

## PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION IN THE REPUBLIC OF ARMENIA: REASSESSMENT AFTER THIRTY YEARS\*

UDC 352.075 (479.25)

DOI: 10.52063/25792652-2021.4-125

**KATERINA ALTUNYAN**

*Yerevan State University, Faculty of International Relations,  
Chair of Public Administration, Assistant,  
Ph.D. in Political Sciences,  
Yerevan, the Republic of Armenia  
[katya.altunyan@ysu.am](mailto:katya.altunyan@ysu.am)*

***The purpose of the article is to point out the priority issues of modernization of public administration system in the Republic of Armenia. Reassessment refers to periodic reevaluation of public administration theory's provisions progress, growing importance and the role of public administration in the modern Armenian state. Taking into consideration the special status of public administration in transitional countries, the current research have been undertaken on the main issues of speedy development. Besides, the paper reviews a fresh and revised picture on public administration having target to make suggestions on further improvement the whole system.***

***The study was conducted on theoretical basics of public administration, using a comparative method of classic and new public management concepts. Considering statements based on theory and formulating theory as an object, we proceed to substantiate, showing that from the point of view of political science, public administration is considered as a comparative and social activity, which means the influence of government policies and actions on the state and society. A brief outline of the conceptual framework for determining the main stages of public administration reforms in the Republic of Armenia and general relations with the bloc of Central and Eastern European countries is given.***

***Summing up, our findings in this paper strongly suggest that modernization of the public administration should be carried out at three main levels: the state, the institutional and the social. The key point in this process is to develop the capacity to support policy.***

**Keywords:** *public administration, public reforms, public policy, public service, government in the Republic of Armenia (RA), transition, state governance, Central and Eastern European (CEE) countries, Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS).*

### Introduction

A scientific view at the development trajectories suggesting that public administration by which we understand both its theoretical and practical value, as well as its ability to develop and conduct public policy, has largely conditioned the modernization of countries or states with transition economies and political systems (Mussari R., Cepiku D., 353-355). This thesis is considered as a key perception of public administration in many CEE countries. Nevertheless, in some post-soviet countries, including the RA, it

---

\* Հոդվածը ներկայացվել է 08.11.2021թ., գրախոսվել՝ 26.11.2021թ., տպագրության ընդունվել՝ 25.12.2021թ.:

was not considered as such, because the public administration was viewed as a synonym of state governance. The development of public administration, i.e. state and municipal bodies, civic-political movements, political parties, civil society organizations and mass media have been established over time.

To explain this phenomenon, the research revealed the following reasons. **First**, in western or western-oriented countries (no matter if it is unitary or federal) state governance is the government of a country subdivision, which shares political power with the national government having some level of political autonomy. In contrast, many post-communist or transition countries have no areas possessing a degree of political autonomy and sub-national regions cannot decide on their own, so they are directly controlled by the national government. **Second** reason is difference of organized and responsible institutions that made up the public administration and policy. In the developed system of public administration, the state bodies, political parties, non-government organizations, mass media are significantly differentiated and functionally specific. While in transition system, many of them still did not have an environment of strong civil society, professional political parties and free mass media. Among the institutions, the state bodies were comparatively institutionalized and responsible. **Third**, the interpretation of government's role within the public administration is another interesting aspect of reasoning. The effective role of government in the developed world relates to the regulation of public sector and systematic application of laws, strategies and public policies. According to another approach to the role of government in transition countries, the government function by fully "manual override" principle using direct interventions in various sections of public life and overemphasizing the role of public officials and servants.

With a closer look at reasons it becomes clear that in reality there are many other sub reasons, such as quality of potential relations between public administration sectors and institutions, distribution and redistribution of resources, transparency, openness and accountability of bureaucracy. The result of above-mentioned causality and contemporary studies shows the importance of strengthening the public administration system in the period of democratic transition. In the Armenian case, three major issues must be taking into consideration while giving a scientific explanation to the main features of public administration system development trajectories (see more detailed Altunyan K., Kalantaryan E., 17-26). These issues would be the following: *a) understanding of public administration in transitional countries as compared to the developing ones, b) defining the changing role of the State within the public administration paradigm, c) illustrating linkages between theoretical and practical stages of public administration and public policy.*

### **Comparative Study on Public Administration as a Tool in Developing and Transitional Countries**

There is good opportunity to address the issue and make some clarifications while discussing the differences between developed, developing countries and countries in transition. It is noteworthy that such division and classification of countries and the terminology itself continuously was referred to with skepticism by the Armenian academic and official circles at least until recently. Some people see difficulties in possibilities of the most optimal qualification of the difference between them.

There are various metrics to assess the political social, economic development levels of country if it meets some criteria. According to United Nation Organization, all developed countries were located in either North America, Europe or Developed Asia and

Pacific. The so-called developed countries are usually rich ones with high-income. According to this criteria, one hundred and twenty-six countries were considered “developing” and located in Africa, Asia or Latin America and the Caribbean (UN Country Classification, 143-150). In addition, the World Bank emphasizes that the developing countries are considered mainly upper-middle and lower-middle income countries, which in turn, are divided into three subgroups of least developed, landlocked developing and small island developing countries (Hamadeh N, Rompaey Van C., Matreau E.). Both of above-mentioned organizations use quantitative measures, such as GDP per capita, income, human development index etc. In some cases, being rich, for example, does not developed at all, so qualitative aspect also matters. Therefore, emphasizing the qualitative side of development, it is more appropriate to use the term “**modernized country or state**”. The point is that it is more useful for comprehensive assessment and emphasizing the access to public services, institutionalization, good governance and other core aspects of public administration. Global experience shows that developed countries have been able to modernize through public administration and public policy. In other words, the state is constantly directing its revenues and resources to reform the public sector and to govern in line with the demands of a changing society. The logic of developing countries is that they are moving towards increasing their resources (economic, social, technological, scientific etc.), which again aims at public sector modernization. Finally, in that context, the term “transition” covers the countries emerging from a socialist-type command economy towards a market-based economy. As known, the transition process measured by overall transition indicators cultivated for example by European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD). Having analyzed the EBRD’s reports it becomes clear that the process of modernization of any country presupposes a multifaceted process with high economic potential and public involvement (EBRD Transition Report). If the modernization of the country does not proceed with the above-mentioned requirement, but is dictated or imposed from above (elite) without public involvement, institutional design, economic model or vice versa, modernization has an objective public demand, but for which the country does not have sufficient resources, then we are dealing with a transitional process. This process is characterized by continuous changing and creating of various governmental and financial institutions, constitutions, market models, choosing the effective systems of rule.

Based on the above-mentioned, it becomes obvious that public administration has been an important tool for modernization in developing countries of CEE. Their cases are of special interest for the RA due to their previous socialist-type economic and communist political system. Research on these countries emphasizes that after the collapse of Soviet Union, the role and areas of public administration increased to large extent. It played an important role in formulation of policies for the development, mostly because the political leaders were not considered capable and good at making effective policies at all. Moreover, public administration had important role in state building, especially by building up such institutions like public sector and cooperation. It leads to political socialization by regulating and aggregating attitudes, values, norms, ideas and feelings among people towards the whole system (Attila, 7-8).

Along with the above, there are factors that have impact on public administration reforms in CEE countries. In the early period of transition, for example, neo-Weberian administration principles might have been more influential, than “New Public Administration” concept (NPA). Which is more interesting, during the 2000s, a large number of CEE countries started to use the provisions of “New Public Management” (NPM) applying private sector management principles to government organizations. The principles of client focus, decentralization, the separation of policy making from implementation, and the use of private partners for service delivery are the language of

NPM. The logic of public administration reforms in CEE countries were supported by International Financial Institutions (IFIs). It focused on reducing overall costs of the government, mainly through privatization of state owned enterprises and reduction of wages bill to bring government spending down to sustainable levels and free resources for other uses more beneficial to the economy. Additionally, CEE countries transformed to multi-party democracies and in that way linking the economic and political reforms. Due to these reforms, many successfully completed their transition to market economy and democracy using public administration as a tool.

Except the common historical past, Armenia and the other CIS member-countries are quite different from CEE countries. Being honest, we should mention that the CIS itself is a union of quite different states for their social, political, economic and religious aspects. For Armenia, and other CIS countries even more pressing than the problem of moving from authoritarianism to democracy is the issue of constructing institutions and consolidating the political regimes. The task of the future democratic development is the depersonalization and a greater institutionalization of power. In Armenia particularly, effective institutional building was prevented because of concentration of political and economic power, and in the result of these phenomena state capture”, clientelism and corruption appeared, so under these conditions informal structures became an influential instrument for public administration. Based on these characteristics, Engel and Erdman proposed sub-type of authoritarian regime called neo-patrimonial political regime (Engel and Erdman, 45-46).

According to many international organization assessments, especially recent EBRD transition report, Armenia is still in transition. The logic of public administration concept was established since 2000s, when at the same period many CEE countries run the NPM principles for modernization. Based on these facts, it becomes clear that modernization through public administration reforms is more complex than getting from “a” to “b” (for example from socialist-type system to democratic). A continuous and never-ending process is even reversible. Modernization has multiple social, economic, and political dimensions. In their turn, socio-economic and political development based on three stages: factor-driven (institutions, infrastructures, macro-economic, stability, public health, basic education), efficiency driven (higher education, flexibility of labor market, development of market), innovation-driven (development of technology flexibility of labor market, development of market) etc.

## The Changing Role of State within the Public Administration Paradigm

It is unfortunate when, three decades after independence, the issue of statehood in Armenia appears in political discourse. There is a deep confidence that the state is a symbol of independence, but it is viable, when it functions. From the theory, we know that the role of state has changed within the public administration paradigm over time. This make it possible to see the evolution and development of modern state in a comparative was as a polity. In the Armenian reality, the statehood as an institution has been redefined to some extent, but has not ceased to be the highest value. Since the independence, many have been criticizing state institutions with the reference to their ineffectiveness and continuously have insisted on the necessity to reconsider its role within the public administration paradigm. Why does this question arise?

Recently, in one of the known articles entitled “Europeanization of Public Administration in Central and Eastern Europe: The Challenges of Democracy and Good Governance” Atilla analyses stages of development of state as a **polity**, **politics** and **policy** within the logic of public administration theory and practice. Analyzing the issue of statehood and evolution of states (including post-soviet CEE countries) the author argues

that many had some difficulties with the second stage and the most advanced ones are at the third stage. Nevertheless, to understand the meaning we will discuss all the three stages of state development and will transfer it to the Armenian reality.

According to Atilla, **the first stage is to create the modern polity** with its institutional system in the formal-legal framework. Polity emerged by the separation of bureaucracy from the public life as a separate world with its own rules and disciplines in the “Weberian” universe. As mentioned in Max Weber’s study of rational bureaucracy concept, advantage of bureaucratic government is that it is based on order. In addition, bureaucratic government includes individual responsibility and meritocracy, merit-based promotion through the career ladder, efficient internal communication and customer relations. The institutional structure of polity can be grasped at four levels, at two state levels and two societal levels that give the complete map of politics-policy relationship. Leaning on this perception, hence, in 1991, the soviet state governance mechanism was replaced by another political and economic system in the RA. The constantly adopted system of public administration corresponds to the standards of free economic relations and unitary democratic states. Various components of public administration started being regulated by Constitution and appropriate laws. By the Constitution adopted by the 5 July 1995 Referendum, it was declared that the RA is a sovereign, democratic, social state governed by rule of law. Until the first presidential election (1991) the government was formed in the parliament and was accountable to it. However, the country afterward began to move slowly to **semi-presidential system**, the president was the one to ensure the regular functioning of three branches of power. He did not directly control any of those branches but had the power to interfere in their actions. Later, according to official statement, to modernize the system of public administration new amendments were made in Constitution approved in 2005. From the very beginning, as a supreme body of the executive power, the government (bureaucracy) developed and implemented the domestic policy, managed state property, provided for state policy in the fields of science, education, culture, healthcare and other fields. State governance is implementing also by the head of region (or “marz” in Armenia), which means that state governance covers also the regions in the RA. It is very important to mention that like other countries, many measures have been taken to use check balance on the executive in Armenia. For long period, the coalition government was used as a control on the executive branch, but it was more formal than substantial tool.

The logic of public administration system changed from a semi-presidential system to a **pure parliamentary system** in 2015 conducted by constitutional referenda. In the new system, PM enjoys strong executive powers (the “super PM” system). To make reforms systemic and sustainable, strong political will needs to be reinforced by strengthened institutions and enhanced administrative capacity. Understanding of such transition in the conditions of war and the immaturity of political parties, the society conditionally agreed to adopt a new constitution. The Armenian society did not fully understand the need for a transition to parliamentary rule, but the vote in favor of constitutional reform took place on the condition that acting president Serzh Sargsyan, as he had publicly promised, would not run for prime minister. However, on April 17, 2018, Armenia’s Parliament voted 77-17 in favor of Serzh Sargsyan to become Armenia’s Prime Minister, even after previously stating that he would not accept the position after his presidency concluded. Much of Armenia’s population interpreted the constitutional referendum as a political maneuver.

**The second stage widens it to** a more articulated and deeply structured **politics** with numerous actors and processes in the public sector. Finally, the governance turn in the 2000s indicates the long transition **to the policy stage**, when the detailed and sophisticated public policy structures permeate the whole society. The upper state level

appears as **politics** in the government and as a **policy** below the government level with the special state agencies. The upper societal level appears as the top social actors (organized interests and NGOs, etc.) with a more politicized side and at the basic societal level as a more policy-oriented side. Atila noticed that the state which meets these criteria is the ideal model of state. Tangible reforms of public administration started since 2000s in the RA. Many hoped that would render the government system more democratic. Newly adopted regulations supported the public service, particularly the law of civil service it would be possible to recruit servants through the competition. Unfortunately, the structure of the government was left largely untouched. However, it has stepped into a new stage of development and generated reforms in the state governance as whole. The difficulty with realizing of those reforms is that there were sometimes no clear equivalent activities. The transition process and further modernization of public administration system were influenced by economic means. After all, we know that the successful transition of the CEE countries has been greatly stimulated by **economic means**. Closed borders with Azerbaijan due to Nagorno-Karabakh conflict and serious tensions with Turkey because of denying policy of Armenian genocide in the Ottoman Empire directly put the country under economic blockade. In the wake of Armenia's economic transition, transformation into market economy faced many problems. Poverty, economic uncertainty, scarce resources did not ensure the normal course of reforms. Armenia entered transition as the second poorest country in the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) according to the GDP per capita. Due to the low initial starting point Armenia lags behind most of the peer countries in GDP per capita (Bogov D., Kresic, Beschastna G., 7-8). Since at least 1997, popular movements of different scales were taken as a result. Without going too far, let us mention a few examples from the recent past. In summer of 2013, protests against the increase in the cost of public transport were held. Another one was a social movement named "I will only pay 100 dram" aimed to contain the prices while drawing the attention of the authorities to the lack of maintenance and the state of decay of public vehicles. Another couple of examples are "No to plunder" and "Electric Yerevan" social protest movements organized against the electricity price hikes and the amendments to the Turnover Tax law. Finally, in 2018, because of massive peaceful protests and under the pressure of population the logic of development tried to shift to the third stage. This allows us naturally to interconnect the roots of that process with the problems raised in second stage of state development within the public administration paradigm. Despite the small steps taken to build a modern system of public administration in the second stage of state development, the formation of public administration actors, the gap between them all, did not allow the system to develop in a harmonious manner. To date, almost all public administration institutions are in need of development, and the current legislative framework needs to be improved. Since 2018, from the point of view of the possible impact on the public administration system, based on the tendencies of public administration and the developments at the national level, transforming the role of the state and spreading the new concept of public administration was distinguished.

### **Some Linkages between Theoretical and Practical Stages of Public Administration and Public Policy**

Public administration is an interesting science, which adopts a scientific method and an interaction between theory and practice. It plays the role of a driving force in social life and aims at constantly improving the appropriateness of the policies and the quality of the results-conformity with the law. Thus, this allows us to claim that theoretical

and practical development of public administration contributes to the improvement of policy-making process. For that purpose, the international research on more effective and good governance discusses the following linkages along with others (Nakarosis V., 29). For the countries in transition, the followings have had special attention: *a) the influence of government reforms, priorities on public administration and sufficient cooperation among the institutions responsible for public policy-making, b) the necessity of leadership in policy implementation toward the achievement.*

The Armenian government have coordinated public administration reforms by emphasizing priorities of different generations or modernization phases. Based on official data, the first phase from 1991 to 1999 is marked by building the state governance system, which included creation of institutions, administrative-territorial division, privatization, land reform, budget-treasury, tax-customs, and statistical systems. In the second phase, from 2000 to 2009, a number of new institutions were introduced, such as civil service and remuneration systems, public procurement, local government and community service, debt management etc. Finally, the third phase, from 2010 to 2020, the institutional priorities were proclaimed, such as e-Government, program budgeting, auditing, strategic planning etc (Public Administration Reforms Strategy). Public administration reforms seek to work seriously on a comprehensive agenda for governance transformation and modernization. A wide field of cooperation was opened for working with public sector organizations. A number of NGOs expressed their desire to work on solving systemic problems. The revolutionary political elite held consultations with representatives of NGOs representing their interests and opened up the involvement of state and non-state actors. Moreover, the parliamentary system has many advantages over the presidential or semi-presidential ones, especially if we mean public administration reforms. It is more convenient in case of political crisis, because, for example, the prime minister and members of the cabinet can be replaced. Which is more important that bureaucracies are more accountable to elected leaders, which means that elected officials have more leeway to set policy than bureaucrats or unelected officials. The negative connotation of bureaucracy refers to a situation when governing officials controls too much public authority and escape supervision by other members of organization. The revolutionists can tackle the administration's structure, resources or norms to induce in line with the revolutionary goals. As mentioned by Schomaker, there are different scenarios according to which the public administration (mostly through bureaucracy) can be affected by a revolution. **In the first scenario**, public administration can induce revolution (see also Waldo, pp. 362-368). **In the second scenario**, public administration can be exposed to revolution and react. Moreover, reaction might be negative expressing resistance, resilience or sabotage against new system, but also positive by cooperation, loyalty and work with or for the new system. According to **the third scenario**, public administration can be exposed to a revolution and react; the consequences would not be shirking or exit (Schomaker R.M., pp.43-45). Analyzing the Armenian processes after revolutionary elite came to power within the context of these scenarios, it should be stated that the bureaucracy reacted sometimes negative, which was assessed by the political authorities as sabotage. As a response, in September 2019, the Prime Minister signed a decision to establish a Council for the Development of Public Administration Reform Strategy and to approve its Action Plan. As of 2019, several public administration reform strategies have been adopted in parallel, particularly the e-Government, the Anti-Corruption, Public Financial Management Reform Strategy etc.

Any democracy needs economic and institutional guarantees. Newly elected revolutionary political elite resolved the urgent task of holding an economic revolution. Back in 2018, the economic sector was quite large in the pre-election program of leading political block. **One of the main pillars** of economic reforms was the management of

public investment projects and programs. To this aim, a Public Investment Management Framework was prepared. In 2020, the European Bank of Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) investment portfolio in Armenia amounted to 160 million euros, which was the largest annual package during the entire partnership period. **The second pillar** of public reforms intended to protect public sector efficiency, transparency, accountability and performance to strengthen anti-corruption, justice services and public sector management. In Armenia, for example, the types of corruption included various spheres of public life, but also embezzlement and misuse of public funds (Saltanat L.S., Condrey E., Goncharov D., 343-344). In that case, government approved “Anti-Corruption Strategy” and its Action Plan (2019-2022). Recognizing the destructive impact of corruption on the proper functioning of the state and building trust between the authorities and citizens, the new political forces have focused their efforts on creating the core agenda for a new approach to this phenomenon, assuming a complete transformation of Armenia’s anti-corruption system (Miarka A., pp 66-75). In the context of justice reform, the revolutionary government launched the transitional justice process and approved a legislative criminalizing electoral bribery in 2018. Then, the National Assembly fully adopted the early pension system for judges of the Constitutional Court of the RA. The crisis posed to the country, the coronavirus epidemic, the serious and deep challenges during the war unleashed by Azerbaijan against the Artsakh Republic caused great damage to all the reforms and programs undertaken as of September 2020 in the RA.

As a reaction to the above-mentioned and many other challenges that faced the Armenian state and society, objectively was driven a new task to reconsider, modernize the value, methodological and behavioral foundations of the public administration system. In 2021, **the Public Administration Reform Strategy** was adopted and reforms were built around seven strategic milestones that should become the hallmarks of the public administration system. These hallmarks are people-centered, fair, stable, responsible, dynamic, innovative and effective. Emphasizing the extraordinary role of bureaucracy on problem solving, new reforms are planned to be carried out in the field of public service. To harmonize the public and civil services, it is planned to form a group of professional civil servants holding senior management positions. These new type of civil servants will be appointed on a competition basis to positions, and their functions will include policy development, implementation, consulting, operational management (Public Administration Reform Strategy, 92). This is nothing more than the creation of a new institutional position or actor responsible for public policy-making in line with public administration goal. Besides, analyzing the stages of the reforms provided by the Strategy, it becomes obvious that in the first stage (2021-2023) it was planned to carry out functional-institutional modernization by providing needed components of research, analytical, legislative and institutional regulations. During the second stage (2024-2026) of implementing the Strategy, it was aimed to achieve a new education policy in the field of public service and preparing a new generation. Finally, during the third stage (2027-2030) the vision is the high-quality policy development and implementation, the creation of meritocratic public service system.

Recalling the statement about leadership in policy implementation toward the achievement, the research for recent years shows that the leadership as a way to develop and modernize in comparative perspective had positive dynamic. According to the World Bank’s Worldwide Governance Indicators, in 2018, Armenia scored only 42 out of 100 in control of corruption, 48 out of 100 in the rule of law, and 40 out of 100 percentiles on voice and accountability. Just for comparing, it is essential to recall that according to the 2016 Global Corruption Barometer, Armenia was perceived as one of the most corrupt countries in the region, with high incidence of bribery (Indicators reflecting Armenia’s status on governance). Another problem was the dependence of the

judiciary on ruling elites, which continues to be an obstacle to the separation of powers in post-revolutionary Armenia. Politicization of judiciary harmed its independence and credibility. Judiciary is the least trusted institution among Armenian people (Ilke Dagli Hustin, 15). In 2020, the Washington-based Social Progress Imperative published the 2020 Social Progress Index, which ranked Armenia 50th out of 163 countries, up from 54th last year and 61st in 2018 (Social Progress Index Executive Summary, 6-10). The indicator reflects the results of all 17 UN Sustainable Development Goals. It is 76.46 points ahead of all other countries in terms of social progress. For example, Georgia is ranked 56th, Turkey is ranked 92nd, Iran is ranked 93rd and Azerbaijan is ranked 104th. Norway is the world leader in terms of social progress with 92.73 points. The Social Progress Index includes indicators such as basic human needs, well-being, nutrition and primary health care, and personal freedoms.

Analyzing democratic developments in 2019, the British Economist Intelligence Unit ranked Armenia among the winners and among the countries with the greatest progress. In 2018, Armenia ranked 103rd among 167 countries, improving its position by eight points. The greatest progress has been made in the area of effective government work (Economist Intelligence-Armenia). The authoritative human rights organization Freedom House in its regular report on democracy called "Freedom in the World" ranked the Republic of Armenia among the countries that have made the most progress. Assessing the level of democracy by 25 different criteria, Freedom House in Armenia recorded a progress of 6 points in 2018, or 50 out of 100 possible, instead of 44 last year. Nevertheless, it still belongs to the group of partially free countries. According to Human Rights Watch, one of the most influential Western human rights organizations, the early parliamentary elections in Armenia on December 9, 2018 met international standards, passed in a truly competitive atmosphere. However, there are still problems and shortcomings in the field of human rights. According to the E-Government Development Index (EGDI) conducted by the United Nations, Armenia has improved its position by 19 points in 2020, one of the largest advances in the Asian region, improving from 87 to 68 (EGDI-Armenia Overview). In 2021, according to the Heritage Foundation's index of economic freedom, Armenia ranks 32nd among 178 countries, improving its position by 2 points. Armenia is a leader among the Eurasian economic union (EEU) countries (Index of Economic Freedom-Armenia-2021).

## Conclusions

The research of public administration system and evaluation found out the following assessments. From beginning of 1990s Armenian people want the state and its public administration to act as a social and economic promoter, capable of ensuring equitable distribution of opportunities, sustainable management of resources and equitable access to opportunities (political, economic, social and cultural). Modernization through public administration is a complex process and many factors derived from that dimension.

In recent years, public administration system is increasingly modernizing. Due to the problems of state development at the second stage, the main priority of system should be the perspective to achieve the third stage. Analysis of official strategies and legislative regulations reveals the will to prepare background to complete the transition. Moreover, research showed that leadership as a way to develop and modernize in comparative perspective has some positive dynamic. However, still in the RA, public administration and public policy do not play a major role in the delivery of services and the provision of much needed economic infrastructure. But, most important of all, an established non-partisan civil service is vital to democracy as it makes it possible to have

a peaceful and orderly political succession, and thus genuine pluralism. There is still need to foster dynamic partnership with the civil society and the private sector, to improve the quality of public service delivery, enhance social responsibility and feedback on public service performance. There is need to overcome the patronage system in the public service system in favor of merit system (especially in the civil service). Capacity development in the public administration needs to be addressed at three levels: the individual, the institutional and the societal. Key in this process are capacity development for policy support.

### Works Cited

1. Altunyan Katerina, Kalantaryan Edgar, "Public Management Reforms in the Republic of Armenia", *Journal of Social Technology and Research*, 6(100)2019 January-February, "SPO SOTIS", pp. 17-26.
2. Attila Ágh, "Europeanization of Public Administration in Eastern and Central Europe: The Challenge of Democracy and Good Governance", pp. 7-8. <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/33270628.pdf> [Available 05.11.2021]
3. Bogov Dmitri, Kresic Ana, Beschastna Galina, "Armenia Diagnostic", *Report October 2019, EBRD*, pp. 7-8. <https://www.ebrd.com/documents/strategy-and-policy-coordination/armenia-diagnostic.pdf?blobnocache=true> [Available 05.11.2021]
4. Country Classification: Data Sources, Country Classifications and Aggregation Methodology, "Statistical Annex of United Nation", "World Economic Situation and Prospects", pp. 143-150. [https://www.un.org/en/development/desa/policy/wesp/wesp\\_current/2014wesp\\_country\\_classification.pdf](https://www.un.org/en/development/desa/policy/wesp/wesp_current/2014wesp_country_classification.pdf) [Available 05.11.2021]
5. "Economic Intelligence –Armenia, Report 2019". <https://country.eiu.com/armenia> [Available 05.11.2021]
6. "EDGI-Armenia Overview", 2020, <https://publicadministration.un.org/egovkb/en-us/Data/Country-Information/id/8-Armenia> [Available 05.11.2021]
7. Erdmann Gero, Engel Ulf, "Neopatrimonialism Revisited: Beyond a Catch-all Concept", *GIGA Working Paper Series No. 16, Hamburg: German Institute of Global and Area Studies*, pp. 45-46.
8. "European Bank for Reconstruction and Development Transition Report 2020-21", <https://2020.tr-ebrd.com/countries/#> [Available 05.11.2021]
9. Hamadeh Nada, Rompaey Van Catherine, Matreau Eric, "New World Bank country classifications by income level: 2021-2022", *World Bank Blog, July 21, 2021* <https://blogs.worldbank.org/opendata/new-world-bank-country-classifications-income-level-2021-2022#:~:text=The%20World%20Bank%20assigns%20the,%2C%20and%20high%2Dincome%20countries.> [Available 05.11.2021]
10. Ilke Dagli Hustin, "Score Armenia Pilot Study: Analysis and Recommendations", by the USAID/OTI and implemented by the Centre for Sustainable Peace and Democratic, 2019, p. 15. <https://www.socialcohesion.info/library/publication/score-armenia-pilot-study> [Available 05.11.2021]
11. "Indicators reflecting Armenia's status on governance" <https://ogp.gov.am/files/libraries/1/1611143693659.pdf> [Available 05.11.2021]
12. "Index of Economic Freedom-Armenia-2021" [https://www.heritage.org/index/pdf/2021/countries/2021\\_IndexofEconomicFreedom-Armenia.pdf](https://www.heritage.org/index/pdf/2021/countries/2021_IndexofEconomicFreedom-Armenia.pdf) [Available 05.11.2021]
13. Miarka Agnieszka, "Armenia's Domestic Policy after the Velvet Revolution: Selected Issues", "Central Asia and the Caucasus", Volume 21, Issue 2, 2020, pp. 66-75. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/342313150\\_Armenia's\\_Domestic\\_Policy\\_after\\_the\\_Velvet\\_Revolution\\_Selected\\_Issues](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/342313150_Armenia's_Domestic_Policy_after_the_Velvet_Revolution_Selected_Issues) [Available 05.11.2021]
14. Mussari Riccardo, Cepiku Denita, "Public Administration Reform in Transition: Reflection from the Albanian Experience", "Journal of Public Management Review", Volume 9, by Routledge, 2007, pp. 353-375.
15. Nakrosis Vilatis, "The Influence of Government Priorities on Public Administration Reforms in Europe", *The NISPA Journal of Public Administration and Policy*, Vol. VII, No 1, 2015, p.29.

16. Public Administration Reform Strategy of the Republic of Armenia, 2021, Decree of the Government of the Republic of Armenia of July 2021, L-decision <https://www.e-draft.am/projects/3438> [Available 05.11.2021]

17. "Public Administration Reform Practice Note", UNDP, November 12, 2015, <https://www.undp.org/publications/public-administration-reform-practice-note-0> [Available 05.11.2021]

18. Saltanat Liebert, Stephen E. Condrey, Goncharov Dmitry, "Public Administration in Post-Communist Countries. Former Soviet Union, Central and Eastern Europe, and Mongolia", Routledge, London, 2013, pp. 343-344.

19. "Social Progress Index in 2020: Executive Summary", "Social Progress Imperative", pp. 6-10. <https://www.socialprogress.org/static/37348b3ecb088518a945fa4c83d9b9f4/2020-social-progress-index-executive-summary.pdf> [Available 05.11.2021]

20. Schomaker Rahel, "Revolution and Public Administration", CUAS Villach and German Research Institute for Public Administration, "Spryer", pp. 43-45.

21. Waldo Dwight, "Public Administration in a Time of Revolution", Public Administration Review, Vol. 28, No. 4 (Jul. - Aug., 1968), pp. 362-368.

**ՀԱՆՐԱՅԻՆ ԿԱՌԱՎԱՐՈՒՄԸ ՀԱՅԱՍՏԱՆԻ ՀԱՆՐԱՊԵՏՈՒԹՅՈՒՆՈՒՄ.  
ՎԵՐԱԳՆԱՀԱՏՈՒՄ ԵՐԵՍՈՒՆ ՏԱՐԻ ԱՆՑ**

**ԿԱՏԵՐԻՆԱ ԱԼԹՈՒՆՅԱԼ**

*Երևանի պետական համալսարանի  
միջազգային հարաբերությունների ֆակուլտետի  
հանրային կառավարման ամբիոնի ասիստենտ,  
քաղաքական գիտությունների թեկնածու,  
ք.Երևան, Հայաստանի Հանրապետություն*

Հոդվածի նպատակն է վերհանել Հայաստանի Հանրապետությունում հանրային կառավարման համակարգի արդիականացման առաջնահերթ խնդիրները: Այդ խնդիրների վերագնահատումը հանրային կառավարման տեսության հայեցակարգային դրույթների համատեքստում, կարող է նպաստել ժամանակակից հայկական պետությունում հանրային կառավարման կարևորության ու դերի աճին: Հաշվի առնելով անցումային երկրներում հանրային կառավարման հատուկ կարգավիճակը՝ սույն հետազոտությունը կատարվել է զարգացման ու արդիականացման հիմնական խնդիրների շուրջ: Բացի այդ, հոդվածում դիտարկվում է հանրային կառավարման նոր հարացույցը, որի նպատակն է համակարգային խնդիրների լուծման համար թիրախային առաջարկությունների ձևակերպումը:

Ուսումնասիրությունն իրականացրել ենք հանրային կառավարման տեսական հիմունքների հիմքով՝ կիրառելով կառավարման դասական ու նոր տեսությունների համեմատական մեթոդը: Տեսական պնդումները ցույց են տվել, որ քաղաքագիտության տեսանկյունից հանրային կառավարման ուսումնասիրությունը կառավարության գործունեության վերլուծությունն է, ինչը նշանակում է կառավարության քաղաքականության ու գործողությունների՝ պետության և հասարակության վրա ազդեցությունների ուսումնասիրություն:

Հոդվածում սահմանվել է հայեցակարգային խնդիրների համառոտ շրջանակ՝ բացահայտելու ՀՀ-ում հանրային կառավարման բարեփոխումները և ընդհանուր համեմատությունը Կենտրոնական և Արևելյան Եվրոպայի երկրների հետ:

Ամփոփելով սույն ուսումնասիրության հիման վրա ստացված արդյունքները՝ ակներև է դառնում, որ հանրային կառավարման արդիականացումը պետք է ներառի երեք հիմնական մակարդակներ՝ պետական, ինստիտուցիոնալ ու հասարակական: Վերջինն էլ պահանջում է հանրային քաղաքականությունների աջակցող կարողությունների զարգացման զուգակցում:

**Հիմնաբառեր՝** պետական կառավարում, հանրային բարեփոխումներ, հանրային քաղաքականություն, հանրային ծառայություն, Հայաստանի Հանրապետության կառավարություն, անցումային կառավարում, պետական կառավարում, Կենտրոնական և Արևելյան Եվրոպայի (ԿԱԵ) երկրներ, Անկախ Պետությունների Համագործակցություն (ԱՊՀ):

## ГОСУДАРСТВЕННОЕ УПРАВЛЕНИЕ В РЕСПУБЛИКЕ АРМЕНИЯ: ПЕРЕОЦЕНКА ТРИДЦАТЬ ЛЕТ СПУСТЯ

**КАТЕРИНА АЛТУНЯН**

*ассистент кафедры государственного управления  
факультета международных отношений  
Ереванского государственного университета,  
кандидат политических наук,  
г. Ереван, Республика Армения*

Цель статьи – указать на приоритетные вопросы модернизации системы государственного управления в Республике Армения. Под переоценкой понимается периодическая переоценка прогресса положений теории государственного управления, растущего значения и роли государственного управления в современном армянском государстве. Данное исследование посвящено основным проблемам ускоренного развития стран с переходной экономикой с учетом их особого статуса государственного управления. Кроме того, в статье рассматривается новая парадигма государственного управления с целью внесения целевых предложений по дальнейшему совершенствованию всей системы.

Исследование проводилось на основе теоретических положений общественного управления с применением сравнительного метода классической и новой концепций государственного управления. Теоретические положения доказывают, что с точки зрения политологии изучение государственного управления - это анализ деятельности правительства, что означает изучение воздействия государственной политики и ее действий на государство и общество. В статье сформулирован краткий круг концептуальных вопросов по определению реформ общественного управления в Армении и дано общее сравнение с блоком стран Центральной и Восточной Европы.

Обобщая результаты, полученные на основе данного исследования, мы приходим в выводу о том, что модернизация государственного управления должна осуществляться на трех основных уровнях: государственном, институциональном и социальном.

Ключевым моментом в этом процессе является развитие потенциала для поддержки политики.

**Ключевые слова:** *государственное управление, государственные реформы, государственная политика, государственная служба, правительство Республики Армения, переходный период, государственное управление, страны Центральной и Восточной Европы (ЦВЕ), Содружество Независимых Государств (СНГ).*