



American Journal of Environmental Economics (AJEE)

ISSN: 2833-7905 (ONLINE)

VOLUME 4 ISSUE 1 (2025)



PUBLISHED BY
E-PALLI PUBLISHERS, DELAWARE, USA

Collaborative Governance and Sustainability: The Role of Inter-Agency Partnerships in Implementing Sustainable Practices in Local Settings

Raquel Silva Gomes¹, Bárbara Damasio dos Reis², Felipe Gramonski dos Santos², Gislene Silva Lima², Isidro José Bezerra Maciel Fortaleza do Nascimento³, Jádý Figueredo de Souza Saraiva⁴, Tiago Luz De Oliveira⁵, Silvio da Conceição Barbosa², Antonio Timoteo Printes da Silva^{4*}

Article Information

Received: August 17, 2025

Accepted: September 25, 2025

Published: January 21, 2026

Keywords

Accountability, Governance, Innovation, Interinstitutional Collaboration, Public Administration, Sustainability

ABSTRACT

Governance, innovation, and sustainability have been consolidated as strategic pillars of public administration, articulating themselves in an interdependent way in the search for efficiency, social justice, and institutional legitimacy. The literature shows advances in management models, open innovation and sustainable practices, but also highlights tensions between bureaucracy, accountability and valuing civil servants, configuring a complex field of debates. In view of this, this study aims to analyze the interactions between governance, innovation and sustainability, with emphasis on interinstitutional partnerships and their impacts on the implementation of collaborative practices in the public sector, through an integrative literature review. The methodology was based on an integrative review carried out on Google Scholar, with articles published between 2020 and 2025. Descriptors in Portuguese and English on “public governance”, “innovation”, “sustainability” and “interinstitutional collaboration” were used. The selection favored methodological rigor, thematic adherence and theoretical relevance. The results reveal that the valorization of human capital, organizational flexibility and accountability are central elements of governance. Innovation, in its organizational, open, and social dimensions, is connected to sustainability, which is structured in long-term indicators, environmental accounting, and integration of social and economic agendas. It is concluded that collaborative arrangements strengthen public governance and expand the adaptive capacity of the administration in the face of contemporary challenges.

INTRODUCTION

Collaborative governance has been consolidated as a central axis in the construction of sustainable solutions, as it involves multiple actors in the formulation and implementation of public policies. According to Albaroudi *et al.* (2025), the integration between public, private and community institutions represents an indispensable strategy to strengthen climate resilience and promote the sustainable use of natural resources. In this sense, collaborative arrangements expand institutional responsiveness while reinforcing the legitimacy of sustainability policies at the local scale.

According to Zebua *et al.* (2025), practical experiences in waste management show that processes of social learning and community engagement are only consolidated in contexts of interinstitutional cooperation. This finding reinforces that sustainability cannot be understood only as the result of isolated actions, but as the result of collaborative networks that promote social innovation, inclusion, and effectiveness in environmental policies. Thus, it is opportune to investigate the role of interinstitutional partnerships as a strategic vector for the consolidation of sustainable practices in local environments.

In this context, this article is justified by the need to understand how collaborative governance models can strengthen public and private policies aimed at sustainability. Recent literature points to both advances and gaps in the integration between innovation, sustainability, and social participation, which makes research essential to align theory and practice in the field of administrative sciences.

In view of this, this article proposes to analyze the role of interinstitutional partnerships in the implementation of sustainable practices in local environments, through an integrative literature review.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The debate on public governance highlights tensions between bureaucracy, accountability, and valuing civil servants and institutions. According to Bryson *et al.* (2007), contemporary governance depends on the strategic use of human capital and engagement to align administrative structures with organizational results. According to Hood (1991) and Denhardt and Denhardt (2015), practices of meritocracy, performance evaluation, and transparency reinforce accountability, but still encounter resistance in rigid bureaucratic models. For Rodrigues *et al.* (2021) and

¹ Instituto Federal do Paraná, Brazil

² Metropolitan University of Science and Technology, USA

³ Universidade de São Paulo, Brazil

⁴ Universidade Federal Fluminense, Brazil

⁵ Universidade Federal do Amazonas, Brazil

* Corresponding author's e-mail: edson_nogueira@ufam.edu.br

Costa *et al.* (2025), more flexible structures favor retention and innovation, while rigid models increase stagnation and dropout.

Perry and Hondeghe (2008) point out that motivation in the public sector depends on the balance between extrinsic incentives and symbolic recognition. Castro and Oliveira (2023) and Franco *et al.* (2024) emphasize the importance of both symbolic and material valorization for state efficiency, yet they also highlight the persistence of barriers to equity, diversity, and mobility.

Dias and Ramos (2020) add that inclusive policies and periodic reviews are indispensable to mitigate inequalities and ensure organizational sustainability. Along these lines, Weber (1978) and Mintzberg (1983) recall that bureaucracy is only modernized if it is accompanied by a review of the criteria for progression and incentives, avoiding alienation and strengthening the adaptive capacity.

According to Denhardt and Denhardt (2015) and Pollitt and Bouckaert (2011), strengthening public legitimacy requires aligning institutional governance, accountability, and valuing human resources. In this sense, governance emerges as a structuring axis capable of articulating administrative modernization, organizational justice, and fiscal sustainability. This debate prepares the ground for the next thematic axis, sustainability, reinforcing the importance of integrated strategies between career policies, skills management and institutional equity.

The contemporary debate on innovation in the public and organizational sector evidences a transition from linear models to multisectoral ecosystems, in which government, business, civil society, and the environment interact in dense networks of knowledge and practice. According to Freeman (1987) and Lundvall (1992), innovation should be understood as a systemic and cumulative process, in which interactive learning and human capital are central assets.

This perspective was deepened by Etzkowitz & Leydesdorff (2000), with the Triple Helix, and expanded in the proposals of Carayannis & Campbell (2012), to include civil society and the environment, showing that competitiveness depends on the articulation between technology, institutions and social values.

At the organizational and public level, such advances indicate that innovation is affirmed when sustained by flexible institutional arrangements, capable of overcoming bureaucratic rigidity. Perez (2002) reinforces that technological cycles only produce structural transformation when they find support in public policies and adaptive governance strategies.

More recently, Silva *et al.* (2025) exemplify this logic by analyzing smart cities, where data, infrastructure, and universal services become axes of regional development. However, in peripheral contexts, connectivity barriers and territorial inequality still reduce the reach of these initiatives.

In the field of open innovation, Carayannis & Campbell (2012) highlight the relevance of collaborative arrangements that overcome asymmetries between public

and private actors. Monteiro *et al.* (2025) reinforce this view by showing that bidirectional flows of knowledge create environments of co-creation and favor the adoption of emerging technologies in distributed ecosystems. Such models depend, however, on organizational resilience and institutional alignment, under penalty of fragmentation and loss of effectiveness. In addition, Silva *et al.* (2024) show that innovation-driven budgets amplify the need for cross-cutting policies, articulating financing and intersectoral policies.

In the area of social innovation, authors such as Matos *et al.* (2025) highlight the role of the third sector as a catalyst for structural transformations in areas neglected by the State and the market. These practices include urban mobility, educational inclusion, solidarity economy and renewable energies, setting up laboratories for social experimentation.

Acker (2006) reminds us, however, that without overcoming institutional barriers of gender, class and race, the scalability of social innovation remains limited. Recent literature connects these initiatives to circular economy practices and green technologies, bringing them closer to social and ecological justice agendas.

The discussions converge to the understanding that innovation, in its organizational, open and social dimensions, constitutes a fundamental link for contemporary sustainability. Santos *et al.* (2025) point to the diffusion of green technologies as a vector of transformation; Campana *et al.* (2025) reinforce environmental accounting as a transparency mechanism; and Pereira *et al.* (2025) underline socio-environmental education as key to forming collective competencies. In dialogue with Carayannis & Campbell (2012), it becomes evident that innovation only acquires effectiveness when integrated with environmental and social agendas, articulating adaptive governance and cognitive justice.

In the contemporary scenario, sustainability emerges as a structuring principle of public and organizational management, articulating environmental governance, economic-social-environmental integration and strategic management. According to Carayannis and Campbell (2012) and Nascimento *et al.* (2025), models such as the Fivefold Helix expand the role of governments, the productive sector, the university, civil society, and the environment in promoting sustainable innovations that foster integrated policies and multisectoral solutions. Weber and Rohrer (2012) argue that environmental governance presupposes adaptive regulation, intersectoral coordination mechanisms and transparency, and that it is essential to articulate economic instruments, institutional rules and social participation. Lavarda *et al.* (2017). Contemporary strategies depend on the construction of composite indicators, collaborative governance, and the reconfiguration of decision-making processes from the perspective of long-term sustainability, requiring budgetary flexibility and institutional innovation (Carayannis & Campbell, 2012; Weber & Rohrer, 2012; Silva *et al.*, 2024).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study was developed through an integrative literature review, a procedure that allows the systematization of theoretical and empirical findings, identifying convergences, divergences, and research gaps on the investigated theme (Souza *et al.*, 2010). Articles published between 2020 and 2025 were analyzed, prioritizing productions indexed in databases of wide scientific recognition, such as Scholar, in order to ensure the scope and relevance of the publications.

Descriptors in Portuguese and English were used that articulated the terms “public careers”, “functional progression”, “remuneration”, “inclusion in the public service” and “PCCTAE”. In addition to the time frame, it was decided to include classic authors in the area of public administration and people management (such as Maslow, Herzberg, Perry & Wise), whose contribution is essential to sustain the theoretical discussion.

The inclusion criteria included articles with thematic adherence, methodological rigor and theoretical relevance for understanding the challenges and trajectories of technical-administrative professionals in education. Duplicate publications, studies without a direct relationship with the object of the research, and studies without scientific consistency were excluded.

After selection, the articles were submitted to a content analysis process, according to Bardin (2011), with thematic categorization into four axes: remuneration, functional progression, inclusion/diversity and institutional/motivational impacts. This systematization allowed the construction of an analytical funnel, in which the specific findings were triangulated with the classic and contemporary literature, ensuring a critical and reasoned discussion.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The articulated analysis of the ten articles reveals that governance, innovation, sustainability, motivation, inclusion and budgetary impact are dynamically intertwined, configuring challenges and opportunities for sustainable development. According to Silva *et al.* (2024), the adoption of cross-cutting agendas in the public budget requires adaptive governance and budget flexibility so that themes such as equity, the environment, and social inclusion can generate real impact. This finding is connected to Pollitt and Bouckaert (2011), who argue that the sustainability of public reforms only materializes when accompanied by intersectoral coordination mechanisms, and to Bryson *et al.* (2007), who emphasize the importance of human capital as a strategic asset of governance.

As Nascimento *et al.* (2025) highlight, the Quintuple Helix model shows that sustainable innovation is strengthened when there is articulation between government, universities, companies, civil society, and the environment. However, institutional gaps and territorial differences still limit the effectiveness of the model, requiring policies that are sensitive to the local reality.

This result reinforces the classic propositions of Freeman (1987) and Lundvall (1992) on the systemic nature of innovation, while aligning with Etzkowitz & Leydesdorff (2000) and Carayannis & Campbell (2012), who point to the importance of articulation in multisectoral networks to consolidate innovative ecosystems.

According to Silva *et al.* (2025), experiences with smart cities, such as Palmas-TO, demonstrate that governance practices integrated with technological innovation and investments in sanitation, education, and sustainability result in improved quality of life and social inclusion, even if challenges in connectivity and the regional innovation ecosystem persist. These findings dialogue with Perez (2002), for whom technological cycles only produce transformative effects when sustained by adaptive public policies, and with Weber and Rohracher (2012), who highlight the need for multi-scalar coordination in heterogeneous environments.

According to Sousa *et al.* (2025), the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in environmental policies depends on harmonization between regulations, adequate funding, and strong governance. These results reinforce the paradigm of the Triple Bottom Line (Elkington, 1997), which proposes the inseparable integration of the economic, social and environmental dimensions as a condition for sustainable practices.

According to Matos *et al.* (2025), the third sector stands out as an agent of transformation through social innovation, promoting inclusion and sustainability in vulnerable communities. The article reinforces that collaborative partnerships overcome financing and management barriers, expanding the impact of actions and enhancing sustainable practices. This point converges with Sachs (1993), who defends the centrality of distributive justice in sustainable development, and with Acker (2006), who emphasizes the need to overcome inequalities of gender, class, and race in order to increase the scalability of social innovations.

As Santos *et al.* (2025) argue, green technologies play a central role in enabling the transition to the circular economy, promoting efficiency and waste reduction in strategic sectors. Despite the potential, challenges such as greenwashing and the absence of standardized metrics still threaten the effectiveness of circular practices, indicating the need for clear public policies and indicators. This finding dialogues with Barbier (1987), who already defended the integration between ecological, social and economic variables as the core of sustainability.

According to Viana *et al.* (2025), environmental governance based on coercive isomorphism, although important to standardize organizational practices, only produces transformative effects when combined with institutional density and multi-scale articulation of actors, avoiding the risk of symbolic and superficial responses. This conclusion reinforces Hood's (1991) criticism of the limitation of uniform models of public management, which often prioritize symbols of efficiency to the

detriment of real results.

As Campana *et al.* (2025) point out, environmental accounting increases transparency, strengthens corporate governance, and attracts sustainable investments. However, the authors point to standardization obstacles and the risk of greenwashing, recommending regulatory harmonization and independent audits to consolidate gains in organizational sustainability. This result is connected to the approach of Denhardt and Denhardt (2015), who reinforce the role of accountability as the basis of public legitimacy.

In terms of education, Pereira *et al.* (2025) show that the development of socio-environmental skills requires active methodologies and coherent evaluation, integrated into teacher training. Curricular interdisciplinarity and institutional involvement are essential to sustain educational transformations aligned with sustainability. This result converges with Sachs (1993), when he proposes that sustainability is only consolidated when accompanied by critical training and active participation of citizens.

Finally, Monteiro *et al.* (2025) highlight that open and collaborative innovation, which involves several institutional actors, contributes to more sustainable and efficient practices. However, the effectiveness of these partnerships depends on overcoming regulatory barriers, managing technological diversity, and strengthening leadership for coordination and mutual trust. This result is articulated with Carayannis & Campbell (2012), when they emphasize that collaborative ecosystems require flexible governance and institutional trust to thrive.

In summary, the results demonstrate that the effectiveness of sustainability depends on the integration between solid governance structures, collaborative innovation, flexible budget policies and measurement indicators, connecting technological and social practices to environmental justice and inclusion. This panorama reaffirms that only multisectoral articulation in dialogue with classics such as Brundtland (1987), Sachs (1993) and Elkington (1997) allows progress in the consolidation of sustainability as a global and local paradigm.

CONCLUSION

This article aimed to analyze, through an integrative review, the interfaces between governance, innovation and sustainability, highlighting their impacts on public management and organizations. From the findings, it was possible to identify that the classic and contemporary literature converges on the centrality of collaborative governance, multisectoral innovation and sustainable practices as strategic axes for administrative modernization and social inclusion.

The results show that, although there are significant advances in models such as the Fourfold Helix, smart cities and green technologies, institutional, budgetary and territorial barriers persist that limit the effectiveness of policies. Authors highlight that social innovation and environmental accounting can increase transparency,

inclusion and engagement, but depend on solid institutional arrangements and intersectoral articulation to achieve systemic impact.

Thus, the debate demonstrates that the consolidation of effective public policies requires the integration of adaptive governance, collaborative innovation and sustainability as a guiding principle. The strengthening of indicators, the active participation of civil society, and the transversality of policies emerge as promising ways to align administrative efficiency and social justice, expanding the legitimacy and transformative capacity of institutions.

REFERENCES

- Albaroudi, E., Elbehairy, M., & Al Hinnawi, M. N. E. (2025). *Artificial intelligence innovations for sustainable water management and climate resilience in Saudi Arabia's Vision 2030 framework*. ResearchGate. <https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Elham-Albaroudi/publication/395591418>
- Barbier, E. B. (1987). The concept of sustainable economic development. *Environmental Conservation*, 14(2), 101–110.
- Bechtluft, R. P., & Costa, B. L. D. (2021). Determinantes da desigualdade salarial entre as carreiras do governo de Minas Gerais. *Revista de Administração Pública*, 55, 836-860.
- Bryson, J. M., Ackermann, F., & Eden, C. (2007). Putting the Resource-Based View of Strategy and distinctive competencies to work in public organizations. *Public Administration Review*, 67(4), 702–717.
- Campana, C. A., Neto, A. C., do Carmo, A. P. F., da Silva, A. T. P., dos Santos, E. M., de Oliveira, E. D., ... & da Silva, E. N. (2025). A influência da contabilidade ambiental no desempenho sustentável das empresas: Uma revisão sistemática da literatura. *Contribuciones a Las Ciencias Sociales*, 18(3), 1–17.
- Castro, M. A. A., & Oliveira, K. P. (2023). Carreiras individuais descortinando as trajetórias de servidores técnico-administrativos em educação – TAEs. *Revista de Ciências da Administração*, 25(65), 1–21.
- Costa, A. A. P. (2025). Análise das desigualdades salariais e de progresso na carreira dos servidores técnico-administrativos em educação no Brasil. *IOJR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 30(2), 17–22.
- Denhardt, R. B., & Denhardt, J. V. (2015). *The new public service: Serving, not steering*. Routledge.
- Dias, J. F., & Ramos, J. R. (2020). Gestão pública e diversidade: Um olhar sobre os desafios na administração federal brasileira. *Revista de Administração Pública*, 54(3), 435–460.
- Elkington, J. (1997). *Cannibals with forks: The triple bottom line of 21st century business*. Capstone.
- Franco, D. M., Freitas, F. B., Silva, F. D. A., Branco, F. A. C., Ferreira, H. S., do Nascimento, J. W., ... & da Silva, E. N. (2024). Perfil demográfico e diversidade no plano de cargos dos técnicos administrativos em educação: Análise das principais variáveis. *Cuadernos*

- de Educación y Desarrollo, 16(13), e7064.
- Hood, C. (1991). A public management for all seasons? *Public Administration*, 69(1), 3–19.
- Matos, F. R. P. (2025). Inovação social no terceiro setor: Uma revisão sistemática sobre impacto e sustentabilidade. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 30(2), 35–40.
- Mintzberg, H. (1983). *Structure in fives: Designing effective organizations*. Prentice Hall.
- Monteiro, S. M. C. (2025). Interinstitutional collaborations in open innovation and sustainability: An integrative literature review. *American Journal of Development Studies*, 3(2).
- Nascimento, I. J. B. M. F. (2025). A quintupla hélice como modelo de inovação e sustentabilidade: Uma revisão sistemática de literatura. *IOSR Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 2(3), 1–9.
- Pereira, G. A. (2025). Educação para a sustentabilidade e o desenvolvimento de competências socioambientais. *IOSR Journal of Research Method in Education*, 15(2), 53–57.
- Perry, J. L., & Hondeghem, A. (2008). *Motivation in public management: The call of public service*. Oxford University Press.
- Pollitt, C., & Bouckaert, G. (2011). *Public management reform: A comparative analysis – New Public Management, governance, and the Neo-Weberian State*. Oxford University Press.
- Sachs, I. (1993). *Strategies for sustainable development: Theory and practice*. United Nations University Press.
- Santos, D., Reis, B., Souza, C., Silva, E., Souza, E., Vilhena, F., ... & Oliveira, K. (2025). Inovação Tecnológica Na Sustentabilidade: Uma Revisão Sistemática Sobre O Papel Das Tecnologias Verdes Na Transição Para Economia Circular. *Contribuciones A Las Ciencias Sociales*, 18(1), e14482.
- Silva, E. F. (2024). Orçamento público e agendas transversais: Uma revisão integrativa sobre sustentabilidade, interdependências setoriais e inclusão. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 29(11), 32–37.
- Silva, F. D. A. (2025). Desenvolvimento e avaliação de cidades inteligentes na região Norte do Brasil: O caso de Palmas-TO. *IOSR Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 2(3), 10–16.
- Sousa, B. H. A. B. (2025). A integração dos Objetivos de Desenvolvimento Sustentável (ODS) nas políticas ambientais: Uma revisão integrativa. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 27(3), 50–54.
- Viana, M. C. V. (2025). Relações entre isomorfismo coercitivo e governança ambiental: Uma revisão integrativa sob a perspectiva da teoria institucionalista e sistêmica. *IOSR Journal of Environmental Science, Toxicology and Food Technology*, 19(7), 15–20.
- Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and society*. University of California Press.
- Zebua, R. S. Y., Wahyudi, A., Hermawati, I., & Wiryanto, W. (2025). Social learning, public participation and community engagement in waste management: A bibliometric analysis of trends and gaps. *Cleaner Waste Systems*. Elsevier. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S277291252500209X>