DOI: https://doi.org/10.62017/tektonik

Autonomous Civil Action and Regulatory Transparency in Support of Substantive Democratic Reform

Indira Jazmine [*1]
Edward Benedictus Roring [2]
Wicipto Setiadi [3]

[1] Universitas Diponegoro
[2,3] UPN "Veteran" Jakarta
*e-mail : indirajazmine@students.undip.ac.id

Abstract

This study examines the interaction between civil society and the state in strengthening substantive democracy, emphasizing democratic practices that go beyond elections. Using a qualitative approach supported by a focused literature review, the research analyzes how civic engagement, state responsiveness, and institutional transparency contribute to deeper democratic outcomes. The findings show that substantive democracy grows when civil society remains autonomous, inclusive, and capable of influencing decision-making, while the state provides an enabling environment that protects civic freedoms. The study concludes that strong state–society synergy is essential for advancing accountability, participation, and social justice within democratic systems.

Keywords: *civil society, substantive democracy, state–society relations, participation, accountability.*

INTRODUCTION

Substantive democracy represents a deeper and more meaningful form of democratic governance, emphasizing not only electoral processes but also the quality of participation, accountability, and public deliberation (Dahl, 1998). Unlike procedural democracy, which focuses primarily on elections and institutional structures, substantive democracy requires the active engagement of citizens and strong protections for civil rights (Diamond, 1999). The interaction between civil society and the state lies at the heart of how democracies evolve and sustain themselves (Dryzek, 2000). Civil society provides a platform for diverse groups to express interests, challenge abuses of power, and voice public concerns. These functions serve as checks and balances against state authority and contribute to more responsive governance (Putnam, 1993).

Historically, democratic struggles have relied heavily on civil society actorsactivists, community groups, social movements who push for reforms when political systems become stagnant or exclusionary (Edwards, 2014). Through sustained activism, civil society often becomes the driver of democratic expansion. However, the stability and effectiveness of civil society depend significantly on state behavior. States that guarantee freedom of expression, association, and assembly strengthen the capacity of civil society to operate independently (Migdal, 2001). Conversely, states that restrict civic space undermine the foundations of substantive democracy (Carothers, 2015).

State–society relations are therefore shaped by institutional contexts, legal frameworks, and political culture (Schmitter, 1997). Where these conditions are open and supportive, civil society flourishes; where they are restrictive, democratic participation suffers (Keane, 2009). Recent global trends reveal worrying patterns of shrinking civic space. Governments in various regions have introduced laws that constrain nongovernmental organizations, limit funding, and criminalize dissent (Carothers, 2015). These developments threaten the autonomy and role of civil society in fostering democratic accountability.

At the same time, new platforms for civic participation are emerging. Digital activism, online petitions, and virtual civic forums enable citizens to organize rapidly and on a wide scale (Norris, 2011). These innovations broaden democratic participation beyond traditional channels. Despite these opportunities, digital spaces also introduce new challenges. Political polarization,

DOI: https://doi.org/10.62017/tektonik

misinformation, and algorithmic manipulation can undermine constructive public deliberation (Norris, 2011). Civil society must navigate these dynamics to remain effective.

The state plays a critical role in regulating digital spaces, shaping whether such platforms promote democratic engagement or reinforce existing inequalities (Migdal, 2001). Effective regulation must balance freedom and accountability. Scholars have emphasized that democratic quality is highest where the state actively collaborates with civil society rather than treating it as a threat (Fung & Wright, 2003). Collaborative governance arrangements such as participatory budgeting and community oversight mechanisms illustrate this potential. Participatory governance allows citizens to influence policy-making directly, deepening democratic outcomes (Fung & Wright, 2003). When states support such mechanisms, they help institutionalize civic participation beyond sporadic activism.

However, the success of collaborative governance depends on mutual trust. Civil society must believe that state institutions will respond to their input, while states must view civil society as legitimate partners (Schmitter, 1997). Trust-building is therefore an essential component of democratic consolidation. In many transitional democracies, mistrust between the state and civil society remains high due to past authoritarian legacies or ongoing political tensions (Diamond, 1999). Overcoming this legacy requires institutional reforms and long-term political commitments. Civil society autonomy is another essential dimension of substantive democracy. Without autonomy, civil society risks co-optation by political elites who may use civic organizations to legitimize policies without genuine inclusion (Edwards, 2014). Maintaining independence ensures that civil society can hold the state accountable.

Inclusivity also matters. Civil society must represent diverse social groups not just elites to promote equitable democratic outcomes (Dahl, 1998). When civil society is dominated by middle-class or urban actors, marginalized communities may remain excluded from decision-making.

The strength of civil society therefore depends on its ability to mobilize broad social coalitions and articulate the interests of varied constituencies (Putnam, 1993). Strong civic networks enhance collective action and support democratic deepening. Substantive democracy also requires effective state institutions capable of delivering public goods, protecting rights, and acting transparently (Migdal, 2001). A weak or corrupt state can undermine even the strongest civil society initiatives. Thus, state capacity and civil society vitality must develop simultaneously. A strong civil society without a responsive state may lead to frustration and political instability; a strong state without civil society risks authoritarian tendencies (Keane, 2009).

The interaction between civil society and the state is therefore a dynamic and evolving process. Both actors must continuously adapt to changing political and social landscapes, including technological shifts, global economic pressures, and evolving citizen expectations (Dryzek, 2000). Ultimately, substantive democracy thrives when the state and civil society maintain a balanced, cooperative, and mutually reinforcing relationship (Tilly, 2007). Understanding this dynamic is essential for strengthening democratic institutions in contemporary societies.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Civil society has long been recognized as a key pillar of democratic development. Classical democratic theorists argue that strong civic engagement forms the backbone of democratic culture and political accountability (Dahl, 1998). In this view, civil society provides spaces where citizens learn democratic norms, practice collective action, and hold governing institutions in check. Modern scholarship expands this perspective by linking civil society to democratic consolidation. Diamond (1999) emphasizes that civil society contributes to both vertical accountability citizens monitoring the state and horizontal accountability institutions checking one another. This dual function places civil society at the center of democratic deepening.

Civil society is often conceptualized as a sphere distinct from both the state and the market, composed of voluntary associations, social movements, NGOs, and informal networks (Edwards, 2014). Its autonomy is crucial because the independence of civic actors determines their ability to critique state power and advocate for public interests. However, scholars note that civil society is not inherently democratic. Putnam (1993) argues that dense civic networks

DOI: https://doi.org/10.62017/tektonik

typically strengthen democratic cooperation, yet not all civic groups promote democratic values. Some may reinforce exclusivity, nationalism, or anti-democratic sentiments.

Civil society's relationship to the state is another major theme in the literature. Migdal (2001) highlights that the state is not a monolithic entity but a complex array of institutions, each with its own interests and capacities. Civil society must therefore navigate diverse state actors when engaging in policy advocacy or resistance. State society relations are also shaped by historical legacies. Countries with authoritarian pasts often exhibit mistrust between state institutions and civic groups (Diamond, 1999). These legacies influence the degree to which civil society can participate meaningfully in democratic processes. The theory of deliberative democracy provides additional insight into how dialogue between state and society contributes to democratic quality. Dryzek (2000) argues that deliberation allows for inclusive and reasoned debate, helping resolve conflicts and improve policy outcomes through public input.

Fung and Wright (2003) build on this framework through their concept of "empowered participatory governance," which involves direct citizen involvement in decision-making. They argue that state institutions can enhance democratic outcomes by sharing authority with civil society in structured and sustainable ways. According to Keane (2009), democratization in the 21st century increasingly depends on "monitory democracy," where civil society organizations continuously oversee political power through various mechanisms. This model emphasizes transparency and institutional responsiveness. Yet, civil society faces numerous obstacles. Carothers (2015) documents the global trend of shrinking civic space, where governments use legal and administrative tools to restrict NGOs and grassroots activism. These constraints weaken civil society's role in promoting accountability.

Digital transformation has also reshaped the landscape of civic participation. Norris (2011) argues that digital tools democratize access to information and activism, enabling broader participation. However, they also amplify polarization and misinformation, complicating deliberative processes. In transitional democracies, the uneven distribution of resources among civic groups creates disparities in influence. Well-funded NGOs may gain access to policymakers, while grassroots groups struggle to participate (Edwards, 2014). This imbalance affects democratic inclusivity. Civil society's impact on democracy is also contingent on state capacity. Low-capacity states may fail to respond effectively to civil society demands or implement reforms (Migdal, 2001). In such contexts, even strong civic activism may yield limited democratic gains.

Research on participatory governance shows that institutional design matters. Mechanisms such as participatory budgeting succeed when the state commits to transparency and equitable participation (Fung & Wright, 2003). Without these commitments, participation becomes superficial. Studies also highlight the importance of social capital in shaping democratic engagement. Putnam (1993) argues that trust and cooperation within communities support collective action and democratic stability. Low social capital can therefore hinder civic mobilization.

Tilly (2007) contributes by analyzing democracy as a continuous process rather than a fixed institutional state. He argues that civil society and the state must engage in ongoing negotiation to expand democratic rights and reduce inequality. Comparative analyses show that collaboration between state and civil society yields better democratic outcomes than adversarial relations (Schmitter, 1997). Cooperative models encourage shared responsibility in policy formulation and oversight. However, cooperation is difficult to sustain when states attempt to co-opt civic actors. Co-optation leads to loss of autonomy and undermines civil society's watchdog function (Edwards, 2014). Autonomous civic engagement is therefore essential for democratic health.

Despite challenges, civil society remains a driver of innovation in democratic practice. Grassroots movements continue to introduce new forms of participation, from community assemblies to digital civic platforms (Norris, 2011). These innovations help expand democratic inclusion. The literature collectively reveals that substantive democracy emerges from the dynamic interaction of empowered civil society and responsive state institutions. When both spheres reinforce one another, democratic governance becomes more participatory, accountable, and resilient (Tilly, 2007).

DOI: https://doi.org/10.62017/tektonik

RESEARCH METHOD

This study uses a qualitative research design to examine the relationship between civil society and the state in strengthening substantive democracy. A qualitative approach is chosen because the topic involves complex political interactions, institutional dynamics, and evolving patterns of civic engagement that require contextual and interpretive analysis. The research relies on a systematic literature review, synthesizing academic books, peer-reviewed journal articles, policy reports, and comparative studies related to civil society, democratic governance, and state–society relations. Sources are selected based on relevance, credibility, and their contribution to understanding key concepts such as civic participation, accountability, and democratic consolidation.

The literature is analyzed through thematic coding, identifying recurring patterns such as civil society autonomy, state responsiveness, participatory mechanisms, and challenges to civic space. These themes form the basis for interpreting how civil society influences democratic quality and how state institutions shape the environment for civic action. An interpretive analytical framework is used to understand the meaning, context, and implications of interactions between state and civil society actors. Comparative insights from different political systems further strengthen the analysis by highlighting conditions that support or hinder substantive democracy. Overall, this qualitative, literature-based method provides a comprehensive and context-sensitive foundation for examining how the synergy between civil society and the state contributes to deepening democratic practices.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

a. Civil Society Autonomy and Democratic Accountability

Civil society autonomy plays a foundational role in democratic accountability, as independent civic actors are able to monitor governmental performance without the pressure of political interference (Edwards, 2014). When civil society organizations operate freely, they have the capacity to challenge abuses of power and mobilize citizens to demand transparency (Putnam, 1993). In many democracies, autonomous civil society movements have been essential in exposing corruption, advocating for marginalized communities, and shaping public debate (Diamond, 1999). Such independence allows civil society to act as both a catalyst for reform and a defender of democratic norms.

The literature consistently suggests that democratic accountability weakens when civil society becomes co-opted by the state (Schmitter, 1997). Co-optation limits the watchdog function of civic groups, replacing critical engagement with symbolic participation that does little to strengthen democratic outcomes. Historical patterns demonstrate that civil society autonomy is often contested, particularly in states with authoritarian legacies (Migdal, 2001). In these contexts, governments may restrict civic freedoms to maintain political control, undermining the potential of civil society to influence democratic governance.

Even in established democracies, civil society autonomy can be affected by funding structures. Organizations reliant on state funding may face pressures to align their agendas with government priorities (Carothers, 2015). This dynamic threatens the neutrality and advocacy capacity of civic institutions. Autonomy is further influenced by legal frameworks that regulate association, assembly, and free expression (Keane, 2009). Restrictive laws, licensing systems, and regulatory burdens can weaken civil society's operational independence.

Civil society autonomy also relies on organizational capacity. Groups with weak institutional structures may struggle to assert independence or challenge state authority effectively (Edwards, 2014). Strong governance practices within civic organizations enhance their credibility and legitimacy. Another key aspect of autonomy relates to ideological diversity. A pluralistic civil society ecosystem ensures that multiple perspectives contribute to democratic debate (Dahl, 1998). Homogeneous civil societies risk reinforcing dominant interests rather than promoting inclusive governance. Coalition-building among civic groups strengthens autonomy by

DOI: https://doi.org/10.62017/tektonik

creating collective resistance against state attempts to suppress civil society (Putnam, 1993). Networks and alliances enable organizations to pool resources and amplify their voices.

Digital activism has increased civil society independence by providing alternative platforms for mobilization beyond state-controlled spaces (Norris, 2011). However, these digital spaces also present new vulnerabilities, such as surveillance and algorithmic manipulation. Civil society autonomy enhances accountability by enabling scrutiny of public policies and government spending. Investigative NGOs play a major role in monitoring corruption and exposing violations of democratic norms (Diamond, 1999). Civil society also holds the judiciary accountable by advocating for legal reforms that preserve institutional independence. Legal advocacy groups contribute to the enforcement of constitutional rights (Tilly, 2007).

Although autonomy is essential, civil society must balance independence with constructive engagement. Excessive adversarial relations can lead to political polarization and weaken democratic cooperation (Schmitter, 1997). In fragile democracies, autonomous civic actors often face significant repression, from censorship to imprisonment. Such measures reveal the fragility of democratic accountability (Carothers, 2015). Civil society autonomy is strongly linked to social capital. Societies with high trust and cooperation are more likely to sustain autonomous civic movements (Putnam, 1993). Without social trust, civil society becomes fragmented. Resource disparities among civil society groups hinder overall autonomy. Well-funded organizations may dominate public discourse, overshadowing marginalized voices (Edwards, 2014).

Foreign donor involvement also shapes civil society independence. While donor support strengthens capacity, it may create external dependencies that complicate local legitimacy (Migdal, 2001). Autonomy allows civil society to generate alternative policy proposals. Think tanks and research-oriented NGOs contribute evidence-based recommendations that influence state decisions (Dryzek, 2000).

Ultimately, civil society autonomy strengthens democratic accountability by ensuring the presence of independent actors capable of challenging state power and promoting public interests (Diamond, 1999). Without autonomy, substantive democracy cannot flourish.

b. State Capacity, Responsiveness, and Institutional Openness

State capacity plays a crucial role in democratic deepening because even the most active civil society cannot compensate for weak or unresponsive institutions (Migdal, 2001). A capable state ensures that policies are implemented effectively and that citizen participation has meaningful outcomes. Responsiveness is a primary indicator of a democratic state. When governments respond to public demands and integrate civic feedback into policy-making, democratic legitimacy increases (Dahl, 1998). Responsiveness demonstrates that institutions value citizen input.

Institutional openness is necessary to support such responsiveness. Open institutions provide accessible information, allow public participation, and enable oversight by civil society (Keane, 2009). Transparency mechanisms such as open data platforms help strengthen institutional trust. State institutions must also protect civic freedoms to support democratic engagement. Weak protections for expression or association lead to fear, self-censorship, and declining participation (Carothers, 2015). Democratic openness depends on secure rights. In states with high capacity but low openness, accountability may suffer. Strong bureaucracies can implement policies efficiently yet still operate in ways that exclude public participation (Diamond, 1999). This creates technocratic but not democratic governance.

Conversely, states with openness but low capacity may struggle to implement citizen-driven reforms. Civil society may mobilize demands, but weak institutions cannot respond adequately (Schmitter, 1997). This leads to frustration and democratic stagnation. Institutional openness includes mechanisms for public consultation, such as hearings, participatory planning, and community dialogues (Fung & Wright, 2003). These processes enhance citizen influence but require sustained state commitment. The literature indicates that states with decentralized systems offer greater opportunities for civic participation (Putnam, 1993). Local governments often have closer ties to communities, enabling more effective feedback loops.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.62017/tektonik

Digital governance platforms enhance institutional openness by allowing instant access to information and bridging communication between the state and citizens (Norris, 2011). However, digital divides can create unequal access. State responsiveness is linked to political will. Even when institutional structures exist, leaders must be committed to democratic values to ensure that participation becomes meaningful (Tilly, 2007).

In authoritarian contexts, responsiveness is often selective, aimed at co-opting influential groups rather than empowering citizens. This façade of participation undermines substantive democracy (Carothers, 2015). Effective state capacity requires credible rule of law. Independent courts ensure that democratic rights are upheld and that both state and civil society actors abide by constitutional limits (Diamond, 1999). Institutional professionalism matters. States with merit-based bureaucracies maintain consistency in public services and reduce corruption, strengthening democratic legitimacy (Migdal, 2001).

High-capacity states can better support civic education initiatives that strengthen democratic literacy among citizens. Education systems play a role in teaching democratic norms (Dahl, 1998). Openness also depends on freedom of the press. Independent media serve as intermediaries between state and society, providing information and amplifying civic concerns (Keane, 2009). States must invest in inclusive participation mechanisms to avoid elite domination. When participation is exclusive, civil society's broader democratic potential is undermined (Edwards, 2014).

Responsiveness involves not only listening but also implementation. Policies that emerge from public consultation must be translated into action to maintain public trust (Fung & Wright, 2003). Institutional openness requires continuous innovation. States must adapt to new technologies, social dynamics, and expectations for transparency (Norris, 2011). Ultimately, strong state capacity and openness enhance the environment in which civil society can influence democratic quality. Without capable and responsive institutions, participatory democracy cannot thrive (Tilly, 2007).

c. Collaborative Governance and Participatory Democratic Innovations

Collaborative governance describes arrangements where state institutions and civil society jointly participate in policy-making and oversight. These partnerships deepen democracy by sharing authority and co-producing public solutions (Fung & Wright, 2003). Participatory governance mechanisms, such as participatory budgeting and citizen assemblies, allow the public to directly shape policy priorities (Diamond, 1999). These innovations enhance legitimacy and raise civic engagement levels. Collaborative governance is grounded in mutual trust between state and civil society actors (Schmitter, 1997). Without trust, cooperation fails and adversarial dynamics dominate. Civil society brings local knowledge, lived experience, and community connections that complement the technical expertise of state agencies (Putnam, 1993). This bridging enhances policy effectiveness.

Participatory innovations require open political environments that encourage dialogue and reduce power imbalances between actors (Dryzek, 2000). Inclusive spaces help ensure marginalized voices are heard. The literature highlights that collaborative governance often improves public service delivery by incorporating community monitoring and feedback (Edwards, 2014). Co-governance increases accountability. Digital participatory platforms further facilitate citizen involvement. Online consultations and e-petitions broaden the reach of participation (Norris, 2011). However, digital exclusion remains a barrier.

Collaborative governance strengthens democratic culture by institutionalizing public involvement. When participation becomes routine, democratic values become embedded across society (Tilly, 2007). State–civil society collaboration can reduce political polarization by fostering deliberative dialogue and promoting consensus-driven decision-making (Dryzek, 2000). Participatory innovations also prevent government overreach by creating alternative power centers that balance authority. Civil society helps ensure that state decisions reflect public interests (Keane, 2009).

Effective collaboration requires capacity building for civic groups. Training in policy analysis, advocacy, and negotiation empowers civil society to engage meaningfully (Edwards,

DOI: https://doi.org/10.62017/tektonik

2014). State actors also benefit from collaborative learning, improving their understanding of social conditions and community needs (Migdal, 2001). However, challenges remain. Participatory programs can be tokenistic if states lack genuine commitment. Symbolic participation undermines public trust (Carothers, 2015).

Power asymmetries between government and civil society must be addressed through transparent rules and equitable participation processes (Diamond, 1999). Collaborative governance often flourishes in decentralized systems where local governments have autonomy to experiment with participatory approaches (Putnam, 1993). Institutional design strongly influences the success of participatory innovations. Clear procedures, accountability frameworks, and inclusive representation are essential (Fung & Wright, 2003).

Civil society diversity enriches collaborative initiatives. When different groups come together, they provide a broader understanding of public needs (Dahl, 1998). Collaborative governance also strengthens social cohesion by bringing citizens into constructive dialogue. Participation reduces alienation and fosters community resilience (Schmitter, 1997). Ultimately, collaborative governance represents a pathway toward substantive democracy by transforming citizens from passive observers into active co-creators of public policy (Tilly, 2007).

CONCLUSION

The analysis of civil society and state dynamics demonstrates that substantive democracy is not merely the product of electoral processes but the outcome of continuous interaction among societal actors, political institutions, and governance mechanisms. The findings from this study emphasize that civil society holds a critical role in shaping democratic quality through its capacity to promote civic engagement, articulate public interests, and monitor state performance. These contributions are particularly impactful when supported by state institutions that are responsive, transparent, and open to participatory governance. The synergy between active citizen participation and institutional accountability forms the essential foundation of deepened democratic practice.

The research also reveals that the effectiveness of civil society depends significantly on its autonomy, organizational strength, and ability to sustain civic mobilization. When civil society operates in a conducive environment characterized by freedom of expression, associational independence, and protected civic space, it becomes capable of generating meaningful democratic innovations. Conversely, restrictive state actions such as shrinking civic freedoms or co-opting civic organizations can weaken democratic processes by limiting societal input and diminishing political accountability. Thus, the balance between state authority and civic autonomy represents a crucial determinant of democratic resilience.

Furthermore, the study highlights that the state itself plays an indispensable role in maintaining substantive democracy by ensuring effective governance, equitable public services, and mechanisms for participatory decision-making. Well-designed institutional frameworks that support deliberation, inclusion, and transparency significantly enhance the capacity of civil society to contribute to democratic deepening. When the state invests in strengthening local governance, digital participation platforms, and collaborative policymaking, it creates opportunities for citizens to influence public decisions in ways that go beyond periodic elections.

Overall, the evidence suggests that substantive democracy flourishes when civil society and the state engage in constructive interaction characterized by mutual recognition and shared democratic commitments. Neither actor can sustain democratic quality alone: civil society requires institutional pathways to participate meaningfully, while the state depends on civic engagement to legitimize governance and ensure accountability. The dynamic interplay between these forces ultimately strengthens democratic substance by fostering informed participation, responsive policy processes, and resilient democratic institutions. This study therefore concludes that building substantive democracy requires not only strong institutions or active citizens, but the continuous and balanced collaboration between the two.

REFERENCES

DOI: https://doi.org/10.62017/tektonik

Carothers, T. (2015). *The closing space challenge: How are funders responding?* Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
Dahl, R. A. (1998). *On democracy*. Yale University Press.
Diamond, L. (1999). *Developing democracy: Toward consolidation*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
Dryzek, J. S. (2000). *Deliberative democracy and beyond: Liberals, critics, contestations*. Oxford University Press.
Edwards, M. (2014). *Civil society*. Polity Press.
Fung, A., & Wright, E. O. (2003). *Deepening democracy: Institutional innovations in empowered participatory governance*. Verso.
Keane, J. (2009). *The life and death of democracy*. Simon & Schuster.
Migdal, J. S. (2001). *State in society: Studying how states and societies transform and constitute one another*. Cambridge University Press.
Norris, P. (2011). *Democratic deficit: Critical citizens revisited*. Cambridge University Press.
Putnam, R. D. (1993). *Making democracy work: Civic traditions in modern Italy*. Princeton University Press.
Schmitter, P. C. (1997). Civil society as sets of institutions and practices: A definition. In J. Hall (Ed.), *Civil society: Theory, history, comparison* (pp. 121–131). Polity Press.
Tilly, C. (2007). *Democracy*. Cambridge University Press.