Skilling and Motivating Staff for Co-production

Chapter 25

Skilling and motivating staff for co-production

Sanna Tuurnas

Abstract

This chapter focuses on skilling and motivating staff for co-production. As the co-production literature emphasises, staff plays a key role in the implementation of co-production, but for that, they may need new skills and training as well as motivation. Therefore it is vital to understand, how staff can be skilled and motivated to co-produce? Seeking answers to this question, this conceptual chapter discusses core skills that professionals need in co-production: segmenting, communication and enabling skills. These skills are interlinked, supporting the motivation of citizen co-producers. Next, the chapter focuses on motivation of professionals, emphasizing the aspects of boundaries and identity work. Consequently, the chapter draws together essential elements of studying the 'regular producers' in the co-production, offering also hands-on advice for skilling and motivating personnel.

Key words: skills, motivation, personnel, professionals, interaction, boundaries

Introduction

In the context of public services, co-production mostly takes place between public service personnel and citizens, service users or a group of citizens. This chapter examines co-production from the viewpoint of public service personnel. Despite the fact that co-production has become very popular across the globe, for many people working in public service organisations co-production still remains a 'black box' and a novel approach. Moreover, co-production is not necessarily an easy issue for staff. This can explained by professionals experiencing fear of losing power over decisions, or even their jobs, or through the lack of understanding or experience of co-production. (see Bovaird 2007, Bovaird and Loeffler 2012, Osborne and Strokosch 2013, Tuurnas 2015).

Furthermore, there is a consensus among academics that co-production does not just happen automatically, but requires skilling and motivation, on the part of both personnel and citizen co-producers (e.g. Bovaird 2007, Bovaird and Loeffler 2012, Steen and Tuurnas 2018, Osborne and Strokosch 2013, Verschuere et al. 2012). For instance, Bovaird and Loeffler (2012, 1130) have recognised the "need to develop the professional skills to mainstream co-production". Therefore, there is a need to understand better the process of co-production from the staff's perspective, focusing on questions of skilling and motivating them to co-produce.

Against this backdrop, this chapter focuses on the question, how can staff be skilled and motivated to co-produce? The chapter starts by identifying the core skills that staff need in different types of co-production. These skills are categorised as segmenting skills, communication skills and enabling skills. All these skills are interlinked, supporting the motivation of citizen co-producers. The chapter also discusses how staff can be motivated to co-produce. Here, it considers the special angles of professional boundaries and identity work. As will be demonstrated, crossing and transforming boundaries between staff and citizen co-producers can be seen as a necessity for successful co-production.

It should be noted that the focus on public service personnel is naturally very broad and it is difficult to make unambiguous statements about it for several reasons. First, public service personnel may refer to a very heterogeneous group of public service staff; nurses, teachers, social workers, librarians, youth workers, police officers, prison guards, teachers and many more included. Alongside different occupations, the focus on public service personnel refers to various levels of public service duties: from street-level actors to commissioners, planning officers to senior managers. Here, front-line staff often have the advantage in co-production, as they are naturally more in touch with service users and often know them due to their work at street-level. Then again, co-production might appear different to the senior managers and commissioners, who – due to their managerial duties – look at co-production rather through a 'systems' than a 'people' lens. They may also not have much real-life street-level contact with their co-production target groups. Third, in times of marketization and collaboration in public services, it should be noted that not all public service personnel actually work in public organisations - they also work in private or third sector organisations, which can have various cultures and readiness for co-production. Keeping these differences in mind, the chapter gives examples from this extensive category of public service personnel, limiting the examination broadly to those staff members who work *for* public service providers and for the public.

In general, this research is conceptual in nature, drawing together studies and theories concerning public service personnel and co-production, mainly from the co-production literature, but, as co-production is a multifaceted concept, the chapter covers different streams of literature, such as innovation and professionalism research and health care studies, in providing a robust base for the arguments presented.

What are the core skills required from staff for co-production?

In co-production, the logic of service production moves from traditional idea of delivering public services *for* the public towards the idea of delivering public services *with*, or even *by* the public

(Bovaird, 2007, Osborne and Strokosch, 2013, Pestoff 2012). This logic requires a new relational approach between citizens and staff in public service organisations. New types of citizen-personnel partnerships appear, as citizens take up a more important role in public service delivery. For instance, citizens may act as volunteers alongside public service personnel. Here, the citizens are nor subordinates nor clients, but partners, who may possess different knowledge and expertise to the personnel, but all the same should be treated as equal partners in public service delivery and design. Moreover, in co-production, citizens, both as individual service users or as members of community groups (through community co-production; cf. Bovaird and Löffler, 2012) are given an opportunity to use their local and situational knowledge in various development activities concerning public spaces or services (see also Brandsen and Honingh 2016, Osborne and Strokosch 2013, Tuurnas et al. 2016).

These examples help to illustrate the various roles which citizens play in co-production. In certain types of co-production, citizens are service users or clients (Alford 1998). In some other types, they may be residents (Tuurnas 2016), volunteers or leaders of pop-up activities (Botero et al. 2012). Moreover, co-production can take place in various phases of service delivery. As the literature illustrates, co-production extends across the full value chain of service planning, design, commissioning, managing, delivering, monitoring and evaluation activities (Bovaird 2007, Verschuere et al. 2012). Especially in top-down approaches of co-production (i.e. approaches and models where co-production is initiated by public organisations), it is often for the personnel of the public sector organisations to understand whose contributions are needed, when and how. Thus, co-production requires from the staff a thorough understanding of the service chains, but also the various modes of citizenship. For this, staff need to be skilled in segmenting the right citizen or user groups, who have the right kind of situational knowledge for realizing co-production.

Segmenting skills

Related to the implementation of co-production, Alford and O'Flynn (2012, 242-243) underline the need for staff to segment client groups in order to understand and meet their special needs. Different user groups may also have specific knowledge, and depending on the focus of co-production, successful co-production may require different approaches and different platforms to reach the right user/citizen groups (discussed more specifically below). To give an example, users of social services consist of various user groups, such as elderly, families with small children or youth. These groups can have divergent preferences in their use services or their meetings with staff (e.g. online/face-to-face). Some user groups may also need more support and encouragement to co-produce than others.

Here, it is often the responsibility of staff to identify the gaps, such as language support for immigrants (cf. Moynihan and Thomas 2013). Moreover, it is essential for staff to understand and know their target groups. For instance, according to the five nation study by Parrado et al. (2013), different citizen groups may be especially likely to take part in different co-production activities, with women and elderly most willing to co-produce. Thus, staff need to be skilled for understanding the various roles which user groups play in co-production, and in identifying key issues in motivating certain citizen/user groups.

Moreover, it is also noteworthy that in certain types of co-production activities, such as in developing built environments, citizens possess different roles as clients, residents, voters, patients or obligatees (cf. Alford 2002, Bäcklund et al. 2014), holding different expectations toward public service organisations. To demonstrate the importance of segmenting in such cases, a neighborhood development project (Tuurnas 2015, 2016) can be used as an example. In the project, a group of local government personnel attempted to create new types of interactions between local government and citizens, at the same time trying to renew services in a specific neighborhood. Contacting the right groups proved to be difficult, as it was not always clear whether it was the wider citizenry living in the area or specific user groups whom they wanted to reach. Also the relationship between the co-producing parties (staff and citizens) vary, depending on their roles as co-producers (Osborne and Strokosch 2013, Thomas 2013). For example, prisoners are obligatees in relation to prison authorities. However, they may be asked to participate voluntarily in co-creation projects, aiming to improve their return to social life after their time in prison. Here, the roles of the prisoners shifts from obligatees to volunteering co-producers (cf. Brandsen and Honingh 2016). This kind of role change requires a different kind of approach from prison officials, compared to their everyday encounters with the prisoners.

Furthermore, segmenting as a skill underlines the importance of understanding the specific points in the service delivery chain at which contributions from citizens are needed, from planning to delivering, and monitoring to evaluation of the services for co-production (cf. Bovaird 2007). These different points in the service chains also entail various roles for citizens, necessitating different amounts of citizen contribution and effort and, accordingly, different methods and co-production strategies (Bovaird and Loeffler 2012, Alford 2002, Verschuere et al. 2012). For example, co-production in the planning phase of the service delivery chain can include methods such as participatory budgeting or open design laboratories, which require short-term commitment from citizen co-producers. Then again, some other forms of co-production, such as volunteering, may

require more long-term commitment and training, which therefore also calls for quite a different approach from staff. (cf Tuurnas et al. 2015). Furthermore, when citizen contributions are needed for evaluation of a certain service, the target group may be easily limited to those who have used the services but, when co-production is planned for engaging residents more generally (e.g. in designing a public space), the target group may be broader and more difficult to define and limit. Therefore, as Thomas (2013, 789) notes, the agencies should think thoroughly about what they "need or want to ask of the public". Often, this is no longer simply a matter of segmenting, but also requires various communication skills, another essential skill on the part of staff.

Communication skills

Communication skills are strongly linked to segmenting, calling for different approaches and strategic understanding of communication in relation to different citizenship roles. Also, as pointed out in the previous section, citizens prefer different channels of communication: some may favour online communication, whereas others may find this difficult and unreliable. Therefore, it is important to understand that communication varies extensively across diverse types of co-production. Table 25.1 offers one way to present the nature of communication which different types of co-production entail.

Table 25.1. Different types of co-production and communication skills (adapted from Tuurnas, 2020, 143)

	Concepts	***Rationales for co-production***	***Communication skills between public service personnel and citizens***
Co-production as public-people partnerships	Volunteering, active citizenship	Promoting volunteering - citizen's role as a partner for public service organisations to enrich the quality or quantity of services	Often based on dialogue to frame and negotiate co-production tasks. Equal partnership requires dialogue skills. Clear guidelines are needed in public tasks.
Co-production as user-centred service processes	Co-creation, co-design	Service-user centeredness in public services to create efficient and effective services that empower the users	Based on dialogue between different stakeholders for value-creation. Skills are needed so that encounters with the clients are empathetic and empowering.
Co-production as a way to enhance participatory democracy	Citizen participation, engagement	Enhancing legitimacy of public activities. Fostering democracy and empowerment through citizen consultation	Based on interaction, but the processes do not necessarily include dialogue. Securing representativeness calls for skills related to

		strategic understanding of various communication channels. Securing legitimacy calls for expectation management skills.

First, when co-production is based on forming partnerships between public service personnel and volunteering citizens (co-production as *public-people partnerships*), communication is based on dialogue – it cannot be based merely on one-way communication from one side or another. Here, the staff need to be skilled to meet the volunteers, not as sub-ordinates, but as experts-by-experience who can bring needed quality and quantity of inputs to the services to which they contribute (van Bochove et al. 2016, Claxton-Oldfield 2008, Tulloch et al. 2015, Tuurnas et al. 2016, Verschuere et al. 2012).

The case study of a mediation service (Tuurnas et al. 2016) can be used as an example of the type of dialogue needed in the these public-people partnerships. Here, volunteering citizens act as mediators (or 'conciliators') between an offender and victim, seeking conciliation between the parties in the mediation. This empirical study noted that, although the staff are often in charge of the process, they should give the volunteers space to create their own solutions, or find the best solutions through dialogue. However, the staff members themselves declined an authoritative role in the mediation process, in order not to harm the creativity of volunteering mediators.

At the same time, as the case study by Williams et al. (2015) illustrates, volunteers need to know the limits of their rights as volunteers – a member of an American neighbourhood watch group who shot a 'suspicious' teenager clearly had not understood those limits. Therefore, it cannot be underlined strongly enough, how important it is that public service staff, such as the police, give clear instructions (sometimes non-negotiable) to volunteers, in order prevent excesses in their use of authority (as well as to keep them safe) (cf. Verschuere et al. 2012, 6).

The second type of co-production, presented in Table 25.1, concerns *user-centred service processes*. In this type of co-production, communication skills focus especially on the staff-service user relationship (not necessarily focusing so much on volunteer-staff co-production), that should ideally be based on empathetic encounters and equal dialogue. Bartels (2014, 669) offers a valuable conceptualisation of a core skill for staff in this respect, viz. communicative capacity:

[communicative capacity refers to] “the ability to recognize and break through dominant communicative patterns by adapting the nature, tone, and conditions of conversations to the situation at hand”. Thus, staff need the skill to ‘read’ patients or service users and to interact accordingly.

Here, it is also important for staff to step down from the authoritative expert role, and give room for the service users to exercise empowerment. For instance, users of social services can be asked how would they like to proceed in their situation, possibly offering them advice to select the right path to follow (see, for example, QCOSS Community Door eTraining 2018). Also co-design methods can be useful. Co-design is a valuable way of understanding service users’ or citizens’ needs, through drawing service paths or gathering stories from service users. Branco et al. (2017) report how co-design was used to improve care of people with dementia; patients and their families were asked to co-design services with clinicians, whose role was to evaluate the feasibility of the activities proposed by the patient and his/her significant people, and assist in implementing them.

The third type of co-production, as shown in Table 25.1., concerns communication with citizens in situations where the aim is to enhance *participatory democracy* by communication with a wide array of publics. Citizen consultation of this type can only be referred to as ‘co-production’ when the contributions of citizens are significant (cf. Bovaird 2007), but when this is the case, co-production often touches the mid- and top-level personnel groups, such as planning officers. Here, the target group is much wider than in the previous types of co-production: staff may need to reach the whole citizenry living in a particular area to secure representativeness and equality and to prevent only the loudest voices being heard (cf. Lowndes and Sullivan 2008, Jones and Ormston 2014). Consequently, public sector personnel need to be skilled in using various arenas and platforms in order to communicate with wide audiences. For instance, communication skills may be needed when asking the public their perceptions about neighbourhood development (cf. Lowndes and Sullivan 2008, Tuurnas 2016). Interaction is thus required between public officials and the residents, e.g. in citizen hearings and surveys, but the process itself does not necessarily lead to dialogue (although ideally there would be time and space for discussion and feedback, too).

This also applies to managing expectations raised through participation: although it might be tempting to promise remarkable impacts to motivate people to participate, false expectations may have contrary effects than wished for. Tuurnas (2016, 5) found that local government personnel in a neighbourhood project had awkward consequences after providing opportunities for citizen consultation. After

sending out surveys and organising workshops, the project members had a variety of different ideas about how to improve the neighbourhood and, thus, felt pressured to act accordingly. However, implementation capacity was lacking: the project group had only limited financial means to realize the ideas suggested by residents. Even the smallest suggestions, such as increasing the colourfulness of the neighborhood, proved difficult to realize, not to mention wider questions of improving safety, for instance. Here, the skills of expectation management (Olkkonen and Luoma-aho 2014, 234-235) could be a valuable for staff in co-production. As the authors explain: "In essence, an organization with good expectation management matches behaviour with what is communicated and avoids creating unintended or misleading expectations".

Overall, the skills of public sector personnel in interacting with citizens seem to play a key role in fostering co-production and participation (Marschall 2004, Jones and Ormston 2010). For instance, the study of Marschall (2004) underlines the importance of governmental actors formally connecting with citizens in order to stimulate participation and mobilization of citizens. Communication skills are not limited only to creating interaction and dialogue between citizens and public sector personnel, but also between different groups of citizens. This notion shifts attention from communication alone to the wider skills of facilitation and coordination – the enabling skills.

Enabling skills

There is a general understanding in co-production literature that the role of public service personnel shifts from offering top-down expertise towards coordination of co-production (cf. Bochove et al. 2013, Bovaird 2007, Verschuere et al. 2012). As noted before, public service staff not only mobilize and activate citizens to co-produce but also facilitate and coordinate collaboration between individuals and public service organisations and between different groups of citizens. Especially in a top-down perspective to co-production, the role of staff is also to take into account the expectations of the public organisation in terms of whether, what and with whom to co-produce (cf. Alford and O'Flynn 2012).

This top-down view of co-production offers less room to examine citizen activism and bottom-up co-production initiatives, but in such cases, especially if citizen activation is a desired outcome, the role of staff can be to facilitate and motivate people by 'bridging and bonding' communities and people. For instance, in local government activities, staff try to bring together different communities and residents, acting as facilitators of community activities (Jones and Ormston 2013, Lowndes and

Sullivan 2008, Marschall 2004, Tuurnas 2016, Wagenaar 2007). The importance of staff as stimulating forces for creating 'active citizenship' gains support from the study of Jones and Ormston (2014) , who emphasise that to access the potential of active communities a lot depends on the local authorities' willingness to foster cooperation, which requires skills and the development of trust.

Linked to this, the concepts of 'asset-based approach' and 'strength-based approach' can offer a new way of enabling as an overall task for public bodies, underlining the importance of individual and community assets for creating better communities and services (cf. Fox 2017). Instead of focusing on the problems and needs of communities, the approach focuses rather on what individuals or communities *can* do, with the right kinds of support. This approach can be a useful hands-on enabling tool, especially for those in managerial positions. Particularly in times of austerity, local government officials and politicians may become more interested in using the asset-based approach to re-design the local service systems to make use of the local assets, which are already there, but have not been sufficiently utilised. This can be done, for instance, by making a living map of local assets; segmenting and identifying the strengths of communities or user groups; and enabling them to act. However, it should be underlined that this approach also requires investment and effort, e.g. in early intervention, and thus does not conform to the logic of merely cutting and saving money (Fox 2017).

Moreover, the asset-based approach applies not only to community co-production or to the managerial level of staff, but also to individual encounters on the frontline. As Fox (2017, 2) notes: "An asset-based public body does not have 'customers' (whose only responsibility is to pay taxes), rather it views everyone, including people with long term support needs, as citizens, with rights and responsibilities." Thus, enabling skills are also needed on an individual level. With the increase in self-care, this enabling role falls naturally on health care service staff (cf. Oudshoorn 2012, Vallo Hult et al. 2017). Wu et al. (2014, 195) studying self-care in diabetes, highlight the enabling role of health care staff, especially through their ability to design education programs and interventions for promoting self-care.

In this kind of role, staff also need to use their enabling skills to tackle resistance among patients who who may feel that they are given the tasks that should be performed by public service personnel, for instance, by monitoring or measuring their own blood pressure or body weight as a part of their treatment (Oudshoorn 2012). Hence, it is important that staff are also able to motivate patients to take responsibility over their own health. Especially co-*design* skills may become useful. As Sarasohn-

Kahn (2013, 18) shows, users who co-designed services will also be more prone to find motivation and capability to co-manage their own health.

Overall, the shifting responsibilities and roles involved in co-production may be a difficult issue for both patients and staff. Particularly when co-production is clearly a result of austerity, citizens might suspect that government is merely transferring responsibility, while it withdraws from service production (cf. Moynihan and Thomas 2013, Oudshoorn 2012). Regular staff may also feel betrayed or fear losing their jobs due to austerity measures disguised as co-production – sometimes also rightly so (cf. Blackladder and Jackson 2011). In this case it can be difficult to motivate staff to engage eagerly in co-production. However, this is often still not the case, and co-production can be beneficial both to the work of staff and to the quality of the service. So, as staff play a key role in making co-production work, it is necessary to look at their motivation, too.

Motivating staff to co-produce: professional boundaries and how to transform them?

In this section, the motivational side of co-production by staff is examined from the viewpoint of (professional) boundaries and the importance of identity work. Whereas boundaries help to explain the potential problems in co-production, identity work is presented as a potential solution to tackle those problems. Indeed, the motivation for staff to co-produce may be hindered due to protection of professional boundaries, caused by fear or lack of understanding about the benefits of co-production (van Bochove et al. 2016, Tuurnas 2015). Maintaining or opening the boundaries also defines to which extent collaboration can actually be realised (Rashman et al. 2009). In co-production, the boundaries between the staff and citizen or client co-producers are at the core.

Then, how do such boundaries appear in reality? Here, a study by Claxton-Oldfield (2008) provides an illustrative warning. Their research on volunteers in hospice palliative care showed that professionals can defend their boundaries - for instance, by not inviting volunteers to team meetings. Professionals also used their discretion as way to exclude volunteers by raising concerns about patient confidentiality. As a result, and not surprisingly, volunteers felt valued by the patients and the families, but not by doctors, social workers and nurses (ibid. 125). Overall, several research studies suggest that co-production with volunteers may be seen as a threat to the status and role of staff (cf. van Bochove et al. 2016, Merrell 2000).

However, there are also research findings that indicate the opposite. For instance, as van Bochove and colleagues (2016) demonstrate in their empirical research, professionals working in the field of social services seem to gain more upgrading than downgrading due to task-division with volunteers (see also Tulloch et al. 2015). First, this is due to the possibility for staff to focus on more specialized tasks, as some of the easier tasks are handed over to the volunteering co-producers. Second, coordination of volunteers can be seen as an upgrade of the tasks performed by public service personnel. Third, volunteering citizens can also help improve performance and quality through providing additional skills that are needed in the hectic work of caring (see van Bochove et al. 2016, Tulloch et al. 2015, Tuurnas et al. 2016). This is a notion that could be used in motivating staff to accept volunteers in their 'professional domains'. What is more, it is also important to communicate to staff that co-production does not lessen their value to the organisation. In this way, and through positive experiences of crossing and transforming boundaries, staff may feel more open towards co-production. However, to make this transformation happen, there may be a need for identity work.

In her longitudinal in-depth field study, Lifshitz-Assaf (2018) highlights the importance of *professional identity work* for transforming professional boundaries. In the research of NASA's open innovation model and its affects on R&D professionals, it was shown that professionals' identity is essential in the adoption of change and innovation (ibid. 772). It was also shown that those professionals who went through the identity refocusing work deconstructed their boundaries in a way that allowed them truly to adopt external knowledge and to share their own internal knowledge.

This study also helps in understanding the profound changes needed in the self-perceptions of public service personnel. When aiming to open professional boundaries, it is important to focus on the question of *why* people do their work, instead of focusing on the question, *how* they do it. Her study also underlines the importance of changing the working environment as a supporting element to open up: those who had several working roles across projects, units and disciplines, were more prone to "refocus their professional identity and dismantle their knowledge boundaries" (ibid. 771-772).

Finally, in motivating staff to open up to co-production, the role of organisational support cannot be underestimated. It is not just the individual staff members who will need to learn new skills, but often there is a need for organisational learning alongside individual learning (Rashman et al. 2009, Tuurnas 2015). As research has shown, co-production may clash with some core values which guide the staff working for the public. These include dilemmas related to representativeness and neutrality of public service activities (cf. Jaspers and Steen 2018, Tuurnas 2015). Here, it is important for

managers to negotiate risks related to co-production with the staff (Brown and Osborne 2013). In the same way, organisations which develop an open culture and demonstrate credible commitment towards co-production by adjusting structures and procedures (e.g. incentive structures and supportive performance management) can encourage and motivate staff to co-produce (Steen and Tuurnas 2018, Tuurnas 2015, Verschuere et al. 2012, Voorberg et al. 2014).

Drawing together the findings: skilling and motivating the personnel for co-production

This chapter has focused on examining the skilling and motivating of public service personnel for co-production. First, I have presented core skills needed in co-production, categorised as *segmenting*, *communication* and *enabling skills*. While this kind of typology is certainly not the only way of listing the key skills of professionals, it offers one window into examining the various changes and challenges that co-production brings about to the customary work of public service personnel. When discussing and presenting these skills, it also becomes clear that co-production is a wide and complex issue for the staff to undertake in general.

Second, the chapter examined the motivation side of public service personnel from the perspective of boundaries and identity work. This provides a reflective viewpoint for understanding the in-depth changes that co-production might catalyse among staff. It is essential to understand that allowing, and indeed even inviting, citizens to enter the traditional professional domains of public service workers can be a fundamental change in the identity of these staff. Therefore, the role of managers and supporting organisational structures was also highlighted.

Moreover, in line with Bovaird and Loeffler (2012) the chapter strongly underlines a need for motivational work and revised training for public service personnel. So, what exactly could be done in organisations which wish to train staff to be successful co-producers? To answer this question, I present three hands-on suggestions that can be useful in this respect.

First, there is evidently a need for interaction training for staff. As Vallo Hult et al. (2017) show in relation to physicians and digitalization of health care, a variety of new skills starting from advancing IT skills and learning to use new systems and databases is needed. Moreover, appropriate governance of the role which ICT increasingly plays in modern occupations, helping staff to communicate with citizens in their different roles, is needed. Moreover, Vallo Hult et al. (2017) underline that professional education is lagging behind by focusing on ‘formal lectures and learning by heart’ and on medical knowledge to treat patients, neglecting education for working in an environment of

complex situations with active patients, using new (digitalized) platforms and crossing new boundaries of professional and non-professional expertise. All in all, formal education and training organisations can be seen as core players in skilling and motivating staff for co-production.

Second, co-production requires new attitudes toward citizens and service users, focusing on the behavioural aspect of skilling and motivating staff. But how can attitudes be changed? As noted ein this chapter, empathy plays a crucial role in making co-production encounters successful, helping the collaborating parties to trust each other (see, for example, O´Leary et al. 2012). Empathy can be seen as a personal quality, but it can also be enhanced by training. For instance, in the study by Henry-Tillman (2001) students were asked to shadow their patients throughout their treatment. This way, the students learned to see their patients as people, not merely as symptoms. Also social media channels, such as patient blogs, may help health care staff to understand the experiential side of the illnesses they treat, and thereby may increase empathy (Thoër et al. 2017). Overall, these findings suggest that understanding the entirety of a person's life beyond the symptoms or social problems seems to be crucial for increasing empathy. Also co-design methods, such as creating service paths or using patient stories, can be useful in bringing the worlds of staff and service users and citizens closer to one another, motivating both parties for co-production.

Third, it is important to understand that skilling and motivation to co-produce not only stems from formal training or using specific methods. The role of *learning by doing* is crucial; co-production oriented organisations can give their staff opportunities to learn about co-production by organising opportunities to experiment. Moreover, in a networked environment, the staff can also be encouraged and motivated to co-produce through learning from each other. Tuurnas (2015) shows that increased interaction among public service personnel, representing different fields, seemed to support individual staff members in learning about co-production from each other, and then potentially adapting and adopting the learned methods in their own fields.

Finally, the chapter opens up some avenues for future research. First, in the skilling of staff for co-production, we still need empirical understanding concerning the perspectives of staff: what are the trickiest parts of co-production, what types of co-production take staff furthest out of their comfort zones and why? Here, surveys across different professional fields and levels could bring particularly illuminating insights. Second, the different types of skills presented here as segmenting, communication and enabling skills could be examined and developed further through empirical studies in different task environments, as a way to develop the categorisation of the core co-production skills for public service personnel. Questions arising here include: how are these co-

production skills handled in the formal education of students in various fields of public services? And, do personal attributes make a difference in mastering certain skills more than others, and if so, how can new types of boundary-breaking teams be built up in public service organisations (cf. the study of Lifshitz-Assaf; 2018)? Third, in relation to the motivation of staff, the idea of identity work could be studied further in different types of co-production tasks, across different occupations, to understand the transformation which co-production brings about to staff in their work.

References

Alford, J. (1998). A public management road less travelled: Clients as co-producers of public services. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 57(4), 128–137. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8500.1998.tb01568.x.

Alford, J. (2002). Why do public-sector clients coproduce? Towards a contingency theory. *Administration and Society*, 34(1), 32–56. https://doi.org/10.1177/0095399702034001004.

Alford, J. and J. O'Flynn (2012). *Rethinking Public Service Delivery. Managing with external providers.* Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bartels, K.C. (2014). Communicative Capacity: The Added Value of Public Encounters for Participatory Democracy. *The American Review of Public Administration* 44(6) 656–674. doi: 10.1177/0275074013478152.

Blackladder, M. & Jackson, R. (2011, 8 November). Dispelling the myths around job substitution by volunteers. *Guardian* https://www.theguardian.com/voluntary-sector-network/2011/aug/18/volunteers-not-threat-to-workers. Accessed 8 November 2018.

van Bochove, M., Tonkens, E. Verplanke, L. & Roggeveen, S. (2016). Reconstructing the professional domain: Boundary work of professionals and volunteers in the context of social service reform. *Current Sociology*, 1-20, doi: 10.1177/0011392116677300.

Botero, A., Paterson, A. G. & Saad-Sulonen, J. (2012). *Towards peer production in public services: Cases from Finland*. Helsinki: Aalto University.

Bovaird, T. (2007). Beyond engagement and participation: User and community co-production of public services. *Public Administration Review*, 67(5), 846–860. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2007.00773.x

Bovaird, T. & Löffler, E. (2012). From engagement to co-production: How users and communities contribute to public services. *Voluntas*, (23), 1119–1138. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2007.00773.x.

Branco, R. M., Quental J. & Ribeiro, Ó. (2017). Personalised participation: an approach to involve people with dementia and their families in a participatory design project, *CoDesign*, 13(2), 127-143. https://doi.org/10.1080/15710882.2017.1310903.

Brandsen, T., & Honingh, M. (2016). Distinguishing Different Types of Coproduction: A Conceptual Analysis Based on the Classical Definitions. *Public Administration Review*, 76(3), 427-435. https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12465.

Bäcklund, P., Kallio, K.P. & Häkli, J. (2014). Residents, customers or citizens? Tracing the idea of youthful participation in the context of administrative reforms in Finnish public administration. *Planning Theory and Practice* 15 (3), 311–327. https://doi.org/10.1080/14649357.2014.929726.

Claxton-Oldfield, S. & Claxton-Oldfield, J. (2008). Some Common Problems Faced by Hospice Palliative Care Volunteers. *American Journal of Hospice & Palliative Medicine*, 25 (2), 121–126. https://doi.org/10.1177/1049909107312593.

Fox, A. (2017). The Asset-Based Area. A Briefing Document. Think Local Act Personal, https://www.thinklocalactpersonal.org.uk/_assets/Resources/BCC/AssetBasedArea.pdf. Accessed 1 March 2019.

Jaspers, S. & Steen, T. (2018). Realizing public values: enhancement or obstruction? Exploring value tensions and coping strategies in the co-production of social care. *Public Management Review,* 21(4), 606–627. doi: 10.1080/14719037.2018.1508608.

Jones, T. & Ormston, C. (2014). Localism and accountability in a post-collaborative era: Where does it leave the community right to challenge? *Local Government Studies,* 40(1), 141–161. doi: 10.1080/03003930.2013.801834.

Henry-Tillman, R., Deloney, L.A, Savidge, M., Graham, C.J. & Klimberg, V.S. (2001). The medical student as patient navigator as an approach to teaching empathy. *The American Journal of Surgery* 183(6), 659–662. doi: 10.1016/s0002-9610(02)00867-x.

Lifshitz-Assaf, H. (2018). Dismantling Knowledge Boundaries at NASA: The Critical Role of Professional Identity in Open Innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 63(4)746–782. https://doi.org/10.1177/0001839217747876.

Lowndes, V. & Sullivan, H. (2008). How low can you go? Rationales and challenges for neighborhood governance. *Public Administration*, 86(1), 53–57. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9299.2007.00696.x.

Marschall, M. (2004). Citizen participation and the neighborhood context: A new look at the coproduction of local public goods. *Political Research Quarterly,* 57(2), 231–244. doi: 10.1177/106591290405700205.

Merrell, J. (2000). Ambiguity: exploring the complexity of roles and boundaries when working with volunteers in well woman clinics. *Social Science & Medicine* 51(5), 93–102. doi: 10.1016/s0277-9536(99)00442-6.

Moynihan, D.P. & J.C. Thomas (2013). Citizen, Customer, Partner: Rethinking the Place of the Public in Public Management. *Public Administration Review,* 73 (6): 786-796. https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12109.

O'Leary, R., Y. Choi and C.M. Gerard. (2012). The Skill Set of the Successful Collaborator. *Public Administration Review* 72(1), 70-83. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2012.02667.x.

Olkkonen, L. & Luoma-aho, V. (2014). Public relations as expectation management? *Journal of Communication Management*, 18(3), 222–239. https://doi.org/10.1108/JCOM-02-2013-0012.

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), 31–47. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.12010.

Oudshoorn, N. (2012) How places matter: Telecare technologies and the changing spatial dimensions of healthcare. *Social Studies of Science* 42(1), 121–142. https://doi.org/10.1177/0306312711431817.

Parrado, S., van Ryzin, G., Bovaird, T. & Loeffler, E. (2013). Correlates of co-production: evidence from a five-nation study of citizens. *International Public Management Journal*, 16(1), 85–112. https://doi.org/10.1080/10967494.2013.796260.

Pestoff, V. (2012). New public governance, co-production and the third sector social services in Europe: Crowding in and crowding out. In V. Pestoff, T. Brandsen & B. Verschuere (Eds.), *New public governance, the third sector and co-production* (pp. 361–380). New York: Routledge.

QCOSS Community Door eTraining, (2018). *Free online training for the community services sector Courses.* https://etraining.communitydoor.org.au/mod/page/view.php?id=99. Accessed 8 February 2019.

Rashman, L., Withers, E. & Hartley, J. 2009. Organizational learning and knowledge in public service organizations: A systematic review of the literature. *International Journal of Management Reviews,* 11(4), 463-494. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2009.00257.x.

Sarasohn-Kahn, J. (2012). A Role for Patients The Argument for Self-Care. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 44(1S1), 16–18. doi: 10.1016/j.amepre.2012.09.019.

Steen, T. & Tuurnas, S. (2018). The Roles of the Professional in Co-production and Co-creation Processes, In: Taco Brandsen, Bram Verschuere and Trui Steen (Eds.) *Co-production and Co-creation: Engaging Citizens in Public Services,* (pp. 80–92). New York: Routledge.

Thomas, J. C. 2013. Citizen, customer, partner: Rethinking the place of the public in public management. *Public Administration Review*, 73(6), 786-796. https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12109.

Thoër, C., Millerand, F. & Gellersted, M. (2017). When Medicine Is Becoming Collaborative: Social Networking Among Health-Care Professionals. In: L. Menvielle, F. Audrain-Pontevia & W. Menvielle (Eds.): *The Digitalisation of Health care. Challenges and Opportunities*, (pp.119–134). London: Palgrave& MacMillan.

Tulloch, O., Taegtmeeyer, M., Ananworanich, J., Chasombat, S., Kosalaraksa, P. & Theobald, S. (2015). What can volunteer co-providers contribute to health systems? The role of people living with HIV in the Thai paediatric HIV programme. *Social Science & Medicine* 145, 184-192. doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2014.09.017.

Tuurnas, S. (2015). Learning to co-produce? The perspective of public service professionals. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*. 28(7), 583–598. 10.1108/ijpsm-04-2015-0073

Tuurnas S. (2016). Looking beyond the Simplistic Ideals of Participatory Projects: Fostering Effective Co-production? *International Journal of Public Administration,* 39(3), 1077-1087. https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2016.1178284.

Tuurnas S., Stenvall J., Rannisto P-H. (2016). The Impact of Co-production on Frontline Accountability – the Case of Conciliation. *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 82(1), 131–149. https://doi.org/10.1177/0020852314566010.

Tuurnas, S. (2020). How does co-production shape public sector communication? In V. Luoma-aho & M.J. Canel (Eds.). *Handbook of Public Sector Communication* (pp. 139-151). New York: Wiley Blackwell.

Vallo Hult, H., Hansson, A, Svensson, L., & Gellerstedt, M. (2017). ICT as support for learning: demanding new competence among physicians. *INTED2017 Proceedings*, pp. 4629-4636. doi: 10.21125/inted.2017.1090

Verschuere, B., Brandsen, T. and Pestoff, V. (2012). Co-production: The state of art in research and the future agenda. *International Society for Third Sector Research*, 23(4), 1083–1101. doi 10.1007/s 11266-012-9307-8.

Voorberg, W.H., Bekkers, V.J.J.M. and Tummers, L.G. (2014). A systematic review of co-creation and co-production: Embarking on the social innovation journey. *Public Management Review*, 17(9), 1333-1357. doi:10.1080/14719037.2014.930505.

Wagenaar, H. (2007). Governance, Complexity, and Democratic Participation. How Citizens and Public Officials Harness the Complexities of Neighborhood Decline. *The American Review of Public Administration* 37(1), 17–50. https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074006296208.

Williams, B.N., Kang, S-C., & Johnson, J. (2015). (Co)-Contamination as the Dark Side of Co-Production: Public Value Failures in Co-Production processes. *Public Management Review*, 18(5), 692-717. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2015.1111660.

Wu, S-F. V., Tung, H-H, Liang, S-Y, Lee, M-C & Yu, N-C., (2014). Differences in the perceptions of self-care, health education barriers and educational needs between diabetes patients and nurses. *Contemporary Nurse*, 46(2), 187–196, doi: 10.5172/conu.2014.46.2.187.