The role of policy instruments in structuring participation process: the use of mayoral orders within social services in the city of Milan
by Alessandro Maggioni

working paper

International Conference "Participatory local welfare, citizenship and third sector organization. What is at stake?" - Pisa Stream 2 Promoting social participation at local level

- *Please do not quote -*

Introduction

In the last years both at local and national level a growing attention towards the issue of urban security has been widespread within citizens and policy entrepreneurs. Among the securitarian policies implemented in Italy we find the so called "pacchetto sicurezza" in 2008. It was a set of interventions that changed in several ways both national and local laws. Within a wider set of innovations one aim of this policy was to stress the role of the Mayor in facing urban security issues and the connected perception of social insecurity. According to that, a monocratic instrument of local policy, the *ordinanza sindacale[1]*, was innovated both widening the possibility of its utilization, and expanding the issues it can be used for. This instrument was named *ordinanza sindacale di sicurezza urbana[2]*. In the same year, after an intense press campaign by the local media, the city committee of Milan began addressing some social issues, as alcohol and drugs consumption and street sex-work, which were involving the use of public space, presenting them in the public speech under a securitarian point of view. The Mayor chose to tackle them introducing a device of three urban security orders in order both to respond to the political pressure of self-organized neighbourhood committees and to gain some political consensus. Within this new policy-window (Kingdon 2010) the Social Policy Department, according with the Mayor, aimed to use this securitarian device to underpin the cooperation among social workers of third sector and the local police forces appointed to ensure the respect of the mayoral orders, within a new social service

---

1   Mayoral Order
2   Urban Security Mayoral Order

named "Unità Multidisciplinare Integrata"[3]. In the article this policy analysed focusing the attention on those instruments that defined its institutional framework. The regulation of complex issues based principally on public intervention trough a single type of policy instruments (the *urban security mayoral order*), the underlying securitarian logic of these instruments and the lack of reflexivity that these instruments bring with them led to a distinctive participation process. What we would like to stress in this article is not the type of the participation (Coston, 1998) or the relationship between the policy maker and the third sector organizations. The aim is to tackle the participation processes by another point of view. We are interested in highlighting how the policy instruments influenced the participatory practices inside and outside the policy network. This aim can be translated in three more specific question of research. How the participation process was structured by a securitarian institutional framework? What kind of participation practices within the policy network did come from it? Which was the impact of this framework on the policy process (Lascoumes, Le Galès 2007)?

The article is divided in four parts that progressively get close us in responding to the questions posed above. Firstly, we define the boundaries of the conceptual framework that have driven our analysis: we present in a synthetic way the key elements of the sociological neo-institutionalism, pointing out in which sense the policy instruments can be considered institutions and we describe the dimensions of *urban security mayoral order* by a sociological point of view. In the second part, the description of the policy is focused mainly on the different phases of the policy cycle, stressing the way the public actor chose to call the third sector organizations to participate to the policy. In the third section we answer to the questions posed. We will see how the use of this particular instrument had structured the organizational field (Powell, Di Maggio 1983) in two opposite poles, provoking a cleavage between *ethic* and *strategic* actors. Moreover, another distinctive dynamics took place during the implementation phase: the group of third sector organization involved in sex workers' team felt in a stage of *impasse*; meanwhile the organizations that have worked with addiction problems acted a *decoupling* strategy during the implementation of the policy process. In the conclusion we comment these results arguing that the policy instruments are crucial in shaping the behaviour if the policy actors. From a theoretical perspective, the results collected with this case study permit to clarify the specific role of the broader institutional context, the role of the actor's position outside and inside the policy network (Peters, 1998; Pavolini 2003) and the centrality of policy instruments in structuring the concrete practices in the participation processes, even beyond the predisposition of the policy maker.

---

3   Multidisciplinar Integrated Unity

How to understand participation in public policies: a theoretical framework

This article has the aim to highlight the role that policy instruments have in structuring participation practices of third sector organizations within the policy processes. According to a wide literature, institutions have a role in regulating the way actors play and purse their interests (March, Olsen 1984; Krasner 1988; Powell, Di Maggio 1991; Mingione 1997). The term "institution" is used to address a configuration of rules and procedures more or less coordinated that regulate the interactions and the behaviours of actors and organizations (Powell, DiMaggio 1991). Lascoumes and Le Galès (2007, p. 4) propose a definition of the policy instruments that include them in the set of key institutions involved in the policy processes: "a public policy instrument constitutes a device that is both technical and social, that organizes specific social relations between the state and those it addressed to, according to the representations and meanings it carries. It is a particular type of institution, a technical device with the generic purpose of carrying a concrete concept of the politics/society relationship and sustained by a concept of regulation." A policy analysis can be based on its instruments considering three basic hypotheses:

1) Policy instruments are not neutral: they produce specific effects, independent from pursued objectives or from the will of policy-makers, they are able to drive the public action and the policy process in an autonomous way (Lascoumes *et al*, 2011).

2) A policy instrument produces a specific representation of the issue targeted by the policy (Le Galès, 2011).

3) A policy instrument can set a specific approach to an issue since it supports a specific hierarchy of the reality, and in some cases it can lead to propose a comprehensive explanatory scheme of that issue (Lascoumes *et al*, 2011).

The first and the third hypothesis can be very fruitful in this case study to give a peculiar conceptual base to the reaction of the actors that had led to different participation practices. The second hypothesis state that the instrument chosen play a role in the definition of the general framework of the implementation that can promote or prevent the participation in the different phases of the policy cycle. Analysing the policy through its instruments, and considering them as institutions (Lascoumes, Le Galès 2004), allow us to stress how the organization of a social space can affect the behaviour of the actors that were included in the participation process -even if with strict margin of discretion-, and at the same time, the behaviour of those that were excluded. From a sociological point of view, the boundaries of a social space of a public decision are defined by the actors that are involved in it: decision makers, executors, beneficiary. Its organization, is structured not only by the roles of the actors and the   different power of influence that these roles bring with them, but

also through the strategic way each actor choose to play its role. Both the settlements of the roles and the strategic opportunities are strongly influenced by the institutional framework that underpin the implementation of the decision considered. In our case this institutional framework is made by a device of three urban security mayoral orders. If we want to answer to the questions posed above is necessary to outline the characteristics of this particular institution in our case study. Until 2008 the *mayoral order* could be used only for a limited period of time and just for urgent and unpredictable situations, but the pressure perceived by the local administrations, in the last years, is become progressively more intense due to the increasing of the perception of social insecurity (Castel, 2004 trad. it). The emphasis on the importance of local leadership to tackle the issues related to the urban security, was one of the points of the national political agenda from the beginning of right-wing government in 2008. This emphasis led to the introduction of a new instrument at disposal for the Mayor: the *mayoral order of urban security*. The innovation of the instrument concerned the widening of the possibility of use, both considering the issue that could be faced with, and the abolition of the limit of time. These changes have to be intertwined with a concept of "urban security" that was not clear in the text of the law and were understood in a very discretionary way by each Mayor[4]. Therefore, in 2008 we had a new policy instrument that was monocratic, discretionary, and that can regulate an undefined set of urban life aspects for an undetermined period of time. Highlighting the characteristics of this instrument as an institution, help us in understanding how it can affect the implementation process, the relationship among the actors involved in the organizational field and their behaviour. Through an historical reconstruction of the use of "classic" mayoral order, made through a documents analysis, and using the data of the interviews submitted to privileged witnesses about the implementation process, we have defined three dimensions of this instrument. The constitutive dimension concern the allocation of power resources within the local government. The implementation of the mayoral orders makes visible the use of *power* by the Mayor, that usually act through *authority*[5] for the composition of the interests within the local politics. The normative dimension, defines the horizon of conceivable, according to the issue that the local government deal with time by time. With the urban security mayoral order the public action go towards a labelling process, that put in a security and repressive frame the social phenomenon that is supposed to be regulated. The cognitive dimension steers the actors within the organization of the knowledge of the reality, giving more importance to some aspects at the expense of others and using the former to justify their actions. Considering the urban security

---

4 In April 2011 the *urban security mayoral order* was declared unconstitutional due to its vagueness in defining the condition for its use, the lack of a limit of time and the extreme widening of the issues it could face.

5 For the different definition of the therms "power", "force", "influence", "authority", please see Bachrach and Baratz (1963)

mayoral order this dimension intervenes simplifying the issues that are regulated, distinguishing among those who accomplish with the behavioural criteria and those that not. In the chart that follows we put them in relation with the policy elements they have shaped and, in this way, we mean to set a reading grid to have some insight about the participatory practices during the implementation process.

Tab. 1 Dimensions of the mayoral orders of urban security and policy elements influenced by them.

Elements of the instrument	Elements of the policy

Costitutive dimension (urban scale; monocratic)	- structure of the power relations within the local authority
	- link between spatial scale and systemic impact of the policy
	- structure of territorial power relations trough an action of distinction:
	  a) access to policy network
	  b) production of excluded social groups
	- expected *vs* realized effects

Cognitive dimension	- relation governing/governed - communicative and visibility value - reductionism and semplification
Normative dimension (securitarian approach)	- political culture: government *vs* governance - representation of the problem - political legitimacy - strategic reactions and cleavages in organizational field

After the definition of its institutional dimensions is important to stress that was an instrument easy to introduce within the public action due to the fact that is monocratic: the Mayor itself can decide without any consultation to introduce a new mayoral order that was cogent for all the citizens of the city or for some defined groups. For this reason it was often used to gain political consensus directly to the Mayor or to the policy entrepreneur that sponsored its introduction. Furthermore, it was costless because it did not led to a redistribution of resources but worked just trough a blaming process that affected some of the weakest groups of the population that normally do not have voice. The urban security mayoral orders, not only in Milan, had targeted minority groups that were considered a threat for the interests of the majority: ethnic minorities (roma, migrants); social minorities (mendicants, squeegees, prostitutes, homeless, hawkers); religious minorities; deviant groups (alcohol and drugs consumers).

We can see now, how these dimensions had played a role within the participation processes. The

constitutive dimension the participation process in two ways. Firstly it affected the process of equalisation (Ceri, 1998), in fact this instrument put the public actor in the position of a gate-keeper, both for the access to the policy network and the definition of the policy's normative framework. Secondly, considering the issues addressed by the policy (street prostitution, alcohol consumption in public space and drug consumption and purchasing in public spaces), it organized the social space following a principle of distinction (Cella 2006): it divided who followed the rule and who did not, who had the power to define the deviant behaviour and who were defined by those groups. Considering that this instrument shaped the institutional framework of a social policy, the cognitive dimension is crucial to understand what kind of information about the issues the instrument brought to the policy actors. The reductionism and the simplification of the reality produced by the urban security mayoral order, that is associated also with its activity of distinction, is an obstacle for triggering a reflective activity during the implementation process. Social issues have usually a complex origin, and normally as much complex device of instruments is needed to tackle them. The normative dimension is perhaps the one that have the most important influence in the participation process. The use of this instrument was the expression of a will of the public actor to move the equilibrium of its public action towards a government perspective, where the voice given to other actors diminish. Moreover, the representation of the problem within a securitarian framework, was in contrast with the dominant normative framework of the social workers in the field of prostitution and addiction social policies in Milan. In the third part of this article we will see in a detailed and specific way how all of these aspects have been related with the third sector actors and their participation attitude during the implementation.

The implementation process.

In last years at both local and national level a growing attention to the issue of security in urban spaces has spread among citizens and policy entrepreneurs. Among the political answers given to this issue we can include in 2008 the "pacchetto sicurezza" that included six laws concerning to the govern of the security identifying five areas of intervention: irregular migration, organized criminality, everyday criminality, road safety and urban decorum. One of these laws changed the role of the Mayor in the govern of urban security, extending its responsibilities and designing a new policy instrument: the urban security mayoral order (by now in the text only 'mayoral order' or 'order'). From august 2008 to 2011, when this instrument was declared unconstitutional, dozens of municipalities in almost all the Italian Regions, introduced hundreds of orders aimed at the regulation of different all kind issues: from the possibility to sit down in more than three individuals in the public garden areas, to the advanced closing of some categories of shops, from the fine for the

clients of street sex-workers, to the contrast of peddling sanctioning the use of too big bags, from the prohibition of wearing the *niqab* in public spaces, to the obligation of signal to the city council the stranger tenants. The city of Milan contributes to this securitarian enthusiasm implementing a device of three mayoral orders, aimed at sanctioning the consumption of alcohol in public spaces, the prostitution on the streets, purchase the and consumption of drugs in public spaces. Between 2007 and 2009 the local media of the area of Milan had given emphasis to two of these issues underlying how they was a threat to urban decorum: the street prostitution and the consumption of alcohol in public spaces. The arose in the public speech of these issues began with the claim of citizens that had given importance to some aspects that can be summarized in some common points: the warship of rest, the rows that frequently happened, the handling of waste, the threat for morality and the decreasing of building prices. This first phase of mobilization was nourished by an important policy entrepreneur (Kingdon, 2010): the Security Assessor that in that period was at the same time the Deputy Mayor, and thanks to that he could handle great political resources. He had connected explicitly the street prostitution and the alcohol consumption to an urban security issue. The Deputy Mayor posed himself as a policy entrepreneur that could led to a tangible public action the claims of the organized moral entrepreneurs, as the citizens committee and local media were. Together with the permanency of these issues within the political agenda, some experts (psychologists, officials of the *Azienda Sanitaria Locale* – local health care agency -, the health care assessor) began to take the floor within the public speech. In November 2009 a new dramatization, more oriented to a social work frame, found a concretion in the public action with the opening of a new social service named "Unità Multidisciplinare Integrata" (UMI by now in the text), within the Department of Social Policy. This social service born, according to the explicit intentions of the Mayor and the Social Policy Assessor, with the aim of draw up to the mayoral orders cited above, asking for the collaboration of the third sector organizations. Only those that had accepted this new frame were admitted within the policy network (Peters, 1998; Pavolini 2003). The synergy between social workers and local police forces were presented to the citizenship, and to other actors involved in the policy as well, as the new regulation approach of the "urban disorder" caused by the presence and visibility of some groups targeted as marginal. The acceptance of the third sector organizations was certified with the subscription of an official document that revised the normative framework according to the normative payload of the Mayor order. Its content can be summarised, according to the same words used by the Social Policy Assessor, with the statement "reception only in legality". Nevertheless, from the beginning of the implementation process it was clear that this collaboration couldn't have been realized. Indeed, both local police officers and social workers involved in the policy, carried out strong strategies of resistance both in the coordination arenas and at the street

level field. The UMI was designed to be divided in two areas: the addiction area (including drugs and alcohol abuse), and the prostitution area. During the implementation it met several difficulties in finding an operational fluency as it was affected by the cleavages that the institutional framework of the mayoral orders has produced within the organizational field of the third sector organizations operating in the Milan local welfare. It was affected also by the resistance of the organizations inside of the policy network that tried (and succeeded) to modify, specially within the addiction area, the securitarian frame of this social policy. On the contrary, the prostitution area suffered in a deep way the securitarian frame in which it is plunged. Moreover, it was implemented with scarcity of economic and human resources and at the end of 2010 this area was closed.

The city council was active on this policy with two different departments: on one hand the urban security one make pressure as a policy entrepreneur to enhance the securitarian frame; on the other hand the social policy department imposed a new securitarian frame to the organizations of the third sectors that have traditionally worked with the drugs and alcohol abuse. This new frame comprehended also a new regulation of power relations, which has centralized most part of decisional power in the hand of the public actor, with a small degree of voice conceded to the third sector's partners. Following this description of the policy cycle we can identify two different moments where the policy instrument had played a role about the participation practices.

Public policy instruments between participation practices and cleavages in the organizational field.

To analyse a public policy through its policy instruments allow us to emphasizes how the organizations can carry out strategic behaviour in participation practices, in reaction to institutional pressures that push them towards a coercive isomorphism (Di Maggio, Powell 1983; Oliver 1991) that in this case interest particularly the normative framework. Indeed, even going through a kind of aut aut concerning the organizational frame to follow, the third sector organizations that had accepted to be involved in the UMI implementation, had carried out also an active resistance behaviour that is possible to split in two different moments. Firstly we consider the moment when the Assessor of the Social Policy Department present to all the organizations the opportunity to participate to this policy. The second moment was during the implementation, when participation dynamic went through different paths within the addiction and prostitution area.

In the first, the city committee become an actor in a gate-keeping position setting up normative and organizational criteria that have to be satisfied to enter in the policy network. It played this role using two interacting resources. On one hand the legal resource that had shaped the institutional frame which the organizations were called to fit to. Factually, the Department of Social Policy have

chosen the technique of the "manifestazione di interesse"[6]. By this way was possible to come into operation the securitarian framework of the urban security orders within the policy process. In fact, all the organizations that wanted to chose to the policy network had to subscribe a sharing of the normative framework set up by the public actor. On the other hand the resource that have been utilized was the political one. The municipality drove the shaping of the new securitarian framework with the adoption of two programmatic documents. These papers redefined the general frame of the Social Policy Department for what concerns the social policies on the addiction field[7]. These changes had shaped also the distribution of economic resources favouring the organizations normatively compatible to the new frame imposed considering both valorial orientations and courses of action with users. Trough, the *constitutive dimension,* the orders had imposed, in a hierarchical way, some norms, monocratically defined by the Mayor, that detected in a discretionary way the adequacy of the behaviours that were possible to follow in a urban context, operating an action of distinction. In fact, who did not follow the prescriptions contained in the mayoral order is put outside of the social norm and it is sanctioned for this reason. As mentioned above the use of this instrument open to the possibility to change the framework of the local welfare. Within the addiction policies the attempt was to move out from the principle "to educate, not to punish" that has characterised the policy interventions in Milan in the last decade, to the principle "welcome but within legality". The nature of the new frame have produced a distinction also within the organizational field of third sector organizations. This distinction was imposed in synergy with the *normative* dimension that, through the "manifestazione di interesse", had delimited the operative procedures of social workers in order to transform them in a coherent way regarding to the new framework. It was in this way that the public actor gain the position of a gate-keeper for the policy network. The result was the production of a deep cleavage in the organizational field between *strategic* and *ethic* bodies. The former were those who accepted to enter in the policy network following the conditions of the Social Policies Department, the latter had not accepted those conditions and for this reason they had had hard difficulties in the relationship both with the public actor and the *strategic* organizations operating in the addiction field. The first group of actors chose to formally acquiesce to the institutional pressures of municipality. The latter chose to blame the public actor criticizing both the type of legal resource chosen and the way the political resource had been used, trough public debates were they invited the Mayor and the Assessor of the Social Policy Department without any response, and with a public document submitted by the CNCA of

---

6 It can be translated as: "display of interest"
7 These documents are: "Services of Milan, which measures of prevention and contrast to distress and to addictions (objectives and actions)" and "Measures of social support aimed to contrast prostitution and alcohol and drugs addcition"

Lombardy[8]: a regional federation part of a national representative body of the third sector organizations. Moreover, this cleavage had meant the interruption of the coordination activities among *strategic* and *ethic* bodies even in different sectors of social policies. So, is possible to state that this device of three mayoral orders had shaped the participatory choices of the actors within the organizational field making them put themselves along that cleavage. During the interviews to the members of different *strategic* organizations the reasons of their choices can be arranged around some common needs but without a clear priority. These are (1) the need to enter into the policy network with the aim to contrast the attempt of the public actor to change the paradigm; (2) the need to had a good position within the power relationship that had structured the structure of opportunities to contribute to the arrangement of the local welfare also in other policy sectors; (3) the need to gain the economic resources related to this policy-even if not indispensable-that see the public actor as the only provider. In this first moment the role of the mayoral order is traceable mainly in two dimensions that we have defined above in Tab.1. Considering the *constitutive dimension* we see how the mayoral order underpin a structure of the power relationships that gave to the public actor, thanks to its monocratic character, the role of gate-keeper of the policy network. In this case the distinction operated among who had decided to adapt to this new frame and who had refused it. The *ethic* bodies that had chosen to stay out of this new framework had been sanctioned with the exclusion (Pellizzoni, Osti 1999) out of the policy network. Is important to consider that the participation is linked to the necessity of express an identity, to affirm a presence, an existence (Melucci, 1982) and in this case we can say that this is passed through the choice of to not participate. In fact, this choice of the *ethic* bodies was combined with a different kind of mobilization outside the policy and in explicit opposition towards the framework of the policy instrument and the self-centred way of definition of the policy design by the public actor. On the other side the *strategic* bodies that had accepted this peculiar opportunity of participation had obtained the access to the policy network but limiting in a dramatic way their agency, as we are going to see in the paragraph that follows.

In the second phase of the policy, during its implementation, the mayoral orders had shaped the participation practices of the actors within the policy network. Concerning to the prostitution area the order made hard the setting up of the social service. In fact, this instrument had an underlying logic uncorrelated to a social work perspective, especially in its normative dimension. Its content had given a representation of the problem in securitarian terms that were useful only in supporting a public action focused on the control of the territory aimed to contain the visibility of the

---

8   Coordinamento Nazionale Comunità di Accoglienza – *National Organization Treatment Centers*. In the Lombardy region it represent 188 different organizations.

phenomenon. The impossibility to think about a social service, in such shaped institutional framework, led to an impasse in the action of each organization involved in this area of the UMI. These *strategic* bodies had tried to suggest a new mission with new objectives for the policy that could went further than symbolic dimension, but they did not find any way out for their action. Moreover, during the implementation, that was supervised by a public official, the normative a and cognitive dimensions had been used to close the viability of the street-level social workers (Lipsky, 1980). Their participation was prevented time by time according to the strict criteria contained in the mayoral order that defined the access to the policy benefits for the sex-workers, without any consideration of the situation the social workers could met in their activity on the road.

The area of addictions had followed a different path for the participation of the third sector organizations. Within it the organizations were able to set up an autonomous process of normative isomorphism among them (Powell, Di Maggio 1983), which consented to take a new mission, new methodological procedures and objectives, different from those that would be reached according to the frame imposed by the Department of Social Policy trough the orders framework. This different practice of participation within the policy network was possible thanks to two mechanisms. The first concerned the suspension of the coercive isomorphic pressure of the policy instrument via the same public official of the management that was so rigid in the prostitution area. The aim was to seek for the prevailing of the "reason of the service" against the "reason of the politics"[9] that the institutional framework play for. The second mechanism was the opening of a reflective actions (Bifulco, 2008) opportunity during a supervising process that were asked by the social workers of the organizations involved and granted by the management. That experience consented the detection of common operational elements among social workers with different set of values, the elaboration of a shared methodology, and a common course of action that lead to a new, internal, framework of that area of the UMI.

This deep difference among the two areas of the policy could be explained trough a distinction among different levels of participation (Pellizzoni 2003). What we had observed within the prostitution area of the policy could be defined as a *cooperation* in which the agency is mostly compressed, as we have seen above, by the cognitive and normative dimension of the instrument. Thanks to the different attitude of the management in the addiction area, the third sector organizations had experienced a different type of participation that allowed them to take the *collective decisions* about their courses of action in order to institutionalize a new social service. Considering the *strategic* actors there were also a third level of participation behind the scenery.

---

9   We believe that is substantial and useful to use the words that the public official has chosen to understand the
    reasons of his behaviour.

During the implementation process the presidents of these organization had tried to pressure the Department of Social Policy, with the aim of changing the structure of the policy, asking the abrogation of the mayoral orders, in order to open the policy network to all the human and organizational resources of the local welfare and to start a process of design of a new, more general, policy. This attempt has failed.

In a "garbage can" decision making (Cohen, March, Olsen 1972; Peters 2002), the innovation and the implementation of a public policy that involved different participation practices of different actors, should pass through iterative processes without well-defined purposes, but only with general guidelines: exactly what the normative and constitutive dimensions of the mayoral order did not permit. This was possible only in the addiction area thanks to the role of the management. This choice had opened a sub-policy arena within the implementing policy. The reasons and the conditions that had favoured this attitude were not an object of this article but is useful to underline almost one aspect of its professional profile. This public official, in fact, was a long running street-level social worker professional in the addiction field of the city of Milan. Thus, probably, his professional culture (Bloor, Dawson 1994) was more oriented to the "regime of regular action" rather than the "regime of planned engagement" (Thevenot, 2007). and he was influenced by it in his decisions. The concept of decoupling (Oliver 1991) is useful to describe the peculiar participation practices in this policy. Indeed, this concept show the detachment between, (1) what an organization do to adhere to the institutional pressures, and the essential legitimacy that is necessary to obtain the possibility to participate to the policy network; and (2) what comes from the values that members of the organizations are socialized to. In this policy network, the will to impress a new institutional frame trough a coercive policy instrument had achieved on the one hand the unfruitfulness of the service (in the prostitution area) and on the other hand a strategic resistance that led to an institutional framework (in the addiction area) that was mismatched comparing it with normative and cognitive dimensions of the mayoral orders. Thus, having used an instrument (1) with a different framework to the social work culture, (2) without sharing the decision of its implementation with the involved actors and (3) implemented through a strictly authoritative mode, achieved resistance motions during the implementation process within the policy network and provoked a cleavage in the organizational field.

Before to going further with our conclusion in is useful to briefly summarise some key points of the line of reasoning that we have proposed here. The public policy that we have analysed has an institutional framework shaped by a device of three urban security mayoral orders. To grasp the role that this instrument had had in structuring the participation practices, we have looked at it analytically and we have defined three dimensions. The constitutive one concern the allocation of

the power resources within the local government and in our case study it had structured the possibility to enter in the policy network and the agency of the actors that were inside. The cognitive dimension organizes the type of knowledge that the actors can manage during the implementation process. The normative dimension give a representation of the issue that play a framing role and define by which perspective the public action face the issue. In our case the securitarian frame have had specific effect both before and during the implementation of the decision. The detailed role of each dimension is outlined in the chart that follows.

Tab. 2 Role of the urban security mayoral order in structuring the participation practices of the third sector organizations.

	Design of the Policy	Implementation of the policy
Constitutive dimension	*inside the policy network:* gate-keeping of the public actor, *strategic* bodies choose to participate with a decoupling strategy.	*inside policy network:* - prostitution area: lack of voice and agency for the actors. - addiction area: official appointed to the implementation act as a filter and suspend the impact of the order opening a discretionary room
	outside the policy network: gate-keeping of the public actor, *ethic* bodies mobilize themselves to contrast the policy entrepreneur.	*outside policy network:* cleavage within the organizational field between *ethic* and *strategic* bodies.
Cognitive dimension	*inside policy network:* Not present.	*inside policy network:* - prostitution area: strict criteria of the order impede the social assessment. - addiction area: the suspended order allowed to re-think the priorities through a supervision processes for the social workers
	outside policy network: Not present.	*outside policy network:* Not present.
Normative dimension	*inside policy network:* failed attempt to change the operational framework of the social workers.	*inside policy network:* - prostitution area: operational impasse (cooperation). - addiction area: the public official and the supervision give space to a new normative framework (collective decisions).
	outside policy network: attempt to change the framework of the whole sector of addiction policies.	*outside policy network:* cleavage within the organizational field between e*thic* and *strategic* bodies.

Conclusion

We can recall here the research question of this case study in a general way: in what way did an

institutional framework defined by three mayoral orders, shape the participation practices of third sector organizations in the different phases of this social policy? The question is quite wide and is useful to redefine it in more specific questions: (1) what impact the institutional framework of the policy have had on the organizational field? (2) what kind of practice the actors have played? (3) what impact has had on the operational activity of the third sector bodies inside the policy network? The answer to this question can be tracked in the body of the article but is useful to systematize them, also in order to propose a theoretical contribution about the role that the policy instrument can have in the participation process. The device of the mayoral orders (1) had operated as a factor of restructuring of the organizational field, sanctioning a distinction between who was in inside and who was outside the policy network, (2) it had had a normative impact in the *outside* provoking a cleavage within the organizational field of the third sector organizations that have an long history of participation in the local welfare, (3) it has had a normative impact in the *inside* influencing the implementation process in the cooperation practices.

We have proposed to structure a policy approach focused on the instruments around three hypothesis, that are at the same time three typical effect that are imputable to the instrument (Lascoumes 2011; Le Galès 2010). We now consider these hypotheses, and we put them in relation with the results of our case study. In this way, we try to highlight how the policy instruments have influenced the participation process, even going beyond the intention or the predisposition of the public actor:

- A policy instrument produces a specific representation of the issue targeted by the policy. Properly for this reason a great part of the third sector organization had refused to participate to the policy designed by the public actor. Furthermore, the opposition was so deep, that they interrupted their shared activities with the *al* that accepted to enter in the policy network. So, by this point of view the policy instrument have structured the organizational field posing a rigid filter of distinction among those that have the legitimation to participate and those that do not have.

- A policy instrument sets a specific approach to the issue because it supports a hierarchy of the variables of the reality and, in some cases, it can lead to an explanatory scheme of the social reality. The *strategic* actors had accepted to enter within the policy network properly because they have though that this kind of use of the mayoral orders was absolutely dysfunctional to have an impact on the society due to the wrong social scheme that they brought with them. Thus, they had decided to accept the opportunity to participate with the intention to change the policy during the implementation. They were able to do it only in the addiction area, but it was possible. On the other hand, the *ethic* bodies chose to adhere to

their grounding values without playing a decoupling strategy. The consequence was a public mobilization against both the securitarian framework and the gate-keeping approach of the public actor within the policy design.

– Public policy instruments are not neutral but they have an autonomous force of action that consent to resist to eventual external pressures of different actors. This kind of effect was at the origin of the impasse of the prostitution area within the UMI. The normative and the constitutive dimension of the instrument, where the former define the structure of opportunity for the operative actions, and the latter restrict the agency of the third sector organizations, have defeated all the intentions of the social workers endorsing a securitarian approach to the problem.

So we think that is possible to state, also by a theoretical point of view, that the policy instruments had shaped the opportunity of the participation, they had selected who could participate and who could not, they had had an impact in the participation practices of who decided to participate. Going further in stressing the importance of the policy instrument in the participation process we see how, at least in this case, it has structured not just who participate and in which way but also its justification. We can also highlight that a policy instrument that promotes a top-down approach without any space for negotiation it is not the best solution to reach the goals of the policy, especially if the implementation will involve other actors. In fact the lack of voice, the compression of the agency, and the impossibility to negotiate the normative framework and the operational actions, will probably lead to participation practices that can produce effects independent from the purposes of the policy entrepreneur.

References

Cito uno in inglese in qui welfare attori riflessivi Bifulco L. (2008) *Gabbie di vetro. Burocrazia, governance e libertà,* Bruno Mondadori, Milano

Bifulco L., Centemeri L. (2007) "Governance and participation in local welfare: the case of Italian Piani di Zona" *Social Policy & Administration* Vol. 42 No. 3 pp 211-27

Bloor G., Dawson P. (1994) "Understanding Professional Culture in Organizational Context" *Organization Studies* March 15: 275-295

Bobbio, L. (2003) **"**Building social capital through democratic deliberation: the rise of deliberative arenas" *Social Epistemology, 17, n°4, pp 343-357*

Borraz O., John P. (2004) "The transformation of urban political leadership in western Europe" *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* Vol 28 No. 1 pp 107-20

Carrer M. (2011) *"Le ordinanze dei sindaci e la scorciatoia della Corte. Osservazioni, a prima lettura, alla sentenza della Corte Costituzionale 7 aprile 2011, n° 115",* Forum di Quaderni Costituzionali

Casey, J. (2002) "Confrontation, collaboration and costs: third sector participation in the policy process" *Australian and New Zealand third sector review* Vol. 8, n°2, pp. 71-86

Inglese polity press Castel R. (2004) *L'insicurezza sociale. Che significa essere protetti?* Einaudi, Torino (trad it.)

Caulfield J., Larsen H. O. (ed) *"Local government at the millenium"*, Leske + Budrick, Opladen 2002

Michelle lanont boundariy work in annual sociology Cella G. Primo (2006), "Tracciare I confini. Realtà e metafore della distinzione" Il Mulino Bologna

Cittalia Fondazione (2009) *"Oltre le ordinanze i sindaci e la sicurezza urbana"*, marzo

Ceri, P. 1998 *Quale teledemocrazia?* In P. Ceri e P. Borgna (a cura di), *La tecnologia per il XXI secolo*, Torino, Einaudi, pp. 267-286.

Cohen M., March J., Olsen J. (1972) "A Garbage Can Model of Organizational Choice" *Administrative Science Quarterly* Vol. 17, No. 1, pp 1-25

Coston J. (1998) "A model and typology of NGO-Government relatioships" *Nonprofit and voluntary sector quarterly* vol 27, n°3, pp 358-382.

Powell W., Di Maggio P.J. (1983) "The iron cage revisited: institutional isomoprphism, and collective rationality in organizational fields" *American Sociological Review* Vol. 48 Aprile pp 147-60

Powell W., Di Maggio P.J. (1991) "Introduction", Powell W., Di Maggio P.J. (ed) *The new institutionalism in organizational analisys* Chicago IL, University of Chicago Press pp 1-40

Eliadis P.F., Hill M.M., Howlett M.(2005) *Designing government: from instruments to governance* McGill's-Queen Press

Fiss P.C., Zajac E. (2006) "The symbolic management of strategic change: sense giving via framing and decoupling" *Academy of Management Review* Vol. 49, No. 6 pp1173-1193

Flyvbjerg B. (2006) "Five misunderstandings about case-study research" *Qualitative Inquiry* Vol.12 No.12 pp 219-245

Genieys W., Ballart X., Valariè p. (2004) "From 'great' leaders to building networks: the emergence of a new urban leadership in southern europe?" *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* Vol.28.1 March pp 183-99

Hall P.A., Victoria C.H. (1993) *Labor visions and state power: the origin of business unionism in the United States* Princeton University Press

Hall P.A., Rosemary C.R. Taylor (1996) "Political Science and The Three New Institutionalisms" *Political Studies* XLIV, 936-957

Hill H.C. (2003) "Understanding implementation: street level bureaucrats' resources for reform" *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* Vol.13 No.3 pp 265-282

Hood C. (1983) *The Tools of Government* Macmillan, London

HoodC. (2007) "Intellectual Obsolescence and Intellectual Makeovers: reflections on the tools of Government after two decades" *Governance: An International Journal Of Policy, Administration and Institutions* Vol. 20 No.1 pp 127-144

Howlett M., Cashore B., (2007) "Re-visiting the new othodoxy of policy dynamics: the dependent variable and re-aggregation problems in the study of policy change" *Canadian Political Science Review* Vol.1 No.2

Kingdon J.W., James A.T. (1984) *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies* Longman Classics Edition pp 165-195

Krasner S.D. (1998) "Sovereignty: an institutional perspective" *Comparative Political Studies* No.1

Lascoumes P., Le Galès P. (2007) "Introduction: understanding public policy through its instruments - from the nature of instruments to the sociology of public policy instrumentation" *Governance: an International Journal of Policy, Administration and Institutions* Vol.20, No.1 pp 1-22

Lascoumes P., Le Galès P. (a cura di) (2009) *Gli strumenti per governare* Bruno Mondadori, Milano (trad. it).

Lascoumes P., *et al*., (2011) "Public policy seen through the prism of its instruments" *Presses de Sciences Po/Revue francaise de science politique* Vol 61 n°1 pp 1-17.

Le Galès P. (2005) *Recomposition de l'Etat et territoire: l'Etat règulateur, une rèvolution bureaucratique en marche?* **Communication pour le colloque de l'AFSP, septembre, Lyon**

Le Galès P. (2006) *Le città europee. Società urbane, globalizzazione, governo locale* Il Mulino, Bologna ing. Oxford press

Le Galès P. (2011) *Policy instruments and governance* in Bevir M., *The SAGE Handbook of Governance* Sage Publication Ltd.

Lipsky M., *Street-level Bureaucracy; Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Services*, Russell Sage Foundation 2010

Linder S.H., Peters B.G. (1998) *The study of policy instruments: four school of thought* in Guy B. Peters, Franks K.M. Van Nispen, (ed) *Public Policy instruments: evaluating the tools of public administration* Chelthenam, Uk, Edgar Elgar

March J.G., Olsen J.P. (1984) "The new institutionalism: organizational factors in political life"

American Political Science Review Vol.78, No. 3 pp 738

Mingione E. (1997) *Sociologia della vita economica* Carocci, Roma ong. Fragmented societes

Melucci, A. 1982 *L'invenzione del presente* Bologna, Il Mulino

Napolitano G. (2008) *Le nuove ordinanze del Sindaco* Maggioli Ed. Rimini

Oliver C. (1991) "Strategic response to institutional processes" *Academy of Management Review* Vol.16 No.1 pp 145-179

Pavolini E. (2003) *Le nuove politiche sociali. I sistemi di welfare tra istituzioni e società civile* Il Mulino Bologna inglese vcon ranci 2003

Pellizzoni, L. e G. Osti (1999) "*Democrazia e cooperazione nella tutela dell'ambiente*" in Quaderni di Sociologia, XLIII, 21, pp. 113-143 europen journal of social theory

Pellizzoni, L. "Cosa significa partecipare" *Rassegna Italiana di Sociologia* a.XLVI, n°3 luglio-settembre 2005

Peters, B. G. (1998) 'Policy networks: myth, metaphor and reality' in Marsh, D. (ed.) Comparing Policy Networks. (Buckingham: Open University Press).

Peters G.B. (2002) "The politics of tools choice" in Salomon L., Micheal Odus V. Elliott, *The tools of government: a guide to the new governance* Oxford University Press, Oxford

Salomon L., Micheal con Odus V. Elliott (2002) *The tools of government: a guide to the new governance* Oxford University Press, Oxford

Thevenot, L. 2007 L'*action au pluriel: sociologie des regimes d'engagement* La decouverte

Yin R.K. (1981) "The case study crisis. Some answers." *Administrative Science Quarterly* No. 26 pp 58-65

Zucker L. (1991) *The role of institutionalisation in cultural persistence* in Powell and DiMaggio *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis* Chicago IL, University of Chicago Press, pp 83-107