FROM AUSTERITY TO ABUNDANCE?

CRITICAL PERSPECTIVES ON INTERNATIONAL PUBLIC SECTOR MANAGEMENT

Series Editors: John Diamond and Joyce Liddle

Recent Volumes:

EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

This page intentionally left blank

FROM AUSTERITY TO ABUNDANCE? CREATIVE APPROACHES TO COORDINATING THE COMMON GOOD

EDITED BY

MARGARET STOUT
West Virginia University, USA

ISOQAR certified
Management System,
awarded to Emerald
for adherence to
Environmental
standard
ISO 14001:2004.

ISOQAR REGISTERED

Certificate Number 1985
ISO 14001

INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

CONTENTS

This page intentionally left blank

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

C. F. Abel	Stephen F. Austin State University, USA
Koen P. R. Bartels	Bangor University, UK
Ros Beddows	Staffordshire University, UK
Nicola Gratton	Staffordshire University, UK
Karen Kunz	West Virginia University, USA
Jeannine M. Love	Roosevelt University, USA
Nidhi Vij Mali	University of Mississippi, USA
Luís Moretto Neto	University Center of Brusque (UNIFEBE) and Federal University of Santa Catarina (UFSC), Brazil
James Rees	The Open University, UK
Alessandro Sancino	The Open University, UK
Irene Schindele	Kienbaum Consultants International GmbH, Germany
Victor Burigo Souza	Professor at State University of Santa Catarina (UDESC), Brazil
Margaret Stout	West Virginia University, USA
Evelien Tonkens	University of Humanistic Studies, The Netherlands
Imrat Verhoeven	University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands

This page intentionally left blank

FOREWORD: TOWARD A POLITICS OF BELONGING

There are two obstacles to an adequate understanding of the multiple challenges the world faces at the beginning of the twenty-first century. (I'm speaking of "the world" and not humankind, to include the totality of society, democracy, and the natural environment in our current predicament.) The first is a crisis of imagination, the second a crisis of collective action.

For many of us, the perfect storm of problems that threaten our very existence as a viable democratic society embedded within a natural environment is hard to grasp. These threats defy our cognitive and moral capacities because of their systemic, dynamic, interconnected nature (Ison, 2010). The rapidly deteriorating parameters of a resilient natural and climatological environment; the frightening instances of unusual and extreme weather patterns; the large movements of refugees, escaping war and drought zones, toward the affluent societies in temperate climate zones; the worldwide rise of political authoritarianism and the concomitant erosion of democracy; the increasing inequality in wealth; the epidemic of loneliness and alienation that by now afflicts all generations (Monbiot, 2017, p. 16); the ever-increasing intrusion of corporations and governments into our private lives; the global "corpocracy" of giant transnational firms (Crouch, 2011); and the implication of national governments in many of these developments — all hang together in unpredictable ways.

The language in which we try to describe these issues is rooted in the very categories and practices that have created the problems in the first place. In everyday political discourse, concepts such as "markets," "freedom," "democracy," "the people," and "truth" have become part of the problem not the solution. They hold us captive by drawing virtual but all too real boundaries around ways of thinking that are considered acceptable and authoritative, in the process effacing important alternative ways of seeing, talking, and acting from view. When, in the more affluent societies, things seem to proceed pretty much as normal for most people, there is really no reason for concern, let alone collective action. The unintended result is that a crisis of imagination morphs into a breakdown of decency and empathy (Margalit, 1996) — a moral crisis, in other words.

The second obstacle is a crisis of collective action. The late Tony Judt (2010) observed that by now, two generations have grown up who do not have any experience, thus no expectations, of the benevolent powers of the state. Somewhere in the middle of the 1970s, the capacity and willingness of national

governments to distribute wealth fairly, create a solidarity-based, universalist system of risk containment, and open up access to affordable quality education for all, began to wane. In its place came an arid discourse of individual responsibility, small government, austerity, and the corporate takeover of public service. Within the space of two decades, the Social and Christian-Democratic ideal of human and cultural flourishing transformed into an "everyday neoliberalism" that pervaded the innermost recesses of our personal dispositions and subjected our collective and democratic institutions to rampant financialization (Brown, 2015; Mirowski, 2014). With this change in the master ideology of our age, governments simply dispensed with much of their capacity for collective problem-solving, retreating into an obsession with security and financial solvency. It is no wonder that in the process they also lost much of their political legitimacy, opening the door to political extremism into the heart of government. This state of affairs leads Margaret Stout to declare in the "Introduction" that the time of incremental policy-making is over. As she states: "Moving from a period of flush government coffers and public − private partnerships in the 1990s into one of austerity and load shedding − both of which are often driven by market interests and their effects − has demanded revolutionary or at least evolutionary thought in public management and administration."

This edited volume demonstrates that there is a positive alternative, both in imaginative thought and collective action. Love and Stout's chapter, "Are Social Movements Prefiguring Integrative Governance," is a preview − a trailer if you please − of their upcoming book, *Integrative Governance: Generating Sustainable Responses to Global Crises*, wherein Stout and Love present a public philosophy for an alternative form of collective action that respects nature, fosters inclusiveness and solidarity (Prainsack & Buyx, 2017), and suggests a positive alternative to an economic and administrative system that is based on the appropriation and extractive exploitation of the commons (Bollier, 2002). This is a tall order because, as I argued earlier, the authors are up against an all-embracing hegemonic bloc. Their first task is to disentangle themselves from the language of extraction and the illusion of centralized control and to literally create a different vocabulary. For this, they turn toward the relational philosophy of Mary Parker Follett. Theirs is a world not of fixed objects and entities but an open world of process and becoming (see also Connolly, 2011). We inhabit this world not as individuals in the spirit of entrepreneurism, but as "stewards" of an intricate assemblage of materiality, social relations, institutions, experience, knowledge, and intention. Stout and Love (2019) use the term "co-creating" for these ongoing processes of attending to the commons, that is, co-creating in an awareness of the interconnectedness and emergent character of our social and material environment. Rightly, they refer to this pragmatist spirit as an ethic: "Stewardship is an ethic that combines the sense of *reverent interconnectivity* with a commitment to *emergent principles*. The inherent value of relatedness and reverence for interconnectedness demands mutual care, responsibility, and answerability for our actions" (emphases in original). In practical terms, this ethic becomes a plea for a radical, transformative form of democracy and an

integrative mode of governance in which citizens play a much larger role in collective problem-solving.

This edited volume builds on this formulation of an abstract relational public philosophy. It contains numerous empirical chapters that explore the varied nature of citizen involvement in governance co-production, the nature of collaboration in governance networks, the role of e/m-governance, and the transformative potential of action research, among other things. The value of the book is that it demonstrates that in these government−citizen collaborations and social movements, new ideas and practices that position themselves as alternatives to the hegemonic political-economic model of exploiting the commons are developed and tested. At the moment, these often local initiatives are far from being consolidated into a transformative movement. That is probably too much to ask at this point in time. Yet, the editor of and contributors to this book have taken upon themselves the hard work of locating and carefully researching, interpreting, and articulating the alternative ideas and practices that positively and effectively address the overwhelming challenges that humankind faces. In this work, they fulfill a tremendously valuable public service.

The next step needs to be one of transforming political rhetoric. We need visionary, charismatic thinkers who are able to formulate a new narrative that combines the different elements of the public philosophy that are developed in this and other works by Stout, Love, and like-minded scholars. Such a narrative will help us to reclaim our communities, our workplaces, and our sense of belonging, restoring faith in our capacity for empathy and collaboration, and bringing back a vibrant, nourishing natural environment. George Monbiot, the great British public intellectual, calls such a narrative a "politics of belonging" (2017). This book takes an important step towards such a politics of abundance.

Hendrik Wagenaar
King's College London, UK

REFERENCES

Bollier, D. (2002). *Silent theft. The private plunder of our Commonwealth*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Brown, W. (2015). *Undoing the demos. Neoliberalism's stealth revolution*. New York, NY: Zone Books.

Connolly, W. E. (2011). *A world of becoming*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Crouch, C. (2011). *The strange non-death of neoliberalism*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Ison, R. (2010). *Systems practice. How to act in a climate-change world*. London: Springer.

Judt, T. (2010). *Ill fares the land. A treatise on our present discontents*. London: Allen Lane.

Margalit, A. (1996). *The decent society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Mirowski, P. (2014). *Never let a serious crisis go to waste*. London: Verso.

Monbiot, G. (2017). *Out of the wreckage. A new politics for an age of crisis*. London: Verso.

Prainsack, B., & Buyx, A. (2017). *Solidarity in biomedicine and beyond*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stout, M., & Love, J. A. (2019). *Integrative governance: Generating sustainable responses to global crises*. London: Routledge.

This page intentionally left blank

INTRODUCTION

Margaret Stout

This book series on *Critical Perspectives on International Public Sector Management* offers a unique opportunity to explore what isn't working, as well as creative alternatives to mainstream public administration. Arguably, the new millennium has brought about much to critique. These early decades have been rife with governance crises and growing citizen discontent with government's capacity to meet a plethora of social, economic, and environmental crises. Moving from a period of flush government coffers and public–private partnerships in the 1990s into one of austerity and load shedding – both of which are often driven by market interests and their effects – has demanded revolutionary or at least evolutionary thought in public management and administration. Increasingly, we realize that we can no longer rely on incremental reform for change; we must transform broken systems that cannot keep up with our globalized society, economy, and environment.

Whether at the local, regional, state, nation, or international level of action, dwindling organizational resources demand interjurisdictional and intersectoral cooperation. As necessity is the mother of invention, creative innovations in governance have emerged and are gaining purchase. *From Austerity to Abundance? Creative Approaches to Coordinating the Common Good* explores some of these emergent trends in creative transformation of the public sector through collaborative governance practices.

In this transformational era, partnerships are increasingly of a different ilk than those arising through new public management (Kaboolian, 1998). Receding are the formal partnerships of government contracts with private corporations and nonprofit organizations – PPPs that emerged in the earlier rush toward privatization (Hodge & Greve, 2007). Growing are the fluid collaborative governance networks (Brinkerhoff, 1999) that are as likely to be led and populated by civil society groups as government agencies and private sector organizations (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Imperial, 2005; Innes & Booher, 2004;

Rhodes, 1996). Indeed, "civil society actors are demonstrating their value as facilitators, conveners, and innovators as well as service providers and advocates, while the private sector is playing an increasingly visible and effective role in tackling societal challenges" (Davis et al., 2013, p. 5). Considering various social movements and solidarity economy efforts, some even claim that civil society efforts are ushering in a systemic transformation of the entire political economy (Alperovitz, Speth, & Guinan, 2015).

In this volume, I sought to demonstrate that government is no longer the sole bearer of the burden of producing or even coordinating the pursuit of the common good. In short, governments need not function as "meta-governors" (Koontz, 2006; Mathur & Skelcher, 2007; Sørensen & Torfing, 2005, 2009). Civil society actors and groups have long been "the glue that binds public and private activity together in such a way as to strengthen the common good" (Davis et al., 2013, p. 5). While they have always functioned as trusted "watchdogs, ethical guardians and advocates of the marginalized or under-represented" (5), they also show us how to function in an effective, collaborative manner while upholding the very promise of democratic governance in societal change (Stout & Love, 2019). In short, governments can actually *learn* more effective approaches to participatory, collaborative governance from civil society.

I believe the resulting chapters answer that call. Set against the backdrop of social, economic, and environmental crises that challenge us globally at all levels of analysis, Love and Stout pose the question, "Are Social Movements Prefiguring Integrative Governance?" In response, they argue that government-led collaborations largely fail to achieve the advantages sought (Huxham & MacDonald, 1992). Building on a governance typology (Stout & Love, 2016) designed to identify the characteristics of integrative governance (Stout & Love, 2019), they demonstrate that contemporary social movements are instantiating its philosophy and practices in ways that overcome the limitations of traditional collaborative governance. Specifically, these movements use voluntary peer-to-peer networks, one-to-one tactics, and information communication technologies far more effectively than public sector attempts to leverage these organizing tactics. Furthermore, their growing capacity to build networks of networks across defined policy arenas and issues provides meaningful guidance for global governance.

Diving into the manner in which social media memes generate and perpetuate cultural "truths," Abel and Kunz employ Smithian analysis in "Unsettling the Memes of Neoliberal Capitalism through Administrative Pragmatism." Arguably, these late capitalist memes represent much of what social and solidarity economics movements seek to transform. What is most compelling about this analysis is the clear demonstration that the neoliberal interpretations of Adam Smith's theories are actually a bastardized version of his oeuvre, when taken as a whole. The alternative memes suggested in the chapter are founded in the very words of capitalism's earliest proponent and provide rallying cries around which social movements could organize – and which public administrators could support through pragmatist engagement practices. This combination may indeed cause economic policy-makers to take notice and shift perspectives.

Carrying on in this critical vein, Sancino, Rees, and Schindele argue that "coordinating the common good through cross-sector collaborations" can often be "a game of exploitation and competition." They argue that all too often, the driving government motivation behind cross-sector collaboration is simply one of austerity – getting more public value for less government investment. On the private sector side, the business of producing public value is becoming more opportunistic in postcapitalist society. Using structuration theory to analyze several cases of public–private collaboration, they demonstrate that rather than altering its modus operandi to reflect the values and methods of civil society groups, government tries to mold those groups into its own image through top-down authority as well as financial incentives and sanctions. As a result, government exercises domination through hierarchy and competition, thereby reducing the potential value add of collaboration. Thus, if we do not attend to the power dynamics at play in cross-sector collaborations, we may never achieve the progressive expansion of public value sought.

Also critiquing a case of coproduction among federal and state governments and community-based organizations, Vij Mali explores "Tackling Maternal Health through Cell Phones: Evaluating a Collaborative Framework." While e-governance (electronic) and m-governance (mobile phones) are held up as solutions to achieving better public service outcomes, she finds that there are many barriers to successful deployment of such efforts, particularly in rural, tribal settings. In the end, just like any other public service delivery method, the services must be of high quality, the end-users should be included in program design, and programs must be culturally relevant and appropriate, and while digital tactics can be valuable as support mechanisms, they cannot replace the value produced through face-to-face encounters. To succeed as information dissemination and collection platforms, e/m-governance must be deployed within a trusting relationship, like those established between village health workers and families.

Addressing the relational power dynamics involved in collaborative governance, Stout, Bartels, and Love engage the challenge of "Clarifying Collaborative Dynamics in Governance Networks." They argue theoretical frameworks that integrate empirical research on all different types of governance networks, public–private partnerships, and instances of public participation fail to clearly delineate the characteristics of *effective* collaboration. Employing the same logic model approach of such frameworks, they apply Mary Follett's theory of integrative process to shape normative standards for collaboration: a relational disposition, a cooperative style of relating, and a participatory mode of association. These characteristics can be used to assess the degree to which governance network dynamics are *collaborative*, as opposed to the counterproductive dynamics associated with *hierarchy* and *competition*. Like any other ethical framework or evaluative criteria, these normative standards are appropriate for operationalizing and learning collaboration and for use as an ideal-type in future empirical inquiry. Such studies could contribute to a typology of governance networks grounded in their operational dynamics.

Souza and Neto apply a similar framework in order to better understand and improve the power dynamics in coproduction efforts in "A Typology of Coproduction: Emphasizing Shared Power." The chapter provides a helpful translation (from Portuguese) of Salm and Menegasso's (2010) framework, which integrates several typologies of public participation in application to coproduction of the public good. Souza and Neto extend and clarify this typology so that it more effectively describes the characteristics of community-led coproduction (self-organizing production of the common good), state-led coproduction (public−private partnerships), self-interested coproduction (participating for personal reward/gain), symbolic coproduction (noninfluential political action), and manipulative coproduction (following the law or program rules). They employ this revised framework to analyze United Nations award-winning cases of coproduction, arguing that only by better understanding the meaning of genuinely democratic coproduction, we can adequately evaluate such practices. More specifically, only those that have the institutionalized characteristics of state-led coproduction or promote community-led coproduction should be considered excellent.

The final three chapters explore these collaborative dynamics between public administrators and citizens. Gratton and Beddows explore a specific public engagement approach that reflects the characteristics of both symbolic and functional coproduction in "Get Talking: Managing to Achieve More through Creative Consultation." This creative approach to participatory action research was used to engage young people in crafting a local fire prevention strategy, including input to both policy and implementation. The Get Talking method proved more effective than traditional consultation techniques in terms of the experience for both staff and community participants − both felt they were valued partners in coproduction. Furthermore, a more inclusive group of young people were willing to participate. All felt a stronger level of commitment to the program they had a hand in designing. They conclude that creative approaches to participatory planning, while not meeting all tenets of participatory action research, are valuable, pragmatic tools for achieving democratic coproduction of the public good.

In "Joining the Citizens: Forging New Collaborations between Government and Citizens in Deprived Neighborhoods," Verhoeven and Tonkens take up the notion of community-led coproduction. Specifically, they analyze the upsurge of citizens' initiatives as a form of blended action in which governments play a role of civic enabler, as opposed to top-down controller or director. These efforts not only prevent cooptation of community efforts when responding with needed government support, but can also inspire citizen-led initiatives through open-ended encouragement. This approach flips public participation on its head − communities are in the lead and *government* participates in activities designed and made by citizens. This reversal of typical power dynamics requires new capacities from front-line, street-level administrators. Specifically, they must gain the interpersonal skills necessary to develop trusting, authentic, collaborative relationships − as whole people, not just a work role.

Demonstrating the importance of this relational approach to practice, Bartels describes engaging in "Encounters with an Open Mind: A Relational Grounding for Neighborhood Governance." He explains that neighborhoods have increasingly become sites for area-focused social service programming. However, these small-scale, face-to-face methods require fundamental changes in the relational interactions between practitioners and community members. Specifically, expert traditions and habits of competition and top-down authority must be relinquished so that street-level workers can enter into relational practice with an open mind – open to who should participate in program design, open to integrative solutions that may require constructive responses to conflict, and open to collaborative action among equals. Illustrating with vignettes from a study of Dutch Neighborhood Practice Teams, he demonstrates how these relational attitudes and skills generate the most robust instances of coproduction of the common good with great potential for transforming hegemonic governance institutions.

Woven together, these chapters tell a story of the developmental path of democracy – an ongoing journey that is increasingly led by the world's citizens in response to government's failure to achieve and maintain a just and sustainable society at any level of analysis. Pertinent to public management in particular, when social change is being activated by the grassroots, it is more likely for public administrators to be at the helm of meaningful change – so long as policy-makers authorize them to do so. As Gratton and Beddows, Verhoeven and Tonkens, and Bartels all elucidate, participatory democratic practices of policy-making and program design at the local level are where we learn and develop the skills of deep, strong democracy (Barber, 1984; Green, 1999; Mansbridge, Hartz-Karp, Amengual, & Gastil, 2006) – both as citizens and as practitioners.

These participatory practices require what Stout, Bartels, and Love claim to be collaborative dynamics – a relational disposition, a cooperative style of relating, and a participatory mode of association. They also reflect what Souza and Neto describe as the characteristics of community-led coproduction, which enables the highest degree of citizen power in participatory practice. Thus, it is not surprising to find that the new social movements that are demanding and generating such coactive power are the sources Love and Stout turn to for guidance. As also noted by Vij Mali, their successful pairing of face-to-face networks and one-to-one organizing with global information communications technology is likely the recipe that will enable participatory democracy to scale out to a global scope.

Through the generative power of networking networks across policy domains, we may actually witness in our time a successful transformation of the cooptive approaches to coproduction Sancino, Rees, and Schindele as well as Souza and Neto critique, enabling a restructuring of our political economy in accordance with the more cooperative capitalist memes Abel and Kunz offer up.

REFERENCES

Alperovitz, G., Speth, J. G., & Guinan, J. (2015). The next system project: New political-economic possibilities for the 21st century. Washington, D.C.: Next System Project.

Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2008). Collaborative governance in theory and practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *18*(4), 543−571.

Barber, B. R. (1984). *Strong democracy: Participatory politics for a new age*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Brinkerhoff, D. W. (1999). Exploring state−civil society collaboration: Policy partnerships in developing countries. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *28*(4, Supplement), 59−86.

Davis, N., Farrell, E., Guinault, A., Lang, T., Magnoni, S., Maloney, K., … Van der Elst, K. (2013). *The future role of civil society*. Geneva: World Economic Forum.

Green, J. M. (1999). *Deep democracy: Community, diversity, and transformation*. New York, NY: Rowman & Littlefield.

Hodge, G. A., & Greve, C. (2007). Public-private partnerships: An international performance review. *Public Administration Review*, *67*(3), 545−558.

Huxham, C., & MacDonald, D. (1992). Introducing collaborative advantage: Achieving inter-organizational effectiveness through meta-strategy. *Management Decision*, *30*(3), 50−56.

Imperial, M. T. (2005). Using collaboration as a governance strategy: Lessons from six watershed management programs. *Administration & Society*, *37*(3), 281−320.

Innes, J. E., & Booher, D. E. (2004). Reframing public participationL strategies for the 21st century. *Planning Theory and Practice*, *5*, 419−436.

Kaboolian, L. (1998). The new public management: Challenging the boundaries of the management vs. administration debate. *Public Administration Review*, *58*(3), 189−193.

Koontz, T. (2006). Collaboration for sustainability? A framework for analyzing government impacts in collaborative-environmental management. *Sustainability: Science, Practice, & Policy*, *2*(1), 15−25.

Mansbridge, J. J., Hartz-Karp, J., Amengual, M., & Gastil, J. (2006). Norms of deliberation: An inductive study. *Journal of Public Deliberation*, *2*(1), 1−47.

Mathur, N., & Skelcher, C. (2007). Evaluating democratic performance: Methodologies for assessing the relationship between network governance and citizens. *Public Administration Review*, *67*(2), 228−237.

Salm, J. F., & Menegasso, M. E. (2010). Proposta de modelos para a coprodução do bem público a partir das tipologias de participação. *Anais do XXXIV Encontro Científico de Administração da Associação Nacional de Pós-Graduação e Pesquisa em Administração - Enanpad*, Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brasil.

Rhodes, R. A. W. (1996). The new governance: Governing without government. *Political Studies*, *44*(4), 652−667.

Sørensen, E., & Torfing, J. (2005). The democratic anchorage of governance networks. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, *28*(3), 195−218.

Sørensen, E., & Torfing, J. (2009). Making governance networks effective and democratic through metagovernance. *Public Administration*, *87*(2), 234−258.

Stout, M., & Love, J. M. (2016). *A radically democratic response to global governance: Dystopian utopias*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Stout, M., & Love, J. M. (2019). *Integrative governance: Generating sustainable responses to global crises*. London: Routledge.