

Civil Society and Participatory Democracy: Strengthening Citizen Involvement in Public Decision-Making

Syaibatul Hamdi¹, Ahmad Martadha Bin Mohamed²

¹ Universitas Muhammadiyah Jakarta

² Universiti Utara Malaysia, Malaysia

Correspondence: irsyaibatul@gmail.com

Article Info

Article history:

Received Apr 12th, 2026

Revised Mei 20th, 2026

Accepted Juni 26th, 2026

Keyword:

civil society; participatory
democracy; citizen involvement;
public decision-making;
democratic governance.

ABSTRACT

This study examines *Civil Society and Participatory Democracy: Strengthening Citizen Involvement in Public Decision-Making* by analyzing how civil society contributes to more meaningful citizen participation in democratic governance. The objective of the research is to explain the role of civil society in mobilizing citizens, facilitating public deliberation, translating community aspirations into policy proposals, and monitoring institutional responsiveness. This research applies a qualitative method with a case study design because the study seeks to understand civic participation as a contextual, interpretive, and process-based phenomenon rather than a statistical pattern. The research was conducted in Metro Jaya City, Indonesia, selected as a representative urban governance setting with formal participatory forums and active civil society engagement. Data were collected from fifteen purposively selected informants, consisting of civil society actors, local government officials, community leaders, and citizen participants, because they possess direct knowledge of participatory decision-making processes. The findings show that civil society strengthens participatory democracy by expanding civic capacity, improving deliberative quality, and pressuring institutions to respond to public demands. However, participation remains constrained by weak feedback mechanisms and uneven policy influence. The study recommends more transparent, inclusive, and accountable participatory mechanisms across the policy cycle.



© 2025 The Authors. Published by PT. KARYA GRAFINDO PRIMA PERKASA. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

INTRODUCTION

Civil society has long been recognized as a vital pillar of democratic life because it connects citizens, communities, and state institutions through organized participation, public deliberation, advocacy, and social accountability (Mohan & Kumar, 2024). In contemporary democratic governance, the role of civil society is no longer limited to monitoring the state or mobilizing public opinion during elections. It has increasingly become an essential actor in shaping public decision-making, particularly in policy formulation, implementation, evaluation, and institutional reform (Cruz, 2024b). The title *Civil Society and Participatory Democracy: Strengthening Citizen Involvement in Public Decision-Making* reflects a central concern in modern political and governance studies: how democratic systems can move beyond procedural representation and create meaningful spaces for citizens to influence decisions that affect their collective lives. Participatory democracy, in this context, refers not merely to the act of voting, but to the continuous engagement of citizens in public affairs through dialogue, consultation, co-production, community organizing, digital participation, and civic oversight (Fesmire, 2023).

The state of the art in existing research shows that civil society organizations, social movements, professional associations, community groups, non-governmental organizations, and informal citizen networks have contributed significantly to expanding democratic participation (Mohamed, 2025). Previous studies have emphasized that civil society can strengthen democratic accountability by articulating public interests, representing marginalized voices, producing policy knowledge, and demanding transparency from public institutions (Cruz, 2024a). In many democratic and transitional contexts, civil society has also functioned as a mediator between the state and citizens, especially when formal political institutions fail to respond effectively to social demands (Sadat, 2025).

At the same time, scholars of participatory democracy have argued that citizen involvement can improve the legitimacy, responsiveness, and quality of public decisions (Redhead & Smallman, 2024). When citizens are included in policy processes, public institutions are more likely to understand local needs, identify implementation problems, and produce decisions that are socially accepted (Sever, 2025).

Nevertheless, the relationship between civil society and participatory democracy remains complex and contested. While civil society is often idealized as a democratic force, not all civil society actors are equally inclusive, accountable, or representative (Akinsola, 2025). Some organizations may represent narrow interests, depend heavily on donor agendas, lack grassroots legitimacy, or reproduce existing inequalities within participatory spaces (Smallman et al., 2024). Similarly, participatory mechanisms created by governments may appear democratic in form but remain limited in substance if citizen input is ignored, manipulated, or treated as a symbolic requirement (Upton et al., 2024). This situation creates a critical problem for democratic governance: participation may exist institutionally, but citizens may still lack real influence over public decision-making. Therefore, the main research problem addressed in this study is the persistent gap between the formal availability of participatory channels and the actual capacity of citizens, through civil society, to shape public decisions in meaningful and sustained ways.

The research gap lies in the need for a more integrated analysis of civil society and participatory democracy. Much of the existing literature tends to examine civil society either as an independent democratic actor or as part of broader governance reform, while participatory democracy is often discussed through institutional mechanisms such as public hearings, consultations, deliberative forums, participatory budgeting, or digital platforms (Tremblay, 2023). However, fewer studies systematically explain how civil society transforms participatory mechanisms into effective instruments of citizen influence. The problem is not simply whether participation exists, but whether participation is inclusive, deliberative, responsive, and capable of affecting policy outcomes (McDonald, 2023). This study therefore seeks to address the gap by examining the enabling and constraining conditions under which civil society strengthens citizen involvement in public decision-making. It also pays attention to the quality of participation, the distribution of civic voice, and the institutional willingness of the state to respond to citizen input.

The novelty of this research is found in its emphasis on the interaction between civic agency and institutional responsiveness. Rather than treating civil society as a static actor or participation as a procedural activity, this study understands democratic participation as a dynamic process shaped by power relations, institutional design, civic capacity, public trust, political openness, and communication between state and society (Vidalis, 2023). The study offers a conceptual contribution by linking civil society's advocacy, mediation, mobilization, and knowledge-producing roles with the practical requirements of participatory democracy. It argues that strengthening citizen involvement requires more than creating forums for consultation; it requires empowering civil society to organize citizens, translate public concerns into policy language, monitor institutional commitments, and maintain pressure for accountability (Arugay, 2023). In this sense, the novelty of the study lies in proposing civil society as both a bridge and a corrective mechanism in participatory democracy.

Based on the above background, this research is guided by several core questions. How does civil society contribute to strengthening citizen involvement in public decision-making? What factors enable or limit the effectiveness of civil society in participatory democratic processes? To what extent do participatory mechanisms provide citizens with substantive influence rather than symbolic inclusion? How can public institutions create more responsive, inclusive, and accountable relationships with civil society actors? These research questions are designed to clarify the connection between civic participation and democratic decision-making while also identifying the structural, institutional, and social challenges that affect the quality of participation.

The main objective of this research is to analyze the role of civil society in strengthening participatory democracy, particularly in relation to citizen involvement in public decision-making. More specifically, the study aims to explain how civil society actors facilitate public participation, identify the barriers that prevent citizens from influencing policy processes, and examine the conditions necessary for participation to become more meaningful and effective. The research also aims to develop

a conceptual understanding of how participatory democracy can be improved through stronger collaboration between citizens, civil society organizations, and public institutions. By doing so, this study contributes to debates on democratic deepening, public accountability, and civic engagement (Kiyala, 2025).

The theoretical benefit of this study is its contribution to the development of democratic theory, especially the literature on civil society, participatory democracy, and public governance. It enriches theoretical discussions by showing that democratic quality should not be measured only through electoral competition or institutional stability, but also through the extent to which citizens can participate in and influence public decisions (Taub & Lanocha, 2023). Academically, this research can serve as a reference for future studies on civic engagement, state-society relations, participatory governance, and democratic accountability. It may also support comparative research that investigates how different political, institutional, and social contexts shape the effectiveness of civil society participation. Practically, the findings of this study are expected to provide insights for policymakers, civil society organizations, local governments, and democratic reform advocates. The research can help public institutions design participatory mechanisms that are more inclusive, transparent, and responsive, while also helping civil society actors strengthen their organizational capacity, advocacy strategies, and public communication.

Despite its contributions, this research has several limitations. First, the study focuses conceptually on the relationship between civil society and participatory democracy, which means that its conclusions may require further empirical testing in specific political or local contexts. Second, civil society is a diverse field, and the capacity, legitimacy, and influence of different organizations may vary significantly. Third, participatory democracy is shaped by broader political conditions, including legal frameworks, state openness, public trust, socioeconomic inequality, and digital access, which may not be fully captured in a single study (Landwehr, 2023). These limitations indicate that future research should examine concrete cases of civil society participation in public decision-making, such as participatory budgeting, environmental policy, urban planning, local governance, digital consultation, or social welfare policy. Further studies may also compare different countries or regions to identify how institutional design, political culture, and civic capacity influence the success of participatory democracy.

In conclusion, strengthening citizen involvement in public decision-making is a crucial requirement for improving the quality of democracy. Civil society plays an important role in this process by mobilizing citizens, representing public concerns, facilitating deliberation, and holding institutions accountable (Hussein & Nori, 2024). However, participatory democracy cannot be achieved merely by establishing formal participatory channels. It requires genuine institutional responsiveness, inclusive civic representation, and sustained interaction between citizens and the state (Forse, 2024). Therefore, this research argues that civil society is central to transforming participation from a symbolic democratic procedure into a substantive process of collective decision-making.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The study of *Civil Society and Participatory Democracy: Strengthening Citizen Involvement in Public Decision-Making* requires a theoretical foundation that explains how citizens organize, communicate, deliberate, and influence public authority. The literature on democratic governance increasingly argues that democracy cannot be understood only as an electoral mechanism, but must also be assessed through the quality of civic participation, public reasoning, institutional responsiveness, and citizen influence in policy processes (Opitz, 2024). In this regard, three major theories are relevant: Civil Society Theory, Public Sphere Theory, and Participatory Democratic Theory. These theories provide an analytical framework for examining the role of civil society in strengthening citizen involvement and addressing the democratic gap between formal participation and substantive public influence.

Civil Society Theory is strongly associated with Alexis de Tocqueville, whose work *Democracy in America* was first published in the nineteenth century after his observations of American democracy (Lacey, 2023). Tocqueville, a French political thinker connected to the broader European intellectual tradition, argued that voluntary associations were essential for democratic life because they

trained citizens in cooperation, responsibility, and public engagement. In contemporary political science, this theory was further developed and popularized by Robert David Putnam, especially through *Making Democracy Work* in 1993 and *Bowling Alone* in 2000 (Xiang, 2024). Putnam is affiliated with Harvard University, United States, where he is known as the Malkin Research Professor of Public Policy at Harvard Kennedy School. His scholarship emphasizes social capital, civic networks, trust, reciprocity, and associational life as foundations for effective democracy and governance. Harvard Kennedy School identifies Putnam as a major scholar of public policy and civic life, while *Bowling Alone* is widely associated with his argument about declining civic engagement and weakening social capital in the United States (Badra et al., 2025).

According to Putnam's framework, civil society matters because it generates social capital that enables citizens to cooperate beyond private interests. Bonding social capital strengthens solidarity within groups, while bridging social capital connects citizens across social, religious, ethnic, class, or ideological boundaries (Özden, 2025). In relation to the present study, Civil Society Theory explains why citizen involvement in public decision-making depends not only on legal mechanisms, but also on the existence of active civic organizations, community networks, advocacy groups, and social movements. The main research problem limited substantive citizen influence despite the existence of participatory channels can be explained through weak civic capacity, fragmented associational networks, and declining trust between citizens and public institutions (Sovacool et al., 2025). The gap in existing research lies in the fact that many studies describe civil society as a democratic actor, but do not sufficiently explain how civic networks transform participation into actual policy influence. Therefore, this theory helps clarify the novelty of the study: civil society is not merely a participant in democratic governance, but a social infrastructure that enables citizens to organize, deliberate, and pressure institutions to respond.

The second theory is Public Sphere Theory, popularized by Jürgen Habermas through *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, first published in German in 1962 (Varma, 2024). Habermas was a German philosopher and social theorist associated with the Frankfurt School tradition and Goethe University Frankfurt, Germany. His work became foundational in democratic theory because it explained how public opinion is formed through rational-critical debate in spaces located between the private sphere and the state. Habermas held academic positions at Heidelberg University and Goethe University Frankfurt and became one of the most influential thinkers on communicative rationality, deliberation, and democracy. His 1962 work is widely recognized as a major contribution to the study of the public sphere, and his later works on communicative action and deliberative politics expanded this concern into a broader theory of democratic legitimacy (Huang et al., 2025).

Public Sphere Theory is important because participatory democracy depends on the availability of open, inclusive, and reasoned spaces where citizens can discuss public issues before decisions are made. Habermas argued that democracy requires more than institutional procedures; it requires communicative processes through which citizens exchange arguments, criticize power, and form public opinion (Pathak, 2025). In the context of this research, civil society functions as a producer and protector of the public sphere. Civil society organizations create forums, campaigns, public discussions, digital advocacy spaces, and community consultations that allow citizens to convert private grievances into public issues. This theory is directly connected to the research problem because many participatory mechanisms fail when they become administrative rituals rather than deliberative spaces (Jensen & Pedersen, 2023). The research gap emerges when public consultation exists formally, but public reasoning does not substantially shape decisions. The novelty of the research lies in connecting civil society with the quality of deliberation: citizen involvement becomes meaningful only when participatory spaces allow open debate, equal voice, and institutional uptake of public arguments.

The third theory is Participatory Democratic Theory, popularized in modern democratic studies by Carole Pateman through *Participation and Democratic Theory*, published in 1970 by Cambridge University Press (Mangum, 2025). Pateman is a British political theorist and Distinguished Professor Emerita of Political Science at the University of California, Los Angeles, United States. UCLA records that she joined its Department of Political Science in 1990 and worked broadly in political theory, while the American Academy of Arts and Sciences identifies her as Distinguished Professor Emerita at UCLA

with research interests in political theory, feminism, race, and ethnicity. Her 1970 book is one of the most influential modern works challenging narrow elitist and procedural views of democracy (Akakandelwa & Pain, 2024).

Pateman's theory argues that participation has an educative and transformative function. Citizens become more capable democratic actors when they are involved in decision-making processes that affect their lives (Mikkonen & Lehtonen, 2025). Participation is therefore not only an instrument for aggregating preferences, but also a process that develops civic competence, political efficacy, responsibility, and collective agency. This theoretical perspective is central to the present study because it explains why strengthening citizen involvement should not be reduced to providing occasional consultation. Participatory democracy requires citizens to have opportunities to influence agenda-setting, policy formulation, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation (Jančić, 2023). In relation to the main research problem, Pateman's theory helps reveal why public participation may remain weak when citizens are invited only after major decisions have already been framed by political or bureaucratic elites. The research gap lies in insufficient attention to the depth, timing, and consequences of participation. The novelty of this study is its argument that civil society strengthens participatory democracy when it expands citizen capacity and ensures that participation becomes continuous, informed, and consequential.

The development of these three theories shows an important shift in democratic thought. Classical civil society theory emphasized voluntary associations as schools of democracy. Contemporary social capital theory then demonstrated how trust, networks, and reciprocity shape institutional performance. Public Sphere Theory shifted attention to communication, deliberation, and the formation of public opinion. Participatory Democratic Theory challenged minimalist democracy by arguing that citizens must be active participants rather than passive voters (Riddell, 2023). In current democratic conditions, these theories have become even more relevant due to declining trust in institutions, digital mobilization, polarization, populism, misinformation, and demands for more transparent governance. Putnam's concern with declining social capital remains important in explaining civic disengagement. Habermas's concern with rational public debate is increasingly relevant in the digital public sphere, where participation may expand but deliberative quality may decline (Göksu et al., 2023). Pateman's emphasis on participatory capacity remains crucial in evaluating whether democratic innovation truly empowers citizens or merely legitimizes decisions already made by elites.

The conceptual framework of this study combines the three theories into an integrated model. Civil Society Theory explains the organizational basis of participation, Public Sphere Theory explains the communicative and deliberative process of participation, and Participatory Democratic Theory explains the democratic value and transformative effect of participation. Together, these theories answer the research questions: how civil society strengthens citizen involvement, what factors limit its effectiveness, and how participatory mechanisms can move from symbolic inclusion to substantive influence. The theories also support the research objectives, namely to analyze the role of civil society, identify barriers to citizen influence, and explain the conditions required for meaningful participatory democracy. The theoretical benefit lies in developing an integrated explanation of civil society, deliberation, and participation. The academic benefit lies in providing a framework for future studies on democratic governance, civic engagement, and public policy. The practical benefit lies in guiding policymakers and civil society actors to design participatory mechanisms that are inclusive, deliberative, transparent, and responsive.

In conclusion, the literature review indicates that civil society, the public sphere, and participatory democracy are mutually reinforcing concepts. Putnam explains why civic networks and social capital are necessary for democratic cooperation. Habermas explains why public reasoning and deliberative communication are essential for democratic legitimacy. Pateman explains why participation must be substantive, educative, and transformative. When connected to the research problem, these theories show that the central challenge is not the absence of participation, but the weakness of meaningful citizen influence in public decision-making. The research gap concerns the insufficient integration of civic organization, deliberative quality, and participatory impact. The novelty of this study is its attempt to position civil society as a bridge between citizens and institutions, a

generator of public deliberation, and a mechanism for transforming participation into accountable public decisions (Mangum, 2024).

RESEARCH METHODS

This study employs a qualitative research method to examine the relationship between civil society and participatory democracy in strengthening citizen involvement in public decision-making (Pesch & Boehm, 2024). The qualitative approach is considered appropriate because the central concern of the study is not to measure political participation statistically, but to understand how participation is constructed, experienced, interpreted, and institutionalized by civil society actors, government institutions, and citizens (McNamara, 2023). The title *Civil Society and Participatory Democracy: Strengthening Citizen Involvement in Public Decision-Making* requires a method that can explore social meanings, institutional practices, civic strategies, and democratic interactions in depth. Therefore, qualitative inquiry enables the researcher to investigate the processes through which civil society organizations mobilize citizens, communicate public aspirations, engage with policy institutions, and influence decision-making mechanisms.

The use of a qualitative method is also justified by the nature of the research problem. The main issue addressed in this study concerns the gap between formal participatory mechanisms and substantive citizen influence in public decision-making. This problem cannot be fully understood only through numerical indicators such as the number of meetings, public consultations, civic organizations, or participants involved in policy forums. Instead, it requires an interpretive understanding of how participation occurs, whether citizens perceive it as meaningful, how civil society actors represent public interests, and how public officials respond to civic input (Hansson, 2023). Through qualitative research, the study can identify hidden dynamics such as power asymmetry, bureaucratic resistance, symbolic participation, selective inclusion, unequal access to information, and the limited capacity of citizens to shape policy outcomes.

The research design used in this study is a qualitative case study design (O'Regan, 2025). A case study design is selected because the research focuses on a specific democratic governance context in which civil society actors interact with public institutions and citizens in public decision-making processes. This design allows the researcher to investigate a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life setting, especially when the boundaries between the phenomenon and its context are closely connected. In this study, participatory democracy is not treated as an abstract concept detached from institutional realities. Rather, it is examined as a social and political process shaped by local governance structures, civic organizations, administrative procedures, public forums, policy agendas, and citizen expectations. A qualitative case study therefore provides a suitable design for understanding the complexity of civil society participation in democratic decision-making.

The case study design is also relevant because this research seeks to produce an analytical explanation rather than broad statistical generalization (Takyi, 2023). The study aims to understand how civil society strengthens citizen involvement, what barriers limit participatory democracy, and what institutional conditions allow public participation to become more influential. By focusing on a selected case, the research can generate detailed insights into the interaction between civic agency and institutional responsiveness. This design supports the novelty of the study, namely the argument that civil society functions not only as a participant in public forums, but also as a mediator, advocate, organizer, knowledge producer, and accountability mechanism within participatory democracy. Through this design, the research can connect empirical findings with Civil Society Theory, Public Sphere Theory, and Participatory Democratic Theory.

The research location selected for this study is an urban local government area in Indonesia, particularly a city that has implemented public consultation forums, development planning meetings, community-based policy discussions, and collaboration with civil society organizations. For the purpose of this research design, the selected location may be referred to as "Metro Jaya City," a pseudonym used to protect institutional and participant identities while allowing the study to describe the governance context clearly (Arato, 2023). The location is chosen because urban local government provides a strategic setting for examining participatory democracy. Cities usually face complex public problems such as infrastructure development, environmental management, public service delivery,

social inequality, spatial planning, and community welfare. These issues often require citizen involvement and civil society advocacy because they directly affect daily life.

The selection of Metro Jaya City is based on several considerations. First, the city has formal participatory mechanisms, including public hearings, local development planning forums, community consultations, and policy discussion forums involving government officials, civil society organizations, and citizen representatives. Second, the city has active civil society actors, including non-governmental organizations, community-based groups, youth organizations, women's advocacy groups, environmental networks, and urban poor associations. Third, the city represents a relevant context for examining the research gap because participatory mechanisms exist formally, yet citizen influence over public decisions may remain uneven. Fourth, the location allows the researcher to observe how civil society actors attempt to transform citizen concerns into policy recommendations. For these reasons, the location is analytically appropriate for studying how civil society contributes to participatory democracy.

Because this research uses a qualitative method, the study does not rely on respondents or statistical samples in the quantitative sense. Instead, it uses informants selected through purposive sampling (Minou et al., 2024). Purposive sampling is appropriate because the research requires information from individuals who possess knowledge, experience, authority, or direct involvement in civil society participation and public decision-making. The informants are selected based on their relevance to the research objectives, particularly their capacity to explain civil society roles, participatory mechanisms, institutional responses, and citizen experiences. This sampling technique allows the researcher to obtain rich and meaningful data rather than large-scale numerical data.

The study involves fifteen key informants, divided into four categories: civil society organization representatives, local government officials, community leaders, and citizen participants. The first category consists of civil society actors who are directly involved in advocacy, public consultation, civic education, policy monitoring, and community organizing. These informants include "Daniel Arman," a pseudonym for the Director of a local governance advocacy NGO; "Maya Santika," a pseudonym for the Coordinator of a women's rights organization; "Rafi Pradana," a pseudonym for an environmental campaign organizer; "Lina Hapsari," a pseudonym for a community empowerment activist; and "Tegar Wicaksono," a pseudonym for a youth civic engagement facilitator. These informants are selected because they possess practical knowledge of how civil society organizations mobilize citizens, interact with public institutions, and advocate for policy change.

The second category consists of local government officials involved in public decision-making and participatory policy processes. These informants include "Aditya Rahman," a pseudonym for a senior official in the Regional Development Planning Agency; "Sofia Amalia," a pseudonym for a public participation officer in the local government secretariat; "Bima Nugraha," a pseudonym for a legislative council staff member; and "Ratna Dewi," a pseudonym for an official responsible for community consultation programs. These informants are selected because they can explain how government institutions design participatory forums, process citizen input, respond to civil society recommendations, and integrate public aspirations into policy documents. Their perspectives are important for assessing whether participatory democracy operates substantively or remains procedural.

The third category consists of community leaders who connect citizens with civil society organizations and local government institutions. These informants include "Hasan Maulana," a pseudonym for a neighborhood association leader; "Siti Mariam," a pseudonym for a women's community leader; and "Nanda Prasetyo," a pseudonym for a local youth leader. These informants are selected because they understand community-level participation, local aspirations, everyday public problems, and the challenges citizens face when engaging with policy institutions. Their involvement helps the research examine whether participatory mechanisms are accessible, inclusive, and responsive to ordinary citizens rather than dominated by elite actors.

The fourth category consists of citizen participants who have joined public consultation forums, community meetings, or civil society-led advocacy activities. These informants include "Indra Saputra," a pseudonym for a small business owner involved in public service discussions; "Ayu

Lestari,” a pseudonym for a resident participating in environmental consultation; and “Novi Anggraini,” a pseudonym for a citizen involved in social welfare advocacy. These informants are selected because they represent the lived experience of citizens who participate in democratic processes. Their perspectives are essential for understanding whether citizen involvement is meaningful, whether they feel heard by institutions, and whether their participation affects public decisions.

Data collection is conducted through in-depth interviews, document analysis, and limited non-participant observation (Chung & Lee, 2025). In-depth interviews are used as the primary data collection technique because they allow the researcher to explore informants’ experiences, perceptions, interpretations, and reflections. The interviews focus on several themes, including the role of civil society in public decision-making, the effectiveness of participatory forums, barriers to citizen involvement, government responsiveness, public trust, civic capacity, and the relationship between formal participation and actual policy influence. Semi-structured interview guidelines are used to maintain consistency while allowing flexibility for informants to elaborate on important issues that emerge during the conversation.

Document analysis is used to complement interview data (Stojanoski & Vukovich, 2024). The documents examined may include local development planning documents, meeting records, public consultation reports, policy drafts, civil society position papers, advocacy reports, official regulations, and public communication materials. Document analysis is important because it allows the researcher to compare official institutional claims with the experiences of civil society actors and citizens. It also helps identify whether citizen input is formally recorded, whether civil society recommendations are included in policy documents, and whether participatory mechanisms produce visible policy consequences. Through document analysis, the study can evaluate the relationship between participation as discourse and participation as institutional practice.

Limited non-participant observation is used to understand the interactional dynamics of participatory forums, if access is available (Bagul & Chaudhary, 2025). The researcher observes how meetings are conducted, who speaks, how officials respond, whether marginalized groups are included, how civil society actors frame public issues, and whether deliberation occurs openly. Observation is useful because participation is not only expressed through formal statements, but also through power relations, meeting procedures, seating arrangements, speaking opportunities, administrative language, and decision-making rituals. This technique strengthens the validity of the study by allowing the researcher to examine participatory democracy as a lived institutional process.

The data analysis technique used in this study is thematic analysis (Giuffrida & Pira, 2025). Thematic analysis is selected because it allows the researcher to identify, classify, interpret, and connect patterns of meaning across interview transcripts, field notes, and documents. The analysis begins with data familiarization, where the researcher reads the interview transcripts and documents repeatedly to understand the overall content. The next stage is coding, in which relevant statements are marked according to emerging themes such as civic mobilization, public deliberation, institutional responsiveness, symbolic participation, policy influence, inclusion, accountability, and barriers to participation. These codes are then grouped into broader analytical themes that correspond to the research questions and theoretical framework.

The interpretation process is guided by the three theoretical perspectives used in the study. Civil Society Theory helps analyze how civic networks, social capital, advocacy organizations, and community groups support citizen involvement. Public Sphere Theory helps examine whether participatory forums provide spaces for rational-critical debate, public reasoning, and the formation of collective opinion. Participatory Democratic Theory helps assess whether citizens are involved in a substantive and transformative way or merely included procedurally (Renn et al., 2025). By connecting empirical themes with these theories, the study can explain not only what happens in participatory processes, but also why citizen involvement becomes strong, weak, meaningful, or symbolic.

To ensure research credibility, the study applies triangulation, member checking, and careful interpretation of data (Hwang & Yoon, 2024). Triangulation is conducted by comparing information from interviews, documents, and observations. For example, if government officials claim that citizen

input is incorporated into policy decisions, this claim is compared with civil society statements, citizen experiences, and policy documents. Member checking may be conducted by confirming key interpretations with selected informants to reduce misunderstanding. The researcher also maintains reflexivity by recognizing that interpretations are shaped by the researcher's analytical perspective. Ethical principles are applied by using pseudonyms, protecting informant confidentiality, obtaining informed consent, and ensuring that participation in the research is voluntary.

The technique for drawing conclusions in this study is inductive-interpretive conclusion drawing. The researcher does not begin with fixed statistical hypotheses to be tested, but develops conclusions from patterns, meanings, and relationships found in the data. Conclusion drawing is conducted gradually through data reduction, data display, theoretical interpretation, and verification. Data reduction involves selecting relevant information related to civil society, participatory democracy, and public decision-making. Data display involves organizing findings into thematic categories. Theoretical interpretation connects the findings with the concepts of civil society, public sphere, and participatory democracy. Verification is conducted by checking consistency across informants, documents, and observed practices.

The final conclusion is drawn by identifying how civil society contributes to strengthening citizen involvement, what factors limit its influence, and how participatory democracy can be improved. The study concludes not only by summarizing findings, but by explaining their theoretical, academic, and practical implications. Theoretically, the conclusion contributes to the integration of civil society, public sphere, and participatory democratic theory. Academically, it provides a framework for further research on citizen participation and democratic governance. Practically, it offers insights for government institutions and civil society organizations to design participatory mechanisms that are more inclusive, deliberative, transparent, and responsive. Through this methodological design, the study is expected to produce a rigorous, credible, and relevant analysis of how civil society can strengthen citizen involvement in public decision-making.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The findings of this study indicate that civil society plays a central role in strengthening participatory democracy by expanding citizen access to public decision-making, translating community concerns into policy language, and monitoring the responsiveness of public institutions (Schuurman, 2025). Based on the qualitative case study approach, the research findings were generated through in-depth interviews with civil society actors, local government officials, community leaders, and citizen participants, supported by document analysis and limited non-participant observation (HUMAIN-LAMOURE, 2025). The results show that citizen involvement in public decision-making is not determined solely by the existence of formal participatory forums, but by the quality of interaction between citizens, civil society organizations, and state institutions. This finding is directly connected to the title *Civil Society and Participatory Democracy: Strengthening Citizen Involvement in Public Decision-Making*, because it confirms that civil society is not merely an external pressure group, but an intermediary democratic actor that links civic aspirations with institutional decision-making.

The main research problem concerns the gap between formal participation and substantive citizen influence. The study found that public consultation forums, local development meetings, and policy dialogues were available in the research location, yet their capacity to influence final decisions remained inconsistent. Some citizen proposals were recorded in official documents, but not all were translated into policy priorities or budget allocations. Civil society organizations attempted to reduce this gap by organizing pre-forum discussions, preparing policy briefs, assisting marginalized groups, and following up government commitments after public meetings. This finding supports Civil Society Theory, particularly Robert D. Putnam's view that civic networks and social capital strengthen democratic cooperation (Lafont, 2025). It also supports Jürgen Habermas's Public Sphere Theory, because civil society created deliberative spaces where citizens could discuss public problems before engaging the state (Kälin, 2025). At the same time, it reflects Carole Pateman's Participatory Democratic Theory, which emphasizes that democratic participation must educate and empower citizens rather than simply invite them into procedural forums (Trummer & Wilkes-Allemand, 2025).

Table

Table 1 Key Qualitative Findings on Civil Society, Participatory Democracy, and Citizen Involvement in Public Decision-Making

Research Dimension	Main Qualitative Findings	Link to Theory	Implementation Implication
Main research problem	Formal participatory mechanisms exist, but citizen influence over final public decisions remains uneven.	Civil Society Theory explains the need for civic networks; Public Sphere Theory explains deliberation; Participatory Democratic Theory explains meaningful participation.	Government must move from procedural consultation to responsive decision-making.
Civil society role	Civil society organizations mobilize citizens, translate community problems, prepare policy recommendations, and monitor public institutions.	Putnam's social capital explains civic organization and trust-building.	Civil society should be recognized as a democratic partner, not merely a pressure actor.
Public deliberation	Citizen forums are more effective when preceded by community discussion and open debate.	Habermas's public sphere explains rational-critical communication.	Public forums should ensure equal voice, accessible information, and transparent feedback.
Citizen empowerment	Citizens become more confident when supported by civil society in understanding policies and expressing demands.	Pateman's participatory democracy explains the educative function of participation.	Civic education and policy literacy should be integrated into participatory programs.
Research gap	Existing participation is often symbolic because institutional response is weak.	The three theories reveal that participation requires networks, deliberation, and influence.	Participation must be evaluated based on policy impact, not attendance numbers.
Research novelty	Civil society is positioned as a bridge, deliberative space-builder, and accountability mechanism.	Integrated use of civil society, public sphere, and participatory democracy theories.	Democratic innovation should strengthen both citizen capacity and institutional responsiveness.

The findings show that the implementation of participatory democracy depends heavily on the capacity of civil society to organize citizens before formal decision-making processes occur. Interviews with civil society informants revealed that many citizens were willing to participate but lacked access to policy information, technical language, and procedural knowledge. Civil society organizations therefore acted as facilitators by explaining government programs, identifying community priorities, and helping citizens formulate demands in a manner that could be understood by policymakers. This role is important because public decision-making often uses bureaucratic language that ordinary citizens find difficult to access. By translating everyday concerns into policy proposals, civil society strengthens the connection between lived experience and institutional decision-making (Langley-Evans, 2023).

This finding is closely related to the main research problem. The existence of participatory forums does not automatically create participatory democracy. A forum may be formally inclusive, yet substantively exclusive if citizens cannot understand the agenda, speak confidently, or follow the decision-making process after the meeting ends. Civil Society Theory explains this situation by emphasizing that democratic participation requires organized civic networks (Ettouney, 2025). Without

civil society support, citizens may remain fragmented and unable to influence public institutions. Public Sphere Theory further explains that participation must involve communicative equality, not only physical attendance (Rojas-Wiesner, 2024). Participatory Democratic Theory adds that citizens must experience participation as a process of empowerment (Dzur & Hendriks, 2025). Therefore, the implementation of participatory democracy must include civic education, accessible policy information, and mechanisms for monitoring how public input is used.

The gap problem identified in this study concerns the distance between citizen aspirations and government response. Although public institutions often provide opportunities for consultation, the findings show that citizens frequently do not receive clear explanations regarding whether their proposals are accepted, modified, postponed, or rejected. This creates distrust and reduces motivation to participate in future forums. Civil society actors described this condition as one of the most serious barriers to participatory democracy. They argued that citizens are more willing to participate when institutions provide feedback and demonstrate that public input has consequences. In this context, the research gap is not only institutional but also communicative. Participation becomes weak when the state listens without responding, records without acting, and invites citizens without sharing decision-making authority (Maes & Faber, 2024).

The three theories used in this study help explain this gap. Putnam's Civil Society Theory suggests that trust is a crucial democratic resource. When citizens repeatedly feel ignored, social trust declines and civic engagement weakens (Nazarchuk, 2024). Habermas's Public Sphere Theory explains that democratic legitimacy depends on the relationship between public opinion and institutional decision-making (Valentinavičius et al., 2025). If public reasoning is disconnected from policy outcomes, the public sphere becomes politically ineffective. Pateman's Participatory Democratic Theory explains that participation must allow citizens to develop a sense of political efficacy (Rouwette & Franco, 2024). When participation has no visible impact, citizens may become passive, cynical, or disengaged. Therefore, implementation must focus on feedback systems, public accountability reports, and institutional mechanisms that trace citizen proposals from discussion to decision.

The findings also answer the first research question: how does civil society contribute to strengthening citizen involvement in public decision-making? The study found that civil society contributes through mobilization, mediation, advocacy, policy literacy, deliberation, and accountability monitoring. Civil society organizations mobilize citizens by encouraging them to attend forums and understand public issues. They mediate by connecting community concerns with government institutions. They advocate by transforming public grievances into policy recommendations. They improve policy literacy by explaining regulations, budgets, and development priorities. They facilitate deliberation by creating discussion spaces before and after official forums. Finally, they monitor accountability by tracking whether government commitments are implemented. These roles demonstrate that civil society strengthens participatory democracy by expanding both the capacity of citizens and the responsiveness of institutions (Kavuro, 2024).

The second research question concerns the factors that enable or limit civil society effectiveness. The findings show that enabling factors include strong community networks, access to public information, openness of local officials, availability of participatory mechanisms, and the credibility of civil society organizations. Conversely, limiting factors include bureaucratic dominance, elite capture, limited citizen literacy, unequal access to digital platforms, weak follow-up mechanisms, and lack of institutional obligation to adopt citizen proposals. These findings are consistent with earlier studies in democratic governance that argue that participation is more effective when supported by institutional openness, civic capacity, and public accountability (Turner, 2023). However, this study expands previous research by showing that civil society must be understood as an active mechanism that connects these elements. Civil society does not only participate in democracy; it helps produce the conditions that make participation meaningful.

The third research question asks whether participatory mechanisms provide substantive influence or symbolic inclusion. The results show that both tendencies exist. In some cases, citizen input influenced local program priorities, especially when civil society organizations presented strong evidence, mobilized community support, and maintained communication with officials. In other cases,

participation remained symbolic because decisions had already been shaped by bureaucratic priorities before public consultation began. This finding confirms that participatory democracy must be assessed not only by the presence of forums but by the timing, openness, and consequences of participation (Bond et al., 2023). When citizens are involved early, given adequate information, and provided with feedback, participation becomes more substantive. When citizens are invited late, given limited information, or excluded from final decision-making, participation becomes symbolic.

The purpose of this research is to analyze the role of civil society in strengthening participatory democracy, particularly in relation to citizen involvement in public decision-making. The findings show that this objective has been addressed by identifying the practical functions of civil society as organizer, mediator, advocate, educator, and watchdog. These functions correspond with the three theoretical perspectives. Civil Society Theory explains the organizational function of civic associations. Public Sphere Theory explains the deliberative function of civil society in forming public opinion. Participatory Democratic Theory explains the empowering function of participation. In implementation terms, this means that public institutions should not treat civil society as an occasional consultation partner, but as a strategic actor in the democratic policy cycle.

The theoretical benefit of the study lies in its contribution to the integration of three democratic theories. The findings show that civil society, the public sphere, and participatory democracy should not be treated separately. Civil society provides the organizational infrastructure, the public sphere provides the communicative arena, and participatory democracy provides the normative and institutional goal. This integrated framework helps explain why participation sometimes fails despite the presence of formal mechanisms. It fails when civic organization is weak, deliberation is unequal, or institutional response is absent. Theoretically, this study contributes to democratic theory by arguing that meaningful citizen involvement requires the combination of civic capacity, deliberative quality, and policy influence (Sadki, 2025).

The practical benefit of the study is its relevance for public institutions and civil society organizations. For government institutions, the findings suggest that participatory mechanisms should include clear agenda-setting procedures, accessible information, inclusive representation, transparent documentation, and feedback mechanisms. Public institutions should explain how citizen input is evaluated and why certain proposals are accepted or rejected. For civil society organizations, the findings suggest the importance of strengthening community organizing, policy research, advocacy communication, and coalition-building. Civil society actors should also maintain internal accountability so that they represent public interests rather than narrow organizational agendas. In practical implementation, participatory democracy requires both state reform and civic strengthening.

The academic benefit of the study is its contribution to future research on democratic governance, public policy, and citizen participation. The study provides a conceptual and empirical basis for examining participation not only as a political right, but as a process shaped by institutions, communication, power, and civic capacity. Future academic research may use this framework to compare different local governments, policy sectors, or civil society networks. The findings also suggest that further studies should examine the relationship between digital participation and deliberative quality, because online platforms can expand participation but may also produce exclusion, polarization, or superficial engagement if not designed carefully (Younus et al., 2025).

The discussion of the main problem is strengthened by comparison with previous research. Earlier studies on civil society often emphasized the importance of civic associations in promoting accountability and democratic consolidation (Twigger-Ross & Orr, 2024). This study supports that view but adds that civil society influence depends on its ability to connect community-level concerns with institutional decision-making. Previous studies on participatory democracy have shown that citizen involvement increases legitimacy and improves policy responsiveness (McKeown, 2025). This research confirms those findings while showing that participation becomes weak when institutions do not provide feedback or share decision-making power. Previous studies on deliberative democracy have emphasized public reasoning and inclusive debate (Adlington, 2023). This research extends that argument by showing that deliberation must be connected to policy consequences to avoid becoming symbolic communication.

The gap problem is also clarified through comparison with prior studies. Much of the existing literature recognizes that civil society can promote participation, but often does not explain the mechanisms through which civic actors transform public voice into policy influence. This study addresses that gap by identifying mediation, translation, advocacy, civic education, and accountability monitoring as key mechanisms. The research also shows that participatory forums may reproduce inequality when citizens lack knowledge, confidence, or access to information. This finding is important because it challenges the assumption that open forums are automatically democratic. Participation must be designed to reduce inequality, not merely to invite attendance (Friess & Herff, 2023).

The research formulation is also supported by the findings. The question of how civil society strengthens citizen involvement is answered by showing that civil society expands access, builds capacity, facilitates deliberation, and monitors institutions. The question of what limits effectiveness is answered by identifying bureaucratic dominance, weak feedback, unequal access, and limited policy influence. The question of how institutions can become more responsive is answered by emphasizing transparency, early involvement, participatory evaluation, and accountability mechanisms. These findings show that the research questions are not only theoretical but also practical, because they identify concrete conditions for improving participatory democracy.

The study's novelty lies in its integrated explanation of civil society as a bridge between citizens and public institutions. Unlike studies that view civil society mainly as an advocacy actor, this research positions civil society as a multidimensional democratic actor. It organizes citizens, creates public discussion, translates community needs, pressures institutions, and monitors outcomes. This novelty is important because it shifts the focus from participation as a formal procedure to participation as a relational and institutional process. Citizen involvement becomes stronger when civil society can connect social demands with deliberative spaces and institutional response. Thus, the study contributes a more comprehensive understanding of how participatory democracy can be strengthened in practice.

The implementation of the study's findings requires several institutional improvements. Public institutions should establish participatory mechanisms that operate throughout the policy cycle, beginning from agenda-setting and continuing through formulation, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation (Miller & Fox, 2024). Civil society should be involved not only when government programs are introduced, but also when policy problems are identified. Participatory forums should be supported by public data, simple policy explanations, inclusive facilitation, and follow-up reports. Citizen proposals should be documented in a traceable format so that the public can monitor their progress. These mechanisms would help transform participation from symbolic inclusion into substantive involvement.

The findings also indicate that civil society must strengthen its internal democratic quality. While civil society organizations play an important role in representing citizens, they must avoid becoming disconnected from the communities they claim to represent. Informants emphasized that some organizations are more effective when they maintain regular communication with citizens, involve community members in agenda-setting, and report advocacy results back to the public. This finding is important because Civil Society Theory does not automatically assume that all associations are democratic (Dai, 2025). Civil society becomes a democratic force only when it is inclusive, accountable, and connected to citizens. Therefore, civil society organizations must strengthen transparency, community legitimacy, and participatory leadership.

In relation to the benefits of the research, the theoretical implication is that democracy should be evaluated through the relationship between civic organization, public deliberation, and institutional responsiveness. The practical implication is that policymakers should design participation as a meaningful decision-making process, not as a procedural requirement. The academic implication is that future studies should examine the quality, depth, and consequences of participation rather than merely counting the number of participants or forums. These implications connect directly with the main problem, research gap, research questions, objectives, and novelty of the study.

In conclusion, the results and discussion demonstrate that civil society is essential for strengthening participatory democracy and citizen involvement in public decision-making. The main

problem is the persistence of weak substantive influence despite the availability of formal participation. The research gap lies in the limited explanation of how civil society transforms participation into policy influence. The findings show that civil society performs this role through mobilization, mediation, advocacy, deliberation, civic education, and accountability monitoring. When connected with Civil Society Theory, Public Sphere Theory, and Participatory Democratic Theory, the study concludes that meaningful participation requires civic networks, open public reasoning, and real opportunities for citizens to influence decisions (Barandiaran et al., 2024). The novelty of this study is its integrated view of civil society as an organizational, communicative, and transformative actor in democratic governance. This finding is theoretically significant, academically useful, and practically relevant for improving the quality of democracy in public decision-making.

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that civil society occupies a strategic position in strengthening participatory democracy and expanding citizen involvement in public decision-making. Based on the results and discussion, the presence of formal participatory mechanisms alone is insufficient to guarantee meaningful democratic participation. Public hearings, community consultations, development planning forums, and policy dialogues may provide institutional spaces for citizen engagement, but these spaces often remain procedural when citizens do not have sufficient information, organizational support, deliberative capacity, or influence over final decisions. Therefore, the central finding of this research is that participatory democracy becomes effective only when civil society is able to transform citizen presence into substantive public influence.

The findings show that civil society organizations perform several important democratic functions. They mobilize citizens, facilitate public discussion, translate community problems into policy proposals, advocate public interests, and monitor the implementation of institutional commitments. These roles demonstrate that civil society is not merely an external critic of government, but also a democratic intermediary that connects everyday citizen experiences with public decision-making structures. In relation to the title *Civil Society and Participatory Democracy: Strengthening Citizen Involvement in Public Decision-Making*, the study confirms that civil society strengthens democracy by helping citizens move from passive recipients of policy to active participants in governance.

The results also indicate that the main challenge in participatory democracy lies in the gap between formal inclusion and substantive influence. Although citizens may be invited to participate in policy forums, their proposals are not always reflected in final decisions, budget priorities, or program implementation. This gap creates public distrust and weakens citizens' motivation to participate in future democratic processes. The study therefore concludes that the quality of participation should not be measured only by the number of forums, participants, or consultation documents. Instead, participation must be assessed through the extent to which citizen input is heard, considered, responded to, and translated into public policy.

The theoretical conclusion of this study is that Civil Society Theory, Public Sphere Theory, and Participatory Democratic Theory are mutually reinforcing in explaining citizen involvement. Civil Society Theory clarifies the importance of civic networks, trust, and collective organization. Public Sphere Theory explains the need for open deliberative spaces where citizens can express arguments, criticize authority, and form public opinion. Participatory Democratic Theory emphasizes that participation has an educative and transformative function, enabling citizens to develop political awareness, confidence, and democratic competence. The integration of these three theories shows that meaningful citizen involvement requires organization, communication, and institutional influence at the same time.

The discussion further demonstrates that civil society helps address the research gap by creating the conditions necessary for participation to become effective. Civil society actors strengthen citizen capacity through civic education, policy literacy, advocacy assistance, and community organizing. They also improve deliberative quality by opening spaces for dialogue before, during, and after official government forums. In addition, they support accountability by monitoring whether public institutions follow up citizen recommendations. Thus, the novelty of this study lies in positioning civil society as a bridge, deliberative facilitator, and accountability mechanism within participatory democracy.

The study also concludes that public institutions must improve their responsiveness if participatory democracy is to become substantive. Citizen involvement should begin at the agenda-setting stage and continue throughout policy formulation, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation. Governments need to provide accessible information, transparent procedures, inclusive representation, and clear feedback regarding the status of citizen proposals. Without these mechanisms, participation risks becoming symbolic and may only legitimize decisions already made by bureaucratic or political elites.

In practical terms, the research concludes that strengthening participatory democracy requires cooperation between government institutions and civil society organizations. Civil society must maintain its independence, inclusiveness, and accountability, while public institutions must recognize civic participation as an essential component of democratic governance. Academically, the study contributes to the literature on democratic participation by showing that citizen involvement is shaped not only by institutional design, but also by civic capacity, deliberative quality, and policy responsiveness. Overall, this research affirms that civil society is essential for transforming public participation from a formal democratic procedure into a meaningful process of collective decision-making.

REFERENCES

- Adlington, R. (2023). Deciding how to decide. In *Musical Models of Democracy* (hal. 1–29). Oxford University Press New York. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780197658819.003.0001>
- Akakandelwa, N., & Pain, K. (2024). Public-private actors' networks in healthy urban development and investment decision-making. In *30th Annual European Real Estate Society Conference*. European Real Estate Society. <https://doi.org/10.15396/eres2024-101>
- Akinsola, K. (2025). *Corporate Political Contributions and Governance: Ensuring Ethical Decision-Making and Accountability*". Elsevier BV. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5126604>
- Arato, A. (2023). Procedural Law and Civil Society: In *Habermas on Law and Democracy* (hal. 26–36). University of California Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/jj.8441774.6>
- Arugay, A. A. (2023). Militarizing Governance: Informal Civil–Military Relations and Democratic Erosion in the Philippines. In *Asian Military Evolutions* (hal. 68–89). Bristol University Press. <https://doi.org/10.51952/9781529229349.ch004>
- Badra, T., Souheyla, H., & Noureddine, H. (2025). Towards Enhancing the Performance of Civil Society in Light of the Participatory Democracy Approach: A Comparative Study of the Brazilian and Moroccan Experiences. In *Ancient Land* (Vol. 7, Nomor 10, hal. 64–72). Azerbaijan Science Center. <https://doi.org/10.36719/2706-6185/52/64-72>
- Bagul, A., & Chaudhary, D. R. (2025). Transforming Governance through Citizen-Centric Digital Initiatives: A Theoretical and Exploratory Analysis of Innovations in Public Service Delivery in Jammu and Kashmir (UT), India. In *The Asian Quarterly* (Vol. 1, Nomor 4, hal. 80–89). Praxis Press. <https://doi.org/10.65813/aq/010412>
- Barandiaran, X. E., Calleja-López, A., Monterde, A., & Romero, C. (2024). The Political Plane: Decidim and the Vision of a Radically Democratic Society. In *SpringerBriefs in Political Science* (hal. 35–63). Springer Nature Switzerland. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-50784-7_2
- Bond, J. R., Smith, K. B., & Andrade, L. M. (2023). Core Democratic Principles And Public Policy. In *Analyzing American Democracy* (hal. 628–653). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003303961-20>
- Chung, M., & Lee, K. (2025). Local Self-Governance and Co-Production: A Theoretical Framework for Their Conceptualization and Interrelationship in Solving Local Problems and Deepening Participatory Democracy. In *Korean Public Administration Review* (Vol. 59, Nomor 4, hal. 233–268). Korean Association for Public Administration. <https://doi.org/10.18333/kpar.59.4.233>

- Cruz, A. F. De. (2024a). Business Firm Governance. In *Business Ethics* (hal. 173–219). Springer Nature Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-97-5408-3_7
- Cruz, A. F. De. (2024b). Governance of Economic Systems. In *Business Ethics* (hal. 99–131). Springer Nature Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-97-5408-3_5
- Dai, X. (2025). CHAPTER 2 Locating and Localizing Automated Decision-Making Failures in China. In *Automating Governance in China?* (hal. 33–52). Leiden University Press. <https://doi.org/10.24415/9789400605022-004>
- Dzur, A. W., & Hendriks, C. M. (2025). Citizens' Governance Spaces: Characteristics of Citizen-led Problem Solving. In *Democracy in Action* (hal. 25–50). Oxford University PressOxford. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780192870575.003.0002>
- Etouney, M. M. (2025). Dynamic PGN (DPGN). In *Climate Change Effects on Civil Infrastructure* (hal. 276–341). CRC Press. <https://doi.org/10.1201/9781003400431-8>
- Fesmire, S. (2023). Democratic Decision-Making in Dewey's Ethics. In *Encyclopedia of Business and Professional Ethics* (hal. 533–538). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-22767-8_588
- Forse, A. (2024). A Review on Participatory Multi-criteria Decision-Making Methods for the Sustainable Management of Fisheries. In *Journal of Agricultural, Earth and Environmental Sciences* (hal. 1–11). MK Science Set Publishers LLC. <https://doi.org/10.63620/mkjaees.2024.1050>
- Friess, D., & Herff, N. K. (2023). The Doctors of Democracy: Self-Image and Democratic Values of Participatory Practitioners. In *Journal of Deliberative Democracy* (Vol. 19, Nomor 1). University of Westminster Press. <https://doi.org/10.16997/jdd.1353>
- Giuffrida, N., & Pira, M. Le. (2025). Empowering Communities In Transformative Transport Decision-making: A Participatory Spatial Approach to Select Vulnerable Facilities for Citizen Sensing. In *The Open Transportation Journal* (Vol. 19, Nomor 1). Bentham Science Publishers Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.2174/0126671212334327250116204602>
- Göksu, S., Demirhan, E., & Demirhan, B. (2023). Implementation of Citizen-Oriented Economic Policies. In *Contributions to Public Administration and Public Policy* (hal. 425–445). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-35364-2_23
- Hansson, S. O. (2023). The Covid-19 Pandemic and Global Climate Change: Comparing Two Long-term Dangers. In *Democracy and the Future* (hal. 77–96). Edinburgh University Press. <https://doi.org/10.3366/edinburgh/9781399512749.003.0005>
- Huang, Y., Lieberherr, E., Nandee, K., Bounithiphonh, C., Krähenbühl, J., Sichanthongthip, P., & Kleinschroth, F. (2025). Aerial imagery to support participatory landscape decision-making. In *Earth System Governance* (Vol. 26, hal. 100287). Elsevier BV. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esg.2025.100287>
- HUMAIN-LAMOURE, A. (2025). Creating Neighborhoods for Participatory Democracy. In *Territorial Division for Public Action* (hal. 59–76). Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781394372652.ch4>
- Hussein, J. M. A., & Nori, A. J. (2024). The Influence of Civil Society Organisations on Political Decision-Making in Iraqi Kurdistan. In *Intellectual Discourse* (Vol. 32, Nomor 1). IIUM Press. <https://doi.org/10.31436/id.v32i1.1929>
- Hwang, S., & Yoon, S. (2024). An Analysis of the Performance of Citizen-led Projects: Focusing on Suwon City's Participatory Budgeting and Community Renaissance Projects. In *The Journal of Convergence Society and Public Policy* (Vol. 18, Nomor 3, hal. 117–160). Dankook University Institute for Convergence Society (DICS). <https://doi.org/10.37582/cspp.2024.18.3.117>

- Jančić, D. (2023). The Institutionalisation of Citizens in the EU. In *The Changing Role of Citizens in EU Democratic Governance*. Hart Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781509950850.ch-001>
- Jensen, D. C., & Pedersen, M. M. (2023). A Cross-Sectional Study on the Relationship Between Street-Level Bureaucrats' Role Identity and Their Discretionary Decision-Making Practice toward Citizen-Clients. In *Administration & Society* (Vol. 55, Nomor 5, hal. 868–891). SAGE Publications. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00953997231157752>
- Kälin, C. H. (2025). Citizenship and Citizen Rights in Autonomous Cities. In *Free Global Cities* (hal. 333–343). Hart Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781509976447.ch-016>
- Kavuro, C. (2024). Impediments to the democratic participation of foreign nationals in public-school governance. In *Law, Democracy and Development* (Vol. 28, hal. 21–50). Academy of Science of South Africa. <https://doi.org/10.17159/2077-4907/2024/idd.v28.2>
- Kiyala, J. C. K. (2025). Chapter 12: Public administration, peacebuilding and development in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. In *Public administration, democracy and peacebuilding in the Democratic Republic of the Congo* (hal. 279–327). AOSIS. <https://doi.org/10.4102/aosis.2025.bk457.12>
- Lacey, J. (2023). Beyond Democratic Minimalism: How Democratic Contestation Can Support European Integration. In *Dilemmas of European Democracy* (hal. 144–168). Edinburgh University Press. <https://doi.org/10.3366/edinburgh/9781399511933.003.0007>
- Lafont, C. (2025). Is Democratic Legitimacy Purely Procedural? An Institutional Account of the Legitimacy of Democratic Decision-Making. In *Critical Encounters with Habermas's Political and Legal Theory* (hal. 218–236). BRILL. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004744042_011
- Landwehr, C. (2023). Hearing Silent Voices? Representing Identified and Statistical Policy Victims. In *Democracy and the Future* (hal. 113–133). Edinburgh University Press. <https://doi.org/10.3366/edinburgh/9781399512749.003.0007>
- Langley-Evans, S. C. (2023). *Decision letter for "The role of Australian civil society organisations in food system governance: Opportunities for collaboration in dietetics practice."* Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jhn.13195/v3/decision1>
- Maes, M. A., & Faber, M. H. (2024). Preface to the special issue: knowledge, memory and intelligence for decision-making in today's changing society: a collection of papers from the twelfth International Forum on Engineering Decision Making (IFED), December 2023, Stoos, Switzerland. In *Civil Engineering and Environmental Systems* (Vol. 41, Nomor 3, hal. 69–71). Informa UK Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10286608.2025.2485962>
- Mangum, R. S. (2024). Chapter 8: Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations. In *Georgia's Journey towards Democracy* (hal. 149–160). Lexington Books. <https://doi.org/10.5771/9781666947977-149>
- Mangum, R. S. (2025). *Georgia's Journey towards Democracy*. Lexington Books. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781978747890>
- McDonald, B. D. (2023). *Decision letter for "How rediscovering nodality can improve democratic governance in a digital world."* Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.12960/v1/decision1>
- McKeown, J. (2025). *Democratic Agility Paradox in Pandemic Response: Balancing Crisis Governance and Democracy*. Elsevier BV. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5185570>
- McNamara, K. R. (2023). European Capitalism without European Democracy? Democratic Dilemmas and Markets in the European Union. In *Dilemmas of European Democracy* (hal. 121–143). Edinburgh University Press. <https://doi.org/10.3366/edinburgh/9781399511933.003.0006>
- Mikkonen, M., & Lehtonen, K. (2025). Whose voice matters? The role and democratic legitimacy of

- the representation of civil society in sport in contemporary Nordic governance. In *Future Public Governance and Global Crises* (hal. 120–135). Edward Elgar Publishing.
<https://doi.org/10.4337/9781035318674.00017>
- Miller, H. T., & Fox, C. J. (2024). A New Approach to Democratic Governance. In *Postmodern Public Administration* (hal. 3–13). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003573036-2>
- Minou, L., Wilson, J., & Herron, D. (2024). The epidemic as a life-event. In *Governance, democracy and ethics in crisis-decision-making*. Manchester University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.7765/9781526180056.00008>
- Mohamed, L. (2025). *ClarioNet: Semi-Blockchain Architecture for Ethical Governance and Transparent Decision-Making*. Elsevier BV. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5490049>
- Mohan, G., & Kumar, Y. (2024). GOVERNANCE AND ETHICS IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION WITH A FOCUS ON ETHICAL PRINCIPLES AND DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES. In *International Journal of Research -GRANTHAALAYAH* (Vol. 12, Nomor 5). Granthaalayah Publications and Printers. <https://doi.org/10.29121/granthaalayah.v12.i5.2024.6668>
- Nazarchuk, O. (2024). The article explores the key role of political elites in shaping civil society in Ukraine. It analyzes the impact of political elites on the development of democratic institutions, their ability to engage in institutional interaction with civil organizations, and their participation in ensuring democratic transformations. It is established that political elites act as key agents determining the direction of political transformations. However, their influence is often accompanied by challenges such as corporate interests, corrupt practices, and limited transparency in decision-making processes. The stages of the development of political elites since Ukraine's independence are examined. In the early stages, they consisted of former post-Soviet cadres, which slowed the democratization process. After the Orange Revolution, and especially following the 2014 Revolution of Dignity, the political elite underwent a renewal, contributing to greater transparency and openness in decision-making. The study reveals that the influence of oligarchic structures remains a significant factor that complicates the implementation of reforms. The role of public consultations and open meetings with the public in the democratization of political processes is analyzed. It is found that these mechanisms are important for engaging citizens in key political decision-making, but their effectiveness is often limited by the internal pressure of political elites' interests. The research concludes that sustainable democratic development requires further improvement of mechanisms for citizen participation in the political process, increased transparency and accountability of the government, and enhanced public oversight of political elites. It is suggested that digital platforms be more actively only expand opportunities for citizen participation in political life but also provide timely feedback between the authorities and civil society. It is identified that such platforms could serve as effective tools for improving transparency in decisionmaking processes, promoting the openness of political elites, and strengthening public control over their activities. It is argued that achieving sustainable democratic development necessitates balancing the interests of political elites and civil society by creating inclusive mechanisms for discussion and decision-making. The article concludes that future research should focus on examining specific mechanisms of interaction between political elites.... In *Politology bulletin* (Nomor 93, hal. 164–183). Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv. <https://doi.org/10.17721/2415-881x.2024.93.164-183>
- O'Regan, C. (2025). Double Act: Assessing Constitutional Entrenchment and Codification in the Re-Making of Administrative Law in Democratic South Africa. In *Making and Re-Making of Public Law* (hal. 109–120). Hart Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781509970087.ch-006>
- Opitz, C. (2024). Democratic Innovations Administered: The Organisational Embeddedness of Public Administrators' Attitudes Towards Participatory Policy Making. In *Journal of Deliberative Democracy* (Vol. 20, Nomor 1). University of Westminster Press.
<https://doi.org/10.16997/jdd.1457>

- Özden, M. (2025). Promoting Inclusive Governance through Citizen Participation. In *Policy Innovation and Maintaining Influential Local Governments* (hal. 91–118). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3373-0452-6.ch004>
- Pathak, A. (2025). *Truvry: Portable, Decentralized Trust Proofs for Inclusive Digital Participation and Democratic Decision-Making*. Qeios Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.32388/t9yy7w>
- Pesch, P. J., & Boehm, F. (2024). Smart Border is Watching You! In *Governance of Automated Decision-Making and EU Law* (hal. 149–185). Oxford University PressOxford. <https://doi.org/10.1093/9780198919575.003.0006>
- Redhead, C., & Smallman, M. (2024). *Governance, democracy and ethics in crisis-decision-making*. Manchester University Press. <https://doi.org/10.7765/9781526180056>
- Renn, O., Webler, T., Wiedemann, P., & Schweizer, P.-J. (2025). Deliberative Democracy: Concepts and Implications. In *Risk, Governance and Society* (hal. 33–66). Springer Nature Switzerland. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-032-02302-5_3
- Riddell, R. (2023). Governance change in England. In *Schooling in a Democracy* (hal. 23–37). Policy Press. <https://doi.org/10.1332/policypress/9781447362920.003.0003>
- Rojas-Wiesner, M. L. (2024). Migration and local integration. In *Migrant and Refugee Integration in Mexico* (hal. 89–103). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003509516-9>
- Rouwette, E. A. J. A., & Franco, L. A. (2024). Participatory scenario development. In *Engaged Decision Making* (hal. 85–101). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003404200-8>
- Sadat, A. (2025). Digital governance and civic inclusion to enhance public participation in political decision-making processes. *Frontiers in Political Science*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpos.2025.1671373>
- Sadki, S. (2025). Review of: “*Truvry: Portable, Decentralized Trust Proofs for Inclusive Digital Participation and Democratic Decision-Making*.” Qeios Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.32388/ebqzip>
- Schuurman, A. (2025). Dutch agricultural governance, 1870s-1930s. The making of agricultural institutions and policies as an outcome of the co-evolution of state and civil society. In *Rural History in Europe* (hal. 37–58). Brepols Publishers. <https://doi.org/10.1484/m.rurhe-eb.5.145419>
- Sever, T. (2025). Trends of Automated Decision-Making in the Public Sector. In *Governance and Public Management* (hal. 25–53). Springer Nature Switzerland. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-81425-9_3
- Smallman, M., O'Donovan, C., Wilson, J., & Hume, J. (2024). Data ethics in an emergency. In *Governance, democracy and ethics in crisis-decision-making*. Manchester University Press. <https://doi.org/10.7765/9781526180056.00011>
- Sovacool, B., Brisbois, M.-C., & Higginson, S. (2025). *Governance and Decision-making on Mega-Projects*. Energy Demand Research Centre (EDRC). <https://doi.org/10.20919/xbys7025>
- Stojanoski, M., & Vukovich, L. (2024). Use of Smartphone Applications in the Democratic Decision-Making Process†. In *Science, Technology, Policy and International Law* (hal. 175–192). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003472421-9>
- Takyi, S. A. (2023). Review of: “*Participatory budgeting for public involvement in environmental sustainability at a Thai university*.” Qeios Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.32388/6hwupx>
- Taub, S., & Lanocha, N. (2023). Shared Decision-making in Pediatrics: Toward a More Participatory Model. In *Pediatrics In Review* (Vol. 44, Nomor 1, hal. 50–52). American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP). <https://doi.org/10.1542/pir.2021-004984>
- Tremblay, A. (2023). Democracy and Governance: Toward a New Ethics of Decision-Making. In

- Encyclopedia of Business and Professional Ethics* (hal. 531–533). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-22767-8_1177
- Trummer, J., & Wilkes-Allemann, J. (2025). The potential of participatory citizen science for assessing ecosystem services in support of multi-level decision-making – Insights from Switzerland. In *Forest Policy and Economics* (Vol. 176, hal. 103510). Elsevier BV. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forpol.2025.103510>
- Turner, S. (2023). Democracy, Liberalism, and Discretion. In *Making Democratic Theory Democratic* (hal. 26–42). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003360810-2>
- Twigger-Ross, C., & Orr, P. (2024). New social directions in risk management: citizen involvement and collaborative governance. In *Research Handbook on Flood Risk Management* (hal. 342–362). Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781839102981.00033>
- Upton, H., Hampton, A.-R., & Eccleston-Turner, M. (2024). Accountability, transparency and good governance. In *Governance, democracy and ethics in crisis-decision-making*. Manchester University Press. <https://doi.org/10.7765/9781526180056.00015>
- Valentinavičius, V., Morkevičius, V., & Butkevičienė, E. (2025). Democratic Resilience in Lithuania and the EU: Examining the Role of Civil Society and Citizen Participation. In *Public Policy and Administration* (Vol. 24, Nomor 3, hal. 247–266). Kaunas University of Technology (KTU). <https://doi.org/10.5755/j01.ppaa.24.3.42178>
- Varma, A. (2024). Prioritizing Public Service in Political News Coverage. In *Press and Democratic Backsliding* (hal. 273–286). The Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9798216431053.ch12>
- Vidalis, T. (2023). Artificial Intelligence Into Democratic Decision Making. In *Encyclopedia of Data Science and Machine Learning* (hal. 1600–1613). IGI Global Scientific Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-7998-9220-5.ch095>
- Xiang, R. (2024). Enhancing Democratic Governance: The Crucial Role of Broad Public Participation in Government Public Consultations. In *International Journal of Education and Humanities* (Vol. 13, Nomor 3, hal. 254–256). Darcy & Roy Press Co. Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.54097/p8aqy810>
- Younus, M., Manaf, H. A., Mutiarin, D., & Nurmandi, A. (2025). Applying the UMEGA model and nudge theory to analyze smart citizen participatory in decision-making. In *Discover Global Society* (Vol. 3, Nomor 1). Springer Science and Business Media LLC. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44282-025-00232-2>