Sheffield Hallam University

A Sheffield Hallam University thesis

ProQuest Number: 10760412

ProQuest.

ProQuest 10760412

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

Third sector, Welfare Governance and Social Citizenship in Greece and the UK

Ioannis Prinos

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements of

Sheffield Hallam University

for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

December 2016

Abstract

This study looks at how the third sector (TS) in Greece and the UK is shaped by crisis and the politics of austerity. The empirical research for this thesis involved a comparative case study of two medium-sized third sector organisations (TSOs), one in Greece and one in the UK. Both organisations are to some extent user-led and support vulnerable social groups. The thesis addresses two main research questions: firstly, to what extent and in which ways do TSOs utilise governance 'technologies of self'; and secondly, how do they perceive social citizenship, while supporting their service-users' efforts for socioeconomic (re)integration? The thesis thus contributes to an area largely unexplored by previous research: the role of TSOs in the 'remaking' of social citizenship rights through their possible co-optation as local welfare agents, and the ways they may be applying behavioural governance strategies for the social control of the marginalised. In a welfare culture where individuals must learn how to *self-regulate* and care *for themselves*, rather that the welfare state caring *for them*, the nuances of TSOs' response as instruments of governmentality in different countries, have remained largely unaddressed.

Through ethnographic observations and in-depth qualitative interviews, the analytical focus of the study is on the experiences and perceptions of primarily staff members and secondly service-users, during their everyday activities. From this premise, attention is then paid to the organisations' practices as social actors within their national habitus. Specifically, their relation to dominant welfare discourses and policies is scrutinised, emphasising the latter's effect on their identity, strategies, goals and relationship with their service-users.

The study finds that the UK organisation is focused inwards, using various discipline and user-monitoring technologies reflecting national discourses within the welfare system, in which it aspires to remain an active actor. These technologies are characterised by conditionality, benefit sanctions, notions of civility, proper morals, adaptability, responsibility and antisocial behaviour. The goal is to transform welfare protection into arbitrary individual privileges attained through adherence to externally set rules observed by service providers such as TSOs, which in order to remain relevant, 'fight' *for* social inclusion, rather than *against* social exclusion.

In contrast, the Greek organisation, is focused outwards, to the social and the political. It carries itself as a sociopolitical actor opposing dominant welfare narratives promoting charity and individual responsibility for social problems in the form of antisocial behaviour and unproductive lifestyles. It attempts to draw service-users into a practical and ideological commitment to activism in a sociopolitical movement of solidarity and resistance to neoliberal austerity. Consequently, and to the detriment of the services offered, social control practices are again employed, but towards the promotion of a new social and economic paradigm. Hinging on direct democracy from the ground-up, the ultimate goal is the reinstitution of the social welfare state as the sole guarantor of social citizenship for all. Future comparative research could focus solely on the 'voice' of service-users, investigating the existence of a TS-dependency institutional stigma, but also, their sway over the activities, strategies and aims of TSOs supporting them.

Acknowledgements

Without the invaluable contributions and support of several people, the completion of this thesis would not have been possible. I would like first to thank my supervisors Peter Wells, Ryan Powell and Chris Dayson, whose constant guidance, prompt feedback, keen insights and encouragement, kept me on track and helped shape an amorphous mass of ideas and ponderings into a cohesive piece of focused academic work.

On the same note, it goes without saying that a very special thanks is directed to all the research participants in Greece and the UK. I can't really properly express my profound gratitude to the people who devoted their time to my investigation and put up with my inane questions, which often laid their personal lives and feelings bare, even when more pressing issues demanded their attention.

Also, I would like to express my gratitude to all my fellow PhD students whose struggles and 'small defeats and triumphs' mirrored my own, and whose suggestions often revealed new avenues to improve the project and made this whole endeavour feel like a shared journey. Similarly, I would like to thank all the research staff and the administrative team at CRESR for being there for whatever I might need, always willing to offer their advice, or answer the silly queries of a foreigner about everyday life issues in the UK.

Last but not least, I would like to thank my 'natural allies' in whatever I do. My family and friends in Greece for their unshakable faith in me, and for ensuring that my summer breaks were as sunny, loving and carefree as possible. Thank you.

Table of Contents

iv

Chapter 1. Introduction

This thesis involves the investigation of two partly user-driven, small to medium-sized, nonprofit, social purpose third sector organisations (TSOs) in Greece and the UK[1]. It is anchored on a twin thematic axis with the third sector (TS) at its centre: the governance of beneficiaries' behaviour in welfare, and the meaning (conceptually and practically) of social citizenship as the end-goal of social welfare interventions and processes of socioeconomic (re)integration. In the UK, as agents and partners of the state in social welfare, TSOs apply governance 'technologies of self' influenced by discourses, aiming at the social control of their disadvantaged and marginalised service-users. In Greece, a new wave of social solidarity TSOs of a more informal and hybrid nature responding to the crisis appear to do the same but in reverse, with the goal of creating a sociopolitical movement of resistance to austerity and neoliberalism. Thus, this comparative case study concerned first, the ways and to what ends the two organisations incorporate practices which enable the control of users, and how are these linked to dominant state policies, subsequently shaping their perception of, and relation with their 'target groups'. In this respect, the study aims to contribute to a less-examined side of the TS: the TS as an instrument of governmentality and the existence and nature of governance and social control practices in its activities. Effectively, as 'governance technologies' are included in TSOs' activities, their role as social services providers is challenged on multiple levels. Through processes strongly associated with the socioeconomic, cultural and political national context, they seem to be either becoming a governable terrain and a 'useful partner' for the state to advance its welfare policy agendas (UK case), or a political actor, 'pushing' agendas of its own (Greek case).

Furthermore, various welfare reforms and political discourses associated with transformations in the conceptualisation and operationalisation of social citizenship have taken place in Europe in the last three decades (Evers & Guillemard, 2012). Their unifying characteristic has been a shift away from state welfare provisions as the backbone of social rights (Somers & Wright, 2008). The role of TSOs as actors in the welfare mix promoting (or resisting) such processes, has remained largely unaddressed in Greece and the UK. Moreover,

---

[1] In the interest of maintaining full confidentiality and anonymity for all involved in the research, the two organisations which formed the case study, are not named. They are referred only as 'the Greek TSO' or 'Greek organisation', and the 'UK TSO', or 'UK organisation'.

relevant research on the TS, often focuses on the advantages of TSOs supporting vulnerable and marginalised social groups and their social (re)integration. However, very rarely are the following questions asked: *what kind of integration are we talking about? What is accomplished in terms of social equality, justice and citizenship rights for the users? At what 'price'?* Subsequently, the ways the two organisations perceive social citizenship for the disadvantaged in the context of supporting their service-users' efforts for socioeconomic (re)integration were examined. In particular, they were investigated as processes interrelated with the aforementioned issues of governance and control in the TS, and social welfare in general. As a result, this research could also contribute to a gap which exists with regards to our knowledge and understanding of the TS as an actor in the welfare mix. Namely, the ways TSOs in different countries, in order to stay relevant, respond to certain state welfare discourses and policies in this era of austerity and globalisation (i.e., state retrenchment, privatisation of public services, contracting, employability and conditionality policies, welfare individualisation, benefit sanctions, etc.). Such policies, although promoting the heavy involvement of the voluntary TS within the welfare system, are also profoundly altering the texture of social citizenship. As it stops being the expression of fundamental social rights guaranteed by the welfare state for all, the goals, identity and structure of TSOs are deeply affected, in their effort to find their place within rapidly changing welfare systems.

The concept of the 'third sector' is a heavily contested one. It has become so nebulous, that for many, it often means no more than something *other than* the family, the state, or the market (Billis, 2010). Research shows that TSOs can be many things: private nonprofit or nongovernment organisations (NGOs), social movements, volunteer groups, civil society collectives, social cooperatives, etc.), whose unifying link seems to be first and foremost what they *are not* (Brandsen, Van de Donk & Putters, 2005). The TS has been have characterised as a 'loose and baggy monster' (Kendall & Knapp, 1996: 65) and as a 'hidden subcontinent of enormous size and complexity' (Salamon, 1995: 17). Nevertheless, in the last 30 years, a remarkable revival of interest in the role of the TS within the public sphere has been witnessed. Especially social purpose TSOs, active in social welfare, the support and the socioeconomic (re)integration of vulnerable and disadvantaged social groups, have been put under the spotlight. They have been essentially touted as a 'panacea', for the problems that states face in the midst of neoliberal transformative processes, huge public deficits, unemployment and social marginalisation, which must be sorted out (Evers & Laville, 2004).

As governments are faced with fears about declining political participation, anxieties about meeting welfare needs, and worries about the nature of citizenship and particularly social citizenship rights, social welfare policy and the TS, have become a prime field for the application of governance strategies (Carmel & Harlock, 2008). TSOs, increasingly came to be regarded as 'a place where politics can be democratised, active citizenship in the local community strengthened, the public sphere reinvigorated and welfare programmes suited to pluralist needs designed and delivered' (Brown et al., 2000: 57). Great effort has been put to render the TS as a constitutive part of modern governance; a governable terrain in order to increase its capacity to deliver public services through the creation of a welfare market. Priorities have been set for TSOs, such as their marketisation, professionalisation and a focus on payment-by-results models, performance-measurement and outcomes-orientation (Harris, 2010). Thus, as Jessop observes, 'even where both the national and international levels are dominated by attempts to promote a neoliberal regime shift, TSOs have become a central focus of neocommunitarian strategies for addressing problems of social exclusion at a local level (Jessop, 2002: 464). As a result, structural problems and socioeconomic processes irrevocably tied with capitalist crises and the political agenda of ruling elites such as poverty, unemployment and marginalisation, can remain undetected and unaddressed. Consequently, the role of TSOs and their relation with the state in regarding governance policies, the reconfiguration of social citizenship and strategies of control in social welfare, though highly important, remains largely unexplored.

This intrusion of narratives and strategies of governance and control altering the meaning of welfare transfers as well as that of social citizenship and subsequently influencing the identity, goals and practices of TSOs, has not been a sudden, isolated development. A discourse of correction, discipline, monitoring and control of the behaviour and perceptions of the vulnerable, disadvantaged, or 'undesirables', had 'invaded' social policy and the welfare state, a long time ago. In his analysis of the historical transformation of the penal system in Europe in the early 18th century from overtly and forcibly 'punitive', to gently 'correctional', Foucault (1977) discusses the transfusion of this logic into the whole of society, including social welfare (hospitals, schools, charities, etc.). For Foucault, systems of production, domination, and socialisation, fundamentally depend on the successful subjugation of bodies. They require that bodies be mastered and subjected to training so as to render them docile, obedient, and useful. Some institutions, such as forced labour, master the body from the outside, using physical force and restraint to make the individual do its

bidding. Others, however, aim to have their commands internalised, producing an individual who habitually does what is required, without need of further external force, thus achieving self-regulation. This self-controlled body is brought about, by exerting an influence on and ultimately governing, what Foucault calls 'the soul'; which in turn, directs behaviour, through what he called 'technologies of self'; enter social welfare and the TS.

Under the influence of neoliberalism, the third way, neocommunitarianism and the social investment welfare model and within the context of globalisation, it can be argued that a similar shift has taken place concerning social citizenship rights and welfare protection. In post-war Europe, social citizenship was widely considered to represent the ability for equal participation into the social, economic, political and cultural life of the nation and was guaranteed by the social welfare state (Dwyer, 2000). Even if Marshall's (1950) notion of 'full social inclusion for all' often carried in practice 'the requirement of being willing and available for employment', as well as the 'policing of social security' to that end (Morris, 2002: 3), it was still the guiding principle. But, in recent years, as increasingly any kind of dependence has begun to be negatively compared with the desirable status of independence and self-sufficiency (Taylor-Gooby, 1996), independence and self-sufficiency have been set up as transcendent values; attainable aspirations deemed 'appropriate' and needed for all members of society. Simplified notions of dependence and subsidy are joined. Condemnation or pity, are considered appropriate responses for those unable to live up to the ideals of societies dominated by the values of market capitalism, particularly those who are dependent and in need of any kind of external subsidy from the state, the community, TSOs, etc. (Somers & Wright, 2008).

This stigma of dependency favours the sanctioning or termination of welfare benefits, so the individual can 'learn' to be independent and self-sufficient (Peck & Tickell, 2002). This discourse of individualism, learning, adaptation, and 'productive behaviour', serves as an argument against not only governmental social welfare transfers, but the whole post-war conceptualisation of social welfare architecture. It undermines the welfare state as the primary expression of social citizenship rights enhancing social cohesion. Social welfare provisions in particular, are attempted to be constituted not as guaranteed rights enabling the full realisation of citizenship (equal access to healthcare, education, employment, housing, sustenance, etc.) for everyone (Lister, 1998). In contrast, they are reconstructed as heavily regulated and diminishing individual 'prizes'. Attainable rewards, by those depicting the

9

'proper behaviour', lifestyle tendencies and demonstrable adherence to arbitrary requirements and notions of morality, duty, or contribution to the community (Dwyer, 2004).

In addition, the politics of austerity that arose in the wake of the 2007-2008 economic crisis have compounded the pressures on the TS, as they have produced deep cuts to public social services, just as the need for such support has been magnified (McBride & Whiteside, 2011). European governments have turned to non-governmental institutions to pick up the social deficits created by economic recession and the state's retreat from social provision responsibilities, essentially rebalancing the role, positioning and responsibilities of the state, the civil society and individuals (Alcock, 2012; Taylor-Gooby & Stoker, 2011). Inevitably, these developments together with the shifts in social welfare and reconfiguration processes of the welfare mix, are influencing in various ways TSOs, as actors within this welfare mix.

However, the TS in different countries has not been affected similarly, or responded in the same way. In Greece, since 2009, steep austerity measures and public budget cuts have been imposed in the context of the bail-out deals for the national debt signed with the European Union (EU), European Central Bank (ECB) and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) ('the Troika'). The neoliberal policies pursued, have led to the dissolution of an already anaemic social welfare state, leading to enormous social problems of unemployment, marginalisation, and an overall deterioration of social cohesion (Robolis, 2013). Its negligible -compared to the rest of the EU- TS, has experienced a 'Big Bang' of initiatives (Bourikos, 2013), albeit with very distinct motivation and goals. At the same time, social welfare in the UK, although not subjected to fiscal adjustments of the same ferocity, has nevertheless been under the steering sway of neoliberal ideas for several years and the country as a whole will / should be in a state of 'permanent austerity' for the foreseeable future, as its former Prime Minister had declared (Clarke et al., 2013). The TS, in contrast with Greece, is a well-established and important partner in UK social policy. Now, it has been put at the forefront of government agendas intent on reforming both the practices, as well as the overall strategic direction and structure of social welfare, ultimately changing its relationship with service-users (Loopstra et al., 2013). Hence, welfare, social policy and by extension the TS have become an optimal field for wider governance agendas. The TS in the two countries, appears to be a prime example of TSOs being inside a nexus of centrifugal processes, revolving around the governance of the disadvantaged and marginalised, as well as their socioeconomic (re)integration for the attainment of the rights flowing from social citizenship.

In this context of the social welfare state and the TS responding to and being shaped by crisis and the politics of austerity, the overall aim of the thesis is to investigate whether and how third sector organisations (TSOs) in Greece and the UK, exert social control over vulnerable service-users, through governance practices. The consequences of such processes for their identity, goals and relation with their target groups, is a 'dark side' of the TS, largely unexplored by previous research. Taking this line of inquiry one step further and in light of the transformations to social citizenship due to welfare reforms and social policy developments these latest years, the thesis aims to illuminate the ways the two TSOs perceive social citizenship for the disadvantaged. It especially concerns, how in the context of supporting their service-users' efforts for social (re)integration, TSOs are becoming (consciously or unconsciously) instruments of governmentality, or structure their identity in opposition to social policy reforms, thus promoting or hindering government welfare agendas. Both of these two central themes lack adequate empirical substantiation. Hence, the following main research questions (RQs) have been framed:

RQ1. How do the two organisations apply governance 'technologies of self' for the social control of disadvantaged and marginalised service-users?

RQ2. How do the two organisations perceive social citizenship for the disadvantaged in the process of supporting their service-users' efforts for socioeconomic (re)integration?

However, as mentioned, the TS does not obviously exist in a vacuum. It is intricately tied to developments in economic policy, social policy and of course, the social welfare state. In order to examine such governance 'technologies of self', their underpinning narratives, and effects of their application on the TS, it is imperative to investigate dominant state discourses and policy agendas in welfare in the two countries. Similarly, to gain an in-depth understanding of the possible role of TSOs in transformations of social citizenship rights springing from government initiatives in welfare (i.e., discourses and policies concerning welfare benefits), and the ways they seek to promote their service-users' efforts for socioeconomic (re)integration, it is important to look at how, as institutional welfare actors, they respond to such processes. As a result, the following question which could be positioned between the two RQs, linking them and seeking to embed this research in the current economic, social and political context in Greece and the UK, has emerged: *How are such*

11

practices (of governance) related to dominant state discourses concerning the governance of welfare and as a result, how do they affect the organisations' identity and goals and practices? It is only through the problematisation of such discourses and practices and an investigation of their effects on the two TSOs as actors in the welfare mix, that the two RQs can be meaningfully elucidated. Consequently, this inquiry has been present in the author's mind throughout the fieldwork, as well as the analysis of the findings as they relate to the main RQs.

Since this research project incorporated an investigation of contemporary social phenomena in their natural context where behaviours, social interactions and meanings are dynamically constructed and perceived, a qualitative research design was employed. The primary methodological tool, were qualitative, in-depth semi-structured interviews. While certain research inquiries were prioritised and topic guides were used, the participants were generally encouraged to say 'their own story, in their own words'. Additionally, with the aim of refining the specific research questions, sensitising the researcher to his queries, collecting in-depth data on lived experiences and also as a robust triangulation technique, ethnographic observations were conducted. Moreover, as a secondary triangulation tool and with the expectation that the social contexts of the discussions themselves could potentially unveil further patterns of diversity, two focus groups were performed. Finally, for the analysis, a 'thematic analysis' approach was utilised, involving a process of abstracting from the data and constructing the most salient for the research purposes main themes (categories) and sub-themes. These were coded, grouped, associated and compared, in search for patterns of similarity or variations, which could lead to interpretive conclusions and theoretical extrapolations.

In short, the study indicates that the UK TSO, appears to prioritise the use of various discipline, monitoring and surveillance technologies on its service-users, reflecting the dominant discourses of the welfare mix in the country. These are characterised by conditionality, sanctions and the governance of behaviour (a narrative of civility, proper morals, adaptability, responsibility, etc.). The essence of this modern social welfare architecture, seems to be found in an enabling investment state, focusing not on redistribution and social protection, but on the provision of individual opportunities. Such opportunities are mostly intended to facilitate access to the labour market, by shaping the behaviour, aspirations and expectations of the vulnerable and disadvantaged. TSOs are thus becoming primary agents of the state in 'co-producing' these welfare reforms, due to their flexibility,

12

local grounding and 'better reach', reorienting their practices accordingly. As a result, the ways TSOs perceive social citizenship for their service-users through their socioeconomic (re)integration, are heavily affected. The goal is not anymore to facilitate the attainment of social rights, but to be an overseer in a peculiar 'race'. A race to secure categories of privileges through adherence to externally set (to the needs of the vulnerable) rules. Consequently, the organisation strives *for* social inclusion rather than *against* social exclusion and for equality of opportunities rather than state-protected social equality and justice.

In contrast, the Greek TSO in the case-study, carries itself as a sociopolitical actor in complete opposition to such narratives, advocating for a robust, redistributing welfare state, fully guaranteeing the rights of social citizenship for all. Its rhetoric and activities apart from social support services, actually promote the idea that social purpose TS collectives such as itself, should not exist. It was indicated that this mentality sometimes results in the provision of social services taking 'a backseat' in the organisation's priorities as it is torn between that, and being a political activist collective engrossed in various sociopolitical causes. Furthermore, the organisation was observed to also apply certain governance technologies but in a more intrinsic manner. The aim is to draw service-users into a practical and ideological commitment of activism to this loose and diverse sociopolitical movement of resistance to austerity, formed by various formal and (mostly) informal solidarity organisations of the civil society and the TS since the advent of the crisis. Subsequently, again a mode of social control is incorporated into the organisation's activities, though informed by a completely different conception of social citizenship. It seems as an attempt to resist the government's plans for a welfare state based on conditionality and shrinking responsibilities, and promote the post-war vision of a fully inclusive, state-protected, social welfare.

The thesis first examines the concept of the TS and its most prominent associated terms (i.e., the civil society, the nonprofit sector, etc.) in research. A brief discussion of the historical development of the TS in Europe follows. Then, we turn our attention to the national habitus in which this case study takes place, talking specifically about the development and current state of the TS within the context of social welfare in Greece and the UK, making a special note of the extreme social consequences of the Greek crisis. The next two chapters form the theoretical framework of this study. In the first, a dynamic link is drawn between various processes of socioeconomic policy and welfare reforms shaped by ideologies and state policy agendas such neoliberalism, the third way, neocommunitarianism and social investment / inclusion welfare models on the one hand, and subsequent changes to

the nature and role of the TS on the other. The second, focuses solely on a discussion of governance strategies / technologies of control and social citizenship, within the overall context of welfare and the TS.

Following that, the case study is presented and the two investigated TSOs are discussed in detail. Subsequently, the research design, the epistemological and ontological underpinnings of the methodology and the specific methods that were employed are explained, while the ways they were actually used in the field are also explicated. A thorough analysis of the findings follows, along with some initial interpretations by the author. The final part of the thesis, involves a discussion of the overall conclusions that can be drawn from the findings within the goal of elucidating the RQs, a reflection on the research project as a whole pointing out its limitations and merits, and lastly, some suggestions for further research in the field.

Chapter 2. The third sector and its emergence as an actor in the welfare mix

The development of a robust and vigorous public realm was one of the defining features of Western capitalist democracies; a core element of 'welfare capitalism' in its many varieties (Huber & Stephens, 2001). However, during the last 30 years, different aspects of the public realm and public services, especially social policy and the social welfare state, have been subjected to processes of reform and dissolution, much owed to the advent of the forces of globalisation, neoliberalism and finance capitalism's dominance in the economy (Koeter & Wedow, 2010). In various ways, public social services have been challenged in the name of the 'private', bringing about what John Baldock has called the 'declining publicness of public services' (2003: 68). The (re)construction of a distinction between public and private, involves the division of institutions, organisations, activities, dispositions and ways of being into the different realms. In the process, boundaries are redrawn, identities and positions are reallocated and roles are renegotiated, while formerly clear separations are erased.

This blurring of boundaries has become central to the world of social policy, defining what may be 'safely' left to the private world of the family or non-state organisations and what needs must be met publicly through state action (Donzelot & Epstein, 2006). It involves defining the terms of the private realm (especially through legal regulation) and the conditions under which the public power may intervene in the private realm (Bode, 2006). In European social policy terms, the rise of 'welfarism' in post-war western capitalism, saw the boundary redrawn towards an expanded and more interventionist public realm, primarily through a robust social welfare state. However, this notion has been increasingly challenged the last 30 years, simultaneously with the rapid rise of the non-market (not-for-profit), non-state, voluntary TS, as a prominent social services provider (Anheier, 2004).

2.1. The historical roots and assumed forms of the early third sector movement in Europe

Broadly speaking, the roots of this parallel to the state, family and the private economy space, can be retraced back to ancient times; to the Greek funds for the ritual organisation of funerary ceremonies and the Roman colleges of craftsmen (Demoustier, 2001). The first guilds and associations of people appeared in an embryonic form in Germanic and Anglo-

Saxon regions in the 9th century. In the 11th century, various trade or professional associations and confraternities emerged, responding to objective needs for assistance, reciprocal support and charity. The medieval epoch and beyond, was characterised by a rich associative life, revolving around organising and protect communities, not only in Europe, but also on other continents. Examples are the food corporations in medieval Byzantium and post-medieval guilds in the Muslim countries, the professional castes in India, or the confraternities of craftsmen in primitive Africa and in pre-Colombian America (Constantelos, 1991; Defourny & Develtere, 1997).

But until the French revolution, in Europe, associative organisations remained under the control of the church or the state. Their repression by the authorities contributed to the dissemination of the new idea of freedom of association (Demoustier, 2001). The 19th century was a formative century for the modern TS, decreasing inequalities and improving living standards. It was characterised by an outburst of ideas, concepts, experiences, co-operative, associative or mutual aid practices, institutional and utopian initiatives, in reaction to the social brutalities of the Industrial Revolution (i.e., poverty and exploitation), liberal philosophies, and state actions against the workers' movements or associations (Demoustier, 2001). Especially in the second half of the 19th century, various forms of social action and initiatives emerged, mostly related to the defence of the weakest segments of the population (i.e., industrial workers), against the aggressive practices of the owners of the means of production.

Before being institutionalised at the end of the 19th century and the early 20th, this 'associationism' was inspired by a number of ideologies, converging or competing, that influenced the formation of the TS. The main ideas that played a fundamental role were: the 18th and 19th century 'utopian socialism' i.e., Owen, Fourier, Leroux, Saint-Simon, Proudhon and others (Mellor et al., 1988), that promoted the values of co-operation and of mutual support; Christian philanthropy, morals and socialism that established the 'intermediary corps to combat individual isolation and absorption of individuals by the state' (Defourny & Develtere, 1997: 3); and the liberal movement, favouring mutual help associations by praising economic liberty and refusing state interference. In England, utopian socialism gave birth to many cooperative initiatives, where the community was considered as 'the most appropriate body for achieving a harmonious society' (Hardy, 1979: 20). In Greece, under Turkish Ottoman rule since the dissolution of Byzantium in 1453, an approximation of the first associative efforts during the 18th and 19th centuries were the informal '*Secret Schools*'

(*Κρυφά Σχολειά*) established by priests (Grigoriadis, 2013). These covert gatherings hadn't any real formal structure or direction, other than keeping Greek language, history and traditions 'alive'. All these initiatives were connected to the specific needs of communities, protecting, promoting, or resisting particular social relations. Eventually, these various movements and organisational forms constituting the progenitors of the modern TS, spread in their diversity all over Europe.

2.2. The conceptualisation of the third sector in academic research: chasing a chimera?

It has long been recognised that individuals and communities may choose (or forced by social context) to associate and meet their needs for goods and services through collective institutions other than states, markets, or households (family). During the last quarter of the 20th century, however, there have been increasingly formalised attempts to study these institutions through the development of sets of theories that delineate a distinctive sector (Hall, 1992). The problem has always been the huge diversity of the field, which often results in new scholars bringing alternative definitions of the subject area with them (Morris, 2000; Salamon & Anheier, 1992a; 1992b), while disagreement over chief terms perplexes the matter even more (Alcock, 2010). Alcock, further reminds us of the strong association between our understanding of the TS and attempts at its definition, with applied policies and particular narratives mostly in the realm of social welfare: '...within discourse we can identify the different definitions that protagonists produce from within the agendas and constraints that they are operating...However, not all discourses are of equal importance or impact. Those of powerful interests speak more loudly, and perhaps more articulately, than others' (2010: 6). This sentiment resonates with this thesis, as the relation of the TS both in Greece and the UK with dominant state discourses in the realm of welfare and social policy concerning social citizenship and behaviour governance, was evident in the research.

Gosta Esping-Andersen's (1990) book entitled *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*, famously produced a threefold typology of social democratic, conservative and liberal welfare regimes, making reference to the *welfare mix* in various countries. Similarly, many prominent scholars in the field of the TS, model it as one of the pillars of the welfare mix; the others being the state, the market (private, for-profit sector), sometimes adding family, the space of 'the private', or 'the informal sector' as a fourth (see i.e., Alcock, 2008; Billis, 1989; Billis, 2010; Evers & Laville, 2004; Salamon & Anheier, 1997). These different

17

pillars (circles) can constantly overlap, contest, or cooperate with organisations, institutions and other social actors incorporated into complex relational processes. Hence the work of Billis (2010) about hybrids and the hybridisation of the sector. As Alcock (2010: 10) argues: 'All of these models aim to capture a similar notion of a third sector (although not all use this terminology), and to distinguish this from the public and private sectors (and in some an informal sector too)'. Thus, even today, organisations that are neither statutory, nor profit maximising, are being collectively and often interchangeably called the voluntary, third, nonprofit or informal sector, the civil society, or, as belonging to the social economy, social entrepreneurship and innovation, philanthropy, the non-governmental or informal sector, and several other categorisations (Defourny & Nyssens, 2010). For several years, scant attention had been given to how these multiple and often competing definitions relate to one another (Lohmann, 1992; Morris, 2000). Muukkonen (2009: 1) stresses that: 'hosts of concepts are used either synonymously or differently...but have in common the idea of a sector that exists between other established or basic institutions'.

One more attempt at a thorough disambiguation of the various terms used in the study of the TS would be a stimulating theoretical exercise, but is beyond the scope of this research. However, for clarity reasons, the most prominent ones will be briefly discussed. The oldest concept used in the field, is 'the civil society'. Its meaning during Greek and Roman antiquity, referred to the political sphere where independent citizens could congregate to organise their own government (Muukkonen, 2009), symbolising civilised society as opposed to chaos and barbarism (Ehrenberg, 1999)[2]. Today, it emphasises the distinction between the official realm of the state and the grassroots activity of ordinary people and also, between the market and their daily life (Salamon et al., 1999). It includes not only all kinds of autonomous associations, cooperatives, social movements, mutual aid and other informal groups, but also families and informal personal networks (Bush Zetterberg, 1996). While being used frequently, it has several different meanings, depending on how one frames the state, society, and its basic institutions (Cohen & Arato, 1994).

The basic institutions of a society can be seen in most economic, nonprofit and TS theories, as state and market, as for example, in the seminal Johns Hopkins University's Global Civil Society Project (Salamon et al., 1999). In this frame, the civil society actually

---

[2] Greek: '*Κοινωνία Πολιτών*' and Latin: '*Societas Civilis*'.

incorporates the TS (among other things), and this approach is employed in the current thesis. Or, if we see the basic institutions of society as state and family such as Ehrenberg (1999), then civil society is equal to the market or, if separated from it, the fourth sector. If the institutions of organised religion are added as the fourth basic institution instead, then civil society is the fifth sector (Muukkonen, 2000). This is the case, unless one or more of these institutions are included in civil society, which is the approach of the majority of definitions in the field.

The quite popular -especially in the UK- concept of 'the voluntary sector' (Kendall & Knapp, 1996), also has a history that colours its meaning, although today, voluntary mostly refers to independence from the state as well as freedom of association and participation (Smith, 1993; Van Til & Williamson, 2001). Alcock (2010), notes that in his report of the commission on the future of the voluntary sector in the UK, Deakin wrote: 'There is no single "authentic" voluntary sector for which a simple master plan can be drawn up' (Deakin Commission, 1996: 16). Nevertheless, the term 'voluntary organisations' is often used in conjunction with 'third sector organisations', as the vast majority of TSOs in the UK realise the two aforementioned criteria and exhibit -at least to some degree- voluntary participation and action (Kendall, 2003). The same applies for Greece; TSOs are, if not dependent, at least also reliant to a large degree, on voluntarism (Nasioulas, 2012a).

'Social economy', 'social entrepreneurship' and 'social enterprises' mainly concern the (re)introduction of social justice into production and allocation systems (Laville & Delfau, 2000). Current literature on social economy mainly addresses the challenge of bringing social justice values back into the economy; for example, by combating social exclusion, and reinventing solidarity in production relations (Salamon & Anheier, 1999). Writers in the field mostly agree on the adherence to the two social economy criteria of limited profit distribution to members and one member, one vote (Moulaert & Ailenei, 2005). Social economy, designates the universal practices and forms of mobilising economic resources towards the satisfaction of human needs that belong neither to for-profit enterprises, nor to the institutions of the state (Evers & Laville, 2004). This approach has resulted in 'social economy' and 'the third sector' often being used interchangeably, thus overlooking the considerable differences in their expression in different countries and time periods (Nyssens, 2006). In this case study, neither of the two organisations has any business / market activities of note, while Greek legislation doesn't make a clear distinction between

social enterprises and social purpose TSOs, associations or cooperatives. Hence, 'third sector organisations' seems as appropriate.

Finally, another concept almost synonymous with the TS (especially in the U.S.), is 'the nonprofit sector'. The concept of the nonprofit sector, has its roots in U.S. tax legislation (Muukkonen, 2009). Hall has argued that in the early 1970s, American philanthropy leaders 'realised that both the nature of the tax-exempt universe and public policies toward it had fundamentally changed' (1987: 17), because of the 1969 Tax Reform Act. The primary institutions of society were framed as being the state and the market; no room for families or religions, although Etzioni (1973) saw family as a support mechanism for market failure. The key question was whether nongovernmental corporations distributed their profits to their owners or to outsiders and whether organisations were formal, voluntary, and independent or not (Salamon et al., 1999). However, this approach has been downplayed since, due to the Johns Hopkins University's Comparative Civil Society Project, in which civil society is effectively equated to the nonprofit sector, which is equated to the TS.

For Salamon and Anheier (1992a; 1992b), the nonprofit sector is defined as a collection of organisations that are formal (institutionalised to some extent); private (institutionally separate from government); non-profit-distributing (not returning profits to their owners); self-governing (controlling their own activities); and voluntary (involving a degree of voluntary participation). Obviously, this excludes many types of organisations belonging to the European TS, such as social movements, cooperatives, or self-help organisations. Thus, the term 'nonprofit' when used in the current thesis, will not denote a fundamentally different type of organisation, but stress our approach of distinguishing the two social purpose TSOs in the study, from any kind of state, market or civil society-related institution employing business-oriented, profit-making practices. In short, unless explained in-text why it is otherwise, this thesis adopts Salamon's and Anheier's approach, where 'the civil society' and 'the nonprofit sector' are essentially used as synonymous to 'the third sector'.

2.3. The third sector in Greece

Voluntarism has long been considered a staple of the TS (Salamon, 1995). In Greece, voluntarism reflects the Greek civil society's weakness after the 1974 transition to democracy (Sotiropoulos & Bourikos, 2014). Evidence on the size of voluntarism and the TS in Greece

is extremely scarce (Sotiropoulos, 2014). The relatively more recent data (since the mid-2000s) is not conclusive, because there have been very few relevant research projects, using different sampling frames and sampling techniques. Generally, available surveys show that Greeks do not normally engage in voluntary action. A national survey in 2006, showed that 29 per cent of Greeks participated in activities of ecclesiastical or religious associations, three per cent in charity activities, eight per cent in entertainment groups, and five per cent in political parties and labour unions (Hellenic Statistical Authority, 2006). Even after the crisis hit, an average of seven per cent of Greeks devoted money to community activities, while on average, Greeks devoted three per cent of their time to voluntary community activities.[3] In fact, this study of volunteering in EU countries, showed that Greece has the lowest level of voluntary action in the EU, with just 1.7 per cent of the population aged over 15 involved in any type of voluntary and community activities.

Still, Greece presents a rich and deep TS past. Subsistence, productive and civic self-organisation, was highly developed in the Greek cultural space already since classical times and in a more modern form, since the Byzantine era. Greek cooperative traditions are maybe the oldest in Europe (Nasioulas, 2010)[4]. TS activities in the Greek domesticity through the age-old small community system, reproduced a decisive body of meaningful ties deployed in favour of social cohesion during the Turkish Ottoman rule (1453-1821). The ethnic group of 'Romioi' (civilians of the Byzantine Empire, of Greek descent, culture and Christian Orthodox religious faith), self-organised in autonomous ways, excelled in conserving, expanding and revitalising international commercial networks, both for subsistence and market economy, throughout the Balkans, central Europe and the eastern Mediterranean. Community-based productive clans were decisively active in the national liberation wartime activities of 1821. Following the liberation, they kept pushing towards democratic governance of rural social reproduction, along with national integration processes and the social development visions of the 19th and 20th century (Nasioulas, 2010; 2012b).

---

[3] Published study available at <http://ec.europa.eu/citizenship/pdf/doc1018_en.pdf> accessed on 16-03-2016.

[4] Institutionalised livestock cooperatives have been widespread throughout many centuries in many areas of Greece, under the Greek appellations 'syntehnies', 'synafia', 'tseligata', 'mitata', 'sempries', 'paradiarika', 'konakia' and 'koinata'. As several of these appellations linguistically show, a solid connotation to the ancient term 'koinon' is being made – 'koinon' meaning common, joint, reciprocal or political.

Nevertheless, the Greek TS and social economy have only recently been institutionally recognised (*Law 4019/2011 concerning 'The Third Sector, Social Economy, Social Entrepreneurship and Other Provisions'* in 2011), and this in an extremely inadequate and vague manner. Almost any type of organisation, institution, association or collective which couldn't be strictly categorised as a for-profit business or a public (state) institution, was bundled up in the aforementioned legislation (Nasioulas, 2012a). The law consists of 20 articles and ironically, Article 1, §1, quite adequately illustrates an earlier point, mirroring in practice the conceptual challenge of categorisation, definition and terminology in the study of the TS. The article, identifies the TS and social economy together, as 'the sum of social, economic, entrepreneurial, productive and support activities, undertaken by juridical entities or associations, cooperatives, firms and other forms of collectives, whose statutory goal is the pursuit of collective benefit and the service of wider social interests' (http://www.hellenicparliament.gr/UserFiles/bcc26661-143b-4f2d-8916-0e0e66ba4c50/k-koinep-pap.pdf.). Thus, given the lack of a dedicated state agency which monitors and measures the TS in Greece, the more recent statistical representation of the TS in the country, leaves a lot to be desired in terms of understanding exactly the impact of social purpose, non-profit TSOs, which obviously are of particular interest to this research (Table 1).

Table 1. Number of Greek third sector organisations by organisational structure and area of activity

The Third Sector in Greece (2011/12)	Nº Organisations	Nº Jobs	Members
Cooperatives and other similar firms (TOTAL)	**7.197**	**14.983**	**1.052.785**
Cooperative banks	25	1.238	196.179
Agricultural Cooperatives	6.376	11.300	713.714
Housing Cooperatives	545	n/a	120.242
Electricians' Cooperatives	23	200	600
Plumbers' Cooperatives	33	200	2.500
Women's agro-tourist cooperatives	130	100	2000
Pharmacists Cooperatives	41	1.500	5.500
Limited Liability Social Cooperatives	16	400	2.000
Mutual Insurance Cooperatives	7	40	10.000
Sea Mutual Insurance Cooperatives	1	5	50
Mutual Societies and other similar forms (TOTAL)	**11**	**1.140**	**180.000**
Mutual Help Funds	4	1.100	150.000
Occupational Insurance Funds	7	40	30000
Associations, foundations, nonprofit cooperatives and other nonprofit and voluntary organisations (TOTAL)	**50.600**	**101.000**	**1.500.000**
Associations in general	50.000	100.000	1.500.000
Foundations	600	1000	-
Civil nonprofit companies	n/a	n/a	n/a

Source: Nasioulas (2012a)

It should be noted that the above representation doesn't include the host of 'informal', hybrid TSOs and movement-like solidarity and anti-austerity collectives created during the crisis, neither distinguishes between simply existing organisations (registered by a court) and actually active ones. In addition, the recent fiscal measures, bureaucratic inertia and lack of funding have resulted in the aforementioned law being essentially defunct. In the research Sotiropoulos and Bourikos (2014) conducted, 14 out of the 27 organisations studied did not even know that such a law exists, while another six, considered the administration, finance and political networking aspects of the law too complicated and costly to deserve their attention.

2.4. The Greek crisis and the social consequences of a retreating social welfare state

The social consequences of the economic crisis in Greece have been tremendous, mostly resulting from policy measures adopted from May 2010 onwards. At that time, Greece, the European Commission (EC), the ECB and the IMF, the so-called 'Troika', signed the first Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) and loan agreement, as Greece was unable to service its soaring public debt (129 per cent of GDP in 2009). The MoU was accompanied by austerity measures in return for the loans, including but not limited to: severe wage and pension cuts and cuts in public social spending (health, education, benefits, government employment. etc.). Admittedly, a rationalisation of the Greek welfare state was needed (Sotiropoulos, 2004). Runaway government expenditure on pharmaceutical and hospital supplies and in the unequal provision of state funds including early pensions and supplementary allowances to privileged groups of beneficiaries (i.e., liberal professions and employees of state-owned enterprises) was extremely high.

At the same time, the unemployed and precariously employed enjoyed minimal, if any, social protection (Sotiropoulos & Bourikos, 2014). In short, before 2010, state-guaranteed social solidarity in Greece was deformed. It manifested in the unequal disbursement of social assistance funds distributed according to long-term patronage arrangements of political clientelism between successive governments and organised interests of recipients with strong voice and political leverage (Matsaganis, 2013). The situation did not improve after 2010, as governments drastically cut social expenditure, streamlining social spending somewhat, but resulting in a massive state retreat from social protection of salaried strata, the unemployed, the poor and the socially marginalised and excluded (Venieris, 2011).

Consequently, between 2008 and 2013, the Greek economy was in recession for six consecutive years and by the end of 2013, GDP had shrunk by 25 per cent and by almost 41 per cent by the end of 2015[5]. In 2013, unemployment rose to 27.5 per cent, while youth unemployment (15-24 age group) stood at 61 per cent[6]. Notably, owing to the fragmented,

---

[5] Data of the Hellenic Statistical Agency, as summarized at:
<http://www.statistics.gr/documents/20181/1234958/greek_economy_14_11_2015.pdf/30427c68-8693-4395-931e-8f006e8c3523?version=1.0> accessed on 17-03-2016.

[6] Data of the Hellenic Statistical Agency, as summarized at:
<http://www.statistics.gr/documents/20167/1234944/greek_economy_18_12_2014.pdf/30312c68-8693-4395-931e-8f006e8c3416?version=1.0> accessed on 17-03-2016.

occupation-based, inefficient and very unequal structure of the Greek welfare state, covering mostly the insiders (i.e., civil servants, employees of state-owned enterprises and the liberal professions) rather than the outsiders (i.e., precariously employed workers of hundreds of thousands of small and medium enterprises and the self-employed), social protection was sparse: only 17 per cent of all those unemployed obtained (an insignificant) unemployment benefit in 2013.

Moreover, in 2012, as much as 35 per cent of the country's population ran the risk of poverty or social exclusion, while the share of those who were severely materially deprived was 19 per cent[7]. As the government cut civil service salaries and pensions, raised income and property taxes and rolled back the Greek welfare state for four years in a row (2010-2013), there was a dramatic decline in the living standards of the middle and low-income groups, with the per capita income declining from 17.374 Euros in 2008 to 12.354 Euros in 2013 (Matsaganis, 2013). In brief, most Greeks could not rely now on either their personal income or the receding welfare state and obviously, not on Greece's weak, modern voluntary movement and social support TSOs either.

The blow to social cohesion has been especially profound, due to the inability of extended family networks in Greece, to perform their traditionally accepted and expected role of 'taking care of their own'. Most Greeks have always sought support from their families, relatives and friends first, and the clientelist networks of patronage used by major political parties, second (Hadjiyanni, 2010). In contrast with northern and western EU countries (i.e., the UK), in Greece, social cohesion and support have always been preserved primarily through especially strong family and kinship ties (Ferrera, 2005; Hadjiyanni, 2010). At the same time, the problems of welfare state retrenchment, served to compound the issue even further. The Greek social welfare state can be tentatively classified as a variation of the corporatist-state model (Esping-Andersen, 1990). It has always been leagues away in its scale, resources, organisation and effectiveness from its counterparts in the EU, due to various historical reasons (Katrougalos, 1996). The modern Greek state, from its formation in 1831, has been almost constantly engrossed in local or international conflicts, a devastating civil war in 1945-1949 which followed WWII, and a military dictatorship in 1967-1973. The

---

[7] Published study available at:
<http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/european_economy/2013/pdf/2013_05_03_stat_Appendix_en.pdf> accessed on 16-03-2016.

civil war in particular, between the left-wing People's Liberation Army and the right-wing government army backed by the Western Allies, created a sharp division in Greek society. Thus, an oppressive state actively prosecuting those who fought on the defeated side (and their families), suppressing their individual, social and civil rights, was formed (Venieris & Papatheodorou, 2003).

This state of affairs which lasted until the 1980s and the formation of a government by the Socialist party of PA.SO.K, prevented the establishment of a welfare state similar to the post-war 'golden era' of Keynesian social welfare in Europe. The latter 'presupposed a working compromise built upon a social contract between the social actors, guaranteed by the state' (Katrougalos 1996: 48). The related political turmoil during the 1945-1980 period, resulted in the socioeconomic marginalisation of parts of the population, a significant delay in the introduction of capitalist reforms and the formation of corresponding state institutions, economic underdevelopment, corrupt state-protected market forces, and the overall scarcity of resources in a poor state. Thus, the traditional place of familialism patterns, kinship networks and political clientelism as the primary (and often only) means of social protection and mobility, was embedded in both social consciousness and daily social practice (Katrougalos, 1996; Venieris, 2003). Consequently, what started as a fiscal crisis demanding austerity measures for a specific timeframe in order to 'right the ship again', quickly became a full-fledged humanitarian crisis (Sotiropoulos & Bourikos, 2014).

2.5. The revitalisation of the third sector and the emergence of a new type of TSOs in Greece

Traditionally, Greek TSOs and NGOs, have depended on state funding, provided to them by various ministers in a less-than-transparent fashion (Nasioulas, 2010). Before the onset of the crisis, TSOs and other formal NGOs, (i.e., associations of families with more than three children), had forged strong financial and political links and patronage relations with the central government (Matsaganis, 2011). They benefitted from such privileged relationships, because they regularly received state funding. Thus, many organisations, while belonging to the Greek civil society and the TS, had essentially become state tools in certain social policy sectors (i.e., family and child care policy). Things changed drastically after the economic crisis set in. Aiming to cut government expenditure, the Greek government limited state funding to TSOs and in 2012 suddenly froze all state funds earmarked for TSOs. Moreover,

in 2014, prosecutors revealed that a criminal investigation was under way for the misuse of funds dispensed by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in a shady manner to Greek humanitarian nonprofit NGOs and TSOs, such as organisations focused on cultural and environmental issues, or the disabled (Sotiropoulos & Bourikos, 2014).

However, after 2010, charity-oriented TSOs rose to the challenge of mitigating the effects of the economic crisis. Together with Greek appendixes of international NGOs and the Greek Orthodox Church,[8] they mobilised to help people in need, using whatever funds at their disposal, municipal resources and also contributions by individuals and sponsors, to provide (primarily) food, as well as limited medical and social services (Sotiropoulos & Bourikos, 2014). Mobilisation of the civil society was becoming noteworthy in multiple sub-sectors of social protection. TSOs, charities and philanthropy NGOs coexisted with various informal social networks, solidarity collectives and informal self-help groups, which often had neither a formal organisational structure, nor any official status.

For example, after 2010, informal groups organised bartering, exchange and distribution networks, in the context of which they exchanged goods and services for vouchers or online credits. In 2012, there were at least 22 such exchange networks in 17 cities, while another example is the emergence of time banks, namely voluntary networks in which participants commit time to help one another (Bourikos & Vellianiti, 2013). Furthermore, a different type of social solidarity initiative was manifested in the informal distribution networks, among which the most famous was the 'Potato Movement'.[9] In healthcare, the unemployed and self-employed that had stopped paying health insurance to their occupation-based social security funds, lost access to public healthcare. Poor people, who could not count on their family for financial aid, resorted to the Greek branches of

---

[8] The Greek Orthodox Church stands at the crossroads between the civil society and the state. It is not a typical third sector organisation, in the sense that -at the national level- it is officially recognised by the Constitution of Greece as the carrier of the prevailing religion in the country, while clerics are on the state's payroll. Yet, at the community level, clerics and volunteers have traditionally formed social solidarity groups to support the poor, mostly by providing food, clothes and shelter.

[9] Farmers used to sell their products to middlemen, who then transferred the agricultural produce to cities and sold it to supermarkets and grocery stores, thus inflating the original price of the products. Some farmers outside of the city of Thessaloniki, decided to bypass the middlemen and started selling directly to consumers, by regularly travelling to the city centre to sell their products or making arrangements to receive orders directly from consumers. The movement spread and municipalities in other areas helped to create 'social groceries', namely shops housed on the premises of municipal buildings in which volunteers distributed these goods to poor citizens who could not afford them from the supermarkets anymore

international healthcare NGOs, such as the '*Doctors without Borders*' and the '*Doctors of the World*'. In addition, volunteering doctors, nurses and social workers put together informal healthcare networks. They created make-shift clinics, called '*Social Medical Centres*', usually in space provided by municipal authorities, with 33 such clinics in 29 cities existing in 2012, while pharmacists and doctors set up '*Social Pharmacies*' (Bourikos, 2013).

In the provision of food and shelter, the church, private (supermarkets) and voluntary formal and informal organisations, teamed up to provide food to people in need. Moreover, informal networks of volunteers served as intermediaries between on the one hand shelters for the homeless and poor households, and on the other, restaurants, hotels and bakeries, which could spare food putting the former in touch with the latter. Finally, regarding cultural and educational services, as low-income families could not afford to pay for cramming lessons[10], often deemed necessary to prepare pupils for the university entrance examinations, volunteering high school teachers set up 'social cramming schools' (*koinonika frontistiria*) where pupils took lessons for free.

Obviously, this 'Big Bang' of the Greek TS is a rational response to the crisis. As the government rolled back the welfare state, as the spending cuts and dismissals of employees increasingly affected not only low-income, but also middle-income groups, citizens through nonprofit TSOs and philanthropy NGOs, stepped in to occupy the newly available public space (Bourikos, 2013). However, the sudden parallel emergence and widespread proliferation of new, informal, social solidarity groups alongside the church and 'formal' TSOs, is of particular interest. Many of these grassroots initiatives, openly oppose the goals and practices of their more 'traditional cousins', while depicting if not a substantial degree of sociopolitical activism, at the very least a clear and public political stance. The latter is based on anti-austerity demands, anti-government sentiments, a rhetoric of resistance to neoliberal policies enforced as part of the signed MoUs, and strong advocacy of a robust social welfare state. The Greek TSO in this case study, while existing in another form for some years before the crisis, can be considered as belonging to this new wave of hybrid social purpose TSOs created in the last seven years.

---

[10] In Greece, it is very common for pupils in the last three years of high school to engage in costly, supplementary 'shadow education' services, outside of the state educational system. This takes the form of either evening, private small group classes ('*frontistiria*'), or private 1 on 1 tutoring at home, so that pupils can better prepare themselves for the National University Entry Exams (Kassotakis & Verdis, 2013).

2.6. The third sector in the UK

According to Esping-Andersen (1990) and Salamon and Anheier (1997), the UK features a liberal welfare regime (in contrast with Greece's more 'corporatist-redistribution' model). It is characterised by its market logic, restricted government expenditure, high level of voluntary activity, facilitation of income support on a 'less eligibility' model and encouragement of private forms of welfare and social security. Although this classification is contested by some (i.e., see Bagguley, 1994), a strict classification of the welfare mix in the UK, is outside of the scope of this thesis. The history of the TS in the UK, exemplifies the common approach which views its development and participation in voluntary groups as synonymous with the role of the TS within the welfare regime (Williams, 1998). A role which -although changing- traditionally remains especially important (Powell & Barrientos, 2004).

Under New Labour government, there have been numerous government reports on volunteering in the UK (i.e., DETR, 1998; Home Office, 1998; 2003a; HM Treasury, 2002; 2005; HM Treasury and Cabinet Office 2007; Social Exclusion Unit, 1998; 2000). All give primacy to the nurturing of voluntary groups (a TS approach). Indeed, in 2006, several government agencies previously responsible for harnessing the voluntary sector were brought together to form a new Office of the Third Sector. The Office approached the TS as NGOs which are driven by their values and which principally reinvest any financial surpluses to further social, environmental or cultural objectives, mainly through 'formal volunteering' (helping via groups). In 2010, the Office of the Third Sector was renamed as the Office of the Civil Society by the Conservative-Liberal coalition government taking responsibility for charities, social enterprises and voluntary organisations in the Cabinet Office. The importance of voluntarism and the TS in the UK, can also be seen in that -in contrast with Greece- the UK features one of the highest percentages of people over 15 devoting part of their time to voluntary / community activities in the EU, with 44 per cent (Mathou, 2010)[11]. The prolificacy of such organisations in the UK, as well as the variety of fields they are active and their financial characteristics, can be seen below (Tables 2 and 3). This thesis refers to the 'UK third sector' or the 'UK TSO' for reasons of consistency when compared to the

---

[11] Published study available at <http://ec.europa.eu/citizenship/pdf/doc1018_en.pdf> accessed on 16-03-2016.

'Greek third sector' or 'Greek TSO'. However, it should be noted that the UK TSO in the case study operates only in England and sometimes there can be found considerable differences even between TSOs with similar characteristics, goals and activities in different parts of the UK, for example between England and Scotland.

Table 2. Number of UK third sector organisations by country

2013/14	Micro	Small	Medium	Large	Major	Super-Major	Total
England	65.332	45.020	17.769	3.768	505	39	**132.433**
Wales	4.021	2.192	773	167	19	0	**7.172**
Scotland	10.222	6.026	2.592	549	57	1	**19.447**
Northern Ireland	1.529	1.239	1.016	129	0	0	**3.913**
United Kingdom	81.104	54.477	22.150	4.613	581	40	**162.965**

Source: NCVO/TSRC, Charity Commission

2013/14	Number of organisations	% of organisations	Income (£m)	Expenditure (£m)	Assets (£m)	Average Income (£)
Culture and recreation	23,440	14.4	5,391.5	5,053.3	6,893.8	230,012
Education	7991	4.9	1,680.6	1,614.2	1,961.5	210,308
Parent Teacher Associations	12,382	7.6	170.8	156.4	329.0	13,798
Playgroups and nurseries	6943	4.3	557.7	541.2	675.5	80,323
Research	3446	2.1	2,856.1	3,412.9	20,409.7	828,824
Health	6671	4.1	4,768.7	4,522.4	6,643.9	714,836
Social services	29209	17.9	9,733.0	9,400.8	11,600.1	333,221
Scout groups and youth clubs	6427	3.9	238.0	244.9	413.8	37,038
Environment	5797	3.6	2,999.3	2,817.6	4,788.6	517,380
Development	10578	6.5	960.9	911.6	1,615.1	90,843
Village Halls	7191	4.4	117	107	233.4	16,274
Housing	3711	2.3	1,500.6	1,385.2	4,317.2	404,373
Employment and training	2015	1.2	1,129.0	1,078.6	1,097.0	560,283
Law and advocacy	3856	2.4	1,311.4	1,216.0	1,270.7	340,089
Grant-making foundations	12533	7.7	3,961.0	3,278.5	36,466.3	316,049
Umbrella bodies	1160	0.7	431.3	431.7	605.4	371,774
International	5727	3.5	4,341.8	4,089.6	2,375.8	758,128
Religion	13850	8.5	1,611.1	1,453.0	3,503.2	116,326
Total	**162927**	**100.0**	**43,759.9**	**41,714.9**	**105,199.8**	**268,586**

Source: NCVO/TSRC, Charity Commission

In Evers and Laville's (2004) review of the TS, the various authors agree that TS definitions, are inevitably constructed in the political and cultural contexts they are incorporated, while Peter Alcock (2010: 12) notes: 'They are also a product of historical dynamics and the legacies of political and cultural change'. Accordingly, the history of the UK TS, broadly speaking reflects the accommodation between religion, commerce and the state (Evers & Laville, 2004). Prior to the Reformation in the 16th century, the Catholic Church was the dominant institution for meeting social need and exercising social control in England, interwoven with the support mechanisms of the informal sector and the feudal system, and supplemented by the activities of town guilds. The Reformation overturned this accommodation, and the Church of England continued to dominate social life and civil society well into the 18th century, as the institutionalised religion of the governing elite.

In this context, the 18th century also saw the rise of a more organised and 'formal' type of philanthropy, which Owen refers to as 'associative philanthropy' (Owen, 1964: 3). Black (1984) suggests that the relatively early demise of the guild system in comparison with central Europe, along with the potency of mutualism (i.e., building societies, burial societies, consumer and producer cooperatives, housing associations, etc.) and an almost unbroken tradition of freedom of association, explains the precocious development of trade unions, philanthropy, cooperatives and friendly societies in the UK, and their centrality in working class organisation. Consequently, at first, the TS emerged at both the local and national levels as a substitute for state inaction, as industrialisation and urbanisation in the 18th and 19th centuries created demands for social services that government was reluctant to provide (Kendall, 2003). During this period, both its adversarial and its role as a substitute service provider were particularly important in promoting the interests of the poor.

By the turn of the century, the balance in the welfare mix was beginning to gradually shift towards the state. As Taylor (2004: 129-30) notes: 'first regulation, then funding, and only finally taking increasing responsibility for delivery, with the pace of change varying in different policy fields'. In the mid-20th century, government took over as the principal provider of social services and for a time, the TS persisted primarily in a supplementary mode (i.e., friendly societies administrating health insurance in the National Insurance Act of 1911). Yeo argues that 'friendly societies, building societies, cooperatives, educational associations, clubs and institutes were very large organisations indeed, not only in their own right but as regards their market presence in their own produce areas, i.e., insurance, mortgages, retail distribution, adult learning and sociability, as well as the manufacture of

32

some products' (2001: 21). However, Beveridge in his milestone report, *Voluntary Action*, argued societies became 'more official and less personal; more of insurance agencies and less of social agencies' (1948: 78-79).

According to Taylor (1992), legislation in the 1940s on income support, health and education, solidified a comprehensive social welfare state. It should be noted though, the state monopoly was never complete and certain welfare services such as residential care, provision for special needs, the lifeboat service and independent counselling, remained part of the TS, which nevertheless, was demoted to junior partner in the 'welfare firm' (Owen, 1964). Voluntary TSOs, cooperative and mutual enterprises and associations, demonstrated their resilience over the 1950s and 1960s, maintaining a specialist role and providing services in areas which were not seen as a priority by the state, or developing a complementary role in others. Eventually, from the 1960s, the limitations of government provision became more apparent and the complementary and adversarial models of TS-government relations grew in prominence, as the split between a more statist welfare model and a mixed economy model (in favour of the latter) became more obvious (Alcock, 2016). But, inspired by the civil rights movement and other social movements across the world, the very scale of state intervention provoked reaction (Kendall & Knapp, 1997). Campaigns regarding poverty, homelessness and peace, along with a new age of mutualism emerged as welfare consumers organised for better goods and services (Black, 1984).

The Conservative government in 1979, committed to roll back the reach, resources and responsibilities of state welfare, thus the advance of Thatcher's New Right neoliberalism, privatisations and the creation of welfare markets was inevitable (Larner, 2006). By the late 1980s, the private sector was already significant in social care. Government policies were seeking to shift the burden of finance from state, to private insurance and to another corner of the welfare mix triangle, the family, with a renewed emphasis on personal responsibility for caring, and a greater role for the TS (Taylor, 2004). This was particularly true in social housing and social services, where service delivery was transferred to the voluntary and commercial sectors through contracting, professionalisation, results-orientation and accountability practices. Ultimately, the TS and government relationship evolved toward a complementary relationship into the new welfare mix, mostly through the third way agenda: 'The pioneers of state socialism saw the voluntary sector moving away from the... "parallel bars" role in social provision...with more emphasis now to be placed on...complementing and supplementing the new universalism' (Kendall & Knapp, 1997: 252). TSOs continued to

be a key player in several social care and support activities as agents of the state, fulfilling new responsibilities and operating in traditional areas where there was no statutory obligation (Kendall, 2003). Gradually, as the government increasingly considered TSOs as its agents in efficient service delivery as compared with relatively equal partners in service provision during the 1980s, the mechanism of the contract started replacing that of the grant in fulfilling government's role as financier. In this arrangement, the TS was construed as an instrument of government, competing with for-profit businesses in the contract market (Morris, 2000).

The New Labour government in 1997, was searching for this third way (Blair, 1998; Giddens, 1998) between market and state. Key elements were a commitment to a partnership rather than a contract culture; tackling social exclusion; a positive climate for enterprise; and the mobilisation of citizens and communities under a banner of rights, but also duties and responsibilities. The third way and neocommunitarianism, offered new opportunities to the TS, which was to enjoy increasing prominence and additional funding (i.e., the written 'compact' with the voluntary sector) (Home Office, 1998). Government requirements were imposed on local public bodies, to consult voluntary organisations, communities and service-users in developing services and defining a 'best value' framework for public services. Faith in the sector's capacity to contribute to public value by promoting active citizenship and voluntarism, addressing social cohesion and helping reduce social exclusion through civil renewal, local community regeneration and the fostering of social capital, was evident. Thus, New Labour increased welfare spending, especially on these third way policies (i.e., baby bonds, tax credits) but also on mainstream welfare (Alcock, 2014).

These policies have left a strong impact on the current welfare mix in the UK. The first, is the emphasis on partnership. While the previous conservative governments approached the market and the TS as alternatives to what they perceived as state control, the New Labour administration saw partnership as its central theme, emphasising 'governance' rather than 'government' (Harris, 2010), but accepting state retreat -in both control and resources- from social welfare provision. Cross-sector partnerships such as Social Impact Bonds (SIBs), promoted new forms of delivery, attempting to bring all agencies together at a community level, with the community as an active stakeholder. Second, the UK (as did most European countries at the time) embraced the language of social enterprise, attempting to 'combine the promise of social cohesion and self-organisation within a market economy' and 'provide an alternative to both the paternalism of public services and the privatism of the market' (Leadbeater & Christie, 1999: 10). Third, as this narrative was emphasising quality

34

user-personalisation of public services, TSOs were crucial to the expansion of a service providers' mixed economy (Plant, 2003). Finally, the linking of social rights to individual responsibility, moral principles, behavioural standards and community duty based on conditionality, was also a key shift in the conceptualisation of social citizenship and social welfare, sparked a resurgence of governance practice in welfare, and is a central characteristic of the UK welfare mix and the TS today (Somers & Wright, 2008).

This section, tracing some milestones and important shifts in the history and nature of welfare and the TS in the UK, will allow us to better understand the perceptions and experiences of the participants with regards to governance practices and social citizenship transformations in the context of their involvement with the case study TSO. Nevertheless, it is important to also look at some insights previous research has yielded on the overall 'ethos of charity' and the discourses of care in day-to-day activities of UK TSOs, both on an organisational, as well as an individual level (workers and volunteers). Of course, the TS is not a homogenous category, neither is the specific subset of social purpose, small to medium-sized voluntary TSOs with a predominantly local character which concern this study.

Without talking about governmentality and governance practices *per se*, there has been previous related research on the ethos and discourses of charity in UK TSOs, as well as the motivations and perceptions of their volunteers and staff members. These studies indicated that there is a great deal of complexity involved, with regards to the ethos of charity, but also the control and oppression narratives and practices in the support of service-users within the various spaces of care (Cloke, Johnsen, & May, 2005). Notions of morality and ethos have always been associated with charity, voluntarism and the TS and indeed, have been seen to heavily influence social policy overall (Allahyari, 2000). In the UK for example, the New Labour government's third way shift towards voluntarism, community, TS and the civil society in welfare, can be seen in the *Change a Life* campaign concerning the homeless (ODPM, 2000). This policy initiative essentially indicated what is *moral* and *good* in the provision of care for the homeless (voluntarism and donations) and what was considered *wrong* (direct state contribution / handing out money). Other authors have also indicated the degree of diversity existing in the construction and expression of the organisational ethos of voluntary organisations active in the realm of care for the vulnerable in local communities, specifically in the interaction of the 'self' of those providing services, with the 'other', represented by service-users (Popke, 2003). In that respect, there are many layers in processes

concerning who attempts to 'convert' whom (the TS worker / volunteer the service-user, or vice versa?) and draw them to their world and way of thinking (Allahyari, 2000).

Coles (1997) presented three general, ideal types of ethos in charitable organisations: Christian 'caritas' (care), secular humanism and postsecular charity. Voluntary organisations guided by Christian caritas, are obviously inspired by the values of Christian religion, specifically love and charity. Based on these principles given to man by God, a certain ethos of *giving* and *receiving* and a framework of behaviour is constructed towards our self, as well as the 'other'. The secular humanism approach is similar, but with the important difference that it focuses on the human origin of values and their association with logic and rationality. It does not attribute the origins of justice, morality, compassion, love, equality, etc. to God, but to pure human motives, reason, and the proclivity for altruism. However, Coles admitted that the organisations of care adopting this more secular approach, retain in their ethos many of the Christian-born philosophies of their cousins belonging to the first category. Finally, critiquing both approaches as inexorably linking *caring* and *giving* in the name of charity to the self and as a result they are always related to processes of discrimination and 'othering', Coles argued for a post-secular approach: 'Giving must navigate the tensions between receptively addressing the other's extant perspectives, desires, and joys, on the one hand, and responding to them in ways that might enhance the other's capacity to receptively and generously engage the world, on the other. Ignoring the former imperative leads to blind imperialism; ignoring the latter leads to a slackening of the will to resist and move beyond the life-stunting limits of present beings' (1997: 105).

In their own research, Cloke, Johnsen and May, indicate that 'Some organisations unashamedly desired some kind of conversion of the homeless other, elevating spiritual needs alongside the more commonly recognised physical and emotional needs. Other organisations expected homeless people to raise their own levels of self-responsibility, reflecting an ethos of care in return for deliverable changes in lifestyle and attitude. Yet other organisations espoused something closer to post-secular charity, eschewing both evangelism and any expectation of the changing self of homeless people' (2007: 1090). However, they found that while Coles' archetypes have merit as a way of conceptualising the discourses of the overall ethos present in TSOs, even organisations which could be categorised as clearly representing one of these approaches, in practice they depicted '...multiple layers of faith-based and secular ethics of generosity and service. Service provision for homeless people in England involves Christian organisations functioning in a secular humanist world often engaging in

partnership projects involving Christian and non-Christian organisations and individuals. Equally, secular organisations seemed often to be drawing implicitly on ethical principles which were equivalent to those which provided the foundation for faith-based service organisations' (Cloke et al., 2007: 1090). In short, various discourses of ethos where shown to be adopted with different degrees of intensity by the staff and volunteers even in the same organisation. These are first and foremost constructed and expressed in the day-to-day interactions and interrelations between staff members, volunteers and the service-users (mainly homeless people), and less as the implemented outcome of a long-term, organisational strategic decision.

Similarly, various discourses were shown to describe the ethos of charity staff members and volunteers of TSOs embody as individuals. They were characterised as motivated by a sense of doing *good* and by self-identifying as *righteous* people (Van Til, 1998) indulging in 'moral selving by creating a more virtuous self' (Allahyari, 2000: 4); by meaning-construction processes including both *giving* and *receiving* (i.e., personal satisfaction, socialisation, a sense of community, contribution to the public, creativity, alleviation of loneliness or feelings of worthlessness for pensioners, etc.); by loyalty to fellow workers and volunteers and the organisations themselves; or, by a personal identification with the plight of the service-users through frequent interrelation (Cloke et al., 2011). What these findings suggest, is that volunteering in general and the work of voluntary TSOs in particular, can't be understood in a singular manner and can't be reduced only to faith, political beliefs or strong social convictions, despite their unquestionable importance (Cloke, et al., 2007).

Consequently, the discourses and practices of governance within TSOs and their relation with welfare policy agendas shaping their perception and approach towards their service-users' struggle for socioeconomic (re)integration and citizenship, cannot be always understood only as a deliberate strategy fuelled by religious or political beliefs. People involved in the practice of care through TSOs in the UK, don't always do it only, or even mainly, because they need to fulfil an obligation. They are not necessarily involved due to notions of civic duty or proper behaviour and citizenship, welfare narratives which as it'll be shown in **chapter 3,** have been promoted in various ways by successive British governments, especially since the start of the century. It seems that a more personal choice and form of ethics is present and can be equally or even more influential, rather than an overarching organisational ethos or culture. As Cloke, May and Johnsen found: 'Despite the current political culture which seeks to promote volunteering as an integral part of what citizenship

should entail, people volunteer because they want to, not because of any sense of obligation or civic duty, reflecting a form of ethical citizenship rather than political citizenship' (2007: 1099).

It must be pointed out that the research referenced above, concerns only studies conducted in the UK and included TSOs which in most cases exclusively worked with the homeless. As discussed in **section 2.3**, research on the TS in Greece is very underdeveloped. However, we can surmise with some confidence, that the above findings concerning the multi-layered nature of both the general organisational ethos of social purpose TSOs, as well as the complexity of the motivation and identification processes of workers and volunteers with regards to their 'selves' as providers and the 'others' as service-users, could tentatively be applicable to their counterparts in Greek TSOs. Thus, these are some important insights to keep in mind when problematising the ways governance technologies of control are applied by the two case study TSOs, shaping their understanding and aims regarding their users' socioeconomic (re)integration efforts and social citizenship status. The next chapter, will examine the discourses, ideological underpinnings and policy agendas accompanying the most noteworthy reforms which have significantly changed the landscape in social welfare and the TS in Greece and the UK, in recent decades.

Chapter 3. Welfare reforms 'reforming' the third sector

Societies develop distinctive political traditions and institutional models, imprinted in national dispositions toward organising, while definitions of public and private, what exists in-between and the division of labour between public and private sectors, are neither stable nor formalised, but rather tend to shift over time (Jepperson & Meyer, 1991). Likewise, TSOs are constantly affected by governmental pressures, oversights and conscious political agendas, with the boundaries between such processes often being blurred (Kendall, 2003). Thus static concepts and approaches are of little use.

In short, during the post war Keynesian era when a robust social welfare state was built, it was generally assumed that the social security institutions of the state displaced charitable organisations and the family in the provision of welfare and other social services, which is a key distinction between the UK and Greece. However, TSOs did not fade away, but reconfigured their practices from their paternalistic charitable origins, to become community-centred, public service providers. Actually, the state and the TS grew in tandem, in a symbiotic relationship (Salamon, 1995; Scott, 2003; Shields & Evans, 1998). A mixed economy (Rekart, 2011; Valverde 1995a; 1995b) with a high degree of state-nonprofit cooperation was forged, although the TS's role in this relationship was often invisible (Hall, 1997). Hence, rather than a state monopoly on welfare provision, social services were delivered through a combination of state and privately run and administered initiatives. Such TS services were joined together with the state through the public sector's financial support and while TSOs were a secondary element in the Keynesian welfare state structure, they nonetheless remained significant junior partners in the construction and delivery of social services (Deakin, 2003; Kendall, 2009). As social welfare and the overall direction of economic policy have undergone drastic reforms in Europe in the last 30 years, so has the TS.

3.1. Towards a new welfare mix and a new conception of social citizenship

In the 1980s, European policies inspired by Thatcher's and Reagan's neoliberal administrations in the UK and the US, provoked serious social strains: income polarisation, social marginalisation and persistent poverty (Harvey, 2007). There was an increasing pressure on market forces, families and the civil society for generating life-chances, a discourse of individual responsibility and morality, an enthusiasm for public outsourcing and

39

'off-loading' to the TS, as well as other altered visions of the welfare architecture, which eventually prompted a mounting fear of the high political, social and economic costs of failing to tend to social cohesion. Eventually, such concerns provoked talk of modernising the European social model, the third way, a new social democracy driven by neocommunitarianism, and so on (Jepsen & Pascual, 2005).

The notion of welfare architecture, assumes the distinction between welfare regimes and welfare states; the idea of architecture refers to the former. As Goodin and Rein put it (2001: 771): '...the term "welfare regime" refers to the larger constellation of socioeconomic institutions, policies and programmes all oriented toward promoting people's welfare quite generally. It certainly includes the transfer-oriented "welfare state" sector, narrowly conceived. But it also includes the tax as much as the transfer sector of the public economy. And it also includes, alongside both, the productive sector of the economy'. Therefore, welfare architecture reflects decisions about how to produce welfare in any country: whether via purchased welfare (markets), via the reciprocity of kin (families), via collective support in communities (voluntary TS), or via collective public solidarity, (state provision). It essentially structures the 'responsibility mix' of a citizenship regime, thus creating a 'welfare mix'.

Of course, consideration of citizenship immediately directs attention to the state, because citizenship cannot exist without the state (Marshall, 1950). Decisions about the boundaries and forms of social citizenship determine the responsibilities of the other components of the welfare mix. That which the state doesn't take on is left to markets, families or communities and the TS. As Goodin and Rein (2001: 779) claim: '... in a capitalist market economy, what the market can be made to do, the state does not need to do'. Indeed, very often the distinctions among welfare architectures are created by choices about what the state will treat as a matter for social citizenship (government protection) and what concerns individual market capacity. It is in that regard that in recent years, political jurisdictions are shifting the boundaries of the responsibility mix, defining new forms of social security and redesigning social citizenship, by assigning more responsibility for welfare creation to markets, families, communities and the TS, legitimising this new welfare mix.

When Keynesian economics dominated in the post-1945 years, all welfare regimes allocated a key role to the market as the foundation of well-being for citizens and their family (Taylor-Gooby, 2001). The role of the other three welfare components (state, family, TS / community), was to fill gaps left by market provision. The prevailing assumption was that

social spending would complement the market economy (Banting, 1987). The community was also important, because many social services were publicly funded, but actually provided by TSOs anchored in localities. Sometimes the partnership was quite explicit, as in the Bismarckian welfare regimes of continental Europe, where religious institutions and unions organised pension funds and provided social services (Esping-Andersen, 2002). In other cases, it was less visible, as in liberal welfare regimes where the welfare state also involved the nonprofit agencies providing various services, at least partially with public funds, with the UK as a primary example (Ascoli & Ranci, 2002). In post-1945 social welfare states, government spending on social programmes and services, was considered expenditure on social security for social protection, cohesion and regeneration, as well as stimulation of the economy in times of recession. Therefore, social spending was viewed as supporting the economy, as well as individuals, groups and families (Esping-Andersen, 2002). This underlying logic of the welfare mix, gave social citizenship its state-protected implementation in European countries, and later came under heavy criticism by neoliberal ideas.

3.2. Neoliberalism reconfiguring the welfare mix

Neoliberalism has been one of the main ideological and political trends which have inspired the sweeping changes in social welfare systems across Europe the last three decades (Lazzarato, 2009), and by extension, the role and identity of the TS. Neoliberal policies have been implemented in almost every society on the globe, in different forms and under different conditions. It has been articulated with conservative policies as for example in the US and the UK, in more social-democratic ways as in Scandinavian societies, or, as in the case of Greece, through a 'sudden infusion of neoliberal practices throughout the whole spectrum of public policy', especially since 2009 (Arampatzi & Nicholls, 2012: 2593). As a result, fairly specific neoliberal configurations have appeared in different countries (Birch & Mykhnenko, 2010). Thus, it is a heavily contested term and its varied and multilevel influence is constantly debated. However, the full exploration of its advent and dominancy within the sphere of applied public policy, economics and social policy, is beyond the scope of this research. Nevertheless, this thesis adopts the more critical approaches in the discussion (see i.e., Ferguson, 2010; Harvey, 2007; Hasenfeld & Garrow, 2007; Jessop, 2002; Lemke, 2002; Plehwe, Walpen, & Neunhöffer, 2007; Waqcuant, 2009). More specifically, it focuses on the reconfiguration of social welfare by neoliberalism with TSOs and community-based,

voluntary active citizenship being put at the forefront of social provision. This discourse argues that through neoliberal changes, TSOs are supposedly being given the tools, incentives and opportunities to become the independent, flexible and effective social services providers needed in modern societies. The predominance of contracting out public social services to the TS is an example of that (Davies, 2008). As a result, a conception of citizenship tied to responsibility and contribution through employment, voluntarism and the realignment of social welfare and independent action among TSOs, can be realised (Milbourne & Cushman, 2015). Thus, a 'fairer', more efficient welfare system, more available resources for the competitive market economy and the enhancement of the employability and individual skills of the vulnerable, can presumably be achieved. However, as it will be shown, the reality is not quite like this.

The neoliberal perspective of the 1980s, assumed markets should generate all well-being and that social spending and state intervention were in conflict with economic prosperity (Harvey, 2005). Such ideas generated neoliberals' vision of the proper 'responsibility mix', downplaying the role of the state in favour of structural adjustments under the guidance of free markets. Relationships across the pillars of the welfare mix had to be redesigned. They had to allow markets, community-based voluntarism, TSOs and the civil society, reclaim their 'rightful' space in the allocation of well-being, shrinking the space of state-protected social citizenship. Individuals were also called on to 'exercise greater responsibility' for themselves and families for their members. This neoliberal strategy with its distinctive combination of anti-welfarism and anti-statism has sought to dismantle welfare states, and the social, political, economic and organisational settlements that sustained them (Clarke & Newman, 1997). Neoliberal discourse, whether academic or political, has challenged conceptions of the public interest, replacing them with the rule of private interests coordinated by markets. Monopoly providers of public services should be replaced by efficient suppliers, disciplined by the competitive realities of the market. Disintegrating conceptions of the public as a collective identity, should substitute social citizenship with individualised and economised identities of taxpayers and consumers (Harvey, 2007).

In the neoliberal narrative, the 'private', consists of many parts, naturalised by being grounded in extra-social or pre-social forms (Frank, 2000). First, it designates the market as the site of private interests and exchange. Private interests, are both those of the abstract individual (rational economic behaviour and choice) and the capitalist corporation. Both types of individual (economic man and the corporation), are supposedly stifled by state norms

and interventionist politics, suffering the burdens of taxation, and regulation, the interference with their freedom and the shackling of the 'entrepreneurial spirit' by 'big government' (Harvey, 2007). Public institutions are challenged in the name of what Frank (2000) calls market populism. But the 'economic man' is also a 'family man', motivated by such interests grounded on the pursuit of rational self-autonomy and self-sufficiency, just like the liberated market does. This neoliberal remaking of the public realm, brought a shift of social responsibilities, resources and the provision of social goods and services from the public sector to the private sector. From the public sphere and the government, to the private sphere, where they become matters if not for markets to solve, then of individual behaviour, or a family and household concern (Harvey, 2005).

Additionally, Barbara Cruikshank (1993; 1999), shows how the borders between the private and the public are redrawn in this neoliberal model of rationality. The 'self-esteem' approach considers a wide variety of social problems to have their source in a lack of self-esteem on the part of the persons concerned. Cruikshank analyses the corresponding government programmes in California launched on the basis of this assumption and ascertains that their implementation involved more than just replacing the political by the personal and collective action by personal dedication. The 'self-esteem movement', Cruikshank suggests, is not limited to the personal domain as its goal is a new politics and a new social order. It promises to solve social problems by focusing on the private and heralding a revolution not against capitalism, racism, the patriarchy and so on, but against the (wrong) way of governing ourselves. In this way, the angle of possible political and social intervention changes. It is not sociopolitical structural factors that decide whether unemployment, poverty, alcoholism, criminality, homelessness, mental health problems and so forth can be solved, but individual-subjective categories.

These meanings of the private have been central to the dissolution of the public realm under neoliberalism in the UK, embodied in the Thatcher Conservative Party's mission to break the 'shackles of socialism' (Leys, 2003). Although not uncontested, they've been the dominant tendencies insisting that there is no general public interest (only private choices). In this context, neoliberal governments and private sector interests, laboured to install economic and managerial discourses as the dominant frameworks for decision making in crucial public issues, especially social policy and the welfare state; an ideological politics, that sought to establish regimes of truth beyond politics (Clarke, Gewirtz, Hughes, & Humphrey, 2000). The TS occupies an ambivalent place in this discourse, being not public, nonprofit, but

43

expected to be more 'business-like' in the contract culture of state outsourcing (Deakin, 2001), through the processes of marketisation, managerialism and professionalisation.

Although these positions drew hefty criticism (mostly from academia), they quickly gained traction (Somers & Wright, 2008). Many point to neoliberalism's links with rising social and economic inequality, poverty and marginalisation on the one hand, and its ideological, political and governmental implications on the other (see i.e., Ferguson, 2008; Gledhill, 2004; Klein, 2002; Leitner, Peck, & Sheppard, 2007; Shaikh, Saad-Filho, & Johnston, 2005). Bourdieu, for instance, describes neoliberalism as 'the eroding of the "left hand" of the state -those organisations which potentially safeguard the interests of the dominated, the culturally and economically dispossessed, women, stigmatised ethnic groups, etc.- alongside the simultaneous building up of the "right hand" of the state; organisations and agents of finance, budget, militarism and the rule of law' (2003: 34-35). He refers to neoliberalism as 'a mode of production that entails a mode of domination based on the institution of insecurity, domination through precariousness' (2003: 29). Trouillot, points out that neoliberalism is about 'market extremism'; the notion that the market 'is not only the best, but the only reliable social regulator' (2003: 53), an idea, that may be read as 'an argument against liberal democracy' (2003: 54) and ultimately, against social citizenship and state-protected social rights.

3.3. The social investment state as an effort to 'temper' neoliberalism?

Despite these opposing discourses, under neoliberal influence, governments started limiting access to, and redesigning social programmes. Those for the unemployed and social assistance recipients were targeted for cutbacks if not elimination, while new programmes insured the 'employable' (particularly young people and lone parents), would be supplied to the labour market rather than going on to social assistance (Evans, Richmond & Shields, 2005). The neoliberal perspective was particularly enthusiastic about the TS role, seeing it as an alternative source for collective solidarity to that of the state. Communities, nonprofits and voluntary organisations were called on to organise themselves to become more business-like, to be given contracts to provide services such as job training, or support the vulnerable elderly (Kendall & Knapp, 2000). The social investment perspective's macro-economic analysis retains the focus on the supply-side of neoliberalism and in this context, social investment (rather than spending) provides discursive coherence (Jenson, 2010). As more

activities are organised according to market principles, individuals and their families are called on to invest in their own human capital and future, and TSOs to foster social capital within communities so that individuals can succeed in the labour market (Jenson, 2009).

Nevertheless, it was becoming increasingly apparent to European leadership, that the state should also share some of this responsibility (i.e., child care), and ensure access to the means of acquiring human capital, such as education and training (Jenson, 2009; Nelson & Stephens, 2012). Hence the terms 'social investment approach', 'social investment strategy', the 'social investment state' (SIS), the 'social investment welfare state', the 'social investment mix', or the 'social investment welfare mix', begun to circulate as a blueprint for successfully linking social and economic concerns (Lister, 2004). However, the truth is that even such supposedly opposed to neoliberalism approaches, started pursuing similar trajectories on how to generate welfare. They especially highlighted the need for the welfare state to shift to one of social investment, rather than one offering state protection of social rights (Somers & Wright, 2008). Hegemonic neoliberalism in the 1980s and 1990s had already altered the conceptualisation of social citizenship through the social welfare state (Plehwe, Walpen & Neunhöffer, 2007). States needed to behave more like businesses. Government departments should provide their business plans so that their 'citizen-clients' can assess their success, while promising transparency and accountability to their 'stakeholders'. Second, the state's role was to be more entrepreneurial, by making its spending 'pay off'. The idea of social investment, served to project this image of the more business-like, market-friendly and dynamic entrepreneurial state that neoliberals advocated. This rhetoric fitted well with the New Public Management (NPM) and New Public Governance (NPG) models, sharing similar concerns that many governments had embraced since the 1980s (Osborne, 2008; 2010; Saint-Martin, 2000).

Thus, since the year 2000, a new agenda was defined for the European welfare state, under the now commonly accepted title 'social investment state'. The SIS revamped social policies. It promoted three main mechanisms to address new social risks: activation, individualisation and human capital investment over the life course (Lister, 2004). It rescaled welfare states, promoting social policy as a productive factor which enhances growth and employment. In brief, the state has to enable citizens to care *for themselves*, rather than caring *for them* (Häusermann & Palier, 2008). Some EU countries adopted socioeconomic strategies to 'modernise' (rather than dismantle) their welfare states and reconcile them with renewed economic growth (i.e., the UK through its third way strategy and the Netherlands through

45

'flexicurity'). Greece, was more preoccupied with balancing its old age and health care budgets than with restructuring its welfare system towards social investment policies, although it also tentatively started to reflect this welfare reorientation especially in the last eight years (Matsaganis, 2013). With the Lisbon Strategy, the EU officially adopted this policy orientation (Jenson & Saint-Martin, 2006), aimed at boosting growth and jobs, investing in people's capacities and providing equal opportunities for inclusion and individual growth.

As the investment strategy focuses on the integration of people into the labour market, the aim is to produce an adaptable, skilled and educated workforce, ready to face new risks through welfare policies encouraging active participation (Somers & Wright, 2008). Citizens should be empowered through public policies to be flexible to changing demands of knowledge-based (labour) markets (Lister, 2004). As a result, the SIS, while highlighting the importance of the TS, community and civil society, preserves core neoliberal tenets. It aims at redeploying public spending from passive social transfers to investments in education and training, the reconciliation of work and family, labour market activation measures, increased conditionality, individual skill enhancement, and the promotion of lifelong learning and employability (Taylor-Gooby, 2004).

3.4. The social investment state, the third way and the third sector: continuing the neoliberal trend?

This new welfare paradigm was further supported by three other ideas: 'making work pay', a new role for the individual, and a mix between rights and duties (Dean, Bonvin, Vielle, & Farvaque, 2005). Anthony Giddens (1998), the progenitor of the third way political movement, in his seminal book *The Third Way: The Renewal of Social Democracy*, introduced the notion of social investment as a normative concept, calling for a new partnership in the assignment welfare functions to families, TSOs, markets and states, challenging the state to develop an entrepreneurial culture, encourage risks and open possibilities. This approach implied several changes: a shift of focus on the main risks the welfare state faces; strong emphasis on the individual responsibility at stake; a renewed role for social policy and lastly, rethinking the aims, instruments and main fields of welfare policies. States were to ensure a functioning economy with full employment; redistribute income to ensure a greater measure of equality than the market provided; and, advance an

46

equality agenda (i.e., housing, human rights, workers' rights, women's rights, etc.) (Callinikos, 2001).

Following the advent of Thatcherism in the UK, New Labour's attempted modernisation of public services sought to introduce increased pluralism and competition to drive innovation and efficiency (Plant, 2003). New Labour continued withdrawing government from the direct provision of public services. TSOs were thought to be pivotal to the expansion of the mixed economy of service-providers, facilitating greater user-choice and increased personalisation of public services (Plant, 2003; Geppert & Williams, 2006). To this end, the government worked with TSOs, to develop new responsibilities in mainstream policy for shaping, commissioning and delivering public services in welfare benefit services, social care, education, crime reduction and healthcare (Burgess, Propper, & Wilson, 2005). It was a conscious decision to simultaneously promote partnership, but also independence and mutual respect between the public and the TS (Office of the Third Sector / Compact Voice, 2007).

According to New Labour, government support had resulted in a quiet revolution with the transformation of the third sector ready to rival market and state (Pratchett & Durose et al., 2009). This neocommunitarian approach though, involved a fundamental reconfiguring of TS governance centring on partnerships and evident in the 'voluntary sector compacts'[12] (Craig & Taylor, 2002). Similar policy projects included the Active Communities Initiative, increasing the role of volunteering in community life, the New Deal for Communities focused on involving local organisations in deprived neighbourhoods' regeneration and the 'Futurebuilders' investment fund, to strengthen TSOs role in health, social care, crime, social cohesion, education, children and young people (Cabinet Office, 2007; Craig & Taylor, 2002). Further anti-state critiques also came from those within the TS who criticised the government's stifling management of services such as housing, care for the elderly and people who were often institutionalised by the care they received (Deakin, 2005). Moreover, demands for increased pluralism of supply and competition between the public and the TS were also raised up, stressing the ability of TSOs to meet users' needs through an interactive process of advocacy, advice and information (Unwin, 2004; Aldridge, 2005).

---

[12] The Labour government in 1998 introduced voluntary sector 'Compacts', setting out commitments by the governments and the voluntary sector in each of the UK's four jurisdictions (England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland), to improve the ways they work with each other, examining the potential for increasing the role of TSOs can play in public service delivery and exploring the scope for modernising the infrastructure and for regulating the third sector.

Therefore, in the third way's social investment perspective, poverty or disadvantage can be tolerated and welfare must strive for social inclusion and equality of opportunity, not equality as a staple social justice. Only when such problems become permanent, do they need a response. High rates of inequality, low wages, poor jobs, or temporary deprivation are a serious problem only if individuals become long-term trapped in those circumstances and especially if they foster anti-social, behaviour, such as criminality, offences, dropping out, and so on, affecting future life-chances (Jenson & Saint-Martin, 2003). This approach has affected strongly the UK and in more recent years (since the crisis of 2008), Greece. In Greece, it can be seen as part of the wider web of recent policies furnishing state withdrawal from social provision, envisaging a minimal role for the state and a view of lifelong learning which has more to do with lifestyle, culture, consumption and the civil society (Prokou, 2011). The aim of social inclusion, which is emphatically linked only to employment, is to be served through withdrawal from public education policy and achievement of lifelong training, depending on notions of individual responsibility and active citizenship (see i.e., *Law 3879/2010* in the *Official Gazette of the Hellenic Republic, 2010*). In the UK, it has been most visible since the 1990s' and in particular, in the use by policy-makers of a narrow-sided view of 'employability' and its role in tackling the social inclusion of disadvantaged groups (McQuaint & Lindsay, 2005). In short, welfare policies have been hinging on the 'supply-side of employability'; on how best to 'activate' and 'up-skill' individuals, the unemployed and other disadvantaged groups, attempting to re-establish the balance between the rights and responsibilities of individuals (citizens) within welfare states (Gazier, 2001; Lister, 2002).

This shift towards a work-focused welfare state arguably views labour market participation as the ultimate solution to social and economic exclusion (Evans, 2001; Powell, 2000). In addition, market participation essentially equals social citizenship, and 'individual victim blaming' is at the core of social policies (see i.e., Hillage & Pollard, 1998; Evans, Simmonds, & Nathan, 1999). Under the influence of third way and neoliberal policies within the social investment state, these reforms flourished. Moreover, this new spin on employability, promotes a reactionary understanding of unemployment, vulnerability and marginalisation. It seeks to blame the jobless individual's predicament upon her / his inadequacies and individual characteristics, rather than acknowledging a lack of opportunities within the labour market and structural inequality within capitalist market economies (Peck & Theodore, 2000). As Haughton et al., argue: '...that the unemployed should be induced to price themselves back into work; that the government has neither the responsibility nor the

capability to create jobs, but instead should direct its energies to the supply-side of the labour market' (2000: 670). Accordingly, a narrative has been weaved concerning the existence of a 'culture of worklessness' (see i.e., Murray, 1990 and his analysis of an 'underclass') which must be remedied by 'deterrent welfare policies based on a work culture' (McQuaid & Lindsay, 2005: 212). Hence, as TSOs should carry the load of social services and social cohesion through the 'steering' and 're-skilling' of individuals in communities, the latter become a prime candidate for the application of governance policies and the reconfiguration of social citizenship. Consequently, through the privatisation of social services (i.e., healthcare), contracting, professionalisation, marketisation and a focus on accountability and measurable results, a social welfare market was created. To remain relevant, TSOs should adhere to governance techniques recalibrating their strategies, goals and practices; like their service-users: they need to adapt.

3.5. Neocommunitarianism: the third sector as an agent of state governance and control

This revival of interest in the welfare role of the TS, was accompanied by a revival of the local and the community. But this devotion to communities, essentially places responsibility on those deprived communities. They become a space of 'responsibilisation' and a strategically important arena in which local and national political-economic elites are 'aggressively attempting to promote economic regeneration from below' (Brenner & Theodore, 2002: 374). As Jessop (2002) outlines, such experiments included neo-statism (a market-conforming but state-sponsored approach to economic and social restructuring), neo-corporatism (a negotiated approach to restructuring by private, public and TS actors) and neocommunitarianism. Neocommunitarianism emphasises the contribution of the TS to economic development and social cohesion. This approach, apparent in the UK's third way, sought a citizenship of active participation and positive attitude, where rights are dependent upon the performance of duties (Giddens, 1998; 2006; Fitzpatrick, 2005). High emphasis is put upon reciprocity between individuals and rights, responsibilities and obligations that reflect the interdependencies of communities. Benefits should be provided conditionally and in response to demonstrable need. The government's duty is to compose a dynamic civil society, clamping down on incidents of crime and incivility (Flint, 2006).

As actors in a dynamic civil society, TSOs are seen as having a comparative advantage over other sector agencies, able to operate in environments which the state cannot (Labour Party, 1997). Public service workers, for example were often perceived as representatives of an authority which certain groups mistrusted, whereas TSOs are independent of government and therefore free to be unequivocally on the user's side, becoming key local sites for promoting social cohesion via the development of citizenship and social capital. (Kendall, 2000). New Labour, showed 'philosophical enthusiasm for the third sector as an integral part of civil society' (Kendall, 2000: 542). The localism of TSOs in particular, meant they could develop 'customized solutions to local problems of social exclusion' (Amin, Cameron, & Hudson, 2002: 28). Furthermore, TSOs could facilitate 'citizen responsibility', involving individuals in local services-delivery, social participation, and thus active citizenship (Etzioni, 1995). Thus, communities became crucial for the (re)production of social capital, norms and networks, improving economic efficiency and social cohesion (Putnam, 1993).

The Conservative-Liberal coalition government in the UK in 2010, expanded New Labour's approach to the governance and positioning of the TS within this new welfare architecture (Morel, Palier, & Palme, 2012). Implementing a huge austerity programme of financial cuts and privatisations in the public sector, government employment and the welfare state, it reintroduced the neoliberal discourse focusing on the notions of morality, personal preference, a provable 'work-ethic' and citizen responsibility as the indicators of 'who gets what' concerning social programmes (Wiggan, 2012). The TS role became clearer with the promotion of the apolitical construct of 'The Big Society' agenda, focusing on ending New Labour's alleged centralism, state inefficiency, bureaucracy, corruption and disrespect of the taxpayer's money. These policies aimed to create opportunities and demand for empowering communities, encouraging social action, voluntarism, and choice in public service delivery (Lowndes & Pratchett, 2012). However, Barker notes: 'There is nothing inherently egalitarian or radical in pluralism; everything depends on what kind of pluralism is being spelled out. The "Big Society", like any other member of this broad family, is an initially empty concept, given substance by the groups and institutions chosen, the powers accorded to them and the function they perform. Pluralism is a hold-all category...' (2011: 51). The next chapter discusses social citizenship and governance in context of the TS and social welfare overall.

Chapter 4. Social citizenship, the governance of behaviour and the third sector

'Social citizenship' has been gaining increasing attention among social scientists (Somers & Wright, 2008). Most conceptions include theoretical dimensions related to political membership, individual freedom, economic stability and growth, social cohesion and social inclusion[13]. Even if the modern concept of citizenship (*citoyen*) originates from autonomous European city-states and refers to rights attached to a person's status as city member (Turner, 1993), it currently refers to membership of a particular political community. Citizenship status, is compounded by what has been described as catalogues of rights (Cohen & Arato, 1992). Several authors have emphasised the importance of various types of rights, departing from a discussion of the British sociologist T.H. Marshall, the principal theorist of social citizenship and his classical distinction between civil, political, and social rights.

In his seminal essay entitled *Citizenship and Social Class* published originally in 1950, Marshall contended that social provision in the context of social citizenship, constituted one of three sets of rights associated with citizenship in modern Britain, the others being civil and political rights. The civil component was necessary for the achievement of individual freedoms including freedom of speech, contract, assembly, equality before the law (and due process of law), the right to own property and the right to justice. The basic motive, is to protect citizens against unwarranted governmental encroachment on their autonomy, a notion based on a fear of government especially prevalent in the US (Smith, 1999). As these civil elements are composed of the rights necessary for individual freedom, the institutions directly associated with them are the courts of justice. The political element, was constituted by the rights 'to participate in the exercise of political power, as a member of a body invested with political authority or as an elector of the members of such a body' (Marshall, 1950: 64). So political rights, concern the democratic mediation between citizens and state (free elections and a secret ballot), highlighting collective self-determination. The most important associated institutions are parliaments and local government.

---

[13] S. Betzelt and S. Bothfeld (eds.), Activation and Labour Market Reforms in Europe. Challenges to Social Citizenship (2011); P. Taylor-Gooby, Reframing Social Citizenship (2009); B. Hvinden and H. Johansson (eds.), Citizenship in Nordic Welfare States (2007); W. Kymlicka, Multicultural Citizenship. A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights (1995).

Finally, Marshall defined the social component of citizenship, as 'the whole range, from the right to a modicum of economic welfare and security, to the right to share fully in the social heritage and to live the life of a civilised being according to the standards prevailing in the society' (1950: 32). These three components evolved through the 17th and 20th centuries, via a process of institutional differentiation by which special agencies and institutions evolved to express them (i.e., courts of justice, parliament and councils of local government, the educational system and public social services, etc.) (Turner, 1990). Welfare state policies and institutions in particular, express the social layer of citizenship. The idea is that by providing civil rights, society mitigates the impact of force and violence in social relations. Political rights, ensure power is not confined to elites, and by providing minimum standards of living (social rights), the state offsets the vagaries of market processes and corrects the gross inequalities of distribution arising from the free operation of markets.

4.1. Social citizenship and welfare

Analyses of social citizenship obviously focus on the third catalogue of rights, the social rights. The notion is that citizens must be assured of a basic material subsistence enabling them to follow their own life projects, equally participate in the social, economic and community life, in work of mutual concern, protected by the danger of social exclusion (Nilssen, 2009). To function as free, equal, and autonomous society members within its political, economic, and social structures, citizens need rights which secure access to fundamental resources enabling them to make well-informed and conscious choices (Rothstein, 2001). Following this approach, it is interesting then that lack of access to social citizenship rights, seems to be an awful lot like experiencing social exclusion. According to Levitas et al. (2007: 9): 'Social exclusion...involves the lack or denial of resources, rights, goods and services, and the inability to participate in the normal relationships and activities, available to the majority of people in society, whether in economic, social, cultural or political arenas. It affects both the quality of life of individuals and the equity and cohesion of society as a whole'. Therefore, governmental redistribution of resources and service provision, allow people to meaningfully belong and participate in society and exercise their rights as citizens.

By guaranteeing the material well-being of citizens through social rights rather than arbitrary benevolence, the welfare state aims to protect citizens against social risks that

reduce their ability to act as independent persons and exercise their political and civil rights. Distinct from traditional charity and discretionary policies on poverty, social rights are regarded as individual rights anchored in the status of citizenship. The Marshallian approach highlights the close relationship between law and citizenship; citizenship is understood as constructed by the institutionalisation of legal rights (and duties). As Habermas (1996) has ascertained, democracy depends equally on both types of rights. For Marshall, social citizenship is primarily justified on the basis of an equal status in relation to civil and political citizenship and as a counterbalance to the inequalities anchored in social class.

Several authors considered the citizen's capacity to act autonomously and pursue her / his own interests, values, and life projects, to be an important aspect of social citizenship (see i.e., Levitas, 1998; Selbourne, 1994; Taylor-Gooby, 1991). The state has a duty to respect the civil rights of citizens, such as personal liberty. On the other hand, social citizenship is founded on the values of the welfare state and the principle of care, concerning our (society's) collective political and ethical obligations towards those citizens incapable of exercising autonomy and comprises the distribution of various resources (i.e., money, treatment, care, social support, etc.). While the principle of autonomy, concentrates on the negative freedom of citizens, the principle of care, concerns their actual opportunity to exercise their freedom in social life (King & Waldron, 1988). A lack of material subsistence reduces this possibility severely, as access to social rights (i.e., health services, education, and social insurance), is an important premise for individual freedom and social inclusion (Levitas, 1998).

Problems such as unemployment, poverty, homelessness, illness, and illiteracy often lead to reduced self-determination, subservience, and social marginalisation / exclusion. Social rights are institutionalised through various legal instruments and implemented through an administrative and professional apparatus. How this is done, affects citizens' status with respect to the welfare state and thus social citizenship (Parker, 1998). As they are primarily implemented through the formal institutions of the welfare state, a tension exists between individual freedom in the realm of civil and political rights (and thus, the capitalist market), and state intervention in the realm of social rights (Chatterjee, 2004). Hence the association of social citizenship with welfare reforms.

A frequently invoked criticism, is that Marshall presents the rights of citizenship in a purely complementary fashion, ignoring the problematic connections between civil and social rights, socioeconomic conflicts and inequality, or providing legitimacy to questionable

welfare practices such as workfare and conditionality (see i.e., Barbalet, 1993; Kymlicka & Norman, 1994; Mead, 1997; Turner, 2001). Alternatively, King and Waldron (1988), as well as Lister (2002; 2005) have argued that in Marshall's conception of citizenship, status equality is the guiding principle. Thus, his approach actually informs a defence of the 'traditional' welfare state and is opposed to welfare conditionality, in a unified conception of citizenship where social rights are essential for the meaningful realisation of civil and political rights.

4.2. Social welfare reforms: from protected social rights to individual privileges

Regardless of one's stance in these debates, one thing is clear: when examining social citizenship and the relationship between the TS, government welfare policies and social rights, it is important to concentrate on the interaction between policy, welfare institutions and citizens. In the post-war period, citizenship in the UK institutionalised the ideals and aspirations of peacetime reconstruction in all Western Europe; an embodiment of social Keynesianism (Turner, 2001). In this sense, citizenship was a status position mitigating the negative effects of economic class within capitalist society. One paradox of citizenship as a status, is that differences in status entitlement can be as much a cause of status inequality as a mitigation of class inequality; status entitlement in a bureaucratic welfare system may become the occasion for status competition over scarce resources (Lockwood, 1996; Runciman, 1996). Marshall recognised this in the paradoxical relationship between equality of opportunity and equality of condition when discussing educational attainments and social mobility. Social mobility on the basis of educational certification, was intended to remove hereditary privilege, but in practice meant the 'right to display and develop differences' (Marshall, 1950: 94). Thus, citizenship as a principle of social membership may function through social conflicts over entitlements, as a criterion of social exclusion.

In that regard, Esping-Andersen (1990) argued that the post-war social welfare regimes were grounded in the presupposition that political government could achieve the gradual and simultaneous betterment of the conditions of all blocs within society; employers, labourers, managers, and professionals. The welfare state would contain the dangers posed by the worst off and reinforce the security and individual freedoms of the better off. It would also make it legitimate to confine and reform the mentally ill, the criminals, the delinquent, the work-shy and the socially inadequate; those that had refused this social contract or

weren't assenting to it (King, 2005). Hence, all strata of society could be bound into an agreement for social progress through civility, solidarity, and security guaranteed by the state. However, the modern image of the facilitating state, the enabling state, the social inclusion state, the social investment state, or the state as an animator, has challenged this conception (Donzelot & Estebe, 1994).

It is this image that infused neoliberalism and third way politics in the final decade of the 20th century (Stevenson, 2004). Political government was to be relieved of its powers and obligations to centrally know, plan, calculate, and steer. It was no longer required to answer all society's needs for order, security, health, and productivity. Individuals, firms, organisations, TSOs, localities, schools, parents, hospitals, and housing estates, would share responsibility for these issues; a double movement of autonomisation and responsibilisation. Populations once under the 'tutelage' of the social welfare state, are to be set free to find their own destiny. Yet, at the same time, they are also held responsible for society's destiny. Politics is to be returned to society itself, but no longer in a social form, but in the form of individual morality, organisational responsibility, and ethical community (Rose, 1996; 2000).

Therefore, social rights increasingly came to be regarded as promoting passivity and dependency among the poor, as a result of the absence of obligation to participate in society (Murray, Lister, & Buckingham, 1996; Rose, 2000). The welfare state has been criticised for social paternalism, interventionism, corruption, inefficiency, lack of transparency and clarity with taxpayers' money, promoting new structures of dependency, moral decay, and economic destructiveness (see i.e., Clayton & Pontusson, 1998; McCluskey, 2003; Navarro, 2007). For neoliberalism, whose ideological core is market fundamentalism, the welfare state harms the economic interests of most people and actually, the economy overall (Somers & Wright, 2008). For the poor, the market is the terrain of character-building and behaviour-control incentives, whereas the social, is the site of incentives to parasitism (Hacker, 2002; Block & Somers, 2003; Somers & Block, 2005).

In other words, neoliberalism, the third way and neocommunitarianism, from different angles, have framed the narrative that social citizenship, social rights and the welfare state as their primary guarantor, not only do not complement civil rights, but actually distort the notion of citizenship in society. Social well-being flows from unimpeded private pursuit of individual preferences and interests. Accordingly, policies focus on the goal of economic efficiency: maximising aggregate resources and free competition in the (presumably free) market, while social cohesion is the duty of proactive families, vigilant communities and the

TS (Etzioni, 1997). Thus, efficiency is distinguished from the goal of social equity, representing redistribution of resources according to equality values. Efficiency is about expanding the societal pie and redistribution about dividing it (Jessop, 1998). This fundamental -and fundamentally flawed- division between redistribution and efficiency, has enabled neoliberal and neocommunitarian reformists to turn social citizenship from a public benefit, to an almost public threat. By distinguishing rights to economic and social security as 'redistribution', these become implicitly (if not explicitly) suspect and subordinate. If the free market is by definition the system that maximises overall societal well-being (and individual freedom), then redistribution, diverging from that market, inherently risks detracting from overall societal well-being and individual freedom (Blekesaune, 2007). Hence, the assertions that redistributive policies replace individual market freedom (public gain) with paternalist government protection that benefits particular groups (Duggan, 2012).

It is from problematic premises such as this and the deduction that redistribution tends to be the mark of non-citizens or subordinate citizens giving rise to policies of governance and social control in welfare hinging on individual duties and behaviour follows: those who are deemed inadequate to assume the responsibilities of freedom because of their incapacity or incivility. Criticising the neocommunitarian 'Big Society' agenda applied since 2010 in the UK, Slater argues that: 'the state is making a steady switch from a remedial to a generative force in respect of marginality, inequality and precarity' (2014: 17). In other words, the legitimisation of these welfare policies, is based on the effective stigmatisation of those in need of social protection. TSOs are featured as having all the 'necessary tools' to deliver this new vision of social citizenship. With their grounding in local communities, increased social capital capacity, and as the 'expert knowledge holders' or 'gatekeepers' of socioeconomic (re)integration, they can be the prime coordinators of compliance by the needy (Duggan, 2012).

By contrasting social citizenship's welfare redistributive policies with a presumptively normal market distribution, the ground of the market shifts from natural human rights to natural laws of economics, not subject to the scrutiny of socioeconomic processes (Dwyer, 2004; Lazzarato, 2009). This policy discourse reduces social rights to market calculations, arguing that claims to such rights obscure the costs of particular governmental choices, 'thus playing upon the sensibilities of the middle class concerning the 'tax payer's money' (Matsaganis, 2013: 87). Additionally, with social rights regarded as baseline civil rights, 'moral hazard' was introduced. Developed from insurance industry

practices, media studies and now by neoclassical economics, it argues that those who are insured (protected from bearing costs), tend not to reduce those costs, as long as they remain under the insured's control (Nyman & Maude-Griffin, 2001). Moral hazard, is now coined to claim that those protected by redistribution against the costs of certain actions, will tend to increase them. Hence, the SIS, with the pronounced role of TSOs and the civil society in welfare provision, becomes a prime enabler for the application of governance and social control policies. Therefore, for example what families really need is not state social support, but training, proper behaviour and proactive job-seeking (Van der Klaauw & Van Ours, 2013). Local TSOs can provide this 'knowhow' and if that fails, well, there are always foodbanks.

4.3. Community and social capital as the enablers of the third sector and the social investment state

As a result of this shift in the conception of social citizenship, it is not the language of society used to identify a territory between the authority of the state, the free amoral exchange of the market, and the liberty of the autonomous, rights-bearing individual. It is the language of community; a space that can maximise individual potential (Department for Communities and Local Government, 2006). Community appears as a kind of natural, extra-political zone of human relations (Somers & Wright, 2008). Yet, simultaneously, as a crucial element in political government, for it is on its properties and activities, that the success of certain political programmes depends (Healy & Graham, 2008). Hence, community must become the object and target for the exercise of government power on local populations, while remaining, somehow, external and a counterweight to politics.

Community is thus an affective governance and ethical field (Bowles & Gintis, 2005). It is through the political objectification and instrumentalisation of community, through strategies for the governance of autonomy, sentiments, values, identities, allegiance, trust, and mutual dependence, that neoliberalism and neocommunitarian dominance can be found. Thus, reinvention of the community is linked to new ways subjects of government are collectivised and rights of social citizenship are expressed within welfare reforms, and the recalibration of the roles of the public (state), the private (markets) and the civil society (Rose, 2000). The new social investment state is used to 'responsibilise' citizens (Ilcan & Basok, 2004), enforce moral values under the guise of community and obligation (Brown,

57

2006), shifting responsibility for well-being and social justice away from the state (Fyfe, 2005; Jessop, 2002).

Therefore, this approach on social citizenship, is based on discourses of social capital and community, as they seem to realise its logic. Mobilisation from below and capacity building from above, can help with uneven development and marginalisation, creating the 'virtuous circle' of social capital, economic growth and social cohesion, neocommunitarians and TS advocates covet (Carley, Smith, & Jenkins, 2013). However, the positive effects of local civil society networks and the corresponding funding programmes can't be assumed. The analytical definition of this potential in the loose concept of social capital, helps to better anchor the neoliberal project in society, allowing the subordination of social and political goals to market priorities of economic competitiveness, and social relations into context-independent causal relations (Fine, 2004; Navarro, 2002).

4.4. Social welfare, power, discipline and governance

The state has been gradually relieved of many of its prior responsibilities for the welfare of its citizens, while using expressive, emotive, and moralistic rhetoric to demonise those who seek state help (Carley, Smith, & Jenkins, 2013; Powell, 2015; Slater, 2014). There appears to be a 'unifying ethos' connecting these social welfare reforms, pressures on the TS and the very fabric of social citizenship rights. Policies related to poverty, inequality, health, housing, mental health, substance-use, education, disadvantage, family life, unemployment, etc., seem to revolve around governance interventions and the social control of welfare beneficiaries through for example, benefit sanctions and increased conditionality. Thus, cutbacks to welfare, dismantling of trade unions, privatisation of healthcare, SIBs, marketisation of the TS, the emphasis on welfare programmes focusing on antisocial behaviour (ASB), a focus on community voluntarism, individual duties, morality, personal attitudes and life choices, converge on notions of controlling those in need; shaping their desires and behaviour to regulate socioeconomic (re)integration. There is thus a strange, simultaneous process of state retrenchment but also increased intervention. This discourse and its accompanying policies, laud individual success in an unregulated market economy, deny the existence of structural inequality, and eschew governmental responsibility to support those in need until such a time when they must be forwarded to charities and TSOs, or incarcerated for their behaviour (Garland, 2001). This late modern discourse has primed European public to be receptive to

58

the anti-welfarist / pro-social-control rhetoric which began in the 1980s by the proponents of neoliberalism (Beckett & Western, 2001). Hence, it is important to examine the narratives underpinning agendas of governance, discipline and social control in welfare and the TS.

4.5. Discipline: from punishment to control and reformation in welfare

Foucault (1977) concludes *Discipline and Punish* describing a 'carceral archipelago'; a society infused at all levels with a network of surveillance and disciplinary institutions and technologies. The change in penal styles throughout Europe and the United States between about 1750 and 1840, was a qualitative shift, rather than a mere decrease in the quantity or intensity of punishment. The target of punishment was shifted so that it affects the 'souls' of offenders, rather than just strike their bodies, altering the nature of punitive regimes in the Western world (even though control of the body remained crucial for control of the soul). The move between discursive regimes, from the image of an exceptional form of discipline, to a generalised surveillance of the whole social body, was 'a fundamentally historical transformation, with its own patterns, sequences, and nuances' (1977: 209). It is here that Foucault comments on the widening of the carceral circle beyond the specific architecture of prisons, into various institutions and processes, which are broadly related to social welfare (i.e., schools, hospitals, factories, convents, lodging houses, charity institutions, mutual improvement societies, etc.). The new concern of the prison, that is, to know criminals, understand the sources of their criminality and intervene to correct them, had profound implications for criminal justice. Judgment shifts away from the crime itself, towards questions of character, family background, individual history and environment, so that reformation can be achieved. The result was a penal system not so much punitive as corrective; more intent on studying and then producing 'normal', conforming individuals, than dispensing punishments (Foucault, Burchell, Gordon, & Miller, 1991).

4.6. Knowledge as the instrument to exercise power and control in social welfare

On a wider scale, these developments in the penal system can illustrate models of how power operates in modern society and the governance of welfare. Open physical force, violence, and the ceremonies of might, were replaced by a mode of power based on detailed knowledge, surveillance, routine intervention, and gentle correction (Garland, 1997). The idea was to monitor, survey and regulate thoroughly and constantly ('the panopticon'), rather than to

repress sporadically, improving troublesome individuals, rather than to destroying them (Foucault, 1991); to exercise power, transform and manipulate 'the soul, the seat of the habits' (1977: 131). Foucault used three interrelated concepts to analyse the fundamentals of punishment and any structure of domination: power, knowledge, and the body. The power to govern individual behaviour is consolidated on knowledge, approximating the discourse and technologies of surveillance, discipline and control focusing on governance of the individual, used in modern social welfare policies. This 'self-controlled' body is shaped influencing the soul which directs behaviour. In this sense, power strategies have their operative impact on the bodies of their subjects, thus, 'a micro-physics of power' (Foucault, 2003).

Foucault called this monitoring and sanctioning process, 'normalisation'. An essentially corrective, rather than punitive in orientation method, concerned to induce conformity first, and exact retribution or expiation secondly (Rose, 1999). Welfare reforms and modern pressures on TSOs seem to follow a similar logic (i.e., UK benefit sanctions mechanism). They involve individual assessment in relation to desired standards of conduct and measurement of individual behaviour against these rules. Surveillance and examination procedures provide this knowledge, allowing close observation, assessment of standards, and identification of failure to conform. Departures from set standards are thus recognised and dealt with, exercising power and control (i.e., warning, sanction of benefits). Since the 'object' is to be corrected rather than punished, the actual sanctions, tend to involve training to bring conduct into line. Hence comprehensive dossiers or case records, which allow individual characteristics to be assessed over time and comparatively (Rose, 1999).

Thus, power for Foucault, refers to the various forms of domination and subordination that operate whenever and wherever social relations exist. He describes power as a 'political technology' and speaks about 'technologies of power' (1977: 24). This relationship between forms of power and the bodies caught up in them, involves the third element; 'knowledge'. Knowledge refers to the knowhow on which techniques and strategies produce knowledge of their target. The successful control of anything, requires a degree of understanding of its forces, reactions, strengths, weaknesses and possibilities. Conversely, the more is known, the more controllable it becomes. This approach which renders knowledge of the subject to be controlled being a requirement for the exercise of power and domination, appears to be instrumental for the application of governance policies in welfare, with TSOs being used as local agents of the state to that end.

4.7. Governance of behaviour, moral judgements, welfare and the third sector

As social benefits from protected rights by virtue of the status of citizenship have become conditional, social citizenship rights are attached only if certain obligations are fulfilled (Marston & Watts, 2004). Cohen (1979), notes that the change in the application of discipline Foucault talks about, rather than signalling an end to discipline as a mechanism of control, it signified its liberation from the narrow confines of the penal system and its dispersion across the wider society. This trend can be identified in many European countries and the UK is a prime example. In the mid-1980s, Cohen had already identified elements of a more punitive and disciplinary urban governance emerging, fuelled by self-reinforcing moral panics, that serve to narrow the boundaries of acceptable behaviour (Cohen, 1985). In 2006, the Prime Minister's Strategy Unit declared: 'In the longer term, the bigger issue may be the balance of responsibility between the state and the citizen. Long-run public service reform will also require new thinking on the balance of responsibility between government and citizens...[including] greater personal responsibility for behaviour, which is key in the long run to improving outcomes in health and education, welfare and the environment' (2006: 60). The emphasis on neighbourhood-level crime mapping and prevention, policy implementation through partnerships, central control through monitoring and the rhetorics of 'rights', 'duties', responsibilities' and 'respect' (i.e., New Labour's 'Respect Agenda'), all characterise welfare architecture reorientation, towards the governance of behaviour (Lister, 2006; Newman, 2001; Peck, 2004; Powell, 2008).

Moreover, this narrative of individual 'responsibilisation' concerning social policy, bonded well with welfare reforms based on conditionality and employability. Paul Hoggett (2000) for example, argued that the concept of 'well-being' -which was often mentioned by staff members of the UK TSO- provides a core principle around which a new vision of welfare could be organised. For Hoggett and his co-thinkers, well-being is defined essentially in mental-health terms. Frequently, policy makers are inclined to focus on the individual in an attempt to tackle the problem of legitimation experienced by official authority (Giddens, 2006). For some, such policies represent an attempt to re-establish the social virtue of self-discipline (Jones & Novak, 2012); for others, it is about encouraging people to adopt 'positive' or 'healthy' lifestyle choices and a community-oriented behaviour, which will enhance their overall well-being, hence the term positive welfare (Burgess, 2012). Writing in the same vein, Richard Layard claimed that public social policy should be directed towards

making society happier. He observes that 'to become happier, we have to change our inner attitudes as much as our outward circumstances' (2006: 31). Whatever the motive and by adding the 'psychological deficits' spin, this analysis fitted nicely with the discourse presenting social problems as the outcome of individual character traits, and 'wrong' personal choices which should be somehow set right. Through minimising the influence of the social, a culture is fostered where the internal world of the individual becomes the site where society's problems are raised and where it is perceived they need to be resolved, opening the way for new modes of welfare governmentality.

Foucault's (1991) work on governmentality and Rose's (1999: 158) 'new prudentialism', imply that freedom is a practice that is cultivated only as part of both explicit moral regulation and implicit moral and legal cultivation of citizens to make responsible use of the liberties granted. Hindess (1996) has referred to government as 'the regulation of conduct by the more or less rational application of the appropriate technical means' (1996: 106). The narratives hailing responsibilisation in social welfare and the governance of citizens in local communities so that they bear the financial risk and cost of illness or protection from crime, poverty and unemployment, are well documented (see i.e., Dean, 1999; 2007, Ilcan and Basok, 2004; O'Malley, 1996; 2004; Rose, 1996; 1999; 2000). Similarly, Bob Jessop (1993; 1999; 2002) detects an emerging 'Schumpeterian Workfare Regime' (SWR) from the late 1980s, 'cultivating among citizens the skills and aspirations required for survival and competitiveness in a dynamic, innovative, entrepreneurial, competitive, flexible labour market' (1999: 355). This point harkens back to the concept of employability and its use as a control mechanism since it presents 'worklessness as a behavioural and cultural shortcoming among individuals' (Crisp & Powell, 2016: 2). Thus, behaviour will principally support labour market goals such as employability and willingness to invest in one's own skills and being responsible for one's self, with welfare conditionality being the key tool.

Rose (2009), further argues that the self-regulating autonomy of subjects is to be achieved through the utilisation of government power, channelled through constructing values, beliefs and sentiments underpinning responsible self-government and shaping individuals' conduct ('ethnopower'). Accordingly, political discourses are extended to wider moral and ethical debates about conduct, manifested through governance techniques reinforcing 'good' and 'acceptable' behaviour in the public realm such as behaviour contracts and parenting orders (Field, 2003; Flint, 2012). This signals an increasing contractualisation

of social relations and a retreat of state social protection (Ramia, 2002). Flint and Nixon (2006), referring to governance through communities and contracts, stress that: 'Assessments of civility and required behaviour are related to community norms and values and are extended from a passive conduct based on desistance from uncivil and antisocial acts to a more active citizenship comprising volunteering, communal endeavour and engagement in neighbourhood governance processes. Thus civil conduct is related to establishing a self-governing citizenship that plays out at collective levels through constructing self-governing communities' (2006: 941).

Contractual governance through such contemporary social regulation of behaviour, has been especially prominent in the UK. First, contracts entail a degree of reciprocity and mutuality distributing responsibilities and obligations; secondly, they conceptualise a role for the subject as an active, responsible agent; thirdly, they are premised on the rational choice of participating parties and regulate behaviour through the voluntary engagement of subjects, which engenders a sense of ownership, encouraging an active, rather than passive responsibility for the self-regulating and self-policing of individual conduct (Crawford, 2003). This notion of community governance pervades antisocial behaviour discourse and policy (Flint, 2006; Garrett, 2007). Incivility has been officially defined by its impact on communities (Home Office, 2003b; Scottish Executive, 2003). The New Labour government at the time, expected communities to set clear standards of behaviour and conduct within new structures of neighbourhood governance; to hold public social control agencies, (i.e., police and local authorities) to account, undertaking a range of legislative, policing and judicial functions previously belonging to the state (Flint, 2006).

Various tools infusing social policy with stipulations for the governance of behaviour have been used in the UK. Anti-Social Behaviour Orders (ASBOs), which were created under the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, are civil orders place tailor-made prohibitions on named individuals from entering certain areas and / or carrying out specified acts. Acceptable Behaviour Contracts (ABCs) are defined as a written agreement between a person who has been involved in anti-social behaviour and one or more local agencies whose role it is to prevent such behaviour (Home Office, 2002). Parenting Orders, also represent a further extension of governance into the sphere of private and communal interactions based on an understanding of the breakdown of 'organic' familial relations (Cleland & Tisdell, 2005), where welfare entitlement criteria codify required behaviour and public policy serves to reaffirm and enforce obligations to show respect to others (Field, 2003; Deacon, 2004). But

proper conduct and required behaviour, are also located in the organic linkages of rights, expectations, responsibilities and obligations arising from (irrevocable) membership of communities. Casey and Flint (2007) for example, examined the issue of non-reporting antisocial behaviour in local communities as is the implied obligation of 'proper citizens' within the community.

In this reconfiguration of social control, the limits of the sovereign state necessitate a new coalition of governors, with enhanced roles for citizens and the private, voluntary and community sectors (Garland, 2001). King (2006), also notes that behaviour governance and responsibility-based policies particularly related to antisocial behaviour, are targeted at the most disadvantaged and vulnerable populations diverting attention from the responsibilities of the organised wider society (the welfare state) for tackling the causal reasons for anti-social behaviour in deprived neighbourhoods. Thus, a change of emphasis for the welfare state is signalled: from social steering through welfare incentives and benefits, to social control through supervisory orders, the disincentives of criminal justice and the withholding, or threat of withholding, welfare support (Casey & Flint, 2007). As Field (2003) notes, such welfare contacts stipulate that benefits (i.e., social assistance programmes), should be conditional on the recipients agreeing to behave in a civil manner. Withholding welfare benefits from antisocial claimants could ensure that they adhere to the behavioural rules characterised by social virtues; virtues determined by the government, and articulated by the TSOs in local communities, changing their nature as service providers. Of course, it should be noted that governments legislate, but the standards of behaviour are always more widely determined through long-term, ongoing social, cultural and psychogenetic processes.

All the multilevel socioeconomic developments, discourses, practices and policy agendas discussed in this chapter, are dramatically changing the landscape in social welfare and the TS. Their relation to the activities and role of TSOs as welfare actors both in Greece and the UK in processes concerning the support of the socioeconomic (re)integration of their service-users and the transformation of social citizenship rights as the latter realised through welfare policies and provisions, is a field where empirical evidence is lacking. This potentially 'dark side' of the TS in the two countries is scrutinised in this thesis. In-depth knowledge concerning TSOs and their relation with their service-users acquired through this lens, has been rare indeed and in the Greek case, non-existent. A comparative case study such as this can allow us to capture the complexity of these processes enabling the gathering of insights regarding the *typical*, as well as the *exceptional*. TSOs seem to be drawn into

practices of governance and social control in welfare and their co-optation -covertly or overtly, due to need or choice- as instruments of governmentality promoting neoliberal narratives which alter the fundamental nature of social citizenship, the application of social rights and the meaning of social integration of the disadvantaged. But little is known with regards to how they are affected or how they respond in this churning welfare backdrop in times of austerity, which challenge their perception of social justice, solidarity and public service, as well as their independence (from both the market and the state) and essentially, their core values informing the delivery of social services. These less-explored facets of TS activities, identity, strategy and goals in Greece and the UK as welfare actors in the midst of such processes, constitute the main knowledge gap that this thesis has tried to address. The next chapter involves a comprehensive examination of the research design and methodology employed in this project, as well as a discussion of the epistemological and ontological underpinnings of the selected approach.

Chapter 5. Research Design, Methodology and Methods

There exists a vast literature on research design, different research techniques and methods. Despite variations in content and style, most focus on how to do research with occasional forays into the philosophy of knowledge (Creswell, 2013). Every research design in social sciences is shaped -at least implicitly- by a research paradigm(s). Research paradigms address the philosophical dimensions of social sciences and are a set of fundamental assumptions and beliefs as to how the world is perceived; a conceptual framework that guides researcher behaviour (Jonker & Pennink, 2010). Although philosophical backgrounds usually remain implicit in most research, they affect its practice. Authors have emphasised that it is important to initially question the research paradigm to be applied, because it substantially influences how one undertakes a social study, the way of framing and understanding social phenomena (Creswell, 2012; Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill, 2009; Neuman, 2011).

The two main philosophical dimensions to distinguish existing research paradigms, are ontology and epistemology (Kalof, Dan & Dietz, 2008; Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill, 2009). They relate to the nature of knowledge and the development of that knowledge, respectively. The term 'epistemology' comes from the Greek word 'episteme' (επιστήμη), which literally means science. In simple terms, epistemology is the philosophy of knowledge (Trochim, 2000). It concerns the acceptable beliefs on the way to generate, understand and use knowledge. Epistemology is intimately related to ontology and both, to methodology. 'Ontology' comes from the Greek word 'on' (ον) which means 'this that is; that exists'. Thus ontology concerns the study of existence; of reality. As ontology involves the philosophy of reality or the view of how one perceives reality and epistemology addresses how we come to know that reality, methodology identifies the particular practices used to attain knowledge, referring to research framework in the context of a particular paradigm.

In terms of social research, ontologically one can perceive that the existence of reality is external and independent of social actors and their interpretations, termed objectivist (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009) or realist (Neuman, 2011). Alternatively, subjectivist or nominalist theory, views reality as dependent on social actors who contribute to social phenomena. Related to this disambiguation, there are two main research paradigms commonly accepted: positivism, and interpretivism / constructivism. In their purest form,

these are considered to be the extremes with a number of derivative paradigms in the middle reconciling -to a degree- the two[14] (Creswell, 2013). For positivism, reality is external, objective and independent of social factors (Wahyuni, 2012). Only observable phenomena can provide credible data and facts. Positivists tend to focus on causality and law-like generalisations. As research is undertaken in a value-free manner, the researcher is independent of the data and attempts to maintain an objective stance and clear distance from the studied phenomena. As a result, the research methodology primarily related to this paradigm, is quantitative. In contrast, constructivism argues that reality is socially constructed, subjective and dynamic, consisting of equally important multiple levels. Constructivists theorise that subjective meanings and social phenomena are intricately related, focusing upon the details of a given situation, the reality behind it, as well as the associated subjective meanings and motivating actions. As research is value-laden, the researcher is always part of the data and therefore, subjective interpretations are produced. This approach concerns primarily qualitative methodology and has influenced the most this study's research design and methods.

5.1. Research Design, Positionality and selection of Methodology

A methodology refers to a model to conduct a research within the context of a particular paradigm. It carries the underlying sets of beliefs that guide a researcher to choose one set of research methods over another (Yin, 2013). Because methodologies are closer to research practice than the philosophical concepts found in paradigms, most researchers usually state that i.e., they are conducting 'qualitative', instead of 'interpretivist / constructivist' research (Sarantakos, 2005). 'Qualitative research, is concerned with collecting and analyzing information in as many forms, chiefly non-numeric, as possible. It tends to focus on exploring, in detail, smaller numbers of instances which are seen as being interesting, and

---

[14] The most prominent of such paradigms are postpositivism / critical realism and pragmatism. Critical realism, views research as valued laden and considers reality as existing independently of human thoughts and beliefs, but is interpreted through social conditioning and while observable phenomena can provide credible data, they can only be explained within a context. Pragmatism, is essentially a mesh of the two main paradigms. Reality can be both objective and subjective, both observable phenomena and subjective meanings can provide acceptable knowledge and research is value laden, but there is always a degree of objectivity; everything depends on the particular research questions and the nuances of each research project.

aims to achieve depth rather than breadth' (Blaxter, Hughes & Tight, 1996: 61). It also embraces positionality and reflexivity in social research. Positionality is concerned with how the fact that people are positioned within various contexts and processes of power, affects the way they understand the world. Reflexivity involves thinking carefully on one's position as a researcher and declaring one's positionality. The aim is to make explicit the researcher's role in knowledge production. Its role in research involves reflection on self, process, and representation, as well as critically examining power relations and politics in the research process and researcher accountability in data collection and interpretation (Jones, Nast, & Roberts, 1997). It is important that this occurs from the beginning to the end of the research process. Just adding it on at the end is mere introspection which can leave positivist methodologies intact. A reflexive research process can open up the research to more complex and nuanced understandings of issues, where boundaries between process and content can get blurred. While it has been argued that reflexivity can result in 'navel-gazing' (and indeed it can), the author does not believe that being reflexive about one's own positionality is to self-indulge, but to reflect on how one is inserted in grids of power relations and how that influences methods, interpretations, and knowledge production (Kobayashi, 2003). In qualitative research, adopting a reflexive lens and being acutely aware of one's positionality and the 'insider-outsider' dimension of the research, can better situate both the researcher and the participants as well as the research as a whole within the context of the particular institutional, social, and political realities present. As Peake & Trotz (1999: 37) assert: 'It can strengthen our commitment to conduct good research based on building relations of mutual respect and recognition. It does, however, entail abandoning the search for objectivity in favour of critical provisional analysis based on plurality of (temporally and spatially) situated voices and silences'.

Researchers begin data collection with certain assumptions about the phenomenon being investigated, situations to be observed, and people to be interviewed. The more one is like the participants in terms of culture, gender, race, socioeconomic class and so on, the more it is expected that access will be granted, meanings shared, and validity of findings assured. Thus, it has commonly been assumed that being an insider means easy access, the ability to ask more meaningful questions and read non-verbal cues, and most importantly, be able to project a more truthful, authentic understanding of the culture under study. On the other hand, insiders have been accused of being inherently biased, and too close to the culture to be curious enough to raise provocative questions (Merriam et al., 2001). The outsider's

advantage lies in curiosity with the unfamiliar, the ability to ask taboo questions, and being seen as non-aligned with subgroups thus often getting more information (Hopkins, 2007). Therefore, often, the insider's strengths become the outsider's weaknesses and vice-versa.

Thus, the knowledge produced is within the context of our intersubjectivities and the places we occupy at that moment (physically and spatially as well as socially, politically, institutionally, etc.). In qualitative research, knowledge is always partial and representations of knowledge produced through field research, embody power relations and positionalities that the researcher must be aware of in undertaking ethical and reflexive research. Intersubjective learning is important in such processes, which are often iterative and difficult to pre-define. The knowledge produced in research occurs within the context of the research process, embedded within broader social relations processes that place both the researcher and the respondents in different locations. As such, the findings in this thesis are interpretive and partial, yet telling of stories that may otherwise not be told, hopefully revealing broader patterns that may or may not be stable over time and space.

Even though matters of positionality and reflexivity are discussed in more detail in **chapter 9** of this thesis, it is important to stress that in this research project in particular, doing fieldwork both 'at home' as well as abroad, brought in some dynamics, mainly in terms of concerns of insider-outsider processes and levels of socioeconomic differentiation. Both in Greece and the UK, people placed the author in certain categories, exerted authority or subservience and 'familiarised' or 'othered' him to various degrees. The relationship was informally 'negotiated' especially in the first few weeks of fieldwork in each case. Overall, in Greece the process was smoother and the common issues of positionality (power relations, insider-outsider tensions, etc.) in qualitative research were either less visible, or eventually had a positive effect, as existing commonalities took precedence. The researcher's national identity and ethnicity; his attire and ability to engage in regular conversation in the everyday-used 'common tongue'; his experience of having lived in a working / lower-middle class neighbourhood, as well as being a volunteer in an anti-drug nonprofit, voluntary community in the past, and his good knowledge of the non-government / non-market sector in Greece, enabled him to bridge gaps easier and become more accepted faster than in the UK case. As Maria (member, female, 26 years old) said: '*...I'm glad to have you here Giannis; you are, after all, one of us basically. The fact that you are interested in who we are and what we do, the way you talk with us shows that. You are just a regular guy who cares about social*

injustice and inequality in this country and you want to do something about it. You just do it as a scientist, we do it as activists'.

In the UK, things weren't as straightforward for obvious reasons. The fact that the author is not British and had no experience (only theoretical knowledge) with the TS in the country, made the process of transitioning from an outsider to at least a tolerated and gradually an accepted observer, more demanding and complex. However, his lower-middle class background, experiences of growing up in a relatively poor family in Greece, his relatable attire and manner of speech (since his spoken English are still not on the level commonly associated with people of high education, power and authority) and above all, the extended observation sessions, helped assuage the participants reserve towards his daily presence in their organisation. In any case, a considerable effort to blend in as much as possible, ever conscious of the inherent differences and the power relations embedded in that was put, a process that ultimately can benefit any qualitative research investigation.

The author's overall research approach, is closer to constructivism, accepting the importance of subjective meanings, reflexivity, awareness of positionality and a fluid, constructed social reality which is constantly interpreted and re-interpreted in a value-laden research project. Hence, the selection of a qualitative research design and the particular research methods used. Methods concern the specific procedures, tools and techniques to gather and analyse data. However, a research method is to a degree, a-theoretical and independent from methodologies and paradigms (Sarantakos, 2005). For example, an interview, can be used in different methodologies. Research purpose and research questions are the suggested starting points to develop a research design, because they provide important clues about the substance that a researcher is seeking (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009; Yin, 2013). A research method that facilitates a deep investigation of a real-life contemporary phenomenon in its natural context where behaviours, social interactions and meanings are dynamically constructed and perceived, is a case study (Woodside, 2010; Yin, 2012). This PhD thesis, concerns two social purpose TSOs in two different countries and their relation to state welfare policies, focusing on the dimensions of governance, social control, as well as the nature of social citizenship for disadvantaged social groups and its connection with their social (re)integration. In that respect, a comparative, qualitative case study, was more appropriate. Similarly, the RQs concern contemporary social phenomena into different social contexts, as they are experienced and perceived by the actors involved: staff / members, volunteers and service-users of the two TSOs.

At the same time, some respondents, either currently, or in the past, had experiences of marginalisation, vulnerability and disadvantage. Thus, certain queries, could potentially be of a personal nature, touching on subjects and experiences which have deeply affected them. In those cases, it is imperative for the participants to be able to tell their 'own story, in their own words freely relating their experiences with them being the decision-makers of the amount of details they'll want to share' (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1992: 137). This is something a closed questionnaire measuring simple answers such as 'Yes / No, Maybe, Very important / Not so important' etc., can't achieve. Furthermore, researcher imposition and leading are particularly problematic to control in quantitative design and methodology. When developing the questionnaire, researchers make their own decisions and assumptions as to what is and isn't important, something significant may be overlooked. The same can be argued about semi-structured qualitative interviews. However, in this case, the presence of the researcher (clarifications), the ample time provided and the encouragement for participants to use their own words, are reasonable safeguards against researcher bias.

Additionally, and reflecting on the wording of the RQs, the researcher's purpose was to shed some light on the *how* and *why* in these particular cases and national habitus, thus incorporation of context and in-depth data on lived experiences was needed. Such depth could not be attained by the use of large surveys and statistical analysis of Likert scales. Quantitative research design is informed by the positivist paradigm, using frequencies, percentages and statistical generalisation to relate its findings to a much larger population and achieve replication. In contrast, a qualitative case study, focuses on analytical and contextual generalisation to develop and extend theory or provide a new lens to examine social reality. Qualitative research overall, is directed toward naturalistic or idiographic generalisations made about particulars *in context*. For example, in RQ2, the goal was to elucidate what socioeconomic (re)integration of their service-users means for the TSOs and how their perceptions translated into actual organisational practices and policies. More than that, the intention was to observe and experience up-close, the realisation of these practices in the day-to-day 'life' of the organisations.

As a result, qualitative semi-structured interviews, ethnographic observations and focus groups seemed as the best methodological tools which could complement both this constructivist approach and the specific RQs. Finally, there were some practical concerns to consider, which certainly affected the research design. A study involving more cases was simply not feasible, both time-wise and resources-wise. On-site interviews and observations

are typically inexpensive. While this research strategy is labour intensive, it is not as capital intensive as surveys or experiments. The researcher worked alone and as a result, could determine the degree of his own involvement. Moreover, his expertise and experience, are more comprehensive with qualitative methods than they are with surveys and statistical analysis. Consequently, a qualitative research design was selected, with semi-structured qualitative interviews, ethnographic observations and focus groups as the chosen methods.

5.2. Methods

5.2a. Qualitative semi-structured interviews

With the above research design considerations in mind, the primary methodological tool that was decided to be employed, were semi-structured but open in nature, qualitative interviews. Qualitative interviews, sometimes called in-depth or ethnographic interviews, have a long history in social research and are among the most familiar strategies for collecting qualitative data, and are closely related to the approaches of interpretative / constructivist sociology (Flick, Kardoff & Steinke, 2004; Newman, 2011).

While all interviews are used to get to know the interviewee better, this varies depending on the research questions and the researcher's disciplinary perspective (Silverman, 2011). Broadly speaking, the purpose of the qualitative interview, is to contribute to a body of knowledge that is conceptual, theoretical and based on the meanings life experiences hold for the interviewees (Newman, 2011). Unlike the positivist, highly structured survey interviews and questionnaires, qualitative interviews allow the interviewer to delve deeply into social and personal matters, well suited to the exploration of attitudes, values, beliefs and motives shaping everyday practices (Rubin & Rubin, 2005). Additionally, they can evaluate the validity of the respondents' answers by observing non-verbal indicators, useful when discussing sensitive issues (Bailey, 1987), facilitate comparability by ensuring that all questions are answered by each respondent without outside influences, and have been shown to have higher response rates than questionnaires (Gubrium & Holstein, 2001). Moreover, qualitative interviews often play an important role in ethnographic research based on observations, by incorporating the imparting of expert knowledge about the investigated research field, the recording and analysis of the informants' subjective perspective, or the collection of data relating to their life history (Flick, Kardoff & Steinke, 2004).

Qualitative interviews have been categorised in a variety of ways, with most authors differentiating qualitative interviews as unstructured, semi-structured and structured (see i.e., Sarantakos, 2005; Silverman, 2010). Unstructured interviews are more or less equivalent to loosely guided conversations. The most widely used unstructured interview originates from the ethnographic tradition of anthropology (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1992). Ethnographers gather data through participant observations and record field notes, as they observe from the side-lines, or join those they are studying. During this process, the investigator identifies one or more key informants (based on their knowledge, willingness and role in the particular social setting) to interview, taking notes while observing and questioning. The structured interview, is mostly related to quantitative surveys due to their efficiency in standardisation, reliable grouping of responses and more straightforward data analysis procedures. Interaction is limited by a script and a fixed set of questions (Gubrium & Holstein, 2001). It can be conducted in person, over the phone, or through technologies such as internet chat, and uses both closed and open questions to gather query specific issues, but usually asks participants to select from a numerical range or set of fixed responses (i.e., Likert scales). Every participant is generally asked the same questions in the same order and for closed questions, participants answer using standardised response categories.

Semi-structured, in-depth qualitative interviews are the most widely used interviewing format for qualitative research and can occur either with an individual or in groups (Longhurst, 2009). The interviewer does not keep a tight rein on the interview, but instead tries to apply a non-directional approach, allowing the interviewee through the use of open-ended questions, to explore the subject in as much depth and from many angles. Questions are framed in such a way, so that respondents can elaborate on anything that might be significant to them, therefore acquiring a wide and diverse range of responses. Such interviews can be used as a stand-alone method or in conjunction with another method or methods ('triangulation'). Their length varies, but most commonly take between 30 minutes to several hours to complete (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). They combine predefined questions found in structured interviews with the open-ended exploration of an unstructured interview. The general goal is to gather systematic information about central topics, while also allowing for new topics to emerge (Bryman, 2015). Also, they are often used when there is some knowledge about the studied issues, but further details are still needed. They are generally organised around a set of predetermined open-ended questions or main themes to be explored (topic guide), with other questions emerging from the interview dialogue. Their flexibility

and open structure help uncovering previously unknown issues and address complex topics through probes and clarification (Bryman, 2015). The topic guide can ensure that particular points are covered with each participant, but also allow respondents and interviewers to raise additional concerns. Thus, semi-structured qualitative interviews were selected as the primary method, complemented by ethnographic observations.

5.2b. Ethnographic observations

According to van Donge, 'the main focus of ethnography, is everyday life' (2006: 181). Therefore, the aim is to observe the flow of mundane, daily life and interactions. Bertaux, argues that the examination of social relations is 'the very substance of sociological knowledge' (1981: 31). Herbert, similarly stipulates that ethnographers aim to 'unearth what the group takes for granted, and thereby reveal the knowledge and meaning structures that provide the blueprint for social action' (2000: 551). These meaning structures are at the heart of social research, as social life is organised around them. This was the deciding factor in employing, non-obtrusive (non-participant) observations as well as direct participant observations.

Observations have been part of the methodological arsenal of social scientists over the past century, notably within the discipline of sociology involving the researcher's active engagement with the members of the community they are studying (Atkinson & Hammersley, 1994). In contrast to anthropology in which ethnography methods originate, in sociology, much ethnography is based on the assumption that observations can mitigate the negative impact an outsider to the studied social space would incur. (Wolcott, 1999). Most often, when observations are employed, the researcher attempts to at least nominally and temporarily, be considered as a member of the studied group, or, trusted enough by it to be perceived as close enough to that (Van Maanen, 2011).

Ethnographic observations, in contrast to most research techniques that do not involve personal witnessing, provide for the gathering of rich and detailed data. The researcher not only observes activity, but inscribes that material in 'field notes', documents that form the evidentiary basis of the published report (Van Maanen, 2011). These notes provide the 'facts' that are observed, including actions, statements, and the observer's thoughts. Thus observation is often an inductive methodology, with the field data intuitively revealing important issues, rather than deductively testing pre-established hypotheses. Therefore, the

usual problem of being an outsider in a particular social context, could be mitigated (an indeed it was) by developing what van Donge refers to as the 'anthropological eye', which means both the '...ability to observe the social environment, as well as to be able to build insights on interpretations of everyday life' (van Donge, 2006: 182-183). This doesn't mean recording everything happening in the observed space. Certainly, in this case, the RQs guided to a degree what to look at, especially early during the fieldwork. However, as a better impression of what is significant was acquired, the exact wording and particular focus of the RQs can be attributed largely to the ethnographic observations. Moreover, as an observer, either participant or not, the researcher is involved in some manner in the activity, forming direct understandings of the dynamics and motivations of observed behaviour, therefore claiming that the findings are close to the scene as it is known by others (Wolcott, 1990). Thus, observations support Max Weber's demand to produce research characterised by *verstehen*, or a personal, interpretive understanding, leading to lived knowledge (Brewer, 2000).

These commonly accepted merits of ethnographic observations along with the researcher's own positive experience with the method in previous research, prompted their use both as a supplement to the interviews, as well as a data triangulation technique. For example, in order to truly understand what interview questions related to the elucidation of RQ1 and how the two TSOs (consciously or unconsciously) apply monitoring and governance technologies in response to state welfare strategies for the control of service-users, the respondents' answers would be insufficient. Social meaning was to be understood in context, as it is realised and applied in daily organisational practices by the actors involved. The impact of governance and discipline techniques on organisational identity couldn't be just described, but seen as it unfolds and influences the 'life' of the organisation.

Similarly, considering RQ2, the way participants perceive social citizenship and their activities for the support of their service-users' socioeconomic (re)integration, weren't contained just in their opinion. Theorising on these matters should be constructed, by contrasting what is told, with what was experienced and interpreted as being done. These two dimensions were imperative for building associations between collected data, as well as the more abstract knowledge produced by zooming out and using social theory and previous research in the field, to inform our own interpretations. Thus, both researcher and respondent bias was minimised, since what was said and what was actually observed, either confirmed

75

certain understandings, or revealed discrepancies and tensions the researcher might have missed, and perhaps even the participants themselves, weren't aware of.

5.2c. Focus group discussions

Focus groups have been employed in research over the last 35 years, mainly in marketing and politics to explore the potential reception of new products and services, or the effects of propaganda campaigns. In recent years, this methodological approach has also become quite popular in social research (Morgan & Krueger, 1993). Focus groups vary, but usually include a semi-structured session with multiple participants (four minimum), an informal setting, moderation by a facilitator (or facilitators), the use of general guideline questions or other data elicitation stimuli (i.e., photos), and a means to record the information generated through group interactions (Krueger & Casey, 2009). In short, focus groups are a data collection technique, combining qualitative research principles and small group dynamics knowledge. This approach capitalises on the interaction among the group members to enhance the collection of deep, strongly held beliefs and perspectives. It is useful to elucidate social context, examine new or complex issues involving values and beliefs that underlie behaviour (Krueger & Casey, 2009).

When utilising focus group discussions, an important decision is whether to use constructed or natural groups (Hollander, 2004). Constructed, are groups whose members have not met before. Natural, are the groups whose members have already met and are usually involved in a network of relationships and common activities (i.e., colleagues, friends, flatmates, families, etc.). As natural focus groups consist of people with pre-existing, interpersonal relationships interacting with each other regularly, they are usually characterised by the need for social conformity, peer acceptance and anxiety for consistent representation of self (Hollander, 2004). Thus, participants 'may feel compelled to appear consistent with earlier expressed beliefs or to monitor their statements to forestall future awkwardness' (Hollander, 2004: 627), consequently not being so forthcoming or honest. Nonetheless, when the goals of the research require, or are enhanced by such pre-existing group dynamics and the elicitation of 'natural' social interactions, they are quite useful (Hollander, 2004).

On the other hand, in constructed groups, participants who are unlikely to meet again, face less personal cost if they express deviant views and are more likely to be honest

(Hollander, 2004). Their representation of self during the discussion can be more genuine, since there is no pre-existing image on their fellow discussants' minds. Still, constructed focus groups can also be problematic, as 'in focus groups made up of strangers, participants desires to make a good impression may outweigh any sense of obligation to the researcher' (Hollander, 2004: 627), thus nullifying any honesty incentives through a desire to impress and show knowledge about the discussed topic (Jenkins, 1992). Therefore, focus groups, sometimes may foster disclosure and others, concealment. Moreover, in focus groups, participants interact with each other and the interviewer, virtually co-constructing meaning and recreating their past experiences along the way and this recreation is shaped by the particular context (Hollander, 2004). As a result, '…these processes limit their usefulness as a tool for understanding individual thoughts, feelings, or experiences. However, they make focus groups an excellent site for analysing the processes of social interaction in social context' (Hollander, 2004: 603).

It was decided that two such group discussions (one for each organisation) would be arranged, if time, availability and circumstances permitted. Their main purpose would be to be used as an added triangulation tool. The only available option for preparing these focus groups, was to use natural groups, as the prospective participants would all be involved with the two TSOs. The researcher was aware, that data triangulation using multiple methods, couldn't ensure 'respondent honesty'. Nevertheless, if nothing else, the focus groups could confirm the data collected through interviews and observations and reveal relevant contextual social knowledge. It was intended that such data comparisons, could provide more insight about the meaning of the informants' individual interview answers, as well as about what was observed. Additionally, the social contexts of the focus groups themselves -their limitations notwithstanding- could potentially unveil discrepancies or patterns of diversity concerning issues indicating almost unanimous agreement. For example, the Greek TSOs members boasting of their good cooperation and democratic, participatory organisational structure, or the UK organisation's staff declaring they 'are not political'.

5.3. Application of the methods in the field

This project was not a covert research effort and no manipulation of any kind, was intended or attempted, while total anonymity and confidentiality for all involved was maintained. Furthermore, the participants were all fully informed of the study's goals and the methods

that would be employed. They were all adults in total control of their mental faculties and had agreed to freely participate and withdraw at any time on their own volition, signing a participant consent form (**Appendix I**). What was expected of them had been explained in detail both in written form in a participant information sheet (**Appendix I**), as well as orally, in face-to-face meetings. For the UK case, the researcher had to be first screened by the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS), in order to acquire permission to work with vulnerable social groups. With regards to debriefing, participants were informed that the transcribed interview material and any part of the PhD thesis, would be freely available by request. The collected data was held in the researcher's personal notebook and journal (i.e., field notes, interview notes, etc.) and in electronic storage devices such as the researcher's USB memory stick, a hard drive and a digital recorder which are all password locked. Finally, any confidential personal information will be disposed after the submission of the PhD thesis. Also, both TSOs were provided with a short summary of the research results, before the final submission of the thesis.

The fieldwork lasted approximately ten months (December 2014 - September 2015), spread more or less evenly between Greece and the UK, with the Greek TSO being the first examined case. In Greece, full access to the organisation was secured through two meetings with the gatekeeper, a previous acquaintance of the researcher and a founding member of the TSO. As mentioned, the gatekeeper was informed about the research and was reassured about issues concerning the protection of anonymity and confidentiality. In the UK, access was acquired first through one of the researcher's supervisors who emailed the CEO of the selected organisation, introducing the researcher and gauging the possible availability of the TSO. The researcher then followed up with another email and a meeting was arranged. The CEO was apprised in detail about the goals of the research and the methods to be used. Subsequently, full access was granted.

5.3a. The Observations

In both cases, ethnographic observations were the first method to be employed, more intensively at first, but carried on almost throughout the whole research. This was done, in order for the researcher to be immersed in the field and this new sociocultural space, and start building an understanding of the 'flow of life' in the two organisations. Observations were the optimal method to become socialised within this environment, its norms, cultural

78

traditions, and jargon. As Hammersley and Atkinson note, the main objective of ethnography, is not to collect 'bias-free, pure data, but to focus on finding the right way of interpreting that data' (1992: 131); for that, a direct experience of the organisations' daily social reality, was crucial for the research design. Furthermore, the researcher was an almost complete outsider in both cases, but the building of a modicum of trust and rapport with participants is essential in qualitative research projects with such participatory elements (Wolcott, 1999).

Therefore, extensive observation sessions and everyday, informal interactions (i.e., stepping outside with a potential respondent for a smoke and some chatting), helped immensely in building trust relationships with prospective participants. This process enabled the participants to become used to the researcher's presence, eliciting more natural, normal interactions and minimising any 'disruption effect' that the researcher might cause to daily activities. As time passed, it can be argued that this early ethnographic work facilitated the process of the participants -sooner rather than later- viewing the researcher not as an outsider and maybe not as an insider either, but as someone with good familiarity of the group; not so distanced from it. Moreover, it enabled the researcher to identify 'suitable' respondents for the interviews, amend the focus of the RQs, and the particular themes they relate to.

Operationalisation of the observations, was similar in both cases. For approximately the first six to eight weeks, everyday (except weekends), the researcher went to the premises of the organisation (usually between 8 and 9am). There, observations were conducted until 'closing time' which was after 3pm for the UK TSO and after 5pm for the Greek. Although, it should be noted that in contrast with the UK case, the Greek TSO most often remains open until late in the evening (9 to 10pm), operating mostly as a community centre by volunteers. However, this practice fluctuates and most services are unavailable roughly after 6pm (i.e., the social store, the social pharmacy and the storage closes after 5.30pm). During the observations, the researcher took notes concerning what was witnessed (both the mundane and the potentially significant) in terms of space, events and social interactions. In addition, field notes regarding initial understandings and the researcher's tentative reflections were kept, the latter forming a rudimentary research journal. These observations, didn't feature the researcher isolated just taking notes of the happenings around him. Even though, ample time was spent in the main lounge in both organisations, since many people tended to congregate there and would often be in a talkative and relaxed mood and therefore, easier to be engaged.

One of the main goals was to familiarise with future respondents and in turn, make them more comfortable around the researcher's presence. Thus, sessions were balanced

between observing and note-taking on the one hand, and trying to mix and mingle in a more active, participatory manner, on the other. Casual chats and 'informal conversations' were frequently sought. As events of interest unfolded, the researcher would ask the actors about particular incidents, always taking notes afterwards. No recording mechanism of any kind (sound or image) was used during the observations. Additionally, in both cases, the researcher participated in various group meetings. On neither case was he allowed to record the proceedings; only take notes. Regarding the Greek TSO, eight general assemblies were attended, 13 council meetings, 14 task team meetings and numerous informal meetings. For example, meetings took place almost every day at around 5pm, just before most people left, which resembled more of a catching up with the day's events. Similarly, in the UK TSO, every morning there is a brief meeting between staff members regarding the day's upcoming tasks. Moreover, in the UK case, four volunteer meetings were attended, three staff meetings, ten 'life-changing activities' (two art classes, two literacy and language classes, two health and hygiene sessions, two IT classes and two sessions concerning positive attitude and well-being), one 'outside activity' (football) and two meetings with outside organisations; namely, an Islamic community centre concerning a donation, and one with the representative of a bus company which offered free tickets to service-users. Finally, the researcher participated in three outings with some members of the Greek TSO, concerning drug-users and two concerning the homeless, while he also accompanied some UK TSO's staff members and service-users in a city outing, for a 'photography and coffee' session.

Gradually, and in order to experience first-hand the daily life of the organisations, the researcher assumed limited informal voluntary roles, which enabled even more natural and direct interactions with members, volunteers and service-users. For example, in the Greek organisation the researcher helped out a few times with the reception desk (communication team), as well as the storage room; similar roles he undertook in the UK organisation. In both cases, this was done together with the volunteer(s) or staff member(s) that were normally on these tasks. As the weeks passed, significant themes related to the RQs emerged and data saturation started to develop. Hence, the observations became more focused on specific events (i.e., observation of a particular meeting).

Eventually, as the topic guides started to be modified due to initial findings from this ethnographic work and several respondents were recruited for the interviews, the latter took prominence. In both cases, at approximately the twelve-weeks mark, the observation sessions were reduced to three per week and in the very final weeks, they were rarely more than two

per week. Also, it was practically neither feasible nor productive to maintain the initial, intensive rhythm. Field notes needed to be sorted out and studied, so in conjunction with the time-consuming interview transcripts, a rudimentary analysis of the findings could commence. The ongoing effort to arrange and conduct interviews was taking large amounts of time, especially in the Greek case, where there was the added task of accurately translating transcripts in English. Thus, as patterns of behaviour and activities started to be recognised and repeated with regularity, the observations moved a bit to the background, in order to leave ample time for the semi-structured interviews.

5.3b. The Interviews

In total, 53 qualitative, semi-structured interviews were conducted, with 26 respondents in Greece and 27 in the UK, all recruited directly during the ethnographic observations. Also, four short, follow-up interviews were conducted, two with Greek and two with UK respondents. The sampling technique used, was partly purposive and partly based on 'snowballing'. The gatekeepers and first contacts of the researcher in the two organisations, personally introduced him to several prospective respondents in the first days of the fieldwork who in turn, introduced him to others. This initial, potential sample, was later modified and enriched through the observations by more informed decisions, regarding what questions needed to be asked, what knowledge was sought and who could (likely) provide it. As a result, participants were 'singled-out', approached to discuss the possibility of an interview and eventually recruited. The participants, belonged to three main groups: volunteer members of the organisation in Greece / paid staff members in the UK (who comprise the majority of the total sample), 'regular volunteers' (volunteers on a frequent basis) and 'external service-users' (participants who were service-users and weren't, in any way, involved as activists or volunteers.). As the two TSOs are partly user-driven, with the exception of external service-users, for the other two groups, there is an important distinction for the reader to keep in mind: between those who are (or have been) service-users and belong (or used to belong) to disadvantaged social groups, and the rest.

The procedure for arranging and conducting the interviews, remained the same for both organisations. After a participant was identified and approached, the research and the interview in particular were explained, questions had been asked and answered (i.e., assurances concerning confidentiality), an appointment was scheduled (usually for a few days

after this meeting). All interviews were conducted in private interview rooms in the organisations' premises. The UK TSO has three such designated rooms for the 'registration interviews' and any private consultations. The Greek TSO has one for similar purposes. The choice for the location was always made by the participants, but it was also the preference of the researcher for it to be a relatively neutral place, comfortable, quiet, and easily accessible to both parties. In all interviews, nobody else was present, apart from the researcher and the interviewee and complete privacy was ensured. On average, the interviews lasted one hour and 45 minutes, with the shortest being just over an hour, and the longest, two hours and 20 minutes. There were 14 times in total when the interview had to be rescheduled (11 with the participants' initiative, three due to circumstances in the organisations at the time). There were three times (two in the UK and one in Greece), when the participants asked for a short break during the interview.

A representative qualitative interview in this project could be described as follows: the researcher and the respondent would go to the room at the arranged time and sit across each other so there is good eye-contact. The researcher would again ask the participant if they had any questions regarding the procedure or the research in general and if that was the case, clarifications were given. Then, the researcher would hand out the one-page participant consent form and wait for the respondent to read it carefully, fill in the needed information and sign it. After that, he would present to the respondent the digital voice recorder that was used and ask one more time if the interviewee was willing for the conversation to be recorded[15]. Subsequently, the researcher would ask if all was ready for the interview to begin and after the respondent's confirmation, the interview commenced. As mentioned, during the fieldwork, a list of themes and specific questions (amended as the fieldwork progressed) had coalesced into an interview topic guide (**Appendix II**). Having this topic guide on hand, which the participant was free to peruse before, or during the interview, the researcher would start asking questions slowly and with clear articulation, beginning with more 'general information' matters, and gradually moving on to the more substantial, thought-provoking, or sensitive and personal ones. Rarely, short notes were hand-written on a notebook.

In short, the researcher attempted to adhere to the commonly accepted standards of a 'good' qualitative interview. Effort was made before and during the interviews, for the

---

[15] There was only one participant in the UK, who refused to be recorded. Instead, in this case, extensive notes of the answers were kept as meticulously as possible.

respondents to be put at ease, although the daily interactions during the observations had already helped immensely to build the necessary trust foundations and goodwill with most participants. The respondents were asked questions in a respectful, but straightforward manner. The researcher tried to carefully listen to responses, choose and change his language depending on who was interviewed (i.e., use of less academic, 'formal' language when the educational background was relatively low), as well as notice body language and nonverbal cues. In general, it was important to act in a way that was supportive, but without getting into leading territory, swaying participants to a particular opinion. After the interview was concluded and the recording had stopped, a short debriefing talk followed, during which, the respondent was prompted to provide any comments or ask questions.

5.3c. The Focus Groups

Regarding the focus group discussions, exactly the same strategies were used, apart from the sampling which was strictly purposive. Overall, two focus groups were conducted (one for each TSO), with four participants each (two females and two males in both cases). They took place in the organisations' premises in the afternoon, in two large meeting rooms and lasted approximately two hours and 45 minutes, with the researcher as a facilitator. The participants in the Greek TSO were two members (one 'healthy' and one 'non-healthy') and two regular volunteers (one 'healthy' and one 'non healthy' who was soon to become a member); in the UK TSO, there were two staff members, one service-user working in the organisation as a volunteer and one current service-user. While the same themes examined in the individual interviews were used as a general guide for the conversation, in both cases the discussion was 'free-flowing' and informal. Both focus groups were recorded and fully transcribed (and in the Greek case translated) by the author. All the participants were purposively selected to highlight the diversity within the TSOs and potentially reveal patterns of differing perspectives concerning the explored issues. They all had different social, economic and education backgrounds, their age varied from 20 to 61 years old, and their experience of involvement with the organisations ranged from relatively small, to quite large.

5.4. Qualitative Data Analysis

There are few, if any, agreed-on rules in qualitative data analysis (Miles, Huberman, & Saldana, 2013). Data can be gathered with different methods and different intentions on

mind, while different preoccupations may lead to emphasis on different aspects of analysis. An ethnographer may be more interested in describing social processes, a policy analyst in evaluating results, and a sociologist in explaining and discovering associations between them. Descriptive work might be optimal in a particular qualitative research project, more interpretive or explanatory work in another, while a third, might require a mix of these. Because each study is unique, any guidelines need to be used with creativity and judgment. Charmaz (2006) recommends imaginatively engaging with the data and then solidly grounding the interpretation directly back in the data.

Renata Tesch (2013: 17-25), beyond discussing the use of software in qualitative data analysis, identified three basic qualitative analysis orientations: the 'language-oriented', interested in the use of language and the meaning of words (how people communicate and make sense of their interactions); the 'descriptive / interpretive' approaches, which are oriented to providing thorough descriptions and interpretations of social phenomena, including their meaning to those who experience it; and the 'theory-building' approaches which aim to identify connections between social phenomena (i.e., how events are structured or influenced by how social actors perceive define situations). Other authors, demarcate qualitative analytic methods as roughly divided into two camps. Within the first, there are those stemming from a particular theoretical or epistemological position i.e., 'grounded theory' (Strauss & Corbin, 1998), or 'narrative analysis' (Murray, 2003). Then, there are methods that are more independent of theory and epistemology, i.e., studies guided by either realist or constructionist paradigms (Dey, 2003). While such classifications are contestable and not 'water-tight', still, they capture the extended family of various qualitative data analysis strategies used to describe, interpret or explain social action, behaviour, cultures and sociopolitical processes, with an emphasis on the meaningful character of social phenomena and the researcher's influence. The data analysis strategy employed in this case study, combined elements from both the aforementioned interpretive and theory-building approaches, using as its main tool, 'thematic analysis'.

Thematic analysis can be seen as a foundational method for qualitative analysis, incorporated in many theoretical approaches to different ends (Holloway & Todres, 2003; Fereday & Muir-Cochrane, 2006). It is widely used, but there is no clear agreement about what it is and how to do it (see i.e., Boyatzis, 1998; Tuckett, 2005), hence it is not frequently a 'named' analysis approach like other methods. So, while not explicitly claimed as the method of analysis, a lot of qualitative analysis is essentially thematic at its core (Aronson,

1994). It can be used to report participant experiences and meanings, or it can be closer to constructionism, examining the ways in which events, realities, meanings and experiences are the effects of social discourses, uncovering associations and developing theoretical explanations.

In the present study, the analysis started during data collection through the observations and interviews, scouring it for overarching themes. A theme (often called a category), was considered a broad designation which captured something especially important about the data in relation to the research questions, and represented an abstracted reflection of some level of patterned response or meaning within the data set (i.e., 'governance', 'social control', 'social citizenship right', etc.). There are various conventions for representing prevalence in qualitative analysis that does not provide a quantified measure; writing for instance: 'the majority of participants' (Meehan, Vermeer & Windsor, 2000: 372). Such descriptors, rhetorically suggest a theme existed in the data, and this was the author's approach in this research, except when it was judged that a more specific designation was required.

Themes, categories, or patterns within data can be identified in qualitative thematic analysis either in an inductive, or 'bottom up' way (see i.e., Patton, 1999), or in a theoretical or deductive, 'top down' way (see i.e., Boyatzis, 1998). An inductive approach means the themes identified are strongly linked to the data themselves (closer to grounded theory analysis). In inductive analysis therefore, data coding doesn't fit into a pre-existing coding frame, or the researcher's analytic preconceptions. Researchers who emphasise the importance of 'grounding' categories in the data, most often follow this technique, advocating a 'line-by-line', or 'bit-by-bit' approach to generate categories, where each bit is considered in detail, to identify aspects relevant to the analysis (see i.e., Strauss, 1987). The aim is theory fully grounded in the data. Once categories have been developed, the researcher proceeds to a more integrated analysis of the core categories which emerge from this process.

In contrast, a theoretical thematic analysis tends to be driven by the researcher's theoretical and analytic interest in the area. This form of thematic analysis may provide less rich descriptions of data overall, but a more detailed analysis of some aspect of the data, as it begins with categories which are based on a general comprehension of the data, and then proceeds to a more detailed categorisation (Jones, 1985). The emphasis here is on a 'holistic' approach, attempting to grasp basic themes or issues in the data, absorbing them as a whole. Broad categories and their interconnections are then distilled from a general overview of the

data, before a more detailed analysis refines these through a process of subcategorisation. Additionally, the choice between inductive and theoretical, maps onto how and why the data is coded. Codes can be fixed for a specific research question (theoretical approach), or the specific research question can evolve through the coding process (inductive approach). However, researchers cannot completely free themselves of their theoretical and epistemological commitments and thus, most modern qualitative analysis falls between these two 'extremes'. This was the case in this study, although admittedly, it was closer to a theoretical thematic analysis, rather than to an inductive one.

In general, qualitative analysis involves some type of themes exploration, categorising, grouping and comparing data (Bryman & Burgess, 2002). Grouping data includes developing a set of criteria to distinguish observations, remarks or reflections on this data as similar or related. Typically, this is done through the development of a set of categories (or themes), with each category expressing a criterion (or a set of criteria) for distinguishing some observations from others in some particular respect(s) (Patton, 2005). Categorisation thus, requires a dialectic to develop between categories and data. Data within each category can then be compared and further distinctions can be drawn within each category, to allow for more detailed comparisons within a set of sub-categories. Conversely, different categories can be compared and interrelated for a more encompassing analysis. This process continues until the researcher is satisfied that all relevant distinctions between observations have been drawn, and can be compared effectively in the established category system (Bryman & Burgess, 2002).

Early on, themes did indeed emerge inductively from the data and the RQs were revised, but the researcher didn't go into the field as a *tabula rasa* (blank slate). While open to what the observations and first interviews would reveal, the main issues explored by the RQs were, inevitably, providing a certain perspective on what to look for. For example, matters of pressure or influence by government welfare policies and discourses on TSOs and their activities concerning the support and (re)integration of the disadvantaged, provided themes such as *control, discipline, power structures, organisational identity, the nature of the welfare mix in the country'* and so on. Thus, in each case, after the first few weeks, the themes, enriched by the data, started to be broken down to sub-themes / sub-categories. Subsequently, they and the -now modified- RQs, were the guiding lens through which data continued to be collected.

The analysis started with some early data coding, based on these initially traced themes, related to the RQs. Codes refer to 'the most basic segment, or element, of the raw data or information that can be assessed in a meaningful way regarding the phenomenon' (Boyatzis, 1998: 63) and represent an effort to group data into meaningful sub-categories (Tuckett, 2005). But, the challenge is to be able to create conceptual tools to classify and compare the essential features of the studied phenomena. This involves a process of abstracting from the immense detail and complexity of the data those features which are most salient for our purpose and facilitate comparisons, hence the construction of main themes. Themes (or categories), are where the interpretative analysis of the data occurs, and arguments about the examined phenomena are made (Boyatzis, 1998). The researcher therefore, attempted to find interesting features in a systematic fashion across the entire data set, collating data relevant to each code.

For example, the extract of a participant speaking about the detailed records assiduously maintained on service-users in the UK TSO, was coded as '*monitoring*'; the observation of a short meeting involving sanctions against a service-user who 'misbehaved', was coded as '*discipline*'. Then these codes were collated into potential themes, gathering all data relevant to each one (i.e., the previous codes were grouped into the main overarching theme of '*social control*'). During the analysis, all themes were reviewed to check if they 'work' in relation to the coded data with associated codes being 'upgraded' into sub-themes such as i.e., '*monitoring*'. As this process progressed, themes were more concretely defined and named, with i.e., '*governance technologies*', becoming a sub-theme of '*social control*'. Simultaneously, codes, sub-themes and main themes, were constantly studied, in order to reveal associations and relationships based on similarities or differences within the data, looking for patterns or variations which could lead to interpretive analytical conclusions.

Overall, it was attempted for the overarching themes and categories arising from the data but related to the meaning(s) the RQs were trying to elucidate to be such, that the analytic claims which follow in chapters **7, 8** and **9,** were grounded in, but go beyond the 'surface' and 'semantics' of the data. To that end, towards the analysis end-phases, the researcher asked questions such as: '*What does this theme mean?*' '*What are the assumptions underpinning it?*' '*What are its implications?*' '*What conditions are likely to have given rise to it?*' '*Why do people talk about this in this particular way (as opposed to other ways)?*' '*What did I see happened, in contrast with what interviewees said?*' '*Why the same organisational goal linked to this theme is served by so different strategies and activities in*

87

the two TSOs?' The two analysis chapters (**7** and **8**) in the thesis, will attempt to adequately answer such questions. The next chapter however, will focus on a detailed presentation and discussion of the two TSOs forming this case study.

There is a truism in academia that all social research simplifies the investigated phenomena (George & Bennett, 2005). However, case studies can do this in ways that strongly relate to the experiences of individuals, small groups, or organisations. They retain more of the 'noise' of real life than many other types of research (Gerring, 2001). Indeed, other forms of research, such as experiments or carefully structured questionnaire surveys, base their success on the ability to exclude such noise, and focus precisely upon the particular phenomenon or possible causal relationship that is to be investigated. There are good reasons for doing much research in this way, but an unavoidable problem with it is that in some circumstances, the excluded noise may be a highly significant part of the story. The present study is such an example. The overall, day-to-day lived experiences and meaning-construction processes of the participants (staff members, service-users and volunteers) within the context of the regular, everyday activities of the organisations, are crucial for the researcher to understand the social processes under investigation. This is the primary reason for choosing a comparative case study to elucidate the examined issues in this research.

But this decision was immediately followed by the question of *how many* cases should be examined. Not only an academic rationale but also practical constraints of time, resources and feasibility had to be taken into account. Obviously, since from the start a comparative research of the TS, governance in welfare and social citizenship transformations between Greece and the UK had been decided, the actual question posed had been actually: *more than two (N=2) cases or not? If yes, how many?* After consideration, it was decided that two cases (N=2) would offer the best balance between optimisation and feasibility, for several reasons. The research as a whole, was constrained by the three-year timeframe and available funding in the context of the PhD programme the author was attending. Given the prioritisation of *depth* over *breadth*, as well as the selection of a rigorous qualitative methodology with a strong ethnographic (participatory and non-participatory observations) element described in the previous chapter (**chapter 5**), the study of four cases (2x2 format) was quickly dismissed. In order to retain research consistency, four cases would literally mean hundreds of participants and potentially thousands of hours in the field. In addition, in the Greek case, every interview transcript, every fieldwork note, any and all data, had to be carefully and accurately translated into English. Adding the time needed for analysis, possible follow-ups and writing the actual thesis, the time and resources available were simply not

enough for the author to complete the needed empirical work and achieve the aforementioned depth in the analysis, or the degree of scientific excellence and rigor expected in a PhD research project.

As a result, the real dilemma quickly became: *two or three cases?* If three cases were used, even though the aforementioned practical constraints would still be steep, it was possible -albeit doubtful- that they could be overcome. In cross-case social research, having three cases is not uncommon, as the third case can be used as a triangulation tool, so that the weaknesses in each single data collection source, are compensated by the counter-balancing strengths of another source (George & Bennett, 2005). Additionally, the selection of a third case could help to create (at the risk of losing some depth) more theory-driven variance and divergence in the data, by selecting a more *atypical* case than the other two. This approach may produce more contrasting results and help built emergent social theory (Eisenhardt, 1991). However, even if the author was convinced that the robustness of the collected data using three cases would offset the loss in depth and the risk of overextending due to the aforementioned practical limitations, other problems would be encountered.

Specifically, the question posed was: *from which country should the third case be?* The possible answers to that were problematic. No clear-cut, valid criterion was found that could guide this choice. There was no answer that could be given in terms of research design, that could adequately explain why our sample included twice the number of participants and cases from one of the two countries. Furthermore, and perhaps more importantly, apart from a possible triangulation technique, what would be the academic merit of adding a case from either country? If said case proved to also be a more *typical* case, then there would be just an instance of *more of the same*, something that in a qualitative case study which by default excludes attempts of statistical generalisation, wouldn't add anything to our interpretations and theoretical inferences. Moreover, without an estimate of population variability in qualitative research, no basis for statistical inference exists. If on the other hand, the added case depicted a higher degree of variation along the examined research dimensions, the comparative aspect would suffer. There would be evidence for the existence of such variance in one country but not in the other; not because it wasn't actually found, but because there hadn't been an effort to uncover it in an equal sample in the first place. Consequently, any attempt in theorising and achieving the analytical and contextual generalisation pursued in this qualitative study, would not be able to incorporate the more nuanced analysis emerging from one of the cases, due to insufficient data.

Therefore, for the above practical and academic reasons two cases were selected as the best possible alternative. However, this does not mean that there are no weaknesses to this choice, mostly inherent in case study research itself, and primarily related to the limits of what can be 'safely theorised' and inferred with some confidence from a comparative study consisting of two cases (the two organisations). Relative literature suggests that although early identification of the research questions and possible constructs is helpful, it is equally important to recognise that both are tentative in this type of research (Kvale, 1989). No construct is guaranteed a place in the resultant theory, no matter how well it is measured and theorising from case studies may result in narrow theory. Case study theory-building, is a bottom-up approach, such that the specifics of data produce the contextual generalisations of theory. The risks are that the theory describes a very idiosyncratic phenomenon or that the theorist is unable to raise the level of generality of the theory and acquire a more macro perspective (Gerring, 2001). Hartley (1994: 208-209), defines a case study as: 'a detailed investigation, often with data collected over a period of time, of one or more organisations, or groups within organisations, with a view to providing an analysis of the context and processes involved in the phenomenon under study'. Gerring (2004: 342), takes a similar approach: 'an intensive study of a single unit or a small number of units for the purpose of understanding a larger class of (similar) units. A unit connotes a spatially bounded phenomenon -e.g., a nation-state, organisation, revolution, political party, election, or person-observed at a single point in time or over some delimited period of time (although the temporal boundaries of a unit are not always explicit, they are at least implicit)'. In a qualitative case study such as this, 'hardwired', stable over time, irrefutable casual relationships were not sought. Rather, the goal was to generate contextual, value-laden and intersubjective social knowledge.

Thus, this research doesn't attempt to proffer a universal, stable across time and space theory of the role of the TS in the socioeconomic (re)integration of vulnerable and disadvantaged social groups. Or to theorise in a similar manner on welfare reforms hinging upon governance practices and transformations of social citizenship rights as these are expressed by the welfare state and promoted by social purpose, nonprofit TSOs in Greece and the UK. Rather, this work is probably better understood less as a confirmatory study, but more as an exploratory study of how a more general phenomenon occurs in the two different settings. The point is, theory confirmation / disconfirmation is not this (or any for that matter) case study's strong suit (Geertz, 1995). The selection of *crucial* or highly *typical* cases cannot

fully overcome the fact that cross-unit N is minimal (two cases). There is no doubt, that the investigation of other TSOs both in Greece and the UK, could probably tell a different story, although the amount of variance can't be surmised. But this problem wouldn't be resolved even if the research involved a 3x3 or 4x4 cross-case study between the two countries. If it was attempted to do so using the same methodological approach, it can be argued that significant analytical depth would be lost. As it will be discussed in **section 6.1**, the designated criteria for the selection of the two specific TSOs can assure with some reliability that they exhibit a high degree of representativeness within their respective sub-sets of TSOs: in Greece, the many hybrid TSOs supporting the vulnerable becoming active as a response to the crisis and the tremendous social spending cuts and welfare state retrenchment. In the UK, traditional, small to medium-sized, locally oriented, nonprofit, voluntary TS charities striving to remain relevant in a welfare mix characterised by lack of funds and state support, cross-sector partnerships, marketisation pressures, conditionality and the association of welfare benefits to 'pro-social' behaviour, individual 'morality' and employability narratives.

Nonetheless, this case study while consisting of just two units, also tried to remain attentive to inferences that span similar units outside the formal scope of the investigation. In that respect, any inferences and attempts of theory-generation concerning TSOs as instruments of governmentality and their role as welfare actors in processes involving the transformation of social citizenship and welfare rights, are tentative. They must be limited to this particular point in time, these particular countries and the author's own input by designating the research focus through the RQs, as well as analysing and interpreting the findings, and there are benefits to that. The juxtaposition of seemingly similar cases by a researcher looking for differences can break simplistic frames. In the same way, the search for similarity in a seemingly different pair also can lead to more sophisticated understanding of social reality (Gerring, 2001). The result of these can be new categories and concepts which the investigators did not anticipate.

With that said, another question must then be asked: *how can the contradictory or paradoxical evidence between the two cases be explained?* Are the differences due to factors present *within* the organisations, or are they a result of the wider differences (social, cultural, historical, political, economic, etc.) *between* the two countries? Can they exist because of both? The answer in such an interpretive, qualitative research project can't be singular and in the end, it doesn't really matter. The processes shaping the investigated issues and their effects to the participants and the two organisations are what is important. In our case, the

politics of austerity and neoliberal welfare reforms changing the TS, depicting similar trajectories in the two countries and eliciting on some levels similar, and on other, very different responses by the two cases.

The broader fundamental differences of the two social contexts were of course taken into account. However, the given similarities in the purpose, activities and declared goals of the organisations, reveal that any theoretical inferences based on evidenced variation, are certainly influenced by the national context, but not wholly determined by it. For example, the fact that as it will be discussed in **chapters 7, 8** and **9**, the Greek TSO employs governance and soft social control practices towards it service-users in its efforts to support their socioeconomic (re)integration, but not overtly and with different goals than its UK counterpart, can't be attributed solely to the different national context. Rather, it seems that this strategy aims to satisfy a similar need to the UK TSO: namely to retain and increase its support and resources to promote its aims without jeopardising its values through for example, a full-blown shift to marketisation or *'by becoming a tool of the government'* (Dimitris, member of the Greek TSO, male, 52 years old). The difference, is that the UK TSO uses such techniques in order to remain 'compatible' with the dominant trends in the UK welfare mix. In contrast, the Greek organisation chooses a course of opposition against government social policy and similar developments in the Greek welfare mix, albeit with dubious results for its effectiveness and reach as a service provider, as well as the integration prospects of its service-users.

6.1. Case study selection

As Seaside and Gerring assert: 'Case selection is the primordial task of the case study researcher, for in choosing cases, one also sets out an agenda for studying those cases' (2008: 294). For selecting the two TSOs in this comparative case study, there was first a general criterion: the organisations should be similar enough to allow for meaningful comparisons, but also diverse enough, to facilitate the elucidation of differences in the TS and its relation with welfare policies in the two countries, Greece and the UK. But, the identification of truly representative cases which also achieve variation on relevant dimensions, is a difficult balance to strike. The main challenge is, that comparative case studies -positivist or interpretivist- usually attempt to be representative of a broader population's features, even if any generalisations are issued tentatively (Gerring, 2004). In a purely qualitative project like

the present study, they are dependent on the particular social context, and the transformative influence of the author's interpretations, making sense of the experiences and interpretations of others (the participants).

The question of case study selection has received relative little attention from scholars since the work of Eckstein (1975), or Lijphart (1971; 1975). More recent work has noted its problems such as that of sample bias (see i.e., Collier & Mahoney, 1996; Rohlfing, 2008; Sekhon, 2004). Ideally, case study research should use multiple cases and methods to analyse the collected data (Woodside, 2010). The rationale behind a multiple case study, is to enable comparisons between the observed practices obtain a more comprehensive understanding. However, in truth, scholars continue to lean primarily on pragmatic considerations such as time, money, expertise, and access, or are influenced by the theoretical prominence of a given case (Gerring, 2004). These are perfectly legitimate factors in case selection. Yet, they do not provide a *methodological justification* for why case A might be preferred over case B. Given the dangers of selection bias in purposive case selection, random case selection has also been advocated, especially by quantitative researchers (see i.e., Sekhon, 2004). However, in this study, since a set of criteria had been already determined as crucial for the comprehensive elucidation of the RQs, purposive selection was decided early on. It was concluded, that the case study should aim to strike a balance between the two TSOs being a *typical*, or *representative* case (exemplifying to some degree, a rather stable cross-case relationship) and also, a *diverse* case (achievement of a high degree of variation along the investigated dimensions). Following this choice, a combination of the more practical considerations, as well as the designated criteria, was used to make an informed decision.

6.2. Criteria for the selection of the specific case study organisations

The selection criteria were the following: the two TSOs should be organisations which can be broadly categorised as belonging to the nonprofit, TS; non statutory collectives but not for-profit businesses; they should have a strong voluntary element and no (or very limited) market activities; feature similar numbers of participants[16]. As in Greece the size of TSOs is on average much smaller than their UK counterparts, a medium-to large sized Greek TSO,

---

[16] In the interest of maintaining full anonymity for all participants in the research, the participant names used in the thesis are purely fictional.

and a small-to medium sized UK TSO were selected. More specifically, the aim was to have a robust sample of more than 40 participants which is approximately the sum of the staff (full and part-time) of the UK TSO, and the members of the Greek TSO. Furthermore, the TSOs shouldn't be new in the field, but well known to the local community. Also, they should have established themselves in what they are, what they do and how they do it, in order to minimise the potential inability to collect data, due to the respondents' inexperience.

Moreover, due to the focus on TS relations with social welfare policies, the organisations needed to have a similar and clear social purpose: the support and socioeconomic (re)integration of service-users belonging to vulnerable and disadvantaged populations (i.e., the extremely poor, mental patients, former offenders, drug-users, the homeless, the long-term unemployed, etc.). Also, the organisations should be to a degree user-driven, so that some participants have been in on 'both sides of the fence' (vulnerable / disadvantaged as well as 'mainstream'). Additionally, due to the researcher's limited finances and time constraints within the PhD programme, the fieldwork should avoid added accommodation expenses (i.e., staying at relatives in Greece and no need for overnight accommodation in the UK). Finally, access was considered. It was reasoned that full access could be gained, as there was a previous connection with gatekeepers in both cases. In the Greek case, a personal acquaintance of the author with one of the organisation's oldest members. In the UK, in the research centre where the author is a PhD student, a number of people professionally knew the CEO and other staff members. Therefore, in both cases, there was at least a modicum of trust and a first bridge of communication for the researcher to use. In this context, an overview of the two organisation's core goals, activities and strategies, framing a comprehensive outline of the case study is provided. For the reader's convenience, basic information about the two TSOs is summed up in the following three tables (Tables 4, 5 and 6):

Table 4. Organisational History

Overview	Timeline of Organisational Transitions and Milestones
Greek TSO	1. Therapeutic mental health hospital workshop – **1996**
	2. External support centre (association) for mental patients under the jurisdiction of the hospi – **1999**
	3. Disbanding of the centre due to lack of funding – **2001**
	4. Re-opening as a limited liability social enterprise and support centre for vulnerable soc groups – **2002**
	5. Transition into a nonprofit social association based primarily on volunteerism a discontinuation of all business activities – **2006**
	6. With the advent of the crisis, increased focus on political activism – **2008**
	7. Final transition into its current form, that of a nonprofit, voluntary social cooperative w significant anti-austerity / anti-neoliberal activities and a leftist political orientation – **2011**
UK TSO	1. Breakfast ('tea and toast') and shelter for the poor and the homeless outside the Cathedra **1990**
	2. Creation of two charity projects: the breakfast club and the homeless adults' club – **1991**
	3. Merging of the two Cathedral projects into a new, separate nonprofit registered charit **1996**
	4. The organisation changes its name to signify the unity between the two former cha projects – **2006**
	5. The organisation moves into its purpose built accommodation as a 'drop in' support 'crisis' centre for the vulnerable (focusing on the homeless), where it remains to this day – **20**
	6. Initial plans are drafted for a transition of the organisation into a social cooperative an 'horizontal' governance structure within the next 5 years – **2015**

Table 5. Organisational structure and resources

erview	Funding - Resources	Governance Structure
eek TSO	Donations in currency or the provision of items by individuals, as well as select small businesses, other organisations, the church and local city councils The organisation doesn't keep an extensive and detailed record, but last year, it was calculated that the cost for the operation of the social kitchen, the social store and the social pharmacy was around €200.000	The organisation operates solely through direct participatory democratic structures, where the rule 'one member – one vote' for the achievement of a simple majority applies in all decision-making 1. **General Assembly** 2. **Coordinating Council** 3. **The various 'Task Teams' of members and volunteers**
TSO	Donations in currency or the provision of items by individuals as well as businesses, other organisations or nonprofit institutions, etc. Grants by public bodies such as the Big Lottery Fund and from local government agencies Sponsors which display their brands on the organisation's website and promotional leaflets (mostly private businesses EU funding programmes for nonprofits and social entrepreneurs Last year, almost £550.000 were needed to fund the operation of the organisation	The organisation features the hierarchical, 'pyramid' governance structure typically found in UK registered charities and nonprofit TSOs. 1. **Trustees** 2. **Governors** 3. **CEO and the drop-in centre's Manager** (the latter was in the hospital for the whole duration of the research and the CEO had assumed his duties) 4. **Management and Support Staff** (basically the whole staff and regular volunteers of the organisation) 5. **Client Group** (informal liaison committee with the organisation consisting of service-users)

Table 6. Organisational Activities

Activities / Services	Direct Support Activities	Secondary Support Activities
Greek TSO	Social Kitchen (meals), Social Store (provisions, food, clothing, home necessities, etc.), Social Pharmacy (primary medical and healthcare services: GP and medicine) Therapeutic Workshop (mostly used by people with mental health problems such as depression or phobias) Temporary Shelter Community Centre / Café (simple drinks and sandwiches free of charge or at a symbolic price) Mobile 'outside crews' supporting with basic provisions drug users, the homeless and immigrants / refugees	Psychological and Social Counselling (i.e., for substance abuse) Internet and PC usage, Phone usage, IT skills workshops and art workshops (when volunteers are available) Legal support for debts Active presence at courts where homes are auctioned by banks (forcibly stopping auctions) Liaison with the state / public social welfare services (application filling, phone calls, provision of contact details and information, referencing people to the appropriate services, etc.) Creativity workshops (mostly painting and wooden sculpting Informational stands raising awareness concerning giving blood or organ donation
UK TSO	Breakfast and lunch Laundry and shower facilities Clothing, food, cooking, toiletry and washing packs for 'rough sleepers' and other vulnerable social groups Primary healthcare services (GP, dentist, gynaecologist) The organisation's address can be used as a provisional address for homeless people (they receive their mail from the organisation) A safe, warm space with hot drinks for symbolic prices (i.e., 10p)	Psychological and Social Counselling (i.e., for substance abuse) Internet and PC usage, Phone usage, sockets for charging mobile phones and laptops Liaison and referencing to other TSOs in the area and social purpose nonprofits (i.e., homeless shelters) Provision of information and contact details regarding public social services (i.e. welfare benefits) and other TSOs, as well as general advice Various personal development and social integration activities: anger management class (reduce aggression and anti-social behaviour) art classes, IT and blogging class, photography indoor and outdoor sports activities, sessions on

		job-seeking, health, hygiene and well-being; literacy and numeracy classes; ornaments-making workshops (i.e., using empty cans)

6.3. The Greek third sector organisation

The Greek TSO, concerns an organisation in a southern Greek city. It started as a mutual assistance association for mental health patients, after *Law 2716/1999 'Development and modernisation of mental healthcare services and other provisions'* was passed[17]. This legislation concerned the government's effort to promote the deinstitutionalisation of mental health patients, by gradually transferring responsibility for their care and socioeconomic (re)integration into new forms and structures, outside of the few, old and cramped beyond capacity mental health public hospitals. Article 12, involved various types of collectives, which would form 'protected', state-financed therapeutic workshops and production units, designed to enhance the social skills, job skills and self-confidence of patients; mutual assistance associations, and partly state-financed limited liability cooperative social enterprises, combining social with economic goals. Since then, the organisation has transitioned to a different structure, reinventing itself twice, into a social cooperative at the time of the research.

The precursor of the Greek TSO, was a therapeutic workshop, operating inside the psychiatric hospital of 'Agia Sofia' in an experimental manner since 1996. It was first created as an association in the form of a support centre for mental patients in 1999. Legally, it was recognised as a mutual assistance society under the direct overseeing of the hospital. Its operation was fully funded by it and its staff was comprised by rotating hospital staff and volunteers. During the day, the patients would be at the unit (in local council-owned premises), where they interact with each other and the therapists more freely, outside of the 'sterilized' hospital environment. While being occupied in simple handiwork (i.e., gift boxes,

---

[17] The law can be accessed (in Greek) at: http://www.psychargos.gov.gr/Documents2/per centCEper cent9D.per cent202716_1999_per centCEper centA6per centCEper cent95per centCEper cent9Aper cent20per centCEper cent91per cent2096.pdf

ornaments, wooden sculptures, small furniture, etc.), they could develop their social skills and alleviate stress. In the evening, they would return to the hospital.

In 2001, due to the lack of funding and bureaucratic obstacles, this external social support unit and most of the other similar initiatives were effectively disbanded. However, one of the doctors and some of the volunteers involved, wanted to continue the effort. They secured the same council-owned space and re-established the workshop, initially as a limited liability cooperative enterprise in 2002, aimed at becoming a local social support centre not only for mental health patients, but for any excluded and vulnerable populations, through the provision of vocational training, employment skills, the augmentation of their individuality, enhancement of their self-esteem, social skills and sense of independence. Volunteers would offer psychological support, information concerning state social services, etc. Also, there was the aforementioned gift shop. At the time, funding for the organisation's activities was provided partly by sales of the gift-shop[18], partly by donations, and partly by EU-government co-funded programmes for nonprofits and social entrepreneurship, such as *Now!* and *Leader*.

In 2006, with the organisation having been established in the local community, the founding members, in order to retain their autonomy and disgusted by the amount of micropolitical power-play and the clientelist tactics demanded to receive funding and support by the welfare state, decided to break away. Then, the legal structure changed into that of a nonprofit, social purpose association, discontinued all business practices (although the workshop remained for therapeutic reasons), and started gradually anchoring all activities solely on voluntarism[19]. Since 2008, due to the crisis and the heavy involvement of volunteers from marginalised and disadvantaged social groups, the organisation became increasingly political. It started networking with trade unions and this new wave of informal solidarity TSOs combining its social activities with a substantial amount of political activism. Its attachment to these collectives, allowed for interaction with various groups of volunteers and service-users resulting in its substantial growth.

---

[18] It should be noted that there were no fixed prices for the objects sold, so the gift shop sales essentially retained more of a 'donation nature' and less that of actual market sales.

[19] The brother of one of the founding members, an independent businessman who had been also involved in cooperative efforts in the past, provided substantial capital to the organisation during these first years (without any requirements).

With the *Law 4019/2011*, the organisation again changed its structure into that of a nonprofit social cooperative, the main motivation being some substantial tax exemptions stipulated by this law. However, these were revoked in 2012, due to the fiscal adjustments demanded by the Troika. Today, it is thus typically (by law) recognised as a nonprofit social cooperative, but only on paper. In truth, its goals, activities, internal governance and practices are more similar to those of the informal, voluntary solidarity groups of the wider TS and anti-austerity movement in Greece discussed in **chapter 2**. To 'outsiders', the members refer to their organisation as a 'social collective' or more commonly as a 'social cooperative'. To other similar TSOs and in general people who are knowledgeable of the field of sociopolitical activism in Greece, they refer to themselves as a *'People's Social Solidarity Collective'* (AΔKA). The author was told that the change was also due to the very positive connotation the word 'cooperative' has for the average Greek, while in contrast terms such as 'voluntary nonprofit' or 'NGO', are presently very negatively charged in public opinion[20].

At the time of the research, the organisation had 19 members and six regular volunteers, but these numbers constantly change. The supreme instrument of governance is the members' 'General Assembly', where all the decisions are taken jointly for all matters concerning the organisation, big and small. Keeping with the principles and values of direct democracy, joint decision-making and equality, the 'one member - one vote' rule is observed and the assembly is open to all members. Volunteers can participate and pose subjects for discussion but can't vote, unless they are 'regular volunteers'. As a regular volunteer, one devotes more than 12 hours per week to the organisation for more than three months. Regarding the assemblies, Giorgos, a founding member stressed that:

> *We decided that we will not have presidents and leaders; everyone is equal.*
> *The general assembly decides for all matters that come up. We really want*
> *to have the assembly and the organisation open for all; that would be ideal.*
> *But this could cause huge practical difficulties, as there are many people*
> *who volunteer for a week and then disappear, or have very specific tasks*
> *and thus have no spherical knowledge of organisational issues, neither the*
> *ability to really commit to all our activities which are demanding;*

---

[20] See section **2.5** for the reasons.

constantly clashing with the government and its mechanisms, is not easy (laughter)!

The executive branch of the general assembly is the 'Coordinating Council', which consists of seven elected members for a three-month term, each of whom however, can be recalled with a majority vote from the general assembly. The goal of the council is to ensure the decisions of the general assembly are kept to the letter and that both the long term social goals together with the founding values and political goals are served, as well as that the day-to-day activities are run properly. The coordinating council meets as needed (practically it is always in session). Vassilis, another founding member said:

> *Its aim is to organise all that you see around you. Its decisions are applied as a subset of the broader decisions taken in the general assembly, which are the 'binding contract' for everything here. It makes sure they are on track and its job is to further specify and specialize them to be applied in the field.*

Finally, the frontline staff of the organisation, are the 'Task Teams' appointed by the assembly and the council. These are essentially work-groups appointed specific responsibilities. There is the communication and information team, the social store team, the social pharmacy team, etc. Membership is determined as required depending on anyone's skills and time, but most often, members and volunteers are rotated wherever there is need.

The organisation offers a variety of social support services to vulnerable and disadvantaged social groups, without exceptions; everyone is welcome, regardless of race, religion, country of origin, or any socioeconomic criterion. Members and volunteers adhere to certain values and principles; namely, social solidarity, cohesion, equality, democratic organisation from the ground-up and sociopolitical activism. There is a *de facto* rejection of corporatism with no cooperation, promotion or acceptance of donations from for-profit businesses, except for small enterprises specifically chosen (small independent businesses). No advertisement of any kind for fear of exploitation and stigmatisation of service-users and their problems is allowed, meaning no interaction with the established media which are seen as symbols of modern capitalist relations. Furthermore, since 2010, no funding from EU programmes is sought. Overall, the organisation projects a strong alternative culture and an

identity of resistance to neoliberal capitalism. It views with disdain the 'mercy of the wealthy' founded in traditional philanthropy institutions and charities controlled by elites, as well as the modern practices of more traditional, mainstream TSOs.

One of the most long-standing services offered, is the 'Social Store', in operation since 2009. It is essentially a small supermarket, providing for free the most necessary items and goods (i.e., bread, milk, eggs, detergents, toilet paper, olive oil, vegetables, fruits, etc.) for a household first and foremost, as well as other items supplied by private donations, the local council of the area, other TSOs, the aforementioned businessman's cooperative supermarket and small independent businesses. Also, the social store operates a storage room where donated clothing is provided, mostly for the homeless, who were virtually non-existent in the past, but appeared in large Greek cities with the crisis. Then there is the 'Social Pharmacy'. This is a voluntary pharmacy offering medicine and primary medical care (i.e., simple medical tests, and check-ups, etc.) to people who no longer have access to public healthcare (i.e., because they are unemployed, or otherwise have lost their social / health insurance). The doctors and pharmacists in the social pharmacy are also volunteers, while the medical supplies are acquired through donations, from other TSOs, private pharmacies, or directly by public hospitals.

Additionally, the organisation's volunteer psychologist and three social workers, provide psychological support. Five computers with internet connection can be used by service-users and three times per week a volunteer teaches basic IT skills. Furthermore, the communication task team, provides information and acts as 'a middleman' between service-users and public social services. Greek public administration is notorious for its cumbersome procedures and this is *always one of the most valued services offered*' (Dimitris). Contact details about welfare benefits, government or local council social programmes, shelters, hospitals, or other TSOs are provided, together with a telephone line (free of charge) and practical help for filling out forms and applications (i.e., applications for a reduced, 'social bill' to the state-owned energy company). Moreover, legal aid free of charge for people in litigation with banks to save their homes is offered. In collaboration with the local council and the church, the organisation also operates a soup-kitchen three times a week (sometimes more), which serves food for up to 60 people.

Also, at the time of the research, the members were trying to set up a small homeless shelter in an abandoned small factory in the area. However, due to bureaucratic obstacles and disputes regarding the premises ownership, this hasn't been possible. Nevertheless, members

103

have occupied the space, made repairs and operate a temporary, rudimentary homeless shelter. In addition, the gift shop still remains, but only for therapeutic reasons for mental health service-users suffering from social anxieties and phobias. In the same space, art or writing classes and events occasionally take place. At the time of the fieldwork there was a volunteer music teacher and music classes were given to service-users twice every week. In the past, there was also a literacy volunteer teacher, so it all depends on availability.

It should be noted, that the organisation operates a small café where coffee and simple snacks are offered at symbolic prices (i.e., a cup of coffee and toast costs only 10 cents). Coffee is for free for members, regular volunteers and service-users at the premises, but at the café there is this symbolic price for everyone else. Actually, this café (adjacent to the main premises) as well as the living room / lounge, serve as what could be approximated in the UK as a community centre; members, volunteers and service-users often rest and socialise there. Finally, there are also 'external' social support activities. For example, two times the researcher accompanied a crew of members at well-known drug-use sites in the city, to provide users with clean syringes, water, food, disinfecting and cleaning materials. On another occasion, on a very cold night, another crew wandered the areas where homeless congregate, directing them to the shelter and opening the organisation's offices for others.

As mentioned, the organisation has a dual social and political character. Many of its activities, involve the institution together with other TSOs, and various informal civil society activist groups, of a resistance movement to austerity and the neoliberal measures imposed since 2010. The latter have caused unprecedented strain to the social welfare state, public health, social security, income and employment. The organisation is a part of this (mostly) leftist, radical movement, seeking to overturn these policies and focusing on the reinforcement of a social welfare state, guaranteeing the social rights of all citizens. This sentiment is evident in its goals, stated in its article of association (see **Appendix III**), declaring that health, education, food, social security, energy, housing, protection against unemployment, etc., are all social goods tied to social rights. They can't be treated in market terms, bought, sold or quantified in any manner. Free and immediate access for all should be secured by the state.

The motto '*nobody alone in this crisis*' is indicative of the value of social solidarity, can be found in organisational texts, and was repeatedly echoed by the participants. Moreover, it reveals the members' and volunteers' will to answer the political challenge of resisting the imposed economic and welfare reforms. To promote instead, a social vision of

equality, participation, community engagement, direct democracy and co-decision, through various forms of grounded, grassroots collective action. It is astonishing perhaps, that in the aforementioned declaration, is clearly stated that the members don't want to legitimise such initiatives (the sentiment *'we are not a charity and we don't want to create beggars'* was present in most interviews) in the state's as well the public's perception. They don't consider their efforts as becoming a permanent institution in society, but a response to the state abandoning its responsibilities, especially towards the most vulnerable social groups.

These aims are realised in various ways: cultural activities (i.e., concerts); an open-for all, local neighbourhood assembly for social matters in the area; active participation and support of protest activities regarding unemployment, social policy, welfare, marginalisation, stigmatisation, fascism and social solidarity (i.e., participation in demonstrations, in symbolic occupation of public hospitals, or in occupation of factories by workers on strike); information stands around the city raising awareness concerning austerity politics; attendance of symposiums and citizens' initiatives (i.e., about neoliberalism or the erasure of all public and private debts, etc.). All participants, members and volunteers without exception, were fully aware of this dual purpose of the organisation, declaring that the two dimensions are equally important as *'they promote a cohesive, democratic paradigm for the sociopolitical and economic organisation of society from the ground-up'* (Vassilis).

6.4. The UK third sector organisation

The UK TSO, is located in a northern English city. Its history is much more straightforward than the Greek one, reflecting the fact that the TS in the UK, has a much longer history as an established social services provider within the national welfare mix. The organisation is a nonprofit registered charity, tracing its beginnings back to 1990. The cathedral in the city had seen the number of homeless and poor people using its simple shelter and offered them a simple breakfast ('tea and toast'). This concern, led to the establishment of two projects; the breakfast club and a club for homeless adults. The two merged as one charity in 1996. In 2006, the name was changed to signify the unity between the two efforts and in 2007, the organisation moved into its purpose built accommodation. Its focus is the homeless, and those designated as vulnerable to become homeless and be inducted in processes of marginalisation and exclusion. As a result, the organisation targets various deprived, vulnerable and disadvantaged social groups as its diverse range of services reflects. It is not a

faith-based charity, nevertheless its Christian origins and the influence of Christian values and ethics is evident in its identity, priorities and practices.

In the UK, charity law covers the rules relating to the operation of charities and is essentially the legal and regulatory framework of the voluntary third sector. The main piece of legislation is the Charities Act 2011, which came into effect in 2012. It sets out how all charities in England and Wales are registered and regulated, and replaces most of the Charities Acts 1992, 1993 and 2006, and all of the Recreational Charities Act 1958. (Garton, 2013). Current legislation, sets out the government's Charity Commission guidelines, for TSOs activities. These include i.e., the delineation of public benefit as one of the cornerstones of charity and trustees' understanding of their duties; the observance of the voluntary principle, the ways independence, accountability and transparency are operationalised; campaigning and lobbying can be legitimate activities of advocacy for those 'without a voice' and secure better services, even though by law, charities are explicitly forbidden to be created for political purposes (O'Halloran, McGregor-Lowndes, & Simon, 2008).

The fact that the UK TSO is not political in any way, was explicitly corroborated by all the respondents on numerous occasions. The organisation abstains from any kind of campaigning or lobbying regarding welfare policies. In contrast with the Greek case, there are no activities, events or a single leaflet criticising, or otherwise addressing policies influencing service-users such as i.e., benefit sanctions. The same applies for developments in the TS. The vast majority of the UK respondents displayed a remarkable lack of knowledge, or indeed interest in social policy, changes in social welfare or within the sector. They reflected the organisation's commitment to remain a 'traditional' TSO, providing relief and support to vulnerable populations without being concerned with the more structural processes which may put the latter in disadvantage. In short, as Peter (male, 61 years old), an experienced staff member who has been with the UK TSO in various roles for almost eight years now, put it: '*we just play the hand we are dealt with, whatever that is*'.

Overall, the UK TSO is much more meticulous in organising its internal operations. It is a more 'formalised space' with a clearer demarcation between service-users and staff. There is a codification of etiquette and rules in place. Detailed, formal regulations, concerning health and safety, rules of conduct within the centre, monitoring, evaluation and disciplinary procedures regarding service-users, action plans for staff, etc., while extensive records are kept on registered service-users. Additionally, in contrast with the Greek organisation's flat governance structure, it employs a more traditional pyramid structure and

106

hierarchy, with more clearly defined roles and duties. However, the fieldwork indicated that in daily practice, activities take place and duties are assigned based mostly on need, availability and circumstances, and less on designated roles within the organisational hierarchy. From top to bottom, there are the nine Trustees, which hold seven full board meetings per year, plus sub-committees. Trustees, have overall control of the TSO and are responsible for making sure it is fulfilling its purpose. The three Governors host the open annual meeting. The trustees and governors are free to visit the project at any time and are invited to particular meetings and events, although they have very minimal direct interaction (if any) with the service-users and staff (apart from the CEO). During the fieldwork, there was never an occasion, where the trustees had a hands-on approach with the organisation, or were even mentioned for that matter.

The staff in the Management and Support team undertakes duties at the front of house, attend meetings with clients, frontline staff, as well as governance meetings. Frontline staff and volunteers carry out the bulk of the day-to-day operations; they contribute and develop the social services and support activities through their work. The Client Group, which is an informal committee comprised by 'regular service-users' (people who engage with the organisation in some manner almost daily). In cooperation with the frontline staff and management (basically the CEO), the client group provides informal consultation and reviews, which enable feedback 'from the ground' to inform service development. It should be noted though, that the client group, the CEO and staff members from both the management and frontline teams, met only once during the four-month fieldwork. When the CEO was asked, his reply was that there is not an established schedule which concerns how often these meetings take place and that they are of a more 'informal nature'. Therefore, it can be surmised that it is doubtful how much of a practical impact, users' views have on the daily activities of the organisation or on any long-term plans and changes. With regards to the governance of the organisation, Robert, argued that:

> *It's vital that we all know our roles; try to perform them and communicate*
> *constantly, especially when there are problems. I think it's better for*
> *everyone if we have duties and our particular skills define what we do in*
> *the centre. At the same time, it's important to be flexible and responsive; as*
> *we often have to deal with sensitive matters. Everything won't go by the*

book always, but keeping in mind regulations, cooperating and using common sense, usually ensures that the results are good.

Indeed, despite the defined roles and the associated titles (i.e., chief executive, centre manager, volunteer coordinator, duty worker, etc.), staff members, beginning with the CEO, do try to share responsibilities and tasks to minimise the effects of a vertical hierarchy. For example, every morning, staff members have a brief meeting discussing the upcoming workday. Volunteer meetings are held once every month and service-users are free to approach any staff member regarding any issue. If a service-user has a problem, internal regulations state that the problem must be raised in writing, and sent to the centre's manager. Nevertheless, it was observed that apart from serious incidents (i.e., violence or drug-dealing), nobody issued a 'formal complaint'. Instead the matter was at least attempted to be addressed first by any staff member(s) present at the time. Still, the lower and middle level staff as well as service-users, don't seem to have a strong voice concerning the long-term policies of the organisation as these are set out and reviewed by a sub-committee comprised of executives and trustees who then submit it to the board of trustees for ratification. Finally, the CEO has put forward a plan for a transition of the organisation in the next three years to a more open, participatory structure; that, of a cooperative. The central goal is to exponentially increase staff, volunteer and user involvement, in decision-making. To the knowledge of the researcher, there hasn't been any deliberation with staff members or service-users for the designation of the precise details of this plan, but when asked, participants were aware of it. Indications are, that it is still in an infant stage, but no further information was given to the researcher.

As stated in its documents, the UK TSO is committed to providing both 'crisis' and long-term support to vulnerable individuals experiencing, or in danger of experiencing, social exclusion. Its service-users include vulnerable people experiencing mental and physical health problems, drugs and alcohol use, extreme poverty, entanglements with the criminal justice system (i.e., young offenders), social problems often intertwined with homelessness (Arnold, 2012). The organisation doesn't have any business activities apart from charging a low price for some of its services (i.e., laundry, breakfast and lunch). All its resources, financial and otherwise, are donated by individuals, businesses, public bodies such as the Big

Lottery Fund and (when available) from local government agencies[21]. As a result, its fundraising activities are crucial for its continued existence[22]. On the organisation's webpage, there is a section where the logos and brand names of the various businesses and institutions supporting it are situated. In contrast with the Greek TSO, there is no criterion regarding from where or how funds are raised. Any for-profit business is welcome to contribute and actually, the coordinator of funding campaigns, expressed her regret that the organisation has not attracted the interest of large businesses or a banks. Fundraising events are plenty, such as 'Action Days' (i.e., presentations, coffee-mornings, bake sales, etc.), or the 'Sleep Out' event, where people across the city together with staff members and volunteers, are invited to spend a night out in the street using a sleeping bag.

Currently, the organisation has 15 members of staff (full-time and part-time) and assists 60 to 80 people per day. Depending on the week, there are six to eight rotating part-time and full-time volunteers. During the fieldwork, there were more than 30 different volunteers. They are supporting the staff, helping in the kitchen, the laundry room, the cleaning of the premises, running the lounge, storage room or reception desk and help facilitating other activities such as the art classes, the film and jewellery making sessions, etc. About half are current or previous service-users of the organisation who have moved on to this new role. The amount of retention among service-users who aren't participating in its extra activities and workshops, was indicated as a huge challenge. Thus, during the last five years the 'Partner Programme' was instigated, designed to help service-users keep engaging with the organisation. The volunteers involved have actually been instrumental in its development and implementation. With participants' individual progress evaluated by staff members, it aims to help service-users achieve as many personal goals as possible, acquire self-confidence, job-skills, improved health, a sense of structure and responsibility, reduce

---

[21] The organisation participates in the Big Lottery Monitoring Framework, a 2014-2017 project. It receives funding and is evaluated on the basis of delivering specific results such as service-users developing more stable lifestyles, a sense of personal achievement and responsibility, improved self-confidence and mental and physical health, demonstrable increase of their employability, reduced anti-social behaviour, reducing homelessness in the area, etc. That is one of the reasons several service-users are specifically monitored and assessed on a regular basis. The Big Lottery Fund is a non-departmental public body, responsible for distributing funds raised by the National Lottery for 'good causes'. Over 80 per cent of its funds go to voluntary and community organisations, but it also makes grants to statutory bodies, local authorities and social enterprises.

[22] It costs more than £550.000 pa to fund the services offered.

anti-social behaviour, but also, enable the organisation to keep providing high quality services to those in need.

The first level (author's term) of offered social services provides immediate support to disadvantaged individuals. On a daily basis, from 8am to 1.30pm, breakfast[23], lunch, shower and laundry facilities (30p per wash) are provided. Service-users who volunteer are given up to £4.50 for bus-fares; specialized 'rough sleepers' packs' and toiletry packs are given to homeless people depending on availability; food parcels are provided for those who don't want, or can't afford the price for the meals (25p for breakfast and £1 for lunch) as well as clothing and washing detergents[24]. Similar to the Greek organisation, the main lounge operates as a 'safe space' where service-users can relax and socialise. In the same area, there are four computers with an internet connection for the service-users. Also, there is a phone line on the front desk (reception area) for people to use free of charge, as well as sockets for charging up their mobile phones. In addition, the organisation's address can be used as a mailing address for the homeless to collect their mail. Furthermore, while not being an 'official practice', duty workers may act as liaisons with public welfare and other TSOs, providing contact information and referring service-users to the appropriate places. For example, the organisation works closely with another TSO situated nearby, which deals exclusively with helping people into accommodation or refers people to foodbanks in the city. Moreover, due to the partnership with local health and social care agencies, service-users can access primary nursing, physiotherapy, chiropody and dentistry clinics, and receive general information or advice on health matters, hygiene and well-being. What is more, once per week, there is an in-house NHS GP and a dentist, offering their services free of charge, as part of a collaborative programme of the NHS with TSOs, as well as a volunteer certified counsellor (therapist) providing psychological support and evaluations.

Organisational activities more intended to facilitate the socioeconomic (re)integration of service-users, form the second level (author's term) of offered services. These are group

---

[23] Only homeless people who are not in interim accommodation have access to the breakfast.

[24] There are certain rules and procedures with regards to these provisions. For example, service-users who can prove they receive no benefits (via letter or a telephone call to the appropriate agency) can have one food parcel per week and use the laundry twice a week for free. For service-users under probation, the food parcel is for free, but use of the laundry twice a week costs 60p; service-users who are volunteers can have a food parcel and use the laundry every day they are on duty; for rough sleepers there are other arrangements, for people on benefits yet others, and so forth.

activities, focusing on helping service-users' efforts to '*return to normality*' (Robert) and are called 'life-changing opportunities'. There are classes, sessions, meetings and workshops, aiming to keep service-users engaged within the safe environment of the organisation, to improve their self-esteem, confidence, team-work aptitude, social skills, language and job-skills; assist them in acquiring a greater awareness of community and diversity in society, a sense of individual responsibility and understanding of the importance of setting and achieving goals; develop stability and structure in their daily lives, reduce unseemly conduct. or promote 'proper behaviour'. In general, they are intended to encourage a more 'healthy' and less chaotic lifestyle, in order for service-users to (re)integrate into 'the mainstream' and have a 'meaningful future'.

There is one scheduled activity every day, but whether it takes place or not, depends on interest. These change over time, but during the research included: the anger management class (reduce aggression and anti-social behaviour); the art class (experimenting with paint, plastic, graphic design, collage work, clay modelling, etc.); the IT and blogging class (image editing, video editing, use of social media, making a CV online, use of office-management software, etc.); photography (involving outings in the city with staff members, volunteers and service-users taking photographs); sports (pool, table tennis, football, boxing which can help teach users the value of discipline, hard work and group effort); sessions on job-seeking (online and offline); on health, hygiene and well-being; literacy and numeracy classes (asylum seekers often participate in these), and ornaments-making workshops (i.e., using empty cans).

According to staff members and their description in promotional material, these activities are considered to be instrumental for helping service-users escape the cycle of poverty, marginalisation, homelessness, abuse, anti-social behaviour and exclusion. Involvement in these activities, is hoped to facilitate a healthy, safe environment and simulate social interactions and circumstances in 'normal society' and thus, prepare users for the labour market. In this context and to investigate these two organisations forming this case study, the following research questions were posed:

RQ1. How do the two organisations apply governance 'technologies of self' for the social control of disadvantaged and marginalised service-users?

111

RQ2. How do the two organisations perceive social citizenship for the disadvantaged in the process of supporting their service-users' efforts for socioeconomic (re)integration?

The following chapter, will examine **RQ1**, focusing on discourses and practices of governmentality and social control in social welfare and the TS, through the analysis of the data the investigation of the two case study TSOs' activities has yielded.

Chapter 7. Governance of behaviour and social control of service-users in welfare: the third sector and the state

Governance has been described as 'ensembles of practices and procedures that make some forms of activity thinkable and practicable both to its practitioners and those upon who it is practised' and an 'attempt to regulate and steer social subjects' (Gordon, 1991: 3). Social subjects could be individuals, groups of people, organisations, institutions, etc. (Carmel & Harlock, 2008). On the other hand, as we saw, Foucault's 'government technologies of self' involve the means and ensuing processes through which social subjects are regulated. It is this rarely examined side of the relation of TSOs with their service-users and the issue of social control within the context of state policy discourses shaping social welfare and the TS, which was investigated. One of the declared goals of the Greek TSO, clearly written in its internal article of association, is to combat marginalisation processes and the stigma often attached to disadvantaged groups, helping service-users in their efforts for social integration. Similarly, in the UK TSO, while not directly stated in any organisational documents, the effects of (especially long-term) marginalisation and stigmatisation of vulnerable people such as the homeless, is nevertheless an issue that the staff members are aware off, and try to curb with their services and activities. Within the context of their efforts to increase social inclusion and facilitate the socioeconomic (re)integration of vulnerable social groups, they hope that the offered services and varied support can minimise the effects of marginalisation and deprivation on the well-being of service-users. However, a significant difference was identified in the two TSOs' approach regarding their understanding of both marginalisation and (re)integration processes. Especially, in the ways the organisations attempt to help

vulnerable social groups overcome their position of multiple social disadvantage and the behavioural governance and control strategies they employ to this end.

7.1. Marginalisation and stigma: the plight of the service-users and the different strategies of the two TSOs

In short, the study indicated that in the Greek organisation, there are no interventions or activities specifically developed to reduce stigma, and actually the respondents don't believe that there are any which could be implemented. At least, not any which do not, eventually, contribute to the perpetuation and reconstruction of inequality and stigmatisation processes. Dimitris (male, 52 years old) one of the older and founding members of the organisation said[25]:

> Yes, I believe that we do help with the stigma, but only to an extent. It can never fully leave a person who has been socially excluded, because to a great degree, it doesn't depend on the individual. It is internal but it is also external, a 'black sign' attached by 'mainstream society', and many will always only see this negative stereotype, 'the lazy', 'the failure', 'the criminal', the 'bad person' before anything else, regardless if the conditions have changed. So, volunteering here and participating in our social interventions, help some people regain their confidence, self-respect and trust to themselves and also understand the specific policies which cause these problems.

And Giorgos, another founding member (male, 53 years old) adds:

> The problem is the rest of society, and neoliberal capitalism which enforces that stigma on them. This is not under our control. We sometimes achieve 'small victories' here and there, but we are basically opposing the foundations of power not only in Greece but the whole EU. The main

---

[25] All the participant quotes presented in the thesis, are excerpts taken from both the interviews, as well as 'informal chats' and discussions during the observations.

responsibility for a significant weakening of the social stigma accompanying marginalised people, belongs to the state. We don't want to replace it, but we do try to steer or oppose it when we can. It is in that process, in practicing solidarity, in raising awareness, organising in direct democracy, etc., that I believe we can make progress. But, truth be told, social stigma can never be erased without a change in dominant social values and embedded politics; in the way of thinking of the massive people. And that takes time.

Lydia (female, 44 years old), a service-user with mild mental health problems, as well a physical disability who had been working as a volunteer in the social store at the time of the research, comments:

I feel a lot better since I came here Giannis. The doctors and everyone here have helped me a lot. My confidence when talking to people, getting out of the house, looking for work, is a lot higher. Here, I also learned a lot about politics and how society works, things that I didn't know so much about. I know how some people look at me and others like me, who don't talk properly, are not rich and whatever. That's what you mean by 'stigma' right? But now I don't take these things to heart you know? It's something difficult to change, but here, we are trying to; I think we are doing well.

These sentiments were expressed almost unanimously by all Greek respondents, members of the organisation and volunteers, most of whom are, or have been, service-users. It becomes evident, that in the context of its sociopolitical goals, there is the conviction in the organisation that primarily its values can help service-users with the problems of marginalisation and stigmatisation. These are: solidarity, equality, direct democracy and social cohesion. The intention is for these to be practiced daily through participation in the organisation's support activities: assemblies and discussions; the mobilisation of the people from the 'ground-up'; raising political awareness and engaging in sociopolitical activism together with other collectives (i.e., civil society and community groups, trade unions, etc.), to secure lost social rights. These are the 'vessels' through which members of disadvantaged social groups may regain their social identity as equal citizens. Nevertheless, as mentioned,

Greek respondents also recognise that the stigma attributed to disadvantaged social groups, is rooted on long-standing prejudices, stereotypes, misconceptions and mainstream ignorance. They are also aware of the structural mechanisms of inequality and marginalisation embedded in the capitalist system, as well as power relations within the broader social hierarchy which affect stigmatisation processes. As such, it is their belief that it is very difficult for TSOs and collectives of the civil society to incur immediate and broad, long-term social changes in that regard; especially, in a country in crisis such as Greece, with a veritable mountain of increasing social problems rooted in poverty, unemployment, inequality and marginalisation.

In contrast, in the UK TSO, while there are references to the effects of marginalisation (especially long-term homelessness or substance abuse), there are no direct references to stigma in the description of the organisation's activities and services. Nonetheless, staff members believe that the 'life-changing activities' offered, can build service-users' self-esteem, self-respect and confidence, contribute to a change into a healthier lifestyle, enhance a sense of individual responsibility and minimise antisocial behaviour, thus enabling disadvantaged people to overcome stigma. The aim of such activities as stated in the organisation's internal documents, is to enable service-users to develop their self-esteem, boost their confidence, sense of achievement and a more stable and healthy lifestyle, through the various life-changing activities discussed in **chapter 5**. The main goal is to introduce more structure and a more responsible, positive and proactive, rather than passive attitude in their daily lives. Robert (male, 55 years old), the current CEO and one of the oldest staff members commented:

> *The idea is to provide a life-change opportunity for those clients who want*
> *to. An opportunity for employment, for meaning, fulfilment, normality and a*
> *future so that gradually they can start to enjoy the structures that we do in*
> *our daily lives. Working with our staff and volunteers can have an impact*
> *on other aspects of their lives, not just what happens within the*
> *organisation. We want to maintain contact and get clients to volunteer, give*
> *them a first, second and third chance if needed, because there is often a lot*
> *of regression. With the workshops, the activities and the volunteer partners*
> *programme, we try to help them change their life expectations but also*
> *aspirations; their whole outlook of life. I believe in this manner they can*

focus on bettering themselves and their attitude. For example, by taking responsibility of past mistakes and trying to rise above them. So the stigma might always be there for some, but if you talk to the people here who through great effort have managed to get their lives back on track, you will see that they don't care anymore about the occasional strange look. That has a lot to do with getting people out of harmful social environments. Giving them this safe environment here and the opportunity to forge new relationships, with people who go through the same process of changing themselves.

Leanne (female, 48 years old), a staff member for six years now added:

Yes, I think that we give the people the opportunity to not feel bad themselves and not be stigmatised anymore. By trying to inspire them to change their lives but also giving them tangible skills, we can help them turn their lives around. When a client is feeling confident that she can find employment and actually have the structure in her life to keep it, by learning to hold herself accountable for her lifestyle, by meeting deadlines, she can feel more valuable and included. That's how vulnerable people can put the past behind and not be finger-pointed all the time, because they have managed to escape these conditions and these 'unhealthy' environments in their lives.

Harriett (female, 43 years old), likewise talked about the self-improvement and life-changing activities offered:

Oh, I don't think that we would be doing what's needed for our clients if such classes were not offered. Listen, for many clients, social interaction in a positive environment which can bring out their talents is actually the best therapy. Many are lacking components in their lives that we take for granted, such as friendships, respect, communicating and working with other people, etc. It's brilliant to see their progress since coming here, and how much healthier their life is; the respect and positivity with which they

regard other people and themselves. It's a great step forward, to a more stable lifestyle.

Oliver (male, 32 years old), a homeless man who now works with another TSO which deals exclusively with providing the homeless with accommodation but still comes to the organisation everyday for his meal, said:

> *They are really useful. Unfortunately, I can't come to all of them as I'm also training for a job now, but in the beginning, they helped me a lot. I learned to use the computer, the therapist here has helped me with my drinking problems, I come to see the doctor, I've taken some of the art classes...it's great to feel that you've done something constructive with your day.*

These activities are not being referred to as stigma or marginalisation deterrents *per se* in any of the promotional material, internal documents or fund-raising campaigns of the organisations. Nevertheless, it is obvious that they are primarily meant to serve not the immediate, practical needs of service-users seeking support (i.e., food, healthcare, hygiene, clothing, etc.), or deal with the extreme circumstances of a personal crisis as staff members explained to us. Their purpose is to engage service-users in the process of (re)integration as equal participants in social and economic life through a gradual 'self-remaking' process and the associated life-changing opportunities. Thus, by extension, they are intended to help them overcome stigma, or at the very least develop a new outlook of themselves and learn to manage and mitigate the adverse effects of the stigma often attached to vulnerable social groups, as part of their efforts. The experiences of service-users in the two organisations with regards to marginalisation and stigmatisation, becomes clear if we look at a few more participant comments. Athina, (female, 31 years old) a member of the Greek TSO with mental health problems said:

> *We are stigmatised all the time and for life. Still, it hurt. I felt cut off, that I wasn't getting a second chance that I deserved. I wasn't dangerous to anyone. And neither wanted much. A job, an opportunity to get out of the house. These things I wanted like many other people. But I couldn't have*

them, so this made me feel, sad and lonely. So, I was basically frustrated and disappointed with the rest of the world. I was sad and I felt useless.

Regarding the impact of her involvement with the organisation on that, she commented:

> *I don't feel stigmatised anymore. Actually, sorry, I do, but I don't care. I consider this as a second home. These people here are my friends, trust me and give me responsibilities. But still, some people think that to be involved with a place like this there must be something really wrong with you, you know? You are still not 'normal'. Because of the stereotypes in society, the media and this consumerism and individualism culture. If those don't change, this stigma will not change. Oh, and simple ignorance of course. People don't know us, don't know what we do here.*

On the same issues, Eleni (female, 30 years old), a former offender, drug-user and another member, commented:

> *I was doubly stigmatised by everyone. I felt that I was excluded from the rules that apply to 'normal people'. I was afraid to speak up. But the stigma never really goes away. We have to accept that. For some people I will always be "Eleni the junkie, the failure, the convicted drug dealer" With my voluntary work here, I am able to continue my studies and I feel that now I can do things. But I've heard all kinds of weird things about us. The biggest problem though, is created by mass media; this image of strong individuals chasing success, and the image of people seeking support. It's difficult to change it.*

Takis (male, 54 years old), a service-user and now part-time volunteer who was homeless for about a year before the organisation helped him get into a municipality shelter, argued that:

> *I was discriminated all the time. People would just turn their heads away and for the state, we basically don't exist. I know people here aren't like that. But when I was in the streets, people saw us as criminals, or lazy, as if*

we liked this life. Frankly, I really don't care anymore. I know people like me, who receive help, are maybe looked at in a weird way just because we need support and hang around here, but again, I really don't care.

Jennifer (female, 42 years old), a service-user in the UK TSO with alcoholism and mental health problems commented:

I know that you will probably hear from many clients' things like, "the society this and the society that. They have a point but these are all stupid things mate. We make who we are. There are other kids with problems. Worse problems than mine. So yes, I feel discriminated, although a lot of it has to do with my own mistakes in life. Here, at least I am not judged. I'm more confident and don't care what other people think.

Regarding the existence of an 'institutional stigma' attached to her because she depends on benefits and receives help from a TSO, she argued that:

I'm not so sure about that. As I told you I'm anyway already looked down by other people because of me being unemployed and being an alcoholic, so me hanging around here...I don't think it does anything to add to that. I suppose it might, but I don't really know.

Similarly, Samuel (male, 26 years old), an unemployed former offender and a service-user who is now in the volunteer and job-placement programme of the organisation, stated:

The programme here has been everything for me mate, everything. They gave me a second chance. They helped me psychologically, financially, and helped me regain my confidence with the activities and stuff. I've used the time here to understand myself and I realised that unless I was honest with myself nobody would help me. You know, being here is not an easy option. They don't take you by the hand. I had to continually challenge myself, to learn how to best manage myself, which helps with stigma and stuff that you say.

Concerning institutional stigma, Samuel argued that:

You mean if I feel being labelled exactly because I am here? I don't think so really. Maybe for some people...But in general I think people react more positively when I tell them I'm a volunteer here, or that I'm doing the literacy programme. I think I had more problems before I became a client here.

Steve (male, 28 years old), who was homeless for two years and is now in temporary accommodation with the help of the organisation, added about the same issues:

When you are out on the streets, you are an outcast and since your only concern is to have food, get warm and just survive, you are invisible to others. I am much better now, more confident and secure, not worrying what other people think about me so much, because here people care. That's what got me on my feet so I don't feel I am discriminated so much anymore; or maybe I just don't care. If it still happens with some people, then they are just stupid.

Beth (female, 42 years old), a volunteer therapist providing psychological support and counselling in the organisation, had the following to add on the matter of stigma:

I've found that the stigma of seeking counselling predicts the willingness to use counselling services -especially for males- over and above the effects of the stigma associated with being homeless, an alcoholic, or extremely poor. Because, many clients develop this self-stigma of seeking help in the first place, and go through a process of degrading and devaluing themselves, simply for seeking that help. So I think there is a definite relationship between public stigma and the decision to seek help which is mediated by self-stigma. The activities and self-improvement opportunities here, can definitely help people overcome the effects of stigmatisation.

The narrative concerning their experiences in the two organisations concerning marginalisation and stigmatisation, did not change significantly for the rest of the respondents. The way participants, regardless of the particular problems they had faced (or are still facing), described their experiences could be summarised as a sense of disconnect from the rest of society and a loss of self-confidence and self-esteem. An increased feeling of social awkwardness and their induction in a self-contained loop of poverty, unemployment, substance-abuse and marginalisation, which in turn enhanced the feeling of being unable to 'mingle with normal people'. As a result, a feeling of being 'unworthy' and unable to have equal opportunities for participation in the social and economic life of the country is prevalent. However, the above quotes highlight a stark difference in the ways the two organisations attempt to help vulnerable and disadvantaged social groups overcome stigma and the effects of marginalisation, and promote their socioeconomic (re)integration. For the respondents, the end result might be much the same: service-users not letting stigma affect them anymore (albeit, for different reasons), and in a way, becoming able to 'rise above it'. However, the two organisations attempt to achieve this through different means.

In the Greek case, the participants didn't speak so much about the organisation helping them dealing with the problems of being marginalised and stigmatised by providing activities which allow them to develop usable skills, attitudes, behaviour and lifestyles, and thus for example, boost their employability chances through interviewing workshops. There aren't any specific activities tailored to improve the communication and interviewing skills of service-users; no literature, or sports, or numeracy classes; there is no need for service-users' participation and 'progress' to be recorded and monitored in some manner; such procedures don't really exist. In contrast, it is intended for service-users who choose to engage further with the organisation as volunteers and members, to participate in awareness campaigns and sociopolitical activism. For example, in interventions such as rallies, symbolic occupations of public buildings, local community assemblies, acts of solidarity towards immigrants or workers on strike, etc., in order for them to better understand the structural causes of stigma and marginalisation. In addition, through their daily interactions in the context of their induction into a group, a non-judgemental environment of communal feeling bound by people with the same goals and often similar difficulties, *self-growth will occur naturally* (Dimitris). Consequently, members of disadvantaged social groups are expected to only follow their own determination in how much they will be involved in what the organisation

121

stands for and what it does, *'without being told how to live their lives on an everyday basis'* (Giorgos).

Within the context of the declared principle of the organisation *'we are not a charity and people don't need charity'*, it is thought that the whole experience of helping to offer social services, socialising with other vulnerable people, being socially active and politically involved, by caring for broader social and political causes (even ones that do not concern them directly), service-users can (re)develop their social identity as equal citizens. More importantly, the intention is for the whole of society -especially vulnerable social groups- to gradually develop the profound understanding that the difficulties they are facing should not be attributed to some kind 'faulty individuality'; their character, habits or lifestyle which are somehow deemed inferior according to current social norms. On the contrary, their demands for employment, social services, access to health, education, nutrition and energy, are social rights they are entitled to, regardless of their life choices and lifestyle, their race or religion and of course, the way they look, dress, talk, behave and in general, live. These rights *'should be guaranteed by the state for all and have been taken from them by specific policies and elite groups in society'* (Giorgos). For the activists in the Greek TSO, the only way to (re)acquire them, is by democratically organising with other people so that they can collectively resist and push governments and the state in general, towards what they consider as the 'right direction'.

In other words, members are striving not to treat the people who approach them as 'different'; as individuals to be re-educated or re-habilitated in some manner. They don't believe that it is their lack of skills, or questionable lifestyle that has primarily contributed to their induction into discrimination and stigmatisation processes and consequently a situation of extreme disadvantage and marginalisation. Granted, they don't argue that factors such as individual life choices don't come into play at all and may not be related to one's predicament, but for them, they are simply irrelevant. As Dimitris puts it:

> *...the fact that the last seven years in Greece, apart from the 'usual suspects' (young drug-users, ex-offenders, etc.), people from all social classes and a mixed economic background such as middle-class, former business owners, pensioners, highly educated scientists, are turning to charities and the church to cover basic social needs, is proof enough that*

122

something more structural and more far-reaching has happened to the system.

In this way, they try to divert the attention of service-users from themselves, to what is happening in society, in order for marginalisation to become an external foe that can be defeated, and stigma, to be ignored. Therefore, the focus of disadvantaged social groups can be put in finding ways to combat the generating structural causes of inequality and marginalisation. According to the organisation's political stance, these lie within the laws of the capitalist system and the specific neoliberal reforms which have been sweeping across Greece as part of the bailout deals with the EU, ECB and the IMF. Within this struggle, the participation in democratic, collective processes of self-organisation at the local level, in every neighbourhood, service-users might attain the confidence and sense of purpose to regain their identity as equal citizens, and hence, become indifferent to stigmatising narratives in mainstream social perception.

Thus, it seems that the Greek TSO's strategy, turns its 'eye' outwards, to the collective. While recognising that stigmatisation harms perceptions of personal control (Sidanius et al., 1999) it espouses that the enhancement of a disadvantaged group's social identity through activism aiming not only at short-term, practical matters (i.e., access to employment, housing, education, etc.), but also long-term structural sociopolitical changes, may provide a method of coping with the adverse effects of stigmatisation and marginalisation. Because, as it has been highlighted, stigmatisation processes do not just discount personal aspects of the self, but actually implicate another important aspect of the self, namely, one's group membership and social identity (member of society - citizen), hence contributing to social marginalisation and exclusion processes (Tajfel & Turner, 1986).

In the UK case, the approach is different. The emphasis is put on the individual; on the (re)integration of service-users into the existing social and economic system, which obviously are the capitalist market, the UK labour market and welfare system, but not through collective action. Beneficiaries are intended to cultivate their individuality, by developing the commonly accepted and even expected skill-sets, lifestyles and behaviour, adapting to the values of individualism, competitiveness and flexibility, as they are currently set in place in mainstream society and realised in the market economy. In this context, any critique, or raising awareness about public social policies and welfare reforms, are not a part of the organisation's activities and services. The core strategy is to help vulnerable

individuals change, not to challenge the establishment itself. The users must adapt to it; it shouldn't change to accommodate them. This doesn't mean that members of staff are supporters of the current neoliberal restrictive policies, the budget cuts in public social spending (e.g., cuts in city council budgets), or the more recent welfare reforms in the UK (e.g., benefits sanctions and increased conditionality), which result in increasingly more people becoming unable to access basic social services (housing, health, employment, education, etc.). Indeed, on occasion, during the interviews, there was some vague scepticism expressed by members of staff concerning these issues when asked. However, adhering to the organisation's strategy, their mindset is clearly not to be political; not to get involved in these kind of discussions, or encourage their service-users to do so, but keep the TSO as an 'insider' within the broader arrangements of social welfare in the country. Lucy (female, 24 years old), a staff member for two years now and working on the public relations and funding campaigns of the organisation, said on the matter:

> No, we definitely stay out of politics. Anyone can have their opinions about this or that, but this has nothing to do with our efforts here. We just want to help those in need, to make a new beginning and if we can't achieve that, at least help them with their day-to-day needs; provide a healthy and safe environment. Whatever governments do or not do, the homeless, and abused women will not just disappear overnight. We deal with the problems of people less fortunate than us, regardless of what happens in politics.

Similarly, the doctor (GP) who voluntarily offers his services to the service-users as part of a partnership programme with the NHS that the organisation has in place, was asked about the work done in the organisation with regards to service-users' more immediate needs:

> It is very important to have a professional medical practitioner check on the clients. I'm happy that I am able to help and hopefully some people who wouldn't otherwise have the opportunity to monitor their health because of their circumstances, they now can. Such programmes in this kind of environment, can be effective focusing on the vulnerable and so improve the public health overall.

Thus the focus in the UK TSO, is to first help vulnerable people find some relief for their immediate problems; '*deal with crises*' as it was put. Second, to build their confidence and sense of self-value, attributes needed to overcome stigma and the adverse effects of marginalisation; '*a life without purpose*' (as stated by many respondents). This is attempted by their gradual induction into programmes and activities intended to help them change lifestyles, develop skills and acquire more structure in their lives; one '*that is more compatible to normal people*' (Harriett) and thus escape the cycles of homelessness, violence, substance abuse, antisocial behaviour and unemployment which lead to stigmatisation, marginalisation and exclusion. Therefore, it is clear, that in contrast with the Greek organisation, the UK case is concentrating on the individual and not on collective goals. Or, to be precise, its collective goals are all focused inwards: '*the effectiveness of the organisation itself in providing immediate social support and life-changing opportunities to the most vulnerable is our priority*' (Robert). The aim is to augment a process of empowerment for vulnerable individuals, which will eventually lead to socioeconomic reintegration into a mainstream, which however remains a non-issue for staff and service-users, as do its exclusionary mechanisms which obviously remain intact.

This is evident in the sessions, activities and workshops for service-users, which include admonishments concerning civility and daily individual behaviour; such as not being rude, not swearing, not smoking, being polite, having a positive attitude and other behavioural guidelines (set even in wall posters in the premises). This approach is believed to help people break out of this cycle of stigmatisation, vulnerability and disadvantage. For example, the importance of healthy eating is stressed, personal hygiene tips are provided and there is even advice on personal budget management. Thus, service-users are helped to overcome stigma and discrimination by re-orienting their present and future goals, changing their daily attitudes, reflecting on their character traits and overall, adhering to external codes of behaviour which are deemed appropriate (by the organisation's staff, who by default act as representatives of 'normality'). 'Normality' is a term quite often used by staff members who were interviewed, stressing the need for behavioural changes that will lead to this 'normality'. Service-users will develop the characteristics which will make them suitable, for, as Robert said: '*reaping the everyday benefits of a structured life and a degree of normality that we all share*'. The implied logic is that this development, may, at some point, lead to paid employment, a flat and what is described as an appropriate, normal lifestyle.

This approach contrasts sharply with the one seen in the Greek TSO, where essentially political discussions about power and how it is essential to the social production and reproduction of stigma and lead to discrimination, marginalisation and exclusion, are fairly common; almost on a daily basis. Service-users who want to, are introduced to and encouraged to think about a view, which contends that relatively powerful groups (the elites) in society create labels and stereotypes about less powerful groups treating their members in accordance with those stereotypes, putting people in disadvantage and processes of stigmatisation. There is a conscious effort from members and volunteers, for the nature of such processes to be understood by service-users who choose to engage with the organisation's sociopolitical activities and also, more broadly, by disadvantaged social groups (through awareness-raising campaigns and local community meetings). More specifically, how their predicament is primarily *'linked not to individual character traits, lifestyles or arbitrary morality assertions, but to socioeconomic inequality and its structural origins in the capitalist market'* (Giorgos). Furthermore, how through sociopolitical activism and organisation in collectivities of the civil society from the ground-up, there can be a collective, democratic attempt for these processes to be resisted and even reversed.

Alternatively, in the UK TSO, there is no mention, acknowledgement or discussion, much less a problematisation or challenge, of this pattern of stable attributions to stereotyping, prejudice, and stigmatisation, reflecting a perceived systematic marginalisation by the more privileged groups. Or, that conversely, the life-outcomes, rights and privileges of members of groups recognised and accepted by the mainstream, sketch a picture of social reality which is unlikely to be seen as generally under the control or the ability of the members of disadvantaged groups to alter, because the status of the former, affords them a position of greater power. This brings to mind Elias & Scotson's (1994) arguments in *The Established and the Outsiders*, concerning the monopoly of power by 'the established'. In turn, this affords them the 'legitimising', economic, political and even ethical / moral power to perpetuate stigmatising processes and discriminating structures. This leads to the solidification of a social identity of inferiority, weakness and overall 'unworthiness', experienced as we saw, as social injustice, material deprivation, limited or no access to core social goods and services (i.e., health, food, clothing, housing, nutrition, energy, education, etc.), but also 'lived through' mundane daily life experiences. As the organisation operates like a 'traditional' nonprofit, UK TS charity, staff, volunteer and in general group meetings concern only internal matters of the organisation: specific events, daily concerns, activities

126

and problems are discussed along with anything related to the daily operations of the organisation but not much more than that. Whereas in the Greek TSO, the daily meetings (and to a greater degree the weekly general assembly), do include the above, but also often incorporate topics related to politics and the social movement the members are trying to create. In the UK case, the focus is always on the organisation and the specific people involved with it.

Therefore, members of staff and volunteers in the UK organisation seem to be ascribing to the view that stigmatisation and negative identification processes (disidentifications) are highly costly, because they hinge on someone's performance, but more importantly, on their character (Ruggiero & Taylor, 1997). Perhaps this is because one's performance, behaviour, qualifications, and even ability in a domain are perceived as less stable and 'can be improved' in contrast to what stereotyping, prejudice and stigmatisation of one's social identity and group membership (i.e., gay, ex-offender, homeless, drug-user, unemployed, poor, etc.) would have us believe. Hence, through suitable support, the characteristics and skills of the vulnerable can be supposedly retrained and rectified, even becoming on par with those of 'normal people' and eventually accepted by the mainstream. Still, the attribution by the mainstream of a lack of long-term success (i.e., long-term unemployment) in any 'respected' domain of society such as job acquisition and professional advancement, to a stable personal characteristic (i.e., laziness, absence of social skills, lack of a work ethic and ambition, dependence on state benefits, etc.), is significant. This is a central component of stigmatisation and discrimination which accompanies neoliberal reforms in social policy (Ruggiero & Taylor, 1997). Thus, discrimination may often be seen as a stable impediment to future success, as it is directly associated with one's personal traits. And this is exactly the focus: not the processes which marginalise vulnerable social groups, but the individual traits which construct behaviour, and more importantly, how a service-user is perceived by the mainstream. Peter commented:

> There are just some things that you need to do if you want to live among other people. That is the way I see it. You need to make the right choices in this life. If you do not learn the importance of personal hygiene, if you do not get used to not swearing every time someone disagrees with you, if you don't take into account deadlines and be punctual, nothing will change in

127

your life. Clients must learn the importance of those things and how when
you commit to something, you must deliver.

Evident in the above comment is the deeply held belief in the importance of the 'habits of good society' long established in previous eras firstly among the upper classes and gradually, even more widely (Wouters, 2007).

These are the issues that staff members try to work on with each individual service-user who engages further with the organisation apart from the actual, practical support (i.e., food, clothing, phone-use, doctor, use of the organisation's address as a home address, etc.). They are working with dispositions and habits, trying to install an augmented sense of personal responsibility and individual choice. It has been indicated that a context dominated by members of more privileged groups, essentially forms a daily reality for disadvantaged groups facing stigmatisation and discrimination (Schmitt & Branscombe, 2002). If we think how often severely stigmatised people are excluded from even 'average' and 'ordinary' social settings and social rights (habitus), being marginalised and pushed in the fringes of societal boundaries is a quite frequent occurrence. It is only natural, that this enhances the performance salience and character dimensions on which the included group excels. Examples include academic performance, employment (much less economic success and advancement), social networking and opportunities for social relationships, romantic partnerships, etc., contributing to higher emphasis put on the relative inferiority of the identity of stigmatised group members on these dimensions (Schmitt & Branscombe, 2002).

Then, in the UK TSO, it seems that the goal is for vulnerable and disadvantaged individuals to develop the skills, behavioural tendencies, lifestyles, general outlook of life and character traits which will allow them to at least start approaching the standards of the more privileged social groups, reconstructing their identity to something more compatible with the norm. It can be said that there are elements of upward class mobility processes here. However, service-users are intended to attain characteristics and behavioural tendencies acceptable to the upper classes, rather than the actual privileges and power afforded by the latter's socioeconomic position. If this new identity is accepted and recognised, individuals can be given a second opportunity for equal participation in the mainstream economic and social life. In contrast with the Greek TSO, the matter of whether the structures and institutions which make up this life will continue to stigmatise, marginalise and exclude

128

others, or can easily again in the future deem them as 'inferior' or 'incompatible' if their personal circumstances change, remains unchallenged.

7.2. Monitoring, discipline and governance 'technologies of self': control of the behaviour of service-users

There is another, especially significant aspect where this discrepancy in the strategy and methods of the two organisations with regards to approaching stigma, marginalisation and helping service-users achieve socioeconomic (re)integration can be highlighted. It refers to the various elaborate and highly detailed monitoring and discipline systems employed in the UK TSO, which are mostly absent from the Greek case. One observation which was striking from the outset of the research, was the existence of numerous CCTV video cameras and the sheer volume of information being kept on the service-users in the UK TSO. It has been eventually understood, that this amount of information was necessary for -among other things- the organisation to be able to implement a monitoring, discipline and punishment-reward scheme; a mechanism for the soft control of service-users' behaviour. More specifically, a file is kept (both on a hard copy and also in digital form in a computer database) on everyone who comes to the organisation and wants to use any services, have a meal, use the facilities (i.e., shower, laundry, telephone, computer, etc.), attend a class and / or participate in activities. Once someone arrives at the reception, in order to interact with the organisation in any manner, they must be registered and that is when this personal record is first created. An introductory, assessment interview with a staff member follows, where the service-user is asked a few background questions (name, age, medical history, previous offences, employment history, how long they have been in the city, if they are receiving any benefits, emergency contact telephone number, etc.), so that this information can be put in their record.

This file is then constantly monitored, updated and enriched, especially in the case that the service-user becomes 'a regular', and starts engaging further with the organisation. For example, when a service-user is inducted into the organisation's volunteering programme, they are appointed a staff member as a supervisor who is responsible for keeping this personal file updated. This entails recording and monitoring the progress of this person during the programme and comment on any incidents of note, or problems with this person's performance and overall behaviour. In addition, there are monthly assessment interviews by

129

the supervisor consolidating this monitoring process of service-users' progress, dedication to a programme or activity and overall, the alacrity with which they pursue these 'life-changing opportunities'.

When a service-user is rated positively in these assessments, this usually involves them taking even more responsibilities and moving on into more demanding positions of higher responsibility within the organisation. However, if there is a negative assessment, there are extended talks with the supervisor concerning the identified difficulties. If the situation continues or deteriorate', said person could be expelled from the programme (although depending on the particular circumstances, there could be a second chance after a while). Overall, when service-users behave in ways which are interpreted by staff as disrupting the operations of the organisation (i.e., violence or threat of violence, getting involved in scuffles with other beneficiaries or staff members, shouting, swearing, bringing alcohol or drugs into the premises, stealing, etc.), or in any manner that goes against the accepted organisational culture, penalties are incurred. The incident(s) are recorded in the designated book of incidents of the organisation by any staff member available at the time. The CEO is notified and a resolution is sought. Depending on the severity of the 'offence', disciplinary action is taken. Such action could incorporate anything: from just a cautionary talk with a staff member or a warning, up to a ban from the organisational premises -and of course all the services, facilities, amenities and activities offered- and even the intervention of police officers. This ban can apply for a day, a week, a month, three months or in some cases, permanently. Appeals of these organisational decisions are possible, albeit through a lengthy, highly specified procedure which however is seldom used, since as Robert put it:

> *Honestly, there are very few occasions of an appeal and even fewer when the initial decision is reversed. Often, the client isn't really interested in appealing, because either they have understood their mistake, or they don't have the inclination, time and patience to go through these procedures. As I believe you have witnessed here, even in case of bans, we try to reach out to the client involved, discussing the matter over and sorting it out. If there is honest contrition and we feel there is genuine understanding about boundaries that exist here and that such behaviour will not be tolerated, usually the ban is lifted or its length shortened 'unofficially', in order for the client to have a second and third chance with us. It is something we are*

130

very keen to pursue, but we are also very firm about clients developing a sense of individual responsibility and maturity in how they conduct themselves. Of course, we also have to ensure the safety of our staff.

The monitoring and discipline systems used are another indication of the focus of the organisation on methods of soft control of service-users' individual behaviour. From the above comments, it becomes apparent that there are certain expectations of conduct which if not observed, may result in specific 'punishments' and exclusion from access to the organisation's services. Service-users are expected to exhibit specific character traits, attitudes and *'reshape their individuality'* (Beth), with their behavioural tendencies recorded and monitored, in order to have the continued support of the organisation.

Turning our attention to the Greek TSO, the initial impression is that such mechanisms of behavioural control are almost totally absent. There are no CCTV cameras; the organisation doesn't keep a book of incidents; there are no posters with instructions for proper conduct on the walls (i.e., 'do not swear', 'be respectful', 'consumption of alcohol is not allowed', etc.); there aren't any policy documents or promotional material of any kind, where phrases such as 'life-changing opportunities', 'changing lifestyles', 'developing a healthy lifestyle', often found in the UK TSO's organisational documents, are used. There are no electronically locking doors in the premises and registration is only needed if a service-user wishes to become a volunteer and eventually a member, or to access certain services related to healthcare and only with the expressed consent of the individual. A database is kept with people who are using such services, but only their name and medical history are recorded. Finally, there is no organisational set of regulations stipulating the official response to offences similar to the UK case. Personal records through which individual progress and behaviour of service-users can be monitored, are not being kept.

So at first glance, it could be said that in the Greek organisation, a policy of behavioural governance of service-users isn't being employed and governance 'technologies of self' aren't used. It certainly appears that the various systematised methods to regulate the conduct of people involved with the organisation employed in the UK TSO, don't seem to be present here; however, is it really so? Hindess (1996) has referred to government as 'the regulation of conduct by the more or less rational application of the appropriate technical means' (1996: 106). Therefore, maybe these means are different? Less visible or less obvious? In his lectures on the *'Genealogy of the State'*, Foucault distinguishes between the

131

Christian pastorate as a spiritual government of the souls oriented to salvation in another world and state reason as a political government of men securing welfare in this world (Lemke, 2002). In much the same way, disciplinary or sovereign power is reinterpreted not as opposite forms of power but as different technologies of government. Such technologies of government account for the systematisation, stabilisation and regulation of power relationships that may lead to a state of behavioural regulation, control and ultimately relationships of domination (see i.e., Hindess 1996; Patton 1998; Lazzarato 2000).

Consequently, it might well be that the technologies of self and the technologies of government instituting processes of governance are different in the Greek TSO, because some of its core organisational goals are different; but, they are still there. As it was discussed in **chapter 5**, the purpose of the organisation since its evolution into a more hybrid nonprofit, social cooperative, is dual: on the one hand, is the purely social goal of offering services and support to vulnerable and disadvantaged social groups providing access to core public goods and services; on the other, is the political goal of creating a social movement comprised of small cells of resistance to neoliberal capitalism market values as they are enforced in Greek society and economy, these last seven to eight years. Ideally, this could provide a whole new sociopolitical and economic paradigm of organisation from the ground-up, based on solidarity, equality and direct democracy, which would eventually *'drag the state back into fulfilling its role as the foremost guarantor of social cohesion, solidarity and regeneration'* (Giorgos). This is to be achieved through the mobilisation of the people. The disenfranchised, with the cooperation of grassroots collectives of the civil society, are to put pressure on the government on a local level first and if possible, on a national level.

Thus, for the Greek organisation, it is evident that everyday individual behaviour is not important; being nice to each other, 'moral' or 'immoral' lifestyles, having great social skills and aptitude for networking or where you spend your money, are not important. More accurately, they are not *relevant* to its purposes. What is important, is for marginalised people to understand the specific dominant neoliberal polices and narratives which dismantle the social welfare state and give birth to so much inequality in the country and all across Europe. In consequence, individual skills, character traits and behavioural tendencies which would make service-users more 'compatible' and suited for a society and economy dominated by such policies and discourses, are not to be cultivated; quite the opposite. They must be ignored and even resisted on an ideological, as well as a practical level. So, the goal concerning anyone willing to be involved with the organisation further as a volunteer and

activist, but also regarding the wider society, is to raise awareness concerning neoliberalism and its ideas; to highlight the inherently exclusionary nature of the capitalist market.

Quoting from a recent document which the organisation circulated on the eve of the July 2015 national referendum concerning a new austerity deal with the Troika, it is seen that neoliberal influence is treated as a '...*manipulative "wrong knowledge" of society and economy which must be dismantled...a faulty, contradictory theory and ideology, that can't stand the light of the real mechanisms of politics and society. It is the extension of economy into the domain of politics and society, the triumph of capitalism over the public and the state* (namely the social welfare state)*, as well as globalisation, which escapes the political regulations of the nation-state and is exempt from any kind of democratic, social control'*.

Moreover, attention is drawn to the destructive effects of neoliberalism on individuals and societal values: '...*the tools neoliberalism uses, most often take the form of a promotion of the devaluation of traditional experiences, a focus on individualisation, personal responsibility and adaptability, which is endangering collective bonds and the societal values of solidarity, cohesion and democracy. The imperatives of flexibility, competitiveness, adaptability, results-orientation, profit-making, mobility, and risk-taking threaten both family values and personal affiliations: neoliberalism is a process of "practical antihumanism" which must be stopped'*. Thus, it appears that for the Greek members, this 'wrong knowledge' of society, politics and economy neoliberalism confers, must be replaced by a 'right', or more emancipatory knowledge.

The above assessments resonate strongly with staunch -especially leftist- critics of neoliberalism, touching on the importance of behaviour-governance strategies, hinging on self-regulation and individual morals. Lemke (2002), refers to neoliberal governance approaches as a continuum, which extends from political government, right through to forms of self-regulation, and discipline techniques, similar to Foucault's 'technologies of self'. Neoliberal forms of government feature not only direct intervention by means of empowered and specialized state apparatuses, but also characteristically develop indirect techniques for leading and controlling individuals (Rose, 1996). The strategy of rendering individual subjects (and also collectives, such as families, nonprofits, associations, etc.) responsible, entails shifting the responsibility for social problems and risks such as illness, unemployment, poverty, marginalisation and overall quality of life in society, into the domain for which the individual is solely responsible, thus transforming them into personal problems of *self-care* and *self-regulation.* What is more, a key feature of neoliberal rationality, is the congruence it

133

endeavours to achieve between a responsible, moral individual, and an economic-rational individual (Evans et al., 2005; Rose, 2013). It aspires to construct responsible subjects whose moral quality is based on the fact that they rationally assess the costs and benefits of a certain act as opposed to other alternative acts. As the choice of options for action is -or so the neoliberal notion of rationality would have it- the expression of free will on the basis of a self-determined decision, the consequences of the action are borne by the subject alone, who is also solely responsible for them. This strategy can be deployed in all sorts of areas and leads to fields of social responsibility becoming a matter of personal provisions (Rose & Miller 1992; Garland 1996; O'Malley, 1996; Rose 1996;).

'Self-esteem' thus, has much more to do with self-assessment than with self-respect as the self continuously has to be measured, judged, and disciplined in order to gear personal empowerment to collective fields (Nettleton, 1997; Rose, O'Malley & Valverde, 2006). In this manner, a forever precarious harmony (and one which therefore constantly has to be reassessed) has to be forged between the political goals of the state and a personal 'state of esteem' of the individual (Cruikshank, 1999). Therefore, the UK organisation is dedicated in giving service-users a second chance in socioeconomic (re)integration by having them assume individual responsibility for past mistakes and current life-changing commitments. The technologies of behavioural regulation and control seem to be well placed to serve these intentions. As a result, for its directors and staff, in order for service-users to have '*their own slice of normality*' and acquire the suitable '*structure in their lives*' (Robert), they need to adapt. They need to change so that they can be included in the current context of welfare policy in the UK, driven by the goals and values of neoliberalism, neocommunitarianism / third way, the 'Big Society agenda', and the 'Broken Britain' narrative. It is a policy context driven by employability and conditionality (i.e., benefits sanctions and zero-hour contracts), as well as a results-driven and market-oriented managerial and professional TS. The activities of the latter appear to be informed by a discourse of individual choices and lifestyles tied to moral categorizations and hierarchies. Therefore, the organisation's monitoring and discipline systems seem to be particularly conducive towards this 'reshaping process' of personal change.

In the Greek organisation's case however, given its goals, it makes sense that the organisation isn't focusing on reshaping individuals' manners, lifestyles or character traits and thus lacks the elaborate recording, monitoring, and discipline systems of the UK case. As Dimitris comments:

134

...we aim at getting disadvantaged people to believe in the values of solidarity, cohesion, equality and democracy practiced daily, and not only for those in need; we try to inspire them to organise and work with us and together with their fellow citizens towards collective sociopolitical goals with favourable repercussions for all society.

Ideally, such activism aspires to resist, influence and even change government policies, subsequently addressing the values and structural mechanisms perpetuated by neoliberal capitalism, responsible for the widespread inequality, poverty and marginalisation. Nevertheless, Dimitris and other members' and volunteers' comments, coupled with the declared goals of the organisation, hint at the existence of processes of governance of behaviour taking place, but in this case on the level of shared values shaped by a strictly oriented organisational identity and culture, not as an attempt for the regulation of daily individual conduct and lifestyles. Although, one can argue that the latter will follow suit 'naturally'.

Therefore, the influence of neoliberal capitalism constitutes 'wrong knowledge' inscribed into the social body which should be defeated on an ideological and practical level by collective action of both the disadvantaged and those in relations of solidarity with them. Shouldn't then this be replaced by the 'right knowledge' and values as practiced by the organisation? If that is the case -and the stated goals of the organisation indicate that it is- then the mobilisation of vulnerable social groups in joint sociopolitical action, demands that the perceptions and the goal-orientation of both those seeking support and anyone else willing to participate in the organisation's activities, must change direction: from the individual, to the collective; to the social and the political. Thus, despite initial appearances, there are behavioural mechanisms of a different kind in place, in order to 'corral' people into becoming activists focused in the organisation's social goals, practices and values. Such mechanisms appear to be operating differently and to different ends than in the UK organisation, but they feature the same element of social control in order to shape service-users' aspirations.

Earlier in this section, the almost complete absence of monitoring and discipline systems in the Greek TSO compared to the UK one, was highlighted. There is however one instance, where monitoring and punishment-reward methods are indeed employed.

Interestingly enough, it is this exact aspect of the UK organisation's operations (actually the only one), where such systems are much more informal, lax and often aren't used at all. The procedure followed for the selection and deployment of volunteers is -compared to other facets of its daily operations- quite simple and flexible. Anyone who wants to volunteer in any capacity, can pick up the appropriate one-page application from the reception desk. Basic information is required such as identification data, and convictions or medical problems, previous experience with volunteering, if the applicant is a service-user in any other organisation, job experience, a contact number, etc., with a short interview following. Normally, the volunteer coordinator should conduct this, but it is actually done by any staff member available at the time (the researcher was allowed to be present during one). This particular interview didn't even take place in one of the closed interview rooms in the premises, but in the main office in the presence of other staff members and took less than five minutes. The topics of discussion concerned entirely a brief explanation of potential duties in the organisation, the applicant's preferences (if any), and her precise time-availability.

When that was done, the applicant was informed she would be notified of any possible placement; her application form was put on a stack of other applications on the volunteer coordinator's office who was absent at the time. Once a volunteer is 'hired', there is a 'placement period' of one week. A record of a volunteer's progress and performance is kept by the volunteer coordinator who provides assessments in three-month intervals, but only if the person in question moved to this role while, or after being a service-user. This is not a special file; it is just the record which is meticulously kept for any registered service-user, but including their performance in a volunteering role. Any problems are dealt with 'informally' on an individual basis (i.e., volunteer not happy with her particular placement, or makes mistakes, etc.), without any specific procedure set in stone, as is the case with other aspects of service-users' involvement.

In contrast, the Greek organisation's equivalent process for becoming a volunteer is much more elaborate and could be described as strict. The application form is a bit more detailed (three pages), but essentially quite similar to the one used in the UK TSO. If an interview is arranged though, it is a very detailed and lengthy discussion, with the one witnessed by the researcher taking up more than an hour. Only three specific members (chosen by the general assembly for a three-month term) at any given time, may perform this interview and if they are not available to see an applicant, an appointment for a later date is arranged. The applicants are first walked around the organisation to get a sense of the

organisation's 'inner workings' and then, in a private room, the interview takes place and they are appraised in detail of the organisation's goals, values and primary activities. Additionally, they are given examples of sociopolitical interventions they would be expected to participate in and asked various questions so that not only their personality and background, but also their political views are gauged, such as: why exactly they would like to contribute; what is their opinion on social issues such as poverty, unemployment, racism, exclusion and stigma, or on the social and economic policy reforms (providing specific examples) enforced as part of the memorandum of understanding between Greece and the Troika, etc. Finally, details are asked regarding any previous experience in volunteering and activism (i.e., trade unionism), which is actually an important determinant of a successful application. The interviewing member then makes an assessment and provides a recommendation either positive or negative, to the first available general assembly. The general assembly makes the final decision, which must be taken with an increased majority of at least two thirds (2/3) of the assembly members present.

Once volunteers have been appointed a specific role and a set of duties in the organisation, they are appointed a member as a supervisor. The latter, have the responsibility to mentor the new volunteers and offer their opinions on the volunteers' performance and especially, commitment to the organisation's social goals and political interventions. The assessment of the first aspect is relatively simple and not all that different from the UK case: there is a valuation of whether the volunteer is productive, does she perform well in teamwork contexts, or under pressure, is she eager to learn, is she efficient in her duties, does she meet appointments, is she afraid of responsibility, etc. The second aspect, that of the personal commitment to the organisation's ideology and identity, is much harder to be measured and weighs a lot on the volunteer's profile. Topics incorporated in this assessment, include participation in the assemblies, in awareness campaigns and other instances of political action and local open community meetings; development of knowledge regarding social policy and vulnerable groups in Greece; participation in the interventions of other similar organisations or trade unions and in industrial action (i.e., presence in a factory occupied by the workers handing out informational material, etc.); cultivation of good relationships with other members, any signs of elitism, judgemental attitude, racism when interacting with service-users, etc.

Eleutheria (female, 29 years old), one of the youngest members with problems of substance-abuse as well as long-term unemployment and one of the three members

responsible for interviewing prospective volunteers at the time of the research, commented on the interviewing and continual assessment process:

> *For us, volunteering is not just some charitable act where we help the 'poor wretches', throw them a piece of bread, giving them a blanket or whatever. All that defines us, is basically a certain trust people have for us. That we haven't sold out to the establishment and that we will never sell them off. That is why the application interview may seem a bit strange. But we have to establish that the person interested has the particular attitude needed. Imagine if one, just one mind you, volunteer or member was a Golden Dawn supporter[26]. The damage to the way people perceive us, would be huge.*

Theofilos (male, 47 years old), a member for four years now, came to the organisation seeking legal support against the bank which was trying to collect on his house mortgage. He has general administration duties in the organisation and added on the same issue:

> *I see your argument; that we may send volunteers away with this tactic. But, we have all collectively decided to accept this than risk being compromised from the inside. Being a volunteer here, is a difficult commitment. Not in the sense of time spent, but in the sense of looking at society and understanding social problems in a completely new way. To do that, you must become really invested in what we do and what we stand for. You must be focused on solidarity and democratic organisation; have a certain attitude. A determination for collective social action and political resistance.*

So it seems that the members, value more their organisational purity, grassroots identity and their effectiveness as political activists, rather than their day-to-day efficacy and helpfulness

---

[26] Golden Dawn is the Greek populist, neo-Nazi political party.

138

as a provider of social services and goods to vulnerable populations. Eleutheria and Theofilos, in the aforementioned comments, argue about a '*certain attitude*' needed; a certain perception of social problems, of inequality and marginalisation. The way the interviewing and assessment processes are applied, indicate that they are mechanisms ensuring that only certain 'types' of people with specific views on particular issues can be accepted as volunteers and potentially, members. Or, at the very least, they are individuals who demonstrate the willingness to embrace such views through their active commitment to the organisation; to its ideas and interventions.

Therefore, of interest is to look into the existence of any 'technologies of self' which are used to shape the behaviour of those involved with the organisation into what Theofilos described as people having '*a specific determined perception, dedicated to collective social action and political resistance*'. Such action, is understood as a form of gathering and at the same time resisting political power which in Greece has been traditionally considered as a synonymous to governmental state power. Poulantzas (1973) had argued that the capitalist state must be relatively autonomous, so that it is able to go against the individual and particular interests of capitalists in order to act in their general / class interests. It can be said that the members feel that they must be able, as a collective, to counter this basis of power with collective power of their own, through practices which might be -at least initially- counter-productive towards the goal of socioeconomic (re)integration of disadvantaged individuals. This stipulation could explain their strategy of focusing more on anti-government political interventions, which may seem counter-productive to the immediate concerns of service-users.

The way this self-steering process takes place in the Greek case, is less formulated and less obvious than in the UK case and as it has been indicated, its purpose is different. The exercise of power within the organisation is subtler. A reason is that there is already a high entry barrier for prospective volunteers. The detailed and almost invasive interview, which seeks to lay bare an applicant's personality and political views, can be reasonably assumed to filter out those that would be undesirable or unsuited as volunteers or members (hence we have used the term 'self-steering' and not i.e., 'self-reshaping'). However, this leaves for consideration what happens with those who are deemed to indeed have the potential to be a part of the organisation and of course, those who are already members, regular volunteers or service-users. The Greek TSO obviously demands a specific mindset and a high degree of ideological, as well as practical commitment from its members and volunteers. These are

serious requirements, potentially to the detriment of personal free time, loss of clientelist networks, personal aspirations (i.e., professional success) and even their health and security (i.e. clashes with riot police). As Lyrintzis has argued, 'being constantly opposed to those in power isn't conducive to that, and in Greek reality it is a huge sacrifice to gainsay, lose, or otherwise not cultivate relations with your political patron' (1984: 109). In short, the sacrifice of several aspects of what would be considered by mainstream Greek society as accepted, as well as expected, 'ambitions by the average, normal person' (Sotiropoulos, 2004: 277).

The ways the organisation keeps its members invested in its activities and culture, attempts to attract new members, volunteers and service-users into its mentality and encourage them to make its sociopolitical causes their own, are subtle and essentially formless with the exception of supervisors of new volunteers. Nevertheless, they are interspersed throughout everything the organisation does, the way it does it and ultimately, what it is and represents. For example, there isn't a series of political seminars that a service-user has to attend in order to have access to the social kitchen, pharmacy, or store. With the exception of becoming a volunteer, there is not a specific procedure through which a member or service-user is monitored, judged and consequently if they are found lacking, someone is then responsible to take disciplinary measures against them. No such measures are designated. The notions of equality, democracy and solidarity are made visible and communicated through the organisation's structure and daily practices. The cooperative, flat hierarchy governance scheme enables overt power relations based on privilege and authority to be subdued; everyone finds themselves in a non-judgemental environment; a context of true equality and direct democracy. The caveat is, that these progressive elements of the organisation's operation and structure, require for those actively engaged with it as members or regular volunteers, to share and actively advance its political viewpoint.

The assemblies are open for all and all votes are equal, regardless of position, role, or experience with the organisation. Actually, there are no positions denoting power and authority in some organisational hierarchy. Every duty is considered valuable and every contribution is appreciated. The organisation is structured and operates, as the antithesis of a for-profit corporation and this ethos of a collective, community endeavour permeates its activities. Any and all problems are solved collectively, through group discussion, where everyone is allowed to speak without the fear of repercussions, since these, do not really exist. This conveys the message to members, volunteers and service-users, that in contrast with the mainstream society, everyone here has an equal voice. In the rare cases that a

140

resolution can't be found and the common ground is elusive, then the issue is decided by a simple majority. If someone, whether a member, volunteer or service-user believes that they can't abide by the decision, they are of course free to leave the organisation should they wish to.

In this context, the stringent process for becoming a member, indicates that individuals must submit to the collectively built knowledge of the organisation and an awareness that their interests and problems are only addressed through their collective action in society. In the absence of behaviour-control mechanisms similar to those existing in the UK organisation, this 'submission' is achieved first through organisational entry barriers, and second, maintained organically, through all the facets of the organisation's identity, structure of governance and activities. In order to truly understand this process, we must remember that any kind of power constructs the individual as a subject, but it is always an individual who is subjected or subjugated in the same process (Foucault, 1977). And where there is submission or subjugation, there is power.

There is a conceptual approximation with Foucault's disciplinary society of 'panopticism', through which the absence of tangible mechanisms and technologies of discipline, can be understood. Panopticism refers to the major shift in disciplinary systems that Foucault examined. It concerns the monitoring and shaping of individual behaviour occurring not through overt systems of surveillance and punishment, but through infusing to subjects (i.e., inmates, pupils or welfare beneficiaries) the knowledge that they are always 'watched', as if they are residents in a great glass sphere, thus enabling them to 'self-regulate'. The comments of members alluding to the fact that those who are not fully committed to the culture, sociopolitical goals and the means the organisation uses to achieve them will, in time, simply leave, make sense. Once you become a member, there are no punishment systems, no 'wardens' and designated 'watchers' who assess others' level of commitment to organisational values, ideology and practices, because they are not needed. The 'watching' is conducted 'invisibly'. Everyone watches everyone else constantly, daily and dedication is demanded by everyone. There is no reason to punish an individual (whether a member, volunteer, service-user, or any combination of these) who did not participate in political action such as for example the manning of an informational stand and the participation in a protest concerning the closing of several offices of the state anti-drug organisation because of public budget cuts. The interview process, the three-month trial period as a volunteer, and the fact that services offered are not tied to individual choices or

141

behaviour, all but guarantee that those who want to be more deeply involved with the organisation, must make a choice: to be 'militants' of an organisation with the characteristics of a social movement of dedicated activists, or not.

The way members and volunteers interact, the nature of their activities and the very fact that they are visible in the local community as activists in an organisation with a clear political orientation which challenges dominant neoliberal narratives and policies, already make overt mechanisms for the governance of behaviour redundant. Discipline to the organisation's identity and related activities is co-created naturally by all involved. Such is a case where discipline can create freedom as well as control. As Foucault (2003) has shown, discipline is necessary to the development of self-control and therefore to subjectivity. For example, it can form the basis for a regulatory network through which the norms of health, security, and welfare can be systematically provided for whole populations, providing a freedom from want, illness, and ignorance that would otherwise be impossible. With that being said, if the researcher understood in one week's time what the organisation believes in, it is certain that members and volunteers also do and make a conscious choice of embracing it. If they didn't, as Katerina (female, 61 years old), a pensioner, a member of the Greek Communist Party and an old member comments:

> There are 'proper charities' owned by bankers and ship-owners covered by the media, participating in fashionable galas and having an admired social presence. But here, we are not asking people to help in a charity; there are other people doing this better than us. We are asking people to be part of something that might well be detrimental to aspects of their personal life. State mechanisms and the government do not want a change in the 'accepted social order'. So if volunteers don't want to change themselves, they just walk away. That is why, for as long as I have been here, the participation of members has only fluctuated because of job or family obligations; mainly the second. It's a whole package Giannis (laughter)!

Giorgos added:

> You subscribe to our ideology and views? Then you are welcome to help in any capacity you can and want. There are people with power and vested

142

interests for whom these views and our actions are a threat and who are the main cogs of neoliberal capitalism. If you don't, you'll simply drift away, since the situation here...how to tell you...the environment here will simply become not to your liking (laughter)!

It is in this process of mobilisation *against* specific people, interests and wide-reaching policies (disidentification from 'others') that inter-group commitment (identification with the group) is attempted to be built within the collective identity of the organisation (Tajfel & Turner, 1986; see also Prinos, 2014 on the mobilisation of disidentifications in Greece in recent years). Subsequently, the commitment and adherence to this collective social identity is then evaluated in daily collective action and interaction. But, it is difficult to practically be measured and gauged, hence the difference in the means of control, behavioural governance practices and the 'technologies of self' found in the two TSOs. Social movement theory and studies, show us that since mobilisation does not always require pre-existing collective identities, activists' efforts to strategically frame identities are critical in recruiting, as well as keeping participants invested (Polletta & Jansen, 2001). 'Frames' are the interpretive packages that activists develop to mobilise potential adherents and constituents (see i.e., Benford & Snow, 2000; Tarrow, 1998). When successful, these frames make a compelling case for the injustice of the condition and the likely effectiveness of collective agency in changing that condition. They also make clear the identities of the contenders, distinguishing 'us from them' and depicting antagonists as human decision makers which, however, are bearers and primary expressers of structural, often impersonal forces (Gamson, 1992; Hunt & Benford, 2004; Klandermans, 2002). In our case, these are the class-based policies of neoliberal capitalism and the markets in recent years in Greece, deemed to be dismantling the social welfare state, creating extensive poverty, unemployment, inequality and marginalisation.

Hence, it is understood why the monitoring and discipline systems in the two organisations are vastly different, both in their nature and in their goals. The Greek TSO has some of the characteristics of a social movement, attempting to employ resource mobilisation processes, building social capital with its members and developing a collective social identity of resistance, tied to redistribution and social rights demands. It doesn't see itself as a legitimate partner of the Greek social welfare state and of public social policy in general. Rather, it tries to operate as a social actor outside of the system. Complementary or

supplementary when it chooses in order to provide a measure of immediate relief to vulnerable social groups, but in opposition otherwise, in order to address the deep-rooted structural mechanisms of capitalism which it espouses as creating social problems. Accordingly, the behaviour of members is constantly regulated in practice by the imperceptible mechanisms discussed earlier, with the collective identity of the organisation, assumed to be the ultimate guarantor of the participants' commitment. Because this identity, is what corresponds to the organisation's value proposition. The actions of individuals ascribing to it and the subsequent new social, economic, and even cultural paradigm, are expected to be guided by its principles.

Alternatively, the UK TSO, is not a part of a social movement, neither does it want to instigate one. It has a relatively small size (for the UK), but it is well-placed within the local network of TS providers, voluntary organisations and various charities offering support and social services to the vulnerable in this northern English city. It participates in multi-partner social programmes together with public institutions, the for-profit private sector and the government (e.g., the local police department's initiative to dissuade street-begging with help and advice from TS staff, the NHS programme for medical professionals offering their services to the organisation, etc.). It works with the city council in poverty-alleviation efforts, it proudly depicts in its webpage corporate logos and private companies which fund its services, etc.

Within the group of the 15 paid (part-time and full-time) members of staff, various dispositions and motivations can be identified, but not this almost single-minded devotion to serving the needs and aspirations of vulnerable social groups in certain ways, found in the Greek TSO. During the interviews, most staff members stated that they see their job as a career like any other and a good opportunity for employment. Others -including all four employees who have had previous experiences of marginalisation and disadvantage- mentioned how highly they value the ability to offer social services to the vulnerable, expressing a more 'altruistic disposition'. Similarly, because of the dedication to the organisation to certain procedures, meticulous recording of individual data, and tiers of rewards or punishment, sometimes slight tensions arose between staff members, regarding the interpretation of all these rules and regulations. For example, what happens when a service-user arrives and asks for access to a meal without been registered and the time frame for registration (daily from 8.15am to 1.15pm) has passed?

144

On one occasion, the employee at the front desk who was just closing for the day (it was around 1.20pm), decided to give such a person a food parcel without registering him. Another staff member who noticed what had happened politely reprimanded his colleague since he went 'against the rules'. He further observed that if they started doing this, then there is no reason to have opening and closing hours and there is no motivation for anyone to come back the next morning to be registered and be informed of all the activities and services the organisation might be able to offer them. Moreover, he commented on the fact that such actions de-motivated potential service-users for understanding that there are rules in society and life in general. They must learn to be responsible and adhere to them like the rest of us. As Elsa (female, 46 years old), a staff member for five years now, said at the time:

> *They must learn to go to the doctor when they have an appointment. In order to find a job, clients must understand that without these rules we all follow, they will never be able to. And besides that, we give the wrong message. What if tomorrow, the same person comes and I refuse to provide him with any service since we are closed? He will naturally say that "yesterday, I came the same hour and this other guy gave me this or let me do that, why don't you"? We are already understaffed, so we must really be coordinated.*

This incident reveals hints of conditionality in the operations of the organisation, similar to the ones found in dominant UK welfare policies. Overall, the UK organisation seems to be going with the flow of the main tenets of welfare architecture and social policy in the country, in terms of structure, goals and practices. The next chapter, concerns the analysis of the findings pertaining to **RQ2**. This research question, investigates the issue of social citizenship as the expression of social welfare provisions, looking at the dynamics of the relationship between the state and TSOs as actors in the welfare mix. In particular, it concerns how social citizenship rights of service-users are perceived by the two TSOs. The chapter elucidates how this understanding and their practices supporting the efforts of the disadvantaged for socioeconomic (re)integration, reflect or oppose dominant welfare discourse and policies in the two countries. Essentially, this leads to different visions of social integration and social citizenship.

Chapter 8. Social welfare and social citizenship: the third sector and the state

Regarding social citizenship and social integration, for the UK TSO, the main idea is that by engaging with the organisation, people seeking support can be (re)integrated within their communities and the wider society. Be inducted to the social as '*normal citizens belonging to society like all of us*' like Abby (female, 28 years old), a staff member, argued. For the Greek TSO, the goal is to organise the disadvantaged into an anti-austerity, pro-welfare state grassroots movement of social solidarity and social cohesion. Through the organisation's interventions and sociopolitical activism, the ultimate aim is to '*resist and alter enforced neoliberal policies in Greece*' (Dimitris). The process focuses on combating socioeconomic inequality and helping vulnerable and disadvantaged social groups play a central role to this struggle of recovering fundamental social rights which should be afforded by the state to all citizens. This is where again, the two organisations while at first glance have similar goals (apart for the political component obviously absent from the UK TSO), their understandings, motivations and strategies especially regarding social citizenship, actually vividly diverge. The most important dimension where this discrepancy becomes apparent, is the way the two organisations perceive the socioeconomic (re)integration of vulnerable, disadvantaged and marginalised social groups. Broadly speaking, this is a goal they share. However, the fieldwork indicates that they mean very different things when stating this goal and have distinct ideas in pursuing it.

8.1. The UK third sector organisation, welfare and social citizenship

The principal logic embedded in the UK TSO's interventions, strives to be compatible with the dominant narrative in social policy in the UK designating the current place and role of the TS in the welfare mix: namely, the conceptualisation of social citizenship as a status related to entitlements which are afforded to people by the welfare state, charities, the civil society and TS voluntary organisations under a regime of strict conditionalities. Ascribing to this logic for the welfare mix and the procurement of state benefits by citizens, the organisation is focusing its efforts on the individual; on 'clients' understanding such requirements, empowering them to do what is necessary to meet them and achieve '*a greater degree of social inclusion and more meaningful lives*' (Robert). The comments of respondents are indicative of the fact. On the issue of what exactly does the organisation hope to achieve for its service-users apart from immediate support and regarding their socioeconomic (re)integration as equal citizens, Robert argued that:

> *We provide a more stable, safe and friendly environment. In our interactions with clients, we first try to make them feel accepted, no matter their past. Then, and depending on the particular set of difficulties they are facing at the time, we help them to acquire some structure in their lives and improve their well-being. We can't help clients who don't want to stay in the process and help themselves. We do what we can for them of course, but if they want to find employment, to get into proper accommodation, acquire skills, develop their talents and actually feel good for themselves and positive for the future, they must try to change their lives. The activities, and workshops are a great way to start doing that.*

Sara (female, 41 years old), a part-time staff member for the last four years and a former drug-user, commented:

> *Speaking from my own experience, clients must really come to grips with their mistakes; take responsibility. I know it might sound a bit harsh, but you need to develop the aspiration to have 'a normal life' and take the necessary steps to do that. Even if that means stop seeing people that you*

147

understand are bad for you; stop drinking, learn to wear clean clothes, take care of your personal hygiene, etc. It might be trendy to swear all the time, or not taking the time needed to prepare a proper CV. We try to help our clients but because they understand that this is the way to achieve things. It must start with you; how you behave and what you want to do with your life.

Similarly, Barbara (female, 52 years old) a staff member, said:

If you come here, and take the interview-skills classes for example, but still, you are going to job interviews looking like you haven't washed or changed in a month, well, this is how people will treat you; this is on you. A client wanting to have a second chance, for example an ex-offender, must think that other people who had more problems than me, are doing something with their lives. So I believe people here can really learn how to adapt and change their lifestyles; have better luck in society and improve their well-being as a whole.

On the same issue, Peter likewise stressed the importance of individual responsibility and proper behaviour which will eventually lead to better opportunities and a higher degree of acceptance in society:

Yes, people should not discriminate based on how you look or how you speak, but, let's face it, it will always happen. Clients should not expect to keep living as they have been and then complain about benefits being sanctioned for example. If all that you do is drinking with your mates, waiting for the government to pay you while you don't do anything to change your life, then there is a problem here. Nobody will just take you by the hand and teach you to behave like a decent person. If you come to the centre but constantly pick fights or arrive to your volunteer post drunk, nothing good will happen. You must try to change on your own and we will help you as much as we can.

Julie (female, 26 years old), a staff member for the last two years working in a secretarial role and thus having minimal interaction with clients at the centre, was of a similar mind:

> *There is indeed discrimination with the homeless for example. It's not fair no matter how you look at it. What we explain here, is that in order to have a job, benefits, or a flat, there are things that are required. You need to be able to meet appointments for example. So we help clients develop a proper, healthy attitude which will allow them to be treated as equal citizens and enhance their well-being. We try to encourage them really. The government will help you only so much and only for as long as it sees that you are serious about living a proper life and are able to sustain that.*

Mark (male, 24 years old), an ex-offender and a volunteer for three years who is now employed (part-time) in a local business, talked about this issue in the same way:

> *Yeah, of course...how can you be a citizen if you have to steal in order to survive? You make a mistake because you may have been forced to do it, because your family was sh*t, but then you don't get any opportunities. You've got to be smart; not being a poser or acting like some tough w*nker all the time. I trusted the people here and got into the volunteer programme and now I'm in a job placement, I have a nice girlfriend and all...It was hard, I won't lie, sometimes I got pissed off and swear, but I quit drinking. People need decent work mate, that's important; and also learn to play by the rules.*

These statements, as well as the type of activities offered and the observed interactions of staff members and volunteers with clients, indicate that for the UK TSO, the effort to overcome marginalisation / exclusion and acquire a status of 'equal citizenship', is tied to requirements of individual morality, proper behaviour, responsibility, as well as a positive outlook and attitude. Social citizenship is approached as dependent on multiple levels of conditionality, ranging from lifestyles, to language and character traits, and of course, other tangible indicators of citizenship in our capitalist societies (i.e., employment, social skills, a bank account, communication and cooperation with the appropriate state authorities, etc.).

149

Adherence to the expectations of the 'proper citizen' set by long-standing social norms in the UK is the goal here. At the same time, a certain language of exclusiveness similar to what Mead (1997) was describing when talking about poverty and welfare dependency discourses is adopted, since social integration (and by extension, social citizenship) is conceptualised as an *'active process'* (Robert); an endeavour of members of disadvantaged groups, since they need to *'earn this'* (Michael) and reap the 'benefits' (pun intended) of social citizenship.

In the UK organisation, the emphasis is put upon individuals belonging to one another so that the reciprocity between rights and responsibilities reflects the interdependencies of social communities. Thus, staff members (as are policy makers) are comfortable 'talking more about obligations than rights' (Beer, 2001: 31). After a somewhat heated chat with a service-user whereupon he complained to her about 'lecturing him' for buying a new (and presumably expensive pair of sports shoes), Mary (female, 59 years old), a regular volunteer said:

> *It is as if he doesn't know that in a couple of weeks he'll be here shouting that the benefits are not enough and he doesn't have enough for his medication, rent and utilities. He didn't have to buy the most expensive snickers out there. We have been over this before with him; he needs to start acting like an adult; that he actually means to try and turn his life around. Such behaviour will not entice anybody to take you seriously and trust you with the responsibility of even a minimum wage job. Now he got angry with me and stormed out when all I try to do is help, not lecture. Sometimes, it's hard to deal with people in the centre...it really is...*

The references to empowerment, structure and proactiveness by respondents, as well as the focus of the offered activities on good behaviour, healthy and structured lifestyles, positive thinking, employability and social skills, hint at that when talking about social integration, it is inclusion which is crucial, rather than equality *per se*. This approach resonates with the dominant narrative concerning social citizenship currently in the UK and the role of TSOs as charities, where equality potentially demands nothing of the poorest, but social inclusion requires everyone, to make a contribution, especially through paid employment. Benefits should be provided conditionally and in response to demonstrable need. The job of the government is to compose a dynamic civil society, clamping down on incidents of crime and

incivility, in which people feel responsible for themselves and for one another. On a political level then, marginalisation, homelessness and poverty alleviation, are seen as a problem of individuals and in particular, of poor people; of the lower classes.

Therefore, the loss of social citizenship can be remedied through targeted intervention into marginalised social groups with a prominent role for charities, TSOs and the civil society, rather than as a problem of inequality requiring as much, if not more intervention by the state into those better off. It is the needy that must 'be changed' in order not to be needy anymore and become an equal contributor to the economic cycle; or, at the very least, kept suitably 'docile' with regards to any process which could potentially lead to political radicalisation. James, (male, 57 years old) a staff member for the last six years, talked about this perception of reciprocity and a 'responsibility to adapt or 'give back' regarding vulnerable and disadvantaged social groups:

> *I told you before Giannis, we can help and we do help, but up to a point. If*
> *clients don't want to change their lifestyles and understand the rules, we*
> *can't help. Look at ****** (a service-user) *for example. He has an*
> *appointment with our counsellor here, we have been reminding him all*
> *week about it and yet he doesn't come. This attitude is the problem and if*
> *you try, you can change it. But you must help us to help you. We'll hear you*
> *going on a tangent about your landlord swindling you, but you must work*
> *with us. If you try to stay within the lines as all of us do, you'll find your*
> *way.*

Drew (male, 21 years old) a young, unemployed ex-offender who had developed mild mental health problems, and had been working with the organisation for a year at the time of the research, appears to agree with the opinions voiced above:

> *Yeah mate, I understood what I had to do if I ever was going to have a*
> *better life; a normal life. The staff here helped me see that. The most*
> *important is to decide to be serious about your life and yourself. I started*
> *doing that, really putting myself in a schedule to attend the classes here.*
> *Being here, listening to people, and doing things is what will help me be*

someone out there; but I had to change my ways. For people like me, it's
not easy. I needed someone to help me stay on course during these times.

Apparently, successful completion of said 'trials' or challenges, will eventually lead to socioeconomic (re)integration and therefore, social citizenship. The service-users who were interviewed seem to endorse this approach.

However, through this logic, hierarchies of power are neglected in the discussion of social citizenship (Fitzpatrick, 2005). The discourse of duties which are 'owed' by the disadvantaged to the taxpayers who fund the welfare services and voluntarily man the TSOs upon which they depend, is put at the forefront. Evidently, this view seems to have influenced the perceptions and expectations of the UK TSO's employees and volunteers for the vulnerable groups they support. Standing (1999: 317-319), terms welfare reforms based on conditionality as a policy of asymmetrical reciprocity where duties are directed from the top to the bottom of the income / wealth ladder, rather than the other way around. This is an argument echoed by Wacquant, when talking about the crafting of the 'neoliberal centaur state...liberal at the top and paternalistic at the bottom' (2010: 217). For the UK TSO, social rights seem to be indeed interpreted as conditional upon the performance of duties, rather than as foundational. The lexicon of social citizenship begins to resemble a relationship of charity, where the disadvantaged are expected to express their gratitude for the largesse of others by signalling and constantly re-signalling their moral worth, adaptability, civil behaviour and overall competence in what is expected from productive citizens by the government, but also, the wider community to which they (almost) belong (Dean, 2003). Concerning this 'duty' of service-users, Luke (male, 35 years old), a part time staff member for the last two years with mild problems of mental health who had originally been a service-user for some time said:

When clients stay within the programme and demonstrate not to us, but to
themselves, that they can be stable and responsible in their lives, that's the
turning point I think. There is no easy way around this, other than trying to
really put an effort to stay engaged with the centre, participate in the
workshops, and maybe start volunteering. If you fail, we are here to help
you try again, as long as you respect yourself and everyone in the centre.

152

The problem with this vision of social citizenship, is that while it doesn't necessarily completely ignore the manufactured nature of social risks, it stops short of viewing their political and ideological origins (Culpitt, 1999). It seems to be related to social policy strategies such as positive welfare in the UK, advocating for a welfare state moving away from directly provided economic maintenance, care and protection, towards individual liberty, responsibility and duty; 'no rights without obligations' (Giddens, 1998: 65). This is a welfare system to which individuals themselves and other agencies except the government contribute, which is functional for wealth creation and prioritises investment in human capital. Moreover, it shifts the focus of social policy and the welfare state from sustaining certain standards of socioeconomic equality by guaranteeing social rights for all, to associating them with notions of civility, morality, proper behaviour and a vague, pro-social attitude.

Frequently, policy makers are inclined to focus on the individual in an attempt to tackle the problem of legitimation experienced by official authority (Giddens, 2006). For some, such policies represent an attempt to re-establish the social virtue of self-discipline (Jones & Novak, 2012). For others, it is about encouraging people to adopt positive or healthy lifestyle choices and a community-oriented behaviour, which will enhance their overall well-being, hence the term positive welfare (Burgess, 2012). The strategies employed by the UK TSO for the socioeconomic (re)integration of its service-users, seem to be indeed focusing on the individual and are influenced by such notions of behavioural self-regulation and healthy life choices, as well as ASB policies. This approach meshes well with its 'inward' and strictly non-political focus. It was observed several times, that service-users often come to the reception desk asking for a specific member of staff, even if the duty worker present at the time can help them with their problem. Subsequently, this personalisation of offered services is in line with the directions of NPM in the UK. The organisation's standpoint on the issue of social citizenship and (re)integration of vulnerable social groups became evident in other observations also. Apart from the workshops offered on-site concerning healthy lifestyles, personal hygiene, time-management, positive thinking, etc., it was seen that the majority of leaflets about community groups, TSOs, NGOs and other various civil society organisations in the centre, concern very similar activities. Their common characteristic is that they are all aligned with the tenets of the dominant government discourse concerning ASB, individual responsibility for one's welfare, employability, conditionality, family morals and productive, proper behaviour. Discussing this

153

organisational focus further with the respondents, it was understood that this logic is considered crucial for the smooth (re)integration of service-users into the mainstream society. Robert had the following to say on the matter:

> There are several clients who have problems when being around other people, for various reasons: alcohol and substance abuse, mental health issues, or a broken family. You've witnessed instances of aggressiveness, of people being rude and offensive, raising their voice, having violent outbursts, or just 'difficult' habits. These are all issues which need to be controlled and if not resolved, toned down. That is why, in everything that we do here, we insist on certain rules being followed by everyone in the centre; clients and employees. The environment that we provide is very important for us, for what we do and it is especially important for the clients. We want to have a space where they can find physical and psychological succour from their experiences; an environment of safety, acceptance and cooperation. Usually, clients do not only face one particular problem, especially the homeless. It is a vicious cycle of poverty, debts, abuse and violence that many clients find themselves in. It is this cycle we try to help them break. To do that, we need to help them move away from habits, behaviours and tendencies which hold them in that circle that keeps them in the same spot. Talking with them, you'll see that we try to instil a sense of hope; of a positive future, a better future. Hence all our encouragements for no swearing, for willing to communicate calmly and constructively even when you are in a disagreement, for not carrying alcohol within the premises, for a healthy lifestyle, the importance of physical exercise, meeting appointments, all that.

James was of a similar mind:

> Yeah, like we discussed before, it is not enough to say "hey look at me! I'm a human being like you, I need a home, a job or whatever!". There are certain things that you need to learn to do and things you just can't do. It's difficult no doubt, since many clients have been on the defensive all their

154

lives. I was taken care of, you know? When I was at my job, whatever I
needed, I was given. But, this doesn't mean that because you had it harder
than other people, you are somehow entitled to things others have worked
hard to acquire. This is why we have the posters on the wall, 'no shouting'
rules, 'be respectful and positive' rules, talk to duty workers and clients in
a polite manner, etc. They serve this same goal.

The comments above indicate a mentality of increasing service-users' social inclusion and employability chances, by cultivating work habits, similar to the arguments of the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP, 2008). Recalling her experiences with a service-user (before the author had begun his fieldwork), when she was threatened with physical violence, verbally abused and harassed, Rose, (female, 43 years old) a staff member for the last three years and former service-user with problems of substance abuse, added:

This incident obviously affected me for a few days but it was just one person
out of the dozens people I meet and work with every week. I mean, it's
difficult to be afraid to come to work, to talk or look at a person when you
are always worried how they are going to take it. So it's important to keep
clients and especially those who come often in a safe, calm environment. All
in all, I think it's good that we insist on people staying with the programme
and following the rules in the centre, because in this way we can help them
develop these habits which will allow them to be more successful in the job
market, with their families, in their whole daily lives really.

Nancy, an ex-offender with alcohol problems who during the fieldwork started volunteering in a part-time capacity (three hours per week), relating to her own experiences, agreed with the aforementioned opinions of staff members:

I know that it can be a bit rough around here, when you are used to living
differently and doing other things with your time, but it is all for the best, I
know that now. If you talked to me a year ago, we wouldn't be able to chat
like we do now. But now I know my mistakes. I know how it is to be
responsible for something and have the satisfaction to see this something

155

not going to pot (laughter)! I eat healthier food now, take care not to get into trouble and doing much better. In my time here, I've understood how important it is to have a positive attitude and not just let time pass you by.

Janet (female, 42 years old), a staff member, also talked about how important it is for service-users to have a healthy lifestyle and a positive attitude, which leads to a self-contained loop of helpful reciprocity in most social contexts:

For me and you, maybe it doesn't seem such a big deal Giannis. But for many clients being malnutritioned or eating all the wrong stuff has had a visible effect on them. Even the skill workshops, what they are intended to achieve is to teach people to be in a productive environment; work with other people; sort out any differences not with their fists but with their arguments. When you try to be positive and polite, it immediately inspires others to treat you and perceive you in the same way. In time, other people will not see you differently and you will get opportunities to put your life back on track.

Harriett, likewise talked about how the improvement of clients' social skills, individual behaviour and daily habits, plays a major role in their efforts for socioeconomic (re)integration and full citizenship:

Look, it's not like we are herding people...we are not forcing any client to do something they don't want to. But providing clients with the framework, the motivation and the support they need to improve themselves in every aspect, is the only way of helping them. To have a safe shelter where you can rest and eat and wash up is great. But the challenge is getting back out there and in order to sustain your progress here, you need to have some basic skills; self-control; learn how to be around other people with different experiences.

Gary (male, 37 years old), another staff member, also talked about the importance of individual responsibility and positive changes that the clients with enough perseverance, can achieve in their lives with the support of the organisation:

> *It will not always be pretty, but that's the way it is. Being honest and harsh with yourself, learn to be patient, abstain from choices and habits which have proven to be destructive for you and others around you. I think that sooner or later this will be appreciated and people can take meaningful positive steps in their lives; make changes. Maybe not immediately, but I have seen it happen, several times here.*

Therefore, playing by the rules set by the government, the UK TSO is engaging in interventions that target vulnerable people's diets, health, sex-life, parenting strategies, psychological inclinations, alcohol consumption, manners, time-management, as well as their 'social presence'; their attitudes and behaviour towards others. It is as if the politicisation of individual lifestyle in welfare, is inversely proportional to the depoliticisation of public life and certainly, social policy (Hoggett, 2000). Consequently, the paradigm of public social policy has shifted from engaging with citizens, to treating them as if they are biologically mature children. As Alan (male, 38 years old), a former service-user (unemployed ex-offender) and now a member of staff employed in the kitchen of the organisation said:

> *...we (staff and volunteers) must be aware and concerned that clients may be lacking in the knowledge and skills necessary apart from the required cooking equipment to prepare healthy meals, and we have to be able to cater to even such simple things with our workshops and activities.*

The reorientation of the UK welfare mix towards attending to the 'therapeutic needs' of the disadvantaged, endorses the claim that in the past, traditional redistributive social policy was far too focused on material goods. The argument for a more individualised, emotional system of welfare is generally pursued on the ground that a holistic approach is needed, one that meets the emotional as well as physical needs of human beings since social inequalities are experienced through psychosocial mechanisms linking structure to individual health (Giddens, 2006). It is argued, that socioeconomic factors now primarily affect health through

indirect psychosocial rather than direct material routes. From this standpoint, the call for interventions towards social groups deemed as vulnerable or potentially antisocial, is justified on the grounds that it contributes to the best mental and physical health of all society.

As a result, the prevailing focus in the organisation is a highly individualised orientation towards the service-users that seeks to disaggregate them and manage them as clients or patients. As long as the latter remain disengaged from politics they can be treated as atomized individuals. Consequently, social citizenship, as the denomination of state-protected social rights enhancing equal socioeconomic opportunities, is replaced by a conception of 'good citizenship'. Good citizenship is conceived as a future reward which is not guaranteed, but must be acquired after overcoming a multitude of conditionalities and by adhering to rules designating proper behaviour, daily habits, social skills, lifestyle and morals. This approach serves only to sustain exclusionary mechanisms and stigmatising processes of 'othering', confirming and consolidating the status of powerlessness, vulnerability and ultimately, non-citizenship of vulnerable, disadvantaged and marginalised social groups.

Consequently, for the staff and volunteers in the UK TSO, perhaps unconsciously, social citizenship and (re)integration of the vulnerable, have essentially become conditional and highly regulated, as per the dominant trends in welfare policy-making in the country. It should be noted though, that the aforementioned phrase *'perhaps unconsciously'* was used purposefully by the author. The researcher did not find any data, or observed any occurrences, which would indicate that there is a conscious, deliberate effort by the organisation as a whole, to design and 'push a specific agenda' regarding vulnerable social groups, in a way the government, think tanks, public institutions, mainstream media or other social actors are doing. All participants involved with the UK TSO are well-meaning, hard-working people, who are doing their best to help the most vulnerable parts of the local community under straining circumstances, often at the expense of their own psychological balance and peace of mind.

Finally, it is important to mention that organisational debates always concerned the daily operation of the organisation; how the organisation can function more smoothly and offer better support and tangible services to its users, improving their situation and lives. For the most part, the strategies, activities and goal-setting employed by the organisation, are chosen on the basis of what is deemed most appropriate for the organisation to stay a relevant, effective and proficient contributor for the vulnerable in the local community, while at the same time ensuring its continuous economic viability and survival. Nevertheless, the

above analysis and discussion, indicates that the welfare mix and wider government policy context for the operation of small to medium scale local TSOs such as the UK organisation in this case study, seem to be particularly suited to take advantage of their vulnerability. A vulnerability related to the economic situation, suited for bringing forth the 'dark side' of the TS as a state agent in welfare, promoting broader government agendas. The result is that there seem to be plenty opportunities to co-opt and direct TSOs' operations on a strategic, as well as a day-to-day level; particularly on the issue of the governance of the behaviour and the socioeconomic (re)integration of marginalised populations as equal citizens.

8.2. The Greek third sector organisation, welfare and social citizenship

The Greek TSO, is very different from the UK organisation, in its approach to the socioeconomic (re)integration and the social citizenship rights of vulnerable, marginalised and disadvantaged social groups; both on a conceptual level, as well as on the practical level of social interventions and activities. Initially, spending time in the organisation and looking at some of the documents and flyers in the premises, of particular interest to the author was the deliberate avoidance by members of words such as 'vulnerable', 'disadvantaged social groups' or 'clients' when referring to service-users. Words such as these are very common in social policy, welfare discussion and among social purpose TSOs and various voluntary collectives in the UK; this case study is a testament of that. In contrast, and in order for the Greek TSO to drive home its central demands of equality and solidarity, members and activists use the term 'marginalised' or don't use any specific term at all. 'People that we try to support', 'people that come here' are the generic phrases which you hear the most in reference to service-users, people seeking advice on matters of welfare bureaucracy, people using the social store or the social pharmacy, etc. Additionally, this choice of words is not just a strategy to avoid or diminish the stigma and welfare-dependency label attached to people seeking help. It was revealed to coincide with the organisation's goal to divert attention from individual problems and move the discussion towards collective, social issues; the political struggle for guaranteed social rights.

In a follow-up phone interview after the fieldwork in both organisations was conducted, Giorgos talked about the reluctance of members and the organisation in general to use fairly well-accepted terms with regards to marginalised social groups:

Well, I don't know Giannis. It's just that we don't see ourselves and other people in this way. I mean, who is not vulnerable in Greek society today except for the oligarchy having the wealth and power? I guess you could say that children are vulnerable, but again, we are not some kind of fund-raising charity for poor children so we can then go to the media and advertise what good people we are: "everything is OK, just give us money and the problem will go away, you can go back to your sofas, you've done your duty to yourselves and society". We try to mobilise people about inequality and poverty; about social problems and abolished social rights as a result of certain policies and ideologies enforced in society for several years.

The internal article of association, the declaration and texts produced in the organisation, voice a strong commitment to social rights which are the expression of social solidarity on an institutional level, without referring to any particular disadvantaged social groups, or anyone which could be characterised, in some way or another, 'disadvantaged'. This sentiment is evident in the stated goals of the organisation, which was created on the basis of a specific political and ideological stance. A declaration that employment, protection from poverty, public education and especially, social security, public health, guaranteed standards of living for the impoverished and marginalised, are all social rights which can't be treated in market terms. They can't be bought, sold or quantified in any manner and for which free, direct and immediate access for all people must be secured by the state. The motto '*nobody alone in this crisis*', is indicative of the value the organisation puts on social solidarity, equality and cohesion, and can be found in any and all texts related to the organisation.

Moreover, it reveals the volunteers' and activists' will to answer the political challenge of resisting the imposed neoliberal reforms in Greece since 2009, promoting instead a social vision of equality, participation, grassroots community engagement and democratic co-decision. As a result, what the organisation has in mind regarding social citizenship when arguing the social support of the disadvantaged and their socioeconomic (re)integration as equal citizens, while on paper might seem similar to the UK TSO's aims, in practice it takes a very different spin. It is a philosophy, which puts heavy emphasis on an application of social citizenship as a web of social rights guaranteed by the state for all without exceptions, conditions or reciprocal requirements. These rights, operationalised

primarily through the welfare state and public social policy, will be the main instruments for the realisation and organisation of a society characterised by social solidarity and cohesion.

The comments of the Greek participants, members, volunteers and service-users, reveal these differences very clearly, especially concerning social integration and the notion of social citizenship with regards to disadvantaged populations. Dimitris argued that:

> *We have the social work that we do such as the provision of food, shelter, psychological support, first-level medical care, etc. But, we also see the broader context of political conflict and the duty to bring to light the main causes that force people to seek out our services. So we try to promote a new paradigm, the prototype of the society that we want to live in. It is a model that so far seems to function within the organisation and this is our suggestion for the whole society, politics and economy. We try to show in practice, that society can function through new political avenues. That's why we talk so much about solidarity and equality. Yes, it is progress when nobody dies from hunger, or homelessness, or drug abuse; but the challenge is for the marginalised to be able to re-enter a society and a job market of equal opportunities. Where social goods such as healthcare, education, a decent pension, decent unemployment benefits will be a given for all. This is what we mean by 'social rights'; human decency for all.*

Marianna (female, 26 years old) an unemployed school teacher and volunteer who became a member during the fieldwork commented:

> *Under no circumstances we wish to substitute the state in its explicit and constitutional obligations to the citizens of this country. We just try to meet primary needs and address this huge gap which has been created in the lives of so many people in Greece not being able to access social goods and services. It is about trying to motivate marginalised people to 'get off their couch'. We are not a charity; we know that solidarity expressed in a social soup kitchen or pharmacy, is a stop-gap solution; a needed first step to help people simply to exist. But this is only the start. Participation in our political struggle and open assemblies will help disadvantaged social*

161

groups acquire awareness about who the 'enemy' is, and the understanding we all have equal value and more power than the government or Brussels, because we are many; many more than them.

Marianna's remarks reveal a similarity with the UK organisation in the sense that personal motivation of the service-users is a goal for both organisations, but to different ends. In the Greek case, individual success of sorts, will come through political activism to achieve social change (linking the individual to the social). In the UK, as we saw it can be achieved through personal adherence to various behavioural standards accepted by the mainstream. Michalis (male, 41 years old), a fired private employee and a member for three years similarly said:

Having social rights is fundamental; it's like having the right to exist in a society as equal. Someone without social security, access to health, education or employment, what kind of a citizen is he? We need to reclaim our national sovereignty and rebuild the social welfare state, but this time according to our needs, the people's needs and not according to what the guys with the expensive suits here or in Europe want. That's why we try to raise awareness and participate in social causes, strikes and demonstrations. Because we have seen how much more optimistic and self-assured everyone becomes. Despite the small progress, the movement is finding new ways to help us face our common problems. Society and economy should be structured around the goal of everyone having decent standards of living.

Athanasia (female, 44 years old) a volunteer and service user (she gets her medicine from the social pharmacy) who had a small business as hairdresser, which she had to close due to the crisis, acquired debts, lost her health insurance and as a result developed health issues, talked about the notion of social rights and citizenship in a similar manner:

Yeah, I would agree that this is a part of what we are trying to help with. Although the question we are asking here, is what kind of society to be integrated in are we talking about? What's the purpose? To provide food or medicine to someone? OK, that's great, but what will happen a month from

162

now? A year from now? This then becomes a charity, and charities don't
solve social problems. We are talking about social rights here. The right to
have a job, for banks not taking your home away, for benefits for your
child, the right to be able to go to the public hospital. There is no society
after a certain point, since everything becomes so fragmented; in
competition like in the market. Democratic participation, organisation in
every neighbourhood, resistance, awareness of the policies that diminish
our rights and helping each other with solidarity in practice; that's when
you are a citizen.

The goal of integrating marginalised social groups through political activism which aims to incur broader social, political and economic changes (redistribute power and wealth) and a new paradigm of organisation from the ground-up as an expression of citizenship, was also mentioned by another service-user, Vaso (female, 52 years old). Vaso is unemployed, her deceased husband's pension is cut almost in half and she has been using the social store to buy necessities (e.g., bread, oil, milk, detergents, etc.) for her family (two underage children) and has also been seeing the counsellor of the organisation to help her with her psychological problems. Regarding citizenship and social integration she commented:

For me, the most important issue is that in this country it seems that all the
time everything is the poor people's fault. If I was younger I would try to
participate more in what people in the organisation are doing, I really
would. I agree completely that by operating with real democratic
procedures not like our parliament's but directly, through the common
people, you feel much more of a citizen and much more in control. For me
and others, this place here gives us the opportunity to scrape by. The
political stuff...I'm not sure. We have a left government and again we have
a third memorandum deal, so nothing really changes. Maybe I'm a bit
pessimistic (laughter)?

Kyriakos (male, 36 years old), a service-user who is suffering from a rare type of blood disease and through the organisation's efforts has managed to receive (part of) the required

treatment needed from the public health system, also talked about his understanding of social citizenship, integration of the disadvantaged and the organisation's role:

> *For me, health and employment are the most important issues, when you talk about 'being a citizen'. The state must be able to provide access to these for all; some help, advice, anything. I'm very grateful to the guys here and all that they have done for me in that regard. But others might not be so lucky. Not everyone lives in big cities; not everyone can even find out about such organisations. And what if such organisations close? Should we be dependent on whoever decides to help others next? Then we become beggars, not citizens Giannis. We need a new, how to say...model for organising society, so at least health, employment and poverty, are one of the main concerns of the state.*

Georgia (female, 38 years old), a member who has had drug problems in the past, but is now offering her services as a therapist and a trained social worker, added:

> *It is a part of what we do. Of course we want to help everyone who comes here to have a better life. But we don't believe that queues outside of the social kitchen are acceptable. One more charity is not what we need. A citizen in ancient Greece meant something else; someone who participated in public life; in the governance of the 'city'. We need to organise a grassroots movement of resistance against the neoliberal policies which have evaporated our social rights and have pushed so many people to the margins. We can't attend to our and everyone's needs all the time; let's be honest. With these policies people will be always deprived of their social rights and essentially their citizenship as long as the power belongs to the few. For us, solidarity and citizenship means striving for equality and justice.*

Giorgos, likewise stressed the importance of a direct relation existing between core social good and services being guaranteed by the state as social rights for all on the one hand, and

the nuances of citizenship as the culmination of a process of socioeconomic (re)integration for the marginalised through political struggle, on the other:

> *To struggle for everyone to be a citizen with protected social rights no matter their economic and social status or political preference, that's the goal. For us, migrants and refugees should be treated as citizens. This is what we mean by social integration of the disadvantaged: equal rights in a more egalitarian society. Working within the movement through direct democratic procedures, seeing how this can bring positive results, changes your attitude towards social problems and life as a whole. You feel as part of a collective with a purpose beyond having money. It's about social justice; because in the end, this is what citizenship is; social justice, cohesion and solidarity. When everyone can cover their needs and use their talents. We don't want a society of charities and beggars, of included and excluded who live on scraps when someone throws some their way. No, employment is a social right, no BUTs. Health, a home, electricity, food, are all social rights for all citizens. State welfare should guarantee that above and beyond anything else.*

Unlike the UK TSO, the Greek organisation seeks to advocate social welfare policies which are not grounded in a neoliberal conception of culture that is primarily based on an assumption that social issues of poverty, healthcare, marginalisation and homelessness are about individual value orientations, antisocial behaviour and personal morals. Social integration of service-users and in general the vulnerable in society and social citizenship rights are interconnected; the one, unerringly should lead to the other. It is a discourse not espousing the approach that the vulnerable and disadvantaged must be persuaded (coerced) as individuals, into behaving in accordance with the values of a worker-centric society and the remnants of a welfare state, operating under the auspices of reciprocal conditionalities, sanctions and discipline mechanisms. The idea is that services need to be flexible, responsive and tailor-made to an individual's circumstances. Individuals no longer, in principle, belong to categories that can be treated as a group in terms of benefit entitlements, and thus be subject to bureaucratic processes of matching entitlement rules to the category of welfare

recipient. They are becoming now, it seems, clients and consumers of new forms of service delivered in new ways (Taylor-Gooby et al., 2004).

We've seen how the current welfare policies in the UK have at their centre TSOs, communities and the civil society providing the means to enhance the degree of inclusion and empowerment of vulnerable populations. But, as it was discussed in **chapter 3**, this type of public participation while seemingly enables individuals to exercise freedom and agency, it is simultaneously an effective means of social regulation and control. As Brodie (2000: 124) argues, as governments come to govern more and more through communities and individuals 'the list of responsibilities for the self-reliant individual grows daily'. In Greece, especially since the advent of the crisis, the already threadbare and fragmented welfare state has been further weakened by reforms and measures inspired by the social investment state welfare and neoliberalism paradigms (Matsaganis, 2011). Resembling the UK, emphasis is being put on social steering and social control of individuals, through the involvement of the community and the TS, as well as by withholding, or the threat of withholding welfare support. Hence, also in Greece, social citizenship is being reduced to rights which are under approval pending strict requirements, essentially inducing whole swathes of the population to processes of marginalisation and exclusion.

It is explained then, why the Greek organisation never refers to individuals; to individual empowerment, initiatives or values. In contrast, the participants spoke constantly of mobilising the people in movements and neighbourhoods; organising through direct democratic participation and advocating power for the disenfranchised masses in order to resist policies which move away from a just and robust social welfare state. As a result, it is intended that the experiences of stigma, shame and deprivation, are substituted by '...*experiences of pride, creativeness, voluntarism, fulfilment, decency and sociopolitical activism, which are birthed from active interaction and public service*' (Dimitris). Vasillis (male, 38 years old), a former alcoholic and now a member, characteristically stated:

> ...*it is very important that people here feel that they are treated as equal and worthy human beings and not believe that because they lost their jobs, they lost their value as human being. Indeed, we see people belonging to vulnerable social groups, stigmatised or marginalised mobilising, because they start understanding that they are worth as much as anybody else and they now know they can contribute to their fellow citizen.*

Essentially, through its interventions and ways of operation, the Greek TSO tries to transfuse its context of values, constructing a new social and collective identity, both of which are prerequisites for the establishment of new, dynamic and engaging social movement processes. This process is similar to the one described and observed in the UK organisation, with service-users who engage further with the organisation regaining their self-confidence. The decisive difference though, is the focus not on individual skills, lifestyles and behaviour, but on the construction of a social identity through collective political struggle seeking to secure '*universal social rights*' (Giorgos).

As it has been discussed, the declared goal of the organisation is dual: first, social support of the disadvantaged and secondly: raising social awareness, perpetual political activism and intervention in social problems related to marginalisation and inequality. All the participants involved with the Greek organisation beyond receiving goods and services, (members and volunteers) without exception, are fully aware of the dual purpose and the political activities of the organisation, declaring that these two dimensions are equally important. But even service-users who are somewhat wary of the use of the term 'political' and mistrust politics in general and existing political parties in particular, realise and accept the organisation's character. Marios, a bankrupt small businessman who had fallen on hard times and who regularly uses the social store, said:

> *We do have political character. But we are talking of political goals and*
> *action tied to the needs of society, not political parties' goals. All of us,*
> *living in this society as citizens, are the ones who should shape politics, as*
> *politics should follow and serve our needs. I support them in what they do;*
> *unfortunately, I had to be financially ruined to understand what being a*
> *citizen means, and what being socially excluded really means.*

Similarly, most of the respondents find the more political interventions of the organisation, equally important to the provision of multilevel relief to vulnerable social groups and the promotion of the values of democracy, solidarity, cooperation, community engagement and voluntarism. This paradigm is upheld both through the operational example of the organisation's democratic and cooperative governance structure and identity, as well as the attempt for an active denunciation of dominant capitalist socioeconomic practices at the

167

micro and macro level. Both processes are considered to be what socioeconomic integration is all about. Apparently, for the members, it is about struggling to secure social rights through sociopolitical activism guided by a specific set of values, informing and realised by practices attempting to form a tangible and practical counter paradigm of the social body; one that seeks to resist the currently dominant neoliberal political, economic and social model, putting grassroots democratic procedures safeguarding an equality and justice-oriented welfare state at its centre. Giorgos was particularly clear about that:

> *Citizenship for us are equal rights and equal opportunities in economy, education, healthcare, etc.; it's not just making people 'more employable'; with 35 per cent unemployment and 60 per cent youth unemployment, so many working 12 hours uninsured and paid 350 euros per month, with 500.000 Greeks having migrated what kind of growth can there be, except one based on exploitation, injustice and disadvantage? We have to look at the bigger picture...all of us.*

Therefore, it can be seen that members understand employability and the sociopolitical ramifications it carries as a watchword of neoliberal governance. The application of political pressure for the reclamation of such rights in favour of a society and economy focused on equality guaranteed by the social welfare state -especially for vulnerable and disadvantaged social groups- is for all intents and purposes the equivalent of the UK TSO's life-changing activities and skill workshops. Aggelos (male, 50 years old) a doctor and member, argued that:

> *By enforcing these policies, the governments lay the groundwork for their own defeat, because what is happening could be the awakening and mobilisation of a whole society. And an awakened society, becomes a better society. The economy, health and educational systems are collapsing together with the whole social welfare state, but at the same time some people are coming together and learning to develop a new radical dynamic, leading to new democratic social movements with demands of redistribution, solidarity, care and equality.*

In that regard, it is this political opportunity for raising awareness and sensitising people to collectively cooperate and self-organise and form diverse social movements with tangible claims for the realisation of their anti-neoliberal vision of social citizenship rights, which seems to motivate the Greek TSO's members and volunteers. Thus, we understand that the organisation attempts to construct contexts of meaning which should meet the expectations of the populations they are projected to. This is done through a process of naming, recognising and promoting these social demands: social rights, social justice, solidarity, a welfare state providing access to core public good and services for all, and a notion of citizenship anchored in social justice. In this way, members make value-adjustments in order to 'reframe pre-existing social, symbolic and cultural patterns which are essential for the awareness, acceptance and public infusion of social movements' (Alexandropoulos, 2001: 18). Moreover, this value frame is one that identifies and establishes the 'opponent' through the processes of the creation of a social group identity. This collective identity is formed upon symbols and emotions arising from a sense of injustice and anger against an 'unjust social condition' and 'stems from the interaction between structural tensions and the emergence of a social actor which defines itself and its opponents on the basis of values and interests' (Della Porta & Gianni, 2008: 178).

The basic components for creating this identity are first, the clear self-identification of actors and key allies, in our case the disadvantaged, lower classes, the 'common people', similar collectives, anti-neoliberal trade unions, civil society solidarity initiatives, etc. Secondly, and perhaps more importantly, the clear identification of the challenges and the opponent by the organisation. Therefore, the formation of a 'we' that is based on trust, mutual support, common values, collective solidarity and political struggle, together with the emergence of the 'other'. The others, are neoliberal market policies, the *'higher echelons of society'* as Giorgos put it, and the national and foreign oligarchies, identified as responsible for the situation (stakes) of this actor and against which it seeks to be mobilised. Hence, in the Greek TSO, the build-up of this social identity as a process of collective empowerment which could lead to state-protected social rights consolidating social citizenship, is based both on a positive definition of the organisation and its associated actors, and on 'the negative definition of who or what is not only excluded from the social movement, but actively oppose it' (Della Porta & Gianni, 2008: 180).

The Greek TSO's members do not appear divided in their belief that the pressure for the reclamation of social rights must come from a people's movement first, and then

169

solidified through state intervention, which ultimately will guarantee social citizenship on the basis of equality and solidarity. Stella (female, 44 years old), a member who is a psychologist and psychiatrist voluntarily offering her counselling services on-site, clarified:

> *We aren't trying to substitute the state. When the state fulfills its obligations again and we live in a social and economic system based more on justice, equality, cohesion and distribution, then this broader dialogue that we try to have with society, can be become a national issue of what kind of a democracy we really want. Our goals do not have to do with a complete political transformation of the system and overthrow the parliament for example. Well, perhaps this parliament (laughter)!*

For the Greek participants, citizenship demands state welfare provision, free from market constraints and values; there cannot be an adequate or attractive notion of citizenship without it. Social citizenship is not about regulating individuals' behaviour, lifestyles and emotions so that they can be better 'used' in the free competitive market and the social relations it sustains. It is about assuring health, education, social services, employment and income support to everyone in our society. Consequently, the welfare state is the main expression of equality and solidarity and the principal element actively supporting social cohesion. This approach is much closer to Marshall's focus upon equality than the UK organisation's and the logic of the social investment welfare model. Although, it must be mentioned that for Marshall, citizenship seems to be about expanding and enriching society's notion of equality by extending its scope through civil, political and social rights within a teleological historic process of the progress of civilization. The development of universal rights of citizenship has pushed forward the meaning of equality by broadening the scope of its application. Marshall stressed that it is not 'absolute equality' he is aiming at, nor is it any rigid equality of wealth, but 'a general enrichment of the concrete substance of civilised life' (1950/1992: 49).

This conceptualisation of socioeconomic reintegration, social citizenship and the welfare state with a focus on equality and solidarity, is a stark departure from the UK organisation's approach. The UK TSO's logic, echoes the neoliberalism, individualism and neocommunitarianism narrative of obligations of the vulnerable and marginalised to the community / society. The 'rights and responsibilities' and 'moral values' rhetoric of the social investment welfare model based on mechanisms of behaviour governance and

regulation of lifestyles, are absent from the Greek TSO's understanding of social support and (re)integration. It does not try to provide access to second rate, temporary alternatives to proper employment. To what it deems as '*the illusion of social inclusion and citizenship through charity and fragmented philanthropy*' as Nikos (male, 54 years old), a member and volunteer pharmacist in the social pharmacy argued. It follows that citizenship hinges on equality; it is not something which can depend on, or be achieved through the altruism of others and the subsequent adoption of particular attitudes and value-orientation by the marginalised. Hearing our discussion with Nikos, Maria (female, 30 years old), a former drug-user and a member added:

> *Everyone is accepted as an equal Giannis, and we want to develop a respectful and trustful relationships. I don't understand what a philanthropist means; I understand a 'philanimalist' (animal friend) but a philanthropist? It seems redundant and quite embarrassing to be called that, or call yourself that. The form of voluntarism cultivated here, is created from the ground up and from the heart of the social body. The state, should ensure that this voluntarism is as little needed as possible.*

The underlying logic seems to be quite the opposite from the belief of many involved with, or advocating for the TS: namely that the state cannot really be a democratic state in the sense of a state broadly controlled through democratic processes, so the most we can hope for, is an external pressure on its actions (Kendall, 2009). The Greek TSO appears to be opting for stronger idea of democracy as a type of 'rule by the people', in which political power is exercised through mechanisms of popular participation and the parameters of state actions are controlled by citizens, in what Giorgos described as '*democratic social control*'.

In a similar manner to the UK, lip service is paid to the ethics and moral obligation of helping disadvantaged members of society, but at a national level, any form of state-funded welfare or entitlement is extremely restricted as this would jeopardise the fiscal goals and debt obligations of the country. At the same time and owing much to the perpetual guilt of right-wing liberals for the atrocities against the leftists and supporters of the communist-led People's Liberation Army during and after the civil war, for some it would be a 'return to the practices which have left Greece indebted and dysfunctional as the last Soviet nation in Europe' (Balcells & Kalyvas, 2014: 1417). As a result, the current reality in Greece is that

171

welfare is essentially to be local and limited. There is certainly no room for an extensive system of nationally guaranteed social rights or services, and the redistribution of social or financial wealth across even small community or group borders is absent, left to the church and the ruling class-owned charities. Stelios, (male, 42 years old) a member with disability and poverty problems, commented on the organisation's particular take of this reality:

> *If we said, "fine, we accept your money, just transfer it to this bank account" then we would be just another NGO; a charity with funders and investors which are so popular lately. The challenge is to move past such schemes of participation, and mobilisation. To prompt anyone who wants to contribute, in moving past this mentality of the passive charitable donor and the needy beneficiary, but have all partners in this relationship as active participants in all that we are trying to do here. We need to keep trying helping people see social matters from a different perspective. Given the circumstances, it's difficult to do so. To offer social services and at the same time move away from this model of philanthropism which even when it's well-meaning, results as an excuse for the absence of state social support, or neoliberal reforms such as privatisations of public social services.*

Theodora (female, 48 years old), a member with mental health problems, further argued:

> *People should not be left alone to fend for themselves. The state has to be there, especially for people with health problems, even if people made a wrong choice so what? It is the responsibility of the state to support them. If not, then I don't understand, why do we have a society, a government an economic system and all that? What's the point? That's why we try to raise awareness. The problem is not how to find a bed or a job for a day or a week and make people beggars. The problem is to move towards a more just and democratic system, where all will have opportunities and support for at least a roof on their heads, their health problems and a minimal employment.*

172

In the UK, as TSOs are increasingly forced to assume the role of 'social regulator' in order to remain relevant, people are taught to accept more personal responsibility for their own welfare arrangements, rather than relying on directly provided public services. Within this process and in order to become active citizens rather than mere demoralized rights claimers, social rights appear to have suffered. In the Greek TSO's perception, the same course is being followed in Greece and it is one that it tries to reverse. Rights guaranteed by the state in Greece are to be limited to civil and political rights (see i.e., Selbourne, 1994). Although, as we saw, social, civil and political rights are heavily interconnected and the impairment of the former, quite drastically minimises the ability, or willingness to exercise the latter. Leonidas (male, 37 years old), a long-time unemployed member who still struggles with poverty, commented about charities and the civil society:

> *What if many people won't give up the time and resources to care about the rights of others? What about classes with different interests in society? Someone gains, the other loses. I think that this differential power and conflicting values in society, make this dependency on the goodwill of others, a covert way to further reduce the people's rights which have been gained through decades of struggle; we just can't depend on private interests, kindness, sensitivity or in general personal initiative Giannis.*

Such arguments indicate that, the nature of the Greek TSO and its conceptualisation of social citizenship and state-guaranteed social rights, are strongly related to its organisational identity as belonging to social movements which have arisen as an anti-neoliberal response to the Greek crisis. The notion of citizenship envisaged in the post-war settlement, although far from universal in practice (Alcock, 1989; Williams, 1999), did at least recognise that social rights had, in Marshall's words, a 'fundamental importance' (Marshall & Bottomore, 1992: 49). This is the welfare and social citizenship model most resembling the Greek organisation's demands. Thanasis (male, 41 years old), an economist and one of the oldest members, was adamant when speaking about the organisation's perception of social rights and welfare:

> *I can't accept a society where there are unemployed people, people who can't have their medicines, children who can't go to school, who are out in*

173

the streets homeless, where refugees and immigrants don't have the same rights as all citizens. That's what we mean when we talk about social rights; protected rights by the state for everyone. They are not for sale and they demand no requirements. Citizenship means having barriers against an economic system which can't be outside of democratic, social control. Because depending on charity is not enough. Charity and voluntarism fluctuate and in reality, don't solve the problems of the system. Organising ourselves in our neighbourhoods to make the elites reverse their course, is the only way to have meaningful changes in the near future.

In conclusion, the overarching difference between the two organisations in approaching the welfare element of citizenship, can be traced to their organisational identity and its compliance or resistance to the current national habitus and overall welfare context. In the Greek case, the organisation develops its identity and activities in direct opposition to the dominant policies and associated narratives. It is more than likely, although impossible to be irrevocably proven within the scope of this research, that the historically underdeveloped and minimal role of the TS within the Greek welfare architecture compared to the UK -together with the crisis- has fashioned much more favourable conditions for the establishment of TSOs such as the one studied. In the UK, the organisation is simply adapting and adhering to the political and economic context. In both countries -in the UK for more than two decades, in Greece more recently- the social component of citizenship is essentially undergoing a redefinition, in which certain welfare rights are increasingly conditional upon citizens first agreeing to conform to appropriate patterns of behaviour as defined by the state or other 'providers of welfare' (Driver & Martell, 1997; Lister, 1997: 8). The focus is not on equality, but on social cohesion. But in such a multifaceted model, social cohesion does not coalesce in a relation between citizens and the state, as it traditionally did. Rather, it flows from individuals in relation with each other, whose behaviour is shaped by a multitude of social factors, many of them well beyond the reach of the state, and some, confined to the realm of individual responsibility.

The study has shown that the UK TSO, as a provider of welfare within this context, can't distance itself from the groundwork ideologies and practices of the UK welfare mix and its shift towards social investment, community reciprocity, conditionality and ASB. The comments of its staff, its strategic aims, activities and governance structure are geared

towards this prevailing approach to social citizenship which is built around the pivotal notion of individual responsibility. This has served two purposes: first, the exclusion of certain individuals from public welfare arrangements becomes less problematic for the provider of welfare. The welfare rights of those deemed 'irresponsible' because they cannot, or will not, meet certain state-endorsed standards or regulations may be withdrawn or reduced. Second, the state can then place the blame for the predicament of those whose right to publicly funded welfare is reduced or removed, firmly at the door of the individuals concerned. Simultaneously, it justifies the withdrawal of an individual's welfare rights and the reduction of its own role (or the role of its appointed agents) in guaranteeing or financing social provision.

In the UK, this welfare consensus has been consistently and purposefully built by both main government parties (Labour and Conservatives) for decades (Mooney & Neal, 2010). Perhaps this can explain to a degree the mostly unproblematic acceptance by the UK TSO of the above discourse and practice, as to a large extent it is an 'insider' and not a campaigning organisation within the welfare mix. In Greece, this welfare consensus is but one part of this new web of liberalisation and fiscal adjustment policies imposed to uphold the bailout deals signed with the creditors (EU / EC, ECB, IMF) after the beginning of the public debt crisis in 2008 (Mpourikos, 2013). It is a policy grounded in broader changes in taxation, public spending, public administration, labour relations, labour law and welfare benefits and can be described as based upon the 'values of individualism, self-interest and private market purchasing' (Alcock, 1996: 48). The end goal is a more overall, structural liberalisation and flexibilisation of economy and society. But in both countries, the advocates of this policy are concerned primarily with drastically reducing the financial costs of public welfare provisions and placing socioeconomic problems within the realm of the individual and communities. This wave of Greek solidarity TSOs like the organisation in this case study, appears to be combating this policy context sitting outside the welfare mix and at the same time, trying to change it.

In contrast, the UK organisation as a more 'traditional' UK TSO, tries to retain its values of altruism, care for the vulnerable, and -due to its Christian origins- the importance of Christian ethics and behaviour. At the same time, it employs the practices, and adheres to the guiding principles of the social investment state welfare model, revolving around conditionality, reciprocity, duties and behavioural regulation. Moreover, the organisation does not primarily acquire resources directly through services rendered. Therefore, it is

175

dependent on whether its core practices can mobilise volunteers, sponsors and donors; attract funding from (mainly the local) private for-profit sector or public bodies. Consequently, it appears that the more efficient strategy to safeguard the present and future of the organisation, is staying clear from antagonising the dominant policies and priorities of the UK welfare model, and the participants seem to understand that. While it retains its community-oriented focus and resists the pressures towards the adoption of a more business-like model, state governance agendas concerning TSOs have clearly influenced both its organisational identity, as well as its activities. The final chapter of the thesis provides an overall concluding discussion of the findings, a reflection on the contribution and limitations of the study, and some suggestions for future research in the field.

Chapter 9. Conclusions, reflection and further research

During this research, several differences regarding the stance of the two TSOs concerning the governance of welfare, control of the users, social citizenship and processes of socioeconomic (re)integration of the disadvantaged were identified. Perhaps a first indication on understanding these differences comes from the language used. The consistent use of the word 'client' instead of 'service-users' in the UK organisation throughout all the interviews, as well as any organisational documents, is telling. It can be interpreted as reflecting the wider shift towards the professionalisation and marketisation of the TS in the UK. Additionally, it is interesting that in the Greek language the word 'client' has a dual meaning: its proper use in written speech, can only refer to a customer; a buyer and consumer of services and / or goods. However, in oral speech, it is often used as a derogatory term; a synonym for a mindless automaton, a slave; a person who only does what is told to, when and how is told to. In other words, in most everyday Greek social contexts (excluding common market exchanges), a 'client', is an individual who is the product of processes of power resulting in it becoming the object of relations of domination. In the Greek TSO, the equivalent words used are simply 'people who come here', or more rarely, 'service-users' and 'beneficiaries'. Obviously, the answers to the main research queries, are more complex than what can be interpreted from this observation and more comprehensive explanatory accounts have to be provided regarding the different approaches employed by the two TSOs.

As it was discussed in **chapters 7** and **8**, a striking, immediately observable difference between the two organisations, was identified in the presence of recording, monitoring and control (punishment-reward) systems concerning primarily the service-users, but also volunteers and workers. Basically, while governance discourses and practices can be seen in both organisations, they seem to be expressed in a radically different manner between the two. The most interesting aspect of this, is not so much the existence of such systems in and on itself, but mainly, the dissimilarity both in terms of the technology present, as well as the prolificacy, overtness and degree of systemisation in their operationalisation. It was seen, that in the UK TSO such systems are abundant, sophisticated and an important part of the regulations for its daily internal operations. In the Greek TSO, they are still present, but much

less visible or sophisticated (i.e., no CCTV cameras, no 'incidents book', no extensive records concerning service-users' behaviour, no specific rules concerning the 'punishment' of inappropriate conduct, etc.), and more organically interwoven into the identity of the organisation. It was stated by most Greek participants that any 'threat' to organisational activities and ethos will be eventually filtered out 'naturally' from the inside, or is dealt with on a case to case basis. During the fieldwork, in the UK TSO there were multiple instances when there was a disruption of organisational activities, or occasions when the police had to be called in to sort things out, due to incidents of theft, drinking, service-users being verbally abusive, or (more rarely) threatening with physical violence, etc. In the Greek TSO, apart from a couple of occasions when heated arguments between service-users threatened to deteriorate into a brawl, there were no such incidents.

Our analysis leads us to conclude that one element that could explain this difference, is that practices of governance and control and in general layers of conditionality in welfare, are much more established in the UK, than in Greece. As such, over the years, social purpose TSOs depending on cross-sector partnerships, contract bids and donations had to incorporate such measures to be a legitimate social services provider. In Greece, these trends have only really started to become dominant in the last decade, in particular, since 2009 and the advent of the economic crisis. Furthermore, the UK TSO is almost twice as old as the Greek organisation, has solidified its presence and identity in the local community and has more resources in its disposal, so that it could acquire and use such systems, more readily. Moreover, it was shown that the funding environment, the political context and especially the self-perceived roles of the two TSOs as welfare institutions in the public sphere, are also different. The UK TSO, aims to remain an effective partner of the welfare mix in the country; cooperate with the welfare state, attract funding and expand its activities, regardless of the broader discourses underpinning welfare or the strategic direction governments wish to take it. The Greek TSO, is more concerned with retaining its 'alternative identity' (in opposition to the state) and with recruiting members for its movement-like sociopolitical activism. Additionally, archetypes of stereotypical behaviour could also be invoked for their explanatory power, such as the 'average Greek' or the 'average British' and their proclivity towards 'rowdiness' or antisocial behaviour. However, such constructs can be widely misleading and even if they held some truth, stereotypes of this nature would have us believe the exact opposite of what was observed. In short, it seems that the expectations concerning

the daily behaviour of service-users seem to be widely different and the governance 'technologies of self' being applied reflect that.

Nevertheless, despite the merits which can be found in the above explanations, they are still inadequate to provide a more holistic elucidation which would lead to comprehensive social knowledge. In order to understand these differences from a sociological perspective at least, one has to take into account the concept of *national habitus* for a more inclusive answer. The notion of habitus has gained prominence in social science and research, mostly because of the work of Bourdieu (1979), and Elias (1996). 'Habitus', derived from 'habit', refers to learned practices and standards that have become so much part of ourselves that they feel self-evident and natural. Habitus is our culturally and socially shaped 'second nature'. What we learn as members of a society, in a specific social position, is literarily incorporated into our bodies and minds and becomes our *self*. Habitus, can then be understood as a personal history, being shaped by the history of the society of which we are part. Thus, our 'self', and in several instances our automatic, yet learned behaviour, is partly determined by the country where we have grown up, the established social norms, and the sociocultural processes that have marked its historical development (Adams et al., 2005).

In the UK, the association of drinking and substance-abuse with marginalised and vulnerable social groups (especially the homeless) is well recorded, as is the prevalence of 'social' or 'binge' drinking in everyday social contexts, even among middle class, or higher middle class university students (see i.e., Webb et al., 1996; Graham et al., 2001; Fitzpatrick & Jones, 2005; Flint, 2009). No such research investigating a 'culture of drinking' exists for Greece, but studies on the level of alcohol consumption and its accompanying social circumstances across the EU, indicate that the UK and northern EU countries are generally on the high end of such graphs, while Greece and southern EU countries are at the lower end (Hupkens, Knibbe, & Drop, 1993). Heavy drinking outside of a meal or a specific festive occasion and especially in the morning or afternoon, is quite rare in Greece, while the opposite is true in the UK. It is simply not a part of the national habitus of the country, while in the UK, it is. What's more, homeless people are one of the primary target groups of the UK TSO, while homelessness as a social problem became visible in Greece only recently, during the years of the crisis. As it was mentioned in **section 2.4**, the percentage of home ownership in Greece is still the highest in the EU. This fact has its roots in several political, economic, social and cultural processes and its discussion is out of the scope of the thesis. But, it is worth mentioning that a very common old Greek saying present to this day, is the

179

following: '*If you haven't built (and owned) a house and haven't gotten a daughter married, you don't know what life is*'. This titbit of popular 'folk wisdom', is a common social perception in the national habitus of Greece, highlighting the importance of having your own home to be later given as a dowry to your daughter and her future husband, as women were almost entirely excluded from the labour market in previous decades and thus, an 'economic burden'.

This line of thinking also ties back with what was mentioned earlier about the different expectations regarding service-users' behaviour in the two TSOs. In the Greek TSO, the numbers of homeless seeking the organisation's support -though significant for Greece- are not even close to the numbers of people using the social store to acquire necessities for the household and the social pharmacy for first level healthcare, or seeking advice and mediation in their dealings with government social services. In contrast, in the UK TSO 'rough sleepers', people which had their benefits sanctioned (cut) and were driven to the streets or are in some sort of temporary accommodation, have a much larger presence. Another aspect of the differences in the national habitus of the two countries discussed in **section 2.4**, is the long-standing prevalence of family and kinship ties in Greece, as a robust provider of welfare and a social 'safety net'. Consequently, most service-users, while experiencing the same conditions of unemployment and extreme poverty or featuring similar alcohol and substance dependence problems, do still have a home. Due to social norms related to the national habitus, we can reasonably deduce that if they drink and become violent or incoherent, they will do so in the safety of their homes, where if something goes wrong, help will come from relatives (i.e., parents) and at the very least, a warm meal and a bed are always provided, free of charge of course. By extension, most of their mates and drinking partners will probably be at their own homes. There is absolutely no reason to come to the Greek organisation's premises even as a social interaction environment, as they are aware of the very negative, almost 'alien' image they would project, consequently limiting their prospects for socioeconomic (re)integration. A similar argument can be made about unemployed ex-offenders, drug users and other vulnerable social groups in the Greek case.

It makes sense then, that governance technologies are used so differently, as the Greek TSO simply doesn't expect many such incidents of antisocial behaviour to occur. It was observed that for the most part, it is correct in its assessment. What is more, even in the few incidents which were witnessed and the situation could have spiralled out of control, the police was never called, therefore rendering such incidents virtually uncontrollable and / or

dangerous. So there must be a collective 'faith' that they will be really rare. That is another aspect of the differences between the Greek and the UK national habitus. The TS and especially any form of sociopolitical activism in Greece has been traditionally associated with the Left and in several cases with the extreme Left and the anarchist movement (Inglehart, 1990; Arampatzi & Nicholls, 2012). Most occupations of buildings, aggressive trade union campaigns and demonstrations, the student movement, even the environmental movement and certainly this new wave of social solidarity and support TSOs, are dominated by people self-identifying as belonging to the Left and hard Left side of the political spectrum (Vatikiotis, 2011). These individuals and their organisations consider all security government agencies but especially the police, as an ideologically-laden, right-wing instrument of the capitalist Greek state, used by the elites to oppress the massive people. Tellingly, entering the Greek organisation's premises one can immediately see one of the posters depicting a masked demonstrator chasing a riot police officer with the words written underneath: '*Terrorise the terrorists*'. Hence, the members and workers would probably never 'call the cops' on occasions of such problematic incidents. Moreover, they would not overtly use punishment and reward systems when interacting with their service-users as they incorporate elements of coercion and prosecution. These have been typically associated in the Greek national habitus with the police, the 1967-1974 military dictatorship and these days, an anti-democratic, neoliberal state serving the interests of local and foreign elites and governments in the EU (Vatikiotis, 2011; Vradis & Dalakoglou, 2011). Consequently, both the organisation's identity and political role as well as the influence of national habitus discourses on the individual perceptions of members, volunteers and service-users, significantly affect its strategies and daily practices.

In this context, the examination of the influence of the national habitus in the two countries can be further augmented by using the findings of previous research on the organisational ethos and discourses present in the daily activities of TSOs, discussed in **section 2.6**. The different narratives internalised by the Greek and UK participants as part of their national habitus, are actually expressed in their day-to-day interrelation with the service-users, sometimes coinciding and sometimes diverging from the overall organisational ethos. As certain social norms are embedded in the individual self, some UK workers and volunteers express their willingness to care for the service-users through their work, considering the various control systems in place a totally ethical and practical way to run things: '... *it's a normal way to operate. How else could we provide a safe environment for*

everyone here?' (Peter). Others, are just content working or volunteering for an established, well-known (locally) charity, through which they can offer services, satisfy their personal need or Christian ethics mandate for *giving* to the vulnerable, and in general, '*giving something back*' (Harriett).

In the Greek TSO, most participants' perceptions with regards to their interactions with service-users, reflect the organisation's identity and ethos. The ways the organisation pursues its aims through its daily activities are, as we have seen, very much influenced by the Greek national habitus together with the narratives it is promoting concerning social citizenship. For example, the self-liberating and citizenship-actualisation narrative of mobilising together with other disadvantaged people 'like you' to 'fight back', has been internalised by many participants. Most of them consider the organisation's governance practices not as a technique of control or recruitment disregarding the service-users' agency, but as a legitimate approach to further their empowerment and socioeconomic (re)integration and as such, express what parts of the Greek Left currently 'stand for'.

Others, especially the older (age-wise) members and volunteers, like their UK counterparts are more absorbed in a 'culture of care'; in the satisfaction they personally draw from supporting those less fortunate or equally unfortunate to themselves, not paying too much heed to how processes of socioeconomic emancipation of the service-users is attempted to be accomplished. Nevertheless, similarly to the UK case, while individual motivations may vary to a lesser or greater degree, the influence of long-standing national habitus discourses is such, that organisational practices are legitimised both ethically and as a form of applied strategy in the eyes of the vast majority of the participants we talked to. Therefore, it can be understood that important as they are, the two TSOs' identities, the ways they perceive their role in the public realm (welfare and politics) can't by themselves account for their approaches with regards to governance and social citizenship. If the social policy contexts in which they operate, the individual motivations of all those involved and especially a certain organisational ethos influenced by national habitus norms and the associated historical sociocultural processes are combined and taken into consideration, they provide us with a more robust and well-rounded explanatory framework.

Moving forward to a concluding discussion of our RQs and findings, it is important to remember that conducting qualitative social research is always a unique experience. The same researcher entering the same field but at another time period, or the same research activities undertaken by another but with different participants at the same time period, can

yield different information. Of course, even identical information may lead to various interpretations. In the end, it is clear that in most cases there does not exist one, obvious answer, and more questions almost always remain. Still, in the search for these answers lies the only way for social scientists to learn from mistakes, improve as researchers, achieve a measure of academic and social relevance in their work and hopefully, open up avenues for future research, for which themselves and others can be better 'equipped'. In this context, in this final chapter of the thesis, some overall conclusions will be drawn. Furthermore, a reflection on the contribution of the thesis, the fieldwork, and the research project will be presented, along with recommendations for future research in the field.

9.1. The third sector, social control and the governance of behaviour of service-users: the case of two TSOs, in Greece and the UK

The two main research questions of this project, refer to the activities of social purpose TSOs and their relation to government discourse and policies within the realm of social welfare and the social state. This research was carried through at a time when economic and social policies especially concerning vulnerable social groups in Greece and the UK, are at the epicentre of reforms and major changes in the public sphere, as the crisis in Greece doesn't appear to relent, and the politics of austerity dominate debates in the UK. The first main research question (RQ1) and related subquestion (RQ1a) of the thesis, concerned the application of governance 'technologies of self' for the control of vulnerable and disadvantaged service-users with experiences of marginalisation and stigmatisation, by two partly user-driven TSOs in the two countries. The goal was to examine how such practices are related to dominant government discourses and policies in social welfare in the two countries, affecting the organisations' goals and identity. The data indicates that both TSOs use systems for the governance of service-user's behaviour, but in a very different way and with entirely different motivations in mind.

Studies on the motivation of individuals to work for, or in some manner be involved with nonprofit social purpose TSOs, show that volunteers, paid staff, executive directors, and presidents often understand themselves as a means to achieve the higher goals of a collective (Onyx & Maclean, 1996; Pearce, 1993). Achieving these goals is a matter of communal action organised in a unifying attitude and thereby a common understanding (consensus) of the organisation's mission. The fact that the Greek TSO doesn't feature overt denominations

of privilege and power such as CEOs, managers or directors, actually reinforces this attitude and the alternative culture of the organisation in the perception of those involved with it. However, the governance of behaviour of service-users is indeed present in the Greek case. It is operationalised in subtle ways, inherent to what the organisation is and its goals within the context of austerity policies, public spending cuts and welfare reforms, dismantling the already fledgling social state in Greece. Nonetheless, in contrast with the UK TSO, this is not achieved through specific 'technologies of self' aiming to control the behaviour of service-users and without the goal of a smooth (re)integration into the social and economic mainstream. The aim is for user-empowerment to be found in collective sociopolitical action and in the expression and communication of what the organisation represents and believes in (its identity). This identity reflects a culture and practice of resistance to austerity and the promotion of social solidarity, social cohesion and democratic participation from the ground-up.

The Greek TSO doesn't need to employ the clearly defined, various monitoring and discipline systems that the UK organisation does, because it strives to turn the attention of members, volunteers and service-users outside of themselves, to the social and the political. Finegan (2000), recognises that organisational forms as well as economic systems themselves, carry with them certain values. Capitalism, in its pursuit of profit and efficiency through hierarchical organisational forms and managerialism, prioritises certain values and excludes other possible social goals, or interests, including values of egalitarianism and social justice (Purcell & Purcell, 2008). From this understanding of values as expressed through the ways organisations are run (means) as well as through the outcomes they produce (ends) (Byrne, 2005), it follows that the Greek TSO would consciously aim not to employ the hierarchical relationships of domination and power found in social relations of capitalist economy. To its thinking, these are the sources of the problems of the people it tries to help and mobilise into political action. Therefore, it would not introduce mechanisms that monitor the level of conformity and ability of members and service-users to adhere to the individual practices, perceptions, character traits and lifestyles capitalist socioeconomic relations presuppose.

On the contrary, its main focus is for vulnerable groups to comprehend this social reality and embrace their identity as disadvantaged and marginalised; not in the sense of powerlessness and weakness, but as people who are being wronged by exterior social, political and economic forces. Since the goal is to 'change the social' (Giorgos), the

individual choices and lifestyles of the people involved do not matter, as the intention is for those to be shaped by their commitment to the common struggle; by the goals, activities and governance structure of the organisation itself. The interventions employed to achieve these aims which form the organisation's alternative (to neoliberal capitalism) identity and culture, construct 'the foundry' where individual priorities, ambitions, lifestyles and perceptions will be (re)built. A system of governance is thus organically created within the organisation. If disadvantaged service-users do not rationalise it 'as the only way to be' they will, by a natural process, find themselves outside of it, simply because they won't be able to abide it. Thus, in a sense, there are exclusionary processes and mechanisms in place within the Greek TSO, which however are not operationalised in a formal manner for the most part.

Essentially, the case of TSOs and other collectives in Greece created or becoming active since the crisis and promoting the value of social solidarity, illuminates an attempt for a largely localised, fragmented reversal of the discursive dominance of neoliberal capitalism. From this specific point of view, this is a reflection of Max Weber's iron cage of rationality (Weber, 2002). Modern capitalism and market values prominence are comprised, not just of, but also through, and with, neoliberalism (Peck, 2010), while Arnsperger (2005), views capitalism as a cultural system. In this system, and particularly its current neoliberal form, norms, associated practices and interactions co-evolve to produce perceived shared ideologies, aspirations and 'rules of expected behaviour' (Shaw, 2011: 134), that largely enact and enforce dominant interests and privilege certain values (Purcell & Purcell, 2008), permeate everyday life and ultimately, decisively shape our understanding of the world (Bourdieu, 2003).

From this perspective, TSOs such as the one which was studied attempting to question and in practice contest main priorities of neoliberal capitalism and more specifically, the dominant economic policies during the debt crisis in Greece, may gain transgressive potential through interrelation. The governance of behaviour of all involved, is attempted through the accumulation of small changes; the demonstration, advocacy and legitimation of a new socioeconomic, political and cultural paradigm; another way of life, based on solidarity, equality, interdependence and self-help. This is the view of social activism and political intervention, as a vehicle for self and social enhancement into the context of the broader economy, society and politics (Brecher et al., 2000). Uitermark and Duyvendak (2008), studying citizen participation in a mediated age in the Netherlands, have actually pointed out the existence and significance of non-market, non-state organisations in that regard. They

185

argue that it is no longer the citizenry that articulates a public discourse, but a public discourse that through the mediation of an institutional entrepreneur like the privately funded 'Neighbourhood Alliance' developing neighbourhoods and promoting a multicultural society, stipulates what type of participation is appropriate. This development raises the critical issue of the nature and mechanisms of democratic engagement in a fragmented, mediatised polity. Consequently, for the Greek TSO, it is rational that people who approach it, may exist at the margins of social and economic life. Similarly, it is only rational, that only people who accept its proposed avenue for resisting and changing their situation through collective action can be, and will be, active actors in the organisation. Their behaviour, political ideology and lifestyle will only follow suit. If not, as Giorgos commented citing an old Greek proverb: *'they will just leave, as a hair falls off dough'*. That is why, there is no need to impose specific mechanisms of social control inspired by neoliberal welfare reforms imposed in recent years in Europe and the UK similar to those observed in the UK TSO. These are considered to be part of the structural causes of its service-users' plight.

In this manner, and within the current social context in Greece, such TSOs have the potential to change the way that we conceptualise and express success to take into account other, new meanings of personal growth tied to social growth and regeneration. As Pratto et al. (2006), explicate, any group or organisational success in these types of situations can acquire an ethical dynamic, which focuses on internal cooperation, solidarity and cooperative culture, 'that enables the growth of the movement from the subject out' (Pratto et al., 2006: 308). Consequently, the power and 'creative capacity of ordinary citizens' to concretely, as well as ideologically, challenge capitalism through the substitution of its imposed norms and cultural narratives with 'non-capitalist discourses', are enhanced (Davies, 2013: 498, 500). This process may demonstrate that people can achieve things for themselves, as well as others, without the central guidance of an authoritarian figure of privilege and power (i.e., a TSO manager). Thus, Greek members 'reject an individualised notion of the self and instead build a more socialised self' (Chatterton & Pickerill, 2010: 480).

In addition, it has been indicated that wherever people are connected with each other by common experiences, which lead to forms of institutions, they live in communal solidarity that is characterised by its density and trust (Granovetter, 2005). This can arise through neighbourhoods, friendships, labour cooperatives, guilds or unions, cultural associations, fraternities, and religious congregations. In these institutions, solidarity manifests itself often in as much as affiliated individuals relate occurrences, situations, and changes both within

186

and outside the community to themselves, so there is a feeling of connectedness based on common memories and consciences (Dopfer, 1991). More than half of the current members of the Greek TSO, are former (or current) service-users with experiences of poverty and marginalisation. The mutual connectedness and immediate affirmation that is required by solidarity, is realised within the organisation every day. As such, Dopfer's findings are corroborated in this case, since all members talked in the interviews about the importance of interacting and building relationships with people who have had similar experiences, will not judge them and thus can understand them. It is with these people that they work collectively to serve their own view of the public interest, and provide a means to achieving the 'higher' social goals of the collective.

Previous research has indeed shown that TSOs, social cooperatives and social purpose nonprofits in general, can challenge capitalist logics of individualism, building upon the interdependence of individual and collective autonomy (Chatterton & Pickerill, 2010). An individual's capacity to make free choices will be restricted in an organisation characterised by the asymmetrical distribution of power and enhanced within an organisation that is collectively self-ruled through the equal and voluntary participation of members in 'direct action' (Pickerill & Chatterton, 2006: 734). As Polletta & Jasper (2001: 296), explain, there is a social, political and moral space, which is collectively constructed and 'produces individual and collective experiences; there, is where the subject is most present'. It is through interactions with others that our own contradictions and incoherence come face to face with our inner selves and thus encourage us to problematise our understanding of the world. It is in disagreement that we 'come to know the basis for (our) own position' (Chatterton & Pickerill, 2010: 482).

It is, therefore, the struggles found in collective action that emancipate individuals, able to resist widespread social conventions and the same time recognise others as subjects, becoming emerged in shared meaning-construction processes regarding their experiences (Brecher et al., 2000). It seems that to an extent, this is true in the Greek case. However, the current study did not indicate such a 'harmonious' recognition and alignment of the self and other, but rather a process for the amalgamation of every individual into a single 'instrument' of the organisation's will and focus, decidedly turned outwards, towards the sociopolitical field. It just happens that the central belief is that this focus will benefit the social and through that, the self. In this manner, the organisation does succeed in creating a 'collective consciousness' for its members; but, through a process of (re)subjectification, rooted in

187

values, interpersonal relations and a reorientation of personal goals towards the public political realm.

In summary, the nature of the organisational identity of the Greek TSO, its practices, governance structure and goals, indicate that it is indeed influenced by government discourse and policy in social welfare in recent years in Greece. But, in contrast with the UK case, it has grown in direct opposition to both this logic and its associated policies. It doesn't attempt to adapt to them and doesn't develop its interventions in accordance, but in direct opposition to them. It has no interest in becoming an agent of the state in the welfare system of the country, but to oppose the policies both on an ideological level and 'on the ground', halting the retreat of the welfare state. At the same time, its members and active volunteers want to influence the behaviour of service-users. But not to shape it in order for the latter to have a better chance in the job market, become more 'attractive' job applicants, develop lifestyles and social skills more akin to social norms which will separate them from the stigmatising stereotypes associated with poverty, homelessness, disability, etc. For those who wish to engage with the organisation further than just receiving a meal, their mentality and behaviour must be shaped. It is needed for them to acquire the necessary mindset in order to believe in this radical movement of the civil society and together with their fellows from other collectives, serve the anti-austerity cause of the organisation in the political field.

However, in terms of actually realising its goals or even getting closer to them, the study indicates that the actual influence and impact of the organisation, is far removed from its lofty goals concerning broad social changes and challenging dominant economic and social policies in the country. Apart from the local community where its presence and work is well-known, hybrid TSOs such as this and other similar social support initiatives in Greece, remain fragmented isles of grassroots solidarity and activism. They seem to be unable to halt the mounting poverty, unemployment and marginalisation, attract large numbers of people in this social movement, or decisively influence mass social perceptions and wider political debates. Informal chats with respondents during the observations, revealed that the failure of the governing radical Left party, which promised so much regarding social welfare, but instead introduced another three-year memorandum of austerity, has left many committed activists 'shell-shocked'. Participants -while still committed to the organisation's goals- expressed doubts about whether there is a realistic alternative, or the neoliberal TINA ('there is no alternative') dogma, is really true. Perhaps this is also indicative of the deeply held

188

organisational belief concerning the 'temporary nature and utility' of the Greek TS and that ultimately, the driving force for any change, should be the organised state.

In the UK organisation, things are different. It is a TSO within the established system for the delivery of social services and the social investment welfare framework in the UK, which is highly influenced by neoliberalism, the third way, neocommunitarianism and the current austerity narratives and economic policies. The new paradigm which has replaced the Keynesian welfare state in previous decades under the influence NPM and NPG in public administration, insists that only the market can deliver effectiveness, efficiency, transparency and measurable results (McLaughlin et al., 2002). Consequently, the business market model is promoted as a superior means for the production of goods and services. This applies equally to social policy (Means et al., 2002) and has become a new type of common sense (Armstrong & Connelly, 1997; Stein, 2001). As a result, market framework, with the goal of greater efficiency by 'imposing an economic discipline upon producers, depoliticisation of service delivery, rationing of outputs and redistributing risk away from the government' (Walsh, 1995: 26) has been created.

This is the context in which this TSO is required to operate. The effects of these policies and their underpinning social discourse on community-based organisational nonprofit structures have been well documented: relatively egalitarian work structures are pushed to mimic the hierarchical structures found in the private (for-profit) and NPM state sectors; managerialism and professionalisation are encouraged; administrative work and statistics keeping, seems to consume the bulk of staff and volunteer time (Baines, 2004); the application of standardised, quantifiable procedures to each and every case regardless of context and without the possibility of deviation in order to serve the goals of accountability and results-orientation, ostensibly removes the ability of workers to respond to specific cases with the creativity, discretion and sensitivity that may have characterised approaches of the TSOs in the past, stifling innovation (Stein, 2001). Finally, older movements for advocacy 'giving voice' to the powerless, are often co-opted into a welfare system with TSOs as its agents, but are more concerned with gaining legitimacy through the use of compromise and accommodation (Brown et al., 2000; Taylor, 2002; Baines, 2004).

Furthermore, as we saw in **chapter 8**, in the UK, policies oriented towards individual behaviour management are used to curb antisocial behaviour (ASB) and at the same time, are increasingly linked to the overall welfare architecture of the country (Flint & Nixon, 2006). They are based on various methods of behaviour governance and on the belief that ASB is

rooted in personal behaviour and individual emotional deficits first and foremost, and something beyond the individual secondly; be it a culture of low expectation, social anomie or 'old-fashioned' poverty. Since welfare reforms and social policy have been gradually turned towards the individual with individual responsibility, morals and adaptability at the centre of this approach for some years, TSOs such as the one in the UK in this case study are evidently influenced by this shift, incorporating in their activities, daily operation and perception of their service-users. Hence, the various monitoring, discipline mechanisms and governance 'technologies of self' present in the organisation explained in **chapter 7**, lending to the development of user social control. What's more, the importance of daily behaviour and specifically of a normative construction of civility, healthy lifestyles and a positive psychological outlook (optimism) stressed in this individualised approach to welfare is, again, well-suited to the organisation's efforts in influencing its service-users' behaviour and character by working with the individual. Finally, it appears that the emphasis put on politeness, proper behaviour, good manners, language and a positive attitude, also reflects the way ASB and individual / family morals have been put at the centre of social policy in the UK. As it was discussed, they have been directly associated to accessing welfare benefits and by extension, (re)integration processes into mainstream 'normal society'.

This politics of behaviour applied in the UK organisation aiming to counter the effects of marginalisation for service-users, can be seen as a quest to gain unfettered access to people's subjectivity (Foucault et al., 1991), and within the context of the applied discipline technologies of self, a means for social control. Managing vulnerable people's emotions appears to be an essential component of an outlook in the organisation, which trusts that changing service-users' attitudes and lifestyles, is an important part of providing social support to the disadvantaged. To do that, the organisation must have the tangible means for monitoring and assessing their 'progress' towards these goals, as well as their 'compliance' with the imposed requirements. The integrated systems of punishment and reward in the organisation complement this general process of individual responses further, in a reflection of Foucault's analysis on gaining access to the 'soul' of the individual to be controlled (Foucault et al., 1991). Of course, to some extent, states (governments) have always sought to influence public attitudes. But influencing public attitudes towards going to war or the issue of capital punishment is very different to the project of manipulating how individuals behave daily, even within the confine of their homes (Clarke, 2007). This therapeutic turn to the private individual conveyed through the politics of behaviour permeating welfare reforms in

190

the UK, is underwritten by the idea that people need support in order to cope with their vulnerability, a view expressed by almost all participants in the organisation, regardless of their status at the time of the research.

Thus, we see in the case of the UK TSO, that the notions of conditionality and reciprocity operationalised in public welfare through the job centres, in the organisation's activities, include morality rules, hallmarks of good behaviour, civility and even demonstration of appropriate values. The latter are supposed to correspond to an ideotype of what an individual should be, which is a narrative evident both in government rhetoric and policy for several years now (Mooney & Neal, 2010). For its staff members and volunteers, adherence to this ideotype is verified through a process of formalisation and performance trials (Powell & Flint, 2009) which are monitored and recorded: punctuality, tidiness, sensible use of personal budget, prompt communication with public social services and other TSOs, use of proper language, a positive and well-mannered attitude while at the organisations premises, etc.

This discourse displayed by staff members, volunteers and service-users themselves when talking about the latter changing lifestyles, taking individual responsibility for these changes and the need to have systems in place which gather information on this process, brings to mind Zygmunt Bauman (2000). In his consideration of trends in modern western society and talking about the significance of space, Bauman draws a distinction between what he calls 'vagabonds' and 'tourists'. Tourists are those who are embedded in society, articulating its values and behaviour norms in being productively employed and conspicuous consumers. Vagabonds are the opposite, those who are excluded from society in that they are neither workers nor (and for Bauman of equal importance) consumers. As Swyngedouw and Kaika (2003: 6) argue: 'The powerful ... are now able to insulate themselves in hermetically sealed enclaves, where gated communities and sophisticated modes of surveillance are the order of the day ... in the closely surveilled spaces of leisure and mass consumption malls and in their suburban housing estates. Concurrently, the rich and powerful can decant and steer the poor into clearly demarcated zones in the city, where implicit and explicit forms of social and bodily control keep them in place'. In our postmodern world of 'liquid modernity', vagabonds are a redundant population, surplus to the requirements of functioning capitalism (Bauman, 2000). And like Bauman's vagabonds, in the UK organisation's view, service-users are clients, who need to 'give something back' and be monitored as they try to 're-train'

191

themselves in order to become productive and 'valuable' citizens and therefore, *'full members of society'* (Robert).

As Foucault (1977) stipulated, it is in the use of knowledge of the offending individual where power to govern its behaviour is consolidated. A similar logic seems to be able to explain the governance 'technologies of self' used in the UK organisation. Individuals are by nature recalcitrant, and so dealing with disobedience is a central problem for any method of control, that is why normalisation for transforming inmates' behaviour was introduced (Foucault, 1977). Hence, the importance staff members put on the service-users understanding their mistakes, taking personal responsibility for wrong choices and wanting to actively change their behaviour and character. In our case, through the extensive record-keeping and monitoring systems, knowledge of the individual is acquired. Through the punishment-reward system, it is attempted to shape service-users in a behaviouristic mode of self-control and correction. Subsequently, they may take personal ownership of changes in their lifestyle and manners, rather than just the organisation attempting to influence their moral thinking from the outside. Although, as we saw, such practices are still present in this web of behaviour-governance strategies being employed.

Nevertheless, while the UK TSO does appear to follow these general directions of reforms in the UK welfare mix in recent years, like the Greek TSO, it also promotes social solidarity while employing these monitoring, discipline, and punishment-reward systems for service-users. It emphasises the restoration and deepening of the sense of community and mutual care in society, but always while keeping things strictly non-political and on the level of Christian-inspired kindness and altruism. It is an organisation which daily tries to express the common bonds among people, the importance of caring and acceptance, as well as the need for moral behaviour. This is the motivation and ideology which seem to inspire its goals and practices of influencing user-behaviour. It is a somewhat peculiar mix which could be summed-up as revolving around church morals, governance and 'British civility'. While managers and staff members stress the need for service-users to acquire job skills, social skills and the appropriate behaviour to adapt and be integrated in economy and society, they also try to build interactions with service-users as moral transactions; not only as market exchanges. Mary said:

We want to retain our values and remember that anyone could be in the place of our clients...and that's the environment that we want to create for

them and with them; to remind them and show them that there is a part of society which still cares and people in our communities willing to help others; not because it is fashionable, but because it's the right thing to do...these are the same principles that we want our clients to rediscover.

Simultaneously, as a collective operating within the modern UK welfare context, the organisation simply tries to do what is deemed necessary in order to survive; stay true to its social goals, but also remain useful, relevant, and more importantly, financially viable in this environment. For it to be able to keep providing immediate social support and helping vulnerable individuals achieve (re)integration into the mainstream socioeconomic life, it has to attract the needed funds and work within the system. As an *'old and well-established'* (Robert) TSO within the local community, the obvious way to do that, is adhere to the current, commonly accepted TS standards in the UK: measurable results, proof of service-user retention and progress, economic efficiency, competiveness, transparency and accountability. The pressures of marketisation and professionalisation, the politics of austerity and the subsequent acceptance of the need to conform, appear to shape its collective identity, goals, governance structure and activities in a decisive manner.

Consequently, and in contrast with the Greek TSO, this identity is formed in accordance to the goal-orientation and practices expected by a traditional, nonprofit UK organisation focused on social services-delivery. Thus it is interspersed with disciplinary and behaviour-governance mechanisms, ensuring compliance to codes of individual *'good behaviour, normality and structure'* (Elsa). Such behaviour seems to fit the type of the supposedly 'responsible', 'respectful', 'adaptive', 'moral' and 'proactive' individual that current UK welfare policies aim for: an individual that is contributing to, and is productive within the modern market context. It is especially well-suited to people unaware of, or not involved with alternative approaches to welfare, poverty, unemployment, homelessness and marginality in the dominant sociopolitical discourse of what Slater calls the 'strategic deployment of ignorance' (2014: 961), spread by neoliberalism. Hence, there exists the need to employ all these monitoring, and performance-measurement systems with the expressed goal to affect service-user behaviour. Thus, it is intended that the social results which will satisfy the aforementioned requirements for the TS can be achieved, therefore keeping the organisation active as an effective and valuable partner within the social welfare mix in the UK.

193

9.2. The third sector, social citizenship and the (re)integration of service-users: the case of two TSOs, in Greece and the UK

The second main research question of the thesis (RQ2), concerned the ways the two TSOs perceive social citizenship of vulnerable and marginalised service-users as they support their efforts for socioeconomic (re)integration. As it turned out, this question was intricately related to the previously examined issue of the relation of TSOs goals and practices with state social policies, hinging upon the governance and control of service-users and welfare beneficiaries. In short and as it was shown in **chapter 8**, the fieldwork indicates that the approach of the two organisations seems very similar initially, at least on the level of general aims concerning the social integration of the disadvantaged. In truth, they diverge quite clearly, for very specific reasons, and with very different motivations.

The participants' narrative weaved through the responses in the interviews, the observed daily life and the declared aims of the organisation, as well as the way the Greek TSO is governed and operates, reveal that its members, activists and volunteers visualise a conception of social citizenship very distinct from their counterparts in the UK. In line with the organisation's dual role as a social services and support provider and at the same time an activist in the political field, this approach directly concerns the welfare state and social citizenship. It demands in practice broad social and political recognition and support of the important role the welfare state has to play and must play, in institutionalising social solidarity and social cohesion for all citizens, above and beyond classifications, requirements and conditionalities. Simply put, for the Greek TSO, economic and social (re)integration of the marginalised, should lead to social citizenship. Social citizenship in turn, enforces non-negotiable, government-protected social rights with overarching power, primarily (and in theory exclusively) through the social welfare state. Consequently, the link it makes between social citizenship and the post-war Marshallian version of a social welfare state as the sole guarantor of social rights for all citizens, is plain to see, and is a defining feature of the organisation's identity, infusing all its activities. Its focus on solidarity, equality and social justice as the culmination of processes of (re)integration of the vulnerable and disadvantaged, obviously diverges from the UK organisation's more individual-oriented logic of integration as social inclusion, resulting from the development of certain skills and the adoption of certain lifestyles and behaviour. This perception has been strongly influenced by the principal aims of the neoliberalism-driven social investment welfare model in UK public social policy.

The notion of individual empowerment and subsequently social integration, takes on an entirely different content for the Greek organisation's members. It is understood, that participation in the anti-austerity social movement via volunteering, can help service-users to overcome the feelings of helplessness and despair, have encounters with difference, as well as develop a concrete feeling of equality and solidarity sparking processes of identification and fostering meaningful social relationships. These relationships, are, however, *outside* of modern stereotypical expectations and capitalist market exchange norms. Thus, it appears that the Greek TSO attempts to function as a space of emancipation for both service-users and volunteers. A space where collective action redefines the groundwork of social relationships and social interaction, as the 'I' is transformed into 'we' and empowerment assumes a definitive collective dimension. Its members do not strive for service-users and prospective volunteers becoming better equipped so that they can be (re)integrated to the mainstream. They do not feel that the disadvantaged have to become more adaptive to the demands of a market economy and a changing welfare system built on spending cuts and privatisations, or hinging upon individual duties and obligations. In contrast, it is this mainstream that they aim to better understand and change through political activism.

As Graeber (2011) has argued, initiatives of collective action and grounded self-organisation aiming to cover social needs and operate within the boundaries of social solidarity confer a new meaning and conceptualisation of voluntarism towards the direction of collective social and political activism. They highlight its true composition and also its adaptation to the new and complex social demands of modern societies. This seems to be the case with the Greek organisation. Subsequently, it can be gleaned that this form (the dual character) of voluntary activism practiced in the organisation, is the foundry where socioeconomic (re)integration is being forged and where its idea of social citizenship can materialise. The process is part of the end goal. It is characterised by the fact that it combines collective action with a value context, on the basis of the creation of new types of grassroots collectives, which have as a primary goal the reestablishment of fundamental and pivotal social rights for all; namely, a minimum income and decent standards of living for all citizens. Rights, considered to have been gained through years of social and political struggle such as free access to public health, education, employment, social security, political participation, housing, etc.

For the Greek TSO, citizenship demands state welfare provision free from market constraints and values; there cannot be an adequate or attractive notion of citizenship without

it; without the rights flowing from social citizenship. But for the members of the organisation, social citizenship is not about regulating individuals' behaviour, lifestyles and emotions so that they can be better used in the free competitive market and the social relations it sustains. It is about assuring health, education, social services, employment and income support to everyone in our society; it is a two-way process, reflecting the post-war 'social contract' between the peoples of Europe and their governments (Pierson, 2001). Consequently, the welfare state is perceived as the main expression of equality and social solidarity and the principal actor that should actively support social cohesion. Moreover, wealth-redistribution and equality in the use and allocation of economic resources, is quite a significant demand in the organisation's political agenda. It must be said, though, that this is another goal that seems unrealistic and appears to serve more as a distant utopian future; an aspiration and testament to deeply held organisational values, meant to turn the attention of the individual to the social. The priority is primarily to ingrain the organisational identity to its members, volunteers and service-users, and less to achieve a tangible outcome through the organisation's activities.

The notions of citizenship, social membership and belonging as they seem to be expressed in practice in the Greek TSO and sought by service-users, hinge very strongly upon economic resources and the welfare state, as a barrier against unemployment, poverty, inability to access public healthcare and the subsequent marginalisation processes. As a result, the Greek case makes a double argument: one the one hand, the demand for public provision of a minimum level of welfare as a national entitlement to all citizens, which defines 'a threshold below which people will not be allowed to fall' (Giorgos). On the other, democratic collective organisation from the ground-up on the basis of the values of solidarity and cohesion, which won't diminish people's sense of power, worth and capacities of meaningful citizenship, despite their individual differences.

Social citizenship, therefore, appears as a crucial goal, but it is also a means for the organisation; as are the development of social solidarity and a sense of community among its members, volunteers and service-users. These are reinforced by the attention the members and volunteers attempt to draw to the capitalist character of the social relations and practices within our (as perceived) market-oriented societies. They are also evident in its cooperative, more open and democratic governance structure, as opposed to the more corporatist hierarchical model the UK TSOs adopts, responding to the pressures of professionalisation, managerialism, marketisation and contracting in the UK. For Greek participants, it is the

196

welfare state which should provide the tangible manifestations of social citizenship as rights, which in turn, realise solidarity and equality in society in practice. It is perhaps ironic, that for all the apprehensions recorded in the relevant TS literature in the UK and almost anywhere else in Europe, as well as the US where the independence and autonomy of TSOs from the state and government power are vital concerns, in the Greek TSO, this is just an afterthought, if that.

Somers and Wright have argued that '...socially inclusive democratic citizenship regimes...can thrive only to the extent that egalitarian and solidaristic principles, practices, and institutions of civil society and the public commons, are able to act with equal force against the exclusionary threats of market-driven politics. To accomplish this, the expansionary threats of both state and market must be impeded' (2008: 8). In the Greek case, the organisation seeks more power to wield in the political field yes, but to the minds of the participants, only to *give it back to the people* (Marianna) and reinforce its particular vision of a social welfare state pursuing equality and protecting all citizens' social rights. Dimitris stated on the matter:

> *...full social citizenship, including the enforceable right to a decent livelihood, full inclusion in the social life of Greece, meaningful political access and participation, requires first and foremost control of the markets, their exclusionary mechanisms and their ideological and cultural influence in society. And that can be done only by a state expressing the will of the majority of the people.*

Thus, it is determined policy and intervention in the socioeconomic field by power-bearing sociopolitical actors which should ensure the practical results of these intentions (social protection and integration of the vulnerable) in the form of protected social rights through applied policies. Not social altruism, or Christian moral values, or charity ideals which do not challenge the fundamental neoliberal values which seem to permeate society.

It is logical then, that the Greek organisation's understanding of the social issues faced by those it tries to support and motivate into collective action reflect, in a way, what Mills (2000: 168) meant when talking about a 'vocabulary of motive': ideas, concepts and linguistic devices which assist the social actor to neutralise the moral bind of living with, but failing to act on human suffering and social need. In our case, the conditions for stimulating

political activism by the disadvantaged as citizens, will be greatly hindered as long as certain battles are not won. If poverty continues to be presented in terms of behavioural frailty rather than policy failure or injustices in the reward structure of society; if the imperative of economic growth over social policy goals relating to social needs and the sense of duty and obligation attaching to the community are accepted as pre-eminent over all other responsibilities; if the idea of freedom is associated only with markets, consumerism and choice; if inclusion, productivity and individual empowerment are presented as morally superior to equality and social justice, consequently, attachment to social problems as a matter of 'proper moral sentiments' or 'ethical and altruistic emotions' will ensue. The goal must be to challenge, on a conceptual and ideological level the welfare reforms, related discourse and social consequences of the politics of austerity, which have been discussed throughout the thesis and have been really felt in Greece during the crisis, while characterising the defining logics of the UK welfare mix.

The rapid decline of a sense of security and a future as a result of the crisis in Greece (Bourikos, 2013), has led organisations such as the one in this case study to the belief that *'social solidarity is weakening, because institutionalised solidarity in the form of the welfare state is weakening'* (Katerina). These changes are accompanied by processes leading to social marginalisation for various social groups, which diminish mutual knowledge and empathy across the welfare divide. Young (1998) has suggested that we have been moving into what he calls the 'exclusive society' in which the marginalisation of the 'deviant' is increasingly managed by ever-more sophisticated strategies of social control as those observed to be employed by the UK TSO. And, despite the rhetoric of various governments in both countries announcing their commitment to social inclusion policies, the actual tendency is to isolate the poor, disadvantaged and workless by what Bauman (1998: 67) has termed 'mental separation': by banishing the poor from the world of 'ethical duty'. This has been accomplished by furnishing the masses with a vocabulary of motives such as the one used by the social investment welfare model. Such motives hail the power of the individual, reduce welfare to a technical and administrative mechanism relying heavily on TSOs and the civil society for managing the socioeconomic (re)integration of welfare beneficiaries and 'problem populations', whether they be unemployed, ex-offenders, asylum seekers, homeless, mental patients or lone parents.

In opposition to these government priorities and traditional charities in Greece and against the backdrop of a debilitating socioeconomic crisis, the Greek organisation, unlike the

198

UK case, resists the acknowledgement of the potential of a welfare system placing great emphasis on responsibility and duty rather than rights which underpin welfare conditionality. As Etzioni described: '... first, people have a moral responsibility to help themselves as best they can. The second line of responsibility lies with those persons closest to the person including kin, friends, neighbours and other community members... Last but not least, societies (which are nothing but communities of communities) must help those communities whose ability to help their members is severely limited' (1995: 144, 146). Theoretically, moving away from the state-led welfare, would result in greater levels of individual autonomy much lower welfare-dependency and stigma (Giddens, 1998), and a greater sense of responsibility and duty to the self, but also the community. Greek governments have followed this logic concerning welfare and social rights in recent years, where the ordering of priorities is solidified: self-help, family help, local help from well-established charities run by those with means, state-retrenchment and off-loading to private contractors (Bourikos, 2013).

Thus, the perception of the Greek TSO regarding social citizenship and the socioeconomic (re)integration of its service-users, directly stems from its connection to the anti-austerity movement developed in Greece these last few years. More specifically, its identity is commensurate with its position as an organic member of the social body, attempting in practice to abolish traditional hierarchies, professionalism and market values or practices. In this manner, as a confrontational response to the national context and the condition of the welfare state in particular, its role has evolved into this twofold sociopolitical character. Subsequently, this dual orientation is encapsulated in its proposed and promoted vision which often comes in unswerving conflict with existing policies and socioeconomic structures. Principally, it attempts to prove that social relations can be forged anew, on the basis of solidarity, equality and respect, in a manner that invalidates the prevailing neoliberal capitalist paradigm of marketisation and commodification of social relations and processes. As a result, it works against the modern view of social citizenship which seems to be prevalent especially in the UK, but also in Greece. This is a view which regards social rights as individualised and conditional rewards to be attained through the fulfilment of arbitrary requirements; the depiction of specific behavioural tendencies; the performance of compulsory duties subject to discipline and punishment mechanisms; and contributions to the welfare system especially through employment patterns imposed by governments and primarily realised within the social sphere by TSOs, charities and the civil society.

Regarding the UK organisation, in the UK back in 2002, the Prime Minister's Strategy Unit, explored the potential for promoting 'happiness policies' at its 'life satisfaction seminar' in Whitehall (Edwards & Imrie, 2008). The British PM Tony Blair had pointed out that while the state will withdraw from directly providing some services it will adopt a more activist role in other spheres. The new emphasis has been towards influencing, regulating and policing people's lifestyles. 'A more responsive NHS can't work unless patients also respond' Blair stated, adding that 'more successful schools depend also on more successful parenting' (Fitzpatrick, 2011: 73). Based on normative judgements and assumptions, the focus was clearly set on patients adopting the right lifestyle and on parents socialising their children according to what the government considered as the 'best practice'.

From this standpoint, policy outcomes depend on the decisions and choices of millions of individuals and companies and as we saw, the task of the enabling state's social investment welfare model, is to empower people to make the right choices (Giddens, 2006; Offe, 2006). This perspective, was expanded by the 2010 Conservative-Liberal coalition government, and is continued by the current Conservative government in the UK. According to it, the problems confronting people are not socially generated, but the result of poor choices made by uninformed, unmotivated or irresponsible individuals. That is why, employed social policies are transferred to the realm of families, and communities as a governance terrain. A prominent role is reserved for the civil society, voluntary organisations and the TSOs, where poverty and social marginalisation equate poor lifestyle choices or lack of individual skills, that keep people from enjoying the full merits of citizenship.

Consequently, changing service-users' and welfare beneficiaries' habits and controlling their behaviour, underpins policies regarding the socioeconomic integration and social citizenship rights of vulnerable and marginalised social groups in the UK. The UK TSO's approach appears to be a good example of that. In the Reagan-Thatcher years, there was a distinct trend towards turning the citizen into a customer (Thomas, 2012). Now, it seems this discourse has been reinforced further by a welfare model preoccupied with 'lifestyle' issues, which is treating disadvantaged people as 'patients', who in addition are found lacking on a value, morals and behavioural level. This view, has clearly influenced the organisation in its perception of service-users and their social citizenship rights, as well as its goals and activities for their socioeconomic (re)integration.

This shift from politics to the personal and away from public life, has been one of the distinctive features of social welfare reforms and consequently the conceptualisation of social

citizenship in the UK in the last two decades. As public life becomes emptied of its content, private and personal preoccupations have been projected into the public sphere (Dwyer, 2004). Consequently, social clashes and discrepancies as are the problems of social marginalisation and disadvantage (i.e., poverty, unemployment, homelessness, disability, substance abuse, etc.), are increasingly perceived as individual misbehaviour, private troubles and personality conflicts. In this climate, the practice of individual therapies aimed at vulnerable people's morals, habits, character traits, behaviour and lifestyles, is seen as a web of measures that are required for the 'healing' of society (Taylor-Gooby, 2002). This type of therapeutic governance which devolves social citizenship into a personal quest leading to better opportunities of participation in social and economic life, which is seen as essentially unproblematic and even empowering, is represented in the UK TSO. Its activities and workshops, the way these are structured and promoted, the perception of service-users by the staff as revealed in the interviews and observations examined in **chapter 8**, all point towards this direction. Additionally, it is underwritten by cultural norms that possess a relatively weak sense of individual capacity. It is an outlook that finds it difficult to accept the ideal of the self-determining subject capable exercising democratic citizenship. It represents the well documented scepticism (see i.e., Mitchell & Irvine, 2008) toward the ability of people in need to act as responsible citizens, without the support of professionals who know best what is in their interest and are the privileged gatekeepers holding 'expert knowledge'.

The study thus indicates, that this -one could say- anti-democratic ethos with which the marginalised are regarded, informs the practices adopted not only by government welfare agencies, but also by social purpose TSOs in the UK. The organisation's conceptualisation and approach in practice of social citizenship, appears to be inspired by the social investment welfare model. Along with the third way's positive welfare approach, behaviour governance agendas and the overbearing influence of the neoliberal discourse and the politics of austerity this model is based on concepts such as social capital, well-being and individual empowerment. It promotes the pivotal role of family upbringing, proper moral values and strong involvement of the community, civil society and the TS in the regulation of the behaviour and the social inclusion of the vulnerable, disadvantaged and marginalised. Underfunded and understaffed, with its survival compromised by TS competition for funds in the welfare market, state-retrenchment, council funding slashes, the pervasiveness of contracting and the pressures of marketisation, managerialism and professionalisation, the UK organisation's understanding of the (re)integration of its service-users' has been tailored

to fit the realities of welfare in the country. People are not so much engaged, as are 'treated', or 'counselled' and tellingly, the introductory registration interview in the organisation, is often called a 'counselling interview'.

There is no talk of social citizenship rights in the organisation. Social solidarity or equality are never mentioned or discussed. In contrast, the vulnerability of certain social groups such as the homeless and its consequences, are heavily featured in the organisation's funding campaigns, local media presence and promotional material. Distinct emphasis is put on the individual; on personal stories of disadvantage but also of positive breakthroughs with the support of the organisation, in an obvious effort to counter the dehumanisation and stigmatisation of the disadvantaged, but also in order to evoke the humanitarian feelings of the mainstream. Strongly influenced by the notion of charity based on Christian values and on '... *what a good person should just do in our society*' (John), staff and volunteers don't refer to marginality, poverty, unemployment, homelessness, mental illness, etc., as social problems rooted on specific policies and economic priorities. There is certainly no mention of government responsibility contributing to the adverse circumstances of service-users.

The fact that the organisation uses the motto *'every individual is different'*, can be interpreted as an attempt to move even further from the sphere of broader public policy, keeping problems into the realm of the individual and the good will of local communities. In this field, the building of social capital of empowered individuals under the guidance and tutelage of TS staff, the generosity of those higher in the socioeconomic hierarchy and in general an optimistic outlook of the *'giving spirit of society'* (Mary), may help the reclamation of social citizenship rights for the marginalised. If we could sketch a rough roadmap for the organisation's perception for people needing social support, it would look something like this: the short-term solution for the vulnerable and disadvantaged is charity and support for the provision of immediate succour and relief. The long-term solution leading to socioeconomic (re)integration, can be found through regulation and alteration of their personal choices, lifestyles, character traits, daily attitudes, behaviour and emotional balance.

This strategy in a way reflects the government's priorities in a welfare architecture dominated directly or indirectly (i.e., neocommunitarianism and the 'Big Society' agenda) by neoliberal ideology and the governance of behaviour of beneficiaries. These policies seem to be preoccupied with ensuring that the balance of power will not threaten the primary operation of the capitalist market and the hierarchical social relations it sustains. That is perhaps the fear of certain policy circles in the realm of social welfare: that more aggressive

202

redistributive measures and guaranteed welfare social rights would threaten the aforementioned balance. As a result, UK TSOs as primary actors within the welfare mix, are influenced by these logics even though they may not consciously support them.

Therefore, it was seen that in practice the organisation espouses a conceptualisation of social citizenship far removed from the Marshallian approach of all facets of citizenship as a unified concept, and even farther from the post-war welfare state's vision of social citizenship. The latter, did not regard public social policy and aggressive anti-poverty or redistribution interventions as disrupting the capitalist market operation, or negatively impacting efficiency, productivity and people's duties to society. For service-users, nothing is guaranteed, and individuals are expected to give something back; uphold a 'reciprocity agreement' with the state and their communities (their fellow citizens in society). Such an agreement stipulates that their social rights (i.e. social benefits) can be minimised, sanctioned, revoked or de facto abolished if they do not contribute to the welfare system as it is currently structured around the country's economy (i.e., mandatory low-wage employment and zero-hour contracts).

What's more, the ASB discourse discussed earlier, adds further layers of often intangible, individualised requirements mediating the status of citizenship of vulnerable social groups. Visible (i.e., benefit sanctions) and less visible (i.e., perpetuation of a vulnerable state of helplessness and dependency on charity) repercussions are in place. If the vulnerable, marginalised and 'deviants' don't adhere to the standards of lifestyle choices, behaviour and moral values set by public welfare institutions (the government), as well as the other prominent actors in the current UK welfare mix such as TSOs, charities and the civil society, they become susceptible to welfare. Thus, they become prime victims of exclusionary mechanisms; an inferior type of citizenship signifying a *de facto* abolishment of social citizenship rights.

Nevertheless, it is important to keep in mind that while the UK organisation's relation with the state appears to be more straightforward, its staff denotes much higher degrees of confidence and realism regarding the organisation's impact and the actual effects of their activities. The study indicated that the support activities and services offered by the organisation to the vulnerable, have grown both in quantity and quality over the years. More people are provided with a wider variety of necessities, more job-skills workshops and language classes are given, health and counselling services have been expanded, arrangements of entry job placements in the private sector have increased, etc. In contrast, the

Greek TSO's goals and strategies, seem to mirror a contradiction regarding its organisational identity absent from the UK case: on the one hand, it builds its identity as an independent, alternative sociopolitical actor opposed to the government, welfare reforms and inflexible public bureaucracy in recent years, prioritising democracy from the ground-up as the answer to a corrupt parliament and a recession which has been imposed by coordinated capitalist elites in Greece and the Eurozone. On the other, it advocates a far-reaching welfare state controlled by the government, with the right and obligation to intervene decisively in society and economy. This vision sketches a society where TSOs will not be needed. The question was asked of Greek participants, what happens to social citizenship rights if the welfare state solely relies on the government's intentions at any given time, without the presence of strong, independent TSOs or civil society and voluntary collectives at least as advocates and the local 'voice' of the disadvantaged?

The answers were vague and ambiguous. They mostly concerned general political analyses referring to a government which at that point 'would be the instrument of the people's will' and therefore would be trusted to 'do the right thing' (Marianna). This optimistic, but somewhat utopian outlook, contrasts sharply with the admission by the majority of members that while important things have been done on a local level in certain communities in large Greek cities to express social solidarity and support the most vulnerable, the political goals of the organisation are very far from being realised. The change sought in dominant social perceptions concerning welfare and disadvantaged populations is even farther from that. Hence, the researcher was left with the strong impression that unlike the UK TSO which appears to be unfettered by such issues, the blatant contradiction within the organisation's outlook of welfare, social citizenship and the TS, remains unresolved. The contradiction is that of a TSO striving to be independent and grow its effectiveness, while simultaneously advocating a stout government, controlling social welfare and social citizenship rights as it chooses, thus rendering the TS irrelevant. This is something that most Greek participants, either dismiss, or don't concern themselves with. Perhaps this is a reason as to why this anti-austerity movement comprised -among others- by Greek TSOs, has remained a fragmented and loose coalition of activists mostly belonging to radical leftist groups, and hasn't gained significant traction with the labour class or middle and lower-middle classes.

In conclusion, the overarching difference between the two organisations in approaching the welfare element of citizenship, can be traced to their organisational identity,

its degree of compliance or resistance to the current national habitus concerning welfare and public social policy and the way their values, goals and practices are informed by this divide. In the Greek TSO's case, the organisation develops its identity and activities in direct opposition to the dominant policies and associated narratives. It's more than likely, although impossible to be proven within the scope of this research, that the historically underdeveloped and minimal role of the TS within the Greek welfare architecture compared to the UK together with the crisis, are related to that. These two elements have fashioned much more favourable social, political, and economic conditions for the establishment of hybrid TSOs with a strong, radical political dimension such as the one in this case study. In the UK, the organisation is just adapting and adhering to the political and economic context. In both countries -in the UK for almost two decades, in Greece more recently- the social component of citizenship is undergoing a redefinition. In this process, certain welfare rights are increasingly conditional upon citizens first agreeing to conform to appropriate patterns of behaviour and life choices, 'as defined by the state or other providers of welfare' (Driver & Martell, 1997; Lister, 1997: 8), such as in our case, TSOs.

The focus is not on equality and social justice, but on inclusion and a culture of investment for the future, where individual skills will lead to employment and thus render welfare payments (now regarded as costs) unnecessary. But in this multifaceted model, social inclusion and social cohesion don't coalesce in a relation between citizens and the state, as they traditionally did. Rather, they flow from individuals in relation with each other, whose behaviour is shaped by a multitude of social factors, many of them well beyond the state's reach, and some, confined to the realm of individual responsibility. Thus, the stance of the two organisations regarding social citizenship and the socioeconomic (re)integration of the marginalised and disadvantaged, has been shown to reflect their identity and perceived role. Their role as a social actor, developed within (or in the Greek organisation's case in opposition of) the current context of economic and political reality and the politics of austerity, as well as the history of welfare reforms, and social policy developments in the two countries. As the state, the economy, their sustaining policy discourses and associated social norms change, TSOs will change. What perhaps remains constant, is the plight of vulnerable and disadvantaged social groups whose basic needs for a decent life and equal socioeconomic participation rights may be framed differently in different eras, but essentially, do not change.

The present research involving the case study of two social purpose, nonprofit TSOs supporting vulnerable and marginalised groups, one in Greece and one in the UK, explored their place in social welfare in the two countries. Specifically, it looked at their response in a context dominated by the politics of austerity and neoliberal transformations of the welfare state changing the nature of social citizenship rights. Consequently, the ways the activities, identity and relationship with their service-users of such TSOs, are influenced by the practices and discourses concerning governance and social control 'technologies of self' in welfare were scrutinised; as were the ways they perceive social citizenship rights through their efforts to promote the socioeconomic (re)integration of their service-users.

The relation of TSOs active in welfare with said narratives and practices of governance and the ways their role as actors in the welfare mix and in transformational processes of social citizenship rights is affected, has been neglected by researchers. Especially in Greece, the historically negligent role of the TS in social welfare and the support of the disadvantaged, has resulted in research on the TS being almost entirely absent. Due to the prevalence of a strong 'social safety net' provided by family networks and clientelist 'transactions' with the political class, as well as high social mobility ensured by a free system of education leading to (usually government) employment, the few voluntary non-state / non-market institutions had been confined to a limited philanthropy role. Most often, the few existing TSOs worked with the church to alleviate the circumstances of very specific target groups (i.e. orphans). This study attempted to shed some light on the resurgence of a multifaceted TS, in some respects more similar to the one in Western and Northern EU countries, as a response to the ongoing crisis. This a first step to better understanding both the TS and social welfare as a whole in Southern EU countries such as Greece, in particular during times of austerity and all-around welfare state retrenchment. As such, it can be a valuable contribution to the field.

By acquiring more insights on the strategic goals and the daily activities of such hybrid TSOs in Greece, it was highlighted that the double role of political activist and social services provider the case study organisation undertakes, doesn't insulate it from the pressures of dominant trends in welfare architecture and social policy. In short, by espousing a Foucauldian analysis approach of governance and governmentality to study the role of TSOs in social control processes, it was shown that social welfare, is being permeated by a

'Panopticon-like' mentality of monitoring and changing the behaviour of beneficiaries based on conditionality and employability policies. These are characterised by an obsession with individual morality and a 'pro-social attitude' (as the opposite of 'antisocial behaviour'), mostly diluted to the willingness to seek and accept any type of employment (even non-paying ones). In this context, TSOs supporting vulnerable populations are challenged in both what they *mean* to do and *how* they do it. Neither the social movement-like structure, characteristics and identity of the Greek TSO, nor its strong values grounded on a welfare state fully guaranteeing social citizenship rights through securing access to core social services and goods for all, prevent it from -like in the UK- seeing service-users as clients of a sort. Resisting the pressures of marketisation to incorporate capitalist market values in its approach, cherishing its independence from the state and perceiving its role as a 'crusader for good' bent on reversing the social budget cuts, privatisation policies and shrinking of public social services in recent years, it needs 'soldiers' for this 'crusade'. Amidst all the good work it does for the marginalised, it still uses governance techniques to recruit potential activists from these service-users, encouraging them to take ownership of its political goals.

As a result, it was seen that it unconsciously mimics the same welfare state practices and discourses promising a more cost-efficient, liberating and meaningful socioeconomic (re)integration for the disadvantaged. The same individual empowerment and social inclusion narratives and policy agendas it seeks to discredit and de-legitimise in public social consciousness through its activism. In that sense, this thesis can inform the debate concerning the response of TSOs trying to remain both autonomous and effective, but also true to their values in this context. Both in Greece and in the UK, TSOs have to deal with increasingly more people needing their succour, scarce funding and a less *supporting* but more *invasive* social welfare state, heaping even more responsibilities for retaining social cohesion and solidarity to their shoulders, already bent low by the weight. Neither a course of ideological and practical opposition chosen by the Greek case, nor one of cooperation and 'smooth adaptation' chosen by the UK case, seem to offer solutions concerning their common conundrum: how not to be co-opted as instruments of governmentality, but at the same time offer social services, combat social exclusion and promote the socioeconomic (re)integration of their service-users. It appears that to view social integration of the disadvantaged as an unconditional, 'owed' social right and a realisation of equality within the bounds of social citizenship while respecting the agency and aspirations of service-users as people, is a challenge for TSOs in both countries.

As it will be discussed in **section 9.5** of the current chapter, more research is needed to understand the decision-making and strategies of such TSOs and the consequences for their present and future in this changing environment. Nevertheless, it should be noted that the conducted fieldwork hints that in both cases, there is a great pre-occupation of the organisations with trying 'to stay in business'. This leaves little room for long-term planning, but lends itself better to more 'knee-jerk' reactions on an organisational level: a multilevel crisis and turmoil in Greece, seems to correspond to conflict and political activism to draw supporters from the vulnerable, is becoming prevalent in the TS; state retrenchment, austerity and marketisation pressures in the UK, correspond to efforts of doing whatever is necessary to remain active as a service provider and effective as a charity and welfare partner of the state, even if this may jeopardise organisational goals and founding values on the long term.

This problematic aspect of TS activities examined using the twin thematic axis of governance and the transformation of social citizenship through welfare state reforms (especially regarding benefit policies), was seen even more clearly in the UK case. The research revealed that despite its admirable intentions and invaluable work concerning the support and well-being of the vulnerable, the UK TSO has tremendous difficulties in navigating the above dilemma. The guiding discourses of the welfare mix in the UK, hinging upon an ever-deepening conditionality, gating welfare provisions and by extension, social citizenship rights behind requirements related to individual behaviour, seep through its activities. The governance practices of co-opting TSOs for the local delivery and legitimisation of such policies (i.e., ASB monitoring programmes), or for example the organisation's cooperation with the local police authorities for the removal of beggars from the city centre, are indicative of its inclusion in wider state agendas as a governmentality tool. The insistence on altering lifestyles, manners of speech and attire of service-users, the direct association of such personal changes with a higher degree of employability and success in the labour market, as well as the various punishment-reward and monitoring systems in place, mirror the core trends of UK welfare architecture, turning from *support* and *protection*, to *control* and *rehabilitation*, and from *combating exclusion*, to promoting *individual inclusion*.

The organisation, highly concerned with securing the necessary funding to remain active and perhaps even expand, incorporates the discussed 'lifestyle activities', in an effort to attract donations, increase its visibility in the area, demonstrate discernible and measurable social results, achieve partnerships with other local TSOs and participate in state-funded programmes and partnerships. In doing so, it is drawn into perpetuating the same

exclusionary mechanisms found in public social policy on a micro, everyday level (i.e., behaviour, speech, looks, etc.), as well as a macro level: for example, not speaking out against the often times irrational demands of job centres for punctuality and consistency, for people who can hardly walk or haven't been eating properly, or taken the bus for years. The researcher witnessed occasions when staff members tried to impose on service-users the importance of such requirements and the need for them to adapt to 'normality', rather than commenting on the absurdity or downright cruelty of such policies. Consequently, while the organisation appears to be effective on helping many people *'turning their lives around'* (Robert), it inadvertently does what is expected from an established TSO in UK welfare, while losing sight of the greater issues: the changing nature of social citizenship and how this affects its goals for social equality, justice, integration and social tolerance. Issues, which nevertheless most participants agreed are at the core of their activities and aims.

In that respect, the study attempted to address this gap in knowledge existing with regards to the precarious position of TSOs in Greece and the UK as welfare actors. Instead of only studying the admirable work of such organisations to reveal the deficiencies of the welfare state and social policy, or examine the dangers to TS independence, an alternative route was chosen. Delving into the experiences of workers, volunteers, service-users and the activities of the organisations through the lens of governance practices and their perception of social citizenship and (re)integration processes, have revealed a lot more; both for them, as well as the dominant ideologies of social welfare as a whole. By resisting the attempts to be a means of social control of the vulnerable and a governmentality implement, the Greek organisation severely limits its impact and reach as a service provider, essentially removing itself as an influential factor from welfare and hindering its goals for widespread social solidarity. It becomes self-absorbed in its political goals which noble as they are, result in the organisation downplaying the immediate needs of its service-users, using governance techniques to mobilise them to its cause, since it has nowhere else to turn to for resources (state or market). Conversely, the UK organisation, in order to remain effective as a social services provider and a willing, as well as effective partner in the welfare system, applies such strategies. It seems to be achieving this aim, the trade-off being that it is essentially working against its values revolving around socioeconomic equality, tolerance and compassion, or its aims to raise social awareness on these issues on the long term.

One way or another, the study indicates that the state (governments), for all its declarations about communities, TSOs, the civil society and voluntarism in general,

shouldering a big load with regards to social welfare and being given the necessary framework and resources to do it, is still 'pulling the strings'. Whether in opposition or accordance to the specific tunes played, TSOs have to navigate a very complex field in order to both support their service-users' efforts for socioeconomic (re)integration and social citizenship rights, and also stay true to their social mission and organisational identity. Having to juggle ideals of public service with the realities of a created welfare market and being pulled to different directions by various forces, more often than not, they instinctively choose or, more realistically, are required to choose, 'the lesser evil' on any given occasion.

9.4. Reflection and Limitations

Overall, looking back at this research project, the execution of the research design, achieved its purpose without encountering any significant pitfalls. The discussion of the findings, indicates the merits of comparative case study research. The comparative aspect of the project, highlights the depth of analysis that can be achieved in TS and social policy research, when cases can be studied through a looking glass investigating similar social processes and policy developments in different national social contexts. The political goals, structure of governance and organisational identity of the Greek TSO are better understood looking at the results of austerity policies and neoliberal social welfare reforms being implemented in the UK. Such policies have been enforced since the start of the crisis in 2008 in Greece, but the results in the broader context of welfare architecture of the UK, have been visible for some time now. Similarly, the struggles of the UK TSO to retain its values and keep providing social support to the vulnerable in the local community without getting involved in politics while at the same time, responding to welfare developments in the UK, can also be examined with greater clarity following the analysis of the Greek case.

The effort for adhering to the demands of economic viability, results-orientation and the governance of service-users' behaviour and lifestyles according to the current dominant UK welfare narratives, has decidedly shaped both the UK organisation's long-term strategy and its daily activities. There is a discourse accompanying welfare reforms, hinging upon antisocial behaviour, benefit sanctions and a demonstrable willingness for often 'dead-end employment', aiming to regulate access to social citizenship rights and the social state. Translated into public social policy, it has created a changing playing field for UK TSOs. The already well-established TS in the country attempts to endure, or depending on each TSO's

choices and priorities, perhaps even thrive in it. In either case, it changes. Hence, the governance 'technologies of self' aiming to achieve central goals of welfare policy for the social control of the vulnerable, and the recalibration of the requirements and meaning of social citizenship rights.

In Greece, where a significant number of hybrid TS collectives of solidarity have responded to the crisis, alternative strategies of governance are again used, but with an entirely different purpose: for attracting service-users and inducing them into a culture and practice of activism and resistance within the anti-austerity movement. It has been understood then, that TSOs can become the vehicle for the application of strategies aiming at the control of the behaviour and aspirations for integration of the disadvantaged and marginalised. More importantly, they can do so, while having different goals, but are informed by similar values of 'social good' and public service. These insights would not be able to be gleaned if the two cases where investigated separately, in isolation and without accounting for, and comparing the national context, hence the contribution of the present thesis.

However, there are a few matters which influenced facets of the research worth pondering on and can be identified as potential limitations of the project. An obvious practical limitation which somewhat hindered -but not seriously jeopardised- the integrity of the study, was its very nature as PhD research effort carried out by one person. The only funding available for the researcher was the monthly bursary granted by the University. As a result, both the case study selection, the number of interviews conducted, as well as the organisations that were examined, were influenced by this fact. Simultaneously, the project was confined to the three-year timeframe of the PhD programme. Thus, only part of the second year was truly available for the fieldwork, as the first basically involved literature review, theoretical study, designation of the precise research goals and preparation of the fieldwork, while the third, was mostly dedicated to analysis and writing (hence its common name in the UK as a 'writing up year').

Furthermore, as the research involved fieldwork in two different countries the time and financial constraints were exasperated. In that regard, neither the resources nor the time at the researcher's disposal were copious enough as to permit for a more extensive study of the issues under investigation (more participants and organisations). For example, it could be potentially useful to have the opinions of some state officials. Additional interviews with policy makers with knowledge of the sector in the two countries, or even local councillors since both organisations have relationships with the local councils in their respective areas,

could be beneficial. They might shed some more light on the pursued welfare policies and the role of TSOs on either the strategic, or a more practical, grounded local level.

However, at the time of the research, in Greece a new government had just been elected, which traditionally means that public services and government agencies in general, will be in a state of flux for a few months at least, as ministers change, council boards and senior public servants are replaced, etc. At the same time, negotiations with the lenders and EU partners concerning the implementation of the memorandums and the debt were reaching a critical point, while the economic situation in the country rapidly deteriorated (bank capital controls). In such strenuous conditions, it would be close to impossible to find anyone within the broader government administration who would be willing to give honest opinions on issues, which clearly can be controversial and are approached through a lens of analysis often critical of state welfare policies. On the other hand, in the UK case, there weren't such problems, but still, extra time would be needed to arrange these interviews. Also, the complete lack of any contacts by the researcher as a foreigner which could facilitate such interviews rendered the task even more difficult. In addition, though useful, the researcher considered that little of significance -if anything- would probably come out of these interviews since with politicians, when they are interviewed, 'there is always the danger of just receiving the cookie cutter answers' (Verba, Schlozman, Brady, & Brady, 1995: 113). Still, as mentioned, in qualitative research few things are set in stone, and such respondents could theoretically be informants with valuable insights. Thus, their absence can be considered a limitation, which nevertheless was largely unavoidable in this study for the reasons outlined above.

Another matter that commonly pops up in qualitative research projects, especially those that involve studies of issues relevant to disadvantaged social groups, is the problem of the researcher's positionality. The power relationships between researcher and participants, as the former is an insider or outsider to a particular group under study can have a significant impact on social research (Merriam, Johnson-Bailey, Lee, Kee, Ntseane, & Muhamad, 2001). The importance of the multiple positionalities of the researcher and the ways in which these various identities may influence and shape research encounters, processes and outcomes, has been widely documented (see i.e., Kobayashi, 2003; Mohammad, 2001; Vanderbeck, 2005). However, in this case study, things were more straightforward, since this project was not an engaged, action research endeavour. It wasn't intended for the participants to co-produce social knowledge. There wasn't an expressed goal to actively engage stakeholders in a joint

212

effort to empower participants belonging to marginal social groups. The researcher didn't present himself as an expert 'knowledge-holder' and 'problem-solver' who can incur social change. In addition, disadvantaged service-users were not the main respondent group.

Still, even if the research design and goals minimised the negative nuances of researcher positionality, the researcher's own identity as a lower middle class, educated white male, could potentially cause problems, especially when in engaging with disadvantaged service-users. Nonetheless, the extensive ethnographic element of the fieldwork involving both observatory and participatory association with the organisations and the participants, helped immensely in that regard. The fact that the researcher never described the possible research outcomes as triggers reversing the effects of dominant policies involving social welfare and TSOs coupled with the familiarity, rapport and trust developed during the ethnographic observations, can be reasonably assumed to have enabled the attainment of a comfortable balance between being an insider and an outsider. Likewise, the researcher's relative position of power to some of the participants as an educated white scientist belonging to the 'mainstream' without experiences of extreme conditions of deprivation, homelessness or substance abuse, was -to a degree- offset by the aforementioned reasons. What is more, his poor economic background and difficult upbringing in a working class neighbourhood, facts that he had the opportunity to relate to respondents (during the observations) before the interviews, allowed for participants to be more at ease, quite possibly reinforcing the impression that he was someone 'who could understand'.

It would be naïve to assume that the author became a 'full insider', or that the relationships were ever fully equal. But, who the author is and the way he interacted with the participants helped in forming the relations of trust that are so important in fieldwork. The lives of participants were only partially accessed, however, the important thing was to be as faithful as possible to the relations in that particular space and time; in the particular contexts of the two organisations, the stories that were shared and the knowledge that was produced through the research, however partial. In this respect, while the participants and the author didn't share the same identity, enough affinities were present (Haraway, 1991), that helped all involved in the investigation have some common ground from which to speak. It can be argued that minor elements of the author's presence, however mundane, such as his clothes or manner of speech which denoted only small differences in class, wealth or power (indeed, in the UK the salary of staff members exceeded the researcher's monthly income), were not

insignificant, and speak to the embodied situatedness of the author as the researcher, which constantly had to be kept in mind.

In the end, it can be argued with some amount of confidence that despite the differences, it was these strong commonalities that 'counted' for most participants and allowed trust relationships and rapport to be built. In Greece, they enabled the author to come as close as possible to an 'insider status' while in the UK, the gradual acceptance of his presence, despite the curiosity of why he was there and where he was from, resulted in a collective positioning of him generally as an accepted outsider doing *useful research* (Rose). Nonetheless, the author had to 'play' with different positionalities to build rapport with different people, especially between staff members and service-users (a more 'professional stance' with the former, a more 'laidback attitude' with the latter). At the same time, he had to be attentive to the ethics and politics involved in such processes of 'fitting in' and the power relations that are involved (as mentioned even through the everyday actions of how he dressed, or how he casually talked to people, etc.).

Moreover, it should be noted that several participants in the UK case, expressed a marked interest on the researcher's well-being and financial situation especially after the application of bank capital controls and also during the July 2015 national referendum in Greece. It could be argued, that at least some of these participants, knowing that particularly these last seven years, Greek society is plagued by huge unemployment and poverty problems, felt a certain type of personal connection with the researcher. Possibly, in a way, the author was perceived as a person facing strenuous economic conditions and social challenges similar to themselves (or the people they work with). Of course, there is no tangible way that this personal impression can be either confirmed or disproved, but if it holds some truth, then this is an instance where the seeming limitation of the researcher's position as an outsider (being Greek), could have actually benefitted the fieldwork.

Nevertheless, these arguments don't completely remove the influence that social class, economic position, political opinions, character traits, etc., might have had on the interpretations discussed in this thesis. As mentioned in **chapter 5**, the author fully embraces the 'baggage' that comes with doing qualitative research, and is aware that defining characteristics such as the above, have indeed shaped this research from start to finish. From its conception, the theoretical approach and research questions, to the analysis and interpretation. One particular aspect of the researcher's identity and position though, has been identified to have influenced some practical facets of the fieldwork, and that is nationality. As

a Greek and not a UK national, the researcher -while fluent in English- is unfamiliar with much of the spoken, everyday British 'slang'. As a result, sometimes it was difficult to follow conversations or understand jokes, use proper 'ice-breakers' in discussions, etc. Subsequently, the use of language was somewhat problematic at times, as for example the researcher could not know the reaction of the respondents to him using what in Greece is considered 'innocent swearing' to tell a joke, since commonly accepted behavioural patterns differ between the two societies. Consequently, it was sometimes difficult to be able to have a more relaxed chat and get to know better the participants, or be able to respond in kind, when respondents used humour which was not immediately understood. Fortunately, the design and length of the qualitative interviews as well as the time spent in the organisations were such, that allowed for clarifications and extra questions. Thus, on that level, it can be determined that there wasn't a serious lack of communication, which resulted in a diminished comprehension of responses.

As a result, in the UK case it was sometimes easier to be 'othered' by participants who were also observing and studying the author in the field. This was perhaps particularly true of some service-users. Reverse power relations were obvious in the (admittedly few) rejections of interviews, somewhat guarded responses or rushed 'informal chats'. Sometimes, people positioned the author with ties to (privileged) educational institutions in the UK as a PhD student, alluding to a perceived inability of his part to relate to them: '...*you have everything mate, so I don't really like how you ask this and that all the time, know what I'm saying?*' (Drew). Nevertheless, contrasting such positionings were the more frequent sentiments of acceptance. Similarities and differences that emerge through the relations involved in the research process demonstrated the ways that alliances and collaborations can be forged. Such fluidity and openness in the research process was not always easy to enact or maintain, especially when inserted into multiple scales of power relations and institutional affiliations, time and budget constraints, etc. Still, overall it can be deemed that these were controlled to a reasonable degree and did not negatively affect the fieldwork or the analysis of the data. On occasion, they even had a positive effect.

Still, comparing this experience with the fieldwork conducted in Greece even though that TSO was the first case to be examined, it can be stated that especially the initial engagements and informal chats with the participants there, were smoother and a modicum of trust was built faster. This can be surmised to also relate to the researcher's previous experience both as a social researcher in Greece, as well as a volunteer social counsellor in a

non-profit, anti-drug rehabilitation community, many years ago. As a Greek and with this prior experience of working with disadvantaged populations, it was much easier. For example, it was easier to change normal speech tendencies to accommodate the language of a participant with a limited vocabulary, switching more seamlessly from academic language, to more informal, everyday language. Consequently, even though they weren't proven to be a crucial detrimental factor to the research overall, the language skills and little familiarity with various British social contexts can be considered a limitation worth mentioning.

Reflecting more specifically on the employed methods, the interviews and observations -the above limitations not withstanding- for the most part, 'worked as intended'. The strategy of having first an extended time period when only observations, interaction with the participants and immersion in the organisations' 'everyday life', were carried out, was particularly effective. The familiarity with respondents, as well as the knowledge acquired, allowed for trust and rapport to be developed, refinement of the research questions, a constant process of refocusing the investigated issues and as a result, more efficient interviews. Occasions of the researcher overextending, were present nonetheless: trying to take too many fieldnotes concerning many different points; mismanaging the available time; distinguishing the mundane from the exceptional and the relevant from the simply interesting; updating and improving the interview topic guide, being slow in transcribing and translating, etc. However, these did not significantly affect the research.

It can be acknowledged though, that the focus groups didn't yield the insights which might have been expected. The focus groups discussed in **chapter 6,** were constructed to elicit as much as possible 'natural interactions'. The participants were handpicked during the observations for their relatively, more diverse approaches in the issues under investigation, and were conducted last; at a time when some initial conclusions had been formed and patterns of similarity or differentiation could be more easily recognised by the researcher. However, the discussions didn't reveal anything new, or at least didn't produce information of a different texture. The respondents in both cases depicted quite homogenous views in almost all the issues discussed, not reflecting some subtle tension that was observed to be existing. It was noticed that they took some care to avoid any kind of confrontational opinions. Any views which could cause arguments, or 'damage' the researcher's general perception of the organisations.

For example, two of the participants in the UK case (staff members), had on several instances expressed a clearly different mindset when talking about the need of the

organisation to comprehensively monitor and regulate the behaviour of the service-users, adhering to the rules unflinchingly at all times. One had argued that such practices are an integral part of the organisation and should even be reinforced. The other, advocated more flexibility and less rigidity concerning the way service-users accessed services, or their treatment when they failed to meet certain requirements, misbehaved, etc. He argued that these procedures stole valuable time from really working on a more personal level with these people, helping them with their problems. Nevertheless, in the group discussion, while essentially repeating the same opinions, they appeared to be agreeing and only slightly differing on minute details (i.e., how often should the service-users' personal records be updated and to what level of detail). A similar behaviour was observed in the focus group of the Greek TSO, for example regarding the issue of whether the organisation should tone down its participation in anti-austerity events and campaigns, and focus more on increasing the volume and quality of the social services offered.

It is unclear to the researcher why these -admittedly few- instances of alternate approaches, didn't surface in the focus groups the way they did in the personal interviews and during the observations. The reason could be that the responses and behaviour of said participants had been indeed misinterpreted or simply misunderstood, and in truth their views had never been so far apart. Or, that their reactions during the focus groups were just the product of the need to conform with the group and peer pressure often encountered in natural focus groups discussed in section **6.3.c**. It can even be assumed, that since focus groups discussions is a method that the researcher has relatively small experience with compared to the other two, it was his lack of skills to 'drive' the conversations in such a way and ask the proper questions in such a manner, that prevented the elicitation of more nuanced responses, and taking full advantage of the group interview setting.

The honesty of responses in social research can be ascertained and controlled only to a degree (Bourdieu, 1990). Therefore, if the first of the aforementioned three explanations is valid, the focus groups served a useful purpose, as an effective triangulation technique and an indicator of any internal group dynamics or existing tensions within the two TSOs influencing towards a certain direction the perceptions of the participants (revealing virtually none). Consequently, if nothing else, it can be said that with the above exceptions, the views shared in the focus groups, reflected the participants' opinions in the interviews and what was observed in the field. Still, this line of argumentation leaves the few instances where the image of two very united and smoothly operating organisations with a single-minded focus,

as they were mostly presented and discussed by the participants was shattered, unexplained. Thus, the inability to tease out and assess the potential impact on the organisations' daily practices or long-term strategies of any such tensions or internal fractures between members, workers and volunteers can be noted as a limitation. This difficulty might have been avoided, if more focus groups with additional respondents had been conducted.

9.5. Future Research

Recent decades have been marked by a re-arrangement of the relationships between the state and TSOs active in social welfare, providing public goods and social services. At the same time, the role of such organisations in the governance of welfare and the social citizenship rights of the disadvantaged has increased, as these issues have become a big part of the shift of welfare and social policy towards conditionality, employability, individuality, personal responsibility, sanctions and the behavioural control of users. A PhD research project couldn't adequately cover all the nuances related to these processes, much less explore new relevant research possibilities revealed during the fieldwork which will be discussed in this section.

Most TS studies focus on a particular country, even on particular industries, services or issues in that country, rather than comparisons across countries. This approach is useful for policy purposes in each of these countries. Nevertheless, apart from an increase of comparative research of different countries in Europe, another route that future research in the field could adopt, is including more organisations of different sizes and focus, when attempting to elucidate similar issues that this study examined in Greece and the UK. While simply more diverse and expansive comparative case studies would be important, there are other points of interest also. For example, in Greece it could be examined how these new, hybrid Greek TSOs by defining themselves in opposition or accordance to specific political parties, might potentially jeopardise their autonomy and values (especially if said parties form a government), or failing to serve their service-users' current primary needs as efficiently as possible. At what point does preoccupation with certain political agendas and structural changes makes such TSOs more of a protest activist group and less a social welfare actor able to cover the current pressing gaps of the social state or counter its deficiencies? In addition, such TSOs to be thrust in the centre of the Greek political arena with very 'experienced players' may, by default, put small voluntary movement-like organisations at a

power disadvantage which may strongly influence their practices and main priorities, and may even jeopardise their membership.

Similarly, but on the flipside, in the UK, a further examination of whether the stance of total abstention from political debates, in truth reinforces the pressures on the sector to embrace broader neoliberal government goals and welfare reforms (i.e., benefit sanctions, employability and workfare) might be warranted. Likewise, it may be worthwhile to investigate how much TSO workers and volunteers are aware that their goals, practices, independence and relation with their service-users might now be externally dictated and essentially usurped.

Moreover, there are further gaps in the state-third sector relationship which have not been addressed, especially on a comparative level and within the context of different welfare systems. Significant work has been done on the effects of national compacts, contracting out services, the role of TSOs in networks of service provision (see i.e., Osborne, 2008) and on issues of TS involvement, such as accountability (see i.e., Kumar, 2003), innovation (see i.e., Osborne, 2008), marketisation (see i.e., Billis, 2010) and partnership (see i.e., Carmel & Harlock, 2008). But, this literature has mostly paid attention to processes at the meso and micro levels. Future studies could look at how these processes relate to TSOs' role in welfare governance and the ongoing transformation of state-protected citizens' welfare social rights into 'privileges', but within different welfare systems in Europe. As the TS is becoming an established subtheme of research in public services delivery and in general social policy, such investigations are more than welcome. They could inform a debate based more on cross-national evidence and less on normative assumptions.

An additional direction that research examining these themes which while touched upon, weren't the focus of this study, is the 'voice' of disadvantaged service-users of TSOs. In particular, the role of TSOs, in the processes of stigmatisation and marginalisation in a comparative context could be explored. This is an aspect of TS research which has commonly been relatively underdeveloped, as it could potentially touch 'the dark side' of the sector. This case study had the opportunity of perusing disadvantaged service-users' perceptions in the context of studying the organisations' daily activities and practices. However, it was only a peripheral concern to the larger, social policy issues examined through the investigation of the two TSOs as welfare agents and their relation with dominant welfare policy discourse and reforms in the two countries. We know that among disadvantaged groups, a pattern of stable attributions to stereotyping, prejudice, and stigmatisation, reflects a perceived systematic

marginalisation by the more privileged groups (Bourdieu, 2005). Because the latter have the power to define who is and isn't fully accepted and transform these definitions (i.e., through the media) into unshakable cultural and social 'truths', rejection by privileged groups implies that one's group can be excluded from social citizenship rights, and definitely from the most 'valued positions' in society (Brown, 2004).

Empirical research has supported the contention that such marginalisation is painful on various levels, resulting in the absence of a 'sense of belonging' and the overall devaluation of these social groups' self-perception and social identity and the increased identification of group members with their 'inferiority' reinforcing the circle of the 'the poverty trap' (see i.e., Sidanius & Pratto, 2001). Talking with service-users having experienced social marginalisation in this study corroborated these findings. Additionally, we also saw government discourse concerning welfare mostly in the UK but also in Greece since the advent of the economic crisis, reinforcing narratives of welfare-dependency, laziness, lack of individual responsibility and adaptability to market demands. These perpetuate stigmatising stereotypes as well as actual social mechanisms of exclusion. In this context, future similar studies could focus on if, and how disadvantaged service-users experience a 'TS-dependency institutional stigma', for example. If TS workers are aware of that, how do they try to combat such processes? Furthermore, if indeed vulnerable service-users acquire a social identity of inferiority, weakness and overall 'unworthiness' just by being involved with such organisations, then how TSOs can facilitate their meaningful socioeconomic (re)integration? How can they be effective -regardless of their intentions- when essentially they reinforce the processes pushing service-users to the social margins? Focusing only on the experiences of service-users in that regard and on a comparative national level, could yield valuable insights on this often overlooked side of TS activities, and its connection to stigmatisation processes seemingly inherent within modern welfare policies.

Another issue which was found to be of interest and touching upon multiple sides of TSOs' identity, goals and practices in this study, concerns TS values. More specifically, the balance and degree of compatibility which exist between on one hand the range of values held by, and informing TS activities and on the other, the intended practical outcomes of these activities. As it became apparent during the research, there are instances where the deeply held values by TSOs may -consciously or unconsciously- conflict with the actual practices they employ in order to continue providing social support to vulnerable social groups, retain their economic viability and expand their services. This disparity was more

220

present in the UK case. But, in the Greek TSO, similar problems were identified. They were more related to TS values being compatible to what TSOs actually do, or if organisations have to adopt complex ways of negotiating between values as beliefs, or as outcomes when creating strategy. It was highlighted in the research and actually acknowledged by participants involved with the Greek TSO, that the political activity of the organisation might be directly 'hurting' the organisation's economic resources. In addition, by default, its values block possible avenues of funding and growth. It is a conscious choice based on these deeply held organisational values.

However, this acknowledgement doesn't change the fact that resources and manpower are constantly funnelled to sociopolitical activism first, and on improving the offered social services second, at the same time when members and volunteers stress the importance of providing the best possible support for service-users. In that sense, future research could look more specifically on how do values held as beliefs and attitudes, affect the ways of working commonly embodied in TS activity in different countries. There is a gap in research on how TSOs deal with potential value conflicts in their practice, especially between stakeholders, in outcomes, process, strategy or motivations. For example, how are ways of working and other internal processes valued by participants, and how do they affect employee, volunteer and stakeholder (service-users) commitment and engagement, as well as the creation of social impact? It would be very useful if such questions could be investigated in a comparative context and in a longitudinal manner (a highly difficult and resource-consuming task). Knowledge could be gained, not only on policy and outcomes-oriented studies of the TS, but also on a more theoretical level.

Finally, questions remain with regard to service-users' input and its impact on organisational planning and activity implementation in terms of how for example, the former feel they need to pursue socioeconomic (re)integration. Little is known about the actual impact on TSOs' strategies of shifts in user-needs or expectations. Understanding whether and how TSOs respond to such changes in different countries is particularly important because of changes in social welfare (i.e., benefit sanctions in the UK). Service-users and in general vulnerable social groups, may have new and emerging needs as social welfare reforms and other public policies evolve. In the UK organisation, service-users tentatively expressed the hope that members of staff would start helping them fill out appropriate forms or write for them the correspondence with welfare services. The organisation's general policy designates that such type of support should be generally avoided in the context of the earlier

221

discussed strategy of service-users developing mainstream skills, and assuming individual responsibility for all aspects of their lives. While this complaint was expressed in the private interviews with the researcher, it wasn't brought forth to the staff as far as the researcher could determine. In contrast, in Greece, members of the organisation seemed to be quite receptive (at least initially) of user demands. For example, it was made known to the researcher, that some time before the fieldwork started, the hours the social store remained open were increased due to several regular users expressing the need for such a change.

It is not entirely clear to the researcher why the Greek TSO seems to be more flexible in responding to changing user needs, when members have stated that many service-users are not really interested in the political views and activities of the organisation and thus don't engage with it beyond the level of using available services. One would expect that the UK TSO would be more flexible, since improving and expanding the offered social services is its sole preoccupation. Perhaps management and senior staff are wary of the long-term impact such changes could have for the ability of the organisation to manage its own affairs effectively. Or, and probably more likely, the reason is that for many service-users, organisations like the one studied in the UK, are the only place to go and have access to at least a semblance of core goods and services. Thus, their expectations are already low and additionally there could be reluctance to express any view or demand that could be perceived as criticism or a sense of entitlement by TS staff. Therefore, subsequent comparative studies could look at this issue having -if possible- an expansive sample of service-users in different countries. In this way, inferences could be drawn regarding how TSOs operationalise their response to user-demands. Overall, the findings of future investigations on the themes discussed in this section, could provide much needed answers on why different TSOs have the identity and characteristics they have, and adapt, resist, or even ignore analogous welfare reforms and agendas.

References

Adams, J., Clemens, E., & Orloff, A. (2005). (Eds.) *Remaking Modernity: Politics, History, and Sociology*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Alcock, P. (1989). Why Citizenship and Welfare Rights offer New Hope for New Welfare in Britain. *Critical Social Policy, 9*(26), 32-43.

Alcock, P. (1996). *Social Policy in Britain: Themes and issues*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Alcock, P. (2008). *Social policy in Britain (3ʳᵈ edition)*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Alcock, P. (2010). Building the Big Society: A New Policy Environment for the Third Sector in England. *Voluntary Sector Review, 1*(3), 379-389.

Alcock, P. (2014). *Social policy in Britain*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Alcock, P. (2016). *Why We Need Welfare: Collective Action for the Common Good*. Policy Press.

Alcock, P., & Kendall, J. (2011). Constituting the Third Sector: Processes of Decontestation and Contention under the UK Labour Governments in England. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organisations, 22*(3), 450-469.

Aldridge, N. (2005). *Communities in Control: The Third Sector Agenda For Public Service Reform*. Social Market Foundation and ACEVO.

Alexandropoulos, S. (2001). *Theories for Collective action and Social Movements*. Kritiki, Athens.

Allahyari, R. A. (2000). *Visions of charity: Volunteer workers and moral community*. University of California Press, Berkeley, CA.

Amin, A., Cameron, A., & Hudson, R. (2002). *Placing the Social Economy*. London: Routledge.

Andrew Barry Goldsmith's College, Thomas Osborne Brunel University, & Nikolas Rose Goldsmith's College. (2013). *Foucault and Political Reason: Liberalism, Neo-liberalism and the Rationalities of Government*. Routledge.

Anheier, H. K. (2004). *The Third Sector in Europe: Five Theses* (pp. 285-299). Springer US.

Arampatzi, A., & Nicholls, W. J. (2012). The Urban Roots of Anti-Neoliberal Social Movements: The Case of Athens, Greece. *Environment and Planning* A, *44*(11), 2591-2610.

Armstrong, H., Armstrong, P., & Connelly, M. P. (1997). Introduction: The Many Forms of Privatisation. *Studies in Political Economy, 53*.

Arnold, K. R. (2012). *Homelessness, Citizenship, and Identity: Culture and Community in the Industrial Workers of the World*. SUNY Press.

Arnsperger, C. (2005). Probing the "Moralization of Capitalism": Democratic Experimentalism and Co-evolution of Norms. *International Social Science Journal, 185,* 433-444.

Aronson, J. (1994). A Pragmatic View of Thematic Analysis. *Qualitative Report, 2*(1), 1-3.

Ascoli, U., & Ranci, C. (2002). The Context of New Social Policies in Europe. In *Dilemmas of the Welfare Mix* (pp. 1-24). Springer US.

Atkinson, P., & Hammersley, M. (1994). Ethnography and Participant Observation. *Handbook of Qualitative Research, 1*(23), 248-261.

Bagguley, P. (1994). Prisoners of the Beveridge Dream? The political mobilisation of the poor against contemporary welfare regimes. *Towards a post-Fordist welfare state,* 74-94.

Bailey, K.D. (1987). *Methods of Social Research.* 3rd edn. The Free Press, New York.

Baines, D. (2004). Pro-market, Non-market: The Dual Nature of Organisational Change in Social Services Delivery. *Critical Social Policy, 24*(1), 5-29.

Baldock, J. (2003). On Being a Welfare Consumer in a Consumer Society. *Social policy and Society, 2*(01), 65-71.

Banting, K. (1987). *Welfare State and Canadian Federalism.* McGill-Queen's Press-MQUP.

Barbalet, J. M. (1993). Citizenship, Class Inequality and Resentment. *Citizenship and Social Theory,* 36-56.

Barker, R. (2011). Big Societies, Little Platoons and the Problems with Pluralism. *The Political Quarterly 82*(1), 50-55.

Barr, N. A. (1998). *The Economics of the Welfare State.* Stanford University Press.

Barrientos, A., & Hulme, D. (2008). *Social protection for the Poor and Poorest: Concepts, Policies and Politics.* Springer.

Bauman, Z. (1998). *Globalisation: The Human Consequences.* Columbia University Press.

Bauman, Z. (2000). *Liquid Modernity.* Polity, Cambridge.

Beckett, K., & Western, B. (2001). Governing Social Marginality Welfare, Incarceration, and the Transformation of State Policy. *Punishment & Society, 3*(1), 43-59.

Beer, S. H. (2001). New Labour: Old Liberalism. In *New Labour* (pp. 18-31). Palgrave Macmillan UK.

Beiner, R. (2003). *Liberalism, Nationalism, Citizenship: Essays on the Problem of Political Community.* UBC Press.

Benford, R. D., & Snow, D. A. (2000). Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment. *Annual Review of Sociology,* 611-639.

Bertaux, D. (1981). From the Life-History Approach to the Transformation of Sociological Practice. In: Bertaux, D. (eds.), *Biography and Society. The Life History Approach in the Social Sciences.* Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Betzelt, S., & Bothfeld, S. (Eds.). (2011). *Activation and Labour Market Reforms in Europe.* Palgrave Macmillan.

Beveridge, W. (1948). *Voluntary Action.* London: George Allen and Unwin.

Billis, D. (1989). *A Theory of the Voluntary Sector: Implications for Policy & Practice.* London School of Economics and Political Science, Centre for Voluntary Organisation.

Billis, D. (Ed.). (2010). *Hybrid Organisations and the Third Sector: Challenges for Practice, Theory and Policy.* Palgrave Macmillan.

Birch, K., & Whittam, G. (2008). The Third Sector and the Regional Development of Social Capital. *Regional Studies*, *42*(3), 437-450.

Birch, K., & Mykhnenko, V. (2010). *The Rise and Fall of Neoliberalism: The Collapse of an Economic Order?*. Zed Books Ltd.

Black, A. (1984). Guilds and Civil Society. *European Political Thought from the Twelfth Century to the Present*. London: Methuen.

Blackshaw, T., & Long, J. (2005). What's the Big Idea? A Critical Exploration of the Concept of Social Capital and its Incorporation into Leisure Policy Discourse. *Leisure Studies*, *24*(3), 239-258.

Blair, T. (1998). *The Third Way*. London: Fabian Society.

Blaug, M. (2007). The Fundamental Theorems of Modern Welfare Economics, Historically Contemplated. *History of Political Economy*, *39*(2), 185.

Blaxter, L., Hughes, C., & Tight, M. (1996). *How to Research*. Open University Press. Buckingham, *UK*.

Blekesaune, M. (2007). Economic Conditions and Public Attitudes to Welfare Policies. *European Sociological Review*, *23*(3), 393-403.

Block, F., & Somers, M. (2003). In the Shadow of Speenhamland: Social policy and the old Poor Law. *Politics & Society*, *31*(2), 283-323.

Bode, I. (2006). Disorganised Welfare Mixes: Voluntary Agencies and New Governance Regimes in Western Europe. *Journal of European Social Policy*, *16*(4), 346-359.

Bonoli, G. (2007). Time matters Postindustrialization, New Social Risks, and Welfare State Adaptation in Advanced Industrial Democracies. *Comparative Political Studies*, *40*(5), 495-520.

Bottomore, T. B., & Marshall, T. H. (1992). *Citizenship and Social Class*. Pluto Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a Theory of Practice* (Vol. 16). Cambridge university press.

Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The Logic of Practice*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P. (2001). *Firing Back: Against the Tyranny of the Market 2*, New York: Greene Press.

Bourdieu, P. (2003). *Firing back: Against the Tyranny of the Market 2* (Vol. 2). Verso.

Bourikos, D. (2013). Social solidarity in the Greek Crisis: A new wave of emergence of the civil society or consolidation of fragmented social citizenship?. *Greek Foundation for European and Foreign Policy (ELIAMEP)*. No. 3/2013, pp 1-35. http//:www.eliamep.gr. Accessed on: 02.08.2016: 17.56.

Bourikos, D., & Vellianiti, M. (2013). A First Look at Social Solidarity during the Greek Crisis. *The Greek Sociological Review*, *14*(3), 267-288.

Boyatzis, R. E. (1998). *Transforming Qualitative Data: Thematic Analysis and Code Development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (2005). Social Capital, Moral Sentiments, and Community Governance. *Moral Sentiments and Material Interests*, 379.

Brandsen, T., Van de Donk, W., & Putters, K. (2005). Griffins or Chameleons? Hybridity as a Permanent and Inevitable Characteristic of the Third Sector. *International Journal of Public Administration*, *28*(9-10), 749-765.

Brecher, J., Costello, T., & Smith, B. (2000). *Globalisation from Below: The Power of Solidarity*. South End Press.

Brenner, N., & Theodore, N. (Eds.). (2002). *Spaces of Neoliberalism: Urban Restructuring in Western Europe and North America*. Blackwell.

Brewer, J. (2000). *Ethnography*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).

Brodie, J. (2000). Imagining Democratic Urban Citizenship. *Democracy, Citizenship and the Global City*, 110-128.

Brown, A. P. (2004). Anti-social Behaviour, Crime Control and Social Control. *The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice, 43*(2), 203-211.

Brown, M. (2006). Sexual Citizenship, Political Obligation and Disease Ecology in Gay Seattle. *Political Geography, 25*(8), 874-898.

Brown, M., Kevin, M., Kenny, S., & Turner, S.B. (2000). *Rhetorics of Welfare: Uncertainty, Choice and Voluntary Associations*. New York: MacMillan Press.

Bruni, L., & Zamagni, S. (2007). *Civil Economy: Efficiency, Equity, Public Happiness* (Vol. 2). Peter Lang.

Bryman, A. (2015). *Social Research Methods*. Oxford University Press.

Bryman, A., & Burgess, B. (Eds.). (2002). *Analyzing Qualitative Data*. Routledge.

Brysk, A., & Shafir, G. (Eds.). (2004). *People Out of Place: Globalisation, Human Rights and the Citizenship Gap*. Routledge.

Burgess, A. (2012). Nudging Healthy Lifestyles: The UK Experiments with the Behavioral Alternative to Regulation and the Market. *Eur. J. Risk Reg., 3*, 3.

Burgess, S., Propper, C., & Wilson, D. (2005). *Will More Choice Improve Outcomes in Education and Health Care? The Evidence from Economic Research*. Centre for Markets and Public Organisation, Bristol University.

Bush Zetterberg, K. (1996). *Det civila samhället i socialstaten* [The Civil Society in a Welfare State]. Stockholm: City University Press.

Byrne, D. (2005). *Social Exclusion* (2nd ed.). Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press.

Cabinet Office. (2007). *Re-tender of the Futurebuilders fund: Discussion paper*, London: The Stationery Office

Carley, M., Smith, H., & Jenkins, P. (2013). *Urban Development and Civil Society: The Role of Communities in Sustainable Cities*. Routledge.

Carmel, E., & Harlock, J. (2008). Instituting the 'Third Sector' as a Governable Terrain: Partnership, Procurement and Performance in the UK. *Policy & Politics*, *36*(2), 155-171.
Casey, R., & Flint, J. (2007). Active Citizenship in the Governance of Anti-Social Behaviour in the UK: Exploring the Non-Reporting of Reporting of Incidents. *People, Place & Policy Online*, *1*(2), 69-79.

Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing Grounded Theory. A Practical Guide Through Qualitative Analysis*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Chatterjee, P. (2004). *The Politics of the Governed*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Chatterton, P., & Pickerill, J. (2010). Everyday Activism and Transitions Towards Post-Capitalist Worlds. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, *35*(4), 475-490.

Clarke, H. D., Borges, W., Stewart, M. C., Sanders, D., & Whiteley, P. (2013). The Politics of Austerity: Modelling British Attitudes Towards Public Spending Cuts. In *Advances in Political Economy* (pp. 265-287). Springer Berlin Heidelberg.

Clarke, J. (2004). *Changing Welfare, Changing States: New directions in social policy*. Sage.

Clarke, J. (2007a). Citizen-Consumers and Public Service Reform: At the Limits of Neoliberalism?. *Policy Futures in Education*, *5*(2), 239-248.

Clarke, J. (2007b). Subordinating the Social? Neo-liberalism and the Remaking of Welfare Capitalism. *Cultural Studies, 21*(6), 974-987.

Clarke, J., & Newman, J. (1997). *The Managerial State: Power, Politics and Ideology in the Remaking of Social Welfare.* London: Sage.

Clarke, J., Gewirtz, S., Hughes, G., & Humphrey, J. (2000). 'Guarding the Public Interest? Auditing Public Services', in J. Clarke, S. Gewirtz and E. McLaughlin (eds.), *New Managerialism, New Welfare?* London: Sage.

Clayton, R., & Pontusson, J. (1998). Welfare-State Retrenchment Revisited: Entitlement Cuts, Public Sector Restructuring, and Inegalitarian Trends in Advanced Capitalist Societies. *World Politics, 51*(01), 67-98.

Cleland, A., & Tisdall, K. (2005). The Challenge of Antisocial Behaviour: New relationships Between the State, Children and Parents. *International Journal of Law, Policy and the Family, 19*(3), 395-420.

Cloke, P., Johnsen, S., & May, J. (2005). Exploring ethos? Discourses of 'charity' in the provision of emergency services for homeless people. *Environment and Planning A, 37*(3), 385-402.

Cloke, P., Johnsen, S., & May, J. (2007). Ethical citizenship? Volunteers and the ethics of providing services for homeless people. *Geoforum, 38*(6), 1089-1101.

Cloke, P., May, J., & Johnsen, S. (2011). *Swept up lives: Re-envisioning the Homeless City.* John Wiley & Sons.

Cohen, S. (1979). The Punitive City: Notes on the Dispersal of Social Control. *Crime, Law and Social Change, 3*(4), 339-363.

Cohen, S. (1985). *Visions of Social Control: Crime, Punishment and Classification* (pp. 145-48). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Cohen, J., & Arato, A. (1992). Politics and the Reconstruction of the Concept of Civil Society. *Cultural-political Interventions in the Unfinished Project of Enlightenment*, 120-142.

Cohen, J. L., & Arato, A. (1994). *Civil Society and Political Theory*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Coles, R. (1997). *Rethinking generosity: Critical Theory and the Politics of Caritas*. Cornell University Press, Ithaca, NY.

Collier, D., & Mahoney, J. (1996). Insights and Pitfalls: Selection Bias in Qualitative Research. *World Politics*, *49*(1), 56-91.

Constantelos, D. (1991). *Byzantine Philanthropy and Social Welfare*. New Rochelle, NY: Caratzas.

Cortes, E. J. (1996). Community Organisation and Social Capital. *National Civic Review*, *85*(3), 49-53.

Craig, G., Taylor, M., Wilkinson, Bloor K., Monro, S., & Syed, A. (2002). *Contract or Trust? The Role of the Compact in Local Governance*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Crawford, A. (2003). 'Contractual Governance' of Deviant Behaviour. *Journal of Law and Society*, *30*(4), 479-505.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Research design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. Sage publications.

Crisp, R., & Powell, R. (2016). Young People and UK Labour Market Policy: A Critique of 'Employability' as a Tool for Understanding Youth Unemployment. *Urban Studies*, 0042098016637567.

Cruikshank, B. (1993). Revolutions Within: Self-Government and Self-Esteem. *Economy and Society*, *22*(3), 327-344.

Cruikshank, B. (1999). *The Will to Empower: Democratic Citizens and Other Subjects*. Cornell University Press.

Culpitt, I. (1999). *Social Policy and Risk*. Sage.

Daly, M., & Silver, H. (2008). Social Exclusion and Social Capital: A Comparison and Critique. *Theory and Society*, *37*(6), 537-566.

Davies, J. (2013). Just do it Differently? Everyday Making, Marxism and the Struggle Against Neoliberalism. *Policy & Politics*, *41*(4), 497-513.

Davies, S. (2008). Contracting out Employment Services to the Third and Private Sectors: A Critique. *Critical Social Policy*, *28*(2), 136-164.

Davies, W. (2012). The Emerging Neocommunitarianism. *The Political Quarterly*, *83*(4), 767-776.

DCLG (Department for Communities and Local Government). (2006). *Strong and prosperous communities: The local government White Paper*, Cm 6939–II, London: The Stationery Office.

Deacon, A. (2004). Justifying Conditionality: The Case of Anti-Social Tenants. *Housing Studies*, *19*(6), 911-926.

Deakin, N. (2001). *In Search of Civil Society*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Deakin, N. (2003). 'The Voluntary Sector', in P. Alcock, A. Erskine and M. May 191-199 (eds.) *The Student's Companion to Social Policy*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Deakin, N. (2005). 'Civil Society and Civil Renewal', in C. Robb (ed.), *Voluntary Action: Meeting the Challenges of the 21st century*. London: NCVO.

Deakin Commission. (1996). Meeting the Challenge of Change: Voluntary Action into the 21st Century: Report of the Commission on the Future of the Voluntary Sector in England. *NCVO: London*.

Dean, H. (1999). *Begging Questions: Street Level Economic Activity and Social Policy Failure*. Policy Press.

Dean, H. (2003). Re-conceptualising Welfare-to-Work for People with Multiple Problems and Needs. *Journal of Social Policy*, *32*(03), 441-459.

Dean, H. (2007). Tipping the Balance: The Problematic Nature of Work-life Balance in a Low-income Neighbourhood. *Journal of Social Policy*, *36*(04), 519-537.

Dean, H., Bonvin, J. M., Vielle, P., & Farvaque, N. (2005). Developing Capabilities and Rights in Welfare-to-Work Policies. *European Societies*, *7*(1), 3-26.

Defourny, J., & Develtere, P. (1997). Elements for Clarifying the Debate on the Social Economy. In *International Conference on the Social Economy in the North and South, Konigswinter* (Vol. 7, No. 8.03, p. 1997).

Defourny, J., & Nyssens, M. (2010). Social Enterprise in Europe: At the Crossroads of Market, Public Policies and Third Sector. *Policy and Society*, *29*(3), 231-242.

Della Porta, D. & Gianni, P. (2008). *Voices of the Valley, Voices of the Straits: How Protest Creates Communities*. Berghahn Books.

Demoustier, D. (2001). *L'Economie Sociale et Solidaire: S'associer pour Entreprendre Autrement*. Paris: Syros.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative research*. Sage.

234

DETR (Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions) (1998). *Modern Local Government: In Touch with the People*, Cmnd. 4014. London: The Stationery Office.

Dey, I. (2003). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A User Friendly Guide for Social Scientists*. Routledge.

Donzelot, J., & Estèbe, P. (1994). L'État animateur, Paris. *Esprit*.

Dopfer, K. (1991). Toward a Theory of Economic Institutions: Synergy and Path Dependency. *Journal of Economic Issues*, 535-550.

Driver, S., & Martell, L. (1997). New Labour's Communitarianisms. *Critical Social Policy*, *17*(52), 27-46.

Duggan, L. (2012). *The Twilight of Equality?: Neoliberalism, Cultural Politics, and the Attack on Democracy*. Beacon Press.

DWP (Department for Work and Pensions). (2008). *Raising Expectations and Increasing Support: Reforming Welfare for the Future* (London: The Stationery Office).

Dwyer, P. (2000). *Welfare Rights and Responsibilities: Contesting Social Citizenship*. Policy.

Dwyer, P. (2004). Creeping Conditionality in the UK: From Welfare Rights to Conditional Entitlements?. *The Canadian Journal of Sociology*, *29*(2), 265-287.

Eckstein, H. (1975). Case Study and Theory in Political Science. *Case study method*, 119-164.

Edwards, C., & Imrie, R. (2008). Disability and the Implications of the Wellbeing Agenda: Some Reflections from the United Kingdom. *Journal of Social Policy*, *37*(03), 337-355.

Ehrenberg, J. (1999). *Civil Society*. NYU Press.

Eisenhardt, K.M. (1991). 'Better Stories and Better Constructs: The Case for Rigor and Comparative Logic', *Academy of Management Review*, *16*(3), 620-27.

Eisenschitz, A., & Gough, J. (1996). The Contradictions of Neo-Keynesian Local Economic Strategy. *Review of International Political Economy*, *3*(3), 434-458.

Elias, N. (1996). *The Germans: Power Struggles and the Development of Habitus.* Cambridge: Polity.

Elias, N., & Scotson, J. L. (1994). *The Established and the Outsiders* (Vol. 32). Sage.

Esping-Andersen, G. (1990). *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism.* Cambridge: Polity.

Esping-Andersen, G. (2002). *Why we need a New Welfare State.* Oxford University Press, USA.

Etzioni, A. (1995). *The Spirit of Community: Rights, Responsibilities and the Communitarian Agenda.* London: Fontana.

Etzioni, A. (1997). The Community of Communities. *Responsive Community*, *7*, 21-32.

Etzioni, A. (2009). The Common Good and Right: A Neo-Communitarian Approach. *Georgetown Journal of International Affairs*, 113-119.

Evans, C., Simmonds, D., & Nathan, M. (1999). *Employability through Work.* Manchester: Centre for Local Economic Strategies.

Evans, M. E. (2001). Britain: Moving Towards a Work and Opportunity-focused Welfare State?. *International Journal of Social Welfare*, *10*(4), 260-266.

Evans, B., Richmond, T., & Shields, J. (2005). Structuring Neoliberal Governance: The Nonprofit Sector, Emerging New Modes of Control and the Marketisation of Service Delivery. *Policy and Society*, *24*(1), 73-97.

Evers, A., Pijl, M., & Ungerson, C. (1994). *Payments for Care*. Ashgate Publishing.

Evers, A., & Laville, J. L. (Eds.). (2004). *The Third Sector in Europe*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Evers, A., & Guillemard, A. M. (Eds.). (2012). *Social Policy and Citizenship: The Changing Landscape*. Oxford University Press.

Feldman, S., & Zaller, J. (1992). The Political Culture of Ambivalence: Ideological Responses to the Welfare State. *American Journal of Political Science*, 268-307.

Fereday, J., & Muir-Cochrane, E. (2006). Demonstrating Rigor using Thematic Analysis: A Hybrid Approach of Inductive and Deductive Coding and Theme Development. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *5*(1), 80-92.

Ferguson, I. (2008). Neoliberalism, Happiness and Wellbeing. *International Socialism*, *117*, 123.

Ferrera, M. (Ed.). (2005). *Welfare State Reform in Southern Europe: Fighting Poverty and Social Exclusion in Greece, Italy, Spain and Portugal*. Routledge.

Field, F. (2003). *Neighbours from Hell: The Politics of Behaviour*. London: Politico's.

Fine, B. (2004). Social Policy and Development: Social Capital as Point of Departure. In *Social Policy in a Development Context* (pp. 80-96). Palgrave Macmillan UK.

Finegan, J. E. (2000). The Impact of Person and Organisational Values on Organisational Commitment. *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology*, *73*(2), 149-169.

Fitzpatrick, T. (2005). The Fourth Attempt to Construct a Politics of Welfare Obligations. *Policy & Politics*, *33*(1), 15-32.

Fitzpatrick, S., & Jones, A. (2005). Pursuing Social Justice or Social Cohesion?: Coercion in Street Homelessness Policies in England. *Journal of Social Policy*, *34*(03), 389-406.

Flick, U., von Kardoff, E., & Steinke, I. (Eds.). (2004). *A Companion to Qualitative Research*. Sage.

Flint, J. (2006). Towards Self-governing Urban Communities: Assessing Citizen Empowerment Strategies Within Anti-Social Behaviour Policy in the UK, *Geographie, Economie and Societe*.

Flint, J. (2009). Governing Marginalised Populations: The Role of Coercion, Support and Agency. *European Journal of Homelessness _ Volume*.

Flint, J. (2012). The Inspection House and Neglected Dynamics of Governance: The Case of Domestic Visits in Family Intervention Projects. *Housing studies*, *27*(6), 822-838.

Flint, J., & Nixon, J. (2006). Governing Neighbours: Anti-social Behaviour Orders and New Forms of Regulating Conduct in the UK. *Urban Studies*, *43*(5-6), 939-955.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and Punishment: The Birth of the Prison*. Trans A. Sheridan. London: Allen Lane, Penguin.

Foucault, M. (1991). 'Governmentality', in Burchell, C. Gordon and Miller, P. (eds.), in *The Foucault Effect*. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Foucault, M. (2003). 'The Subject and Power', pp. 126-44 in P. Rabinow and N. Rose (eds.) *The Essential Foucault: Selections from Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984*. London: The New Press.

Foucault, M., Burchell, G., Gordon, C., & Miller, P. (1991). *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*. University of Chicago Press.

Frank, T. (2000). *One market under God: Extreme capitalism, market populism, and the end of economic democracy.* New York: Doubleday.

Fuentes-Nieva, R., & Galasso, N. (2014). *Working for the Few: Political capture and economic inequality* (Vol. 178). Oxfam.

Fyfe, N. R. (2005). Making Space for "Neo-communitarianism"? The Third Sector, State and Civil Society in the UK. *Antipode, 37*(3), 536-557.

Gamson, WA. (1992). *Talking Politics.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Garland, D. (1990). Frameworks of Inquiry in the Sociology of Punishment. *British Journal of Sociology,* 1-15.

Garland, D. (1997). Governmentality and the Problem of Crime: Foucault, Criminology, Sociology. *Theoretical Criminology, 1*(2), 173-214.

Garland, D. (2001). *The Culture of Control: Crime and Social Order in Contemporary Society.* Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Garrett, P. M. (2007). Making 'Anti-social Behaviour': A Fragment on the Evolution of 'ASBO Politics' in Britain. *British Journal of Social Work, 37*(5), 839-856.

Garton, J. (2013). *Public Benefit in Charity Law.* Oxford University Press.

Gazier, B. (2001). Employability: The Complexity of a Policy Notion. *Employability: From Theory to Practice,* 3-23.

Geertz, C. (1995). *After the fact: Two countries, four decades, one anthropologist.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

George, A. L., & Bennett, A. (2005). *Case studies and theory development.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Geppert, M., & Williams, K. (2006). Global, National and Local Practices in Multinational Corporations: Towards a Sociopolitical Framework. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 17*(1): 49-69.

Gerring, J. (2001). *Social science methodology: A criterial framework.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Gerring, J. (2004). What is a Case Study and What is it Good For?. *American Political Science Review, 98*(2), 341-354.

Giddens, A. (1998). *The Third Way: The Renewal of Social Democracy.* London: Polity Press.

Giddens, A. (2006). Positive welfare. *The Welfare State Reader*, 378-388.

Gledhill, J. (2004). Neoliberalism. *A Companion to the Anthropology of Politics*, 332-348.

Goodin, R. E., & Rein, M. (2001). Regimes on Pillars: Alternative Welfare State Logics and Dynamics. *Public Administration, 79*(4), 769-801.

Gordon, C. (1991) 'Government Rationality: An Introduction', in G. Burchell, M. Foucault and C. Gordon (eds). *The Foucault Effect: Studies in governmentality*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Graeber, D. (2011). Revolution in Reverse. *Revolutions in Reverse: Essays on Politics, Violence, Art and Imagination*, 41-66.

Graham, H. L., Maslin, J., Copello, A., Birchwood, M., Mueser, K., McGovern, D., & Georgiou, G. (2001). Drug and alcohol problems amongst individuals with severe mental health problems in an inner city area of the UK. *Social psychiatry and psychiatric epidemiology, 36*(9), 448-455.

Granovetter, M. (2005). The Impact of Social Structure on Economic Outcomes. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 33-50.

Grigoriadis, I. N. (2013). Religion and Greek Nationalism: From Conflict to Synthesis. In *Instilling Religion in Greek and Turkish Nationalism: A "Sacred Synthesis"* (pp. 13-49). Palgrave Macmillan US.

Gubrium, J. F. and Holstein, J. (eds.). (2001). *Handbook of Interviewing Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Habermas, J. (1995). *Citizenship and National Identity*. Albany.

Habermas, J. (1996). *Between Facts and Norms (W. Rehg, Trans.)*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hacker, J. S. (2002). *The Divided Welfare State: The Battle Over Public and Private Social Benefits in the United States*. Cambridge University Press.

Hall, M. (1997). 'Comments'. In The Emerging Sector: In *Search of a Framework*, ed., Ronald Hirshhorn, 72-74. Ottawa, ON: Canadian Policy Research Networks Inc.

Hall, P. A. (ed.) (1989). *The Political Power of Economic Ideas. Keynesianism across Nations*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Hall, P. D. (1992). Inventing the Nonprofit Sector. *Inventing the Nonprofit Sector and Other Essays in Philanthropy, Voluntarism and Nonprofit organisations*. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, Maryland.

Hammersley, M., & Atkinson, P. (1992). Insiders Accounts: Listening and Asking Questions. In *Ethnography. Principles in Practice*, 2nd edition, Hammersley M. & Atkinson P. London: Routledge.

Haraway, D. (1991). *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*. New York: Routledge.

Hardy, D. (1979). *Alternative Communities in Nineteenth Century England*. London: Longman.

241

Harris, M. (2010). Third Sector Organisations in a Contradictory Policy Environment. *Hybrid Organisations and the Third Sector, Basingstoke, Palgrave*, 25-45.

Hartley, J.F. (1994). 'Case Studies in Organisational Research', In C. Cassel and G. Symon (eds.). *Qualitative Methods in Organisational Research: A Practical Guide*, London, UK: Sage, 208- 29.

Hartman, Y. (2005). In Bed with the Enemy: Some Ideas on the Connections Between Neoliberalism and the Welfare State. *Current Sociology, 53*(1), 57-73.

Harvey, D. (2005). *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. OUP Oxford.

Harvey, D. (2007). Neoliberalism as Creative Destruction. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 610*(1), 21-44.

Haughton, G., Jones, M., Peck, J., Tickell, A., & While, A. (2000). Labour Market Policy as Flexible Welfare: Prototype Employment Zones and the New Workfarism. *Regional Studies, 34*(7), 669-680.

Häusermann, S., & Palier, B. (2008). The Politics of Employment-Friendly Welfare Reforms in Post-Industrial Economies. *Socio-Economic Review, 6*(3), 559-586.

Healy, S., & Graham, J. (2008). Building Community Economies: A Postcapitalist Project of Sustainable Development. *Economic Representations: Academic and Everyday*, 291-314.

Hemerijck, A. (2007, February). Joining forces for Social Europe: Reasserting the Lisbon imperative of "double engagement" and more. In *A Paper presented at the 'Joining Forces for a Social Europe' conference under the German Presidency, Nuremberg* (pp. 8-9).

Herbert, S. (2000). For Ethnography. *Progress in Human Geography*, 24: 550.

Hindess, B. (1996). Liberalism, Socialism and Democracy: Variations on a Governmental Theme. *Foucault and Political Reason: Liberalism, Neo-liberalism and Rationalities of Government*, 65-80.

HM Treasury (2002). *The Role of the Voluntary and Community Sector in Service Delivery: A Cross Cutting Review*, London: HM Treasury.

HM Treasury (2005). *Exploring the Role of the Third Sector in Public Service Delivery and Reform*, London: HM Treasury.

HM Treasury and Cabinet Office (2007). *The Future Role of the Third Sector in Social and Economic Regeneration: Final report*, Cm 7189, London: The Stationery Office.

Hoggett, P. (2000). *Emotional Life and the Politics of Welfare*. F. L. Williams (Ed.). Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Hollander, J. A. (2004). The Social Contexts of Focus Groups. *Journal of contemporary ethnography*, *33*(5), 602-637.

Holloway, I., & Todres, L. (2003). The Status of Method: Flexibility, Consistency and Coherence. *Qualitative research*, *3*(3), 345-357.

Home Office (1998). *Getting It Right Together*. London: Home Office.

Home Office (2002). *A Guide to Anti-social Behaviour Orders and Acceptable Behaviour Contracts*. London: Home Office.

Home Office (2003a). *Building Civil Renewal: Government Support for Community Capacity Building and Proposals for Change*. London: Home Office.

Home Office (2003b). *Respect and Responsibility: Taking a Stand against Anti-social Behaviour*. London: Home Office.

Hopkins, P. E. (2007). Positionalities and knowledge: Negotiating Ethics in Practice. *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies*, *6*(3), 386-394.

Huber, E., & Stephens, J. D. (2001). *Development and Crisis of the Welfare State: Parties and Policies in Global Markets*. University of Chicago press.

Hunt, S. A., & Benford, R. D. (2004). Collective Identity, Solidarity, and Commitment. *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*, 433-457.

Hupkens, C. L., Knibbe, R. A., & Drop, M. J. (1993). Alcohol Consumption in the European Community: Uniformity and Diversity in Drinking Patterns. *Addiction*, *88*(10), 1391-1404.

Hvinden, B., & Johansson, H. (2007). *Citizenship in Nordic Welfare States*. London, Routledge.

Ilcan, S., & Basok, T. (2004). Community Government: Voluntary Agencies, Social Justice, and the Responsibilization of Citizens 1. *Citizenship Studies*, *8*(2), 129-144.

Inglehart, R. (1990). *Values, Ideology and Cognitive Mobilization in New Social Movements*.

Jenkins, R. (1992). Experiments in Epistemology. In: *Pierre Bourdieu*. London/New York, Routledge, 45-65.

Jenson, J. (2009). Redesigning Citizenship Regimes after Neoliberalism. Moving towards Social Investment. *What Future for Social Investment*, 27-44.

Jenson, J. (2010). Diffusing Ideas for After Neoliberalism: The Social Investment Perspective in Europe and Latin America. *Global Social Policy*, *10*(1), 59-84.

Jenson, J., & Saint-Martin, D. (2003). New Routes to Social Cohesion? Citizenship and the Social Investment State. *Canadian Journal of Sociology/Cahiers canadiens de sociologie*, 77-99.

Jenson, J., & Saint-Martin, D. (2006). Building Blocks for a New Social Architecture: The LEGO™ Paradigm of an Active Society. *Policy & Politics, 34*(3), 429-451.

Jepperson, R. L., & Meyer, J. W. (1991). The Public Order and the Construction of Formal Organisations. *The New Institutionalism in Organisational Analysis, 204231.*

Jepsen, M., & Pascual, A. S. (2005). The European Social Model: An Exercise in Deconstruction. *Journal of European Social Policy, 15*(3), 231-245.

Jessop, B. (1993). Towards a Schumpeterian Workfare State? Preliminary remarks on Post-Fordist Political Economy. *Studies in Political Economy, 40.*

Jessop, B. (1998). The Rise of Governance and the Risks of Failure: The Case of Economic Development. *International Social Science Journal,* 50 (155): 29-45.

Jessop, B. (1999). The Changing Governance of Welfare: Recent Trends in its Primary Functions, Scale, and Modes of Coordination. *Social Policy & Administration, 33*(4), 348-359.

Jessop, B. (2002). Liberalism, Neoliberalism, and Urban Governance: A State–Theoretical Perspective. *Antipode, 34*(3), 452-472.

Jones, S. (1985). 'The Analysis of Depth Interviews' in Walker, R. (ed.), *Applied Qualitative Research,* London: Gower.

Jones, J. P., Nast, H. J., & Roberts, S. M. (1997). *Thresholds in Feminist Geography: Difference, Methodology, Representation.* Rowman & Littlefield.

Jones, C., & Novak, T. (2012). *Poverty, Welfare and the Disciplinary State.* Routledge.

Jonker, J., & Pennink, B. (2010). *The Essence of Research Methodology: A Concise Guide for Master and PhD Students in Management Science.* Springer Science & Business Media.

Kalof, L., Dan, A., & Dietz, T. (2008). *Essentials of Social Research*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).

Kassotakis, M., & Verdis, A. (2013). Shadow Education in Greece. In *Private Tutoring Across the Mediterranean* (pp. 93-113). Sense Publishers.

Katrougalos, G. S. (1996). The South European Welfare Model: The Greek Welfare State, in Search of an Identity. *Journal of European Social Policy*, *6*(1), 39-60.

Kendall, J. (2000). The Mainstreaming of the Third Sector into Public Policy in England in the late 1990s: Whys and wherefores. *Policy and Politics 28*(4): 541-562.

Kendall, J. (2003). *The Voluntary Sector: Comparative perspectives in the UK*, London: Routledge.

Kendall, J. (2009). *Handbook on Third Sector Policy in Europe: Multi-level Processes and Organised Civil Society*. Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd.

Kendall, J., & Knapp, M. (1996). *The Voluntary Sector in the United Kingdom*. Manchester University Press, Manchester.

Kendall, J., & Knapp, M. (1997). The United Kingdom. In L. M. Salamon and H. K. Anheier (eds.), *Defining the Nonprofit Sector: A Cross-national Analysis*, Manchester University Press, Manchester.

Kendall, J., & Knapp, M. (2000). *The Third Sector and Welfare State Modernisation: Inputs, Activities and Comparative Performance*. Centre for Civil Society, London School of Economics and Political Science.

King, D. S. (2005). Making People Work: Democratic Consequences of Workfare. *Welfare Reform and Political Theory. New York: Russell Sage Foundation*, 65-81.

King, D. S., & Waldron, J. (1988). Citizenship, Social Citizenship and the Defence of Welfare Provision. *British Journal of Political Science, 18*(04), 415-443.

King, P. (2006) What do we Mean by Responsibility? The Case of UK Housing Benefit Reform. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment, 21*, 111-125.

Kingfisher, C., & Maskovsky, J. (2008). Introduction: The Limits of Neoliberalism. *Critique of Anthropology, 28*(2), 115-126.

Klandermans, B. (2002). How Group Identification helps to overcome the Dilemma of Collective Action. *American Behavioral Scientist, 45*(5), 887-900.

Klein, N. (2002). *Fences and Windows, Dispatches from the Front Lines of the Globalisation Debate*. London: Flamingo.

Kobayashi, A. (2003). GPC Ten Years On: Is Self-reflexivity Enough?. *Gender, Place and Culture, 10*(4), 345-349.

Krueger, R., & Casey, M. (2009). *Focus Groups: A Practical Guide to Applied Science*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kumar, S. (2003). Accountability: A Qualitative Study of Relationships between the Public Sector, the Voluntary Sector and Users of Health and Welfare Services in the Context of Purchase of Service Contracting. *Birmingham: University of Aston*.

Kvale, S. (1989). 'To Validate is to Question', In S. Kvale (ed.). *Issues of Validity in Qualitative Research*, Lund, Sweden: Studentlitteratur, 73-92.

Kymlicka, W. (1995). *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*. Clarendon Press.

Kymlicka, W., & Norman, W. (1994). Return of the Citizen: A Survey of Recent Work on Citizenship Theory. *Ethics, 104*(2), 352-381.

Labour Party. (1997). *Building the future together: Labour's policies for partnership between government and the voluntary sector*, London: Labour Party

Lanz, S. (2013). Be Berlin! Governing the City through Freedom. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, *37*(4), 1305-1324.

Larner, W. (2006). Neoliberalism: Policy, Ideology, Governmentality. In *International political economy and poststructural politics* (pp. 199-218). Palgrave Macmillan UK.

Layard, R. (2006). Happiness and Public Policy: A Challenge to the Profession. *The Economic Journal*, *116*(510), C24-C33.

Lazzarato, M. (2000). Du Biopouvoir à la Biopolitique. *Multitudes*, *1*, 45-57.

Lazzarato, M. (2009). Neoliberalism in Action Inequality, Insecurity and the Reconstitution of the Social. *Theory, Culture & Society*, *26*(6), 109-133.

Leitner, H., Peck, J., & Sheppard, E. S. (Eds.). (2007). *Contesting Neoliberalism: Urban Frontiers*. Guilford Press.

Lemke, T. (2002). Foucault, Governmentality, and Critique. *Rethinking Marxism*, *14*(3), 49-64.

Lévesque, M., & White, D. (1999). Le Concept de Capital Social et ses Usages. *Lien social et politiques*, (41), 23-33.

Levitas, R. (1998) *The Inclusive Society? Social Exclusion and New Labour*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Levitas, R., Pantazis, C., Fahmy, E., Gordon, D., Lloyd, E. & Patsios, D. (2007). *The Multi-Dimensional Analysis of Social Exclusion*, Bristol Institute for Public Affairs, Bristol.

Leys, C. (1990). Still a Question of Hegemony. *New Left Review*, (181), 119.

Leys, C. (2003). *Market-driven Politics: Neoliberal Democracy and the Public Interest.* Verso.

Lijphart, A. (1971). Comparative Politics and the Comparative Method. *American Political Science Review, 65*(3), 682-693.

Lijphart, A. (1975). The Comparable-Cases Strategy in Comparative Research. *Comparative Political Studies, 8*(2), 158.

Lister, M. (2005). 'Marshall-ing' Social and Political Citizenship: Towards a Unified Conception of Citizenship1. *Government and Opposition, 40*(4), 471-491.

Lister, R. (1998). From Equality to Social Inclusion: New Labour and the Welfare State. *Critical Social Policy, 18*(55), 215-225.

Lister, R. (2002). The Dilemmas of Pendulum Politics: Balancing Paid Work, Care and Citizenship. *Economy and Society, 31*(4), 520-532.

Lister, R. (2004). The Third Way's Social Investment State. *Welfare State Change. Towards a Third Way?*, 157-181.

Lister, R. (2006). A New Politics of Respect. *Soundings, 32*(1), 89-100.

Lockwood, D. (1996). Civic Integration and Class Formation. *British Journal of Sociology*, 531-550.

Lohmann, R. A. (1992). *The Commons: New Perspectives on Nonprofit Organisations and Voluntary Action.* Jossey-Bass Inc Pub.

Longhurst, R. (2009). Interviews: In-depth, Semi-structured. *International Encyclopedia of Human Geography*, 580-584.

Loopstra, R., Reeves, A., Taylor-Robinson, D., Barr, B., McKee, M., & Stuckler, D. (2015). Austerity, Sanctions, and the Rise of Food Banks in the UK. *BMJ, 350*, h1775.

Lowndes, V., & Pratchett, L. (2012). Local Governance Under the Coalition Government: Austerity, Localism and the 'Big Society'. *Local Government Studies*, *38*(1), 21-40.

Marshall, T. H. (1950). *Citizenship and Social Class* (Vol. 11, pp. 28-29). Cambridge.

Marshall, T. H. (1992). 1950: Citizenship and Social Class. *TH Marshall & T. Bottomore, eds*.

Marston, G., & Watts, R. (2004). The Problem with Neo-conservative Social Policy: Rethinking the Ethics of Citizenship and the Welfare State. *Just Policy: A Journal of Australian Social Policy*, (33), 34.

Matsaganis, M. (2011). The Welfare State and the Crisis: The Case of Greece. *Journal of European Social Policy*, *21*(5), 501-512.

Matsaganis, M. (2013). The Crisis and the Welfare State in Greece: A Complex Relationship. In *The Greek Crisis and European Modernity* (pp. 152-177). Palgrave Macmillan UK.

Mayer, M. (2003). The Onward Sweep of Social Capital: Causes and Consequences for Understanding Cities, Communities and Urban Movements. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, *27*(1), 110-132.

McBride, S., & Whiteside, H. (2011). Austerity for Whom?. *Socialist Studies/Études Socialistes*, *7*(1/2).

McCluskey, M. T. (2003). Efficiency and Social Citizenship: Challenging the Neoliberal Attack on the Welfare State. *Indiana Law Journal*, *78*.

McLaughlin, K., Osborne, S. P., & Ferlie, E. (2002). *New Public Management: Current Trends and Future Prospects*. Psychology Press.

McQuaid, R. W., & Lindsay, C. (2005). The Concept of Employability. *Urban Studies*, *42*(2), 197-219.

Mead, L. M. (1997). Citizenship and Social Policy: TH Marshall and Poverty. *Social Philosophy and Policy, 14*(02), 197-230.

Means, R., Morbey, H., & Smith, R. (2002). *From Community Care to Market Care? The Development of Welfare Services for Older People.* The Policy Press.

Meehan, T., Vermeer, C., & Windsor, C. (2000). Patients' Perceptions of Seclusion: a Qualitative Investigation. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 31*(2), 370-377.

Mellor, M., Hannah, J., & Stirling, J. (1988). *Worker Cooperatives in Theory and Practice.* Open University Press.

Merriam, S. B., Johnson-Bailey, J., Lee, M. Y., Kee, Y., Ntseane, G., & Muhamad, M. (2001). Power and Positionality: Negotiating Insider/Outsider Status Within and Across Cultures. *International Journal of Lifelong Education, 20*(5), 405-416.

Milbourne, L., & Cushman, M. (2015). Complying, Transforming or Resisting in the New Austerity? Realigning Social Welfare and Independent Action among English Voluntary Organisations. *Journal of Social Policy, 44*(03), 463-485.

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2013). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook.* SAGE Publications, Incorporated.

Mills, C. W. (2000). *The Sociological Imagination.* Oxford University Press.

Mitchell, W., & Irvine, A. (2008). I'm Okay, You're Okay?: Reflections on the Well-being and Ethical Requirements of Researchers and Research Participants in Conducting Qualitative Fieldwork Interviews. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 7*(4), 31-44.

Mohammad, R. (2001). Insider' and/or 'Outsiders': Positionality, Theory and Praxis', in Limb, M., and Dwyer, C.(eds.), *Qualitative Methodologies for Geographers: Issues and Debates.* London: Hodder Arnold.

Monbiot, G. (2011). 'Give me William the Conqueror's Big Society over David Cameron's any day'. *The Guardian*. 31 January 2011.

Mooney, G., & Neal, S. (2010). 'Welfare worries': Mapping the Directions of Welfare Futures in the Contemporary UK. *Research, Policy and Planning*, *27*(3), 141-150.

Morel, N., Palier, B., & Palme, J. (2012). *Towards a Social Investment Welfare State?: Ideas, Policies and Challenges*. Policy Press.

Morgan, D. L., & Krueger, R. A. (1993). When to use Focus Groups and Why. In *Successful Focus Groups: Advancing the State of the Art*, edited by D. L. Morgan. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Morris, L. (2002). *Dangerous Classes: The Underclass and Social Citizenship*. Routledge.

Morris, S. (2000). Defining the Nonprofit Sector: Some Lessons from History. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organisations*, *11*(1), 25-43.

Moulaert, F., & Ailenei, O. (2005). Social Economy, Third Sector and Solidarity Relations: A Conceptual Synthesis from History to Present. *Urban Studies*, *42*(11), 2037-2053.

Mulgan, G., Reeder, N., Aylott, M., & Bo'sher, L. (2011). *Social Impact Investment: The Challenge and Opportunity of Social Impact Bonds*. London: The Young Foundation.

Murray, C. (1990). The Emerging Underclass. *London: Institute of Economic Affairs*.

Murray, M. (2003). Narrative Psychology. *Qualitative Psychology: A Practical Guide to Research Methods*, 111-131.

Murray, C., Lister, R., & Buckingham, A. (1996). *Charles Murray and the Underclass: The Developing Debate*. London: IEA Health and Welfare Unit.

Muukkonen, M. (2009). Framing the Field Civil Society and Related Concepts. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 38*(4), 684-700.

Myles, J., & Street, D. (1995). Should the Economic Life Course be Redesigned? Old Age Security in a Time of Transition. *Canadian Journal on Aging/La Revue canadienne du vieillissement, 14*(02), 335-359.

Myles, J., & Quadagno, J. (2002). Political Theories of the Welfare State. *Social Service Review, 76*(1), 34-57.

Nasioulas, I. (2010). *Social Economy in Greece and its Social Capital. An Integrated, Institutional and National Accounting Recognition*. Athens: Orthos Logos Editions

Nasioulas, I. (2012a). *Greek Social Economy Revisited: Voluntary, Civic and Cooperative Challenges in the 21st century*. Peter Lang.

Nasioulas, I. (2012b). Social Cooperatives in Greece. Introducing New Forms of Social Economy and Entrepreneurship. *International Review of Social Research, 2*(2), 141-161.

Navarro, V. (2002). A Critique of Social Capital. *International Journal of Health Services, 32*(3), 423-432.

Navarro, V. (Ed.). (2007). *Neoliberalism, Globalisation, and Inequalities: Consequences for Health and Quality of Life*. Baywood Pub.

Nelson, M., & Stephens, J. D. (2012). *Do Social Investment Policies produce more and better jobs* (pp. 205-234). Bristol, Policy Press.

Nettleton, S. (1997). Governing the Risky Self. *Foucault, Health and Medicine*, 207-222.

Neuman, W.L. (2011). *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*, 7th edn, Pearson/Allyn and Bacon, Boston.

Newman, J. (2001). *Modernizing Governance: New Labour, Policy and Society*. Sage.

Nilssen, E. (2009). Combating Social Exclusion in the European Union. *The Role of International Organisations in Social Policy, Cheltenham, UK, Edward Elgar*, 72-93.

Nyman, J. A., & Maude-Griffin, R. (2001). The Welfare Economics of Moral Hazard. *International Journal of Health Care Finance and Economics, 1*(1), 23-42.

Nyssens, M. (Ed.) (2006). *Social Enterprise - At the Crossroads of Market, Public Policies and Civil Society*, London and New York: Routledge.

ODPM. (2000). *Change a Life*. Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, London

OECD. (2003). *Asset Building and the Escape from Poverty. A New Welfare Policy Debate*. Paris: OECD.

Offe, C. (2000). Some Contradictions of the Modern Welfare state. *The Welfare State: A Reader*, 67-76.

Office of the Third Sector / Compact Voice. (2007). *Joint Compact action plan 2006-2008: Report to Parliament of the Seventh Annual Meeting to review the Compact on relations between government and the voluntary and community sector*, London: The Stationery Office.

O'Halloran, K., McGregor-Lowndes, M., & Simon, K. (2008). *Charity Law & Social policy: National and International Perspectives on the Functions of the Law Relating to Charities* (Vol. 10). Springer Science & Business Media.

O'Malley, P. (1996). Risk and Responsibility. *Foucault and Political Reason: Liberalism, Neo-liberalism and Rationalities of Government*, 189-207.

O'Malley, P. (2004). The Government of Risks. *The Blackwell Companion to Law and Society*, 292.

Onyx, J., & Maclean, M. (1996). Careers in the Third Sector. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 6*(4), 331-345.

Osborne, S. E. (ed.) (2008). *The Third Sector in Europe: Prospects and Challenges*, London, Routledge.

Osborne, S. E. (2010). *The New Public Governance?: Emerging Perspectives on the Theory and Practice of Public Governance*. Routledge.

Owen, D. (1964). *English Philanthropy, 1660-1960*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Parker, J. (1998). *Citizenship, Work and Welfare. Searching for the Good Society*, Houndmills: Macmillan.

Patton, M. Q. (1999). Enhancing the Quality and Credibility of Qualitative Analysis. *Health Services Research, 34*(5 Pt. 2), 1189.

Patton, M. Q. (2005). *Qualitative Research*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Patton, P. (1998). Foucault's Subject of Power. In The later Foucault: *Politics and Philosophy*, ed. J. Moss, 64-77. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.

Paxton, W., & Pearce, N. (2005). *The Voluntary Sector Delivering Public Services*. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Peake, L., & Trotz, A. (1999). *Gender, Ethnicity and Place: Women and Identities in Guyana*. London: Routledge.

Pearce, J.L. (1993). *Volunteers: The Organisational Behavior of Unpaid Workers*. London and New York: Routledge.

Peck, J. (2001). *Workfare States*. Guilford Publications, 72 Spring Street, New York, NY.

Peck, J. (2004). Geography and Public Policy: Constructions of Neoliberalism. *Progress in Human Geography*, *28*(3), 392-405.

Peck, J. (2010). Zombie Neoliberalism and the Ambidextrous State. *Theoretical Criminology*, *14*(1), 104-110.

Peck, J., & Theodore, N. (2000). Beyond Employability. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, *24*(6), 729-749.

Peck, J., & Tickell, A. (2002). Neoliberalizing Space. *Antipode, 34*(3), 380-404.

Pickerill, J., & Chatterton, P. (2006). Notes towards Autonomous Geographies: Creation, Resistance and Self-management as Survival Tactics. *Progress in Human Geography*, *30*(6), 730-746.

Pierson, P. (2001). *The New Politics of the Welfare State*. Oxford University Press on Demand.

Plant, R. (2003). A Public Service Ethic and Political Accountability. *Parliamentary Affairs*, *56*(4), 560-579.

Plehwe, D., Walpen, B. J., & Neunhöffer, G. (Eds.). (2007). *Neoliberal Hegemony: A Global Critique*. Routledge.

Polanyi, K. (1944). *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*. Beacon Press.

Polletta, F., & Jasper, J. M. (2001). Collective Identity and Social Movements. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 283-305.

Pollitt, C. (1990). *Managerialism and the Public Services: The Anglo-American Experience*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Porter, D., & Craig, D. (2004). The Third Way and the Third World: Poverty Reduction and Social Inclusion in the Rise of 'Inclusive' Liberalism. *Review of International Political Economy, 11*(2), 387-423.

Popke, E. J. (2003). Poststructuralist Ethics: Subjectivity, Responsibility and the Space of Community. *Progress in Human Geography, 27*(3), 298-316.

Poulantzas, N. A. (1973). *Political Power and Social Classes.*

Powell, M. A. (2000). New Labour and the Third Way in the British Welfare State: A New and Distinctive Approach?. *Critical social policy, 20*(1), 39-60.

Powell, M. A. (2008). *Modernising the Welfare State: The Blair legacy.* Policy Press.

Powell, M. A., & Barrientos, A. (2004). Welfare Regimes and the Welfare Mix. *European Journal of Political Research, 43*(1), 83-105.

Powell, R. (2015). Housing Benefit Reform and the Private Rented Sector in the UK: On the Deleterious Effects of Short-term, Ideological "Knowledge". *Housing, Theory and Society, 32*(3), 320-345.

Pratchett, L., Durose, C., Lowndes, V., Smith, G., Stoker, G., & Wales, C. (2009). *Empowering Communities to Influence Local Decision Making: Systematic Review of the Evidence.*

Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., & Levin, S. (2006). Social Dominance Theory and the Dynamics of Intergroup Relations: Taking Stock and looking Forward. *European Review of Social Psychology, 17*(1), 271-320.

Prime Minister's Strategy Unit. (2006). *The UK Government's Approach to Public Service Reform,* London: Prime Minister's Strategy Unit.

Prinos, I. (2014). Golden Dawn, Media Representation and the Neoliberal Restructuring of Social Welfare: On the Greek Crisis and the Mobilization of Disidentifications. *Sociological Research Online, 19*(3), 5.

Prokou, E. (2011). The Aims of Employability and Social Inclusion / Active Citizenship in Lifelong Learning Policies in Greece. *Social Research Review, 136*(136), 2011.

Purcell, M., & Purcell, M. (2008). *Recapturing Democracy: Neoliberalization and the Struggle for Alternative Urban Futures*. Routledge.
Putnam, R. D. (1993). The Prosperous Community. *The American Prospect, 4*(13), 35-42.

Putnam, R. D. (2001). *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. Simon and Schuster.

Ramia, G. (2002). The 'New Contractualism', Social Protection and the Yeatman Thesis. *Journal of Sociology, 38*(1), 49-68.

Rankin, K. N. (2002). Social Capital, Microfinance, and the Politics of Development. *Feminist Economics, 8*(1), 1-24.

Rekart, J. (2011). *Public Funds, Private Provision: The Role of the Voluntary Sector*. UBC Press.

Republic of Greece, (2010). Greek Law Number 3879/2010: Development of lifelong learning and other agendas, *Official Gazette of the Hellenic Republic*, 163 (21 September), 3401-3426 (in Greek).

Roberts, D. E. (1995). Irrationality and Sacrifice in the Welfare Reform Consensus. *Virginia Law Review*, 2607-2624.

Robolis, S. (2013). Economic Crisis and Welfare State. *Social Policy, 1, v2.*

Rohlfing, I. (2008). What You See and What You Get Pitfalls and Principles of Nested Analysis in Comparative Research. *Comparative Political Studies*, *41*(11), 1492-1514.

Rose, N. (1996). Governing "Advanced" Liberal Democracies. *The Anthropology of the State: A Reader,* 144-162.

Rose, N. (1999). *Governing the Soul: The Shaping of the Private Self.* London: Free Association Books.

Rose, N. (2000). Community, Citizenship, and the Third Way. *American Behavioral Scientist, 43*(9), 1395-1411.

Rose, N. (2009). *The Politics of Life Itself: Biomedicine, Power, and Subjectivity in the Twenty-First Century.* Princeton University Press.

Rose, N., & Miller, P. (1992). Political Power Beyond The State: Problematics of Government. *British Journal of Sociology*, 173-205.

Rose, N., O'Malley, P., & Valverde, M. (2006). Governmentality. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science, 2*, 83-104.

Rothstein, B. (2001). The Universal Welfare State as a Social Dilemma. *Rationality and Society, 13*(2), 213-233.

Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. (2005). *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data*, 2nd edn, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, California.

Ruggiero, K. M., & Taylor, D. M. (1997). Why Minority Group Members Perceive or do not Perceive the Discrimination that Confronts them: The Role of Self-esteem and Perceived Control. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72*(2), 373.

Runciman, W. G. (1996). Why Social Inequalities Are Generated by Social Rights. *Citizenship Today: The Contemporary Relevance of TH Marshall*, 49-63.

Saint-Martin, D. (2000). Building the New Managerialist State. *Consultants and the Politics of.*

Salamon, L. M. (1995). *Partners in Public Service: Government-Nonprofit Relations in the Modern Welfare State.* JHU Press.

Salamon, L. M., & Anheier, H. K. (1992a). In Search of the Non-Profit sector I: The Question of Definitions. *Voluntas, 3*(2), 125-151.

Salamon, L. M., & Anheier, H. K. (1992b). In Search of the Non-Profit Sector II: The Problem of Classification. *Voluntas, 3*(3), 267-309.

Salamon, L. M., & Anheier, H. K. (1997). *Defining the Nonprofit Sector: A Cross-National Analysis.* Manchester University Press.

Salamon, L. M., Anheier, H. K., List, R., Toepler, S., & Sokolowski, S. W. (1999). Global Civil Society. *Dimensions of the Nonprofit Sector. Baltimore.*

Sarantakos, S. (2005). *Social Research,* 3rd edn, Palgrave Macmillan, New York.

Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2009). *Research Methods for Business Students,* Pearson Education, London.

Schambra, W. A. (1994). By the People: The Old Values of the New Citizenship. *Policy Review, 69,* 32.

Schmitt, M. T., & Branscombe, N. R. (2002). The Meaning and Consequences of Perceived Discrimination in Disadvantaged and Privileged Social Groups. *European Review of Social Psychology, 12*(1), 167-199.

Scott, K. (2003). *Funding Matters: The Impact of Canada's New Funding Regime on Nonprofit and Voluntary Organisations.* Ottawa: Canadian Council on Social Development.

Scottish Executive (2003). *Putting Our Communities First: A Strategy for Tackling Anti-Social Behaviour*. Edinburgh: Scottish Executive

Sekhon, J. S. (2004). Quality Meets Quantity: Case Studies, Conditional Probability, and Counterfactuals. *Perspectives on Politics, 2*(2), 281-293.

Selbourne, D. (1994) *The Principle of Duty*. London: Sinclair Stevenson.

Semple, J. (1993). *Bentham's Prison: A Study of the Panopticon Penitentiary: A Study of the Panopticon Penitentiary*. Oxford University Press.
Shaikh, A., Saad-Filho, A., & Johnston, D. (2005). *Neo-Liberalism: A Critical Reader.*

Shaw, M. (2011). Stuck in the Middle? Community Development, Community Engagement and the Dangerous Business of Learning for Democracy. *Community Development Journal, 46*(suppl. 2), ii128-ii146.

Shields, J. M., & Evans, B. M. (1998). *Shrinking the State: Globalisation and Public Administration "Reform"*. Halifax, NS: Fernwood.

Sidanius, J., Levin, S., Rabinowitz, J. L., & Federico, C. M. (1999). Peering into the Jaws of the Beast: The Integrative Dynamics of Social Identity, Symbolic Racism, and Social Dominance. In D. A. Prentice & D. T. Miller (Eds.), *Cultural Divides: Understanding and Overcoming Group Conflict* (pp. 80-132). New York: Sage.

Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (2001). *Social Dominance: An Intergroup Theory of Social Hierarchy and Oppression*. Cambridge University Press.

Silverman, D. (Ed.). (2010). *Qualitative Research*. Sage.

Silverman, D. (2011), *Interpreting Qualitative Data: A Guide to the Principles of Qualitative Research*, 4th edn, Sage Publications, London.

Slater, T. (2014). The Myth of "Broken Britain": Welfare Reform and the Production of Ignorance. *Antipode, 46*(4), 948-969.

Smith, D. H. (1993). Public Benefit and Member Benefit Nonprofit, Voluntary Groups. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 22*(1), 53-68.

Smith, R. M. (1999). *Civic Ideals: Conflicting Visions of Citizenship in US History.* Yale University Press.

Smith, S. S., & Kulynych, J. (2002). It May be Social, but Why is it Capital? The social construction of social capital and the politics of language. *Politics & Society, 30*(1), 149-186.
Snow, D. A., Rochford Jr, E. B., Worden, S. K., & Benford, R. D. (1986). Frame Alignment Processes, Micromobilisation, and Movement Participation. *American Sociological Review,* 464-481.

Somers, M. R., & Block, F. (2005). From Poverty to Perversity: Ideas, Markets, and Institutions over 200 years of Welfare Debate. *American Sociological Review, 70*(2), 260-287.

Somers, M. R., & Wright, O. (2008). *Genealogies of Citizenship: Markets, Statelessness, and the Right to have Rights.* Cambridge University Press.

Sotiropoulos, D. A. (2004). The EU's Impact on the Greek Welfare State: Europeanisation on paper?. *Journal of European Social Policy, 14*(3), 267-284.

Sotiropoulos, D. A. (2014). Civil Society in Greece in the Wake of the Economic Crisis. *Report for Konrad Adenauer Stiftung und ELIAMEP.*

Sotiropoulos, D. A., & Bourikos, D. (2014). Economic Crisis, Social Solidarity and the Voluntary Sector in Greece. *Journal of Power, Politics & Governance, 2*(2), 33-53.

Standing, G. (1999). *Global Labour Flexibility: Seeking Distributive Justice.* Palgrave Macmillan.

262

Stein, J. (2001). *The Cult of Efficiency*. Toronto, ON: Anansi Press.

Stevenson, D. (2004). "Civic Gold" Rush: Cultural Planning and the Politics of the Third Way. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, *10*(1), 119-131.

Strauss, A. L. (1987). *Qualitative Analysis for Social Scientists*. Cambridge University Press.

Strauss, A.L., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory*. Thousand Oaks, California: Saga Publication.

Swank, D. (2005). Globalisation, Domestic Politics, and Welfare State Retrenchment in Capitalist Democracies. *Social Policy and Society*, *4*(02), 183-195.

Swyngedouw, E., & Kaïka, M. (2003). The making of 'glocal' urban modernities. *City*, *7*(1), 5-21.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The Social Identity Theory of Intergroup Behavior. In S. Worchel & W. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of Intergroup Relations* (2nd ed., pp. 7-24). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Tarrow, S. (1998). *Power in Movement: Social Movements, Collective Action, and Politics*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press. 2nd ed.

Taylor, M. (2002). 'Government, the Third Sector and the Contract Culture: The UK Experience So Far'. In *Dilemmas of the Welfare Mix: The New Structures of Welfare in an Era of Privatisation,* eds., Ugo Ascoli and Costanzo Ranci, 77-108. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

Taylor, M. (2004). The Welfare Mix in the United Kingdom, in A. Evers and J.L. Laville (eds.), *The Third Sector in Europe*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Taylor-Gooby, P. (1991) 'Attachment to the Welfare State', pp. 23-42 in R. Jowell, L. Brook, B. Taylor and G. Prior (eds.). *British Social Attitudes 8th Report*. Aldershot: Social and Community Planning Research / Dartmouth.

Taylor-Gooby, P. (1996). The Response of Government: Fragile Convergence?. In *European welfare policy* (pp. 199-218). Macmillan Education UK.

Taylor-Gooby, P. (ed.). (2001). *Welfare States Under Pressure*. London: Sage.

Taylor-Gooby, P. (2002). The Silver Age of the Welfare State: Perspectives on Resilience. *Journal of Social Policy*, *31*(04), 597-621.

Taylor-Gooby, P. (ed.). (2004). *New Risks, New Welfare. The Transformation of the European Welfare State*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Taylor-Gooby, P. (2009). *Reframing Social Citizenship*. Oxford University Press.

Taylor-Gooby, P., Larsen, T., & Kananen, J. (2004). Market Means and Welfare Ends: the UK Welfare State Experiment. *Journal of Social Policy*, *33*(04), 573-592.

Tesch, R. (2013). *Qualitative Research: Analysis Types and Software Tools*, London and Philadelphia: Falmer Press.

Thane, P. (2011). *Happy Families?: History and Family Policy*. British Academy.

Thomas, J. C. (2012). *Citizen, Customer, Partner: Engaging the Public in Public Management*. ME Sharpe.

Toynbee, P. (2003). *Hard work: Life in low-pay Britain*. Bloomsbury Publishing UK.

Trochim, W. M. (2000). *The Research Methods Knowledge Base*. Retrieved September 20, 2011.

Tuckett, A. G. (2005). Applying Thematic Analysis Theory to Practice: A Researcher's Experience. *Contemporary Nurse, 19*(1-2), 75-87.

Turner, B. S. (1990). Outline of a Theory of Citizenship. *Sociology, 24*(2), 189-217.

Turner, B. S. (Ed.). (1993). *Citizenship and Social Theory* (Vol. 24). Sage.

Turner, B. S. (2001). The Erosion of Citizenship. *The British Journal of Sociology, 52*(2), 189-209.

Uitermark, J., & Duyvendak, J. W. (2008). Citizen Participation in a Mediated Age: Neighbourhood Governance in the Netherlands. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 32*(1), 114-134.

Unit, S. E. (1998). Rough Sleeping. *London: The Stationery Office.*

Unit, S.E. (2000). National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal: A Framework for Consultation. *Cabinet Office,* 2000.

Unwin, J. (2004). *Speaking Truth to Power.* London: ACEVO/Baring Foundation.

Valverde, M. (1995a). Charity and the State: A Hundred Year-Old Mixed Marriage. *International Review of Community Development, 33*(73), 27-35.

Valverde, M. (1995b). The Mixed Social Economy as a Canadian tradition. *Studies in Political Economy, 47.*

Vanderbeck, R. M. (2005). Masculinities and Fieldwork: Widening the Discussion. *Gender, Place & Culture, 12*(4), 387-402.

Van der Klaauw, B., & Van Ours, J. C. (2013). Carrot And Stick: How Re-Employment Bonuses And Benefit Sanctions Affect Exit Rates From Welfare. *Journal of Applied Econometrics, 28*(2), 275-296.

Van Donge, J. K. (2006). Ethnography and Participant Observation. In *Doing Development Research*, (eds.) Desai V. & Potter R.B. London: Sage Publications.

Van Maanen, J. (2011). *Tales of the Field: On Writing Ethnography*. University of Chicago Press.

Van Til, J. (1988). *Mapping the Third Sector: Voluntarism in a Changing Social Economy*. Foundation Center, New York, NY.

Van Til, J., & Williamson, A. P. (2001). Voluntary Organisations. *2001 International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*, 16306-16308.

Vatikiotis, P. (2011). Networking Activism: Implications for Greece. *Estudos em Comunicação*, *10*, 163-179.
Venieris, D. (2003). Social Policy in Greece: Rhetoric versus Reform. *Social Policy & Administration*, *37*(2), 133-147.

Venieris, D. (2011). *"Economic Crisis, Social Policy Deregulation: The New 'Greek Minor Disaster' 2010-2011"*, A-B/2011, Issue 134-135, pp. 101-31 (in Greek).

Venieris, D. & Papatheodorou, C. (eds.). (2003). *Social Policy in Greece: Challenges and Perspectives*, Athens: Ellinika Grammata (in Greek).

Verba, S., Schlozman, K. L., Brady, H. E., & Brady, H. E. (1995). *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American politics* (Vol. 4). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Vradis, A., & Dalakoglou, D. (2011). *Revolt and Crisis in Greece*. Oakland: AKPress.

Yeo, S. (2001). Co-operative and Mutual Enterprises in Britain: A Usable Past for a Modern Future. Unpublished, but available at s. yeo@ pop3. poptel.org.uk and summarised in *S. Yeo (2001) 'Making Membership Meaningful: The Case of Older Co-operative and Mutual Enterprises (CMEs) in Britain', in N. Deakin (ed.), Membership and Mutuality, Report, (3).*

Yin, R.K. (2012). *Applications of Case Study Research*, 3rd edn, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, California.

Yin, R. K. (2013). *Case Study Research: Design and methods*. Sage publications.

Young, J. (1998). From Inclusive to Exclusive Society. *The New European Criminology: Crime and Social Order in Europe*, 64.

Wacquant, L. (2009). *Punishing the Poor: The Neoliberal Government of Social Insecurity*. Duke University Press.

Wacquant, L. (2010). Crafting the Neoliberal State: Workfare, Prisonfare, and Social Insecurity. In *Sociological Forum* (Vol. 25, No. 2, pp. 197-220). Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Wahyuni, D. (2012). The Research Design Maze: Understanding Paradigms, Cases, Methods and Methodologies. *Journal of Applied Management Accounting Research*, *10*(1), 69-80.

Walsh, K. (1995). *Public Services and Market Mechanisms: Competition, Contracting and the New Public Management*. Macmillan.

Webb, E., Ashton, C. H., Kelly, P., & Kamali, F. (1996). Alcohol and drug use in UK university students. *The lancet*, *348*(9032), 922-925.

Weber, M. (2002). *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism: and other writings*. Penguin.

West, C. (2005). *Democracy Matters: Winning the Fight Against Imperialism*. Penguin.

White, D. (2003). Social Policy and Solidarity, Orphans of the New Model of Social Cohesion. *Canadian Journal of Sociology/Cahiers Canadiens de Sociologie*, 51-76.

White, R. J., & Williams, C. C. (2012). The Pervasive Nature of Heterodox Economic Spaces at a Time of Neoliberal Crisis: Towards a "Postneoliberal" Anarchist Future. *Antipode*, *44*(5), 1625-1644.

Wiggan, J. (2012). Telling Stories of 21st Century Welfare: The UK Coalition Government and the Neo-liberal Discourse of Worklessness and Dependency. *Critical Social Policy*, *32*(3), 383-405.

Williams, F. (1999). Good-enough Principles for Welfare. *Journal of Social Policy*, *28*(04), 667-687.

Wolcott, H. F. (1999). *Ethnography: A Way of Seeing*. Rowman Altamira.

Woodside, A. G. (2010). *Case Study Research: Theory, Methods and Practice*. Emerald Group Publishing.

Wouters, C. (2007). *Informalization: Manners and Emotions since 1890*. Sage.

Appendix I: Research and Fieldwork Documents

UK Participant Information Sheet

Third sector, Welfare Governance and Social citizenship, in Greece and the UK

1. This PhD research entails a comparative case study (through interviews and observation), of two largely 'user-driven' voluntary third sector organisations (TSOs) in Greece and the UK, active in social services delivery and the support of vulnerable social groups facing poverty, unemployment and socioeconomic marginalisation. Emphasis will be given to the organisations' relation with public policies and their forms of adaptation (or resistance) to recent developments promoting the further 'marketisation' and 'hybridisation' of the sector, as well as their role as a political actor and instigator of broader social change. More specifically, these matters will be examined to elucidate the relation between the third sector (TS), technologies of governance and social control in social welfare, as well as the changing nature of social citizenship and the role of TSOs in the recalibration of social citizenship rights.

2. Full anonymity and confidentiality will be retained for all the participants without exception (no names, personal information, contact details will be available to anyone but the researcher). Participation is totally voluntary and all respondents are free to withhold any information as they see fit, or to withdraw completely from the study without any justification at any point, while no manipulation of any kind will be attempted by the researcher.

3. Each respondent will participate in a personal in-depth interview lasting from 1h to 1.30h, describing their experiences with the organisation, as well as their more general views on the organisation, the third sector and public social policies. The interviews will be conducted at a place chosen by the respondent. If the respondents give permission, the interviews will be audio recorded so that they can be later transcribed and analysed by the researcher, ensuring an accurate representation of the opinions voiced.

4. The respondents can approach the researcher and discuss any aspect of the interviews or in general their participation in the study at any point, including any results and conclusions.

5. Responsible for the use of all information collected during the fieldwork is the researcher. Except for the participants, access to this data will be available only to the researcher and his three (3) supervisors, members of the Centre for Regional Economic and Social Research (CRESR) and appointed by Sheffield Hallam University.

6. All collected data will be held in the researcher's personal journal which nobody else will have access to, and in portable or desk electronic storage devices such as the researcher's USB flash stick, PC hard disks and a digital recorder (for the interviews), which are all password locked. Additionally, the researcher will utilise software using the Advanced Encryption Standard (AES) for the encryption of electronic data and all the created folders / files.

7. All personal information and any 'sensitive material' will be destroyed / deleted when the complete PhD dissertation is submitted (autumn 2016).

8. Any conclusions can be used for academic publications (i.e., articles in peer-reviewed international scientific journals, symposium or conference presentations, etc.).

9. Any questions?

Researcher's Contact Details:
Ioannis Prinos, PhD Student
CRESR, Sheffield Hallam University, City Campus, Howard Street
Sheffield S1 1WB
Email: etherealfires@hotmail.com
Mobile: +447553154290

Supervisors' Contact Details:
1. Peter Wells, Sheffield Hallam University Professor (CRESR)
Email: p.wells@shu.ac.uk

Office Phone: 0114 225 6262

2. Ryan Powell, Senior Research Fellow (CRESR)

Email: r.s.powell@shu.ac.uk

Office Phone: 0114 225 3561

3. Chris Dayson, Research Fellow (CRESR)

Email: c.dayson@shu.ac.uk

Office Phone: 0114 225 3539

UK Participant Consent Form

Please answer the following questions by ticking the response that applies:

	YES	NO
I have read the Participant Information Sheet for this study, I have had the full details of the research explained to me and I understand what it entails.	☐	☐
My questions about the study have been answered to my satisfaction and I understand that I may ask further questions at any point.	☐	☐
I understand that I am free to withdraw from the study at any point during the research without giving a reason for my withdrawal, and to decline to answer any particular question(s), or participate in any particular facet of the study.	☐	☐
I agree to provide information to the researcher under the strict conditions of confidentiality and total anonymity set out in the Participant Information Sheet.	☐	☐
I state that I freely wish to participate in the study overall, under the conditions set out in the Participant Information Sheet.	☐	☐

I consent that the information collected for the purposes of this research □ □
study, once anonymised (so that I cannot be identified), can be used for
research and academic publication purposes as set out in the Participant
Information Sheet.

Participant's Name (Printed): _____ Date:_____

Participant's Signature:_____

Participant's Contact details:

_____

_____

Researcher's Name (Printed): _____

Researcher's Signature: _____

Researcher's contact details:

Ioannis Prinos

CRESR

Sheffield Hallam University

City Campus

Howard Street

Sheffield S1 1WB

Email: etherealfires@hotmail.com

Mobile: +447553154290

*Following, are the participant information and consent sheets that were used in the Greek
case study. They are the exact copy of the ones used in the UK case study, but of course they
were translated in Greek by the researcher.*

Ο Τρίτος Τομέας, Κυβερνησιμότητα στην Κοινωνική Πολιτική και Κοινωνικά Δικαιώματα στην Ελλάδα και το Ηνωμένο Βασίλειο

1. Η παρούσα διδακτορική έρευνα συνεπάγεται μια συγκριτική μελέτη που αφορά δύο εθελοντικές οργανώσεις του τρίτου τομέα, μία στην Ελλάδα και μία στο Ηνωμένο Βασίλειο, που δραστηριοποιούνται στον τομέα της κοινωνικής παροχής υπηρεσιών και της υποστήριξης και ενίσχυσης ευπαθών κοινωνικών ομάδων που αντιμετωπίζουν φτώχεια, ανεργία και κοινωνικοοικονομική περιθωριοποίηση. Επιπλέον, έμφαση θα δοθεί στην σχέση τους με τις δημόσιες πολιτικές και της προσαρμογής (ή αντίστασης) τους στις πρόσφατες εξελίξεις που προωθούν την αγοραιοποίηση και υβριδοποίηση του εθελοντικού τομέα, όπως επίσης και στην εξέταση τους ως πολιτικός παράγοντας και κίνημα ευρύτερων κοινωνικών αλλαγών. Πιο συγκεκριμένα, τα ζητήματα αυτά θα εξεταστούν για να ριχτεί φως στη σχέση του Τρίτου Τομέα, 'τεχνολογιών κυβερνησιμότητας και κοινωνικού ελέγχου' και της μεταλασσόμενης φύσης των κοινωνικών δικαιωμάτων.

2. Πλήρης ανωνυμία και απόρρητο θα τηρηθεί για όλους τους συμμετέχοντες, χωρίς εξαίρεση (τα όποια ονόματα, προσωπικά στοιχεία, στοιχεία επικοινωνίας, κ.λπ. θα είναι διαθέσιμα μόνο στον ερευνητή). Η συμμετοχή είναι εντελώς εθελοντική και όλοι οι συμμετέχοντες είναι ελεύθεροι να αρνηθούν οποιαδήποτε πληροφορία κατά το δοκούν, ή να αποσύρουν τη συμμετοχή τους χωρίς καμία αιτιολόγηση σε οποιοδήποτε σημείο της έρευνας, ενώ κανενός είδους χειραγώγηση δεν θα επιχειρηθεί από τον ερευνητή.

3. Κάθε ερωτώμενος θα συμμετάσχει σε μια προσωπική, σε βάθος συνέντευξη που θα διαρκέσει από 1 ώρα έως 1.30 ώρα, περιγράφοντας τις εμπειρίες του στην οργάνωση, καθώς και τις γενικότερες απόψεις του σχετικά με τον τρίτο τομέα και τις δημόσιες κοινωνικές πολιτικές. Οι συνεντεύξεις θα πραγματοποιηθούν σε τόπο που θα επιλέγεται από τον συμμετέχοντα κάθε φορά και οι ερωτώμενοι μπορούν να δουν τις ερωτήσεις εκ των προτέρων. Αν ο δοθεί άδεια από τους συμμετέχοντες, οι συνεντεύξεις θα ηχογραφούνται, έτσι ώστε να μπορούν αργότερα να μεταγραφούν και να αναλυθούν από τον ερευνητή, εξασφαλίζοντας την πλήρη και ακριβή αναπαράσταση των απόψεων που εκφράστηκαν.

273

4. Κάθε συμμετέχοντας μπορεί να κάνει ερωτήσεις και να συζητήσει με τον ερευνητή οποιαδηποτε πτυχή της έρευνας και των συνεντεύξεων όπως επίσης και των τελικών συμπερασμάτων, σε οποιαδήποτε χρονικό σημείο.

5. Υπεύθυνος για τη χρήση όλων των πληροφοριών που συλλέγονται κατά τη διάρκεια της επιτόπιας έρευνας είναι ο ερευνητής. Εκτός από τους συμμετέχοντες, η πρόσβαση σε αυτά τα δεδομένα θα είναι εφικτή μόνο για τον ερευνητή και τους τρεις (3) εποπτεύοντες την παρούσα διατριβή, μέλη του Κέντρου Περιφερειακών Οικονομικών και Κοινωνικών Ερευνών (CRESR), όπως αυτά έχουν οριστεί από το Πανεπιστήμιο Σέφιλντ Χάλαμ.

6. Τα δεδομένα που συλλέγονται θα καταγράφονται στο προσωπικό ημερολόγιο του ερευνητή, στο οποίο κανείς άλλος δεν θα έχει πρόσβαση, καθώς και σε φορητές ή σταθερές ηλεκτρονικές συσκευές αποθήκευσης, όπως το USB stick του ερευνητή, έναν σκληρό δίσκο υπολογιστή και μια ψηφιακή συσκευή εγγραφής (για τις συνεντεύξεις). Οι παραπάνω συσκευές θα είναι πλήρως 'κλειδωμένες' με προσωπικό κωδικό πρόσβασης του ερευνητή. Επιπλέον, ο ερευνητής θα χρησιμοποιήσει όλες τις ηλεκτρονικά καταγεγραμμένες πληροφορίες χρησιμοποιώντας το Advanced Encryption Standard (AES) για την κρυπτογράφηση των ηλεκτρονικών δεδομένων και των φακέλων / αρχείων που θα δημιουργηθούν.

7. Όλες οι καταγραφείσες και συγκεντρωμένες πληροφορίες από την επιτόπια έρευνα, θα καταστραφούν / διαγραφούν πλήρως, όταν υποβληθεί προς έγκριση στο πανεπιστήμιο η τελική διδακτορική διατριβή του ερευνητή (Φθινόπωρο 2016).

8. Τυχόν συμπεράσματα της έρευνας μπορούν να χρησιμοποιηθούν για ακαδημαϊκές δημοσιεύσεις (δηλαδή άρθρα σε έγκριτα διεθνή επιστημονικά περιοδικά, παρουσιάσεις σε ακαδημαϊκά συνέδρια, κ.λπ.)

9. Έχετε κάποιαν άλλη ερώτηση;
Πληροφορίες Επικοινωνίας Ερευνητή:
Ιωάννης Πρίνος
CRESR, Sheffield Hallam University, City Campus, Howard Street
Sheffield S1 1WB

Email: etherealfires@hotmail.com

Κινητό τηλ.: +447553154290

Πληροφορίες Επικοινωνίας Εποπτευόντων:

1. Peter Wells, Sheffield Hallam University Professor (CRESR)

Email: p.wells@shu.ac.uk

Τηλ. Γραφείου: 0044 114 225 6262

2. Ryan Powell, Senior Research Fellow (CRESR)

Email: r.s.powell@shu.ac.uk

Τηλ. Γραφείου: 0044 114 225 3561

3. Chris Dayson, Research Fellow (CRESR)

Email: c.dayson@shu.ac.uk

Τηλ. Γραφείου: 0044 114 225 3539

Έντυπο Συγκατάθεσης Ελλήνων Συμμετεχόντων

Παρακαλώ απαντήστε στις ακόλουθες ερωτήσεις σημειώνοντας την απάντηση που ισχύει:

	NAI	OXI
Έχω διαβάσει το δελτίο πληροφοριών για την παρούσα μελέτη και κατανοήσει πλήρως τα χαρακτηριστικά της παρούσας έρευνας.	☐	☐
Οι ερωτήσεις μου σχετικά με την έρευνα έχουν απαντηθεί ικανοποιητικά και κατανοώ ότι μπορώ να ζητήσω περαιτέρω διευκρινήσεις και να κάνω ερωτήσεις για οποιοδήποτε ζήτημα σχετικά με τη συμμετοχή μου, σε οποιοδήποτε χρονικό σημείο της έρευνας.	☐	☐
Κατανοώ ότι είμαι ελεύθερος να αποχωρήσω από την έρευνα σε οποιοδήποτε σημείο κατά τη διάρκεια της χωρίς να παράσχω	☐	☐

275

συκεκριμένο λόγο για την απόσυρση μου, καθώς και να αρνηθώ να απαντήσω σε συγκεκριμένες ερωτήσεις ή μέρους αυτών.

Συμφωνώ να παρέχω πληροφορίες στον ερευνητή σύμφωνα με τους ☐ ☐
αυστηρούς όρους εμπιστευτικότητας και πλήρους ανωνυμίας που
αναφέρονται στο δελτίο πληροφοριών συμμετεχόντων.

Δηλώνω ότι επιθυμώ να συμμετάσχω στην παρούσα έρευνα ελεύθερα ☐ ☐
και υπό τους όρους του δελτίου πληροφοριών συμμετεχόντων.

Συναινώ ότι οι πληροφορίες που θα συλλεχθούν κατά την παρούσα ☐ ☐
ερευνητική μελέτη, από τη στιγμή που τηρούνται πλήρως οι όροι
ανωνυμίας και εμπιστευτικότητας όπως αυτοί προσδιορίζονται στο
δελτίο πληροφοριών συμμετεχόντων, μπορούν να χρησιμοποιηθούν για
σκοπούς μελλοντικής επιστημονικής έρευνας και ακαδημαϊκών
δημοσιεύσεων.

Όνομα Συμμετέχοντως: _____ Ημερομηνία: _____
Υπογραφή Συμμετέχοντως: _____

Πληροφορίες Επικοινωνίας Συμμετέχοντως:

_____

_____

Όνομα Ερευνητή: _____

Υπογραφή Ερευνητή: _____

Πληροφορίες Επικοινωνίας Ερευνητή:
Ιωάννης Πρίνος
CRESR
Sheffield Hallam University
City Campus

Howard Street

Sheffield S1 1WB

Email: etherealfires@hotmail.com

Κινητό τηλ.: +447553154290

Πληροφορίες Επικοινωνίας Εποπτευόντων:

1. Peter Wells, Sheffield Hallam University Professor (CRESR)

Email: p.wells@shu.ac.uk

Τηλ. Γραφείου: 0044 114 225 6262

2. Ryan Powell, Senior Research Fellow (CRESR)

Email: r.s.powell@shu.ac.uk

Τηλ. Γραφείου: 0044 114 225 3561

3. Chris Dayson, Research Fellow (CRESR)

Email: c.dayson@shu.ac.uk

Τηλ. Γραφείου: 0044 114 225 3539

Interview with a member of staff of the UK TSO

Section A: Introduction and general information of members / volunteers.

1. How old are you?

2. What is your educational level?

3. What is your place of residence?

4. What is your marital and family status?

5. Before ***** were you employed? If so, what was your profession[27]?

6. How long have you been working in *****?

7. Where exactly are you occupied here? What do you do?

8. How many hours per week do you work in *****?

Section B: The organisation's creation rationale and coverage of social needs

1. Do you know how was the idea for such an organisation born?

2. Do you know details of how did the practical implementation and organisation of this effort commence?

3. In your opinion, what need(s) brought about the birth of organisations such as *****?

4. What are the main goals and social aims of the organisation?

5. What needs does ***** attempt to cover? What services does it provide?

6. Which citizens does ***** refer to? Which are the 'target groups'?

7. Could you give me an estimate of how many similar TSOs to ***** operate in the country?

Section C: Mode of governance and operation, decision making and value framework

---

[27] ***** is used to denote the name of the organisation.

1. Is there an article of association or set of rules which regulate the organisation? How it was created?

2. Is there a coordinating body and what is its role?

3. In general, how are any decisions concerning the operation, governance, activities and decisions taken?

4. Is there a 'hierarchy' within *****, as well as concerning any influence to the organisation's decision making?

5. Which are the main values and principles the organisation adopts and how does it promote them (value framework)?

Section D: Members of staff, volunteers, organisational form of ***, personal experience in the organisation, community response and relation to society**

1. How did you learn about the existence of the organisation?

2. Why and how did you decide to work here?

3. How do you personally perceive the concept of volunteerism in *****?

4. Are there any criteria for the selection of volunteers?

5. Are there any criteria for the selection / acceptance of service-users?

6. Have you had any previous experience / participation in collective action either as a volunteer or as an employee? If yes, could you please tell me about it?

7. Practically, how is ***** organised internally? How it systematises its day-to-day activities?

8. How many employees are there, how many members and volunteers offer their services and how many service-users are involved with *****?

9. What is the response and support from society except for members, volunteers and service-users in relation to the provision of material support or in connection with the various interventions carried out by *****?

10. Do service-users participate in some way in the organisation's activities?

11. In addition to the various social services, are any other activities developed by *****? How does the organisation try to combat marginalisation and stigmatisation?

12. Is there an institutional stigma attached to service-users involved with TSOs such as ***** and if yes, how do you try to overcome such processes?

13. In general, do you agree with the operation of ***** and how decisions are taken? Please justify your opinion.

14. Do you feel that your work in ***** has affected your wider thinking with regard to citizenship, ethics, your political identity and the concept of social solidarity; If so, how?

15. Do you think that in general the organisation's values, mode of governance (i.e., direct democracy), strategies and activities, and promotion of community engagement as a way to address social problems could influence public social policy and if yes in what ways?

16. Do you think what you are and what you do as an organisation, influence wider social perceptions of the public and if yes how?

17. Beyond the social contribution do you personally feel satisfaction / pleasure from your work in *****;

Section E: TSOs, welfare governance and social citizenship

1. What do you mean exactly when you talk about the socioeconomic integration of service-users? How do you perceive integration of the vulnerable and disadvantaged?

2. Do you know what social citizenship is?

3. What is the relation between social citizenship rights and social welfare?

4. How do you see TSOs such as this within this relation?

5. Do you think there are issues of social control and governance of the behaviour of service-users within welfare and particularly TSOs? What is the situation in this organisation?

6. Why are the lifestyles of service-users important for the organisation?

7. Why data on the service-users is kept so meticulously by the organisation?

8. What is your opinion on the 'reward and punishment' procedures in place designating the organisation's response to service-users performing well or misbehaving within the boundaries set by organisational rules?

9. What is your opinion on the requirements placed on service-users concerning access to the organisation's services?

10. Do you think that matters of anti-social behaviour should come into play when dealing with service-users within the organisation?

11. How do you think such practices affect the organisation's perception and relation with its service-users?

12. Is there a particular strategy concerning how the organisation approach service-users in general?

13. Do dominant narratives in public debates concerning social welfare influence the organisation? Its identity and activities?

14. What is the role of state social policy in such processes? How does it affect this organisation and the TS in general?

15. Do you think for example that benefit sanctions is a fair and effective policy? Do such policy measures send a message -if any- to social purpose TSOs such as this regarding their interactions with service-users?

16. Do you have any worries concerning the autonomy of the organisation and the TS in general, from government agendas?

Section F: TSOs as a sociopolitical movement of resistance and solidarity

1. Given that TSOs similar to ***** operate in many areas of the country with civil and voluntary initiative, would you say that ***** is part of a social movement and if yes, why?

2. *(If the answer to question 1 is positive)* What do you consider to be the main features and characteristics which make up the identity of this movement of TSOs and other initiatives of the civil society?

3. What is your position on the changes in public social services and the social state that have occurred and continue to occur (i.e., medical care, social security, health insurance, labour rights, employment, housing)?

4. Can you identify the source of these changes?

5. What are the main social purposes, collective demands and ultimate goals of *****

6. Would you say that the organisation has a political dimension apart from addressing crucial social needs and if yes, what is it?

7. *(If the answer to question 6 is positive)* What are the policy recommendations and the social context is the organisation suggesting?

8. *(If the answer to question 6 is positive)* What practices do you adopt in order to promote these political demands (i.e., complaints, intervention, prevention, use of media, information and communication campaigns to raise awareness, protests, rallies, cultural events, etc.)?

9. Do you know about collectivities of the third sector similar to ***** existing in other countries? What is your relationship with them?

10. How do you personally perceive and realise the concept of solidarity as a social practice both in terms of the wider society, and also in terms of the organisation's operation, goals and particular practices / social interventions?

11. *(If there is a positive answer in question 1)* Do you believe that this movement of collective resistance and solidarity activities developed from TSOs such as ***** can shape a different perception regarding the meaning and concept of the active citizen and of policies generated from the ground-up and the heart of the social body? If yes, how?

Section G: Alliances and confrontations, the third sector, and relation with the state and the market.

1. Have you considered the possibility of the 'adoption' or co-optation of organisations such as ***** by the state in order for the latter to affix to them their obligation to provide public social services? What is your position against such a possibility?

- *Depending on the previous answer:* Do you think that the state through the government tries to use organisations such as ***** as a means of social control of the disadvantaged, aligning TSOs' goals with a neoliberal agenda and priorities?

3. What is the relation of ***** with the 'official state'? With public institutions, universities, social organisations and the ministries?

4. What is your opinion on public social services and social policy currently?

5. Do you collaborate with other similar to ***** TSOs, voluntary organisations, social associations, cooperatives, etc.? If yes, how and under what conditions do these partnerships arise? How would you judge them?

6. What is the organisation's relation with trade unions?

7. What is the organisation's relation with the media?

Section H: Difficulties, concerns and challenges

1. What are the main problems currently faced by *****? Are there challenges that you foresee will have to be met soon?

2. How do you see the future of TSOs such as ***** in the UK?

3. It is clearly noted in the literature, that TSOs and various forms of voluntary, civil society organisations continue to expand rapidly in all countries in Europe these recent years. Which are the main reasons in your opinion?

Interview with a regular volunteer of the UK TSO

Section A: Introduction and general information of respondent

1. How old are you?

2. What is your educational level?

3. What is your place of residence?

4. What is your marital and family status?

5. Are you employed? If so, what is your profession?

6. How long have you been contributing as a member / volunteer in *****?

7. Where exactly do you offer your services in *****? What is it that you do here?

8. How much time do you devote on average per week in *****?

Section B: Organisation's creation rationale and coverage of social needs

1. Do you know how the idea for such an organisation was born?

2. Do you know details of how did the practical implementation and organisation of this effort commence? Did you have in mind some example or did you move more 'spontaneously'?

3. In your opinion, what need(s) brought about the birth of organisations such as *****?

4. What are the main goals and social aims of the organisation?

5. What needs does ***** attempt to cover? What services does it provide?

6. Which citizens does ***** refer to? Which are the 'target groups'?

Section C: Mode of governance and operation, decision making and value-framework of the organisation

1. Is there an article of association or set of rules which regulate the organisation? How it was created?

2. Is there a coordinating body and what is its role?

3. In general, how are any decisions concerning the operation, governance, activities taken?

4. Do you identify the existence of a 'hierarchy' in *****? If yes, what is its influence on the organisation's identity and decision making processes?

5. Which are the main values and principles the organisation adopts and how does it promote them (value framework)?

Section D: Members, volunteers, organisational form of ***, personal experience in the organisation, community response and relation to society**

1. How did you learn about the existence of the organisation?

2. Why and how did you decide to volunteer your services to the organisation?

3. How do you personally perceive the concept of volunteerism in *****?

4. Are there any criteria for the selection of volunteers?

5. Are there any criteria for the selection / acceptance of service-users?

6. Have you had previous experience / participation in collective action and volunteerism? If yes, could you please tell me about it?

7. Practically, how is ***** organised internally? How it systematizes its day-to-day activities?

8. How many paid employees, volunteers and service-users are involved with *****?

9. What is the response and support from society except for members, volunteers and service-users in relation to the provision of material support or in connection with the various interventions carried out by *****?

10. Do service-users participate in some way in the organisation's activities?

11. In addition to the various social services, are any other activities developed by *****? How do you try to combat marginalisation and stigmatisation?

12. Is there an institutional stigma attached to service-users involved with TSOs such as ***** and if yes, how do you try to overcome such processes?

13. In general, do you agree with the operation of ***** and how decisions are taken? Please justify your opinion.

14. Do you feel that your involvement in ***** has affected your wider thinking with regard to citizenship, ethics, your political identity and the concept of social solidarity; If so, how?

15. Do you think that in general, the organisation's values, mode of governance (i.e., direct democracy), strategies and activities, and the promotion of community engagement as a way to address social problems could influence public social policy and if yes in what ways?

16. Do you think what you are and what you do as an organisation, influence wider social perceptions of the public and if yes how?

17. Beyond the social contribution do you personally derive satisfaction / pleasure or any sense of achievement from your involvement with *****?

Section E: TSOs, welfare governance and social citizenship

1. What do you mean exactly when you talk about the socioeconomic integration of service-users? How do you perceive integration of the vulnerable and disadvantaged?

2. Do you know what social citizenship is?

3. What is the relation between social citizenship rights and social welfare?

4. How do you see TSOs such as this within this relation?

5. Do you think there are issues of social control and governance of the behaviour of service-users within welfare and particularly TSOs? What is the situation in this organisation?

6. Why are the lifestyles of service-users important for the organisation?

7. Why data on the service-users is kept so meticulously by the organisation?

8. What is your opinion on the 'reward and punishment' procedures in place designating the organisation's response to service-users performing well or misbehaving within the boundaries set by organisational rules?

9. What is your opinion on the requirements placed on service-users concerning access to the organisation's services?

10. Do you think that matters of anti-social behaviour should come into play when dealing with service-users within the organisation?

11. How do you think such practices affect the organisation's perception and relation with its service-users?

12. Is there a particular strategy concerning how the organisation approach service-users in general?

13. Do dominant narratives in public debates concerning social welfare influence the organisation? Its identity and activities?

14. What is the role of state social policy in such processes? How does it affect this organisation and the TS in general?

15. Do you think for example that benefit sanctions is a fair and effective policy? Do such policy measures send a message -if any- to social purpose TSOs such as this regarding their interactions with service-users?

16. Do you have any worries concerning the autonomy of the organisation and the TS in general, from government agendas?

Section F: TSOs as a sociopolitical movement of resistance and solidarity

1. Given that TSOs similar to ***** operate in many areas of the country with civil and voluntary initiative, would you say that ***** is part of a social movement and if yes, why?

2. *(If the answer to question 1 is positive):* What do you consider to be the main features and characteristics which make up the identity of this movement of TSOs and other initiatives of the civil society?

3. What is your position on the changes in public social services and the social state that have occurred and continue to occur (i.e., medical care, social security, health insurance, labour rights, employment, housing)?

4. Can you identify the source of these changes?

5. What are the main social purposes, collective demands and ultimate goals of *****

6. Would you say that you have a political dimension apart from addressing crucial social needs and if yes, what is it?

7. *(If the answer to question 6 is positive):* What are the policy recommendations and the social context the organisation is promoting?

8. *(If the answer to question 6 is positive):* What practices do you adopt in order to promote these political demands (i.e., complaints, intervention, prevention, use of media, information and communication campaigns to raise awareness, protests, rallies, cultural events, etc.)?

9. Do you know if collectives of the third sector similar to ***** exist in other countries particularly in countries? If there are, what is your relationship with them?

10. How do you perceive and realise the concept of solidarity as a social practice both in terms of the wider society, and also in terms of your operation, goals and particular practices / social interventions?

11. *(If the answer to question 1 is positive)* Do you believe that this movement of collective resistance and solidarity activities developed from TSOs such as ***** can shape a different perception regarding the meaning and concept of the active citizen and of policies generated from the ground-up and the heart of the social body? If yes, how?

Section G: Alliances and confrontations, the third sector, and relation with the state and the market.

1. Have you considered the possibility of 'adoption' or co-optation of organisations such as ***** by the state in order for the latter to affix to them their obligation to provide public social services? What is your position against such a possibility?

- *Depending on the previous answer:* Do you think that the state through the government tries to use organisations such as ***** as a means of social control of the disadvantaged, aligning TSOs' goals with a neoliberal agenda and priorities?

3. What is the relation of ***** with the 'official state'? With public institutions, universities, social organisations and the ministries?

4. What is your opinion on public social services and social welfare currently?

5. Do you collaborate with other similar to ***** TSOs, voluntary organisations, social associations, cooperatives, etc.? If yes, how and under what conditions do these partnerships arise? How do you judge them?

6. What is your relation with trade unions?

7. What is your relation with the media?

Section H: Difficulties, concerns and challenges.

1. What are the main problems currently faced by *****? Are there challenges that you foresee will have to be met soon?

2. How do you see the future of TSOs such as ***** in the UK?

3. It is clearly noted in the literature, that TSOs and various forms of voluntary, nonprofit civil society organisations of a varied nature continue to expand rapidly in all countries in Europe these recent years. Which are the main reasons in your opinion?

Interview with a member of staff or regular volunteer of the UK TSO who is (or had been) a service-user in some manner

Section A: Introduction and general information of members / volunteers.

1. How old are you?

2. What is your educational level?

3. What is your place of residence?

4. What is your marital and family status?

5. Are you employed? If so, what is your profession?

6. How long have you been contributing as a member / volunteer in *****?

7. In which of the internal service teams do you offer your services?

8. How much time do you devote on average per week in *****?

Section B: Experiences with marginalisation, stigmatisation or in general inability to cover crucial social needs (the 'road' to involvement with ***)**

1. Do you want to tell me first some things about you, how you grew up, your relationship with your parents, and your experiences as a teenager, your relations with your friends / peers, etc.?
- *Series of small clarifying questions breaking down the socioeconomic background of the respondent and the experiences which eventually led them to *****, which are framed differently depending on the specific interviewee and the flow of the discussion.*
2. What happened *(in depth description of the respondent's 'difficult experiences')*?
3. How did you feel at that time (i.e., as an extremely poor, marginalised or stigmatised person after the experiences of marginalisation or deprivation and lack of access to main social goods and services have been established)? How did you see yourself, your identity and others (the mainstream society)?
4. Did you seek help from public social services and in general the state? If no why, and if yes, what were your experiences?
- *Clarifying questions on the experience with public social services if needed.*
5. What is your opinion on public social services currently?

Section C: Personal experience with *** (the organisation)**

1. How did ***** help you?

2. Why did you remain involved with ***** as a volunteer?

3. How do you see yourself, your identity and the rest of society now that you are involved with *****? Do you still feel stigmatised or marginalised in the same way? What are the differences than before?

- *Depending on the answer, possible clarifying questions regarding the existence and nature of an institutional stigma because of the association with a TSO such as *****.*

4. How do you see the organisation as a TSO in general? Its goals and activities, as well as its mode of operation and governance?

5. What do you think could be improved?

6. How do you see the organisation and its interventions now, as opposed to before (if the respondent has been with the organisation for several years)?

7. What is your relation with the other members / volunteers and service-users of *****?

8. Do you believe there are subgroups between service-users of the organisation divided by the type of problem? I mean for example do the former drug addicts tend to socialize more with other former drug addicts and so on and so forth?

9. Do you feel that your involvement in ***** has affected your wider thinking with regard to citizenship, ethics, your political identity and the concept of social solidarity; If so, how?

10. Beyond the social contribution do you personally feel satisfaction / pleasure from your involvement with *****?

Section D: Organisation's creation rationale, main goals and coverage of social needs / provision of social services.

1. Do you know how the idea for such an organisation was born?

2. Do you know details of how did the practical implementation and organisation of this effort commence? Did you have in mind some example or did you move more 'spontaneously'?

3. In your opinion, what need(s) brought about the birth of organisations such as *****?

4. What are the main goals and social aims of the organisation?

5. What needs does ***** attempt to cover? What services does it provide?

6. Which citizens does ***** refer to (criteria)? Which are the 'target groups'?

7. Could you give me an estimate of how many TSOs similar to ***** operate in the country?

Section E: Mode of governance and operation, decision making and value framework.

1. Is there an article of association or set of rules which regulate the organisation? How it was created?

2. Is there a coordinating body and what is its role?

3. In general, how are any decisions concerning the operation, governance, activities and decisions taken?

4. Do you distinguish the existence of a 'hierarchy' in *****, as well as concerning any influence to the organisation's decision-making?

5. Which are the main values and principles the organisation adopts and how does it promote them (value framework)?

Section F: TSOs, welfare governance and social citizenship

1. What do you mean exactly when you talk about the socioeconomic integration of service-users? How do you perceive integration of the vulnerable and disadvantaged?

2. Do you know what social citizenship is?

3. What is the relation between social citizenship rights and social welfare?

4. How do you see TSOs such as this within this relation?

5. Do you think there are issues of social control and governance of the behaviour of service-users within welfare and particularly TSOs? What is the situation in this organisation?

6. Why are the lifestyles of service-users important for the organisation?

7. Why data on the service-users is kept so meticulously by the organisation?

8. What is your opinion on the 'reward and punishment' procedures in place designating the organisation's response to service-users performing well or misbehaving within the boundaries set by organisational rules?

9. What is your opinion on the requirements placed on service-users concerning access to the organisation's services?

10. Do you think that matters of anti-social behaviour should come into play when dealing with service-users within the organisation?

11. How do you think such practices affect the organisation's perception and relation with its service-users?

12. Is there a particular strategy concerning how the organisation approach service-users in general?

13. Do dominant narratives in public debates concerning social welfare influence the organisation? Its identity and activities?

14. What is the role of state social policy in such processes? How does it affect this organisation and the TS in general?

15. Do you think for example that benefit sanctions is a fair and effective policy? Do such policy measures send a message -if any- to social purpose TSOs such as this regarding their interactions with service-users?

16. Do you have any worries concerning the autonomy of the organisation and the TS in general, from government agendas?

Section G: Members of staff, volunteers, organisational form of *****, community response and relation to society

1. How did you learn about the existence of the organisation?

2. Why and how did you decide to volunteer your services to the organisation?

3. How do you personally perceive the concept of volunteerism in *****?

4. Are there any criteria for the selection of volunteers?

5. Are there any criteria for the selection / acceptance of service-users?

6. Have you had previous experience / participation in collective action and volunteerism? If yes, could you please tell me about it?

7. Practically, how is ***** organised internally? How it systematizes its day-to-day activities?

8. How many offer their services and how many service-users are currently involved with *****?

9. What is the response and support from society except for members, volunteers and service-users in relation to the provision of material support or in connection with the various interventions carried out by *****?

10. Do service-users participate in some way in the organisation's activities?

11. In addition to the various social services, are there any other activities developed by *****?

12. In general, do you agree with the operation of ***** and how decisions are taken? Please justify your opinion.

13. Do you think that in general the organisation's values, mode of governance (i.e., direct democracy), strategies and activities, and the promotion of community engagement as a way to address social problems, could influence public social policy and if yes in what ways?

14. Do you think what you are and what you do as an organisation influence wider social perceptions of the public and if yes how?

Section H: TSOs as a sociopolitical movement of resistance and solidarity

1. Given that TSOs similar to ***** operate in many areas of the country with civil and voluntary initiative, would you say that ***** is part of a social movement and why?

2. What do you consider to be the main features and characteristics which make up the identity of this movement of TSOs and other initiatives of the civil society?

3. What is your position on the changes in public social services and the social state that have occurred and continue to occur (i.e., medical care, social security, health insurance, labour rights, employment, housing)?

4. Can you identify the source of these changes?

5. What are the main social purposes, collective demands and ultimate goals of *****

6. Would you say that you have a political dimension apart from addressing crucial social needs and if yes, what is it?

7. What are the policy recommendations and the social framework you are suggesting?

8. What practices do you adopt in order to promote these political demands (i.e., complaints, intervention, prevention, use of media, information and communication campaigns to raise awareness, protests, rallies, cultural events, etc.)?

9. Do you know of TSOs similar to ***** exist in other countries? Does the organisation have any relationship with them?

10. How do you perceive and realise the concept of solidarity as a social practice both in terms of the wider society, and also in terms of your operation, goals and particular practices / social interventions?

11. *(Depending on the answers about TSOs as a sociopolitical movement)* Do you believe that this movement of collective resistance and solidarity activities developed from TSOs such as ***** can shape a different perception regarding the meaning and concept of the active citizen policies generated from the ground-up and the heart of the social body? If yes, how?

Section I: Alliances and confrontations, relation with the state and the market

1. Have you considered the possibility of the 'adoption' or co-optation of organisations such as ***** by the state in order for the latter to affix to them the obligation to provide public social services? What is your position about such a possibility?
- *Depending on the previous answer:* Do you think that the state through the government tries to use organisations such as ***** as a means of social control of the disadvantaged, aligning TSOs' goals with the current neoliberal agenda and priorities?

2. What is the relation of ***** with the state? With public institutions, universities, social organisations and the ministries?

3. Do you collaborate with other similar to ***** TSOs, voluntary organisations, social associations, cooperatives, etc.? If yes, how and under what conditions do these partnerships arise? How do you judge them?

4. In the UK, there are strong pressures for the marketisation of voluntary sector organisations. For them to become more business-like and adopt market criteria in their approach, goals and priorities, become more competitive and results-driven. How these developments have influenced ***** and you personally? What is your opinion?

5. What is your relation with trade unions?

6. What is your relation with the media?

Section J: Difficulties, concerns and future challenges.

1. What are the main problems currently faced by *****? Are there challenges that you foresee will have to be met soon and which are they?

2. How do you see the future of TSOs such as ***** in the UK?

3. It is clearly noted in the literature, that TSOs and various forms of voluntary, civil society organisations expand rapidly in all countries in Europe these recent years. Which are the main reasons in your opinion?

Interview with a service-user of the UK TSO

Section A: Introduction and general information of members / volunteers

1. How old are you?

2. What is your educational level?

3. What is your place of residence?

4. What is your marital and family status?

5. Are you employed? If so, what is your profession?

6. How long have you been involved with ***** as a service-user?

7. - *If the service-user participates in some manner even rarely, as a volunteer:* How much time do you devote on average per week in *****?

8. What kind of support do you receive from ***** exactly?

Section B: Experiences with marginalisation, stigmatisation or in general inability to cover crucial social needs (the 'road' to involvement with *****)

1. Do you want to tell me first some things about you, how you grew up, your relationship with your parents, and your experiences as a teenager, your relations with your friends / peers, etc.?

- *Series of small clarifying questions breaking down the socioeconomic background of the respondent and experiences which eventually led them to *****. These questions are framed differently depending on the specific interviewee and the flow of the discussion.*

2. What happened (*in depth description of the respondent's 'difficult experiences'*)?

3. How did you feel at that time (i.e., as an extremely poor, marginalised or stigmatised person after the experiences of marginalisation or deprivation and lack of access to main social goods and services have been established)? How did you see yourself, your identity and others (the mainstream society) at the time?

4. Did you seek help from public social services and in general the state? If not why, and if yes, what were your experiences?

- *Clarifying questions on the experience with public social services if needed.*

5. What is your opinion on public social services currently?

Section C: Personal experience with ***** (the TSO)

1. How did you learn about the existence of the organisation?

2. Why and how did you decide to seek the support of *****?

3. How did ***** help you?

4. How do you see yourself, your identity and the rest of society now that you are involved with *****? Do you still feel stigmatised or marginalised in the same way? What are the differences with before?

5. How does ***** promote your socioeconomic (re)integration?

- *Depending on the answer, possible clarifying questions regarding the existence and nature of an institutional stigma because of the association with a TSO such as *****.*

6. How do you see ***** as a voluntary TSO in general? Its goals and activities, as well as its mode of operation and governance?

7. What do you think could be improved?

8. How do you see the organisation and its interventions now, in the last 5 years, as opposed to before *(if the respondent has been with the organisation for several years)?*

9. What is your relation with the members and regular volunteers? Is there a relation?

10. Do you feel that your involvement in ***** has affected your wider thinking with regard to citizenship, ethics, your political identity and the concept of social solidarity; If so, how?

Section D: Organisation's main goals and coverage of social needs / provision of social services

1. In your opinion, what need(s) cause the birth of organisations such as *****?

2. Are you aware of the main goals of the organisation? If yes, what is your opinion?

3. What needs does ***** attempt to cover? What services does it provide?

4. Which citizens does ***** refer to? Which are the 'target groups'?

Section E: Mode of governance and operation, decision making and value framework

1. In general, do you know how are any decisions concerning the operation, governance, activities and decisions taken? If yes, what is your opinion?

2. Are you aware of the main values and principles the organisation adopts? If yes, how does it promote them (value framework)?

3. In addition to the various social services, what other activities are developed by *****?

Section F: TSOs, welfare governance and social citizenship

1. How do you perceive the socioeconomic integration of the vulnerable and disadvantaged?

2. Do you know what social citizenship is?

3. What is the relation between social citizenship rights and social welfare?

4. How do you see TSOs such as this within this relation?

5. Do you think there are issues of social control and governance of the behaviour of service-users within welfare and particularly TSOs? What is the situation in this organisation?

6. Why are the lifestyles of service-users important for the organisation?

7. Why data on the service-users is kept so meticulously by the organisation?

8. What is your opinion on the 'reward and punishment' procedures in place designating the organisation's response to service-users performing well or misbehaving within the boundaries set by organisational rules?

9. What is your opinion on the requirements placed on service-users concerning access to the organisation's services?

10. Do you think that matters of anti-social behaviour should come into play when dealing with service-users within the organisation?

11. How do you think such practices affect the organisation's perception and relation with its service-users?

12. Is there a particular strategy concerning how the organisation approach service-users in general?

13. Do dominant narratives in public debates concerning social welfare influence the organisation? Its identity and activities?

14. What is the role of state social policy in such processes? How does it affect this organisation and the TS in general?

296

15. Do you think for example that benefit sanctions is a fair and effective policy? Do such policy measures send a message -if any- to social purpose TSOs such as this regarding their interactions with service-users?

16. Do you have any worries concerning the autonomy of the organisation and the TS in general, from government agendas?

Section G: Members, volunteers, organisational form of ***, community response and relation to society**

1. Are there any criteria for the selection / acceptance of service-users?

2. Do service-users participate in some way in the organisation's activities?

Section H: TSOs as a sociopolitical movement of resistance and solidarity

1. Given that TSOs similar to ***** operate in many areas of the country with civil and voluntary initiative, would you say that ***** is part of a social movement and why?

2. If yes, what do you consider to be the main features and characteristics which make up the identity of this movement of TSOs and other initiatives of the civil society?

3. What is your position on the changes in public social services and the social state that have occurred and continue to occur (i.e., medical care, social security, health insurance, housing, etc.) during the latest years?

4. Can you identify the source of these changes?

5. How do you perceive the concept of social solidarity as ***** promotes and practices it?

6. Do you believe that this movement of collective resistance and solidarity activities developed from TSOs such as *****, can shape a different perception regarding the meaning and concept of the active citizen and policies generated from the ground-up and the heart of the social body? If yes, how?

Section I: Alliances and confrontations, relation with the state and the market

1. Have you considered the possibility of the 'adoption' or co-optation of organisations such as ***** by the state in order for the latter to affix to them their obligation to provide public social services? What is your position with regards to such a possibility?

- Depending on the previous answer: Do you think that the state through the government tries to use organisations such as ***** as a means of social control of the disadvantaged, aligning TSOs' goals with a neoliberal agenda and priorities?

2. Do you know if ***** collaborates with other similar TSOs, voluntary organisations, social associations, cooperatives, etc.? If yes, how and under what conditions do these partnerships arise? How do you judge them?

- Depending on the previous answer: In the UK, there are strong pressures for the marketisation of voluntary sector organisations. For them to become more business-like and adopt market criteria in their approach, goals and priorities, become more competitive and results-driven. How do you judge this development and how has it influenced ***** and you as a service-user? What is your opinion?

Section J: Difficulties, concerns and future challenges

1. What would you say are the main problems currently faced by *****? How do they affect you as a service-user?

2. How do you see the future of TSOs such as ***** in the UK?

3. It is clearly noted in the literature, that TSOs and various forms of voluntary, civil society organisations expand rapidly in all countries in Europe these recent years. Which are the main reasons in your opinion?

Interview with a member or regular volunteer of the Greek TSO
* Translated from Greek to English by the author

Section A: Introduction and general information of members / volunteers

1. How old are you?

2. What is your educational level?

3. What is your place of residence?

4. What is your marital and family status?

5. Are you employed? If so, what is your profession?

6. How long have you been contributing as a member / volunteer in *****?

7. In which of the internal service teams do you offer your services?

8. How much time do you devote on average per week in *****?

Section B: Organisation's creation rationale and coverage of social needs

1. Do you know how was the idea for such an organisation born?

2. Do you know details of how did the practical implementation and organisation of this effort commence? Did you have in mind some example or did you move more 'spontaneously'?

3. In your opinion, what need(s) brought about the birth of organisations such as *****?

4. What are the main goals of the organisation?

5. What needs does ***** attempt to cover? What services does it provide?

6. Which citizens does ***** refer to (criteria)? Which are the 'target groups'?

7. Could you give me an estimate of how many similar to ***** TSOs operate in the country?

Section C: Mode of governance and operation, decision making and value framework

1. Is there an article of association or set of rules which regulate the organisation? How it was created?

2. Is there a coordinating body and what is its role?

3. In general, how are any decisions concerning the operation, governance, activities and decisions taken?

4. Do you distinguish the existence of a 'hierarchy' both between different teams of members and volunteers and inside the different teams in *****, as well as concerning any influence to the organisation's decision making?

5. Which are the main values and principles the organisation adopts and how does it promote them (value framework)?

Section D: Members, volunteers, organisational form of ***, personal experience in the organisation, community response and relation to society**

1. How did you learn about the existence of the organisation?

2. Why and how did you decide to volunteer your services to the organisation?

299

3. How do you personally perceive the concept of volunteerism in *****?

4. Are there any criteria for the selection of volunteers?

5. Are there any criteria for the selection / acceptance of service-users?

6. Have you had previous experience / participation in collective action and voluntarism? If yes, could you please tell me about it?

7. Practically, how is ***** organised internally? How it systematizes its day-to-day activities?

8. How many members and volunteers offer their services and how many service-users are involved with *****?

9. What is the response and support from society except for members, volunteers and service-users in relation to the provision of material support or in connection with the various interventions carried out by *****?

10. Do service-users participate in some way in the organisation's activities?

11. In addition to the various social services, what other activities are developed by *****? How do you try to combat marginalisation and stigmatisation?

12. Is there an institutional stigma attached to service-users involved with TSOs such as ***** and if yes, how do you try to overcome such processes?

13. In general, do you agree with the operation of ***** and how decisions are taken? Please justify your opinion.

14. Do you feel that your involvement in ***** has affected your wider thinking with regard to citizenship, ethics, your political identity and the concept of social solidarity; If so, how?

15. Do you think that in general your (the organisation's) values, mode of governance (i.e., direct democracy), strategies and activities, your promotion of community engagement as a way to address social problems could influence public social policy and if yes in what ways?

16. Do you think what you are and what you do as an organisation, influence wider social perceptions of the public and if yes how?

17. Beyond the social contribution do you personally feel satisfaction / pleasure from your involvement with *****;

Section E: TSOs, welfare governance and social citizenship

1. What do you mean exactly when you talk about the socioeconomic integration of service-users? How do you perceive integration of the vulnerable and disadvantaged?

2. Do you know what social citizenship is?

3. What is the relation between social citizenship rights and social welfare?

4. How do you see TSOs such as this within this relation?

5. Do you think there are issues of social control and governance of the behaviour of service-users within welfare and particularly TSOs? What is the situation in this organisation?

6. Why are the lifestyles of service-users important for the organisation?

7. Why data on the service-users is kept so meticulously by the organisation?

8. What is your opinion on the 'reward and punishment' procedures in place designating the organisation's response to service-users performing well or misbehaving within the boundaries set by organisational rules?

9. What is your opinion on the requirements placed on service-users concerning access to the organisation's services?

10. Do you think that matters of anti-social behaviour should come into play when dealing with service-users within the organisation?

11. How do you think such practices affect the organisation's perception and relation with its service-users?

12. Is there a particular strategy concerning how the organisation approach service-users in general?

13. Do dominant narratives in public debates concerning social welfare influence the organisation? Its identity and activities?

14. What is the role of state social policy in such processes? How does it affect this organisation and the TS in general?

15. Do you think for example that benefit sanctions is a fair and effective policy? Do such policy measures send a message -if any- to social purpose TSOs such as this regarding their interactions with service-users?

16. Do you have any worries concerning the autonomy of the organisation and the TS in general, from government agendas?

Section F: TSOs as a sociopolitical movement of resistance and solidarity

1. Given that TSOs similar to ***** operate in many areas of the country with civil and voluntary initiative, would you say that ***** is part of a social movement and why?

301

2. What do you consider to be the main features and characteristics which make up the identity of this movement of TSOs and other initiatives of the civil society?

3. What is your position on the changes in public social services and the social state that have occurred and continue to occur (i.e., medical care, social security, health insurance, labour rights, employment, housing)?

4. Can you identify the source of these changes?

5. What are the main social purposes, collective demands and ultimate goals of *****

6. Would you say that you have a political dimension apart from addressing crucial social needs and if yes, what is it?

7. What are the policy recommendations and the social context you are suggesting?

8. What practices do you adopt in order to promote these political demands (i.e., complaints, intervention, prevention, use of media, information and communication campaigns to raise awareness, protests, rallies, cultural events, etc.)?

9. Do you know if collectivities of the third sector similar to ***** exist in other countries particularly in countries facing a similar crisis (i.e., Argentina) or elsewhere in Europe? If there are, what is your relationship with them?

10. How do you perceive and realise the concept of solidarity as a social practice both in terms of the wider society, and also in terms of your operation, goals and particular practices / social interventions?

11. Do you believe that this movement of collective resistance and solidarity activities developed from TSOs such as ***** can shape a different perception regarding the meaning and concept of the active citizen policies generated from the ground-up and the heart of the social body? If yes, how?

Section G: Alliances and confrontations, the third sector and relation with the state and the market

1. Do you collaborate with other more 'traditional' TSOs, NGOs and charities? If yes, how and if no, why?

2. You know of course that these more 'traditional' TSOs depend on state or private funding. What is your opinion about them and the general attitude of ***** (cooperation or competition, etc.)? At what points would you differentiate yourself as an organisation (i.e., financial, operational, and organisational)?

302

3. Given the previous question, have you considered the possibility of the 'adoption' or co-optation of organisations such as ***** by the state in order for the latter to affix to them their obligation to provide public social services? What is your position against such a possibility?

- *Depending on the previous answer:* Do you think that the state through the government tries to use organisations such as ***** as a means of social control of the disadvantaged, aligning TSOs' goals with a neoliberal agenda and priorities?

4. What is the relation of ***** with the 'official state'? With public institutions, universities, social organisations and the ministries?

6. What is your opinion on public social services and social policy currently?

7. Do you collaborate with other similar to ***** TSOs, voluntary organisations, social associations, cooperatives, etc.? If yes, how and under what conditions do these partnerships arise? How do you judge them?

8. What is your relation with trade unions?

9. What is your relation with the media?

Section H: Difficulties, concerns and challenges

1. What are the main problems currently faced by *****? Are there challenges that you foresee will have to be met soon?

2. How do you see the future of TSOs such as ***** in Greece?

3. It is clearly noted in the literature that TSOs and various forms of voluntary, civil society organisations expand rapidly in all countries in Europe these recent years. Which are the main reasons in your opinion?

<u>**Interview with a member or regular volunteer of the Greek TSO who is (or had been) a service-user in some manner**</u>

* *Translated from Greek to English by the author*

Section A: Introduction and general information of members / volunteers

1. How old are you?

2. What is your educational level?

3. What is your place of residence?

4. What is your marital and family status?

5. Are you employed? If so, what is your profession?

6. How long have you been contributing as a member / volunteer in *****?

7. In which of the internal service teams do you offer your services?

8. How much time do you devote on average per week in *****?

Section B: Experiences with marginalisation, stigmatisation or in general inability to cover crucial social needs (the 'road' to involvement with *****)

1. Do you want to tell me first some things about you, how you grew up, your relationship with your parents, your experiences as a teenager, your relations with your friends / peers, etc.?

- *Series of small clarifying questions breaking down the socioeconomic background of the respondent and experiences which eventually led them to *****, which are framed differently depending on the specific interviewee and the flow of the discussion.*

2. What happened (in depth description of the respondent's 'difficult experiences')?

3. How did you feel at that time (i.e., as an extremely poor, marginalised or stigmatised person after the experiences of marginalisation or deprivation and lack of access to main social goods and services have been established)? How did you see yourself, your identity and others (the mainstream society)?

4. Did you seek help from public social services and in general the state? If no why, and if yes, what were your experiences?

- *Clarifying questions on the experience with public social services if needed.*

5. What is your opinion on public social services currently?

Section C: Personal experience with ***** (the organisation)

1. How did ***** help you?

2. Why did you remain involved with ***** as a member and volunteer?

3. How do you see yourself, your identity and the rest of society now that you are involved with *****? Do you still feel stigmatised or marginalised in the same way? What are the differences than before?

- *Depending on the answer, possible clarifying questions regarding the existence and nature of an institutional stigma because of the association with a TSO such as *****.*

4. How do you see the organisation as a TSO in general? Its goals and activities, as well as its mode of operation and governance?

5. What do you think could be improved?

6. How do you see the organisation and its interventions now, during the crisis, as opposed to before (if the respondent has been with the organisation before 2009)?

7. What is your relation with the other members / volunteers and service users of *****?

8. Do you believe there are subgroups between the members in the organisation, divided by the type of problem? I mean for example do the former drug addicts tend to socialize more with other former drug addicts and so on and so forth?

9. Do you feel that your involvement in ***** has affected your wider thinking with regard to citizenship, ethics, your political identity and the concept of social solidarity; If so, how?

10. Beyond the social contribution do you personally feel satisfaction / pleasure from your involvement with *****?

Section D: Organisation's creation rationale, main goals and coverage of social needs / provision of social services

1. Do you know how was the idea for such an organisation born?

2. Do you know details of how did the practical implementation and organisation of this effort commence? Did you have in mind some example or did you move more 'spontaneously'?

3. In your opinion, what need(s) brought about the birth of organisations such as *****?

4. What are the main goals of the organisation?

5. What needs does ***** attempt to cover? What services does it provide?

6. Which citizens does ***** refer to (criteria)? Which are the 'target groups'?

7. Could you give me an estimate of how many similar to ***** TSOs operate in the country?

Section E: Mode of governance and operation, decision making and value framework

1. Is there an article of association or set of rules which regulate the organisation? How it was created?

2. Is there a coordinating body and what is its role?

3. In general, how are any decisions concerning the operation, governance, activities and decisions taken?

4. Do you distinguish the existence of a 'hierarchy' both between different teams of members and volunteers and inside the different teams in *****, as well as concerning any influence to the organisation's decision making?

5. Which are the main values and principles the organisation adopts and how does it promote them (value framework)?

Section F: TSOs, welfare governance and social citizenship

1. What do you mean exactly when you talk about the socioeconomic integration of service-users? How do you perceive integration of the vulnerable and disadvantaged?

2. Do you know what social citizenship is?

3. What is the relation between social citizenship rights and social welfare?

4. How do you see TSOs such as this within this relation?

5. Do you think there are issues of social control and governance of the behaviour of service-users within welfare and particularly TSOs? What is the situation in this organisation?

6. Why are the lifestyles of service-users important for the organisation?

7. Why data on the service-users is kept so meticulously by the organisation?

8. What is your opinion on the 'reward and punishment' procedures in place designating the organisation's response to service-users performing well or misbehaving within the boundaries set by organisational rules?

9. What is your opinion on the requirements placed on service-users concerning access to the organisation's services?

10. Do you think that matters of anti-social behaviour should come into play when dealing with service-users within the organisation?

11. How do you think such practices affect the organisation's perception and relation with its service-users?

12. Is there a particular strategy concerning how the organisation approach service-users in general?

13. Do dominant narratives in public debates concerning social welfare influence the organisation? Its identity and activities?

14. What is the role of state social policy in such processes? How does it affect this organisation and the TS in general?

15. Do you think for example that benefit sanctions is a fair and effective policy? Do such policy measures send a message -if any- to social purpose TSOs such as this regarding their interactions with service-users?

16. Do you have any worries concerning the autonomy of the organisation and the TS in general, from government agendas?

Section G: Members, volunteers, organisational form of *****, community response and relation to society

1. How did you learn about the existence of the organisation?

2. Why and how did you decide to volunteer your services to the organisation?

3. How do you personally perceive the concept of volunteerism in *****?

4. Are there any criteria for the selection of volunteers?

5. Are there any criteria for the selection / acceptance of service-users?

6. Have you had previous experience / participation in collective action and voluntarism? If yes, could you please tell me about it?

7. Practically, how is ***** organised internally? How it systematizes its day-to-day activities?

8. How many members and volunteers offer their services and how many service-users are involved with *****?

9. What is the response and support from society except for members, volunteers and service-users in relation to the provision of material support or in connection with the various interventions carried out by *****?

10. Do service-users participate in some way in the organisation's activities?

11. In addition to the various social services, what other activities are developed by *****?

12. In general, do you agree with the operation of ***** and how decisions are taken? Please justify your opinion.

13. Do you think that in general your (the organisation's) values, mode of governance (i.e., direct democracy), strategies and activities, your promotion of community engagement as a way to address social problems could influence public social policy and if yes in what ways?

14. Do you think what you are and what you do as an organisation influence wider social perceptions of the public and if yes how?

15. Do you think that in general your (the organisation's) values, mode of governance (i.e., direct democracy), strategies and activities, your promotion of community engagement as a way to address social problems could influence public social policy and if yes in what ways?

Section H: TSOs as a sociopolitical movement of resistance and solidarity

1. Given that TSOs similar to ***** operate in many areas of the country with civil and voluntary initiative, would you say that ***** is part of a social movement and why?

2. What do you consider to be the main features and characteristics which make up the identity of this movement of TSOs and other initiatives of the civil society?

3. What is your position on the changes in public social services and the social state that have occurred and continue to occur (i.e., medical care, social security, health insurance, labour rights, employment, housing)?

4. Can you identify the source of these changes?

5. What are the main social purposes, collective demands and ultimate goals of *****

6. Would you say that you have a political dimension apart from addressing crucial social needs and if yes, what is it?

7. What are the policy recommendations and the social context you are suggesting?

8. What practices do you adopt in order to promote these political demands (i.e., complaints, intervention, prevention, use of media, information and communication campaigns to raise awareness, protests, rallies, cultural events, etc.)?

9. Do you know if collectivities of the third sector similar to ***** exist in other countries particularly in countries facing a similar crisis (i.e., Argentina) or elsewhere in Europe? If there are, what is your relationship with them?

10. How do you perceive and realise the concept of solidarity as a social practice both in terms of the wider society, and also in terms of your operation, goals and particular practices / social interventions?

11. Do you believe that this movement of collective resistance and solidarity activities developed from TSOs such as ***** can shape a different perception regarding the meaning and concept of the active citizen policies generated from the ground-up and the heart of the social body? If yes, how?

Section I: Alliances and confrontations, relation with the state and the market

1. Do you collaborate with other more 'traditional' TSOs, NGOs and charities? If yes, how and if no, why?

2. You know of course that these more 'traditional' TSOs depend on state or private funding. What is your opinion about them and the general attitude of ***** (cooperation or competition, etc.)? At what points would you differentiate yourself as an organisation (i.e., financial, operational, and organisational)?

3. Given the previous question, have you considered the possibility of the 'adoption' or co-optation of organisations such as ***** by the state in order for the latter to affix to them their obligation to provide public social services? What is your position against such a possibility?

- *Depending on the previous answer:* Do you think that the state through the government tries to use organisations such as ***** as a means of social control of the disadvantaged, aligning TSOs' goals with a neoliberal agenda and priorities?

4. What is the relation of ***** with the 'official state'? With public institutions, universities, social organisations and the ministries?

5. Do you collaborate with other similar to ***** TSOs, voluntary organisations, social associations, cooperatives, etc.? If yes, how and under what conditions do these partnerships arise? How do you judge them?

- *Depending on the previous answer:* In the UK, there are strong pressures for the marketisation of voluntary sector organisations. For them to become more business-like and adopt market criteria in their approach, goals and priorities, become more competitive and results-driven. Do you think there is a similar situation in Greece and if yes how it has influenced *****? What is your opinion?

7. What is your relation with trade unions?

8. What is your relation with the media?

Section J: Difficulties, concerns and future challenges

1. What are the main problems currently faced by *****? Are there challenges that you foresee will have to be met soon?

2. How do you see the future of TSOs such as ***** in Greece?

3. It is clearly noted in the literature, that TSOs and various forms of voluntary, civil society organisations expand rapidly in all countries in Europe these recent years. Which are the main reasons in your opinion?

Interview with a service-user of the Greek TSO

* Translated from Greek to English by the author

Section A: Introduction and general information of members / volunteers

1. How old are you?

2. What is your educational level?

3. What is your place of residence?

4. What is your marital and family status?

5. Are you employed? If so, what is your profession?

6. How long have you been involved with ***** as a service-user?

7. - *If the service-user participates in some manner even rarely, as a volunteer:* How much time do you devote on average per week in *****?

8. What kind of support do you receive from ***** exactly?

Section B: Experiences with marginalisation, stigmatisation or in general inability to cover crucial social needs (the 'road' to involvement with *****)

1. Do you want to tell me first some things about you, how you grew up, your relationship with your parents, your experiences as a teenager, your relations with your friends / peers, etc.?

*- Series of small clarifying questions breaking down the socioeconomic background of the respondent and experiences which eventually led them to *****. These questions are framed differently depending on the specific interviewee and the flow of the discussion.*

2. What happened (in depth description of the respondent's 'difficult experiences')?

3. How did you feel at that time (i.e., as an extremely poor, marginalised or stigmatised person after the experiences of marginalisation or deprivation and lack of access to main social goods and services have been established)? How did you see yourself, your identity and others (the mainstream society) at the time?

4. Did you seek help from public social services and in general the state? If not why, and if yes, what were your experiences?

- Clarifying questions on the experience with public social services if needed.

5. What is your opinion on public social services currently?

Section C: Personal experience with *** (the organisation).**

1. How did you learn about the existence of the organisation?

2. Why and how did you decide to seek the support of *****?

3. How did ***** help you?

4. How do you see yourself, your identity and the rest of society now that you are involved with *****? Do you still feel stigmatised or marginalised in the same way? What are the differences with before?

5. How does ***** promote your socioeconomic (re)integration?

*- Depending on the answer, possible clarifying questions regarding the existence and nature of an institutional stigma because of the association with a TSO such as *****.*

6. How do you see the organisation as a voluntary TSO in general? Its goals and activities, as well as its mode of operation and governance?

7. What do you think could be improved?

8. How do you see the organisation and its interventions now, during the crisis, as opposed to before *(if the respondent has been with the organisation before 2009)*?

9. What is your relation with the members and regular volunteers? Is there a relation?

10. Do you feel that your involvement in ***** has affected your wider thinking with regard to citizenship, ethics, your political identity and the concept of social solidarity; If so, how?

Section D: Organisation's main goals and coverage of social needs / provision of social services

1. In your opinion, what need(s) brought about the birth of organisations such as *****?

2. Are you aware of the main goals of the organisation? If yes, what is your opinion?

3. What needs does ***** attempt to cover? What services does it provide?

4. Which citizens does ***** refer to? Which are the 'target groups'?

Section E: Mode of governance and operation, decision making and value framework

1. In general, do you know how are any decisions concerning the operation, governance, activities and decisions taken? If yes, what is your opinion?

2. Are you aware of the main values and principles the organisation adopts? If yes, how does it promote them (value framework)?

3. In addition to the various social services, what other activities are developed by *****?

Section F: TSOs, welfare governance and social citizenship

1. What do you mean exactly when you talk about the socioeconomic integration of service-users? How do you perceive integration of the vulnerable and disadvantaged?

2. Do you know what social citizenship is?

3. What is the relation between social citizenship rights and social welfare?

4. How do you see TSOs such as this within this relation?

5. Do you think there are issues of social control and governance of the behaviour of service-users within welfare and particularly TSOs? What is the situation in this organisation?

6. Why are the lifestyles of service-users important for the organisation?

7. Why data on the service-users is kept so meticulously by the organisation?

8. What is your opinion on the 'reward and punishment' procedures in place designating the organisation's response to service-users performing well or misbehaving within the boundaries set by organisational rules?

9. What is your opinion on the requirements placed on service-users concerning access to the organisation's services?

312

10. Do you think that matters of anti-social behaviour should come into play when dealing with service-users within the organisation?

11. How do you think such practices affect the organisation's perception and relation with its service-users?

12. Is there a particular strategy concerning how the organisation approach service-users in general?

13. Do dominant narratives in public debates concerning social welfare influence the organisation? Its identity and activities?

14. What is the role of state social policy in such processes? How does it affect this organisation and the TS in general?

15. Do you think for example that benefit sanctions is a fair and effective policy? Do such policy measures send a message -if any- to social purpose TSOs such as this regarding their interactions with service-users?

16. Do you have any worries concerning the autonomy of the organisation and the TS in general, from government agendas?

Section G: Members, volunteers, organisational form of *****, community response and relation to society

1. Are there any criteria for the selection / acceptance of service-users?
2. Do service-users participate in some way in the organisation's activities?

Section H: TSOs as a sociopolitical movement of resistance and solidarity

1. Given that TSOs similar to ***** operate in many areas of the country with civil and voluntary initiative, would you say that ***** is part of a social movement and why?

2. If yes, what do you consider to be the main features and characteristics which make up the identity of this movement of TSOs and other initiatives of the civil society?

3. What is your position on the changes in public social services and the social state that have occurred and continue to occur (i.e., medical care, social security, health insurance, labour rights, employment, housing) during the latest years?

4. Can you identify the source of these changes?

5. What are the policy recommendations and the social context ***** is suggesting?

313

10. How do you perceive the concept of social solidarity as ***** promotes and practices it?

11. Do you believe that this movement of collective resistance and solidarity activities developed from TSOs such as ***** can shape a different perception regarding the meaning and concept of the active citizen and policies generated from the ground-up and the heart of the social body? If yes, how?

Section I: Alliances and confrontations, relation with the state and the market

1. Do you know if ***** collaborates with other more 'traditional' TSOs, NGOs and charities? If yes, how and if no, why?

2. Have you considered the possibility of the 'adoption' or co-optation of organisations such as ***** by the state in order for the latter to affix to them their obligation to provide public social services? What is your position with regards to such a possibility?

- *Depending on the previous answer:* Do you think that the state through the government tries to use organisations such as ***** as a means of social control of the disadvantaged, aligning TSOs' goals with a neoliberal agenda and priorities?

3. Do you know if ***** collaborates with other similar TSOs, voluntary organisations, social associations, cooperatives, etc.? If yes, how and under what conditions do these partnerships arise? How do you judge them?

- *Depending on the previous answer:* In the UK, there are strong pressures for the marketisation of voluntary sector organisations. For them to become more business-like and adopt market criteria in their approach, goals and priorities, become more competitive and results-driven. Do you think there is a similar situation in Greece and if yes how it has influenced ***** and you as a service-user? What is your opinion?

Section J: Difficulties, concerns and future challenges

1. What would you say are the main problems currently faced by *****? How do they affect you as a service-user?

2. How do you see the future of TSOs such as ***** in Greece?

3. It is clearly noted in the literature, that TSOs and various forms of voluntary, civil society organisations expand rapidly in all countries in Europe these recent years. Which are the main reasons in your opinion?

Appendix III: Organisational Documents

The Greek TSO's Declaration

* Translated from Greek to English by the author

In recent years, we have been experiencing a policy that has brought tragic consequences on our lives. The financial crisis revealed another, deeper crisis of values and institutions. The collapse of employment, the dismantling of public health care structures, social security public institutions and the transformation of social welfare protection from a public good into a commodity, is one of the many results, perhaps the worst, of the implementation of neoliberal austerity policies of governments in recent years, in order to achieve the objectives of the toughest fiscal adjustment enjoyed by citizens of any European country since WWII. The government and the Troika dissolve the national health system and public health services throughout the country. They close primary health structures, mental health and substance abuse support units, hospitals and schools, merge clinics, dismiss doctors, nurses, teachers and workers in the public social sector, degrade social care services, cut poverty and unemployment benefits mental health. We, the people, as active citizens, must organise our resistance.

We organise our lives and take control of our daily reality, creating solidarity structures to support and relieve all those in need. We create hot spots of resistance towards those who seek the dismantling the of welfare state, a main priority of the social and economic policies imposed since the signing of the first memorandum between the Greek government and the Troika. We join the struggle together with the parts of society which have embraced us, to reverse these policies, to provide a free, public and universal social welfare system providing social support, from prevention, to rehabilitation and social (re)integration. We organise the provision of principal social goods and services to all the people without any form of exclusion or exception. We oppose and fight any kind of stigma, marginalisation or racism. In this context, we create social solidarity and support structures and collectives such as *****. We declare the following:

1. The People's Social Solidarity Collectives (AΔKA) such as *****, are not a charity and do not offer charity. We are autonomous, independent, self-organised and self-managed collectives and cooperative of citizens who provide voluntary and completely for free primary and secondary social welfare services to the best of our abilities and as much as our resources allow, to: the uninsured, the poor, the unemployed, the marginalised, excluded, and vulnerable, Greeks, refugees and immigrants, without discrimination, regardless of religion, nationality, sexual orientation, gender and age. With concrete actions, public interventions, and varied sociopolitical activism, we mean to create a movement of resistance to austerity and neoliberalism. We struggle for the complete abolition of austerity measures and cutbacks on the welfare state and public social programs. Together with other collectives of the people, trade unions and social movements, our central goal is the unfettered access of all to health, sustenance, employment, energy, education, housing and in general the social, political, economic and cultural life of Greek society.

2. In AΔKA such as *****, participate jointly and equally the skilled and unskilled, the educated and uneducated, the employed and unemployed, the insured and uninsured. Currently, participants include teachers, doctors, dentists, psychologists, social workers, pharmacists, economists, public employees, unemployed citizens, ex-offenders, substance abuse patients, mental health patients, etc., who devote their time into the support of the operation of *****. Along with workers from the public and private sectors, we are fighting to defend public social welfare structures which are being shut down one after the other. Our initiative springs from the common people's needs and not from some notion of volunteering as a value in itself; as a trendy pass-time of self-absorbed elites or bored pensioners. The main characteristic of all those involved, is the belief in social solidarity as a way of life. A new model of social organisation that creates social cohesion, co-equal relationships and mutual respect, and the belief that social welfare is the highest priority and obligation of the organised state in any civilized society.

3. AΔKA such as ***** are nexuses of struggle and resistance that seek to produce primary knowledge and action, contributing to the restructuring of the social fabric. They are open sites of interaction and organisation, trying to activate as many people as possible, promote the participation of members, volunteers, service-users and the whole society, act as open collectives, with direct and participatory democracy based on equality of all members. All

316

decisions relating to the functioning and objectives of the collective are obtained in the open general assembly, which can all attend. The principal governance instrument of the collective is the coordinating council elected by a simple majority by the general assembly.

4. In *****, we have no intention nor illusion about the possibility of substituting or absolving the state from its responsibility to offer social welfare services and guarantee decent standards of living for all. We try to build a social safety net to support people and also, through a constant, daily, democratic, social and political struggle, we demand from the government to assume its responsibilities. We do not offer charity, nor want to educate our fellow citizens in a logic of compassion, begging and supplication, but to collectively raise social awareness about the political issues at stake, fight together for our social rights, and demand free access to social welfare, primarily health, employment and education, for all the people.

5. ***** relies solely on the solidarity of the people. It has no dependence, nor accepts any money or donations from anyone (the state, individuals, groups or institutions / organisations) who support the demolition of public social welfare, directly or indirectly. With the exclusion of the above, we receive offers and donations in goods / items for our needs, but do not advertise anyone for any donation made, nor we accept any sponsors, with the exceptions of collectives or small independent businesses which demonstrably share our values and goals. Even in these cases, our policy concerning no advertising or promotion from anyone, applies. Finally, we do not allow any political party to be in any way affiliated or involved in the operation and activities of the collective, nor do we allow the exploitation of our work for any kind of gain or profit by anyone.

6. ***** promotes nationwide networking and cooperation with any and all anti-austerity collectives, social organisations of the third sector, nonprofit cooperatives, associations and groups of the civil society which share our values and goals. We aim to coordinate joint actions and initiatives in order to claim social welfare rights for all, based on our common features and principles. We do not interfere with the operation of other AΔKA and respect their particular regulations, activities and modes of operation. We are committed to promoting equal participation and solidarity between us, as members of a broad social movement of the people opposing austerity and neoliberalism.

7. ***** is opposed to any kind of exclusion; national, economic, social, religious or racial. We actively support, promote and participate in actions which further the removal of mechanisms of marginalisation and exclusion. We participate in broader self-organised social networks of solidarity and seek cooperation among relevant initiatives, which aim at combating poverty, exclusion, marginalisation and stigmatisation of the vulnerable, who have unfortunately multiplied in our society because of this crisis. In cooperation with other AΔKA and solidarity structures, we provide legal assistance to people who need it when collective goods such as housing are threatened.

8. Apart from our own social solidarity activities (social store, social kitchen, social pharmacy, etc.), we work with other solidarity structures, spare bazaars, forms of market exchanges which form a direct link with the producers, and generally any self-organised initiative that contributes to the struggle for social relief, cohesion and access to social goods for all.

9. We actively support all initiatives by the people to develop new structures of social solidarity and seek to exchange experiences in order to improve our effectiveness. We actively oppose the rhetoric and activities of all fascist and neo-Nazi groups in our society.

10. We participate or organise workshops, symposiums and conferences in universities, public buildings and on the street, on the issues of social solidarity, marginalisation, social rights, social welfare, the welfare state, the politics of austerity, neoliberalism and the humanitarian crisis. We set up information networks, participate in meetings of scientific bodies, publish brochures and other informational material. We organise open assemblies in neighbourhoods, concerts and cultural activities with independent artists who share our values, participate in rallies, coordinate with trade unions in marches, make symbolic occupations of public buildings or businesses, have mobile crews for the on-site support of drug-addicts and homeless people in the city and in general, we are present in all the struggles of the people for decency and democracy.

The Greek TSO's Internal Article of Association

* Translated from Greek to English by the author

1. We are not a charity and we don't offer charity.

2. We identify ourselves as an anti-neoliberal, anti-austerity and anti-fascist, social purpose cooperative collective, striving to offer support through vital social services and goods to our fellow citizens suffering from the economic situation in the country.

3. All activities of the collective, are designed and implemented to promote social solidarity, social cohesion and ensure free and universal access to social welfare rights, good and services for all the people.

3. The collective strongly defends any policy which seeks to strengthen the social welfare state in the country, and strongly opposes any policy which seeks to dismantle it.

4. All people are welcome in ***** as members, volunteers or service-users without any exclusion based on race, nationality, sex, sexual orientation, religion, socioeconomic background and educational level. However, any views or actions by someone involved with ***** in any capacity, which reveal any kind of fascist or racist views on any level, will result in the general assembly discussing the matter and potentially deciding the permanent expulsion of this individual from the collective.

5. All members are equal and uphold the values of the collective.

6. The collective is nonprofit, has no business activities and takes the form of a social cooperative.

7. Its resources come from the joint, voluntary efforts of its members, volunteers and service-users and donations, primarily in the form of items and goods that are needed for the social store, the social kitchen and the social pharmacy. Monetary donations are approved or rejected by the general assembly on a case-to-case basis.

8. Our assessment of the current incarnation of the EU and its institutions, is that it is a neoliberal, reactionary tool of the markets and a proponent of the most aggressive 'casino-capitalism' ideologies. It serves the interests of capitalist elites and the ruling classes across Europe. It enables their political representation to impose conservative austerity policies, assaulting the social, labour, welfare and democratic rights of European peoples. As a result, no funding from EU programmes of any kind is sought or accepted.

9. The supreme instrument of governance of the collective is the general assembly, where all members participate and have an equal right to be heard and vote. Service-users and non-members can participate in its discussions and voice their opinions, but can't vote.

10. All decisions are taken democratically and collectively by the general assembly and the coordinating council.

11. The general assembly elects the coordinating council which is the executive branch of the collective. It consists of seven elected members for a three-month term. Each council member can be recalled with a majority vote from the general assembly.

12. The coordinating council appoints the various task teams within the organisation and monitors their activities (i.e., the team and the individual duties of its members who run the social store).

13. The general assembly constantly assesses the coordinating council for its compliance with the collective's goals and values, as well as the implementation of its decisions.

14. There are no criteria for involvement with the collective as a member, volunteer, or service-user, other than the acceptance of its main values and goals. The precise procedures for becoming a member or a volunteer in the collective are decided and amended as needed, by the general assembly. The daily duties of each and every member or volunteer are decided by the coordinating council, but can be changed by consultation within the general assembly when needed.

15. There are no leaders, managers or directors. Everything is decided collectively and democratically in the assembly, by means of a simple majority.

16. Any and all problems arising in the collective can be discussed and debated internally, but compliance with the assembly's decisions is mandatory for all members. Its decisions are final, but can be amended or changed in subsequent meetings if needed. There are no formal procedures of appeal, as the collective operates as a democratic community of equals on the basis of co-decision.

17. Cooperation and coordination with other collectives and structures of social solidarity is actively sought by all members. Participation in common activities and events with such collectives, is decided by the general assembly on a case-to-case basis.

18. The members are free to retain their political views and party affiliation. However, if and when they participate in meetings and activities of their respective parties, they do so as individuals and do not represent the collective, nor are they free to discuss any internal issues of the collective with anyone outside of it. If a member has, beyond any doubt, done so, the general assembly has the right to discuss and potentially decide her expulsion from the collective.

19. Participation of the collective in political parties' events and activities is decided on a case-to-case basis by the assembly, but is usually avoided. In all cases, the members must always strive to ensure the collective's autonomy from the government and lack of affiliation to any particular political party.

20. No advertising of individuals, donors, businesses or institutions is allowed, except for other AΔKA. Exceptions (i.e. a trade union's certain intervention or a cultural event) are discussed and decided by the assembly on a case-to-case basis. Any interaction with the established media (i.e., national TV networks and newsgroups), is forbidden for the protection of the integrity and autonomy of the collective and its service-users, as the media in the country are the 'battering ram' of neoliberal and austerity policies, stigmatising the disenfranchised in our society. Exceptions (i.e. certain independent, voluntary radio stations) are again discussed and decided by the assembly on a case-to-case basis.

Verbal Snapshots - Observation Portfolio

A morning in the Greek TSO

*This verbal snapshot is the result of an early observation session, which took place one morning in the premises of the Greek TSO. The session lasted several hours. This is a small excerpt from the researcher's notes on that day.

It is now 8.10am, and today I'm standing in front of the Greek TSO. It is early, so only a few members will be here. The premises of the organisation are situated in a working and lower-middle class high density population area, to the southeast of the city. I arrived by bus for today's observation session. The area has good transportation connections with lots of bus lines to the centre of the city. The building is nondescript and old, as many buildings in the city are. There is a plain, large and visible sign above the main door which writes 'Cooperative of Social Solidarity and Support, *****'. There is a large glass wall on the right of the front door similar to those seen in the front of clothes shops. It is covered with various notices and posters, from OKANA, OAEΔ, KEΘEA[28], a number of other TSOs and various nonprofits, all active in the support of vulnerable and marginalised social groups, promoting interventions and events and providing useful information about events, open meetings and contact details. It is quite a cluttered front. The street is quite a busy one, connecting to several large arteries and at this hour, shops are open and traffic is already heavy. As I am taking this closer look at the front of the building, I notice that someone has approached behind me and is looking at one large flyer for an open discussion the members are organising one week hence in the central square of the area, titled '*Debt as a tool of subjugation, unemployment and modes of resistance*'. He looks like being in his thirties, not very tall, black hair, black jeans and a grey, heavy jacket; the sun is shining, but it is a winter sun so it is a bit chilly. He mustn't be a member, as the previous week I had the opportunity

---

[28] State public services implementing policies related to substance abuse, unemployment and poverty.

to meet almost all the members of the organisation. He might be just someone interested in the activities, or perhaps looking for job-skills workshops. He turns around and walks away. There isn't anything else noteworthy to catch my attention standing here, so I decide to walk inside and start with my observations. I have no interviews arranged yet, so I'm aiming to just start getting 'the feel' of the place and hopefully collect some 'raw information' on the organisation's structure and activities today.

As I walk in, I remember that even from the initial discussions with members here to gain access for the fieldwork, I was struck by how much different the space looks and feels than a business office, or a Greek public services office for that matter. The walls are brightly coloured with shades of blue, yellow, green and white which you typically find in kindergartens or elementary school classrooms. There are various posters, stickers, notes, artwork and flyers on the walls. The walls of this entry hall are actually covered under so many of them that they are practically used as a notice board. There are WWF and other posters of environmental awareness, to 'Doctors Without Borders', 'Free Gaza and Palestine', an old one about the famine in Somalia, the movement 'Occupy Wall Street', the Greek 'I Won't Pay' movement (referring to bank debts and exorbitant taxes imposed as part of the bailout agreements) and a couple protesting the EU support to neo-Nazi groups getting power in Ukraine. There are several 'Anti - Golden Dawn' and anti-fascism posters, invitations to rallies and events concerning the rights of immigrants referring to the current refugee crisis. There are also various posters promoting the interventions and activities of other TSOs, social cooperatives and informal TS groups belonging to this wave of anti-austerity collectives of the civil society which has been growing in Greece. I can also see notifications about local art events and concerts, quotes from songs or poetry such as 'Liberty needs virtue and courage' and a quote from leftist philosopher Kastoriadis 'You'll either be free, or be quiet. You can't have both'. There are also a few simple colourful children's drawings, which as I had found out earlier, were sent to the organisation after a visit to a local elementary school.

This entry hall is not austere, or 'professional', or 'business-like' at all. I can see that everything is in good working condition but not flashy, looking like it has been selected for maximum utility and cost efficiency. It also seems to me that there is a conscious effort concerning the impression created to any visitor, to feel that this is a place run by ordinary, common people whom you can find anywhere; maybe that is the goal. I make a note to ask members about that later. But, to me at least, the contrast with the interior of almost any

public services office or business I have been in Greece is tangible and too noticeable to be just a coincidence. Everything points the whole space itself is arranged in such a way that the service-user or any visitor for that matter, is made to feel as comfortable as possible. Perhaps members of vulnerable social groups coming here, will not be daunted by the prospect of facing a powerful bureaucrat of the Greek state, but on the contrary can be set at ease about meeting someone with no particular 'official authority' who just might be able to help in some manner. This way, the service-users doesn't feel as vulnerable in the power continuum between giver and beneficiary, as often happens.

Of course, this could all be just in my head. It could be that the members just fancy the place to look like that; it reflects their wishes for their 'working environment', without any specific agenda or motive. In any case, the place is cosy and has an almost lazy, family atmosphere, and it certainly devoid of any kind of elitism which might invoke feelings of inferiority by the service-user towards the members and volunteers. But, as I note all this down I can't stop thinking it could be that I'm just 'grasping on straws' here and overreaching with my interpretations. Further fieldwork is needed to jump to this kind of conclusions. Still, that's the 'vibe' that I'm getting. Entering and on the left, there is a big wooden desk of brown colour where a reception / first contact person sits at all times. That's the front desk of the organisation one might say. I greet the member sitting behind it, a young woman in her late twenties. She has dark brown hair and wears a simple purple blouse and jeans. She smiles at me asking 'still here?', to which I answer 'I just got started here!'. She laughs and tells me if I need anything, I can just 'bug' her about it. I respond that I'm just looking around taking some notes for the time being and she responds with a nod and a smile. The desk is tidy, with the usual assortment of office equipment, a telephone, a computer and a fax machine. There is no carpet on the floor. In front of the desk, are two comfortable chairs in blue colour. To the right there is a small sofa also in blue colour; in front of it, a small round table with only a vase with some flowers in the middle and two stacks of leaflets on the side. As I pick one, I see that it is from another TSO, informing people of the two places in the centre of Athens where voluntary blood giving will be taking place over the next days. The other is really just a stack of simple typed A4 pages, concerning the call for a local demonstration in three days in a nearby neighbourhood, against the cutting of some trees in a small park, in order for the pavement to be reconstructed and a private garage to be built. I comment to the girl in the front desk, that there are usually a lot more stacks of promotional leaflets here, to which she replied that 'we remove the very old ones at some point'. To the

324

right and behind the desk, is the door leading to the main lounge / living room of the organisation. I nod to her and walk towards it.

Here is the largest area of the organisation premises, which is a mix between a small kitchen and a living room. A small door on the left leads to the bathroom. There are eight chairs and three large comfy sofas, a wide table in the middle, and a smaller round one under the windows; a blue carpet, several orange and yellow fluffy sitting pillows, light blue curtains with shapes of planets on them, a small fridge with the usual assortment of funny magnets and small stickers with notes and reminders on, and a TV which is broken but for some reason (when I asked why it is not removed, I received variations of the answer: 'it doesn't bother anyone') remaining at its place. There are decks of cards, board games, newspapers, and other entertainment items which one might find in a cafeteria on the small table.

Moreover, five very long bookshelves filled with many books, pamphlets and magazines are lining the wall opposite of the stove and cupboard. I look at them and the selection is very varied. They mostly come from the members, volunteers and donations and are predominantly Greek publications. There are history books, children's stories, Greek philosophy, publications of research centres such as the National Centre for Social Research (EKKE), books on policy and international relations. Also, there are magazines and pamphlets of other TSOs, and cooperatives, others on the environment and animal life, various publications of local councils, concerning social matters and the environment, material from museums, anecdotes and funny stories, books on psychology, mental health and education, several dictionaries and the occasional leisure magazine concerning sports. Finally, there are two wardrobes here with some clothes inside them. When I asked what was the purpose of the wardrobes and the clothes, I was told that sometimes members stay until late and might need to take a quick nap here, or want to put some extra work, or that there could even be some urgent need for social action outside, and thus there were a few changes of clothes in the closets for just such occasions.

The same 'informal look' of a space 'genuinely' lived daily by people and is not there just for show and thus doesn't need to remain assiduously clean looking as it is expensive jewellery left untouched in its sparkling glass case, permeates the room. Its furniture and walls are painted in vibrant shades; it is clearly a room where the members and service-users can relax, have something to drink and chat. Looking at the walls clockwise, there is a poster with a Nazi swastika dripping blood calling the people of Europe to resist fascism, a white

poster where in red is written a passage from one of the greatest Greek poets, the communist Ioannis Ritsos called '*Ρωμιοσύνη*' (Greekness), a poster containing a fictionalized map of the world where Palestine is an independent nation with Jerusalem as its capital, Cyprus hasn't been invaded by Turkey and the USSR still exists. Furthermore, there is a yellow poster of the 'Greek Social Forum for the Integration of Immigrants', another civil society group active for some years now. There is a poster of an environmental NGO concerning the protection of the Greek mountain bear, a poster commemorating the social movements' rallies and demonstrations during the 27th G8 summit in Genoa, Italy. Additionally, there is a poster of a nonprofit association which is active in the promotion of social and agricultural tourism and the protection of the environment in the surrounding areas of Attica (Athens). Finally, there is a poster of the movement which had been created the years of the crisis in Greece similar to the one in Spain named 'I don't pay the banks', which is active in the support of people dragged into the courtrooms by banks seeking to claim their houses due to their inability to repay mortgages and loans. The poster shows a real life photograph of protesters (some of them I recognize as member of this organisation) within the movement holding large signs with various mottos against the austerity, capitalism and neoliberalism.

This room actually also acts as a small, local community centre for the surrounding neighbourhoods, where members of vulnerable social groups can come and meet others, talk about their problems, make friends, have a coffee, read the newspaper, have some time in a quiet place and also take this opportunity to get out of the house and socialise (i.e., elderly people). Furthermore, all members and volunteers at the social store and the social pharmacy just adjacent to this building, pass through here from time to time during the day to get a drink or something to eat and of course to sit and speak with the people coming here even if it is just for a couple of minutes. Two members are already here, tidying up. We exchange 'good mornings'. One is a man in his late fifties. Of medium height, he wears a white shirt, a yellow pullover and dark brown pants. The other is a young woman in her late twenties dressed in boots, jeans and a black blouse of some sort. They are talking about how they might move the furniture around as the current setup isn't so efficient. The woman asks my opinion to which I reply 'I really don't know, looks fine to me'. She says 'yes it is OK, but I think we would have more space if we moved the sofa over there'. 'Whatever you think guys', I reply.

To the back of this room (actually it is the same space) is a small kitchen. A long kitchen counter with two sinks and one small stove takes up almost the whole length of the

wall opposite from where I'm standing. Different types of equipment and things usually found in kitchens are arrayed on the counter: a boiler, a microwave oven, a place to put knives, towels, napkins, two pots and a bag that I don't know what it contains. A large fridge is on its right, covering most of the wall opposite of it. Above the sinks are three big cupboards, apparently for storing food and also the various cooking utensils, plates, cups, glasses, etc. A member is currently washing something, a glass I think. On the counter there is also a small bag of fruits; oranges which I assume she has been washing or will do so later. She has short blonde hair and is wearing jeans and a grey jacket. I say 'hello' and she responds greeting me back and asking me how I am. We chat a little bit about the cold weather today. Under the counter are three sets of medium-sized drawers serving a similar purpose. On the fridge there are five small magnets. Three are in the shapes of animals, an elephant, a dolphin and a cat, another is an anti-Nazi symbol (a swastika with a big, red X) and another depicts a traditional Greek mill which you can still find in some Aegean island. Additionally, on the fridge there are two pictures of landmarks of the city, and a picture featuring an overview of what looks like a large anti-austerity and anti-government demonstration. On the right of the fridge there is a small open space ending in the upper right corner of the room. A tall lamp sits on the corner and underneath it, are three big, orange, stuffed sitting-pillows.

To the left of this space (living room - kitchen) is a medium-sized conference room where meetings and assemblies of take place. It is the room that I have been thinking would be very suitable as a room to conduct the personal interviews. It is dominated by a large round table, several seats and three sofas in light blue colour. Far to the right of this table there is a large window covered by a curtain light green in colour; but, this not a modern conference room, with projectors, telephones or computers. No such apparel is present. Again, the room is clean and simple. It is less cluttered than the other rooms and doesn't resemble the lushly decorated and overtaken by high technology, conference rooms in for-profit businesses, or even town halls and sometimes universities; its function as a social space is quite different from these and its physical appearance and arrangement reflects that. To the back and the right of this space is a small room with five computers. I can now see that it is empty as the door is open. Turning my attention back to where I am, I notice that the walls here have seen their share of wear and tear, but are again covered in quite a few posters mostly promoting anti-austerity events. There are even colourful graffiti on the wall, opposite of the door I just entered. It depicts a clearly bruised and battered human in shades of white

327

being crashed under the weight and the enormous walls of banks, skyscrapers and governmental buildings in shades of black, dark grey and dark red, under the fading light of a setting sun.

A woman, half-long brown hair, wearing a black t-shirt that has a red 'OBA' printed on the back of her t-shirt under her neck is in the room. She walks from the bookshelves that are on the right side of the table and she sits in front of an open notebook on the table. She puts her hand in her pocket and takes a plastic bag out of it. She opens the plastic bag and takes from it a wallet, a folded paper and a pencil. She folds the plastic bag and sticks it in her pocket. She unfolds the paper and starts to write something on it. I know her, she is a volunteer (soon to become a member) here. She notices me as I enter and I ask her what is she doing here writing so early. She answers that she is a student so she is just doing some work before service-users start to be coming in, as she will have exams soon and she hasn't been studying a lot. I comment that 'she'll be fine' and smile. Just then, the member in the living room comes in and approaches the young woman asking her if she knows if ***** called the organisation yesterday. I don't know to whom they are referring to. She says she doesn't think so and he sighs saying 'what can you expect from *****?'. He then leans over her and they both look at her notebook. He says to her: 'history is great, if we learn from it, to which she laughs and agrees replying that 'you're exactly right'. The guy then stands up and starts to walk back towards the living room.

I say 'see you later' to the girl and I follow the guy back to the main room. A door to its right, leads to a room used as a workshop for therapeutic purposes and for artists to express themselves. It is empty right now. To the left and right are cases that service-users with mental health problems work on. Pencil holders, cups, plates, cooking utensils, garden pots, jewellery boxes, ashtrays, beads, vases, jars, glasses and other items all made from a combination of wood, metal and various recycled materials, are strewn around. There are two windows. They look really old and worn out. Two tables with three chairs each, identical (but smaller) to the one at the front hall are here under the windows. Many half-finished items are on top of them. The floor has no carpet and there is sawdust as well as discarded materials and simple tools here and there. It really looks like a workshop used just minutes ago. This isn't really a room that anyone goes in, except if they want to work on such things and I've been told that when there was a volunteer music teacher, guitar lessons were given here. There are considerably fewer posters on the walls, and they are of only a purely artistic nature, in contrast with the highly political ones in the other rooms. I can see to my right, a

328

painting featuring nature (a forest), a poster depicting a small sunlit bay, and another with the ruins of an old Byzantine castle in Peloponnese. To my left there is a large poster with a snowy mountain, and a smaller one with a bear and her two cubs. I make a note to ask if there is a reason why there are no posters of a sociopolitical nature like in other rooms. Of course, it could be just a coincidence.

I now walk outside to the adjacent building which is the social store; essentially a mini-market which offers a variety of goods to people who can't afford it and also has a few items on very, very low prices. It is just opening so I greet the two members that I see inside. They greet me back, commenting that I am pretty early to which I respond that since I woke up really early today, there was really no reason for me to wait a couple of hours before coming. There isn't really anything striking about this space. It is like any other small super-market. The white painting is peeling from the walls from multiple places. A counter where the people can take bags to carry what they take and several rows of shelves with various products. To the back, is a door (now locked) which opens up to a storage room. I say to the members here that I'll see them later and walk to the side of the store which to a door that opens up to a small café. The door is unlocked but the café isn't open yet. It is a light blue wooden door its style and colour very reminiscent of the traditional doors seen in Cyclades islands in the Aegean Sea. Everything seems to be placed and decorated with great care here. It reminds me of these small hostels and restaurants in Greek touristic areas which family generations. The floor is of made of simple but good wood with a cheerful light blue carpet of rectangular shape in the middle.

As I enter and on the left, I can see the recently painted wall in bright white, which features a green apple tree painted on it. A small square table with four simple chairs is situated there, of the exact same type that you can find in a traditional, old-fashioned Greek 'καφενείο' (café). A small glass vase with a few daisies is in the middle. On the right, is a tall counter with a cash machine. It is made from the same wood as almost everything else and its workmanship clearly demonstrates that it is also made to resemble the counters in the old traditional cafes in the 1950s and 60s. Behind that, is a small stove obviously for preparing the coffee and next to it is a fridge. Colourful cups and bottles with hand drawn motifs inspired by Greek nature, mostly the sea, sky and mountains covering the landscape, line three wooden shelves behind the aforementioned counter. An old style, wall clock is in the middle, also wooden of course, and a couple of kitchen ornamentations to its left and right (a yellow fish and a watermelon). 'This is really a nice little café' I think to myself and I head

back to the main premises of the organisation. There isn't really anything happening here right now to observe anyway. I decide to head over to the social pharmacy, it should be opening now.

The social pharmacy is located to the back of the living room in the main premises of the organisation. It also looks like any other pharmacy more or less. I enter and greet the member currently typing something on the computer on the counter. He is a retired pharmacist. He has grey, short hair and is of average height. He wears the white overcoat that's usually can be seen worn by doctors and in general medical staff. He asks if everything is all right with me and I answer that everything is fine. 'How are things here today?' I ask. 'Fine, he replies, same as usual'. The only distinguishing features are two posters on the left wall. One is an informational poster of a nonprofit organisation which is active in the creation of communities of socioeconomic integration for people with mental health problems outside of mental hospitals and psychiatric clinics, quite similar to what this organisation was many years back. The other is a black and white poster from an anti-drug nonprofit community '*18 and Above*' working with the state anti-drug organisation OKANA, stating with large letters '*All together we can*'. 'Not things usually seen in private pharmacies', I think to myself. It is now 9am and the members and volunteers present will soon have a meeting as they do almost every morning, so, maybe to have a cigarette break and see if I can be present at that. I step outside.

Snapshot Ends

This verbal snapshot is the result of an early observation session which took place one morning in the day centre of the UK TSO. The session lasted several hours. This is a small excerpt from the researcher's notes on that day.

It is now 8am and today, I am standing in front of the 'drop in' day centre of the UK TSO. This is the place where service-users come and it is where the bulk of the organisation's work with the service-users is done. The offices (a much smaller space basically consisting of three rooms) is where the CEO's and the secretary's offices are situated. Most of the administrative work is done there, in another building on the third floor. Both the day centre and the offices of the organisation are situated in the centre of the city, but not on one of the wide avenues which see much traffic but on a backstreet. Breakfast will be served in a few minutes, so I stand a little bit on the side and to the left of the main entrance to smoke a cigarette. Three young men and a young woman are also standing outside to the right of me. Two of them smoking and one of them is drinking from a can of beer if I'm not mistaking. The woman is playing with a dog which however I think is not hers, since the guy who is holding the leash is the guy with the beer. I do know from previous research on homeless people that dogs are quite frequently companions of -especially long-term- homeless people, but that is just an educated guess; I could be wrong. I think briefly about introducing myself and maybe trying to arrange interviews for the future but I decide not to.

They all have a very animated discussion, but it is difficult for me to follow. As well as I can write English, I still lament my sometimes apparent inability to understand what exactly is being said outside of an academic context, when people just talk 'informally' with their mates. I console myself with the notion that I have improved since I first came to the UK, but it still bothers me; that, and my accent. Anyway, we exchange a couple of looks and it is my third observation in the organisation today, so I have started to tentatively recognize 'regular service-users' and probably some of them have started to recognize me, but that is not the case. So I decide not to talk to them. I gather that they wait for breakfast and it would be silly of me to bother people whose situation forces them to be out in the streets waiting to receive breakfast from a social purpose TSO with details about my research so early in the morning. And in any case, I've already met other service-users yesterday who sounded willing to have a chat in the near future, so there is no real need for me to attempt such an

331

awkward approach. Maybe after breakfast if they hang around…so I turn my attention to the building itself.

Nothing in particular really stands out to me about this place as a first impression. As usual in the UK, the walls are clean from graffiti or posters, in contrast with Greece, where especially in the centre of cities it is rare to be able to 'see' a wall behind everything that's attached to it. But, it looks as if it is a relatively new building, so no distinctive English 'red brick walls'. The front door is actually a glass, thick double-door, which only opens electronically after a button at the front desk is pressed, for security reasons obviously. The door opens up to a wide entry hall, leading up to the front desk. A grey carpet covers the floor. To the left is a small interview room with two chairs and a window without any other decoration. The door is locked now, but I had taken a look at it the first time I came here. There are notice boards to my right. On them, are flyers promoting activities and workshops of the organisation but also of other various local TSOs. Workshops concerning healthy eating, good behaviour, hygiene, interview skills, sports activities, art classes, language classes; there is a huge number of them. To my right, is also a fire extinguisher, with a paper underneath it with instructions of use, in English of course.

From the first day I came, I was interested in the fact that the front desk is like a very small 'bunker', or a small canopy of rectangular shape. There is basically a wide 'hole' on the wall, behind of which is the desk and which is completely covered by a thick metal cowling when the day centre closes. In contrast with the Greek TSO, there is nothing especially striking about the space. The walls have a very pale, white colour, almost grey. It could may well be a university secretariat or a public service office. It is neat and austere, but simple, without anything especially welcoming or foreboding standing out. I exchange a few words with Sara (a part-time member of staff and previously a service-user) at the front desk whom I've already met, and wait for her to open another security glass door which opens only electronically, to the end and a little bit to the right of this front hall. As I walk to enter through this door, what strikes me as peculiar, is that it is awfully quiet. The carpet muffles any sound that my sport shoes would make and I get the strange feeling that I am the only one in the building. Of course, I remember that indeed there are not many people in the premises yet, since breakfast is about 20 minutes away yet.

The layout of this main, lounge / common room which I enter, consists of a medium-sized room with two red sofas and two chairs, a TV, several shelves with books and magazines and a lounge table at the centre of all that, which today is stacked with flyers

similar to the ones I mentioned earlier. Those which caught my eye, specifically refer to the sports activities offered by the organisation. Magazines and newspapers are also on this table. The furniture is common office space furniture, simple and practical. Entering the room, I can see just to my right a big poster on the wall. It just shows a very beautiful waterfall. Nothing is written on it. Immediately on the left is a small machine for hot drinks (coffee and tea) on a wooden cupboard with some shelves and drawers on it. On the shelves there are glasses, napkins, numerous tea bags, a few simple plates and a jar with what I presume is coffee. Only two people are sitting in this living room currently, talking quietly to each other, probably also waiting for breakfast. One of them, is a young, brown haired guy with a beard, dressed in a simple blue jumper and jeans. The other is also a young guy, blonde, dressed in a black and green tracksuit and white sport shoes, who seems to be also watching TV and eating some kind of dry nuts. He looks in his early twenties and is very intent on the program that he is watching, which if I'm not mistaken is the news. I've met all the staff members so they must be a service-users. Tall, blonde-haired with a kind of reddish tint, pale white skin, clean-shaven, he answers with a brief 'hello' and a nod to my 'hey, good morning', while the other guy also says 'good morning mate'. Just to my left in the corner, sits a huge pot with some kind of plant in it that I can't recognize. It doesn't look plastic, so the people here, are probably taking care of it. I notice again that the blonde guy's is still looking at me and by his look, I can say that he must feel very uncomfortable and curious about what this strange guy (whom he had never seen before) barging in the lounge at this hour just pacing around, is up to. It is a look that I've also experienced during the early days of the Greek fieldwork, and have come to expect in social research.

To the left and a bit in the back of the room (just on the left as you enter from the front hall), there is another security door that can be entered from the outside only with a personal code that each of the staff members has. It opens up to the front desk and the office where all the paper work, telephone work is done, the CCTV monitors are, and all the organisational documents together with the service-users' personal records are situated. This space is much more cluttered than the lounge. Lots of files, 'post-its', papers, etc. It has a much more 'informal feel' to it. Two notice boards occupy the right and left walls. One is quite large, the size of an old school blackboard. This is used for members of staff when they are going out of the centre, to write when they are coming back, where they will be and a contact number to reach them while they are away. If they are going out with a service-user, the name of that person is written too. The other one, is smaller. Jokes are written on it (i.e.,

an admonishment for a certain staff member who apparently keeps losing his and everybody else's pens), reminders for internal meetings, tasks which have to be completed by various staff members, as well as a large poster which articulates the kind of behaviour and attitude expected by everyone in the organisation. Things like *'being respectful'* *'being positive'*, *'don't bring or consume alcohol within the premises'*, *'don't smoke in the premises'*, *'don't raise your voice'*, *'don't loiter outside the premises'* *'smile'*, *'think before you act'*, the importance of team work and good communication, etc. are written. In general, not much else can be said about this office, other than it is a very busy place. Staff members have a much more relaxed attitude, than the employees in a bank for example. They are all very casually dressed, constantly talking to each other, alternating between tasks, teasing each other, etc.

Going back to the lounge, to the front and the right of it, is a small room (without a door) with four computers for the service-users to use, currently unoccupied, as it is rather early in the day. To the left of the lounge, is a door which leads to the washing machine rooms and shower rooms of the organisation. At the back of the lounge, behind and a little to the left of the computer room, is a large double door (not electronically locked) leading to the restaurant and further back, the kitchen of the organisation. Double doors form the entrance to the kitchen and a big sign posted on their right informs me that only people who work in the kitchen are allowed access. I slowly look back at the restaurant. This is a large space with big tables, very clean, with white walls and colourful yellow chairs around the tables. It is no different from any other business, university cafeteria or restaurant I've ever seen. There is a conversation taking place between two girls who are at my left but I can't quite catch what they are saying. They stop and look at me. I say 'hello' and they say 'hi'. One is a volunteer (ex-service-user), I had met her, the other must be a service-user.

Not wanting to sit in the restaurant as people would be coming soon to get their breakfast meals, I go back to the lounge. I call it a lounge but it could easily be better described as a living / sitting room, as here is where service-users just sit and relax, talk, have a hot drink, wait between workshops or consultations with staff members, etc. As I just lean on the wall looking around, I notice for the first time that the entire floor is covered by a dark blue carpet. Despite the cloudy weather, there is a good amount of light due to the large windows, which remind me of the big windows in classrooms, such as in universities. These are actually also doors which open up to a small closed-off (to the street) garden with two large benches. This the place where usually service-users who are smokers go out to smoke. I can understand that, as it is a relatively quiet space and there isn't all this hassle that would be

334

needed to go through all these security doors on the way out and then on the way back in. I go through the door leading to the washing rooms and showers. To the left of a short corridor is a conference room. I enter it. Inside, there is a large, round wooden table with light brown colour and eight light brown chairs are arrayed around it. Several coloured flyers mostly informing and inviting people to the workshops and activities of other TSOs cover the walls. A laptop is on top of the table, currently switched off but with its charger connected to a socket on the right wall. There is no indication as to who is its owner. Near this large table, is a smaller wooden table in a common rectangular shape, which occupies a small space in the right hand side and the back of the room. It has the normal brown colour of wood.

A blonde-haired girl also in her early thirties, dressed in a black sweater, black mini-skirt and grey boots is sitting on this table eating. I know who she is, I had met her the previous day. She is a staff member and greeted me with a 'hi are you all right?' as I entered. I've always found this all too common British expression so peculiar. While here is used as a greeting, in Greece it is used either as a direct question for someone's health (if for example they are visibly distraught or injured), or as an euphemism for asking someone if they are serious (something like 'are you crazy?'). Anyway, from what I can see, she has prepared a sandwich with black wheat bread, tomato, leek, some kind of ham, some other type of green salad, and yellow cheese. She also has a red apple next to her plate. I ask her why she is eating here alone and she tells me that she just wanted a bit of quiet to have something to eat, as she has a slight headache this morning. I comment that I always have a headache in the mornings with this British weather. She laughs, commenting on the fact that she also hates the weather in this country, but also that what annoys her, is that it gets too boring with all this grey. I respond by agreeing saying that in a sense it also gets boring in Greece when the only question is just how hot it will be today, sometimes even in winter. She nods and we seem to be totally in agreement in our assessments. I say that I'll see her later and I should let her eat, she says 'OK, catch you later' and I exit the room.

It is now 8.30am and breakfast has started to be served as I hear and see several people coming through the lounge and going straight for the restaurant. I notice that another guy is sitting on one of the sofas where the other two were sitting and that the TV is now closed. I can't rightly understand how tall he is because he is sitting but he definitely doesn't look British. He has black short hair, a few days of beard, dressed in a brown sweater, black jeans and brown shoes. He looks to be in his thirties but I can't be completely sure about that. He seems to be reading a book. Actually half-reading it, because in his one hand he is holding

his cellphone and he also regularly looks up. I notice that the book is actually about the English language. It is quite big and the title legible from where I sit. The title reads: '*Grammar and Syntax of the English Language*'. I say 'hello' and ask if he is learning English. He looks up and confirms that he is. His accent tells me that probably my initial assessment is correct and he is from the Middle East most likely. He asks me if I work here and I answer no, explaining briefly that I'm doing some research for my PhD. I ask him if he is a service-user and he says that he is. He is a refugee from Afghanistan and he has applied for political asylum here in the UK. But he is unemployed and he didn't know English when he came. The language workshops here have helped him a lot. He is trying to improve his language skills, which while he talks, I think to myself that they are very good. It is time for me to have another cigarette. 'Damned habit' I think to myself. I wave goodbye to the guy I was talking too, he waves back, and I walk towards the exit doors. Soon, people will be finishing their breakfasts and at least some of those, might head on to the lounge. Also more service-users will start to be coming in for their various needs as the morning progresses. Soon, it will be a good time to attempt striking a few conversations and observe the staff members and volunteers in their work and interactions. So I think that it would be better to do my smoking now, so not having to interrupt my observations later. I step out of the building and start thinking of my interview topic guides and maybe a couple of 'ice-breakers' or two for striking up conversations...

Snapshot Ends