Citizenship and the Production of Public Recreation: Is there an Empirical Relationship?

Troy D. Glover, Ph.D.
Department of Leisure Studies, University of Illinois

The purpose of the study was to test whether relationships exist between citizenship orientations and service production. The study incorporated existing conceptual and theoretical literature into an informed empirical analysis to inform subsequent conceptual and theoretical work. In a comparison of respondents at three community centers, each tied to a distinct model of service production, the findings suggest that co-production was associated more strongly with political and social citizenship than were contract and direct provision models. Civil citizenship orientations, however, were not associated with a particular model. The results imply that relationships exist between how people think of themselves as participants in their communities (citizenship orientations) and the nature of public services (production models).

KEYWORDS: *Citizenship, public leisure services, service production*

In the leisure literature, fostering citizenship is often cited as a traditional rationale for the delivery of public recreation services (Coalter, 1998; Ravenscroft, 1993; Reid, 1995; Stormann, 2000). Johnson and McLean (1994), for instance, noted that the public provision of leisure in North America was intended historically to "inculcate desirable character traits in both the individual and in the society" (p.120). Leisure was, and continues to be, a means through which the state can mold individuals into the ideal citizen. Indeed, to this day, public recreation agencies continue to combine the pleasure of participation in leisure activities with enduring social values, such as reciprocity, social trust, and civility, to potentially enrich individuals, groups, and communities. In so doing, government has assumed a direct role in the delivery of leisure services.

By acting on behalf of its citizens to address their social (leisure) needs, however, government distrusts individuals to judge for themselves what is in their own interests or in the interests of the public good. Coalter (1998) contended that the history of public recreation provision has rested upon this very notion. "Individual choices," he explained, "are regarded as distorted and the general societal, as well as personal, welfare is maximized by

changing people's behavior by overriding their ignorance, or negative view, of particular goods, services or activities" (p. 25). Similarly, Whittington (1998) argued that government intervenes directly "into the development of individual character to instill citizens with a proper sense of social purpose and to serve as a corrective to defects in democratic society" (p. 28). In short, the state serves, not simply as a mechanism for the production of services, but more importantly, as having its own purposes in expressing and affecting the public good (Walsh, 1995).

Based on these observations, critics of government, underpinned by a variety of political ideologies, have contested whether the state ought to force its own values upon its citizens. "Social cohesion," Saunders (1993) wrote, "is best fostered by leaving individuals and the groups they form to get on with their own lives" (p. 79). Saunders, a classical liberal, insisted that social compassion is something that cannot be demanded or granted by government. Instead, he believed compassion arises out of the experience of exercising autonomy in one's personal life. Similarly, Ignatieff (1989), a socially moderate liberal, argued articulately that active citizenship and a moral social order cannot be enforced; rather, government can ensure only that the appropriate conditions are present through which such things can develop. Similar sentiments have been expressed in the leisure literature. Hemingway (1999), Pedlar (1996), and Stormann (1996) are among a litany of scholars who have questioned whether recreation practitioners are capable of truly determining what is in the best interests of society. When an administrative or professional hierarchy dispenses benefits and entitlements, Hemingway (1999) reasoned "it is too easy to allow claims of expertise to degenerate into claims of authority" (p. 162). Considerable skepticism exists, consequently, about the state's ability to achieve outcomes in accordance with the public good.

Still, many see a salient role for the public sector as an enabler of recreation services (Arai, 1996; Murphy, 1989; Pedlar, 1996; Whitson, 1986). Classical liberals, libertarians, and market liberals on the right argue that community emerges when people are left to themselves to deal with community issues (Saunders, 1993; Self, 1993), whereas welfare liberals on the left argue for greater state intervention to enable citizen action and rectify past injustices (Oldfield, 1990; Pierson, 1991). Irrespective of their differing political ideologies, proponents of facilitation advocate a reduced role for government. In this regard, the state is encouraged to support civil society— the mediating third domain between government and the market (Barber, 1999) that deals with associational life (Foley & Edwards, 1996)—in its attempt to realize public ends autonomous from state power and direction. By doing so, government can help to affirm political citizenship and give its citizens an outlet to express their civic membership in a political community. Whether the emphasis is on "the volunteer spirit" or "social autonomy," facilitation presumes that citizen initiative and organization enjoy certain advantages over state action and prevent the abuses and failures of state

power (Foley & Edwards, 1997). Advocates of reduced government, therefore, envision greater citizen autonomy as the ideal model for service delivery.

Although the traditional boundaries that have distinguished public, not-for-profit, and commercial sector agencies have become increasingly blurred over the last decade or so (Slack, 1999), more often than not it has meant that public and not-for-profit agencies have come to resemble for-profit businesses (Arai, 1999; Glover, 1998). With the emergence of alternative producers in the public service delivery process (Burton & Glover, 1999), notably commercial contractors, public recreation agencies have been criticized for straying from their traditional mandate of fostering citizenship (Stormann, 1993, 1996, 2000). In response to the increasingly mixed economy of leisure, many scholarly critics have adopted what Coalter (1998, 2000) labeled a normative citizenship paradigm. They have voiced concern about the increased commodification of leisure and criticized the merits of commercial producers by drawing a distinction between "active citizenship," as promoted by the public or not-for-profit sectors, and "passive consumption," as encouraged by the commercial sector. All told, that which underpins the normative citizenship paradigm is the belief that public provision plays a central role in securing citizenship.

Though proponents of privatization are present in the recreation field (Crompton, 1999; Curtis, 1990; Lane, 1997), few have discussed critically the implications of commercial sector involvement in the provision of recreation as regards citizenship. Perhaps the sole exception has been Coalter (1990, 1998, 2000). With respect to the construction of citizenship, Coalter argued that the salience of the state's role as a direct provider may be more symbolic than real. The services provided by government, he pointed out, constitute an increasingly small component of leisure opportunities. Moreover, he contended that simply because public funds are used to provide recreation services does not necessarily imply that all sections of the community will want them. By contrast, "the profit-oriented and supposedly exploitive nature of commercial leisure provision does not automatically mean that it does not provide satisfying forms of social membership and identity" (1998, p. 24). Consequently, Coalter lamented the lack of research on the nature, role, and significance of the commercial sector in the provision of leisure and citizenship opportunities, and subsequently, encouraged leisure researchers to examine commercial service providers in relation to the construction of citizenship.

Intended more specifically for research on commercial recreation services, Coalter's (1998) questions regarding the commercial sector's role in the construction of citizenship can be applied to its role as a producer of *public* recreation services, too. Is there a relationship between the producer of public services and citizenship? Although Coalter (2000) suggested there has been too much emphasis on production in relation to citizenship, Hemingway (1999) has encouraged leisure researchers to consider the effects of the model (or mode, as he put it) of service production on the development

of "strong" citizenship, given that production and consumption occur simultaneously. In theory, at least, there appears to be some association. But this proposition remains largely theory based, as there is a decided absence of any empirical research to confirm such a relationship. In fact, most of the literature on citizenship has been conceptual, rather than empirical. The purpose of this study, therefore, was to examine empirically the citizenship orientations of individuals at three community centers with different service production arrangements in order to determine whether the model of service production was related to the citizenship orientations held by respondents from each community center.

Theoretical Framework

This study was conducted under the assumption that citizenship serves, either implicitly or explicitly, as a value structure with which individuals regard the decisions and policies of government. In this sense, citizenship, as a state of mind, underpins individual beliefs about the obligations of the state. In the context of leisure studies, it is not unreasonable to apply questions pertaining to the duties of government to the provision of public recreation, given the variety of ways that services are produced. Thus, it is the intention here to test the relationships between citizenship and service delivery. Before doing so, however, it is necessary to construct for the reader the theoretical foundation upon which citizenship is built and describe its relationship, in theory, to the different types of production models used in the public sector to deliver leisure.

T. H. Marshall and Citizenship Theory

Beyond the formal definition of citizenship—that is, membership in a nation-state (Bottomore, 1992)—modern theories of citizenship have drawn their inspiration from T. H. Marshall (1950, reprinted in 1992), a sociologist who attempted to reconcile the formal framework of democracy with the social consequences of a capitalistic economic system. Marshall argued that social policies and reforms, through the creation of a comprehensive welfare state, would limit the negative implications of class differences on individual life chances and subsequently enhance individuals' commitment to capitalism. Upon proposing his theory, Marshall outlined the historical development of citizenship in Britain, which provided the setting for his analysis of the problems associated with social policy in modern society. More importantly, though, he theorized that citizenship was composed of three dimensions of rights that exist in relation to the state.

The first dimension in Marshall's theory, *civil citizenship*, refers to the rights necessary for individual liberty. According to Marshall, civil or legal rights were developed in the seventeenth century in response to absolutism and institutionalized in the growth of law courts, habeas corpus, and individual legal rights to a fair trial. In addition to including the rights to per-

sonal liberty, freedom of speech, and justice, civil citizenship is associated with property ownership and the freedom to conclude valid contracts. With respect to the latter two, civil citizenship is necessary within a capitalistic system because it gives citizens, as part of their status, the capacity (or right) to engage independently in the market economy. It also obliges government to refrain from interfering with the personal choices of individuals by leaving them to look after their own needs. The civil dimension of citizenship and the rights associated with it can, therefore, be understood as individual freedom from government intervention.

The second dimension in Marshall's theory, *political citizenship*, refers to participation in the democratic exercise of political power, either as a member of a political community (e.g., a voter) or as an individual elected by the members of such a community (e.g., a politician). Political citizenship developed in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries with the evolution of the modern parliamentary democracy and institutionalized in the political system of competing parties. Apart from the formal democratic process, political rights also include civic participation in the development of local public policy and rights to association. The political dimension of citizenship and the rights associated with it can, therefore, be understood as a fundamental right to engage in the democratic process.

The third dimension of Marshall's theory, *social citizenship*, embodies the claim that citizens ought to have access to those resources that allow them to live a civilized existence in accordance with the standards prevailing in society. Accordingly, Marshall saw the state, not merely as the guarantor of social rights, but as the focal point of an inclusive, paternalistic social order. With the growth and institutionalization of the welfare state, social rights were expanded during the twentieth century to include social entitlements such as unemployment benefits and the provision of education. In practice, the delivery of social welfare requires the state to tax citizens in order to finance services sufficiently, thereby obligating individual citizens to contribute toward the collective interests of society. Such measures are justified on the basis that publicly funded services are necessarily in the interest of the public good, and thus, require the (financial) support of the citizenry. The social dimension of citizenship and the rights associated with it can, therefore, be understood as rights to social interdependence within a community of citizens.

While Marshall discussed the historical heritages of each dimension in his seminal piece, he saw civil, political, and social rights as merging into modern conceptions of citizenship. Bulmer and Rees (1996) noted, however, that each dimension is often treated as an ideal type employed to understand, at an abstract level, the social processes of citizen action. Perhaps the most important feature of Marshall's theory, then, is the dynamic interplay among the three dimensions of rights. Ideological tensions exist between civil and social rights, both of which constrain government, albeit in different and often conflicting ways. Civil rights are rights *against* the state whereas social rights are claims for the benefits guaranteed *by* the state (Macpherson

1985). This distinction reveals the difference between civil and social rights in terms of the state's obligations to its citizens. As Barbalet (1988) observed, "for people to act as citizens, the state must grant freedoms the state cannot invade and therefore actions which the state cannot perform; for persons to consume as citizens the state must provide, and is therefore obliged to perform specific actions" (p. 20). Consequently, civil and social rights differ in terms of the expectations they place on government. In the classical liberal tradition, civil citizenship restricts the role of the state to that of a referee of economic activity that regulates competition and ensures that each citizen respects each other's rights. Civil rights, in this fashion, support self-interested individualism by encouraging citizens to make self-serving decisions that can be destructive or insensitive to the greater public good. They are underpinned by the notion that individuals should not be reduced to satisfying the social needs of others, given that individuals have the means to look after their own interests.

In comparison, proponents of a comprehensive welfare state recognize the social injustices the market can cause. In response, they advocate the direct delivery of certain public services to mitigate inequalities. To justify such an endeavor, a distinction is made between opportunity and condition. While an individual is granted similar *opportunities* to his or her fellow citizens via civil rights, he or she does not necessarily achieve the same social *conditions* or outcomes without state intervention. Such inequalities of conditions arise because opportunities are distributed unevenly (Barbalet 1988; Laxer 1999). Hence, the essence of social citizenship is the right to welfare, which has led to the creation of a variety of public institutions to deliver social goods, including leisure, on an egalitarian basis, and a taxation system from which the state can acquire the financial means to deliver social welfare (Turner 1986).

The conflict between the tendency of capitalism to produce greater inequality in society, as encouraged by civil citizenship, and the tendency and intent of the welfare state to create greater equality, as encouraged by social citizenship, makes political citizenship a particularly relevant dimension of citizenship. Political citizenship comes into play when some means of managing the tension between civil and social rights becomes necessary. For this reason, effective political citizenship ought to be rooted in civility. That is:

> in conversation with our fellow citizens, we must be willing both to listen and to respond. Together, in general conversation governed by civility and restraint, we make and hear the claims of which society is composed. Together, then, listening and responding, we forge a fragile social identity. We come to reflect one another as part of the general interpretive project we call social life, and in doing so attempt to create the political order that will serve to hear and answer the various claims we all wish to put in play. (Kingwell, 2000, p. 116)

Under this civic republican conception of citizenship, a politics of discourse must allow for the expression of differing political views such that debates take place in a context of toleration (Miller, 1989). Given the dynamics of

the interaction described, *how* the dimensions of citizenship intermingle under various conditions or circumstances emerged as a question for this study.

Weaknesses with Marshall's Theory

Irrespective of its contribution as the foundation for citizenship study, weaknesses with Marshall's theory have been identified. Most relevant to the present discussion is the observation that it fails to address cultural (Kalberg, 1993; Turner, 1990) and gender (Assiter, 1999; Kerber, 1999; Walby, 1994; Werbner, 1999) differences in the experience of citizenship. These criticisms have emerged alongside contemporary understandings of the nature and meaning of citizenship that have emerged in the literature (Ellison, 1997). State-centered conceptions of citizenship have expanded beyond Marshall's framework to recognize diversity and the legitimacy of interest group claims, thereby giving rise to *pluralist* citizenship theory. Founded in feminist thinking, pluralist citizenship theory incorporates difference as part of a recast understanding of social inclusion. It is critical of universal discourses and explores the mechanisms that exclude the demands of marginalized groups. Central to its message is the notion that power relations affect the likelihood that citizenship rights can be held universally. Marshall's theory was formulated in terms of rights, which pluralist citizenship theory suggests remain empty unless the individual has the power to exercise them. In addition to pluralist citizenship theory, Ellison noted the emergence of *poststructuralist* citizenship theory, which decenters the notion of an individual, self-aware condition of being a citizen. It argues that citizenship is not immediately available to the individual because it derives its identity only from an individual's involvement in indeterminate subject positions. To sum up, poststructuralism challenges notions of collective identities such as citizenship, suggesting the there are too many roles in one's life to assume that there exists a universal condition associated with a particular group of persons. Individuals perhaps perceive citizenship differently.

Retaining the essence of these theories, Ellison argued that citizenship must be understood as a reflexive process. By reflexivity, Ellison meant:

> the general process, driven by social, political and economic change, by which actors, confronted with the erosion, or transformation, of established patterns of belonging, readjust existing notions of rights and membership to new conceptions of identity, solidarity and the institutional foci of redress. (p. 711)

In other words, meaning resides in the minds of individuals so that citizenship becomes an identity that is socially constructed, often defensively in response to one's social, political, and economic environment. Ellison's notion of reflexive citizenship introduces the notion that civil, political, and social citizenship are each entrenched in subjective values and beliefs that serve to inform individuals' expectations of the state and of themselves as members of the state. Though Marshall did not intend his framework to be interpreted specifically in this manner, maintaining his original dimensions

serve as an accepted point of departure for the operationalization of citizenship (Bulmer & Rees, 1996; Ellison, 1997; Turner, 1993). In, Bulmer and Rees' (1996) words:

> for all their imperfections, [Marshall's distinctions] still have a robust usefulness. Their deployment, moreover, throws into stark relief, just as it did in Marshall's day, the contrast between inequalities of class, income, race, and gender, and the egalitarian aspirations—however they may be constructed—embedded in the concept of citizenship. This tension between the reality of equality and the ideal of equality is a timeless one that gives the topic its continuing appeal and its contemporary relevance. (p. 283)

In brief, any attempt to operationalize citizenship as a construct must begin with Marhsall's theory.

Citizenship Orientations: Marshall Modified

With respect to the extent to which government ought to intervene in citizens' lives (civil citizenship), permit citizen participation in the development of policy alternatives (political citizenship), and provide social services (social citizenship), individuals hold a variety of attitudes or beliefs that span the ideological spectrum. These "citizen orientations" are not themselves dichotomous, but instead represent degrees of support for the ideas that underpin each dimension of citizenship.

Under this premise, civil citizenship orientations reflect the degree to which individuals oppose government intervention, as expressed on a continuum from strong opposition to strong support. The continuum serves as a measure of what Berlin (1969) termed *negative liberty*, which describes the total absence of external constraints imposed by others. Within the context of government, negative liberty denotes the absence of government intervention wherein citizens are free to do as they wish. From this perspective, individuals are left completely to themselves to enforce their own morality and conduct, without the threat of government interference. With respect to civil citizenship orientations, then, attitudes in favor of negative liberty, which are rooted in libertarian doctrine, egoism, and self-interest, sit at one end of the continuum, while attitudes opposed to such a system, which are rooted in government paternalism, are found at the other.

Political citizenship orientations display the degree to which individuals see themselves as having an active role in the affairs of their communities. While there exists several models of democracy, including classical Athenian, republicanism, liberal, direct, and participatory (Held, 1996), it is perhaps sufficient to plot political citizenship orientations along a continuum that spans from purely representative, which entails only token citizen participation, to participatory processes, which function to sustain citizen power (Arnstien, 1969; Hemingway, 1999). For those forms of participation that align themselves on the continuum closer to the former, political involvement is restricted to the selection of a legislative body charged with the responsibility

of looking after public interests. Alternatively, for those that align themselves closer to the latter, citizens are involved directly in, and may in fact control, the discussion, selection, and implementation of policy alternatives.

Social citizenship orientations indicate the degree to which individuals support the government's role in the provision of social welfare. The continuum serves as a measure of positive rights claims—claims to sufficient goods and services, which make at least a minimally decent human existence possible (Bowie & Simon, 1998). Positive rights imply the need for state action and an obligation for citizens to contribute toward efforts designed to satisfy the social needs of others. In particular, individuals must aid their fellow citizens by funding indirectly the sort of institutions that produce the services presumed necessary to secure social entitlements. With respect to social citizenship orientations, then, attitudes in favor of positive rights (rooted in welfare liberalism) sit at one end of the continuum, while attitudes opposed to any such role for the state (rooted in classical liberalism) are found at the other.

The orientations described reflect the assumption that citizenship serves, either implicitly or explicitly, as a value structure with which individuals regard the decisions and policies of government. Presumably, these orientations can be shaped through citizens' interaction with government institutions, such as public community centers, just as government had intended originally. With the emergence of alternative models of public service delivery, however, there is some question as to what sorts of citizenship orientations are associated with each model. This question succinctly describes the intent of the study. Before describing the methods of the study, though, it is necessary to briefly explain the ideal types that exist in practice.

Production Models

In the context of leisure services, models of public service production usually take one of three ideal forms. Under the first model, *direct provision,* services are produced exclusively by a public agency with the assumption that the state plays a vital role in dispensing social entitlements to the general public. It has been, and continues to be, the most common model of public service production with respect to leisure services (Crompton, 1999; Burton & Glover, 1999). Service production entails collaborative efforts between the political (e.g., elected officials) and administrative (e.g., public administrators) wings of government to set public policy. Though mechanisms are put in place to permit citizens to provide input, participation among citizens is often more token than it is real. Resembling what Mintzberg (1996) described as *government-as-machine,* the structure of the model is bureaucratic and dominated by rules, regulations, and standards. Though it offers consistent policies and deliberate execution, its structure lacks flexibility and responsiveness to individual initiative (Mintzberg, 1996). The services it produces are regarded as *merit goods,* or goods that benefit all of society, but which citizens are likely to under-use, if left to themselves to consume (Coalter, 1998). They are distributed equally to all citizens irrespective of need or

the amount of taxes paid, and such decisions are justified on the basis that everyone should be treated the same.

Under the second model, *contract*, a private, usually commercial, contractor produces services on behalf of a public agency and its constituents. The rationale for this privatization strategy is to deliver services more efficiently (Glover, 1999). In essence, the contractor applies business-like principles to the management of government. Accordingly, its organizational structure takes the form of one of three distinct types depicted by Mintzberg (1996): *performance-control*, which results in the decentralization of government into distinct "businesses" guided by performance targets and accountability standards; *government-as-network*, which fashions government into an intertwined network of temporary relationships to work out problems as they arise; or *virtual government*, which produces all public services by nongovernmental agencies. Each structure discourages democratic participation, which is viewed as inefficient, relying instead on consumer demand to determine if services are profitable enough to warrant further delivery. The services it produces are, for all intents and purposes, *private goods* because they target those who can afford and choose to pay for them. The contractor creates an arm's length relationship between itself and the users of services, and it encourages citizens to consume. The service does remain a type of public good, though, albeit an impure one, because even under the contract model, state subsidies are often available to those who wish to access services, but financially are unable to pay for them.

Under the third model, *co-production*, civic-minded individuals or community groups participate jointly with a public agency to produce public recreation services. As co-producers, the public agency facilitates production by serving as an enabling agent that takes on the task of co-ordination, referral, and technical assistance. Further, the public agency attempts to empower citizens by giving them the necessary authority to determine the course of actions for their particular communities. Co-production, in this way, resembles an approach to community intervention that Rothman (1995) labeled *locality development* wherein individuals from a common geographical area are brought together to address collective interests or reconcile differences with the intent to better their community. The leisure services they produce are *local public goods*, or goods that benefit only the members of a particular community (Rosen, Boothe, Dahlby, & Smith, 1999). Leisure, in this context, provides a forum that encourages citizens to redefine themselves and their community through the creation of activities that focus upon self-development or community betterment (Smale & Reid, 2001). The co-production model, therefore, supports civic engagement and the development of community associations. Services are distributed by using a compensatory equity approach to address disparity amongst community groups by allocating services "so that disadvantaged groups, individuals, or areas receive extra increments of resources" (Crompton & Lamb, 1986, p. 157).

In sum, each model reflects the relationship between producer and citizen. In the context of the production of public services, the state plays a crucial role in cultivating civil, social, and political citizenship. By selecting

a particular model to deliver public services, public policy decisions have profound implications for the extent to which the dimensions of citizenship are fostered or repressed. In relative terms, civil citizenship orientations are likely to be associated more strongly with co-production and contract than with direct provision because co-production and contract emphasize private initiative over a direct role for government; social citizenship orientations are more likely to be associated more strongly with co-production and direct provision than with contract given the importance that co-production and direct provision place on addressing social equality in their communities; and political citizenship orientations are more likely to have a stronger association with co-production than with contract or direct provision because co-production is intended to provide an outlet for civic engagement. The aim of this exploratory study was to determine whether these hypotheses were correct.

Method

Research Sites and Subject Selection

Given the intent to test the relationship between citizenship orientations and "ideal" models of service production, real-life examples of community centers that shared characteristics with and resembled closely the three production models described above were sought as research sites. The resulting site selections were located in Southwestern Ontario, Canada. Services at the first community center, DP-CC, were produced using a direct provision model of service production. That is, a municipal recreation department arranged *and* produced services exclusively, namely swimming, skating, and running/walking. By and large, the needs of the users and how they were met were determined in accordance with the professional judgement of the public employees who staffed the center.

Services at the second community center, CM-CC, were produced using a contract model of service production. The municipality in which the center was located hired a private contractor (a local resident) to operate the facility, which consisted primarily of an indoor ice rink, in addition to a shuffleboard surface, curling rink, and meeting rooms. The municipality maintained its ownership of the facility. Although a citizen board was established to oversee the conduct of the contractor (each member of the board was appointed by the Town Council), the contractor made day-to-day decisions about the facility. Moreover, he received pecuniary incentives for keeping the arena schedule booked solidly throughout the year.

Services at the third community center, CP-CC, were produced using a co-production model of service production. Funding for service provision was received, in large part, from provincial and municipal granting agencies, but residents in the immediate neighborhood produced the services themselves. Outreach programs and voluntary committees were organized to facilitate active community involvement in the delivery of recreation-related services. The activities delivered at the CP-CC were different than those at

the DP-CC and CM-CC in the sense that sport, though present, was not a major focus at the center. More commonly, a voluntary association provided drop-in programs such as "Take a Break," a two-hour program available to community members who wished to drop off their children and chat with other community members over a cup of coffee. This program, among others, reflected a willingness to provide services that resonated with community members' needs and requests. The delivery of unconventional recreation services—that is, unconventional in comparison to the services delivered at other two community centers—was expected given the tenets of co-production.

Although the three facilities were selected deliberately because of the models they represented, it should be noted that none embodied a "pure" example, a fact that Hemingway (1999) expected is more common than not. In certain instances, each displayed attributes that were characteristic of another model. For instance, at each community center, user fees were charged (not just at the CM-CC, as might be expected in theory) and volunteerism was encouraged (it was not exclusive to the CP-CC). Moreover, the CM-CC, like the CP-CC, had a citizen board that overlooked the operation of its facility. A citizen board is not a typical feature of a contract arrangement, in theory. Given the impurity of the cases in the study, some respondents may have found it challenging to distinguish among models of service production. Nevertheless, the selection of the sites was deemed sufficient for the purposes of this study given that the present models were reasonably distinct and it was unlikely that pure models existed in practice.

Each community center had at least a five-year history of supporting its particular production model. This criterion was desirable in order to improve the possibility that respondents were familiar with the production model at the community center at which their surveys were collected. The possibility remained, despite this criterion, that some respondents were still unaware of the actual model used to produce services at their community center, but presumably it enhanced the possibility of familiarity in respondents.

In addition to providing recreation services that were produced with a particular model of service production, the communities in which the facilities were located provided distinct contextual backdrops for respondents. Clearly, the production models were unlikely to be distributed randomly in any locality or province, but instead reflected reigning political and social ideologies. DP-CC was located within an urban center with a population of approximately 80,000 residents. Technology was the region's leading industry, which characterized the area as a community of white-collar workers. In general, residents were largely middle-class and socially moderate. DP-CC was one recreation center, albeit the largest, among many (including not-for-profit and commercial competitors) from which residents could choose.

The town in which CM-CC was located was a rural community with a relatively small population spread across a large geographical area. Most of its residents were employed in the agricultural and farming industry. In gen-

eral, the population was relatively socially conservative, and included few visible minorities. The CM-CC was a common meeting place for residents to gather (e.g., to watch a minor hockey game), and was the *only* arena of its kind within close proximity to the downtown area.

The area in which the CP-CC was located was an "at-risk" community within an urban center with a population of approximately 100,000. The population the community center served was spread out among six or seven neighborhoods in a well-defined catchment area. The area was characterized by a higher than average unemployment rate, single parent households, and minority groups. In general, many residents were financially dependent upon government assistance. Consequently, the CP-CC was an important resource from which residents received social support.

In sum, the focus here was on the production model, rather than the subjects—that is, on structure rather than individual behavior. In this regard, the approach used was consistent with one of the principal methodological approaches to have emerged in the recent comparative social science literature, the "new institutionalism." It argues that a full understanding of social, political, and economic life depends on blending new lines of research on institutions with traditional disciplinary insights into the social structures that lie at their core (Brinton & Nee, 1998; Knight, 1992; March & Olson, 1989). Under such an approach, understanding the foundation of social norms, networks, and beliefs within institutions is crucial to explaining much of what occurs in society. The new institutionalism fails to accept that behavior is a sufficient basis for explaining all social phenomena, for behavior occurs in the context of institutions, and can only be understood in this way. Institutions are important because their machinery is steeped in norms and codes of conduct that have implications for social behavior. Given the intent to study the effects of different production models on service users, whether the study population was representative of the three communities as wholes was not at issue. The procedures that were followed were expected only to capture various insights into the citizenship orientations of diverse groups of people. The results serve as a point of departure from which future research might be conducted.

Procedures

A contact from each community center was shown the instrument before data collection began. All three were receptive to the study, and appeared pleased to gain information about the users of their facilities. They were selected based on their positions as the managing directors of the facilities selected for the study. Each provided feedback on the questionnaire and agreed mutually upon the inclusion of items. Only the executive director at the CP-CC appeared to understand the citizenship aspect of the study; the other two seemingly dismissed it as "ivory tower" type questions. Nonetheless, there were no issues about the inclusion of the citizenship items. The final

draft was pilot tested with eight college students. Minor changes, related mostly to the wording of items, were made to the survey instrument based upon their feedback.

Strategies for data collection were devised to reflect various degrees of familiarity with the production models. To gather responses from a wide array of people who represented broadly participants at each community center, the contacts from each community center were asked to provide a comprehensive list of appropriate times and places that certain individuals and groups could be reached. The community centers were visited at the recommended times and places, and questionnaires were distributed to groups scheduled to meet at those times. Groups were selected based upon the recommendation of each contact, who indicated that they were frequent users of the facility and contributed to its overall character. During group meetings, the nature of the study was described and the group members were encouraged to complete a questionnaire. The number of questionnaires distributed was equal to the number of people present at the meetings.

For those individuals who visited the centers on their own (e.g., not part of a scheduled group meeting), an attempt was made to introduce a degree of randomness to the selection process. Relatively small groups of individuals typically could be found at CP-CC and CM-CC at any one time, so it was possible to approach and ask all individuals to complete a questionnaire. At DP-CC, which was a much larger facility with several possible access points, the researcher rotated from the front entrance, to the entrance to the ice rink, to the concession stand, and to the swimming gallery, spending approximately 20 minutes at each spot. At each location, all passersby were approached and asked to complete a questionnaire.

Variables in the Study

The dependent variable in the study, citizenship orientations, was derived from an 18-item version of the Citizen Profile (CP) scale developed by Glover (2000), which was based on Marshall's (1992) conceptualization of citizenship. The CP was divided into three sub-scales, each with 6-items, representing the civil, social, and political dimensions of citizenship. The subscales combined to create a citizenship profile of respondents. Items in the scale were accompanied by a 7-point Likert-type scale that ranged from "very strongly agree" (7) to "very strongly disagree" (1). Higher agreement was indicative of a stronger orientation.

The independent variable, exposure to models of service production, was a nominal measurement defined by three groups of respondents: those exposed to co-production at the CP-CC, those exposed to contract at the CM-CC, and those exposed to direct provision at the DP-CC. Survey instruments were coded differently so as to identify from which community center they were collected.

TABLE 1
Factor Structure of the Citizenship Profile Scale

Item	Mean	Factor 1 (PD)	Factor 2 (CD)	Factor 3 (SD)	Communality
I should have a say in the local government services that are provided in my community	5.98	**.829**	.008	.125	.709
I have a right to participate in my community in more substantial ways than by merely choosing political leaders.	5.75	**.812**	.005	.157	.686
I have a right to attend public meetings to discuss issues of importance to my community.	6.21	**.796**	.109	.160	.672
I have a right to be involved in discussions about the local government services provided in my community.	5.97	**.788**	.005	.210	.668
I have a responsibility to connect and talk with my fellow citizens about community issues and decisions.	5.40	**.646**	−.009	.245	.487
I have a duty to contribute actively toward creating the community in which I wish to live.	5.57	**.488**	−.005	.465	.457
I have a responsibility to be in control of my own life, without intrusion from government.	5.76	.007	**.828**	.005	.693
I believe government should not interfere with my individual rights.	5.41	.006	**.881**	.008	.670
I should be able to use the money I earn as I see fit, without government intervention.	5.38	−.004	**.796**	.005	.639
I have the right to make moral choices as I see them, not how the government sees them.	5.71	.206	**.682**	.003	.509
I have a right to take advantage of my economic success without losing a large portion of it to support others.	4.97	−.003	**.595**	−.251	.418

TABLE 1
(*Continued*)

Item	Mean	Factor 1 (PD)	Factor 2 (CD)	Factor 3 (SD)	Communality
I should not be required to share with the rest of my community the money I earn.	4.40	−.142	**.531**	−.285	.383
Government has a responsibility to provide services that will alleviate the inequalities in my community.	5.10	.119	.177	**.749**	.606
I have a duty to contribute at least the minimum taxes necessary so that others can live a decent life.	5.31	.243	−.004	**.690**	.537
I expect government to provide subsidies to those in need.	5.25	.006	.004	**.670**	.455
I have an obligation to support the sort of institutions that provide local government services.	4.86	.170	−.002	**.648**	.449
If I wish to live in a good society, I have a responsibility to share my wealth with others.	4.53	.187	−.240	**.617**	.474
I have a duty to pay the taxes that are needed to finance adequately the local government services in my community.	5.33	.357	−.168	.526	.433
Eigenvalues		5.059	3.293	1.593	
% Variance Explained		28.103	18.293	8.852	
% Cumulative Variance		28.103	46.396	55.248	
Alpha		.86	.81	.77	

Results

Survey Response

In total, 304 respondents completed questionnaires. Of that total, 69 were collected from individuals attending on-site group meetings and 235 were collected from individuals visiting on an individual basis. The former approach accounted for a 40% return rate as 171 surveys were actually distributed to group members. By contrast, the latter approach accounted for a 92% return rate as 255 surveys were distributed to individuals. Of the 304 surveys that were gathered, 103 (33.9%) were collected from DP-CC, 100 (32.9%) were collected from CP-CC, and 101 (33.2%) were collected from CM-CC. The respondents from the DP-CC and CM-CC were remarkably similar. They were generally young, well educated (reported at least some post secondary education), and employed. Their perceived financial circumstances were satisfactory to quite comfortable. The respondents from the CP-CC, however, were generally younger, less well educated, fewer of them were employed, and their perceived financial circumstances were slightly less optimistic than were the respondents from the DP-CC and CM-CC. Also, there were more women who responded to the questionnaire from CP-CC (n = 71, 71%) than from DP-CC (n = 47, 46.1%) and CM-CC (n = 51, 50.5%), which was, according to the executive director of the CP-CC, typical of the make-up of CP-CC users.

The Citizen Profile (CP) scale

Principal components analysis was performed to verify the three dimensions of the CP scale (see Table 1). The three-factor solution accounted for 55.2% of the total variation in the data. The explained variance reported for the CP was reflective of a good factor solution because it was between 50 and 75% of the variance in the original variables with one sixth as many factors as there were variables (Diekoff, 1992). The rotated component matrix (varimax) showed that every item belonging to the civil dimension (CD), social dimension (SD), and political dimension (PD) loaded on the expected factors. For the most part, it appeared that the CD, SD, PD were stable and strong factors. One item out of six in the political dimension (PD) was a mixed loading, however. The item, "I have a duty to contribute actively toward creating the community in which I wish to live," loaded more strongly on the PD (.488), but it also fell under the SD (.465). In addition to its implied participatory democratic approach to policy development, the item conceivably relates to the development of social networks and social trust, two concepts central to a social citizenship orientation. Nevertheless, the results from a reliability analysis revealed that the CD (α = .81), the SD (α = .77), and PD (α = .86) were internally consistent.

Table 2 reports the means, standard deviations, and bivariate correlations for the dimensions of citizenship. Overall, mean scores indicated higher agreement with a political citizenship orientation ($\bar{x}$ = 5.81, SD =

TABLE 2
Correlation Matrix for the Citizenship Dimensions

	Mean	SD	N	Political Citizenship	Social Citizenship	Civil Citizenship
Political Citizenship	5.81	.96	304	—		
Social Citizenship	5.06	1.11	304	.504**		
Civil Citizenship	5.27	1.19	304	.023	−.139*	—

** Correlation significant at the .01 level
* Correlation significant at the .05 level
Note: Higher mean scores indicate higher level of agreement

.96), followed by a civil citizenship orientation ($\bar{x}$ = 5.27, SD = 1.19), then a social citizenship orientation ($\bar{x}$ = 5.06, SD = 1.11). In each case, the scores reflected relatively high agreement. The table also reveals that social citizenship was correlated positively with political citizenship (r^2 = .504, p < .01), and negatively, albeit weakly, with civil citizenship (r^2 = −.139, p < .05). These results were not surprising given the tension described above between social and civil rights. Moreover, it was conceivable that political and social citizenship were correlated positively because political involvement in the shaping of public policy regarding local government services, many of which are social in nature (e.g., recreation) implies some sense of support for the provision of such services.

Table 3 reports separately the means, standard deviations, and bivariate correlations for the dimensions of citizenship among respondents. Respondents from CP-CC ($\bar{x}$ = 6.03, SD = 1.04), DP-CC ($\bar{x}$ = 5.81, SD = .70), and CM-CC ($\bar{x}$ = 5.60, SD = 1.06) showed their strongest agreement with the political dimension, possibly because it was the most neutral among the three dimensions of citizenship, neutral, that is, in that agreement with the items related to political citizenship did not necessarily imply an obvious ideological perspective, whereas agreement with the items related to social or civil citizenship revealed distinct ideologies in terms of their willingness to accept or reject a direct role for government in citizens' lives.

Following relatively strong political citizenship orientations, respondents from the CM-CC ($\bar{x}$ = 5.37, SD = 1.03) and DP-CC ($\bar{x}$ = 5.17, SD = 1.11) reported strong mean scores on civil citizenship, too, whereas CP-CC respondents reported strong social citizenship ($\bar{x}$ = 5.36, SD = .94). The differences between the CM-CC and DP-CC respondents, on the one hand, and the CP-CC respondents, on the other, suggested divergent priorities in terms of how their tax dollars should be allocated. The former appeared to be more individually oriented; the latter appeared more community-minded.

At each community center, political citizenship was correlated positively with social citizenship. Separately, however, civil citizenship was correlated

TABLE 3
Correlation Matrices for the Citizenship Dimensions Among Respondents

| | | | | | Correlations | | |
	Location/Variable	Mean	SD	N	Political Citizenship	Social Citizenship	Civil Citizenship
DP-CC	Political Citizenship	5.81	.70	103	—		
	Social Citizenship	5.08	1.07	103	.516**	—	
	Civil Citizenship	5.17	1.11	103	.032	−.297**	—
CP-CC	Political Citizenship	6.03	1.04	100	—		
	Social Citizenship	5.36	.94	100	.324**	—	
	Civil Citizenship	5.27	1.40	100	−.150	.001	—
CM-CC	Political Citizenship	5.60	1.06	101	—		
	Social Citizenship	4.74	1.23	101	.604**	—	
	Civil Citizenship	5.37	1.03	101	.265**	−.130	—

** Correlation significant at the .01 level
* Correlation significant at the .05 level
Note: Higher mean scores indicate higher level of agreement

TABLE 4
A Comparison of Citizenship Orientations Among Respondents

Item	Site	Mean	SD	F	df	p
Civil Citizenship	CP-CC	5.27	1.40			
	DP-CC	5.16	1.11			
	CM-CC	5.37	1.03	.74	2,301	.476
Political Citizenship	CP-CC	6.02[a]	1.04			
	DP-CC	5.81	.70			
	CM-CC	5.60[b]	1.07	4.98	2,301	.007
Social Citizenship	CP-CC	5.36[a]	.94			
	DP-CC	5.09	1.07			
	CM-CC	4.74[b]	1.23	8.13	2,301	<.001

Note: Higher scores indicate higher agreement with statement
[a,b] Superscripts accompanying mean scores indicate groups significantly different from one another using Scheffe post-hoc test.

negatively with social citizenship at the DP-CC ($r^2 = -.297$, $p < .01$), and correlated positively with political citizenship at the CM-CC ($r^2 = -.265$, $p < .01$). That political citizenship was correlated positively with social citizenship, and civil citizenship was correlated negatively with civil citizenship was expected given the reasons mentioned above; however, that civil citizen-

ship was correlated positively with political citizenship at the CM-CC was rather unexpected, albeit understandable; involvement in the political arena may be regarded as an important way for individuals to ensure that the state does not intrude in the private lives of citizens. And so, it may be viewed as an important function to preserve liberty.

A Comparison of Citizenship Orientations

Comparing the citizenship orientations among respondents from the three community centers, civil citizenship orientations did not differ ($F_{2,301}$ = .74, p = .476). Orientations regarding the political ($F_{2,301}$ = 4.98, $p < .01$) and social ($F_{2,301}$ = 8.13, $p < .001$) dimensions, however, were significantly different. CP-CC respondents had stronger political and social citizenship orientations than did those exposed to contract at the CM-CC. These results were not unexpected given that opportunities to shape policy at the CM-CC were relatively unavailable to users, unlike at the CP-CC where citizens were encouraged to participate in such processes. Political citizenship orientations were presumed to be strongest among CP-CC respondents and weakest among CM-CC respondents for these reasons. Moreover, because a private contractor operated the CM-CC, users at the CM-CC may have regarded the services as being private, whereas the services at the CP-CC were clearly provided in order to service the community and meet its social needs. In this sense, it was not surprising that social citizenship orientations were strongest among CP-CC respondents, and weakest among CM-CC respondents. It was surprising, however, that DP-CC respondents did not differ from the others politically or socially. This finding will be discussed in the following section.

DISCUSSION

An intriguing discussion emerges from the comparison of the respondents who were exposed to different models of public recreation service production in terms of their citizenship orientations. Respondents from the CP-CC showed stronger orientations for social and political citizenship than did respondents from the CM-CC, yet the respondents from each community center were similar in terms of their civil citizenship orientations. A more detailed discussion of these findings follows.

Exposure and Civil Citizenship

As noted earlier, civil rights and obligations place an emphasis upon the individual (Marshall, 1992). In order to accommodate such rights, the state either refrains from interfering in the lives of its citizens or it offers sufficient choice so that citizens can make decisions for themselves (Bowie & Simon, 1998). In the context of public recreation service delivery, the former involves a co-production arrangement with grassroots organizations; the latter involves the privatization of the conditions of consumption. In both instances, the state relegates itself to the periphery in order to accommodate

and support private initiative. For this reason, Saunders (1993) insisted that proponents of the political Right and Left agree alike about the need to hold government at arm's length, while encouraging "mediating institutions" to address individual and collective needs. The difference, however, is that the Right, under the contract model, champions a commercial agency as the mediating institution, whereas the Left, under a co-production arrangement, advocates a voluntary one.

It was not surprising, then, that respondents exposed to the contract model demonstrated a strong civil citizenship orientation. In general, the contract model invites self-interested individualism by encouraging citizens to make self-serving decisions that can potentially be destructive or insensitive to the greater public good (Smith & Huntsman, 1997). However, under the contract model, individualism is analogous to rational egoism, as in the case of public choice theory (Self, 1993), whereas under co-production, it is regarded as self-interest properly understood (Tocqueville, 1969). That is, individualism, in the context of a participatory approach to democracy that the co-production model supports, involves recognition of interdependency on the part of the participant: "autonomy implies some measure of responsibility, simply because autonomy means that one has the capacity to relate intention to behavior and thus to give reasons for behaviors to others" (Warren, 1993, p. 216). However, the civil sub-scale of the CP did not measure these attitudes. Nevertheless, the important commonality to note between those exposed to co-production and the contract model is the fundamental belief that one's individual rights must be protected against the infringement of the state and of political power (Allison, 1996). Accordingly, it was conceivable that respondents exposed to both co-production and the contract model would hold such strong civil citizenship orientations.

By supporting a traditional public facility, however, respondents from the DP-CC were expected to demonstrate a weaker civil citizenship orientation. That is, they were expected to be more willing to support the state provision of public services. Because the public sector has delivered a variety of services traditionally, including leisure, for the expressed purpose of providing social welfare, it would make intuitive sense that those who support this model would be more willing to accept an active role for government in their lives. As noted, however, there has been a transition in recent years to deliver services that satisfy and appeal specifically to individual preferences, as opposed to building human capacities (Hemingway, 1996; Johnson & McLean, 1994; Reid, 1995; Schultz, McAvoy & Dustin, 1988; Smale & Reid, 2001). Indeed, market mechanisms have emerged in the public sector not only because of their potential for revenue generation through user fees (Savas, 1987; Walsh, 1995), but also because they allow producers to transfer to the recipient the burden of deciding which services to retain (Johnson & McLean, 1994; Saunder & Harris, 1990). This contemporary approach to direct provision resembles the "demand and supply model" that is characteristic of the contract model (Osborne & Gaebler, 1992; Savas, 1987). Reid

(1995) contended that, at present, the public sector "views recreation as a commodity rather than as a means to some more fundamental goal like individual or community development" (p. 25). In other words, the state often employs an entrepreneurial method of service delivery. Exposure to this method perhaps explains why the responses of the individuals from DP-CC reflected a strong civil citizenship orientation.

In general, though, responses from all of the research participants were perhaps indicative of the declining trust in government and its institutions, which speaks to autonomy from state intervention (Bliss, 1997; Graham & Phillips, 1997; Putnam, 1995, 2000). Certainly, some of the items that composed the civil sub-scale of the CP referred to the protection of individual rights against the state. Bliss (1997) observed, "we are beginning to realize that the thrust to strengthen individual opportunities and freedoms, to create the truly autonomous individual, has been accompanied, perhaps necessarily, by the strengthening of the individual's distrust of most of the organizations that traditionally claimed a right to help organize his or her life" (p. 32). Distrust in government, and by extension, the strengthening of individualism may have been the dominant undercurrent in most participants' responses to the civil sub-scale of the CP.

Exposure and Social Citizenship

Theoretically, social citizenship orientations should be strongest amongst those exposed to direct provision by virtue of the fact that the provision of recreation services is a form of social welfare. Indeed, Coalter (1998) suggested that there is a clear implication in the leisure literature "that the sense of freedom and self-fulfillment associated with social citizenship are to be found only in [direct] public provision" (p. 24). Barbalet (1988), however, questioned whether social rights and the welfare state are analogous because he contended that social policy in the public sector is not necessarily an expression of social rights. That is, presumably social rights no longer assist in the development and function of social services, like leisure.

Similarly, Johnson and McLean (1994) noted that only public recreation services thought to enhance public values were delivered by the public sector in the past. However, they insisted that, presently, there is no agreement about what constitutes these values. As a consequence of attempting to serve an increasingly multicultural and pluralist society, recreation programming in the public sector has been reduced to responding to individual leisure preferences as opposed to being guided by an ideal. Perhaps, then, direct provision is in a state of tension between serving two distinct mandates: the public interest and self-interest. Public recreation services are still delivered in order to benefit the wider community; however, they are exchanged as commodities in order to satisfy individual wants, too (Reid, 1995). As a result, it is unclear whether the social citizenship orientations of DP-CC respondents

failed to differ from the other respondents because the public sector is truly "in-between" these two extremes or because of the absence of a clear philosophical direction. This question is decidedly a matter for future research.

The fact that respondents from the CP-CC revealed stronger social citizenship orientations than respondents from the CM-CC was not a surprise. Central to the idea of social citizenship is its emphasis on the rights of all citizens to claim material support from their fellow members in situations where they cannot for some reason sustain life according to the standards prevailing in society (Marshall, 1992). The CP-CC was located within a community that depended upon much social assistance, which suggests that the demographic profile of the community—that is, the relatively large number of female respondents and the lower socioeconomic status of the CP-CC sample—also might have contributed to stronger social citizenship orientations as compared to the other two communities. However, the CP-CC was founded upon the principles of bringing people together to alleviate social, political, and economic differences. As the executive director of the community association at the CP-CC explained, the process of service delivery helped eliminate the perception of services for the rich and the poor and reduce negative stigma associated with the targeted area. As a result, the co-production model fostered a sense of equality among residents, which lends support to Putnum's (1995) contention that "networks of civic engagement foster sturdy norms of generalized reciprocity and encourage the emergence of social trust" (p. 67). Prior to the establishment of the CP-CC, the executive director asserted there was an absence of any sense of community. Foley and Edwards (1997) insisted that civic associations emerge for this very reason. Perhaps this explains why the municipality in which the community center was located forged an arm's length relationship with the CP-CC. It gave the association the autonomy to address the needs of the community. It was reasonable, therefore, to believe that the model of service production to which respondents at the CP-CC were exposed was associated with their social citizenship orientation.

Exposure and Political Citizenship

Because it employs a participatory approach to democratic decision-making, co-production presumably fosters in its participants a stronger political citizenship orientation than does the contract model (Hemingway, 1999). Co-production favors mediated consensus (Arai, 1996; Arai & Pedlar, 1997; Smale & Reid, 2001) whereas the contract model supports other ways of making collective decisions, namely markets (Osborne & Gaebler, 1992; Ravenscroft, 1993; Savas, 1987). In essence, the premise that underpins the co-production model in a leisure context is the notion that the administration of public recreation services is the responsibility of the community and its neighborhoods (Stormann, 1993). This approach was adopted by the CP-CC, whose services were participant-directed, not prescribed professionally. In fact, any potential initiative or partnership required approval from the organization's program committee before the association implemented it.

This approach was much different than the one employed by the CM-CC where professional judgement invariably subverted genuine forms of citizen participation. Though it offered outlets for citizens to provide feedback regarding their program and activities, including an arena board that oversaw the contractor's performance, the CM-CC supported a form of citizen participation resembling what Arnstein (1969) described as manipulation. It involved placing citizens on a "rubberstamp" advisory board in order to engineer their support. A select few, including the contractor, maintained the authority to determine the final decisions about all matters concerning policy. Instead of seeking genuine citizen participation, the provider distorted involvement so that, in reality, the committee was a public relations vehicle. By contrast, the co-production model at the CP-CC was adopted to encourage citizens to engage in a meaningful public discourse about policy in order to determine and fashion the community in which they wished to live. The model aimed to give community members a voice (Arai, 1996) by involving all citizens in community matters (Hutchison & Nogradi, 1996). By encouraging civic engagement, a term Putnam (1996) defined as people's connections with the life of their communities, the CP-CC likely produced strong political citizenship orientations in local residents, its participants and volunteers. Alternatively, by engineering citizen feedback, the CM-CC maintained the status quo and discouraged true civic engagement.

Conclusion

This study demonstrates how existing conceptual and theoretical literature can be incorporated into an informed empirical analysis, which in turn informs subsequent conceptual and theoretical work. Having done so, it offers empirical evidence that a relationship exists between citizenship orientations and exposure to different models of service production. Though not substantiated empirically in this paper, the author has assumed, in theory, that the model of service production influences citizenship, yet the reverse might be true. That is, people with certain citizenship orientations might be more inclined to use community centers that adopt particular models of service production. It certainly stands to reason that if people are situated within a specific citizenship orientation (with attendant valorization of specific conceptions of individual and collective action, government action, institutions, etc.), then they will support congruent policy decisions (production models). But, in reality, it might be indicative of a more dynamic interaction between institutions and individual behavior. This is not the appropriate space in which to resolve the puzzle of which matters most, or whether it is the production model or citizenship orientation that should be altered, but it is clear that relationships exist between how people think of themselves as participants in their communities (citizenship orientations) and the nature of public services (production models). For this reason alone, the nature of the relationship is a topic for future research, which ought to keep leisure and recreation researchers, along with their colleagues in sociology and political science, occupied for some time.

References

Allison, L. (1996). Individualism. In I. McLean (Ed.). *The concise Oxford dictionary of politics* (pp. 239-240). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Arai, S. M. (1996). Benefits of citizen participation in a Healthy Communities Initiative: Linking community development and empowerment. *Journal of Applied Recreation Research, 21*(1), 25-44.

Arai, S. M. (1999). Privatization and the impact on voluntary associations: Tensions between service provision and citizenship. *Leisurability, 26*(4), 10-18.

Arai, S. M., & Pedlar, A. M. (1997). Building communities through leisure: Citizen participation in a healthy communities initiative. *Journal of Leisure Research, 29*(2), 167-182.

Arnstein, S. R. (1969). A ladder of citizen participation. *American Institute of Planners, 35,* 216-224.

Assiter, A. (1999). Citizenship revisited. In P. Werbner, & N. Yuval-Davis (eds.), *Women, citizenship and difference.* London: Zed Books.

Barbalet, J. M. (1988). *Citizenship: Rights, Struggles and Class Inequality.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Barber, B. R. (1999). Clansmen, consumers, and citizens. In R. K. Fullinwider (Ed.), *Civil society, democracy, and civic renewal* (pp. 9-29). New York, NY: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Berlin, I. (1969). *Four essays on liberty.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Bliss, M. (1997). Canada in the age of the visible hand. In T. Kent (Ed.). *In pursuit of the public good: Essays in honour of Allan J. MacEachen* (pp. 21-34). Kingston, ON: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Bottomore, T. (1992). Citizenship and social class, forty years on. In T. H. Marshall & T. Bottomore (eds.), *Citizenship and social class* (pp. 55-93). London: Pluto Press.

Bowie, N. E., & Simon R. L. (1998). *The individual and the political order: An introduction to social and political philosophy.* 3rd Edition. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Brinton, M. C., & Nee, V. (eds.). (1998). *The new institutionalism in sociology.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Bulmer, M., & Rees, A. M. (1996). Conclusion: Citizenship in the twenty-first century. In M. Bulmer, & A. M. Rees (eds.), *Citizenship today: The contemporary relevance of T. H. Marshall* (pp. 269-283). London: UCL Press.

Burton, T. L., & Glover, T. D. (1999). Back to the future: Recreation services and the re-emergence of the enabling authority of the state. In E. L. Jackson & T. L. Burton (Eds.). *Leisure studies: Prospects for the 21st century* (pp. 371-155). State College, PA: Venture Publishing.

Coalter, F. (1990). The politics of professionalism: Consumer or citizens? *Leisure Studies, 9,* 107-119.

Coalter, F. (1998). Leisure studies, leisure policy and social citizenship: The failure of welfare or the limits of welfare? *Leisure Studies, 17,* 21-36.

Coalter, F. (2000). Public and commercial leisure provision: Active citizens and passive consumers? *Leisure Studies, 19,* 163-181.

Crompton, J. L. (1999). *Financing and acquiring park and recreation resources.* Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Crompton, J. L., & Lamb, C. W. (1986). *Marketing government and social services.* Toronto, ON: John Wiley and Sons.

Curtis, J. E. (1990). McRec—the challenge of the 90's? *Parks and Recreation, 25*(1), 52-57.

Diekhoff, G. (1992). *Statistics for the behavioral sciences: Univariate, bivariate, multivariate.* Chicago, IL: Wm. C. Brown Publishers.

Ellison, N. (1997). Towards a new social politics: Citizenship and reflexivity in late modernity. *Sociology, 31*(4), 697-717.

Foley, M. W., & Edwards, B. (1996). The paradox of civil society. *Journal of Democracy, 7*(3), 38-52.

Foley, M. W., & Edwards, B. (1997). Escape from politics? Social theory and the social capital debate. *American Behavioral Scientist, 40*(5), 550-561.

Glover, T. D. (1998). Reinventing local government: Consequences of adopting a business model to deliver public recreation services. *Journal of Applied Recreation Research, 23*(4), 339-366.

Glover, T. D. (1999). Propositions addressing the privatization of public parks and recreation services: Implications for efficiency, effectiveness, and equity. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration, 17*(2), 1-27.

Glover, T. D. (2000). *An examination of the relationship between citizenship orientations and the way public recreation services are produced.* Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada.

Graham, K. A., & Phillips, S. D. (1997). Citizen engagement: Beyond the customer revolution. *Canadian Public Administration, 40*(2), 255-273.

Held, D. (1996). *Models of democracy* (2nd ed.). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Hemingway, J. L. (1996). Emancipating leisure: The recovery of freedom in leisure. *Journal of Leisure Research, 28*(1), 27-43.

Hemingway, J. L. (1999). Leisure, social capital, and democratic citizenship. *Journal of Leisure Research, 31*(2), 150-165.

Hutchison, P., & Nogradi, G. (1996). The concept and nature of community development in recreation and recreation services. *Journal of Applied Recreation Research, 21*(2), 93-130.

Ignatieff, M. (1989). Citizenship and moral narcissism. *Political Quarterly, 60*(1), 63-74.

Johnson, R., & McLean, D. (1994). Leisure and the development of ethical character: Changing ideals of the North American ideal. *Journal of Applied Recreation Research, 19*(2), 117-130.

Kalberg, S. (1993). Cultural foundations of modern citizenship. In B. S. Turner (Ed.), *Citizenship and social theory* (pp. 1-18). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Kerber, L. K. (1999). *No constitutional right to be ladies: Women and the obligations of citizenship.* New York: Hill & Wang Publishers.

Kingwell, M. (2000). *The world we want: Virtue, vice, and the good citizen.* Toronto: Viking Press.

Knight, J. (1992). *Institutions and social conflict.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lane, G. (1997). Privatization: An end to the parks and recreation profession as we know it? *The Voice, 15,* 8-15.

Laxer, J. (1999). Reflections on the public good in the new gilded age. *Queen's Quarterly, 106*(1), 17-26.

Macpherson, C. B. (1985). Problems of human rights in the late twentieth century. In C. B. Macpherson (Ed.). *The rise and fall of economic justice and other essays.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

March, J. G., & Olson, J. P. (1989). *Rediscovering institutions.* New York: The Free Press.

Marshall, T. H. (1992). Citizenship and social class. In T. H. Marshall & T. Bottomore (Eds.). *Citizenship and social class* (pp. 3-51). London, UK: Pluto Press. (Original work published 1950).

Miller, D. (1989). *Market, state and community: Theoretical foundations of market socialism.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Mintzberg, H. (1996). Managing government, governing management. *Harvard Business Review,* May-June, 75-83.

Murphy, J. (1989). An enabling approach to recreation service delivery. In T. L. Goodale & P. A. Witt (Eds.). *Issues in an era of change* (pp. 197-210). State College, PA: Venture Publishing.

Oldfield, A. (1990). *Citizenship and community: Civic republicanism and the modern world.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Osborne, D., & Gaebler, T. (1992). *Reinventing government: How the entrepreneurial spirit is transforming the public sector.* New York, NY: Penguin Books Limited.

Pedlar, A. (1996). Community development: what does it mean for recreation and leisure? *Journal of Applied Recreation Research, 21*(1), 5-23.

Pierson, C. (1991). *Beyond the welfare state? The new political economy of welfare.* London: Polity Press.

Putnam, R. D. (1995). Bowling alone: America's declining social capital. *Journal of Democracy, 6*(1), 65-78.

Putnam, R. D. (1996, winter). The strange disappearance of civic America. *American Prospect,* (24), 34-48.

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

Ravenscroft, N. (1993). Public recreation provision and the good citizen. *Leisure Studies, 12,* 33-44.

Reid, D. (1995). *Work and leisure in the 21st century: From production to citizenship.* Toronto, ON: Wall & Emerson.

Rosen, H. S., Boothe, P., Dahlby, B., and Smith, R. S. (1999). *Public Finance in Canada.* Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson.

Rothman, J. (1995). Approaches to community intervention. In J. Rothman, J. L Erloch, & J. F. Tropman (eds.), *Strategies of community intervention* (pp. 26-63). Itasca, IL: F. E. Peacock Publishers.

Saunders, P. (1993). Citizenship in a liberal society. In B. S. Turner (Ed.). *Citizenship and Social Theory* (pp. 57-90). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Saunders, P., & Harris, C. (1990). Privatisation and the consumer. *Sociology, 24*(1), 57-75.

Savas, E. S. (1987). *Privatization: The key to better government.* Chatham, NJ: Chatham House.

Schultz, J. H., McAvoy, L., & Dustin, D. (1988). What are we in business for? *Parks and Recreation, 23*(1), 52-54.

Self, P. (1993). *Government by the market? The politics of public choice.* London, UK: MacMillan.

Slack, T. (1999). Changing boundaries and new management implications for leisure organizations. In T. L. Burton, & E. L. Jackson (eds.). *Leisure studies: Prospects for the 21st century* (pp. 399-434). State College, PA: Venture Publishing.

Smale, B. J. A., & Reid, D. G. (2001). Public policy on recreation and leisure in urban Canada. In E. P. Fowler, & D. Siegel (eds.). *Urban policy issues: Canadian perspectives* (2nd Ed.) Toronto, ON: Oxford University Press.

Smith, G. E., & Huntsman, C. A. (1997). Reframing the metaphor of the citizen-government relationship: A value-centered perspective. *Public Administration Review, 57*(4), 309-318.

Stormann, W. F. (1993). The recreation profession, capital and democracy. *Leisure Sciences, 15,* 49-66.

Stormann, W. F. (1996). Recreation's role in community development: Community recreation. *Journal of Applied Recreation Research, 21*(2), 93-130.

Stormann, W. F. (2000). The death of the Olmstedian vision of public space. *Journal of Leisure Research, 32*(1), 166-170.

Tocqueville, A. de. (1969). *Democracy in America* (J. P. Mayer, ed.). Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Turner, B. S. (1986). *Citizenship and capitalism: The debate over reformism.* London: Allen & Unwin.

Turner, B. S. (1990). Outline of a theory of citizenship. *Sociology, 24*(2), 189-217.

Turner, B. S. (1993). Contemporary problems in the theory of citizenship. In B. S. Turner (Ed.). *Citizenship and social theory* (pp. 1-18). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Walby, S. (1994). Is citizenship gendered? *Sociology, 28*(2), 379-395.

Walsh, K. (1995). *Public services and market mechanisms: Competition, contracting and the new public management.* London: Macmillan Press Limited.

Warren, M. E. (1993). Can participatory democracy produce better selves? Psychological dimensions of Habermas's discursive model of democracy. *Political Psychology, 14*(2), 209-234.

Werbner, P. (1999). Political motherhood and the feminization of citizenship. In P. Werbner, & N. Yuval-Davis (eds.), *Women, citizenship and difference.* London: Zed Books.

Whitson, D. (1986). Leisure and the state: Theorising struggles over everyday life. In F. Coalter (ed.), *The Politics of Leisure*. Leisure Studies Association Conference Papers no. 24. Leisure Studies Association, Eastborne, UK.

Whittington, K. E. (1998). Revisiting Tocqueville's America: Society, politics, and association in the nineteenth century. *American Behavioral Scientist, 42*(1), 21-32.