

Panel 'The civicism of the third sector'

Taco Brandsen (Radboud University Nijmegen, The Netherlands)

Paul Dekker (coordinator) (The Netherlands Institute for Social Research (SCP), The Netherlands)

Bernard Enjolras (Institute for Social Research (ISF), Norway)

Adalbert Evers (Justus-Liebig-Universität Giessen, Germany)

Besides obvious goals for the reform of social services, such as raising productivity and saving costs, there is also a continuing talk about softer improvements in terms of 'better quality', 'more responsiveness' and 'good governance'. In this panel, we want to explore the idea of 'civism' as a central point of reference for such debates about desirable qualities of governance and service operations that are not easy to define. We see civicism as the quality of institutions, organisations, procedures, to stimulate and reproduce civil attitudes and behaviour of individuals as well as a civic culture. Thus, civicism is a wider expression than civility, encompassing both the behaviour and value orientations of agents and related qualities of institutions, organisations and procedures.

We want to pay attention to various aspects of civicism, from the more social side of supporting 'decent' behaviour of clients, professionals and decision makers in service provision, to the more political aspects of supporting active citizenship and responsive government.

Is civicism a fruitful concept for the analysis of developments in the third sector? What are the main concerns related to it in different times, in different fields of services, and at different levels of governance and management, from the perspective of policymakers and managers as well as and not at least the perspective of citizens-consumers?

These questions are dealt with in four papers, written from different angles and disciplinary backgrounds and referring to various national experiences: the development of the idea of civil society, the history of social services in Germany, organizational studies of management-professional-client in particular in the Netherlands, and comparative governance studies in Europe.

This panel originates from Cinefogo wp 15 'Between states and citizens'

Civic qualities in service delivery: the interaction of professionals and managers

Panel 'The civicness of the third sector'

Taco Brandsen

Radboud University Nijmegen, Nijmegen School of Management, Department of Political Science & Public Administration, PO Box 9108, 6500 HK, Nijmegen, The Netherlands, + 31 24 3611973, t.brandsen@fm.ru.nl

Although third sector research often associates civicness with voluntarism, many human services are delivered by professionals and it would be strange to disregard the civic qualities of their work. In some of the literature, the civic qualities associated to professional service delivery are attributed to intrinsic motivation and/or past training, mirroring assertions on voluntarism. They are pictured as having essentially altruistic motives and a strong commitment to quality. By implication, managerial efforts to structure and curb their work are set in direct opposition to efforts to raise quality levels. The empirical evidence to support such claims is, however, at best mixed.

The argument in the paper will be that civicness is the quality of organisations to deal with increasingly difficult trade-offs between competing values. Professionals in the public services are under increasing pressure and this has led to a backlash against New Public Management and its perceived champions, the managers. It will be argued that such (partly justified) criticism of managerialism must not be framed as a clash between professionals and their managers. In fact, the evidence suggests that the boundaries between these different occupational groups are blurring rather than hardening. This is a response to developments in the public services that have made it more difficult for all members of organisations to balance the different values they need to take into account. These include values we describe as "civil" and which are of specific significance in personal social services. It may be impossible to resolve the friction, but the civic quality of organisations is crucial in helping organisations to manage it.

Civiness: from civil society to civic services?

Panel 'The civiness of the third sector'

Paul Dekker

The Netherlands Institute for Social Research (SCP), PO Box 16164, NL – 2500 BD Den Haag, T + 31 70 3407434, F +31 70 3407044, p.dekker@scp.nl

According to many authors of philosophical and policy-oriented works about civil society, activity in this sphere of voluntary associations is an important source of civiness in modern society. Frequently referring to Alexis de Tocqueville's analyses of the role of associations in the American democracy in the 1930's, associations are supposed to be a substantial source of civiness, at least for the citizens involved in them. They exercise 'civic skills' such as chairing a meeting and writing a letter (Verba et al 1995), and they develop 'civic virtues', such as the ability to tolerate and deal with diverging opinions) and other attitudes and capacities that make them to good, active and critical citizens (cf. Warren 2000, Fung 2003). The voluntary associations are not only 'schools for democracy' for their members, but are also supposed to contribute as such to a civilised and democratic society, embodying pluralism and forming a countervailing power for the state. The evidence for these positive roles is mixed at best (Chambers 2002). The idea might be out-dated. Nowadays there are other settings. The workplace is of more interest: there is a greater variety of people, more than in old times it is a social place where people talk about the news, community affairs and maybe politics. Considerations of justice, equal rights, social responsibilities, environment etc. etc. are probably more important in the average workplace than on the average sports field, etc. At least, people spend much more time in their workplace than in a voluntary association. As regards the learning of civic skills and civic virtues schools are important as well. However, another type of organisations might be the real inheritors of the former voluntary associations: the variety of social services, which are often hybrids combining at least public and voluntary elements.

The paper starts with a brief discussion of civility and civic virtues in present day civil society theories and research. Two very different but nevertheless interrelated aspects of civility are distinguished: the aspect of everyday civil or decent behaviour and the aspect of a civic democratic culture (cf. Almond and Verba 1989) that includes civil courage to stand up against suppression. It then focuses on the results of an mainstream of quantitative empirical research into the civic effects (or correlates) of involvement in voluntary associations. The results are not very convincing: correlations are often small and causality is disputable. Next we look at more fragmented and qualitative evidence for civiness in hybrid organizations in which elements of voluntary involvement are combined with governmental private market involvement, leading to more civic discourse and a higher level of public accountability (Eliasoph 2006). In the final part we discuss the civiness of social services. What is their

potential as places where strangers meet and where public money and accountability combine with local embeddedness and voluntary involvement. Could they be developed into new schools of democracy?

Between market and civic governance regimes: civicism in the governance of social services in Europe

Panel 'The civicism of the third sector'

Bernard Enjolras

Institute for Social Research (ISF); Munthesgt 31; NO - 1152 Oslo
Tel: +4723086100; Fax: +4723086101; <http://www.samfunnsforskning.no>

The paper will focus on the civic dimension in the governance of social services in Europe. The civic dimension may be conceptualized as a "repertoire of action" constituted by three features: (i) the pre-eminence of collectives (collective good, general will, public interest, solidarity, etc.); (ii) the prevalence of democratic rules of governance (representation, participation, deliberation, election) and (iii) the qualification of the persons and the regulations of relations between persons according to their rights and legal rules (law, citizenship, civil rights, social rights, etc.).

The study will be based on the data collected through two separate studies: the CIRIEC study "Social services of general interest and governance", and the "study on the situation of health and social services of general interest in Europe" realised for the DG Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunity, in collaboration with the European Centre for Social Welfare Policy and Research. Based on these data the paper will analyze how the civic dimension of social services is expressed at the level of the governance of these services.

The main argument of the paper is that the institutional constructions that regulate the provision of social services - conceptualised as governance regimes- can be analyzed along two ideal-typical regulative conceptions reflected into two different governance regimes: market-based or competitive governance vs. civic-based or partnership governance.

A *governance regime* will be characterized by three dimensions that taken together will allow constructing a typology of governance regimes. These three dimensions of a governance regime are:

1. The actors involved in the provision of services of public interest as well as their characteristics (their goals and values, their institutional forms, their resources, the type of incentive they respond to, their legitimacy);
2. The policy instruments used in order to reach public interest and their combination. It is possible to distinguish three types of policy instruments: regulatory instruments that aim at normalizing behaviour of social actors and have a coercive character. Financial incentives that have a non coercive character and information transfer that are based on their force of conviction.

3. The institutional modalities by which the actors are coordinated and by which they interact within a policy network. Policy instrument are not “self implementing”. Their application demand organizational efforts. Organizational aspects are linked to the way policy formulation and policy implementation are institutionally linked.

The paper will show that the regulation and governance of social services in Europe takes place within a mix or compromise between two ideal-typical governance regimes: the market-based and partnership-based governance regimes.

Shaped by historical discourses – The civicness of social services

Panel 'The civicness of the third sector'

Adalbert Evers

Justus-Liebig-Universität, Giessen FB 09 Bismarckstr. 37 D 35390 Giessen, Germany
+49 641 99 39305, adalbert.evers@uni-giessen.de

Civil society is increasingly seen not only as a third sector besides state and markets, but as a complex outcome of the impact of civil values and principles throughout society, including state politics and business. In this context it is assumed that civility has more to do with the subjective side (Forni 2002), cultures and manners, while civicness includes as well the role of institutions and organisations and moreover those dimensions of agency, that are linked with "civitas" – active citizenship and the impact of politics on society and its "civic capital".

From that point of view the civicness of social services is not a matter of the share, third sector organisations hold in service provision, but a complex historical product (Kocka 2000) of culture and politics. Therefore, different to purely analytical perspectives of concepts of welfare mixes, that look at constellations of state- market and society-/community- principles, it is suggested to look at the historical processes of shaping of social services and the impact of discourses (Howarth 2000) that have at a time specific organizing ideas about the intended interplay of state, market, society and community in welfare and especially in social services; in past and presence it is them that shape social services over time and the impact and meaning of civicness on their behalf.

It is suggested to differentiate between (a) the classical historical state-welfare discourse linked with public social services and citizens' rights and entitlements, (b) the more recent discourse on giving more autonomy to civil society forces and a third sector with its 1968 connotations, empowering users as actors in a service society and (c) the most recent consumerist discourse for which more civility is next to more autonomy and choice of consumers of services on welfare markets and finally (d) the managerialist discourse on the right social investments in services (like education), that address the citizens as workers and performers. In each of these discourses (i) the respective Leitbild of social services and professionalism, (ii) the figure of the individual user and of being engaged, (iii) the role of third sector organisations and finally (iiii) the concept of governance of the respective mixed economy of social services is different and so is the meaning and impact of civicness.

Presently none of these discourses is totally dominating. In the social service field respective different Leitbilder of services are partly coexisting, partly superseding each other. Often a new generation of politics for service modernisation however try to intertwine patterns of the different discourses described above. They conceptualize services that should be at a time fair and accessible, efficient and open to choice, but

likewise interactive, empowering and open for voice and self organizing (Newmann 2001). Different welfare mixes in social services and the appearance of hybrid service organisations (Evers 2005) mirror the attempt to merge items and goals that do not go together easily or without tensions. It will be discussed in the conclusions, what such a strive for blended concepts might mean with respect to the civiness of social services, the impact of civility and third sector organisations.

For the sake of the argument on the value of a historical-analytic approach, the paper will have to take throughout a concrete national example. Germany is chosen, the country, the author is best acquainted with. With an eye on the history of its discourses and social services the ways will be sketched, the three different discourses mentioned above have taken shape and mingle in today's welfare politics and notions of civiness.