

## Chapter 9

### A Delphi Study on the Cooperativization of the Social Services in the Province of Gipuzkoa<sup>1</sup>

Enekoitz ETXEZARRETA ETXARRI,<sup>2</sup> Eusebio LASA ALTUNA,<sup>2</sup> Anjel Mari ERRASTI AMOZARRAIN,<sup>2</sup>  
Juan Carlos PEREZ DE MENDIGUREN<sup>3</sup>

#### 1. The theoretical framework

##### 1.1. *Who is responsible for the provision of social services?*

What is the State's role and what is that of the market with respect to the provision of welfare services? Must the State, as in the social democratic model, be the main provider or must these services be privatized and supplied by the market as upheld by the neoliberal thesis? Today, these are key questions in most European countries and the generalized reply in recent times points towards the gradual privatization of services.

However, neither of these two possible strategies deals appropriately with the question of public participation in the provision of these services. Or rather, each of them responds in a different way to this aspect. The social democrats situate public control in the use of the mechanisms of the representative democracy, and the neoliberals situate this control in the purchasing power of the individual on the market. However, neither of them considers the role that civil society must play as an active agent in the provision of the aforementioned services and not as

---

<sup>1</sup> This study has focused on the province of Gipuzkoa, which is one of the three provinces (or historical territories as they are called officially) that comprise the Basque Autonomous Community, which is at the same time one of the 17 autonomous communities belonging to Spain.

<sup>2</sup> Teacher and Researcher, University of the Basque Country, The Institute of Cooperative Law and Social Economy-GEZKI.

<sup>3</sup> University of the Basque Country, Institute for International Cooperation and Development Studies-HEGOA.

a mere user of such. Nor do they bear in mind the collective dimension beyond the individual intention (regarding voting or purchasing), of civil society itself, which, articulated through various entities of the third sector, needs to be taken into account in these matters.

And the fact is that this third sector has always behaved in a highly integrated manner both with the State and with the market as far as the provision of public services is concerned (Branden, Pestoff, 2008). In countries where the third sector plays a major role, such as Germany or Holland, the third sector has been fundamental in the construction of the post-war welfare states. In others, the third sector has stood out as a result of the wave of liberalization of the last three decades, as is the case in the United Kingdom.

Furthermore, although the literature regarding public management has ignored it for a long time, initiatives based on direct citizen-based participation in the provision of basic services have always existed. As Ostrom concluded (1999), no market can survive without a government-based provision of public goods, but, by the same token, no government can be efficient and fair without a considerable input on the part of the citizens. This input, this greater implication of the “users”, can be channelled through a democratic system of state supervision or through third sector entities (Walzer, 1988).

This strategy of providing more decentralized and participative social services brings the local dimension in territorial terms to the foreground, and the third sector or the social economy in terms of governance, as both spaces (in principle) have a tendency to democratize and re-socialize social structures.

In essence, the strategy is to rise to two challenges at the same time using the same tools: the democratic regeneration of the public structures on the one hand and the reform of the welfare state on the other, through greater participation from the social economy. Participation from the social economy is, therefore, considered to be able to “play a significant role in the renovation of the democratic political systems and of the configuration of the Welfare State” (Pestoff et al., 2008: 593).

### ***1.2. The “welfare mix” as the framework for action***

Since the end of the 1980s and the beginning of the 1990s, a number of political policies were implemented in all European countries which still condition to a great extent the framework for action regarding public decisions. These policies sought to solve a problem which was raised in the following way: how to face the reality of new emerging social risks from the public institutions,

taking into account the restriction imposed by a hypertrophic, inefficient public sector, with no possibility of organizational expansion?

At the same time, the nature of these new risks radically questioned the efficiency of the traditional mechanisms of income transfers offered by the welfare states (social security, for example, the pension system, etc.) and reoriented policies towards the priority of deploying a wide network of social services (Ascoli, Ranzi, 2002).

The solution to this dilemma was to adopt privatization policies which, as Ascoli and Ranzi pointed out (2002), ran in two directions: i) reorganization of the public system through the introduction of market mechanisms in public management (*New Public Management*), and; ii) the intense, direct incorporation of private, non-profit-making agents into the offer of welfare services. A second set of privatization policies, complementary to the aforementioned policies which have an influence on the offer, was oriented towards directly financing demand (via direct aid or tax incentives), offering a wider choice in the face of an ever more diverse offer.

All this is gradually giving shape to a new institutional framework, which is known as *welfare mix* (Evers, 1991; Evers, Svetlik, 1993), *mixed economy of welfare* or *welfare pluralism* (Johnson, 1999). These welfare systems, which, according to Johnson (1999), have always really been mixed, will reconsider the central elements of the European welfare systems: the State ceases to be the principal provider of services and delegates those functions to private lucrative and non-profit entities, while maintaining at the same time a central role in all that concerns the financing, regulation and inspection of these services (Evers, 2005).

Questioning the centrality of the State leads to the acknowledgement of a plurality of actors, two of which stand out and had barely been taken into account by welfare state theorists: the informal sector and the third sector (Johnson, 1999). Consequently, these new currents acknowledge the value of the work carried out both in the domestic environment and through non-profit entities in the provision of welfare services, explicitly recognizing the essential contribution made by these two sectors (Evers, Svetlik, 1993).

Lastly, as well as acknowledging the plural nature of the welfare systems, the theorists of *welfare mix* establish the role and influence of each of these agents in the welfare systems that have arisen as a result of the crisis in the welfare state. So, as a general tendency, they indicate that the State will gradually withdraw from its responsibility for the direct provision of services in favour of private entities while at the same time reinforcing its function as regulator, funder and assessor of the quality of the service offered. The public sector ultimately becomes responsible for the public service provided, no matter how little it has participated directly in any provision. And, at the same

time, as a driving force and facilitator, it will also guarantee the user's "freedom of choice", opening up the provision of public services to competing private entities and endowing the user with solvency through demand policies.

Well beyond the discursive value of this plural or mixed character of actors, the fact is that this new reorganization has been resolved basically by a scheme to "roll back the state", where private entities, mainly of a profit-making character, have gained ground in detriment to third sector entities.

### *1.3. Alternatives to privatization: coproduction, governance and co-construction*

The crisis of the welfare state and the progressive configuration of mixed models (or privatized models) in the public services has given rise to a profusion of literature on different ways of understanding this collaboration between public and private agents.

One of the first approaches was that which the American theorists adopted in public management in the 70s and the 80s under the concept of co-production (Parks et al, 1999). At that time, the debate over the most efficient way of providing public services was largely dominated by those who proclaimed the need to create centralized and bureaucratic structures. However, through the proposal for co-production, these authors sustained that the most efficient system was one that enabled civil society to produce, at least in part, the services that they would later consume.

Commenté [JA1]: 1991 in biblio

This first approach had a very limited vision, focusing only on the role of individuals or groups of individuals in the production of the aforementioned services (Brandsen, Pestoff, 2008). In the United Kingdom, though, co-production has been used more recently to study the role of voluntary or community entities in the provision of public services (Osborne, McLaughlin, 2004). And, from a more European standpoint, co-production has also referred to the growing organized implication of the citizens in the production of their own welfare services (Pestoff, 2005). They all conclude that the participation of the third sector (understood as groups of citizens or groups of organizations) transforms the manner in which public services are provided, at the same time as the third sector is also transformed by the very service that it provides (Brandsen, Pestoff, 2008).

But beyond conceiving this collective action on the part of citizens in the provision of services, there are those who analyse the participation of civil society before provision, that is, in the phases concerning planning, design or articulation of the services. Following the classification proposed by Osborne and McLaughlin (2004), at least three forms of cooperation between the third sector and the public sector should be distinguished:

- co-governance, where the third sector participates in the planning and provision of the service;

- co-management, where the third sector collaborates with the State in the provision of services;
- co-production, in the strict sense of the word, means that citizens produce their own services, at least in part.

This classification enables us to identify two analysis variables: the collective or individual nature of the relationship, on the one hand, and the policy cycle phase, on the other. Therefore, with respect to the former, co-production would signify participation of an individual nature, whereas the others signify interaction between organizations (both public and private). And as far as the phase is concerned, a distinction is made between planning and provision.

On the same lines is the contribution of the concept of co-construction as opposed to the concept of co-production. As Yves Vaillancourt established (2011: 40):

*... En suma, la coproducción de las políticas públicas se desarrolla sobre el plano organizacional (en la organización de productos y servicios), mientras que la co-construcción se desarrolla sobre el plano institucional (en la fijación de orientaciones generales y de elementos fundadores de la política).*<sup>4</sup>

This first notion of co-production is also very close to the notion of welfare mix or mixed economy of welfare, which has previously been analysed (Evers, 1991; Evers, Svetlik, 1993; Pestoff, 1999; Johnson, 1999). The notion of co-construction, therefore, would go further, as Vaillancourt says (2011: 43): “*la co-construcción se relaciona con las políticas públicas en el momento de su elaboración y no solamente en el momento de su implementación.*”<sup>5</sup>

Vaillancourt (ibid.) distinguishes four types or models of co-construction: a) the first, known as mono-construction, is that in which the State does not have a share but is the sole protagonist when it comes to decision-making; b) neoliberal co-construction, (now in fashion in many countries, notably with the popularity of the mainstream of *New Public Management*), where the State is motivated to create public policies in cooperation with the dominant socio-economic actors in the market economy; c) corporate co-construction, certain sectors of socio-economic activity and actors from the field of trade unions and management are included in dialogue and deliberations

---

<sup>4</sup> “...All in all, the co-production of public policies develops at an organizational level (in the organization of products and services), whereas co-construction develops at an institutional level (in the establishment of general guidelines and founding elements of the policy”).

<sup>5</sup> “Co-construction is related to public policies as they are drawn up and not only as they are implemented”.

concerning the State, while others are excluded, and finally; d) democratic, solidarity-based co-construction.

This final model of co-construction is characterized in the following way: a) the State remains as a partner that is different from the others involved – it converses, interacts and deliberates with the non-State actors and, at the same time, is “over” but “close” to them; b) although the State is a partner of civil society, it does not stop being a partner of the market economy actors (it forms part of a general perspective of plural economy); c) it implies a deliberation between the best of representative democracy and participatory democracy, and d) it implies recognition of the participation of the social economy actors, as well as a partnership-based relationship between the State and the aforementioned actors (Vaillancourt, 2011).

As it considers social economy to be the principal ally, this model of “democratic and solidarity-based co-construction” fully coincides with the “partnership-based governance” model proposed by Enjolras (2008). This author contrasts this model with the current hegemonic model, which he refers to as “competitive governance”, and which is based on the extension of market regulatory mechanisms (Enjolras, 2008: 19).

Over this model, previously referred to as *New Public Management*, Enjolras favours the partnership-based model, where the public sector does not play such a coercive role, but rather a role of coordinator between various agents of civil society and the State itself. Here, the local sphere appears as a privileged space, as it is the area where social capital makes it possible to develop institutional links and enhance the territory. In this network of agents, the social (and solidarity-based) economy plays a central role in the implementation of this model of governance as it enhances the local dimension in territorial policy and the democratic structure in organizational aspects.

Following the review of the theoretical models of relationship between the State and the economy, we present the results obtained in the case study carried out in the province of Gipuzkoa. This study endeavoured to collate the opinion of a number of experts in matters of social policy regarding the strategy of cooperativizing the social services sector.

## **2. Case study: the cooperativization of social services in the province of Gipuzkoa**

### **2.1. The Basque welfare system**

As established by Moreno (2009), the Spanish welfare system is characterised by three main elements: the decentralized structure of the design and application of social policy, the important

participation of third sector institutions in the provision of services and the “over-exploitation” of family resources for the upholding of these policies. Therefore, the family and social environment is clearly the main support for social needs in Spain, while public policies reveal a decentralized territorial model and a management model based on coordination between the public and private sectors.

As far as the classification of “welfare systems” established by Esping Andersen (1993) is concerned, the Spanish model follows a model of its own making (Mediterranean), which is based on the hybridization of characteristics of the three regimes referred to. The fields of health and education grounded on universalistic programmes (the social democratic model) complement each other with a guaranteed income system within the social security system (the continental model), whereas, in the field of social assistance, that which prevails is the liberal one (Noguera, 2000).

The Basque Country falls within this context with full competence for the development of social policy (both for its financing and application) and with a social structure also rooted in strong participation from the family in the satisfaction of social needs.

However, in comparative terms, the public sector and the third sector are significantly more developed in the Basque Country (Gallego et al., 2003). Although there are significant differences between various sub*Los tres mundos del Estado de Bienestar* sectors (senior citizens, disabled people, children and social exclusion), it could be said that the management model of Basque social services is a public-social collaborative model.

This greater public performance in the Basque Country is supported by data that show the increasing scope of the public sector in the provision of social services. Between 1988 and 2006 the number of public workers in this sector has quadrupled while social spending per capita has multiplied by 8.7 points (Gizarte.doc, 2009).

Nevertheless, this important development in public intervention has rested on various policies which, ultimately, have increasingly limited the real scope of the public sector. Three main public policies have been developed over the last few years: a) increased social payments, derived largely from the opening of new benefits contemplated in the Dependency Law in Spain approved in 2006; b) financial support for the opening of private centres and; c) the opening of new state-owned centres managed, in most cases, by private sector entities (Arrieta, Etxezarreta, 2012).

These strategies have ultimately reinforced the greater contribution of the family circle and private entities in the provision of social services. The greater presence of private entities is reflected in the data referring to the evolution of social services centres between 2001 and 2009: the

centres managed by private entities have increased by 57%. Nonetheless, this increase has also gone hand in hand with a significant increase in the management of centres by the third sector (42%) and, by the public sector, (31%) (SIIS, 2012).

Lastly, despite the recent tendencies towards privatisation, the composition of all the centres still shows a clear public-social structure in the Basque Country: 49% of social service centres are managed by third sector entities, 39% are publicly managed and only 12% are privately run (SIIS, 2012).

## **2.2. Case study**

### *2.2.1. Methodological aspects*

The aim of the Delphi study below is to present the opinions of the various policy makers of the Department of Social Policy in the County Council of Gipuzkoa with respect to the strategy of cooperativizing the management of the social services in their territory.

It has been chosen to apply the Delphi methodology because it is a technique used in social research which makes it possible, with a group of experts, to obtain the most reliable group opinion possible. It is a repetitive method (each expert is asked the same question at least twice) which respects the anonymity of the participants and includes controlled feedback, since the study coordinator is in charge of the return of the most important contributions and of omitting irrelevant information (Landeta, 1999). The ultimate aim of this technique is to try to narrow the initial differences between the experts, with a view to obtaining a group opinion with the greatest consensus possible while carrying out the survey in a personalized way in order to try to avoid group dynamics, which annul or exert a certain pressure on the opinion of each participant.

To this end, a panel of experts was created. The study was narrowed down to the province of Gipuzkoa due to the fact that the public institutions with the highest degree of responsibility in the management of social services in the Basque Autonomous Community are the County Councils themselves. After opting for the nearest Council, that of Gipuzkoa, contact was made with experts who, besides having a deep knowledge of the sector, have an influence on it as the majority of them are government policy makers. In this Delphi study, there were initially 16 participants, 11 of whom had a political profile (elected representatives, the majority playing a leading role or an advisory role in the main sections of the Department of Social Policy), whereas the remaining 5 had a more technical profile (all of them were area heads of services). Of the 16 experts who initiated the process, 13 finished the whole process satisfactorily.



The survey was based on a battery of 26 questions, classified in 5 sets and almost all of which were to be answered on a Likert scale of 1 to 5 (where 1 represents total disagreement, 5 total agreement and 3 neither in favour nor against). A great effort was made to formulate the questions in such a way that they were clear and comprehensible, adapting the language used from one academic register to another of more common usage. Each set of questions then ends with an open question which consists of a space in which the experts may write down any observation related with the previous questions.

The idea of this approach is to combine the quantitative results with the qualitative results. On the one hand, the answers have been objectified by means of averages and standard deviations, and the level of alignment between the first round and the second round has been analysed through the comparison of these two variables. On the other hand, should the answers not show a clear consensus or there be no clear significant movements towards a convergence between the experts, analysis of the qualitative contributions will have led to a search for arguments that might justify the nature of the answers obtained.

The research process, the results of which can be seen below, took place in three phases. In the first phase, a Focus Group with the participation of various policy makers from the department together with social agents and researchers was organized, and it was here that the most significant variables and those which gave rise to more intense debate regarding the proposed object of study were detected. When the questionnaire which included these variables had been designed and the experts who were to form the panel had been contacted, in the second phase the experts were required to answer the questionnaire twice in two consecutive rounds, knowing in the second round the averages obtained in the first round for each question, and also the most significant contributions made by the experts (controlled feedback). The research process ended with a seminar organized by the authors of the study themselves in which the return of results (detailed below) was carried out before the participants.

### *2.2.2. Main results*

#### *a) Management model*

A first set of questions analysed the position of the experts as far as the ideal model of social services was concerned and allowed them to opt for a strictly public model, a strictly private model or a concerted model.

Three important aspects of the results obtained should be noted: a) an overwhelming majority showed themselves to be against the private model (92%); b) a solid majority (62%) supported the

public model, and; c) a significant number of experts did not rule out the concerted model (38%), as they believed that this was the model that really prevailed nowadays in Gipuzkoa. However, the answers regarding the suitability of the concerted model showed a significant dispersion, as the experts were divided in the same proportion between those for and those against (31%), while a third part of the experts took no sides.

The process of convergence between experts did not change the initial answers significantly, the only aspect worthy of note being a greater concentration of views opposing the private model in the second round.

As far as the qualitative analysis is concerned, a good part of the contributions underlines the importance of keeping these services under public responsibility although, later, the management model may not be shared on the same level. There were experts who recognized the value of the contribution of the third sector entities in the management of these services and there were those who believed that the management model is not a determining factor in the final quality of the services.

#### b) The co-construction model

A second set of questions referred to the issue of the level of participation of the social economy in decision-making as far as the design itself of the social services was concerned. The questions covered three types of participation models: informative, consultative and decision-making models. In the informative model, the third sector is only taken into consideration when it comes to revealing the decisions adopted. At a consultative level, its opinion is included in the final decision as the third sector is regarded as an agent with a voice of authority in the sector. At the third level, the third sector is co-decision-maker together with the public administration, which could match the model of co-construction previously theorized.

The results obtained in this section are as follows: a) a significant majority (76%) is against the third sector being taken into account only at an informative level; b) the consultative model fully convinces almost nobody as practically the majority of the experts position themselves within the intermediate values, i.e., there is not a vast majority that supports it or rules it out; c) however, over half the experts (54%) look favourably upon co-construction, provided that the public administration has the final word. It must be noted that there also exists a significant percentage of experts who are against this last aspect.

The analysis of the degree of convergence between the experts yields some interesting results in this set of questions, as it can be clearly seen that the opinion of the participants has gradually veered towards the consultative model and moved away from the co-construction model.

This process may have been motivated by the contributions made, as many of them emphasize that the decision in case of difference of opinion or conflicting interests must ultimately fall on policy makers as they are ultimately responsible for the quality of the services provided. In this regard, it is worth noting that the participation of the third sector and other social agents also caused some experts to have misgivings when considering that this space may also accommodate a series of private interests which are not particularly compatible with the common interest.

#### c) Formalization of indirect management

The third set of questions refers to the way in which the relationship between the public administration as the contracting party (and responsible) for the service and the social economy as manager or provider of the same should be formalized. Three different formulas were considered: the establishment of concerted partnerships, in which the administration gives financial support to a private service; externalization, where the administration puts out to tender the management of a public resource to a private agent, and; a collective bargaining agreement, through which the administration establishes on a discretionary basis a financial commitment with a private entity to the provision of a particular service.

The general result of this set of questions is that the experts are not sure which of the three formulas should be the general norm. None of these three options achieved sufficient majorities either in favour nor against. More than half of the opinions are at an intermediate point in the three questions (54%, 62%, 54%, respectively), and there are hardly any opinions that can be found at either of the extremes (i.e., I totally agree or I totally disagree).

The level of convergence between experts simply reinforces this indeterminacy: in the concerted model, as in that for externalization and collective bargaining, the variations appreciated between rounds all tend towards an intermediate point, moving away from totally favourable or unfavourable positions. There may have been a consensus when it came to moderating the initial answers.

This lack of clear positioning on the Likert scale makes the qualitative analysis essential for the understanding of these results. Most of the experts point out that the nature of the service to be provided is what determines the way of formalizing this relationship, whether that be through the concerted model, public contracting or collective bargaining. There is no perfect model which is

valid for all types of service. However, there are those who hold that contracting is the formula that offers greater guarantees, although the social services law<sup>6</sup> favours a concerted model with respect to the future. According to another participant, collective bargaining should be reserved only for those services that are not covered in the catalogue of services (and, therefore, are not public responsibility). Lastly, there are those who play down this aspect and point out that the important thing is for the objectives and the catalogue of services to be well defined.

d) Positive discrimination measures

A fourth set of questions puts on the table the use of measures of a discriminatory nature to the advantage of the entities of the third sector as a whole and, more specifically, to the benefit of cooperative forms.

This question obtained perfectly clear responses: a) a vast majority (69%) was in favour of positive discrimination towards the third sector as opposed to the capitalist private sector; b) an even greater majority (85%) holds that “social clauses” are the most efficient tool for this type of measures, and; c) a consistent majority (61%) also believes that the cooperative formula is that which should be most particularly preserved, although this point also accounts for a significant percentage (31%) against this.

The analysis of convergence between the experts also reinforces this feeling of consensus in the three responses, as those positioning themselves in favour of the first two questions did not alter and, for the suitability of cooperatives, this partisan stance becomes stronger in the second round.

However, we believe that the experts’ contributions in this case are of special interest as they give a more detailed insight into the apparent consensus reflected by the quantitative results. The majority of the comments point out that the important thing is the quality of the services provided, beyond the legal forms (for profit or non-profit) of the provider and, once the first is guaranteed, the use of discriminatory measures make sense. There are other comments warning that the legal form is not a guarantee of anything, nor is it a guarantee that the service is of the necessary quality, or that everything really works in a democratic, non-profit-making manner.

---

<sup>6</sup> Law 12/2008 on Social Services of the Basque Autonomous Community was approved in 2008.

This law points out among other aspects that for the development and maturation of the social services it is necessary to advance towards a concerted model, surpassing the inefficiencies created as a consequence of different contractual relationships between public administration and private providers.

It may be concluded, therefore, that the majority position themselves in favour of discriminatory measures.

e) Cooperativization strategy

The last set of questions deals with the validation by the experts of the cooperativization strategy of the social services, proposed as a working hypothesis given that this strategy has not been implemented to a great degree in the territory yet.

This validation hinges on three fundamental questions: a) whether this cooperativization process is considered to be in favour of or in detriment to the public nature of the social services; b) whether cooperativization is valued as an objective in itself or an intermediate step towards a different scenario (or towards a public model or a privatization model), and; c) which model would be identified as the most suitable considering the cooperativization of the sector.

The global result of this set of questions is that the experts show significant doubts and disagreement with respect to these three questions.

Concerning the cooperativization strategy as a way of increasing public and social control, there are a wide variety of opinions, distributed almost equally among supporters, detractors and those who remain neutral. A similar distribution is obtained for the issue as to whether cooperativization is regarded as a way of privatizing social services, since a higher percentage of experts reject this hypothesis (46%), although a significant number support it (31%) or do not rule it out.

Neither are clear results obtained as to whether it is a desirable objective or not. Most experts believe that it could constitute an option (69%), though not to alleviate occasional problems of management (16%), or as an intermediate objective towards publication of the system as a whole (16%). Nor is it regarded as an end in itself or as a desirable model towards which social policies should be oriented, as only a third adopt a positive position on this aspect.

Lastly, as regards the model preferred for the cooperativization of the sector, a choice of four models was given: the creation of associated work cooperatives (with no additional characteristic); promotion of public utility cooperatives; encouraging social initiative cooperatives; or forming part

of the social capital of mixed cooperatives.<sup>7</sup> The model with the greatest support is that of the social cooperatives (an average of 3.91 in the second round), followed by that of the mixed cooperatives (3.33), that of public utility (3.18) and finally that of normal cooperatives (2.16).

This order of preferences could indicate certain characteristics that the experts regard as being essential guarantees of the cooperativization process of the social services: a) that these cooperatives should be non-profit-making; b) that they should be compatible with greater public control, and; c) that they should be regarded, like the educational cooperatives in the education sector, as integral parts of the public/concerted model of social services.

### 3. Final conclusions

Through the literature review, it has been seen that the greater implication of the social economy in the design and provision of the social services could be regarded as being a valid strategy in the attempt to socialize (and not privatize) public services, i.e., in an endeavour to open them up to public participation and self-management. Thus, note has been taken of theoretical proposals which, beyond the individual nature of citizen participation, (Co-production), value the collective dimension of this action through social economy entities. The “democratic and solidarity-based co-construction” proposed by Yves Vaillancourt, or the “*partnership-based governance*” theorised by Bernard Enjolras, could be two theoretical reference points to be borne in mind in this sense.

Moving this concern to a specific territorial sphere, i.e., the Department of Social Policy of the County Council of Gipuzkoa, a Delphi study has been developed regarding the possibility of gradually cooperativizing the social services sector, the main results of which are as follows:

- The department is more inclined towards a public rather than a concerted model, with a perfectly clear ideological premise: that, in the final analysis, the responsibility for the quality of the services provided is public and may under no circumstances be privatized;

---

<sup>7</sup> The first three options are purely private cooperatives, where the social capital is the exclusive property of the worker-members. The second and third are legal acknowledgements offered by the Basque Government to cooperatives that perform a public function and to non-profit cooperatives respectively. And, lastly, the mixed cooperative formula, although it is as yet unknown in the Basque Autonomous Community, would enable the financial participation of the public sector (as a collaborating partner or in whatever way may be determined) in the cooperative itself.

- As regards the co-construction model, the department believes that the participation of the social economy in the design of the social services, albeit basically consultative, is very important as the public authorities reserve the right to exclusive decision-making power in the event of disagreement or conflicting interests;
- Where the manner of formalizing indirect management is concerned, the department believes that each type of service requires a different framework of relationships (concerted, recruitment or collective bargaining), which is why it does not decidedly wager for a generalization of any of them for the system as a whole;
- As far as positive discrimination measures are concerned, it is worth noting that the department values the incorporation of social clauses in public procurement very positively, although these clauses should be applied between entities which firstly certify sufficient technical capacity, the aim being to endeavour to encourage and preserve certain practices rather than specific legal concepts (such as non-profit-making or cooperative practices);
- As for the working hypothesis regarding the gradual cooperativization of the social services sector, it must be said that, nowadays, this strategy is not shared within the department. Although the majority would not put this process on a level with a privatization process, it is not interpreted as a valid way of expanding the public model. Moreover, it is believed that the strategy of cooperativization should go beyond solving specific situations, although this is not thought to be a final objective in itself. And, lastly, among the preferred models of cooperativization, support is given to those that encourage the non-profit-making nature of cooperatives and guarantee greater control on the part of the policy makers.

With respect to future lines of work, it would be interesting to continue looking into the strategic decisions taken by the department, as many of them are beginning to shape a horizon that is different from that outlined so far.

In a territory where collaboration with the third sector has usually been regarded as the most suitable model, the last government team advocated a re-publication of the services,<sup>8</sup> but the new

<sup>8</sup> As testified by the recent creation of a regional autonomous body (Kabia) which will gradually take on the management of municipal residences. In the opinion of the political decision-makers, this body aims to be “*an important instrument to advance towards a change in the model oriented towards the direct management of social services in Gipuzkoa*”, <<http://www.noticiasdegipuzkoa.com/2014/07/14/sociedad/euskadi/diputacion-de-gipuzkoa-asumira-la-gestion-de-las-residencias-municipales-a-traves-del-organismo-autonomo-kabia>>, consulted 17-07-2014)

elected government continues along the same bases of collaboration with the third sector. This is why the strategy of cooperativizing the management of social service centres does not appear at the moment to be the primary political objective of the Department of Social Policy although, as can be seen in the study, the favourable positioning regarding the inclusion of social clauses in public recruitment might well open up spaces that would accommodate both objectives.

## References

- Arrieta F., Etxezarreta E., 2012, "Análisis de la colaboración público-privada en el sector de los servicios sociales en Gipuzkoa: el modelo guipuzcoano de concertación con el tercer sector a debate", *Oñati Socio-Legal Series*, 2 (4): 130-43.
- Ascoli U., Ranci C. (eds), 2002, *Dilemmas of the Welfare Mix: The New Structure of Welfare in an Era of Privatization*, New York, Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
- Brandsen T., Pestoff V., 2008, "An Introduction", in V. Pestoff, T. Brandsen (eds), *Co-Production. The Third Sector and the Delivery of Public Services*, Oxon, Routledge: 1-9.
- Enjolras B., 2008, *Gouvernance et intérêt général dans les services sociaux et de santé*, Bruxelles/Bern/Berlin/Frankfurt am Main/New York/Oxford/Wien, Peter Lang.
- Esping-Andersen G., 1993, *Los tres mundos del Estado de Bienestar*, Valentzia, Alfons el Magnànim.
- Evers A., 1991, "Shifts in the welfare mix", *Eurosocial*, 57/58: 7-8.
- Evers A ; Svetlik I., 1993, *Balancing Pluralism: New Welfare Mixes in Care for the Elderly*, London, Avebury.
- Evers A., 2005, "Mixed Welfare Systems and Hybrid Organizations: Changes in the Governance and Provision of Social Services", *International Journal of Public Administration*, 28 (9): 737-48.
- Gallego R, Gomá R., Subirats J. (eds), 2003, *Estado de Bienestar y Comunidades Autónomas: la descentralización de las políticas sociales en España*, Madrid, Tecnos, Universitat Pompeu Fabra.
- Gizarte.doc, 2009
- Johnson N., 1999, *Mixed Economies of Welfare: A Comparative Perspective*, Hertfordshire, Pearson Education/Prentice Hall Europe.
- Landeta J., 1999, *El método Delphi. Una técnica de previsión del futuro*, Barcelona, Ariel Social.
- Moreno L. (ed.), 2009, *Reformas de la Políticas del Bienestar en España*, Siglo XXI, Madrid.



- Noguera J.A., 2000, "Conclusiones. La reestructuración de la política social en España", in L. Adelantado (coord.), *Cambios en el Estado del Bienestar. Políticas sociales y desigualdades en España*, Bartzelona, Icaria.
- Osborne S., McLaughlin K., 2004, "The Cross-Cutting Review of the Voluntary Sector: Where Next for Local Government Voluntary Sector Relationships?", *Regional Studies*, 38 (5): 573-82.
- Ostrom E., 1999, "Crossing the Great Divide: Coproduction, Synergy, and Development", in M. McGinnis (ed.), *Polycentric Governance and Development: Readings from the Workshop in Political Theory and Policy Analysis*, Ann Arbor MI, University of Michigan Press.
- 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., [1991] "Consumers as Co-Producers of Public Services: Some Economic and Institutional Considerations", *Policy Studies Journal*, 9 (7): 1001-11. Commenté [JA2]: 1999 in texte
- Pestoff V., 1998, 1999, 2000, *Beyond the Market and State. Social Enterprises and Civil Democracy in a Welfare Society*, Singapore/Sydney/Tokyo, Ashgate.
- Pestoff V., 2005, "The Third Sector and the Democratization of the Welfare State: Revisiting the Third Sector and State in Democracy and Welfare Theory", Östersund, Research Report.
- Pestoff V., Osborne S.P., Brandsen T., 2008, "Patterns of Co-production in Public Services", in V. Pestoff, T. Brandsen (eds), *Co-production. The third sector and the delivery of public services*, Oxon, Routledge: 99-103.
- SIIS-Centro de Documentación y Estudios/Dokumentazio eta Ikerketa Zentroa, 2012, *II Informe sobre la situación de los Servicios Sociales en la CAPV*, Consejo Vasco de Servicios Sociales, Eusko Jauriaritza-Gobierno Vasco, Vitoria-Gasteiz, <<http://www.siiis.net/es/boletin-gizarte-doc.php>>, consulted .
- Vaillancourt Y., 2011, "La economía social en la coproducción y la coconstrucción de las políticas públicas", *Revista del Centro de Estudios de Sociología del Trabajo*, 3: 31-68.
- Walzer M., 1988, "Socializing the Welfare State", in A. GUTMANN (ed.), *Democracy and the Welfare State*, Princeton NJ, Princeton University Press.

#### Abstract

This paper shows the main results obtained from the Delphi study, which was conducted with politicians and technicians from the Department of Social Policy in the County Council of Gipuzkoa, concerning the possibility of cooperativizing the provision of social services in this province. With this in mind, the structure of this paper is structured in two different parts. The first

part develops the theoretical framework which serves as inspiration for the empirical work, where note is made of the main theoretical proposals that have a bearing on the collective dimension of citizen participation in the management of public services. Among the various models, those that prioritize public participation through social and solidarity economy entities stand out. The second part concerns itself with the presentation of the field research results. To this end, the methodological notes concerning the preparation process for the Delphi analysis are presented first and are immediately followed by a synthesis of the main results obtained in this study. The paper ends with a section of conclusions and future lines of action.

**Keywords**

Co-construction; Co-production; Welfare Mix; Social and Solidarity Economy; Social Services