

WIAS Discussion Paper No.2010-003

**PLACING STATE-VOLUNTARISM LINKS IN WELFARE
POLITICS**

A THEORETICAL REVIEW

October 18, 2010

Taekyoon Kim (Waseda University / WIAS)



1-6-1 Nishiwaseda, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 169-8050, Japan
Tel: +81-3-5286-2460 ; Fax: +81-3-5286-2470

PLACING STATE-VOLUNTARISM LINKS IN WELFARE POLITICS

A THEORETICAL REVIEW

ABSTRACT

This paper aims to describe a theoretical account for the varying relationship between the state and voluntary agencies in delivering social services. By addressing how two traditional opponents pave a way for relational linkages in terms of social provisions, it elaborates the way of constructing and locating inter-sectoral relations in the context of welfare politics, whose fronts would be moving over time. Against the previous categorization of state-voluntary sector links, primarily based upon instrumental utilities of the voluntary sector, this study presents an alternative relational linkage model that can be socially constructed by the interactions between state autonomy and organized voluntarism at a given historical contingency. Such a historical-institutionalist approach results in four possible categories: legitimization, mobilization, cooptation, and accommodation.

Taekyoon Kim, D.Phil.
Assistant Professor
Waseda Institute for Advanced Study
tkkim@aoni.waseda.jp

INTRODUCTION

The last three decades witnessed a rapid increase in the number of voluntary or nonprofit organizations in many countries. Peer self-help groups and community-based organizations mushroom, and their functions widely range from advocacy to service provider. The upsurge of the voluntary sector reflects the growth of social movements aiming for greater citizen participation in the formation and implementation of public policy and for greater decentralization of governmental functions. Despite its salient functions, however, the voluntary sector has received little attention from academic publishers and writers. Given that it has been overlooked in scholarly research, the voluntary sector is one of the least understood components of modern society and the political economy of the welfare state in particular.

The voluntary sector in the mixed form of welfare, however, began to be rediscovered by disenchantment with market solutions, which lack in attentions to socially excluded individuals and communities, and market's vulnerability to the changing economic environment in global financial markets. Another reason for growing concerns about voluntary agencies is grave skepticism about the capacity of the state to deliver public services that satisfy user expectations and diverse citizen aspirations. It is in this regard that the return to the voluntary sector since the mid-1970s coincided with both growing national and international economic pressures, and the paralleling retreat of the state from the universal coverage of welfare provision. Such a practical expectation on to what degree voluntary associations could contribute to delivering social services more effectively has moved closer to central concerns, from the periphery of most social policy agendas.

Public concerns over the voluntary sector have been diversely addressed in tune with different social and political backgrounds in which voluntarism is anchored. American and European scholars, indeed, approached the functional utility of the voluntary sector respectively from very different angles: whereas American social scientists viewed voluntary associations as an essential ingredient of a civil, liberal society on the theoretical basis of Tocqueville's observations in *Democracy in America*, many European scholars found it difficult to see the voluntary sector as an organizational universe of its own, locating it in conjunction with state intervention (Bauer, 1990; Finlayson, 1990). While American scholars' research on the voluntary sector has been mostly done in the tradition of either microeconomics or organizational analysis, European approaches tend to describe its macro-political mechanisms, mainly focusing on the social and political contextualization of state-voluntarism linkages.

The formulation of social policy in relation to voluntary agencies, therefore, depends on how the framers of such policy view the nature of the relationship between voluntary organizations and the state. Accordingly, the underlying nucleus of state-voluntary sector relations develops from the moving frontiers of the welfare mix, which should be understood as the notion of historical relationships shifting over time between the state and civil society, rather than a static thing (Thompson, 1963). An ahistorical or too narrow view of that relationship, without serious considerations of historical relatedness, can lead to the distorted identification of the voluntary sector, by highlighting its practical utilities rather than its historical evolution vis-à-vis the state. In the United States during the 1980s, for example, the belief that voluntary agencies are simply substitutes for government service provision spawned a miscalculation of the ability of charities to compensate for cutbacks in public budgets for social service delivery (Murray, 1982). In this sense, a macro-sociological and historical perspective on the statutory-voluntary relationship is necessarily required for comprehensive scholarly attempts to not only locate the voluntary sector in the context of the welfare mix, but also prepare sensible prescriptions of social policy in dealing with voluntary agencies.

Some previous literature relevant to the state-society studies demonstrates that the dominant paradigm for explaining the sectoral relationship has been one of competition, whereupon the state and voluntary associations vie for dominance. This view seems to find support in the writings of both conservative American theorists such as Berger and Neuhaus (1977) and social policy analysts on the left, such as Donnison (1984). However, it is, more recently, argued that even countries with more state-centred traditions are trying to utilize voluntary organizations in new ways to improve the effectiveness of public services. An increasing number of scholars suggest that partnership rather than conflict characterizes the relationship between the two sectors in many countries, though the partnerships were not necessarily of the same type (Kuhnle & Selle, 1992; Salamon, 1995; Johnson, 1999; Ringen, Kwon, Yi, Kim, & Lee, 2010). The effective governance ends in welfare provisions via cooperation between the state and non-state sectors, which would deny the strict sectorization to some extent. Sectoral boundaries, indeed, are far from constant, rather becoming increasingly blurred.

In examining the changing patterns of state-voluntary links, this paper proceeds in three steps. First, it starts by exploring existing approaches to the state-voluntary mix, with the special attention to the social construction perspective. Second, it tackles the linkage issues by demonstrating how state-voluntary relations are shaped and changed by variations of social embeddedness and institutional adaptations. Finally, it develops how the two sectors are able to adapt themselves mutually to a given social and political environment, and describe what institutional tools have been employed by the government sector in order to incorporate voluntary organizations into a certain form of collaboration. To this end, the autonomy of the state, the degree of organized voluntarism and interactions between them are advanced as critical variables differentiating the linkage patterns of state-voluntary relations.

THREE APPROACHES TO THE VOLUNTARY SECTOR

THE ECONOMIC APPROACH

The economic approach to the voluntary sector does often overlook the underlying organizational rationales of voluntary associations or does it fail to investigate organizational cultures. Rather, it examines their functions and contributions to resource allocation and social welfare. This approach is presented by the American micro-economic school which views voluntary agencies either as a replacement of the twin failure of market and state, or as an institutional option to reduce transaction costs in the process of service delivery (Estelle, 1990; Hansmann, 1987; Rose-Ackerman, 1990). From the economic perspective, nonprofit organizations are considered as a more trustworthy actor because they have fewer incentives to sideline service qualities in order to increase profits, thereby reducing information asymmetries between producers and consumers.

Micro-economic analyses, however, have been criticized on various grounds. Regarding comparative purposes, their greatest deficiency comes from the fact that they cannot explain cross-national variations in the size and composition of the voluntary sector, due to excluding variables external to the micro-economic model, which include social, ethnic, and ideological heterogeneity. Also, this approach fails to spell out why market and state only are not able to compensate each other's shortcomings, instead of resorting to the third sector. Moreover, American sociologists criticize such an economic method, mainly by revealing its inherent limitation: it cannot deal with the effects of a wide range of institutional factors and state policies (DiMaggio & Anheier, 1990). Economic models tend not to reflect the essentially symbiotic and mutually independent nature of the government-nonprofit power relations in most countries. The economic approach, which is heavily

relying on opportunity costs of rational choice and economic utilities of the voluntary sector, is not an appropriate method to describe the overall contours of the state-voluntary sector linkage that requires the existence of governmental sectors corresponding to organized movements of voluntary agencies.

THE SOCIOLOGICAL APPROACH

In general, much of research on voluntary and nonprofit organizations by sociologists, just like the economic approach, has focused on particular sub-sectors rather than on the inter-sectoral relationship as a whole. The sociological approach tends to put more weight on micro-level observations such as the origins of voluntary organizations and organizational analysis covering behavioural distinctions between nonprofits and for-profits, rather than macro-level analyses that can be relationally combined with other sectors. Nevertheless, it cannot be concluded that sociological perspectives totally ignore the government-voluntary sector relationship, because they design the linkage development from micro-level organizational behaviour analysis to its macro-level relations to state institutions. Characteristically, DiMaggio and Anheier (1990) attempt to explain the existence of nonprofit organizations in organizational, sectoral, and societal terms by repositioning 'nonprofit' as a dependent variable, with a significant conclusion that the origins, behaviour, and functions of the voluntary sector reflect institutional factors that are chiefly mobilized by the state.

As regards institutional factors, a new sociological institutionalism puts forward that organizations are becoming more homogeneous, and bureaucratic components remain as the common organizational form (DiMaggio & Powell, 1991). Therefore, structural change in organizations seems less driven by competition or by the need for efficiency than by institutional rigidity. Institutional forms of organizational change occur as the result of 'institutional isomorphic' processes that make organizations more similar without necessarily making them more efficient. Accordingly, tracking the changing processes of institutional characteristics of the voluntary sector may help to evince the contours of the shifting patterns of its sectoral relations to the state.

In a much broader sense, a group of sociologists introduce the notion of 'public sphere' as a political space where to identify the roles of the voluntary sector within the terrain of the welfare state (Evers, 1993). Wuthnow (1992), borrowing its conceptual basis from Habermas, proposes that the public sphere is built upon the connotation of a mythical arena in which citizens act independently of self-interest or state coercion, by rational rules in enlightened solidarity. The voluntary sector, possibly, remains at the centre of the public sphere, by engaging in social programmes established in this middle ground between the state and market. However, we can witness that voluntary organizations are not the only mechanisms by which people can express values, nor do they obviously command more effective rationality than other types of institution. In no country are they ever likely to control anything like a sufficient proportion of the country's resources instead of the state or the market, and informality and small size of the voluntary sector hamper itself to become the best guarantor of surrogates for state provision. We, thus, need more knowledge about how the state relates to the voluntary sector for more precise accounts in lines with the public sphere.

THE SOCIAL CONSTRUCTION APPROACH

Beyond sociological and economic approaches described above, a scholarly attempt to combine state intervention and responsive voluntary agencies culminates in a raft of middle-ranged institutional solutions, which are constructed by macro-social processes of the welfare state. This approach tends to assume that an appropriate level of independence of

the voluntary sector depends on the degree of its autonomy in relations with the state and associated public authorities. The notion of social constructivism in search of the *making* of state-voluntary links, thus, is necessarily tied up with historical institutionalism to demonstrate the evolution of how to incorporate sectoral relations into a particular set of institutional arrangements (Thelen & Steinmo, 1992). Indeed, it contributes to enriching the understanding of how the voluntary sector responds to state intervention, and marshals its influence in order to shape state policies; simultaneously, it attempts to expand knowledge of how the state invents institutional devices designed to control voluntary forces at different historical junctures. In consequence, the social construction approach helps to reveal the underlying structure of sectoral relations embedded in given historical conditions.

The terms and structure of the social construction are determined not by an instrumental management of the voluntary sector, but by various modes of its interactions with the state. At one extreme, the voluntary sector degenerates itself from political challenger against the state to an extended arm of the state. Increased state penetration into the affairs of the voluntary sector prompts an increasing number of voluntary associations to evolve into a 'shadow state' acting in lines with state guidelines (Wolch, 1990). The voluntary sector's capacity to act independently and initiate social change is at stake as it remains as a 'para-state apparatus' which is involuntarily administered by public authorities and charged with major service responsibilities that otherwise should be taken by the public sector. In this case, the voluntary sector is in danger of losing its autonomy, thereby being restrained in the shrinkage of its advocacy functions. Nevertheless, this extreme stance that the social position of voluntary organizations is solely constructed along with state intervention brings about unbalanced frameworks within which the countervailing value of the voluntary sector can be sidelined.

By contrast, 'corporatist' perspectives come to the fore as we need to see mutual penetrations between the state and voluntary agencies on a relatively equal basis. In theory, corporatism has a flexible utility of democratic governance in the sense of providing the middle ground where public authorities and other societal groups sit together to reconcile their interests towards the formation of state-society partnership for welfare provisions. The recognition of voluntary organizations as a partner participating in state decision-making becomes a political solution accompanying the notion that civil society and the state are able to grow hand in hand in a positive fashion. In this regard, the voluntary sector offers a buffer zone between the state and civil society, in which institutional designs to promote state-voluntary sector partnerships mitigate political conflicts and enhance social cohesion (Lehmbruch, 1984).

In a nutshell, the social construction approach contributes to eliciting a middle-range emulsion between the state's macro-level structures and the voluntary sector's micro-level reactions to the state's structural bearing, even if the power balance of state-voluntary relations is always shifting over time in accordance with different sets of historical contingencies (Giddens, 1979).

LINKAGE DEBATES

While the voluntary sector is the point of departure, we now know that the voluntary sector cannot be properly understood without a better understanding of the state. The relationship between the state and voluntary associations has grown out of different political, social and cultural contexts. Such relations, then, account for organizational, ideological and service-delivery structures of the voluntary sector in the context of the modern welfare state. In this regard, debates over possible scenarios regarding this sectoral relationship necessarily involve a considerable degree of complexities of the macro-micro link between the state and civil society (Münch and Smelser, 1987).

Although some forms of linkages between the state and the voluntary sector are increasingly being accepted as inevitable, whether these linkages are desirable remains controversial. Overall, there are two distinctions on the linkages of voluntary organizations and government: the 'functionalist' perspective, which favours such linkages, and the 'liberationist' perspective, which argues for fewer linkages (Coston, 1998). It is fairly notable that it is quality and not necessarily quantity of linkages that determines the ramifications – whether positive or negative. In many cases, state-voluntary relationships have commonly been thought of as competitive or conflictive, and government has been looked upon as a body which has actively infringed upon the autonomy of voluntary organizations. However, Salamon and Anheier (1996: 43)'s data on voluntary associations in seven countries challenge the 'conflict theories' and thus "lend credence to an alternative theory that sees government and the non-profit sector as potential partners and allies". Alongside the positive notion of government-voluntary sector partnerships, it can be also argued that the establishment of such rapprochement must be based on a strategic vision of the voluntary mission and how best it can be realized by non-voluntary forces. In fact, albeit the positive findings, it is vital to remember that many voluntary organizations continue to insist on strict autonomy, whereas many governments remain determined to repress and control voluntary operations. In consequence, all types of the state-voluntary nexus include always a gear-changing complexity of linkages, which range from constructive positivism to coercive negativism.

Such debates over a particular set of linkage between the state and voluntary agencies have been placed at the centre of how to promote service provision via the voluntary sector. By tracking the historical development of relationships between the British government and the Charity Organisation Society in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Lewis (1995) concludes that the provision of welfare in Britain has always been mixed by the combination of voluntary forces and statutory agencies, even if the balance of power between the two sectors had been consistently challenged and changed. Such a sectoral linkage is also endorsed by Webb and Webb (1912: 225-35)'s earlier work, which shows that a conceptualization of the government-voluntary linkage had been shifted from the relationship as separate spheres to one as active interactions that they describe as the idea of the 'extension ladder' of the public sector. The overriding notion of these scholarly accounts for state-voluntary relations in the early stages of modern state-building is mostly confined to how the state manipulated voluntary welfare associations as a shadow state agency operating on behalf of the state.

Further development of linkage debates over the changing boundaries between the two sectors is elicited by the twofold elaborations in postwar welfare states. First, initiatives of the sectoral relationship have been increasingly taken by non-state actors, rather than the state itself. According to Deakin (1995)'s research on state-voluntary partnerships, it is a gross oversimplification to portray the evolution of the voluntary sector over the postwar period as being merely a consequence of the retreat of the state. Other variables such as changing values and external factors – for instance, democratization, economic crisis, or collective forces of the voluntary sector – are as influential as the growth and subsequent shrinkage of the state's sphere of action. Second, contemporary discussions of the state-voluntary welfare mix in Western democracies are stretched out to take in such a new societal issue as participation and active citizenship (Hirst, 1997; Brown, Kenny, Turner, & Prince, 2000). The creation of centralized voluntary associations, which emphasize solidarity among voluntary organizations and independence from the state, facilitates the process of politicization and its associated social movements. In doing so, the voluntary sector, despite its internal disruptions and limits, can provide community involvement, client focus and avenues for democratic engagements in propelling welfare provisions as the realization of social citizenship. The recent weights of linkage analyses, thus, concentrate on community-based voluntary associations providing relevant welfare services and sustaining social capital.

All in all, a consistent theme in the government's stance towards the voluntary sector, albeit the oscillation of its intensity, would be identified with the fact that the linkage effort has always existed in order to utilize voluntary welfare provision in reducing the costs of government provision in a changing social and political environment. On the other side, the voluntary sector has been expanding its sphere of influence vis-à-vis the state by not only mobilising organized power for participatory involvements but also being incorporated into the state's governance institutions.

CATEGORIZING THE STATE-VOLUNTARISM LINKAGE

Many scholars in search of the state-voluntary linkage in the social policy context have devised a model or typology by which its changing contours can be properly measured and expected (Brinkerhoff & Brinkerhoff, 2002). While voluntary associations recognize that they cannot insulate their members or clients from external political systems due to their innate weaknesses such as insufficient manpower, financial shortage, and the lack of expertise, the state, on its part, is necessarily aware of the needs and activities of voluntary organizations in the sense that the latter has a significant influence on overall service patterns and often state policies as well. Beyond minimal efforts, both government and voluntary organizations can benefit, in a variety of contexts, from a more deliberate pursuit of cooperative relationships. Such a mutual gain is more likely to lead to a blurring of the boundaries between the two sectors, thereby expanding the number and range of quasi-public organizations. Therefore, it may be seemingly impossible or useless to classify the changing relationship between the two sectors into several fixed types that are artificially preset. Nevertheless, categorising state-voluntary relations is significantly meaningful for the reason that systematic efforts for taxonomy and modelling provide a handy tool for quick comparisons between different welfare regimes, the selection of preferred types, and the invention of programmes and projects accordingly. The categorization, indeed, is designed to assist governments, voluntary organizations, and other practitioners, when they need to identify and promote the most productive state-voluntary sector relationship under a specific model of contextualization. By and large, the linkage model can be carved up by two broad but conflicting patterns: 'instrumental' and 'relational.'

INSTRUMENTAL LINKAGES

The first model is tightly anchored in the economic effectiveness of the nonprofit sector, with the particular reference to its functional or instrumental utilities in terms of service provision. By relying on different strands of welfare contributions that the voluntary sector can provide, Young (2001) divides the changing sectoral relations into three sub-clusters: voluntary agencies as self-governing supplements in parallel with the state, ones as complements to the state in a close partnership, or ones as an adversarial challenger. In supplementary model, nonprofits are seen as fulfilling the demand for public goods left unsatisfied by government. In complementary model, nonprofits are regarded as partners to government, helping to carry out the delivery of public goods, which is largely financed by government. In the adversarial model, nonprofits prod government to make changes in social policy and to hold itself accountable to the public. This formulation of classification seems to utilize and duplicate Kramer (1981: 234)'s earlier classic taxonomy that categorized the service provider role of voluntary agencies as primary, complements, and supplements.

In a more comprehensive respect, Gidron and other collaborators develop an alternative state-voluntary typology with the following four models: government dominant, third sector dominant, a dual system, and collaborative model (Gidron, Kramer & Salamon, 1992). In the government-dominant model, government plays the primary role in both

financing and delivery of social services, whereas the third-sector-dominant model, by contrast, places the voluntary sector in the key role of financing and administering social and health services. The dual system sets government and the third sector alike to finance and deliver welfare services, but the two sectors work separately or parallel to each other. For example, the third sector might supplement government services by using its own funds to fill a specific service niche not covered by government. In the fourth model, the third sector and government work together rather than separately. The authors' final conclusion is that the collaborative model is much more common and desirable than many policy-makers or critics of the welfare state believe. However, this typological formulation does not differ fundamentally from the previous works of instrumental linkages because it does not present any possible and substantive ways of *how* the state and voluntary agencies construct (or destruct) a particular set of interactive relations.

This sort of instrumental approach, entrenched in the practical fabric of the voluntary sector, may contribute to galvanizing the normative nature of voluntarism as an alternative source of service providers, thereby securing voluntary associations as a secondary replacement of the public welfare. Nevertheless, such a functional social policy categorization encounters difficulties in locating actual paths of causal relations between the state's welfare policies and voluntary responsiveness. With no serious consideration of historical and relational contexts, any accounts for state-voluntary links can be easily entrapped into the web of instrumentality, which views voluntarism only as a means of service provision, lacking in the processes of the construction of sectoral linkages.

RELATIONAL LINKAGES

In comparison with American scholars' reliance on the instrumental aspect of state-voluntary linkages, many European scholars make efforts to elaborate the interactive mechanism laying behind sectoral relations which they consider especially important in, what they label, a 'relational perspective' (Kuhnle & Selle, 1992: 26-31). The first dimension relates to how to measure the closeness of voluntary agencies to the state with respect to scope, frequency and easiness of communications and interactions. Political culture and social systems play an intermediate role in determining how great the ideological distance between the two sectors can be and maintaining the voluntary sector's proximity to the state in either near and integrated forms or distant and separated modes. The second dimension, reversely, involves the independence of voluntary organizations from the state, and hence they may be either autonomous or dependent in terms of financing and organizational control. Whether the foundation of social structure is market-oriented or state-dominated marks out the general profile of state intervention and the resulting dependency of the voluntary sector. Accordingly, combining the two dimensions creates the four variances of relational linkages: integrated dependence, separate dependence, integrated autonomy, and separate autonomy. They all represent varying degrees of the sectoral interaction and its impacts on the relationship formation, which may fill the gaps left by the functionalist approach that assumes voluntary organizations as a surrogate of social service providers.

However, this relational linkage is bound to face two methodological drawbacks in categorizing state-voluntary relations. First, its unawareness of historical consideration may retard us to explore the transformation of sectoral relations, which can be often reshuffled and merged over time in accordance with the shifting power balances between the two sectors. Second, it may fail to give an accurate explanation on how the state and voluntary agencies would reach an institutional solution as a final outgrowth of their interactions in the wake of the formation of sectoral relations. In response to these weak points, we move into the next section in search of a sensible underpinning for combining historical and institutional factors within the purview of the relational perspective.

INSTITUTIONALIZING THE MOVING FRONTIERS: STATE AUTONOMY, VOLUNTARY CHALLENGES, AND INSTITUTIONAL OUTCOMES

Locating the state-voluntary linkage in welfare politics, it can be said, entails a nuanced interpretation of its middle-ranged relations intersecting between state autonomy, voluntary reactions, and institutional arrangements constructed by the two sectors (Seibel, 1990; Kim, 2008). Categorizing such relational linkages, therefore, comes up with different sets of institutional adaptations embedded in social and historical settings. In this regard, understanding social embeddedness and historical contingencies is the first-order condition required to characterize and institutionalize the moving frontiers of state-voluntary sector relations. Neither government nor the voluntary sector can escape from what is imposed on them in lines with institutional apparatuses and national foundations of politics, all of which have evolved in national history with endorsement by ideological justifications (Mahoney & Rueschemeyer, 2003). In so doing, the sectoral linkage does not necessarily follow the instrumental logic of economic superiority in terms of quality and efficiency in providing welfare services. Voluntary organizations provide a broad span of organizational behaviour allowing for efficient provision of public goods, strategic filters absorbing the pressure of social and political tensions, and reformative challenge against the state's social policies. Whatever the function of the voluntary sector may be, it is shaped by the structure of its social embeddedness in a given social and historical condition. Accordingly, it makes sense to assume that the state-voluntary sector linkage is shaped by the embeddedness structure which, at the same time, steers institutional designs by which the mission of voluntary associations, in turn, is determined in accordance with historical contingencies. Under this historical-institutional framework, we can further explain that there is a variety of policy options for the use of the voluntary sector as a tool of government action: subsidiaries, vouchers, contracting, supplements, complements, and collaboration (Salamon, 2002).

The structure of social embeddedness, which is the foundation for different linkage patterns, is constituted and articulated by the distinctive mixture between degrees of state autonomy and degrees of organized voluntarism. The degree of state autonomy is referred to as the effectiveness of governance that the state exercises in the terrain of social policy: to what degree the state is capable to intervene into and control organizational patterns of the voluntary sector, and hence how autonomous the state is in shielding itself from organized challenges from social forces. The magnitude of state intervention is differentiated along a continuum from failed states with a marginalized function of governance to strong states with a high level of social engineering (in either democratic or authoritarian ways). The degree of organized voluntarism is referred to as collective forces of voluntary organizations by mobilizing social movements or delivering their voices to government via organized channels. Likewise, the magnitude of organized voluntarism is differentiated along a continuum from decentralized to nation-wide scope of voluntary actions. On the one hand, small community-based groups tend to play an intermediate and subsidiary role as service providers, which are done on behalf of the state by statutory tools of governance. Peak associations at national level, on the other, intend to play a role in marshalling organized voluntarism in order to coordinate policy-making and service provisions with the government. Accordingly, the restricted interaction of small organizations results in relatively strong autonomy of the state, but the embeddedness structure dominated by the active involvement of peak associations can make state autonomy becoming weaker. Thus, varieties of the embeddedness structure generate different patterns of government-voluntary linkages that also shape different modes of institutional adaptation in a changing social and historical environment.

FIGURE 1. TWO VALUE DIFFERENTIATIONS OF STATE-VOLUNTARISM LINKS

		Organized Voluntarism	
		Low	High
State Autonomy	Low	<i>LEGITIMIZATION</i>	<i>ACCOMMODATION</i>
	High	<i>MOBILIZATION</i>	<i>COOPTATION</i>

As a result, it is worthwhile to confirm that middle-ranged categories of state-voluntary sector relations culminate into institutional adaptations as a logical corollary of sectoral interactions. Along with varying juxtapositions of state autonomy and organized voluntarism, state-voluntary sector links can be grouped into four different institutional arrangements as shown in figure 1: legitimization, mobilization, cooptation, and accommodation (Kim, 2008: 824). All four categories of institutional arrangements are entrenched by historical contingencies affecting the profiles and density of interactions between the two sectors. I demonstrate these four different categories of institutional adaptation by taking the South Korean experience as a primary example.

LEGITIMIZATION

As for institutional adaptation as *legitimization*, in which the state and voluntary agencies are both too unstable and disorganized to influence the other's behaviours, the relational pattern between the two sectors will be developed at the point where the state seeks to preserve its legitimate control over society even though its control is not so effective to stabilize national systems. The low profile of state welfare and the fragmented social demand for welfare result in two-way institutional solutions for the enhancement of legitimacy: a minimum of welfare provision which is limited to a few key social groups such as civil servants; and calls for the third party involvement in providing welfare services instead of the state. In practice, this type of the relational linkage can be found in cases of 'failed states' on a rocky road of state building (Fukuyama, 2004). The outbreak of the Korean War in 1950 led to absolute poverty and economic disasters in the young Republic of Korea, and severe damage to traditional self-help networks in local communities. In response to the entailing welfare vacuum in this historical event, the government was driven to request emergency relief aid from the international community, thereby allowing foreign voluntary agencies to take over the distributive functions of social protection, which otherwise should have been done by the Korean government. Ironically, the absence of state welfare and the consequent domination of foreign relief agencies caused political leaders to perceive them as a potential challenge to legitimate governance. The Rhee government restored its regulatory authorities by

positioning itself astride the flow of foreign relief assistance, legislating for its legitimate control over foreign relief activities, and launching selective public welfare schemes limited to specific groups such as war veterans, policemen, and civil servants who could serve to maintain social security and the political legitimacy of this war-stricken government. In a nutshell, the overall process of interactions between the Korean government and foreign voluntary agencies in the wake of the Korean War demonstrates how the two actors relate each other to an institutional set of legitimization.

MOBILIZATION

The second category of sectoral linkages between the state and voluntary organizations crystallizes into institutional adaptation as *mobilization*. Historical contingencies in this categorization create a particular structure of social embeddedness in which state autonomy overshadows organized voluntarism. The weakening of organized voluntarism against state welfare increasingly marginalizes collective actions of the voluntary sector, and makes it possible for the state to penetrate society and achieve coercive compliance from civil society. This category identifies the state as a strong regulator whose main tasks are to muster resources from the voluntary sector and force voluntary associations to take over the mission of service provisions on behalf of the state. Typically, many historical evidences of mass mobilization campaigns spearheaded by Communist regimes, such as the Soviet Russia in the 1920s and China in the late 1950s, come under the category of mobilization. Korea's authoritarian Park Chung Hee regime in the 1970s is another good example to show how the strong state designs and campaigns mass mobilization as an institutional solution to impose welfare responsibilities on non-state actors at local communities. By launching New Community Movement, the Park regime successfully justified the mobilization of welfare contributions from the voluntary sector and subordinated social policy issues to the national priority of economic development. The voluntary sector, during the period of the authoritarian developmental state, played an instrumental role as service providers, just like extended arms of government agencies.

COOPTATION

Cooptation is an institutional tactic of neutralizing or controlling over a minority by assimilating them into the established chain of governance (Cawson, 1985). This category of state-voluntary relations, more often than not, takes place in the structure of social embeddedness where the state still remains in a relatively high degree of autonomous governance but needs to face an increasing organized challenge from the voluntary sector. By means of the selective incorporation of the limited number of influential voluntary actors, the state aims to mute social disorder and lock the selected groups under the government's controlling system. Cooptation through participation ends up as manipulation, rather than the promotion of welfare benefits, because its underlying rationale is not to empower people but to strengthen the governance function. Institutional development during the period of Korea's Fifth Republic in the 1980s best describes institutional adaptation as *cooptation*: Chun's military regime, armed with despotic machinations to control over society, reached a deadlock in the face of the growing challenge of civil society which eventually matured into the driving force for the democratic transition in June 1987. The government exercised the cooptation strategy integrating the small number of voluntary peak associations into service delivery systems that public authorities administered, thereby converting the potential confrontation into a cooperative stance toward state engagement.

ACCOMMODATION

Institutional adaptation as *accommodation* is based upon interactions between a relatively low degree of state intervention and further strengthened collective actions of organized voluntarism. Under this structure of state-voluntary relations, the state, which faces an upsurge of advocacy voluntary groups, is supposed to deteriorate into passive acceptance of social demands for reforming public welfare schemes. The expansion of organized voluntary forces leads to the horizontal development of stronger networks that grow into peak associations at the national level (Kendall, 2003: 66). The politicization of social policy issues in accordance with the expansion of social welfare movements brings advocacy functions to the fore while it undermines voluntary agencies' traditional mission as service providers. In response to this drastic shift of sectoral relations, the state deliberately accommodates (or neutralizes) the assertive demands of the voluntary sector by differentiating its institutional solutions between national associations and small community-based groups. In fact, the Korean welfare politics in the wake of the 1987 June Uprising for democratization shows the duality of accommodation: 'passive' and 'proactive' (Kim, 2008: 837). Passive accommodation is designed to handle the politicized new umbrella networks by accepting their collective claims for public welfare reforms to the minimum, or integrating them into statutory institutions under the rosy slogan of 'state-civil society partnerships'. Proactive accommodation emphasizes the allocative function of voluntary services, by which the state intervenes actively in conventional and small community groups, in order to mobilize them as a major partner in a subordinate position for the delivery of social services by service contracts and public funding. The financial crisis in 1997 can be also seen as another historical juncture at which the Korean government took further measures of dual accommodation strategies as did in the democratic transition (Kim, 2010). It is because the social fallouts of the external crisis hold the sectoral link in a constant fashion: further diminishing state autonomy and growing organized voluntarism.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The historical-institutional linkage model discussed above helps to verify what modes of institutional adaptation between the state and the voluntary sector have been historically evolving at different social and political backdrops. Placing state-voluntary relations into the politics of the welfare state is not a simple and mechanical process focusing on a practical utility of the voluntary sector, but a relational and multifaceted adaptation to social changes over time in shaping distinctive patterns of sectoral relations. Indeed, state-voluntary links can be seen as a tug-of-war between forces from below, in the form of organized voluntarism, popular constellations, and collective actions of various descriptions, and forces from above, in the form of state apparatus of control and governance. That relationship has been a shifting one, regulated by the relative strength of the competing parties and by the social embeddedness constructed by interactions between the two sectors. As a result, some different modes of mixed governance in the terrain of welfare services are created in the meeting ground of the state and civil society. This paper, in this regard, presents four modes of institutional adaptation categorizing different syntheses of the state and voluntary agencies.

Nevertheless, to say that a strong theoretical rationale and causal linkages exist for government-voluntary relationships is not to say that this cooperation has worked out practically in the way the theory predicts. Moreover, most literature shows concerns about the role of the state, relatively ignoring the dynamics of the voluntary sector. Alongside the state, the voluntary sector also continues to expand and undergo its own transformation. Thus, we need to reinforce the weaknesses in the previous research that takes on the state-

centred perspective, by adopting research designs for the voluntary sector as our tasks ahead. Consequently, a country's political tradition and culture, the theory of organizational analysis, and the social embeddedness of inter-sector relations offer good starting points for further studies in understanding and measuring sectoral relations, as well as envisaging either the possibility of encouraging or discouraging competition between the state and voluntary agencies.

REFERENCES:

- Bauer, B. (1990). Voluntary Welfare Associations in Germany and the United States: Theses on the Historical Development of Intermediary Systems. *Voluntas*, 1(1), 97-111.
- Berger, P. & Neuhaus, R. (1977). *To Empower People: From State to Civil Society*. Washington, D.C.: American Enterprise Institute.
- Brinkerhoff, J. & Brinkerhoff, D. (2002). Government-Nonprofit Relations in Comparative Perspective: Evolution, Themes and New Directions. *Public Administration and Development*, 22(1), 3-18.
- Brown, K., Kenny, S., Turner, B. & Prince, J. (2000). *Rhetorics of Welfare: Uncertainty, Choice and Voluntary Associations*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Cawson, A. (Ed.) (1985). *Organized Interests and the State: Studies in Meso-Corporatism*. London: Sage.
- Coston, J. (1998). A Model and Typology of Government-NGO Relationships. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 27(3), 358-82.
- Deakin, N. (1995). The Perils of Partnership: the Voluntary Sector and the State, 1945-1992. In J. Davis Smith, C. Rochester, & R. Hedley (Eds.), *An Introduction to the Voluntary Sector* (pp. 40-65). London: Routledge.
- DiMaggio, P. & Anheier, H. (1990). The Sociology of Nonprofit Organizations and Sector. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 16, 137-59.
- DiMaggio, P. & Powell, W. W. (1991). The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48, 147-60.
- Donnison, D. (1984). The Progressive Potential of Privatisation. In J. le Grand & R. Robinson (Eds.), *Privatisation and the Welfare State* (pp. 45-77). London: Allen and Unwin.
- Estelle, J. (1990). Economic Theories of the Nonprofit Sector. In H. Anheier & W. Seibel (Eds.), *The Third Sector: Comparative Studies of Nonprofit Organizations* (pp. 21-30). New York: de Gruyter, 1990.
- Evers, A. (1993). The Welfare Mix Approach: Understanding the Pluralism of Welfare Systems. In A. Evers & I. Svetlik (Eds.), *Balancing Pluralism: New Welfare Mixes in Care for the Elderly* (pp. 3-32). Aldershot: Avebury.
- Finlayson, G. (1990). A Moving Frontier: Voluntarism and the State in British Social Welfare 1911-1949. *Twentieth Century British History*, 1(2), 183-206.

- Fukuyama, F. (2004). *State-Building: Governance and World Order in the 21st Century*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Giddens, A. (1979). *Central Problems in Social Theory: Action, Structure, and Contradictions in Social Analysis*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Gidron, B., Kramer, K. & Salamon, L. (Eds.) (1992). *Government and the Third Sector: Emerging Relationships in the Welfare State*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hansmann, H. (1987). Economic Theories of Nonprofit Organization. In W. W. Powell (Ed.), *The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook* (pp. 27-42). New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987).
- Hirst, P. (1997). *From Statism to Pluralism: Democracy, Civil Society and Global Politics*. London: UCL Press.
- Johnson, N. (1999). *Mixed Economies of Welfare: A Comparative Perspective*. Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall Europe.
- Kendall, J. (2003). *The Voluntary Sector: Comparative Perspectives in the UK*. London: Routledge.
- Kim, T. (2008). The Social Construction of Welfare Control: A Sociological Review on State-Voluntary Sector Links in Korea. *International Sociology*, 23(6), 821-47.
- Kim, T. (2010). The Welfare State as 'Shadow Regulator' in Korea after the Economic Crisis: An Interpretation from the Viewpoint of the Voluntary Sector. *WIAS Research Bulletin*, 2.
- Kramer, R. (1981). *Voluntary Agencies in the Welfare State*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Kuhnle, S. & Selle, P. (Eds.) (1992). *Government and Voluntary Organisations: A Relational Perspective*. Aldershot: Avebury.
- Lehmbruch, G. (1984). Concertation and the Structure of Corporatist Networks. In J. Goldthorpe (Ed.), *Order and Conflict in Contemporary Capitalism* (pp. 60-80). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lewis, J. (1995). *The Voluntary Sector, the State, and Social Work in Britain: The Charity Organisation Society/Family Welfare Association since 1869*. Aldershot: Avebury.
- Mahoney, J. & Rueschemeyer, D. (2003). Comparative Historical Analysis: Achievements and Agendas. In J. Mahoney & D. Rueschemeyer (Eds.), *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences* (pp. 3-38). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Murray, C. (1982). The Two Wars Against Poverty: Economic Growth and the Great Society. *Public Interest*, 69, 3-16.
- Munch R. & Smelser, N. (1987). Relating the Micro and Macro. In J. Alexander, B. Giesen, R. Munch, & N. Smelser (Eds.), *The Micro-Macro Link* (pp. 356-87). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Ringen, S., Kwon, H., Yi, I., Kim, T., & Lee, J. (2010). *The Korean State: A Social Policy Analysis*. New York: Oxford University Press [forthcoming].
- Rose-Ackerman, S. (1990). *The Economics of Nonprofit Institutions: Studies in Structure and Policy*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Salamon, L. (1995). *Partners in Public Service: Government-Nonprofit Relations in the Modern Welfare State*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Salamon, L. (Ed.) (2002). *The Tools of Government: A Guide to the New Governance*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Salamon, L. & Anheier, H. (1996). *The Emerging Nonprofit Sector: An Overview*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Seibel, W. (1990). Government/Third-Sector Relationship in a Comparative Perspective: the Case of France and West Germany. *Voluntas*, 1(1), 42-60.

- Thelen, K. & Steinmo, S. (1992). Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Politics. In S. Steinmo, K. Thelen, & F. Longstreth (Eds.), *Structuring Politics: Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Analysis* (pp. 1-32). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thompson, E. P. (1963). *The Making of the English Working Class*. New York: Vintage.
- Webb, S. & Webb, B. (1912). *The Prevention of Destitution*. London: Longmans.
- Wolch, J. (1990). *The Shadow State: Government and Voluntary Sector in Transition*. New York: Foundation Center.
- Wuthnow, R. (Ed.) (1992). *Between States and Markets: The Voluntary Sector in Comparative Perspective*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Young, D. (2001). Alternative Models of Government-Nonprofit Relations: Theoretical and International Perspectives. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 29(1), 149-72.