



Co-Production and Service Delivery in Public Organizations: Benefits and Challenges

Adel Inezarene ^{*(1)}

Intissar Ariouat ⁽²⁾

Adel.inzarene@univ-mosta.dz

Intissar.ariouat@univ-mosta.dz

University of Mostaganem, (Algeria)

University of Mostaganem, (Algeria)

Received: 25/01/2024

Accepted: 24/04/2024

Abstract

Since the 1970s, co-production has been a focal point for academics and practitioners in the public sector. It has gained more attention and has been used in various contexts in recent years, especially in response to the COVID-19 crisis that the world has faced in recent times. This study aims to discover how well co-production works for providing public services. According to the study, if co-production is implemented in environments conducive to its success, in a political, legal, administrative, social, economic, and cultural framework promoting individual participation, it can significantly improve the efficacy and caliber of public services.

Keyword: production, cooperation, participation, Public Organizations, new public governance.

*Corresponding author:

1. INTRODUCTION

The quality of public services serves as a crucial benchmark for evaluating the effectiveness of governments and states in managing public affairs and fostering robust communities and societies. Delivering high-quality services is pivotal in improving citizens' quality of life and promoting economic and social development, particularly amid the rapid transformations and accelerated changes that societies undergo across all sectors. This necessitates a comprehensive examination of the processes involved in formulating, implementing, and evaluating policies related to public services. Such a review should generate innovative insights, embrace a proactive vision, and adopt advanced strategies to ensure service effectiveness while addressing the needs and aspirations of the entire society. Governments must acknowledge challenges and proactively develop solutions to guarantee the timely and effective provision of services.

This framework's collaborative engagement in public service delivery presents a pivotal chance to bolster efficiency, augment accessibility, and realize sustainable progress. Thus, a major topic of this research is: **How much does co-production affect achieving quality and efficacy in public service delivery?**

To tackle the issue at hand, the study proposes the following hypothesis:

The efficiency and effectiveness of service provision are enhanced by the increased utilization of co-production to provide public services.

The study employs a descriptive and analytical approach to address the problem and evaluate the hypothesis. Its aim is to highlight the significance of the co-production approach and its major implications for public service provision within public organizations.

2. Analysis of co-production under public administration frameworks:

The provision of public services can be examined through three primary models of public administration. These models exhibit variations in several dimensions. Each model is situated within a specific context, adheres to a distinct organizational doctrine, and allocates specific responsibilities to citizens, government employees, and politicians. As highlighted by Binghamton and Hartley, these models can also be viewed as competing or coexisting, representing an overlapping reality for policymakers and managers. The specific circumstances or contexts evoke behaviors and decisions aligned with one of the prevailing governance and service delivery concepts."(sicilia et al, 2016, p11) Based on this, these models can be traced along the following axes:

2.1 Old Public Administration Model:

Until the late 1970s, the OPA paradigm was the dominant administrative model in public administration, centered on bureaucracy, hierarchy, control, and clearly defined regulations. In this situation, government personnel are the intermediary between politicians and the general population, creating a vertical chain of authority. Public servants are impartial implementers, whereas politicians make decisions. (sicilia et al., p11)

In this model, governments provide Public services directly; nonetheless, as mentioned, it is assumed that the population is "somewhat homogeneous" and their role is envisioned as a "client" role. Citizens play a passive role, while public institutions actively participate in the reciprocal relationship. (Fugini, 2016, p02) Government employees often adhere to professional rules and deliver standardized services, but they frequently overlook the population's specific needs. Co-production has emerged as an alternative to this traditional model, driven by the belief that effective service production and delivery require active involvement from

beneficiaries. Citizens are not merely passive recipients; they play a crucial role in determining the success or failure of government initiatives. Their contributions are essential in soft services (such as education, health, and disaster management) and hard services (including policing, waste management, and national security). Co-production, therefore, represents a collaborative effort involving ordinary and consumer producers. (Sorrentino et al, 2018, p 279).

2.2 The NPM model:

The goal of reforming the old public administration model aimed to enhance the effectiveness and caliber of public services by employing strategies borrowed from the private sector. Consequently, this initiative led to the development of the (NPM) paradigm. With the advent of (NPM), the concept emerged that government should be administered like running a business. NPM advocated for market-type mechanisms and managerial tools, such as the specialization and fragmentation of regulations, performance-based approaches, widespread use of contracting and outsourcing, and the perspective that citizens are consumers of public services rather than clients. By rebranding the recipients of public services as customers with the power to exercise choice—for instance, by switching from one service provider to another if their requirements are not fully met—the NPM model upended the traditional public administration paradigm. In this customer-centric paradigm, government workers must progress from professional civil servants to completely professional managers. Customers are not involved in any phase of public service administration. Politicians are involved here in an oversight capacity. (sicilia et al, p11.)

Hence, as Denhardt suggests, “the interaction between public sector organizations and their constituents is characterized by self-interest, resembling transactions commonly observed in a supply-and-demand market. The New Public Management (NPM) model aligns with the perspective that citizens function as consumers of public services rather than mere clients. Consumers are anticipated to

make informed and discerning decisions among various service providers, and they may even discontinue their association with a provider if dissatisfied” (Fugini, p. 02).

This new context has changed the perception of co-production from something essential for public services to something that can be added to the service delivery methods available to public sector managers to increase efficiency and do more with less effort. (Sorrentino et al., p 279).

The application of co-production within the paradigm of New Public Management has proven difficult for the following reasons: (Elke et al., 2021, p 120)

A. Although co-production has historically been portrayed as a tool for empowerment, the division of labor between public service managers and service consumers within NPM has reinforced a power dynamic that favors the latter as Individuals and customers have few possibilities to engage in decision-making systems that are often closed and occupied by professionals who are qualified by specialized knowledge and skills as experts. Therefore, professionals may feel resentment or even resistance to involving service users in the production process, especially when their interference in the administrative process is considered effective or when they fear losing control and diminishing the value of professional expertise.

B. In instances where co-production has been implemented, it has faced scrutiny as a form of administrative oversight. This criticism arises from the engagement of service users in service production, which is seen as a way to legitimize decisions that have already been made.

C. The uneven implementation of co-production is a challenge. The potential for co-production may be limited to particular groups of individuals and marginalized communities who need more resources, expertise, or information required for active participation.

2.3 The NPG model:

Since the criticisms of (NPM), several hybrid models have emerged in public administration reform. The most prominent model is New Public Governance (NPG), a product of the need for an inclusive model that transcends the distinction between management and administration and provides a more comprehensive theory for understanding public administration. NPM has been criticized for being too close to the private sector and the traditional management model for needing to be more adequate in decision-making and administrative processes. The goal of NPG is to overcome both negative aspects. (Çagır D. Çolak, 2019, p529)

Stephen Osborne uses the term NPG to designate a new coordination for implementing public policy and delivering public services. He goes on to say that NPG involves changes not only in public administration and organization but also in the performance of the state itself. Thus, Osborne defines the new governance style within a state characterized by dual pluralism: the multiplicity of interconnected actors involved in policy delivery and the multiplicity of policy-making processes that intersect across political and administrative levels. This means paying attention to the institutional and external environment within which policies are formulated and delivering public services. (Torfing & Triantafillou, 2013, p12.)

New Public Governance includes several important characteristics, including:

- When providing public services, the state is pluralistic, involving various interdependent participants. Bourdieu draws attention to this plurality by pointing out how the formation of numerous actors and jurisdictions has fragmented the policy space and how local, national, and international actors are becoming more interdependent. (Robinson, 2015. P11) This hybrid public administration concept emphasizes the state apparatus's significance in delivering public services. Simultaneously, it acknowledges that bureaucratic capacity tends to grow when it collaborates with social actors during deliberative processes and in implementation

and oversight. The concept of NPG is grounded in a more pragmatic and equitable perspective that considers the interplay of the public, private, and civil sectors. This viewpoint aligns with the principles of post-New Public Management and underscores the adoption of innovative service tools: (Cavalcante, 2019, pp 211-212)

- Instead of emphasizing organizational structure and function, NPG is predicated on the relationships between organizations and the management of processes. It views trust, relational capital, and relational contracts as the fundamental governance mechanisms. (Robinson, P11) Therefore, the differences in the idea of public sector consumerism associated with the shift from NPM to NPG can be summarized by saying that the logic of NPG represents a transition towards increasing recognition of the broader and more active participation of citizens as co-producers in more collaborative systems for delivering public services. (Wiesel and Sven, 2014, pp 177-179).

-Applying programs and providing public services under the NPG require external interaction from administrative leadership, often collaboratively with various stakeholders. (Osborne, 2010, p 322)

- The NPG model focuses on participation, partnerships, networks, integrated services, and new ways of co-production and emphasizes a more active citizen model and the importance of social responsibility that NPM neglected. (Çağrı D. Çolak, p 529.)

The new public governance model focuses on cooperation between the public and private sectors and the participation of stakeholders in providing better services.

Numerous observers have highlighted that transitioning from New Public Management to New Public Governance necessitates a fundamental shift in how citizens are perceived—from passive consumers to active co-producers. In this revised perspective, citizens engage more actively in service delivery and decision-making, requiring coordinated efforts across multiple agencies. These changes are closely linked to reforms prioritizing a citizen-centric approach to service quality,

moving away from a singular focus on efficiency and economic performance. Additionally, there is a heightened emphasis on collaboration among organizations rather than competition, all in meeting citizens' needs. Consequently, effective network coordination, rather than market-driven exchanges, becomes a central task for public institutions. The notion of customer choice as a competitive force gives way to broader considerations about whether organizations collectively address citizens' requirements. This shift necessitates reorienting accountability practices beyond individual, organizational outputs to encompass cross-organizational processes and overall service delivery outcomes. (Wiesel and Sven, pp 177-179).

Therefore, in the post-NPM age, Co-production is viewed as an additional institutional arrangement that can be adopted to help public sector organizations achieve their goals. This approach is founded on the premise that individuals external to the governmental sphere constitute "considerably untapped potential," and their engagement could result in transformative advancements in public services. Professionals must adopt a more adaptable approach within this framework, redirecting their focus from inward to outward concerns and forging partnerships with the citizenry. (Fugini, p 03.) Implementing public programs and delivering public services in the era of New Public Governance requires general managers to interact externally and often collaboratively with various stakeholders. Such relationships build implementation support, protect programs from unexpected and negative shocks, and stimulate productive co-contributions from potential partners during implementation. (Osborne, p 322) The role of citizens is to work as production partners, as they possess knowledge, resources, assets, and capabilities that can be used to create greater public value. (sicilia et al, p11.) The role of the citizen here has shifted from a customer within the context of the traditional public administration model to a consumer within the NPM model and a producer within the NPG model.

So, the paradigm shift from the NPM to the NPG has reimagined the concept of cooperation in the provision of public service, which was absent during the

emergence of the NPM model.

3. Understanding the concept of Co-production:

3.1 How to define co-production?

There is ongoing disagreement over what constitutes co-production and how to define it. The phrase "co-production" was first used in the 1970s by Elinor Ostrom and her research group to describe the real-world phenomenon of citizens participating in developing public goods and services. To formulate a clear definition of the co-production concept, several authors have opted to exclude certain overlapping concepts; these exclusions encompass collaboration, public-private partnerships, strategic alliances, social marketing, community governance, and representative democracy. (Elke et al, 2021, p 81)

In Elinor Ostrom's words, co-production allows people to actively participate in creating public goods and services that they value. Co-production is often voluntary, and people can participate in planning and production processes to improve public services. (Eriksson, p 295)

The phrase "co-production" has drawn criticism from Bovaird and Loeffler, who argue that it is too wide to have any practical use in public services. "Which services are not co-produced?" they inquire. All of these, per Bovaird and Loeffler, are meant to involve experts and the general public in the implementation and delivery of public services. (Van Eijk and Steen, 2016, p30)

Various definitions of co-production have been proposed, including the following:

- Co-production is described as "the voluntary or required participation of public service users in any aspect of service design, management, delivery, and evaluation" by Osborne, Radnor, and Strokosch." This means that co-production is integral to the service delivery and management process. Pestoff argues that co-production in public

service management typically means the contribution of individuals or groups to the delivery of public services. This contrasts with the traditional model in which government officials design and deliver services without citizen participation. (Eriksson, p 295).

- According to Alford, co-production is a term that describes any proactive behavior by an individual or group out of the government organization that either works in tandem with the organization's production or functions on its own but is impacted by an agency action. This behavior is at least partially voluntary and generates value, consciously or unconsciously, for the public and private sectors, either through outputs or results. (Ryan, 2012, p 315)

- Brandsen and Honingh proposed the following definition: "a relationship between a paid employee in an organization and individual citizens engage in a partnership that necessitates the citizens' direct and proactive involvement in the organization's operations." (Veiko et al, 2019, pp 1667-1668)

- Parks and others provide the following definition: a collaborative endeavor where public service personnel and citizens both partake in activities supporting public service delivery. The foundation of "Citizen Production" is the voluntary efforts of people and organizations to raise the caliber and scope of their services. (BRIX et al., 2020, pp 171-172)

Based on the definitions mentioned above, the key elements of coproduction are: (Fugini, p 07.)

- Voluntary and not forced or stereotypically defined.
- Active participation rather than passive participation by users.
- Pay attention to producing outcomes and outputs that have value for the public.

- It should cover the whole political process (from conception to implementation).
- It necessitates interdependence among the participants to achieve results in terms of knowledge and input offered.
- It should be creative and adaptable to changing demands and technological advancements.
- It improves public services' resilience and sustainability. By enhancing new resources—the majority of private—coproduction can find ways to accomplish more with less.
- The character of the interaction among the coproduction participants.

So, coproduction is based on blending the activities of formal actors providing the service and the activities of citizens as volunteers, whether as individuals or groups, to enhance the public service cycle.

3.2 Characteristics of co-production:

The following characteristics can be used to describe the meaning of co-production in service delivery (Fugini, p 15.)

- Co-production is often an implied characteristic of public services rather than a choice.
- Co-production can occur in public service delivery at all levels of government and in contexts characterized by increasing multilevel governance. It is particularly important for public service delivery at the local level, the level closest to citizens.
- Various stakeholders participate in the co-production process (e.g., municipal workers, non-governmental organizations). This procedure is ongoing and changes over time as they interact. (BRIX et al., p 173)
- Certain policy domains are distinguished by a significant level of joint effort,

notably in sectors like healthcare, education, environmental protection, public safety, leisure activities, and social services.

- Co-production can occur at different stages of the public service cycle, from design to delivery.
- Co-production transcends particular settings, manifesting as a series of interlinked interactions that span diverse environments, such as crossing the lines of administrative or organizational divisions. Consequently, a multitude of factors can influence the dynamics of co-production. (BRIX et al., p 173)
- Rather than delineating a comprehensive definition of the notion, many forms of co-production can be differentiated.
- Co-production in public service delivery differs from co-production in providing goods or co-production of public service outputs.
- When it comes to producing public goods and outputs, co-production takes place at a higher level and calls for a more sophisticated strategy that incorporates other related activities like peer production and inter-organizational collaboration.

3.3 Levels of Co-production:

Brudney and England distinguish between three types of co-production (Bovaird et al., 2014, p05)

- **Individual co-production:** active and voluntary behaviors that citizens perform for their benefit (e.g., turning in faulty fire alarms), where residents are forced to engage in the service according to the provider's design (e.g., social services clients receiving counseling support).

- **Group co-production:** the active and willing involvement of several citizens in teams. These groups may have formal or informal mechanisms for internal and external coordination between service agents and group members (e.g., neighborhood associations, where people volunteer to enhance the services they receive).

- **Collective co-production:** cooperative efforts that produce collective goods from which the whole community may benefit (depending on whether citizens act collectively or individually). Collective co-production is characterized by the collaboration of one or more government bodies within a single entity or across several, engaging directly and concurrently with numerous informal participants to tackle interconnected issues. This model diverges from traditional co-production, which typically involves a distinct section of the populace, yielding individual advantages for the members of that group. In contrast, collective co-production encompasses a broad spectrum of community members, including citizens, volunteers, and non-governmental organizations, with the benefits being distributed across the entire community. (Cepiku et al, 2020, p02)

Generally, it is straightforward to differentiate between individual and collective co-production. Individual co-production occurs when the client or customer, either independently or as part of a collective, engages in the creation or a portion of the services they consume, obtaining "substantial personal advantages." On the other hand, collective co-production is predicated on the notion that co-production involves a wider spectrum of contributors beyond just the users, extending to include additional community members like citizens, volunteers, and non-profit collaborators. This form of co-production is designed to yield societal benefits at large. To harmonize the collective and individual elements of co-production, three classifications of co-producers are recognized, each with a unique function in the process: Customers are involved in the latter stages of the product or service delivery process, assuming a contributory role in co-production, whereas suppliers and

partners have a more primary involvement. A cross-European comparative analysis has shown that the attributes of those actively engaging in collective co-production significantly diverge from those participating in individual co-production. Collective co-production is even more strongly correlated with self-efficacy than its individual counterpart. (Sorrentino et al, p 281).

Alford and his team posit that the individual user is pivotal in co-production, given their direct contribution of inputs and consumption of the services offered. This sets them apart from volunteers or citizens who may not be direct service users. The individual level holds significance as an individual's inputs can impact the service provider's output and outcomes, creating private value for the user and public value for the wider populace. Contrarily, Bovaird and his team emphasize collective co-production in service delivery, diverging from Alford's focus on individual co-production. They propose that collective co-production can cultivate social capital and utilize existing social networks to yield valuable outcomes. This highlights the necessity of trust between the user and the service provider, as well as among individuals participating in collective co-production. (Eriksson, p 298)

4- Different effects of co-production on public services

4-1 Factors Contributing to the Escalating Engagement with Co-production:

Interest in public sector co-production has changed over time, with both academic and practical perspectives experiencing periods of prominence and decline. While the concept largely disappeared from mainstream discourse during the 1980s, coinciding with the rise of NPM reforms, it gained momentum again with post-NPM reforms that reexamined people's roles in public service delivery.

In addition, several reasons for this can be summarized as follows:

- The escalating doubts and worries, along with the increasing discontent among certain citizens about the validity of public decisions and the diminishing trust in government, have progressively driven governments to include citizens in public decision-making processes. (Cepiku et al., p 4) Co-production is frequently seen as a strategic method to promote wider inclusion in the provision of public services. Its extensive range includes various forms of citizen involvement, making it a relevant concept for understanding a broad array of collaborative tools. (Cornips et al., 2023, p2) Co-production offers a chance to build a harmonious relationship between government bodies and civil society, potentially leading to positive societal effects and strengthening social capital.

- The prevailing view is that enhancing the residents' expertise and background can elevate the caliber of public decision-making. Efforts are being made to refine public providers by way of integrating the information and networks of users; there is a pressing requirement for public services to serve individual needs more accurately and to adapt more readily to user demands, and co-production is being leveraged as a strategy to curtail expenses. In this particular instance, co-production is seen as a transformative mode for services, equipping them to tackle better pressing issues and meet the urgent challenges of curbing public expenditure, addressing the needs of an aging population, managing the rise in chronic health conditions, and fulfilling the increasing public expectation for high-quality, tailored services. (sicilia et al, p10.)

- It is recognized that incorporating citizens' perspectives early on can lead to more effective and credible outcomes, especially when addressing significant and challenging decisions.

Certain groups of citizens, especially those with a particular interest, are increasingly demanding participation in decisions that affect them and their well-being.

- The increasing acknowledgment by the government that service providers' involvement can enhance and optimize government services. (Cepiku et al, pp 4-5) As Alford points out, "significant capabilities and resources" can be brought by customers and managers, and managers who ignore these capabilities will miss their opportunity. (Ryan, p 318)

- Co-production has garnered increasing attention and significance due to its potential to address a range of factors that hinder the efficient provision of services. As Marshall aptly observed, "the bottom line is that without active involvement of citizens, the government's ability to provide public goods and services is significantly impaired." Osborne further emphasized that co-production holds great promise for comprehending the complexities of Providing public services in the twenty-first century, where navigating intricate relationships between institutions and multi-stakeholder policy processes is crucial for successful service provision. (sicilia et al, p10.)

- According to Needham, the resurgence of co-production, particularly in the social sector, can be attributed to the following factors (Fugini, p. 43)

- The diminishing trust in goal-setting based on targets and processes based on the market.
- The growing demands for power delegation to citizens.
- The urgency to enhance efficiency and curtail public expenditure.
- The heightened recognition of the significance of knowledge produced through user interaction.

- The escalating commitment to personalizing social care effectively boosts user participation.

Certain academics posit that collaborating to produce public goods and services correlates with the austerity measures nations are experiencing, alongside a heightened need for intricate services to address multifaceted issues. Conversely, co-production can enhance the orientation of public services towards user needs, bolstering responsiveness and amplifying both the efficiency and efficacy of service provision while also fostering innovation within the public domain. (Cepiku et al, pp 4-5) Others see co-production as a way to deal with the challenges of the increasing democratic deficit and citizenship. (Fugini, p 03.) From this angle, co-production serves as a mechanism for reallocating roles and duties among the government, civil society, and private individuals. It offers tangible benefits to citizens by fulfilling their needs, enhancing satisfaction, and fostering empowerment. Moreover, it improves services and contributes to their sustainability. Additionally, co-production imparts significant societal values by bolstering higher citizenship and democratic governance and amplifying empowerment and involvement. (Cepiku et al, pp 4-5)

Therefore, the reasons that have rendered co-production a crucial proposition in the cycle of public service provision have varied. Consequently, we are led to inquire about the most significant impacts and areas influenced by the implementation of collaborative production.

4-2- Impact of co-production on public services:

Adopting a collaborative production approach has a multidimensional impact, affecting various levels, such as public sector organizations, citizens, the environment in various forms, and the very essence of the service itself. Thus, co-production aims to accomplish various objectives across political, economic, and social domains.

In a 2011 report titled "Together for Better Public Service - Partnership with Third Sector and Citizens," the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development emphasized the significance of co-production as a solution for public governance. According to Hood and Dixon, co-production is currently being used in public institutions, even though only some experimental research has conclusively identified co-production projects' short- and long-term outcomes. Some research has suggested that the presumed benefits may only sometimes come to fruition. This implies that co-production is often regarded as a concept of inherent value to the institutions that embrace it. (BRIX et al., p 170)

Here, we analyze some of the manifestations of the impact of co-production.

4.2.1 Co-production as a strategy to enhance participation:

The literature on cooperation presents very contrasting ideas regarding how far it can be considered a strategy to increase participation. It improves the understanding of how policy and decision-making differ from one another. It highlights how diverse groups should be widely involved in society to improve democratic problem-solving and decision-making in metropolitan settings. In addition, co-production can enhance the consolidation of social capital bonds and build bridges and connections, enhancing adaptive and transformative capacity in various regions, especially at the local level. Also, some writers have raised some affirmations that cooperation may enable well-represented groups of citizens. Cooperation can reduce the barriers that prevent these citizens from participating. For example, Schafft and Brown confirmed how cooperation helped enhance the lives of Hungarian Roma, a collection of those with a lower socio-economic status than different Hungarians. Based on this, cooperation redistributes energy among new kinds of stakeholders. (Cornips et al., 2023, p03) Eriksson expands this argument to include the diverse roles and outcomes of representing groups of citizens at different stages of cooperation. Subsequently, the

notion of "representative cooperation" emerges, characterized by the voluntary engagement of group delegates in assessing, designing, and providing public services, which facilitates value creation for fellow group members. In the world of "consultant bureaucracy," Riccucci, Van Ryzin, and others explore the correlation between the diploma of cooperation and the representation of client companies within governmental businesses. This is completed by appointing public officials who have shared demographic tendencies with the purchasers. Their findings advise that both poor and symbolic illustrations of clients can decorate trust in governmental institutions and bolster the propensity to contribute to producing public services. (Elke et al., p 72)

In addition, in rising economies wherein governments regularly have confined resources, co-production has yet to have an opportunity. "The article by using Ishaani Mukherjee and Nelanganya Mukherjee titled "Designing Sustainable Outcomes: Promoting Behavioral Change in Co-production Programs", explores three cases of big citizen participation that show the cost of co-production for selling sustainable trade not best for residents however with citizens. Those instances in 3 developing international locations (Bangladesh, India, and Indonesia) show how a hit success of most important desires such as rural sanitation relies upon on the capability to alternate the behaviors of people and communities". (Sorrentino et al, pp 284-286).

4.2.2 The impact of co-production on the social level (social welfare):

Citizens' contributions to co-production are often overlooked, yet they are vital to the success of this approach. These contributions encompass the skills, abilities, and motivations of citizens who interact with service providers and the rich tapestry of social capital embedded within their networks and communities. As Boyle and Harris aptly state, these contributions are "the forgotten drivers of change" that distinguish effective systems from those that fail. Ryan emphasizes that citizens should not be treated as mere "sources of input" but as "hidden resources" with

immense potential for improvement. "No service that ignores this resource can be effective," he asserts. (Ryan, p318)

There are many eventualities in which co-production is considered the right means of providing social care. Co-production can be used with distinctive humans in diverse social contexts and situations. Co-manufacturing can gain from user know-how in creating cost, enhancing offerings, and promoting the development of mutual support mechanisms among users. Through non-stop interaction between stakeholders, new know-how is created, and new results for public services are defined. Co-production can enhance the development of social capital in society via communicate and self-aid among individuals and institutions. In social care, it is essential to distinguish between exceptional types of services supplied by co-manufacturing, ranging from lengthy-term care to brief-term interventions. In the primary case, along with taking care of the elderly and prone human beings, users and social care workers officially connect for long periods, so voice is the best choice for governance if customers are disappointed with the carrier they obtain. The significance of this kind of service is excessive, and co-production may additionally support the creation of public value. The concept of public value may be defined as a framework that facilitates us to hyperlink what we consider value and requires public assets with improving methods of understanding what our 'target audience' sees as cost and how to communicate with them. On the other hand, within case of brief-time period offerings, which include home care, customers are permitted to enforce exit techniques in case of complaints about the quantity and quality of services. (Fugini, pp 45-46.)

The benefit of co-production is that it can help communities and individuals become more capable of independently responding to social demands in the future, as well as the sense of well-being that emerges from this real-time activity. Co-production also contributes to public services' external and social impact and

effectiveness. Public services that meet people's immediate and long-term social, health, and economic needs and make a more significant, sustainable contribution to society depend on this value co-creation. (Osborne et al., 2016, p 647).

The effect of co-production is obvious within the context of public zone austerity, in which co-manufacturing has been seen as a manner to faucet into community assets. Proponents of co-production argue that it allows for the development of a solution centered around users' desires, leading to multiplied personal pleasure, performance profits, and reduced charges of government employees to supply services. Additionally, they argue that "local possession" of the services produced enhances the capacities and, ultimately, the trust of individuals. Co-production also promotes brotherly love in a fragmented society by reaching democracy in the public area and growing citizen agreement with governments. (Polzer and Goncharenko, 2021, pp 283-284)

Vanleene, Verschuere, and Voets have classified the advantages of co-production into the subsequent domains: (BRIX et al., pp 172-173)

a- Achievement of innovative potential: Co-production leads to:

- An enhanced capacity for innovation by fortifying networks across various disciplines and fostering partnerships between public and private sectors.
- The amalgamation of diverse viewpoints and needs and amplified opportunities for comprehending the intricacy of social issues and pinpointing sustainable solutions through collaboration.

b- Enhancement of individual well-being and citizen empowerment through:

- Introducing new roles and interactions encompass allocating responsibilities and authorities in service delivery.

- The proactive involvement of citizens in service delivery, whereby they take on the role of co-producers.

c- Increased effectiveness and efficiency in the public sector: Through:

- Understanding what people have to say to determine what they need from public services.

- Improve service targeting, cut down on service failures, and develop services customized to the populace's demands.

- Raising public sector costs and enhancing citizen satisfaction.

d- Mobilization of resources:

- Cross-disciplinary specialized cooperation.

- Retaining current services or developing new ones using fewer resources.

- Maintaining the current level of service despite financial pressures.

e- Increased democracy:

- Empower and encourage citizens and different interested parties to participate in the control of public affairs and affect the system of public policies and public offerings.

- NGO and character residents can participate in choice-making and democratic consultation within the scope of public authority.

- Delegating authority to the bottom to a suitable degree, such as citizens and many civil establishments.

- Openness in the public sector.

- Encouraging local democratic governance.

Co-production can play a significant role in realizing numerous advantages in the administration of public organizations, enhancing their efficiency in managing public service and attaining sustainable development. This is predicated on the engagement of the beneficiary throughout the formulation, execution, and assessment of public service policy. The community's involvement in decision-making related to public service is a fundamental prerequisite for the sustainability of public service and the assurance of the rights of future generations. It is also worth noting the substantial political impact of the co-production approach. Various researches suggest that this approach is a key solution to address the issue of deficit and democratic decline in different countries. This is accomplished by stressing the importance of correspondence between the people and the government, boosting the participation of all societal sectors, advocating for transparency and accountability, and heightening trust in democratic institutions.

In summary, co-production provides a comprehensive approach to enhancing public service delivery, offering a spectrum of benefits beyond mere service provision. By empowering citizens, encouraging collaboration, and stimulating innovation, co-production can revolutionize how government services are conceived, delivered, and experienced.

5- Evaluation and discussion:

Despite the splendid significance and benefits of using co-production in the provision of public offerings, numerous challenges may be confronted in the application of co-manufacturing. The more stressful the co-manufacturing necessities, the more resources the user requires regarding time, effort, and monetary resources. In addition, customers will no longer only need you to offer those sources, but they also have to be prompted to accomplish that.

Furthermore, the latest research has proven that self-efficacy, or the belief that citizens can reassert, is a critical determinant of cooperative efforts, particularly in co-manufacturing. Since capability, willingness, and self-efficacy can be lacking in some of the most vulnerable user groups, co-manufacturing can result in marginalization. More importantly, while users are requested to co-produce but are not able or unwilling, it is miles not likely to cause the expected notion of effect that is supposed to reduce feelings of uncertainty. (Fledderus, et al., 2015, pp 149-150)

A significant barrier to co-production is the reluctance to embrace change, leading to the dismissal of citizen involvement by organizational proprietors. Kershaw and colleagues' research within the Australian museum sector revealed that despite theoretically acknowledging the potential for museum participatory practices, professional institutions still need to actualize co-production in practice. This reluctance primarily stems from the specialized nature of museum work, where coordinators are averse to power-sharing with the public and exhibit a need for co-production competencies, thereby signifying an aversion to change. (Cepiku et al, pp 35-36)

Another obstacle appears when co-production represents a collective work. Here, groups of users participate and cooperate in providing public services. Since cooperation is a prerequisite for the success of collective co-production, trust within the group becomes an important factor. There are many possibilities for this trust to emerge. When users know each other, building trust is easier than when they are relative strangers. Residents who come together and participate in promoting neighborhood safety and delivering it within community policing systems are more likely to know each other or have some sense of common interest as they live in the same area. However, when there are no such links, there must be other factors besides group identity that facilitate trust. Strangers are less likely to trust each other because they have little information about their intentions. When there are doubts about

whether other users are committed to co-production, and when there is a chance that people will avoid providing their efforts in service delivery, collective co-production is negatively affected. The realization that others may be making more efforts in co-production than you are increases feelings of uncertainty about the expected outcome. Therefore, uncertainty is one obstacle that affects the application of co-production in public service. (Fledderus et al., 2015, pp 149-150)

Another challenge in comparing the consequences of co-manufacturing is its multifaceted utility and extraordinary justifications in unique disciplines consisting of volunteering, fitness, social work, urban and rural improvement, and cultural intake. Each discipline shapes a distinct form of the co-manufacturing concept and gives exceptional frameworks for it, which means that co-manufacturing results will range from area to discipline and from context to context and that evaluating the outcomes of different co-manufacturing projects may be tough. (BRIX et al., p 173)

Despite the importance of co-production in promoting the participation of different marginalized and excluded groups, this raises challenges about participation mechanisms and the interpretation of the basic motivations for participation. As with classical types of participation, wealthy residents with better education may additionally dominate those approaches due to their more advantageous social and cultural capital. In addition, the professionalization of co-manufacturing can save people with a decreased socioeconomic reputation from participating, as they feel they need to catch up in capacity and assets. This can result from public groups - now not always deliberately - elevating the barrier to participation, requiring unique talents and technical know-how from participating citizens. (Cornips et al., 2023, p03) In addition, economic and social characteristics and the networks people can mobilize are explanatory elements for participation because abilities, time, and resources enable people to participate more effectively. Thus, co-production becomes only available to some, and it can be the prerogative of those with higher incomes

and higher levels of education. In this way, co-production becomes a factor that reinforces inequality in the inclusion of all segments of society.

In light of the identified barriers and challenges, the prerequisites for enacting co-production entail readying the overall milieu and the attributes of the milieu where co-production activities are conducted. This encompasses a variety of factors, including resource availability, traditions of state and governance, legal structures, and socioeconomic and cultural considerations. Studies indicate that co-production is more prevalent when governments are exempt from the financial burdens of delivering public services due to fiscal constraints. The presence of social capital and a foundational infrastructure for public services are vital in bolstering co-production. The legal context also plays a pivotal role in co-production, as Szescilo articulately points out. The law serves as an instrumental means to foster and propagate co-production and to alleviate its adverse impacts by facilitating the devolution of duties from public institutions to the populace while safeguarding public values and addressing potential discriminatory issues that may arise from co-production initiatives. The significance of the regulatory framework in encouraging co-production by establishing the parameters for public participation is also underscored. (Cepiku et al., p 23)

Ghosh and Moore recognized forms of organizational incentives or motivations to promote co-manufacturing: governance incentives, which respond to a decline in governance potential at the nearby or national level, and logistical incentives, which refer to instances in which some services cannot be efficaciously brought to end beneficiaries due to environmental complexity or adjustments and excessive expenses. According to Bovaird, governance incentives are more likely to result in co-manufacturing in joint-making plans and design, even as logistical incentives are much more likely to cause co-production in joint delivery. These incentives can help differentiate between instances wherein co-manufacturing is considered an "actual

solution" and cases wherein co-production is considered a means to achieve greater effects at a decreased value. Regarding organizational issues, Alford talked about how co-production involves growing appropriate organizational structures and ways of life. Javerski and Kohli say such structures should be characterized by low decentralization and excessive verbal exchange. In addition to structure, the organizational way of life must be reshaped to grow the point of interest of provider users and different contributors to the network. (sicilia et al, p14.)

Beyond the mere presence of resources, the capacity for involvement in providing government services is crucial to guarantee individual participation in these services. This capacity hinges on the requisite knowledge, skills, and material means necessary to deliver a communal service. The accessibility of such knowledge, skills, and resources often varies according to the economic and social standing of the individuals involved. Nevertheless, government organizations can remove constraints on individuals' ability to participate by providing them with the appropriate information and essential resources. Time is another important resource that affects willingness to participate. Specifically, more time is needed to ensure co-production service delivery. For example, in the context of consumer participation in service delivery, a study by Hunt et al. shows that the time available to consumers, in addition to skills, is one of the key factors for participation. (Cepiku et al, pp 32-33)

Ostrom listed a few organizational requirements that need to be fulfilled for co-production to be successful (Silvia et al., p. 14).

- Outlining the limits of the user group and the resource itself;
- Adapting the rules governing the use of the resource and provision to suit local conditions;

- Involving collaborators in decision-making processes, either directly or through participation;
- Building a (social) infrastructure to settle disputes between interested parties.
- Regarding executive abilities to encourage co-manufacturing, there is a need for new professional capabilities, including the capacity to discover and take advantage of humans' property, giving humans the space to expand them, and using several tools to work with humans instead of simply treating them. In this regard, Alford pointed to the need for the capability to apprehend patron wishes. Promoting these administrative abilities means changing how specialists are skilled, selected, advanced, and controlled.
- Co-production necessitates the creation of efficient instruments that draw in the populace and bolster their abilities. Studies have underscored the significance of civic networks in fostering and encouraging involvement. Lowndes and associates articulated that engaging in political participation solo is more challenging and less enduring (except for highly driven individuals) than mutual interaction amplified by group and network communications. Group involvement offers ongoing validation and feedback, affirming the pertinence of participation and its worth. Such networks can be crucial in stimulating people's willingness to partake and persist in co-production activities. (Cornips et al., 2023, p03)

Therefore, public meetings, advisory committees, and surveys can be used at distinctive levels of the public service cycle to gain greater statistics, share choice-making authority, and supply public offerings better.

It is also essential to mention the significance of verbal exchange technology in selling the trend towards co-manufacturing and enhancing the values of participation. Communication technologies and social media allow faster and wider interplay

between public establishments and capability members or co-creators, as they allow for greater green statistics to float via instantaneous entry to information trade. Digital conversation technologies additionally allow an increase in the scope and collectivity of interplay. In widespread use, virtual technologies can affect interaction through multiple approaches. They assist in speaking with people, permitting citizens to speak with establishments without problems or vice versa. However, they will also lessen the need for direct interaction, cooperation, and co-creation. Alternatively, they will allow citizens to self-organize, making them skip present-day establishments. (Lember, et al, 2019, P 1672)

Therefore, there are many mechanisms related to the service product and how it is managed or to the participating citizen and those related to the general political, economic, administrative, social, and cultural context. The success of co-production in achieving its goals of rationalizing and enhancing the effectiveness of public services is related to these determinants, especially the availability of a legal and regulatory framework that defines cooperation mechanisms, in addition to incentives and a culture of cooperation among citizens. Any disruption in this area will lead to co-production failure in its various forms.

6. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, co-production is a pivotal transformation when creating and providing public services. It poses a significant challenge to the public sector, particularly in light of contemporary societal developments and the complexities of the state in the twenty-first century, in which many stakeholders participate in various stages of the public service cycle. Thus, co-production emerges as a critical factor in harmonizing endeavors and resources, redesigning and enhancing public services in more efficient and effective ways that respond to the aspirations and needs of society if the appropriate environment is provided for it, whether related to the public sector or that related to the citizen.

Study results:

- The development of co-production received fluctuating interest until the late 1980s when the appearance of post-NPM models significantly raised the issue as an approach to reforming the delivery of public service.
- There are many definitions of co-production. However, generally, the philosophy of co-production is based on the voluntary participation of citizens in all stages of delivering public service.
- Co-production is an important strategy to empower citizen participation.
- Cooperative co-production serves to re-evaluate the dynamics between the state and society by redistributing roles and responsibilities among the government, third sector, and private citizens. This allows citizens to build trust in government, enhancing satisfaction and meeting their needs.
- Co-production allows the exploitation of experiences and skills in preparing public service programs, which gives them an innovative vision and meets society's needs.
- The citizen is not a passive recipient of the service but rather an active and productive actor who participates in all its stages.
- Co-production is a way of improving public life by involving everyone who is affected by it. It can work well in different situations, but it is not always easy. Co-production helps people have a say in the decisions that affect them, to have more power and opportunities, and to create positive changes together.

Co-production is a promising approach to improving the delivery of public services. It can increase efficiency, effectiveness, and responsiveness to the requirements of the populace. However, the success of co-production requires a supportive environment, including the following:

- A clear legal and regulatory framework that defines the roles and responsibilities of the various stakeholders.
- Incentives for citizens to participate and a culture of cooperation among citizens.
- The availability of resources, skills, and abilities of the participants.
- A supportive context that includes social trust and cooperation.

5. Bibliography List:

- Bill Ryan, (2012), "Co-production: Option or Obligation?", *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, vol. 71, No 3, pp. 314–324.
- BOVAIRD, T. et al, (2015), "Activating Citizens to Participate in Collective Co-Production of Public Services", *Journal of Social Policy*, Vol 44, No 1, pp. 1 - 23
- Çağrı D. Çolak, (2019), "Why the New Public Management is Obsolete: An Analysis in the Context of the Post-New Public Management Trends", *Croatian and Comparative Public Administration*, Vol. 19 No. 4.
- Carola Van Eijk and Trui Steen, (2016), "Why engage in co-production of public services? Mixing theory and empirical evidence", *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 2016, Vol. 82, No 1, pp 28–46.
- Denita Cepiku et al., (2020), *The Co-production of Public Services Management and Evaluation*, Palgrave Macmillan, Switzerland.
- Elke Loeffler, et al., (2021), *The Palgrave Handbook of Co-Production of Public Services and Outcomes*, Springer International Publishing Palgrave Macmillan, Switzerland.
- Erik M. Eriksson (2019) "Representative co-production: broadening the scope of the public service logic", *Public Management Review*, Vol 21, No 2.
- Fredrika Wiesel and Sven Modell, (2014), "From New Public Management to New Public Governance? Hybridization and Implications for Public Sector Consumerism", *Financial Accountability & Management*, Vol 30, No 2.
- Jacob Torfing & Peter Triantafyllou, (2013), "What's in a Name? Grasping New Public Governance as a Political-Administrative System", *International Review of Public Administration*, Vol. 18, No. 2.
- Jacob. BRIX et al, (2020), "Evaluating the outcomes of co-production in local government", *Local Government Studies*, Vol 46, No 2.
- Joost Fledderus, et al., (2015), "User co-production of public service delivery: An uncertainty approach", *Public Policy and Administration*, Vol 30, No 2, Pages: 145 - 164
- Leila Cornips et al., (2023), "Co-production as a strategy for enhanced equal representation in public service delivery: The case of Rotterdam", *Cities*, Vol 141.
- Maddalena Sorrentino, et al, (2018), "Understanding co production as a new public governance tool", *Policy and Society*, Vol 37, No 3, pp 277-293.

- Mariafrancesca Sicilia et al., (2016), "Public services management and co-production in multi-level governance settings", *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, Vol 82, , No 1, Pages: 8 - 27
- Mariagrazia Fugini et al., (2016), *Co-production in the Public Sector Experiences and Challenges*, Springer Nature, Switzerland.
- Mark Robinson, (2015), "From Old Public Administration to the New Public Service", UNDP Global Centre for Public Service.
- Osborne, et al., (2016). "Co-Production and the Co-Creation of Value in Public Services: A suitable case for treatment?". *Public Management Review*, Vol 18, No 5, pp. 639-653, 2016.
- Pedro Luiz Cavalcante, (2019), "Trends in Public Administration after Hegemony of the New Public Management: a literature review", *Rev. Serv. Public Brasília*, Vol 70 , No 2.
- Stephen Osborne, (2010), *The New Public Governance?*, Routledge, New York.
- Tobias Polzer and Galina Goncharenko, (2021), "The UK COVID-19 app: The failed co-production of a digital public service", *Financial Accountability & Management*, Vol.8 , No 2.
- Veiko Lember, et al. (2019) "The potential impacts of digital technologies on co-production and co-creation", *Public Management Review*, Vol 21, No 11, 1665-1686.