A social quality approach as (re)integration of civil society, the market and the state

Introduction: Conversation

Civil society is currently positioned in much thinking as one part of a trinity: the market, the state and civil society (or more narrowly the third sector as organisational form). Such separateness or disintegration is often premised on the distinctiveness of the value-bases and ways of organising within each sector (Billis 1993). This positions civil society as outside of and acting upon the market and the state. Indeed it positions each of the market, the state and civil society as outside of and acting upon each other. In particular it maintains the negative definition of civil society and the associated third and non-profit sectors as parts of residual categories. This separateness (and indeed creation) of the third sector as the organising infrastructure of civil society and non-profits as the more formalised of these organisations were carved out through definitional and classificatory projects such as the Johns Hopkins Comparative Nonprofit Sector Project. Separate governance and management from the state and non-distribution principles as separateness from the market were core principles of non-profit organisations for instance, while multiple stakeholders were the reality. Issues of empirical reductionism, homogenisation and contextual complexity plagued such projects. This separation into state, market, and third sector means that theory and practice predominantly starts from predefined and positioned form and function and easily enters into institutionalist traps rather than opening itself to political and societal challenges.

This paper provides critical reflections from a cross-disciplinary conversation on the directions of current theory and practice and shares critical thinking on other possible theory and practice outlooks for a (re)integrated civil society, state and market.¹ This

¹ Though it should be highlighted that this opens up in a field of contradictions rather than in a harmonious field. CS is in itself double-edged by historically positioning itself outside while remaining within and claiming that it is a dominant force there. The problem is the contradiction between bourgeois and citoyen (see Herrmann, forthcoming [c]).
reflective process was used to generate critical questions for third sector theorists and practitioners in the (not necessarily new or unique) climate of ‘facing crises’. In the quest for such alternative theory and practice directions beyond western welfare states, and attempts to create welfare systems in transitioning social systems, such critical reflection and questioning is central (Law 2004). This means thinking from society rather than from sectors. With this it is future and challenge oriented rather than functionalist.

The authors come from two different points of reference on challenges for third sector policy and practice. Wendy is a human geographer working on grounded theories of organisational change, both transactional and transformative, in the third sector. As a grounded theorist her focus has been micro-analysis of organisational practice within particular social policy fields. This analysis has particularly examined the impact of New Public Management (NPM) on third sector organisation’s governance, management and service provision systems (see for example Earles 2007; Baulderstone & Earles 2009) and state-third sector relations (Earles & Moon 1998). In her view organisations are artefacts and as such they can provide clues to the past and hints for the future, and the anatomy of local organising can illuminate global tendencies.

Peter takes another stance – leaning more to the macro-perspective, coming from sociology, economics and law. Having said this, mentioning the macro-perspective is actually not really correct as what he is focussing on is also a micro-perspective. But his point is to see this micro-perspective in people’s everyday life embedded onto complex life worlds (if the term can be allowed without suggesting allusions). The point here is that the individual can only be understood as a matter of individual practices. In short, the perspective of social philosopher is a matter of Catch 22 in that the macro-perspective comes from the micro and the micro-perspective contains, moreover: creates the macro.

The approach taken in the paper is to first allow Wendy and Peter to each provide a perspective on current directions. Wendy explores the (dis)integration of local systems of practice. From her grounded analysis she argues that there has been both territorial and vertical disintegration in systems of non-profit management and provision, a diffusion of means of governance and a shift to instrumentalism in relationships under
the regime of NPM. Such change she argues has created a narrow and over- emphasised positioning of nonprofits as service providers for the state and an ongoing quest for reintegration through partnership and hybridisation.

Peter then explores functional differentiation as a fundamental disembedding of societal relations and processes. From his philosophical analysis he argues that though CSOs remain ‘elementary forms’ (in terms of the germs from which the larger entity and its holistic character emerges), they cut themselves off by functional specialisation – reference is made to the Marxist understanding as it is developed in the Jewish question. This opens the way for reflexive control, geared to developing supply orientations rather than seeking specialised answers for societal demands. Organisations, being caught in such mechanisms, are tending to become independent from soci(et)al realities, focusing on the need of self-maintenance rather than goal-maintenance. Such approaches to explaining and rationalising the means and ends (ideals) of actors and action within and across sectors he argues fail to recognise the debilitating impact of differentiation and fragmentation.

Peter then provides an account of the social quality approach as a means of (re)integrating civil society, the market and the state. It is argued that the social quality approach allows integration of a wider set of actors, arenas and actions in which the social is actually produced, ‘creatively consumed’, distributed and exchanged. As such it allows the recognition and acceptance of approaching social goals through alternate systems in a more specific and differentiated way in unique soci(et)al settings, radically referring to everyday life and practice in small communities and societies alike.

Finally, they explore together the implications for third sector theory and practice.

(Dis)integration of systems of practice

Operationalising the trinity of civil society (or more often the third sector), the market and the state has created fertile ground for endeavours such as marketisation and (shadow) statisation of social provision through civil society actors (Deakin & Walsh 1996; Wolch 1999); quests for renewed partnership between the state or market and civil society in social provision (Alcock 2010: McGregor-Lowndes & Murnour 2003);
and specific politicisation of civil society through the polarisation of market-based social provision and political/social action (Eikenberry & Kluver 2004).

These endeavours have given rise to struggles to create and enact concepts and practice related to different types of capital. For instance, organisational capital conceptualised as ‘processes for organising’ and social capital as ‘relationships’ (Cassidy, Leviton, & Hunter 2006). Capital approaches potentially reduce civil society, market and state actors, and activity, to the mechanisms of exchange and the currency of investment, effectively ‘keeping society going’ from a transactional perspective. They also fail to problematise the rationale and motivation for civil, state and market activity – (re)production through allocation and distribution. Such (re)production is increasingly premised on the individual and individual fulfilment through “materialism” and perpetual growth and ‘improvement’.

Overall non-profits have been increasingly positioned in debates on the role of the state (and impacted by market principles and logics as they have pervaded the state) with a consequent narrow and over-emphasised positioning of non-profits as service providers for the state. In such practice developments, territorial and vertical disintegration have manifested in marketised and statised local systems of practice as concentration of strategic functions of need identification and resource allocation in centralised state agencies and divestment of operative provision to increasingly fragmented and substitutable third and market sectors (Earles 1999). Anheier (2009) reflects this in his account of one possible future for the third sector (in relations with the state and market):

First, nonprofits are increasingly part of new public management (NPM) approaches and what could be called a mixed economy of welfare and development. Expanded contracting of nonprofit organizations in governmental welfare provision, voucher programs, or client/user empowerment projects are examples of this development. (Anheier 2009: 1082)

Such disintegration was paralleled by a diffusion of governance with associated dismantling or devaluing of participatory structures, professionalization and opaqueness of dialogue spaces (Earles 1999). There was also a resultant underlying
shift to instrumentalism, as contractualism, in relationships under the regime of NPM. This resulted in increased technocratic formalisation of non-profit organisations with managerial practice firmly positioned within positivist paradigms and hierarchical ways of being; as well as increased organisational individualisation within a market paradigm that in many cases threatens mission disjuncture and generates an over-focus on the infrastructure or form not the vision.

The experience of disintegration prompted a quest for re-integration through partnerships with both the state and the market. Indeed, Salamon and Anheier (1996) identified the changing relationship with the state beyond a paradigm of conflict and third party government, particularly the shift from agent-of-the state to partner-with-the-state, as crucial issues for the emerging third sector early on in the non-profit definition project. The re-invigorated focus on relations with business and the emergence of non-profit businesses is a more recent phenomenon (Eikenberry & Kluvers 2004). There is also a growing recognition of, and a fascination with, hybrid (and hybridisation of) organisations, such as business arms of non-profit organisations, quasi-nongovernment organisations, and social enterprise (Billis 1993, 2010). Such recognition and detailed mapping of the collapsing of sectors and the qualified celebration of new partnerships (Alcock 2010) are testament to the paradox of conceptual and empirical separation.

Indeed in our quest for recognition of civil society as equally legitimate as the market and the state we may have fallen into the trap of “the modern rational mind (that) makes divisions of non-dual reality into two and then forgets that it has done this. Then it forgets that it forgot? As a result we continue to puzzle on how to put the two back into ’one’ again” (Cacioppe 2000: 53). In effect, civil society, particularly third sector theorists, might have created non-profits as ‘value-based organisation’ in order to study it (see for example, Leat 1998), as economists created ‘rational man’, and then we have forgotten we created it. In dealing with managerialism and marketisation as a matter of improving supply by and through non-profit organisations we have stopped positioning these organisations within society as a whole and have taken for granted that there is a standard position for these organisations that does not need to be questioned or debated.
Much of what had been said, then, remains trapped in principally acknowledging the trinitary formula – and the thus specified role and function of the ‘third sector”, however not asking for overcoming the limitation and limiting of the given soci(iet)al conditions which seem to systematically strangulate or suffocate the “sector” – even if this happens “only” by its ‘recognition’.

However, if we look at the reality today – in a globalised and further globalising context – we find a paradoxical situation: on the one hand we see ourselves confronted with the continuation of what had been presented before: the – at least apparent – demarcation of different sectors, following very much a specific pattern as it is founded in the emerging capitalism of the enlightenment. Civil society is – in this perspective – not least some kind of artefact: On the one hand it is a matter of disembedding, the outplacement of certain processes on a level of societal production that can claim superiority to the extent that it delivers a new superstructure, claiming to keep things together or even to ‘create entity’, a new integrated unit as matter of an abstract idea. One may go so far saying the holy trinity of religiosity underwent a transformation, civil society now claiming representing the absolute idea. – In actual fact this happened at least in parts of the Western world and we can see it by looking in particular at French and German philosophy and the idea of the absolute idea; already earlier by the claims of the Italian Renaissance and its claim of reintegrating what had been beginning to crumble during the middle ages: rationality as means of founding a new holistic world view – and thus aiming on a ‘new holiness’.

On the other hand, however, this new holiness had been a fertile ground for the emergence of another holiness: the fetish of commodity production and consumption which provide the final dissolution of the actual societal and social unity. Capitalism, being closely linked to utilitarianism, meant on the one hand dominance of the world of commodity and claims of the superiority of the individual as rational decision maker and on the other hand it meant that with dissolution of complex social realities we find – perhaps paradoxically – the growing illusions of the citoyenitée.
Looking at societal reality this had been very much a matter the establishment of a permanent and fundamental contradiction: the dominance of the economic system of commodity production\(^2\) versus the claim of the dominance of the political as finally determining mechanism of societal steering. In this light, civil society could well claim (i) some kind of independence and (ii) a position of bridge-builder – as Kramer saw it: the role of vanguard, improver, guardian and service provider. In his words:

\(1\) As vanguard, the purpose of the voluntary agency is to innovate, pioneer, experiment, and demonstrate programs, some of which may eventually be taken over by government. \(2\) As improver or advocate, the agency is expected to serve as a critic, watchdog, or gadfly as it pressures a governmental body to extend, improve, or establish needed services. \(3\) As value guardian of voluntaristic, particularistic, and sectarian values, a voluntary agency is expected to promote citizen participation, to develop leadership, and to protect the special interests of social, religious, cultural, or other minority groups. \(4\) As service provider, the voluntary agency delivers certain services it has selected, some of which may be a public responsibility that governments is unable, is unwilling, or prefers not to assume directly or fully.

\((\text{Kramer, 1981: 9})\)

However, reality and claim would henceforth stand in permanent and rather fundamental contradiction – and though it is not the topic here, it should be mentioned en passent that it is going in parallel with the contradiction between the classes: the working class, depending on the labour power, i.e. the actual execution of productive processes and the bourgeoisie as ‘supervisor’, overseeing production, producing ideas and linking them intellectually by considered values.

However, as much as the latter statement is made en passent it points nevertheless at a crucially important point: in tendency increasing independence of organisational mechanisms – from the thinking to the management of thinking and acting –

\(^2\) Mind, this is not the same as the dominance of material and in particular economic processes as brought forward by the Marxist notion of the relationship between basis and superstructure.
independent from soci(et)al realities, focusing on the need of self-maintenance rather than goal-maintenance.

As issue we find this development tackled in both general sociology and theory of organisations. In general theory of sociology it is very much seen as matter of either a secular process of differentiation (see for instance Parsons, Luhmann). Here the point is especially concerned with a process of increasing ‘rationalisation’ that comes along with specialisation in terms of the knowledge-orientation and segmentation as main organisational feature. Commonly this is linked to a perspective of seeing society and social action as based on functionalist principles – of course, to the extent to which the social is seen by following methodological individualism the perspective is prone to utilitarian orientations. On the other hand we find in theories/sociology of organisation especially two strands of argument: One is concerned with the managerial issues, orienting on maintenance of existing and mobilisation of additional resources by relating the different elements within organisational systems; another is concerned with more critical perspectives that can be ordered under the heading of alienation, pointing on ‘managerialisation’ and ‘technisation’ of processes, alienating individuals and also disembedding processes from their ‘genuine’ objective, their social aims.

However, all this leaves one fundamental question outside of the equation: namely the question of the social itself. Such critique means that we actually claim that by making reference to the social quality approach we will be able to turn the entire view on the ‘Third Sector’ back on its feet – a matter for the cognition of the sector, for its analysis and also for developing strategies of the work within relevant units.

Social Quality – its architecture and polity outline

The reproach brought forward by the social quality approach against social science is basically that the latter lost its understanding of the social and thus fails to provide a meta-theory that allows understanding matters in their overall societal context. Again, this is not an issue that is entirely alien to social science. On the contrary, we find a discussion on this topic as a core issue, in particular by ventilating around the definition of structure, process and agency and the relationship between them. The problem, however, is that a core point is left out, namely the definition of the social itself. One
may go so far, saying that enlightenment pushed for the emergence of a social science that distanced itself again from ontological and epistemological questions. A simplified sequence would suggest the following:

* the social as absolute existence – in the recognition of the good in god – as matter of metaphysical relations (be they religious or equivalent);

* the striving for cognition of the social in real life by an emerging and increasingly secularising philosophy that searched for responsibility of people as personalities – individual and social;

* the idealisation of the social in the ‘absolute idea’ – again the old idea of Christianity or other mystical forms, but more so the idea of the rational: the rational structure of society, the rational actor that invisibly and the elaboration of rational processes. And paradoxically exactly this rationalisation is a new lapse. As much as Adam and Eve had been supposedly damned to take responsibility themselves, the emerging social science damned itself to an orientation on giving responsibility away to predefined rationalities.

⇒ Against such stances the social quality approach sees the social as matter of simultaneity of actors, processes and structures. For this the following definition had been elaborated:

* The Social Quality Approach understands the social as the outcome of the interaction between people (constituted as actors) and their constructed and natural environment. With this in mind its subject matter refers to people’s productive and reproductive relationships. In other words

  * the constitutive interdependency between processes of self-realisation and processes of the formation of collective identities

  * is a condition for ‘the social’, realised by the interactions of actors, being – with their self-referential capacity – competent to act and their framing structure, which translates immediately into the context of human relationships.

The following graph may clarify the references:
It does actually centre on the social being itself in its very essence processual rather than seeing only the development of and within the social. Furthermore, it emphasises the dialectics within different structures rather than emphasising the dialectics between structure and actor/agency. Analytically this tension can be broken down in the following way.

* the tension between biographical and societal development

* the tension between institutions and communities

This is not to say that these are static – on the contrary, each of them is dynamic in the very essence and also ‘shifting from one status to its juxtaposition’, in particular communities being institutionalised and institutions being communitarised; and in
some ways also biographical developments being staturised and staturised developments being transferred into biographical patterns.³

⇒ It is important to recognise that the social itself gains a categorical character – and with this a certain quality. We have to look at how quality is understood for our purpose:

Description

First quality can be understood as ‘description’: a measurement instrument that is insofar complex as it aims on understanding the social according to strict criteria. These are given by a set of three sets of dimensions with four factors each – this is presented in the following table.

³ This cannot be explored here and is not least about the question of revisiting citizenship – it will be touched upon in Herrmann, forthcoming (b)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>FACTORS</strong></th>
<th><strong>CONSTITUTIONAL FACTORS</strong></th>
<th><strong>CONDITIONAL FACTORS</strong></th>
<th><strong>NORMATIVE FACTORS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHOWING</strong></td>
<td>Processes</td>
<td>Opportunities &amp; Contingencies</td>
<td>Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FACTORS</strong></td>
<td>Personal (Human) Security</td>
<td>Socio-Economic Security</td>
<td>Social Justice (Equity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Recognition</td>
<td>Social Cohesion</td>
<td>Solidarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Responsiveness</td>
<td>Social Inclusion</td>
<td>Equal Valuation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal (Human) Capacity</td>
<td>Social Empowerment</td>
<td>Human Dignity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSESSMENT</strong></td>
<td>Qualified by Profiles</td>
<td>Measured by Social Quality Indicators</td>
<td>Allowing Judgement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAIN DETERMINANTS</strong></td>
<td>Each factor is an outcome of processes concerning the formation of a diversity of collective identities, strongly influenced by the interplay of processes of self-</td>
<td>Each factor is mainly influenced by aspects of the interaction between the two main tensions and is, therefore, especially situated in one part of the quadrangle of</td>
<td>Each factor is influenced by the dialectic relationship between conditional and constitutional factors and is therefore providing a thread, welding the different</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
realisation across two main tensions and therefore also situated in one part of the quadrangle of the conditional factors.

the constitutional factors together.

---

**Evaluation**

The same criteria apply for the evaluation – and later again for the imagination. The difference, however, is that we are now not simply describing the social (or the social dimension of a situation, institution, behaviour, process ... ) but now we are looking for a quality standard that

*is concerned with the means and processes and relations necessary for people to be capable of actively participating in social relations and actively influencing the immediate and more distant social and physical environment.*

We are at a stage where we are looking for ways of valuing the present patterns in terms of their contribution to ‘good quality’. However, this ‘goodness’ is given by the interaction of the different factors. So we are here actually looking at the processuality and how it creates space for soci(et)al practice.

**Imagination**

Here we are looking – on the basis of preceding analysis – for ways to enhance the interplay. Appropriateness is an important matter in question – as matter of matching existing conditions: reflecting the history(ies), resources, structures etc. (always in their ‘Gewordensein’, i.e. taking them in the way from where and in which way they
developed). This brings another dimension into play, namely the historical process, understood as

>a notion that generalizes an intricate complex of internal transformations and actions of various historical subjects, as a result of which important societal changes and integration, continuous enlargement of intersocietal systems take place, transition to the new levels of development is going on, and in general (taking into consideration the present results and future perspectives), humankind gets transformed from a potential unity into an actual one.\(^4\)

It is as well an important issue insofar it allows to determine a fundamentally new framework for civil society (organisations), not seeing them as ‘element of a given overall structure but as elementary form of an ongoing process of production, reproduction and change.

As said, in both cases, the evaluation and the imagination, the following definition of social quality applies:

\[
\text{Social quality is concerned with the means and processes and relations necessary for people to be capable of actively participating in social relations and actively influencing the immediate and more distant social and physical environment.}
\]

Deemed to failing action or able to develop practice?

The question to be asked is whether we are deemed to failing action or able to develop (re-integrative) practice when ideal types have become real yet the quest for pure non-profitness unsustainable.

Two institutional dis-integrated futures posited for the third sector to date include the furtherance of a mixed economy and reframing as agents of social capital maintenance. Ongoing corporatisation of the nonprofit sector as part of buttressing the philanthropic base (Eiderberry & Kluvers 2004) via partnerships with business and venture philanthropists will no doubt increase the individualist behaviours of third sector

\(^4\) Grinin, 2006: 14
organisations. The resultant morphology of the third sector in a mixed economy may well become that of ‘nonprofit businesses’ or ‘entrepreneurial nonprofits’. This movement is matched by a parallel transformation, the emergence of the concept of social businesses and so-called ‘responsible corporations’ (see Herrmann, forthcoming (a) for a critique of the concept of corporate social responsibility). Such transfers from the third sector to the market and from the market to the third sector will no doubt intersect.

Reframing as agents of social capital maintenance is an alternate future noted by Anheier (2009).

*Second, they (non-profit organisations) are seen as central to civil society approaches, specifically the Neo-Tocquevillian emphasis on the nexus between social capital and social and economic development. Attempts to revive or strengthen a sense of community and belonging and enhance civic mindedness and engagement (including volunteering and charitable giving) are illustrative of this perspective.*

*(Anheier 2009: 1083)*

This raises the expectation that civil society can act as a panacea to counteract individualisation (with the rise of social capital acting as stimulation for state and market operation). This broadens the composition of the third sector as the heterogeneous infrastructure of civil society to include a wider spectrum of (in)formalisation (including self-organising community and a wide range of avenues for participation and connection). Van Til (2008) calls for such widening when he challenges the narrow focus of third sector empiricism which has made invisible a broad range of grassroots, cooperative and mutual benefit organizations. The emergence of social capital formation as core business creates an alternate yet intermeshed legitimacy for the third sector alongside the state and the market.

Both of these futures maintain, yet challenge by convergence or collapsing of categories, the trinity. There is a sense of needing to move beyond analysing increased hybridity to considering more fundamental organisational change and transformation. So third sector theorising gives way to a new focus on organisational morphing rather than the
assumption of static form. The unit of analysis and theorising is still however the organisation or organising.

An alternate future of the third sector has been alluded to by Anheier (2009) that of a bastion of accountability within society.

Third, nonprofits are part of a wider social accountability perspective that sees these organizations as instruments of greater transparency, heightened accountability, and improved governance of public institutions. Such mechanisms include citizen advisory boards, community councils, participatory budgeting, public expenditure tracking, and monitoring of public services.

(Anheier 2009: 1083)

Nonprofits as sites of dissent, innovation and transformative collectivism, and as agents of change are not new castings. This could involve a resurgence of the conflict paradigm (a major issue for the third sector alluded to by Salamon and Anheier 1996) or a sideways movement to new paradigms of collaborative competition (see Baulderstone & Earles 2009 for an exposition of partnering while contracting).

The question however is accountability against what measures and within what worldview? There have been three waves or paradigms of third sector-ism to date. The first wave empirically explored non-profitiness while the second wave established third sector-ness (Taylor 2010). The third wave is emerging around the maxim of social impact as a positive not residual definition for activity geared at creating organisations and organising to enable social investment.

What would SQ mean for/say about this?

Implications for the practice and theory of the Third Sector are obvious though not easy to implement. They can be summarised in two respects.

First, the concept reflects very much the restrictions of the sector and sector research itself. In the literature it is frequently – especially with respect to terms like NGOs or NPOs – mentioned that we are only able to develop a ‘negative’ category, looking at a
'residual' value rather than a positive outlook that is immanent. And indeed this is a problem as we find with many respects the contradictions within the sector or between its organisations. However, the proposed framework allows it to make a step away from a structuralist approach towards an open concept. In this light we two moments need to be emphasised. (i) we are dealing in and with a ‘field’ or ‘space’. In theoretical respect we can link very much to the works brought forward by Norbert Elias and Pierre Bourdieu, being captured by the terms habitus and figuration. So we are actually not starting from the organisational setting but focus on the societal setting and the challenges with it: the processes, their blockages and accelerations. From here, then, we can get a grasp of social spaces and the different actors in the perspective of their contribution to social quality. (ii) we have the means to re-visit the question of ‘social capital’. In the presented light of capital we are able to see civil and civic activities from the third sector as demand driven. Rather than looking for “what do and can individuals contribute?”, we are now concerned with the issue of “where can individuals locate themselves within and between the spaces of society?”. This means that we are now looking at the question of power and its two dimensions: (a) the one of abilities (pouvoir, koennen, possere) and (b) the other of control.

– Obviously, Antonio Gramsci delivered already much of the groundwork which, though forgotten over time and political rejections, gains increasing meaning again.

Second, linking to what had been said in the previous section it is important to note a paradox. The third sector will only be able to emerge as a positive force – and possibly: will only be able to survive with a distinct feature if it is ready to give up claiming a separate and distinct role. The positive claim can as factually relevant can only be put into practice by starting truly from the soci(et)al entity of which it is part and to the development of which it wants (and claims) to contribute. Having mentioned structure and processuality as constitutive, the sector organisations are facing the challenge to see themselves as process within a changing structure, that is see themselves as changing the structure – adaptation, in this light, is adapting action rather than the orientation of practice.
Conclusions: What strategy?

Within and beyond third wave third sector-ism is a space that does not involve managing individual conflicts whether they are with the state or market, or within the third sector. A space beyond mapping and managing divisions and separations that enables organising that is genuinely working for change and which accepts the contradictions if seeking to represent society. A space, an eco-system, where the focus is agency not form; that transcends the illusion of competition and the dominance of the market paradigm; and where there is freedom, alternate thinking, democracy, and innovative problem-solving.

Integral theory approaches (see Wilbur 1997 for an exposition of such approaches) would seek to (re)integrate the biographical and societal; and the institutional and the less formal. As an integral theory approach, a social quality approach seeks to work from that which is inherent in practice not that which is espoused in ideals. This requires a movement away from the notion of the trinity and the ‘solution’ of adjusting the balance between the three sectors that so occupies current policy debate and the adversary and/or ally positioning of ‘outside’ and ‘inside’ and ‘acting upon’ that so saps the energy of those who seek to design and implement policy and practice. This requires (re)cognition of the inherent entity of the social and economic and political (actors and actions) and the remerging of allocation and distribution as (re)production (as aims and arena for actions). These are essential enabling elements for a (re)new(ed) standpoint, the social, and a one-world approach (differentiated but the same).

Postscript: beginning of a conversation ...

Beginning of a conversation – claiming such title for the final section has a special historical slant also. It is not just about considering a renewed of perhaps even new dialogue between two different perspectives – perspectives that could be called micro- and macro-perspective. It is – more importantly – considering to return to a dialogue that has been at the beginning not of social debates and social research in this area: a dialogue, the social and societal limitations from which it emerged and its inherent limitations of limiting itself to its own success. We can easily say that systems tend to orient towards self-reproduction and self-maintenance – the different perspectives on
this, be it one from economics, theory of power, systems theory etc., all have their specific merits and don't need to be explored here. Nor does it deserve exploration to look into details of the emergence of the process of the ‘original accumulation’, the tipping-point at which systems reached a stage where interactive orientations turned into self-reflexivity. Important is, however, to look back into history and take up a debate that saw civil society (organisations), NGOs, NPOs and all these members of a large, diverse and split family as part of a wider societal range: being part of nationally, socially and substantially different ‘systems’ and aiming on change by starting exactly from this ‘integrated’ position. There are surely different perspectives – the Marxian/Gramscian, the managerial/institutionalist, the subsidiarian-Catholic notion, the Republican stance to name but a few. In any case, only a retrospective analysis will help us to understanding and tackle the wider challenges of today.

_The great problem for tomorrow, as for today, is to create a mass civilisation of high quality. To do so is very costly. It is unthinkable without large surpluses devoted to the service of society, and without the leisure that mechanization will no doubt soon be able to offer us. In the industrialised countries, such a future can be envisaged not too far ahead. The problem is more complex in the world as a whole. For, just as economic growth has civilization more accessible to some social classes than to others, it has similarly differentiated various countries in the world._

_(Braudel, 1987: 21)_
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