



UDC: 351.07

<https://doi.org/10.59849/2409-4838.2026.1.52>

## COLLABORATIVE GOVERNANCE: STATE-CIVIL SOCIETY RELATIONS AND FORMATION OF STATE POLICY

Vagif Farid Mammadov 

Azerbaijan University of Tourism and Management, Baku, Azerbaijan  
vagifmammadov23@gmail.com

*Over recent decades, collaborative governance has become one of the core paradigms of contemporary public administration. This transformation is closely linked to the growing recognition that complex public problems cannot be effectively addressed solely through the actions of state actors. As a result, civil society organizations have begun to play an active role not only in policy consultation processes, but also in the co-design, implementation, and oversight of public policy. This article re-examines collaborative governance across diverse governance contexts and analytically explores the opportunities for joint policy formation between the state and civil society. Drawing on a synthesis of recent empirical and conceptual studies in the fields of health, environmental protection, energy, social protection, rural and territorial governance, as well as digital governance, the analysis demonstrates that collaborative governance generates meaningful and sustainable policy outcomes only when supported by institutionalized participation mechanisms, clearly defined accountability structures, and sufficient governance capacity.*

*The primary scientific contribution of the study lies in the development of an integrative conceptual framework that directly links institutional design, interaction dynamics, and accountability mechanisms to the outcomes of policy co-production. This approach moves beyond normative assumptions that portray collaborative governance as automatically beneficial and instead emphasizes that the effects of collaboration are contingent upon contextual and institutional conditions. From a practical perspective, the study offers policy-oriented recommendations for designing collaborative governance mechanisms that enhance effectiveness, inclusiveness, and democratic accountability across policy domains.*

**Keywords:** *institutional design, state–society interaction, public value creation, governance capacity, power asymmetries*

### INTRODUCTION

Over the past two decades, collaborative governance has emerged as a dominant framework in public policy and public administration research. This shift reflects broader transformations in state capacity, administrative complexity, and democratic expectations, which increasingly require the inclusion of non-state actors in governance processes. Civil society organizations (CSOs) are now widely recognized as critical partners in addressing public problems, contributing expertise, legitimacy, and social embeddedness to policy processes [1-3].

However, despite the growing prominence of collaborative governance, its practical outcomes remain contested. While some studies emphasize its potential to enhance policy effectiveness and democratic legitimacy, others underline risks related to co-optation, unequal power relations, and symbolic participation [3-7]. Moreover, much of the existing scholarship remains fragmented across policy sectors, with limited efforts to integrate insights from health, environmental, energy, social protection, and place-based governance. This fragmentation constrains cumulative theoretical development and weakens our understanding of how collaborative governance functions across diverse institutional and contextual settings.



Against this background, the significance of re-examining collaborative governance lies in the growing reliance of governments on civil society actors to co-produce public policy in increasingly complex and uncertain governance environments. As states face constraints related to capacity, legitimacy, and policy implementation, collaboration with civil society has shifted from a complementary practice to a central governance strategy. Yet, the institutional conditions under which such collaboration leads to meaningful outcomes—rather than symbolic participation or co-optation—remain insufficiently theorized and empirically clarified.

A key gap in the literature concerns the limited attention paid to the mechanisms that translate collaborative arrangements into substantive policy co-production. Existing studies often focus either on participatory structures or on sector-specific outcomes, without systematically linking institutional design, interaction processes, and governance performance. As a result, collaboration is frequently treated as a normative ideal rather than as a contingent, power-laden, and context-dependent process shaped by institutional arrangements and accountability structures.

This article addresses this gap by rethinking collaborative governance through a synthetic analysis of recent empirical and conceptual research on state–civil society collaboration. It focuses on how public policy is co-produced through institutionalized interaction between public authorities and civil society organizations across multiple policy sectors and governance contexts. In doing so, the study is guided by two core research questions: (1) How do institutional arrangements shape the ways in which states and civil society organizations co-produce public policy across different governance contexts? and (2) Under what conditions does state–civil society collaboration generate meaningful governance outcomes, and when does it instead reproduce power asymmetries, co-optation, or symbolic participation?

Accordingly, the object of this study is state–civil society collaboration in the co-production of public policy, with particular attention to the institutional mechanisms, interaction dynamics, and structural constraints that influence collaborative governance outcomes. By integrating evidence across sectors and contexts, the article seeks to contribute to a more nuanced and critical understanding of collaborative governance that is both theoretically grounded and policy-relevant.

## MAIN PART

### **Collaborative Governance and State–Civil Society Relations: Conceptual and Empirical Perspectives**

Collaborative governance has emerged as a central conceptual framework for understanding how states interact with non-state actors in the formulation, implementation, and oversight of public policy. At its core, collaborative governance refers to institutionalized arrangements in which public authorities and civil society actors engage in collective decision-making processes oriented toward public problem-solving. This perspective departs from hierarchical models of public administration by emphasizing shared authority, mutual dependence, and deliberative interaction.

From an institutional perspective, collaborative governance is closely linked to the concept of co-governance, which emphasizes the formalization of roles, responsibilities, and accountability mechanisms between the state and civil society. Some scientists argue that durable collaboration depends on stable institutional frameworks that clearly define participation rights and decision-making authority [2]. In the absence of such frameworks, collaborative arrangements risk remaining episodic or symbolic rather than substantive.

The concept of co-production extends the analytical scope of collaborative governance by focusing on the joint creation of public value. Rather than treating civil society organizations (CSOs) as external stakeholders, co-production conceptualizes them as active contributors to governance capacity and policy outcomes [3]. This shift reflects a broader transformation in governance thinking, in which the state increasingly acts as a coordinator within multi-actor governance arrangements rather than the sole provider of public goods.



At the same time, collaborative governance is shaped by structural power asymmetries between state institutions and civil society actors. Empirical research shows that collaboration often unfolds within unequal political and economic contexts, constraining civil society autonomy and limiting substantive influence. In land and disaster governance, for example, collaborative arrangements may coexist with exclusion, co-optation, or strong state dominance when institutional safeguards are weak [4, 5].

These concerns have motivated a growing body of critical scholarship that treats collaborative governance as a politically embedded and context-dependent process rather than a normatively desirable model. From this perspective, institutional design plays a decisive role in mediating power relations and shaping governance outcomes [6-8]. Accountability mechanisms—such as public oversight and integrated control systems—are therefore essential for ensuring that collaboration enhances transparency and democratic legitimacy rather than diffusing responsibility [6, 9].

Contextual conditions further influence how collaborative governance operates in practice. Place-based and comparative studies demonstrate that collaboration is deeply affected by territorial institutions, social capital, and historically embedded state–society relations, leading to significant variation across governance settings [10-13]. These findings challenge universal governance models and underscore the importance of institutional context.

Sectoral research reinforces this differentiated understanding. In health and social protection, collaboration with civil society has been linked to improved service reach and responsiveness at the local level [10, 14]. In environmental and energy governance, CSOs contribute primarily through norm-setting, public mobilization, and implementation support, with their influence remaining contingent on political openness and institutional recognition [12, 15].

Finally, recent scholarship extends collaborative governance into digital and transnational policy arenas, where civil society participation increasingly operates beyond the nation-state and reshapes conventional notions of authority and accountability [16, 17].

Taken together, the literature suggests that collaborative governance should be understood not as a single institutional model but as a spectrum of context-dependent arrangements shaped by institutional design, power relations, and governance capacity. Building on these conceptual foundations, this study examines how state–civil society collaboration functions as a mechanism of public policy co-production and under what conditions it produces meaningful and accountable governance outcomes.

### **Theoretical Framework for Co-Production in Public Policy**

To establish a clear analytical distinction, this article conceptualizes collaborative governance as the overarching institutional and decision-making framework through which state and civil society actors interact, while co-production is treated as a specific process and outcome that may, but does not necessarily, result from such collaboration. Collaborative governance structures participation, authority, and deliberation, whereas co-production refers to the joint creation of public value through shared problem definition, policy design, implementation, and oversight.

This distinction is analytically important because collaborative arrangements do not automatically generate co-production. Collaboration may remain consultative, symbolic, or implementation-oriented without granting civil society actors substantive influence over policy content. Co-production, by contrast, implies a deeper level of integration in which civil society actors contribute meaningfully to both policy formulation and execution. By separating governance arrangements from production processes, the framework avoids conflating participation with co-production and enables a more precise assessment of collaborative outcomes.

From an institutional perspective, co-production emerges where governance arrangements enable sustained and structured interaction between public authorities and civil society. Tsujinaka et al. (2013) describe such arrangements as co-governance systems, in which collaboration is stabilized through formal rules, norms, and clearly defined organizational roles [2]. These institutional fo-



undations transform episodic participation into continuous policy engagement and reduce dependence on political discretion.

A core assumption of co-production theory is functional interdependence between the state and civil society. While the state retains formal authority and regulatory power, civil society contributes complementary resources, including contextual knowledge, social trust, mobilization capacity, and normative legitimacy. This complementarity enhances governance capacity and policy responsiveness and has been observed across multiple policy domains, particularly in health and social protection.

At the same time, co-production is fundamentally shaped by power relations. Structural asymmetries in authority, resources, and legal standing often position the state as the dominant actor, constraining civil society autonomy and limiting joint decision-making [3]. In such settings, co-production may resemble delegated implementation rather than genuine policy co-authorship. Empirical evidence from land governance illustrates how co-production can coexist with exclusionary outcomes when underlying power imbalances remain unaddressed.

Accountability mechanisms therefore constitute a central dimension of co-production frameworks. Public oversight allows civil society actors not only to participate in policy processes but also to monitor implementation and scrutinize state action. Building on this logic, Jomonqulov (2025) emphasizes integrated control systems that combine hierarchical administrative oversight with horizontal civil society monitoring [5]. Within the co-production framework, such mechanisms function as safeguards against co-optation and symbolic participation.

Contextual variation further conditions co-production dynamics. Place-based research demonstrates that institutional effectiveness depends on territorial characteristics, social capital, and historically embedded state–society relations, resulting in significant variation across local governance settings [7]. Comparative institutional analyses similarly show that national governance traditions shape both the scope and depth of civil society involvement.

Sectoral research reinforces this differentiated understanding. In health and social protection, co-production tends to enhance policy reach and adaptability at the local level, where CSOs operate in close proximity to beneficiary communities. In environmental and energy governance, co-production plays a stronger role in norm diffusion, public mobilization, and implementation support, with effectiveness remaining contingent on political openness and institutional recognition.

Recent scholarship further extends co-production theory to digital and transnational governance arenas, where collaboration increasingly transcends national boundaries and challenges traditional notions of authority and accountability. These developments suggest that co-production should be conceptualized as a multi-level and multi-scalar governance process.

Building on these insights, this study adopts a theoretical framework in which co-production emerges from the interaction of three interrelated dimensions: (1) institutional design, which structures participation and authority; (2) interaction dynamics, through which state and civil society actors negotiate roles and resources; and (3) accountability mechanisms, which mediate power relations and governance outcomes. Together, these dimensions provide an analytical basis for examining how collaborative governance translates into meaningful public policy co-production across sectors and contexts.

### **Mechanisms of Policy Co-Production and the Roles and Capacities of Civil Society Actors**

Policy co-production materializes through a set of institutional and interactional mechanisms that structure how states and civil society organizations (CSOs) jointly contribute to public policy. These mechanisms define not only channels of participation but also the allocation of authority, responsibility, and accountability within collaborative governance arrangements. Examining these mechanisms is essential for moving beyond abstract accounts of collaboration toward a clearer understanding of how co-production operates in practice.



### **Institutional and Interactional Mechanisms of Co-Production**

A central mechanism of policy co-production is institutionalized participation, whereby civil society actors are formally integrated into policy processes through advisory councils, participatory committees, co-management bodies, or joint implementation platforms. Such arrangements create structured opportunities for sustained interaction and reduce the risk of episodic or symbolic engagement. Institutionalization enhances predictability and role clarity, thereby increasing the likelihood that collaboration translates into substantive policy influence.

Joint implementation and service delivery constitute a second key mechanism, particularly at the local level. In policy sectors such as health and social protection, CSOs frequently operate as intermediaries between public authorities and beneficiary communities, contributing to outreach, targeting, and the adaptation of services to local needs. Through these roles, co-production becomes embedded in routine governance practices rather than remaining confined to formal decision-making arenas.

Public oversight and monitoring represent a further mechanism through which co-production extends beyond service delivery. Civil society engagement in monitoring policy implementation and administrative conduct strengthens transparency and accountability. Integrated control systems that combine hierarchical state oversight with civil society monitoring are especially important in mitigating risks related to corruption, inefficiency, and elite capture [5]. In this sense, co-production involves shared responsibility for governance integrity as well as policy outcomes.

Finally, agenda-setting and normative mechanisms play an important role in shaping policy trajectories. In environmental, energy, and digital governance, CSOs influence policy by articulating societal values, mobilizing public support, and shaping normative frameworks. These mechanisms underline that co-production encompasses not only operational contributions but also the co-creation of policy priorities and meanings.

#### **Roles and Capacities of Civil Society Actors**

The effectiveness of policy co-production depends significantly on the roles and capacities of civil society actors. CSOs contribute contextual knowledge, social trust, and mobilization capacity that complement state expertise and administrative resources. Their proximity to communities enables them to identify local needs, mediate between citizens and public authorities, and adapt policy interventions to specific contexts.

However, civil society roles are shaped by uneven organizational capacities. Professionalized CSOs with technical expertise and stable funding are generally better positioned to engage in sustained collaboration, particularly in complex policy domains such as environmental governance and social protection [8]. By contrast, smaller or grassroots organizations often face resource constraints and limited institutional recognition, which can restrict their influence within collaborative arrangements.

Capacity asymmetries among CSOs also interact with broader power dynamics in state–civil society relations. Empirical evidence suggests that collaboration may constrain civil society autonomy when participation is conditional on compliance with state agendas or funding requirements. In land governance contexts, for example, civil society involvement has at times been confined to consultative roles, while substantive decision-making authority remains centralized within state institutions or aligned vested interests.

Contextual conditions further shape civil society roles. Place-based research demonstrates that territorial institutions, social capital, and historically embedded state–society relations influence both the capacity and legitimacy of CSOs. Comparative analyses likewise indicate that national governance traditions condition the degree of autonomy and influence afforded to civil society within collaborative governance frameworks.



### **Constraints and Enabling Conditions**

While policy co-production holds considerable potential, its effectiveness depends on enabling institutional and political conditions. Legal recognition of civil society participation, access to information, and stable funding arrangements facilitate meaningful engagement. Conversely, weak accountability mechanisms and opaque decision-making structures undermine trust and limit the transformative potential of collaboration.

State-building and crisis contexts pose additional constraints. Where institutional capacity is weak or political stability is fragile, collaborative arrangements may become instrumentalized, serving short-term administrative needs rather than fostering genuine co-production [15]. These conditions highlight the need to conceptualize co-production as a dynamic and context-sensitive governance process rather than a fixed institutional model.

Taken together, these mechanisms, roles, and conditions illustrate that policy co-production is a multi-dimensional process shaped by institutional design, interaction patterns, and actor capacities. Civil society actors perform diverse and context-dependent roles ranging from service provision and monitoring to agenda-setting and norm entrepreneurship. The effectiveness of co-production ultimately depends on how these roles are enabled, constrained, or transformed within specific collaborative governance arrangements.

A cross-sectoral perspective further underscores this variability. In health and social protection, co-production is primarily embedded in service delivery and local implementation, where proximity to beneficiaries is critical. In environmental and energy governance, co-production relies more heavily on norm-setting, public mobilization, and long-term collective action, making outcomes more dependent on political openness and institutional recognition. Rural and place-based governance contexts likewise demonstrate that territorial institutions and social capital limit the transferability of standardized governance models [11, 13].

Despite these differences, several mechanisms—most notably institutionalized participation, access to information, and accountability structures—emerge as cross-cutting enablers of co-production across policy sectors. This suggests that while collaborative governance rests on shared institutional foundations, the forms and intensity of policy co-production remain inherently sector- and context-dependent.

### **The State's Role in Enabling Collaborative Governance**

While collaborative governance has gained prominence, alternative theoretical perspectives question both its feasibility and desirability. State-centric approaches argue that collaboration may dilute authority, blur accountability, and weaken administrative coherence, particularly in contexts requiring rapid decision-making or strong regulatory enforcement. From this perspective, hierarchical governance is often viewed as more effective in ensuring policy consistency and responsibility. Market-oriented approaches similarly prioritize efficiency and competition over deliberation, suggesting that collaborative arrangements may introduce coordination costs and slow policy implementation.

Acknowledging these critiques, this article does not treat collaborative governance as inherently superior to hierarchical or market-based models. Instead, collaboration is conceptualized as a context-dependent governance strategy whose effectiveness varies across policy domains and institutional settings. By explicitly considering power asymmetries, risks of co-optation, and accountability challenges, the analysis situates collaborative governance within a broader governance repertoire rather than presenting it as a normative ideal.

Within this broader perspective, the role of the state remains central to enabling collaborative governance. Rather than withdrawing from governance, the state acts as an enabler, regulator, and guarantor of collaborative arrangements. Its institutional capacity, legal authority, and political commitment shape whether collaboration with civil society becomes substantive or remains symbolic.



A core enabling function of the state lies in institutional design. By establishing formal participation frameworks—such as consultative councils, co-management bodies, and multi-actor implementation platforms—the state defines the rules of engagement and allocates decision-making authority. Clearly articulated institutional mandates enhance predictability and reduce uncertainty for civil society actors, fostering sustained engagement rather than episodic involvement [11, 14].

Legal recognition and regulatory support further condition collaborative governance. Where civil society participation is embedded in legislation and administrative procedures, collaborative arrangements tend to be more stable and resilient to political change. Conversely, weak or ambiguous legal frameworks render collaboration dependent on administrative discretion, undermining trust and long-term commitment.

The state also plays a critical role in capacity-building and resource allocation. In policy sectors such as health, social protection, and environmental governance, governments increasingly rely on civil society organizations (CSOs) for implementation and outreach. Empirical research suggests that collaboration is most effective when states invest in strengthening civil society capacity rather than treating CSOs as low-cost service providers [10, 11]. Stable funding arrangements, access to information, and technical assistance enable civil society actors to contribute meaningfully to policy co-production.

Finally, the enabling role of the state extends to safeguarding pluralism within collaborative governance arrangements. By promoting inclusive participation and preventing the monopolization of collaborative spaces by a narrow set of professionalized organizations, the state can help preserve the representativeness and diversity of civil society engagement [1]. Failure to do so risks narrowing participation and reproducing existing inequalities within collaborative governance structures.

#### **Power, Conflict, and Accountability in Collaboration**

Despite its cooperative framing, collaborative governance is inherently shaped by power asymmetries and potential conflict. The state retains formal authority, regulatory control, and access to public resources, positioning it as the dominant actor in most collaborative arrangements. These asymmetries influence interaction dynamics and shape which interests are ultimately reflected in policy outcomes.

Empirical research demonstrates that collaboration may result in co-optation when civil society participation is conditional on compliance with state-defined agendas. In disaster governance, civil society organizations (CSOs) often balance cooperation with efforts to preserve autonomy, adjusting their strategies to maintain access while avoiding open confrontation [3]. Similar patterns appear in land governance, where collaborative forums coexist with exclusionary decision-making structures dominated by state or economic elites [4]. In such contexts, collaboration may formally include civil society while substantively limiting its influence.

Conflict within collaborative governance should therefore not be interpreted solely as dysfunction. Rather, it reflects divergent interests, values, and interpretations of public problems. Productive collaboration requires institutional arrangements that allow conflict to be articulated, negotiated, and managed rather than suppressed. Where dissent is excluded or neutralized, collaboration risks devolving into symbolic participation that reinforces existing power relations.

Accountability mechanisms play a central mediating role in addressing these power imbalances. Public oversight enables civil society actors not only to participate in governance processes but also to monitor implementation and scrutinize administrative conduct [6]. Building on this logic, Jomonqulov (2025) emphasizes the importance of integrated control systems that combine hierarchical state oversight with horizontal civil society monitoring [5]. Such arrangements enhance transparency, clarify responsibility, and reduce the risk that collaboration obscures accountability rather than strengthening it.

Accountability challenges vary across policy domains. In environmental and energy governance, the dispersion of authority across multiple actors complicates responsibility allocation, ma-



king accountability mechanisms particularly salient [12, 13, 17]. In digital governance, civil society's growing role in norm-setting and constitutional debates raises accountability questions that increasingly transcend national jurisdictions.

Power-related challenges are further intensified in state-building and crisis contexts. Weak institutional capacity and political instability constrain the state's ability to manage collaborative processes, increasing the likelihood that collaboration becomes instrumental, short-term, or primarily symbolic [15]. These conditions underscore that collaborative governance cannot substitute for strong public institutions but is fundamentally dependent on them.

Taken together, these dynamics indicate that collaborative governance is neither inherently egalitarian nor automatically democratic. While the state plays a decisive enabling role, persistent power asymmetries and accountability gaps shape collaborative outcomes. Empirical evidence suggests that collaboration frequently falls short of genuine co-production not due to implementation failures alone, but because of structural conditions such as weak institutional safeguards, constrained civic space, and asymmetric resource dependencies. Recognizing these conditions allows for a more realistic assessment of collaborative governance as a contingent and power-sensitive governance strategy rather than a universally transformative model.

## CONCLUSION

This article set out to rethink collaborative governance by examining how states and civil society co-produce public policy across diverse governance contexts. Drawing on recent empirical and conceptual literature, the analysis demonstrates that collaborative governance is best understood not as a single institutional model, but as a spectrum of arrangements shaped by institutional design, interaction dynamics, actor capacities, and power relations.

The findings indicate that collaboration can enhance policy effectiveness, inclusiveness, and legitimacy when it is supported by clear institutional frameworks, legal recognition of civil society participation, and robust accountability mechanisms. Across policy domains—including health, social protection, environmental and energy governance, rural development, and digital governance—civil society actors provide contextual knowledge, social trust, and mobilization capacity that complement state authority and administrative resources. These contributions, however, translate into meaningful policy co-production only when collaboration is institutionalized and civil society autonomy is preserved.

At the same time, the analysis highlights persistent structural challenges. Power asymmetries between state institutions and civil society actors remain a defining feature of collaborative governance, shaping participation and policy outcomes. In the absence of effective accountability and integrated control systems, collaborative arrangements risk devolving into symbolic participation or co-optation, thereby undermining democratic governance objectives. These risks are particularly pronounced in contexts characterized by weak institutions, limited resources, or high levels of political centralization.

Several policy implications follow from these findings. First, governments aiming to promote collaborative governance should prioritize institutionalization over administrative discretion. Embedding participatory mechanisms in legal and procedural frameworks is essential for ensuring stability, predictability, and continuity in state–civil society collaboration.

Second, capacity-building should be treated as a core investment in governance rather than a supplementary measure. Enhancing civil society access to information, technical expertise, and sustainable funding strengthens its ability to engage in policy co-production beyond narrow service delivery functions.

Third, accountability must be strengthened through integrated oversight systems. Effective collaborative governance requires mechanisms that combine hierarchical state accountability with



horizontal civil society monitoring, thereby clarifying responsibility and mitigating power imbalances.

Finally, policymakers should adopt context-sensitive approaches to collaborative governance. Sectoral characteristics, place-based conditions, and historically embedded state–society relations significantly shape collaborative outcomes, limiting the effectiveness of uniform governance templates. Adaptive institutional design that reflects contextual variation is therefore critical for fostering meaningful and accountable collaboration.

## REFERENCES

1. Bäck, A., Modin Asper, M., Madsen, S., Eriksson, L., Costea, V. A., Hasson, H., Bergström, A. Collaboration between local authorities and civil society organisations for improving health: A scoping review // – *BMJ Open*, – 2025, 15 (3), – e092525.
2. Brandsen, T., Trommel, W., Verschuere, B. The state and the reconstruction of civil society // – *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, – 2017, 83 (4), – p. 676–693.
3. Busscher, N., Vanclay, F., Parra, C. Reflections on how state–civil society collaborations play out in the context of land grabbing in Argentina // – *Land*, – 2019, 8 (8), – p. 116.
4. De Nigris, M., Giuliano, F. The role of organised civil society in the implementation of the renewable energy transition and renewable energy communities: A qualitative assessment // – *Energies*, – 2023. №16, – p. 4122.
5. Foli, R. K., Ohemeng, F. L. K., Kpessa-Whyte, M. Collaborative governance in social protection programs in developing countries: Evidence from Ghana // – *Policy and Society*, – 2025.
6. Gumenyuk, V., Dolianovska, I., Miakinchenko, I., Obushenko, N., Kamardina, Y. Modern challenges for state-building: Interaction between civil society and the state // – *Salud, Ciencia y Tecnología – Serie de Conferencias*, – 2025. №4, – p. 645.
7. Jomonqulov, B. The relationship between civil society and state governance: The need for an integrated control system // – *Oriental Journal of History, Politics and Law*, – 2025, 5 (9), – p. 35–44.
8. Kolmodin, S. What’s place got to do with it? Collaboration among civil society actors in northern rural Sweden // – *Journal of Rural Studies*, – 2025. №119, – p. 103797.
9. Marzak, G. A. Obshchestvennyy kontrol kak forma vzaimodeystviya grazhdanskogo obshchestva i gosudarstva // – *İzvestiya MGTU —MAMII*, – 2014, 8 (1–5), – p. 199–203.
10. Moysan, T., Ródenas-Rigla, F. The participatory processes in public policy-making: A scoping review // – *Societies*, – 2024. №14, – p. 244.
11. Orlova, A. N. State and civil society: Cooperation and interconnection // – *Vestnik of Kostroma State University*, – 2024, 30 (1), – p. 243–250.
12. Palladino, N., Redeker, D., Celeste, E. Civil society’s role in constitutionalising global content governance // – *Internet Policy Review*, – 2025, 14 (1), – p. 1830.
13. Syal, R., van Wessel, M., Sahoo, S. Collaboration, co-optation or navigation? The role of civil society in disaster governance in India // – *Voluntas*, – 2021. №32, – p. 795–808.
14. Tsujinaka, Y., Ahmed, S., Kobashi, Y. Constructing co-governance between government and civil society: An institutional approach to collaboration // – *Public Organization Review*, – 2013. №13, – p. 411–426.
15. Wang, Y., Qiu, Y. How civil society organizations influence environmental governance in the Global South // – *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, – 2025. №75, – p. 101556.
16. Xu, K., Wen, S., Duan, K., Hua, W. Exploring the impact mechanism on collaborative governance of urban–rural integrated development in the Yangtze River Delta region // – *Land*, – 2025. №14, – p. 2393.
17. Yngve, L., Kassman, A. Civil society and governance: A survey of local authority and NPO collaboration from an institutional perspective // – *Journal of Civil Society*, – 2024, 20 (4), – p. 404–425.



## ƏMƏKDAŞLIQ ƏSASLI İDARƏETMƏ: DÖVLƏT–VƏTƏNDAŞ CƏMIYYƏTİ MÜNASİBƏTLƏRİ VƏ DÖVLƏT SİYASƏTİNİN FORMALAŞMASI

V.F. Məmmədov

Son onilliklərdə əməkdaşlıq əsaslı idarəetmə müasir dövlət idarəçiliyinin əsas paradıqlarından birinə çevrilmişdir. Bu transformasiya mürəkkəb ictimai problemlərin yalnız dövlət aktorlarının fəaliyyəti ilə səmərəli şəkildə həll edilməsinin mümkün olmadığına getdikcə daha çox qəbul olunması ilə əlaqəlidir. Nəticə etibarilə, vətəndaş cəmiyyəti təşkilatları artıq tək cəsi siyasət üzrə məsləhətləşmə proseslərində deyil, həm də dövlət siyasətinin birgə hazırlanması, icrası və icrasına nəzarətdə fəal rol oynamağa başlamışdır.

Bu məqalədə əməkdaşlıq əsaslı idarəetmə müxtəlif idarəetmə kontekstlərində yenidən nəzərdən keçirilir və dövlətlə vətəndaş cəmiyyətinin dövlət siyasətinin birgə formalaşdırılmasında iştirak imkanları analitik şəkildə müzakirə olunur. Səhiyyə, ətraf mühitin mühafizəsi, energetika, sosial müdafiə, kənd və ərazi idarəçiliyi, eləcə də rəqəmsal idarəetmə sahələrində aparılmış müasir empirik və konseptual tədqiqatların sintezinə əsaslanan təhlil göstərir ki, əməkdaşlıq əsaslı idarəetmə yalnız institusionallaşdırılmış iştirak mexanizmləri, aydın müəyyən olunmuş hesabatlılıq strukturları və kifayət qədər idarəetmə potensialı mövcud olduqda mənalı və davamlı siyasət nəticələri yarada bilər.

Tədqiqatın əsas elmi töhfəsi institusional dizaynı, qarşılıqlı fəaliyyətin dinamikasını və hesabatlılıq mexanizmlərini dövlət siyasətinin birgə formalaşdırılmasının nəticələri ilə birbaşa əlaqələndirən inteqrativ konseptual çərçivənin irəli sürülməsidir. Bu yanaşma əməkdaşlıq əsaslı idarəetmənin normativ şəkildə avtomatik müsbət təsir göstərməsi ilə bağlı yanaşmalardan kənara çıxaraq, əməkdaşlığın təsirinin kontekstual və institusional şərtlərdən asılı olduğunu vurğulayır. Praktiki baxımdan isə tədqiqat müxtəlif siyasət sahələrində effektivliyi, inklüzivliyi və demokratik hesabatlılığı artıran əməkdaşlıq əsaslı idarəetmə mexanizmlərinin formalaşdırılması üçün siyasətyönlü tövsiyələr təqdim edir.

**Açar sözlər:** *institusional dizayn, dövlət–cəmiyyət qarşılıqlı əlaqəsi, ictimai dəyərin yaradılması, idarəetmə potensialı, güc asimetriyası*

## КОЛЛАБОРАТИВНОЕ УПРАВЛЕНИЕ: ВЗАИМООТНОШЕНИЯ ГОСУДАРСТВА И ГРАЖДАНСКОГО ОБЩЕСТВА В ФОРМИРОВАНИИ ПУБЛИЧНОЙ ПОЛИТИКИ

В.Ф. Мамедов

В последние десятилетия коллаборативное управление стало одной из ключевых парадигм современного государственного управления. Данная трансформация связана с возрастающим признанием того, что сложные общественные проблемы не могут быть эффективно решены исключительно за счёт деятельности государственных акторов. В результате организации гражданского общества начинают играть активную роль не только в консультационных процессах по вопросам политики, но и в совместной разработке, реализации и контроле за осуществлением государственной политики.

В данной статье коллаборативное управление рассматривается заново в различных управленческих контекстах, а возможности участия государства и гражданского общества в совместном формировании государственной политики анализируются с аналитической точки зрения. Анализ, основанный на синтезе современных эмпирических и концептуальных исследований в сферах здравоохранения, охраны окружающей среды, энергетики, социальной защиты, сельского и территориального управления, а также цифрового управления, показывает, что коллаборативное управление способно обеспечивать значимые и устойчивые политические



результаты лишь при наличии институционализированных механизмов участия, чётко определённых структур подотчётности и достаточного управленческого потенциала.

Основной научный вклад исследования заключается в выдвижении интегративной концептуальной рамки, которая непосредственно связывает институциональный дизайн, динамику взаимодействия и механизмы подотчётности с результатами совместного формирования государственной политики. Данный подход выходит за рамки нормативных представлений о коллаборативном управлении как автоматически положительном явлении и подчёркивает зависимость его эффектов от контекстуальных и институциональных условий. С практической точки зрения исследование предлагает ориентированные на политику рекомендации по формированию механизмов коллаборативного управления, способствующих повышению эффективности, инклюзивности и демократической подотчётности в различных сферах государственной политики.

**Ключевые слова:** *институциональный дизайн, взаимодействие государства и общества, создание общественной ценности, управленческий потенциал, асимметрия власти*