

Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| List of Figures..... | 19 |
| List of Tables | 19 |
| List of Appendices..... | 21 |
| List of Abbreviations..... | 23 |
| Foreword by <i>Sabine Kropp</i> | 25 |
| 1 Introduction..... | 27 |
| 1.1 Problem definition and research question | 29 |
| 1.1.1 Why should we care about formal institutional mechanisms for citizen participation? | 29 |
| 1.1.2 Ukraine’s hybrid regime as an ambiguous case for local citizen participation | 30 |
| 1.1.3 Why is the variation in institutional mechanisms for citizen participation in Ukraine puzzling? | 33 |
| 1.1.4 The research question..... | 43 |
| 1.2 Central argument: Institutions for citizen participation as a by-product of local patronal politics..... | 44 |
| 1.3 Methodological approach..... | 48 |
| 1.4 Contribution | 52 |
| 1.5 Structure of the book..... | 53 |
| 2 Citizen Participation. Concept and Its Operationalization for the Cases in Ukraine..... | 59 |
| 2.1 Conceptualizing citizen participation..... | 59 |
| 2.1.1 Theoretical approaches to citizen participation: Between democracy enhancement and government efficiency..... | 59 |
| 2.1.2 Definition of citizen participation as a multi- dimensional process..... | 62 |
| 2.2 Operationalizing citizen participation through formal institutional mechanisms | 70 |

| | | |
|-------|---|-----|
| 2.2.1 | Institutional mechanisms for citizen participation in Ukraine..... | 71 |
| 2.2.2 | Measurement of variation in institutional mechanisms for citizen participation..... | 79 |
| 2.3 | Conclusion..... | 82 |
| 3 | A Framework for Explaining Variation in Opportunities for Local Citizen Participation | 85 |
| 3.1 | Unpacking the context for citizen participation: Hybrid political regime | 85 |
| 3.1.1 | Alternative conceptualizations of regime hybridity | 86 |
| 3.1.2 | Hybrid regime as the outcome of elite interactions that limit access to societal resources and functions | 88 |
| 3.2 | Conceptualizing patronal networks and their arrangements | 90 |
| 3.2.1 | Arrangements of patronal networks: The typology | 90 |
| 3.2.2 | Cohesion in patronal networks..... | 93 |
| 3.2.3 | Delineating patronal networks from corrupt networks | 95 |
| 3.3 | Explaining opportunities for citizen participation: Patronal networks and resource preferences of incumbents..... | 97 |
| 3.3.1 | Uncertainty in patronal network arrangements and the institutional preferences of local politicians..... | 100 |
| 3.3.2 | Explicating the causal mechanism: The functional fit of citizen participation to incumbents' governance resources | 104 |
| 3.4 | Summary: How incumbent cherry-picking in varying arrangements of patronal networks translates into diverse opportunities for citizen participation..... | 123 |

| | | |
|-------|---|-----|
| 4 | Research Context and Design | 129 |
| 4.1 | Context of the study | 129 |
| 4.1.1 | Ukrainian patronal politics and its sub-national dimension..... | 129 |
| 4.1.2 | Institutional enablers for patronal politics at the local level..... | 131 |
| 4.2 | Empirical strategy and main methodological considerations | 134 |
| 4.2.1 | Comparative case study in five purposefully selected cities..... | 135 |
| 4.2.2 | Data collection: semi-structured interviews, open data sources and (local) media..... | 138 |
| 4.2.3 | Content analysis for interview data | 142 |
| 4.3 | Case selection | 143 |
| 4.3.1 | Regional centres as potential cases..... | 143 |
| 4.3.2 | Measurement of variation in arrangements of patronal networks..... | 144 |
| 4.3.3 | Mapping potential cases | 148 |
| 4.3.4 | Selecting cases | 150 |
| 4.4 | Operationalization of the independent variable for the case studies..... | 154 |
| 4.4.1 | Identifying patronal networks in the case studies | 154 |
| 4.4.2 | Identifying arrangements of patronal networks in the case studies..... | 158 |
| 4.5 | Operationalization of the dependent variable for the case studies..... | 161 |
| 4.5.1 | Chernivtsi..... | 161 |
| 4.5.2 | Lviv | 164 |
| 4.5.3 | Kropyvnytskyi..... | 167 |
| 4.5.4 | Odesa | 168 |
| 4.5.5 | Kharkiv | 171 |
| 4.6 | Summary and outlook for the empirical chapters..... | 174 |

| | | |
|-------|--|-----|
| 5 | Kharkiv. A Single-Pyramid Arrangement Restricts Opportunities for Citizen Participation..... | 177 |
| 5.1 | The arrangement of patronal networks | 177 |
| 5.1.1 | The patronal network landscape | 177 |
| 5.1.2 | A single-pyramid arrangement at the city level: Patronage via the executive | 184 |
| 5.2 | Adoption of participatory mechanisms..... | 189 |
| 5.2.1 | Struggles for citizen informing via the Rules of Procedure of the city council and the executive committee..... | 189 |
| 5.2.2 | Continuing limits to consulting, control and partnership mechanisms in the city charter | 191 |
| 5.2.3 | The participatory budget: The only supported participatory mechanism..... | 193 |
| 5.3 | A single-pyramid arrangement amplifies the role of mayors' personal preferences for participation | 194 |
| 5.4 | The selective functional fit and (non-)adoption of participatory mechanisms..... | 196 |
| 5.4.1 | Prioritizing the partnership dimension as supplementing organization and authority: The advantages of PB for the patron..... | 197 |
| 5.4.2 | Restricted consulting and (nearly) impossible control provide a good fit to the mayor's prioritised resource of authority..... | 201 |
| 5.4.3 | Misfit of the informing dimension to the mayor's governance resources..... | 202 |
| 5.5 | Conclusion..... | 204 |
| 6 | Odesa. Coordination under a Dominant Network Hampers Participatory Institutions..... | 207 |
| 6.1 | Arrangement of patronal networks..... | 208 |
| 6.1.1 | The patronal network landscape | 208 |
| 6.1.2 | Coordinated network arrangement, facilitated by the mayor..... | 213 |

| | | |
|-------|--|-----|
| 6.2 | Adoption of participatory mechanisms..... | 218 |
| 6.2.1 | Fragmented gains for citizen informing: The Rules of Procedure of the city council and of the executive committee | 219 |
| 6.2.2 | Control and consulting dimensions: Tolerated electronic petitions and the “good-as-is” city charter | 222 |
| 6.2.3 | Partnership dimension: The participatory budget as a flagship participatory project..... | 223 |
| 6.3 | A coordinated arrangement of patronal networks limits options for citizen participation | 225 |
| 6.3.1 | Selective adoption of mechanisms within informing dimension – the right target and time..... | 225 |
| 6.3.2 | Consulting, partnership, and control mechanisms selectively avoided because they infringe on the nodality and authority of the executive | 227 |
| 6.4 | Functional fit: Enables selective introduction of mechanisms within consulting and partnership dimensions, and disables most others..... | 228 |
| 6.4.1 | Electronic petitions: The mayor’s consulting mechanism..... | 228 |
| 6.4.2 | Functional fit of the participatory budget to the mayor’s preferred resources | 229 |
| 6.5 | Conclusion | 231 |
| 7 | Lviv. The Coordination of “Equals” Returns Accessible Participatory Institutions | 233 |
| 7.1 | Arrangement of patronal networks..... | 233 |
| 7.1.1 | The patronal network landscape | 233 |
| 7.1.2 | Coordinated arrangement of local patronal networks under the mayor’s brokerage and occasional challenger attempts | 241 |

| | | |
|-------|--|-----|
| 7.2 | Adoption of participatory mechanisms..... | 250 |
| 7.2.1 | Informing dimension: The Rules of Procedure of the city council and the executive committee | 251 |
| 7.2.2 | Control and consulting dimensions: The city charter, its constituent regulations and electronic petitions..... | 253 |
| 7.2.3 | Partnership dimension: The participatory budget and local initiative..... | 257 |
| 7.3 | The framework-setting role of the arrangement of patronal networks | 260 |
| 7.3.1 | Coordination restricts the adoption of mechanisms of citizen informing | 261 |
| 7.3.2 | Steered participation: The consulting and control dimensions “filtered” through the executive | 262 |
| 7.3.3 | Partnership: A win-win solution under the supervision of the executive..... | 263 |
| 7.4 | The functional fit as an enabler for participatory institutions..... | 264 |
| 7.4.1 | Functional fit: Steered participation strengthens the mayor’s brokering of resources | 264 |
| 7.4.2 | The informing dimension misaligns with the mayor’s brokering resources..... | 266 |
| 7.5 | Conclusion | 268 |
| 8 | Kropyvnytskyi. Competition-Turned-Selective-Coordination Slowed Down Participatory Developments .. | 271 |
| 8.1 | Arrangement of patronal networks: Competition turned into selective coordination | 272 |
| 8.1.1 | The patronal network landscape | 272 |

| | | |
|-------|--|-----|
| 8.1.2 | Dynamic arrangement of local patronal networks: From competition to selective coordination | 276 |
| 8.2 | Adoption of participatory mechanisms..... | 282 |
| 8.2.1 | Informing dimension: The Rules of Procedure of the city council..... | 283 |
| 8.2.2 | Control and consulting dimensions: The city charter, electronic petitions and consultations with public..... | 290 |
| 8.2.3 | The participatory budget | 294 |
| 8.3 | The framework-setting role of the arrangement of patronal networks | 295 |
| 8.3.1 | How competition was a “window of opportunity” for the informing dimension of participation | 295 |
| 8.3.2 | The increasing coordination between patronal networks stalled the adoption of mechanisms within the control dimension..... | 297 |
| 8.3.3 | The partnership dimension: The participatory budget – a priority in the coordination phase..... | 298 |
| 8.4 | The functional fit of citizen participation to resource preferences of local politicians | 299 |
| 8.4.1 | Politicians’ governance resources and the functional fit of informing and control | 300 |
| 8.4.2 | Politicians’ governance resources and the functional fit of partnership and consulting ... | 303 |
| 8.5 | Conclusion | 306 |
| 9 | Chernivtsi. Competing Arrangement and the Mayor’s Functional Fit Return Accessible Participatory Mechanisms..... | 309 |
| 9.1 | Arrangement of patronal networks..... | 309 |
| 9.1.1 | The patronal network landscape | 309 |

| | | |
|--------|---|-----|
| 9.1.2 | Dynamic development of competition between major patronal networks..... | 315 |
| 9.2 | Adoption of participatory mechanisms..... | 322 |
| 9.2.1 | The city charter..... | 322 |
| 9.2.2 | The Rules of Procedure of the city council | 325 |
| 9.2.3 | The participatory budget..... | 327 |
| 9.2.4 | Electronic petitions | 327 |
| 9.3 | Competing arrangement of patronal networks is conducive to political support for citizen participation..... | 329 |
| 9.3.1 | How competition between patronal networks returned participatory institutions within the informing and control dimensions..... | 330 |
| 9.3.2 | The consulting dimension and its (mis)use for inter-network competition | 332 |
| 9.4 | The functional fit of citizen participation and “the public” as a resource..... | 332 |
| 9.4.1 | Participatory budget as a tool to supplement governance resources for leaders of both competing networks..... | 333 |
| 9.4.2 | The mayor’s organizational resource: Civil society activists as “the public” | 334 |
| 9.5 | Conclusion..... | 337 |
| 10 | Conclusion. Participatory Institutions as By-Products of Incumbent Choices in Patronal Network Arrangements of Varying Uncertainty..... | 339 |
| 10.1 | Synopsis | 339 |
| 10.2 | Comparative analysis: Uncertainty and incumbent functional fit in patronal network arrangements..... | 343 |
| 10.2.1 | Comparing the arrangements of patronal networks and their related uncertainty | 343 |

| | | |
|--------|--|-----|
| 10.2.2 | Context uncertainty and preference for power-sharing vs power-concentrating institutions | 354 |
| 10.2.3 | Micro-level mechanism: The resource-reducing and resource-supplementing logic of functional fit of citizen participation | 357 |
| 10.3 | Key findings: uncertainty and incumbent functional fit in arrangements of patronal networks | 369 |
| 10.4 | Implications for research and policy at the local level in hybrid regimes | 372 |
| 10.5 | Outlook for further research: Democratization in hybrid regimes “from the back door”? | 375 |
| 11 | Bibliography | 379 |
| 12 | Appendices..... | 445 |