

Paper presented to the Political Studies Association Conference 2008

Swansea, 1st – 3rd April

Reinvigorating the Civic: Searching for a Rationale for our Research Programme

Sarah Cotterill¹, Liz Richardson¹ Gerry Stoker², Corinne Wales²

¹ Institute for Political and Economic Governance, University of
Manchester

² Centre for Citizenship and Democracy, University of Southampton

Comments welcome. Please address to Liz Richardson
liz.richardson@manchester.ac.uk

Reinvigorating the Civic: Searching for a Rationale for our Research Programme

Our core claim is that there is a causal link between civic orientations, tempered by facilitating conditions to civic behaviour (see Figures 1 and 2). This more collectively orientated behaviour allows citizens to engage, cooperate or self-govern to improve key outcomes for society at large. Reinvigorating or reenergizing the civic therefore carries with it the potential of considerable social and economic benefit. This paper aims to explore the nature of the links between civic orientation and civic behaviour.

This paper contains four main parts. First we define civic behaviour. Second we argue that the understanding of civic behaviour necessarily involves complicating a simplistic rational choice framing of the issue because of the potential for moral motivations in civic behaviour and a recognition that human decision-making is influenced by factors beyond instrumental calculation. A third section offers our own model for understanding the scope for intervention in influencing civic behaviour. The concluding section begins to pull out the implications for our work.

1. What is civic behaviour?

Our conceptualisation of civic behaviour is relational. It is contextualised in the relationships between citizen and citizen and between citizen and the collective community. Underpinning our research is the idea that civic behaviour is the function of a set of particular dispositions in that it is action that shows regard for others; reflects both wisdom and responsibility in its employment and that when individuals act in a civic way they are, in significant dimensions, oriented toward the collective good. What makes for 'good' civic behaviour is temporal, unfixed and dynamic – the 'good' citizen of Athenian democracy was one skilled in the art of soldiering, the 21st century 'good' citizen might recycle domestic waste or help support their local park management committee.

The literature on social dilemmas can aid thinking about civic behaviour. "Social dilemmas are situations that contain a conflict of interests between the private interests of individuals and the broader public interests of society at large" (Van Vugt et al., 2000: 19). In a social dilemma, if everyone contributes all will benefit, but each individual faces a temptation to not contribute in the hope that they can be a "freerider" on the collective effort (Ostrom, 1990). Social dilemmas have been described in relation to two types of problem: firstly common good problems, where action is required to achieve a collective good (Olson, 1965); secondly common resources problems, where restraint is needed to preserve collective resources (Ostrom, 1990, Ostrom, 1998). From

this social dilemmas perspective, civic behaviour can take the form of action towards a common good (such as voting, participating in public decisions, volunteering or shopping ethically) or restraint to conserve collective resources (such as recycling, energy conservation or choosing not to drive) and there is a distinction between behaviour initiated by individuals and collective behaviour in formal or informal groups (Van Vugt et al., 2000). The concepts of taking action to achieve common goods and exercising restraint to preserve common resources are a useful way of thinking about civic behaviour, but the social dilemmas literature focuses primarily on the actions of people within groups. Civic behaviour is a wider concept which goes beyond involvement in groups: civic behaviour is concerned with the relationship between individuals (singly or in groups) and society as a whole. So, while we can learn from the social dilemma literature, it cannot tell the whole story.

As we see it, civic behaviour is rooted in society; it includes both action to influence institutions and actions taken when citizens are doing it for themselves. There is a distinction between individual civic behaviour and the collective activity of groups (see table 1).

		<i>Type of activity</i>	
		Influencing institutions	DIY
<i>Level of Activity</i>	Individual	Individual political action	Individual DIY
	Collective	Collective political action	Collective DIY

Table 1. Classification of civic behaviour

Civic behaviour can manifest itself in four ways. (a) *Individual political action*, where individuals seek to influence institutions by complaining, signing petitions or contacting politicians; (b) *collective political action* where people work together to influence institutions by marching on parliament, attending health forums or joining political parties; (c) *Individual DIY*, when individuals act in the wider public interest by reducing their consumption, recycling household waste or shopping ethically; (d) *Collective forms of DIY* civic behaviour include being a member of a community group, forming a social enterprise, pledging to exchange favours formally (e.g. via a timebank) or informally (mutual aid) or becoming a volunteer.

Civic behaviour to influence institutions seeks to influence rules, laws and policies of national and local government and other institutions like schools, police or health services. It includes *conventional* political behaviour such as contacting an MP, voting or joining a political party; *oppositional behaviour* such as taking part in protests and rallies and *innovative* new forms of activity, for example through joining community governance structures which are

relatively new opportunities attracting previously under-represented groups (John, 2008), such as joining a neighbourhood forum or attending a patients' forum of a local health trust. All of the forms of civic behaviour which seek to influence institutions can be taken either as individuals (complaining, signing petitions, contacting politicians) or through collective action (marching on parliament, attending health forums or joining political parties).

Do-It-Yourself (DIY) civic behaviour is where citizens are doing it for themselves rather than seeking to persuade or influence institutions. This can include self-help activity with wider social benefits and any situation where citizens take the initiative to implement solutions to social problems. This behaviour can be individual or collective.

In relation to individual DIY or socially motivated ethical 'self-governance', civic behaviour both overlaps and can be distinguished from the emerging notion of pro-social behaviour, it overlaps because both forms of behaviour impact positively on the collective, it can be distinguished because civic behaviour is a product of collective orientation whereas pro-social behaviour need not be. Thus, being respectful of each other's cultural differences or reducing one's car use for environmental reasons is both pro-social and civic due to the significantly other-regarding nature of any such behaviour whereas eating more healthily or drinking less alcohol (which some class as pro-social e.g. Taylor 2007), whilst desirable both for the individual and society is less obviously motivated by civic orientation. However, in practice it is hard to operationalise this distinction as each individual potentially will have multiple motivations for their self-governance. For example people eating more healthily as vegetarians may be doing so as a by-product of their concern for the negative environmental impacts (deforestation, soil erosion) or social justice implications of meat production. While others choosing to cycle to work rather than drive may be as interested in the muscle toning, cash and time saving benefits as in the environmental benefits.

Civic behaviour requires effort. Exercising self-restraint and personal responsibility, becoming informed about issues that affect communities, participating in consultations, changing entrenched habits for collective ends, all demand considerable exertion by individuals. As Taylor acknowledges, in order 'to have the society we want, we need to agree to give more back' (Taylor, 2007: 3). The behaviour exacted by this mutually advantageous reciprocal relationship between the individual and the collective may place 'heavy burdens' on individuals in order to achieve socially desired ends (Goodin, 1980: 131). Policy interventions therefore may be needed to support the emergence of civic behaviour.

2. Complicating the Rational Choice Model: A necessary element in understanding civic behaviour

Civic behaviour asks something different from the citizen. It challenges the citizen to be, at least, not narrowly self-interested and to think beyond the short-term. We are in the realm of moral incentives. Goodin identifies three

forms of moral behaviour and motivation (Goodin, 1980). The first is referred to as prudential morality and is premised on an appeal to long-term or enlightened self interest usually by way of careful reflection on the part of the individual. The second is where moral principles are held and internalized by the individual but are given the same status as more self-interested, instrumental motivations and are tradable in the prominence they are given in decision-making. The third area is where moral principles are held to be sacred and require to be protected from more profane motivations and not to be traded under any circumstances. For Goodin, taking morals seriously entails distinguishing them from and resisting their *contamination* by 'more mundane (and especially egoistic) concerns' (Goodin, 1980: 137). He differentiates seriously-held moral principles from both enlightened self-interest and from morality as part of utility function. Seriously morally motivated behaviour is endangered if more mundane motives are evoked and played off instrumentally in a 'motivation mix'.

Each form of moral action carries with it implications for what can be done to stimulate it. To illustrate, a donor to a blood bank could see the issue as a matter of long-term rational interest (I might need some blood in the future). Information, incentives and even modest coercion (in times of emergency) might be acceptable external stimulants in these circumstances. Alternatively blood donors could see it as a moral commitment and as long as it is made a convenient and easy task will carry on doing it. Finally they could see it an absolute moral duty and regard the act of giving blood as an outward expression of their commitment to their fellow human beings. Coercion or reward for giving blood in these circumstances would undermine the commitment, or 'crowd out' the altruistic motivation. This idea was originally put forward by academic Richard Titmuss (Titmuss, 1970) in *The gift relationship*, who argued that monetary compensation for donating blood might reduce the supply of blood donors. He argued that paying for blood donations would undermine cherished social values and would therefore reduce or totally destroy people's willingness to donate blood (Titmuss, 1970). The significance of this in relation to interventions aimed at encouraging civic behaviour is that conventional public choice levers such as financial incentives may inadvertently transform civic orientations into self-interested gains and loss calculations: 'the introduction of a monetary reward for performing a task which subjects originally regarded as intrinsically enjoyable consistently reduced the intrinsic pleasure subjects reported deriving from the task and, furthermore, reduced their rate of volunteering to repeat the experiment' (Goodin, 1980: 139).

In short we commonly design institutions and policy interventions for rational knaves (LeGrand, 2006) but the stimulation of civic behaviour requires a more subtle approach because individuals may act out of seriously-held moral motivations as well as self-interest (Frey, 2007, Frey and Jegen, 2001, Goodin, 1980). Goodin posits that it is seriously-held moral principles that policy-makers would really like to tap:

they can get people to do lots of things they would not otherwise do – but they are also terribly precarious. These principles are highly susceptible to

'pollution' from less pure motives, in which case a motivational flip-flop is to be expected, polluted principles can no longer be taken seriously. If we are really to take advantage of seriously-held moral principles for enforcement of social policies, then, we must design our schemes in such a way as to avoid this pollution and the motivational flip-flop it entails (Goodin, 1980:140)

Goodin's observations are echoed by Bruno Frey in *Crowding Out Theory* (Frey, 2007, Frey and Jegen, 2001). In a discussion document presented to the Australian Government, Frey argues that it is most commonly assumed that the 'Price Effect' applied to demand means that a price rise reduces the quantity demanded, and, applied to supply a higher price induces an increase in supply. Thus, paying a higher compensation unequivocally raises the effort and quantity of work. Frey argues that whilst a powerful, empirically testable, explanation for behaviour, experimental social psychology has illustrated that price change can induce exactly the opposite effect on behaviour. In other words, the rationality of the Price Effect is not valid under all conditions and circumstances. In short, 'external and, in particular, monetary incentives do not mechanically induce human beings to act in the desired way, because they crowd out intrinsic motivation under identifiable conditions' (Frey, 2007: 4-5) .

Example of Crowding Out Effect

Day-care centres provide a striking case of monetary intervention achieving the opposite of what would be expected on the basis of the Price Effect. Such institutions are confronted with the problem that parents sometimes arrive late to pick up their children, which forces the employees to stay after the official closing time. To remedy the situation, economists would typically suggest imposing a monetary fine for collecting children late. Such punishment is expected to induce parents to be on time. A study on a day-care centre in Israel revealed a completely different outcome (Gneezy and Rusticchini 2000a, 2000b cited by Frey, 2007: 14)

After the introduction of a rather hefty fine, the number of parents arriving late increased substantially. Introducing a monetary fine transforms the relationship between parents and day-care employees from a mostly personal to a more monetary relationship. As a result, the parents' intrinsic motivation to keep to the time schedule was reduced or crowded out altogether, the perception being that the employees were now 'paid' for the disamenity of having to stay longer. Being late for picking children up was no longer associated with any feeling of guilt (Frey, 2007: 14)

Frey presents an alternative model of human behaviour that draws distinctions between extrinsic and intrinsic motivations and attempts to explain action in terms of purely internal considerations – in particular, self-esteem and self-determination. He contends that both self-esteem and self-determination can be damaged by those external interventions which are perceived by citizens as controlling or not recognising the worth of their intrinsic motivations. In this way, for Frey, intrinsic motivations can be 'crowded out' by extrinsic controls (Frey, 2007: 6) Moreover, external intervention may induce a shift from other regarding or group regarding more selfish preferences and behaviour (Frey, 2007: 8). Another theory that mirrors Goodin's analysis is 'cognitive consistency theory' which proposes that people are motivated to seek consistency between their beliefs, values and perceptions. Where there is a clash between their actions and

values/attitudes, people often resolve the discrepancy by changing their values or attitudes rather than their behaviour' (Halpern et al., 2004)

Moreover, the NEF recently reported that experimental economists have found that 'fairness' is often a significant factor in modifying citizens' willingness to behave civically. For example, 'people believe that costs should be fairly distributed between those responsible for the necessity of the public good, and those who will benefit from it' (Dawnay and Shah, 2005: 6). If people perceive that something is fair – they are often willing to contribute more.

A recent Government intervention concerning personal transport use appears in line with what Crowding-Out Theory would suggest encourages behaviour consistent with moral incentives. A nationwide team of personal transport advisers, who call at the homes of drivers thinking of switching to greener forms of travel but not knowing how, is being considered to help break Britain's dependency on the car. This intervention has already been trialled in Peterborough where 20,000 people have been given personal advice at a cost of £750,000. The impact has been reported as a 10% drop in car use among those contacted by the team. One of the advisers, interviewed by the BBC suggested that citizens who requested advice received 'information and enthusiasm' from the team¹. Thus, information accompanied by personal recognition, supportive encouragement and praise seems to have actually made some impact on the intractable issue of car dependency. Further steps to reinforce adapted behaviour are value affirming social mechanisms such as equipping offices and places of work with the appropriate facilities to cater for cyclists – such as showers, safe storage areas and places to change (Halpern et al., 2004: 29).

The entrenched rational choice model in public policy assumes self-interested, 'rational' behaviour is a product of processes of cognitive deliberation and instrumental calculation and on this basis policy interventions often start with supplying citizens with sufficient information to make informed choices about the available options. Citizens are then able to make informed choices in terms of costs and benefits and make decisions that will maximise their net utility. The classic levers of government that follow from this model are information, price signals (taxes or subsidies) and legal sanctions. Given the moral dimension to civic behaviour there are grounds for looking beyond the simplistic rational choice model. A recognition of other factors too in the composition of human decision-making takes us away from a reliance on a simple rational choice model. The fields of psychology, economics and consumer behaviour reveals scholars that have argued that individuals have cognitive limitations or 'bounded rationality' (Simon, 1957); that individuals will reduce or bypass cognitive processing by employing mental 'short cuts' such as heuristics, cues and habits (Tversky and Kahneman, 1974); that decisions may be influenced by emotion as well as cognition (Marcus et al., 2000, Marcus et al., 2005); and that habit is a significant mediator of motivation and behaviour (Dawnay and Shah, 2005, Jackson, 2005, Maio, 2005). Moreover, in addition to these cognitive, affective and normative influences on

¹ <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/7069793.stm> (accessed 3.12.07)

behaviour, citizens are deeply embedded in social and institutional contexts which also constrain and shape why and how they act.

In our search for a more nuanced, and policy pragmatic understanding of what possible levers could encourage civic behaviour we felt it prudent to adopt an intellectually eclectic approach, drawing on literatures from behavioural and social psychology as well as political science. Methodological advances in our project involve collectively 'weighing up the 'balance of evidence' from a wide variety of studies from different kinds of perspective and establishing broad understandings from which to inform more detailed and more specific policy development' (Jackson, 2005: 6).

Research on social dilemmas is usually based on either laboratory experiments in which a group of participants are faced with dilemmas and their responses observed, or field research examining co-operation amongst people who share access to a limited resource. Both these research approaches examine co-operation within groups, a narrower focus than the current interest in civic behaviour. Yet there are some interesting parallels (Biel, 2000). Ostrom suggests that evidence from both experiments and field research on social dilemmas demonstrates that cooperation far exceeds that which might be predicted by pure rational choice and identifies the need for "second generation models of rational choice" which take account of wider theories of human behaviour (Ostrom, 1998: 3). Levels of co-operation are influenced by numerous and complicated structural variables such as the size and heterogeneity of the group and the discount rates. But cooperation is also influenced by heuristics, norms and rules. Heuristics are rules of thumb learned over time, about what behaviours achieve successful outcomes. Norms are the internal values that an individual attaches to particular types of action, such as feeling a "warm glow" when helping other or feeling a "sucker" for cooperating when others do not. Norms are specific to time, culture and individuals. Rules are shared understandings about what behaviour and sanctions are acceptable. Ostrom identifies three basic norms which form the core relationships in society: reciprocity, reputation and trust. These three basic norms are widely taught in all societies but individuals will vary between cultures in the extent to which they will use them and in how structural variables will affect their levels.

Factors that come into play when citizens act in any particular situation are myriad and intertwined. Behaviour is related to conscious intentions but also to subconscious habit, to agency but also to situational constraints, to rationalisation but also to emotional drivers, to autonomy but also to the regulating effects of social norms. In an extensive review of frameworks of consumer behaviour and behaviour change, Tim Jackson's (2005) report contends that in order to even begin sense-making about behaviour, we need a model that accounts for motivations, attitudes and values; contextual or situational factors; social influences; personal capabilities; and habits. One such model was Harry Triandis' theory of interpersonal behaviour illustrated over the page. Broadly, Triandis recognises that in addition to the cognitive factors influencing choice, both social factors and emotions play a part in forming intentions. Social factors include norms, roles and self-concept –

where norms are injunctive (what should and should not be done); roles are 'sets of behaviours that are considered appropriate for persons holding particular positions in a group' (Triandis 1977: 8 cited in Jackson 2005) and self-concept is the idea that a person has of themselves in relation to the goals they pursue and the behaviours they engage in. This ties in with Pattie and Seyd & Whiteley's analysis of political behaviour, as separate, distinct acts on a single continuum of activities is complemented by the thesis that there are structures to political behaviour. Behaviour is not random or haphazard, rather there exists clear repertoires of political activity. So, 'people who purchase or boycott particular goods for political or ethical reasons are also more likely to give money to, or raise money for, an organisation, sign a petition, display a poster or campaign badge, and vote in a local government election'. And, 'people who contact a politician are more likely to in other forms of contact with public officials, legal personnel, organisations, or the media' (Pattie et al., 2004: 294, qu 7ai/7aii). And, 'people who take part in demonstrations are more likely to attend party meetings, participate in illegal protest, form a group of like-minded people, or take part in a strike; in other words they engage in some form of collectively organised behaviour' (Pattie et al., 2004: 84). Triandis' model delineates a specific role for emotional factors influencing behaviour which accommodates recent attempts in political theory to retrieve the affective dimension (Marcus et al., 2000, Marcus et al., 2005). Moreover, Triandis highlights the importance of past behaviour or habit on present action, and, the moderating influence of external contextual factors.




Figure 1 Triandis' Theory of Interpersonal Behaviour (Jackson, 2005)


Another interesting example from the field of social psychology is Paul Stern's attempt to develop a theory of environmentally significant behaviour. Environmentalism is defined by Stern as "the propensity to take actions with pro-environmental intent" (Stern, 2000). Stern identifies four types of variable which contribute to environmentalism: personal capabilities, contextual forces, attitudinal factors and habit. *Personal capabilities* include individual knowledge and skills and the possession of resources such as literacy, wealth, status and time. *Contextual forces* include government regulation, legal and institutional factors, costs and incentives. Social norms and expectations also form part of the context. Contextual forces can have different meanings to individuals depending on their beliefs and attitudes. *Attitudinal factors* include "the general predisposition to act with pro-environmental intent" (Stern, 2000: 416), which is affected by values, beliefs and personal norms. Beliefs here refer to an individual's awareness of adverse consequences and their belief that they can make a difference, as well as their individual worldview. Alongside their general attitudes to environmentalism, individuals are likely to hold particular attitudes to specific examples of environmental behaviours and their actions will be influenced by non-environmental attitudes. *Habit* is an important element in environmental behaviour: any change in behaviour will often require the breaking of old habits or the establishment of new ones.

A collection of writings edited by Van Vugt et al. (2000) applies a social psychology approach to the study of cooperation, viewing co-operation as a form of social dilemma. This is interesting in that it straddles the worlds of social psychology and social dilemmas, seeking to reconcile the social dilemma perspective with the fact that people actually do co-operate. Importantly this approach views co-operation as relational: people are concerned with how they are tied to others in society and all motives for co-operation are linked to a desire for social connections. This desire is not always altruistic, but even when the motives for co-operation are self-esteem, seeking respect or getting experience for a better job, these are still associated with relationships. From this perspective it is "rational" for people to contribute to society. Individual motivation to co-operate is affected by the self (social value orientation), the group (social identity theory) and the society (prevailing norms of fairness and justice). Collective problems can be addressed at the micro level of individuals, the meso level of community and the macro level of authorities. There is an interconnection between these levels and each has consequences for the others, contributing to trust and efficacy. For example, dissatisfaction with the functioning of authorities will have a negative effect on what people want to contribute locally. This interplay between macro, meso and micro levels also indicates the need for a multi-disciplinary approach between political scientists, sociologists and psychologists.

3. Explaining civic behaviour and understanding the scope for intervention

Our model expressed in Figure 2 suggests that facilitating conditions could support a set of orientations and dispositions held by citizens that in turn lead to civic behaviour. In this section we unpack each of the first two blocks in the model that are seen as causally linked with civic behaviour.

Figure 2: A model of the drivers of civic behaviour



* material, institutional and cultural

** Constructed through consequential and moral reasoning, roles and self-concepts, social norms, affect (emotions) and habits

*** Expressed by individual and collective forms of political action and influencing institutions, and of 'DIY'

Figure 2 shows that the both facilitating conditions and orientations and dispositions are presumed to feed directly into civic behaviours in the model, although there are interactions between the two sets of factors. It does not assume an environmental determinist position that people's orientations and dispositions are premised on the environment in which they operate. Nor does it assume (as in Triandis) that people's emotions, habits, roles etc are formed outside of the opportunity structure within which they perceive themselves to be operating. Our experimental interventions (discussed in the final section of this paper) are aimed at changing both sets of drivers to increase and deepen civic behaviour. We are testing the claim that civic

behaviour has a causal link to social and policy outcomes through data analysis (discussed in section 4 of this paper).

Underlying conditions for model

There are a set of socio-economic factors at the individual level that might be assumed to affect citizens' capacity or likelihood to be civic, such as

- individual and household income and employment
- long term illness
- level of formal education
- car ownership

These are important underlying conditions that will have correlations and possibly some causal links to civic behaviour due to factors such as the extent of inequality of access experienced by citizens because of resource constraints experienced by different citizens (lack of income, education etc). They appear in our model as a set of potential covariates for any/all of the elements of the model.

Facilitating Conditions

We need to recognise that citizens are not making decisions about civic behaviour in a vacuum but rather there are structural factors that influence the choices that they make. We regard these as facilitating conditions creating or closing opportunity structures available to the citizen. Broadly these are factors that apply at the macro- or meso- levels, both objective and subjective factors that affect the wider environment within which individuals operate civically (or not).

We suggest a broad split between material, institutional and cultural facilitating factors.

(a) Material factors

We define material factors as aggregate socio-economic factors/demographics of neighbourhood the person operates in, as might be reasonably assumed to affect an individual's capacity to be civic. For example, Robert Putnam's recent suggestion based on his data that increased ethnic diversity causes people to be generally less engaged in their neighbourhoods and with each other, both people from their own and different ethnic groups – what he calls 'hunkering down' (Putnam, 2007).

We are particularly interested in degrees of homogeneity or heterogeneity in socio-economic conditions in a neighbourhood as they affect civic behaviours, as well as levels of inequality. For example, does the degree of variation in income levels (as well as the average income level) within the neighbourhood make a difference? Are people more civic in places where people are more like or less like themselves? We are interested in different types of mix in neighbourhoods and how these types of mix overlap in terms of if and how this affects levels and types of civic behaviour: income; levels and types of employment; ethnicity; tenure, household and housing type, residential mix.

Material factors could refer to the degree of scarcity of the good that citizens are being asked to direct their civic behaviour towards (are buses numerous enough to encourage public transport?). Our conceptual model would include a broad range of material factors, such as availability of public transport, proportions of people in a neighbourhood who had been brought up in an organised religion, the extent of community involvement in a person's circle, although the available data will be more limited than this.

(b) Institutional factors

Institutional factors refer to the way in which public agencies structure their offers to engage in civic behaviour (is it easy or difficult, are there hidden barriers?). This includes the opportunity structures available to an individual in their environment for civic behaviours (actual not perceived). Opportunity structures include the quantity and volume of opportunities, for example number of volunteering opportunities, opportunities to attend meetings, join groups, make comments. It also includes the quality of those opportunity structures as could reasonably be judged according to criteria such as strength of influence and degree of control by citizens, strength of mechanisms linking opportunity structure and institutional responsiveness, or even the extent of community infrastructure i.e. support for engagement and capacity building.

But institutional factors are not solely about structures. They are importantly about the way that those structures operate, i.e. the sets of rationalities, rules and practices embedded in institutions as they affect the practice of civiness (e.g. responsiveness, nature of interactions between professionals and citizens, how structures are operationalised). These should be observable factors rather than perceptions.

(c) Cultural factors

Cultural factors refer to the set of values, attitudes and expectations that are associated by citizens with civic behaviour (is the culture conducive to and antithetical towards civic behaviour). This factor assesses the extent of

understanding of the socio-legal values of the wider society as they relate to the cultural principles of citizenship. Cultural factors include understandings of an overarching commitment to tolerance, fair play, free speech, and other basic rights and freedoms that facilitate the practices of civiness and citizenship. They form part of the overall environment within which people act as citizens, although in practice there may be little differentiation within the UK on peoples' understanding of these values and principles and therefore not have much explanatory power in the model, or potential for change through the interventions.

This factor is distinct from people's *acceptance* of these cultural principles (included in Moral Reasoning), and also from people's judgements about levels of observance of other arguably less fundamental, or at least more specific and local social norms and values (included in Social Norms).

Orientations and Dispositions

People's actions are not only affected by facilitating conditions (the structure and context in which they operating) it also affected by their internal decision-making process (by what is going in their heads). Broadly these are elements of the model that operate at a micro- level and apply to how people think, feel and process things in relation to civic behaviour. We suggest that there are six aspects to orientations and dispositions:

- consequential reasoning
- moral reasoning
- roles and self-concept
- social norms
- affect/emotions
- habits

Below we discuss these factors in more detail.

(a) consequential reasoning

Consequential reasoning is a form of instrumental reasoning based on a calculation of the perceived costs and benefits and likely outcomes of civic activity. it includes an understanding of short- and long- term cost-benefits and outcomes to individual and the collective, i.e. includes enlightened self-interest. This type of reasoning requires the citizen to have sufficient information on which to base their calculations. In considering why citizens behave in the way that they do the simple rational choice model posits that individuals will act in accordance with the results of a personal cost-benefit analysis in order to maximise their own utility. Social psychological research supports this, for instance, a recent report suggests that there is a greater

likelihood of someone doing something if they believe that their action will have a public impact. 'For example, among those who think turning appliances off rather than to standby can make 'a lot' of difference, over half (54%) actually do this 'all of the time'. In contrast, among those who don't think it would make much difference, only one in five (20%) habitually turn appliances off' (BrookLyndhurst, 2004: 13). Relatedly, the more effect or control people feel they can exercise on an outcome the more motivated people feel to behave in a civic way. Although this is not always the case; car use is a notable exception: 'those who recognise that making fewer journeys would make a big difference to the environment are in fact no more likely actually to drive less' (BrookLyndhurst, 2004: 14).

In line with this, many policy interventions have sought to provide the citizen with information to encourage autonomous, responsible choosing. However, significant studies have also revealed that merely supplying information or expanding available choices can actually work to reduce the amount of control or effect that citizens feel they have in their lives (Dawnay and Shah, 2005: 12)

Self Efficacy	
Too much information	can lead to a feeling of helplessness and inaction
Too much choice	can lead to feeling overwhelmed; not knowing what to choose; not making any choice at all or dissatisfaction with choices made
A participatory approach to problem solving can be highly motivational and effective in encouraging behaviour change, as well as making people happier.	

Furthermore, the BrookLyndhurst report also notes that:

Believing an action will make a difference is not enough on its own. Indeed, there is a "gap" across all of the sustainable behaviours between believing an action is environmentally worthwhile and actually doing it. So, for example, while 72% think that recycling paper and glass could make 'a lot' of difference to the environment, only 50% habitually recycle these materials (a gap of 22 percentage points) (BrookLyndhurst, 2004)

The work of Herbert Simon (1957) and Tversky and Kahnemann (1974) throw some light on such anomalies. They argue that in actual fact a number of elements such as information costs and future uncertainties mitigate rational decision-making and prompt citizens to employ mental shortcuts to lessen the burdens of choosing. A variety of these decision-making 'rules of thumb' are illustrated in the table below:

Mental Shortcuts	
Discounting	Citizens place greater emphasis on costs or benefits in the near future or recent past. So they 'discount' the future.
Regency and Peak experience	People place more emphasis on what is fresh in their minds, and short-lived, extreme experiences rather than average experiences.
Loss or Gain	People tend to feel loss more keenly than gain.
Recall and Imagination	People often judge how likely something is to happen on the basis of how easy they can call it to mind. People are often more scared of flying than car travel, for example, because air crashes are dramatic and easy to recall.
Intuition	People jump quickly to intuitive answers, which can be wrong, even to very simple mathematical questions. However, where an outcome is particularly important to us, we are more likely to engage our active conscious thinking to evaluate the situation and get the right answer.

(adapted from (Dawney and Shah, 2005: 2)

(b) moral reasoning

We have already looked at some of the issues around moral reasoning in this paper. Moral reasoning is based on injunctive personal norms and internalised moral principles - 'the right thing to do'. It includes the extent of *identification with* and *acceptance of* the values of the wider society, and the cultural principles of citizenship, e.g. to behave responsibly or to behave morally and ethically. As individuals, each of us has expectations regarding our own behaviour that are consistent with our own values and attitudes. Practical considerations in relation to levers designed to encourage civic behaviour are shown in the chart below.

Doing the 'right' thing		
	Encouraged by	Crowded-out by
Self-esteem; Self –determination	Intervention perceived as: supportive, informative in positive way	Intervention perceived as: controlling e.g. deadlines, threats, intense surveillance

Self-esteem; Self –determination	Reward expectation: praise and social approval, reciprocity	Reward expectation: material (esp. monetary)
Self concept	Making commitments	

(c) Roles and self-concept

Roles are sets of behaviours that are considered appropriate for persons holding particular positions in a group. Self-concept is the idea that a person has of themselves in relation to the goals they pursue and the behaviours they engage in.

(d) Social norms

Social norms are part of the individual's modelling of their 'cultural' environment. This element of the model includes an individual's perception of the expected and accepted behaviours and values in their local environment. This includes their perceptions of the norms and behaviours of citizens *and* institutions, and therefore includes trust in institutions as well as fellow citizens. An individual's perception of the social norms in their area potentially affects civic behaviour, for example, if someone feels that other people in their neighbourhood would help out if someone was being threatened, they may be more likely to help out themselves. The idea is that people will factor in what they feel is generally expected or accepted behaviour locally to their own decisions to act.

As individuals, each of us has expectations regarding our own behaviour that are consistent with our own values and attitudes. We also have perceptions about how other people see us. So peer norms or pressure could have an impact. Sometimes, when citizens find themselves doing something that is inconsistent with their values and attitudes they may well change them to justify what they are doing. However, once citizens have publicly expressed their values and attitudes say in a neighbourhood meeting, it becomes much more difficult for them to be modified and their behaviour is more likely to change. 'In this way, commitments can be very important: when someone has promised to do something, they are likely to stick to this even without rewards or punishments' (Dawnay and Shah, 2005: 8).

(e) Affect and emotion

A sense of attachment would appear to be an important part in meeting the challenge of engagement. You have to feel part of something or order to join in. In the C.L.E.A.R framework developed by Lowndes et al they identify a '**Like to**' factor:

The argument is that if you feel a part of something, you are more willing to engage...Sense of community can be a strong motivator for participation. Conversely, an absence of identity or commitment to a locality can militate against participation (Lowndes et al., 2006). An emotional response can be a stimulus to action.

In dominant democratic theory, reason and emotion are conceptualised as two autonomous agents warring for sovereign control, where reason is extolled and emotion denigrated:

In a democratic society, reasonable decisions are preferable to unreasoned ones: considered thought leads to the former, emotions to the latter; therefore deliberation is preferable to visceral reaction as a basis for democratic decision making (Kuklinski et al., 1991: 1 cited in Marcus et al., 2005: 8).

However, as Marcus and his colleagues point out, the Scottish enlightenment philosophers recognised that reason and emotion were entwined. Marcus et. al. write: ““Interests” and “sentiments” emerged as a new category of emotion, a calculating version of emotion. This formulation was useful to explain the newly emergent forms of economic activity then taking place ... These new taxonomic creations - the interests and sentiments – were initially created as variants of emotion... it is common now to treat interest as an entity distinct and separate from emotion, emotion then becomes, in the modern period, a narrower category more closely associated with the passions and zeal - the dangerous variants of emotion” (Marcus et al., 2005: 7). A governing emotion was understood to be the foundation of human action and reason was subordinated as a faculty usefully employed for critical calculation and public deliberation. Moreover, he cites much evidence to claim that ‘reason is given its force and vitality from its *dependence* on emotion and has been well supported by recent work in philosophy and neuroscience’ (my emphasis) (Marcus et al., 2005: 6).

The theory of affective intelligence is underpinned by this idea that emotion and reason are cooperatively inter-related. The central claim of affective intelligence scholars is that ‘when citizens encounter a novel or threatening actor, event, or issue on the political horizon, a process of fresh evaluation and political judgement is triggered’ (Marcus et al., 2000: 1). The citizen is conceptualised as an individual who, for the most part, is guided by entrenched values and enduring habits. This is resonant with civic culture and social capital literature (Almond and Verba, 1963, Putnam, 2000) which views civic culture as a collective summation of individual level ‘habitual politics’. However, affective intelligence theory posits that once citizens perceive some novelty or threat within their familiar environment, their values may be reappraised, their habitual routines interrupted that this may prompt them to take on *the burdens of reasoned choice* (my emphasis) (Marcus et al., 2000: 62).

Consider the individual who is a life-long Conservative voter. Come election time their voting decision is largely a result of this entrenched value position. However, imagine that in the months preceding the election a financial crisis

hits the UK during the term of an incumbent Conservative Government, or some novel policy initiative which seemed counter-intuitive to the traditional Conservative platform becomes the focus of public debate. These types of events may threaten the party loyal individual enough to urge her to re-appraise her political habits or vote in response to a threatened Opposition victory. They may not actually make it to the polling booth unless sufficient enthusiasm is generated by the Conservative party campaign or anxiety by a popular opposition. Or consider the person who takes little part in community affairs until they are spurred into action by their anger over the closure of a local school or plans to build on a neighbourhood park. It is in circumstances like these where citizens 'will be motivated to learn, will pay far more attention to contemporary affairs and will be far more influenced in the choices they make by the careful consideration of alternative outcomes. Anxious voters will, in most instances, act very much like the rational voters as depicted by theories of public choice' (Marcus et al., 2000: 63).

Affect / Emotion	
Anxiety / Novel situations	Prompts change or involvement Citizens prepared to take on 'the burdens of reason'

(f) Habits

Individual behaviour is, for the most part highly routinized and embedded within social norms rather than explicit acts of decision-making (Gronow and Warde, 2001, Maio, 2005). Habits are now recognised to be important in relation to behaviour in two respects. Firstly, people do many things in life without consciously thinking about them:

Habit helps us to cut down on the amount of decision making we have to do. When I shop in the supermarket, the habit associated with the routine speeds up the experience. If I go to a different store, my habit is disrupted and shopping takes longer. In busy lives this cognitive efficiency gives us important shortcuts to decisions (Holdsworth and Steedman, 2005: 6)

Secondly, habits make individual behaviour hard to change (Dawnay and Shah, 2005, Jackson, 2005, Maio, 2005)

Even when we consciously think about what we do, it can be difficult to change our behaviour. Perhaps I think it is a good idea for people to use public transport, but I don't know where the bus stop is or when the bus runs. I think I should find out, but I don't know how, so I continue using my car. The rewarding feeling – my journey by car was easy and hassle free – reinforces my old bad habit (Dawnay and Shah, 2005: 5)

As Tim Jackson states, a habit 'interferes substantially with the ability of the individual to make decisions in his or her own best interests' (Jackson, 2005: 36). Indeed, the embeddedness of behaviour in habits can act to reverse the

transaction costs of rational deliberation: ‘A distinct cognitive effort is now required to overcome habitual behaviour, even where the new behaviour carries substantial benefits to the individual concerned’ (Jackson, 2005: 36-37). The New Economics Foundations suggests factors that should be taken into consideration when trying to encourage more civically oriented behaviour (Dawnay and Shah, 2005: 5):

Habit
Are there any habits that are likely to be barriers to behaviour change, and if so, how strong are they likely to be?
How can any such habitual behaviour be raised to people’s conscious awareness?
What incentives, financial and non financial, can people be given to help them change their behaviour?
What feedback can be given to help reinforce the new behaviour and cement it as a new habit? Can this feedback be tailored to occur close in time to the action to maximise this learning effect?
Sometimes visual cues can help remind us to change our behaviour

4. Implications – using the model in our research projects

We are embarking on an integrated programme of research activities to explore the different elements of the model we have outlined in this paper. In the best traditions of applied social science, this research aims to be methodologically innovative. This is not just innovation for its own sake, but because the civicness-outcome link is notoriously tricky to tie down and to ascertain the direction of causation. For this reason, we use advanced statistics for the survey analysis, and apply the experimental method to ascertain the impact of interventions designed to improve civic engagement.

1. Re-analysis of data from the Citizenship Survey is has two parts. First it is aimed at exploring the connections laid out in our model in order to give us a sense of what factors help to determine civic behaviour and hopefully therefore civic outcomes. In effect we identify external factors or facilitating conditions and then internal factors (ideas about what is going inside people’s heads) to explain civic responses by citizens.

Second, we are linking Citizenship Survey data on civic behaviours with outcomes and performance data at the local authority level to investigate claims that civic behaviour helps to create better social and policy outcomes. We will explore and test the idea that there is a causal link between civic orientations/behaviour and core outcomes that societies

depend on, such as economic growth, social cohesion, lower crime and a better environment. The survey reanalysis will provide some base line information on the central hypotheses of civiness and outcomes, and seek to find out whether and under what conditions area-based government initiatives have had an effect. The regression analysis can help us test out the civic-outcome link with a series of statistical controls. Although we expect the findings to support the hypotheses, we also expect some limitations in pointing the causal arrow, which is why we have proposed the use of experimental models.

2. The Deliberative Experiment is an intervention that aims to change both the facilitating conditions and internalized processes of citizens. We will randomly select a panel of internet users to discuss social and community cohesion, and check to see whether their political interest, knowledge and engagement has changed as a result and in comparison to a control group
3. A randomised control trial (RCT) run in collaboration with a social enterprise to establish what interventions can successfully encourage household cycling and examine the relevance of peer effects on environmental behaviour. We are also developing a second RCT.
4. We pioneer a new type of qualitative evaluation - design experiments - which share some features of action research and of experiments. By allowing policy-makers and the researchers to alter the intervention as it is introduced allows both leverage on the causal connection and on improving the intervention. We will undertake three design experiments:
 - a. Collaborative research with a local authority exploring how staff can encourage callers who phone the contact centre about environmental issues to get more involved in neighbourhood environmental activity, changing a customer-focussed relationship into a citizen-focussed one.
 - b. Working with a local authority to make the process of decision making more accessible and transparent, challenging the organisational culture and the behaviour of individual officers and councillors.
 - c. The design and development of an infrastructure and process for the development of neighbourhood boards which can provide opportunities for co-production, accountability and an enhanced community leadership role for councillors.
5. A series of seminars to develop a heuristic with policy-makers about civil renewal and civic behaviour.

Table 1 How the research projects link to our model

	Facilitating conditions	Orientations & Dispositions	Civic Behaviour
HOCS Analysis	The re-analysis of the citizenship survey data will test the model and examine how the different elements interact. It will explore correlations and causal claims about the link between levels of civic behaviours and wider outcomes.		
Deliberative Experiment	Shaping institutional factors by providing two contrasting institutional forums for more deliberative engagement	Change reason and cognition processes by giving focused expert supported attention to an issue. Break habitual patterns of thought by systematic challenge [and emotional saliency?]	Examine the impact of the intervention on civic behaviour, efficacy and political trust.
Randomised control trials	Test if different interventions can increase recycling.	Change consequential reasoning by focussing attention. Draw out moral reasoning. Examine impact of social norms on behaviour. Break habitual thinking	Examine the impact of the intervention on ethical self-governance, efficacy and political trust.
Design Experiment (a) Promoting Neighbourhood Activity	Shaping institutional factors to transform a customer-focused relationship into a citizen-focussed relationship.	Examine how different types of motivation affect the response to the intervention. Draw out moral reasoning.	Examine the impact of the intervention on civic behaviour, efficacy and political trust.
Design Experiment (b) Transparent Decision Making	Shaping institutional factors to enable citizens to hold local authority to account.		Examine whether improving access to decision making raises civic behaviour, efficacy and political trust.

Design Experiment (c) Neighbourhood Boards	Shaping institutional factors to provide opportunities for co-production and improved accountability.		Examine whether improving access to decision making raises civic behaviour, efficacy and political trust.
--	---	--	---

References

- ALMOND, G. & VERBA, S. (1963) *The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations*, Sage.
- BIEL, A. (2000) Factors promoting cooperation in the laboratory, in common pool resource dilemmas, and in large-scale dilemmas: similarities and differences. IN VAN VUGT, M., SNYDER, M., TYKLER, T. R. & BIEL, A. (Eds.) *Cooperation in Modern Society*. London, Routledge.
- BROOKLYNDHURST (2004) Bad Habits and Hard Choices: In Search of Sustainable Lifestyles. <http://www.brooklyndhurst.co.uk>.
- DAWNAY, E. & SHAH, H. (2005) Behavioural economics: seven principles for policy makers. London, New Economics Foundation.
- FREY, B. (2007) Motivation Crowding Theory: A New Approach to Behaviour. *Roundtable on Behavioural Economics and Public Policy*. Melbourne, Australia
http://www.pc.gov.au/data/assets/pdf_file/0006/67146/frey.pdf
accessed 28th February 2008.
- FREY, B. S. & JEGEN, R. (2001) Motivation Crowding Theory: A Survey of Empirical Evidence. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 15, 589-611.
- GOODIN, R. E. (1980) Making Moral Incentives Pay. *Policy Sciences*, 12, 131-145.
- GRONOW, J. & WARDE, A. (Eds.) (2001) *Ordinary consumption*, London and New York, Routledge.
- HALPERN, D., BATES, C., MULGAN, G., ALDRIDGE, S., BEALES, G. & HEATHFIELD, A. (2004) Personal Responsibility and Changing Behaviour: the state of knowledge and its implications for public policy. London, Cabinet Office: Prime Minister's Strategy Unit.
- HOLDSWORTH, M. & STEEDMAN, P. (2005) 16 pain-free ways to help save the planet. NCC.
- JACKSON, T. (2005) Motivating Sustainable Consumption. Centre for Environmental Strategy, University of Southampton.
- JOHN, P. (2008) Can new forms of citizen governance redress the representation bias of political participation? (forthcoming).
- LEGRAND, J. (2006) *Motivation, agency and public polity: of knights and knaves, pawns and queens*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- LOWNDES, V., PRATCHETT, L. & STOKER, G. (2006) Diagnosing and remedying the failings of official participation schemes: the CLEAR framework. *Social Policy and Society*, 5, 281-291.
- MAIO, G. (2005) Tackling obesity - changing behaviour. *ESRC Seminar series: Mapping the policy landscape*

http://www.esrcsocietytoday.ac.uk/ESRCInfoCentre/Images/obesity_brochure_tcm6-5517.pdf.

- MARCUS, G. E., NEUMAN, R. & MACKUEN, M. (2000) *Affective Intelligence and Political Judgement*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- MARCUS, G. E., SULLIVAN, J. L., THEISS-MORSE, E. & STEVENS, D. (2005) The Emotional Foundation of Political Cognition: The Impact of Extrinsic Anxiety on the Formation of Political Tolerance Judgements. *Political Psychology*, 26, 949-963
- OLSON, M. (1965) *The logic of collective action: public goods and the theory of groups*, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.
- OSTROM, E. (1990) *Governing the Commons, the Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- OSTROM, E. (1998) A Behavioral Approach to the Rational Choice Theory of Collective Action. *The American Political Science Review*, 92, 1-22.
- PATTIE, C., SEYD, P. & WHITELEY, P. (2004) *Citizenship in Britain: Values, Participation and Democracy*, Cambridge University Press.
- PUTNAM, R. (2000) *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*, New York, Simon and Schuster.
- PUTNAM, R. D. (2007) E Pluribus Unum: Diversity and Community in the Twenty-first Century. The 2006 Johan Skytte Prize Lecture *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 30, 137-174.
- SIMON, H. (1957) *Models of Man*, New York, John Wiley.
- STERN, P. (2000) Toward a Coherent theory of Environmentally Significant Behavior. *Journal of Social Issues*, 56, 407-424.
- TAYLOR, M. (2007) Pro-Social Behaviour: the Future - it's up to us. London, RSA.
- TITMUS, R. M. (1970) *The gift relationship: from human blood to social policy*, Glasgow, HarperCollins.
- TVERSKY, A. & KAHNEMAN, D. (1974) Judgement under uncertainty: heuristics and biases. *Science*, 185, 1124-1131.
- VAN VUGT, M., SNYDER, M., TYKLER, T. R. & BIEL, A. (Eds.) (2000) *Cooperation in Modern Society*, London, Routledge.