Research Anthology on Citizen Engagement and Activism for Social Change

Information Resources Management Association
USA

IGI Global
PUBLISHER of TIMELY KNOWLEDGE

Published in the United States of America by
IGI Global
Information Science Reference (an imprint of IGI Global)
701 E. Chocolate Avenue
Hershey PA, USA 17033
Tel: 717-533-8845
Fax: 717-533-8661
E-mail: cust@igi-global.com
Web site: http://www.igi-global.com

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Information Resources Management Association, editor.
Title: Research anthology on citizen engagement and activism for social change / Information Resources Management Association, editor.
Description: Hershey, PA : Information Science Reference, [2022] | Includes bibliographical references and index. | Summary: "This research publication addresses social change and the various ways citizens are involved in shaping society, covering topics such as accountability, social media, voter turnout, and leadership"-- Provided by publisher.
Identifiers: LCCN 2021040447 (print) | LCCN 2021040448 (ebook) | ISBN 9781668437063 (hardcover) | ISBN 9781668437070 (ebook)
Subjects: LCSH: Social change. | Social action. | Political participation.
Classification: LCC HM831 .R467 2022 (print) | LCC HM831 (ebook) | DDC 303.4--dc23
LC record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2021040447
LC ebook record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2021040448

British Cataloguing in Publication Data
A Cataloguing in Publication record for this book is available from the British Library.

Chapter 74
Co-Creation of Public Values:
Citizenship, Social Justice, and Well-Being

Dina von Heimburg
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6293-084X
Levanger Municipality, Norway & Nord University, Norway & Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Norway

Ottar Ness
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7322-2227
Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Norway

Jacob Storch
Joint Action Analytics, Denmark

ABSTRACT

Well-being is of vital importance for individuals as well as society at large. UNs Sustainability Goal #17, 'Partnership for the Goals', support co-creation and co-production as necessary approaches to reach public values such as citizenship, social justice, and well-being. However, co-creation and co-production is not enough. It is necessary to address who participates in co-creation, how they participate, and how participation affects outcomes. Inclusive participation in everyday life, public services, and democracy is crucial to achieve active citizenship and well-being for all. This chapter will discuss how voices of citizens in marginalized and vulnerable life situations needs to be included and recognized in democracy and public sector practices as well as in decision-making processes. The chapter suggests how public sector organisations can promote active citizenship, valued social roles, and well-being through participation in co-creation of public values, placing well-being for all and social justice at the forefront of public value co-creation.

DOI: 10.4018/978-1-6684-3706-3.ch074

INTRODUCTION

How do we create communities where people feel valued and add value to others? How can the public sector, citizens and stakeholders work together to support citizenship, social justice and well-being? There is an urgent need for political consensus, collaboration and co-creation across the whole of government, and the whole of society, to achieve sustainable development and create well-being for all, leaving no one behind (United Cities and Local Governments [UN], 2015; World Health Organization [WHO], 2019a). Equity, health, and well-being are crucial determinants of sustainable societies, and for which collaboration and inclusive participation is imperative (European Commision [EU], nd; Kickbush 2012; Marmot, 2014; Marmot et al., 2020; OECD, 2020; WHO, 2019a,b). The importance of well-being is highlighted in the UNs SDG#3; ´Ensure healthy lives and promote wellbeing for all at all ages´. Although, moderate progress has been made to reach SDG#3 goals, the SDG goal #10 on reducing inequity requires attention to achieve social justice.

High levels of inequality create social gaps in health and well-being, and harms society in many ways. It hampers social cohesion and can reduce a sense of citizenship, resulting in lost opportunities for many aligned with increased crime and social vulnerability affecting the whole population (International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance, 2013; Marmot, 2014; Wilkinson & Pickett, 2009). Moreover, it reduces social trust in general, and especially in public and democratic institutions (International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance, 2013; OECD, 2020; WHO, 2019b). The need to belong and the dependency to other people is universal and a basic part of being human (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). According to Prilletensky (2020), many of the above-mentioned problems origins in what he describes as an 'Me-culture' formed by societal fragmentation and neoliberal tendencies in the society. However, a 'We-culture' of inclusiveness, belonging, compassion and reciprocal support is required to support wellbeing for all, and, as the SDG's urges; to leaving no one behind.

The WHO Health Equity Status Report (WHO, 2019a) captures the impact of policies on inequities in health and well-being over the last 10 to 15 years. This report have identified five critical factors and assigned to each a percentage reflecting its contribution to the overall burden of health inequity: Income security and social protection (35%); living conditions (29%); social and human capital (19%); access to and quality of health care (10%); and employment and working conditions (7%). Addressing these factors is above all a political choice, and where opinions and political will-formation are informed by democratic participation (WHO, 2019b; Marmot et al., 2020). These factors are also connected to measures beyond available public services. Acknowledging the significance of social support, public services cannot simply 'deliver' friendships and caring social networks to citizens as a service. The public sector also has limited measures available for creating good living environments and meaningful work for all that ensures economic safety, as these values are highly dependent on stakeholders outside of the public sector. Creating public value that addresses the abovementioned factors thus relies on collaboration and co-creation across the whole of society, crosswise sectors, at multiple levels.

In general, the responsibility for participatory processes to create public value falls to the public sector, with a particular responsibility on administrations and political leaders. However, participatory processes can also be invited by companies, non-governmental organizations and social entrepreneurs, who might enable numerous entry points and openings to endorse more participatory and empowering processes, even in settings in which there are no participatory traditions (WHO, 2019b). Contrary to making progress towards social justice and well-being for all, political parties and political views are becoming more polarized, people are getting more disengaged, and those affected by low levels of

well-being tend to be excluded from democratic processes (International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance, 2013; OECD, 2020; WHO, 2019a,b). In parallel, social inequities in health and well-being are accelerated by neoliberal societal tendencies, and where late stage neoliberalism has contributed to alienate people from 'the collective' (Gergen, 2009; Pūras, 2020). Such societal tendencies are leading to pressing public health problems, crime, polarization and marginalization, and are threatening human rights and sustainable development across the globe (Pūras, 2020; WHO, 2019a,b; Wilkinson & Pickett, 2009).

Social justice is vital to achieve well-being for all, aligned with deepening democracy and to revive trust in public institutions (OECD, 2020; WHO, 2019b). However, progress to create equal opportunities within and between populations is slower than expected (UN, 2019). The creation of well-being for all, and sustainable development as fundamental public values, are linked to a whole-systems-approach, including the need for participation and co-creation between stakeholders, sectors and levels of government (WHO, 2013; 2016). Building solutions for achieving well-being and citizenship is good for both people and society. It empowers citizens, is good for decision-making processes, ensures that solutions address real needs and desires, and legitimizes policies and political decisions. However, the paradox is that citizens who have lower levels of well-being than the average population, also tend to participate less in developing policies that affects their lives (Hanefeld et al., 2019; OECD, 2020; WHO 2019a,b). Even though that it is important that everybody actively participates in democracy and society, it is even more crucial to foster participation amongst those who are marginalized, vulnerable, silent and potentially anti-social (Hanefeld et al., 2019; International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance, 2013; Smith, 2009).

According to the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (International IDEA; 2013) and WHO (2019a), groups who suffer from marginalized vulnerable living conditions tend to be subjected to lower levels of well-being and are at the same time being politically less active. Examples of such groups are people with low socio-economic status, ethnic and linguistic minorities and migrants, people with disabilities; young people; people not in education, employment or training; fragile elderly people; indigenous peoples; those from remote and rural geographic locations; and people discriminated against on the basis of their gender or sexual orientation. Nevertheless, equity in participation in processes as well as fair outcomes resulting from co-creation processes is hard to achieve (WHO, 2019b; OECD, 2020). Thus, innovation and sociological imagination are needed (Atkinson et al., 2017) in the processes of co-creating well-being as a public value.

In order to put the citizens as a resource and active contributors, rather than consumers in the public sector, public policy reforms across the globe are currently desired a transition into the megatrend "New Public Governance" (NPG) aligned with co-production and co-creation approaches to inclusive participation towards well-being (Brix et al., 2020; Commission on the Future Delivery of Public Services 2011; Mortensen et al., 2020; OECD 2011; Pestoff, 2019; Storch & Hornstrup, 2020). Co-creation with citizens, living in vulnerable and marginalized situations, is a promising approach to reduce inequities and to build strong foundations for more sustainable and democratic well-being societies. The aim of this chapter is to discuss how societies can be made more socially inclusive, sustainable and fair by using co-creational processes. Questions needed to be discussed is then: Who should participate? How? Where? And with what purpose and consequence? This involves how voices of citizens in marginalized and vulnerable life situations needs to be included and recognized in co-creation processes in democracy and public sector service delivery and decision-making.

PARTICIPATION IN CO-CREATING PUBLIC VALUES

Democracy and the public sector could ultimately be described as socially constructed ways to organize societies to serve the purpose of creating public value (Selloni, 2017). Over the last decades, public organizations across the world are increasingly asked to refocus their strategies to pursue public value through a collaborative approach (Moore, 1995; Pestoff, 2019; Storch & Hornstrup, 2020). Public value is acknowledged as a ´game changer´ for the public sector, governance and democratic leadership, acting as a catalyst for radical change and public sector reform (Moore, 1995; Torfing & Sørensen, 2019). Our conception of public value, in this chapter, is following Ayres´ (2019, p. 281) definition:

Creating outputs and outcomes in the interest of the common good, including the clients, citizens and stakeholders which the policy affects. Doing this requires that the voices and expectations of affected groups feed into policy deliberations in a meaningful way.

This shift towards public value in general, aligned with societal objectives of well-being for all, implies a shift in roles, both for citizens, communities, organizations, public servants, leaders in the public sector and elected political representatives.

The basic idea in the co-creation logic which currently endeavors to transform the public sector and democracy, is to facilitate and mobilize active involvement of citizens and stakeholders in the creation of public value. This is grounded in acknowledging that a wide range of actors, stakeholders and organizations, across the whole of society, are vital contributors to 'co-creating' public value (Pestoff, 2019). The term co-creation covers a 'jungle' of co-dimensions (Osborne, 2018; Brix et al., 2020; Cluley & Radnor, 2020; Mortensen et al., 2020; Voorberg et al., 2015). In this chapter, the term 'co-creation' is approached as a participatory and deliberative logic in practice, policies and democratic processes; encompassing co-production and other related concepts. The term 'co-production' often refers to a relationship between actors engaging in the voluntary or involuntary production of any public service. Osborne et al. (2016) argue that public service delivery cannot exist without co-production, as the value resulting from public services is created in the nexus of interactions. The public service users (i.e. citizens) tend to be positioned as the main value producer in the creation of both individual and public values. Adding on to co-production, the term 'co-creation' often entails the whole policy-process, including a political dimension (Pestoff, 2019; Selloni, 2017). In this perspective, co-creation of public values can happen at any stage in the policy-process; from co-initiation, co-design, co-implementation, co-production, to co-evaluation (Pestoff, 2019; Torfing et al., 2019; Selloni, 2017). Torfing et al. (2019, p. 802) provides a general definition of co-creation in the public sector:

A process through which two or more public and private actors attempt to solve a shared problem, challenge, or task through a constructive exchange of different kinds of knowledge, resources, competences, and ideas that enhance the production of public value in terms of visions, plans, policies, strategies, regulatory frameworks, or services, either through a continuous improvement of outputs or outcomes or through innovative step-changes that transform the understanding of the problem or task at hand and lead to new ways of solving it.

In a co-creational logic, relevant and affected actors are presumed to participate in defining and solving shared problems and common tasks (Torfing et al., 2019). However, participation per se in co-creation and co-production of public value outcomes does not ensure that processes nor outcomes are socially just. Understanding "what adds value to the public" (Benington, 2009, p. 233) requires engagement with citizens and stakeholders.

However, this is not a new approach; even in the cradle of democracy in ancient Greece, Aristotle's concern was to develop democratic institutions and state systems that pursued the "public interest". Aristotle made a distinction between pursuing a common interest where every citizen can flourish and fulfill their purpose as human beings in community life, as opposed to pursuing the interest of sovereigns and other powerful leaders in the society (Diggs, 1973; Selloni, 2017). Thus, Aristotle firmly placed ´the public interest´ within a framework of pursuing well-being, where living a meaningful life above all was the most desired value.

PROMOTING WELL-BEING AND CAPABILITIES

Well-being is a fundamental value for individuals, and for societies to prosper. A high level of well-being constitutes a meaningful goal for people across all sectors of society. Well-being reflects how people evaluate and experience their lives and their life conditions, and is inherently linked to freedom, mastery and meaning in life, to positive emotions, social connection and well-functioning, to health and mortality (Diener et al., 2017).

It is well documented that well-being is closely associated with, and often a cause of, a wide range of important individual and societal outcomes like social connectedness and integration, innovation, productivity, work and school performance, improved health (i.e., cardiovascular and immune system functioning), healthy behaviour, and longevity (Kickbush 2012; Marmot, 2014; Marmot et al., 2020; Steptoe et al., 2015). The health, finance, educational, and labour sectors, and their related services, are therefore increasingly focusing on promotion of mental capabilities to fight some of the most urgent societal ailments of today including both mental and physical health problems, school dropout, social marginalisation, work disability, and long-term sick leave. At the core of this activity is the objective to improve quality of life and well-being as a public value (Phillips, 2006).

The Capabilities framework provides a viable path to progress well-being for all, while also, specifically, addressing issues of social justice (Davidson et al., 2009; Nussbaum, 2000; Sen, 1999). The capabilities framework emphasizes the importance of people's freedoms to live a life, they have a reason to value. Peoples opportunities to achieve well-being, depend on capabilities such as vitality, living conditions or having loving relationships with others. Accordingly, the capability approach also involves taking action to empower citizenship, so people can impact on their life circumstances and living environments through democratic participation (Freire, 1997; Marmot et al., 2020; WHO, 2019b).

Sen (1992, 1999) links the development of capabilities to freedom and quality of life, inspired by the Aristotelian notion on human flourishing. Further, Sen makes a solid argument for replacing economic imperatives in societal development with freedom to achieve well-being. He argues that policies, and the evaluations of these, should concentrate on people's quality of life and the conditions affecting our possibilities to live a life we have a reason to value. According to Dréze and Sen (2002, p. 6), within this framework, developments of capabilities are not to be mistaken as an individual process:

The [capability] approach used in this study is much concerned with the opportunities that people have to improve the quality of their lives. It is essentially a 'people-centered' approach, which puts human agency (rather than organizations such as markets or governments) at the centre of the stage. The crucial role of social opportunities is to expand the realm of human agency and freedom, both as an end in itself and as a means of further expansion of freedom. The word 'social' in the expression 'social opportunity' (…) is a useful reminder not to view individuals and their opportunities in isolated terms. The options that a person has depend greatly on relations with others and on what the state and other institutions do. We shall be particularly concerned with those opportunities that are strongly influenced by social circumstances and public policy.

Capabilities are understood as freedoms to engage in valued social activities and roles, addressing what people can be and do (Sen, 1992, 2005). Hence, the development of capabilities is an issue of moral significance to achieve social justice and well-being. This demands interdisciplinary, collaborative and participatory approaches to societal development, placing human rights and capabilities, democracy and empowerment and meaning making processes at the center of attention. According to Prilletensky (2020) there is no wellness without fairness. Based on a long history of interdisciplinary research, he suggests that this is about 'mattering', which is a central dimension of human well-being. 'Mattering' is about feeling valued as a person, and adding value in the life of others. Both of these dimensions are vital for well-being (Prilletensky, 2020). To make sure that everyone matters, inclusive citizenship is needed.

INCLUSIVE CITIZENSHIP AND RELATIONAL WELFARE

A vital part of well-being is inclusive citizenship. Achievement of full citizenship in the community is curated by a person's social environment, including social connections and the support and capital offered by those connections (Harper et al, 2017). Building on the work of Michael Rowe (2015) and colleagues (Clayton, O'Connell, Bellamy, Benedict, & Rowe, 2020) citizenship is defined as a connection with the rights, responsibilities, relationships, roles and resources associated with being a full member of society. This is also called the 5 Rs of citizenship and is a foundation for well-being and community integration (Clayton, et al.,2020; Rowe, 2015).

One ongoing example of radical change towards inclusive and active citizenship is the transformation of welfare states towards *relational welfare* (Cottam, 2018). This approach places people and the relationships between them as a focal point to reinvent and design societies and welfare systems. In this perspective, the objective and success criteria of a welfare state is that citizens can live well and enjoy a good quality of life, and not primarily assessing quantity and cost of public services (Ness & Heimburg, 2020; Storch & Hornstrup, 2020).

Focusing on inclusive citizenship and relational welfare there is a need to start by standing in communities, shoulder by shoulder, where one seeks insight together to understand the complexity of problems and possibilities to approach these from an everyday life perspective (Cottam, 2018; Desai et al., 2019; McNamee et al., 2020; Ness & Heimburg, 2020; Pelletier et al., 2009; Storch & Hornstrup, 2020). As Cottam (2018, p. 46) points out: "participation cannot be seen as something special or unusual that must be celebrated. We need to create systems that make participation easy, intuitive and natural". Following this, Ness and Heimburg (2020, p. 36) have provided the following description of relational welfare:

Relational welfare is a human centred and collaborative approach premised on human rights, social justice and societal sustainable development. Relational welfare means that welfare is a resource that people co-create together, where personal and collective relationships and environments are placed at the centre of development. Within this, the foremost mission of the public sector is to build public value as a common good by supporting conditions that enable all people to flourish and live a life they have reason to value and the capacity to sustain. The purpose is to strengthen the resources, relationships and communities to create positive and sustainable life courses, now and in the future.

However, radical changes, and placing well-being for all, as a focal public value in democratic processes in the public sector does not happen in a vacuum. Enabling inclusive citizenship and relational welfare towards well-being involves looking at social worlds as co-created. Useful questions to consider in such co-creational processes are borrowed from Pearce (2007, p. 53): (a) *what are we making together?* (b) *how are we making it?* (c) *what are we becoming as we make this?* And (d) *How can we make better social worlds together?* In order to make transformation towards well-being, we will now address some principles that may guide inclusive participation and well-being in co-creational processes, aligned with developing a relational account of welfare to promote well-being for all. These principles follow the work of Cormac Russell (2020, p. 15) on Asset Based Community Development (ABCD): (1) *Citizen-led*; (2) *Relationship-oriented*; (3) *Asset-based*, (4) *Place-based*; and (5) *Inclusion focused*.

Citizen-Led

A citizen-led approach means to move a mindset towards communities first, and institutions second (as opposed to a service-led approach). A citizen-led approach argues that there are certain things that citizens, by relating to each other can create, by themselves, and in collaboration with services in the public sector. Transformative change when using a citizen-led perspective is viewed through questions like: *What is it that citizens in communities are best placed to do together? What is it that citizens best can do with some outside help? What is it that communities need outside institutions to do for them? How can public sector institutions and other stakeholders do to support their wishes, hopes and dreams on co-creating nurturing communities*? Such questions put citizens in charge of change. They take on collective leadership by using what they have, to secure what they need. In this way, citizens support public servants, administrative leaders and politicians in how best they can be helpful to create value of importance to the citizens themselves. By highlighting a citizen-led approach it is important that all citizens are being included, also those who are living in marginalized and vulnerable living situations. A citizen-led apprach does not provide arguments for welfare state retratchment, rather it invites us to use redistributive measures and welfare institutions as platforms for inclusive participation (Pūras, 2020; Di Martino & Prilletensky, 2020). Since, until citizens in a given place know what they have, which is local and within the scope of their control, they cannot know what they need from other actors in society (Russell, 2020). This is a starting point of inclusiveness in co-creational processes.

Relationship-Oriented

Transformative change is bound by human relationships. A significant body of research suggest that supporting and loving relationships are the most vital of all assets for health and well-being (Antonovsky, 1987; Ersoy, 2017; Prilletensky, 2005; Putnam, 2000; Pūras, 2020). Human relationships and social

networks are vital for socially just participation and creating capabilities and well-being for all in public value co-creation. The importance of attending to relationships is increasingly acknowledged as vital for organizational functioning and interactive forms of governance aligned with co-creation (Bartels & Turnbull, 2019).

All citizens have assets that should be recognized in developing their communities. An asset-based approach, focusing on capabilities, goes beyond individuals and to tap into relational and shared power to take control over conditions affecting their well-being. Relational powered capabilities enable capacity-building to amplify and multiply the capacities of individuals, ensuring the societal whole is greater than the sum of its individual parts (Gergen, 2009; Pūras, 2020; Storch & Hornstrup, 2020; Russell, 2020). A relationship-oriented approach is not to be confused with the fact that the individuality of citizens does not matter. Rather, it points to the fact that having a good life depends on other beings, and relates to the ties of trust, care, kindness and empathy that all humans need to flourish in communities (Pūras, 2020). These are values that no individual can create alone, and where relational power matters (Cottam, 2018; Gergen, 2009; Rowe, 2015; Russell, 2020).

Asset-Based

Public services can get better results by 'working with' rather than 'doing to', drawing on the strengths and assets of individuals and communities to improve outcomes (Gergen 2009, 2014; Storch & Hornstrup, 2020; Russell, 2020). A radical focus on nurturing capabilities moves the discourse from looking at citizens as vulnerable (deficit-model) to approaching them as able, working to enhance capabilities to participate in deliberation and impact policies and social conditions that affects their well-being (asset-based model). In other words, to focus on 'what's strong', not 'what's wrong', and to use 'what's strong' to fix 'what's wrong' (Russell, 2020). The point is to shift the focus from community or citizen needs to community and citizen capacities. This means that the co-creational processes towards inclusive citizenship and well-being starts by asking about the personal "gifts" that citizens can contribute toward building their community: What are the skills they can put to work? What are the abilities and talents they can share? What are the experiences from which they have learned? What are the interests and dreams they would like to pursue?

Once collected, the aggregate information forms a knowledge base about local capacities that can be mobilized toward community building. These powerful human resources can be directed toward: Promoting economic growth, local enterprises, and job connections; organizing local community-building activities and projects; showcasing local talents and celebrating community; facilitating citizen action around critical issues and building relationships, trust, and social capital (Pūras, 2020; Russell, 2020).

Place-Based

Citizenship, participation and co-creation also relate to the question of *where* co-creation of practices and policies should be introduced in order to promote inclusion and lower thresholds for participation. Small local places set the stage for creating conditions for sustainable and satisfying lives (Russell, 2020). A place-based approach can facilitate potentials for out-reach democracy in the settings of everyday life, the places people live and act across the life span. This aspect is in accordance to the settings-approach to empowerment and deals with where the experiments are conducted, in arenas and settings where the

people live their everyday lives; where they live, learn, play, work, shop, leisure, use the internet (social media) and where settings have impact on wellbeing (WHO 1986, 2016).

The focus in the places where people live their everyday life is also aligned with a focus on local level governments. A report on the role of local governments in achieving the SDGs, supported by the European Commission, states that "Local governments are policy makers, catalysts of change and the level of government best-placed to link the global goals with local communities" (United Cities and Local Governments, 2015, p. 1). Accordingly, a place-based approach could lower the thresholds to reach groups of citizens who are socially excluded and experience severe barriers to participate in community life and co-creational processes on equal terms.

People live their everyday life in local communities. Further, it is in these settings that citizens have the closest connection to public services and the richest opportunity to participate in dialogues about conditions that affect their quality of life and sustainable development (WHO, 2016). Neighbourhoods, small towns, villages and estates are the scale at which local residents can be empowered to make an impact through acts of relating to each other and collective citizenship. The settings and places where people live their everyday lives are also the context within which the multiplicity of helping agencies an public sector provision can agree a common ground that moves them beyond their administrative silos, to work across boundaries to create values that are valued by the public. Research show that well-being is higher in areas where citizens have greater opportunities to become directly involved in the democratic process and participation in civil society. Having more opportunities to influence democratic processes increases people's well-being (OECD, 2020; Touchton & Wampler, 2014).

Inclusion-Focused

Social inclusion involves both an active form of citizenship (Ware, Hopper, Tugenberg, Dickey, & Fisher, 2007) and a sense of belonging (Prince & Gerber, 2005). This may result from being part of mainstream social networks and connections (social capital) to engage in meaningful social and occupational activities within the community. Barriers to social inclusion include not just social stigma and discrimination, but also practical issues that may arise because of people's mental health or social difficulties, such as low income, unemployment or poor housing (Bradshaw et al., 2007; Hall, Kakuma, Minas, Martins & Kermode, 2019; Pūras, 2019, 2020; Wright & Kloos, 2007).

Iris Marion Young (2000) claims that the norms of democratic deliberation are contextual and culturally specific, valuing some discourses and arguments, while devaluating others. Young maintains that this happens even though deliberation, theoretically, builds on premises of equity and a deliberative process towards unity. Responding to this, and expanding the notion of the deliberative model, she suggests a communicative approach that considers difference in voices as a resource to democracy, where members of a polity recognize each other in their particularity, listen to, understand, and give room for alternative ways to present an "argument", such as story-telling and ways of greeting that nurtures recognition and empathy.

Following Smith (2009, p. 12), principles of inclusion should focus on inclusiveness as an analytic concept; "the way in which political equality is realized in at least two aspects of participation: presence and voice". Inclusive participation and strengthening capabilities aims to empower citizens through active citizenship. Beyond enhancing capabilities related to presence and voice for politically marginalized and silent groups it also extends to addressing the democratic discourse and public sector co-creation as a whole, and to considering relational aspects of inclusion (through recognition), reflexivity (through

empathetic listening and taking on others' perspectives), and dialogue (through respectful and culturally sensitive processes of relating). This requires human capacity in terms of facilitating such processes.

In accordance to Fung (2015), democratic inclusion requires a focus on three major aspects of participation: (1) *Who participates* (inclusivity); (2) *How do they participate* (intensity and quality); and (3) *How are discussions and decisions linked with policy and public action* (influence). The aspect of social inclusiveness, embedded in all three dimensions, is thus intended in a twofold way: On one side most of participatory actions included should target a specific marginalised group, on the other side those initiatives should also involve multiple and diverse groups, in order to ensure an open and fertile participatory environment, which do not generate segregation. Supporting citizens to discover and connect local assets, is thus about actively inviting 'strangers' to take part in a 'collective' (Russell, 2020). When it comes to creating an environment and communities where all citizens can develop their capabilities and flourish, there is nobody who's gifts and assets are not desired in the pursuit of co-creating well-being for all as a public value.

ILLUSTRATIONS OF INCLUSIVE PARTICIPATION TOWARDS THE CO-CREATION OF WELL-BEING FOR ALL

To illustrate how the principles above can be realized in practice, three short case narratives is provided to illustrate the principles on an international and state level, local government level and neighbourhood level respectively.

State Level: Well-Being Governments and the Case of New Zealand

There is consensus from research that some democratic and participatory processes systematically limit groups of citizens from gaining economic, social, political and cultural inclusion; and these factors are strongly associated with inequities in health and wellbeing.

This is connected to an ongoing transition of creating 'well-being societies', or 'economies of well-being'. An example at the State level that reflects principles of social justice and well-being outlined in this chapter can be found within the alliance formed by the Well-being Economy Governments (WEGo, nd). This network (established in 2018) of dedicated governments (New Zealand, Iceland and Scotland) have gained large-scale international attention and widespread praise for pursuing inclusive population well-being to forefront economic values. These governments share expertise and transferable policy to challenge the acceptance of GDP as the ultimate measure of a country's success. The objectives of the group are as follows: (1) *Collaborate* in pursuit of innovative policy approaches aimed at enhancing well-being through a broader understanding of the role of economics—sharing what works and what does not to inform policy making. (2) *Progress* towards the UN SDGs, in line with Goal 17, fostering partnership and cooperation to identify approaches to delivering well-being. (3) *Address* the pressing economic, social and environmental challenges of our time. As an example, the NZ government unveiled the world's first ´well-being budget´ in 2019, aiming to replace GDP with a national framework measuring well-being, equity and sustainability as the ultimate societal goals. In developing the policies and assessments for progress, the state agencies in NZ invited and mobilized a large-scale participatory, deliberative and collaborative process where citizens with diverse backgrounds contributed by constructing meaning and purpose for national policies. In the development of the Child and Youth Wellbeing Strategy, the

NZ government, with the support of partner agencies, engaged with more than 10,000 New Zealanders, including 6,000 children and young people. As a result of what mattered most to New Zealanders in negotiation with knowledge built on research, all policies in NZ are now evaluated through a lens of *kindness, empathy* and *wellbeing* (Ness & Heimburg, 2020).

Local Government Level: The Wigan Deal in United Kingdom

Since 2011, Wigan Council has embarked on a major transformation of their approach to creating public value, coined as ´The Wigan Deal´. This transition was based on an acknowledgement of the community as the primary driver of creating health and well-being for all. This approach thus implied transformative role perceptions and practices amongst citizens, other stakeholders and organizations in the community, public servants, municipal leaders and politicians in Wigan. The Wigan transition was based on the idea of building a different relationship with local people and build a new relationship with the public through shared ways of working across all the services, institutions and organizations operating in a place. An important fundament for the changes that was made in Wigan was nurtured by building on a 'strength-based' or 'asset-based' approach. The assed based approach cultivates the strengths of individuals and communities to build independence and improve health and well-being with local stakeholders and citizens, especially attending to nurture capabilities amongst groups who not normally participate. This new approach involved moving towards asset-based working at scale, empowering communities through a 'citizen-led' approach to public health and creating a culture which permits staff to redesign how they work in response to the needs of individuals and communities. In sum, the Wigan Deal consists of the following four components (Naylor & Wellings, 2019, p. 5-6):

- working with local people in an 'asset-based' way that seeks to recognise and nurture the strengths of individuals, families and communities and to build independence and self-reliance
- creating a culture in which innovation is encouraged and frontline staff are permitted to make decisions for themselves and rethink how they work
- empowering communities, including by investing in local voluntary sector organisations and community groups
- creating the conditions for closer partnership working between agencies

The Wigan Deal is an informal agreement, in line with a psychological contract in the community between the council and everyone who lives or works there, taking on joint action to create a better borough. At the heart of this is an attempt to strike a new relationship between public services and local people. Wigan's transformative journey, documented by the Kings Fund (Naylor & Wellings, 2019), shows that it is possible to achieve substantial economic savings while protecting or improving outcomes: Wigan has moved from being under relentless financial pressure, to achieve a stable economic situation with room for even increased investments in their local community. However, the most important outcome of the Wigan deal is not about money, it is about people. Several key metrics tell a story of improvement after the implementing the Deal, where Healthy life expectancy has increased significantly, bucking the trend for stagnation seen in general metrics for the UK. Care Quality Commission assessments suggest that the quality of social care services in Wigan has improved, aligned with improved staff engagement. In fact, recognizing these improvements, the Local Government Chronicle named Wigan the Council of the Year in March 2019.

As suggested by an evaluation of the Wigan Deal (Naylor & Wellings, 2019), this transition was made possible because of the way public services was genuinely transformed, aligned with upfront investment available to help bring about innovation. Moreover, change was made possible and achieved through bold leadership and a long-term strategic commitment to working differently with local people and communities through an enabling style of leadership. Leaders supported frontline staff to build capacity for innovation based on their conversations with citizens using public services, embracing a people-centred, participatory, empowerment-oriented and community-based approach to service delivery. The Wigan deal also embarked a new form of commissioning to support their approach. Accordingly, the Council in Wigan has moved from a transactional commissioning model to a more collaborative one, embedding voluntary and community sector organisations as partners of the "Deal", where commissioning includes to actively support development and improvement of joint actions towards common goals.

Although other areas have explored similar approaches, Wigan is noteworthy for the scale and consistency with which these ideas have been applied in practice. The Deal is facilitated by local and deeply contextual drivers for change. Organizational and societal learning can be drawn from this particular case to inspire change elsewhere and illustrate the kind of work that is needed to shift to a new model of public service delivery and public value co-creation (Naylor & Wellings, 2019; Jordan, 2019).

Neighborhood Level: From Stairway to Stairway in Aarhus, Denmark

In the City of Aarhus, Denmark, there has grown an ambition to re-imagine how public welfare organizations operate. One of the really promising projects that offers novel pathways for how the to work with families on the edge of society is named 'From Stairway to Stairway' which literally means going out knocking on peoples doors in order to meet citizens in their local context an build an emerging working relationship with citizens and their families experiencing multiple difficulties in life such as poverty, mental illness, unemployment, loneliness, exclusion and the like. The projects take place in Gjellerup, Denmark, with an ethnic population of more than 90% with non-Danish background. The projects build on the experiences from Wigan Council, UK, that was one of the first municipalities to offer a full-scale experiment on how to practice relational co-production. In Aarhus the municipality has moved in to one of the apartments in the area with a multi-professional team with competencies within all the major areas of public welfare, such as family unit, job consultants, social workers, integration, health workers and leisure and culture worker. Through a relational approach they work to build:

- Trustful relationships between citizens and the professionals as basis for positive development
- Building connections to a greater personal network, local community, civic society and not least job and education
- Public services so that it matches the need for professionals to be more open, flexible, risk-taking and citizen centric in their works as opposed to system loyal.
- Cross professional collaboration so citizens experience more holistic and coordinated services

The first goal has been to enroll 60 families in the project. Rather than waiting for them to show up at one they have gone out into the area in order to find families often living lives outside the society at large having no; (official) income, no education and no public support.

The experiences so far, one year in to the project, are that building relationships with the families has been easier than expected and the general experiences is that many of the families indeed have hopes and dreams for the future, but lags knowledge and capacity to ask for help or have a history of difficulties that have created a state of 'learned helplessness'. The first step in the project has been to go out into the area talking with people, knocking on people's doors in order to find and locate those families and citizens with whom they have no prior or little relationship with. Once a relationship has been established, they work to build trust so that these families start opening up and share their hopes and dreams, whatever these might be. Working with the families from what matters to them, enable an emerging expanding relationship where one small step leads to the next and eventually, they experience being able to take leaps into an expansive process leading to job and/or education.

Hence, the approach insists on letting the families take charge of their own development and that the role of the professionals is support the citizens in building confidence and capacity to take agency over their own situation and development. The project leader, Pernille Randrup explains (Andersen & Reiermann, 2020):

The families define how they want to use us under the condition that the process leads towards job. But this isn't a problem because all of them want's that as one of their first priorities, but they want more than that too… We stay with them as long as they want us there. Even if they get in to work, they can stay in contact if they need help or wants to talk through issues.

The results emerging from the project are promising. The goal is to get 80% of the adults into permanent employment, and in order to achieve such outcomes they need to work holistically helping the families succeed with all aspects of life especially supporting their children building success in school and through social activities such as sport and culture or community activities. The city CEO, Niels Højberg (2020), sees the project as enabling a leap in to how the city will work in the future:

The core is that the council and its professionals can't deliver a set of pre-destinated set of services to its citizens, but instead they must learn to develop solutions that are needed together with the citizens involved.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The world is continuously facing complex problems and challenges that demands joint action in the whole of society and increased citizen participation. As made explicit by SDG # 17, collaboration is key for sustainable development, which also includes to nurture co-creation and joint action to promote wellness and fairness, reduce inequalities, and create sustainable cities and communities. Social justice and well-being for all, leaving no one behind, are revitalized as public values in contemporary societies through the SDG's and human rights. Societies across the world still fail to address the persistent and widening social gap in opportunities to achieve well-being (UN, 2019).

Although this chapter has provided promising principles and illustrations, one must critically reflect on, and address, dark sides of co-creation. Co-creation and co-production in the public sector are still probed as a suitable approach to address the complexity of problems connected to inequities. In fact, co-production and co-creation research indicate that adopting a co-creation approach tend to increase

social inequities (Steen et al., 2018). Steen et al. (2018) identify seven potential evils of co-creation and co-production: the deliberate rejection of responsibility, failing accountability, rising transaction costs, loss of democracy, reinforced inequalities, implicit demands and co-destruction.

Socioeconomically privileged citizens tend to participate more in co-creational processes than those who struggle with various aspects of deprivilege and stigma (Jakobsen & Andersen, 2013). Privileged citizens higher up in the socioeconomic ladder tend to have assets (i.e., power through networks and relationships, money, education and work positions) that facilitate participation (Ostrom 1996; Steen et al., 2018). If this 'dark side of co-creation' is not properly addressed, unequal access to favorable conditions for participation in co-creation of public value could potentially lead to value creation for some proportions of the public, and not for all. Accordingly, this could potentially widen the social gap in health and well-being, and thus threaten basic human rights and sustainable development (Pūras, 2019, 2020; Pūras & Gooding, 2019). However, co-creation can reduce inequity in health and well-being when working with co-creation in socially just ways (Jakobsen & Andersen, 2013; Williams et al., 2020).

When research and transformative community change are worked out *for* rather than *with* citizens, then people are unlikely to engage in a wide range of relevant concerns promoting public interest (Gergen, 2014; McNamee & Hoskin, 2013; Smith, 2009;). Such engagement is closely connected to the notion of citizenship and the 5R's of citizenship previously described (rights, responsibilities, relationships, roles and resources associated with being a full member of society) (Rowe, 2015). Active and inclusive citizenship nurtured in ways that enables participation in society on equal terms is basically at the heart of bringing a socially just relational welfare into life; a form of state and community-building that nurtures active and inclusive citizenship towards well-being for all. Co-creating well-being as a public value in inclusive and generative ways, can thus be viewed as a process of mattering, being valued and adding value in the life of others (Prilletensky, 2020; Di Martino & Prilleltensky, 2020). The future prosperity of communities, local government and states across the world will thus depend on the willingness and ability to seize opportunities to nurture citizenship in ways that accumulate capabilities to enhance the well-being of present and future generations.

Inclusive and active citizenship is vital to co-create public value in ways that are socially just and favorable for achieving well-being. Public value co-creation needs to attend to the whole of the population, a proportionally support inclusive citizenship for and with people who are at risk of being left behind in co-creation processes. In line with Moore's (1995) seminal work on public value on what is beneficial for society, we will argue for a normative account of value creation, linked to the capabilities framework, human rights and the UN's sustainable development goals. Well-being for all and social justice should be placed at the heart of public value creation, where value is co-created across the whole of society, carefully supported through active and inclusive citizenship.

The emancipatory and democratic promises of the co-creation paradigm need to grasp sense-making of and explore new practices of public value co-creation. Studies has demonstrated elsewhere that co-creation can be transformative and emancipatory, and support socially just outcomes from if processes are carefully supported (Boone, 2019; Jakobsen & Andersen, 2013). All the three cases we have described above from New-Zealand, Wigan and the neighborhood in Aarhus, relates to a normative account on well-being and justice as public values. The three cases illustrate how such an approach to public value can be co-created through active and inclusive citizenship and co-creation with stakeholders and actors across sectors and settings – placing the public at the heart of public value creation in the public sector, in society and through democracy. The cases demonstrate the need to, and the potential for supporting citizenship amongst groups and individual who are at risk of being left behind, socially, and economically.

Protecting and promoting societal goals of health and well-being for all starts with people, taking on relational responsibility for each other (McNamee & Gergen, 1999; Di Martino & Prilleltensky, 2020). By relationally attending to each other as a collective, participation in public value co-creation could be made easy, intuitive and natural (Cottam, 2018), and facilitate the identification of, connection between, and mobilization of a wide range of resources and assets in the places where people live their lives (Russell, 2020). The collaborative, citizen-focused and participatory wave represented by the co-creation approach (Mortensen et al., 2020), has the potential to create movements towards a desired future. Levitas (2013) argues for a utopian approach to pursue a future-forming consideration of alternative social futures. Without such a future-forming approach, people and societies can be at risk being stuck in status quo, unable to move beyond the day-to-day issues that permeate the political landscape (Gergen 2014). The examples from New Zealand, Wigan and neighborhoods in Aarhus, constitute examples of future-forming practices with potentials for upscaling and further development, aligned with the principles we have suggested to guide a future-forming approach based on the premises of being citizen-led, relationship-oriented, asset-based, place-based and inclusion-focused.

Throughout the last decades, collaboration and active citizen participation has been increasingly endorsed as essential approaches to tackle complex societal problems and promote human flourishing across a wide range of practices and academic disciplines (Bradbury, 2015; Cottam, 2018; Hersted et al., 2020; McNamee et al., 2020; Pestoff, 2019). However, if co-creation and public deliberation is not carefully designed and facilitated, it could unintentionally increase polarization, generate frustration and reinforce democratic echo-chambers that create adverse effects in creating well-being opportunities (Bartels, 2016). Democracy matters for equity and well-being, and inclusive participation matters for democracy. We encourage innovation in the public sector and democracy aligned with research strategies promoting a transformative purpose, radically attending to human relationships aligned with a participatory approach. By outlining case illustrations and a framework for developing a relational welfare that builds on principles of being citizen-led, relationship-oriented, asset-based, place-based and inclusion focused, we hope to inspire to stimulated dialogues, new thoughts and innovations aimed at promoting social justice, health and well-being for all as fundamental, and essentially, co-created public values.

FUNDING

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

REFERENCES

Andersen, T. K., & Reiermann, J. (2020, February 24). 22.000 ansatte i Aarhus Kommune skal udvikle velfærd med borgerne [22000 employees in Aarhus Commune must developed welfare with the citizens]. *Mandag Morgen*. http://www.mm.dk

Antonovsky, A. (1987). *Unraveling the mystery of health: How people manage stress and stay well*. Jossey-Bass.

Atkinson, R., Mckenzie, L., & Winlow, S. (2017). *Building better societies. Promoting social justice in a world falling apart*. Policy press. doi:10.1332/policypress/9781447332022.001.0001

Ayres, S. (2019). How can network leaders promote public value through soft metagovernance. *Public Administration*, *97*(2), 279–295. doi:10.1111/padm.12555

Bartels, K., & Turnbull, N. (2020). Relational public administration: A synthesis and heuristic classification of relational approaches. *Public Management Review*, *22*(9), 1324–1346. doi:10.1080/14719037.2019.1632921

Bartels, L. (2016). *Unequal democracy: The political economy of the new gilded age* (2nd ed.). Princeton University Press.

Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, *117*(3), 497–529. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.117.3.497 PMID:7777651

Benington, J. (2009). Creating the Public In Order To Create Public Value? *International Journal of Public Administration*, *32*(3-4), 232–249. doi:10.1080/01900690902749578

Boone, K., Roets, G., & Roose, R. (2019). Raising critical consciousness in the struggle against poverty: Breaking a culture of silence. *Critical Social Policy*, *39*(3), 434–454. doi:10.1177/0261018318820233

Bradbury, H. (2015). *The SAGE handbook of Action Research* (3rd ed.). Sage. doi:10.4135/9781473921290

Bradshaw, J., Hoelscher, P., & Richardson, D. (2007). An index of child well-being in the European Union. *Social Indicators Research*, *80*(1), 133–177. doi:10.100711205-006-9024-z

Brix, J., Krogstrup, H. K., & Mortensen, N. M. (2020). Evaluating the outcomes of co-production in local government. *Local Government Studies*, *46*(2), 169–185. doi:10.1080/03003930.2019.1702530

Clayton, A., Miller, R., Gambino, M., Rowe, M., & Ponce, A. N. (2020). Structural Barriers to Citizenship: A Mental Health Provider Perspective. *Community Mental Health Journal*, *56*(1), 32–41. doi:10.100710597-019-00490-w PMID:31659550

Cluley, V., & Radnor, Z. (2020). Rethinking co-creation: The fluid and relational process of value co-creation in public service organizations. *Public Money & Management*, ●●●, 1–10. doi:10.1080/09540962.2020.1719672

Cottam, H. (2018). *Radical help: How we can remake the relationships between us and revolutionalise the welfare state*. Virago.

Davidson, L., Ridgway, P., Wieland, M., & O'Connell, M. (2009). A capabilities approach to mental health transformation: A conceptual framework for the recovery era. *Canadian Journal of Community Mental Health*, *28*(2), 35–46. doi:10.7870/cjcmh-2009-0021

Desai, M. U., Bellamy, C. D., Guy, K., Costa, M., O'Connell, M. J., & Davidson, L. (2019). "If You Want to Know About the Book, Ask the Author": Enhancing community engagement through participatory research in clinical mental health settings. *Behavioral Medicine (Washington, D.C.)*, *45*(2), 177–187. doi:10.1080/08964289.2019.1587589 PMID:31343967

Diener, E., Pressman, S. D., Hunter, J., & Delgadillo-Chase, D. (2017). If, why, and when subjective well-being influences health, and future needed research. *Applied Psychology. Health and Well-Being*, *9*(2), 133–167. doi:10.1111/aphw.12090 PMID:28707767

Diggs, B. J. (1973). The common good as reason for political action. *Ethics*, *83*(4), 283–293. doi:10.1086/291887

Di Martino, S., & Prilleltensky, I. (2020). Happiness as fairness: The relationship between national life satisfaction and social justice in EU countries. *Journal of Community Psychology*, *48*(6), 1997–2012.

Ersoy, A. (2017). *The impact of co-production. From community engagement to social justice*. Policy Press. doi:10.1332/policypress/9781447330288.001.0001

European Commission. (n.d.). *The european pillar of social rights in 20 principles*. https://ec.europa.eu/commission/priorities/deeper-and-fairer-economic-and-monetary-union/european-pillar-social-rights/european-pillar-social-rights-20-principles_en

Fung, A. (2015). Putting the public back into governance: The challenges of citizen particpation and its future. *Public Administration Review*, *75*(4), 513–522. doi:10.1111/puar.12361

Gergen, K. J. (2009). Relational Being: Beyond self and community. Oxford.

Gergen, K. J. (2014). From mirroring to world-making: Research as future-forming. *The Journal of Social Behaviour*, *45*(3), 287–310. doi:10.1111/jtsb.12075

Gergen, K. J., McNamee, S., & Barrett, F. J. (2001). Toward transformative dialogue. *International Journal of Public Administration*, *24*(7-8), 679–707. doi:10.1081/PAD-100104770

Hall, T., Kakuma, R., Palmer, L., Minas, H., Martins, J., & Kermode, M. (2019). Social inclusion and exclusion of people with mental illness in Timor-Leste: A qualitative investigation with multiple stakeholders. *BMC Public Health*, *19*(1), 702. doi:10.118612889-019-7042-4 PMID:31174504

Hanefeld, J., Reeves, A., Brown, C., & Östlin, P. (2019). Achieving health equity: Democracy matters. *Lancet*, *394*(10209), 1600–1601. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(19)32128-2 PMID:31519433

Harper, A., Kriegel, L., Morris, C., Hamer, H. P., & Gambino, M. (2017). Finding citizenship: What works? *American Journal of Psychiatric Rehabilitation*, *20*(3), 200–217. doi:10.1080/15487768.2017.1338036

Hersted, L., Ness, O., & Frimann, S. (Eds.). (2020). *Action research in a relational view: Dialogue, reflexivity, power and ethics*. Routledge.

Højberg, N. (2020), *22.000 ansatte i Aarhus Kommune skal udvikle velfærd med borgerne*. https://www.mm.dk/artikel/22000-ansatte-i-aarhus-kommune-skal-udvikle-velfaerd-med-borgerne

International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance. (2013). *Overcoming political exclusion strategies for marginalized groups to successfully engage in political decision-making*. International IDEA.

International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance. (2017). *The global state of democracy exploring democracy's resilience*. International IDEA.

Jakobsen, M., & Andersen, S. C. (2013). Coproduction and equity in public service delivery. *Public Administration Review*, *73*(5), 704–713. doi:10.1111/puar.12094

Jordan, E. (2019). *The Wigan Deal.* Centre for Public Impact. https://www.centreforpublicimpact.org/case-study/the-wigan-deal/

Kickbusch, I. (2012). 21st century determinants of health and wellbeing: A new challenge for health promotion. *Global Health Promotion*, *19*(3), 5–7. doi:10.1177/1757975912454783 PMID:24802779

Levitas, R. (2013). Some Varieties of Utopian Method. *Irish Journal of Sociology*, *21*(2), 41–50. doi:10.7227/IJS.21.2.3

Marmot, M. (2014). *Review of social determinants and the health divide in the WHO European Region: Final report*. World Health Organization.

Marmot, M., Allen, J., Boyce, T., Goldblatt, P., & Morrison, J. (2020). Health equity in England: The Marmot Review 10 years on. UCL, Institute of Health Equity.

McNamee, S., & Gergen, K. J. (Eds.). (1999). *Relational responsibility*. Sage.

McNamee, S., Gergen, M., Borges, C. C., & Rasera, E. (Eds.). (2020). *SAGE handbook of social constructionist practice*. Sage.

McNamee, S., & Hoskin, D. M. (2012). *Research and Social Change: A relational constructionist approach*. Routledge. doi:10.4324/9780203127537

Moore, M. H. (1995). *Creating public value: strategic management in government*. Harvard University Press.

Mortensen, N. M., Brix, J., & Krogstrup, H. K. (2020). Reshaping the hybrid role of public servants: Identifying the opportunity space for co-production and the enabling skills required by professional co-producers. In H. Sullivan, H. Dickinson & H. Henderson (Eds.), The Palgrave handbook of the public servant. Palgrave Macmillan.

Naylor, C., & Wellings, D. (2019). *A citizen-led approach to health and care: Lessons from the Wigan Deal.* The KingsFund. https://www.kingsfund.org.uk/sites/default/files/2019-06/A_citizen-led_approach_to_health_and_care_lessons_from_the_Wigan_Deal.pdf

Ness, O., & Heimburg, D. v. (2020). Collaborative action research: Co-constructing social change for the common good. In S. McNamee, M. Gergen, C. C. Borges, & E. Rasera (Eds.), *SAGE Handbook of Social Constructionist Practice* (pp. 34–45). Sage.

Nussbaum, M. C. (2000). *Women and human development: The capabilities approach*. Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511841286

OECD. (2020, March 9). *How's life 2020?* https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/sites/9870c393-en/index.html?itemId=/content/publication/9870c393-en

Osborne, S. P. (2018). From public service-dominant logic to public service logic: Are public service organizations capable of co-production and value co-creation? *Public Management Review*, *20*(2), 225–231. doi:10.1080/14719037.2017.1350461

Osborne, S. P., Radnor, Z., & Strokosch, K. (2016). Co-production and the co-creation of value in public services: A suitable case for treatment? *Public Management Review*, *18*(5), 639–653. doi:10.1080/14719037.2015.1111927

Ostrom, E. (1996). Crossing the great divide: Coproduction, synergy, and development. *World Development*, *24*(6), 1073–1087. doi:10.1016/0305-750X(96)00023-X

Patton, G. C., Sawyer, S. M., Santelli, J. S., Ross, D. A., Afifi, R., Allen, N. B., Arora, M., Azzopardi, P., Baldwin, W., Bonell, C., Kakuma, R., Kennedy, E., Mahon, J., McGovern, T., Mokdad, A. H., Patel, V., Petroni, S., Reavley, N., Taiwo, K., ... Viner, R. M. (2016). Our future: A Lancet commission on adolescent health and wellbeing. *Lancet*, *387*(10036), 2423–2478. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(16)00579-1 PMID:27174304

Pearce, W. B. (2007). *Making social worlds: A communicative perspective*. BlackwellPublishing.

Pelletier, J.-F., Davidson, L., & Roelandt, J.-L. (2009). Citizenship and recovery for everyone: A global model of public mental health. *International Journal of Mental Health Promotion*, *11*(4), 45–53. doi:10.1080/14623730.2009.9721799

Pestoff, V. (2019). *Co-production and public service management: citizenship, governance and public service management*. Routledge.

Phillips, D. (2006). *Quality of life: Concept, policy and practice*. Routledge. doi:10.4324/9780203356630

Prilleltensky, I. (2005). Promoting well-being: Time for a paradigm shift in health and human services. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health*, *33*(Suppl 66), 53–60. doi:10.1080/14034950510033381 PMID:16214724

Prilleltensky, I. (2020). Mattering at the intersection of psychology, philosophy, and politics. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *65*(1-2), 16–34. doi:10.1002/ajcp.12368 PMID:31407358

Prince, P. M., & Gerber, G. J. (2005). Subjective well-being and community integration among clients of assertive community treatment. *Quality of Life Research: An International Journal of Quality of Life Aspects of Treatment, Care and Rehabilitation*, *14*(1), 161–169. doi:10.100711136-004-2407-1 PMID:15789950

Pūras, D. (2019) *Special rapporteur on the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health.* United Nation Human Rights Council, Forty-first session (24 June–12 July 2019). A/HRC/41/34. https://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/HRC/41/34

Pūras, D. (2020). *Special rapporteur on the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health.* United Nation Human Rights Council, Forty-fourth session (15 June–3 July 2020*).* A/HRC/41/34. https://undocs.org/en/A/HRC/44/48

Pūras, D., & Gooding, P. (2019). Mental health and human rights in the 21st century. *World Psychiatry; Official Journal of the World Psychiatric Association (WPA)*, *18*(1), 42–43. doi:10.1002/wps.20599 PMID:30600633

Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. Simon & Schuster.

Rowe, M. (2015). Citizenship and mental health. New York: Oxford.

Russell, C. (2020). *Rekindling democracy: A professional's guide to working in citizen space*. Cascade Books.

Selloni, D. (2017). *Co-design for public interest services*. Springer. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-53243-1

Sen, A. (1992). *Inequality re-examined*. Clarendon Press.

Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. Anchor Books.

Sen, A. (2005). Human rights and capabilities. *Journal of Human Development*, *6*(2), 151–166. doi:10.1080/14649880500120491

Smith, G. (2009). *Democratic innovations: Designing institutions for citizen participation*. Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511609848

Steen, T., Brandsen, T., & Verschuere, B. (2018). The dark side of co-creation and co-production: seven evils. In *Co-production and cocreation: engaging citizens in public services* (pp. 284–293). Routledge.

Steptoe, A., Deaton, A., & Stone, A. A. (2015). Subjective wellbeing, health, and ageing. *Lancet*, *385*(9968), 640–648.

Storch, J., & Hornstrup, C. (2020). Re-imagining the welfare state: From systems delivery to collaborative relationship. In S. McNamee, M. Gergen, C. C. Borges, & E. Rasera (Eds.), *SAGE Handbook of Social Constructionist Practice* (pp. 570–580). Sage. doi:10.4135/9781529714326.n55

Torfing, J., & Sørensen, E. (2019). Interactive political leadership in theory and practice: How elected politicians may benefit from co-creating public value outcomes. *Administrative Sciences*, *9*(3), 1–18. doi:10.3390/admsci9030051

Touchton, M., & Wampler, B. (2014). Improving social well-being through new democratic institutions. *Comparative Political Studies*, *47*(10), 1442–1469. doi:10.1177/0010414013512601

United Cities and Local Governments. (2015). *The sustainable development goals: What local governments need to know.* https://www.uclg.org/sites/default/files/the_sdgs_what_localgov_need_to_know_0.pdf

United Nations. (2019). *The Sustainable Development Goals Report 2019*. https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/report/2019/

United Nations. (n.d.). *The 17 goals*. https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/?menu=1300

Voorberg, W. H., Bekkers, V. J. J. M., & Tummers, L. G. (2015). A systematic review of co-creation and co-production: Embarking on the social innovation journey. *Public Management Review*, *17*(9), 1333–1357. doi:10.1080/14719037.2014.930505

Ware, N. C., Hopper, K., Tugenberg, T., Dickey, B., & Fisher, D. (2007). Connectedness and citizenship: Redefining social integration. *Psychiatric Services (Washington, D.C.)*, *58*(4), 469–474. doi:10.1176/ps.2007.58.4.469 PMID:17412847

Well-being Economy Governments. (n.d.). *The network of wellbeing economy governments (WEGo).* https://wellbeingeconomygovs.org/

Wilkinson, R., & Picket, K. (2009). *The spirit level: Why more equal societies almost always do better*. Bloomsbury Press.

Williams, O., Sarre, S., Papoulias, S., Knowles, S. C., Robert, G., Beresford, P., Rose, D., Carr, S., Kaur, M., & Palmer, V. (2020). Lost in the shadows: Reflections on the dark side of co-production. *Health Research Policy and Systems*, *18*(1), 43. doi:10.118612961-020-00558-0 PMID:32380998

Word Health Organization. (2019a). *Healthy, prosperous lives for all: The European health equity status report*. World Health Organization.

Word Health Organization. (2019b). *Participation as a driver of health equity*. Word Health Organization.

World Health Organization. (1986). *Ottawa charter for health promotion*. World Health Organization.

World Health Organization. (2013). *Health 2020: A European policy framework and strategy for the 21st century*. World Health Organization.

World Health Organization. (2016). *Shanghai declaration on health promotion*. World Health Organization.

Wright, P. A., & Kloos, B. (2007). Housing environment and mental health outcomes: A levels of analysis perspective. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, *27*(1), 79–89. doi:10.1016/j.jenvp.2006.12.001 PMID:19183703

Young, I. M. (2000). *Inclusion and democracy*. Oxford University Press.

ADDITIONAL READING

Brix, J., Krogstrup, H. K., & Mortensen, N. M. (2020). Evaluating the outcomes of co-production in local government. *Local Government Studies*, *46*(2), 169–185. doi:10.1080/03003930.2019.1702530

De Maeyer, J., Vandenbussche, H., Claes, C., & Reynaert, D. (2017). Human rights, the capability approach and quality of life: An integrated paradigm of support in the quest for social justice. *Therapeutic Communities*, *38*(3), 156–162. doi:10.1108/TC-03-2017-0011

Gergen, K. J., McNamee, S., & Barrett, F. J. (2001). Toward transformative dialogue. *International Journal of Public Administration*, *24*(7-8), 679–707. doi:10.1081/PAD-100104770

Lindgreen, A., Koenig-Lewis, N., Kitchener, M., Brewer, J. D., Moore, M. M., & Meynhardt, T. (2019). *Public value: Deepening, enriching, and broadening the theory and practice*. Routledge. doi:10.4324/9781315163437

Lister, R. (2007). From object to subject: Including marginalised citizens in policy making. *Policy and Politics*, *35*(3), 437–455. doi:10.1332/030557307781571579

Riemer, M., Reich, S. M., Evans, S. D., Nelson, G., & Prilletensky, I. (2020). *Community psychology: In pursuit of liberation and wellbeing* (3rd ed.). Red Globe Press.

Torfing, J., Andersen, L. B., Greve, C., & Klausen, K. K. (2020). *Public governance paradigms: Competing and co-existing*. Edward Elgar Publishing. doi:10.4337/9781788971225

Torfing, J., Sørensen, E., & Røiseland, A. (2019). Transforming the Public Sector Into an Arena for Co-Creation: Barriers, Drivers, Benefits, and Ways Forward. *Administration & Society*, *51*(5), 795–825. doi:10.1177/0095399716680057

Vanleene, D., Voets, J., & Verschuere, B. (2018). The co-production of a community: Engaging citizens in derelict neighbourhoods. *Voluntas*, *29*(1), 201–222. doi:10.100711266-017-9903-8

White, S. (2017). Relational wellbeing: Re-centering the politics of happiness, policy and the self. *Policy and Politics*, *45*(2), 121–136. doi:10.1332/030557317X14866576265970

KEY TERMS AND DEFINITIONS

Capabilities: What people are able to be and to, linked to people's opportunities to live the kind of life people value, and have reasons to value

Citizenship: The legal link between an individual and a state where the citizens are entitled to certain protection and privileges, built on Five R's of citizenship: rights, roles, resources, responsibilities, and relationships.

Co-Creation: Two or more actors collaborate to create public value by sharing ideas, knowledge and resources with each other.

Inclusive Participation: Giving people voice and presence in social life and in democratic processes, which enables socially just processes and outcome.

Mattering: Feeling valued and feeling like you add value. Key components include being recognized and having an impact.

Public Value Creation: Creating outputs and outcomes in the interest of the common good, including the clients, citizens, and stakeholders which the policy affects.

Relational Welfare: A logic and practice where welfare is a resource that people co-create together, where personal and collective relationships and environments are placed at the centre of development.

Social Justice: The fair and equitable allocation of burden, resources, and power in society.

Well-Being: how people evaluate and experience their lives, and their objective living conditions. Well-being is inherently linked to freedom, mastery and meaning in life, to positive emotions, social connection and well-functioning, to health and mortality.

This research was previously published in Processual Perspectives on the Co-Production Turn in Public Sector Organizations; pages 20-41, copyright year 2021 by Information Science Reference (an imprint of IGI Global).