The Third Sector Organizations for Sustainable Development, Governance and Participatory Citizenship

Emiliana Mangone*

1. **Author/s information**
*   University of Salerno (Italy) - Department of Human, Philosophical and Education Sciences

2. **Contact authors' email addresses**
*   emangone@unisa.it

Additional information about
Italian Sociological Review

can be found at:
About ISR - Editorial Board - Manuscript submission

The Third Sector Organizations for Sustainable Development, Governance and Participatory Citizenship

Emiliana Mangone

Emiliana Mangone
University of Salerno (Italy) - Department of Human, Philosophical and Education Sciences

Corresponding author:
Emiliana Mangone
Address: Via Ponte don Melillo - 84084 Fisciano (SA) - Italy
Phone: +39 089 962321 - Fax: +39 089 962129
E-mail address: emangone@unisa.it

Abstract
The interaction between Public and Third Sector, which is an expression of Participatory Citizenship, can't be considered an "arena for fighting" because of the gap between politics and the civil society. For these reasons the object of this study is to go deeper into some aspects related to the relationships between the Third Sector and the Public sector, because The problem about the Third Sector's development is understanding if these Third Sector organizations are looking for a "role" or a "responsibility".
Keywords: Third sector, Sustainable development, Citizenship

1. Sustainable Development and Participatory Citizenship

Sustainability is a mode by which development forms that are not invasive or damaging for the social, environmental and cultural characteristics of a given territory are designed. Today when we speak about development we mean *sustainable development* seen as a development process aimed at providing basic environmental, social and economic services to all the members of a community, without impairing the environmental and social setting in which such services are provided.

The existence of a fair and effective system of services (a sustainable welfare system) is one of the determinants ensuring the participation in social life and the expression of individual skills to all citizens, in a civilized and democratic country. This condition is one of the three necessary but not sufficient condition[1], identified by Sen (Sen, 1995; 1999), so that financial, social or territorial barriers do not hinder the effective enjoyment of rights. The changing contexts and their greater complexity leads the need to start thinking about modernizing innovation actions able to provide social responses to real citizens' needs and to combine resources and quality standards. The extension of rights is indeed accompanied by a decreasing capacity of public funding, shifting the attention to the cost containment, the market (profit world) and the Third Sector (non-profit world).

In fact, the issue of development is evolving today in the direction of *sustainable development*, commonly defined as the development process in which, despite the presence of many diversified interests, environmental, social and economic needs are coped with by matching and integrating three macro-objectives: a) *economic competitiveness*; b) *environmental sustainability*; c) *social cohesion and balance*.

Therefore a development strategy must be based on an "integrated logic" able to embrace in a non contradictory way the three objectives that determine territorial sustainable development. It is certainly difficult to get an overall view of these objectives because of resistance and overlapping, therefore local governments must act as political intermediaries, by involving all the stakeholders of territorial sustainable development.

---

[1] Sen, identifies two other conditions: a) financing through general taxation, and b) gratuity at the time of consumption - the financing system has to ensure that the individual contribution is determined only by capacity of paying and not by the risk of disease and/or services received.

In the last decades the participatory process has been expanded to increase the number of subjects who somehow and for different reasons participate in the *decision-making* and planning process in a given territory. The new modes of government based upon *governance* must not only highlight citizens' actions as they convey their needs, but will also acknowledge the role that they and their associations (both formal and informal) can play as partners in a development process rather than as passive recipients of benefits and services.

On the base of our point of view, we affirm that the total embedded and integration at territory carry out with citizenship that divide in three orders (to exercise individual freedom; to participate at political life; to participate at dynamic of society). In the actual cultural and political context the dimension of solidarity is changed (Zoll, 2000) but we must divide the problem of citizenship on two orders: on the one hand, the order *legal-formal* that permits to exercise the individual freedoms and participation to political life because the person "exists as citizen"; on the other hand, the order *substantial* that realizes a real participation of citizens to dynamics of society. The form of citizenship that can integrate the demands of all citizens is *participatory citizenship* (Mangone, 2010), because through that we can avoid the existence of "last class citizens", basing its application on equity. It represents the way of managing territories enabling citizens to participate in government life and/or strengthening the sense of belonging.

Participatory citizenship values differences in order to build development paths oriented to save the humanitarian dimension of life, starting from the sense of identity and belonging (embedded) to the territory that each person expresses in improving social way of life. This means "doing community".

Participatory citizenship is both an objective of government policies in a territory and a methodological approach that characterizes decision-making and planning. So different modes of participatory citizenship can be envisaged from different and complementary perspectives: a) a mode that helps to develop and implement policies designed for preserving and protecting a *common good*; b) a mode enforcing the right to influence in a democratic manner decision-making processes affecting individual and collective life in a territory; c) a mode that is shaped by the right to be included, to be assigned duties and responsibilities in daily life at the local level, as participation begins to take place in each individual's daily life (Jedlowski, Leccardi, 2003).

The development of a territory cannot neglect the dynamics of identity and belonging that spring from the practice of *participatory citizenship* which is embodied by a partnership model: «in fact it requires an agreement based upon social understanding of the complementary role of institutions and citizens in building plans. The processes that give rise to partnership can be seen as procedures of dialogue-oriented or deliberative democracy: procedures that by the term "democracy" mean the substantial equality of participants *regardless of* the role and status of individual actors, while by the term "deliberative" they mean the commitment to comparing one's own reasons with those of other people and, if necessary, to change their essence and contents on the basis of more compelling arguments» (Antoniacomi *et al.,* 2002: 52). *Participatory citizenship*, through the protection of rights and the fulfilment of duties, contributes to the conservation, the enhancement and the production of common goods and to the consolidation of the sense of belonging and identity, turning the citizens into main actors together with the territory as a whole.

In this context is fundamental the role of institutions that can exercise on two complementary plans: on the one hand, the institution is a contemporary guarantee of individual, social and political freedoms of citizens to achievement the *entitlements* (Dahrendorf, 1988) that permits to choice about the future; on the other hand, the institution is a promoting of actions to building a comparison between all social and local actors (in specific the organizations of Third Sector). The latest can, for competency and interests, to support the process of development guaranteeing the success through the interventions on territory.

Such process is based upon the principle of subsidiarity, that must be seen as a support to widely shared responsibilities and not as a lack of will on the part of the government to shoulder its own responsibility connected to fostering territorial development and citizens' welfare. Utilizing subsidiarity as the main governing principle of the new local development policies demands as a prerequisite that local administrations turn themselves into the promoters of people's growth as active subjects and productive members of society. A correct application of vertical subsidiarity (among public agencies) and of horizontal subsidiarity (between public agencies and the civil

society seen as a whole made up of both individual and collective subjects) preserves and enhances the role of the territory, on the one hand when it acts as a guarantor for the principles of solidarity among all citizens and, on the other hand, when it monitors and checks adequately the whole range of offers, by assuring fairness and a seamless network of interventions and services covering the whole territory.

Hence the role of local government will have to be built upon the management of different subjects, with specific and special interests, interplaying with territorial needs and demand, for the purpose of carving out a comprehensive sustainable development policy. Not only will the new development policies have to strengthen and guarantee the "participatory citizenship" of all the community's members first by taking stock of all their needs (Ciocia, 2007), but then they must also understand the role they can play as active partners rather than as passive recipients of benefits.

In the light of what we have argued above, we acknowledge that development processes, as active and integrated plan making, hold a strategic value within the more complex framework of global sustainable development, in which quite a number of problems in terms of relation and integration between the public sector and the social parties (in specific Third sector Organizations) to really application of participatory citizenship.

2. Problematic interaction between Public and Third Sector: the strategy of governance

New local development paths cannot be paved unless the different decision-making and institutional levels back up the entities springing from the territory. In other words, this is a *bottom-up concerted* development pattern, centred on territorial regeneration and enhancement of available human and social resources. In the last decades, development patterns originating from within the territory (endogenous development) have come to the fore, drawing attention by politics and economics to bottom-up concerted development that often takes place spontaneously and is regulated by *best practices,* rather than by standardized norms, moulded by local territorial reality. So concerted development takes on a less "centralized" dimension in favour of a range of tools more connected to experience, culture, identity of individual places and aimed at creating *opportunities* and *synergies* rather than constraints and norms. The positive outcomes of many concerted processes are visible: they created a cooperative climate conducive to an effective management of the European community, national and regional intervention tools and enhanced the role of local and social realities in implementing regional policies.

It is therefore necessary to put in place a territorial governance method aimed at a constant utilization and consolidation of social capital (Donati, 2007) - even though such methodology may seem exhausting and inconclusive - as this will ensure a relative effectiveness not only in case a decision must be made, but also, above all when the processes and interventions to be implemented require a strong interaction among different social and/or territorial actors. Development processes and their peculiarities involve a multiplicity of private and public, collective and individual subjects: such specific aspects require instruments fit for systematic concerted efforts and institutional, economic and social partnership. Hence the priority given to instruments for active citizenship that go along with negotiated planning (Granata, 1999; Mangone, 2008), which, as is well known, is the regulation agreed upon by public subjects or between the public subject involved and the public and private party or the parties interested in implementing different interventions connected to a single development aim, that require an overall evaluation of specific activities.

Any reasoning about development cannot disregard the value of cohesion among different viewpoints and interests, and integration among different instruments and behaviours. Therefore renewed commitment and skill and, above all, the will of subjects involved in development processes not to dodge the responsibility that these entail for local representatives and communities.

In development dynamics resources are crucial; there is no doubt that by this word we do not make exclusive reference to financial resources, but we also indicate territorial capacities and intelligence that must be preserved, promoted and accumulated: to this end it is necessary to define

structural and service actions to direct and channel resources, thus matching demand with supply in the territory, with a view to increasing the number of subjects who possess all the necessary information and have a chance to profit from present and future opportunities.

Local development policies cannot leave out interaction and widespread understanding among the different actors involved in the development process; this axiom implies the need to cooperate at the territorial level, and this operation often brings about a cultural "leap forward" that is matched by some specific changes in collective behaviours, such as: a greater capacity for dialogue in subjects belonging to the same context and the decreased number of micro-conflictual initiatives. It follows from all this that those in charge of management must get ready to take up future challenges by setting up new organizational structures and, with respect to that, cooperation constitutes the prime tool for triggering the development process effectively.

Development policies must try to make the most of territorial resources, by directly choosing the most suitable strategies and the management of their output: the territory must behave like a private actor within a market-driven logic, becoming a competitive actor able to grasp the best opportunities and the most adequate resources, without impairing local characteristics and peculiarities. In line with this logic, local government bodies must play a key role as "helmsmen" steering development, placing the emphasis on growth and enhancement of some aspects that are crucial for effective implementation of interventions (Mangone, 2001): *interventions integration and coordination*; *networking*; *stimulating role* and *advocacy and consciousness-raising activities.*

The public government role will be performed by putting together different subjects holding specific and particular interests that interplay with the needs and demand for the development of the territory, in pursuit of a comprehensive *community policy* (networking).

From this perspective, the tools of participatory citizenship and negotiated planning allow to implement the subsidiarity principle more effectively, and consequently to strengthen stable forms of partnership between local government and social parties, taking into account realistic feasibility elements that can gear cooperation work to objectives that are actually important. Strong participation and cooperation must be fuelled not only at the institutional level; such modes of action must not be seen only as new instruments for legitimating representation, but also and mainly as preconditions for a new start in local development policies that takes its moves from the territory.

However, the administrative decentralization process in Italy, active since decades, hasn't defined yet the role of the territories, related to citizens' rights/duties, to the relationship between central and local Governments, and between local governments and social components. The approbation of recent laws represented a step more towards the clarification of the role of both institutional local bodies and non institutional Third Sector bodies[2], regarding an idea of sustainable territorial development that is centred upon that field of action ensuring security and welfare for society founding these new forms of government on governance.

Before going on, we have to clarify the meaning of the terms "Third Sector" and "Governance". The first term, without entering in the debate on its definition for which we refer to literacy, is generally used to mean a set of private organizations (social economy, non-profit organizations, voluntary organizations, civil society and others), acting for social and collective needs. They can be distinguished from commercial companies because they lack profit purpose.

One still evident aspect, even if referred to some decades ago, is the label stuck on these groups by Kendall and Knapp (1995): it is a "loose and baggy monster" without trying to cage it in. they are very relevant as they have a strong involvement in the implementation of public welfare. These organizations are a *medium* between individuals and State, but as for the services delivery they put themselves between the Market and the State. Relations between Public and Third Sector are changing: the choice of a *welfare society* caused a tighter collaboration among them. We will discuss later about that.

About the term governance there isn't yet a common use or definition for *governance*, as for many other words which refer to "new generation" methodologies of negotiation and cooperation.

---

[2] Without entering in the debate on its definition, as Third Sector, we generally mean a set of private *organizations*, acting for social and collective needs and they are different from commercial companies because they lack of profit purpose.

For the sake of brevity, we cannot present all the stances that emerged and are still emerging on this issue, so we will try to propose a synthesis of the concept of *governance*.

The term governance is popular but imprecise. For Rodhes (1996; 2007) it can means: minimal state; corporate governance; new public management; "good governance"; socio-cybernetic systems; and self-organizing network. However, governance is not synonymous of government as «governance signifies a change in the meaning of government, referring to a *new* process f governing; or a *changed* condition of ordered rule; or the *new* method by which society is governed» (Rodhes, 1996: 652-653) and one of its definition is the «governance refers to self-organizing, interorganizational networks» (Ibidem: 660) characterized by: interdependence between organizations; continuing interaction between members; game-like interactions regulated by rules; and a significant degree of autonomy from the state. This idea of governance is more related to management then politics. Other authors emphasized political aspects and moreover the coordination of all actors involved in the achievement of a common goal. Healey, for example, affirms that governance arrangements «shape what is considered relevant for collective action and how such action should be conducted» (Healey, 2004: 92). While, Kooiman (2003) considers social-political interactions as essential elements of governance, as already indicated by Stoker (1998) in clarifying the governance concept with his five classic propositions: «1) Governance refers to a set of institution involves institutions and actors that are drawn from but also beyond government; 2) Governance identifies the blurring of boundaries and responsibilities for tackling social and economic issues; 3) Governance identifies the power dependence involved in the relationships between institutions involved in collective action; 4) Governance is about autonomous self-governing networks of actors; and 5) Governance recognizes the capacity to get things done which does not rest on the power of government to command or use its authority. It sees government as able to use new tools and techniques to steer and guide» (Ibidem: 18). In the light of these statements we can say that adopting a governance perspective means being open to the fact that public governing is not only carried out by one actor but it is a shared set of responsibilities.

Finding a synthesis on governance is very difficult. From Rodhes definition the debate is open (Bevir, Rodhes, 2006; Kjær, 2011) and many other authors gave their own definitions. For this paper, however, a very interesting definition was proposed by Bovaird and Löffler (2002), who defined governance as a system of formal and informal rules, structures and processes that define the ways in which individuals and organizations can exercise power over the decisions (by other stakeholders) which affect their welfare and quality of life. In other words, *governance* indicates the changeover from programming systems based on hierarchical models and *policy making* direction, to programming systems based on the principle of subsidiarity (vertical and horizontal) and cooperation between public and private sector.

Therefore a new era has come for territorial development policies (Barbieri, Mangone, 2009), with the advent of new planning modes that have forced the public and the social private to co-programming and co-planning which includes an innovation on policies' contents and an indication of new operational models of participation and organization to be adopted by local bodies in the elaboration of such policies.

Anyway, there's a paradox in participation: citizens can't participate if they aren't represented in an official organization, and in particular in an organizations of the so-called Third Sector who are the link between citizens and Public sector.

This kind of organizations stand as links in the chain binding the citizen to public institutions (the State and local administrations in general) but in terms of service production dynamics they come between the Market and the State. On the other hand that part of the third sector or co-sector (Cipolla, 2002) that along with volunteer work includes paid work progressively takes up the middle position in a system made up of two poles: the formal one, the State (institutions in general) and the Market, and the informal one, volunteering and primary networks (Di Nicola, 1986; 1998; Donati, 2003; Donati, Colozzi, 2004; 2006). The relationship between Public and Third Sector is still changing: this welfare is not residual and consider the real needs of citizens, the collaboration between Third Sector and public institutions are more tight and substantial - not formal (Accorinti, 2008).

Because of this feature peculiar to Italy, the relation between the Third Sector and public institutions does not follow any model: «it does not fall into the liberal model due to the scarce independence of non-profit organizations in our country; it is not in line with the social democratic model because of the weak regulation enforced by the state; finally, it does not follow the corporative model owing to the lack of common values and to the poor coordination among sectors. The Italian case seems to be characterized only by contradictory elements: a strong functional interdependence in the absence of an effective coordination; a highly autonomous management in non-profit organizations in the absence of a final piece of legislation that separates them from the state sphere and prevents them from being affected by commercial interests; the tendency to delegate public liabilities in a polity characterized by patronage systems and particularism» (Ranci, 1999: 246).

The problem concerns the type of representativeness that Third Sector organizations, guided by an instrumental rationality, can guarantee to the collectivity. Can the collective interest be represented and guaranteed by organizations whose aim is to increase their competitiveness to survive in a territory with an insufficient application of the principle of subsidiarity and insufficient actions of *governance* ?

3. Social Capital, Third Sector and Development

This new model to govern and manage the territory in order to realize a sustainable process of local development can be put into effect only through a mobilization of social resources, relations and opportunities: in other words the effectiveness of territorial development policies depends on and needs the *social capital*[3] of such territory.

In the last decades analyses of territorial economic development have relied mainly on the explanation based upon the concept of social capital. The concept of social capital disproves the view according to which it is the market that creates stable relations in the territory; according to Granovetter (1973; 1974; 1987; 1992) the opposite is true: stable relations in the territory determine market structures with their peculiarities. Social capital inherently contains a view of development that is not confined to economic aspects, but is linked to the degree of *civicness* (Putnam, 1992) and community freedom and above all to adopting correct behaviours based on trust (Gambetta, 1990; Fukuyama, 1995), which are all elements that refer to belonging and reciprocity. In development processes social capital, by involving directly social actors, elicits leadership in the territory by means of actions that lead to share the local development path towards a common objective.

The territory is not something abstract, it's a place of production: it assumes its own identity trough the social capital built thanks also to Third Sector organizations, which constitute a new reciprocity between individuals and their territory (Boccacin, 2009). Third Sector in an important actor of territory because produces social capital. This condition is demonstrated by best practices in the services system, but the Italian current *welfare* structure represents at the same time a development opportunity and a cage: the organizations broaden their action field up to became co-responsible with public institutions in satisfying social needs (Boccacin, 2010). Nevertheless, the same action is likely to be ensnared by a close net of managing and bureaucratic responsibilities. Despite these negative aspects, the Third Sector represents a concrete and rapidly growing reality of the Italian welfare, which leads the idea of participatory citizenship (Rossi, Boccacin, 2008).

Social capital undoubtedly lies at the core of territorial development processes, as it is the main pillar supporting an adequate local development strategy that not only exploits resources, but above all builds and increases them, enhances and accumulates them in order to take account of social and territorial peculiarities in the implementation of local development planning , even to prevent huge migration flows, such as those we are witnessing in some geographical areas, which in the long run would undermine the development process itself. As a matter of fact, being social capital based

---

[3] The most important contribution to the definition of the concept of social capital to Coleman (1990), who argues that it is created when relations among people change in ways that facilitate action and it is not tangible as it is incorporated into relations among people.

upon relations, migration of a certain number of actors from a given territory diminishes the potential of that territory. The social capital for its intangibility and it is generating of collective benefits it hasn't to be considered a property of actors, but it has to be considered as a "public good" (Coleman, 1990) and therefore it must be protected as such: in order to build up social capital instead of wasting it one path only must be followed to strengthen social ties through trust and empowerment; this is the only way in which even territories that may seem, at a superficial glance, "hopeless" would become productive locations and producers themselves of development processes allowing the community to survive and to improve its own quality of life.

The Third Sector, in general, has the task to produce a new model of sociality orientated to the creation of "relational goods" characterized by trust and reciprocity (Pasquinelli, 1998). Third Sector through different forms and ways creates internal social cohesion and positive external aspects for the whole community (Donati, Colozzi, 2011), as it can implement different structural solutions in response to the complex needs expressed by it. The relations created can "make a difference" as for the forms of reciprocity, and for the level of stakeholders' involvement, and for the effectiveness of the performances and services realized.

However, while these functions are "latent" (Merton, 1968), those concerning the relations with the Public sector are "manifest":

-     the first one is related to *rights protection and denunciation* (in the sense to make individual problems collective ones) to change the political agenda, with the risk to cause a site-specific territorial defense (Pasquinelli, 1998): on the one hand, action taken by advocacy groups can contribute to modify the political agenda, to denounce specific situations, to voice the problems of those who have no say; on the other hand, such positioning may result in particularism;

-     the second one is to *promote and produce new employment:* the Third Sector is a container and a promoter of "social capital" and represents an important potential of employment. Delors' White Paper in 1993 pointed to the Third Sector as one of the main areas of job creation which should have created several million new jobs by the end of the last century (Kendall, 2009). Without tackling economic matters, we have to underline the risk that the "occupational growth" becomes an aim itself to let such organizations survive in the "market";

-     the last function is *service providing*, to increase the competition in a double direction: between Third Sector organisations, and between them and privates. In order to face competition, Third Sector organizations must specialize, by devising cutting-edge communication and marketing strategies (Citarella *et al*., 2010) to preserve their image and activity (Martelli, 2006), and must clearly identify the target for their services.

The Third Sector is a reality of Italian *welfare* (Forum Terzo Settore, 2010) and including a new idea of participation citizenship, represents both a development tool and a great bond: in fact, a definition of territorial development policies needs a great interaction between public and private, and a large understanding between all components involved in the *decision making* process. The Third Sector is a vital component of a fair and enterprising society, where individuals and communities feel empowered and enabled to achieve change and to meet social and environmental needs. In specific, there is a vitally important role for many parts of the third sector in helping to carrying out the new welfare programs.

Shared responsibilities, planning and managing together are necessary but not sufficient to make actions really effective. The cooperation between Public and Third Sector, and between Third Sector organizations (Manfredi, 2003a; 2003b) needs a cultural "revolution", including changes in collective behaviours, and a better dialogue between actors involved in the same context without micro-conflicts (De Conno, 2004). This means that social actors have to face the future trough new organization models, focusing on two key factors: *innovation* and *experimentation*. The first one is based on three strategic factors (Manfredi, 2003a): capacity of *involvement* in the surrounding environment; orientation to internal and external interests; ability to create relationships for a strong and long-lasting collaboration. On the other hand, the *experimentation* has to build new development processes, such as activities, projects and actions with a high management flexibility and a correspondence of programmes to the real needs of the citizens, in order to guarantee the creation of a new sociality and solidarity.

The main question about Third Sector as expression of the social capital of a territory is to understand if such organizations are looking for a "role" or a "responsibility", or an integration

between both aspects. Problems in the interaction between public and private and the peculiarities themselves, let us say that Third Sector is looking for an executive role, more than a responsibility one: the participation doesn't happen in *governance* processes, but in the phase of project and realization of events, not only for a lack of a common based orientation, but also because these organizations couldn't find and value two important resources: *trust* (Mutti, 2003) and *knowledge*.

4. Future prospective

It is clear that when we talk about the Third Sector we do not refer to it as a negative element in the chain of *governance* or focus only on the negative aspects that characterize it , on the contrary we think that the Third Sector is potentially the social party that can still contribute a lot to building a new sociality and new participatory forms (Alecci, Bottaccio, 2010) conducive to *governance* processes. In fact, it has not yet taken the lead as a promoter and actor of change the way it could. While in the next few years we will witness highly competitive dynamics because of the progressive growth of social enterprises, the Third Sector needs to adopt a strategy to occupy centre stage within *governance* and subsidiarity principle implementation processes. But in order for them to achieve this aim, the Third Sector organizations must take a direction that points to:
-    the shift from "appropriation logic" to "solidarity logic", being fully aware of the limitations of an individual action fighting against the feelings of insecurity and fear elicited by contemporary society, thus giving rise to new cooperation and social solidarity forms, viewed as joint and organized risk offsetting (Zoll, 2000; Morganti, 2010);
-    the integration between the role that Third Sector organizations have already been able to design for themselves, and the responsibility they have as a form of expression of collective needs that can have an impact, being a social force, upon the political agenda and the new alliances based on autonomous subjectivities and specific parties (public and Third Sector) at play on the political and social level;
-    enhancement of knowledge and trust as resources that allow a full and widespread involvement with the surrounding environment, starting from the stimulus provided by the latter to the improvement of individual organizational and collective knowledge, to deeper trust relations and above all to the increment of social capital.
The risk we face is that Third Sector organizations orient themselves towards a logic of "appropriation" (of spaces and positions) covered by solidarity and participation matters. The problems discussed can be synthesized as follows: a) lack of inter-organizational cooperation and common action with many micro-conflictual situations; b) excessive search of a role focused on the organizations' surviving; c) Scanty use and improving of the trust and knowledge resources.
Interactions between Public and Third Sector, which are expression of participation, can't simply become an "arena for fighting", used to "say" and not to decide or "do", because the trust relationship between politicians (institutional *decision makers*) and civil society is eroded. Therefore the participation has to be concluded with external orientated action, with transparent procedures and visible positions, in which it's clear the actors' role, responsibilities and behaviour, in order to let them considered "reliable" by the collectivity.
Four major areas of common interest between the Third Sector and Public has identified: a) enabling voice, because most people desire to have a greater say over issues that affect their lives, but many feel that they are not currently able to do so; b) strengthening communities, because there are also potential strains on the connections in society; c) transforming public services, because they can effectively meet their objectives and support their beneficiary groups by providing some services in partnership with the Public and Markets; and d) encouraging social enterprise, because one of the most important developments in the third sector has been an acceleration of interest and innovation in social enterprise.
The challenge Third Sector has to face is to grant the plural voice of citizens who want to express their needs in the political arenas, where they can't be directly considered because under or bad represented or deprived of a relationship based on trust with their representatives. Third Sector organizations have not only to play a role in providing services, but also to undertake action of promotion and qualification of activities aiming to protect *common goods* and collective rights.

The hope for the future is that Third Sector Organizations share action between different sections of the community, and work with Public and others to promote understanding and relationships across society.

References

Accorinti M. (2008), *Terzo settore e welfare locale*, Carocci, Roma.

Alecci E., Bottaccio M. (2010) (eds.), *Fuori dall'angolo: idee per il futuro del volontariato e del terzo settore*, L'ancora del Mediterraneo, Napoli.

Antoniacomi G., De Torre L., Fazzi L., Grieco G., Plotegher V. (2002) (eds.), *La pianificazione sociale come progettualità politica*, Animazione sociale, 10, pp. 29-54.

Barbieri A., Mangone E. (2009), *Social Politics of the State and Territories*, ReS-Ricerca e sviluppo per le politiche sociali, 1-2/2008, pp. 38-54.

Bevir M., Rhodes. R.A.W. (2006), *Governance Stories*, Routledge, London.

Boccacin L. (2009), *Terzo settore e partnership sociali: buone pratiche di welfare sussidiario,* Vita & Pensiero, Milano.

Boccacin L. (2010) (ed.), *Le partnership sociali: concettualizzazione ed evidenze empiriche*, Sociologia e Politiche Sociali, 3.

Bourdieu P. (1979), *La distinction. Critique sociale du jugement*, Ed. De Munuit, Paris.

Bovaird T., Löffler E. (2002), *Moving From Excellence Models of Local Service Delivery to Benchmarking* "*Good Local Governance*", International Review of Administrative Sciences*,* 68, pp. 9-24.

Ciocia A. (2007) (ed.), *Per un welfare dalla parte dei cittadini. Aspetti territoriali della domanda delle politiche sociali*, Carocci, Roma.

Cipolla C. (2002) (ed.), *Trasformazione dei sistemi sanitari e sapere sociologico,* FrancoAngeli, Milano.

Citarella P., Martello S., Vecchiato G., zicari S. (2010), *Come comunicare il Terzo Settore. Che la mano sinistra sappia quel che fa la destra*, FrancoAngeli, Milano.

Coleman J.S. (1990), *Foundations of social Theory*, The Belknap Press of Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts and London.

Daherendorf R. (1988), *The Modern Social Conflict. An Essay on the Politics of Liberty*, Weidenfeld & Nicolson, New York.

De Conno A. (2004) (ed.), *Per una strategia di pianificazione sociale basata su infrastrutture di cittadinanza*, in Studi Zancan. Politiche e servizi alle persone, 1, pp. 10-29.

Di Nicola P. (1986), *L'uomo non è un'isola. Le reti sociali primarie nella vita quotidiana*, FrancoAngeli, Milano.

Di Nicola P. (1998), *La rete: metafora dell'appartenenza. Analisi strutturale e paradigma di rete*, FrancoAngeli, Milano.

Donati P. (2003), *Famiglia e capitale sociale in Italia*, San Paolo Cinisello, Balsamo.

Donati P. (2007) (ed.), *Il capitale sociale. L'approccio relazionale*, Sociologia e politiche sociali, 10, 1.

Donati P., Colozzi I. (2004) (eds.), *Il privato sociale che emerge*, FrancoAngeli, Milano.

Donati P., Colozzi I. (2006)(eds.), *Terzo settore e valorizzazione del capitale sociale in Italia: luoghi e attori*, FrancoAngeli, Milano.

Donati P., Colozzi I (2011) (eds.), *Il valore aggiunto delle relazioni sociali*, FrancoAngeli, Milano.

Forum Terzo Settore (2010) (ed.), *Le sfide dell'Italia che investe sul futuro: libro verde del terzo settore*, Forum Terzo Settore, Roma.

Fukuyama F. (1995), *Trust*, The Free Press, New York.

Gambetta D. (1990) (ed.), *Strategie della fiducia*, Einaudi, Torino.

Granata F. (1999), *Gli strumenti della programmazione negoziata*, Liguori Editore, Napoli.

Granovetter M. (1973), *The Strength of Weak Ties*, American Journal of Sociology, 78, 6, pp. 1360-1380.

Granovetter M. (1974), *Getting a Job*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.

Granovetter M. (1987), *Economic action and social structure: The problem of embeddedness*, American Journal of Sociology, 3, pp. 481-510.

Granovetter M. (1992), *Economic Institutions as Social Costructions: A Fremework for Analysis*, Acta Sociologica, 32, 1, pp. 3-11.

Healey P. (2004), *Creativity and Urban Governance*, Policy Studies, 25, pp. 88-102.

Jedloski P., Leccardi C. (2003), *Sociologia della vita quotidiana*, il Mulino, Bologna.

Kendall J. (2009) (ed.), *Handbook on third sector policy in Europe: multilevel processes and organized civil society*, Eduard Elgar Pub, Chamberley.

Kendall J., Knapp M. (1995), *A Loose and Baggy Monster: Boundaries, Definitions and Typologies*, Smith J.D., Rochester C., Hedley R. (eds), An Introduction to the Voluntary Sector, Routledge, London, pp. 66-95.

Kjær A.M. (2011), *Rhodes' contribution to governance. Theory: praise, criticism and the future Governance debate*, Public Administration, 89, 1, pp. 101-113.

Kooiman J. (2003), *Governing as Governance*, Sage, London.

Manfredi F. (2003a), *Le strategie collaborative delle aziende non profit*, Terzo Settore, 6, pp. 18-22.

Manfredi F. (2003b), *Aziende non profit: le quattro fasi della strategia collaborativa*, Terzo Settore, 7/8, pp. 22-26.

Mangone E. (2001), *L'azione politica dell'Ente e il welfare locale*, Qualità sociale, oct-dec, 17, pp. 26-34.

Mangone E. (2008), *Gli strumenti della programmazione partecipata,* Saccheri T., Masullo G., Mangone E., Sociologia della salute. Fondamenti e prospettive, C.E.I.M editrice, Mercato San Severino.

Mangone E. (2010), *Tra disgregazione sociale e integrazione: il caso di Acerra*, Parra Saiani P., Della Queva S., Cuppone F., Scotti D., Ceresa A., Pirni A., Mangone E., Per un'integrazione possibile. Processi migratori in sei aree urbane, FrancoAngeli, Milano.

Martelli S. (2006), *La comunicazione del terzo settore nel mezzogiorno*, FrancoAngeli, Milano.

Merton R.K. (1968), *Social Theory and Social Structure*, Free Press, New York.

Morganti M. (2010), *Non profit: produttività e benessere. Come coniugare efficienza e solidarieta nelle organizzazioni del terzo settore*, FrancoAngeli, Milano.

Mutti A. (2003), *La teoria della fiducia nelle ricerche sul capitale sociale*, Rassegna Italiana di Sociologia, 4, pp. 515-536.

Pasquinelli S. (1998), *Ambivalenze e paradossi della solidarietà*, Animazione sociale, 2, pp. 25-32.

Putnam R. (1992), *Making democracy work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J.

Ranci C. (1999), *Oltre il welfare state. Terzo settore, nuove solidarietà e trasformazioni del welfare*, il Mulino, Bologna.

Rodhes R.A.W. (1996), *The New Governance: Governing without Government*, Political Studies, XLIV, pp. 652-667.

Rhodes R.A.W. (2007). *Understanding Governance: Ten Years On*, in Organization Studies, 28, 8, 1243-64.

Rossi G., Boccacin (2008) (eds), *Capitale sociale e partnership tra pubblico, privato e terzo settore. Vol. I. Casi di buone pratiche nei servizi alla famiglia*, FrancoAngeli, Milano.

Sen A. (1995), *Inequality Reexamined,* Clarendon Press, Oxford.

Sen A. (1999), "*Uguali e Diversi*" davanti alla salute, Kéiron, 1, pp. 8-17.

Stoker G. (1998), *Governance as theory: five propositions*, International Journal of Social Sciences, 50, 1, pp. 17-28.

Zoll R. (2000), *Was ist solidarität heute?*, Suhrkamp, Frankfurt.