



## ORIGINAL PAPER

# Managing the Concept Mapping of Civil Society: A Relational Analysis of its Targeted Topics for Public Participation and Democratization Practice

Anca Parmena Olimid\*

### Abstract:

The present paper revisits the social and political postulates of the civil society in the post-communist period and it highlights the main aspects of the institutional capacity and dimensions recognized as basic principles for a democratic society. The attempt to highlight the social and political actors of transition focuses on a complex analysis of the proper understanding of the rule of law and the normative criteria that usually interrelate with the framework of civil society and its functional and institutional lens. We demonstrate analytically and emphasize using content and legal analysis that aiding and enabling an efficient civil society depends on the legal inputs of the social reform outputs.

**Keywords:** *civil society, governance, state, participation, representation*

---

\*Associate Professor, PhD, University of Craiova, Faculty of Social Sciences, Political Sciences specialization, Center of Post-Communist Political Studies (CEPOS), Phone: 0040251418515, Email: parmena2002@yahoo.com

### Introduction

The debate about civil society and its relational analysis with the local governance and democracy practice has its origins in the political, social, cultural encounters of the last twenty years, but nowadays it finds its inner discussion in the terms of actions, democratic mechanisms and political processes.

Thus, the research hypothesis across the civil society's actions and its linkage to the governance and democracy approaches focuses on the following approaches: How is best defined the civil society considering the state-society relationship? Are local observation, national encounters and gradual-generalization decisive in defining the civil society's lens? Is civil society considered as a democratic practice necessary in the transition context? Can be the civil society considered as an organizational construct in Eastern Europe? Can civil society be exclusively focused on an "experiential" approach to social continuity and change?

We demonstrate analytically and emphasize using the concept mapping method that the content analysis advances an efficient civil society depending on the democratic inputs and the social reform outputs: 1. similarities between European and non-European countries regarding the linkage between governance and the civil society participation comparing the place and practice of "civil society groups in multilevel governance" (Laforest, 2013); 2. the process of democratization: political, social and economic terms; 3. The legal requirements for a minimum analytical framework of the civil society in post-communism.

One point concerns the context of the state-civil society relationship also serving as the agenda-setting role within the political transition characterizing two periods: 1. first approach: beginning of the 1990s to mid 1990s: cross-national approaches (national variables): reconciliation, political dialogue, local justice mechanisms; 2. second approach: beginning of 2000s: causal variations: consequences of economic and political reforms, judicial mechanisms, integration mechanisms.

### Methodology

Before proceeding to determine the common basis for the research of the civil society and its actions, this study defines the actual approaches used to explain the concepts and definitions (hereinafter Dcv) surrounding civil society and describing four main phases of the its : Dcv1. civil society and the discourse of democratization in post-communism; Dcv2. civil society and its variations in post-communism; Dcv3. civil society and the practice and discourse of the local governance considering the historical institutionalist approach (Georgescu, 2014); Dcv3. civil society as based "experiential" approach to social continuity and change distinguishing between two common usages of the term social continuity, social policies and social control.

Since the study deals with the conceptual interpretations arising due to the civil society's actions and its lens, it is important to individualize the four approaches emerging in the community constituents. Moreover, it will point out that the civil society is considered as a community of citizens linked by goals, objectives and common interests contributing to a collective activity.

To abstract useful concept mapping (hereinafter CM1... a, b, c) for the civil society and the associated targeted topics, we will use, as research method, the "concept mapping"

that will create and generate “the relationship among a set of targeted topics” linking and representing the concepts as a “network diagram” (Given, 2008: 108).

The tables associated in the analysis will contain in the Column 1 the author’s name, in Column 2 the concept mapping from A to C and Column 3 the targeted topics associated with each concept mapping (hereinafter Tt1...a, b, c). The linkages between Concept Mapping A, B and C are identified to refine the new fixed-approaches of the civil society considering the concept mapping variations (CM1... a, b, c) and targeted topics interfaces (Tt1...a, b, c). Based on the concept mapping-targeted topics linkage, the analysis has the potential to enable the following kinds of connections: civil society is... (Table 1) - civil society as... (Table 2) - civil society as organizational structure (Table 3). Each table delivers associated conceptualizations around the main civil society assets: interface of the transnational networks and society aid, space for the communication of ideas, linkage between democratic practices and social intervention connecting community level engagement and involvement and regulatory mechanisms in Europe.

### **Civil society and the discourse of democratization**

When considering the debate about the civil society society and the discourse of democratization, McIlwaine reveals and launches a concise definition of the civil society in the so-called “transnational” perspective.

By acknowledging the micro- and macro- levels of meanings, the author characterises not only the social practice variations, but also the explorations of the governmental organizations. McIlwaine also argues that the understandings and conceptual meanings of the civil society research encounter and examine how civil society scales from the local level to the macro-level (global or transnational levels meaning: viewpoints, interpretations and transnational scales. McIlwaine’s study also recognizes the meanings of the so-called transnational civil society and the exploration of the governmental organizations in a Gramscian viewpoint (McIlwaine, 2007). Furthermore, Grajzl and Murrell claim that the interpretation of the civil society’s actions and acts is often dominated by “partisan interest groups and politicians” (Grajzl, Murrell, 2009: 1-41). Moreover, the same authors initiate a discussion on the “welfare implications of fostering civil society critically” depending on the particularities of the local environment in transitional countries and developing regions (Grajzl, Murrell, 2009: 1-41).

In the same direction, Spina and Raymond witness the civil society debate “through outside assistance” by facilitating a better understanding of social interventions and acts (Spina, Raymond, 2014: 878-879). Moreover, the same authors stimulate and establish the debate over the “functioning state institutions” and the social capacity of the assistance, mechanisms and processes during the post 1990’s period developing narrow definitions of the term of “civil society aid” and “substantial foreign assistance” (Spina, Raymond, 2014: 878-879). A further conceptual interpretation is indicated by Peter Burnell and Peter Calvert who guideline o broader view of civil society beyond the various relations between state and civil society.

This certainly explains the disciplinary outcomes of the demands and additional resources for the stability of democratic system accountability (Burnell, Calvert, 2004). By so developing the fundamental principles of representation of state, the authors discuss the social role of political actors and the relevant frameworks of a consolidated democracy (Burnell, Calvert, 2004: 15-16). Burnell and Calvert tend to argue the equilibrium of competitive democratic forces and polarizing the “dominance and subordinacy in social life” (Burnell, Calvert, 2004: 16-17).

## Managing the Concept Mapping of Civil Society: A Relational Analysis ...

In other words, the authors set different contexts and resolutions of the relationship between civil society and democratization by giving to “a multiplicity” of factors roles and norms for controlling and legitimating “the relationship between civil society and democratization” (Burnell, Calvert, 2004: 17-18) (furthermore, for the concept mapping – targeted topics analysis on “civil society is...”, see Table 1 Concept Mapping of the Civil Society: Civil society is).

**Table 1. Concept Mapping of the Civil Society: Civil society is...**

<b>Author</b>	<b>Concept Mapping A (hereinafter CM<sub>a</sub>)</b>	<b>Targeted topics A (hereinafter Tt<sub>a</sub>)</b>
<b>Mcllwaine (2007)</b>	<i>Civil society (network)</i> (CM1 <sub>a</sub> )	Transnational networks (Tt1 <sub>a</sub> )
<b>Mcllwaine (2007)</b>	<i>Transnational civil society</i> (CM2 <sub>a</sub> )	Including exploration of governmental organizations (Tt2 <sub>a</sub> )
<b>Spina and Raymond (2014)</b>	<i>“civil society aid” and “substantial foreign assistance”</i> (CM3 <sub>a</sub> )	Functioning state institutions (Tt3 <sub>a</sub> )
<b>Grajzl and Murrell (2009)</b>	<i>Civil society assistance</i> (CM4 <sub>a</sub> )	Social interventions and acts (Tt4 <sub>a</sub> )
<b>Burnell and Calvert (2004)</b>	<i>Civil society (social life)</i> (CM5 <sub>a</sub> )	Dominance and subordinacy in social life (Tt5 <sub>a</sub> )

Source: Author’s own compilation

This first table of the concept mapping of the civil society, that of the targeted topics of transnational networks, governmental organizations, state institutions, social acts and social life (Tt1-2<sub>a</sub>), can be a source to identify and to reveal the conceptual system mapping (CM1-2<sub>a</sub>), enabling the civil society at the interface of the transnational civil society (CM2<sub>a</sub>) and the “substantial foreign assistance” (CM3<sub>a</sub>).

By adding the new concept mapping of the “civil society aid” (CM3<sub>a</sub>) and the civil society assistance (CM4<sub>a</sub>) to the Concept Mapping A, the new conceptual devise of the civil society becomes the concept learning that might be linked to the combination of “social life”, “social intervention” and “society assistance”.

Based on the above reasoning, it seems right to set the new fixed-approach of the civil society and its practical approach, “social life”. Looking closer at the Table 1, each column introduces different heading for each author that labels the following statements: Mcllwaine (2007)\_civil society (network)/ transnational civil society\_transnational network/ exploration of governmental organisations; Spina and Raymond (2014)\_civil society aid and assistance\_state institutions; Grajzl and Murrell (2009)\_civil society assistance\_social intervention; Burnell and Calvert (2004)\_social life\_dominance and subordinacy.

### **Civil society and the politics of community-driven conceptualization**

Although civil society rediscovered in post-communism the representations of social representation and interventions, the concept of “civil society as...” has emerged assuming the preconditions of the transitional state and social determinations dominated. on the one hand by the space of public communication and, on the other hand, by the importance of the institutional changes.

In the comparative discussions on civil media and local governance, it is often used a particular set of approaches of civil and uncivil societies (Olimid, 2014). One response is called the “democratic civilised West” and it sees the current conditions of the establishment of the civil society-media-global governance linkage. Ame Hintz argues “the term” is used “as frame which has been filled with different people at different time” (Hintz, 2009: 19).

Based on the understandings of the common usages of the governance discourse, the author argues that the civil society is an open space of communication of ideas and exchange of “interest and values”– distinguishing between “civil” and “uncivil” societies in which the shared background of social spheres enables the “space of oppositional citizens groups and social movements” (Hintz, 2009: 20).

This approach emerged during the end of the 1990’s influenced by the social continuity of transition and the necessities of political change aiming to expose the “based experiential” understandings of how the post-communist civil society levels the civic participation and social involvement vs the weakness of the social participation. Marc Morjé Howard, influenced by based “experiential” approach to social continuity and change, explains that the transformative consequences of communist to post-communist institutions using the main causal factors, mechanisms and processes and examining the “relative influence of a set of factors from difference times in people’s lives on their attitudes toward” social approaches and patterns (Howard, 2003: 19). As a result of this “relative influence”, the author attempts to determine depend institutional pattern and “a uniform set of experiences” (Howard, 2003: 19).

Another crucial pattern of the civil society’s experience involves the social approaches of the distinction between rights, rationality and membership when considering the meanings and understandings of civil society and citizenship. Building on the adequate grounding of citizenship rights, Somers argues that the “modern citizenship” presents alternative explanations to the legal approaches, but also a convergence of institutional analysis (Somers, 1994).

The central characteristic of the established democracies rates the context of theorization of “global civil society”, the setting agenda of the democratisation and the legitimacy of state. This focus is appropriated by Baker that argues the political equality and the necessities of rights “without questioning” or reducing “action in global civil society” (Baker, 2002). As Mentzel also considers, the civil society has to mark national identity and the place of the linkage nation-civil society in the arenas of the revolutions of 1989 (Mentzel, 2012).

Other contemporary discussions locate the “civil society in a politics of civic-driven change” and describe a particular set of conceptual diffusions aimed at focusing on the rights practice, citizenship approaches and leadership processes (Fowler, Biekart, 2013). Reasons for an advanced analysis of the leadership processes are being connected through a focus on the social and political actors usually interrelating the framework of civil society and its functional and institutional lens: 1. civil society as democratic practice (Ku, 2000); 2. civil society as a manageable concept within the communitarian

## Managing the Concept Mapping of Civil Society: A Relational Analysis ...

logic (Rosenblum, 1994); 3. civil society and the conceptual separation of civil society from the state involving social actors and society self-limitations (Akman, 2011); 4. the civil society and the active role of development in global governance (Smith, Brassett, 2008); 4. civil society as an organizational construct within the public sphere bringing together citizens with common interests and sharing same goals (Bee, 2014); 5. the transitional justice, governmentality, and EU democratic construction (Kurki, 2011); 6. the civil society as an open system and the role of social capital as basis of democratic citizenship (Lehning, 1998) (furthermore, for the concept mapping – targeted topics analysis on “civil society as...”, see Table 2 Concept Mapping of the Civil Society: Civil society as).

**Table 2. Concept Mapping of the Civil Society: Civil society as...**

<b>Author</b>	<b>Concept Mapping B (hereinafter CM<sub>b</sub>)</b>	<b>Targeted topics B (hereinafter Tt<sub>b</sub>)</b>
<b>Hintz (2009)</b>	<i>Civil society as open space (CM1<sub>b</sub>)</i>	civil society as an open space of communication of ideas and exchange of “interest and values” (Tt1 <sub>b</sub> )
<b>Howard (2003)</b>	<i>Civil society as “experiential” approach (CM2<sub>b</sub>)</i>	influenced by based “experiential” approach to social continuity and change (Tt2 <sub>b</sub> )
<b>Somers (1994)</b>	<i>Civil society as convergence (CM<sub>b</sub>)</i>	“modern citizenship” and a convergence of institutional analysis (Tt3 <sub>b</sub> )
<b>Baker (2002)</b>	<i>Civil society as linkage of rights and actions (CM4<sub>b</sub>)</i>	political equality and the necessities of rights “without questioning” or reducing “action in global civil society” (Tt4 <sub>b</sub> )
<b>Mentzel (2012)</b>	<i>Civil society as linkage of nation-civil society (CM5<sub>b</sub>)</i>	national identity and the place of the linkage nation-civil society in the arenas of the revolutions of 1989 (Tt5 <sub>b</sub> )
<b>Fowler and Biekar (2013)</b>	<i>Civil society as politics-driven change (CM6<sub>b</sub>)</i>	“civil society in a politics of civic-driven change” (Tt6 <sub>b</sub> )
<b>Ku (2000)</b>	<i>Civil society as democratic practice (CM7<sub>b</sub>)</i>	democratic practice (Tt7 <sub>b</sub> )
<b>Rosenblum (1994)</b>	<i>Civil society as communitarian logic (CM8<sub>b</sub>)</i>	communitarian logic (Tt8 <sub>b</sub> )
<b>Akman (2011)</b>	<i>Civil society as linkage to social acting (CM9<sub>b</sub>)</i>	social actors and society self-limitations (Tt9 <sub>b</sub> )
<b>Smith and Brassett (2008)</b>	<i>Civil society dependent on development (CM10<sub>b</sub>)</i>	active role of development in global governance (Tt10 <sub>b</sub> )
<b>Bee (2014)</b>	<i>Civil society as construct (CM11<sub>b</sub>)</i>	organizational construct (Tt11 <sub>b</sub> )

<b>Kurki (2011)</b>	<i>Civil society as linkage of legal and democratic links (CM12<sub>b</sub>)</i>	transitional justice, governmentality, and EU democratic construction (Tt12 <sub>b</sub> )
<b>Lehning (1998)</b>	<i>Civil society dependent on citizenship (CM13<sub>b</sub>)</i>	role of social capital as basis of democratic citizenship (Tt13 <sub>b</sub> )

Source: Author’s own compilation

The second table of the concept mapping of the civil society, that of the targeted topics of “open space of communication of ideas” (Tt1<sub>b</sub>), “experiential” approach to social continuity and change” (Tt2<sub>b</sub>), “convergence to the institutional analysis” (Tt3<sub>b</sub>), “the linkage nation-civil society in the arenas of the revolutions of 1989” (Tt5<sub>b</sub>), “politics of civic-driven change” (Tt6<sub>b</sub>), “democratic practice” (Tt7<sub>b</sub>), “communitarian logic” (Tt8<sub>b</sub>), “organizational construct” (Tt11<sub>b</sub>), outline other sources to enable the conceptual system mapping (CM1-2<sub>b</sub>), revealing the civil society’s linkage to the social actions (CM9<sub>b</sub>) and democratic links (CM12<sub>b</sub>). As in Table 1, by adding the new concept mapping of the “open space” (CM1<sub>b</sub>) and the dependency on citizenship (CM13<sub>b</sub>) to the Concept Mapping B, the new conceptual devise of the civil society becomes the framework modelling for the new application domain of the concept mapping of civil society as linkage between democratic practice-communitarian logic-development-dependent citizenship.

As in Table 1, when considering the linkages author-concept mapping-targeted topics, we reveal the following statements: Hintz (2009)\_civil society as open space\_interests and values; Howard (2003)\_experiential approach\_continuity and change; Somers (1994)\_convergence\_citizenship and institutional analysis; Mentzel (2012)\_nation and civil society linkage\_arenas of the revolutions of 1989; Kurki (2011)\_linkage of legal and democratic approaches\_EU democratic construction; Lehning (1998)\_citizenship\_social capital.

### **Civil society and the politics of post-civil society**

Another recent literature development concerns the “politics of post-civil society” (Gudavarthy, 2013). Gudavarthy argues that the theories regarding the civil society is defined as a manageable process with new forms, insights and strategies and identity articulation of human rights movements and trajectories of the constitutional-democratic connection between civil society and oppositional politics (Gudavarthy, 2013: 8).

A further issue concerns the institutionalist emphasis of the European civil society shaping the policy initiatives and the social sphere of the civil dialogue (Smismans, 2003). Despite the differences in demonstrating the politics of post-civil society, Gudavarthy and Smismans share the common attribute of the constitutional-democratic performance and the participation of civil society providing a direct resource for the public engagement and involvement (Themudo, 2013).

In a recent study, other authors outline a series of approaches to the politics of conflict as a “constructivist critique of consociational and civil society theories” (Dixon, 2012). Moreover, Dixon presents “a (critical realist) constructivist critique of both consociational and civil society/transformationist approaches and their crude understandings of politics and the prospects for political change” (Dixon, 2012). Furthermore, the changing conditions of the public activities show that the increasing

## **Managing the Concept Mapping of Civil Society: A Relational Analysis ...**

citizens' participation links social dialogue to the deliberative democracy (Öberg, Svensson, 2012).

As for the particular interest of civil society to relate the principles of “liberty, autonomy”, Castiglione argues for the “conjunction with the great social and political” requirements (Castiglione, 1994).

### **Civil society as organizational structure**

The term civil society is also dependent upon the importance of the organizational structure and a multi-level conception. Öberg and Svensson (2012) argue that challenge of the civil society sector has to focus on the linkage between the deliberative democracy and the national arenas of the public debate (Öberg, Svensson 2012).

Therefore, it is the organizational engagement that is important and there are the influencing decisions of the national public policies that should be analysed and interpreted first (Öberg, Svensson 2012). As a society reaches and develops trans-national networks, we may encounter the emergence of several approaches: civil society behaviour and actors preferences; conflict-oriented approaches and national infrastructures dealing with the local governance variations, power relations and governmental relations (Sellers, Kwak, 2011).

A much more critical observation of this approach comes from exploring the collaborative and connecting environmental governance linking the power relations and bridging actors, sectors, community and experiences Ali-Khan and Mulvihill argue that characteristic patterns of environmental governance explore and facilitate the collaborative approaches of the civil society actors, the determinants and the “potential role of actor agency” (Ali-Khan, Mulvihill, 2008: 1974-1975).

While many are arguing that exploring the variations of civil society actors, governmental officials and leaders bridges also actors and decisions, Wallman Lundåsen argues that there are specific forms of political participation encouraging the various measurement of community level involvement and engagement (Wallman Lundåsen, 2015). The same author explores the local voluntary associations participation contributing to the framework of a “consociational context” of the “local political culture” (Lundåsen, 2015).

Furthermore, despite the apparent potential of consociational context” of the “local political culture” and citizens engagement, there is a particular proposition of Skelcher and Torfing, involving the concepts of “civic participation” and “citizens' sense of democratic ownership of governmental processes” (Skelcher, Torfing, 2010). The same authors also explore the multi-level structure of the democratic governance involving the “institutionalized participatory governance” and “the traditional forms of representative government” (Skelcher, Torfing, 2010: 71-72).

Setting-up the institutional design of the civic participation and democratic ownership, Skelcher, and Torfing highlight that the “democratic governance of regulatory policies in Europe” depends on the way in which also the civil society-governments-social-political context-economic competitiveness is developed (Skelcher, Torfing, 2010: 71) (Furthermore, for the concept mapping – targeted topics analysis on “civil society as organizational structure”, see Table 3 Concept Mapping of the Civil Society: Civil society as organizational structure).



**Table 3. Concept Mapping of the Civil Society: Civil society as organizational structure...**

<b>Author</b>	<b>Concept Mapping C (hereinafter CM<sub>c</sub>)</b>	<b>Targeted topics C (hereinafter Tt<sub>c</sub>)</b>
<b>Gudavarthy (2013)</b>	<i>civil society is defined as a manageable process CM<sub>c</sub></i>	“politics of post-civil society”; articulation of human rights movements and trajectories of the constitutional-democratic connection between civil society and oppositional politics (Tt1 <sub>c</sub> )
<b>Smismans (2003)</b>	<i>Civil society as institutional emphasis (CM2<sub>c</sub>)</i>	policy initiatives and the social sphere of the civil dialogue (Tt2 <sub>c</sub> )
<b>Themudo (2013)</b>	<i>Civil society linkage to the public participation (CM3<sub>c</sub>)</i>	a direct resource for the public engagement and involvement (Tt3 <sub>c</sub> )
<b>Öberg and Svensson (2012)</b>	<i>Civil society as organizational structure (CM4<sub>c</sub>)</i>	deliberative democracy and the national arenas of the public debate (Tt4 <sub>c</sub> )
<b>Sellers and Kwak (2011)</b>	<i>Civil society linkage to the conflict-oriented research (CM5<sub>c</sub>)</i>	trans-national networks; civil society behaviour and actors preferences (Tt5 <sub>c</sub> )
<b>Ali-Khan and Mulvihill (2008)</b>	<i>Civil society linkage to the power relation (CM6<sub>c</sub>)</i>	environmental governance exploring and facilitating the collaborative approaches of the civil society actors (Tt6 <sub>c</sub> )
<b>Lundåsen (2015)</b>	<i>Civil society linkage to the specific forms of political participation (CM7<sub>c</sub>)</i>	the various measurement of community level involvement and engagement (Tt7 <sub>c</sub> )
<b>Skelcher and Torfing (2010)</b>	<i>Civil society and the - linkage to the consociational context of local approach (CM8<sub>c</sub>)</i>	“local political culture” and citizens engagement (Tt8 <sub>c</sub> )
<b>Skelcher and Torfing (2010)</b>	<i>Civil society - linkage to the institutional design of European policies (CM9<sub>c</sub>)</i>	“democratic governance of regulatory policies in Europe” (Tt9 <sub>c</sub> )
<b>Dixon (2012)</b>	<i>Civil society and - linkage to the politics of conflict (CM10<sub>c</sub>)</i>	“constructivist critique of consociational and civil society theories” (Tt10 <sub>c</sub> )

Source: Author’s own compilation

## Managing the Concept Mapping of Civil Society: A Relational Analysis ...

The third table of the concept mapping of the civil society, that of the targeted topics of constitutional-democratic connection between civil society and oppositional politics (Tt1<sub>c</sub>), of the policy initiatives and the social sphere of the civil dialogue (Tt2<sub>c</sub>), of the direct resource for the public engagement and involvement (Tt3<sub>c</sub>), enables various concept mapping from defining civil society as a manageable process and mechanism (CM1<sub>c</sub>), as linkage to the public participation (CM3<sub>c</sub>), power relations (CM6<sub>c</sub>) and political participation (CM7<sub>c</sub>), connecting the concept mapping to the local approach. As in Table 1 and Table 2, by adding the new concept mapping of the consociational context of local approach (CM8<sub>c</sub>) and of the institutional design of European policies (CM9<sub>c</sub>) to the Concept Mapping C, the new conceptual devise of the civil society reveals for Table 3 the model framework of the new domain of civil society as linkage between the targeted topics of: the community level involvement and engagement (Tt7<sub>c</sub>), citizens engagement (Tt8<sub>c</sub>), “democratic governance of regulatory policies in Europe” (Tt9<sub>c</sub>) and “civil society theories” (Tt10<sub>c</sub>). As in first two tables: Table 1 and Table 2, when considering the linkages author-concept mapping-targeted topics, we enable the following statements: Gudavarthy (2013)\_manageable processes\_movements and trajectories of the constitutional democracies; Smismans (2003)\_institutional emphasis\_policy initiatives: Themudo (2013)\_public participation\_public engagement; Sellers and Kwak (2011)\_conflict oriented research\_behavior and actors preferences; Ali-Khan and Mulvihill\_power relations\_environmental governance; Dixon (2012)\_politics of conflict\_constructivist theories of the civil society.

### Participatory democracy, civil society’s lens and local linkages

As Skelcher and Torfing remind us, the consociational context of local approach is attractive because it is the result of the “local political culture” and citizens engagement. Under these circumstances, Busher believes that civil religion is also a factor that reconfigures the responses to the “contemporary repositioning of the nation state within the supra-national political, economic, legal and cultural orders entailed by globalization” (Busher, 2012: 414-415). Civil society is seen as depending on how current reconfigurations of civilizational arguments face the references to the civilizational belongings (Busher, 2012: 414-415). As Gil de Zúñiga, Jung and Valenzuela note, the social media use also reveals that the “*informational purposes similarly contributes to foster democratic processes and the creation of social capital*” (Zúñiga, Jung, Valenzuela, 2012: 319). Accordingly, these formulations emphasize that the knowledge and efficiency of the political structures depends on the democratic processes and the political participatory behaviors “*in the context of today's socially-networked-society*” (Zúñiga, Jung, Valenzuela, 2012: 319).

The authors argue that the key objective is to test how civil society faces the democratic processes and political structures actions. Civil society does however seek to answers to the challenges of the civic participation in multiracial and multi-ethnic contexts.

Thus, the expanded model of community engagement and citizens’ involvement relates and also outlines various consequences and marks for the normative aspects of policy-making processes of the social context enabling the multilevel approach. The exploration of the immigration phenomenon allows the test of the civic engagement and participation integrating migration-civic engagement factors, various levels of participation and civic attitudes and political participation (Gastil, Xenos, 2010).

Other recent literature findings investigate the religion-civic culture linkage and require the reconceptualization of the individual–country level and of the relationship between local, regional, and national association membership (Lam, 2006). However, norms of membership and/ or citizenship are linking the good governance outcomes to the “citizens’ attachment to civic norm” (Kotzian, 2014). In well-structured society, both good governance and the norms and principles of citizenship determine “the importance citizens attach to these norms” (Kotzian, 2014).

Furthermore, the roles and the impact of the regulatory state framework enables a certain discussion on the decision making process and the transfer of state action to the “global South” (Hochstetler, 2012). By considering the key elements of the deliberative democracy, de Brelàz and Alves argue that the “different stages of advocacy and lobbying processes” and “the influence of regulatory framework” legitimates the linkage between the deliberate type of democracy, representation and the public discussion (de Brelàz, Alves, 2011: 202-203). Wheatley also examine the extent to which the democratic approaches to political authority and global governance at the micro- and macro-levels of regulatory policies in Europe results from “*the idea of legitimate political authority*” (Wheatley, 2012). In addition to this focus, the key role of the operational levels of democratic legitimacy can be applied in “multiple regulatory regimes” (Wheatley, 2012: 158-159) and “in the absence of a global constitutional settlement and establishment” (Wheatley, 2012: 160). Howe

As noted above, the linkage between local-regional-national-global governance on the vertical approach to the particular area interest of the “varieties of capitalism” and the dynamics of the institutional system affecting the “the management of institutional heterogeneity by transnational corporations” (Faulconbridge, 2008: 185). However, Faulconbridge argues that enabling a relational analysis between national institutional systems and practice reveals “different work practices” at “macro-level categories” (Faulconbridge, 2008: 185).

Despite the fact that the relational analysis of civil society’s actions and lens in global governance plays a targeted role for the democratic mechanisms in the developing countries (Waheduzzaman, As-Saber, 2015). Waheduzzaman and As-Saber also reveal that the level of participatory governance “insinuates” that the citizens’ participation emerges as an important element of the functionality of the political system relating participation-local development actions and activities and the development initiatives (Waheduzzaman, As-Saber, 2015: 474-475).

Sellers and Kwak also establish the local patterns of the relations between state (local state)-society-local governance-governmental institutions. This analysis reveals that the national infrastructures for local governance are linked to the “national variations in the shape of civil society” (Sellers, Kwak, 2011: 620). The relations between the national variations to the local patterns and local state engagement also enable the consideration of the “knowledge and policy mobilities” used to analyze the local effects of development and sustainable designs (Faulconbridge, 2015).

## Conclusions

The present article argues that the relationship between the context of the civil society at national level and the local connection between a strong civil society and a sustainable democracy has to enable the institutional design of the society behaviour and actors preferences.

## Managing the Concept Mapping of Civil Society: A Relational Analysis ...

In conclusion, in the associational context of the post-civil context and the political life and democracy, expanding the conceptual arenas and prospects of the local/global and environment governance, consolidation of democracy and a pro-democratic civic participation and engagement develops trans-national networks and dynamize the civil society approaches by combining the theories of organizational structures and local governance encounters.

### References:

- Akman, A. (2012). Beyond the Objectivist Conception of Civil Society: Social Actors, Civility and Self-Limitation, *Political Studies*, 60, 321-340.
- Ali-Khan, F., Mulvihill, P. R. (2008). Exploring Collaborative Environmental Governance: Perspectives on Bridging and Actor Agency, *Geography Compass*, 2, 1974-1994.
- Baker, G. (2002). Problems in the Theorisation of Global Civil Society, *Political Studies*, 50, 928-943.
- Bee, C. (2014). Transnationalisation, Public Communication and Active Citizenship. The Emergence of a Fragmented and Fluid European Public Sphere, *Sociology Compass*, 8, 1018-1032.
- Burnell P., Calvert P. (2004). Civil Society in Democratization, London: Frank Cass.
- Busher, J. (2012). From Ethnic Nationalisms to Clashing Civilizations: Reconfigurations of (Un)Civil Religion in an Era of Globalization, *Religion Compass*, 6, 414-425.
- de Brelàz, G. and Aquino Alves, M. (2011), Deliberative Democracy and Advocacy: Lessons from a Comparative Perspective. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 28, 202-216.
- Dixon, P. (2012). The politics of conflict: a constructivist critique of consociational and civil society theories, *Nations and Nationalism*, 18, 98-121.
- Faulconbridge, J. R. (2008). Managing the Transnational Law Firm: A Relational Analysis of Professional Systems, Embedded Actors, and Time-Space-Sensitive Governance, *Economic Geography*, 84, 185-210.
- Faulconbridge, J. (2015). Mobilising sustainable building assessment models: agents, strategies and local effects. *Area*, 47, 116-123.
- Fowler, A., Biekart, K. (2013). Relocating Civil Society in a Politics of Civic-Driven Change. *Development Policy Review*, 31, 463-483.
- Gastil, J., Xenos, M. (2010). Of Attitudes and Engagement: Clarifying the Reciprocal Relationship Between Civic Attitudes and Political Participation, *Journal of Communication*, 60, 318-343.
- Georgescu, C. M. (2014). Governance and intra-governmental relations during transition: A historical institutionalist approach of Romanian public administration reform dynamics, *Revista de Științe Politice. Revue des Sciences Politiques*, 44, 39-50.
- Gil de Zúñiga, H., Jung, N., Valenzuela, S. (2012). Social Media Use for News and Individuals' Social Capital, Civic Engagement and Political Participation, *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 17, 319-336.
- Given, L. (2008), *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods*, London: SAGE Publications.
- Grajzl, P., Murrell, P. (2009). Fostering civil society to build institutions, Why and when, *Economics of Transition*, 17, 1-41.
- Gudavarthy, A. (2013). *Politics of Post-Civil Society: Contemporary History of Political Movements in India*, New Delhi: Sage Publications,
- Hintz, A. (2009). *Civil society Media and Global Governance*, Berlin: LIT Verlag.

- Hochstetler, K. (2012). Civil society and the regulatory state of the South: A commentary. *Regulation & Governance*, 6, 362- 370.
- Howard, M. M (2003). *The Weakness of Civil Society in Post-Communist Europe*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kotzian, P. (2014). Good Governance and Norms of Citizenship: An Investigation into the System- and Individual-Level Determinants of Attachment to Civic Norms, *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 73, 58-83.
- Ku, A. S. (2000). Revisiting the Notion of “Public” in Habermas's Theory-Toward a Theory of Politics of Public Credibility, *Sociological Theory*, 18, 216-240.
- Kurki, M. (2011). Governmentality and EU Democracy Promotion: The European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights and the Construction of Democratic Civil Societies, *International Political Sociology*, 5, 349-366.
- Laforest, R. (2013). Shifting scales of governance and civil society participation in Canada and the European Union, *Canadian Public Administration*, 56, 235-251.
- Lam, P.-Y. (2006). Religion and Civic Culture: A Cross-National Study of Voluntary Association Membership, *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 45, 177-193.
- Lehning, P. B. (1998). Towards a Multicultural Civil Society: The Role of Social Capital and Democratic Citizenship, *Government and Opposition*, 33, 221-242.
- McIlwaine, C. (2007). From Local to Global to Transnational Civil Society: Re-Framing Development Perspectives on the Non-State Sector, *Geography Compass*, 1, 1252-1281.
- Mentzel, P. C. (2012). Nationalism, civil society, and the revolution of 1989, *Nations and Nationalism*, 18, 624-642.
- Öberg, P., Svensson, T. (2012). Civil Society and Deliberative Democracy: Have Voluntary Organisations Faded from National Public Politics? *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 35, 246-271.
- Olimid, A. P. (2014). Civic engagement and citizen participation in local governance: innovations in civil society research, *Revista de Științe Politice. Revue des Sciences Politiques*, 44, 73-84.
- Rosenblum, N. L. (1994) Democratic Character and Community: The Logic of Congruence?, *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 2, 67–97.
- Sellers, J. M., Kwak, S.-Y. (2011). State and Society in Local Governance: Lessons from a Multilevel Comparison, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 35, 620-643.
- Skelcher, C., Torfing, J. (2010). Improving democratic governance through institutional design: Civic participation and democratic ownership in Europe, *Regulation & Governance*, 4, 71-91.
- Smith, W., Brassett, J. (2008). Deliberation and Global Governance: Liberal, Cosmopolitan, and Critical Perspectives, *Ethics & International Affairs*, 22, 69-92.
- Smismans, S. (2003). European Civil Society: Shaped by Discourses and Institutional Interests, *European Law Journal*, 9, 473-495.
- Somers, M. R. (1994). Rights, Relationality, and Membership: Rethinking the Making and Meaning of Citizenship, *Law & Social Inquiry*, 19, 63-114.
- Spina, N., Raymond, C. (2014). Civil Society Aid to Post-communist Countries, *Political Studies*, 62, 878-894.
- Themudo, N. S. (2013). Reassessing the Impact of Civil Society: Nonprofit Sector, Press Freedom, and Corruption, *Governance*, 26, 63-89.
- Waheduzzaman, W., As-Saber, S. (2015). Politics and Policy in Achieving Participatory Governance in a Developing Country Context, *Politics & Policy*, 43, 474-501.

## Managing the Concept Mapping of Civil Society: A Relational Analysis ...

Wallman Lundåsen, S. (2015). Civil Society and Political Participation: What Type of Political Participation is Influenced by Community Level Involvement in Civil Society? *Swiss Political Science Review*, 21, 140-157.

---

[Article Info](#)

***Received:*** January 20 2016

***Accepted:*** March 10 2016

---