

TALLINN UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY
DOCTORAL THESIS
39/2023

Reluctant Co-Producers of Public Services: Understanding Micro-Level Dynamics

LAIDI SURVA



Contents

List of publications	6
Author's contribution to the publications	7
INTRODUCTION	8
1 FOCUS AND AIMS OF THE THESIS.....	8
2 RESEARCH STRATEGY.....	12
3 ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK.....	17
3.1 What is public service co-production?.....	17
3.1 Why is co-production important?	21
3.2 How are public services co-produced?.....	23
3.3 Who co-produces?.....	26
3.4 Reluctant co-producers	29
4 KEY FINDINGS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR UNDERSTANDING RELUCTANCE TO CO-PRODUCE PUBLIC SERVICES	33
5 CONCLUSION	39
References	41
Acknowledgements.....	51
Abstract.....	53
Lühikokkuvõte.....	56
Appendix: Publications I-III	59
Curriculum vitae.....	120
Elulookirjeldus.....	123

List of publications

The dissertation is based on the following original publications:

- I. **Surva, L., Tõnuri, P., & Lember, V.** (2016). Co-Production in a Network Setting: Providing an Alternative to the National Probation Service. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 39:13, 1031–1043, DOI: 10.1080/01900692.2016.1193752. (1.1)
- II. Tõnuri, P., & **Surva, L.** (2017). Is Volunteering Always Voluntary? Between Compulsion and Coercion in Co-production. *Voluntas*, 28:1, 223–247, DOI: 10.1007/s11266-016-9734-z. (1.1)
- III. **Surva, L.** (2022). Maintaining the Ideals of Co-Production During Rapid Digitalisation: Comparative Case Study of Digital Restorative Services in Estonia, Finland, Ireland and Portugal. *Voluntas*, DOI: 10.1007/s11266-022-00502-6. (1.1)

Author's contribution to the publications

The main arguments of the thesis have been developed in three original articles. The author's contribution to them was as follows:

- I. The author of the thesis is the first author and contributed by formulating the research problem and structuring the research design together with the second and third author. The author of the thesis conducted in-depth, semi-structured interviews with service coordinators, mentors, and clients. Furthermore, for a better ethnographic insight, the first author spent 3 weeks as an intern in Tallinn Prison to observe and understand the role of prison staff in the co-production process.
- II. The author of the thesis is the second author of this article and contributed by formulating the research problem, structuring the research design, conducting data collection and analysis, and summarizing the findings together with the first author. The author of the thesis contributed by collecting data for Case 1 (volunteer firefighters) and Case 2 (assistant police officers), which included in-depth, semi-structured interviews and policy document analysis.
- III. The author of this thesis is the sole author of the article.

INTRODUCTION

1 FOCUS AND AIMS OF THE THESIS

Co-production of public services has been used as a concept to describe the changed nature of relationships between public sector organisations and citizens. Since the concept was first introduced in the late 1970s, it has seen a global resurgence in recent years (Nabatchi et al., 2017). Perhaps not least because of the 2008 economic crisis and the politics of austerity (Jukić et al., 2019) and because traditional welfare states are no longer affordable and governments are looking for new ways to provide public services (Voorberg & Bekkers, 2016). In addition, it has been argued that active citizen participation and public service co-production constitute a cornerstone of democracy and democratic governance (Pestoff, 2009).

The key idea behind co-production is that services are delivered not only by the professional and managerial staff in the public sector but are co-produced by citizens and communities (Vargo & Lusch, 2004; Joshi & Moore, 2004; Pestoff, 2006; Bovaird, 2007). As citizens bring in their ideas, time, skills, and other resources (Alford, 2002; Verschuere et al., 2012; Lindsay et al., 2014; Spanjol et al., 2015), they become co-creators working with public officials (Voorberg & Bekkers, 2016). This makes public service provision a multi-faceted and relational process, where end-user engagement is integral to its effectiveness (Radnor & Osborne, 2013).

Public sector organisations can be seen to be moving away from standardised service provision, i.e., the role of a service provider delivering a service to a passive recipient – the citizen – toward diversity, multi-actor arrangements, and the development of partnerships with citizens (Lee & Allaway, 2002; Joshi & Moore, 2004; Meuter et al., 2005, Pestoff, 2012). This takes place in the context of a broader shift towards collaborative and network-based forms of service planning and delivery, thus replacing public service monopolies and public-private competition (Torfing et al., 2019; Campanale et al., 2020). Involving citizens in co-production has become a core feature of public value creation (Alford 1998; Alford, 2002; van Beuningen et al., 2011; Osborne & Strokosch, 2013) where risk and responsibility of successful service delivery is shared between the user, i.e., the citizen, and the service provider, making the former partly accountable for service outcomes (Bandura, 2001; Fledderus et al., 2014).

This thesis sets out to analyse the different interrelations and dilemmas that come into play in the process of public service co-production in what Loeffler and Bovaird (2020) call the joint contributions of citizens ('experts by experience') and organisational staff ('experts by profession'). More specifically, the thesis focuses on a particular kind of co-production relationship where service users are reluctant or forced to engage in the co-production process. For service co-production to bring results and create public value, it is imperative that citizens, i.e., the people who use and benefit from the service, give their input. This can be done through actively voicing their needs, and thus, helping with the design of the service, or being personally involved in service implementation. In most cases, it can be assumed that both the citizens and service providers are naturally motivated to participate in public service co-production. This is reflected in current research, which mostly focuses on situations where citizen participation is voluntary or even citizen-initiated. However, much less is known about public service co-production where citizen motivation is either low or absent altogether, especially when participation in the co-production process is somehow externally forced upon the citizen (II). There are many vital public services, such as restorative justice services or prisoner resocialisation

programmes, where service users are reluctant to co-produce, but where increasing the involvement of reluctant co-producers can bring about a leap in service quality and public value. There is a need to better understand the underlying dynamics of these particular kinds of relationships.

With this specific research gap in mind, the focus of the thesis is on co-production of services where citizens might be reluctant to participate either because it is a compulsory process **(I)**, because it is a requirement for receiving their welfare benefits **(II)**, or because the format of the service does not fully support its underlying principles **(III)**.

The main interest of the author lies in the multiple roles that people play as citizens, clients, paying customers, or subjects (Mintzberg, 1996; Nabatchi et al., 2017).¹ A major challenge in this is that service co-production has many meanings and many faces (Alford & Yates, 2016). Additionally, it will be shown how the public service ecosystem (Osborne et al., 2022) can shape service co-production and what its impact is on the underlying principles, efficiency, results, and outcomes of services. This knowledge is helpful for drafting and implementing policy and improving governance. Furthermore, understanding the underlying mechanisms for reluctant citizens to partake in public service co-production could help governments and non-governmental organisations (re-)organise their work to better match the needs of citizens, not least so because different forms of co-production, be they based on individual, group, or collective activities, are highly influenced by micro-level activities. As Osborne and colleagues (2022) concluded, value is not created in isolation by public service users, rather it is the interactions of the institutional, service and individual levels of public service delivery that explain the complexities of public services and value creation at the levels of society, the service, and the individual.

In order to delve into these processes, the author investigated how public sector principles like formalisation, standardisation and the drive for equality can co-exist with the need for an individual approach and a design to co-producing ex-prisoners' resocialisation services **(I)**; what the nature of relationships between volunteers and the state is and how they affect volunteer motivation, and in turn, public service co-production in unemployment services and police and rescue services **(II)**; and what happens to the co-production of restorative justice services when digitalisation enters into the wider picture of public service design and delivery **(III)**. By selecting these cases, the thesis improves our understanding of reluctant co-production, its micro-level dynamics, and especially of how people choose to take part in service co-production. For the latter, the discussion will be focused on the choice–coercion–compulsion nexus that leads people to co-produce. Although there are authors (e.g., Osborne & Strokosch, 2013) who argue that co-production is an innate feature of any service, this thesis uses the choice–coercion–compulsion nexus to offer a more nuanced understanding of how citizens make an active, or at least conscious choice to co-produce public services. Importantly, the focus is on individuals and not organisations participating in service co-production. Although co-production can also be seen as a relationship between citizen-led organisations and the government, or as a governance mechanism in a wider sense, this thesis focuses on co-production at the individual level.

¹ Unless stated otherwise, throughout this thesis, terms like 'citizens', 'users', 'customers' etc. are used as synonyms when referring to people participating in public service co-production either in the planning, designing, implementing or evaluation phase of public services. However, the author acknowledges the differences in roles a person can play in co-creating public policies or services, a point that will be explained further in Section 3.3.

The thesis is guided by the following over-arching research question: **what is the role of choice, coercion and compulsion in involving reluctant co-producers in public service co-production?** Three individual articles were written to answer the research question, drawing mostly on the Estonian experiences.

Article I, co-authored with Dr. Piret Tõnurist and Dr. Veiko Lember, posed the question of how the formalization and equality driven public sector affects co-production and hence, user engagement. The article examines the policy implementation phase of co-production, focusing on individual relationships, motivation, and trust, which are largely out of the direct control of the government. It is based on a case study of a volunteer mentoring service for a group of reluctant co-producers – ex-prisoners in Estonia, where experimentation and the inclusion of motivated citizens were used to contend with the limits of traditional service provision and lack of resources. Albeit convincingly showing the possibilities of generating new practices through co-production and the involvement of enthusiastic volunteers, it similarly became clear that the diffusion of bottom-up practices is extremely difficult due to the inherent qualities of the public sector: namely, hierarchical authority and a quest for equality, accountability, and legitimacy. The article helps to understand why (former) offenders would dedicate their time and energy to bettering the services that in a way could be seen as tools used for surveillance, supervision, and superiority.

Article II, co-authored with Dr. Piret Tõnurist, sought to answer the question of what happens to volunteering and volunteer motivation when the state knowingly starts to use volunteers in the co-production of public services. It was shown that using citizens in co-production is rife with controversies that influence the very nature of volunteerism. Governments sometimes see volunteers as a substitution or a supplementary resource in service delivery, preying on their intrinsic and extrinsic motivation to participate in service co-production. The article ties volunteer motivation to the process of co-production and citizen–state interaction, showing how the state uses volunteerism, compulsion and coercion to involve people in service co-production and asking how the state’s engagement strategies for citizens influence volunteer motivation and free choice. These effects were illustrated by a comparative case study of volunteering in rescue and police services and in a volunteer programme for the unemployed in Estonia.

The single-authored article III investigated the immediate effects of digitalisation on co-producing restorative services and how digitally mediated practices can be normalised while safeguarding the fundamentally co-productive nature of restorative justice. With ever-increasing advancements in digitalisation, not enough attention has been paid to the effects that digitalisation has on the nature and results of public services and on the service co-production process itself. The article set out to uncover the underlying beliefs, behaviours, and practices that support going digital with restorative services. The aim was to see how ‘the new normal’ of digital services could be introduced to services that are highly reliant on human contact and how this could be done in a way that does not hinder achieving the goals set for the service. The case study carried out with restorative services in four European countries helped to understand the immediate effects of an abrupt shift from face-to-face to digitally mediated co-production where service counterparts were reluctant to make the shift. It was shown that even though digitalisation can have practical benefits in terms of saving costs on travelling or reaching citizens in remote areas, for example, the risk of service quality depletion is too high to consider going fully digital and replacing face-to-face services altogether.

The thesis contributes to the public service co-production research by offering another angle for analysing the citizen–state interaction in public service co-production, namely the choice—coercion—compulsion nexus underlying citizens’ motivation in the co-production process for services involving some degree of reluctance from the citizens’ side. Such is the case with services where citizens are reluctant co-producers, such as with offenders **(I)** or the unemployed **(II)**, or with services that are designed to reflect and respect the needs of crime victims **(III)**. The assumption of the proposed underlying logic was first discussed in article **(I)**, where the focus was on services designed for ex-offenders, a highly institutionalised policy field. The framework was further developed in article **(II)** which examined state interaction with volunteers and how it affects volunteer motivation and free choice. More specifically, the thesis sets out to illustrate how the state – when co-producing public services with its citizens – can invoke citizens’ internal wellbeing, solidarity, and accepted normative values, or at the other end of the spectrum, use sanctions and material rewards to direct people’s behaviour. In article **(III)**, the argument was taken further to demonstrate that sometimes reluctance to participate in public service co-production is not so much because of the content of the service but rather because of its format, more specifically it is concerned with how digital channels can change the quality of an otherwise necessary and useful service. Through these three articles, the thesis helps to explain in more detail the role that reluctant co-producers can and should play in service design and delivery.

The rest of the thesis’ introduction is comprised of the following sections. First, the research strategy is described. Second, the analytical framework is explained. Third, the empirical findings and their implications are introduced. Fourth, conclusions and future avenues of research are suggested.

2 RESEARCH STRATEGY

This thesis examines the phenomenon of public service co-production from three key perspectives: the people involved in the process, the environment they participate in, and the relationships that form the basis of a successful service. According to Morgan and Smircich (1980), all social science, be it quantitative or qualitative, is based on interrelated sets of assumptions regarding ontology, human nature, and epistemology. When quantitative approaches attempt to freeze the social world into structured immobility and see human beings as subjects to the influence of a deterministic set of forces, then qualitative approaches take a more flexible stance. Because to capture the full flow of social phenomena, one needs to accept that human beings not only respond to the social world, but also actively contribute to its creation. For researchers to fully understand social processes, they “can no longer remain as external observers, measuring what they see; they must move to investigate from within the subject of study and employ research techniques appropriate to that task” (Morgan & Smircich, 1980: 498). The aim of this thesis is to go deep in attempting to understand the roles people take in the public service co-production process and how those roles are influenced by the amount of choice, coercion, or compulsion that is involved in different services. Because of the nature of the research question, qualitative research methods are most suitable for finding an answer. Qualitative researchers attempt to go beyond descriptions to obtain an in-depth understanding of a phenomenon, instead of investigating and describing a phenomenon to a certain level (Anyan, 2013). Therefore, this thesis is based on research methodology for case studies and relies on several data collection and analysis methods in addition to the literature review: document analysis (I, II), in-depth, semi-structured interviews (I, II, III), focus groups (III), and direct observation (I, III).

A case study is an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-world context, especially when the boundaries between the phenomenon and its context may not be evident (Yin, 2011). A case study might help to identify new or omitted variables and hypotheses (through a combination of deduction and induction), examine causal mechanisms, develop historical explanations of particular cases, attain high levels of construct validity, and model complex relationships (Bennet, 2004). Case studies rely on the use of theory or conceptual categories to guide the research and analysis of data. Without a theoretical framework – theories, models, and concepts – or specific knowledge of institutional conditions and social patterns, the researcher is in danger of spending considerable time gathering basic information and providing descriptions without meaning (Meyer, 2001). A theory-driven approach to analysing a case helps to capture information on the more explanatory ‘how’, ‘what’ and ‘why’ questions and may help generate knowledge that is potentially transferable to a range of contexts, thus providing input to theory development or helping to refine already existing theories (Crowe et al., 2011). The empirical work of the thesis is primarily informed by various strands of co-production theories as explained in Chapter 3.

There are different types and categories of case studies. For example, a case study can be intrinsic (researching a unique phenomenon, i.e., the case is selected on its own merits, not because it is representative of others), instrumental (using a particular case to gain a broader understanding of an issue or a phenomenon) and collective (studying multiple cases to generate an even broader appreciation of a particular issue) (Crowe et al., 2011). Table 1 below summarises the selected types of cases in the thesis.

Table 1. Focus and methodology of the publications

Article	Level of analysis	Case study type	Research methods	Research questions
I	Service	Exploratory Intrinsic Single Interpretivist	Literature review Document analysis Interviews Observation	How does the formalization and equality driven public sector affect co-production and hence, user engagement?
II	Service	Descriptive Instrumental Multi Interpretivist	Literature review Document analysis Interviews	What happens to volunteering and volunteer motivation when the state knowingly starts to use volunteers in the co-production of services?
III	Service	Explorative Abductive Collective Multi Process-oriented	Literature review Interviews Focus groups Observation	What were the immediate effects of digitalization on the nature of restorative services? How to safeguard the underlying principles of restorative justice when providing services digitally? How to embed new practices in existing service processes?

Source: author

Irrespective of the type of case study chosen, the data collection procedures should be guided by the research question and the choice of design. For a case study, the methods often include analysis of documents in archives, interviews, questionnaires, and observations (Yin, 2011). The choice between methods is also subject to constraints in time, financial resources, and access (Meyer, 2001). However, one should always strive for data triangulation – establishing converging lines of evidence – by checking and re-checking at least three independent sources (Yin, 2011). Triangulation enables the researcher to study many different aspects related to the case, examine them in relation to each other and view the process within its complete environment, also the researcher’s capacity for understanding becomes an important factor (Meyer, 2001). Based on the research questions posed in the publications of this thesis, and as argued above, four main data collection methods were used. Firstly, direct observation was used in (I) and (III), because it allowed studying people in their normal environment and understanding the investigated phenomena from their perspective (Baker, 2006). An observer may gather data as a participant who operates covertly, concealing any intention to observe the setting (III); a participant-as-observer, who forms relationships and participates in activities while observing; an observer-as-participant, who maintains only superficial contact with the people being studied; and a complete observer, who

merely stands back and eavesdrops on the proceedings **(I)** (Meyer, 2001). The major strength of direct observation is that it can illuminate the discrepancies between what people say in interviews and what actually takes place. Observation is a unique method that requires the researcher to take up different roles and to use her/his five senses to collect data (Baker, 2006). It is important, however, to remain detached enough to collect and analyse relevant data.

Secondly, in-depth, semi-structured interviews were used **(I, II, III)** to gather descriptions of the life-world of the interviewee with respect to their interpretation of the meaning of the described phenomena (Anyan, 2013). Interviews allow the interviewees to talk about their experience and understanding. The strength of this method lies in the flexible and responsive interaction between the interviewer and the respondents, which permits probing for meaning, covering topics from several angles, and clarifying the questions for the respondents (Meyer, 2001). Most of the interviews carried out during the writing of this thesis were recorded and transcribed to maintain accuracy and richness of data. This also allowed the author to be fully engaged in the conversation, and thus, encourage the interviewee to talk, possibly resulting in a better flow of ideas and ultimately, more data.

Thirdly, focus group interviews were used **(III)** to gain a better insight into the experience and beliefs of the participants and to clarify some of the data collected through observation and interviews. In focus groups, a relatively informal atmosphere is created and people are encouraged to discuss specific topics in order for the researchers to uncover underlying norms, beliefs, values (Parker & Tritter, 2006). Fourthly, document analysis was used **(I, II)** to supplement and possibly challenge the findings from previous stages. The following paragraphs provide details on how these methods were applied in the publications.

First, in order to examine the micro-level dynamics (individual relationships, motivation, and trust) in the policy implementation phase of co-production, an in-depth single case study approach was taken to analyse an alternative probation service in Estonia. With this service, experimentation and the inclusion of motivated citizens were used to contend with the limits of traditional policymaking and implementation as well as the lack of resources **(I)**. Various data sources were used to analyse the case, including 10 in-depth, semi-structured interviews with the service coordinators, mentors, and clients (ex-prisoners) between December 2013 and October 2014. First, the service designers and coordinators were contacted to understand the initial motivation and reasoning behind the service. The coordinators then suggested a list of ex-prisoners to talk to, and after receiving their consent, meetings were organized with them one at a time. Considering the specificity of the target group, it was paramount to ensure that they trust the interviewers. To understand different perspectives, people with different backgrounds were selected: two of the service providers had prior prison experience and four did not; also, three clients were interviewed to understand the recipient's side. Interviews were anonymized for the purpose of full disclosure. Furthermore, for a better ethnographic insight, the author of this thesis spent three weeks as an intern in Tallinn Prison to observe and understand the role of prison staff in the co-production process. In addition, document analysis (policy and concept papers, evaluation reports, previous studies) was carried out prior to and in parallel with the interviews to gain a better understanding of the service process, its factual historic background, and plans for service development in the near future.

Second, to understand how states' increased engagement and interaction with volunteers affects volunteer motivation and free choice, a comparative case study was carried out, analysing the motivation behind state engagement in different forms of co-production: volunteering in rescue and police services and in a volunteer programme for the unemployed in Estonia **(II)**. The strategic documents that guide service provision as well as co-production and volunteer involvement in the respective services were analysed to gather key factual data and trace the history of the services. In order to get a better understanding of the internal mechanisms, procedures, and peculiarities of each of the services, nine semi-structured interviews were conducted between June 2014 and August 2015 (with both inductive and deductive questions) with ministry-level policy makers, mid-level managers, service/volunteer coordinators, and also the volunteers themselves, especially to understand their motivational concerns. The snowball method was used to some extent to reach the most knowledgeable experts or most vociferous volunteers in each service, not to limit ourselves only to official spokespersons. However, it was not possible to fully remove the chance of bias from the interviews as the most active volunteers and volunteer network managers also work together the closest with public authorities. To minimize this problem, information acquired previously from other interlocutors was cross-checked during the interviews, giving a chance to find and analyse possible discrepancies or points of conflict. Interviews were anonymized for the purpose of full disclosure.

Third, in order to explore the effects digitalisation might have on the nature and results of co-produced services, namely, in restorative practices, a comparative case study approach was used **(III)**. The data for the analysis came from observing four online meetings of the European Group for Restorative Justice between April and July 2020, semi-structured interviews with the Estonian restorative justice service manager after each online meeting (April–May 2020), and in-depth interviews and focus groups with restorative service practitioners from Estonia, Finland, Ireland, and Portugal in February and March 2021. At the European Group meetings, the author took notes of practices in various countries as a neutral observer and systematised the notes after each meeting. Based on the discussions at the online meetings, the Estonian restorative justice service manager held reflection sessions from April to July 2020 with volunteer mediators (19 in total), which were followed by the author interviewing the restorative justice service manager to collect reflections from the volunteer mediators. Two additional phone interviews were held with the restorative justice service manager in August after the initial data had been gathered in order to clarify details and understand the roles different parties play in the online mediation process. Lastly, in February and March 2021, based on the insights obtained from the two previous steps, focus group interviews were held with the country representatives from Estonia (three interviewees), Finland (two interviews with two participants in each), Ireland (three interviewees), and Portugal (individual interview). From each country, at least one participant from the online European Group meetings was present and accompanied by at least one practitioner, except for Portugal, with whom an individual interview was conducted. The focus group interviews were carried out online, using Zoom or Skype, as was most convenient to the participants.

Although the methodology of case studies is highly useful for gaining in-depth insight into and a multi-faceted understanding of a complex issue, there are also limitations to the chosen methodology and these, with possible mitigating actions, are listed in Table 2.

Table 2. Potential pitfalls and mitigating actions when undertaking case study research

Potential pitfall	Mitigating action
Selecting/conceptualising the wrong case(s), resulting in insufficient theoretical generalisations	Developing in-depth knowledge of theoretical and empirical literature, justifying the choices made
Collecting large volumes of data that are not relevant to the case or too little to be of any value	Focusing data collection on research questions, whilst being flexible and allowing different paths to be explored
Defining/bounding the case	Focusing on related components (either by time and/or space), being clear what is outside the scope of the case
Impossibility of perfectly controlling case comparisons	See above
Lack of rigour	Triangulation, respondent validation, the use of theoretical sampling, transparency throughout the research process
Ethical issues	Anonymising appropriately as cases are often easily identifiable to insiders, informed consent of participants
Integration with the theoretical framework	Allowing for unexpected issues to emerge and not force-fitting, testing out preliminary explanations, being clear about epistemological positions in advance
Information-processing biases	Applying a multi-case approach to add confidence to findings, or have more than one unit of analysis in each case
Indeterminacy/inability to exclude all but one explanation	Coming up with and testing alternative explanations

Based on: Meyer, 2001; Bennet, 2004; Crowe et al., 2011

Stemming from the limitations outlined above, the author of this thesis recognizes that the methodology and the small number of cases chosen will not allow for broader generalisations and the findings and the conclusions based on them apply only in certain contexts. However, the case study approach was not chosen for broad generalisations or representativeness, but for acquiring a deeper understanding of the phenomena studied. In addition, the chosen methodology does not set limits to conducting similar case studies in other countries in a comparative manner, possibly confirming the findings of this thesis.

3 ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

The aim of this chapter is to describe the context of co-production and to explain why public service co-production deserves our attention, what is its exact nature and who are the parties involved in it. Hence, this chapter provides the conceptual background for the what, why and who questions of public service co-production. The chapter is structured as follows. First, it starts with clarifying the definition of public service co-production as used in the thesis. Second, it explains why co-production is important for public service efficiency, effectiveness, and outcomes. Third, it looks at who are the actors involved in public service co-production, what kind of roles they play, and what are the main aspects that need to be considered in services that require active input from citizens. Fourth, the chapter takes a closer look at reluctant co-producers and why they deserve extra attention. Through explaining the different aspects of the analytical framework, the thesis proposes that effective public service co-production is highly dependent on the engagement, participation, and understanding of individual citizens. However, it is equally influenced by the wider governance system surrounding service co-production and underpinning public service provision as well as by technological development and digitalisation, which can alter the way services are produced and experienced.

3.1 What is public service co-production?

The understanding that there is a reciprocal relationship between public service organisations and their clients – citizens and communities – can be said to have originated from the Nobel Prize-winning political economist Elinor Ostrom, who argued already in the 1970s that citizen’s activities affect both the output and outcomes of public agencies (Ostrom et al., 1978). Parks and colleagues, Elinor Ostrom among them, went on to explain that service co-production is dependent on technological, economic, and institutional influences (Parks et al., 1981). Since then, different terms and definitions have been used to describe the phenomenon of service co-production. According to Jukič and colleagues (2019), there are three different categories of definitions of co-production. First, there are the general definitions where the emphasis is placed on the actors involved in the co-production process. Second, there are the definitions confined to the service delivery phase. Third, there are what they call all-encompassing definitions, which go beyond the delivery phase of services and look at co-production throughout the development, design, management, delivery, and evaluation of the services. In academic literature, co-production of services has been understood as an add-on to public service providers’ activities in the production of an output (Ostrom et al., 1978) or a core feature of value creation (Alford, 1998; Osborne & Strokosch, 2013; Fledderus et al., 2015). To go even further, “co-production comprises the intrinsic process of interaction between any service organization and the service user at the point of delivery of a service” (Osborne et al., 2016: 641). It can be seen as direct citizen involvement in the design and delivery of services (Brudney & England, 1983; Pollitt et al., 2006; Voorberg et al., 2015) or a relationship between public organisations and citizens (Bovaird, 2007; Brandsen & Honingh, 2016). Authors have regarded service co-production as a policy tool (Howlett et al., 2017), structural transformation of the public sector (Meijer, 2016), or a participatory governance arrangement moving from a state-centric service to partnerships and collaborations (Campanale et al., 2020; Sorrentino et al., 2018), network governance, and new service configurations (Penny, 2016). In short, this variety of perspectives indicates how the conceptualization of public service

provision has been moving from services *for* the public towards services *by* or *with* the public (Bovaird & Loeffler, 2012). The aim of this section is to clarify the main terms and definitions used in literature and to briefly describe some of the similarities and disparities to broaden the understanding of the topic and explain why and how the term 'service co-production' is used throughout the thesis.

Co-production research has shown that co-production can be viewed as an umbrella concept, covering a wide variety of activities in any phase of the public service cycle where the state and citizens work together to co-produce benefits (Nabatchi et al. 2017). Co-production can take place for a private benefit of those directly involved in the activity or for philanthropic or altruistic purposes, where the beneficiary is a wider group of people (Bovaird et al., 2015). Research has shown that co-production is a central feature of a wide variety of public services. Different authors have focused on, for example, urban infrastructure and primary education (Ostrom, 1996), parental participation in childcare and preschool education (Pestoff, 2006, 2012), healthcare (Brandsen & Honingh, 2013; Fledderus et al. 2014; Vennik et al., 2016; Sorrentino et al., 2017), and mental health (Slay & Stephens, 2013). There are case studies focusing on fire services and public housing (Alford, 2014), health, community safety and care of the local environment (Bovaird et al., 2015), services for vulnerable adults (Osborne et al., 2022), and prisoner reintegration **(I)**. Co-production is also integral to public safety and employment services **(II)**, community safety (Van Eijk et al., 2017), environmental services (Alonso et al., 2019), social care, health, transport, and criminal justice (Mazzei et al., 2020), local welfare and law and order (Loeffler & Timm-Arnold, 2020), policing and criminal justice (Loeffler & Bovaird, 2020), or restorative practices **(III)**.

Co-production is, therefore, a multi-faceted phenomenon. Having many different aspects to it gives a concept flexibility in practice and research. However, it also brings major challenges because the concept is at risk of becoming too blurry to be analysed properly. For example, co-production can be individual or collective, focusing on citizens, clients, or volunteers, bringing public or private value, being interdependent or substitutable, performed jointly or separately, based on voluntary participation versus people being nudged or coerced to doing so, and more (Alford & Yates, 2016). In addition, co-production can be substitutive, i.e., replacing government inputs by inputs from users, or additive, i.e., adding user inputs to professional inputs (Bovaird & Loeffler, 2012). Distinguishing between different types of co-production is relevant as it helps to define what is expected from the citizens, allowing us to understand why and how citizens become a part of the service-provision process. Depending on the exact roles and responsibilities of different stakeholders in the service provision process, co-production can be divided into different types. Osborne and Strokosch (2013) write about consumer co-production, which focuses on the consumer at the operational stage of the service production process, participative co-production that aims to improve the quality of public services already at the strategic planning and design stage of services, and enhanced co-production aimed at changing the paradigm of service delivery and building on user-led innovation. Brandsen and Honingh (2016) identify four potential types of co-production: complementary co-production in service design and implementation, complementary co-production in implementation, co-production in the design and implementation of core services, and co-production in the implementation of core services. Being part of the core service provision process from the design phase onwards places more responsibility on citizens but it also gives them more say in the way

services are provided. In the same instance, it makes service providers put more emphasis on how citizens are involved in the process.

Bovaird and Loeffler (2013) take a rather open approach to service co-production and outline four different types of activities that constitute co-production. Firstly, they talk about co-commissioning, in which citizens give their input at the very early stages of the service process. This includes co-planning of policy, being involved in setting the direction for services in a wider sense. It can also include being involved in prioritisation, for example, through participatory budgeting. This allows citizens' voices to be heard in terms of which services to focus on when planning budgetary resources. Alternatively, it can take the form of financing services, for example, through fundraising. Secondly, people can get involved in co-designing services, having a say in how a service process – or journey – should look like and where the focus should be. Ideally, the aim of getting actively involved in designing services should be to make sure that the methods, channels, timing, formats etc. reflect what each individual client needs or prefers, or, alternatively, what the specific needs or requirements of certain groups of people are. The third type of service co-production is the co-delivery of services in which citizens and public sector organisations actively collaborate to provide a service. It can involve the co-management of services, for example, as school governors or by forming a trust to manage community assets. Co-delivery can also mean co-performing services in peer support groups or through neighbourhood watch type of activities. According to Bovaird and Loeffler, the fourth and last type is co-assessment of services, which can take the form of either co-monitoring service provision or co-evaluating the results and impact of public services. Involving citizens in assessment activities can provide an 'insider view', helping to better understand the impact of different services on citizens. As they put it, only co-assessment can "bridge the gap between hard facts and the perceptions and feelings of local people" (Bovaird & Loeffler, 2013: 11).

There is no one best or perfect co-production mechanism, but there are different possible co-production mechanisms dependent on specific conditions and characteristics (Park, 2020). Different authors have used various definitions to pinpoint the main essence of service co-production. Table 3 shows how the concept of co-production has evolved over the past 45 years.

Table 3. Definitions of co-production (Source: author, based on literature)

Author(s)	Definition
Ostrom et al., 1978: 383	Citizen activities supplement police activities in the production of an output, the arrest. Citizens, then, in some instances become coproducers with police through the contribution of their activities.
Parks et al., 1981: 1002	Coproduction involves a mixing of the productive efforts of regular and consumer producers. This mixing may occur directly, involving coordinated efforts in the same production process, or indirectly through independent, yet related efforts of regular producers and consumer producers.
Brudney & England, 1983: 59	An emerging conception of the service delivery process, which envisions direct citizen involvement in the design and delivery of city services with professional service agents.
Ostrom, 1996: 1073	The process through which inputs used to provide a good or service are contributed by individuals who are not “in” the same organization.
Joshi & Moore, 2004: 40	Institutionalised co-production is the provision of public services (broadly defined, to include regulation) through regular, long-term relationships between state agencies and organised groups of citizens, where both make substantial resource contributions.
Pollitt et al., 2006: 15	A permanent or temporary involvement of different actors in different stages of a sometimes complex production cycle.
Bovaird, 2007: 847	Provision of services through regular, long-term relationships between professionalized service providers (in any sector) and service users or other members of the community, where all parties make substantial resource contributions.
OECD, 2011: 32	A way of planning, designing, delivering and evaluating public services, which draws on direct input from citizens, service users and civil society organisations.
Bovaird & Loeffler, 2012: 1121	The public sector and citizens making better use of each other’s assets and resources to achieve better outcomes or improved efficiency.
Fledderus et al., 2014: 427	An arrangement where both clients and ‘regular’ producers contribute a mix of activities at the point of delivery of public services.
Voorberg et al., 2015: 1356	Active involvement of end-users in various stages of the production process.
Brandsen & Honingh, 2016: 431	Coproduction is a relationship between a paid employee of an organization and (groups of) individual citizens that requires a direct and active contribution from these citizens to the work of the organization.

Loeffler & Bovaird, 2016: 1006	Public services, service users and communities making better use of each other's assets and resources to achieve better outcomes or improved efficiency.
Osborne et al., 2016: 640	Co-production is the voluntary or involuntary involvement of public service users in any of the design, management, delivery and/or evaluation of public services.
Nabatchi et al., 2017: 769	An umbrella concept that captures a wide variety of activities that can occur in any phase of the public service cycle and in which state actors and lay actors work together to produce benefits.
Brandsen et al., 2018: 3	A joint effort of citizens and public sector professionals in the initiation, planning, design and implementation of public services.
Campanale et al., 2020: 2	Co-production can be considered a new form of governance arrangement and a collaborative management logic whereby different individuals not belonging to the same organization – and, in particular, citizens – provide their inputs to the delivery of public services.
Park, 2020: 457	Co-production is a deliberately collaborative intra-organisational process with the goal of providing more responsive and effective services and involving both employees and affected lay actors who engage in the implementation/ delivery phase of service production processes with a capacity to influence the end services from which they benefit.

For the purpose of this thesis, with its focus on the individual rather than group processes, service co-production will be approached as **‘the voluntary or involuntary involvement of public service users in any of the design, management, delivery and/or evaluation of public services’** (Osborne et al., 2016: 640). This definition allows room for analysing the reasons and motivations of citizens participating in the public service co-production process, hence explaining the choice—coercion—compulsion nexus. Based on the proposed definition of public service co-production, the following subsections of this thesis will look in further detail into different aspects of the co-production of services.

3.2 Why is co-production important?

Traditional professional public services that involve an organisation providing services and clients passively receiving them are somewhat inapt at solving complex wicked problems that increasingly characterise the 21st century society. Instead, we see that the services that truly make a difference in people's lives are designed and often delivered by the service users themselves. Citizen co-producers do not only receive private value from service delivery, but they also contribute to the collective co-creation of public value to stakeholders who do not necessarily engage in the co-production process (Osborne et al., 2016; Steen & Tuurnas, 2018). One of the emerging tasks for public service organisations is to engage, help, and motivate users to generate their own content and solutions to public problems, thus increasing public service effectiveness

(Meijer, 2011). This is best done via co-production processes where the ‘production’ aspect refers to transforming tangible or intangible inputs into more valuable outputs and the ‘co-’ means that results are achieved by two or more parties (Alford & Yates, 2016). Seeing the growing importance of the service user in the service process, it is only natural to deduce that a big part of public service outcomes depends on the active participation of citizens and their input.

Service co-production has many benefits compared to traditional service provision where the citizens play a passive role in receiving services. It can reduce costs, improve service quality, and increase user satisfaction (Lee & Allaway, 2002; Pestoff, 2006; Bovaird & Loeffler, 2013). Co-production can improve citizen engagement and social cohesion (Jakobsen, 2013; Fledderus et al., 2014), increase public trust and public value (Meuter et al., 2005; Meijer, 2011), and public sector legitimacy (Verschuere et al., 2012; Torfing & Triantafyllou, 2013). Co-production can also be seen as a learning process whereby actors develop new ways to confront public sector challenges (Voorberg et al., 2017). It can even be said that engaging citizens in public service co-production can create value in their lives, irrespective of the outcomes of the service (Osborne et al., 2022). The benefits of service co-production are highly context-dependent and the process needs to be seamlessly intertwined with institutional strengths, contingencies, and limitations, making up “a holistic framework of public service management and delivery” (Bovaird et al., 2019: 230).

There is a growing discussion, both in theoretical literature as well as in practice, of involving citizens and interacting with them already in the creative phases of planning and designing public services to take full advantage of their insight, ideas, skills, and knowledge (Voorberg, 2017; Voorberg et al., 2018), leading to better, more suitable, efficient, and effective service outcomes (Vargo & Lusch, 2004). Previous research has helped us gain a better understanding of public service co-production. For one thing, co-production is different from passive consumerism as it requires active participation from the citizens’ side (Brandsen & Honingh, 2016) to create value together (Rantala & Karjaluoto, 2016; Van Oerle et al., 2018). What is more, service users and their own social networks play a key role in the outcomes of the service process (Tuurnas et al., 2014) and it is expected that citizens take the responsibility for themselves and their environment (Voorberg & Bekkers, 2016). With public services, it is sometimes necessary and not only desirable to involve multiple stakeholders in service provision to achieve public outcomes, whereby service users and their communities take the leading role (Bovaird et al., 2015). Thus, as also argued above, more than ever before, organisations provide services *with*, rather than *for* their customers (Vargo & Lusch, 2004). As Bovaird and Loeffler (2012) said, service outcomes should match with what the service users and citizens see as valuable and not solely reflect what the specialists, service managers, or policymakers see as desirable. They even go as far as saying that taking part in service co-production and value co-creation could bring about benefits to citizens, “which would be unlikely to be achieved without their full involvement in the process” (Bovaird & Loeffler, 2012: 1126).

Trust is another aspect that is crucial for successful co-production. Depending on the nature of the service, there can be different issues with regard to trust. For instance, in healthcare services, the citizens need to trust their care worker, the capacity of the system to provide high-quality services, and their own capacity to play their part in the co-production cycle. Similarly, the care workers have to trust their clients to put in the necessary effort that is required for achieving the expected outcomes. Higher patient

involvement increases patients' sense of control, builds effective relationships with physicians, and improves the perception of professional support, all of which help to build further trust in the physician (Fledderus et al., 2014). Seeing how more and more public services are replaced or supported by digital options, such as web portals, social media, digital communication platforms, or algorithmic decision-making (Soto-Acosta, 2020), people also need to have trust – sometimes called digital trust – in the security measures, safety nets, and adequate performance structures (Bélanger & Carter, 2008). On the other hand, a well-designed co-production process can be used to increase citizens' trust in public organisations, even when the processes are being entered into involuntarily or due to obligation. Trustworthiness can be built into the co-production process by early engagement, open communication, expectations management, and perseverance. However, even if public service co-production is used as a means to increase trust, it can also lead to a blurring of responsibility and accountability, higher transaction costs, loss of democracy, reinforced inequalities, putting pressure on vulnerable service users to participate, and co-producers misusing their role, leading to co-destruction of public value (Steen et al., 2018). The shifting of responsibilities in the co-production process can be stressful for both the professional staff as well as the citizens (Tuurnas, 2021).

Since citizens have such a great effect on service outcomes, it is especially important to zoom into the individual level of service co-production. According to Bovaird and Löffler (2012), citizens become the innovators in the service process, as they know things that professionals do not. They also become critical success factors in services to the extent to which they meet service requirements and scrutinise the service. Citizens can be seen as resources when they dedicate their time, information, and financial resources to co-producing a service, thus improving their own quality of life as well as helping others. Citizens are assets in the service process as they have diverse capabilities and talents, which they can share with professionals and other citizens. Lastly, citizens taking part in public service co-production are community developers who “engage in collaborative rather than paternalistic relationships with staff, with other service users and with other members of the public” (Bovaird & Löffler, 2012: 4). Spanjol et al. (2015: 296) go even as far as saying that “co-production behaviours (and their forms) are fully determined by the characteristics of the customer sphere in which they are created and implemented”.

3.3 How are public services co-produced?

In co-producing public services, citizens bring their ideas, time, skills, and other resources to the service and, thus, the value-creation process (Bovaird, 2007; Verschuere et al., 2012; Lindsay et al., 2014). It can happen at a collective, group or individual level (Brudney & England, 1983), where, in the latter case, co-producers are the direct beneficiaries of the process (Van Eijk & Gasco, 2018). For some government services, involving citizens in co-production is a core feature of value creation (Alford, 1998; Osborne & Strokosch, 2013; Fledderus et al., 2015), an inherent characteristic of service provision, i.e., the only way to receive a service is to co-produce it. Some authors stress the importance of citizens' motivation, self-efficacy, role clarity, and trust as cornerstones of co-production (Alford & O'Flynn, 2012; van Eijk & Steen, 2014; Fledderus & Honingh, 2015), because in the co-production process, risk and responsibility of successful service delivery is shifted to the user, making them partly accountable for outcomes (Bandura, 2001; Fledderus et al., 2014). Motivation can be both self-centred

and altruistic (van Eijk & Steen 2014), ranging between instrumental, obligatory (Barker, 1993) and social (Handy et al., 2010), i.e., people often take part in something because their friends or colleagues do so. Alford (2002) additionally talks about material (e.g., money, goods, or services), solidary (e.g., group membership or being well-regarded) and expressive (i.e., intangible rewards that derive from contributing to a worthwhile cause) incentives, the effectiveness of which depends on the form of co-production being promoted.

In addition to being motivated to co-produce services, the ability, self-efficacy, self-esteem, role clarity, and perceived capability to co-produce a service are important for the success of the co-production process (see also Walker & Johnson, 2006; van Beuningen et al., 2011; Bovaird et al., 2016). Especially with regard to prolonged, complex services where customer compliance is key to achieving service outcomes, customer capabilities, understanding of service requirements and perceived self-efficacy and provider-efficacy are key determinants of success (Spanjol et al., 2015). With involuntary clients, extra effort has to be paid to explain the aims and objectives of the service and the necessity for active participation in the co-production process to achieve desired results. In order to raise citizens' ability to co-produce, organisations can make the co-production task easier or enhance the client's own capacities to perform co-production (Alford, 2002). Therefore, organisations should pay attention to providing information, advice, or training about the service (Walker & Johnson, 2006; van Beuningen et al., 2011; Ford & Dickson, 2012). This could build citizens' confidence in the service provider and make them aware of their role in the co-production process while increasing their understanding of the usefulness and usability of the services they co-produce.

One layer to be considered in public service co-production is digitalisation, because it can change the 'how' of public service co-production. The use of digital solutions in public service provision has an impact on government-to-citizen interaction as it influences the when, where, and how of service production as well as who and in which role is involved in the process (Lindgren et al., 2019). There is heavy reliance on online communities as communication tools, co-creation platforms, or extensions to customer management systems, which all complement face-to-face services (Van Oerle et al., 2018) and citizens are free to choose whichever contact channel they like, depending on the utility and gratification that they receive (Reddick & Turner 2012: 2). Furthermore, digital technologies might frame the way people participate in co-production, ruining the hands-on bottom-up potential of co-production, or they might prompt organisations to put in less energy to provide a fully citizen-centred service (Nicolini, 2007; Wihlborg et al., 2016). Røhnebæk (2014) also questions whether ICT-enabled work is supporting or hampering efforts to create more client-oriented services as it allows individualising welfare services, but at the same time, increasing digitalisation also means more standardisation and a certain degree of rigidity.

There are ample examples of public sector services being complemented by digital solutions, online services, and other means of reaching the more distant recipients to ensure equal service provision for urban as well as rural areas (OECD, 2016). Digital innovation not only increases public sector efficiency, but there is a possibility that it could transform the ways public sector organisations create public value, coordinate their activities, and collaborate with other actors (Kattel et al. 2019). Using ICT is seen to have transformed business processes and removed the physical presence of the service provider and the client from the value-creation process (Lee & Allaway, 2002; Meuter

et al., 2005; Walker & Johnson, 2006; Osborne et al., 2014; Rantala & Karjaluoto; 2017). As Radnor and Osborne (2013: 282) suggest, “public services are inherently knowledge-driven entities”, so in a way, enhancing the methods of service delivery is something natural to the public sector. Sometimes, these innovations are launched to solve a specific problem, whereas at other times, service providers just want to experiment with alternative solutions (Oudshoorn et al., 2005). Sometimes, technological solutions are simply used to coordinate co-production better, other times, new technologies can transform or even substitute traditional co-production practices (Lember, 2018).

Digitalisation can also lead to a new distribution of work, responsibilities, risks and have potentially disruptive effects, not to mention the extra work that is needed for ensuring the high quality of a service that is provided at a distance through a technological solution (Hanlon et al., 2005; Vikkelsø, 2005; May, 2006; Nicolini, 2007; Pagliari, 2007; Halford et al., 2010). In addition, we need to be sure that with the aim of increasing people’s access to services, we do not create a further divide between people with access to technology and the skills needed to co-produce services and people without those possibilities. Creating or feeding that digital divide could potentially increase inequalities in our communities. Therefore, the public sector needs to take a proactive role in exploring, developing, and adapting technological solutions in service co-production (Lember, 2018) and there has to be a way to ensure equal access, consistency and a high quality of service, protection of privacy and personal data, effective tracking of utilisation and outcomes, and so forth (Hanlon et al., 2005; Nicolini, 2007; Llucha & Abadie, 2013; OECD, 2016).

With ICT being used more and more in public service co-production, there are some changes taking place in public bureaucracy and public service provision which require increased interactivity with and greater sensitivity to the diverse needs of customers (Heeks, 1999; Bovens & Zouridis, 2002; Dunleavy et al., 2006; Pan et al., 2006; Jorna & Wagenaar, 2007; Meijer, 2007). Technologies play a role in how tasks are delegated between staff and citizens, between different professionals, and ultimately, between humans and machines, which means that specific responsibilities and competences are needed both from the professionals as well as the citizens (Oudshoorn, 2008; Lindgren et al., 2019). Street-level bureaucrats are being replaced by ICT systems, programmes, websites, mobile applications, algorithms. Traditional caseworkers might become obsolete as digital decision trees take over their traditional administrative discretion (Bovens & Zouridis, 2002) and a new actor enters public administration, i.e., the digital system (Wihlborg et al., 2016). There is also the question of whether the digital infrastructure of public services will ultimately frame and limit public innovation and digital service design and hinder the scale-up of services (Kattel et al., 2019). With digital solutions, the service space, which in earlier times was located in a public service office, has moved to the customer’s sphere, with services being delivered sometimes in people’s living rooms. In that sphere, the public servant usually plays a limited role in co-production efforts (Spanjol et al., 2015).

Although digitalisation might make services more effective, accessible, and quicker to deliver (Meuter et al., 2003; Lin & Hsieh, 2007; Madsen & Kræmmergaard, 2016), there are concerns that digital solutions could prove to be exclusive to citizens that deviate from the normal, that they might – hopefully not intentionally – reinforce the norms of some actors in society while excluding others (Røhnebæk, 2014; Wihlborg et al., 2016; Lindgren et al., 2019). With services that are almost automated, the public servant no

longer plays an active role, except perhaps as a consultant that helps the citizen to navigate the self-service options; and as an alternative, 'real people' could focus on difficult cases that require more discretion. Lindgren et al. (2019: 431) have also raised the question of how it would affect the asymmetrical power relationship between the citizen and the public official if the public servant as a human actor with whom citizens can discuss and negotiate public services is replaced by a programmed system where algorithms make decisions. For example, when judges or doctors use computer-generated guidelines for sentencing or for treatment decisions, especially when considering that people "do not always understand or control the internal design logic of these technologies" (Kattel et al. 2019: 4).

This also highlights the importance of security, data protection, equal treatment of different, including atypical people, and meticulous service design that takes these considerations into account. Rantala and Karjaluoto (2017) have stressed the importance of defining all service processes, including the digital and non-digital, and making sure that these are integrated smoothly and that professionals also understand that the digital side of the services is not just a gadget, but an integral part of the service experience for the citizen co-producer. Van Oerle et al. (2018) echo the same sentiment and urge organisations to be agile and respond to any changes in citizens' ongoing service experience and all the activities that extend beyond the traditional service process, including any ICT-based solutions that are meant to increase service satisfaction. In any case, it is important to design the service co-production process in a way that considers different people's needs, abilities, and willingness to interact via technological solutions, resulting in a process that is truly citizen-centred, integrated with other services, and accessible anytime, anywhere (Globerson & Maggard 1991; Reddick & Turner, 2012).

3.4 Who co-produces?

Since co-production of services in the context of this thesis revolves around individual level co-production in commissioning, designing, delivering, or evaluating services as opposed to collaboration between different organisations, be they from the public, private or third sector, it is important to clarify the meaning of 'human' as one of the basic components in service co-production. On a very basic level, we can categorise the involved parties into two broad groups: those working in public service organisations delivering services and those participating as co-producers from the outside. For the latter group, different words have been used, such as citizen, service user, client, customer, consumer, patient, volunteer, expert by experience etc. Van de Walle (2018) notes that in the 1980s and 1990s citizens were starting to be treated as customers, whereas the reforms in the late 1990s and 2000s prompted discussions about citizens not as mere customers but as true consumers of public services on a public service market. Two decades previously, Mintzberg (1996) concluded that everyone of us wears four hats in society – those of the customer, client, citizen, and subject – and these hats reflect on the relationship we have with government. Taking a closer look at the nuances behind these words gives an opportunity to see how people have been considered in the service process and how their role has changed over time. As McLaughlin (2020) points out, the terms used give an indication of the underpinning ideological nature of wider society and that the words are important not only in terms of their meaning but also in relation to the context in which they are used.

According to Clarke et al. (2007: 2), a 'citizen' is a political construct, a key figure in Western capitalist democracies, whereas a 'consumer' is engaged in economic

transactions on the marketplace, choosing between different options available from alternative service providers. Having rights as citizens means that we also have obligations as subjects, e.g., when paying taxes, being drafted into armies, or adhering to government regulations (Mintzberg, 1996). Citizens voice their needs and aspirations via elections and referenda, but in co-production literature we see that the concept of the 'citizen' crosses boundaries with other concepts, such as those of the customers, volunteers, or service users (Voorberg et al., 2018). Academic public administration debates have looked at the wider implications of talking of 'consumers' rather than 'citizens' and the effects of that switch on democracy as such (Van de Walle, 2018). Furthermore, being referred to as 'clients' suggests a relationship where there is a passive receiver of services taking expert assessment and guidance from professionals who have all the power, knowledge and skills required to decide upon the best course of action (McLaughlin, 2020). Alford and Yates (2016), however, say that 'citizens' and 'clients' are roles, rather than categories, and everyone shows signs of both depending on the context. They also bring in another term – the volunteer – who co-produces either indirectly through community organisations or directly, for example, by helping out an elderly neighbour. It is worth noting, though, that volunteers differ from clients because they do not receive any service while co-producing.

In a way, a step up from the passive client is the 'service user' who is not only a consumer but also a producer of the service, because their contribution of time and effort into the service delivery process is crucial to achieving service outcomes and because the production and consumption of a service are inseparable (Alford, 2016). Although there is a top-down element in this term, "suggesting a hierarchical relationship between those who commission and deliver services and those who are in receipt of them", it could be seen from the bottom-up perspective as well, promoting active participation in the process to ensure that services are fit for purpose (McLaughlin, 2020: 36). Another term that has been used to talk about citizens in the service co-production process is 'expert by experience', because every person is best at telling professionals what they want and need from any particular service. In the end, they will be the ones experiencing the intended and unintended consequences of the delivered service (*ibid.*). No matter the term used, being actively involved in the service process puts the citizen or service user at the centre of the creation of value by these services, as it is not the professional staff that create value in the delivery of public services, but service users create value, "for themselves and others, by their co-production and their use of public services" (Osborne, 2021: 2).

According to Loeffler and Bovaird (2020), the role of citizens in public service co-production has evolved from the role of a 'citizen' in classic public administration to the role of a 'customer' under New Public Management and towards 'partner' in the era of public governance. Loeffler and Timm-Arnold (2020) conclude that people's role in service processes is context-dependent. As such, in the hierarchies of classical public administration, citizens are often seen in a passive role, they are used for gathering information, rather than engaging in actual decision-making. In markets, on the other hand, service users are used to give providers necessary information, and as such, are involved in service co-design and, in particular, co-assessment. However, all the strategic decisions are made by service providers based on people's choices in the market. Lastly, in networks, there are no passive citizens or narrow consumers. Instead, people actively collaborate with service providers, engaging in co-production in the various stages of the service process. Nabatchi et al. (2017) go on to explain that citizens can carry multiple

roles simultaneously, depending on the specific service. For example, they could act as citizens when co-planning a policy, as clients when co-producing social services, like participating in a scheme for the unemployed, or as paying customers when renewing their driver's licence. Voorberg et al. (2015) have a similar understanding, as they state that citizens can take different roles in the service process either as co-implementers (citizens performing some implementation tasks), co-designers (citizens decide how the service will be delivered), or as initiators (government as an actor that follows). These types form a nexus where, at one end, the government plays a bigger role in saying what a service should look like, whereas at the other end, the citizens initiate and design services in which the government plays the role of a partner or supporter.

Understanding the human side is not only important with regards to the citizens involved in co-production but also when it comes to professional service providers. This is especially the case when co-production is initiated by public organisations, and as part of the design phase, public servants decide whose contributions are needed, when, and how (Tuurnas, 2021). Service providers can take different roles in the co-production process. They might be providing specific services for individual customers, working as partners with citizens in services where active input is needed from them, such as citizens sorting recyclables from other waste before collection, they can also engage people as traditional citizens deliberating over the direction of the government, or combining some or all of those roles at a time (Thomas, 2013). What is especially challenging is knowing how to interact with the public in all these roles. Bovaird et al. (2015: 1) further suggest that “service professionals solely employ an ‘enabling’ logic, so the clients actually perform the service task for themselves”.

Hence, there is a need to develop new professional skills that support service co-production and the active inclusion of people in their various roles in the service process. Tuurnas (2021) has grouped those skills into three interlinked categories: segmenting skills, communication skills, and enabling skills. First, however, it is important that the professionals notice, understand, and harness the skills and knowledge that citizens can bring to the process (Bovaird & Loeffler, 2012). Rather than providing a service, the task is to give guidance to the citizen co-producer, ask for and allow input already in the early stages of the service process (Fledderus et al., 2014), because without support, engaging citizens in co-production might create more problems than it solves (Pestoff, 2006). In order to support the citizen in the co-production process, it is important for the organisation to make participation possible, either by simplifying the task or training citizens to perform what is expected of them in terms of service outcomes (Alford & Yates, 2016). In digital services, potential first-time users could be given the opportunity to try the service with no long-term obligations (Meuter et al., 2005). It is important that professionals believe that citizens are educated, skilled, and sufficiently capable to take over some of the tasks in the delivery process and make their own decisions (Fledderus et al. 2015; OECD 2016). Instead of providing a service while citizens are passively receiving it, it becomes the role of the professionals to empower citizens and support their development. Oftentimes, this means learning new skills of how to work *with* people instead of *for* them. This also means collaborating across professional borders and improving the integration of services in order to address the diverse needs and roles of people (Van Gestel et al., 2019).

A new skillset also means that organisations need to rethink how to recruit, train, and develop their staff or, indeed, measure and direct their performance. On another but related issue, there is a need for cultural change in organisations, as many professions

still rely on status and control. Having citizens take some of that professional aura and ethics away might be controversial as professionals feel that 'letting citizens in' is a challenge to their expertise, professional standards, service quality, and legitimacy (Pestoff, 2006; Tuurnas, 2015; Brandsen & Honingh, 2016; Park, 2020). So, in addition to acquiring new skills, a change in mindset is needed, which is not always easy to achieve and takes a long time to develop. However, with proper training, change management, and introduction of new methods, it is possible to alter the way services are provided or, rather, co-produced with citizens (Steen & Tuurnas, 2018; Tuurnas, 2021).

Lastly, with digital development, services traditionally delivered face-to-face are being replaced with digital technologies, thus transforming the interactions between actors involved in service co-production and enabling access to services through technological interfaces, often independent of involvement from professional staff (Meuter et al., 2000; Ho & Ko, 2008). However, when it comes to services that require sensitivity, precision, convincing or are highly complex, face-to-face encounters can be irreplaceable for achieving the expected results. Despite that, the growing use of ICT can and has changed the relationship between public service providers and service users. It is important to understand the implications of this shift away from interpersonal interactions, which are considered a cornerstone of building trust and loyalty with the service provider (Meuter et al., 2005; Mort et al., 2009). For service providers, there has to be a balance, therefore, between the speed of digital development of services and the pace and scope to which people are willing to accept the replacement of human contact with technology.

3.5 Reluctant co-producers

For many public services, the users have to actively contribute to the production process in order to create value, otherwise the service cannot be delivered. This makes public service organisations dependent on the citizens' co-productive input to achieve targets or complete tasks (Alford, 2016). Similarly to Alford (1998) and Fledderus et al. (2015), Brandsen and Honingh (2016) argue that co-production is an inherent feature of service provision, i.e., to receive a service is to co-produce, and hence, the question of free will does not even arise and citizens are, in a way, coerced into co-production. Osborne et al. (2016) explain that the production and consumption of services are inseparable processes and the user is a willing or unwilling, conscious or unconscious participant in those processes. As Alford and O'Flynn (2012: 178) so eloquently put it: "Public service co-production is a social exchange, which entails more diffuse and more deferred reciprocity, with less precise and longer term obligations than the immediate quid pro quo transactions between buyers and sellers". This aspect is especially important with regard to public service co-production where citizen-participation in the process is involuntary. For example, receiving medical treatment or attending classes is defined as co-producing a service, because without pupils learning or patients taking medication as prescribed by their doctor, there would not be effective services like education or healthcare. In short, just by receiving a service, you take part in service co-production (see e.g., Alford, 2009). Going even deeper and quoting Osborne and Strokosch (2013: 46): "from a service-dominant approach, there is no way to avoid the co-production of public services because it is an inalienable element of such services. The question thus is not how to 'add-in' co-production to public services but rather how to manage and work with its implications for effective public service delivery". Brudney and England (1983) refer to this as 'captured co-production', where citizens almost automatically participate

in services that are being provided in a top-down manner. In their view, this is the case with most social services or different types of counselling. In contrast, they talk about active and voluntary behaviours where people knowingly give their input to improve service outcomes, like when turning in faulty fire alarms.

Pestoff (2006) says that there are different types of co-production: it can be positive or negative, cooperative or compliant, active or passive. There are co-production processes where citizens participate out of compulsion because of the high value of a particular service or because they feel their identity as a 'good' citizen is under question (Musick et al., 2000). This might be the case with volunteer firefighters in rural areas, for example, where the state has shut down fire brigades as a result of the number of fires having reduced and it not being cost-efficient to keep a full-time fire- brigade in operation (Tammearu, 2012), or citizens feel a strong connection with an important community institution (Brunet et al., 2001). There are also ways to coerce people to co-produce, for example, by giving access to other services or benefits only if citizens participate in the co-production process (Clarke, 2005). Some authors see that governments might be using citizens in service co-production to lighten the burden of economic downturns (Bovaird & Loeffler, 2012; Penny, 2016) and because providing traditional welfare services has become too costly (Voorberg & Bekkers, 2016). In a way, the state can be seen as exploiting the citizens when stressing the need for public service co-production (Mook et al., 2014).

People who participate in a service process out of obligation, for instance, prisoners, probationers, or compulsory treatment patients, are not always seen as co-producing a service. Instead, they can be seen as being institutionalised and having reduced agency to the extent of no longer effectively negotiating the contingencies of life (Kiernan et al., 2016). It can be said that for some services, the service providers, e.g., social workers, rely more on agency policy, legal mandates, and research than they do on the preferences or needs of the service user (McLaughlin, 2009). Similarly, in probation, it is often the probation officer's strategies and reactions, e.g., giving a warning or imposing sanctions, that can guide the supervisee's motivation and ability to comply with the terms set in the sentence (Norman et al., 2022). It has been shown that especially people from marginalised groups can be incapable or unwilling to participate in co-production with professionals (McMullin & Needham, 2018). These citizen co-producers can be referred to as reluctant co-producers. Fledderus et al. (2014) state that even if co-production is inherent, citizens still have a say in the degree of active input they give to the process. Whether it is based on voluntary or coerced citizen participation, service provision can be viewed as an interactive process where the citizen and the professional bring different types of knowledge and skills to the table, and what is more, citizens have a crucial role to play in ensuring the effectiveness of the service.

With reluctant co-producers, the relationship and value creation process are more ambiguous and also less understood compared to situations where citizens are more willing to co-produce. We can see this, for example, with ex-prisoners co-producing re-entry services (I), the unemployed volunteering as part of their conditions for unemployment benefits (II), or taxpayers declaring their taxes (Çulea & Fulton, 2009). Smith et al. (2012: 1462) go even as far as saying that "the term 'service refusers' might be more appropriate for mental health service users who are subject to compulsory measures of care". However, being coerced into treatment long enough could support the shift from resistance to commitment, leading into better service outcomes (Prendergast et al., 2002). Consequently, engaging reluctant co-producers requires more

effort from public sector organisations, because the service itself is not perceived as beneficial by the client. However, the possible benefits for the citizen co-producer as well as society weigh out the additional effort. One aspect that is crucial for co-production to be successful is trust. Fledderus et al. (2014: 428) cite Offe to define trust as “the belief that others, through their action or inaction, will contribute to my/our well-being and refrain from inflicting damage upon me/us”. Citizens’ trust in government’s ability to deliver services and to really engage them in co-production can increase their willingness to play an active part in the process (van Eijk & Steen, 2014). Alford and Yates (2016) agree with this statement, saying that government’s poor performance might undermine citizens’ trust, and through that, their willingness to co-produce. However, they also state that sometimes shortcomings in performance can instead be the reason why citizens feel they need to engage in co-production.

If we understand co-production processes as something that people take part in voluntarily and actively, then participation out of obligation does not fit the criteria for some authors (Fledderus et al., 2014). For others, however, resistance to service delivery in areas like the criminal justice system or mental health services is as much a form of co-production as a voluntary and conscious willingness to co-produce (Osborne et al., 2016). Either way, designing service processes that support the motivation and self-efficacy of citizens and help them to generate their own content and solutions in the co-production process will help to make services more efficient and responsive to the needs of service users (Meijer, 2011). This also applies to service users who are traditionally considered reluctant or involuntary participants, perhaps even more so. According to Park (2020), when there is mutual consent from the participants in the co-production process, the services usually yield better outcomes. In order to guarantee good service outcomes, it is necessary to make services more open, accountable, and welcoming of sustained, meaningful citizen involvement (McMullin & Needham, 2018). This is an important task, because user engagement enables customising the service to each client’s needs through the process of co-production.

Especially with stigmatised or at-risk citizens, standardised approaches might not always be effective (I). If the service is being co-produced as a result of compliance, it is important to understand why people comply, how to encourage compliance, and which enforcement techniques can be used to support better service outcomes, while considering individual level characteristics, motivation to co-produce, and effective supervision techniques to match those (Norman et al., 2022). Another example comes from the healthcare sector where engaging citizens in service co-production can enhance individual and collective wellbeing, but at the same time, there are also high barriers to co-production due to the specific nature of healthcare services (McMullin & Needham, 2018). For example, engaging veterans in traditional models of mental health may be difficult because of the stigma associated with mental illness (Kiernan et al., 2016). Considering that most social work relationships are involuntary, and oftentimes, the recipients of the service are mandated by law to participate and may resent having to do so (Smith et al., 2012), it is doubly important to understand their role in the service co-production process, be it however ambiguous. In order to design a personalised approach, trust is needed between co-production partners, not least because it helps to overcome the barriers built by different values, understandings, aspirations, and abilities, whether these be perceived or real (Hatzidimitriadou et al., 2012). Hence, staff need to use their enabling skills to tackle resistance among citizens and raise their motivation to

be engaged in co-production, especially when there is a feeling that they are performing tasks normally taken on by public service personnel (Tuurnas, 2021).

On the other hand, reluctance to co-produce services might also come from the professionals' side. Healthcare workers and doctors in particular are less than willing to transfer the responsibility on patients, especially when the latter seek help from less evidence-based treatments (McMullin & Needham, 2018). Reluctance might also be caused by the fact that involving citizens in service co-production means a change in work practices at the operational level, as flexibility, openness, and uncertainty replace rigid procedures and bureaucratic rules (Røhnebæk, 2014). Regular staff may feel like they are losing their jobs due to the austerity measures disguised as co-production (Tuurnas, 2021). Giving more say to the citizens might lead to feelings of redundancy or fear of loss of service quality if some or all of the responsibility for service outcomes is put on service users. There might be reluctance because public servants or service providers resist the intrusion of untrained and inexperienced 'experts' into the service process (Pestoff, 2006). The buy-in and support from public servants is, however, a necessary prerequisite for successful service co-production. Especially as reluctant co-producers often lack trust towards public service organisations and staff, it is important that the staff clearly explain what is expected from the citizen in the co-production process and why (Smith et al., 2012).

4 KEY FINDINGS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR UNDERSTANDING RELUCTANCE TO CO-PRODUCE PUBLIC SERVICES

Public service co-production has received a growing amount of attention and praise, and deservedly so, from academics writing in fields as diverse as public management, public administration, new public governance, service management, third sector research, social innovation, and the list goes on. Oftentimes, co-production rhetoric is normative, placing high relevance on how co-production increases social inclusion, participation, and public trust (OECD, 2016), and improves service outcomes (Campanale et al., 2020), but questions remain whether co-production is, instead, used as a means to an end, not as a goal to aspire to. For example, instead of contributing to citizens' empowerment or making public services more user-responsive, it is a way to keep services running in times of austerity (Jukić et al., 2019). What is more, when the aim is to lower the costs of public services, it is questionable whether co-production actually reduces costs or the costs are simply transferred to the citizens (Pestoff, 2006). As Bovaird and Loeffler (2012) noted, co-production can bring value for money, but it is seldom possible to produce value without money. Understanding the underlying mechanisms in public service co-production becomes even more important in reluctant service co-production, where the citizens participate in the process out of coercion or compulsion, rather than pure choice. Not least because those types of services are often the cornerstone of public safety, public health, and social cohesion. Hence, understanding the logic and motivation behind reluctant co-producers could help the public sector to design more effective and user-driven public services. The aim of this thesis was to take a more detailed look into the individual level of public service co-production, especially into public services where citizen co-producers are reluctant to take part in the co-production process. This meant looking into the dynamics of public service co-production at the micro-level, including in situations where sensitive services have been turned digital to ensure service continuity in circumstances where physical contact between people is limited. Research carried out for this thesis arrived at the following conclusions.

The key actors in any public service are the people involved in the service process.

More so than before, it has become evident that citizen co-producers play a key role in successful public services, be it in the design, implementation, or evaluation phase. It was shown in the first article of this thesis that without the flexible, open, and friendly approach of ex-offenders serving as mentors, the alternative probation service would not have had the same results because of the antagonistic and untrusting way offenders view the state **(I)**. In contrast, the volunteers who were offering their time and lived experience were able to support offenders released from prison to resettle in their communities. Without the human side of the service, without the informal mentoring and support, prisoner reintegration would have been more cumbersome. The article **(I)** explained the importance of personal characteristics of the volunteers offering their support, their intrinsic values, positive social capital, and personal traits that helped to find or build a connection with ex-prisoners, which was key to positive service outcomes. After talking to the offenders serving their prison sentence or those enrolled in the post-prison mentoring service, it was clear that volunteer mentors not working for the government were in a better place to build trust with the offenders, not least so because many of them had personal prior experience in serving a prison sentence or overcoming

substance abuse. On the other side, the sense of ownership of the prisoners and their perceived ability to succeed increased their trust in the co-creation initiative, sometimes also in the government, further ensuring positive outcomes. This shows that a well-designed co-production process can be used to increase citizens' trust in public organisations, even when the processes are being entered into involuntarily or due to obligation. From the government's side, this would require better communication of service goals, managing citizens' expectations, and where possible, engaging the relevant citizens as early on in the process as possible. When it comes to difficult or marginalized target groups, such as offenders **(I)** or the unemployed **(II)**, trust is a key prerequisite. For example, to provide a co-produced mentoring service for ex-prisoners, mutual trust and understanding between the mentors and ex-prisoners is a must, because it takes trust from both sides to get users to co-produce and ensure the effectiveness of the service **(I)**. The more trust there is towards the service provider, the lower the level of perceived risk in getting involved in service co-production.

If an organisation depends on the efforts of their clients in order to produce results, people's motivation is key. There are always reasons for why people take part in co-production and it is important for organisations to understand those reasons in order to encourage co-production, especially when service quality and outcomes depend on the active participation of the client. Seeing that organisations do not have direct control over the efforts that citizens put into co-production, they need to use various tools to raise motivation that fosters internal wellbeing, solidarity, and accepted normative values **(I; III)**. Some of those tools could include education and training, effective and realistic expectation setting, customer-friendly instructions, and other efforts that facilitate customer role clarity and perceptions of ability to co-produce services **(III)**. When people have accurate expectations for the co-production process, their motivation and ability to participate increases. This is why it is crucial for public organisations to design the service process in a way that makes it easy for people to participate and to communicate in sufficient detail what is expected of the citizen co-producer. This is especially important for people who are reluctant to participate in the service co-production process, because they, contrary to self-motivated participants, need extra incentives to take the first steps, and even more importantly, they need constant support to keep participating and giving their input for good service outcomes. Reluctance to participate is often related to the most needed services that are not only crucial for the particular citizen but also for the society as a whole, e.g., social services, public healthcare, or criminal justice services.

With reluctant co-producers, it is necessary to identify and communicate the gains of participating in public service co-production more clearly.

With research carried out for this thesis, it was shown that with some citizen co-producers, it is difficult to involve them in public service co-production because of the way they view the state. On the one hand, they may perceive the state as calling all the shots and controlling their every move **(I)** or as supposedly supporting them in getting their life back on track, while actually just using them as a free resource **(II)**. On the other hand, hesitation to co-produce might be caused by the way the service is provided, as was shown with digital restorative services **(III)**. With reluctant co-producers, one or more of the supporting characteristics – e.g., willingness, motivation, knowledge, skills – are missing and must be evoked and supported. Willingness to co-produce can be

sparked either via internal values and motivation or by using external sanctions or material rewards. In the first instance, one tries to compel citizens to participate, and in the latter case, some form of coercion, either through sanctions or rewards, is used **(II)**. However, as was shown in **(III)**, sometimes service providers need to find ways to enhance the skills and build the self-confidence of citizen co-producers. The key is to find what would work for prospective users, what would bring them meaning and make them give their input towards reaching service outcomes. Even if the service brings beneficial outcomes for the society, for instance, the prison service is used as a measure of increasing public safety and security, as long as there is no direct benefit for the citizen, i.e., no one really wants to be incarcerated, there is an extra need to identify, ensure, and communicate the gains of participating in co-production. Especially with reluctant co-producers, it is important to specify in more detail what is expected of them, why the process is both necessary and beneficial from their point of view, and to establish what the citizens need in order to play their role in the co-production process **(I; III)**. On the other hand, co-production itself can have motivational effects on citizens, and thus, help to improve the mobilisation of the user's resources. Therefore, motivating citizens can be as important as efficiency gains, public financing schemes, technical solutions, or the organisational setup. When organisations value the people involved in service processes, even the ones that are initially reluctant or hostile, and give them the necessary support, it is possible to produce better service outcomes.

Service co-production is a perfectly natural endeavour for the participating citizen when their personal service goals echo those of the organisation or society in general, and the process is entered into voluntarily, if not even from an initiator's position. On the other hand, co-production is rife with controversies that influence the very nature of volunteerism **(II)** and nowhere more so than in situations where the co-production process is entered into involuntarily or under obligation. If taking part in co-production is a prerequisite for receiving services or social benefits **(III)**, for example, it raises the question of what motivates the citizen to really put in the effort needed to achieve service outcomes. It might be quite the opposite – they would do the bare minimum to fulfil the requirements to be eligible for benefits, not really caring about the effectiveness or efficiency of public services. In order for co-production to bring desired results, the service process has to be designed in a way that makes it easy and favourable to actively contribute to co-production **(I; III)**. It would be most beneficial if the target group are involved already in the service design phase, ensuring the best suited process from the citizens' point of view. Instead, many public services, especially those designed for marginalised groups, such as the incarcerated or the unemployed, are the product of a generic mould that produces services that are cheap and relatively easy to uphold. In addition, although engaging citizens in the co-production process promises better outcomes not only in terms of service quality but also in social cohesion, there still remain contradictions in the co-production process itself, as the attempts to individualise service delivery and take target group preferences and competencies into account do not always go hand in hand with public sector values, such as the universality, accountability, and equality of public services **(I)**. For public service co-production to bring results with reluctant participants, it is important to understand what is causing the reluctance and then come up with strategies and actionable measures to overcome it. Sometimes, the reluctance is personal, in which case a highly individualised approach to each participant is needed. Other times, however, the reluctance might be caused by the

nature of the service, e.g., with services like compulsory treatment or serving a prison sentence. Then, the solution should come from redesigning or rebranding the service in a way that would induce and uphold the willingness to co-produce.

Public service providers must make the co-production process fit the specific context and the needs of the citizens involved, while upholding public values like equality, accountability, and legitimacy.

With the ever-growing role of the citizen co-producer in public service processes, government organisations take up the role of the enabler, i.e., making it possible and easy for citizens to give their input in order to achieve service outcomes. However, even though public service co-production can increase the generation of new ideas and innovative approaches, not least so because of the involvement of enthusiastic volunteers, the inherent qualities of the public sector, namely hierarchical authority and the quest for equality, accountability, and legitimacy, can make it difficult to set up fully bottom-up practices. The formalization and equality driven public sector can have strong effects on co-production and hence, user engagement. Taking part in co-production and giving active input to achieve service goals is very much influenced by individual relationships, motivation, and trust, which are largely out of the direct control of the government. **(I)** As the case study of a volunteer mentoring service for ex-prisoners in Estonia showed, the key to service success lay in the courage to experiment and the inclusion of motivated citizens, often with personal experience of prior incarceration. Even though that approach showed success, it was always at odds with traditional policymaking, immersed in overwhelming paperwork and rules, and lack of resources. The article showed how an out-of-the box solution helped to reduce some of the reluctance towards a service that can otherwise be described by terms like surveillance, supervision, and superiority. Instead, the personal trust they had in the volunteer mentor helped the ex-prisoner to place trust also in the service itself. Even more than that, ex-prisoners were willing to participate in a public service as mentors, thus working in collaboration with the government, usually regarded as the enemy. The government, on the other hand, had to take a step back from strict service standards

Building on that and considering the possible power division in co-production processes, one is left to wonder whether citizens are the ones who have the power, authority, and control over resources, or whether public agencies are the dominant player that sets the tone and writes the rules for public service co-production. Even though a service might be advocated as flexible and citizen-led, it is still hampered by the frigidity and low resource pool of the public sector **(I)**. In addition, when we talk about involving vulnerable people (e.g., the unemployed **(II)** or crime victims **(III)**) in public service co-production, it is especially important to be aware of power imbalances that can occur in the service process. When people are pulled into co-producing a service, role clarity, proper training and induction, and support from the government's side are important. Involving citizens in the co-production process might be the best way to achieve service outcomes, but it has to be clear that the level of responsibility shifted onto the citizens should reflect their capabilities and the benefits they receive from being a part of the service process. The government must do its utmost to make sure the co-production process fits the context and the needs of the specific citizens involved. This, however, can be difficult. Often, there is not enough flexibility in public sector processes to ensure relevant support for different citizens. This was shown with the

volunteer-based alternative probation service, where part of the success of the service was due to the fuzzy lines of responsibility for the volunteers, which increased ex-prisoners' trust in the service **(I)**. Demonstrating extra flexibility in service design and showing willingness to consider the special needs and circumstances of service co-producers can go a long way in reducing the reluctance to be in a co-productive relationship with a public service provider.

The state is using the choice–coercion–compulsion nexus to lure citizens to participate in public service co-production, often substituting or supplementing resources needed for service delivery.

The government uses various engagement strategies to influence citizens' motivation and freedom of choice to volunteer in service provision. The state uses volunteerism, compulsion, and coercion to involve people in service co-production **(II)**. In a way, it can be seen as the state knowingly using volunteers in the co-production of services in order to substitute or supplement resources needed for service delivery. Governments are preying on the intrinsic and extrinsic motivation of citizens to coax them to participate in service co-production, influencing the very nature of volunteerism. These effects were illustrated by a comparative case study of volunteering in rescue and police services and in a volunteer programme for the unemployed in Estonia **(II)**. It was shown that the state can utilise incentives and sanctions to keep people involved in co-production, playing on the continuum of compulsion and coercion of volunteers. However, it is questionable whether it is possible or even ethical to increase citizen input in co-production in high-public-value areas or to reach population groups in most need through co-production if relevant motivational factors are not there. The state could and should enable citizen participation, especially for services where positive outcomes are dependent on active input from the citizens. However, it is highly risky to build up entire services based on people volunteering. It can be detrimental to service continuity and sustainability. Furthermore, it seems the line between the state as an enabler and the state as advantage taker can become murky at best.

Using citizens' resources for service co-production or using citizens as resources could potentially blur the lines of responsibility and accountability and lead to higher transaction costs for the citizens. It might seem that due to austerity measures, citizens are taking on tasks normally performed by specialists, for example, with volunteers helping to resettle ex-prisoners **(I)** or taking on the tasks of police officers or firefighters **(II)**. Not only does this mean that some of the specialists could be looking at losing their jobs, but it also could result in citizens feeling compelled to give their spare time, energy, and skills, because without their input, there would not be a service at all and public security could suffer. Talking to volunteer mentors, assistant police officers, and people responsible for volunteer firefighters, it did leave a suspicion that the government is pushing for co-production because providing public services without outside help of the volunteers has become too expensive **(I; II)**. To build on that, when service outcomes depend on citizens giving their input, one is left to wonder who would be to blame when services fail. It is hardly fair to assume that once someone toys with the idea of volunteering, they are expected to remain loyal and available whenever their government might need them. In addition, co-production could possibly perpetuate and worsen the unequal distribution of community resources, giving even more control to the more affluent, because once a "free" public service has been created with the help

of volunteers, the government could use the scarce resources elsewhere, in another region or service altogether. This is especially noticeable with digital service co-production, where the digital divide might exclude some groups from access to public services, or providing services digitally might reduce investments in local services, thus taking away the opportunities in remote areas to meet the service provider face-to-face.

Changing of channels can alter the essence of a public service.

With the ever-growing digitalisation of public services either for increased efficiency, reduction of costs or reaching wider target groups, preserving the inherent nature and goals of the once analogue service should remain as the main concern (III). A case study of restorative services was carried out to understand the immediate effects of an abrupt shift from face-to-face to digitally mediated co-production. The article uncovered the underlying beliefs, behaviours, and practices that support going digital with restorative services that have a fundamentally co-productive nature. It was shown that even though digitalisation can have practical benefits, the risk of service quality depletion is too high to consider going fully digital and replacing face-to-face services, particularly for services that are highly reliant on human contact, which is often, if not always, the case with services designed for crime victims. With highly sensitive services, like restorative practices, it was shown that the digital option can be more vulnerable to breakdown of communication, either because of technical glitches or because in screen-mediated conversations, it is often difficult to read the other's emotions or ensure the feeling of security that face-to-face meetings provide thanks to the work of facilitators. Restorative practitioners that were forced online due to the global pandemic noticed a considerable depletion in the quality of the co-production process, and what is more important, the quality of conversations – the cornerstone of mediation (III). With services that rely highly on human contact and face-to-face communication, such as mediation, digitalisation can be met with noticeable reluctance, as happened during the global pandemic in 2020. However, considering the alternative – no restorative services until the pandemic ends – the discomfort and a feeling of insecurity were endured relatively well (III). It did require noticeable changes in the mediator's role during the mediation meetings. In addition, citizens had to take responsibility for creating a safe and suitable environment for mediation, often participating in the process from the comfort of their own homes, sitting behind a computer screen. Taking all that into account, public service providers have to put in extra effort when digitalising services, especially when it could cause reluctance to co-produce services that are necessary for the wellbeing and safety of citizens.

5 CONCLUSION

Research has shown that co-production is a central feature of a wide variety of public services. Services that truly make a difference in people's lives are co-designed and often co-delivered by the service users themselves. Seeing the growing importance of the service user in the service process, it is clear that a big part of public service outcomes depends on the active participation of citizens and their input. However, value is not created in isolation by public service users, but it is the interactions of the institutional, service-level and individual level of public service delivery that explain the complexities of public services and value creation at the levels of society, the service, and the individual. The main task for public service organisations is to engage, help and motivate users to generate their own content and solutions to public problems, thus increasing public service effectiveness. The benefits of service co-production are highly context-dependent and it is important to understand the interrelations and dilemmas that come into play in the process of public service co-production and the multiple roles that people play as citizens, clients, and paying customers.

In order to look into the intricacies of public service co-production, the thesis posed questions about the role of choice, coercion and compulsion in involving reluctant co-producers in public service co-production. For service co-production to create public value and produce outcomes, citizens need to give their active input. This can be done through voicing their needs, and thus, helping with the design of the service, or being personally involved in service implementation. In most cases, both the citizens and service providers are naturally motivated to participate in public service co-production. However, there are services for which citizen motivation is either low or absent altogether, especially when participation in the co-production process is somehow externally forced upon the citizen. Those types of services were in the focus of this thesis, because increasing the involvement of reluctant citizens in service co-production can bring about a leap in service quality and outcomes.

Research carried out for this thesis showed that participating in public service co-production is, on the one hand, influenced by individual relationships, motivation, and trust, which are largely out of the direct control of the government, but on the other hand, the state plays – or can play – an important role as an enabler, allowing a flexible approach to service design and implementation. However, this flexibility comes at a price, as it would mean that each service is as good as the citizens giving their input. This could put public sector values, such as the quest for equality, accountability, and legitimacy, at risk, because the state does not have full control over the service, and hence, over the outcomes. The services analysed within this thesis all require active input from the citizens. It was shown how the state has used different strategies to engage citizens, invoking their intrinsic or extrinsic motivations. In order to keep people involved in service co-production, the state can find ways to engage people who want to participate out of free choice or who feel compelled to do so as 'good citizens'. Lastly, there are people who are coerced into co-production as a prerequisite for other services or benefits. By actively involving citizens in service co-production as a pre-requisite for something else could have the positive side-effect of familiarising citizens with giving something back to their community, and that can have longer-term effects both for the specific citizen as well as the community and society as a whole. No matter the service or its format, citizens can give valuable input only if they have the necessary knowledge,

skills, and means to do so and this is where public service organisations need to be able to provide necessary trainings and on-going support to citizens.

Considering the aforementioned findings, the main argument developed in the thesis is that for public service co-production to work, trust, personal relationships, and citizens' intrinsic and extrinsic motivation to contribute their time and energy are key and should be nourished, especially with reluctant service co-producers. Often, such reluctance occurs with services that are important from the standpoint of social cohesion, public safety, and personal wellbeing. Therefore, public service organisations can and should combine choice, coercion and compulsion strategies to entice people to co-produce services. Not only because it can lead to better service outcomes, but being involved in co-production is beneficial for the participants, irrespective of the outcomes of the service. It can improve citizen engagement and social cohesion. With reluctant citizens who often lack trust in the government and feel ill-motivated to contribute to social aims, a well-designed service process and support during co-production can result in good personal and societal outcomes. This is why attention needs to be paid to the smoothness, effectiveness, efficiency, and suitability of the co-production process. Understanding the human factor in all of this is central to designing and implementing services that are necessary, accessible, egalitarian, functional, and responsive to citizens' needs. Appreciating those mechanisms helps to make better decisions about service design, citizen engagement, implementation practices, leading to better service quality, satisfaction, and effectiveness. As an additional feature in service co-production, digitalisation is playing an increasingly prominent role in all phases of the service co-production cycle, starting from ideation and planning through to implementation and evaluation. Because of advances in digital technology, it is paramount not to underestimate the possible negative impact digitalisation can have on service co-production and the roles citizens and professional service providers play in the process.

As is with any research journey, the current thesis has its limitations. For one thing, the conclusions are drawn based on case studies. However, keeping a narrow focus helped to pinpoint some of the intricacies of public service co-production from the perspective of the citizen co-producer as well as the state in its role as an enabler. For future research, it would be fascinating to learn more about the various roles that individuals may adopt to engage in co-production, perhaps also in more radical forms of civil society structures, e.g., communities collaboratively engaging in the delivery of services for their own needs, a commons-oriented organisational structure in collaboration with the public sector that could have its roots as far back as in Ostrom's work. On the other hand, one could delve into the possibilities and pitfalls of more intensive use of digital technologies in the context of public service co-production. So, in addition to looking at digital solutions that could speed up some of the services or make them more accessible, it would also be beneficial to analyse the pros and cons – and risks – of intense usage of digital technologies in the design, implementation, and assessment of public services.

References

- Alford, J. (1998). A Public Management Road Less Travelled: Clients as Co-producers of Public Services, *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 57(41), pp. 28–137.
- Alford, J. (2002). Why do public-sector clients co-produce? Toward a contingency theory. *Administration & Society*, 34(1), pp. 32–56, DOI: 10.1177/0095399702034001004.
- Alford, J. (2009). *Engaging Public Sector Clients: From Service-Delivery to Co-production*, Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke, Hampshire.
- Alford, J. (2016). Co-Production, Interdependence and Publicness: Extending public service-dominant logic. *Public Management Review*, 18(5), pp. 673–691, DOI: 10.1080/14719037.2015.1111659.
- Alford, J., & O’Flynn, J. (2012). *Rethinking public service delivery. Managing with external providers*, London, England: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Alford, J., & Yates, S. (2016). Co-Production of Public Services in Australia: The Roles of Government Organisations and Co-Producers, *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 75:(2), pp. 159–175, DOI: 10.1111/1467-8500.12157.
- Alonso, J. M., Andrews, R., Clifton, J., & Diaz-Fuentes, D. (2019). Factors influencing citizens’ co-production of environmental outcomes: a multi-level analysis. *Public Management Review*, 21(11), pp. 1620–1645, DOI: 10.1080/14719037.2019.1619806.
- Anyan, F. (2013). The Influence of Power Shifts in Data Collection and Analysis Stages: A Focus on Qualitative Research Interview. *The Qualitative Report*, 18(36), pp. 1–9.
- Baker, L. M. (2006). Observation: A Complex Research Method. *Library Trends*, 55(1), pp. 171–189, DOI: 10.1353/lib.2006.0045.
- Bandura, A. (2001). Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective, *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, pp. 1–26, DOI: 10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.1.
- Bélanger, F., & Carter, L. (2008). Trust and risk in e-government adoption, *Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, 17(2), pp. 165–176. DOI: 10.1016/j.jsis.2007. 12.002.
- Bovaird, T. (2007). Beyond engagement and participation: User and community co-production of public services, *Public Administration Review*, 67(5), pp. 846–860, DOI: 10.1111/j.1540-6210.2007.00773.x.
- Bovaird, T. Flemig, S., Loeffler, E., & Osborne, S. P. (2019). How far have we come with co-production—and what’s next?, *Public Money & Management*, 39(4), 229–232, DOI: 10.1080/09540962.2019.1592903.
- Bovaird, T., & Loeffler, E. (2012). From Engagement to Co-production: The Contribution of Users and Communities to Outcomes and Public Value. *Voluntas*, 23, pp. 1119–1138, DOI 10.1007/s11266-012-9309-6.
- Bovaird, T., & Loeffler, E. (2013). We’re all in this together: harnessing user and community co-production of public outcomes. Chapter 4. Birmingham: Institute of Local Government Studies.
- Bovaird, T., Stoker, G., Jones T., Loeffler, E., & Roncancio, M. P. (2016). Activating collective co-production of public services: influencing citizens to participate in complex governance mechanisms in the UK, *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 82(1), pp. 47–68, DOI: 10.1177/0020852314566009.

- Bovaird, T., Van Ryzin, G. G., Loeffler, E., & Parrado, S. (2015). Activating Citizens to Participate in Collective Co-Production of Public Services. *Journal of Social Policy*, 44(1), pp. 1–23, DOI: 10.1017/S0047279414000567.
- Bovaird, T., & Loeffler, E. (2013). We're all in this together: Harnessing user and community co-production of public outcomes. In C. Staite (Ed.) *Making Sense of the Future: Do We Need a New Model of Public Services?* Birmingham: INLOGOV.
- Bovens, M., & Zouridis, S. (2002). From Street Level to System Level Bureaucracies: How Information and Communication Technology is Transforming Administrative Discretion and Constitutional Control, *Public Administration Review*, 62(2), pp. 174–184, DOI: 10.1111/0033 3352.00168.
- Brandsen, T., & Honingh, M. (2013). Professionals and Shifts in Governance, *International Journal of Public Administration*, 36(12), pp. 876–883, DOI: 10.1080/01900692.2013.798809.
- Brandsen, T., & Honingh, M. (2016). Distinguishing Different Types of Co-production: A Conceptual Analysis Based on the Classical Definitions, *Public Administration Review*, 76(3), pp. 427–435, DOI: 10.1111/puar.12465.
- Brandsen, T., Steen, T., & Verschuere, B. (2018). Co-Creation and Co-Production in Public Services: Urgent Issues in Practice and Research. In Brandsen, T., Steen, T., & Verschuere, B. (Eds.) *Co-Production and Co-Creation: Engaging Citizens in Public Service Delivery*. Routledge, New York.
- Brudney, J. L., & England, R. E. (1983). Toward a Definition of the Co-Production Concept. *Public Administration Review*, 43(1), pp. 59–65, DOI: 10.2307/975300.
- Brunet, A., De Boer, L., & McNamara, K. T. (2001). Community choice between volunteer and professional fire departments. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 30(1), 26–50, DOI: 10.1177/0899764001301002.
- Campanale, C., Mauro, S. G., & Sancino, A. (2020). Managing co-production and enhancing good governance principles: insights from two case studies. *Journal of Management and Governance*, 25, pp. 275–306, DOI: 10.1007/s10997-020-09508-y.
- Clarke, J. (2005). New labour's citizens: activated, empowered, responsabilized, abandoned? *Critical Social Policy*, 25(4), 447–463, DOI: 10.1177/0261018305057024.
- Clarke, J., Newman, J., Smith, N., Vidler, E., & Westmarland, L. (2007). *Creating Citizen-Consumers: Changing Publics and Changing Public Services*. SAGE Publications: Pine Forge Press.
- Crowe, S., Cresswell, K., Robertson, A., Huby, G., Avery, A., & Sheikh, A. (2011). The case study approach. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 11(100), pp. 1–9, DOI: 10.1186/1471-2288-11-100.
- Çulea, M., & Fulton, M. (2009). Business culture and tax evasion: Why corruption and the unofficial economy can persist. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 72(3), pp. 811–822, DOI: 10.1016/j.jebo.2009.08.005.
- Dunleavy, P., Margetts, H., Bastow, S., & Tinkler, J. (2006). New public management is dead long live digital era governance. *Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory*, 16(3), pp. 467–494, DOI: 10.1093/jopart/mui057.

- Fledderus J., Brandsen, T., & Honingh, M. E. (2014). Restoring trust through the co-production of public services: A theoretical elaboration. *Public Management Review*, 16(3), pp. 424–443, DOI: 10.1080/14719037.2013.848920.
- Fledderus J., Brandsen, T., & Honingh, M. E. (2015). User co-production of public service delivery: An uncertainty approach. *Public Policy and Administration*, 30(2), pp. 145–164, DOI: 10.1177/0952076715572362.
- Fledderus, J., & Honingh, M. (2015). Why People Co-Produce within Activation Services: The Necessity of Motivation and Trust – an Investigation of Selection Biases in a Municipal Activation Programme in the Netherlands. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 0(0), pp. 1–19, DOI: 10.1177/0020852314566006.
- Ford, R. C., & Dickson, D. R. (2012). Enhancing customer self-efficacy in co-producing service experiences, *Business Horizons*, 55, 179–188, DOI: 10.1016/j.bushor.2011.11.005.
- Globerson, S., & Maggard, M. J. (1991). A conceptual model of self-service. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, (11)4, pp. 33–44, DOI: 10.1108/01443579110002977.
- Halford, S., Obstfelder, A., & Lotherington, A.-T. (2010). Changing the record: the inter-professional, subjective and embodied effects of electronic patient records. *New Technology, Work and Employment*, 25(3), pp. 210–222, DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-005X.2010.00249.x.
- Handy, F., Cnaan, R. A., Hustinx, L., Kang, C., Brudney, J.L., Haski-Leventhal, D., Holmes, K., Meijs, L. C. P. M., Pessi, A. B., Ranade, B., Yamauchi, N., & Zrinscak, S. (2010). A Cross-Cultural Examination of Student Volunteering: Is It All About Résumé Building? *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 39(3), pp. 498–523, doi: 10.1177/0899764009344353.
- Hanlon, G., Strangleman, T., Goode, J., Luff, D., O’Cathain, A., & Greatbatch, D. (2005). Knowledge, technology and nursing: The case of NHS Direct, *Human Relations*, 58(2), pp. 147–171, DOI: 10.1177/0018726705052179.
- Heeks, R. (1999). *Reinventing government in the information age: international practice in IT enabled public sector reform*. London: Routledge.
- Ho, S.-H., & Ko, Y.-Y. (2008). Effects of self-service technology on customer value and customer readiness: The case of Internet banking, *Internet Research*, (18)4, pp. 427–446, DOI: 10.1108/10662240810897826.
- Howlett, M., Kekez, A., & Poocharoen, O.-O. (2017). Understanding Co-Production as a Policy Tool: Integrating New Public Governance and Comparative Policy Theory. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice*, 19(5), pp. 487–501, DOI: 10.1080/13876988.2017.1287445.
- Jakobsen, M. (2013). Can Government Initiatives Increase Citizen Coproduction? Results of a Randomized Field Experiment. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 23(1), pp. 27–54, DOI: 10.1093/jopart/mus036.
- Jorna, F., & Wagenaar, P. (2007). The Iron Cage Strengthened? Discretion and Digital Discipline. *Public Administration*, 85(1), pp. 189–214, DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9299.2007.00640.x.

- Joshi, A., & Moore, M. (2004). Institutionalised Co-production: Unorthodox Public Service Delivery in Challenging Environments, *The Journal of Development Studies*, 40(4), pp. 31–49, DOI: 10.1080/00220380410001673184.
- Jukić, T., Pevcin, P., Benčina, J., Dečman, M., & Vrbek, S. (2019). Collaborative Innovation in Public Administration: Theoretical Background and Research Trends of Co-Production and Co-Creation. *Administrative Sciences*, 9 (90), DOI: 10.3390/admsci9040090.
- Kattel, R., Lember, V., & Tõnurist, P. (2019). Collaborative innovation and human-machine networks, *Public Management Review*, DOI: 10.1080/14719037.2019.1645873.
- Kiernan, M., Moran, S., & Hill, M. (2016). Understanding why veterans are reluctant to access help for alcohol problems: Considerations for nurse education. *Nurse Education Today*, 47, pp. 92–98, DOI: 10.1016/j.nedt.2016.02.024.
- Lee, J., & Allaway, A. (2002). Effects of personal control on adoption of self-service technology innovations, *Journal of Services Marketing*, (16)6, pp. 553–572, DOI: 10.1108/08876040210443418.
- Lember, V. (2018). The role of New Technologies in Co-Production. In Brandsen, T., Steen, T., & Verschuere, B. (Eds.) *Co-Production and Co-Creation: Engaging Citizens in Public Service Delivery*. Routledge, New York.
- Lin, J.-S. C., & Hsieh, P.-L. (2007). The influence of technology readiness on satisfaction and behavioral intentions toward self-service technologies. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 23(3), pp. 1597–1615.
- Lindgren, I., Madsen, C.Ø., Hofmann, S., & Melin, U. (2019). Close encounters of the digital kind: A research agenda for the digitalization of public services, *Government Information Quarterly*, 36, pp. 427–436, DOI: 10.1016/j.giq.2019.03.002.
- Lindsay, C., Osborne, S. P., & Bond, S. (2014). The ‘new public governance’ and employability services in an era of crisis: Challenges for third sector organizations in Scotland. *Public Administration*, 92(1), pp. 192–207, DOI: 10.1111/padm.12051.
- Llucha M., & Abadie, F. (2013). Exploring the role of ICT in the provision of integrated care—Evidence from eight countries, *Health Policy*, 111, pp. 1–13, DOI: 10.1016/j.healthpol.2013.03.005.
- Loeffler, E., & Bovaird, T. (2016). User and Community Co-Production of Public Services: What Does the Evidence Tell Us?, *International Journal of Public Administration*, 39:13, 1006–1019, DOI: 10.1080/01900692.2016.1250559.
- Loeffler, E., & Bovaird, T. (2020). Assessing the impact of co-production on pathways to outcomes in public services: the case of policing and criminal justice. *International Public Management Journal*, 23(2), pp. 205–223, DOI: 10.1080/10967494.2019.1668895.
- Loeffler, E., & Timm-Arnold, P. (2020). Comparing user and community co-production approaches in local ‘welfare’ and ‘law and order’ services: Does the governance mode matter? *Public Policy and Administration*, 36(1), pp. 115–137, DOI: 10.1177/0952076720905006.

- Madsen, C., & Kræmmergaard, P. (2016). Warm experts in the age of mandatory e-government: Interaction among Danish single parents regarding online application for public benefits. *Electronic Journal of E-government*, 14(1), pp. 87–98.
- May, C. (2006). Mobilizing Modern Facts: Health Technology Assessment and the Politics of Evidence, *Sociology of Health & Illness*, 28(5), pp. 513–532, DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9566.2006.00505.x.
- Mazzei, M., Teasdale, S., Calò, F., & Roy, M. J. (2020). Co-production and the third sector: conceptualising different approaches to service user involvement. *Public Management Review*, 22(9), pp. 1265–1283, DOI: 10.1080/14719037.2019.1630135.
- McLaughlin, H. (2009). What's in a name: 'Client', 'patient', 'customer', 'consumer', 'expert by experience', 'service user' – What's next? *British Journal of Social Work*, 39(6), pp. 1101–1117, DOI: 10.1093/bjsw/bcm155.
- McLaughlin, H. (2020). Who are the service users? Language, neo-liberalism and social constructions. In McLaughlin, H., Beresford, P., Cameron, C., Casey, H., & Duffy, J. (Eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of Service User Involvement in Human Services Research and Education*. DOI: 10.4324/9780429433306-5.
- Meijer, A. (2007). Why don't they listen to us? Reasserting the role of ICT in Public Administration. *Information Polity*, 12(4), pp. 233–242.
- Meijer, A. (2011). Networked Coproduction of Public Services in Virtual Communities: From a Government-Centric to a Community Approach to Public Service Support. *Public Administration Review*, 71(4), pp. 598–607, DOI: 10.1111/j.1540-6210.2011.02391.x.
- Meijer, A. (2016). Coproduction as a structural transformation of the public sector. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 29(6), pp. 596-611, DOI: 10.1108/IJPSM-01-2016-0001.
- Meuter, M. L., Bitner, M. J., Ostrom, A. L., & Brown, S. W. (2005). Choosing Among Alternative Service Delivery Modes: An Investigation of Customer Trial of Self-Service Technologies, *Journal of Marketing*, 69, pp. 61–83, DOI: 10.1509/jmkg.69.2.61.60759.
- Meuter, M. L., Ostrom, A. L., Bitner, M. J., & Roundtree, R. (2003). The influence of technology anxiety on consumer use and experiences with self-service technologies, *Journal of Business Research*, 56(11), pp. 899–906, doi:10.1016/S0148-2963(01)00276-4.
- Meuter, M. L., Ostrom, A. L., Roundtree, R., & Bitner, M. J. (2000). Self-service technologies: understanding customer satisfaction with technology-based service encounters, *Journal of Marketing*, 64(3), pp. 50–64.
- Meyer, C. B. (2001). A Case in Case Study Methodology. *Field Methods*, 13(4), pp. 329–352, DOI: 10.1177/1525822X0101300402.
- Mintzberg, H. (1996). Managing Government, Governing Management. *Harvard Business Review*, 74(3), pp. 75–85.
- Mook, L., Farrell, E., Chum, A., Handy, F., Schugurensky, D., & Quarter, J. (2014). Individual and organizational factors in the interchangeability of paid staff and volunteers: Perspectives of volunteers. *Canadian Journal of Nonprofit and Social Economy Research*, 5(2), 65–85, DOI: 10.22230/cjnser.2014v5n2a187.

- Morgan, G., & Smircich, L. (1980). The Case for Qualitative Research. *The Academy of Management Review*, 5(4), pp. 491–500, DOI: 10.2307/257453.
- Mort, M., Finch, T., & May, C. (2009). Making and unmaking telepatients: identity and governance in new health technologies, *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, 34(1), pp. 9–33, DOI: 10.1177/0162243907311274.
- Musick, M. A., Wilson, J., & Bynum, W. B. (2000). Race and formal volunteering: The differential effects of class and religion. *Social Forces*, 78(4), 1539–1570, DOI: 10.2307/3006184.
- Nabatchi, T., Sancino, A., & Sicilia, M. (2017). Varieties of Participation in Public Services: The Who, When, and What of Coproduction. *Public Administration Review*, 77(5), pp. 766–776, DOI: 10.1111/puar.12765.
- Nicolini, D. (2007). Stretching out and Expanding Work Practices in Time and Space: The Case of Telemedicine, *Human Relations*, 60(6), pp. 889–920, DOI: 10.1177/0018726707080080.
- Norman, E. M., Wilson, L., Starkey, N. J., & Polaschek, D. L. L. (2022). How probation officers understand and work with people on community supervision sentences to enhance compliance. *Probation Journal*, 69(4), pp. 472–492, DOI: 10.1177/02645505211041579.
- OECD (2011). New forms of partnership with citizens for public service delivery. In: *Together for Better Public Services: Partnering with Citizens and Civil Society*, OECD Publishing, Paris, DOI: 10.1787/9789264118843-5-en.
- OECD (2016). *OECD Comparative Study: Digital Government Strategies for Transforming Public Services in the Welfare Areas*. <http://www.oecd.org/gov/digital-government/Digital-Government-Strategies-Welfare-Service.pdf> (Downloaded on 17.11.2017)
- Osborne, S., Powell, M., Cucciniello, M., & Macfarlane, J. (2022). It is a relay not a sprint! Evolving co-design in a digital and virtual environment: neighbourhood services for elders. *Global Public Policy and Governance*, 2, pp. 518–538, DOI: 10.1007/s43508-022-00053-y.
- Osborne, S., & Strokosch, K. (2013). It takes two to tango? Understanding the co-production of public services by integrating the services management and public administration perspectives. *British Journal of Management*, 24(S1), pp. S31–S47, DOI: 10.1111/1467-8551.12010.
- Osborne, S. P. (2021). *Public Service Logic: Creating Value for Public Service Users, Citizens, and Society Through Public Service Delivery*. New York: Routledge.
- Osborne, S. P., Radnor, Z., & Strokosch, K. (2016). Co-Production and the Co-Creation of Value in Public Services: A suitable case for treatment? *Public Management Review*, 18(5), pp. 639–653, DOI: 10.1080/14719037.2015.1111927.
- Osborne, S. P., Radnor, Z., Vidal, I., Kinder, T. (2014). A Sustainable Business Model For Public Service Organizations?, *Public Management Review*, 16(2), pp.165–172, DOI: 10.1080/14719037.2013.872435.
- Ostrom, E. (1996). Crossing the great divide: coproduction, synergy, and development. *World Development*, 24(6), pp. 1073–87, DOI: 10.1016/0305-750X(96)00023-X.

- Ostrom, E., Parks, R. B., Whitaker, G. P., & Percy, S. L. (1978). The Public Service Production Process: A Framework for Analyzing Police Services. *Policy Studies Journal*, 7(1), pp. 381–389, DOI: 10.1111/j.1541-0072.1978.tb01782.x.
- Oudshoorn, N. (2008). Diagnosis at a distance: the invisible work of patients and healthcare professionals in cardiac telemonitoring technology, *Sociology of Health & Illness*, 30(2), pp. 272–288, DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9566.2007.01032.x.
- Oudshoorn, N., Brouns, M., & Oost, E. Van (2005). Diversity and distributed agency in the design and use of medical video-communication technologies. In Harbers, H. (Ed.) *Inside the Politics of Technology*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press. <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/11482382.pdf> (28.01.2018)
- Pagliari, C. (2007). Design and Evaluation in Ehealth: Challenges and Implication for an Interdisciplinary Field, *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 9(2), e15, DOI: 10.2196/jmir.9.2.e15.
- Pan, S.-L., Tan, C.-W., & Lim, E. T. K. (2006). Customer relationship management (CRM) in e-government: a relational perspective, *Decision Support Systems*, 42, pp. 237–250, DOI:10.1016/j.dss.2004.12.001.
- Park, S. (E.) (2020). Beyond patient-centred care: a conceptual framework of co-production mechanisms with vulnerable groups in health and social service settings, *Public Management Review*, 22 (3), pp. 452–474, DOI: 10.1080/14719037.2019.1601241.
- Parker, A., & Tritter, J. (2006). Focus group method and methodology: current practice and recent debate. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 29(1), pp. 23–37, DOI: 10.1080/01406720500537304.
- Parks, R. B., Baker, P. C., Kiser, L., Oakerson, R., Ostrom, E., Ostrom, V., Percy, S. L., Vandivort, M. B., Whitaker, G. P., & Wilson, R. (1981). Consumers as Coproducers of Public Services: Some Economic and Institutional Considerations. *Policy Studies Journal*, 9(7), pp. 1001–1011, DOI: 10.1111/j.1541-0072.1981.tb01208.x.
- Penny, J. (2016). Between coercion and consent: the politics of “Cooperative Governance” at a time of “Austerity Localism” in London. *Urban Geography*, DOI: 10.1080/02723638.2016.1235932.
- Pestoff, V. (2006). Citizens and co-production of welfare services: Childcare in eight European countries, *Public Management Review*, 8(4), pp. 503–519, DOI: 10.1080/14719030601022882.
- Pestoff, V. (2009). Towards A Paradigm of Democratic Participation: Citizen Participation and Co-Production of Personal Social Services in Sweden. *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics*, 80(2), pp. 197–224, DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-8292.2009.00384.x.
- Pestoff, V. (2012). Co-production and Third Sector Social Services in Europe: Some Concepts and Evidence. *Voluntas*, 23, pp. 1102–1118, DOI 10.1007/s11266-012-9308-7.
- Pollitt, C., Bouckaert, G., & Löffler, E. (2006). *Making quality sustainable: Co-design, co-decide, co-produce and co-evaluate*. Report by the Scientific Rapporteurs of the 4th Quality Conference, Ministry of Finance, Finland.
- Prendergast, M. L., Farabee, D., Cartier, J., & Henkin, S. (2002). Involuntary Treatment Within a Prison Setting. Impact on Psychosocial Change During Treatment. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 29(1), pp. 5–26, DOI: 10.1177/0093854802029001002.

- Radnor, Z., & Osborne, S. P. (2013). Lean: A Failed Theory for Public Services?, *Public Management Review*, 15(2), pp. 265-287, DOI: 10.1080/14719037.2012.748820.
- Rantala, K., & Karjaluo, H. (2017). *Combining Digitization with Healthcare Service Processes : Value Co-creation Opportunities Through Standard Work*. In Pucihar, A., Borštnar, M. K., Kittl, C., Ravesteijn, P., Clarke, R., & Bons, R. (Eds.), Bled 2017, Proceedings of the 30th Bled eConference, Digital Transformation: From Connecting Things to Transforming Our Lives (pp. 471–482). Maribor: University of Maribor Press. DOI: 10.18690/978-961-286-043-1.33.
- Rantala, K., & Karjaluo, H. (2016). *Value Co-creation in Health Care: Insights into the Transformation from Value Creation to Value Co- creation through Digitization*, AcademicMindtrek '16: Proceedings of the 20th International Academic Mindtrek Conference, October 2016, pp. 34–41, DOI: 10.1145/2994310.2994325.
- Reddick, C. G., & Turner, M. (2012). Channel choice and public service delivery in Canada: Comparing e-government to traditional service delivery, *Government Information Quarterly*, 29, pp. 1–11, DOI: 10.1016/j.giq.2011.03.005.
- Røhnebæk, M. (2014). Standardised Flexibility. On the Role of ICT in the Norwegian Employment and Welfare Services (NAV). Series of dissertations submitted to the Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Oslo No. 452. ISSN 1504-3991.
- Slay, J., & Stephens, L. (2013). *Co-production in mental health. A literature review*. London: new economics foundation.
- Smith, M., Gallagher, M., Wosu, H., Stewart, J., Cree, V. E., Hunter, S., Evans, S., Montgomery, C., Holiday, S., & Wilkinson, H. (2012). Engaging with Involuntary Service Users in Social Work: Findings from a Knowledge Exchange Project. *British Journal of Social Work*, 42, pp. 1460–1477, DOI: 10.1093/bjsw/bcr162.
- Sorrentino, M., Guglielmetti, C., Gilardi, S., & Marsilio, M. (2017). Health Care Services and the Coproduction Puzzle: Filling in the Blanks. *Administration & Society*, 49(10), pp. 1424–1449, DOI: 10.1177/0095399715593317.
- Sorrentino, M., Sicilia, M., & Howlett, M. (2018). Understanding co-production as a new public governance tool. *Policy and Society*, 37(3), pp. 277–293, DOI: 10.1080/14494035.2018.1521676.
- Spanjol, J., Cui, A. S., Nakata, C., Sharp, L. K., Crawford, S. Y., Xiao, Y., & Watson-Manheim, M. B. (2015). Co-Production of Prolonged, Complex, and Negative Services: An Examination of Medication Adherence in Chronically Ill Individuals, *Journal of Service Research*, 18(3), pp. 284–302, DOI: 10.1177/1094670515583824.
- Steen, T., Brandsen, T., & Verschuere, B. (2018). The dark side of co-creation and co-production. In Steen, T., Brandsen, T., & Verschuere, B. (Eds.) *Co-production and co-creation: Engaging citizens in public services* (pp. 284–293). New York: Routledge.
- Steen, T., & Tuurnas, S. (2018). The Roles of the Professional in Co-Production and Co-Creation Processes. In Steen, T., Brandsen, T., Verschuere, B. (eds.) *Co-production and co-creation: Engaging citizens in public services* (pp. 284–293). New York: Routledge.
- Tammearu, K. (2012). The State's Activities in Ensuring the Sustainability of Volunteer Rescue Brigades. Master's Thesis. Tallinn University of Technology, Ragnar Nurkse Department of Innovation and Governance.

- Thomas, J. C. (2013). Citizen, customer, partner: rethinking the place of the public in public management. *Public Administration Review*, 73(6), pp. 786–96, DOI: 10.1111/puar.12109.
- Torfig, J., Sørensen, E., Røiseland, A. (2019). Transforming the Public Sector into an Arena for Co-Creation: Barriers, Drivers, Benefits, and Ways Forward. *Administration & Society*, 51(5), pp. 795–825, DOI: 10.1177/0095399716680057.
- Torfig, J., & Triantafillou, P. (2013). What's in a name? Grasping new public governance as a political-administrative system, *International Review of Public Administration*, 18(2): 9–25, DOI: 10.1080/12294659.2013.10805250.
- Tuurnas, S. (2015). Learning to co-produce? The perspective of public service professionals. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 28 (7), pp. 583–598, DOI: 10.1108/IJPSM-04-2015-0073.
- Tuurnas, S. (2021). Skilling and Motivating Staff for Co-production. In: Loeffler, E. & Bovaird, T. (eds.) *The Palgrave Handbook of Co-Production of Public Services and Outcomes*, pp. 491–506, DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-53705-0_25.
- Tuurnas, S. P., Stenvall, J., Rannisto, P.-H., Harisalo, R., & Hakari, K. (2014). Coordinating co-production in complex network settings. *European Journal of Social Work*, DOI: 10.1080/13691457.2014.930730.
- Van Beuningen, J., de Ruyter, K., & Wetzels, M. (2011). The power of self-efficacy change during service provision: Making your customers feel better about themselves pays off, *Journal of Service Research*, 14(1), pp. 108–125, DOI: 10.1177/1094670510379037.
- Van de Walle, S. (2018). Explaining Citizen Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with Public Services. In: Ongaro, E., Van Thiel, S. (eds.) *The Palgrave Handbook of Public Administration and Management in Europe*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 227–241, DOI: 10.1057/978-1-137-55269-3_11.
- Van Eijk, C., & Gascó, M. (2018). Unravelling the Co-Producers: Who are They and What Motivations do They Have? In Steen, T., Brandsen, T., Verschuere, B. (eds.) *Co-production and co-creation: Engaging citizens in public services* (pp. 63-76). New York: Routledge.
- Van Eijk, C. J. A., & Steen, T. P. S. (2014). Why People Co-Produce: Analysing citizens' perceptions on co-planning engagement in health care services, *Public Management Review*, 16(3), pp. 358–382, DOI: 10.1080/14719037.2013.841458.
- Van Eijk, C., Steen, T., & Verschuere, B. (2017). Co-producing safety in the local community: A Q-methodology study on the incentives of Belgian and Dutch members of neighbourhood watch schemes, *Local Government Studies*, 43:3, 323–343, DOI: 10.1080/03003930.2017.1281803.
- Van Gestel, N., Kuper, M., & Hendriks, W. (2019). Changed Roles and Strategies of Professionals in the (co)Production of Public Services, *Administrative Sciences*, 9 (59), pp. 1–15, DOI: 10.3390/admsci9030059.
- Van Oerle, S., Lievens, A., & Mahr, D. (2018). Value co-creation in online healthcare communities: The impact of patients' reference frames on cure and care, *Psychology & Marketing*, 35, pp. 629–639, DOI: 10.1002/mar.21111.

- Vargo, S. L., & Lusch, R. F. (2004). Evolving to a New Dominant Logic for Marketing, *Journal of Marketing*, 68(1), pp. 1–17, DOI: 10.1509/jmkg.68.1.1.24036.
- Vennik, F. D., van de Bovenkamp, H. M., Putters, K., & Kor, J. G. (2016). Co-production in Healthcare: Rhetoric and Practice. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 82(1), pp. 150–168, DOI: 10.1177/0020852315570553.
- Verschuere, B., Brandsen, T., & Pestoff, V. (2012). Co-production: The State of the Art in Research and the Future Agenda, *Voluntas*, 23, pp. 1083–1101, DOI: 10.1007/s11266-012-9307-8.
- Vikkelsø, S. (2005). Subtle Redistribution of Work, Attention and Risks: Electronic Patient Records and Organisational Consequences, *Scandinavian Journal of Information Systems*, 17(1), pp. 3–30.
- Voorberg, W. (2017). Co-Creation and Co-Production as a Strategy for Public Service Innovation: A study to their appropriateness in a public sector context. Doctoral Thesis, Erasmus University Rotterdam. Optima Grafische Communicatie: Rotterdam, the Netherlands.
- Voorberg, W., & Bekkers, V. (2016). Interactive governance and the social construction of citizens as co-creators. *Critical Reflections on Interactive Governance: Self-organization and Participation in Public Governance*, 278.
- Voorberg, W., Bekkers, V., Timeus, K., Tonurist, P., & Tummers, L. (2017). Changing public service delivery: learning in co-creation, *Policy and Society*, 36:2, pp. 178–194, DOI: 10.1080/14494035.2017.1323711.
- Voorberg, W., Bekkers, V. J. J. M., & Tummers, L. G. (2014). *Co-creation in social innovation: A comparative case-study on the influential factors and outcomes of co-creation*. Ottawa, Canada: IRSPM.
- Voorberg, W., Bekkers, V., & Tummers, L. (2013). Embarking on The Social Innovation Journey: A Systematic Review Regarding the Potential of Co-Creation with Citizens, paper for the IRSPM conference, Prague 10-12 April 2013.
- Voorberg, W., Jilke, S., Tummers, L., & Bekkers, V. (2018). Financial Rewards Do Not Stimulate Coproduction: Evidence from Two Experiments. *Public Administration Review*, 78(6), pp. 864–873, DOI: 10.1111/puar.12896.
- Voorberg, W. H., Bekkers, V. J. J. M., & Tummers L. G. (2015). A Systematic Review of Co-Creation and Co-Production. Embarking on the Social Innovation Journey, *Public Management Review*, 17(9), pp. 1333–1357, DOI: 10.1080/14719037.2014.930505.
- Walker, R. H., & Johnson, L. W. (2006). Why Consumers Use and Do Not Use Technology-Enabled Services, *Journal of Services Marketing*, 20(2), pp. 125–135, doi:10.1108/08876040610657057.
- Wihlborg, E., Larsson, H., & Hedström, K. (2016). The computer says no! – A case study on automated decision-making in public authorities. *Proceedings from 49th Hawaii International Conference on Systems Sciences (HICSS)*. Washington, DC: IEEE Computer Society.
- Yin, R. K. (2011). *Applications of Case Study Research. Third edition*. SAGE Publications: Thousand Oaks, California, USA.

Acknowledgements

As anyone who has ever taken up the wondrous journey of PhD studies undoubtedly knows, it is an experience rich in discoveries, discussions, and dedication. Equally importantly, it is a journey not travelled alone. I would like to take this opportunity to express my gratitude to the people who have joined me on this journey, whether they have chosen to do so out of academic curiosity, or have been brought along unknowingly as innocent bystanders, forming a friendly external support team during the various stages of my studies.

I start with Prof. Tiina Randma-Liiv, because she was the first person to whom I voiced the wild idea of enrolling in a doctoral programme. Had it not been for her unwavering support and encouragement, I would not be here today. In addition, she was the person who put me in contact with my supervisor, Dr. Veiko Lember, who has been an excellent guide and mentor. He has helped me structure my thoughts, systemise my thinking, and been very supportive in showing me how to express my arguments and findings on paper so that they would make sense to others. It has been a fully enjoyable process and I cannot thank him enough for always helping me keep my focus. His support, stress-free attitude, and belief in me have been essential. In a similar vein, I am forever grateful to Dr. Piret Tõnurist, my co-author and role model. She has been a true inspiration, full of unexpected and exciting research ideas, and novel ways of discovering undisclosed interrelations and understanding complexities. In addition to her brilliant mind, she is a researcher with a big heart and kind words for everyone she comes in contact with.

My gratitude goes to Prof. Ringa Raudla, who is an embodiment of passion for research and deeper understanding of the society we live in. For me, she has been someone to look up to since my days in MA studies. With her characteristic eloquence, she has shown me what it means to be a good teacher – that is someone who can explain even the most complex of issues in a way that sparks understanding and meaning in total novices. One could only dream that all our professors and lecturers possessed the same qualities. I am very grateful to Prof. Tiina Randma-Liiv, Associate Prof. Dr. Külli Sarapuu, Dr. Chris Giotitsas, Dr. Amirouche Moktefi, and Dr. Alexandros (Alex) Pazaitis for their constructive and helpful comments during the finalisation of the thesis. I sincerely thank everyone I have had the pleasure of cooperating with in Ragnar Nurkse Department of Innovation and Governance. There have been an abundance of intellectual exchanges and fruitful collaborations. It feels like a family where everyone is cared for, supported, noticed, and empowered. No small part in this is played by Piret Kähr, who is like a guardian angel to everyone in our department.

Finally, I would like to thank those closest to me outside of the academia. Thank you, my dear family, friends, and work colleagues for teaching, supporting, and inspiring me and helping me develop. I fully appreciate how my studies have taken their toll on the people closest to me. I cannot emphasise enough how important it has been to me that you have joined me for a run on the forest trail, spent time with me in the gym, forced me to take a break from writing and watch a movie instead, or asked me out for a cup of coffee and hilarious jokes when my stress levels were high. Even when I had not found time for you the last three times you had asked me. Whether you knew it or not, the “so when will the thesis be finalised?” question you did not ask was just what I needed. Because in your heart of hearts, you always knew I would get there. So, thank you for believing in me.

Research that forms this dissertation was supported by the following funding sources: European Commission Seventh Framework Programme (Grant Number 320090) and Estonian Science Fund (Grant Numbers ETF9395, IUT19-13), Archimedes Foundation grants for short-term academic mobility under the DoRa+ programme.

Abstract

Reluctant Co-Producers of Public Services: Understanding Micro-Level Dynamics

Co-production of public services has been used as a concept to describe the changed nature of relationships between public sector organisations and citizens. The key idea behind co-production is that services are delivered not only by public sector professional and managerial staff but are co-produced by citizens and communities. As citizens bring in their ideas, time, skills, and other resources, they become co-creators working with public officials. This makes public service provision a multi-faceted and relational process, where end-user engagement is integral to its effectiveness. Seeing the growing importance of the service user in the service process, it is clear that a big part of public service outcomes depends on the active participation of citizens and their input. The main task for public service organisations is to engage, help and motivate users to generate their own content and solutions to public problems, thus increasing public service effectiveness.

In order to look into the intricacies of public service co-production, the thesis posed questions about the role of choice, coercion and compulsion in involving reluctant co-producers in public service co-production. In most cases, both the citizens and service providers are naturally motivated to participate in public service co-production. However, there are services for which citizen motivation is either low or absent altogether, especially when participation in the co-production process is somehow externally forced upon the citizen. There are many vital public services, such as restorative justice services or prisoner resocialisation programmes, where service users are reluctant to co-produce, but where increasing the involvement of reluctant co-producers can bring about a leap in service quality and public value. There is a need to better understand the underlying dynamics of these particular kinds of relationships. With this specific research gap in mind, the focus of the thesis is on co-production of services where citizens might be reluctant to participate either because it is a compulsory process, because it is a requirement for receiving their welfare benefits, or because the format of the service does not fully support its underlying principles.

In order to delve into these processes, the author investigated how public sector principles, like formalisation, standardisation and the drive for equality, can co-exist with the need for an individual approach and a design to co-producing ex-prisoners' resocialisation services; what the nature of relationships between volunteers and the state is and how they affect volunteer motivation, and in turn, public service co-production in unemployment services and police and rescue services; and what happens to the co-production of restorative justice services when digitalisation enters into the wider picture of public service design and delivery. By selecting these cases, the thesis improves our understanding of reluctant co-production, its micro-level dynamics, and especially of how people choose to take part in service co-production. For the latter, the discussion will be focused on the choice–coercion–compulsion nexus that leads people to co-produce. More specifically, the thesis sets out to illustrate how the state – when co-producing public services with its citizens – can invoke citizens' internal wellbeing, solidarity, and accepted normative values, or at the other end of the spectrum, use sanctions and material rewards to direct people's behaviour. The thesis also demonstrates that sometimes reluctance to participate in public service co-production is

not so much because of the content of the service but rather because of its format. More specifically, it was shown how digital channels can change the quality of an otherwise necessary and useful service. Although there are authors who argue that co-production is an innate feature of any service, this thesis uses the choice–coercion–compulsion nexus to offer a more nuanced understanding of how citizens make an active, or at least conscious choice to co-produce public services. Importantly, the focus is on individuals and not on organisations participating in service co-production. Although co-production can also be seen as a relationship between citizen-led organisations and the government, or as a governance mechanism in a wider sense, this thesis focuses on co-production at the individual level.

Based on the research questions posed in the publications of this thesis, four main data collection methods were used. Firstly, direct observation was used, because it allowed studying people in their normal environment and understanding the investigated phenomena from their perspective. The major strength of direct observation is that it can illuminate the discrepancies between what people say in interviews and what actually takes place. Secondly, in-depth, semi-structured interviews were used to gather descriptions of the life-world of the interviewees with respect to their interpretation of the meaning of the described phenomena. The strength of this method lies in the flexible and responsive interaction between the interviewer and the respondents, which permits probing for meaning, covering topics from several angles, and clarifying the questions for the respondents. Thirdly, focus group interviews were used to gain a better insight into the experience and beliefs of the participants and to clarify some of the data collected through observation and interviews. Fourthly, document analysis was used to supplement and possibly challenge the findings from previous stages.

Research carried out for this thesis showed that participating in public service co-production is, on the one hand, influenced by individual relationships, motivation, and trust, which are largely out of the direct control of the government, but on the other hand, the state plays – or can play – an important role as an enabler, allowing a flexible approach to service design and implementation. However, all of this flexibility comes at a price, as it would mean that each service is as good as the citizens giving their input. This could put public sector values, such as the quest for equality, accountability, and legitimacy, at risk because the state does not have full control over the service, and hence, over the outcomes. The services analysed within this thesis all require active input from the citizens and it was shown how the state has used different strategies to engage citizens, invoking their intrinsic or extrinsic motivations. In order to keep people involved in service co-production, the state can find ways to engage people who want to participate out of free choice, or who feel compelled to do so as ‘good citizens’. Lastly, there are people who are coerced into co-production as a prerequisite for other services or benefits. By actively involving citizens in service co-production as a pre-requisite for something else could have the positive side-effect of familiarising citizens with giving something back to their community, and that can have longer-term effects both for the specific citizen as well as the community and society as a whole. No matter the service or its format, citizens can give valuable input only if they have the necessary knowledge, skills, and means to do so and this is where public service organisations need to be able to provide necessary trainings and on-going support to citizens.

Considering the aforementioned findings, the main argument developed in the thesis is that for public service co-production to work, trust, personal relationships, and citizens’ intrinsic and extrinsic motivation to contribute their time and energy are key

and should be nourished, especially with reluctant service co-producers. Often, reluctance occurs with such services that are important from the standpoint of social cohesion, public safety, and personal wellbeing. Therefore, public service organisations can and should combine choice, coercion and compulsion strategies to entice people to co-produce services. Not only because it can lead to better service outcomes, but being involved in co-production is beneficial for the participants, irrespective of the outcomes of the service. It can improve citizen engagement and social cohesion. With reluctant citizens who often lack trust in the government and feel ill-motivated to contribute to social aims, a well-designed service process and support during co-production can result in good personal and societal outcomes. This is why attention needs to be paid to the smoothness, effectiveness, efficiency, and suitability of the co-production process. Understanding the human factor in all of this is central to designing and implementing services that are necessary, accessible, egalitarian, functional, and responsive to citizens' needs. Appreciating those mechanisms helps to make better decisions about service design, citizen engagement, implementation practices, leading to better service quality, satisfaction, and effectiveness. As an additional feature in service co-production, digitalisation is playing an increasingly prominent role in all phases of the service co-production cycle, starting from ideation and planning through to implementation and evaluation. Because of the advances in digital technology, it is paramount not to underestimate the possible negative impact digitalisation can have on service co-production and the roles citizens and professional service providers play in the process.

Lühikokkuvõte

Tõrksus avalike teenuste koosloomes: mikrotasandi dünaamikad

Avalike teenuste koosloome mõistet on kasutatud avaliku sektori organisatsioonide ja kodanike vahelistes suhetes toimunud muutuste kirjeldamiseks. Koosloome põhiidee seisneb selles, et avalikke teenuseid luuakse koostöös kodanike ja kogukondadega, mitte ei osutata pelgalt avaliku sektori spetsialistide poolt. Kodanikest saavad avalike teenuste koosloojad, kui nad panustavad oma ideid, aega, oskusi ja muid ressursse teenusloome protsessi. Seetõttu võib öelda, et avalike teenuste osutamine on mitmetahuline ja suhetest läbipõimunud protsess, kus lõppkasutajate kaasamine on teenuste lahutamatu osa. Vaadates teenusekasutaja tähtsuse kasvu teenuseprotsessis, on selge, et suur osa avalike teenuste tulemuslikkusest sõltub kodanike aktiivsest osalusest ja panusest. Avaliku sektori organisatsioonide põhiülesandeks on kaasata, toetada ja motiveerida kasutajaid looma ise sisu ja lahendusi avalikele probleemidele, suurendades sellega avalike teenuste tõhusust.

Uurimaks avalike teenuste koosloome keerukust, keskenduti doktoritöös sellele, millist rolli mängivad teenusprotsessi kaasamisel koosloomes osalevate inimeste vaba valik, survestamine ja sund. Enamasti on nii kodanikel kui ka teenusepakujatel olemas sisemine motivatsioon avalike teenuste koosloomes osaleda. Samas on terve hulk teenuseid, milles osalemiseks on kodanike motivatsioon kas madal või puudub üldse, eriti kui koosloome protsess on kuidagi väliselt peale surutud. On palju elutähtsaid avalikke teenuseid, nagu taastava õiguse teenused või kinnipeetavate taasühiskonnastamine, mille puhul teenusekasutajad esmapilgul ei soovi koosloomes osaleda, kuid kus esialgse vastumeelsuse ületamine ja kaasamise suurendamine võib kaasa tuua hüppe nii teenuse kvaliteedis kui ka laiemas ühiskondlikus kasus. Seetõttu on oluline mõista just selliste teenuste koosloome aluseks olevat dünaamikat. Seda spetsiifilist uurimislünka silmas pidades on doktoritöö fookuses nende teenuste koosloome, kus kodanikud on tõrksad kaasa lööma, sest teenuses osalemine on neile kohustuslik, sellest sõltuvad neile määratud sotsiaaltoetused või on asi lihtsalt selles, et konkreetse teenuse formaat ei toeta täielikult teenuse aluspõhimõtteid.

Nendesse protsessidesse süvenemiseks uuris autor, kuidas avaliku sektori põhimõtted, nagu formaliseerimine, standardiseerimine ja võrdsuse poole püüdlemine, võivad kõrvuti eksisteerida individuaalse lähenemise ja kasutajast lähtuva teenusedisainiga endiste kinnipeetavate taasühiskonnastamise teenuste koosloomes; milline on vabatahtlike ja riigi vaheliste suhete olemus ning kuidas see mõjutab vabatahtlike motivatsiooni ja omakorda avalike teenuste koosloomet töötutele suunatud teenuste ning politsei- ja päästeteenuste puhul; ning mis juhtub taastava õiguse teenuste koosloomega, kui avalike teenuste kujundamist ja osutamist hakkab mõjutama digitaliseerimine. Nende juhtumianalüüside kaudu paraneb arusaam vastumeelsest osalemisest teenuste koosloomes, selle mikrotasandi dünaamikast ja eelkõige sellest, kuidas inimesed otsustavad teenuste koosloomes osaleda. Viimase puhul arutletakse valiku-surve-sunni skaala üle, mis inimesi koosloomesse toob. Konkreetsemalt näidatakse doktoritöös, kuidas riik võib avalike teenuste koosloomes panustada kodanike sisemisele healolele, solidaarsustundele ja aktsepteeritud normatiivsetele väärtustele või kasutada sanktsioone ja materiaalseid hüvesid, et suunata inimeste käitumist. Doktoritöös täheldati ka, et mõnikord ei ole vastumeelsus avalike teenuste

koosloomes osalemise suhtes tingitud mitte niivõrd teenuse sisust, vaid pigem selle formaadist. Täpsemalt näidati, kuidas digitaalsed kanalid võivad muuta muidu vajaliku ja kasuliku teenuse kvaliteeti. Kuigi on autoreid, kes väidavad, et koosloome on iga teenuse loomupärane tunnus, kasutatakse käesolevas doktoritöös valiku-surve-sunni skaalat, et pakkuda nüansirikkamat arusaama sellest, kuidas kodanikud teevad aktiivse või vähemalt teadliku valiku avalike teenuste koosloome osas. Oluline on märkida, et käesolevas töös on fookus taotluslikult üksikisikutel, mitte organisatsioonidel, kes osalevad teenuste koosloomes. Kuigi teenuste koosloomet võib vaadelda ka kui suhet kodanikuorganisatsioonide ja valitsuse vahel või kui valitsemismehhanismi laiemas tähenduses, keskendutakse selles töös koosloomele üksikisiku tasandil.

Lähtudes käesoleva doktoritöö publikatsioonides esitatud uurimisküsimustest, kasutati nelja peamist andmekogumismeetodit. Esiteks rakendati otsest vaatlust, sest see võimaldas uurida inimesi nende tavakeskkonnas ja mõista uuritavaid nähtusi nende vaatenurgast. Vaatluse peamine tugevus seisneb selles, et see võimaldab selgitada lahknevusi inimeste intervjuudes öeldu ja tegeliku olukorra vahel. Teiseks kasutati poolstruktureeritud süvaintervjuusid, et paremini mõista intervjuueeritavate arusaamasid seoses kirjeldatud nähtuste tähenduse tõlgendamisega. Selle meetodi tugevus põhineb intervjuueerija ja vastajate vahelisel paindlikkusel ja tundlikumal suhtlusel, mis võimaldab uurida tähendusi, käsitleda teemasid mitmest vaatenurgast ja vajadusel selgitada vastajatele küsimusi. Kolmanda meetodina olid kasutusel fookusgrupi intervjuud, et saada parem ülevaade osalejate kogemustest ja uskumustest ning täpsustada vaatluse ja intervjuude abil kogutud andmeid. Neljandaks kasutati dokumendianalüüsi, et täiendada ja võimaluse korral vaidlustada eelmiste etappide tulemusi.

Dokoritöö raames läbi viidud uuringud näitasid, et avalike teenuste koosloomes osalemist mõjutavad ühelt poolt individuaalsed suhted, motivatsioon ja usaldus, mis on suuresti valitsuse otsese kontrolli alt väljas, kuid teiselt poolt mängib riik olulist rolli võimaldajana, pakkudes paindlikku lähenemist teenuste kujundamisele ja rakendamisele. Sedalaadi paindlikkuse hind on siiski kõrge, sest see tähendab, et iga teenus on sama hea või toimiv kui kodanike panus sellesse. See võib seada ohtu sellised avaliku sektori väärtused nagu võrdsus, vastutus ja legitiimsus, sest riigil ei ole täielikku kontrolli teenuse sisu ja seega ka selle tulemuste üle. Kõigi käesolevas töös analüüsitud teenuste puhul oli vajalik kodanike aktiivne panus. Töös näidati, kuidas riik on kasutanud erinevaid strateegiaid kodanike kaasamiseks, panustades nende sisemisele või välisele motivatsioonile. Selleks, et inimesed panustaksid teenuste koosloomesse, saab riik leida erinevaid viise, kaasamaks neid, kes soovivad osaleda vabast tahtest või kes tunnevad end „hea kodanikuna“ selleks kohustatud olevat. Lõpuks on ka inimesi, keda nõ sunnitakse koosloomes osalema muude teenuste või hüvitiste saamise eeltingimusena. Sel viisil kodanikke teenuste koosloomesse kaasamisel võib olla positiivne kõrvalmõju – kodanikud õpivad midagi oma kogukonnale tagasi andma ning sellel võib olla pikemaajaline mõju nii konkreetsele kodanikule kui ka kogukonnale ja ühiskonnale tervikuna. Sõltumata teenusest või selle formaadist saavad kodanikud anda väärtusliku panuse ainult siis, kui neil on selleks vajalikud teadmised, oskused ja vahendid, ning siinkohal peavad avalikke teenuseid osutavad organisatsioonid suutma pakkuda kodanikele vajalikke koolitusi ja järjepidevat toetust.

Võttes arvesse eespool nimetatud tulemusi, on doktoritöö peamine argument, et avalike teenuste koosloome toimimiseks on keskne tähtsus usaldusel, isiklikel suhetel ning kodanike sisemisel ja välisel motivatsioonil panustada oma aega ja energiat. Eelkõige tuleks toetada tõrksaid teenuste koosloojaid, sest sageli esineb vastumeelsus

just teenuste puhul, mis on olulised sotsiaalse ühtekuuluvuse, avaliku turvalisuse ja isikliku heaolu seisukohast. Seetõttu võivad ja peaksid avalike teenuste pakkujad kombineerima valiku-, kohustus- ja sundimisstrateegiaid, et meelitada inimesi teenuste koostoomesse. Mitte ainult sellepärast, et see võib viia paremate tulemustega teenusteni, vaid ka seetõttu, et koostoomes osalemine on osalejatele kasulik sõltumata teenuse tulemustest. See võib parandada kodanike kaasatust ja sotsiaalset ühtekuuluvust. Tõrksate kodanike puhul, kellel puudub sageli usaldus valitsuse vastu ja kes pole motiveeritud sotsiaalsete eesmärkide saavutamisele kaasa aitama, võib hästi kavandatud teenuse osutamise protsess ja aktiivne toetus koostoomes osalemiseks anda häid isiklikke ja ühiskondlikke tulemusi. Seetõttu tuleb tähelepanu pöörata koostoomes protsessi sujuvusele, tõhususele, tulemuslikkusele ja sobivusele. Inimteguri mõistmine on kõige selle juures võtmetähtsusega, et kavandada ja rakendada teenuseid, mis on vajalikud, kättesaadavad, võrdsed, funktsionaalsed ja kodanike vajadustele vastavad. Nende mehhanismide väärtustamine aitab teha paremaid otsuseid teenuste disaini, kodanike kaasamise ja rakendustavade osas ning võimaldab parandada teenuste kvaliteeti ja tõhusust ning teenustega rahulolu. Teenuste koostoomes lisafunktsioonina mängib digitaliseerimine üha olulisemat rolli kõigis teenuste koostoometsükli etappides alates ideede väljatöötamisest ja kavandamisest kuni rakendamise ja hindamiseni. Digitaal tehnoloogia arengu tõttu on äärmiselt oluline mitte alahinnata võimalikku negatiivset mõju, mida digitaliseerimine võib avaldada teenuste koostoomele ning kodanike ja professionaalsete teenuseosutajate rollile selles protsessis.

Appendix: Publications I-III

Publication I

Surva, L., Tõnurist, P., & Lember, V. (2016). Co-Production in a Network Setting: Providing an Alternative to the National Probation Service. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 39:13, 1031–1043, DOI: 10.1080/01900692.2016.1193752. (1.1)

Publication II

Tõnuri, P., & Surva, L. (2017). Is Volunteering Always Voluntary? Between Compulsion and Coercion in Co-production. *Voluntas*, 28:1, 223–247, DOI 10.1007/s11266-016-9734-z. (1.1)

Publication III

Surva, L. (2022). Maintaining the Ideals of co-Production During Rapid Digitalisation: Comparative Case-Study of Digital Restorative Services in Estonia, Finland, Ireland and Portugal. *Voluntas*, DOI: 10.1007/s11266-022-00502-6. (1.1)

Curriculum vitae

Laidi Surva

Personal data

Date of birth: 22.04.1983
Place of birth: Tallinn, Estonia
Citizenship: Estonian

Contact data

E-mail: survalaidi@gmail.com

Education

09/2011 – 10/2023 Tallinn University of Technology, Faculty of Social Sciences, Ragnar Nurkse School of Innovation and Governance, PhD studies (Reluctant Co-Producers of Public Services: Understanding Micro-Level Dynamics)

09/2005 – 06/2009 Tartu University, Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of State Sciences, Master's degree (June 2009, Tartu). Master thesis: Developing Volunteering on Three Levels: Society, Organisation and Individual

09/2002 – 06/2005 Tartu University, Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of State Sciences, Bachelor's degree (May 2005, Tartu). Bachelor thesis: Change Management in the Context of Administrative Reform: Amalgamation of Rapla City Government and Rapla Municipal Government)

Language competence

Estonian: Native language
English: Proficient
Finnish: Fluent
German: Beginner
Russian: Beginner

Professional employment

02/2023 – Ministry of Justice Estonia, Department of Criminal Policy, Division of Analysis, Team Lead (Youth Justice Reform and Restorative Justice)

09/2022 – 01/2023 Ministry of Foreign Affairs Estonia, Economic Diplomacy Department, Development Division, Project Manager (part-time)

10/2018 – 01/2023	Ministry of Justice Estonia, Department of Criminal Policy, Division of Analysis, Project Manager
05/2016 – 09/2018	EUAM Ukraine, CSSR Component, Lead Adviser on Good Governance
05/2015 – 04/2016	EUAM Ukraine, Strategic Advisory Component, Good Governance Advisory Unit, Strategic Administration Reform Advisor
03/2014 – 05/2015	Ministry of Justice Estonia, Department of Criminal Policy, Division of Analysis, Programme Coordinator for Prisoner Re-Integration (European Social Funds)
11/2009 – 03/2014	Ministry of Justice Estonia, Department of Criminal Policy, Division of Analysis, Advisor
02/2010 – 06/2010	Tartu University, Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of State Sciences, leading seminars
10/2009 – 12/2009	Tartu University, Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of State Sciences, lecturer

Supervised theses

2015	Marten Lauri, Master's Thesis From Co-operation to Co-creation: Partnership between Local Government Units and Community Organizations: The Case of Tallinn <i>Tallinn University of Technology (TalTech), Ragnar Nurkse Department of Innovation and Governance</i>
2015	Katti Mägi, Master's Thesis The Implementation of Voluntary Principles in Internal Security <i>Tallinn University of Technology (TalTech), Ragnar Nurkse Department of Innovation and Governance</i>
2015	Stina Raudsik, Bachelor's Thesis Involvement of youth councils in the decision-making process of local governments: case of Tartu City Government <i>Tallinn University of Technology (TalTech), Ragnar Nurkse Department of Innovation and Governance</i>

- 2013 Käthe-Riin Tull, Bachelor's Thesis
The Role of Different Interest Groups in Political Decision-Making Process: Based on Draft Legislation of The Republic of Estonia Law on Education
University of Tartu, Institute of State Sciences (Johan Skytte Institute of Political Studies)
- 2012 Kuno Tammearu, Master's Thesis
The State's Activities in Ensuring the Sustainability of Volunteer Rescue Brigades
Tallinn University of Technology (TalTech), Ragnar Nurkse Department of Innovation and Governance
- 2012 Alari Saega, Bachelor's Thesis
Possible Membership Policy for Voluntary Military Organizations: Kaitseliit member's voluntary or paid activities
Tallinn University of Technology (TalTech), Ragnar Nurkse Department of Innovation and Governance

Scientific projects

Article II was funded by the European Commission Seventh Framework Programme (Grant Number 320090) and Estonian Science Fund (Grant Numbers ETF9395, IUT19-13).

Elulookirjeldus

Laidi Surva

Isikuandmed

Sünniaeg: 22.04.1983
Sünnikoht: Tallinn, Eesti
Kodakondsus: Eesti

Kontaktandmed

E-post: survalaidi@gmail.com

Hariduskäik

09/2011 – 10/2023 Tallinna Tehnikaülikool, sotsiaalteaduskond, Ragnar Nurkse innovatsiooni ja valitsemise instituut, doktorantuur (Tõrksus avalike teenuste koostöös: mikrotasandi dünaamikad)

09/2005 – 06/2009 Tartu Ülikool, sotsiaalteaduskond, riigiteaduste instituut, magistrakraad avalikus halduses ("Vabatahtliku tegevuse arendamine kolmel tasandil: ühiskond. Organisatsioon. Indiviid")

09/2002 – 06/2005 Tartu Ülikool, sotsiaalteaduskond, riigiteaduste eriala, bakalaureuse kraad riigiteadustes ("Muutuste juhtimine haldusreformi kontekstis: Rapla linna ja valla ühinemine")

Keelteoskus

Eesti keel emakeel
Inglise keel kõrgtase
Soome keel kesktase
Vene keel algtase
Saksa keel algtase

Teenistuskäik

02/2023 – Justiitsministeerium, kriminaalpoliitika osakond, analüüsitalitus, tiimijuht (nooresõbralik õigussüsteem ja taastav õigus)

09/2022 – 01/2023 Välisministeerium, majandusdiplomaatia osakond, majandusdiplomaatia arendusbüroo, projektijuht (osaajaga)

10/2018 – 01/2023	Justiitsministeerium, kriminaalpoliitika osakond, analüüsitalitus, projektijuht
05/2016 – 09/2018	Välismissioon EUAM Ukraine, strateegilise nõuande komponent, hea haldustava juhtivnõunik
05/2015 – 04/2016	Välismissioon EUAM Ukraine, strateegilise nõuande komponent, hea haldustava üksus, strateegilise haldusreformi nõunik
03/2014 – 05/2015	Justiitsministeerium, kriminaalpoliitika osakond, analüüsitalitus, projektijuht
11/2009 – 03/2014	Justiitsministeerium, kriminaalpoliitika osakond, analüüsitalitus, nõunik
02/2010 – 06/2010	Tartu Ülikool, riigiteaduste instituut, seminarijuhendaja
10/2009 – 12/2009	Tartu Ülikool, riigiteaduste instituut, lektor

Juhendatud lõputööd

2015	Marten Lauri, magistritöö Koostööst koosloomeni: kohaliku omavalitsuse ja asumiseltside koostöö Tallinna linna näitel <i>Tallinna Tehnikaülikool, Ragnar Nurkse innovatsiooni ja valitsemise instituut</i>
2015	Katti Mägi, magistritöö Vabatahtlikkuse printsiipide rakendamine sisejulgeoleku valdkonnas <i>Tallinna Tehnikaülikool, Ragnar Nurkse innovatsiooni ja valitsemise instituut</i>
2015	Stina Raudsik, bakalaureusetöö Noortevolikogude kaasamine kohalike omavalituste otsustusprotsessides Tartu Linnavalitsuse näitel <i>Tallinna Tehnikaülikool, Ragnar Nurkse innovatsiooni ja valitsemise instituut</i>
2013	Käthe-Riin Tull, bakalaureusetöö Huvigruppide kaasamine poliitilistesse otsustusprotsessidesse: haridusseaduse eelnõude analüüsi näitel Eestis <i>Tartu Ülikool, riigiteaduste instituut (Johan Skytte poliitikauuringute instituut)</i>

- 2012 Kuno Tammearu, magistritöö
Riigi tegevus vabatahtlike päästekomandode jätkusuutlikkuse tagamisel
Tallinna Tehnikaülikool, Ragnar Nurkse innovatsiooni ja valitsemise instituut
- 2012 Alari Saega, bakalaureusetöö
Vabatahtlikult korraldatud sõjaväeliste organisatsioonide võimalik liikmepoliitika: kaitseliidu tegevliikme vabatahtlik või tasustatud tegevus
Tallinna Tehnikaülikool, Ragnar Nurkse innovatsiooni ja valitsemise instituut

Teadusprojektid

II artikli rahastajateks olid Euroopa Komisjon (*Seventh Framework Programme (FP7)*, toetuse number 320090) ja Eesti Teadusagentuur (toetuse number ETF9395, IUT19-13).