PAR PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION REVIEW

John M. Bryson
Barbara C. Crosby
Laura Bloomberg
University of Minnesota

Public Value Governance: Moving beyond Traditional Public Administration and the New Public Management

Symposium Introduction

A new public administration movement is emerging to move beyond traditional public administration and New Public Management. The new movement is a response to the challenges of a networked, multi-sector, no-one-wholly-in-charge world and to the shortcomings of previous public administration approaches. In the new approach values beyond efficiency and effectiveness—and especially democratic values—are prominent. Government has a special role to play as a guarantor of public values, but citizens as well as businesses and nonprofit organizations also are important as active public problem solvers. The article highlights value-related issues in the new approach and presents an agenda for research and action to be pursued if the new approach is to fulfill its promise.

Creating public value is a hot topic for both public administration practitioners and scholars (Shearer and Williams 2011; Van der Wal, Nabatachi, and de Graaf 2013). Why is that? What is going on? We believe the answer lies with the continuing evolution of public administration thinking and practice. Just as New Public Management supplanted traditional public administration in the 1980s and 1990s as the dominant view, a new movement is underway that is likely to eclipse it. The new approach does not have a consensually agreed name, but many authors point to the need for a new approach and to aspects of its emergence in practice and theory (e.g., Moore, 1995, 2013, 2014a; Boyte 2005; Stoker 2006; Bozeman 2007; Kettl 2008; Alford and Hughes, 2008; Osborne 2010; Talbot 2010; Denhardt and Denhardt 2011; Fisher 2014; Kalambokidis 2014). For example, Janet and Robert Denhardt's (2011) excellent and widely cited book *The New Public Service* captures much of the collaborative and democratic spirit; content; and governance focus of the movement.

While efficiency was the main concern of traditional public administration, and efficiency and effectiveness are the main concerns of New Public Management, values beyond efficiency and effectiveness are pursued, debated, challenged, and evaluated in the emerging approach. In this regard, the emerging approach reemphasizes and brings to the fore value-related concerns of previous eras that were always present, but not dominant (Denhardt and Denhardt 2011; Rosenbloom and McCurdy 2006). This renewed attention to a broader array of values, especially to values associated with democracy, makes it obvious why questions related to the creation of public value, public values more generally, and the public sphere have risen to prominence. This essay highlights some of the key value-related issues in the new approach and proposes an agenda for the future. First, we outline what we believe are the main contours of the emerging approach. Next, we clarify the meaning of value, public value, public values, and the public sphere; discuss how they are operationalized; and summarize important challenges to the concepts. We then discuss how public value and public values are used in practice. Finally, we present an agenda for research and action to be pursued if the new approach is to fulfill its promise.[1]

An Emerging View of Public Administration

Public administration thinking and practice have always responded to new challenges and the shortcomings of what has come before (Kaufman 1969; Peters and Pierre 1998). Table 1, which builds on a similar table in Denhardt and Denhardt (2011, 28 – 29), presents a summary of traditional public administration, the New Public Management, and the emerging approach. The new approach highlights four important stances that together represent a response to current challenges and old shortcomings. These include: an emphasis on public value and public values; recognition that government has a special role as a guarantor of public values; a belief in the importance of public management broadly conceived, and of service to and for the public; and a heightened emphasis on citizenship and democratic and collaborative governance. These concerns, of course, are not new to public administration, but their emerging combination is the latest response to what Dwight

John M. Bryson is McKnight Presidential Professor of Planning and Public Affairs at the Humphrey School of Public Affairs at the University of Minnesota. He wrote *Strategic Planning for Public and Nonprofit Organizations*, and co-wrote with Barbara C. Crosby *Leadership for the Common Good*. He received the 2011 Dwight Waldo Award from the American Society for Public Administration for "outstanding contributions to the professional literature of public administration over an extended scholarly career."
E-mail: bryson001@umn.edu

Barbara C. Crosby, associate professor at the Humphrey School of Public Affairs, University of Minnesota, has taught and written extensively about leadership and public policy. She is author of *Leadership for Global Citizenship* and co-author with John M. Bryson of *Leadership for the Common Good*. Former academic co-director of the University's Center for Integrative Leadership, she has conducted training for senior managers of nonprofit, business and government organizations in the U.S. and abroad.
E-mail: crosb002@umn.edu

Laura Bloomberg is associate dean at the Humphrey School of Public Affairs at the University of Minnesota. Her teaching, research and publications focus on U.S. education policy and administration, cross sector leadership, and program evaluation. Previously she was an urban high school principal and executive director of the University's Center for Integrative Leadership. She worked with former U.S. Secretary of State Hilary Clinton to launch the global Women in Public Service Project.
E-mail: bloom004@umn.edu

Public Administration Review, Vol. 74, Iss. 4, pp. 445–456. © 2014 by The American Society for Public Administration.
DOI: 10.1111/puar.12238.

Waldo (1948/2007) called the periodically changing "material and ideological background." Whether the new approach can live up to its promise—and particularly its democratic promise—is an open question we explore later.

Traditional Public Administration

Traditional public administration (Waldo 1948/2007; Stoker 2006) arose in the United States arose in the late 1900s and matured by the mid-twentieth century as a response to a particular set of conditions. These included the challenges of industrialization, urbanization, the rise of the modern corporation, faith in science, belief in progress, and concern over major market failures. Mostly successful experience with government responses to World War I, the Great Depression, and World War II helped solidify support for traditional public administration and built strong trust in government as an agent for the good of all. In its idealized form, politics and administration were quite separate (Wilson 1887). Goals were determined in the first instance by elected officials and only secondarily refined by technical experts in response to political direction. Government agencies were the primary deliverers of public value through the way they designed and implemented politically defined objectives (Salamon 2002). Efficiency in government operations was the preeminent value. Citizens were viewed primarily as voters, clients, or constituents. Of course, traditional public administration in practice was always more deeply enmeshed in politics than its idealized form would suggest (Waldo 1948/2007; Denhardt and Denhardt 2011, 6–7), and government agencies were themselves prone to failure (Wolf 1979).

New Public Management

After a long gestation period, the New Public Management (Hood 1991) became the dominant approach to public administration in the 1980s and 1990s. In the U.S. the change was marked by Osborne and Gaebler's (1992) best-selling book *Reinventing Government* and the Clinton Administration's National Performance Review (Gore 1993). New Public Management arose out of a concern with government failures, a belief in the efficacy and efficiency of markets, a belief in economic rationality, and a push away from large, centralized government agencies toward devolution and privatization.

In New Public Management, public managers are urged to "steer, not row." They steer by determining objectives, or *what* should be done, and by catalyzing service delivery, or *how* it should be done (rowing), via their choice of a particular "tool" or combination of tools (e.g., markets, regulation, taxes, subsidies, insurance, etc.) for achieving the objectives (Salamon 2002). Markets and competition—often among actors from different sectors—are the preferred way of delivering government services in the most efficient and effective way to recipients seen as "customers," not citizens. Public managers should be empowered and freed from constrictions so that they can be "entrepreneurial" and "manage for results." In practice, of course, managers often face the worst of circumstances in which they are accountable for results, but not allowed to manage for results (Moynihan 2006).

While the challenges that prompted traditional public administration and New Public Management have not disappeared, new material conditions and challenges have emerged. They center on how to *govern*, not just manage, in increasingly diverse and complex societies facing increasingly complex problems (Kettl 2002; Osborne 2010; Pollitt and Bouckaert 2011). Natural disasters, failures of large parts of the economy, unevenly effective health care and educational systems, a stagnant middle class, deepening inequality, and bankrupt communities offer recent examples that have challenged not just governments, but businesses, nonprofits, and civil society generally. In the U.S., these challenges are occurring at a time of historic distrust of a broad range of institutions (Gallup 2014).

The Emerging Approach

The responses to these new challenges do not yet constitute a coherent whole, but the outlines of a new approach are becoming clear in, for example, Janet and Robert Denhardt's (2002; 2011) widely cited framework called the New Public Service, but also in Gerry Stoker's (2006) public value management, Barry Bozeman's (2007) managing publicness, Stephen Osborne's new public governance (2010), and political theorist Harry Boyte's and colleagues' (Boyte 2011) new civic politics.. These scholars draw on different theoretical and epistemological foundations than traditional public administration or New Public Management. Citizens, citizenship, and democracy are central to the new approach, which harkens back to Dwight Waldo's (1948/2007) abiding interest in a democratic theory of administration. The approach advocates more contingent, pragmatic kinds of rationality, going beyond the formal rationalities of Herbert Simon's (1997) "administrative man" and microeconomics' "economic man." Citizens are seen as quite capable of engaging in deliberative problem solving that allows them to develop a public spiritedness of the type de Tocqueville saw in the 1830s American republic when he talked about the prevalence of "self-interest rightly understood" (de Tocqueville 1840/2002; Mansbridge 1990).

Scholars arguing for the new approach see public value emerging from broadly inclusive dialogue and deliberation. The conversation includes community members from multiple sectors because, as Beck Jørgensen and Bozeman (2007, 373–374) note, "public values and public value are not the exclusive province of government, nor is government the only set of institutions having public value obligations, [though clearly] government has a special role as guarantor of public values." This aspect of the approach has many precursors, including for example, the work of Vincent and Elinor Ostrom (Ostrom 1973; Ostrom and Ostrom 1971), which also provides important underpinnings for understanding networked and collaborative governance (McGinnis and Ostrom 2012; Thomson and Perry 2006). The approach encompasses what Boyte (2011, 632–633) terms "public work," meaning "self-organized, sustained efforts by a mix of people who solve common problems and create things, material or symbolic, of lasting civic value," while developing civic learning and capacity as part of the process. This work can engage many different kinds of people, including public-spirited managers from across sectors and citizens. Citizens thus move beyond their roles as voters, clients, constituents, customers, or poll responders to becoming problem-solvers, co-creators, and governors actively engaged in producing what is valued by the public and good for the public (De Souza Briggs 2008). Budd (2014) captures the importance of work in general for the creation of public value, and the special role that labor unions have often played in its creation.

Table 1 Comparing Perspectives: Traditional Public Administration, New Public Management, and the Emerging Approach to Public Administration

Dimension	Traditional Public Administration	New Public Management	The Emerging Approach to Public Administration (e.g., Denhardt and Denhardt's [2011] New Public Service)
Broad Environmental and Intellectual Context			
Material and ideological conditions	Industrialization, urbanization, rise of modern corporation, specialization, faith in science, belief in progress, concern over major market failures, experience with the Great Depression and WWII, high trust in government	Concern with government failures, distrust of big government, belief in the efficacy and efficiency of markets and rationality, devolution and devolution	Concern with market, government, nonprofit and civic failures; concern with so-called wicked problems; deepening inequality; hollowed or thinned state; "downsized" citizenship; networked and collaborative governance; advanced information and communication technologies
Primary theoretical and epistemological foundations	Political theory, scientific management, naïve social science, pragmatism	Economic theory, sophisticated positivist social science	Democratic theory, public and nonprofit management theory, plus diverse approaches to knowing
Prevailing view of rationality and model of human behavior	Synoptic rationality, "administrative man"	Technical and economic rationality, "economic man," self-interested decision makers	Formal rationality, multiple tests of rationality (political, administrative, economic, legal, ethical), belief in public spiritedness beyond narrow self-interest, "reasonable person" open to influence via dialogue and deliberation
The Public Sphere or Realm			
Definition of the common good, public value, public interest	Determined by elected officials or technical experts	Determined by elected officials or by aggregating individual preferences supported by evidence of consumer choice	What is public is seen as going far beyond government, though government has a special role as a guarantor of public values. Common good determined by broadly inclusive dialogue and deliberation informed by evidence and democratic and constitutional values
Role of politics	Elect governors, who determine policy objectives	Elect governors, who determine policy objectives; empowered managers; administrative politics around the use of specific tools	"Public work," including determining policy objectives via dialogue and deliberation; democracy as "a way of life"
Role of citizenship	Voter, client, constituent	Customer	Citizens seen as problem-solvers and co-creators actively engaged in creating what is valued by the public and is good for the public
Government and Public Administration			
Role of government agencies	Rowing, seen as designing and implementing policies and programs in response to politically defined objectives	Steering, seen as determining objectives and catalyzing service delivery via tool choice and reliance if possible on markets, businesses and nonprofit organizations	Government acts as convener, catalyst, collaborator; sometimes steering, sometimes, rowing, sometimes partnering, sometimes staying out of the way
Key objectives	Politically provided goals; implementation managed by public servants; monitoring done via bureaucratic and elected officials' oversight	Politically provided goals; managers manage inputs and outputs in a way that ensures economy and responsiveness to consumers	Create public value in such a way that what the public most cares about is addressed effectively and what is good for the public is put in place
Key values	Efficiency	Efficiency and Effectiveness	Efficiency, effectiveness, and the full range of democratic and constitutional values
Mechanisms for achieving policy objectives	Administer programs through centralized, hierarchically organized public agencies or self-regulating professions	Create mechanisms and incentive structures to achieve policy objectives especially through use of markets	Selection from a menu of alternative delivery mechanisms based on pragmatic criteria; this often means helping build cross-sector collaborations and engaging citizens to achieve agreed objectives
Role of public manager	Ensures that rules and appropriate procedures are followed.. Responsive to elected officials, constituents, and clients. Limited discretion allowed to administrative officials	Helps define and meet agreed upon performance objectives; responsive to elected officials and customers; wide discretion allowed	Plays an active role in helping create and guide networks of deliberation and delivery and help maintain and enhance the overall effectiveness, accountability, and capacity of the system. Responsive to elected officials, citizens, and an array of other stakeholders. Discretion is needed, but is constrained by law, democratic and constitutional values, and a broad approach to accountability
Approach to accountability	Hierarchical, in which administrators are accountable to democratically elected officials	Market-driven, in which aggregated self-interests result in outcomes desired by broad groups of citizens seen as customers	Multi-faceted, since public servants must attend to law, community values, political norms, professional standards, and citizen interests
Contribution to the democratic process	Delivers politically determined objectives and accountability; competition between elected leaders provides overarching accountability. Public sector has a monopoly on public service ethos	Delivers politically determined objectives; managers determine the means. Skepticism regarding public service ethos; favors customer service	Delivers dialogue and catalyzes and responds to active citizenship in pursuit of what the public values and what is good for the public. No one sector has a monopoly on public service ethos; maintaining relationships based on shared public values is essential

Sources: Adapted principally from Denhardt and Denhardt (2011, 28–29); with further adaptations from Stoker (2006, 44; Kelly, Mulgan, and Muers 2002), and Boyte (2011).

In the new approach, government agencies can be a convener, catalyst, and collaborator—sometimes steering, sometimes rowing, sometimes partnering, and sometimes staying out of the way. In addition, the way government's key objectives are set changes. In traditional public administration, elected officials set goals and implementation is up to public servants, overseen by elected officials' and senior administrators. In New Public Management elected officials still set goals. Managers then manage inputs and outputs in a way that ensures economy and responsiveness to customers. In contrast, in the new approach both elected officials and public managers are charged with creating public value so that what the public most cares about is addressed effectively and what is good for the public is pursued. This change for public managers raises obvious questions of democratic accountability, an issue to which we turn later. On the other hand, the change is essentially simply a recognition that managers have always played an important role in goal setting because of the advice they give to elected officials and the need to act in the face of often ambiguous policy direction.

As noted, in the emerging approach the full range of democratic and constitutional values is relevant. Policy makers and public managers are also encouraged to consider the full array of alternative delivery mechanisms and choose among them based on pragmatic criteria. This often means helping build cross-sector collaborations and engaging citizens to achieve mutually agreed objectives (McGuire 2006; Agranoff 2006; Fung 2006). Public managers' role thus goes well beyond that in traditional public administration or New Public Management; they are presumed able to help create and guide networks of deliberation and delivery and help maintain and enhance the overall effectiveness, capacity, and accountability of the system.

The nature of discretion also changes. In traditional public administration, public managers have limited discretion; New Public Management encourages wide discretion in meeting entrepreneurial and performance targets. In the emerging approach, discretion is needed, but is constrained by law, democratic and constitutional values, and a broad approach to accountability. Accountability becomes multi-faceted, and not just hierarchical (as in traditional public administration) or more market-driven (as in New Public Management), since public servants must attend to law, community values, political norms, professional standards, and citizen interests (Mulgan 2000; Dubnick and Frederickson 2010; Romzek, LeRoux and Blackmar 2012). In the emerging multi-sector collaborative environment, no one sector has a monopoly on public service ethos, although government plays a special role; in addition, there is less skepticism about government and a less strong preference for markets and customer service.

Finally, in this emerging approach public administration's contribution to the democratic process is also different. In both traditional public administration and New Public Management managers are not very directly involved in the democratic process, viewed mainly as elections and legislative deliberation. In contrast, in the emerging approach government delivers dialogue and catalyzes and responds to active citizenship in pursuit of what the public values and what is good for the public. The extent to which it is possible for dialogue and deliberation to do so in practice remains unclear, however, in systems that favor elites and are stacked against ordinary citizens (Dahl and Soss 2014).

The emerging approach is partly descriptive of current and emerging practices, partly normative in its prescriptions regarding the role of government and public managers, and partly hopeful as a response to the challenges posed by a "changing material and ideological background." In contrast to traditional public administration and New Public Management, however, the emerging approach often looks ambiguous, unevenly grounded theoretically, relatively untested, and lacking in clear guidance for practice. Yet, what else can one expect in a shared-power, multi-sector, no-one-wholly-in-charge world (Cleveland 2002; Crosby and Bryson 2005)? Old approaches have their own problems and the new approach is still emerging. One thing is clear, however, and that is the fundamental importance in the emerging approach of understanding what is meant by public value, public values, and the public sphere. Progress must be made on clarifying, measuring, and assessing these concepts if the new approach is gain added traction.

Value, Public Value, Public Values and the Public Sphere

The dictionary definition of value as "relative worth, utility, or importance" of something (Merriam-Webster 2014; accessed online April 1, 2014) leaves open a number of questions that have troubled philosophers for centuries, and reappear in the current debate over public values, public value, and the public sphere. These questions concern at least the following: (1) whether the objects of value are subjective psychological states, or objective states of the world; (2) whether value is intrinsic, extrinsic, or relational; (3) whether something is valuable for its own sake or as a means to something else; (4) whether there are hierarchies of values; (5) who does the valuing; (6) how the valuing is done; and (7) against what criteria the object of value is measured. We return to these questions as we discuss four major contributions to the public value literature and in our conclusions.

The public value literature distinguishes among: (1) *public values*, which are many (e.g., Van Wart 1998; Bozeman 2002, 2007; Beck Jørgenson and Bozeman 2007; Meynhardt 2009; Andersen et al. 2012); (2) *creating public value* defined as producing what is either valued by the public, is good for the public, including adding to the public sphere, or both, as assessed against various public value criteria (Benington and Moore 2011; Stoker 2006; Alford 2008; Alford and O'Flynn 2009); and (3) the *public sphere* or *public realm* within which public values and value are developed and played out (Benington 2011).

Barry Bozeman on Public Values

Bozeman (2007, 17), a leading voice in the public value literature, focuses on the policy or societal level. He writes, "A society's *public values* are those providing normative consensus about: (1) the *rights, benefits, and prerogatives* to which citizens should (and should not) be entitled; (2) the *obligations* of citizens to society, the state, and one another; and (3) the *principles* on which governments and policies should be based." Although public values in a democracy are typically contested, a relative consensus is discernible from constitutions, legislative mandates, policies, literature reviews, opinion polls, and other formal and informal sources (Beck Jørgensen and Bozeman 2007).

What Bozeman terms public values *failure* occurs when neither the market nor the public sector provides goods and services required

to achieve public values, which are operationalized in terms of a set of eight criteria, e.g., political processes and social cohesion should be sufficient to ensure effective communication and processing of public values; and sufficient transparency exists to permit citizens to make informed judgments (Bozeman 2002, 2007; see also Kalambokidis 2014). Public value creation is the extent to which public values criteria are met, where these are some combination of input, process, output, and outcome measures. Public values for Bozeman thus are measureable, although clearly there can be disagreements about how the values are to be conceptualized and measured. One implication is that analysts, citizens, and policy makers should focus on what public values are, and on ways in which institutions and processes are necessary to forge agreement on and achieve public values in practice (Davis and West 2009; Moulton 2009; Jacobs 2014; Kalambokidis 2014).

Note that Bozeman's approach is both positive, when he asks what the normative consensus on values is, and normative, when he argues that public values failures should be corrected. Note, too, that Bozeman (2007) is silent on the role of the nonprofit sector and, to a lesser extent, on the public sphere more generally; on the rights, responsibilities, or weights to be given to non-citizens; and on the role and importance of power in contests over public values. Regarding the effects of political power, Jacobs (2014) believes that in the U.S. context Bozeman severely underestimates the extent of dissensus, the disproportionate influence of affluent citizens and organized interests, and the extent to which governing structures favor inaction and drift.

Mark Moore on Creating Public Value

Whereas Bozeman focuses on the policy or societal level, Mark Moore (1995, 52–55), another important voice in the literature, focuses on public managers. He, too, is concerned about *de*valuing of government and public managers in an era of economic individualism and market ascendency, and he initially conceived of public value as the public management equivalent of shareholder value. He seeks both a persuasive rhetoric and an approach to discerning, championing, and achieving public value—or what he calls *creating public value*. Public value primarily results from government performance, so his view of public value creation in this early book is narrower than in much of the later literature.

Moore believes that citizens want from their governments some combination of the following that together encompass public value: (1) high-performing service-oriented public bureaucracies, (2) public organizations that are efficient and effective in achieving desired social outcomes, and (3) public organizations that operate justly and fairly, and lead to just and fair conditions in the society at large. While Moore's definition of public value is vaguer than Bozeman's, it highlights reasonably specific public values: efficiency, effectiveness, socially and politically sanctioned desired outcomes, procedural justice, and substantive justice. Like Bozeman, Moore's definition of public value can encompass input, process, output, and outcome measures.

Moore (2014a) develops the philosophical foundations of his approach to public value as a prelude to establishing what he calls "public value accounting." He makes three assertions: First, a public collectively defined through democratic processes is the appropriate arbiter of public value when collectively owned assets of government are being deployed. Second, collectively owned assets include not only government money, but also state authority. Third, assessing the value of government production relies on an aggregation of costs and benefits broadly conceived; but also on collective determinations concerning the welfare of others, duties to others, and conceptions of a good and just society. Moore (2013, 2014b) uses these philosophical premises to develop a public value account. On the benefit side is the achievement of collectively valued outcomes, while on the cost side are the costs of using public authority and collectively owned assets.

Moore argues that public managers should use the *strategic triangle* (1995, 22–23). Strategy must be (1) aimed at achieving something that is substantively valuable (i.e., must constitute public value); (2) legitimate and politically sustainable; and (3) operationally and administratively feasible (see also Alford and O'Flynn 2009). Moore "equates managerial success in the public sector with initiating and reshaping public sector enterprises in ways that increase their value to the public in both the short and the long run" (1995, 10), which requires a "restless, value-seeking imagination" (Benington and Moore 2011, 3).

Moore is speaking primarily to current and prospective public managers in a democratic society and secondarily to their elected leaders. Like Bozeman, an implication of Moore's work is the need for a healthy democracy with supporting institutions and the processes necessary to forge agreement on and achieve public values in practice.

For Moore, like Bozeman, public value generally refers to objective states of the world that can be measured. Also like Bozeman, Moore sees public value as extrinsic and also intrinsic to the functioning of an effective democratic polity. Again, like Bozeman, something being evaluated may be deemed to hold inherent value or may be seen as a means to something else. Unlike Bozeman, Moore does assume a hierarchy of values in which public organizational effectiveness, efficiency, accountability, justness, and fairness in the context of democratic governance are prime values. For Moore, ultimately elected officials and the citizenry do the valuing, but public managers also play an important role. The valuing can be shown via the public value account.

Rhodes and Wanna (2007) in particular have criticized Moore and his supporters. Not clear, they say, is whether their approach is "a paradigm, a concept, a model, a heuristic device, or even a story… [As a result,] it is all things to all people" (408). They believe Moore downplays the importance of politics and elected officials, overly emphasizes the role of public managers, and trusts too much in public organizations, private sector experience, and the virtues of public servants (409–412).

Alford (2008; see also Alford and O'Flynn 2009) mounts a spirited defense of Moore and offers refutations of each of Rhodes and Wanna's points. He emphasizes Moore's strategic triangle that sees the authorizing environment as placing "a legitimate limit on the public manager's autonomy to shape what is meant by public value" (177). Alford also believes Rhodes and Wanna operate out of an "old" public administration paradigm that draws a sharp distinction

between politics and administration and thus ignore the fact that political appointees and civil servants often have considerable leeway to influence policy and decisions.

Dahl and Soss (2014) also level sharp criticism at Moore's conception of creating public value. In their view, by posing public value as an analog to shareholder value, seeing democratic engagement in primarily instrumental terms, and viewing public value as something that is produced, Moore and his followers actually mimic the very neoliberal rationality they seek to resist and run the risk of furthering neoliberalism's de-democratizing and market-enhancing consequences. Public managers might unwittingly be agents of "downsizing democracy" (Crenson and Ginsberg 2002). The cautions Dahl and Soss raise are serious and should be addressed by those seeking to advance the public value literature.

In addition, Jacobs (2014) believes Moore's hopeful view of public management can be Pollyannaish, at least in the U.S., given sharply divided public opinion on many issues, intensely partisan politics, the power of organized interests, and the many veto points built into governance arrangements. Clearly, public managers are constrained in a democratic society—and rightly so—but there are also many examples of enterprising, public value-producing activities that demonstrate public managers can in fact be active agents in creating public value. The public value literature thus will need to explore much further the conceptual, political, organizational, managerial, and other limits on public managers seeking to create public value in particular circumstances.

Timo Meynhardt on Public Value

Timo Meynhardt (2009, 206), in an important but far less well known approach, believes that public value is constructed out of "values characterizing the relationship between an individual and 'society,' defining the quality of the relationship." The relationship's quality is assessed subjectively by individuals, but when there is inter-subjective weight attached to these assessments, they become objective and might reach Bozeman's requirement of a reasonable normative consensus. Meynhardt believes that public value is *for* the public when it concerns "evaluations about how basic needs of the individuals, groups, and the society as a whole are influenced in relationships involving the public" (212). Public value is also about value *from* the public, when it is "drawn from the experience of the public." Public value for Meynhardt, too, can refer to input, process, output, and outcome measures.

Meynhardt posits four basic dimensions (or content categories) of public value closely connected to a widely cited psychological theory of basic needs (Epstsein, 1989, 1993, 2003) and related to categories in traditional welfare economics. The categories are: moral-ethical, political-social, utilitarian-instrumental, and hedonistic-aesthetical. The "value" an individual attaches to an experience is based on how well the experience satisfies his or her basic needs as assessed against these dimensions. Note that the assessment is a subjective, emotional-motivational, and valenced reaction to an experience of some sort involving the "public," such as an encounter with a government program, an election, or visit to a public space. Inter-subjectively equivalent assessments are a broad measure of the extent to which public value has been created or diminished. To summarize, Meynhardt (2009, 212) sees public value creation as: situated in relationships between the individual and society; founded in individuals; constituted by subjective evaluations against basic needs; activated by and realized in emotional-motivational states; and produced and reproduced in experience-intense practices.

In contrast to Bozeman and Moore's approaches, Meyhnardt's is non-prescriptive; is far more psychologically based; and emphasizes more the interpenetration of public and private spheres. Unlike the other two authors, he pays little attention to the institutions and supra-individual processes involved in public value creation. However, like Bozeman and Moore, Meynhardt also sees public value as measurable, in his case against the dimensions he outlines.

John Benington on the Public Sphere

Beyond public values and creating public value, there is the public sphere. John Benington (2011) sees the public sphere as "a democratic space" (31) that includes the "web of values, places, organizations, rules, knowledge, and other cultural resources held in common by people through their everyday commitments and behaviors, and held in trust by government and public institutions." It is "what provides a society with some sense of belonging, meaning, purpose and continuity, and which enables people to thrive and strive amid uncertainty" (43). Like Dewey (1927/1954), he believes that the public is not given, but must be continuously constructed. Public value is necessarily contested, and is often established through a continuous process of dialogue. For Benington, the public sphere is thus the space—psychological, social, political, institutional, and physical—within which public values and public value are held, created, or diminished. Public value includes what adds to the public sphere. While Benington himself is committed to democracy, note that his extended definition of the public sphere can apply to other forms of government.

Operationally, for both practitioners and scholars, determining who and what the "public" is can be problematic (Frederickson 1991). Nonetheless, Meynhardt (2009, 205) sees the "public" is an "indispensable operational fiction necessary for action and orientation in a complex environment." In other words, as complexity increases the more "the public" becomes a social construct "necessary for acting, but hard to pin down" (204).

In practical terms, the public may already be known, may need to make itself known, or may need to be created. For example, Moore's normative approach requires public managers to look to their "authorizing environments" for direction, although they may conclude that the public can be best served by working to change aspects of the authorizing environment. Moore also asserts that elected officials and the citizens (often via elections) are the arbiters of public value (1995, 38), even when political decision making is deeply problematic on moral grounds. In democratic societies, citizens and managers can challenge these questionable decisions, but not ignore them (54–55). For Dewey (1927/1954), a public is "created" when citizens experience the negative consequences of situations beyond their control (resulting, for example, from market or governmental activities). In other circumstances, public administrators may need to "call a public into being" (Moore 2014a), for example, when designing and managing a public participation process (Fung 2006; Cooper, Bryer, and Meek 2006; Nabatchi 2012).

Public values scholars look to a variety of sources for evidence of what the "public" is, wants, or is good for it. Sources include, for example, literature reviews, legislation, rules and regulations, and opinion polls (Beck Jørgensen and Bozeman 2007; Bozeman 2007; Jacobs 2014). Meynhardt (2009, 2014), as noted, relies on psychological theory to derive the dimensions against which public values can be assessed; he has developed and published results from the use of psychological questionnaires based on this work. Moulton (2009) looks to "public values institutions," which can be of three types, with the three types presumed to differentially affect how public values are realized in practice. Regulatory institutions are legally sanctioned and can establish rules, surveillance mechanisms, and incentives to influence behavior. Normative-associative institutions help create expectations or norms that influence social life via prescriptive, evaluative, or obligatory guidance. Finally, cultural cognitive institutions help create shared conceptions of the nature of social reality and the frames used to create meaning. The three kinds of institutions are analytic constructs and can and do overlap in practice. Andersen, et al. (2012) look to archetypal forms of governance to derive the content of public values; the forms are hierarchy, clans or professions, networks, and markets.

How Public Value Relates to Other Concepts

Part of public value's importance is that it encompasses and goes beyond several other venerable concepts that highlight the proper ends and means of government and broader public action. Among these are the public interest, the common good, public goods, and commonwealth. Public interest originally was associated with the state, not with the public sphere more generally (Gunn 1969), and thus typically refers to the reasons for, or consequences of, government action (Alexander 2002, 226–227). Beyond that, attempts to operationalize the public interest have proved difficult (Sorauf 1957; Mitnick 1976), although not necessarily in the case of applying relatively clear public laws and regulations to specific decisions (Alexander 2002). Vagueness and difficulties of operationalization also plague related terms such as the common good.

Public goods refers to production of non-rival, non-excludable goods and services. Public value differs in three ways: First, it includes remedies to market failures beyond inadequate provision of public goods, along with the institutional arrangements that make the remedies possible. This fits clearly with Bozeman's (2007) view. Public goods are outputs and public value includes the outcomes made possible by public goods. This fits well with Moore's (1995) view. Finally, public value has value for the valuer, which accords well with Meynhardt's (2009) approach.

Probably commonwealth comes closest to capturing the meaning of public value, since the term originally meant "common well-being." In the U.S. from the colonial era through the World War II era, as Boyte (1989) points out, commonwealth meant two things. First, it meant a republican or democratic government of equals concerned with the general welfare and an active citizenry throughout the year. Second, the term "brought to mind the touchstone, or common foundations, of public life—the basic resources and public goods of a community over which citizens assumed responsibility and authority" (4–5). Thus, while similar to public value in meaning, commonwealth is not the same. The identification with a republican or democratic government narrows the definition, while the common foundations of public life are more closely related to the idea of the public sphere.

How the Ideas of Creating Public Value and Policy-Level and Societal Public Values Are Used in Practice and Research

The different strands in the public value literature clearly can be linked. Specifically, Moore's managerially focused idea of creating public value involves producing what the public values or is good for the public, the merits of which can be assessed against a set of more specific public values. These can include Bozeman's and others' societal or policy-focused public value criteria, Meynhardts' psychologically focused criteria, Benington's idea of enhancing the public sphere, and other important values in the public administration field and literature. All may or should be considered when assessing value creation in specific instances.

Uses of the Creating Public Value Idea in Practice and Research

The idea of creating public value has been used as a paradigm, rhetoric, narrative, and kind of performance (Alford and O'Flynn 2009, 178–185). Stoker (2006) has proposed "public value management" as a new *paradigm* better suited to networked governance than traditional public administration or the New Public Management. He is thus moving beyond Moore's primary focus on public managers at the top of a public bureaucracy delivering services or obligations to a focus on networked inter-organizational and cross-sector relations and governance.

Stoker makes the case that traditional public administration and New Public Management are not up to the job of managing in a networked public environment, but he only vaguely considers how leaders and managers in specific instances would achieve efficiency, accountability, and equity, along with broader democratic values (Williams and Shearer 2011; O'Flynn 2007). Nor does he explain how leaders and managers should cope with a democracy having problems with low voter turnout, divided government, competing organized interests, and competing conceptions of what public value might be in any situation (Davis and West 2009; Jacobs 2014).

Critics of public value argue that it has been used as a *rhetorical* strategy to protect and advance the interests of bureaucrats and their organizations (Roberts 1995). The criticism unquestionably has merit in particular cases. As noted above, Dahl and Soss (2014) also highlight the potential of public value rhetoric to undermine democratic processes. Smith (2004, 68–69), however, believes that a "focus on public value enables one to bring together debates about values, institutions, systems, processes and people. It also enables one to link insights from different analytical perspectives, including public policy, policy analysis, management, economics, and political science." Similarly, Fisher (2014) offers a *narrative* that contrasts an oppositional approach to public decision making (public-private, black-white; right-wrong; mine-yours) with an "opposable" or integrative approach wherein public managers can link seemingly unrelated, or contradictory, and sometimes paradoxical constructs to achieve a higher level of public value across sectors. The stories managers create thus can be self-serving rhetoric, but also can be a public-regarding story about what should be, or has been, created.

Finally, as *performance*, public value can serve as a performance measurement and management framework. A key advantage of the public value idea is that there is no single bottom line (Kalambokidis (2014). Moore (2013, 2014a, 2014b), for example, proposes that managers look at costs and benefits, but also at less tangible aspects when they assess public value creation. Bozeman (2002; 2007) and Talbot (2010) argue for using a variety of public value criteria to discern how much public value has been created or diminished. A focus on public value also stimulates attention to the long-term viability and reliability of public investments (Fisher 2014).

A number of governments have made explicit or implicit use of the public value framework. Kernaghan (2003), for example, examines the values statements of four Westminster-style governments; each contains a range of values beyond efficiency. The "joined-up government," "whole-of-government," and collaborative governance initiatives that developed in many countries in response to the fragmentation caused by New Public Management were about coordination and also about recovery and pursuit of public values beyond narrowly defined results and efficiency (Christensen and Lægreid 2007). Unfortunately, some of these efforts have used excessively narrow interpretations of public value. For example, the British government under Tony Blair made explicit use of public value as a way of thinking about performance, but operationalized Moore's strategic triangle by focusing on services (for operational capability), outcomes (for public value), and trust and legitimacy (for the authorizing environment) (Kelly, Mulgan, and Muers 2002). Accenture consultants Cole and Parston (2006) further diminish the meaning of public value. Their approach just repackages existing approaches to performance measurement and management under a different label (Alford and O'Flynn 2009, 185). Dahl and Soss's (2014) cautions about the ease with which the public value approach can be hijacked for purposes not intended by its principal authors is on clear display.

The various approaches to creating public value can be used positively or normatively—and have been. Williams and Shearer (2011, 1374) observe, however, that "the most striking feature is the relative absence of empirical investigation of either the normative propositions of public value or its efficacy as a framework for understanding public management." They do note, however, some exemplary studies. For example, O'Toole, Meier and Nicholson-Crotty (2005) found in a large-N study of Texas school superintendents that the superintendents saw the points of Moore's triangle as constitutive of their roles. And Meynhardt and Metelmann (2009) in a study of the German Federal Labor Agency also found evidence that middle managers think in much the same way as Moore's public value entrepreneurs would.

Uses of Policy-Level and Societal Public Values in Practice and Research

Policy-level and broader public values have also been used in a variety of ways. For example, public values feature prominently in the approach Bozeman and his coauthors have developed called "public value mapping." The approach incorporates a broad range of value considerations in policy decision-making processes by helping (1) identify public values; (2) assess whether or not public value failures have occurred; (3) map relationships among values; and (4) graphically represent relationships between public value failures and market failures (Welch, Rimes, and Bozeman 2014). The approach has been used primarily in the science and technology field (e.g., Bozeman and Sarewitz 2011), but increasingly in other fields (Bozeman and Moulton 2011, i367).

Meynhardt (2014) has developed a public value assessment instrument called the public value scorecard (not to be confused with Moore's 2013, 2014b public value scorecard). The scorecard is an aggregated summary based on individuals' rankings of the value of something related to the public along the dimensions mentioned earlier—moral-ethical, hedonistic-aesthetical, utilitarian-instrumental, and political-social—as well as a fifth dimension related to financial performance (Meynhardt 2014). The scorecard has been used in a variety of situations for both formative and summative purposes.

Andersen, et al. (2012) have developed a third instrument for assessing public values that relies not on public value criteria or psychological assessments, but instead on what they call "organizational design principles" derived from four archetypal modes of governance (hierarchy, clan, network, and market) (717). For each of the four they articulated the role of public organizations, role of citizens, organizational context, control forms, and central values. From these values they developed an instrument they tested on Danish public managers by asking them to what extent the values applied to their organizations. After a variety of analyses, seven dimensions of public value emerged: the public at large, rule abidance, budget keeping, professionalism, balancing interests, efficient supply, and user focus. Their work highlights tensions among the values and the complexity of public managers' values environments (723–724).

Conclusions

Scholars and public professionals are making important theoretical, practical, and operational strides in developing a new approach to public administration as an alternative to approaches that preceded it. They need to do more, however, before the new approach is widely understood, appreciated, and used to advance important public values underplayed by traditional public administration and New Public Management. In this final section we offer some tentative conclusions about where things stand and then outline an agenda for research and practice.

Where Things Stand

While there clearly is an emerging new approach to public administration, it does not have a consensually agreed name. Among the various possibilities, however, the Denhardts' (2011) label the New Public Service certainly appears to be the leading contender based on citations. Whatever the name, attention to issues of public value, public values, and the public sphere are central to the new approach.

The concept of creating public value is popular within both academic and practice settings (Williams and Shearer 2011). Even critics note the broad interest in the idea among practitioners (Rhodes and Wanna 2007). Similarly, Van der Wal, Nabatchi, and de Graaf (2013) assert that the study of public values is gaining in importance in public administration and may well be one of the field's most important current themes. Finally, for several decades scholars

and political commentators have devoted increased attention to the public sphere, including debates about the limits and role of government, the why and how of public engagement and active citizenship, and the need for a strengthened democracy.

This growing interest is in part due to the importance, urgency, scope, and scale of public problems facing the world; the pragmatic recognition that governments alone cannot effectively address many of these problems; and a concern that public values have been and will be lost as a result of a powerful anti-government rhetoric and a host of market-based and performance-based reforms. Following Dewey, the public value literature and the emerging approach to public administration represent the products of a practitioner and scholarly "public called into being" over these concerns.

In the emerging approach government clearly has a special role to play as a creator of public value and guarantor of public values and the public sphere, but in a market-based democracy, government is not the owner of all the processes and institutions having public value potential or obligations (Peters and Pierre 1998). The literatures on cross-sector collaboration, integrative leadership, and networked governance are all responses to the new context, in which public managers frequently must collaborate with nonprofits, businesses, the media, and citizens to accomplish public purposes. A major contribution of the public value literature is the way it draws attention to questions about: (a) the public purposes that are or should be served by organizations in all sectors, by intra- and cross-sector collaborations, by more general governance arrangements, and by public leadership broadly defined; and (b) how public managers and leaders do and should accomplish these purposes. These are important normative and research-related questions needing to be pursued in the new context.

Of course, the concern with purposes and values is hardly new to public administration; what is different are two different parts of the context. The first is that traditional public administration and the New Public Management—while they both have strengths—are not up to the tasks of networked governance, leadership, and management when a variety of public values should be served, including, but hardly limited to, efficiency, effectiveness, and equity. The second is the view that terms such as the public interest and commonwealth are too narrow, other related terms such as the common good are too vague, and the language of public value provides a helpful way forward, as Jacobs (2014) suggests.

A Research and Practice Agenda

Right now the new approach is enmeshed in often vague definitions, conceptualizations, and measurements of public value and the public sphere. While public administration scholars and practitioners may ultimately agree on these public value–related matters, they are unlikely to reach full consensus (Davis and West 2009). That is not necessarily a bad thing. In order to make progress, however, scholars should address the challenges to current formulations, in part through further conceptual refinement, the development of suitable typologies and measures, and rigorous empirical testing. Research should attend to both subjectively held public values and more objective states of the world; whether a specific public value is intrinsic, extrinsic, or relational; whether something is a prime or instrumental public value; whether there are hierarchies of public values; who does the valuing; how the valuing is done; and against what criteria the object of value is measured.

The public value literature does provide a broader sense of public values than typically found in traditional public administration and New Public Management. As the emerging approach to public administration unfolds, the public value literature should be explicitly incorporated, since the issues it addresses are so fundamental. For example, too many performance measurement and management regimes and models focus principally on efficiency and effectiveness directly related to the mission (Radin 2006; 2012; Talbot 2010; Moynihan et al. 2011), and disregard what Rosenbloom (2007) terms non-mission-based values, such as equity, due process, freedom of information, and citizenship development. As a result, too many performance measurement and management schemes may actually weaken public value creation (Kroll and Moynihan 2014). Practitioners thus should work to ensure performance measurement and management approaches do include non-mission-based values and at the very least do not diminish democratic engagement and citizenship behavior. Rosenbloom's (2007) contribution has been noted. Moore (2013, 2014b) has also made a start on some of these concerns with his proposed public value account, as does Meynhardt (2014) with his very different public value account. Bozeman and his colleagues' public value mapping model also makes a contribution. Similarly, public participation processes can be designed to enhance democratic behavior and citizenship (Natachi 2012; Bryson, et al. 2013). Finally, policy analysis as well should include a broad array of values beyond its traditional focus on efficiency, effectiveness, and sometimes equity (Radin, 2013).

Practitioners and scholars also should follow Australia's lead, for example, and draw attention to the expected and actual public value created by policies, programs, projects, and other efforts (Kernaghan 2003). As Jacobs (2014) demonstrates in a U.S. context, the public is "pragmatically liberal"; that is, the public is quite willing to support particular public undertakings when the value is clear and the cost is reasonable. Moore's public value account offers a way of making the case in specific circumstances. Kalambokidis (2014) provides practical advice on some of the ways in which this public value-clarifying work can be done in relation to fiscal and spending policy.

Given the complex networked and collaborative arrangements practitioners now often find themselves in, they have a heightened need to cultivate what Moore calls a "restless, value-seeking imagination" in a democratic context; and public affairs scholars and educators should help them in this effort. That imagination also should incorporate attention to government's special role in assuring concern for important values and standing firm against efforts to diminish them (Dahl and Soss, 2014). Again, the need for imagination is not new to public administration, where creativity, innovation, and strategic thinking and acting have always found a place (Osborne and Brown 2013; Hartley 2014; Bryson 2011). Such imagination often involves bridging the politics-administration divide (Gulick 1933; Appleby 1945), but also knowing when to defer to elected officials (Alford, Hartley, and Hughes 2014). In all these cases, public administrators have a special obligation to turn their imaginations to enhancing democratic governance and citizenship. As noted, policy analysis also can help foster imaginative responses and attention to the array of public values (Radin

2012). Clearly, however, the public value literature should explore much further the conceptual, political, organizational, managerial, and other limits on public managers seeking to create public value in particular circumstances.

Institutions and processes matter for the creation of public value, the realization of public values, and the preservation and enhancement of the public sphere (Talbot 2010; Benington and Moore 2011; West and Davis 2011; Radin 2012; Dahl and Soss 2014; Jacobs 2014; Moore 2014a; Kalambokidis 2014; Budd 2014). The research on performance management regimes makes this clear. Such regimes and the institutions and processes that produce and sustain them and what the consequences are for public value should be the focus of much additional work. The same is true of collaborative, networked governance processes. Work thus should continue on linking managerial behavior attempting to create public value with institutions and processes and policy-level and other important public values related to democratic and collaborative governance (Beck Jørgensen and Bozeman 2007).

Another part of that work is to bring in scholarship from other fields to help enrich the conversation at a time when the public administration can be viewed as too insular (Wright 2011). We look forward to continued research and learning that will determine whether the public value literature will override the challenges and take a permanent place in the ongoing development of the field of public administration scholarship and practice.

Notes

1. This introduction and the symposium articles stem from an international conference on "Creating Public Value in a Multi-Sector, Shared-Power World" at the University of Minnesota, September 20–22, 2012. The conference was co-sponsored by three units of the University of Minnesota: the Hubert H. Humphrey School of Public Affairs, the Carlson School of Management, and the Center for Integrative Leadership. The Minnesota Humanities Center was a cosponsor.

References

Agranoff, Robert. 2006. Inside Collaborative Networks: Ten Lessons for Public Managers. *Public Administration Review* 66(Supplement s1): 56–65.

Alexander, Ernest R. 2002. The Public Interest in Planning: From Legitimation to Substantive Plan Evaluation. *Planning Theory* 1(3): 226–249.

Alford, John. 2008. The Limits to Traditional Public Administration, or Rescuing Public Value from Misrepresentation. *The Australian Journal of Public Administration* 67(3): 357–366.

Alford, John, Jean Harley, and Owen Hughes. 2014, forthcoming. Political Astuteness as an Aid to Discerning and Creating Public Value. In *Valuing Public Value,* edited by John M. Bryson, Barbara C. Crosby, and Laura Bloomberg. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, pre-publication draft.

Alford, John, and Owen Hughes. 2008. Public Value Pragmatism as the Next Phase of Public Management. *The American Review of Public Administration* 38(2): 130–148.

Alford, John, and Janine O'Flynn. 2009. Making Sense of Public Value: Concepts, Critiques, and Emergent Meanings. *International Journal of Public Administration* 32(3–4): 171–191.

Andersen, Lotte Bøgh, Torben Beck Jørgensen, Anne Mette Kjeldsen, Lene Holm Pedersen, and Karsten Vrangbæk. 2012. Public Value Dimensions: Developing and Testing a Multi-Dimensional Classification. *International Journal of Public Administration* 35(11): 715–728.

Beck Jorgensen, Torben, and Barry Bozeman. 2007. Public Values: An Inventory. *Administration & Society* 39(3): 354–381.

Benington, John. 2011. From Private Choice to Public Value? In *Public Value: Theory and Practice,* edited by John Benington and Mark Moore, 31–49. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Benington, John, and Mark H. Moore. 2011. Public Value in Complex and Changing Times. In *Public Value: Theory and Practice,* edited by John Benington and Mark Moore, 1–20. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Boyte, Harry. 1989. *CommonWealth: A Return to Citizen Politics*. New York: Free Press.

Boyte, Harry. 2005. Reframing Democracy: Governance, Civic Agency, and Politics. *Public Administration Review* 65(5): 536–546.

Boyte, Harry. 2011. Constructive Politics as Public Work: Organizing the Literature. *Political Theory* 39(5): 630–660.

Bozeman, Barry. 2002. Public Value Failure: When Efficient Markets May Not Do. *Public Administration Review* 62(2): 145–161.

Bozeman, Barry. 2007. *Public Values and Public Interest: Counterbalancing Economic Individualism*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Bozeman, Barry, and Stephanie Moulton. 2011. Integrative Publicness: A Framework for Public Management Strategy and Performance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 21(Supplement 3): i363–i380.

Bozeman, Barry, and Daniel Sarewitz. 2011. Public Value Mapping and Science Policy Evaluation. *Minerva* 49: 1–23.

Bryson, John. 2011. *Strategic Planning for Public and Nonprofit Organizations, 4th Edition.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bryson, John M., Barbara C. Crosby, and Melissa M. Stone. 2006. The Design and Implementation of Cross-Sector Collaborations: Propositions from the Literature. *Public Administration Review* 66(Supplement 1): 44–55.

Bryson, John, Kathryn Quick, Carissa Schively Slotterback, and Barbara C. Crosby. 2013. Designing Public Participation Processes. *Public Administration Review* 73(1): 23–34.

Budd, John W. 2014. Implicit Public Values and the Creation of Publicly Valuable Outcomes: The Importance of Work and the Contested Role of Labor Unions. *Public Administration Review* 74(4): 506–516.

Christensen, Tom, and Per Lægreid. 2007. The Whole-of-Government Approach to Public Sector Reform. *Public Administration Review* 67(6): 1059–1066.

Cleveland, Harlan. 2002. *Nobody in Charge: Essays on the Future of Leadership*. New York: John Wiley.

Cole, Martin, and Greg Parston. 2006. *Unlocking Public Value: A New Model for Achieving High Performance in Public Service Organizations*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Cooper, Terry L., Thomas A. Bryer, and Jack W. Meek. 2006. Citizen-Centered Collaborative Public Management. *Public Administration Review* 66(Supplement s1): 76–88.

Crenson, Matthew, and Benjamin Ginsberg. 2002. *Downsizing Democracy: How America Sidelined Its Citizens and Privatized Its Public.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Crosby, Barbara C., and John M. Bryson. 2005. *Leadership for the Common Good: Tackling Public Problems in a Shared-Power World*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Dahl, Adam, and Joe Soss. 2014. Neoliberalism for the Common Good? Public Value Governance and the Downsizing of Democracy. *Public Administration Review* 74(4): 496–504.

Davis, Paul, and Karen West. 2009. What Do Public Values Mean for Public Action? Putting Public Values in Their Plural Place. *American Review of Public Administration* 39(6): 602–618.

Denhardt, Janet V., and Robert B. Denhardt. 2003. *The New Public Service: Serving, Not Steering, Third Edition*. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.

De Souza Briggs, Xavier. 2008. *Democracy as Problem Solving*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

de Tocqueville, Alexis. 1840/1969. *Democracy in America*. Edited by J. P. Mayer. New York: Harper.

Dewey, John. 1927/1954. *The Public & Its Problems*. Athens, OH: Swallow Press.

Dubnick, Melvin J., and H. George Frederickson. 2010. Accountable Agents: Federal Performance Measurement and Third-Party Government. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 20(Supplement 1): i143–i159.

Epstein, Seymour. 1989. Values from the Perspective of Cognitive-Experiential Self-Theory. In *Social and Moral Values*, edited by Nancy Eisenberg, Janusz Reykowski, and Ervin Staub, 3–22. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Epstein, Seymour. 1993. Emotion and Self-Theory. In *Handbook of Emotions,* edited by Michael Lewis and Jeanette M. Haviland-Jones, 313–326. New York: Guilford Press Sons, Inc.

Epstein, Seymour. 2003. Cognitive-Experiential Self-Theory of Personality. In *Handbook of Psychology, Volume 5, Personality and Social Psychology,* edited by Theodore Millon, Melvin J. Lerner, and Irvine B. Weiner, 159–184. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Fisher, Thomas. 2014. Public Value and the Integrative Mind: How Multiple Sectors Can Collaborate in City Building. *Public Administration Review* 74(4): 457–464.

Frederickson, George. 1991. Toward a Theory of the Public for Public Administration. *Administration & Society* 22(4): 395–417.

Fung, Archon. 2006. Varieties of Participation in Complex Governance. *Public Administration Review* 66(Supplement s1): 66–75.

Gallup. 2014. http://www.gallup.com/poll/1597/confidence-institutions.aspx; accessed March 12, 2014.

Gore, Al. 1993. *Creating a Government that Works Better and Costs Less: The Report of the National Performance Review.* New York: Plume.

Gulick, Luther. 1933. Politics, Administration, and the New Deal. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 169(1): 55–66.

Gunn, John. 1969. *Politics and the Public Interest in the Seventeenth Century*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Hartley, Jean. 2014, forthcoming. The Creation of Public Value through Step-Change Innovation in Public Organizations. In *Valuing Public Value,* edited by John Bryson, Barbara Crosby, and Laura Bloomberg. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, pre-publication draft.

Hirschman, Albert. 1982/2002. *Shifting Involvements: Private Interests and Public Action*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Hood, Christopher. 1991. A Public Management for All Seasons. *Public Administration* 69(1): 3–19.

Jacobs, Lawrence. 2014. The Contested Politics of Public Value. *Public Administration Review* 74(4): 480–494.

Kalambokidis, Laura. 2014. Creating Public Value with Tax and Spending Policies: The View from Public Economics. *Public Administration Review* 74(4): 519–526.

Kaufman, Herbert. 1969. Administrative Decentralization and Political Power. *Public Administration Review* 29(1): 3–15.

Kelly, Gavin, Geoff Mulgan, and Stephen Muers. 2002. Creating Public Value: An Analytical Framework for Public Service Reform. Discussion on paper prepared by the Cabinet Office Strategy Unit, United Kingdom.

Kernaghan, Kenneth. 2003. Integrating Values into Public Service: The Values Statement as Centerpiece. *Public Administration Review* 63(6): 711–719.

Kettl, Donald F. 2002. *The Transformation of Governance: Public Administration for Twenty-First Century America*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Kettl, Donald F. 2008. *The Next Government of the United States: Why Our Institutions Fail Us and How to Fix Them*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Kroll, Alexander, and Donald P. Moynihan. 2014, forthcoming. Creating Public Value Using Performance Information. In *Valuing Public Value,* edited by John Bryson, Barbara Crosby, and Laura Bloomberg. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, pre-publication draft.

Mansbridge, Jane, ed. 1990. *Beyond Self-Interest.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

McGinnis, Michael, and Elinor Ostrom. 2012. Reflections on Vincent Ostrom, Public Administration, and Polycentricity. *Public Administration Review* 72(1): 15–25.

McGuire, Michael. 2006. Collaborative Public Management: Assessing What We Know and How We Know It. *Public Administration Review* 66(Supplement s1): 33–43.

Meynhardt, Timo. 2009. Public Value Inside: What Is Public Value Creation? *International Journal of Public Administration* 32(3–4): 192–219.

Meynhardt, Timo. 2014. Public Value—Turning a Conceptual Framework into a Scorecard. In *Valuing Public Value,* edited by John Bryson, Barbara Crosby, and Laura Bloomberg. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, pre-publication draft.

Meynhardt, Timo, and Jorg Metelmann. 2009. Pushing the Envelope: Creating Public Value in the Labor Market: An Empirical Study of the Role of Middle Managers. *International Journal of Public Administration* 32(3–4): 274–312.

Mitnick, Barry M. 1976. A Typology of Conceptions of the Public Interest. *Administration & Society* 8(1): 5–28.

Moore, Mark H. 1995. *Creating Public Value: Strategic Management in Government*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Moore, Mark H. 2013. *Recognizing Public Value*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Moore, Mark H. 2014a. Public Value Accounting: Establishing the Philosophical Basis. *Public Administration Review* 74(4): 465–477.

Moore, Mark H. 2014b. Recognizing Public Value: Developing a Public Value Account and a Public Value Scorecard. In *Valuing Public Value,* edited by John Bryson, Barbara Crosby, and Laura Bloomberg. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, pre-publication draft.

Moulton, Stephanie. 2009. Putting Together the Publicness Puzzle: A Framework for Realized Publicness. *Public Administration Review* 69(5): 889–900.

Moynihan, Donald P. 2006. Managing for Results in State Government: Evaluating a Decade of Reform. *Public Administration Review* 66(1): 77–89.

Moynihan, Donald P., Sergio Fernandez, Soonhee Kim, Kelly M. LeRoux, Suzanne J. Piogrowski, Bradley E. Wright, and Kaifeng Yang. 2011. Performance Regimes amidst Governance Complexity. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 21(Supplement 1): i141–i155.

Mulgan, Richard. 2000. 'Accountability': An Ever-Expanding Concept. *Public Administration* 78(3): 555–573.

Nabatchi, Tina. 2012. Putting the 'Public' Back in Public Values Research: Designing Participation to Identify and Respond to Values. *Public Administration Review* 72(5)(September-October): 699–708.

O'Flynn, Janine. 2007. From New Public Management to Public Value: Paradigmatic Change and Managerial Implications. *The Australian Journal of Public Administration* 66(3): 353–366.

Osborne, David, and Ted Gaebler. 1992. *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit Is Transforming the Public Sector*. New York: Basic Books

Osborne, Stephen. 2010. *The New Public Governance?* New York: Routledge.

Osborne, Stephen, and Louise Brown. 2013. *Handbook of Innovation in Public Services.* Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.

Ostrom, Vincent. 1973. *The Intellectual Crisis in American Public Administration.* Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.

Ostrom, Vincent, and Elinor Ostrom. 1971. Public Choice: A Different Approach to the Study of Public Administration. *Public Administration Review* 31(2): 203–216.

O'Toole, Laurence, Kenneth Meier, and Sean Nicholson-Crotty. 2005. Managing Upward, Downward, and Outward: Networks, Hierarchical Relationships and Performance. *Public Management Review* 7(1): 45–68.

Peters, B. Guy, and John Pierre. 1998. Government without Governance? Rethinking Public Administration. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 8(2): 223–243.

Pollitt, Christopher, and Geert Bouckaert. 2011. *Public Management Reform: A Comparative Analysis; New Public Management, Governance, and the Neo-Weberian State*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Radin, Beryl. 2006. *Challenging the Performance Movement*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Radin, Beryl. 2012. *Federal Management Reform in a World of Contradictions.* Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Rhodes, R.A.W., and John Wanna. 2007. The Limits to Public Value or Rescuing Responsible Government from the Platonic Guardians. *Australian Journal of Public Administration* 66(4): 406–421.

Roberts, Alasdair. 1995. 'Civic Discovery' as a Rhetorical Strategy. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 14(2): 291–307.

Romzek, Barbara S., Kelly LeRoux, and Jeannette M. Blackmar. 2012. Preliminary Theory of Informal Accountability among Network Organizational Actors. *Public Administration Review* 72(2): 442–453.

Rosenbloom, David H. 2007. Reinventing Administrative Prescriptions: The Case for Democratic-Constitutional Impact Statements and Scorecards. *Public Administration Review* 67(1): 28–39.

Rosenbloom, David H., and McCurdy, Howard E. Eds. 2006. *Revisiting Waldo's Administrative State: Constancy and Change in Public Administration*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Salamon, Lester M. 2002. *The Tools of Government: A Guide to the New Governance*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Schlesinger, Arthur M. 1986. *The Cycles of American History.* Boston: Houghton, Mifflin.

Simon, Herbert. 1997. *Administrative Behavior*, 4th Edition. New York: The Free Press.

Smith, RFI. 2004. Focusing on Public Value: Something New and Something Old. *Australian Journal of Public Administration* 63(4): 68–79.

Sorauf, Frank. 1957. The Public Interest Reconsidered. *The Journal of Politics* 19(4): 616–639.

Stoker, Gerry. 2006. Public Value Management: A New Narrative for Networked Governance? *American Review of Public Administration* 36(1): 41–57.

Talbot, Colin. 2009. Public Value—The Next "Big Thing" in Public Management? *International Journal of Public Administration* 32(3–4): 167–170.

Talbot, Colin. 2010. *Theories of Performance.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Thomson, Anne-Marie, and James L. Perry. 2006. Collaboration Processes: Inside the Black Box. *Public Administration Review* 66(Supplement): 19–32.

Van der Wal, Zeger, Tina Nabatchi, and Gjalt de Graaf. 2013. From Galaxies to Universe: A Cross-Disciplinary Review and Analysis of Public Values Publications from 1969 to 2012. *American Review of Public Administration*. Online. 23 May 2013.

Van Wart, Montgomery. 1998. *Changing Public Sector Values*. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.

Waldo, Dwight. 1948/2007. *The Administrative State: A Study of the Political Theory of American Public Administration.* New Brunswick, NJ : Transaction Publihers (originally published in New York by Ronald Press).

Waldo, Dwight. 1952. Development of a Theory of Democratic Administration. *Public Administration Review* 46(1): 81–103.

Welch, Jennie, Heather Rimes, and Barry Bozeman. 2014. "Public Value Mapping." In *Valuing Public Value,* edited by John Bryson, Barbara Crosby, and Laura Bloomberg. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, pre-publication draft.

West, Karen, and Paul Davis. 2011. What Is the Public Value of Government Action? Towards a (New) Pragmatic Approach to Values Questions in Public Endeavours. *Public Administration* 89(2): 226–241.

Williams, Iestyn, and Heather Shearer. 2011. Appraising Public Value: Past, Present and Futures. *Public Administration* 89(4): 1367–1384.

Wilson, Woodrow. 1887. The Study of Administration. *Political Science Quarterly* 2(2): 197–222.

Wolf, Jr., Charles. 1979. A Theory of Nonmarket Failure: Framework for Implementation Analysis. *Journal of Law and Economics* 22(1): 107–139.

Wright, Bradley E. 2011. Public Administration as an Interdisciplinary Field: Assessing Its Relationship with Other Fields of Law, Management and Political Science. *Public Administration Review* 71(1): 96–101.

Join *Public Administration Review* on Facebook

to find out more about issue updates and upcoming calls for papers

(http://www.facebook.com/PAReview).