and Gas. Retrieved from: <http://elar.nung.edu.ua/bitstream/123456789/1833/1/an2283.pdf>
- Humen, Y. (2023) Democratic governance: conceptualization of foreign experience, analysis of the key theories and concepts. *Socio-Economic Problems and the State (electronic journal)*, 28(1), 17-29. Retrieved from: <https://elartu.tntu.edu.ua/handle/lib/42446>
- Huntington, S.P. (1993). *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century*. Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press. Retrieved from: <https://archive.org/details/thirdwavedemocra0000hunt>
- International Crisis Group. (2024). *Watch List*. Retrieved from: <https://www.crisisgroup.org/global/watch-list-2024>
- International Foundation for Electoral Systems. (2021). *Overcoming Challenges to Democracy and Governance Programs in Post-Conflict Countries: CEPPS Lessons Learned*. Retrieved from: <https://acortar.link/OVjalj>
- Issacharoff, S. (2022). *Democracy Under Total War. Verfassungsblog on matters constitutional*. Retrieved from: <https://verfassungsblog.de/democracy-under-total-war/>
- Kolodiy, A. (2012). The concept of public (new) governance in its application to democratic and transitional systems. *Democratic Governance*, 10, 1-12. Retrieved from: <https://science.lpnu.ua/sites/default/files/journal-paper/2022/feb/26864/kolodij.pdf>
- Kolodiy, A. (2009). *Concepts of democratic governance as a direction of political and management research*. Lviv: Law. Retrieved from: https://political-studies.com/wp-content/uploads/2010/01/2009_LRIDU-conf_Plenarne1.pdf
- Latygina, N.A. (2011). Conceptualization of democracy. *Economic journal-XXI*, 7(8), 3-6. Retrieved from: <https://harvester.nas.gov.ua/Record/irk-123456789-47825>
- Levitsky, S., & Lucan, A.W. (2023). Democracy's Surprising Resilience. *Journal of Democracy*, 34(4), 5-20. Retrieved from: <https://www.journalofdemocracy.org/articles/democracys-surprising-resilience/>
- McFaul, M. (2002). The Fourth Wave of Democracy and Dictatorship: Noncooperative Transitions in the Postcommunist World. *World Politics*, 54(2), 212-244. Retrieved from: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25054183>
- Nikolina, I.I., & Merezhko, V.M. (2022). Theoretical aspects of building good governance at the local level. *Academic notes of TNU named after V.I. Vernadskyi. Series: Public management and administration*, 33(72), 133-137. Retrieved from: https://pubadm.vernadskyjournals.in.ua/journals/2022/6_2022/20.pdf
- Onuch, O. (2022). Why Ukrainians Are Rallying Around Democracy. *Journal of Democracy*, 33(4), 37-46. Retrieved from: <https://www.journalofdemocracy.org/articles/why-ukrainians-are-rallying-around-democracy/>
- Petrovskyi, P.M. (2023). The democratic trend in the development of the public management sphere of Ukraine in the post-war period. *Democratic governance*, 1(31), 1-12. Retrieved from: <https://science.lpnu.ua/sites/default/files/journal-paper/2023/jun/30655/230940verstka-5-15.pdf>



- Pettai, V. (2022). *Post-Communist Democracies in Decline? Estonia and Poland Compared. Challenges to Democracy in the 21st Century*. Springer. Retrieved from: https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-031-09123-0_11
- Reshota, O.A. (2011). *The concept of democratic governance in the governance reform of the European Union*. Lviv: LRIDU NADU.
- Romanyuk O.I. (2010). The origin of democracy as a significant factor in the establishment of democratic regimes. *Bulletin of Kharkiv National University named after V.N. Karazin. Series: Questions of political science*, 885(16), 55-62. Retrieved from: <https://periodicals.karazin.ua/politology/article/download/3249/2823/>
- Russell, J.D. (2008). Citizenship Norms and the Expansion of Political Participation Political Studies. *Political Studies*, 56(1), 76-98. Retrieved from: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-9248.2007.00718.x>
- Savrikar, N. (2016). *What is the importance of good governance?* Quora. Retrieved from: <https://www.quora.com/What-is-the-importance-of-good-governance>
- Snegovaya, M. (2023). Why Russia's Democracy Never Began. *Journal of Democracy*, 34(3), 105-118. Retrieved from: <https://www.journalofdemocracy.org/articles/why-russias-democracy-never-began/>
- Volynets, E.S. (2009). Regional strategies as factors of democratic governance in Ukraine. Democratic governanc. *Kyiv National Academy of Sciences*, 2, 281-283. (In Ukrainian)
- Westheimer, J., & Kahne, J. (2004). What Kind of Citizen. The Politics of Educating for Democracy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 41(2), 237-269. Retrieved from: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3699366>
- Zozulya, V.O. (2017). Principles of democratic governance in the conditions of globalization. *Investments: practice and experience*, 18, 108-112. Retrieved from: <http://www.investplan.com.ua/?op=1&z=5710&i=21>

