Participatory Governance in Multicentric Systems

Dana-Marie Ramjit
Department of Political Sciene, St. Mary's University, Calgary, Canada
Correspondence Author E-mail: dana-marie.ramjit@stmu.ca

Keywords:	Abstract
Citizen participation; *Co-production;* *Heterarchical leadership;* *Multilevel governance;* *Structural inequalities.*	Contemporary public administration has shifted from hierarchical, state-centric models toward multilevel and multicentric governance, in which authority is dispersed across governments, markets, civil society, and citizens. While citizen participation and co-production are central to legitimacy, inclusiveness, and public service performance, structural inequalities, power asymmetries, and coordination challenges frequently constrain meaningful influence, producing engagement that is often symbolic rather than substantive. Drawing on postinternationalist theory, this paper conceptualizes governance as a turbulent, fragmented, and overlapping system characterized by distant proximities, where interdependence coexists with unequal access to power. It examines how these dynamics shape citizen participation, highlighting how structural, relational, and digital inequalities mediate the translation of presence into influence. The analysis integrates empirical examples from diverse governance contexts to illustrate the risks of co-optation and agenda capture and identifies drivers and barriers of substantive participation. Practically, the paper offers guidance for public managers, emphasizing heterarchical leadership, adaptive coordination, and the design of participatory mechanisms that ensure inclusiveness, accountability, and measurable public value. By linking theoretical insights on turbulence, fragmegration, and distant proximities with strategies for public administration, the paper reframes citizen engagement not as a bureaucratic add-on, but as a structurally conditioned determinant of legitimacy, innovation, and effectiveness in complex governance systems.
Kata kunci:	Abstrak
Partisipasi warga; *Ko-produksi;* *Kepemimpinan heterarkis;* *Tata kelola multilevel;* *Ketimpangan struktural;*	Administrasi publik kontemporer telah bergeser dari model hierarkis yang berpusat pada negara menuju tata kelola multilevel dan multisentris, di mana otoritas tersebar di antara pemerintah, pasar, masyarakat sipil, dan warga. Partisipasi warga dan ko-produksi menjadi pusat legitimasi, inklusivitas, dan kinerja layanan publik. Namun, ketimpangan struktural, asimetri kekuasaan, dan tantangan koordinasi sering membatasi pengaruh secara nyata, sehingga partisipasi sering bersifat simbolis. Berdasarkan teori pascainterasionis, artikel ini memandang tata kelola sebagai sistem yang turbulen, terfragmentasi, dan tumpang-tindih, dengan "kedekatan jarak jauh" di mana saling ketergantungan hidup berdampingan dengan akses kekuasaan yang tidak setara. Artikel ini menelaah bagaimana dinamika tersebut membentuk partisipasi warga, menyoroti bagaimana ketimpangan struktural, relasional, dan digital memediasi penerjemahan kehadiran menjadi pengaruh. Analisis ini mengintegrasikan contoh empiris dari konteks tata kelola yang beragam untuk menunjukkan risiko ko-optasi dan penguasaan agenda serta mengidentifikasi pendorong dan penghambat partisipasi substantif. Secara praktis, artikel ini memberikan panduan bagi manajer publik, menekankan kepemimpinan heterarkis, koordinasi adaptif, dan desain mekanisme partisipatif yang memastikan inklusivitas, akuntabilitas, dan nilai publik

yang terukur. Dengan mengaitkan wawasan teoretis tentang turbulensi, fragmegrasi, dan kedekatan jarak jauh dengan strategi administrasi publik, artikel ini memposisikan keterlibatan warga bukan sekadar tambahan birokratis, melainkan sebagai determinan yang dikondisikan secara struktural bagi legitimasi, inovasi, dan efektivitas dalam sistem tata kelola yang kompleks.

1. Introduction

Over the past several decades, public administration has shifted from hierarchical, state-centric paradigms toward multicentric and multilevel arrangements, in which authority is dispersed across governmental bodies, civil society, market actors, and citizens (Sørensen & Torfing, 2021). Within these arrangements, citizen participation and co-production have become central to legitimacy, inclusiveness, and public service performance, offering avenues to mobilize local knowledge and collaborative power in addressing complex problems (Brandsen et al., 2016; Trondal et al., 2022). Yet this turn toward participation is neither straightforward nor unproblematic as power asymmetries, misaligned incentives, and coordination challenges frequently constrain meaningful influence, producing forms of engagement that are more symbolic than substantive (Huxham & Vangen, 2000; Ryan, 2012; McGinnis, 2011). Khatri and Paudel (2025) investigate the barriers and prospects of women's participation in local governance in Nepal, revealing that while there has been an increase in representation due to policy changes, this advancement does not necessarily translate into substantial influence in decision-making. Similarly, Sherpa & Chepang (2025) found that representation does not equate to influence in Indigenous governance, highlighting that the existence of legal frameworks supporting participation is insufficient if they are not complemented by mechanisms that ensure genuine engagement of all stakeholders.

Technological change amplifies these tensions. Digital platforms and networked communication can lower barriers to entry, facilitate collective action, and extend the reach of co-productive practices (Bennett & Segerberg, 2012). At the same time, persistent disparities in digital literacy, access, and organizational capacity reproduce unequal proximities to decision-making, increasing the risk that well-resourced actors dominate participatory arenas (Martini & Sgambato, 2025). These

dynamics operate within broader processes of glocalization, where local problem-solving is entwined with transnational flows of ideas, resources, and authority (Guilbaud, 2020; Cerny & Prichard, 2017), further complicating the translation of participation into measurable public value.

Democratic theory offers criteria for evaluating these dynamics. Deliberative democracy emphasizes the importance of reasoned discourse, equity, and the substantial inclusion of marginalized voices, positing that mere procedural access is insufficient for meaningful engagement within governance frameworks (Fage-Butler, 2020; Gebh, 2020; Gutmann and Thompson, 2004). This aligns with the argument that participatory processes must not only create spaces for presence but empower citizens to actively shape decisions through informed deliberation (Ramadoni, 2025; Saragih et al., 2025). Agnostic pluralism further enriches this discourse by challenging the presumption that consensus is a necessary outcome. It acknowledges the reality of persistent disagreements among diverse groups and advocates for participatory designs resilient to conflict while safeguarding the potential for meaningful impact (Dryzek & Niemeyer, 2006; Turcanu et al., 2020; Liston et al., 2013). These perspectives clarify that substantive participation requires not only presence but institutional responsiveness under conditions of complexity.

Yet a central theoretical tension remains unresolved. While prescriptive frameworks articulate standards for meaningful engagement, they are seldom situated within governance environments where authority is fragmented across scales and actors. Multilevel arrangements disperse decision-making into fluid domes marked by asymmetrical resources, shifting coalitions, and uneven proximities to power. Existing scholarship documents symbolic inclusion and structural inequality, but it insufficiently theorizes how conditions of turbulence and dispersed authority mediate the realization of substantive participation. The challenge, therefore, is not merely to design participatory forums, but to understand how democratic aspirations are reshaped, constrained, or co-opted within governance systems characterized by fragmentation, crisis, and structurally unequal influence.

To address this tension, this paper adopts postinternationalism as its conceptual foundation. Postinternationalism conceptualizes governance as unfolding across overlapping spheres of authority, cutting across territorial hierarchies and producing conditions of turbulence, fragmegration, and distant proximities, interdependence without equal influence (Rosenau, 1990, 2003). Contemporary public administration research stresses that such turbulence challenges conventional

instruments of control while demanding adaptive, network-sensitive responses from public organizations (Ansell et al., 2023). Viewed through this lens, co-production is both an avenue for innovation and a site of conflict, in which participation can be co-opted to advance pre-determined agendas (Saifullah & Ahmad, 2020; Cerny, 2022).

The argument advanced here is twofold. Theoretically, the paper extends the concepts of turbulence, distant proximities, and fragmegration to the analysis of citizen participation in multilevel governance, clarifying how the diffusion of authority and interdependent networks shapes who participates, how influence is exercised, and with what effects (Cerny & Prichard, 2017; Rosenau, 2003). Practically, it develops guidance for public managers tasked with translating participation into performance, specifically; institutionalizing safeguards against co-optation, leveraging digital tools while addressing inequalities of access and capacity, designing processes that link inclusiveness to meaningful influence and measurable outcomes, and building adaptive capabilities to manage turbulence (Kaufmann & Sidney, 2020; Ansell et al., 2023).

By dissecting these elements, the paper integrates democratic principles with structural analyses of multicentric governance, reframing citizen participation not as a procedural supplement to public administration but as a structurally conditioned determinant of legitimacy, accountability, and public value in turbulent governance systems.

2. Theoretical Framework: Postinternationalism, Turbulence and Co-production

Traditional models of governance, grounded in hierarchical and centralized control, are increasingly inadequate for explaining or managing the complexity of contemporary public administration (Hobbs, 2000; Bellamy, 2017). In response, scholars have emphasized networked, collaborative, and multi-actor forms of governance, in which authority is dispersed across governments, nonstate actors, civil society, and citizens (Torfing et al., 2012; Hooghe & Marks, 2001; Isett et al., 2011). This intellectual curve aligns closely with Rosenau's (1990, 2003) postinternationalism, which conceptualizes governance as inherently turbulent, fragmented, and shaped by overlapping spheres of authority that extend beyond the nation-state.

At the core of postinternationalism is turbulence: the persistent instability arising when diverse actors, states, international organizations, firms, civil society, and communities, pursue competing priorities across local, national, and transnational scales. This multi-actor environment generates uncertainty, nonlinear dynamics, and

rapid shifts in agendas and coalitions. Governance under such conditions departs from linearity and predictable control and it is shaped by distant proximities, a paradox in which intensifying interdependence brings people closer while inequalities in access and power persist. Local decisions vibrate across broader systems, global shocks penetrate local systems, yet information, resources, and authority remain unevenly distributed, leaving some actors structurally near power while others remain persistently distant (Maull, 2011).

Complementing these dynamics is fragmegration, which describes the simultaneous forces of integration and fragmentation. Policy domains coagulate across borders and networks even as authority fragments among multiple nodes, highlighting the complex and unpredictable nature of contemporary governance (Rosenau, 2003). These interlinked dynamics clarify why citizen participation in multilevel governance is both indispensable and precarious: interdependence opens new entry points for engagement, yet uneven proximities and continual fragmentation determine who can participate, how influence is exercised, and with what outcomes.

These theoretical constructs illuminate the challenges of co-production. Collaborative arrangements enable citizens and civil society to contribute localized knowledge, resources, and innovative practices to public decision-making (Bradley & Mahmoud, 2024; Bloodgood et al., 2023; Foley et al., 2021). Yet, such arrangements are prone to cooptation, as institutional or well-resourced actors may shape agendas to serve predetermined objectives, reducing participation to symbolic inclusion rather than substantive influence (Ferreira, 2025; Huxham & Vangen, 2000). The relational complexities inherent in collaboration, divergent interests, competing priorities, and power asymmetries, often exacerbate these tendencies, generating conflict and stalling meaningful engagement.

Empirical studies underscore how structural and relational asymmetries constrain participatory governance. Ulibarrí et al. (2023) show that influential NGOs and government actors dominate environmental management agendas, marginalizing alternative perspectives. Cheung and Fuller (2022) reveal similar dynamics in Hong Kong's climate governance, where institutional preferences frequently outweigh citizen input. In Malaysia, Darmais et al. (2023) document how government authority eclipses community voices, producing policies aligned with official priorities rather than collaborative solutions to drug smuggling. Parallel patterns are evident in authoritarian contexts: Mikhasev and Golosov (2023) illustrate how Russian regimes co-opt private actors into state-aligned coalitions, while Bruun and Rubin (2022)

demonstrate strategic manipulation of water management in Vietnam. In Indonesia, corporate dominance similarly undermines local engagement in ecological governance, particularly in mangrove rehabilitation (Widiyaningrum & Riaji, 2023).

Beyond institutional and political constraints, structural barriers such as limited resources, institutional design, and accountability mechanisms disproportionately affect underrepresented groups, curtailing their capacity to participate meaningfully (Passmore et al., 2021; Madsen & Brix, 2024; Krieger, 2020). At the same time, technological innovations intensify turbulence: digital platforms, online communities, and open data initiatives expand opportunities for mobilization, yet they can also reproduce asymmetries of access, digital literacy, and organizational capacity (McNeely, 2024; Agostino et al., 2020).

Postinternationalism provides a critical lens for understanding these dynamics. Governance is no longer confined to fixed territorial boundaries but unfolds across multicentric networks in which authority is diffuse, contested, and adaptive. Consequently, co-production cannot be assumed to produce equitable outcomes. Instead, effective governance requires responsiveness to turbulence, uneven proximities, and fragmegration, ensuring that participatory initiatives are not only inclusive but capable of delivering tangible improvements in legitimacy, accountability, and public performance.

3. Civic Engagement

Citizen engagement in multilevel governance is shaped by dynamic factors that both enable and constrain engagement. Structural reforms, societal transformations, and technological innovations have opened new entry points for collaboration. Yet enduring inequalities, design flaws, and power asymmetries often limit participation to symbolic inclusion, highlighting the need for governance frameworks that translate engagement into tangible public value.

Several factors propel the expansion of co-productive governance. First, technological innovations, particularly digital platforms, and social media, have lowered barriers to entry by enabling rapid information sharing, collective mobilization, and translocal advocacy (Houtzager et al., 2020; Riggs, 2018). These tools facilitate decentralized engagement that extends participation beyond traditional institutional boundaries, allowing citizens to influence decision-making across multiple levels of governance (Karthikeyan et al., 2024).

Second, societal transformations, including rising education levels, greater civic awareness, and the growth of transnational networks, have built a more informed and assertive citizenry. Citizens increasingly demand voice in policymaking and accountability in service delivery, with civil society organizations, NGOs, and advocacy groups acting as intermediaries that link citizen priorities with institutional processes (Chatterjee & Kumar, 2024; Foley, Hines, & Wessel, 2021; Bradley & Mahmoud, 2024; Bloodgood et al., 2023).

Third, globalization and glocalization have embedded local problem-solving within broader institutional and social networks, connecting local knowledge to global resources and ideas (Arkhipov & Yeletsky, 2021; Guilbaud, 2020). These interdependencies enhance opportunities for innovation but also require coordination across multiple scales, underscoring the turbulent and interdependent nature of contemporary governance.

Despite these enabling conditions, several barriers continue to constrain meaningful engagement. First, power asymmetries remain pervasive. Dominant actors, such as state institutions, well-resourced NGOs, or private entities, can shape participatory agendas to legitimize predetermined outcomes, limiting citizen influence and eroding trust (Shi, 2022; Arko, 2019; Visser & Kreemers, 2019). Second, structural and institutional limitations restrict engagement. Limited capacity, accountability constraints, and resource inequalities disproportionately affect marginalized groups, often producing participatory fatigue, where repeated engagement opportunities fail to translate into substantive influence (Vivier & Sanchez-Betancourt, 2023; Migchelbrink & Walle, 2020; Eckerd & Heidelberg, 2019).

Third, digital inequalities introduce additional asymmetries. While digital platforms expand access, disparities in infrastructure, literacy, and organizational support reproduce uneven proximities to decision-making (Nnenna et al., 2024; Ranchordás, 2022; Iyer & Kuriakose, 2024; Syahruddin et al., 2023). As Rosenau's (2003) concept of distant proximities suggests, apparent inclusiveness may mask structural exclusion, leaving marginalized actors persistently distant from influence. Fourth, institutional design and incentive structures can reinforce selective participation. Rules, norms, and accountability mechanisms often privilege certain voices, particularly when engagement is framed as consultative rather than co-productive (Erman & Todorovski, 2010; Su, Du, Sohn, & Xu, 2017). Such arrangements heighten the risk of cooptation, whereby powerful actors validate existing decisions rather than integrate diverse perspectives.

These undercurrents illustrate a central tension: participation is expected to enhance legitimacy and performance, yet poorly designed processes can undermine both. Effective management of multilevel co-production requires acknowledging participation's dual character, as a driver of innovation and a potential instrument of domination. By addressing structural inequalities, ensuring equitable access to digital tools, and designing processes that link engagement to concrete outcomes, public administrators can move participation beyond ritualized inclusion toward the generation of genuine public value.

4. Dispersed Authority

Postinternationalism emphasizes that authority is no longer monopolized by the state but dispersed across multiple scales and actors (Rosenau, 1990, 2003). This reconfiguration, evident both globally and locally alike, reshapes the dynamics of power, legitimacy, and accountability. Authority is increasingly exercised in pluralized arenas where governments, NGOs, civic associations, and community organizations share space, yet rarely on equal terms (Volk, 2019; Guilbaud, 2020). What emerges is not a smooth diffusion of power but a contested field in which asymmetries determine whose voices prevail.

This pluralization creates opportunities for innovation by broadening the knowledge base and mobilizing diverse resources, but it also generates vulnerabilities. Research shows that non-state actors can enrich governance by amplifying citizen priorities, providing expertise, and facilitating coordination across levels (Ferguson & Mansbach, 2007; Foley, Bronson, & Campbell, 2021). Yet other studies highlight how this same diversity often leads to agenda capture: powerful NGOs or institutional actors dominate, steering participatory processes to reflect predetermined outcomes (Panke & Stapel, 2024). Authority, therefore, is not simply distributed but constantly contested, reflecting the turbulence and adaptive character of contemporary governance systems (Rosenau, 2003).

Scholars have proposed various strategies for managing this contested environment. Chong's (2002) plus nonstate approach argues for the integration of civic and private actors into decision-making, recognizing their capacity to contribute resources and legitimacy. Similarly, collaborative governance emphasizes the design of shared processes that allow diverse actors to deliberate on equal footing, with structured rules to balance influence (Torfing et al., 2012). Sørensen et al., (2020) highlight the role of political boundary-spanning, where elected officials and administrators actively bridge divides between representative institutions and

collective spaces, ensuring citizen input is not overshadowed by technocratic or elite actors. Klijn & Koppenjan (2000) advance network governance, in which public managers assume a facilitative role to coordinate diverse actors while safeguarding against dominance and exclusion. These strategies reflect different attempts to translate pluralization into equitable participation rather than symbolic inclusion.

Nonetheless, as Chikvaidze (2020) and Teivainen and Trommer (2016) caution, nonstate actors often pursue agendas that diverge from collective goals, producing resistance and strategic contestation. Collaboration, therefore, is never neutral but always embedded in asymmetrical relations that privilege stronger actors. The redefinition of authority thus brings with it the persistent risk of cooptation. Processes may appear inclusive while remaining substantively constrained, with engagement reduced to symbolic validation rather than genuine deliberation (Stapper, 2021; Sørensen et al., 2020). Such outcomes erode trust and threaten the legitimacy of governance arrangements.

To counter these risks, authority must be consciously structured through mechanisms of transparency, independent supervision, and safeguards against agenda capture (Bagherzadeh et al., 2021). For public managers and policymakers, this reframing requires a shift from hierarchical control to heterarchical leadership. Authority must be treated as a negotiated process in which institutions enable meaningful participation rather than dictate outcomes. Unless participatory systems are designed to ensure that diverse voices exert real influence, the promise of multicentric governance risks collapsing into a symbolic procedure.

5. Understanding Distant Proximities

Understanding the role of citizens in multilevel governance requires grappling with distant proximities, the paradox that actors are drawn closer through interdependence while remaining unequally positioned to shape outcomes. In this reality, inclusion does not guarantee influence (Rosenau, 2003). Citizens may be formally invited into co-productive processes, yet structural disparities in resources, knowledge, and authority determine whether their participation resonates or dissipates. This paradox is especially evident in glocalized governance through which local problems are intertwined with global agendas (Drori et al., 2014; Iermakova et al., 2021; Belamghari, 2020). Citizens' input vibrates across scales but is filtered through mediators such as NGOs, state agencies, or corporations, with disproportionate influence. This is exemplified in the Western Balkans, where advocacy NGOs have

navigated digital transformation to enhance their engagement strategies, yet face challenges regarding their influence due to existing power structures (Lushka, 2025).

Rosenau's (2003) violin metaphor captures this dynamic vividly: each actor's string vibrates across the governance network, but the strength of the resonance depends on the actor's positional power. NGOs, advocacy groups, and state institutions may thus dominate the orchestration of policy, relegating citizen contributions to background notes (Khanakwa & Mbonigaba, 2022; Moghrabi & Sabharwal, 2017). Kassen (2020) discusses how innovative data-driven collaborations in Nordic countries can enhance public services, yet these benefits are often not evenly distributed, leading to disparities in access and influence.

The digital revolution further complicates these proximities. Digital platforms and open data initiatives lower barriers to information and mobilization (Trautendorfer et al., 2025; Mallinson, 2019), yet they simultaneously reproduce uneven access. Citizens with digital literacy, organizational capacity, and infrastructural support stand "closer" to decision-making, while others remain effectively distant. These asymmetries risk deepening inequalities in influence by privileging well-connected or digitally fluent actors. Kaur (2025) in research on youth political mobilization in the Global South indicates that while digital tools have bolstered the visibility and reach of activist movements, those who lack digital skills or infrastructure are consistently marginalized.

Finally, Rosenau's (2003) concept of fragmegration, the simultaneous pressures of integration and fragmentation, illustrates the instability of these proximities. Collaborative governance requires coordination across diverse mandates and resources, but the very complexity of multicentric systems produces fragmentation, ambiguity, and inconsistent opportunities for engagement (Kessa et al., 2021). For citizens, this often translates into participation without traction: invited to the table yet constrained from shaping outcomes (Åström & Karlsson, 2020; Xin et al., 2022). Such experiences erode trust, create participation fatigue, and weaken the legitimacy of governance arrangements (Indama, 2022; Hartanti et al., 2021).

Distant proximities thus highlight a central dilemma for public managers: how to transform formal inclusion into substantive influence. The task is not simply to broaden access but to close the gap between presence and impact. Addressing these uneven proximities, by designing participatory mechanisms that amplify marginalized voices and institutionalize responsiveness, can shift citizen engagement

from symbolic legitimacy toward a genuine driver of trust, innovation, and effectiveness in governance.

6. Managing Multicentrism

The decline of hierarchical state-centrism has produced governance arrangements that are increasingly multicentric, with authority dispersed across governments, markets, civil society, and citizens (Rosenau, 2003; Hobbs, 2000; Bellamy, 2017). These environments demand coordination across levels and sectors in which power is negotiated within overlapping and adaptive networks rather than monopolized by the state (Rogers, 2009; Ferguson & Mansbach, 2007). Such networks are indispensable for confronting super-wicked problems, including climate change, pandemics, and complex urban development, whose scale, urgency, and cross-sectoral spillovers exceed the capacity of any single institution. Addressing these challenges requires sustained coordination across fragmented jurisdictions, policy domains, and organizational boundaries (Bannink et al., 2024; Ansell & Trondal, 2017).

Yet distributed authority generates vulnerabilities. Power asymmetries and resource disparities allow dominant actors to exploit gaps in coordination, steering decisions in ways that marginalize weaker voices. For example, in the global health arena, studies have shown that well-resourced international health NGOs can overshadow local community perspectives during public health emergencies, thus depriving those communities of necessary representation (PA et al., 2024; Nguyahambi & Rugeiyamu, 2025). Hobbs' (2000) "Swiss cheese" metaphor aptly captures these governance holes: spaces where authority is absent or fragmented, and outcomes are shaped by those with the resources to step in, rather than those representing the broader community (Townsend et al., 2025).

Digital technologies both expand and complicate these dynamics. While platforms and social media provide new channels for engagement, they also reinforce uneven proximities: actors with greater digital capacity or institutional connections are disproportionately able to amplify their influence (Hancock, 2022; Gordon, 2017; Milhaupt & Pargendler, 2017). For instance, during the COVID-19 pandemic, marginalized communities struggled to voice their needs through digital platforms, highlighting the growing divide between those adept at leveraging technology and those who remain disconnected (Patterson et al., 2024; Springman et al., 2022).

Management in a multicentric environment resembles a heterarchical arrangement, in which authority is non-hierarchically distributed across actors and

scales, and the manager's role is to facilitate coordination, ensure accountability, and create conditions in which citizen participation achieves substantive influence (Lichtarski & Piórkowska, 2021; Cumming, 2016). Establishing boundary-spanning roles and cross-sectoral liaison mechanisms can help translate local input into coherent decision-making across networks. For instance, the establishment of integrative governance structures has proven effective in managing local water resources, exemplified by the collaborative actions in Ottawa that reveal how partnerships among various stakeholders can enhance urban sustainability practices (Zeemering, 2016). Governance structures should incorporate deliberative mechanisms that empower citizens to influence agenda-setting, policy design, and resource allocation. A successful instance of this approach is found in the participatory budgeting practices in Toledo, Spain, which allow citizens to directly influence local fiscal decisions (Rottmann, 2023).

A focus on safeguarding against the capture of governance processes is vital. This can be achieved through enhanced mechanisms that ensure citizen contributions are recognized and integrated. The use of citizen oversight boards in urban development projects in California has been shown to enhance accountability and responsiveness (Groenfeldt & Schmidt, 2013). Fourth, addressing digital disparities is crucial to democratizing participation (Pigola et al., 2022). Initiatives in countries like Estonia, where e-governance aims to facilitate access to public services for all citizens, illustrate how digital tools can be designed with inclusivity in mind (Lucas & Smith, 2019).

Governance networks should cultivate adaptive capacities to facilitate responses to turbulence, utilizing scenario planning, iterative policy development, and flexible coordination mechanisms (Samnakay et al., 2024). In the field of climate adaptation, regional collaboration in places like Norway has highlighted how adaptive governance can respond effectively to local conditions while still aligning with national climate objectives (Hillmer-Pegram & Robards, 2015).

Through these mechanisms, the management of multicentric networks is redefined from controlling dispersed actors to strategically coordinating conditions that enhance citizen participation. This reframing addresses the earlier articulated challenge of transforming citizen engagement from meresymbolic inclusion to genuine influence within multilevel, multicentric governance frameworks.

7. Conclusion & Recommendations

In the 21st century, governance is increasingly characterized not by hierarchical state control, but by multicentric networks where authority is dispersed, contested, and fluid (Rosenau, 2003). In this evolving landscape, citizens, NGOs, and public agencies engage across multiple levels to co-produce services and influence policy, presenting both significant opportunities for inclusion and inherent risks of domination. This analysis emphasizes that citizen participation is not a straightforward diffusion of power; rather, it is shaped by shifting authority, the complexities of distant proximities, and the challenges associated with managing multicentric networks.

Consequently, public managers must prioritize not only the invitation for participation but also its translation into substantive influence and measurable public value. Three critical insights arise from this discourse. First, authority within multicentric governance structures is not merely shared but actively negotiated and contested. This requires the design of participatory processes equipped with institutional safeguards against domination by more powerful actors (Kokx & Kempen, 2010). Second, the paradox of distant proximities illustrates that mere presence does not guarantee impact; citizen voices may be included in formal processes yet remain substantively marginal (Belletti et al., 2024). Thus, mechanisms must be established to connect citizen contributions directly to decision-making, resource allocation, and accountability. Third, the presence of governance holes allows dominant actors to maneuver effectively, stressing the need for adaptive coordination strategies that protect weaker participants from being overshadowed by those wielding greater resources (Mickwitz et al., 2021).

Ultimately, the effectiveness of co-productive governance hinges on reconciliation of ongoing tensions between equity and efficiency, inclusion and accountability, as well as collaboration and performance. Resilience should be understood not merely as institutional survival, but as the capacity for renewal amidst ongoing turbulence. This theoretical position offers a powerful catalyst for innovation, legitimacy, and sustainable public value that is essential in navigating the complexities of modern governance.

References

Agostino, D., Arnaboldi, M., & Lema, M. D. (2020). New development: covid-19 as an accelerator of digital transformation in public service delivery. *Public Money &Amp; Management*, 41(1), 69-72. https://doi.org/10.1080/09540962.2020.1764206

Ansell, C., Sørensen, E., & Torfing, J. (2023). Public administration and politics meet turbulence: The search for robust governance responses. Public Administration, 101(1), 3-22. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.12874

Ansell, C., Trondal, J., & Morten, O. (2017). Governance in Turbulent Times. Oxford: Oxford University.

Arkhipov, A.Y. and Yeletsky, A.N. (2021). Modern globalization: development of glocalization and fragmentation of the world economy. International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy, Vol. 41 No. 1/2, pp. 224-238. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSSP-03-2020-0076

Arko, B. (2019). Understanding power asymmetry in participatory development spaces: insights from Ghana's decent work programme. Regional Studies, Regional Science, 6(1), 399 404. https://doi.org/10.1080/21681376.2019.1638298

Åström, J. and Karlsson, M. (2020). Trust in citizens and forms of political participation: the view of public managers. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, 15-25. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-58141-1_2

Bannink, D., Sancino, A., & Sorrentino, M. (2024). Governance without we. Wicked problems and collaborative governance. *Public Policy and Administration*, *0*(0). https://doi.org/10.1177/09520767241239863

Bagherzadeh, M., Ghaderi, M., & Fernandez, A. (2021). Coopetition for innovation - the more, the better? An empirical study based on preference disaggregation analysis. *European Journal of Operational Research*, *297*(2), 695 708. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2021.06.010

Bellamy, R. (2017). A European republic of sovereign states: sovereignty, republicanism and the European Union. European Journal of Political Theory, 188-209. doi: 10.1177/1474885116654389

Belamghari, M. (2020). The Fragmentation of Identity Formation in the Age of Glocalization. Sage Open, 10(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244020934877

Belletti, G., Salcido, G. T., Scarpellini, P., Mengoni, M., & Marescotti, A. (2024). Multilevel governance in farmers' markets: a stakeholder analysis in Tuscany. *Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems*, 8. https://doi.org/10.3389/fsufs.2024.1401488

Bennett, W. L., & Segerberg, A. (2012). THE LOGIC OF CONNECTIVE ACTION: Digital media and the personalization of contentious politics. *Information, Communication & Society*, *15*(5), 739–768. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2012.670661

Bloodgood, E. A., Bourns, J., Lenczner, M., Shibaike, T., Tabet, J., Melvin, A., & Wong, W. H. (2023). Understanding National Nonprofit Data Environments. Nonprofit and voluntary sector quarterly, 52(2), 281–303. https://doi.org/10.1177/08997640221085731

Bradley, S. and Mahmoud, I. (2024). Strategies for co-creation and co-governance in urban contexts: building trust in local communities with limited social structures. *Urban Science*, 8(1), 9. https://doi.org/10.3390/urbansci8010009

Brandsen, T., Steen, T., & Verschuere, B. (2016). "Co-Production and Co-Creation: Engaging Citizens in Public Services." In The Handbook of Service Innovation, 75-92. Springer. https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-319-40288-5_6.

Bruun, O. and Rubin, O. (2022). Authoritarian environmentalism—captured collaboration in vietnamese water management. Environmental Management, 71(3), 538-550. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00267-022-01650-7

Cerny, P.G. (Ed.). (2022). Heterarchy in World Politics (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003352617

Cerny, P. G., & Prichard, A. (2017). The new anarchy: Globalisation and fragmentation in world politics. Journal of International Political Theory, 13(3), 378   394. https://doi.org/10.1177/1755088217713765

Chatterjee, S., Kumar, A. (2024). Geoeconomics, Geopolitics, and the Contemporary International Order: Some Reflections. In: Mishra, O., Sen, S. (eds) Global Political Economy, Geopolitics and International Security. Palgrave Macmillan, Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-97-2231-0_3

Cheung, T. T. T. and Fuller, S. (2022). Rethinking the potential of collaboration for urban climate governance: the case of Hong Kong. Area, 54(3), 408-417. https://doi.org/10.1111/area.12781

Chong, A. (2002). The post-international challenge to foreign policy: signposting 'plus non-state' politics. *Review of International Studies*, *28*(4), 783–795. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0260210502007830

Chikvaidze, D. A. (2020). Multilateralism: its past, present and future. In Cadmus (Vol. 4, Issue 2, pp. 127–133 https://doaj.org/article/44f60d8a1aa64af58a690ec70e8f3696

Cumming, G. S. (2016). Heterarchies: reconciling networks and hierarchies. Trends in Ecology & Evolution, 31(8), 622–632. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2016.04.009

Darmais, Fatmawati, Malik, I., & Alyas. (2023). Collaborative governance in preventing drug smuggling in the Nunukan district. KnE Social Sciences. https://doi.org/10.18502/kss.v8i5.12990

Drori, G. S., Höllerer, M. A., & Walgenbach, P. (2014). Unpacking the glocalization of organization: from term, to theory, to analysis. *European Journal of Cultural and Political Sociology*, 1(1), 85-99. https://doi.org/10.1080/23254823.2014.904205

Dryzek, J. S., & Niemeyer, S. (2006). Reconciling pluralism and consensus as political ideals. *American Journal of Political Science*, *50*(3), 634   649. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5907.2006.00206.x

Eckerd, A. and Heidelberg, R. L. (2019). Administering public participation. The American Review of Public Administration, 50(2), 133-147. https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074019871368

Erman, N. and Todorovski, L. (2010). Analyzing the structure of the EGOV conference community. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 73-84. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-14799-9_7

Fage-Butler, A. (2020). Health-related nudging. Communication & Language at Work, 7(1), 15-27. https://doi.org/10.7146/claw.v7i1.123248

Ferreira, V. (2025). A powerless alternative? Citizen participation, private actors, and corporate dominance in the contested rollout of renewable energy communities in Portugal. Energy Research & Social Science, 129, 104360. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2025.104360

Ferguson, Y., & Mansbach, R. (2007). Post internationalism and IR theory. *Journal of International Studies*, 529-550. doi:10.1177/03058298070350031001

Foley, C. F., Hines, J. R., & Wessel, D. (Eds.). (2021). Global Goliaths: Multinational Corporations in the 21st Century Economy. Brookings Institution Press. http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7864/j.ctv11hpt7b

Foley, M. W., Bronson, A. E., & Campbell, J. (2021). Can the Social Sector Govern? Civil Society, Social Movement Organizations, and Democracy. *Public Administration Review*, 81(5), 853-866. https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13207.

Gebh, S. (2020). The substance of procedures. Philosophy & Social Criticism, 47(1), 22-25. https://doi.org/10.1177/0191453720974732

Gordon, S. (2017). *Online communities as agents of change and social movements.* PA: IGI Global.

Groenfeldt, D. and Schmidt, J. J. (2013). Ethics and Water Governance. Ecology and Society, 18(1). https://doi.org/10.5751/es-04629-180114

Guilbaud, A. (2020). *Diplomacy by Non-State Actors*. In: Balzacq, T., Charillon, F., Ramel, F. (eds) Global Diplomacy. The Sciences Po Series in International Relations and Political Economy. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-28786-3_13

Gutmann, A., & Thompson, D. (2004). *Why Deliberative Democracy?* (STU-Student edition). Princeton University Press. http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt7t5w5

Hancock, R. (2022). VOIP technology in grassroots politics: Transforming political culture and practice? Journal of Sociology, 60(1), 3–20. https://doi.org/10.1177/14407833221086331

Hartanti, F. T., Abawajy, J., Chowdhury, M., & Shalannanda, W. (2021). Citizens' trust measurement in smart government services. *IEEE Access*, 9, 150663-150676. https://doi.org/10.1109/access.2021.3124206

Hillmer-Pegram, K. and Robards, M. D. (2015). Relevance of a Particularly Sensitive Sea Area to the Bering Strait Region: a Policy Analysis Using Resilience-Based Governance Principles. Ecology and Society, 20(1). https://doi.org/10.5751/es-07081-200126

Hobbs, H. H. (2000). *Pondering postinternationalism.* New York: State University of New York.

Hooghe, L. and Marks, G. (2001) *Multi-Level Governance and European Integration*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Houtzager, P. P., Acharya, A., Amâncio, J. M., Chowdhury, A., Dowbor, M., & Pande, S. (2020). Social accountability in metropolitan cities: strategies and legacies in delhi and são paulo. Development Policy Review, 39(1), 59-81. https://doi.org/10.1111/dpr.12481

Huxham, C., & Vangen, S. (2000). "Ambiguity, Complexity, and Dynamics in the Management of Collaboration." International Journal of Project Management, 18(3), 163-169. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0263-7863(99)00032-4.

Iermakova, O., Kamińska, B., Voicilas, D. M., LAIKO, O., Hetman, O., Забарна, Е., … & Halytsia, I. (2021). Glocalization of regional innovation development. *Management Theory and Studies for Rural Business and Infrastructure Development*, 43(2), 195-205. https://doi.org/10.15544/mts.2021.16

Indama, V. (2022). Digital governance: citizen perceptions and expectations of online public services. Interdisciplinary Studies in Society, Law, and Politics, 1(2), 12-18. https://doi.org/10.61838/kman.isslp.1.2.3

Isett, K.R., I.A. Mergel, K. LeRoux, P.A. Mischen, and R.K. Rethemeyer. 2011. Networks in Public Administration Scholarship: Understanding Where We are and Where We Need to Go. Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory 21 (1): i157–i173.

Iyer, D. K. and Kuriakose, F. (2024). Digital platforms as (dis)enablers of urban co-production: evidence from Bengaluru, India. Urban Planning, 9. https://doi.org/10.17645/up.7262

Karthikeyan, R., Al-Shamaa, N., Kelly, E. J., Henn, P., Shiely, F., Divala, T., … &O'Donoghue, J. (2024). Investigating the characteristics of health-related data collection tools used in randomised controlled trials in low-income and middle-income countries: protocol for a systematic review. BMJ Open, 14(1), e077148. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2023-077148

Karns, M., Mingst, K., & Stiles, K. (2015). In International Organizations. CO: Lynne Rienner.

Kassen, M. (2020). Open data and its peers: understanding promising harbingers from Nordic Europe. Aslib Journal of Information Management, 72(5), 765-785. https://doi.org/10.1108/ajim-12-2019-0364

Kaur, H. (2025). Youth Political Mobilization in the Global South: Comparative Study of Online vs Offline Movements. International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research, 7(4). https://doi.org/10.36948/ijfmr.2025.v07i04.54648

Kaufmann, D., & Sidney, M. (2020). Toward an urban policy analysis: incorporating participation, multilevel governance, and "Seeing like a city." PS, Political Science & Politics, 53(1), 1–5. https://doi.org/10.1017/s1049096519001380

Kessa, R., Sadiq, A., & Yeo, J. (2021). The importance of vertical and horizontal collaboration: united states' response to covid-19 pandemic. Chinese Public Administration Review, 12(1), 61-71. https://doi.org/10.1177/153967542101200105

Khatri, S. K. and Paudel, N. (2025). Barriers and Prospects of Women's Participation in Local Governments of Nepal. The Himalayan Geographers, 15, 64-82. https://doi.org/10.3126/thg.v15i1.81414

Khanakwa, S. and Mbonigaba, J. (2022). Institutional arrangements for providing hiv and aids services in uganda: a transaction cost economics analysis. Health Services Insights, 15. https://doi.org/10.1177/11786329221096046

Klijn, E. H., & Koppenjan, J. F. M. (2000). Public Management And Policy Networks: Foundations of a network approach to governance. Public Management, 2(2), 135 158.https://doi.org/10.1080/146166700411201

Kokx, A. and Kempen, R. v. (2010). Dutch urban governance: Multi-level or multi-scalar?. European Urban and Regional Studies, 17(4), 355-369. https://doi.org/10.1177/0969776409350691

Krieger, N. (2020). Measures of racism, sexism, heterosexism, and gender binarism for health equity research: from structural injustice to embodied harm—an ecosocial analysis. Annual Review of Public Health, 41(1), 37-62. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-publhealth-040119-094017

Leat, D., Seltzer, K., & Stoker, G. (2002). Towards holistic governance: the new reform agenda. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave, 10, 978-1.

Lenz, T. (2021). Interorganizational diffusion in international relations. In Oxford University Press eBooks. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198823827.001.0001

Lichtarski, J. M., & Piórkowska, K. (2021). Heterarchical Coordination in Inter-organizational Networks: Evidence from the Tourism Industry. Tourism and Hospitality Management, 27(2), 235–253. https://doi.org/10.20867/thm.27.2.1

Liston, V., Harris, C., & O'Toole, M. (2013). Bridging Normative Democratic Theory and Internet Technologies: A Proposal for Scaling Citizen Policy Deliberations. Policy & Internet, 5(4), 462-485. https://doi.org/10.1002/1944-2866.poi349

Lucas, J. and Smith, A. K. (2019). Multilevel policy from the municipal perspective: A pan-Canadian survey. Canadian Public Administration, 62(2), 270-293. https://doi.org/10.1111/capa.12316

Lushka, I. (2025). Digital Transformation in Civil Society: Mapping the Evolving Strategies of Advocacy NGOs in the Western Balkans. Interdisciplinary Journal of Research and Development, 12(2), 28. https://doi.org/10.56345/ijrdv12n2004

Madsen, K. M. and Brix, J. (2024). Building capacity for digital innovation—a game-study. Creativity and Innovation Management, 34(2), 486-499. https://doi.org/10.1111/caim.12650

Mallinson, D. J. (2019). Who are your neighbors? The role of ideology and decline of geographic proximity in the diffusion of policy innovations. Policy Studies Journal, 49(1), 67–88. https://doi.org/10.1111/psj.1235

Martini, E., & Sgambato, M. C. (2025). Digital Inequalities and Access to Technology: Analyzing How Digital Tools Exacerbate or Mitigate Social Inequalities. *Societies*, *15*(11), 318. https://doi.org/10.3390/soc15110318

Maull, H. (2011). *World politics in turbulence.* Retrieved from library.fes.de: http://library.fes.de/pdf-files/ipg/ipg-2011-1/2011-1__03_a_maull.pdf

McGinnis, M. D. (2011). Networks of adjacent action situations in polycentric governance. *Policy Studies Journal*, *39*(1), 51–78. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1541-0072.2010.00396.x

McNeely, C. L. (2024). Traversing the digital divide in concept and effect: relative interpretations and orientations. *Policy &Amp; Internet*, 16(2), 214-221. https://doi.org/10.1002/poi3.409

Mikhasev, T., & Golosov, G. V. (2023). Reluctant cooptation: The legislative recruitment of the private sector into Russia's dominant party, 2015–2020. *Party Politics*, *31*(1), 101-111. https://doi.org/10.1177/13540688231202856

Mickwitz, P., Neij, L., Johansson, M., Benner, M., & Sandin, S. (2021). A theory-based approach to evaluations intended to inform transitions toward sustainability. Evaluation, 27(3), 281-306. https://doi.org/10.1177/1356389021997855

Mikhasev, T. and Golosov, G. V. (2023). Reluctant cooptation: the legislative recruitment of the private sector into Russia's dominant party, 2015–2020. *Party Politics*, 31(1), 101-111. https://doi.org/10.1177/13540688231202856

Migchelbrink, K. and Walle, S. V. d. (2020). Increasing the cost of participation: red tape and public officials' attitudes toward public participation. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 88(3), 644-662. https://doi.org/10.1177/0020852320942311

Milhaupt, C. J., & Pargendler, M. (n.d.). Governance challenges of listed state- owned enterprises around the world: National experiences and a Framework for reform. *Cornell International Law Journal*: Vol. 50: No. 3, Article 3. https://scholarship.law.cornell.edu/cilj/vol50/iss3/3

Moghrabi, I. H. and Sabharwal, M. (2017). The role of the information society in promoting a better and a more democratic governance. *Journal of Public Administration and Governance*, 7(4), 132. https://doi.org/10.5296/jpag.v7i4.12018

Nnenna, U. J., Perpetua, U. I., Nchaga, A. M., Hadijah, T., Mabonga, E., & Nyamboga, T. O. (2024). Impact of digital governance on public service delivery in East Africa. IAA *Journal of Arts and Humanities*, 11(1), 18-29. https://doi.org/10.59298/iaajah/2024/11.11829.11

Nguyahambi, A. M. and Rugeiyamu, R. (2025). "It is not shrinking, ngos need unlimited freedom": Government Stance on the Perceived Shrinkage of Civic Space in Tanzania. Journal of Social Innovation and Knowledge, 2(1), 77-101. https://doi.org/10.1163/29502683-bja00013

PA, A. R. B., Sitepu, D. S. S. B., Elixabhet, G., Siburian, R., & Adianingsih, Z. R. (2024). Peranan Advokasi LSM Dalam Mendorong Penegakan Hukum dan HAM di Era Reformasi. Journal of Law and Social Society, 1(2), 1-13. https://doi.org/10.70656/jolasos.v1i2.128 Panke, D., & Stapel, S. (2024). Multi-level governance. In Edward Elgar Publishing eBooks (pp. 417–430). https://doi.org/10.4337/9781800373747.00028

Passmore, S. R., Kisicki, A., Gilmore-Bykovskyi, A., Green-Harris, G., & Edwards, D. F. (2021). "there's not much we can do…" researcher-level barriers to the inclusion

of underrepresented participants in translational research. Journal of Clinical and Translational Science, 6(1). https://doi.org/10.1017/cts.2021.876

Patterson, A. S., Clark, M. A., & Rogers, A. (2024). Network power and mental health policy in post-war Liberia. *Health Policy and Planning*, 39(5), 486-498. https://doi.org/10.1093/heapol/czae020

Pigola, A., Costa, P. R. d., Mazieri, M. R., & Scafuto, I. C. (2022). Collaborative innovation: a technological perspective. International Journal of Innovation, 10(2), 204-211. https://doi.org/10.5585/iji.v10i2.22256

Prichard , A. (2010). *Rethinking anarchy and the state in IR theory: the contributions of classical anarchism*. Retrieved from University of Bristol: http://www.bristol.ac.uk/media-library/sites/spais/migrated/documents/prichard0310.pdf

Ramadoni, R., Suryadin, S., Mustamin, M., & Erham, E. (2025). Partisipasi Masyarakat dalam Pembentukan Undang-undang: Studi terhadap Partisipasi Masyarakat Secara Substansial/Bermakna (Miningful Participation). *Sentri Jurnal Riset Ilmiah*, 4(12), 4314-4327. https://doi.org/10.55681/sentri.v4i12.5152

Ranchordás, S. (2022). Connected but still excluded?. *The Cambridge Handbook of Information Technology, Life Sciences and Human Rights*, 244-258. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108775038.020

Riggs, W. (2018). Technology, civic engagement and street science. Proceedings of the 19th Annual International Conference on Digital Government Research: *Governance in the Data Age*, 1-6. https://doi.org/10.1145/3209281.3209383

Rogers, D. (2009). Postinternationalism and small arms control: theory, politics, security. Burlington: Ashgate.

Rosenau, J. N. (1990). Turbulence in world politics: a theory of change and continuity. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Rosenau, J. N. (2003). *Dynamics beyond globalization.* New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Rottmann, S. B. (2023). Forced Migration and the Politics of Belonging: Integration Policy,National Debates and Migrant Strategies. International Migration Review, 59(2), 811   824. https://doi.org/10.1177/01979183231195284

Ryan, C. (2012). Co-Production: Option or Obligation? *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 72(4), 398-406. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8500.2012.00780.x.

Saifullah, K., & Ahmad, A. (2020, July 15). *The Increasing Influence Of The Non-State Actors In   International   Politics*.   https://asce-uok.edu.pk/journal/index.php/JES/article/view/144

Samnakay, N., Alexandra, J., Wyborn, C., & Bender, I. (2024). Climate adaptive water policy in   Australia's Murray Darling basin: soft options or hard commitments? *Ecology and Society,* 29(1). https://doi.org/10.5751/es-14578-290101

Saragih, G. M., Putra, R. K., Ishwara, A. S. S., Nugroho, A. W., & Ivory, J. (2025). Comparison of the Principle of Meaningful Participation in the Process of Law Formation in Indonesia, Switzerland, and Sweden. *Justisi*, 11(3), 889-908. https://doi.org/10.33506/js.v11i3.4346

Sherpa, P. and Chepang, B. (2025). Beyond Tokenism: Indigenous Peoples' Participation in   Decision-Making in Community and National Park Governance in Nepal. *Journal of   Nepalese Studies*, 17(1), 55-67. https://doi.org/10.3126/jns.v17i1.88160

Shi, S. (2022). Research on popular participation in chinese rural governance——the case of   shunde, guangdong. *Academic Journal of Humanities &Amp; Social Sciences*, 5(2).   https://doi.org/10.25236/ajhss.2022.050212

Sørensen, E., & Torfing, J. (2021). "Public Innovation and the Role of Collaboration." *Journal of   Public Administration Research and Theory*, 31(4), 782-797. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/muaa025.

Sørensen, E., Hendriks, C. M., Hertting, N., & Edelenbos, J. (2020). Political boundary spanning: politicians at the interface between collaborative governance and representative democracy. *Policy and Society*, 39(4), 530-569. https://doi.org/10.1080/14494035.2020.1743526

Springman, J., Malesky, E., Right, L., & Wibbels, E. (2022). The Effect of Government Repression on Civil Society: Evidence from Cambodia. *International Studies Quarterly*,   66(3). https://doi.org/10.1093/isq/sqac028

Stapper, E. (2021). Private ordering of public processes: how contracts structure participatory processes in urban development in Amsterdam and Hamburg. *Urban Studies*, 59(9), 1872-1888. https://doi.org/10.1177/00420980211024144

Su, D., Du, Q., Sohn, D., & Xu, L. (2017). Can high-tech ventures benefit from government guanxi and business guanxi? the moderating effects of environmental turbulence. *Sustainability*, 9(1), 142. https://doi.org/10.3390/su9010142

Syahruddin, S., Jalal, N., Laiyan, D., Saragih, D. P., Oja, H., & Purnama, E. N. (2023). Community adaptation in facing the digital governance. *Technium Social Sciences Journal, 49*(1), 393-399. https://doi.org/10.47577/tssj.v49i1.9831

Teivainen, T., & Trommer, S. (2016). Representation Beyond the State: Towards Transnational Democratic Non-state Politics. Globalizations, 14(1), 17–31. https://doi.org/10.1080/14747731.2016.1160599

Torfing, J., Peters, B. G., Pierre, J., & Sørensen, E. (2012). Interactive GovernanceAdvancing the Paradigm. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199596751.001.0001

Townsend, B., Collin, J., Cullerton, K., Lauber, K., Martin, J., Baum, F., … & Friel, S. (2025). Logics of (dis)engagement: mapping variation in organisational norms and approaches to alcohol, UPF and related industries. https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-6901425/v1

Trautendorfer, J., Hohensinn, L., & Hilgers, D. (2025). Contrasting information demand and information supply: Digital platforms as intermediaries of Citizen-Government interaction. *Information Polity*, *30*(4), 321–337. https://doi.org/10.1177/15701255251393049

Trondal, J., Pinheiro, R., Keast, R., & Noble, D. (2022). Governing complexity in times of turbulence. In Edward Elgar Publishing eBooks. https://doi.org/10.4337/9781800889651.00010

Trondal, J., & Bauer, M. (2017). Conceptualizing the European multilevel administrative order. Capturing variation in the European administrative system. European Political Science Review (forthcoming).

Turcanu, C., Oudheusden, M. V., Abelshausen, B., Schieber, C., Schneider, T., Železnik, N., … & Pölzl-Viol, C. (2020). Stakeholder engagement in radiological protection: Developing theory, practice and guidelines. Radioprotection, 55, S211-S218.https://doi.org/10.1051/radiopro/2020036

Ulibarrí, N., Imperial, M. T., Siddiki, S., & Henderson, H. (2023). Drivers and dynamics of collaborative governance in environmental management. Environmental Management, 71(3), 495-504. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00267-022-01769-7

Visser, S. and Kreemers, D. (2019). Breaking through boundaries with par – or not? a research project on the facilitation of participatory governance through

participatory action research (par). Educational Action Research, 28(3), 345-361. https://doi.org/10.1080/09650792.2019.1624380

Vivier, E. and Sanchez-Betancourt, D. (2023). Participatory governance and the capacity to engage: a systems lens. *Public Administration and Development*, 43(3), 220-231. https://doi.org/10.1002/pad.2012

Volk, C. (2019). The problem of sovereignty in globalized times. *Law, Culture and the Humanities*, *18*(3), 716–738. https://doi.org/10.1177/1743872119828010

Widiyaningrum, W. Y. and Riaji, I. A. R. (2023). Collaborative governance on mangrove rehabilitation by indralayang village and pt. pln west java at karang modang. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, 1148-1160. https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-164-7_106

Xin, G., Esembe, E. E., & Chen, J. (2022). The mixed effects of e-participation on the dynamic of trust in government: evidence from Cameroon. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 82(1), 69-95. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8500.12569

Zeemering, E. S. (2016). What are the challenges of multilevel governance for urban sustainability? Evidence from Ottawa and Canada's national capital region. *Canadian Public Administration*, 59(2), 204-223. https://doi.org/10.1111/capa.12167