# *Chapter 1*

# Introduction

John M. Bryson, Barbara C. Crosby,
and Laura Bloomberg

## Contents



Since the mid-1990s, scholars principally in the United States, Europe, Australia, and New Zealand have promoted the concept of public value for several reasons (Williams and Shearer, 2011; Van der Wal et al., 2013). Mark Moore (1995)

originally conceived of public value as a useful counterpoint to the value generated by business enterprises. According to this view, the purpose and role of public management and managers was to create public value seen as a composite of efficiency, effectiveness, socially and politically sanctioned desired outcomes, justice, and fairness in the context of democratic governance. Later, another strand of the public value literature developed a more policy and societal focus. This approach emphasized that both markets and governments can fail to assure important public values are achieved (Bozeman, 2007). Still another strand highlighted the purposes to be served by governance, involving multi-sector collaborations aimed at addressing many of society's most important challenges (Stoker, 2006). This approach in many ways combines the managerial and policy and societal views. Finally, some authors saw public value as a way to draw attention to the public sphere or realm and to highlight the conditions necessary for an effective democracy (Benington, 2011).

The focus on public value is part of the continuing evolution of public administration thinking and practice. What has been called the new public management (NPM) (Hood, 1991) emerged as the dominant view in the 1980s and 1990s, supplanting traditional public administration. Now NPM is being eclipsed by a new movement. 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; Stoker, 2006; Bozeman, 2007; Kettl, 2008; Alford and Hughes, 2008; Osborne, 2010; Talbot, 2010; Boyte, 2011), including ourselves (Bryson et al., 2014). For example, Janet and Robert Denhardt's (2011) widely cited book *The New Public Service* captures much of the collaborative and democratic spirit; content; and governance focus of the movement. Based on citations, their label the *New Public Service* appears to be the leading contender for the emerging approach's name.

The new approach is a response to at least three major changes. These include the growing importance, urgency, scope, and scale of cross-jurisdictional, cross-level, and cross-sector public problems facing the world; the realization 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. As a response to these challenges, the new approach emphasizes public value and public values; recognizes that government has a special role as a guarantor of public values; champions the importance of public management broadly conceived, and of service to and for the public; and emphasizes citizenship and democratic and collaborative governance (Bryson et al., 2014).

Efficiency was the main concern of traditional public administration, and efficiency and effectiveness are the main concerns of new public management. In the emerging approach, values beyond efficiency and effectiveness are pursued, debated, challenged, and evaluated. The emerging approach re-emphasizes and brings to the fore value-related concerns of previous eras that were always present, but not dominant (Waldo, 1948; Rosenbloom and McCurdy, 2006; Denhardt and Denhardt, 2011). This renewed attention to a broader array of values—and 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.

The exploration of a broad array of values beyond efficiency and effectiveness is especially important for helping public and nonprofit managers, government officials, business people, and citizens participating in all sectors think about what kind of society they seek to build—and also counter the perception that value-generation occurs almost exclusively in business enterprises and markets (Waldo, 1948; Bozeman, 2007). In this book, scholars from around the globe present and analyze cases in which public value has been created—or sometimes not. The cases cover a range of substantive areas and policy domains from local to global and the authors analyze them using an array of theoretical frameworks and methodologies. The cases demonstrate how the meaning of public value and public values is intimately related to how they are theorized and addressed by managers, elected officials, and other stakeholders. The cases are organized in four thematic sections: The first three sections involve cases that directly highlight the themes of democracy and citizenship, institutional design, and cross-sector collaboration. The fourth section presents cases that include more than one aspect of the three themes.

Throughout the book attention is devoted, in particular, to the two most dominant approaches to public value: Mark Moore's (1995, 2013) managerially focused ideas about how to create public value, and Barry Bozeman's and colleagues' public policy and societally focused approach to public values. In addition, considerable attention is devoted to the idea of the public sphere, within which public value is created and public values achieved (Benington, 2011).

The book thus makes several major contributions. First, it makes the case that attention to the concepts of public value, public values, and the public sphere is a helpful addition to the literature around public administration's emerging approach. Second, the book brings together what to date have been mainly separate streams in the public value literature, including the managerial focus of some, the public policy and societal focus of others, and the focus on the public sphere of still others. Third, the book explores these concepts in a far broader range of contexts than has been the case to date. Finally, the book presents a variety of ways of operationalizing the concepts of public value, public values, and the public sphere. In short, the book presents an important addition to the public value literature and helps advance its promise, while also demonstrating some of the challenges.

This book is intended for scholars, students, reflective practitioners, and citizen activists. For *scholars* teaching or conducting research focused on public and nonprofit management, performance measurement and management, cross-sector collaboration, democracy and citizenship, or institutional design, the book brings together an array of theorizing, skills, measurement approaches, and processes that foster understanding of public value and public values. The book is also well-suited for *students* in public affairs, public administration, urban and regional planning, education, and public health schools wanting to understand what public value

work looks like in practice. For *practitioners*, the book suggests practical conceptualizations and approaches for finding out what particular stakeholders value and for assessing whether and how much public value is created. *Citizen activists* can employ the book's ideas and approaches to understand how they might advocate for particular management or policy changes; judge whether particular laws, policies, and projects are likely to benefit their communities; and hold their elected representatives accountable for the creation of public value.

The remainder of this introductory chapter will first explore the two dominant approaches to public value theorizing—Moore's and Bozeman's—as they are important lenses for understanding the cases. The chapter will also discuss another key component of the public value literature, the idea of a public sphere or realm. The result will be a coherent and useful overview for thinking about the public sphere, public values, and the creation of public value in relation to the cases specifically and to democracies more generally. The chapter concludes with brief descriptions of the book's main sections and the cases themselves.

## Two Major Public Value Approaches

The meaning of *value* for most readers is very straightforward; it means the "relative worth, utility, or importance" of something (Merriam-Webster, 2014; accessed online March 14, 2014). The common sense definition, however, begs a number of questions apparent in the current debate over public values, public value, and the public sphere (Rutgers, 2008). The questions this book examines concern the following: (1) what *public* values are the focus of concern; (2) what approach to public value creation or assessment is taken; (3) how are different public values reconciled or managed; (4) who does the valuing; (5) how is the valuing done; and (6) against what criteria is the object of value measured? The chapters in this book demonstrate the variety of ways in which these questions can be addressed productively.

In this section, we focus on the two main strands of the public value literature. The first, developed by Mark Moore and his colleagues, is a managerially focused concept of creating public value, while the second is Barry Bozeman's and his colleagues' policy and societally focused conception of public values. In the next section, we attend to the public sphere, a third very important theme in the literature.

### *Mark Moore on Creating Public Value*

Harvard Professor Mark Moore in the mid-1990s developed a normative argument and approach to guide public managers (by which he meant government managers) in a democracy about how to go about the process of formulating, making and justifying policies and decisions aimed at achieving the common good. Moore's 1995 landmark book *Creating Public Value: Strategic Management in Government*

helped popularize the language of public value. In it he elaborated the concept of public value as a counterpoint to shareholder value in business enterprises. Public value embraces business's—and traditional public administration's (Waldo, 1948; Denhardt and Denhardt, 2011)—concern for efficiency, but also embraces additional values such as equity, justice, fairness, and democratic governance.

To help managers carry out their obligations, he developed a "strategic triangle" of managerial actions, which involves: (1) finding appropriate ways of taking into account the "authorizing environment" of mandates and political support, (2) doing what is necessary to create operational capability to produce results, and, (3) actually delivering public value to the citizenry. The action focus is managerial, while the desired outcome is organizations that meet (or can appropriately and legitimately change) their mandates; generate political support in such a way that they can deliver public value and what the public values; and do so efficiently, effectively, accountably, justly, and fairly in the context of democratic governance. Public value is thus a summary term assessed and measured against the extent to which it achieves or realizes in practice more specific public values at reasonable cost. The public values may refer to inputs, processes, outputs, or outcomes.

In recent years, Moore has connected his theory more thoroughly to democratic institutions and processes (Moore, 2013, 2014). He also has considered how nonprofit managers can generate public value (Moore, 2000) and developed a public value accounting process that operationalizes his theory. His ideas have had a considerable impact in the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Commonwealth countries.

Moore's approach has been strongly criticized by Rhodes and Wanna (2007). They note that advocates of the approach have at varying times seen it as "a paradigm, a concept, a model, a heuristic device, or even a story… [As a result,] it is all things to all people" (p. 408). Rhodes and Wanna also assert that Moore's approach shortchanges the importance of politics and elected officials, overemphasizes the role of public managers, and trusts too much in public organizations, private sector experience, and the virtues of public servants (pp. 409–412).

Alford (2008; see also Alford and O'Flynn, 2009) defends Moore and offers refutations of each of Rhodes and Wanna's points. He highlights Moore's strategic triangle that gives the authorizing environment a crucial role to play in placing "a legitimate limit on the public manager's autonomy to shape what is meant by public value" (p. 177). He also believes Rhodes and Wanna operate out of an "old" public administration paradigm that draws a sharp distinction between politics and administration and thus ignores 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 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 pursuing public value might unwittingly be agents of "downsizing democracy" (Crenson and Ginsberg, 2002). Dahl and Soss raise important cautions that should be addressed by those seeking to advance the public value literature.

Jacobs (2014) also believes Moore's hopeful view of public management underplays what is in the United States sharply divided public opinion on many issues, intensely partisan politics, the power of organized interests, and the many veto points built into governance arrangements. The public value literature thus should explore much further the conceptual, political, organizational, managerial, and other limits on public managers' quest to create public value in particular circumstances.

## *Barry Bozeman on Public Values*

In contrast to Moore's more *managerial* focus, Barry Bozeman's 2007 book, *Public Values and Public Interest: Counterbalancing Economic Individualism,* focuses on the *policy* or *societal level* and highlights the intersection of market successes and failures with what he calls public value successes and failures. The book explicitly takes issue with the dominance, especially in the United States, of economic individualism and the neoliberal agenda embodied in the new public management (Hood, 1991; Pollitt and Bouckaert, 2011). Bozeman's work has had a significant impact on public management thinking in the United States and abroad, especially in the science and technology field, but in other fields as well (Bozeman and Sarewitz, 2011; Bozeman and Moulton, 2011).

Bozeman (2007, p. 17) begins by defining public values as "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." Bozeman's definition implies that public values in a democracy are typically contested, meaning the consensus on them is hardly ever complete. Still, one can discern something about the relative consensus on public values from constitutions, legislative mandates, policies, literature reviews, opinion polls, and other formal and informal sources (Beck Jørgensen and Bozeman, 2007). Note, however, that the "normative consensus" may well be on values that many would consider bad.

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 10 criteria, which are presented in Table 1.1 (Bozeman, 2002, 2007; Bozeman and Johnson, 2014). The criteria in part mirror market failure criteria. Public value creation is the extent to which public values criteria are met, and the criteria combine input, process, output, and outcome measures. In addition, Bozeman has developed a "public value mapping process" that juxtaposes public value and market successes and failures. The approach

**Table 1.1 Public Values Criteria**

| *Criterion* | *Definition* | *Illustration of Public Value Failure and Success* |
|---|---|---|
| Creation, maintenance, and enhancement of the public sphere | *As a public value:* open public communication and deliberation about public values and about collective action pertaining to public values.<br>*As a public value enabling institution:* the space, physical or virtual, in which the realization of the public sphere value occurs. | Failure: An authoritarian regime seizes control of the Internet or other social media in an effort to exert control of protestors and thereby thwarts open public communication.<br>Success: A deliberative democracy group is established to bring together diverse stakeholders in a local environmental dispute and these stakeholders engage in free and open public values-related communication. |
| Progressive opportunity | An "equal playing field" is less desirable than collective actions and public policies addressing structural inequalities and historical differences in opportunity structures. | Failure: "Merit based" policies that fail to distinguish the effects of opportunity structures on achievement.<br>Success: Compensatory education programs. |
| Mechanisms for values articulation and aggregation | Political processes and social cohesion should be sufficient to ensure effective communication and processing of public values. | Failure: Combination of US Congress' seniority system and noncompetitive districts leading, in 1950s, to legislative bottlenecks imposed by just a few committee chairs who held extreme |

*Continued*

**Table 1.1 (*Continued*) Public Values Criteria**

| *Criterion* | *Definition* | *Illustration of Public Value Failure and Success* |
|---|---|---|
| | | values on civil rights, national security, and other issues.<br>Success: The US Congress' seniority system reforms taking into account factors related to relevant subject matter experience and expertise. |
| Legitimate monopolies | When goods and services are deemed suitable for government monopoly, private provision of goods and service is a violation of legitimate monopoly. | Failure: Private corporations negotiating under-the-table agreements with foreign sovereigns.<br>Success: Uses of patent policy in allocating intellectual property rights. |
| Imperfect public information | Similar to the market failure criteria, public values may be thwarted when transparency is insufficient to permit citizens to make informed judgments. | Failure: Public officials developing national energy policies in secret with corporate leaders of energy companies.<br>Success: City council's widely advertised and open hearings about proposed changes in zoning. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Distribution of benefits | Public commodities and services should, ceteris paribus, be freely and equitably distributed. When "equity goods" have been captured by individuals or groups, 'benefit hoarding' occurs in violation of public value. | Failure: Restricting public access to designated public use land.<br>Success: Historical policies for the governance of national parks. |
| Provider availability | When there is a legitimated recognition about the necessity of providing scarce goods and services, providers need to be available. When a vital good or service is not provided because of the unavailability of providers or because providers prefer to ignore public value goods, there is a public values failure due to unavailable providers. | Failure: Welfare checks are not provided due to the lack of public personnel or failures of technology for electronic checking transactions.<br>Success: Multiple avenues for rapid and secure delivery of income tax refunds. |
| Time horizon | Public values are long-run values and require an appropriate time horizon. When actions are calculated on the basis of an inappropriate short-term time horizon, there may be a failure of public values. | Failure: Policy for waterways that considers important issues related to recreation and economic development but fails to consider long-run implications for changing habitat for wildlife.<br>Success: Measures taken to ensure long-term viability of pensions. |

*Continued*

**Table 1.1 (*Continued*) Public Values Criteria**

| *Criterion* | *Definition* | *Illustration of Public Value Failure and Success* |
|---|---|---|
| Substitutability vs. conservation of resources | Actions pertaining to a distinctive, highly valued common resource should recognize the distinctive nature of the resource rather than treat the resource as substitutable or submit it to risk based on unsuitable indemnification. | Failure: In privatization of public services, contractors have to post bond-ensuring indemnification, but provide inadequate warrants for public safety.<br>Success: Fishing quotas or temporary bans allowing long-term sustainable populations of food fish. |
| Ensure subsistence and human dignity | In accord with the widely legitimated Belmont Code, human beings, especially the vulnerable, should be treated with dignity and, in particular, their subsistence should not be threatened. | Failure: Man-made famine, slave labor, political imprisonment.<br>Success: Institutional Review Boards' protections of "vulnerable populations" including children, prisoners, and the mentally ill. |

*Source:* Adapted from Bozeman, B. and J. Johnson. 2014. The political economy of public values. *American Review of Public Administration*, published online May 26, 2014. DOI: 10.1177/0275074014532826.

offers an assessment tool to determine the nature and extent of public value creation in the area.

Bozeman's approach is both positive, when he asks what the normative consensus on values is, and normative, when he argues that public value failures should be corrected. Regarding the effects of political power on value consensus, Jacobs (2014) believes that in the United States 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. More recently, Bozeman has rectified some of these concerns (Bozeman and Johnson, 2014).

One implication of Bozeman's approach (and Moore's to a lesser extent) 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; Jacobs, 2014; Kalambokidis, 2014). Moulton (2009, p. 891), for example, draws attention to the way particular kinds of institutions channel the development of "realized publicness," defined as "the extent to which outcomes or objectives achieve public values."

In a complementary effort, Bozeman joined with Beck Jørgensen (Beck Jørgensen and Bozeman, 2007) in developing an inventory of public values. They scanned the public administration literature to come up with a set of seven "constellations" of public values: (1) the public sector's contribution to society, (2) transforming interests to decisions, (3) the relationship between public administrators and politicians, (4) the relationships between public administrators and their environment, (5) inter-organizational aspects of public administration, (6) the behavior of public employees, and (7) the relationships between public administration and the citizens. (Note that a more complete list that went beyond public administration would also articulate the values meant to characterize the relationship between public officials and society and between citizens and society.) Beck Jørgensen and Bozeman also make an important distinction between "instrumental" and "prime" public values, meaning values that help achieve other values and values that are ends in themselves. Other scholars have taken different approaches to cataloguing public values; for example, Moulton (2009) ties sets of values to institutions and Andersen et al. (2012) assign different values to archetypal forms of government organizations.

## *A Third Important, But Less Well-Known Approach*

Beyond Moore's and Bozeman's approaches, it is certainly worth mentioning Timo Meynhardt's (2009) less well-known approach that draws on the psychological and philosophical roots of the human activity of valuing. In his view public value consists of "values characterizing the relationship between an individual and 'society,' defining the quality of the relationship" (p. 206). Individuals assess the quality of

the relationship, and when they develop substantial intersubjective agreement on their assessments, something like Bozeman's normative consensus develops.

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" (p. 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 identifies four basic dimensions of public value closely connected to Epstein's theory of basic psychological needs (Epstein, 1989, 1993, 2003). The dimensions are: moral–ethical, political–social, utilitarian–instrumental, and hedonistic–aesthetical. Any particular public policy, program, election, visit to a public space, as well as actions by nonprofits and businesses that affect the public, can be assessed along these dimensions.

In contrast to Bozeman's and Moore's approaches, Meyhnardt's is nonnormative, in the sense of being nonprescriptive; is far more psychologically based; and emphasizes more the interpenetration of public and private spheres. He also highlights far more the interrelatedness of the subjective and objective. Finally, unlike the other two authors, he pays little attention to the institutions and supra-individual processes involved in public value creation.

## The Public Sphere

The third key component of the public value literature is the public sphere, or the space within which public values exist and in which public value is created. John Benington (2011) defines the public sphere as "a democratic space" (p. 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." Drawing on the Greek notion of the *polis*, as well as modern philosophers, Benington reminds citizens and their representatives of the need to protect and enhance the public sphere. From his perspective, which he elaborates further in the next chapter of this book, public value creation is the production of what the public values and what enhances the public sphere. His approach thus provides a larger frame within which to consider Moore's managers; Bozeman's policy and societally focused actors and institutions; and Meynhardt's (2009, p. 212) individuals involved in relationships with society in which they make "subjective evaluations against basic needs [that are] activated by and realized in emotional-motivational states, and are produced and reproduced in experience-intense practices."

Of course, among the public values that are typically contested is the nature of democracy itself. Those interested in fostering a more democratic public sphere certainly have their work cut out for them in the United States. In the United States

sharply divergent public beliefs and opinions are easily exploited for partisan ends by organized interests and siloed information channels; wherein affluent individuals and business and professional interests exercise disproportionate influence, and the governing structures favor inaction and drift (Jacobs, 2014). In such circumstances, pushes by public managers to create public value may well stall, fail, or even worse, reinforce rather than ameliorate the highly flawed or even antidemocratic forces in the system (Dahl and Soss, 2014).

The public value literature has already had some beneficial impacts in the world of practice. For one thing, it provides a compelling vocabulary that public managers, elected officials, nonprofit leaders, and citizens can use to: highlight the worth of government's and other institutions' public-value creating activities, emphasize values that sustain public life and collective well-being; and hold themselves accountable for producing desired results. In this book the chapter by Kalambokidis, Hinz, and Chazdon, for example, shows one practical way in which Cooperative Extension Services across the United States have used the language of public value to advance the common good. Additionally, public value scholars have produced a host of other methods and tools for creating and assessing public value. Many of these are described in Bryson et al. (forthcoming); they include facilitated dialogue and deliberation processes, public value mapping, system dynamic modeling, strategy mapping, and public value scorecards, among many others.

The chapters that follow will look at specific government policies and programs, as well as intergovernmental initiatives, and cross-sector partnerships through the lens of public value. They reveal considerable potential for achieving public value through democracy and citizen participation, collaboration across boundaries of many kinds, and institutional design.

## Integrating, Reconciling, or at Least Accommodating the Approaches

The two main contrasting views of public value—the managerial and the policy or societal level views—have not been formally integrated, reconciled, or at least accommodated in some way to date. There does not appear to be any reason, however, why they cannot be at least partially, if not fully, integrated in both theory and practice. Indeed, many of the chapters in this book at least implicitly do so.

Theoretically, the challenge is to clarify the connections between Moore's managerially focused approach and Bozeman's policy or societally oriented public values approach. Moore himself does so in part when he asserts that creating public value should involve such public values as efficiency, effectiveness, justice, and fairness in the context of democratic governance. Public value for Moore is thus, as noted previously, a summation of what is achieved or realized in practice in terms of more specific public values. Assessments of net value created will consider both costs and benefits broadly conceived and aligned with public values. A fuller

integration simply requires Moore's approach to incorporate explicitly a broader range of public values, such as those suggested by Van Wart (1998), Beck Jørgensen and Bozeman (2007), Rosenbloom (2007), and others. Of course, ultimately for Moore (1995, pp. 29–31), final determinations of what constitutes public value in a democracy in specific cases is up to elected officials and citizens.

Bozeman also moves toward integration by developing his public value mapping tool, which can be used by public managers to determine what, how, when, and why public value should be created, and often by whom, or at least by which organizations or institutions. Beck Jørgensen and Bozeman (2007) also make a contribution conceptually by outlining their "constellations" of values that bridge from managers to the public and do include values related to inputs, processes, outputs, outcomes.

In terms of practice, the challenge of integration is more difficult, because public values are numerous, often contested, and indeed may be in conflict or even contradictory. Integration may not be possible, although some sort of reconciliation or accommodation may be. Again, however, there is little mystery about ways of proceeding, since public managers, their overseers, and other stakeholders are engaged in the process of deciding what to do all the time. At least six practical approaches are available for addressing public value questions, besides avoiding or suppressing them: analysis, leadership, dialogue and deliberation, the formal and informal processes of democracy, institutional design, and performance management regimes and models.

## *Analysis*

Obviously, analysis can help with exploration of value-related questions, although decision makers and the public can ignore it. Analysis can be used to clarify values; sharpen understandings of the values served—or not—by organizations and institutions; identify what values do and do not underlie, and will or will not be served by, existing or proposed policies, programs, and projects; identify value complementarities, conflicts, contradictions, and trade-offs; and so on. Policy analysis can and often does serve as an important input into the world of political, and often very politicized, networked and collaborative governance in which, as noted, governments, businesses, nonprofit organizations, and civil society all have roles to play in addressing public challenges and creating public value. Policy analysis now provides a variety of analytic approaches and methods that enable "speaking truths to multiple powers" (Radin, 2013, p. 225). The chapters in this book may be viewed as both retrospective and prospective kinds of policy analysis or evaluation.

## *Leadership*

Addressing public value questions is intimately related to leadership (Burns, 1978; Crosby and Bryson, 2005). Because of their roles or personal commitments,

citizens, managers, elected officials, and journalists (among others) may step forward to draw attention to public values or ensure that stakeholders in an issue of public concern have opportunities to air competing public values and consider areas of agreement and divergence. Elected officials and government managers have particular responsibility for defending the public sphere and inspiring and mobilizing fellow citizens to value public life and engage in democratic problem-solving.

In this book, John Benington in Chapter 2 describes the adaptive leadership catalyzed by a police chief in Northern Ireland. This public official reminded competing stakeholder groups of the public value of adherence to two foundational public values, free expression and obedience to the law. He also contributed to creation of public value by engaging stakeholders in taking responsibility for communal well-being. In Chapter 3, Harry Boyte highlights the civic leadership work of Seattle house boaters who championed public values of environmental protection, and he explains how organizers of the campaign to defeat an anti-gay marriage referendum in Minnesota crafted a strategy designed to strengthen the public sphere by appealing to the widely held public value of loving, committed relationships, and by sharply breaking from the polarized approach of earlier campaigns. Many other chapters offer direct or indirect guidance to leaders and committed followers engaged in making public values more salient, and finding ways to enhance public value.

## *Dialogue and Deliberation*

Dialogue and deliberation are also an important way that managers, officials, and citizens can address values, concerns, and what to do about them when the answers are not purely technical (Heifetz, 1994; Heifetz and Linsky, 2002). Through dialogue and deliberation, participants can clarify values and their relationships and agree on which values to prefer, which to trade off, which to avoid or downplay, and so on. Dialogue around value-laden public issues is actually surprisingly extensive in the United States, despite a sense that the citizenry is not engaged much in talking about those issues (Jacobs et al. 2009). Numerous authors in the public value literature make a case for the importance of dialogue and deliberation when it comes to discerning and assessing public value and public values and how they might be achieved (e.g., Moore, 1995; Bryson et al., 2013; Fisher, 2014 ; Kalambokidis, 2014).

To succeed, deliberative processes and practices need institutional and organizational arrangements in place to support them. In addition, the deliberative tradition requires a willingness on the part of would-be deliberators to: resist rushing to judgment; tolerate uncertainty, ambiguity, and equivocality; consider different views, new information, and various analyses; and be persuaded—but also a willingness to end deliberations at some point and go with the group's considered judgment. The deliberative tradition does not presume that there is a "correct" solution or "one best answer" to addressing major challenges, only that there is wisdom to be found via the process (Stone, 2011).

## *Formal and Informal Processes of Democracy*

The formal and informal processes of democracy are also important vehicles for making reasonable and acceptable, if not necessarily wise or good, decisions involving public values (Moore, 1995, 2014; Bozeman, 2007). Analysis, dialogue and deliberation, and leadership obviously can help as part of these processes. More formal processes include at various times and for various purposes: constitution writing; campaigns and elections; direct and representative democracy; majority and super-majority voting; initiative, referendum, and recall; administrative procedures; public hearings; formal participation processes; protection of minority rights; and administrative and other court action; among others. More informal processes include political activism of many kinds, lobbying, consensus-building efforts, and social movements. These formal and informal processes are ways for people with diverse values, interests, beliefs, and opinions to accommodate their differences and to make decisions about how to prioritize, compromise, trade-off, settle, manage, or otherwise deal with value-related questions. Chapters in this book by John Benington and Harry Boyte, in particular, focus on democratic practices.

## *Institutional Design*

Institutions, such as the family, markets, democratic arenas, and primary, secondary, and higher education embody public values and also channel public values. In more formal terms, Douglass North (1990, p. 3) defines institutions as:

> the rules of the game in society … the humanly devised constraints that shape human interaction … complexes of norms and technologies that persist over time by serving collectively valued purposes … some have an organizational form, others exist as pervasive influences on behavior.

Scott and Christensen (1995, p. xiii) define institutions similarly broadly as "the cognitive, normative, and regulative structures and activities that provide stability and meaning to social behavior. Institutions are transported by various carriers—culture, structures, and routines—and they operate at different levels of jurisdiction."

Institutional design is the intentional shaping of institutions to embody desired public values and enable particular values to be realized. Institutional design ranges from "constitution writing" to forming or modifying interactions in groups, such as task groups, committees and clubs. Development and implementation of policies, plans and programs also involves institutional design when enacting or changing laws, regulations, or procedures; or when creating or transforming organizations.

### *Performance Management Regimes and Models*

The final practical approach to integrating managerial public value and policy or societal public values is the use of performance management regimes and specific approaches to, or models for, performance management. A number of important recent books have appeared on this theme, including Moynihan (2006), Radin (2006, 2012), and Van Dooren et al. (2010).

Talbot (2010, pp. 205–215) for example, in an important synthesis of the performance literature, argues that a good theory of organizational and service performance in the public domain should attend to three elements. They are: public values, performance regimes, and specific performance models. The chapters in this book collectively contribute to knowledge about all three elements.

For Talbot, public values are the frame within which the other two elements exist. Talbot defines the second element, performance management regimes, as "a combination of the institutional context within which public agencies work, and the institutional actors that can seek to steer or shape their performance together with the actual ways in which these actors exercise their powers (or do not)" (p. 92). For governments, institutional stakeholders include the chief executive and line departments, along with their partners; the legislature, judiciary, and auditors and inspectors; and citizens, users, and the professions. Cross-sector collaborations would involve an expanded list. The third element is performance management models, or multi-dimensional approaches to performance management that are more specific to organizations and programs. These would include the many specific models available to managing inputs, processes, outputs, and outcomes. As examples, Talbot cites Total Quality Management, the European Union Common Assessment Framework, the second Bush Administration's Program Assessment and Rating Tool, and Bryson's (2011) Strategy Change Cycle (pp. 169–184).

Note that all six ways of integrating Moore's and Bozeman's approaches to public value presume the importance of a workable public sphere. The public sphere is the space within which public values exist and public value might be created.

## Cases of Creating Public Value in Practice

*Creating Public Value in Practice* is the first book to pull together in a theoretically rich, methodologically sound, and practically useful way an excellent and richly varied set of cases that together demonstrate much of what the public sphere, public values, and creating public value might mean in practice. The chapters are organized by cross-cutting themes to advance understanding and also respond to the developments noted above. The themes are: (1) *democracy and citizenship,* (2) *institutional design*, and (3) *cross-sector collaboration*. The first set of cases emphasizes the ways in which public value is created via active citizenship and democratic practice.