

Robert Gawłowski

## Co-production as a tool for realisation of public services

### Abstract

*Objective:* New public governance is one of the most popular paradigms in public administration management. The aim of this article is to examine the co-production of public services, which is gaining interest in many European countries, including Poland, and to find out how co-production is defined, what the reasons to pay attention to this tool are, how we can distinguish between different models of co-production and, last but not least, what the possibilities and drawbacks of introducing it into practice are.

*Research Design & Methods:* The article is a literature review based on the most important public management journals.

*Findings:* In conclusion, the author shows new ways of defining co-production and presents a proposal for further research strategies for the co-production of public services.

*Implications / Recommendations:* The meaning of co-production of public services has varied over the last few years due to the fact that various new elements have emerged. Therefore there is still a huge field, to cover such as conducting research about the use of social media in the co-production of public services.

*Contribution / Value Added:* The most recent literature review about co-production was conducted by Vooberg in 2014. As a result, this article refreshes the knowledge about it and proposes a new research agenda for the future.

*Article Classification:* Theoretical article: original literature review

*Keywords:* public management, public policy, co-production, public governance, social participation

*JEL classification:* R50

### Introduction

Bocianowo is one of the oldest districts of Bydgoszcz. A few months ago, citizens from this part of the city decided that they would voluntarily spend their private money for a public purpose: building a new road. Why did they do that? What prompted them to engage and take part in the delivery of public services?

Over recent decades public administration has undergone dynamic changes regarding public

management. It has been influenced by such factors as the digital revolution, the crisis in the public finance sector, the new role of the citizen in relation to the public administration authorities, as well as the development of new forms of social participation. As a result of these phenomena, one can observe the crisis of traditional public management practices related to Weberian administration, the introduction of new public management tools, and then, within the aforementioned limits of management, the growing popularity of new public management and neo-Weberian bureaucracy (Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2011; Mazur, 2018; Sześciło, 2017). As a consequence, as J. Hausner observed, ‘the modern social order contains components of various orders, enabling different mechanisms

---

Robert Gawłowski  
WSB University in Toruń  
Department of Finance and Management in Bydgoszcz  
ul. Fordońska 74  
85-719 Bydgoszcz  
robert.gawlowski@wsb.bydgoszcz.pl

of co-ordination to be activated (...) This broadens the repertoire of means of action and coordination mechanisms, which can be used by various types of subjects' (Hausner, 2015). But there are more and more of them. Therefore governing management becomes more difficult. New public governance proves inevitable (Mazur, 2015, pp. 17-18). At the same time, the paradigm of new public governance should not be treated as the ultimate answer to the problems and challenges of public administration management. Nevertheless, it does provide the basis for a contextual search for tools and methods of delivering public services which will ensure, on the one hand, the efficiency and effectiveness of their realisation, and, on the other hand, that using these tools will be effective by taking into consideration social needs and the accepted methods of their delivery. One such tool is the co-production of public services, which, despite being first noted in the 1970s (Ostrom & Ostrom, 1971), is now undergoing a renaissance in many European countries. When it comes to the Polish perspective we can pick out two different types of co-production of public services. The first one is the Solecki Fund, which is run according to the Solecki Fund Act. There are a few features that distinguish this tool: it is regulated by law and can be used only by rural entities; the Fund is a sum of money separated from the local budget and earmarked for activities which improve residents' living conditions; some of the amounts obtained from a Solecki Fund are reimbursed by the central budget. From data published by the Ministry of Public Administration and Interior Affairs we can see that the number of municipalities which decided to start a Solecki Fund has increased. Between 2013 and 2016 one can detect a noticeable difference when it comes to the popularity of this tool and nowadays almost 60% of eligible local governments make use of this co-production tool.

The main co-production tool in Poland are Local Initiatives, as referred to in Chapter 2a in the Act on Public Benefits and Voluntary Activities, which regulates relationships between the public administration (central and self-governments),

NGOs and local communities. We can define it as an initiative for preparing and appointing groups of people who propose to deliver public goods or services to local governments. When it comes to the implementation of Local Initiatives in major Polish cities covered by the Union of Polish Metropolis we can say that the number of local initiatives has increased and between 2014 and 2016 there were 280 local initiatives (Gawłowski, 2018).

## Material and methods

The aim of this article is to present theoretical considerations regarding the co-production of public services and to distinguish between the most important categories in terms of co-production based on the most frequently cited articles. The most recent systematic review of co-production and co-creation was prepared in 2014 (Voorberg *et al.*, 2014) and was focused on articles and books which were published between 1987 and 2013. The author firmly believes that this kind of research is important, due to the fact that, despite the growing body of empirical research, co-production continues to be poorly formulated and has become one of a series of 'woolly-words' in public policy (Osborne *et al.*, 2016). In this article the author assesses whether any new elements have appeared in terms of the objectives of co-production, addresses the factors which influence the co-production process with citizens and, last but not least, looks at the outcomes of co-production process. This article consists of four parts. The first one presents the reasons for renewed interest in the co-production of public services. Were they economic or other reasons? This is the most important question that has been answered. The second part shows the way in which to define the phenomenon of co-production; this will allow us to identify the most important characteristics that, in the opinion of researchers, make up co-production. The third part presents the most important models: on what basis can one distinguish between the different types of co-production and

what are the differentiating factors? Finally, the last part looks at the factors that facilitate or inhibit the implementation of a particular tool of public management. In pursuit of that the following research questions can be asked:

RQ1: *What are the factors which influence the co-production of public services and have new one appeared over the last few years?*

RQ2: *How can co-production of public services be defined?*

RQ3: *What are the opportunities and threats for co-production and how have those changed over the last few years?*

The article has been based on an analysis of articles about the co-production of public services which were published between 2000 and 2018 in such journals as the *International Journal of Public Administration*, the *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, *Public Administration Review*, the *Journal of Social Policy and Public Management Review*, as well as monographs by experts on co-production such as J. Alford, J. Thomas, T. Bovaird and E. Loeffler. In total 30 publications were used.

## Literature review and theory development

Co-production of public services: the reasons for renewed interest

The idea of co-production of public services, known also as co-creation, is nothing new in the debate about public management. Its origins date back to the 1970s, when research work was carried out at the Indiana University under the management of Elinor Ostrom on why crime statistics were systematically growing in the United States (despite the police being equipped with cars and other technical equipment), and why the police were defenceless during the riots in 1968. That research led to the conclusion that in order to ensure safety in local environments it had to be

co-created by the local residents and the institutions responsible for its provision. The above-mentioned study, however, was not widely recognised and was used in other areas of public management. That was probably due to the fact that the research results were presented in a period in which the only dominant paradigm of public management was what is referred to as the 'traditional understanding of public administration'. It was based on hierarchical subordination, the realisation of administrative procedures, control and bureaucracy (Weber, 2002). Co-production returned, for a moment, to public debate due to Brudney and England, who drew attention to the outcomes of traditional public services and the limitations thereof (Brudney & England, 1983). Interest in this concept has been renewed quite recently, with the economic crisis in the first decade of the 21<sup>st</sup> century and the criticism of new public management. As Sześciło observed, the uncritical view of the market, deregulation, privatisation and similar slogans of new public management have not become an antidote to the imperfections of the state, but have revealed its inabilities. A nail in the coffin of new public management as a universal concept for the functioning of the state was the global economic crisis of recent years, the sources of which are attributed to the pathologies of the market deprived of effective and smart regulations by the state (Sześciło, 2017).

The literature suggests various reasons for renewed interest in co-production of public services. One of them was the increasing fiscal pressure put on governments in many European countries (Ciasullo *et al.*, 2017; Meijer, 2016; Bovaird *et al.*, 2015), as well as growing social expectations regarding the quality of services and their adaptation to the local needs (Ciasullo *et al.*, 2017). Moreover, some researchers pointed out that the renaissance of the idea of co-creating public services was a natural consequence of the development of the paradigm of new public governance, with which social capital, public administration co-operation with local communities and volunteerism emerged (Bovaird, 2007; Podgórnjak-Krzykacz, 2015;

Meijer, 2016). The need to rebuild trust in the public sector, which after the period of the economic crisis had reached its lowest level for years, was not without significance. As noted by Fledderus, 'reforms introduced from the perspective of co-production were aimed at rebuilding trust in public institutions by changing the way public services were delivered. This was a completely different approach compared to reforms based on the principles of new public management, which were based on the premise of rational choice and the promotion of economic efficiency' (Fledderus, 2015, p. 551). The need to take action in this area was linked to declining trust in public institutions in almost all countries. Moreover, it was widely believed that public officials were cynical and cared only about their own interests (Stoker, 2006). Regardless of the scope of public sector reforms, a constant trend noticeable in all European countries was the move away from the relieving logic characteristics of top-down management towards the enabling logic presented as open to bottom-up impulses, of which co-production of public services was a part of (Bovaird, 2007; Witte & Geys, 2013). According to Meijer, the example of co-production of public services is the best example of how the social contract between citizens and politicians has changed over recent years. In the traditional sense of public management, citizens engaged only during the election period. The possibilities offered by modern technologies, including social media, have made public management an activity based on permanent co-operation between politicians and service recipients (Meijer, 2016). Therefore the return to the idea of co-production of public services is the result of a total change in the field of public management. It is manifested in the need to take into consideration the interests of a much greater number of social groups, communities and organisations than a few decades ago. Therefore, public service managers must understand the diversity of recipients, who can assume the role of a citizen, customer or partner in contact with

public administration, and skilfully manage those relationships (Thomas, 2012). This task becomes even more important as the public sector faces the challenges of climate change, the fight against social inequalities and the demand for electricity. The 'wicked problems' can be defined as a complex, intractable, open-ended and unpredictable issues and none of them will be solved single-handed – by the public sector alone – but only in co-operation with representatives of other sectors. As Alford pointed out, the body of concepts surrounding wicked and ill-structured problems has served to draw attention to complexity in social, natural and political processes, as well as to alert us to their indefinability, intractability and entanglements (Alford & Head, 2017). In this context the co-production of services seems to be an excellent tool to support such activities. The involvement of citizens, apart from the obvious financial benefits, is also seen as a potential element for innovation in public management, as it introduces new insights into the possibilities for the performance of public tasks. For this reason, co-production of services has been identified by some public administration researchers as an innovation tool (Fugini *et al.*, 2016; Voorberg, 2017).

The above-mentioned reasons for renewed interest in co-production of public services allow us to distinguish between two groups of arguments. The first is of a financial and organisational nature and concerns the growing fiscal pressure put on governments and the need to look for new ways of organising and delivering public services. Alongside them, a second group of reasons is important, which is based on changing the expectations of citizens and opportunities involving participation in public management. The best example of this is the technological revolution that has completely transformed the relationship between public administration and citizens by opening up new ways of communication, control and participation in the public decision-making process.

## What is co-production of public services and what types of it are there?

The above-mentioned phenomena have become the basis for a search for new forms of realisation of public services in many European countries. Co-production was a perfect response to this demand because it meant, on the one hand, the alignment of public administration activities with the needs of the recipients thereof and, on the other hand, it solved the problem of financial pressure so important in the public sector. How was this tool of public services management attempted to be defined? According to Alford (Alford, 2009), it was important to draw attention to the conduct of non-public subjects undertaken jointly with public institutions on a voluntary basis and characterised by intentional action to produce public value. In turn, Ciasullo, Palumbo and Troisi emphasised the need for the public sector to inspire the activities taken by the citizens themselves to release the available resources in order to generate public wealth (Ciasullo *et al.*, 2017). When analysing the issues of definition, it is also worth noting the element of time invested: co-production is characterised as a long-term relationship in which each party engages its resources to improve or create a public service altogether. In this approach there is an element of a continuum rather than a mere incidental and often one-off engagement (Podógniak-Krzykacz, 2015). Thus the co-production of public services cannot be understood only as a process of participation which is based on the exchange of information and the submission of ideas (Loeffler & Bovaird, 2016a). Hence co-production is a tool of public management that fundamentally transforms and reorganises the relationship between citizens and public administration, which changes the way such concepts as responsibility for the tasks performed, transparency and quality of services are understood (Meijer, 2016). Going forward, it can be said that, in terms of co-production, public services do not only involve public administration activity selected by means of political choices, but

are an element of interaction, co-operation and co-creation of services organised by a network of subjects representing various sectors of activity (Virtanen & Stenvall, 2014). Consequently, a special type of agreement and co-operation for the creation of public services is needed, whereby the expected outcome of co-operation that goes beyond the standard realisation of public services is an element motivating to act (Fledderus, 2015). When analysing co-production, Sześciło drew attention to three pillars that constitute this way of provision of public services. It is the participation in which the co-decision process takes place, public and private resources are mixed, which blurs the rigid division into administration as service provider and citizen as recipient and customer of the public service system. There is also lack of focus on profit on the part of the participants, which distinguishes the non-commercial nature of co-production (Sześciło, 2015a). Therefore it is particularly important to motivate citizens to engage in the provision of public services. On the basis of research carried out in Belgian and Dutch local government units by Carol van Eijk, Trui Steen and Bram Verschuere, two main groups of factors taken into consideration by citizens can be identified. The first is related to normative motivations, i.e. the perception of one's own commitment in the perspective of necessity or even obligation regarding an activity resulting from the fact of being a citizen and a member of the local community. On the other hand, the second group of factors results from perceiving one's own benefit. This can be an outcome of current problems in the neighbourhood or area of domicile. In this case the co-operation is transactional and is seen as part of the 'investment' (Eijk *et al.*, 2017).

What is worth considering is that co-production has been mostly associated with public service organisations. This means that researchers have focused mainly on organisational and human resources. However, there is growing tendency to join co-production with value co-creation. As Osborne pointed out, when we go to the restaurant we are not only focused on the quality of the meal

itself but also the ambience of the restaurant. This insight is fundamental to understanding the process and importance of co-production for service delivery (Osborne *et al.*, 2016). However, practical aspects of the implementation of co-production may differ, due to the policy, political and economic context in which services are set. As Farr pointed out, these issues have important implications for service provision and the experiences and value that service users can derive from public services (Farr, 2016).

Based on the above, it can be said that co-production is a particular type of co-operation between the public sector and representatives of the private sector or non-governmental sector inspired by bottom-up action for the provision of public services, which is of a long-term nature and results in the creation of public goods beyond the standard activities of public administration. Therefore co-production does not involve the commissioning of public tasks in the form of outsourcing of public services or competitions for non-governmental organisations. It should also not be seen as a one-off co-decision process in which the exchange or submission of ideas occurs. The key element is the voluntary (bottom-up) willingness to engage resources (financial, material, own time, knowledge) for the provision of public services, which is then backed up by public administration. Thus, the co-production of public services is completely different from the traditionally understood public administration, whose main task has so far been to plan and deliver public services to the citizens. Even the change of thinking about public management in the spirit of new public management has not changed this assumption. It was up to the politicians and officials to choose whether they would perform services by themselves or whether they would use other tools, such as outsourcing, commissioning the tasks from outside subjects or privatising them. The dilemma of whether to row or steer (Osborne & Geabler, 1993) has only been transformed into a paradigm of governance, in which citizens have been involved already at the stage of designing

the service, and not, as has been the case to date, at the stage of planning and delivering the services.

This way of understanding co-production is classified in several ways. The first one distinguishes between various types of co-production based on the significance of the third sector in the process of realisation of public services. On this basis, the following are can be picked out: (1) co-governance, understood as the involvement of a third sector in planning and providing public services; (2) new public governance, i.e. the co-operation of a third sector with public administration in the production of public services; and (3) co-production as independent production of public services by citizens and with some public sector support (Brandsen & Pestoff, 2014).

By combining the perspective of administration sciences and management science, Osborne and Strokosch proposed to distinguish between such types of co-production of public services as: (1) co-production of consumers, which is reduced to the provision of services at the operational level by their direct customers; (2) participation co-production, involving co-designing, co-planning and co-provision of a service; and (3) design co-production based on the involvement of citizens in the public services innovation process at the design stage (Osborne & Strokosch, 2013). Thus the process involves increasingly sophisticated forms of co-operation between citizens and public administration. At this point it is worth emphasising one more significant specifics of public services delivered by public administration that undoubtedly distinguishes them from the production of goods delivered by private companies. Public services always arise within the relationship between the producer and the consumer. The separation of those subjects is virtually impossible. It is difficult to imagine the public education service without a teacher–student relationship or health service without a doctor–patient relationship. Hence the dynamics of these relationships have a great impact on the quality of service. This cannot be said in the case of a product manufacturer, in which the relationship between the producer

and the consumer may not exist at all. Therefore, each part of production – from the beginning (the production process) to the end (the consumption of the product) – can be scrutinised and managed separately. This kind of public service logic shows that co-production cannot be viewed as something to be added to ‘traditional’ public service delivery (Radnor *et al.*, 2014). In fact, it offers a completely different point of view about the role of public administration as a producer of public services.

A slightly different view on the classification of co-production may be seen from the legal perspective. Here the organisation, funding, direct provision and, in the end, control and evaluation are of key importance to the delivery of public services. This view is a typical approach for administration sciences. As noted by Sześciło, ‘the idea of co-production influences the process of providing public services at every stage, whereby the fundamental change is in the sphere of direct provision. Co-production takes the most specific institutional and procedural forms’ (Sześciło, 2015b, p. 291). Nevertheless, the states, and in the case of co-production – most often local government units, have the obligation to provide the services and finance them. The activity of residents conducted, for example, as part of the local initiative, allows a reduction of their costs and for them to be adapted to the needs of the local community.

The most common classification in the literature, proposed by Bovaird and Loeffler (2016b), is commonly referred to as the four Cs (from the first letters of the English words). On this basis, the following are distinguished between: (1) co-commissioning of services, which involves co-operation in choosing the best service; (2) co-design used for the preparation for the provision of public services; (3) co-delivery, manifested in co-operation of residents and local administration for the provision of services; and (4) co-assessment, i.e. the use of expertise and experience of public service users in the evaluation process.

The above-mentioned classifications enable us to draw the conclusion that there are two main references on the basis of which different

co-production models are differentiated. The first one is the question of the different phases of provision of public services. It is most often used by representatives of public administration and management sciences. In this way of thinking the researcher mostly pointed out the importance of the relationship between public administration (the producer) and citizens (the receivers). Therefore such elements as citizens’ engagement and willingness to co-produce are very much to the fore. In turn, the second one refers to public policy. This view is more often used by representatives of political sciences and draws attention to the question of individual phases of realisation of public policy (e.g. Zdybała, 2012) and therefore the very important elements are potential outcomes or decision-making process. Based on the above-presented classification, the scope of co-production is very wide. The only restriction on the use of co-production can be legal provisions that will impose barriers on its use.

## Discussion

The co-creation of public services on the principles outlined above seems to have obvious advantages. They manifest themselves in promoting active citizenship attitudes, strengthening social capital among local residents, and restoring the naturalistic way of thinking about local government. However, there are a number of factors that will reinforce or limit the attitudes of co-operation. As pointed out by Podgórnjak-Krzykacz, the following will be of key importance: (1) involvement and trust between residents and local administration; (2) the attitude of officials, who may be open to new initiatives and actions of residents or to treat them problematically; (3) the tradition of co-operation between partners; and (4) organisational and managerial factors related to the decentralisation of tasks to the level of auxiliary units, organisational and substantive support for the submitted initiatives and the reduction of administrative barriers (Podgórnjak-Krzykacz, 2015). In turn, Loeffler and Bovaird pointed out such determinants of co-

operation as: (1) financial and organisational support for proposed initiatives; (2) problems related to finding added value of co-produced projects; (3) difficulty in convincing residents to engage in the provision of services through financial contributions; and (4) lack of competence to realise projects and co-operation of officials with residents (Loeffler & Bovaird, 2016b).

In order to understand the reasons for success of co-production, it is worth taking into consideration some non-financial and non-institutional factors. As Meijer pointed out, the tradition of involvement of the local community in co-operation with public administration will also be of key importance (Meijer, 2016). The role of social capital in the development of new public governance tools will be crucial, as it will determine the costs of control and supervision by the public administration, the attitudes of responsibility of residents towards the surrounding reality, and the participation in local and political initiatives, which will ultimately manifest itself in the social capital (Putnam, 1995). Another factor which is also worth mentioning is the competence of officials themselves, whose outcome of activity can no longer be only procedures (as was the case with the Weberian understanding of administration) or results (characteristic of new public management), but also their attitude to change. This implies the need to strengthen the competences and skills of co-operation with external partners as well as project management (Bovaird, 2007; OECD, 2011). It is not impossible that it is even necessary to appoint a special team that will deal with such projects as co-production. In turn, Alford pointed out such factors as: (1) organisational culture; (2) the specificity of creation of specific services; (3) understanding the needs of recipients of services; (4) incentives that encourage residents to co-operate; (5) organisational structure and the administration of an office; and (6) the methods for measuring effects and budgets (Alford, 2009).

Taking into consideration the above possibilities and drawbacks with regard to the development of co-production of public services, Thomas

pointed out the principles by which the public administration should be guided. These guidelines include: (1) defining in advance what support for residents may be useful with regard to co-production of services; (2) limiting the administrative requirements for subjects that will submit initiatives; (3) considering the best form of assistance (organisational, substantive, financial or other); (4) preparing organisational structures and persons involved in the realisation of co-production projects in the relevant offices; (5) co-operation with networks/organisations/residents to promote co-production; (6) building co-operation incentives; and (7) preparing indicators through which the above activities will be evaluated (Thomas, 2012). The adversities of the above activities make it possible to indicate a barrier to the development of co-production. On this basis the following can be indicated: (1) the desire to avoid risk and ambiguity in the realisation of public tasks; (2) fear of failure; (3) lack of sufficient skills on the part of officials; (4) problems in building trust on both sides; and (5) financial constraints on the part of public and non-governmental sectors (Bovaird & Loeffler, 2016a).

The above-mentioned opportunities and drawbacks with regard to the implementation of co-production of public services are very similar to the implementation of social participation tools. In both cases four aspects of co-operation need to be taken into consideration: organisational/institutional/financial issues; information; knowledge; and competence of representatives of both sectors. The shortcomings in each of them create barriers that can lead to reduced social activity.

## Conclusions

Despite a relatively long period of interest in co-production of public services, this issue remains a domain of science rather than practice. It is hard to answer why that has happened; however, the reason might be that there is still a lack of knowledge when it comes to potential barriers to co-production. Voorberg et al. pointed out that the actions to



overcome barriers were aimed at influencing elements on both the organisational side (policy that support co-production; policy entrepreneurs) and the citizens' side (lowering of the participation costs; generating a feeling of the ownership) (Voorberg *et al.*, 2014). There are no doubts that it is still too little to implement effective co-production policy in practice. Moreover, it is worth considering that it is hard to find any deepened knowledge about potential barriers to co-production in scientific literature. From the first systematic review, nothing has changed and therefore it may be an interesting postulate for further research.

In Polish literature this issue has so far been analysed to only a small extent. Except for publications by Sześciło, it is difficult to point out any authors dealing with this subject. Similarly, the tool is popular in the practice of public management in Poland and is limited to a small scale. Co-production is still considered as a non-essential form of provision of public services. Priority is given to resolving the dilemma of whether public services should be provided through tools typical for public administration or the market. Only then, with the appropriate activity of social partners, are network tools used. This article is intended to provide a cross-cutting indication of the state of scientific debate in the area of co-production of public services. Despite the different views of representatives of various scientific disciplines, many elements of analysis of co-production remain common. The components of co-creation of public services are consistent, as are the opportunities and drawbacks to provision. Certain differences can be seen in the classification of co-production. On the one hand, they depend on the research prospects and scientific categories that are of interest to researchers. On the other hand, a significant difference is the range of tools included in co-production. The *sensu largo* approach that also includes such activities as a participatory budget, to the *sensu stricto* approach, which involves the design, provision and evaluation of public services, can be seen here. However, responding to the first research question we can say that

new reasons have appeared after the publication of Voorberg *et al.* It is the financial crisis which has made co-production of public services more popular among scholar and practitioners. Therefore looking for new ways of cutting public spending and increasing the quality of public services were the main reasons for the popularity of co-production.

Regarding to the second research question, there is one element which has emerged over the last few years. Among many different elements of the definition of co-production, durability of relationships between provider (the public administration) and receiver (a non-public agent) seems to be a new one. In this way of thinking co-production is not a short, or ad hoc contact, but instead a longer-term relationship which changes mutual attitudes between partners. Another thing is that after Voorberg's review of co-production some new classifications have appeared (Voorberg *et al.*, 2014). The most important one is those introduced by Bovaird & Loeffler, who showed a different dimension of co-production (Bovaird & Loeffler, 2016a).

When it comes to the third research question, nothing can be added according to the literature review. It means that we as researchers and practitioners still do not have sufficient knowledge about tangible actions which may result in co-production development. As pointed out previously, it might be interesting to research potential barriers to co-production. So far only Bovaird and Loeffler have added this element of co-production to their research, during which they pointed out that funding and commissioning barriers may partly be a reason why co-production does not develop (Bovaird & Loeffler, 2016b). The next interesting field to cover is the question of whether there is any dark side of co-production. It can be easily imagined that changing very strict model of public service delivery may result on corruption or financial irregularities, therefore there is a point for further research.

The research postulate for further work and analysis on the phenomenon of co-production of public services is the use of IT tools in the provision

of public services and, thus, the realisation of the phenomenon of crowdsourcing on a larger than local scale. Warren, Sulaiman and Jaafar interviewed five hundred citizens and social activists on the role of social media in civic engagement and found that the use of social media by citizens increased their likelihood to participate in the public service delivery. Therefore, conducting research about co-production of public service delivery in terms of using IT, and particularly social media, might deepen knowledge about citizens' engagement and as a result start a new point of co-production public services researching.

### Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

### Funding

This work was not supported by any external source. The author takes full responsibility for the preparing and conducting of research.

### References

- Alford, J. (2009). *Engaging Public Sector Clients. From Service Delivery to Co-production*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- Alford, J., & Head, B. (2017). Wicked and less wicked problems: a typology and a contingency framework. *Policy and Society*, 36(3), 397–413.
- Brandsen, T., Steen, T., & Verschuere, B. (Eds.). (2018). *Co-production and Co-creation. Engaging Citizens in Public Services*. London: Routledge.
- Brudney, J., & England, R. (1983). Toward a definition of the coproduction concept. *Public Administration Review*, 43(1), 59–65.
- Bovaird, T. (2007). Beyond engagement and participation: User and community co-production of public services. *Public Administration Review*, 67(5), 846–860.
- Bovaird, T., & Loeffler, E. (2016a). User and community co-production of public services: What does the evidence tell us? *International Journal of Public Administration*, 39(13), 1006–1019.
- Bovaird, T., & Loeffler, E. (Eds.). (2016b). *Public Management and Governance*. New York: Routledge.
- Bovaird, T., Ryzin, G., Loeffler, E., & Parrado, S. (2015). Activating citizens to participate in collective co-production of public services. *Journal of Social Policy*, 44(1), 1–23.
- Brandsen, T., & Pestoff, V. (2014). Co-production, the third sector and the delivery of public service. *Public Management Review*, 8(4), 493–501.
- Ciasullo, M., Palumbo, R., & Troisi, O. (2017). Reading public service co-production through the lenses of requisite variety. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 12(2), 1–13. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v12n2p1>
- 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.
- Farr, M. (2016). Co-production and value co-creation in outcome-based contracting in public services. *Public Management Review*, 18(5), 654–672.
- Fledderus, J. (2015). Building trust through public service co-production. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 28(7), 550–565.
- Fugini, M., Bracci, E., & Sicilia, M. (Eds.). (2016). *Co-production in the Public Sector. Experiences and Challenges*. Milan: Springer.
- Gawłowski, R. (2018). Co-production of public services in terms of the Polish experience. *Polish Political Science Yearbook*, 47(1), 110–120.
- Mazur, S. (Ed.). (2015). *Public Governance*. Warsaw: Scholar Publishing House.
- Hausner, J. (2015). Governance and its conceptual foundations. In S. Mazur (Ed.), *Public Governance* (pp. 17–36). Warsaw: Scholar Publishing House.
- Mazur, S. (Ed.). (2018). *Public Policy and the Neo-Weberian State*. New York: Routledge.
- Meijer, A. (2016). Co-production as a structural transformation of the public sector. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 29(6), 596–611.
- OECD. (2011). *Together for Public Services. Partnering with Citizens and Civil Society*.
- Osborne, D., & Gaebler, T. (1993). *How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector*. Toronto: Penguin Group.
- 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), S31–S47.

- Osborne, S., Radnor, Z., & Strokosch, K. (2016). Co-production and the co-creation of value in public services. *Public Management Review*, 18(5), 639–653.
- Ostrom, E. (1972). Metropolitan reform: Propositions derived from two traditions. *Social Science Quarterly*, 53(3), 474–493.
- Ostrom, V., Ostrom, E. (1971). Public choice: A different approach to the study of public administration. *Public Administration Review*, 31, 203–216.
- Podgórnjak-Krzykacz, A. (2015). Co-production for local public services – a case study of the cooperative Hallenbad Norten-Hardenbert. *Zarządzanie Publiczne*, 2(30), 165–176.
- Pollitt, C., & Bouckaert, G. (2011). *Public Management Reform. A comparative analysis: new public management, governance, and the neo-Weberian state*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Putnam, R. (1993). *Making Democracy Work. Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Radnor, Z., Osborne, S., Kinder, T., & Mutton J. (2014). Operationalising co-production in public services delivery. The contribution of service blueprinting. *Public Management Review*, 16(3), 402–423.
- Stoker, G. (2006). *Why Politics Matters: Making Democracy Work*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sześciło, D. (2015a). Współzarządzanie jako koprodukcja usług publicznych. *Zarządzanie Publiczne*, 1(31), 13–21.
- Sześciło, D. (2015b). *Governance in public services*. In S. Mazur (Ed.), *Public Governance* (pp. 286–301). Warsaw: Scholar Publishing House.
- Sześciło, D. (2017). *Administracja neoweberowska: biurokracja 2.0?*, article available on the website [https://www.academia.edu/8196749/Administracja\\_neoweberowska\\_biurokracja\\_2.0](https://www.academia.edu/8196749/Administracja_neoweberowska_biurokracja_2.0) (accessed on 14.06.2017).
- Thomas, J. (2012). *Citizen, Customer, Partner. Engaging the Public in Public Management*. New York: M.E. Sharp Inc.
- Virtanen, P., & Stenvall, J. (2014). The evolution of public services from co-production to co-creation and beyond. *The International Journal of Leadership in Public Service*, 10(2), 100–115.
- 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*. Rotterdam: Erasmus University.
- Voorberg, W., Bekkers V., & Trummers L. (2014). A systematic review of co-creation and co-production: Embarking on the social innovation journey. *Public Management Review*, 17(9), 1333–1357.
- Warren, A., Sulaiman, A., & Jaafar, N. (2014). Social media effects on fostering online civic engagement and building citizen trust and trust in institutions. *Government Information Quarterly*, 31(2), 291–301.
- Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and Society*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Witte, K., & Geys, B. (2013). Citizen co-production and efficient public good provision: Theory and evidence from public libraries. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 224, 137–148.
- Zdybała, A. (2012). *Polityki publiczne. Doświadczenia w tworzeniu i wykonywaniu programów publicznych w Polsce i innych krajach*. Warszawa: Krajowa Szkoła Administracji Publicznej.