Shermeister Myron Gennadiyovych, Postgraduate Student, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Kyiv, Ukraine, https// orcid.org: 0009-0002-5964-3425

CHANGING THE VECTORS OF DIALOGUE BETWEEN THE STATE AND CIVIL SOCIETY IN UKRAINE IN MODERN CONDITIONS

Abstract

The article examines the transformation of the vectors of dialogue between the state and civil society in Ukraine in the context of profound socio-political changes caused by military aggression, digitalization of public administration and the European integration course of the state. Based on the analysis of the stages of development of interaction in 1991–2025. The evolution of forms of civic activity is shown – from poorly institutionalized practices of the first years of independence to a high level of mobilization, volunteering, and participation in the formation of state policy after 2014 and, especially, after 2022. It is emphasized that the modern dialogue is characterized by the simultaneous strengthening of partnership and exacerbation of structural problems: a lack of trust, unequal access to participation, fragmentation of institutional mechanisms, competition for resources, wartime information risks and a difference in expectations between the parties.

It is shown that public administration reforms – decentralization, professionalization of the civil service, anti-corruption institutions and the introduction of e-governance – change not only the structure of the management system, but also the political culture of citizens, stimulate the formation of new models of responsibility, accountability and horizontal interaction. At the same time, it has been revealed that intensive digitalization and the growing role of public initiatives require updating normative mechanisms of communication and

creating more sustainable institutional formats of cooperation that can ensure the real participation of broad social groups.

The need to transition to a partnership model based on consistency, transparency, inclusiveness and trust, which would meet the conditions of martial law, the tasks of post-war recovery and long-term goals of democratic development, is substantiated. It is concluded that the further strengthening of Ukrainian democracy directly depends on the ability of the state and the civil sector to build a sustainable, institutionally balanced and value-oriented dialogue that will ensure the effectiveness of public policy, social cohesion and the sustainability of statehood.

Keywords: state, civil society, dialogue, public administration, democratic development, political culture, digitalization, decentralization, volunteer movement.

Problem statement. In the current conditions of socio-political transformation, Ukraine is undergoing a significant rethinking of the role of the state and civil society in the processes of development, security and democratization. The military aggression of the Russian Federation, the strengthening of internal socio-economic challenges, the growth of digitalization of public administration and the European integration course of the state have significantly changed the structure, dynamics and tools of interaction between state institutions and civil society institutions. Traditional communication models built on the vertical logic of "state – society" are increasingly becoming insufficient to effectively respond to new threats and needs of citizens.

In practice, there is an increase in the role of civic initiatives in the areas of defense, social support, volunteering, and monitoring of government activities, as well as an increase in the state's dependence on partnerships with the public sector. At the same time, new forms of tension are emerging: competition for resources,

issues of legitimacy, imbalance of expectations, the problem of trust, inequality of access of different groups of the public to participation in decision-making. This necessitates a rethinking of conceptual approaches to the dialogue between the state and civil society, as well as the definition of a new vector of cooperation that meets the conditions of wartime, post-war reconstruction and prospects for sustainable democratic development.

Thus, the relevance of the study is due to the need to scientifically substantiate changes in the nature of interaction between the state and civil society, to identify the factors of transformation of this dialogue, to determine its new institutional, value and communication parameters. This will allow the formation of a modern model of partnership, which will contribute to increasing the effectiveness of public policy and strengthening democratic institutions in Ukraine.

The state of scientific development of the problem. The problems of interaction between the state and civil society are the subject of attention of a wide range of domestic and foreign researchers, who consider it through the prism of theories of democratic governance, social partnership, public policy and public participation in decision-making. Classical approaches to the analysis of civil society were formed in the works of J. Locke, A. de Tocqueville, J. Habermas, R. Putnam, who emphasized the importance of citizens' activity, trust and horizontal networks as the basis of democratic processes. Modern research (A. Salih, M. Edwards, M. Kimmel, L. Diamond, etc.) reveals the mechanisms of transformation of civic participation under the influence of globalization, digitalization and political crises.

In the Ukrainian scientific tradition, the issue of the development of civil society and its interaction with the state is covered in the works of V. Rebkal, T. Lebedeva, O. Donchenko, V. Troshchynskyi, I. Koliushka, O. Sushko, who analyze the institutional conditions for the formation of civic initiatives, the

peculiarities of partnership between the state and non-governmental organizations, as well as the problems of democratic governance. Considerable attention is paid to the issues of transparency, accountability of the authorities, and public participation tools (public councils, consultations, e-democracy), but these studies often rely on the pre-war context and do not take into account the radical changes of recent years.

After 2014, the scientific discourse shifted towards analyzing the impact of the volunteer movement, digital platforms of interaction and new forms of civic mobilization on public policy. In the works of Ukrainian researchers (L. Shypilova, O. Reznichenko, S. Dembitska, M. Tomenko, etc.) the significant contribution of public organizations in the field of security and defense, humanitarian aid, social protection is emphasized, which actualized the need for new models of partnership. However, the analysis of the thesis about "changing the vectors of dialogue" remains fragmentary: it is not sufficiently studied how exactly the war transformed the mechanisms of public participation, what institutional formats ensure the sustainability of interaction, what risks increase the conflict between state structures and the public sector.

Therefore, despite the presence of a significant amount of theoretical and applied research, the scientific development of the problem requires further deepening. Particular attention should be paid to a comprehensive analysis of changes in the communication, value, institutional and managerial parameters of the dialogue between the state and civil society under martial law, the European integration course and the digital transformation of public administration. This determines the need for systematic scientific research aimed at forming an updated concept of interaction and determining the vectors of its further development.

The purpose of the study is to analyze the peculiarities of the dialogue between the authorities and civil society in Ukraine in the context of modern challenges.

Presentation of the main material. In modern Ukraine, the interaction between the state and civil society forms a complex, dynamic and often contradictory process, which is influenced by military, political, social and economic factors. Despite the intensification of cooperation and the expansion of opportunities for public participation, there are a number of problems that complicate an effective dialogue between the two key actors of social development.

One of the most systemic problems remains the low level of mutual trust. NGOs often perceive the state as non-transparent, bureaucratized, and slow in decision-making, while the authorities often see public initiatives as a threat of uncontrolled criticism or an instrument of influence by certain interest groups. This creates communication barriers and reduces the effectiveness of dialogue.

The next problem is unequal access to participation and representativeness. Formal participation mechanisms (public councils, consultations, electronic petitions) often work nominally. Mostly active, resourced and professional organizations are involved in the process, while small NGOs, local initiatives or vulnerable groups have limited opportunities to be heard. This reinforces the imbalance of representation and creates a sense of exclusion from decision-making processes.

There is a lack of institutional stability and fragmentation of interaction. Cooperation is often based not on system rules, but on situational decisions, personalities, or external factors (in particular, military aggression). The lack of long-term partnership strategies, clear communication regulations, and uniform standards of interaction reduces its consistency and predictability.

In the conditions of impossibility of holding elections, there is extreme politicization and competition for resources. Some NGOs depend on grant funding or support from political actors, which can lead to conflicts of interest, reduced public trust, and limited constructive cooperation. There are also attempts on the

part of the state to control public initiatives or use them for their own information purposes.

A significant problem is the complexity of communication in wartime.

The hostilities have strengthened the role of civil society – especially volunteer structures, which often react faster than the state. At the same time, new challenges arise: competition for humanitarian, material and information resources; problems of coordination of actions; risks of information noise and the spread of unverified data; emotional tension and high social sensitivity.

Although Ukraine is actively implementing digital services (Diia, e-democracy), the digital divide between the state and the public sector remains: some NGOs do not have the technical or analytical capabilities to work with state digital platforms; public services sometimes do not provide tools for feedback or flexible participation formats; There are no transparent algorithms for taking into account public opinion.

The problem is overlapping functions and contradictions in roles. After 2022, civil society took on a number of functions that traditionally belonged to the state (logistics, provision of the military, social support). This, on the one hand, increased the effectiveness of assistance, and on the other hand, created tension in determining responsibility and priorities.

There is a noticeable lack of analytical support and professionalization of dialogue. Both state bodies and some public structures often do not have modern tools for policy analysis, expert resources or the ability to conduct strategic dialogue [1, 2]. This leads to the dominance of emotional or politicized discussions instead of science-based decisions.

Thus, the dialogue between the state and civil society in the face of modern challenges remains a complex and ambiguous process that requires new formats, institutional support and value renewal. The formation of a high-quality partnership is critically important for ensuring the stability of the state, the

effectiveness of public administration and the democratic development of Ukraine [3].

In order to understand the peculiarities of interaction in modern conditions, it is necessary to analyze the evolution of the dialogue between the state and civil society during the period of Independence.

The development of interaction between civil society and the state in Ukraine in 1991–2025 can be conditionally divided into several stages, each of which reflects political, economic, and social changes in the country. These periods demonstrate the gradual formation of institutional mechanisms of cooperation, the evolution of the role of civil society and the nature of the transformation of its relations with the authorities [4]. Below is a generalized description of the key stages based on historical events, legal regulation and current trends.

At the initial stage of independence, civil society was formed almost from scratch, under conditions of weak institutional capacity and dominance of state structures in public life. Citizen activity was low due to economic instability, distrust of the authorities, and post-Soviet stereotypes. Most public organizations either originated from Soviet associations or were created with the support of international donors. The legal framework was minimal: the Constitution of 1996 only laid down the general principles of the activities of public organizations, and the Law "On Associations of Citizens" (1992) contained a number of restrictions. Interaction between the authorities and the public was formal and non-systematic, and the institutions of consultative dialogue did not actually work.

The Orange Revolution became a catalyst for the growth of public participation and the activation of the political role of civil society [5]. NGOs, youth movements, and the media have demonstrated their ability to mobilize society.

During this period, the state began to introduce the first institutional mechanisms of dialogue – in particular, public councils under the authorities

(2007–2008) and legal regulation of social dialogue (2010). The development was facilitated by the adoption of the Law "On Public Associations" (2012), which modernized the rules for registration and activities of organizations. However, the dialogue remained unstable and often declarative. With the advent of Yanukovych's power, pressure on activists and attempts to restrict civil liberties increased, which narrowed the space for cooperation.

The Revolution of Dignity radically changed the place of civil society in the power and political system. Euromaidan demonstrated unprecedented self-organization of citizens, which became the basis of the protest movement, humanitarian support and communication networks. After the change of power, new partnership institutions began to be formed: the Coordinating Council for Civil Society Development, the National Strategy for Promoting the Development of NGOs (2016–2020) [10] and other platforms of interaction. The HS has become an active participant in reforms – anti-corruption, judicial, decentralization. At the same time, tension remained between the authorities and activists due to the slowness of reforms and growing anti-corruption risks.

Since the start of the war in Donbas, civil society has significantly strengthened its position and influence. Volunteer movements, human rights organizations and reform coalitions have become important partners of the state in defense, humanitarian support and implementation of reforms.

Decentralization has expanded the opportunities for interaction at the local level. In 2021, the National Strategy for Promoting the Development of HS was updated with a focus on digitalization, inclusion and strengthening youth participation. At the same time, the problems of trust, politicization and selectivity of interaction remained barriers to a full-fledged partnership.

The full-scale invasion was a turning point that radically changed the role of civil society. The HS has become the main driver of volunteering, international advocacy, humanitarian operations, and control over the use of aid. The state

began to consider public initiatives as a strategic partner in defense and reconstruction.The European integration vector (candidate status in 2022) has increased the importance of the public in monitoring reforms and implementing European standards. Digital participation mechanisms have expanded – through Diia platforms, online consultations, and reconstruction interaction services.

Despite the growing role of the CS, the challenges remain significant: restrictions on freedoms in wartime, competition for resources, information risks, and continued mistrust between individual segments of government and activist communities.

Public administration reform in Ukraine is one of the key factors influencing the transformation of political culture, as it changes the ways citizens interact with the state, forms new management standards and creates conditions for strengthening democratic practices. Institutional changes taking place within the framework of public administration reform, decentralization, e-governance and personnel modernization contribute to rethinking the role of the state, citizen and public institutions in the political system.

One of the most successful and large-scale reforms was decentralization**,** which significantly changed the structure of local government. The transfer of financial, administrative and political powers to the local authorities stimulated the development of public participation, increased the responsibility of local authorities and intensified the political subjectivity of communities. Citizens are increasingly aware of the possibility of influencing local political decisions, which contributes to overcoming passivity and paternalism.

An equally significant direction is the reform of the civil service**,** aimed at introducing professional, competency-based and ethically motivated standards of employees' activities. The introduction of competitive procedures, increasing the transparency of personnel decisions, the formation of integrity standards contribute to changing the managerial culture and increase the level of citizens'

trust in state institutions. Professionalization of the public service is an important factor in the formation of a political culture of responsibility and accountability, which is focused on meeting public needs rather than supporting corporate or political interests.

The introduction of e-governance has become an important component of institutional modernization**.** E-service platforms, open data portals, e-procurement systems, digital services such as Diia contribute to increasing transparency and reducing corruption risks. E-governance not only optimizes administrative procedures, but also opens up new opportunities for citizen involvement in the political process, forming a culture of fast, open and rational communication between society and the state. In addition, digitalization stimulates an increase in the level of political awareness, which is a key element of modern democratic political culture.

Anti-corruption reforms play a significant role in the transformation of political culture**,** which bring changes in the perception of the legitimacy of power, the principles of justice and the rule of law. The activities of the NACP, NABU, HACC, the introduction of financial control mechanisms and transparency of budget processes form new norms of political behavior aimed at intolerance to corruption. Although the effectiveness of individual institutions remains the subject of public discussion, the very fact of the existence of the effective control infrastructure fosters cultural change in the direction of accountability and integrity.

Of particular importance is European integration**,** which acts as a catalyst for the modernization of political culture. Commitments to implement European standards of governance, strengthening the role of human rights, the rule of law and inclusiveness affect the political orientations of citizens and form the value basis of democratic development. European governance practices are becoming a

model for Ukrainian reforms, contributing to a gradual reorientation from post-Soviet models to European norms of political culture.

Conclusions. Summing up, it can be noted that public administration reform is not only an institutional, but also a cultural process that changes the nature of relations between the state and citizens. The introduction of the principles of transparency, openness, efficiency and responsibility becomes the basis for the formation of a new type of political culture – a culture of participation, cooperation and democratic values. In this context, political culture appears not as a passive reflection of institutional changes, but as an active component, which determines the success of reforms and contributes to the formation of a modern democratic model of governance in Ukraine.

References

1. Petrushenko L. A., Hrynchuk N. M., Pelypenko N. S. Instytutsionalizatsiia dialohu vlady ta hromadianskoho suspilstva: teoretychni zasady ta praktychni aspekty [Institutionalization of dialogue between government and civil society: theoretical principles and practical aspects]. Public Administration and Regional Development [Public Administration and Regional Development]. 2021. № 15. S. 61–70. URL: https://pard.mk.ua/index.php/journal/article/download/181/147.

2. Briushkova N. Yu., Nikoliuk O. V., Dobriianska N. V. Instytutsionalizatsiia dialohu vlady ta hromadskosti: instrumenty ta mekhanizmy [Institutionalization of dialogue between government and civil society: tools and mechanisms]. Ekonomika ta derzhava [Economy and State]. 2021. № 1. S. 118–123. https://economics.net.ua/files/archive/2021/No1/20.pdf

3. Bielska T. V. Modeli vzaiemovidnosyn orhaniv publichnoi vlady ta instytutiv hromadianskoho suspilstva [Models of relationships between public authorities and institutions of civil society]. http://www.kbuapa.kharkov.ua/e-book/apdu/2010-1/doc/1/18.pdf. [in Ukrainian]

4. Honyukova L. Bazovi pryntsypy vzaiemodii instytutiv hromadianskoho suspilstva ta orhaniv derzhavnoi vlady u zdiisnenni normotvorchoi diialnosti [Basic principles of interaction of civil society institutions and state authorities in the implementation of standard-setting activities]. Aktualni problemy derzhavnoho upravlinnia, pedahohiky ta psykholohii. [Actual problems of public administration, pedagogy and psychology]. 2013. Issue 2. P. 31–36. http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/apdyptp_2013_2_7 [in Ukrainian]

5. Krutiy O. M. Suchasnyi stan dialohovoi komunikatsii mizh orhanamy derzhavnoi vlady ta hromadskistiu v ukrainskomu suspilstvi [The current state of dialogue communication between state authorities and the public in Ukrainian society]. Derzhavne upravlinnia: udoskonalennia ta rozvytok [Public administration: improvement and development]. 2012. No. 2. http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Duur_2012_2_3 [in Ukrainian]

6. Kryukov O. I. Komunikatsiia vlady i suspilstva yak chynnyk realizatsii polityky informatsiinoi bezpeky [Communication of government and society as a factor in the implementation of information security policy]. Visnyk Natsionalnoho universytetu tsyvilnoho zakhystu Ukrainy. Seriia: «Derzhavne upravlinnia» [Bulletin of the National University of Civil Defense of Ukraine. Series: "Public Administration"] 2017. 1(6). 201–207. [in Ukrainian]

7. Lipovska N.A., Alekseev V.M. Vzaiemovidnosyny derzhavy ta suspilstva : navch. posib. [Relations between the state and society: academic. Manual] D. DRIDU NADU. 2019. 180 p. [in Ukrainian]

8. Lutsyshyn V. Vplyv instytutiv hromadianskoho suspilstva na protses natsionalnoi konsolidatsii v suchasnii Ukraini. [The influence of civil society institutions on the process of national consolidation in modern Ukraine]. Naukovi zapysky [Proceedings]. 4(78). 22-32. https://ipiend.gov.ua/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/lutsyshyn_vplyv.pdf [in Ukrainian]

9. Radchenko O.V., Krutiy O.M., Parubchak I.O. Publichnyi dialoh yak systemotvorchyi fenomen novitnoi derzhavnoi polityky v Ukraini. [Public dialogue as a system-creating phenomenon of the latest state policy in Ukraine]. Publichne upravlinnia: teoriia ta praktyka. [Public administration: theory and practice]. 2014. Issue 4. P. 158–165. http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Pubupr_2014_4_26. [in Ukrainian]

10. Shevchenko, S.O., Melnyk, V.V. (2023). Problema uzghodzhennia vzaiemovidnosyn mizh derzhavoiu ta instytutamy hromadianskoho suspilstva v publichnomu upravlinni [The issue of alignment of relationship between the state and civil society institutions in public administration]. Derzhavne budivnytstvo. [State Formation]. № 2 (34), 21–29. DOI: https://doi.org/10.26565/1992-2337-2023-2-02 [in Ukrainian]

11. Pro Natsionalnu stratehiiu spryiannia rozvytku hromadianskoho suspilstva v Ukraini na 2021-2026 roky: Ukaz Prezydenta Ukrainy vid 27 veresnia 2021 r. № 487/2021 [On the National Strategy for Promoting the Development of Civil Society in Ukraine for 2021-2026: Decree of the President of Ukraine dated September 27, 2021 No. 487/2021]. https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/487/2021#Text

12. Vzaiemodiia derzhavy ta instytutiv hromadianskoho suspilstva [Interaction between the State and Civil Society Institutions]. Ministerstvo yustytsii Ukrainy [Ministry of Justice of Ukraine]. https://minjust.gov.ua/m/str_33679

13. Vzaiemodiia derzhavy ta instytutiv hromadianskoho suspilstva: Roziasnennia Ministerstva yustytsii Ukrainy [Interaction between the State and Civil Society Institutions: Clarification of the Ministry of Justice of Ukraine]. https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/n0018323-11

14. Instytuty hromadianskoho suspilstva ta instytut hromadskykh orhanizatsii v Ukraini: teoretyko-metodolohichni ta normoproektni aspekty [Civil Society Institutions and the Institute of Public Organizations in Ukraine:

Theoretical, Methodological and Normative Aspects]. Ministerstvo yustytsii Ukrainy [Ministry of Justice of Ukraine]. https://minjust.gov.ua/m/str_20126