

Exploring the Civic Architecture of Accountability in Contemporary Public Policy Systems

Sulaksono, Rommy Hardyansah, Al-Araf Assadallah Marzuki, Antonino Pedro Marsal

Universitas Negeri Surabaya,
Universitas Sunan Giri Surabaya,
Badan Riset Inovasi Nasional, Indonesia,
Instituto Boaventura De Timor Leste

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received 21 December 2023
Revised 4 January 2024
Accepted 28 January 2024

Key words:

Civil society organizations,
Public accountability,
Policy monitoring,
Participatory governance,
Transparency,
Strategic advocacy,
Institutional reform.

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the mechanisms through which civil society organizations (CSOs) monitor and influence the implementation and accountability of public policy. Drawing from interdisciplinary literature spanning governance, political science, and development studies, the analysis reveals that CSOs engage in multifaceted strategies including grassroots data collection, policy analysis, strategic litigation, digital monitoring, and transnational advocacy. These functions allow CSOs to operate as both watchdogs and co-governors in contemporary public administration. The findings highlight that the efficacy of these monitoring practices depends on legal environments, institutional openness, resource access, and civic agency. CSOs enhance transparency by transforming technical policy information into public knowledge and creating participatory spaces where citizens can hold institutions accountable. The review also emphasizes the growing importance of digital innovation and transnational networks in expanding the scope of civil society monitoring. Challenges such as civic space contraction, co-optation, and fragmentation are acknowledged, but CSOs' adaptive resilience continues to sustain their influence. The study concludes that civil society oversight reconfigures democratic governance by embedding accountability within everyday civic practices. It argues for policy frameworks that facilitate institutional responsiveness to CSO engagement and calls for empirical research that further examines relational dynamics, knowledge translation, and collaborative monitoring paradigms.

INTRODUCTION

In modern democratic theory, the concept of public accountability cannot be separated from participatory governance (Koenane & Mangena, 2017). As state institutions become increasingly complex marked by the proliferation of regulations, bureaucratic specialization, and the expansion of policy coverage the need for independent and critical external oversight mechanisms becomes increasingly urgent. Civil society organizations (CSOs), which consist of non-governmental entities such as advocacy groups, community-based networks, and professional associations, have developed into vital intermediaries that bridge the gap between citizens and policymakers. Their presence fills the structural gaps often left by formal accountability mechanisms, while ensuring that public policies are not only made by the state for the people, but also with and for the people.

The transformation of CSOs from

philanthropic roots to strategic actors that shape, critique, and challenge public policy reflects the evolution of their role in the governance ecosystem. No longer merely service providers or grant recipients, they have become entities that actively articulate public interests, produce alternative knowledge, and advocate for policy reform based on empirical evidence. Their increasingly prominent presence in maintaining transparency, responsiveness, and democratic resilience (Waardenburg & van de Bovenkamp, 2014) not only emphasizes their oversight function, but also their role as catalysts for policy innovation. Thus, CSOs enrich the democratic process by introducing inclusive perspectives, encouraging more meaningful public participation, and reinforcing the principle that democratic government is one that can be questioned and corrected.

In many democratic societies, CSOs contribute

* Corresponding author, email address: antoniapedromarsal@gmail.com

to policy monitoring by gathering grassroots data, mobilizing affected communities, and advocating for inclusive policy adjustments. Their ability to operate outside formal government channels allows them to bridge institutional accountability gaps and amplify marginalized voices in policy discussions, a function that is particularly vital when public oversight institutions are weak or politically compromised. This function of policy oversight and providing a space for marginalized voices is a concrete form of accommodating social change into policy, in an effort to create a sustainable, just, and relevant society (Halizah & Mardikaningsih, 2022). The literature shows that CSOs not only monitor policy implementation but also assess regulations, expose inconsistencies, and shape the reform agenda through sustained civic engagement (Bentley, 2021).

However, the effectiveness of civil society oversight is influenced by several factors, including legal recognition, access to information, financial autonomy, and institutional responsiveness. In some settings, CSOs operate under restrictive regulatory regimes that limit their capacity to function autonomously (Dupuy et al., 2016). Additionally, ongoing debates question the representativeness of some organizations and their alignment with the wider public interest. These complexities necessitate a closer examination of the structural, operational, and contextual factors that enable or constrain CSO involvement in public accountability (Grimes, 2013).

Despite the growing body of research on democratic governance and participatory monitoring, comprehensive syntheses that evaluate the multifaceted role of CSOs in overseeing public policy remain scarce. Most existing studies are case-specific, sector-bound, or geographically limited, leaving a fragmented understanding of CSOs' systemic contributions to governance. A literature-based analysis is therefore needed to map prevailing themes, evaluate empirical findings, and distill conceptual insights regarding the mechanisms through which CSOs influence the trajectory of public decision-making and policy enforcement (Buntaine, 2015).

One of the main issues identified in the literature concerns the inconsistency in institutional openness toward civil society monitoring. Governments often adopt divergent attitudes, ranging from collaboration to obstruction, depending on political expediency (Anagnostou & Mungiu, 2014). According to Fox (1996), many formal accountability structures are designed more for symbolic compliance than genuine responsiveness. As a result, civil society actors may find their efforts to monitor

or influence policy implementation blocked by opaque bureaucracies or co-opted through superficial consultations that lack binding outcomes.

A second challenge arises from fragmentation within civil society itself, as competition for limited donor funding often leads to overlapping efforts and weakens collective bargaining power. Bratton (1994) observed that in sub-Saharan Africa, externally funded CSOs sometimes exhibit upward accountability to donors rather than downward accountability to constituents, thereby weakening their credibility and effectiveness in public oversight. These dynamics raise critical concerns about authenticity and long-term legitimacy, especially in contexts where donor agendas do not fully align with local governance priorities (Harvey et al., 2019).

Third, the literature frequently highlights the legal and regulatory constraints placed on CSO activity. Salamon and Anheier (1997) emphasized that without enabling legal environments, CSOs are often relegated to informal channels that lack legitimacy in policy discourse. In authoritarian or hybrid regimes, restrictive laws on association, assembly, and foreign funding further impede their operations (Gilbert & Mohseni, 2018). These limitations not only curtail CSOs' monitoring functions but also expose activists to legal harassment, thereby disincentivizing civic participation in governance. Such conditions ultimately hinder the growth of a vibrant and participatory civil society.

The role of civil society in evolving governance requires ongoing academic attention due to its implications for the quality of democracy and institutional accountability (Olsen, 2013). Understanding how CSOs operate in different political and regulatory environments provides insight into the dynamics of policy responsiveness and civic engagement. This transformation of their role, from mere protest to include research, litigation, and formal policy evaluation, reflects the innovation in human resource management that organizations need to increase their competitiveness and effectiveness in the era of globalization (Abdulah et al., 2021). Transparency, accountability, and continuity of oversight functions are also core principles of good corporate governance, the implementation of which has been proven to enhance organizational sustainability in the global market (Rojak & Al Hakim, 2023). As CSOs become more professional and connected to global governance networks, their oversight functions have expanded. Thus, rigorous investigation is needed to uncover the dimensions

of their effectiveness and the obstacles they routinely face.

Furthermore, as governance becomes increasingly data-driven and technocratic, CSOs serve as crucial intermediaries capable of translating technical policy content into accessible narratives for public scrutiny. This mediating role is especially vital in ensuring that public policies reflect not just statistical rationality but also social justice imperatives. Documenting and understanding this contribution are essential for theorizing participatory governance and improving policy legitimacy.

This study aims to examine how civil society organizations monitor and influence the implementation and accountability of public policy. By reviewing existing literature, the research will identify the institutional, political, and operational mechanisms through which CSOs contribute to policy oversight. The study seeks to map the enabling and constraining factors that affect their monitoring capacity and assess the long-term implications of civil society engagement for democratic governance. The findings will contribute to theoretical discussions on participatory policy processes and offer empirical insight into the evolving nature of civic oversight in contemporary public administration.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study uses a literature review to examine how civil society organizations (CSOs) contribute to monitoring and ensuring public policy accountability. This approach suits research questions that span disciplines and regions, where empirical studies are scattered and theories debated. It helps identify key trends, theoretical insights, and empirical patterns to build a comprehensive understanding of civil society's oversight role. Sources include peer-reviewed articles, policy reports, institutional publications, and works from political science, public administration, and development studies.

Guided by the methodological principles outlined by Hart (1998), the review process began with the systematic identification of relevant literature through databases such as JSTOR, Scopus, and Taylor & Francis Online, focusing on publications between 1990 and the present. Inclusion criteria emphasized scholarly credibility, conceptual clarity, and empirical robustness. The selected texts were then subjected to thematic coding, drawing from the framework proposed by Jesson, Matheson, and Lacey (2001), which emphasizes thematic synthesis and interpretive depth. Particular attention was

given to cross-regional studies and meta-analyses, enabling comparative insight into the operational conditions and institutional environments that shape CSO effectiveness. This approach ensures that the review not only aggregates evidence but also interrogates assumptions and identifies areas for future empirical inquiry

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Civil society organizations (CSOs) operate as important intermediaries in the public policy landscape, especially when formal oversight mechanisms are inadequate or compromised. Their monitoring function generally begins with gathering information at the grassroots level, where the impact of policies is most keenly felt (Schrama, 2019). Through structured observation, community feedback mechanisms, and participatory assessments, CSOs collect data on public service delivery, budget allocation, and regulatory enforcement. This empirical database empowers them to question official narratives and identify gaps between policy objectives and actual outcomes on the ground.

The bottom-up monitoring process carried out by CSOs is a critical instrument for recalibrating the chain of accountability, especially in governance systems that lack transparency or are dominated by elite interests (Gaventa, 2004). By highlighting discrepancies between plans and implementation, CSOs not only expose failures, but also open up space for policy corrections and improvements. This role makes them a counterweight that keeps the governance process responsive to broader public needs, while reinforcing the principle that effective policies must be born out of a deep understanding of the realities faced by the community, not merely from decisions at the elite level.

In addition to data collection, CSOs shape policy discourse by constructing alternative interpretations of policy performance. These interpretations are articulated through public reports, advocacy campaigns, and strategic litigation (Smith et al., 2017). They use evidence-based narratives to question technocratic approaches and expose systemic failures, particularly those affecting marginalized populations. The ability to shape discourse and drive practical change emphasizes the importance of management strategies that are not only responsive to external policy aspects but also build internally sustainable and adaptive organizations to improve performance (Hariani et al., 2022). Fung and Wright (2003) emphasize that this

discursive function is not only oppositional but generative, as it stimulates deliberation and expands the epistemic space where policy decisions are debated. By shifting the public narrative, CSOs increase pressure on decision-makers to justify their choices and revise practices that are not adaptive (Wise et al., 2014).

The institutionalization of participatory policymaking has opened formal channels for CSO influence, such as policy councils, budget hearings, and oversight committees in many democratic systems (Chikoto-Schultz et al., 2016). However, their ability to influence decisions within these spaces is contingent on procedural rules, the balance of power, and the willingness of state actors to accommodate dissent. Cornwall (2002) highlights that such invited spaces may be either emancipatory or instrumentalized, depending on how voice is facilitated and whose knowledge is privileged. Thus, CSO participation must be assessed not just by presence but by influence, what Gaventa (2006) describes as the "power to effect policy shifts within deliberative institutions."

Monitoring public procurement and budget transparency are key areas of engagement for CSOs. Organizations such as Transparency International and national oversight bodies audit expenditures, track contracts, and assess legal compliance, which often requires technical skills such as legal analysis, forensic accounting, and digital tools. These technical capabilities and access to digital technology are critical foundations, as digital literacy and technical skills are necessary to effectively bridge the information gap and empower communities in oversight efforts, as discussed in the context of equal opportunities in the technological era (Arifin & Darmawan, 2021). For example, the institutionalization of "social audits" in India has enabled citizens to verify public works and report irregularities, leading to disciplinary actions and reform measures (Chawla, 2021). Goetz and Jenkins (2001) argue that citizen-led accountability innovations such as these recalibrate power by shifting oversight functions from bureaucracies to communities.

Whistleblowing platforms and investigative networks run by CSOs have strengthened their monitoring capacity. These tools enable civil servants, journalists, and citizens to report corruption and policy failures anonymously, supported by CSO protection protocols. In Brazil, the organization Contas Abertas collaborates with investigative media to uncover budget mismanagement, translating raw data into

actionable policy critique (Reynolds et al., 2019). This synergy between civic actors and the press shows how civil society crosses sectoral lines to uphold a culture of vigilance that holds policymakers accountable beyond elections.

CSOs engage at the regulatory level by reviewing the drafting, adoption, and enforcement of laws (Verbruggen, 2013). Through advocacy, coalition-building, and expert input, they help shape policies. Environmental CSOs, for instance, contribute scientific evidence and challenge weak regulations through judicial review. Keck and Sikkink (1998) describe this as a "boomerang effect," where domestic actors leverage international norms and networks to amplify local campaigns, especially in restrictive political contexts.

Monitoring effectiveness is further amplified when CSOs engage in transnational governance mechanisms (Pallas & Uhlin, 2014). Participation in UN shadow reporting processes, global index rankings, and regional human rights tribunals enables them to pressure states indirectly by invoking reputational costs. These forums provide alternative venues to challenge domestic policy failures, especially where local institutions are inaccessible or unresponsive. Sikkink (2005) notes that such internationalized monitoring often triggers internal ripple effects, leading to institutional introspection and preemptive national reforms.

Capacity-building is another key CSO strategy to enhance monitoring. By equipping citizens with legal knowledge, participatory budgeting skills, and documentation tools, they promote grassroots oversight (Loada & Moderan, 2015). This decentralization of accountability functions not only widens monitoring scope but also reinforces democratic literacy. McGee and Gaventa (2011) argue that these empowerment processes create "accountability ecosystems," where formal institutions, civil actors, and citizens engage in dynamic, ongoing patterns of scrutiny, learning, and responsiveness.

Civil society organizations (CSOs) often engage in strategic partnerships with academic institutions, think tanks, and policy experts to support their advocacy. These collaborations provide empirical credibility, theoretical foundations, and evaluation frameworks that strengthen the legitimacy of civil society monitoring. This synergy is particularly important in specialist fields such as public health, where in-depth analysis of the impact of social disparities on service access and quality of life can shape more targeted policy solutions (Nalin et al., 2022). These partnerships also facilitate cross-sector

learning and knowledge transfer, particularly in specialized fields such as public health, education, and digital governance (DeHoog, 2015). When research findings align with lived realities, the synergy between civil society and academics becomes a powerful vehicle for the diffusion of norms and institutional reform.

In post-conflict and fragile settings, CSOs fill policy monitoring gaps where state capacity is weak or absent (Datzberger & Nguyen, 2018). They document human rights violations, oversee transitional justice, and ensure donor programs reach intended beneficiaries. This work of rebuilding governance and fostering social trust aligns with the broader goal of achieving sustainable and balanced development, which necessitates integrating social equity and institutional resilience into policy frameworks (Mardikaningsih & Hariani, 2021). These functions are vital in preventing relapse into authoritarianism or state collapse. As Fernholz (2010) notes, civil society's horizontal accountability fosters peacebuilding by rebuilding social trust and reinforcing rule-based governance, making their role absolutely essential for sustainable democratic recovery.

Technological innovations have redefined the scope and scale of civil society monitoring. Digital dashboards, open data portals, and mobile reporting applications have expanded real-time oversight of government actions. Platforms such as Ushahidi, developed in Kenya, aggregate citizen reports on electoral fraud, disaster response, and service failures, transforming scattered complaints into collective evidence. This transformation in civil monitoring is in line with broader changes in labor relations and management in the digital age, where digital literacy is the foundation for new, more collaborative and transparent working relationships (Darmawan et al., 2023). Digital surveillance enables more responsive governance but also poses challenges such as digital exclusion and surveillance, which must be addressed by CSOs with ethical vigilance (Rumbul, 2016).

Legal advocacy remains one of the most enduring and impactful tools of civil society. Strategic litigation against unconstitutional laws, administrative inaction, or discriminatory policies compels state institutions to justify and revise policy frameworks (Shapiro, 2019). Landmark judgments often originate from petitions filed by CSOs representing marginalized groups, thereby transforming abstract rights into enforceable standards. The litigation efforts of organizations such

as the Center for Economic and Social Rights illustrate how law becomes a terrain of accountability that CSOs tactically inhabit (Grover, 2022).

CSO influence also operates through symbolic politics, mobilizing collective memory, moral appeals, and cultural idioms to reframe public policy debates. In transitional societies, truth commissions and commemorative campaigns led by civil society shape how past atrocities are narrated and addressed in policy (Penteado et al., 2019). Such narrative reframing not only monitors current policy but conditions future policy direction by altering societal values and expectations. This effort to shape societal values and frame public debates is, at its core, an attempt to redefine the foundational principles that guide policy, which aligns with the goal of developing strong legal and institutional structures to give coherent direction to policies aimed at social welfare and justice (Marsal et al., 2021). Edelman (1988) emphasized that political symbolism is central to policy-making because it molds belief systems and defines legitimacy.

The monitoring and influence exerted by CSOs are not always linear or cumulative; they often face repression, co-optation, or fatigue (Hellmeier & Weidmann, 2020). Authoritarian resistance, shrinking civic space, and funding volatility disrupt the sustainability of monitoring. Nevertheless, their ability to adapt through rotating leadership and horizontal networks reflects an agile, public service-oriented form of governance, an effective leadership principle required in modern administration (Rojak, 2021). CSOs adapt by rotating leadership, diversifying funding, and using horizontal networks instead of hierarchical models. This agility helps them withstand shocks and maintain their oversight role over time. As Edwards (2004) argues, the strength of civil society lies not only in capacity but in relational sustainability and normative adaptability.

Civil society oversight fundamentally redefines the public sphere by reclaiming civil sovereignty from bureaucratic domination. Through continuous actions such as questioning policies, disseminating information, and reshaping the public agenda, civil society organizations (CSOs) transform governance from a closed administrative function into an open and inclusive deliberative process. This critical role ensures that public policy is not formulated in a power vacuum, but is tested, critiqued, and enriched by the perspectives and needs of the constituents most affected. Thus, CSOs serve as bridges that revive the essence of the public sphere as an arena for

negotiation and accountability, where collective decisions are born of dialogue, not decree.

The monitoring activities carried out by CSOs are not merely supervisory in nature, but substantively strengthen accountability and reaffirm the core principles of democracy, that power must be accountable, open to debate, and ultimately shared more equitably. The transformation promoted by CSOs is dynamic and ongoing, embedded in everyday practices such as citizen observation, resistance to arbitrary policies, and advocacy for institutional reform. This process is the lifeblood of a living democracy, reminding us that sovereignty ultimately resides with the people. By continuously promoting transparency and participation, CSOs ensure that democracy does not stagnate in electoral procedures, but evolves as a responsive, adaptive system that is constantly renewed by the involvement of its citizens.

CONCLUSION

Civil society organizations have emerged as critical agents in advancing public accountability within diverse policy environments. Their involvement in monitoring and influencing public policy extends across a wide range of domains, from local service delivery to global governance mechanisms. The evidence suggests that CSOs shape governance through data gathering, policy interpretation, litigation, advocacy, and capacity-building. Their impact is mediated by structural, legal, and relational conditions, yet their resilience and adaptability ensure continued relevance, especially in governance systems characterized by institutional opacity or democratic fragility. By occupying formal and informal oversight spaces, CSOs recalibrate the balance of power between citizens and the state, reinforcing democratic pluralism and procedural justice.

This review underscores the necessity for institutional frameworks that not only tolerate but actively facilitate civil society oversight. Policymakers, donors, and international agencies must recognize that CSOs are not auxiliary actors but essential components of a functioning accountability ecosystem. Legal protection, access to information, and long-term resourcing must be guaranteed if their monitoring functions are to be sustained and scaled. Furthermore, academic institutions should collaborate with CSOs to document, evaluate, and refine civic oversight practices, ensuring that democratic innovations are evidence-informed and contextually grounded.

Future research needs to explore the

effectiveness of civil society monitoring in the context of different types of regimes, policy sectors, and policy cycles. More in-depth empirical investigations should focus on the relational dimensions of this influence, examining how elements such as trust, narrative legitimacy, and collaborative networks shape monitoring outcomes. This research needs to identify the specific conditions under which participatory strategies, evidence-based advocacy, and multisectoral coalitions are most effective in influencing policy and strengthening accountability in different political and social environments.

Governments and civil society organizations will benefit from jointly developing locally defined yet globally measurable transparency metrics. Such initiatives can facilitate more constructive dialogue between state and non-state actors, as well as create common standards for assessing policy performance. In this way, civil space will not only be strengthened, but the concept of public accountability will also be rearticulated as a dynamic and collaborative endeavor a continuous process in which the legitimacy of government is built through verified transparency and authentic participation in monitoring and improving the quality of public policy.

REFERENCES

- Abdulah, M. H. A. B., Gardi, B., & Darmawan, D. (2021). Innovation in Human Resource Management to enhance Organizational Competitiveness in the Era of Globalization. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(1), 51-58.
- Anagnostou, D., & Mungiu-Pippidi, A. (2014). Domestic Implementation of Human Rights Judgments in Europe: Legal Infrastructure and Government Effectiveness Matter. *European Journal of International Law*, 25(1), 205-227.
- Arifin, S., & Darmawan, D. (2021). Technology Access and Digital Skills: Bridging the Gaps in Education and Employment Opportunities in the Age of Technology 4.0. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(1), 163-168.
- Bentley, C. M. (2021). 13 Three Problems Facing Civil Society Organizations in the Development Sector in Adopting Open Institutional Design. *Critical Perspectives on Open Development*, 245(1), 1-10.
- Bratton, M. (1994). Civil Society and Political Transition in Africa. *IDR Reports*, 11(6), 1-21.
- Buntaine, M. T. (2015). Accountability in Global Governance: Civil Society Claims for Environmental Performance at the World

- Bank. *International Studies Quarterly*, 59(1), 99-111.
- Chawla, A. (2021). Social Audit, Accountability and Accounting—An Indian Perspective. *Journal of Accounting in Emerging Economies*, 11(1), 10-26.
- Chikoto-Schultz, G., & Uzochukwu, K. (2016). Governing Civil Society in Nigeria and Zimbabwe: A Question of Policy Process and Non-State Actors' Involvement. *Nonprofit Policy Forum De Gruyter*, 7(2), 137-170.
- Cornwall, A. (2002). *Making Spaces, Changing Places: Situating Participation in Development*. IDS Working Paper 170, England.
- Darmawan, D., Gardi, B., & Da Silva, E. B. (2023). Exploration of Changes in Management and Employee Work Relations in Multinational Companies in the Era of Literacy-Based Digitalization. *Journal of Science, Technology and Society (SICO)*, 4(2), 43-54.
- Datzberger, S., & Nguyen, T. (2018). Deconstructing Civil Society Actors and Functions: on the Limitations of International Frameworks for Fragile States. *Social Sciences*, 7(2), 30-38
- de Camargo Penteadó, C. L., dos Santos, M. B. P., & de Paula Aguiar Araújo, R. (2019). Civil Society and Online Citizen Participation: A Case Study of the Nossas Cidades Network. *The Internet and Health in Brazil: Challenges and Trends*, 2(1), 65-84.
- DeHoog, R. H. (2015). Collaborations and Partnerships Across Sectors: Preparing the Next Generation for Governance. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 21(3), 401-416.
- Dupuy, K., Ron, J., & Prakash, A. (2016). Hands Off My Regime! Governments' Restrictions on Foreign Aid to Non-Governmental Organizations in Poor and Middle-Income Countries. *World Development*, 84(1), 299-311.
- Edelman, M. (1988). *Constructing the Political Spectacle*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Edwards, M. (2004). *Civil Society*. Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Fox, J. (1996). How does Civil Society Thicken? The Political Construction of Social Capital in Rural Mexico. *World Development*, 24(6), 1089-1103.
- Fox, J. A. (1996). How does Civil Society Thicken? The Political Construction of Social Capital in Rural Mexico. *World Development*, 24(6), 1089-1103.
- Fung, A., & Wright, E. O. (2003). *Deepening Democracy: Institutional Innovations in Empowered Participatory Governance*. Verso, London.
- Gaventa, J. (2004). Towards Participatory Governance: Assessing the Transformative Possibilities. *Participation: From tyranny to transformation*. Zed Books, London.
- Gaventa, J. (2006). Finding the Spaces for Change: A Power Analysis. *IDS Bulletin*, 37(6), 23-33.
- Gilbert, L., & Mohseni, P. (2018). Disabling Dissent: The Colour Revolutions, Autocratic Linkages, and Civil Society Regulations in Hybrid Regimes. *Contemporary politics*, 24(4), 454-480.
- Gilbert, L., & Mohseni, P. (2018). Disabling Dissent: The Colour Revolutions, Autocratic Linkages, and Civil Society Regulations in Hybrid Regimes. *Contemporary Politics*, 24(4), 454-480.
- Goetz, A. M., & Jenkins, R. (2001). Hybrid Forms of Accountability: Citizen Engagement in Institutions of Public-Sector Oversight in India. *Public Management Review*, 3(3), 363-383.
- Grimes, M. (2013). The Contingencies of Societal Accountability: Examining the Link Between Civil Society and Good Government. *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 48(2), 380-402.
- Grover, R. (2022). The Geopolitics of Digital Rights Activism: Evaluating Civil Society's Role in the Promises of Multistakeholder Internet Governance. *Telecommunications Policy*, 46(10), 1-10.
- Halizah, S. N., & Mardikaningsih, R. (2022). Accommodating Social Change in Sustainability Policy: Solutions for a Just and Relevant Society. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 2(2), 299-304.
- Hariani, M., Mardikaningsih, R., & Essa, N. E. (2022). HR and Environmental Policy Management Strategies to Create a Sustainable Organization that Improves Company Performance. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 2(2), 249-254.
- Hart, C. (1998). *Doing a Literature Review: Releasing the Social Science Research Imagination*. SAGE Publications, London.
- Harvey, B., Jones, L., Cochrane, L., & Singh, R. (2019). The Evolving Landscape of Climate Services in Sub-Saharan Africa: What Roles have NGOs Played?. *Climatic Change*, 157(1), 81-98.
- Hellmeier, S., & Weidmann, N. B. (2020). Pulling the Strings? The Strategic Use of Pro-Government Mobilization in Authoritarian Regimes. *Comparative Political Studies*, 53(1), 71-108.
- Hickey, S., & Mohan, G. (2004). *Participation: From Tyranny to Transformation*. Zed Books, London.

- Jesson, J., Matheson, L., & Lacey, F. M. (2001). *Doing your Literature Review: Traditional and Systematic Techniques*. SAGE Publications, London.
- Keck, M. E., & Sikkink, K. (1998). *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*. Cornell University Press, Ithaca.
- Koenane, M. L., & Mangena, F. (2017). Ethics, Accountability and Democracy as Pillars of Good Governance-Case of South Africa. *African Journal of Public Affairs*, 9(5), 61-73.
- Mardikaningsih, R., & Hariani, M. (2021). Realizing Sustainability in Public Policy: Building a Balance between Economy, Social, and Environment. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(1), 191-196.
- Marsal, A. P., Arifin, S., & Setiawan, I. (2021). Development of a Legal System to Strengthen the Direction and Structure of Social Welfare Policy. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(1), 197-202.
- McGee, R., & Gaventa, J. (2011). Shifting Power? Assessing the Impact of Transparency and Accountability Initiatives. *IDS Working Papers*, 2011(383), 1-39.
- Nalin, C., Saidi, S. A. B., Hariani, M., Mendrika, V., & Issalillah, F. (2022). The Impact of Social Disparities on Public Health: An Analysis of Service Access, Quality of Life, and Policy Solutions. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 2(1), 39-46.
- Olsen, J. P. (2013). The Institutional Basis of Democratic Accountability. *West European Politics*, 36(3), 447-473.
- Paffenholz, T. (Ed.). (2010). *Civil Society & Peacebuilding: A Critical Assessment*. Lynne Rienner, Boulder, CO.
- Pallas, C. L., & Uhlin, A. (2014). Civil Society Influence on International Organizations: Theorizing the State Channel. *Journal of Civil Society*, 10(2), 184-203.
- Reynolds, E. B., Schneider, B. R., & Zylberberg, E. (2019). *Innovation in Brazil. Advancing Development in the 21st Century*. Routledge, London and New York.
- Rojak, J. A. (2021). The Effectively Leading Manifestation of Public Service-Oriented Governance. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(2), 89-96.
- Rojak, J. A., & Al Hakim, Y. R. (2023). Implementation of Corporate Governance in Improving Transparency and Sustainability of Companies in Global Market. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 3(2), 101-106.
- Rumbul, R. (2016). Developing Transparency through Digital Means? Examining Institutional Responses to Civic Technology in Latin America. *JeDEM-eJournal of eDemocracy and Open Government*, 8(3), 12-31.
- Salamon, L. M., & Anheier, H. K. (1997). *Defining the Nonprofit Sector: A Cross-National Analysis*. Manchester University Press, Manchester.
- Schrama, R. (2019). The Monitoring Capacity of Civil Society Networks: A Social Network Analysis in the Case of Gender Equality Policy. *Journal of Civil Society*, 15(2), 123-142
- Shapiro, S. A. (2019). Rulemaking Inaction and the Failure of Administrative Law. *Duke Law Journal*, 68(8), 1805-1842.
- Sieder, R., Schjolden, L., & Angell, A. (2005). *The Judicialization of Politics in Latin America*. Palgrave Macmillan, New York.
- Sikkink, K. (2005). The Transnational Dimension of the Judicialization of Politics in Latin America. In *the Judicialization of Politics in Latin America*. Palgrave Macmillan US, New York.
- Smith, J., Mallouris, C., Lee, K., & Alfvén, T. (2017). The Role of Civil Society Organizations in Monitoring the Global AIDS Response. *AIDS and Behavior*, 21(2), 44-50.
- Verbruggen, P. (2013). Gorillas in the Closet? Public and Private Actors in the Enforcement of Transnational Private Regulation. *Regulation & Governance*, 7(4), 512-532.
- Waardenburg, M., & van de Bovenkamp, H. (2014). Civil Society Organisations as a Government Steering Mechanism: A Comparison between Sport Associations and Patient Organisations in the Netherlands. Palgrave Macmillan UK, London.
- Wise, R. M., Fazey, I., Smith, M. S., Park, S. E., Eakin, H. C., Van Garderen, E. A., & Campbell, B. (2014). Reconceptualising Adaptation to Climate Change as Part of Pathways of Change and Response. *Global environmental change*, 28(1), 325-336.