7. Co-production with citizens: demarcating the mode of collaboration by looking ‘from outside in’

William Voorberg and Ingmar van Meerkerk

INTRODUCTION

In order to effectively address wicked problems, such as the consequences of ageing; increased flood risks and patient-oriented health care, co-production is heralded as a ‘magic concept’ to effectively oppose them. The reason is that, according to some authors, we have entered the *New Public Governance* (NPG) mode as the successor of the ‘Old Public Administration’ mode and the ‘New Public Management’ mode (Osborne 2006; Rhodes 1996). NPG is based on the assumption that effective policymaking and service delivery are the results of collaboration in pluralistic networks involving many actors engaged in horizontal relationships. The underlying justification is the conviction that complex social problems can only be addressed through the pooling of resources, coming from various actors, including citizens (Dunleavy et al. 2005). In order to address these complex problems, solutions need to be sought in inter-organizational relationships and the governance of processes, in which government is no longer the major actor but a participant in these networks (Peters and Pierre 1998). In contrast to New Public Management, governmental efforts are aimed at gaining service effectiveness and are focused on outcomes rather than outputs. In this, the establishment of fertile relationships, based on trust and relational capacity, form the basis of public service delivery (Brandsen, Trommel, and Verschuere 2014; Osborne 2006; Rhodes 1996).

As is put forward in the introductory chapter of this volume, these relationships can be considered as a general category of ‘new’ governance arrangements. This generality is very much reflected in the literature on co-production. Academically, a great variety of collaboration structures are studied under the guise of co-production. They differ considerably with respect to power distribution among stakeholders (as conceptualized by Arnstein 1969), but also collaborative intensity, required instruments to boost or canalize the collabora-

tion and the actor who has the ‘right’ to initiate the collaboration, for instance: parental involvement in childcare (Pestoff 2006); urban housing (Brandsen and Helderman 2012); but also co-production in wildlife research (Corburn 2007). Hence, there is a need for enhanced conceptual clarity with regards to where the boundaries of the co-production concept lie.

Various authors (Brandsen and Honingh 2016; Verschuere, Brandsen, and Pestoff 2012) attempted to specify co-production by looking back to the earliest definitions of Ostrom (1976) and Parks et al. (1981), thereby exploring the lines of co-production by examining the concept ‘from-inside-out.’ In this chapter, our goal is to coin the kind of collaboration that is addressed by co-production by looking ‘from-outside-in.’ That is, we explore the lines of the co-production concept by assessing to what extent it overlaps and differs with related concepts, such as collaborative governance; interactive governance; co-creation and community self-organization. All these concepts are at least partly aimed at understanding how a collaborative relationship between government and citizens can be understood. Our starting point is that when observing the literature of each of those concepts, we see both overlap and differences in terms of how they approach and frame the relationship between government and other stakeholders. Therefore, we argue that in order to understand these conceptual similarities and differences it is useful to consider them as *specific from each other*, rather than addressing them as distinct phenomena. This chapter aims to enhance conceptual clarity and to position co-production in relation to other literature with particular interest in government–citizen interaction in public governance.

The remainder of this chapter is structured as follows. In the following section we address the various concepts, specifying this collaborative relationship. Then we address where, based on the literature, differences and similarities lie between these concepts. In our last section we draw conclusions of what this may imply for the boundaries of the co-production concept.

INTRODUCING COLLABORATIVE CONCEPTS

Collaborative Governance

Collaborative governance is a concept that acknowledges the complex and multiple environments of governments and public managers (Ansell and Gash 2008; Emerson, Nabatchi, and Balogh 2012). Hence, the concept addresses collaboration between governments and other actors in a broad sense (also elaborated upon by Christopher Ansell, in Chapter 2 of this volume). Authors differ in their views as to what kinds of actors are involved, how the collaboration can be typified, and how it is initiated. For instance Ansell and Gash (2008) are very explicit, defining collaborative governance as

“a governing arrangement where one or more public agencies directly engage non-state stakeholders in a collective decision-making process that is formal, consensus-oriented, and deliberative and that aims to make or implement public policy or manage public programs or assets” (Ansell and Gash 2008: 543). Other authors have conceptualized this arrangement using terms such as *joined-up government* (Bogdanor 2005), or *holistic government* (Leat, Seltzer, and Stoker 1999). In the definition of Ansell and Gash (2008), collaboration is given an official character and aims to create widely shared decisions on public policy. One might speak of a ‘forum’ which is formally organized and meets collectively. Moreover, the widely used conceptualization of Ansell and Gash (2008) in particular stresses that public agencies or institutions initiate this forum of collaborative governance.

However, not all authors are so explicit in their definition of collaborative governance. Emerson, Nabatchi, and Balogh (2012) emphasize that collaborative governance involves policy decisions with people across boundaries of public agencies, levels of government and/or public, private, and civic spheres in order to carry out a public purpose (p. 2). In doing so, they emphasize that collaborative governance is about collaboration between actors from different backgrounds but with a very specific shared goal. Their approach to collaborative governance is close to Bryson, Crosby and Stone’s (2006) description of *cross-sector collaboration*, that is, involving collaboration between government, business, nonprofits, philanthropies, communities, and/or the public as a whole (p. 44). In terms of this chapter, it is important to recognize that most authors seem to agree that collaborative governance involves partnerships between a variety of actors, stemming from different backgrounds, to make shared policy decisions, in which different actors may take the lead. Furthermore, according to Ansell and Gash (2008), agencies and stakeholders must meet together in a deliberative and multilateral process in which stakeholders are directly engaged in decision-making. (Coined in this volume by Chris Ansell as ‘collaborative governance as a regime.’) Hence, this concerns a two-way flow of communication, including consultative techniques. Consequently singular ways of communication, such as stakeholder surveys or focus groups, are not considered to be collaborative forms of governance.

Interactive Governance

A concept closely related to collaborative governance is interactive governance. Interactive governance is rooted in the literature on network governance, which acknowledges the plurality of actors involved in the process of public policymaking (Torfing 2012). In this process, multiple actors have a dominant position in the early stages of policy development. Edelenbos (2005) stressed that interactive governance is “a way of conducting policies whereby

a government involves its citizens, social organizations, enterprises and other stakeholders in the early stages of policy making” (Edelenbos 2005: 111). However, other authors define interactive governance broader. For example Torfing et al. (2012: 14) label it as “the complex process through which a plurality of social and political actors with diverging interests interact in order to formulate, promote, and achieve common objectives by means of mobilizing, exchanging, and deploying a range of ideas, rules, and resources.” Studies are dedicated to interactions, outcomes, strategies, democratic legitimacy, and underlying principles (Edelenbos and van Meerkerk 2016b).

To a certain extent interactive governance is broader than collaborative governance, since it not necessarily focuses on consensus-oriented decision-making and collaboration in specific forums, but on interactions between governments and citizens in policy and decision-making processes. For instance, Kooiman defined interactive governance as “The whole of interactions taken to solve societal problems and to create societal opportunities; including the formulation and application of principles guiding those interacts and care for institutions that enable and control them” (Kooiman 2005: 17). Merely, the complexity and interrelated network character of interactions between interdependent, but autonomous actors is stressed (Koppenjan and Klijn 2004; Torfing 2012). Also, these authors stress the emergent and self-organizing character of these networks. While the collaborative governance stream (especially building on the Ansell and Gash definition) stresses the institutional design element (by referring to the forum of decision-making), this is not necessarily the case for interactive governance. In this literature, the decentered and complex nature of multiple processes between governmental and non-governmental actors is stressed. Interactive governance specifically refers to the involvement of other stakeholders in *fundamental* parts of policy development, that is, both problem and solution formulation.

Community Self-organization

The concept of self-organization has its roots in the natural sciences, in particular complex systems thinking, and addresses the emergence of order in seemingly chaotic physical processes (Nicolis and Prigogine 1977). In social sciences, self-organization refers to the emergence of self-steering (or self-governing) structures out of local interactions (Uitermark and Duyvendak 2008). In particular it refers to citizen-initiated bottom-up initiatives. Although some authors also refer to riots, petitions, and other forms of protest under the banner of self-organization, in light of the aim of this chapter, we particularly focus on *community* self-organization, thereby referring to bottom-up initiatives that are citizen or community driven, that aim to deal with a specific set of public issues and have the ambition to set up long-lasting cooperation

structures among citizens. These structures are generally aimed at production and local ownership of services or goods to improve their social and physical environment (van Meerkerk 2014). From a participatory perspective, community self-organization can be considered as a representation of a shift from traditional forms of government-centered citizen consultation toward more active forms of citizenship wherein members of the public engage in informal and loosely structured organizations to advance their policy agendas and engage directly in public administration (Edelenbos, van Meerkerk, and Schenk 2018).

However, these initiatives do not necessarily have to be aimed at improving existing ways of public service delivery. These initiatives are sometimes organized as an addition to, but can also be in competition with service delivery by market or government organizations. Moreover, these initiatives can also be the result of a feeling of service failure (Gofen 2015; Rhodes 1996). Community self-organization may emerge in arenas of policy and public administration that governments withdraw from, due to budget cuts, and in domains that have ‘slipped’ from governmental attention (Barnes 1999). Self-organization arises to address market deficits in meeting citizens’ needs or concerns, for example, within the health care and energy sectors (e.g. Healey 2015).

Although the term ‘self-organization’ seems to imply an absence of government, some have argued that self-organization can only emerge if there is a dense network of foundations and communities within a neighborhood (including governmental institutions) that can facilitate self-organization initiatives (Spekkink and Boons 2015; van Meerkerk, Boonstra, and Edelenbos 2013). In this, the actors involved need to have trusting relationships among themselves in order to successfully initiate self-organization. Consequently, actors will know each other and share a sense of belonging that encourages them to participate in self-organization networks (Peters and Pierre 1998). Government often has an important role in supporting and stimulating these dense networks (Nederhand, Bekkers, and Voorberg 2016). That is, in the public administration literature, self-organization refers not so much to the absence of government in public service delivery, but more to how citizens themselves can be supported to take control of public service delivery.

Co-creation

The co-creation concept, as used here, finds its origins in the private-sector marketing literature. Here, Prahalad and Ramaswamy (2000) emphasized how consumers increasingly play an active role in creating and competing for value. As such, consumers are considered a new competence source for corporations. This new role for consumers implies that companies should encour-

age an active dialogue with consumers, mobilize consumer communities, manage customer diversity, and co-create personalized experiences (Prahalad and Ramaswamy 2000: 81–84). Co-creation involves an equal partnership between consumer and producer, and this partnership is seen as a prerequisite for an organization to remain competitive. Transferred to the public domain, co-creation implies a partnership between public organization and citizens (e.g. Cairns 2013; Carr 2012; Sharma et al. 2011). Co-creation should be considered within the broader attention for social innovation, where citizens as end-users of public services are considered as valuable partners of public organizations and governments (Bason 2010; Osborne and Stokosch 2013). This implies that citizens are involved in the essentials of developing public services, that is, in both the operational and strategic aspects of public service delivery. The general assumption is that citizens bring their specific resources and talents. Henceforth, a partnership occurs between service provider and service user based on mutual dependency. By viewing co-creation in this way, it most closely reflects the third rung of Arnstein's (1969) ladder (partnership). However, co-creation may also reflect the second rung (delegated power). This is because, today, democratic governments are struggling for legitimacy and are considering co-creation in social innovation as a solution to contemporary challenges. Currently, we are witnessing a withdrawal of government from many social domains. This enables citizens to fill the gap by taking over parts of service delivery.

Co-production

Co-production, rooted in the public service and service management literature, is gaining increasing academic attention. It is understood as a way to make public services (rather than public policy) more effective by including citizens in the production process. Ostrom (1996) defined co-production as: “the process through which inputs used to produce a good or service are contributed by individuals who are not ‘in’ the same organization” (Ostrom 1996: 1073). In a broad sense, authors following Ostrom's definition approached co-production as a concept that aimed to address service delivery in the public domain not as a one-way process, but as a negotiated outcome of many interacting policy systems (Bovaird 2007: 846). Parks et al. are more specific in their definition, referring explicitly to the relationship between citizens and public service agents: “the mix of activities that both public service agents and citizens contribute to the provision of public services” (Parks et al. 1981 as paraphrased in Pestoff 2006: 506). Empirical studies on co-production that accept this definition are specifically focused on studying examples of *citizen* involvement in public service delivery (Brandsen and Honingh 2016). Current academic attention to co-production has created a broad realm of different

forms of citizen involvement, studied under the banner of co-production. This variety has three manifestations. First, it involves different policy sectors such as public finance (Abers 1998), public libraries (De Witte and Geys 2013), childcare (Pestoff 2006; Prentice 2006), postal services (Alford 1998) and health care (e.g. Leone et al. 2012; Lindahl, Liden, and Lindblad 2011; Vennik et al. 2016). Second, co-production may refer to citizen involvement on many levels of service provision, maybe involving design, implementation, and decision-making (Brandsen and Honingh 2016). Third, co-production seems to include various forms of citizen involvement, varying from individual involvement to the involvement of large groups (Brudney 1987; Parks et al. 1981).

EXPLORING THE CONCEPTUAL BOUNDARIES

The descriptions above show that these concepts to a large extent overlap, but simultaneously address different empirical phenomena. The reason for this ambiguity is that these concepts are not exclusive, but rather add to each other, whereby one specifies the other. When looking more closely, we can observe important nuances between the different concepts. We introduce these nuances as *dimensions* on which the different concepts differ. We distinguish the dimensions: (1) typical context or policy domain; (2) analytical focus; (3) expected initiator of collaborative structure; (4) expected role of government; (5) expected role of citizens; and (6) power distribution. Table 7.1 shows these dimensions and how our concepts ‘score’ on each dimension in an overview. In doing so, the table shows also where differences and similarities among the different literature bodies lie.

Empirical Context or Policy Domain

From an empirical perspective, authors using these different concepts also seem to have a certain preference for an empirical context. *Collaborative* and *interactive* governance are often used in the context of natural resource management and spatial or environmental planning (e.g. on water management, urban development) (e.g. Ansel and Gash 2008; Bodin and Crona 2009; Margerum and Robinson 2015; van Meerkerk and Edelenbos 2014). Margerum and Robinson (2015) stress that collaborative partnerships are increasing in the field of environmental decision-making. They note that collaboration has been promoted as a means of enabling participation in environmental decision-making with benefits to both process and outcomes. In water management, more integrated approaches are developed to, on the one hand, take a broader perspective on water management and, on the other hand, deal with increasing complexity of water issues (Edelenbos and van Meerkerk

Table 7.1 *Overview of similarities and differences between concepts*

Dimension/concept	Typical context or policy domain	Analytical focus	Expected initiator	Expected role of government	Expected role of citizens	Power distribution to citizens
Collaborative governance	Natural resource management and spatial planning	Collaborative and relational structures of collaboration	Government	Director; boundary spanning; facilitating manager	Deliberative partner	Consultation; partnership
Interactive governance	Natural resource management and spatial planning	Relational dynamics and strategies; performance; democratic anchorage	Government or citizens	Director; boundary spanning; facilitating manager	Deliberative partner	Consultation; partnership
Community self-organization	Urban/neighborhood development, public utilities, health care	Factors enabling/disabling realization of self-organization initiative	Citizens	Facilitator; 'room' maker	Initiator; owner; entrepreneur	Citizen control
Co-creation	Various	Factors enabling/disabling realization of co-creation process	Government or citizens	Facilitator; 'room' maker	Initiator; co-designer in role of service user	Citizen control; partnership
Co-production	Various, primarily in health care and education	Factors enabling/disabling realization of co-production process	Government or citizens	Facilitator	Initiator; co-designer and / or co-implementer in role of service user	Citizen control; delegated power; partnership

2015). Reviewing various studies on collaborative partnerships in water management, Margerum and Robinson (2015: 53) note that “[s]ustainable water management today encompasses a much broader set of issues, ranging from water supply to habitat restoration to water quality. Because these issues cross many jurisdictions and boundaries, a simple consolidation of power under a single entity is unfeasible.” Collaborative governance arrangements are then used to deal with resource interdependencies and competing claims on scarce water resources and to manage challenges of water quality. “... government and nongovernment participants in many countries are [therefore] looking to collaborative partnerships to engage the community, resolve conflicts and sustainably manage water” (Margerum and Robinson 2015: 53).

Based on a systematic review of the literature on *community self-organization*, Igalla, Edelenbos and van Meerkerk (2019) found that most of the studied community self-organizations are within the fields of community and neighborhood development; sustainability; social well-being and health care. This makes sense, since due to the economic crisis, governments have implemented various retrenchment reforms (e.g. budget cuts and a changing role of governments in health care delivery) (e.g. Verhoeven and Tonkens 2013). Also possible is a general dissatisfaction among citizens about government/market-based service delivery (e.g. in the field of sustainable energy) (e.g. Healey 2015; Seyfang and Haxeltine 2012). Faced with crumbling public services and/or driven by dissatisfaction with large-scale organization of service provision, community-based initiatives emerge to organize service provision themselves (Healey 2015). For instance in the field of urban regeneration community enterprises—as an example of community self-organization—are increasingly considered to be valuable agents in social, economic, and environmental regeneration and renewal by policymakers, since governments have implemented austerity measures and cuts in policy programs, alongside longer trends of welfare retrenchment (Haugh 2007; Kleinhans 2017). Furthermore, these grassroots initiatives arise from market deficits in meeting citizens’ needs or concerns, for example within the health care and energy sectors (e.g. Seyfang, Park, and Smith 2013). For some time now, the value of privatization in these sectors is being questioned. In this, the dominant perspective is that it has not met the expectations in generating market competition and sustainable energy or providing tailor made, affordable and accessible health care (Davis and Rhodes 2000; Kettl 2000; Pollitt 2001).

Authors studying *co-creation* use a wider range of policy domains. Popular are co-creation of health care (e.g. Cairns 2013; Fuglsang 2008), but also public transport (Gebauer, Johnson, and Enquist 2010) or education (Díaz-Méndez and Gummesson 2012). In *co-production* there is dominance of case studies carried out in the health care sector (Ryan 2012; Vamstad 2012) and education (Jakobsen 2013; Ostrom 1996). To a certain extent, this can be explained by

the origins of the concepts. For instance, co-creation and co-production in the public domain are associated with *public service* delivery (Osborne and Strokosch 2013). Naturally, empirical cases are examples of such public services. Health care and education are large sectors which are relatively easy to access, compared to for instance public safety. Also, in both health care and education, there is a natural dialogue between service provider and service user. Conversely, collaborative and interactive governance are focused on decision-making processes within situations of salient differences of interests among a variety of stakeholders and resource interdependencies (Koppenjan and Klijn 2004). Empirical illustrations are therefore often found in policymaking processes on complex public issues. Spatial planning and natural resource management are thereby illustrative domains, as governments are faced with high resource interdependencies, face less legitimacy, but increasing demands and self-organizing capacity of stakeholders, and increasingly invite multiple stakeholders to join collaborate processes, for example, for the design of public spaces or the management of natural resources (Healey 1996).

Analytical Focus

There seem to lie some small but significant differences between the objects of study of the authors using the different concepts. Authors using *collaborative governance* seem to have a strong focus on the interactions and relational structures of the collaboration and their outcomes. Next to relational patterns and trust, authors using *interactive governance* (or governance networks as a more specific subcategory, see Torfing et al. 2012) seem to be more interested in the strategies used within the studied network; performance of these networks; and also the democratic anchorage of these networks (Edelenbos and van Meerkerk 2016a; Klijn 2008; Sørensen and Torfing 2007). Especially, the latter is illustrative for more European oriented research on governance networks according to Klijn (2008: 518–519). As he notes:

In the European literature, one finds great attention being paid to the horizontal accountability structures of governance networks and to the influence of stakeholders on policy decisions. Both of these are difficult to reconcile with the more vertical forms of accountability traditionally seen in representational democracy in which elected office holders have much greater power over final decisions.

In this respect, Sørensen and Torfing (2007) spoke about a next generation in governance network studies in which the focus shifted from describing and analyzing the emergence of governance networks towards more attention for outcomes (and factors affecting ‘success’ and ‘failure’) and the democratic problems and potentials. This debate has gained more attention as some

authors argue that interactive forms of governance are democratically problematic. The reason is that they (might) undermine focal democratic norms in liberal democratic theory, such as political equality, authorization and accountability (Papadopoulos 2016). Others stress the democratic potential as they provide new arenas for participation, authentic and due deliberation among a more diverse and flexible pool of stakeholders (e.g. Dryzek 2010a). The later view is strongly related to deliberative democratic theory.

Authors in the field of *community self-organization* study the emergence of independent social structures, which are able to maintain themselves (Nederhand, Bekkers, and Voorberg 2016; van Meerkerk, Boonstra, and Edelenbos 2013). Much literature is focused on analyzing how community self-organization comes about, focusing on key conditions for the emergence and, increasingly, the impact of such initiatives. For instance, Bailey (2012), Purdue (2001) and Selsky and Smith (1994) describe the role of community leadership for developing crucial capacities for community base initiatives to evolve. Others focus on the role of social capital and organizational capacities (e.g. Newman 2007).

Authors in the field of *co-creation* and *co-production* seem to use a more instrumental perspective on the concept at hand. Most literature is dedicated to the identification of influential factors, required to facilitate the collaboration. To be more specific, most literature examines required efforts of governments in order to facilitate citizens to become partners in public service delivery (Voorberg, Bekkers, and Tummers 2015). This can be explained by the strong orientation on public service delivery. Ever since the introduction of the NPM paradigm, the focal point of public service delivery is to serve the needs of citizens. In the NPM paradigm this implies, treating citizens as customers. In the NPG paradigm, this means giving citizens a more central spot in the development and delivery of services (Rhodes 1996). Governments should organize themselves in such a way that citizens can easily participate. This is an important notion, because it showed that, especially in the co-production literature, where there is a strong focus on the role of citizens as executor of public services, this form of participation is not based on an ‘ask-what-you-can-do-for-your-country’ logic, but on a mutual willingness to participate in partnerships.

Expected Initiator

The locus of initiation and ownership is important as it can lead to different dynamics in the relationship and strategies used. The different bodies of literature show differences in regards to who is expected to be the *initiator* of the collaboration. While, *collaborative governance* (in particular as defined by Ansell and Gash 2008) is government-led, we see a difference with *interactive*

governance and, in particular, *community self-organization*. The latter stresses the initiating role of citizens in determining the content and the conditions under which their engagement takes place (Edelenbos, van Meerkerk, and Schenk 2018). Moreover, self-organizing initiatives can emerge as a reaction to government-led forms of participation (Nederhand, Bekkers, and Voorberg 2016). *Interactive* forms of *governance* can both be initiated ‘bottom-up’ and as ‘top-down’ (Edelenbos and van Meerkerk 2016a). Although governments play often a substantial and initiating role in initiating interactive governance processes and arenas, non-governmental actors with mobilizing power can also trigger them. For instance environmental or citizen groups who try to gain influence or develop their own policy alternatives for government proposals. However, in the end, government still decides about the formulation and implementation of public policy. Moreover, governments remain strong power and resource holders: their role in opening up and closing down, regulating access, providing support or managing interactive governance areas is significant (Torfing et al. 2012). Authors in this field stress the dynamic and multi-layered action patterns between actors and arenas in the evolution of interactive governance processes (Koppenjan and Klijn 2004; Teisman, van Buuren, and Gerrits 2009). In *co-creation* and *co-production* literature, collaborative examples are found whereby citizens (e.g. Rossi 2004) and government (e.g. Benari 1990) both have acted as the initiator for the collaborative effort. This variety in initiator role can be traced back to the early definitions, cited by authors in both bodies of literature. Where in community self-organization there is by definition a distinct role for citizens as initiators of the initiative, co-creation literature refers to the involvement of service users in the production process of a product or service (Prahalad and Ramaswamy 2000; Vargo and Lusch 2004). However, this involvement can imply both citizen-led and government-led initiatives. In the co-production literature, authors often refer to Ostrom (1976) or Parks et al. (1981) who broadly point at collaborating with actors outside the organization (Ostrom 1976) or specifically citizens (Parks et al. 1981), thereby ‘allowing’ room to interpret who has the initiative for the public service.

Expected Role of Government

The different concepts all seem to ‘prescribe’ a certain role distribution between government and citizens. Authors using the *collaborative governance* concept seem to adhere to a role of a managing/directing government. Ansell and Gash (2008: 554) for instance stress the role of facilitative leadership: “crucial for setting and maintaining clear ground rules, building trust, facilitating dialogue, and exploring mutual gains.” This facilitating role is often carried out by governmental actors (Spekkink and Boons 2015). A similar conceptualization of

the role of government can be found in the *interactive governance* literature. Within this body of knowledge the role of government in *meta-governing* or *managing* interactive governance areas is stressed (Koppenjan and Klijn 2004; Meier and O'Toole 2003; Torfing et al. 2012). Different managerial styles and strategies are distinguished, such as connecting relevant actors, agendas and interests, facilitating deliberation, developing interaction rules and framing as well as their impact on trust, democratic (throughput) legitimacy and outcomes (e.g. Klijn 2008; van Meerkerk, Edelenbos, and Klijn 2015).

In *community self-organization*, next to facilitating the collaboration, we see a distinct role of making 'room' for citizens. This is related to the earlier mentioned argument, that numerous self-organization initiatives can be considered as a response to governmental actions. For instance, community initiatives and self-organization can be a reaction to government retrenchment (Ostrom 2000), or dissatisfaction with service delivery (Gofen 2015), but also actively provoked by governments with supporting or facilitating policies and capacity building (Cuthill and Fien 2005; Van Buuren 2017). In this respect, governments can provide an institutional leeway by loosening certain regulations or supporting certain policy experiments. Some of the literature is aimed at understanding how such an initiative 'carves out' the necessary room to exist and what challenges this generates (e.g. Gofen 2015). Alternatively, concerning self-organization in public services, studies are aimed at exploring to what extent government assists in making room (or not) for these initiatives (Edelenbos, van Meerkerk, and Schenk 2018).

In *co-creation* and *co-production* most literature is dedicated to what extent government and public organizations have adapted their organization in favor of collaborating with citizens (Bovaird and Loeffler 2012; Gebauer, Johnson, and Enquist 2010; Meijer 2012; Strokosch and Osborne 2017). In doing so, the expected role of government seems to be to facilitate the collaborative structure. In addition, here we recognize the 'enhanced' NPM customer orientation, where there is a central focus on how to make public service more in favor of the needs of the end-users. In the current NPG-paradigm, the emphasis lies in the creation of value by including end users in the production process of the service (e.g. Fuglsang 2008; Gebauer, Johnson, and Enquist 2010; Verschuere, Brandsen, and Pestoff 2012). Therefore, to effectively address the needs of these end-users in this paradigm, the responsibility lies with government to facilitate this.

Expected Role of Citizens

Concerning the expected role of citizens, in both *collaborative* and *interactive governance* citizens are primarily considered as (one of the) network collaborators who collectively need to come to a decision. According to Torfing et

al. (2012: 159) “the image of citizens as voters at the input-side and subject at the output-side of the political system has increasingly been challenged by the view that citizens have a legitimate right to have a say in governance processes that affect them and that this right should be institutionalized.” Citizens become partners or co-producers in the throughput and output of the political system. They are increasingly seen as important partners to enhance the efficiency, legitimacy and effectiveness of public governance. Moreover, citizens nowadays generally have a higher level of education, more socio-economic resources and access to information. Therefore, they are better able to challenge governmental decisions (Dalton 2008). Hence, the more ‘emancipated’ citizen increasingly claims such a role, when confronted with decisions that affect their life sphere (Warren and Parker 2009).

In *community self-organization* obviously, the initiating role lies with citizens. In this literature, the role of a strong feeling of ownership is often displayed (Minkler and Wallerstein 2005; Nederhand, Bekkers, and Voorberg 2016; Peters and Pierre 1998). Moreover, citizens take on an entrepreneurial role (Gofen 2015). Especially community and boundary spanning leadership roles are stressed in the literature on community self-organization and community-led initiatives (Purdue 2001; Selsky and Smith 1994).

The importance of a strong feeling of civil ownership can also be found in the *co-creation* and *co-production* literature (Bovaird and Loeffler 2012; Brandsen and Honingh 2016). This is an important notion, since this is a concrete manifestation of the NPG paradigm, shared ownership of public responsibility is one of the key features (Osborne and Stokosch 2013). Subsequently, another peculiar observation is that in the co-creation literature—in comparison to co-production—the notion of citizens as *value* co-creator is put forward more expressively than in the co-production literature (e.g. Díaz-Méndez and Gummesson 2012; Gebauer, Johnson, and Enquist 2010; Wise, Paton, and Gegenhuber 2012). In the co-production literature there is more attention for the role of citizens as co-implementer of public service. For instance, Benari (1990) talked about garbage disposal at home as a form of co-production. In such a conception, citizens as value co-creator is a less focal point than reflected in the co-creation literature.

Power Distribution to Citizens

In the last dimension, following the notion of Arnstein (1969), different levels of participation can be considered as different forms of power distribution from government to citizens, thereby forming a conceptual ladder of power distribution. In Arnstein’s top rungs of this ladder, citizens have the power to actively influence decision-making or even take full control of a certain initiative or service. Here, Arnstein distinguishes three different levels of

power delegation (Arnstein 1969: 221–223). Rung 3 refers to a ‘partnership’ between citizens and governments, reflecting the ability of citizens to negotiate with governments. This involves the sharing of planning and decision-making responsibilities (e.g. joint policy boards, planning committees). Rung 2 involves ‘delegated power,’ where citizens achieve decision-making authority over a specific plan or program, for instance how public finances are spent. Rung 1 is labeled ‘citizen control,’ and refers to communities taking full control in place of government (e.g. community-controlled schools or neighborhood patrols).

Since *collaborative governance* involves policy decisions with people across boundaries of public agencies; different levels of government and/or public, private, and civic spheres; in order to carry out a public purpose (Bryson, Crosby, and Stone 2006; Emerson, Nabatchi, and Balogh 2012), we place collaborative governance on the second or third rungs (partnership, delegated power) of Arnstein’s ladder; however, with the recognition that the delegation of power and partnerships may refer to actors other than citizens. That is, we consider collaborative governance to be a broader concept than what Arnstein refers to as ‘citizen power.’ *Interactive governance* also accords to the involvement of multiple stakeholders including civil, public, and private actors. However, given the work of authors such as Kooiman (2005) and Edelenbos (2005), interactive governance now specifically refers to the involvement of other stakeholders in *fundamental* parts of policy development, such as, both problem and solution formulation. This results in mutual interdependent relationships between these actors. Therefore, in terms of the levels of Arnstein’s ladder, we also consider interactive governance to be a reformulation of the second and third rungs, which (as with collaborative governance) can involve partnerships with multiple actors. In *community self-organization* literature, in the public administration literature, self-organization refers not so much to the absence of government in public service delivery, but more to how citizens themselves can be supported to take control of public service delivery (Spekkink and Boons 2015; van Meerkerk, Boonstra, and Edelenbos 2013). As such, self-organization reflects the top rung (citizen control) in Arnstein’s ladder of participation. *Co-creation* should be considered within the broader attention being given to social innovation, where citizens as end-users of public services are considered as valuable partners of public organizations and governments (Bason 2010; Osborne and Stokosch 2013). This implies that citizens are involved in the essentials of developing public services, that is, in both the operational and strategic aspects of public service delivery. The general assumption is that citizens bring in their specific resources and talents. As such, a partnership occurs between service provider and service user, based on a mutual dependent relationship. By viewing co-creation in this way, it most closely reflects the third rung of Arnstein’s ladder (partnership).

Arguably, co-creation may also reflect the second rung (delegated power). This is because, today, democratic governments are struggling for legitimacy and are considering co-creation in social innovation as a solution to contemporary challenges. Currently, we are witnessing a withdrawal of government from many social domains. This enables citizens to fill the gap by taking over parts of service delivery. In this case, co-creation can be considered as a form of delegated power since citizens take over a former role of public organizations. Last, academic attention to *co-production* has—as mentioned in our first dimension—created a broad realm of different kinds of citizen involvement, under the banner of co-production. Furthermore, co-production may refer to citizen involvement on many levels of service provision, maybe involving design, implementation, and decision-making (Brandsen and Honingh 2016). Moreover, co-production seems to include various forms of citizen involvement, varying from individual involvement to the involvement of large groups (Brudney 1987; Parks et al. 1981). Given this range of empirical phenomena addressed under the banner of co-production, the concept can refer to any or all of the three top rungs of Arnstein's ladder.

DEMARCATING THE CO-PRODUCTION CONCEPT: CONCLUSIONS

This chapter aimed to demarcate the boundaries of the co-production concept, by 'looking-from-outside-in.' This implied that we explored these boundaries by comparing the literature on co-production with other concepts, aimed at addressing collaboration. In this chapter, we compared the co-production literature with literature on collaborative governance; interactive governance; community self-organization; and co-creation. We proposed to conduct this comparison on six dimensions: (1) typical context or policy domain; (2) analytical focus; (3) expected initiator; (4) expected role of government; (5) expected role of citizens; and (6) power distribution to citizens.

In general, we conclude that, given the numerous similarities on these dimensions, it is far from clear what is exactly meant with the term co-production. Although others have done a great job in enhancing conceptual clarity as to what co-production entails (e.g. Verschuere, Brandsen, and Pestoff 2012; Voorberg, Bekkers, and Tummers 2015) and conceptualizing different types of co-production (e.g. Brandsen and Honingh 2016), by positioning co-production in relation to other interactive forms of governance, it has become clear that the lines with related concepts are very much blurred. Therefore, based on our analysis we make three main conclusions.

Our first conclusion is that—as the introductory chapter of this volume implies—it is useful to consider co-production as a *mode* of collaboration, rather than forming a specific type of collaboration. When comparing the lit-

erature on co-production, we see strong overlap with co-creation and community self-organization with regards to the typical context and policy domain; analytical focus; role distribution among stakeholders. One could argue that co-creation and community self-organization aim to address a *specific form* of co-production. The literature on co-production is vaster than the literature on co-creation and community self-organization (in PA and PM), in regards to the empirical foci of the concepts. Therefore, we encourage authors who wish to use the concept of co-production to be very specific about what kind of collaboration they study and which aspect. In addition, in order to prevent (further) conceptual blurring, they should be specific on whether their analytical focus may also be captured by other bodies of literature.

A second conclusion is that co-production (just as co-creation and community self-organization) addresses collaboration in *public service delivery*. This is important since this explains why the bulk of these literatures is dedicated to investigating influential factors to the co-production process. The different governance modes (PAM, NPM, NPG) reflect an evolution in our conception of how the needs of citizens need to be addressed by public organizations. This orientation on citizen needs creates an obligation for government; hence, concepts addressing this kind of collaboration in public service delivery become very instrumental, instead of questioning to what extent a collaborative notion is required in public service delivery; hence, a focus on influential factors (addressing the ‘how-to’ question). Therefore, we suggest that research focusing on co-production, co-creation and community self-organization preserves these terms for such an ‘instrumental’ approach of collaboration between citizens and government. This would keep these concepts related to the shifts in governance modes and therefore part of a bigger ‘story.’

Third, since interactive and collaborative governance are focused on other aspects of the collaboration (e.g. relational structures and dynamics; performance; democratic anchorage) than the instrumental aspects as mentioned above, it is very possible to study interactive and collaborative governance *within* examples of co-production. For instance, the democratic nature of the interaction process and its relation to representative institutions is an important topic in the interactive/collaborative governance stream. This received (until now) not so much attention in the co-production literature. Although there seems to be a natural focus in interactive and collaborative governance literature on natural resource management and spatial planning, we argue that given the analytical focus on relational dynamics, performance and (most of all) democratic anchorage, introducing such a perspective can be an enrichment of the co-production literature and increases our understanding of to what extent its popularity is justified.

This chapter was aimed at enriching the conceptual discussion about different modes of collaboration, specifically co-production. We are aware that our

readings of the different bodies of literature is very much our interpretation. Therefore, it would be very much welcome to conduct and compare systematic reviews to each body of literature as suggested in this chapter. Hopefully, the dimensions as presented here may form an interesting starting point for comparison.