UNIVERSITEIT
AMSTERDAM

VU Research Portal

Quality of governance

Paanakker, Hester; Masters, Adam; Huberts, Leo

Link to publication in VU Research Portal

Quality of Governance: Values and Violations

Hester Paanakker, Adam Masters, and Leo Huberts

1.1   Topic of the Volume

Why do values matter, and how can they be employed to address the quality of governance? Ongoing theoretical and empirical work explores the collective meaning of public values as guiding sets of action in governance settings and beyond. However, research that explicitly sets out to unravel the meaning of individual values and reflects on their coherent—or incoherent—adherence and significance is far scarcer, especially seen in application in concrete contexts. This volume represents a joint effort of the Study Group on Quality of Governance, a group of international researchers associated with the International Institute of Administrative Sciences (IIAS), to fill this gap and to advance our understanding of concrete value attainment. It is a

H. Paanakker
Radboud University, Nijmegen, The Netherlands
e-mail: h.paanakker@fm.ru.nl

A. Masters (✉)
Centre for Social Research and Methods, Australian National University, Canberra, ACT, Australia
e-mail: adam.masters@anu.edu.au

L. Huberts
Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands
e-mail: l.huberts@vu.nl

continuation of the broader agenda of the Study Group to grasp the complex dynamics of what "Quality of Governance" constitutes and outlines the thematic line of values-based research to uncover the content and scope of the topic. In line with this specific objective, the volume harnesses a very specific framework limited to eight values as its point of departure. The contributions to this volume cover, respectively, democratic legitimacy, accountability, transparency, integrity, lawfulness, effectiveness (in terms of service quality), professionalism, and robustness. As such, it is the first of its kind to look beyond the taken-for-granted nature of abstract, aspirational, and often-assumed rather universalistic values. In a set of independent case studies, this book seeks to provide a truly in-depth examination of *the relevance, limitations, and applicability of some of these claimed core values of the quality of governance*. How does transparency matter to the complex dynamics of a set of public, private, non-governmental, civil society, and other associated actors in daily governance settings? How to interpret the importance of democratic legitimacy? What are critical indicators to uniformly safeguard public effectiveness? And what role do interpretations and semantics play in the violation of such values of governance? The establishment and evaluation of governance processes, practices, policies, and tools geared toward maintaining quality—in society and government—continually demand our attention. Contextual, applied values-based research enables us to peel back some of the layered complexity of these questions.

1.2   Values Covered in This Volume

We specifically aim to complement existing research by zooming in on the importance and meaning of this particular set of values to the overall quality of governance. Therefore, each chapter explicitly addresses one specific value at a time, and each contribution discusses the underlying question of *the relevance, limitations, and applicability of that specific value to the quality of governance*. Of course, many other and perhaps equally valid frameworks exist. Rather than an attempt to streamline or limit our understanding of the role of certain values to quality of governance at the expense of others, we fully acknowledge that our volume represents just one way of looking at quality of governance among many. We do not claim that our perspective is better, more comprehensive, or more conclusive than other distinguished work on quality of governance, which we applaud and are inspired by. By no means do we claim our analysis to be exhaustive in either the number of values or the number of cases discussed. We do present to you an interesting peak into the role of some key values that, in our view, might

very well constitute the core of governance processes in the late-modern world. These values have roles of their own, relationships with each other that mutually reinforce maxims for thought and action, or work in combination with other values that are left outside the equation in this volume.

The choice for this set of eight values is obviously not a random one and builds on extensive groundwork of adjacent literatures. Classifications of the values a quality of governance framework should contain are widespread and diverse. Besides promoting single values such as impartiality (Rothstein, 2011) or democracy (Bevir, 2010) as the central characteristic of governance quality, several more inclusive lists of a range of complementary values exist. Bovens et al. (2007), for instance, distinguish four clusters of values that are relevant to the assessment of good governance: lawfulness, integrity, democracy, and effectiveness/efficiency. A seminal article (La Porta, Lopez-de-Silanes, Shleifer, & Vishny, 1999) empirically addressed the determinants of the quality of governments in a large cross-section of countries. Quality or 'good governance' was interpreted as 'good for economic development,' using the measures of government intervention, public-sector efficiency, public good provision, size of government, and political freedom. That specific focus on 'economic' development is anything but uncommon in the good governance literature. The most influential—and arguably also most heavily criticized—framework is that of the World Bank, which sees good governance as participatory, consensus oriented, accountable, transparent, responsive, effective and efficient, equitable and inclusive, and in accordance with the rule of law.

What these three examples have in common is the fact that they include values that pertain to both *process* (for instance, participation) and *outcomes* (for instance, effectiveness) of governance, or in potential to both (for instance, integrity and equitability). In this volume, we build on the previous work of Huberts (2014), who integrated this insight into a value panorama of seven key values in his book *The Integrity of Governance: What Is It, What We Know, What Is Done and Where to Go.* Based on an elaborated examination of theoretical and empirical work on the morality of governance over the last decades, he hypothesizes that the following central values (clusters) define the quality of governance (Huberts, 2014, p. 213):

1. 'democracy with responsiveness and participation'—paying attention to social preferences and with the involvement of actors having an interest (including citizens);
2. 'accountability and transparency'—being open, honest, and willing to account for behavior;

3. 'lawfulness'—respecting laws and rules;
4. 'incorruptibility and impartiality'—acting in the public interest instead of self-interest or other inappropriate partial interests;
5. 'effectiveness and efficiency of process'—acting capably in agenda-building and preparing, taking, and implementing decisions;
6. 'professionalism and civility'—acting in line with professional standards and standards for (inter)personal behavior; skillfulness (expertise), civility and respect, neutrality and loyalty (including confidentiality), and serviceability for civil servants; and reliability, civility, and trustworthiness for politicians;
7. 'robustness'—being stable and reliable but also able to adapt and innovate.

Huberts (2014) underlines that future research will have to demonstrate how tenable this panorama is and encourages further reflection on its meaning and usefulness. With this volume, we set out to meet this call and produce a coherent collection that provides further insight into how each value relates to the overall quality of governance. For this purpose, the contributions to this volume relate to these key value clusters and fully cover the spectrum.

Specifically, we invited experts on particular values to bring together their knowledge and insights on that value as well as reflect on the central question of the volume. This lead to a slight adaptation of the value labels used to ensure good coverage of the authors' work. For instance, 'democracy with responsiveness and participation' is addressed in this volume as 'democratic legitimacy,' 'incorruptibility and impartiality' is addressed as 'integrity,' 'effectiveness and efficiency' is represented by a contribution of effectiveness understood as service quality, and the cluster 'accountability and transparency' is accounted for by two different contributions (one on accountability and one on transparency) as they represent two quite separate bodies of literature in practice.

Inherently, this expert approach also means that the volume does *not* represent geographical or sectoral distribution in terms of the countries or cases that were selected. Rather, the contributions are independent case studies. The case studies derive their value from the profound, comprehensive, and deep analysis of that value's relevance, applicability, and limitations in concrete contexts, which is where values ultimately manifest themselves and attain their practical 'worth.' The proof of the pudding is in the eating…. It is this demarcated, detailed analysis that carries lessons that reach far beyond the confines of the specific cases or country contexts that are discussed. On this, we hope future research will build further.

1.2.1   *The Good and the Bad: Examining Both Sides of Values*

Without a doubt, quality of governance is a contested topic and one that has own itself a spot in both academic as well as policy debates worldwide. Governance has become one of the key concepts for public administration over the last three decades, and is popularly recurring in several disciplines that study steering,[1] power, authority, politics, policy, administration, government, management, and organization (Bevir, 2009; Fukuyama, 2016; Kettl, 2015; Kjaer, 2004; Rose-Ackerman, 2017). As our understanding of the concept widens and deepens, key questions arise from both empirical studies and normative thinking. Vital among them is how do we delineate between governance that is good and governance that is bad.

This volume scrutinizes this notion of good and bad through a values-based analysis of the *quality of governance.* Concurrent to the dispersion of governance, the concept of *good governance* has permeated both theory and practice of governance in the public sector worldwide (Huberts, Maesschalck, & Jurkiewicz, 2008). Increasing emphasis is put on guaranteeing a certain standard of quality of governance. What quality of governance actually comprises remains subject to debate: interpretations vary from impartial government (Holmberg, Rothstein, & Nasiritousi, 2009; Rothstein & Teorell, 2008) to integrity of governance (Evans, 2012), and from a minimum set of delivered public services (Woods, 2000) to a set of complementary values (Bovens, 't Hart, & van Twist, 2011; de Graaf, Van Doeveren, Reynaers, & Van der Wal, 2011). A common denominator in the vast body of literature on good governance, either explicitly or implicitly, is the central role of values. Since 2000, the public administration field, in general, has witnessed increased scholarly attention to the role of values (Van der Wal, Nabatchi, & De Graaf, 2015), for example, in public-private debates (Reynaers, 2014a, 2014b; Van der Wal, 2008) or in the economic individualism discourse (Bozeman, 2007). Despite discussions on public values labels and definitions, a stable, new, and increasingly diverse agenda seems to have taken root in public administration to map and assess the functioning of governance (Bøgh Andersen, Beck Jørgensen, Kjeldsen, Pedersen, & Vrangbæk, 2012; Van der Wal, 2016; Van der Wal et al., 2015).

---

[1] The word 'governance' derives from Latin origins that imply a notion of "steering." This connotation of 'steering' a society contrasts markedly with the traditional 'top-down' approach of governments 'driving' society.

The concurring shifts to examining quality of governance on the one hand, and to examining if and how which public values are addressed on the other, merge into this volume on values of quality of governance. Contributions include attention to their violation and its corresponding impact on quality at large. As a Study Group of international researchers, we have found a focus on quality of governance and a set of values which underpin this quality has enabled a better understanding of not only the outcomes, but also the processes of governance—which are equally, if not more, important than governance outcomes. To illustrate this importance with a brief analogy, a government policy for a new hospital demands its construction in a controversial location. The government may engage a private consultant to ensure that opposition to the hospital is minimized and land appropriated for its construction. The consultant hires a sub-contractor who engages in violent, unethical, and illegal behavior, keeping no records. Both charge exorbitant fees for their services. The outcome is a well-run hospital as much at the cost of the quality of governance as a badly run hospital that compromises patients' health and well-being—in the process, the values of democracy, accountability, transparency, integrity, lawfulness, and efficiency have all been sacrificed. Such an example is illustrative only, but any scholar or practitioner of public administration need not stretch their mind too far to think of real-life examples which demonstrate how both processes and outcomes of governance are important to quality. Contributions in this volume, therefore, seek to explore the quality issue by looking at process-oriented issues as well as outcome-oriented issues.

In addition, some chapters put more emphasis on exploring the ideal of 'good' quality of governance, whereas others have a stronger focus on violations of a central value, illustrating 'bad' quality of governance. Collectively, these chapters demonstrate our need to examine the 'good' or positive aspects of public values to understand the 'bad' or negative aspects arising from violations of public values—and vice versa. Thus, we derived the sub-title of this book: values and violations. For instance, (1) how does integrity or lawfulness contribute to the accomplishment and preservation of quality?; (2) how can we attain such a value and actuate it to reach its full potential?; and (3) what happens if we fail to address it adequately? We think this satisfactorily complements the scientific and applied studies that pull larger sets of values together in distinct classifications, assigned or assumed weight, aspirational public purposes, or inherent conflicts to be resolved among them. In contrast then, our volume

highlights the complementary importance of single values and stresses their individual indispensability—often best signaled by exploring or theorizing the consequences of violation of these values. In addressing both the positive (values) as the negative (violations) side, our volume represents a tribute to the role of some individual values we deem relevant and whose significance we should not lose sight of when deliberating the quality of governance.

Before describing the contents of this volume in more detail, we will first set out how we understand some of the core concepts used and what theoretical assumptions our work is based on.

1.2.2 Defining Governance and Quality

The attractiveness of the governance concept is partly explainable by the many changes taking place within society in terms of public power and policy-making. In addition to politics, government, and administration, many other actors and organizations have become involved in addressing public problems and challenges (Huberts, 2014). With respect to good governance, Grindle argues 'Not all change has to be orchestrated by the state or demanded by the international financial institutions' (2004, p. 537). One of the 'godfathers' of governance theory, Jan Kooiman (2003, p. 4), defined governing as 'the totality of interactions, in which public as well as private actors participate, aimed at solving societal problems or creating social opportunities; attending to the institutions as the contexts for these governing interactions; and establishing a normative foundation for all those activities.' Globally, governance is generally characterized as who governs, at what level, how and toward what end (Rajagopal, 2013).

In this volume, governance is seen as 'authoritative policy-making on collective problems and interests and implementation of these policies' (Huberts, 2014, p. 68). Governance is about addressing *collective* problems and interests, possibly by one actor but also by a network of public and private actors (Huberts, 2014). Another important element is *authoritative*, a term referring to the relation between the governing actor(s) and the collectivity involved (Huberts, 2014). It presupposes support and legitimacy of the organization or community whose problems and interests are addressed—the relation to Easton's (1953) famous definition of politics as the 'authoritative allocation of values' is of course not coincidental. As will be demonstrated throughout this volume, different entities

may assert the authoritative role of safeguarding values in governance, depending on the context. Examples include central or local governments, civil society, public institutions, private sub-contractors, street-level bureaucrats, financial administrators, legal experts, or, as a counterforce to politics, professionalized bureaucracies.

When reflecting on the quality of governance, of course the central question arises what quality is? Quality is a rather complex concept. Dictionaries tell us it refers to 'the standard of something as measured against other things of a similar kind; the degree of excellence of something,' and to a 'distinctive attribute or characteristic possessed by someone or something' or to 'levels of excellence,' to 'being of good worth, well made, fit for purpose.'[2]

In the context of 'quality of governance,' the concept then refers to standards (of excellence) for governance, to criteria that distinguish between good and bad governance, or in other words to *the relevant values to judge governance* (Huberts, 2014). The literature defines values in a number of ways. These definitions contain common elements such as beliefs or qualities, and each contains subtle differences which can shift the analytical perspective. Here we combine the work of many, leading to a broad definition: values are beliefs or qualities appreciated for constituting, or contributing to, judgments about what is good, right, beautiful, admirable or worthy of praise, and guide people's thoughts and actions (Bozeman, 2007; De Graaf, 2003; Huberts & Van der Wal, 2014; Van der Wal, 2008; Rutgers 2014). Contributions to this volume may harness slightly different definitions. What they have in common are the basic assumptions that values have considerable weight in the choice of action by individuals and collectives and that values underpin practices of good and bad governance. Finally, they emphasize that a perspective of values is a useful tool to evaluate governance policies, instruments, strategies, institutions and systems, and to discuss how the quality of governance can be improved.

This volume explicitly understands quality to pertain to process as well as outcomes of governance. In her reflection on how to define quality in public administration, Löffler (2002) presents an analysis on the way in which the concept of quality evolved in the private and public sectors. She

---

[2] http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/quality and http://en.wiktionary.org/wiki/quality (acc. January 31, 2018).

states that today's notion of quality public services clearly stems for the business concept of Total Quality Management, with a focus on the outcome of customer satisfaction as the point of reference for the degree of quality achieved. In a similar vein, the focus on outcomes recurs in perceptions that 'good governance is that which contributes to the good of society' (Perry, de Graaf, van der Wal, & van Montfort, 2014, p. 27). According to Löffler (2002), quality has always played a role in public administration, at least implicitly, but its meanings have changed over time to include both process and outcome criteria. She quotes Beltrami (1992, p. 770) who distinguished three phases in the evolution of quality in the public sector: quality in the sense of respect of norms and procedures (which we would characterize as process-oriented quality), quality in the sense of effectiveness, and quality in the sense of customer satisfaction (which we would characterize as output-oriented and outcome-oriented quality, respectively).

Initially, quality meant formal correctness, which corresponds to the early notion of quality as technical conformance to specification in industry (Löffler, 2002). The meaning of quality in the public sector changed in the late 1960s when management by objectives gained popularity in public administration (Löffler, 2002). The quality in the public sphere would still include the absence of errors but also started to link the concept of quality with the purpose a product or service is supposed to serve. In the early 1980s, the 'total quality' concept of the private sector was transferred to the public sector in North America and Western Europe, making customer satisfaction the point of reference for the degree of quality achieved (Löffler, 2002). However, although improving the quality of services may increase customer satisfaction as an outcome criterion, it may not necessarily boost trust in government—the latter demands honoring values that target the administrative process:

> … a high quality public administration must not only be able to increase customer satisfaction with public services but also build trust in public administration through transparent processes and accountability and through democratic dialogue. In order to do so, conventional business concepts of quality which regard public agencies as service providers and citizens as customers must be enriched by a democratic concept of quality which perceives public agencies as catalysts of civic society and citizens as part of a responsible and active civic society. (Löffler, 2002, p. 15)

The way this reverts to the importance of guaranteeing quality in how governance comes about signals a move in the public sector during the 1990s from a dominant concern with excellence in service delivery to a concern for good governance in a broad sense, including improvements in quality of life and improvements in governance processes (Bovaird & Löffler, 2003). Involving stakeholders to negotiate 'improved public policy outcomes and agreed governance principles' has become commonplace (Bovaird & Löffler, 2003, p. 316).

These publications illustrate that the interpretation of quality of governance shifted from 'good process' to 'good outcome according to citizens,' and back to good process *in combination with* good outcomes again. In any respect, the values perspective evidently enables us to grasp what quality of governance is about, how it evolves, and how we can assess and improve it. To summarize, we conceive quality of governance here as the relevant values to judge governance processes and outcomes.

1.2.3   Value Pluralism

By using the theoretical stance of value pluralism as a point of departure, this volume fully recognizes the rich diversity and complexity of the value spectrum in global governance. Value pluralism is based on two leading premises.

First, it adopts the idea that, in governance settings, practitioners are faced with multiple coexisting values they must try to accommodate, which reveals their inherently conflicting nature (Berlin, 1982; Spicer, 2001, 2010; Steenhuisen, 2009). In a survey among 231 top public officials or managers in the Netherlands, Van der Wal (2008) researched no less than 20 core values, with lawfulness, impartiality, and serviceability being reported in the top ten as a result. In comparison, Beck Jørgensen and Bozeman (2007) even constructed a 'public values universe' of 72 values, extracted from 230 studies on public values, based on a literature review of public administration journals from the United States, United Kingdom, and the three Scandinavian countries, from 1990 to 2003. They categorized these 72 values into seven overarching families, including *public sector's contribution to society* (among which are the common good and sustainability) and *behavior of public-sector employees* (among which are accountability, professionalism, and moral standards) (Beck Jørgensen & Bozeman, 2007, pp. 360–361). Evidently, it is a sheer impossibility for public officials to address so many categories and so many val-

ues to the same extent at the same time: 'The pursuit of certain values must inevitably comprise or limit our ability to pursue certain other values' (Spicer, 2001, p. 509). Values are often incompatible—for example, the resources consumed in democratic processes may undermine the efficiency of a system. Another example includes lawfulness and effectiveness: strict adherence to complex and partially overlapping national and global rules and regulations, sticking to the letter of the law, can stand in the way of achieving goals (de Graaf & Paanakker, 2015).

Especially, in terms of good governance, it is acknowledged that endless wish-lists of values for governance actors to comply with serve little purpose (Perry et al., 2014). This goes for Western or non-Western, richer or poorer countries alike. Demanding developing countries to adhere to unrealistically long and overwhelming lists of good governance indicators that embody a wide variety of Western values in exchange for different types of aid has proven particularly harmful (Grindle, 2010; Stiglitz, 2002). As Grindle (2004, p. 525) aptly argues, we need to be 'explicit about trade-offs and priorities in a world in which all good things cannot be pursued at once.'

Second, the value pluralism perspective holds that values are not only incompatible but also incommensurable. Lukes (1989, p. 125) describes incommensurability as follows: 'There is no single currency or scale on which conflicting values can be measured […]. Neither is superior to the other, nor are they equal in value.' When values are regarded as incompatible, public officials will most likely opt for a trade-off, weighing the different pros and cons of alternative courses of action and evaluating those in terms of their contribution to some coherent set of measurable goals or values (Thacher & Rein, 2004; Spicer, 2005, p. 541). Conceiving values as incommensurable, however, means that not all choices can be understood as trade-offs as the relative importance of values can often not be measured or determined as such (Thacher & Rein, 2004). It underscores the significance of addressing values in their own right. Different coping strategies can be employed to accommodate different values (Steenhuisen & van Eeten, 2008; Stewart, 2006; Thacher & Rein, 2004), but, as this volume will show, also to accommodate different interpretations of a single value, or to accommodate different interests pertaining to a given value.

If quality of global governance is about managing conflicting and contradictory values (de Graaf & Van Der Wal, 2010; Perry et al., 2014), we are interested in what those values mean and how they matter in the first place. If quality of governance is more than the sum of its parts, which we

endorse, we feel an in-depth exploration of the essential parts is a helpful exercise in comprehending the larger picture. In our view, a contextual perspective is essential and imperative to understanding the variety of values associated with accomplishing and improving quality of governance, including attention to the scope and severity of value-related violations.

1.2.4   Contextual Relevance of Values

Ultimately, what quality means depends on the context in which it is scrutinized. What specific policy issue lies on the table? Which (types of) actors are involved, with what kinds of interests? How well do they succeed in bringing those interests to the table? With what outcomes for different stakeholders involved? How well was the collective action achieved in defining and addressing problems? Moreover, these questions are likely to be answered differently in different cultural and geographical contexts. Despite some shared administrative traditions, democracy might have a different connotation in the Netherlands than that in the United States or in Italy. And more importantly, it may play out differently: different norms may be attached to democracy in different national frameworks, depending on cultural, historical, political, and administrative history. For instance, does democratic governance imply consulting citizens on selected policy issues or not? Does it engender a multi-party system or a dichotomous political system? How acceptable is strategic influencing of voting? And how local is sovereignty over policy implementation allocated? The question of quality evokes different answers over time and space: 'Good governance does not stop with basic agreement on abstract hooray concepts; it also encompasses a continuous process of sense making of values' (Perry et al., 2014, p. 28). Conventionally, scholars subscribe to the impossibility of determining inherently prime values of a universal nature or values with universal and one-dimensional meanings (Rutgers, 2008; Van der Wal, 2016; Yang, 2016). As Bøgh Andersen and colleagues stress: '[w]e know that public values are ultimately context-dependent and that classifications can only be exclusive and comprehensive in a given context' (2012, p. 716).

Internationally, experience taught us blueprints in values thinking and governance practices are neither possible nor desirable. Ethnocentric views can distort building genuine understanding and advancing governance practices in other countries than our own. They can surpass existing

norms, customs, and institutions and eliminate them—and directly or indirectly, their underpinning values—as inferior, which may fail to produce marked societal gains (Brinkerhoff & Goldsmith, 2005; Grindle, 2004). Sometimes, what is considered bad governance from a Western, Anglo-Saxon, or European perspective, 'can serve valuable functions, such as providing a social safety valve or distributing assets to low-income people, that offset its cost to society' (Brinkerhoff & Goldsmith, 2005, p. 208). Accounts of the superiority of neoliberalist values, for instance, and their often imposing character in global governance, are increasingly criticized in scholarly debates up to a point that its full global feasibility is completely refuted (Pollitt, 2015; Rajagopal, 2013; Trommel, 2018). Often, such debates question the added value of neoliberalism to improve quality of governance worldwide. Moreover, as actors 'negotiate, formulate, and implement' governance policies and instruments 'in accord with their particular interests' (Bevir, 2010, p. 3), what constitutes 'good' and how this is to be translated to 'good policy' or 'good service delivery' is to a large extent a matter of choice and opinion. These choices and opinions are often rooted in promoting or defending public actor's specific interests and understandings.

This volume sets out to make sense of such dynamics and explicitly draws them into the narrative of what values matter to the quality of governance, and how. Key to this volume is the notion of the quality of governance as a highly volatile and context-dependent concept, which can only be understood in a given time and place (see Woods, 2000). Viewing its underpinning values as contextually relevant underscores the need for case-based evidence of the role of values in quality debates. This volume addresses this notion by adopting a contextual approach to values and violations of the quality of governance in incorporating contextual reflections and perspectives on a set of demarcated values in designated, independent case studies.

1.2.5   Contributions to This Volume

The individual contributions in this volume follow the order of the values framework as described earlier—democratic legitimacy, accountability, transparency, integrity, lawfulness, effectiveness (in terms of service quality), professionalism, and robustness—respectively. In addition, this volume consists of two parts: *quality: institutionalizing values in governance*

practices (Part I), and *quality: translating values in practitioner behavior* (Part II). Part I covers the contributions on democratic legitimacy, accountability, transparency, integrity, and lawfulness. These chapters are approached by the authors from an institutionalized perspective and mainly focus on how values are embedded in institutional structures and thinking. They consider how these values matter to governance *practices,* such as policies, strategic programs, rules and regulations, and assessment tools that address, or ought to address, overall quality. Of course, institutionalized practices have repercussions for the confines within which governance *practitioners* find themselves working. These practices create a public playing field that may determine and constrain public official behavior in administrative reality.

Hence, rather than *what* is done to accommodate values of governance, which is the focus of Part I, Part II concentrates on *who* is doing it and covers the remaining values of effectiveness, professionalism, and robustness. Within the confines of any larger entity, be it state, institution, or organization, public officials create their own value dynamics on the work floor. Through trial and error, and based on, and sometimes in spite of, institutionalized practices, they actively transfer values to practice— shaping, modifying, and changing values to fit the unique constraints of an organization or society along the process. Part II develops this theme of practitioner behavior with chapters addressing effectiveness in terms of service quality, professionalism in terms of public craftsmanship, and an analysis of robustness and how this value can be seriously undermined by forces of bureaucratic animosity. Thematically, these chapters have a greater focus on behavior of practitioners and how they, when faced with complex governance structures, translate values into practice.

The chapters reflect on values through several case studies in a variety of countries and policy domains, ranging from Italy to Australia and Romania, and from the prison sector to migration and crisis response. Others still are more theoretically oriented. Each contribution offers in-depth examination of the importance of the value at hand as a vital component of quality while at the same time reflecting on issues of violation. Questions dealt with include practical relevance and applicability in complex administrative realities, limitations to optimal utilization and adherence, and sub-optimal realization and its adverse effects. The contributions will be discussed in more detail in the following section.

1.3   Part I: Quality—Institutionalizing Values in Governance Practices

Democratic Legitimacy in Bureaucratic Structures: A Precarious Balance Chapter 2, our first substantive chapter by Neal Buckwalter and Dan Balfour, analyzes the value of *democratic legitimacy*. Their chapter considers the puzzle to what extent can democratic legitimacy be supported and maintained through bureaucratic means and authority? They frame bureaucracy as the process of governance subject to quality of governance scrutiny. Using one of the great failures of public administration in recent times—the lead poisoning in the water supply of Flint, Michigan, USA—these authors examine the concept of democratic legitimacy—what it entails, why it matters, and how it relates to other governance values. This case study and chapter reflects the darker side of governance processes where violations occur, and even the best intentions have led to outcomes harmful to the public. They then turn their focus toward those factors which may strengthen or diminish perceptions of democratic legitimacy, for as their guiding question implies, legitimacy is not a static value but rather exists in a relative state of flux. To flesh out these ideas, they examine the unique use of emergency financial managers in Michigan, an approach which has been much highlighted in recent years through the lens of a large-scale municipal bankruptcy and the water crisis.

Dissecting the Semantics of Accountability and Its Misuse Subsequently, Ciarán O'Kelly and Melvin J. Dubnick address the many different meanings that accountability harbors and examine the effects of such complex and multifaceted interpretations. They argue that good governance is increasingly put on par with the concept of accountability. As a cultural keyword, accountability has become both the medium and the message of modern governance. However, the call to make situations, processes, or people 'more accountable' often reflects a failure to appreciate the fundamentally relational nature of accountability. The concept is often abused to impose and control hierarchical and monopolistic relationships in governance. In Chap. 3, O'Kelly and Dubnick expand the metaphor of the 'forum' as a relational space of accountability to the 'agora' and the 'bazaar,' In doing so, they encourage a broader relational perspective that includes conceptions of people constructing purpose collectively, and people deriving meaning from mutual exchange. As such, the chapter explains how unaccountability tend to be a failure of power, and often a failure of force.

Transparency Assessment in National Systems Sabina Schnell uses Chap. 4 to propose a new conceptual framework for assessing *transparency* at the country level. Her chapter identifies three distinct interpretations of transparency: access to information; two-way communication; and predictability, or decision-making based on clear and publicly known rules. Each represents an increasingly demanding form of transparency, but all are tied to democratic accountability and the rule of law. Using the case of Romania, this chapter illustrates how such a framework can be employed to assess the evolution of transparency in a relatively recent democracy. Schnell's chapter reproduces work she foreshadowed for the Quality of Governance Study Group in 2015, which has since been published by the IIAS journal *International Review of Administrative Sciences.*

Integrity and Quality in Different Governance Phases In Chap. 5, Leo Huberts deals with *incorruptibility and impartiality* when he unpacks the concept of *integrity*—a task complicated by the plethora of meanings attributed to the concept by the extant literature. Furthermore, Huberts recognizes that there may be a number of blindspots in our interpretation of integrity and integrity violations within a quality framework. To address such blindspots, he focuses on four fundamental questions: (1) what is governance?; what is integrity (of governance)?; what is quality of governance in public values, good government, and good governance research?; and (4) what is the meaning/content of integrity in the context of quality of good governance? While answering such questions underpins the goals of the IIAS Quality of Governance Study Group, we recognize that Huberts' theoretical contribution to this volume is but another step and not the final word on our agenda. As he rightly points out, an empirical turn in research on values and quality is required.

The Multi-interpretable Nature of Lawfulness in a National Framework In Chap. 6, Anna Simonati produces an in-depth reflection on *lawfulness* in a detailed Italian case study. Like democratic legitimacy, Simonati demonstrates that lawfulness in terms of public administration is also a fluid value. Italy, like so many other modern democracies, has and continues to undergo administrative reforms in the public sector. Simonati's forensic examination of Italy's laws ruling its infamous bureaucracy demonstrates that despite the Italian constitution providing a rigid foundation for public administration, a level of flexibility is found within the processes of governance exercised by both the executive and legislature. In effect, the instru-

ments of state comply with the general principles in place as well as the rules (i.e. law) in force. Simonati argues that this allows at least three different conceptions of lawfulness. Her analysis demonstrates that lawfulness remains a value for the quality of governance; we, therefore, cannot neglect the technical boundaries—weak or strong—lawfulness provides to an administrative system.

1.4   PART II: QUALITY—TRANSLATING VALUES IN PRACTITIONER BEHAVIOR

Mission Impossible for Effectiveness? Service Quality in Public-Private Partnerships Next, in Chap. 7, Anne-Marie Reynaers covers the value of *effectiveness* and specifically explores the level of effectiveness of public-private partnerships (PPPs) in terms of the quality of Dutch public-private infrastructure and delivery of public services. The chapter analyzes the *quality shading hypothesis*—the assumption that private partners degrade public service quality as they prioritize profits and hence corrode overall effectiveness. The research uses a series of interviews with more than 60 project members in four projects in the Netherlands—the construction and operation of a highway; the construction, renovation, and operation of wastewater cleaning installations; the construction and operation of a detention center; and the renovation and operation of the Ministry of Finance headquarters. The outcome of Reynaers' elaborate research identifies which conditions determine quality in PPPs and concludes that service quality is neither safeguarded nor a priori better protected.

Professionalism and Public Craftsmanship at the Street Level In Chap. 8, *professionalism* is subjected to a rigorous analysis from the perspective of public craftsmanship. Specifically, Hester Paanakker's chapter represents an interpretation of professionalism on the micro level of policy implementation by street-level bureaucrats. Based on empirical data from a prison case study in the Netherlands, she contends that values of public craftsmanship are directly associated with, and derived from, the nature of the profession involved. In addition, even within professions, detailed accounts of good craftsmanship may be highly contextualized, with marginal levels of convergence among professionals. As a consequence, professionalism constitutes a broad category that may yield very different meanings and interpretations and that may harbor many different sub-

values. She concludes that conceptions of good craftsmanship ultimately determine how the public professional thinks, acts, and performs, and that they define how quality of governance is given shape at the frontline level.

Robustness and the Governance Sin of Bureaucratic Animosity In Chap. 9, the final substantive chapter, Adam Masters reflects on the meaning of *robustness*, focusing on the potential bad side of governance by means of individual public official behavior. Masters uses empirical examples from Australia to elaborate on how robustness, as a value that represents reliability and stability but also resilience and adaptive capacity, can be seriously flawed by what he labels as 'bureaucratic animosity.' Masters argues that bureaucratic animosity occurs within the black-letter framework of law and covers a range of governance sins that do not meet the threshold of criminal or corrupt behavior, but still violate the quality of administration. Such violations sometimes have devastating consequences for individuals or businesses, including significant financial loss of capital or income, business failure, and physical or mental harm. This widespread but underacknowledged governance sin involves fixed, inappropriate behaviors that directly undermine the required versatility and reliability of robust governance. For instance, irrespective of alternatives, administrators may be locked into a fixed and inappropriate response to the detriment of citizens or clients, who, in turn, may exacerbate poor governance by taking aggressive or combative approaches toward the system or the bureaucrat. This chapter concludes that both system-generated and client-induced instances of bureaucratic animosity are to the detriment of the robustness of governance.

The observant reader may notice now that the focus of the case studies in this volume has a rather Western character and is limited to American and European perspectives only. This is a limitation we acknowledge. This does not mean that we feel non-Western perspectives should be left out of the equation, on the contrary, but simply that the work of the members of our study group does not cover this geographical terrain directly yet. In addition, it is important to note that this volume contains no claim to universality whatsoever and does not set out to provide a 'global' overview of value attainment. Rather, as emphasized in the beginning of this chapter, we seek to provide a set of interesting, independent case studies that each explore the normative meaning and practical significance of a set of selected core governance values in applied settings. We will reflect on the meaning of this limited scope in more detail in Chap. 10, the conclusion

of this volume, which also identifies important (theoretical and practical) lessons that run across the chapters of this volume and articulates an agenda for future research on the quality of governance, for this study group and beyond.

References

Beck Jørgensen, T., & Bozeman, B. (2007). Public values: An inventory. *Administration & Society, 39*(3), 354–381. http://doi.org/10.1177/0095399707300703.

Beltrami, M. (1992). Qualità e pubblica amministrazione (Quality and public administration). *Economia e diritto del terziario*, (3), 669–781.

Berlin, I. (1982). *Against the current: Essays in the history of ideas.* London: Hogarth Press.

Bevir, M. (2009). *Key concepts in governance* (Sage Key Concepts). London: Sage.

Bevir, M. (2010). *Democratic governance.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Bøgh Andersen, L., Beck Jørgensen, T., Kjeldsen, A. M., Pedersen, L. H., & Vrangbæk, K. (2012). Public value dimensions: Developing and testing a multi-dimensional classification. *International Journal of Public Administration, 35*(11), 715–728. http://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2012.670843.

Bovaird, T., & Löffler, E. (2003). Evaluating the quality of public governance: Indicators, models and methodologies. *International Review of Administrative Sciences, 69*(3), 313–328. https://doi.org/10.1177/0020852303693002

Bovens, M. A. P., 't Hart, P., & van Twist, M. J. W. (2007). *Openbaar Bestuur–Beleid, organisatie en politiek* [Public governance. policy, organization and politics] (7th ed.). Alphen aan den Rijn, Netherlands: Kluwer.

Bovens, M. A. P., 't Hart, P., & van Twist, M. J. W. (2011). *Openbaar Bestuur, Beleid, organisatie en politiek (8th ed.).* Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer.

Bozeman, B. (2007). *Public values and public interest: Counterbalancing economic individualism.* Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Brinkerhoff, D. W., & Goldsmith, A. A. (2005). Institutional dualism and international development. A revisionist interpretation of good governance. *Administration & Society, 37*(2), 199–224. https://doi.org/10.1177/0095399704272595

de Graaf, G. (2003). *Tractable morality: Customer discourses of bankers, veterinarians and charity workers.* Rotterdam, Netherlands: Erim.

de Graaf, G., & Paanakker, H. (2015). Good governance: Performance values and procedural values in conflict. *The American Review of Public Administration, 45*(6), 635–652. https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074014529361

de Graaf, G., & Van Der Wal, Z. (2010). Managing conflicting public values: Governing with integrity and effectiveness. *The American Review of Public Administration, 40*(6), 623–630. https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074010375298

de Graaf, G., Van Doeveren, V., Reynaers, A.-M., & Van der Wal, Z. (2011). Goed bestuur als management van spanningen tussen verschillende publieke waarden. *Bestuurskunde, 20*(2), 5–11.

Easton, D. (1953). *The political system: An inquiry into the state of political science.* New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf.

Evans, M. (2012). Beyond the integrity paradox–towards 'good enough' governance? *Policy Studies, 33*(1), 97–113. https://doi.org/10.1080/01442872.2011.637324

Fukuyama, F. (2016). Governance: What do we know, and how do we know it? *Annual Review of Political Science, 19.* http://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-042214-044240.

Grindle, M. S. (2004). Good enough governance: Poverty reduction and reform in developing countries. *Governance: An International Journal of Policy, Administration, and Institutions, 17*(4), 525–548. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0952-1895.2004.00256.x

Grindle, M. S. (2010). *Good governance: The inflation of an idea.* Harvard Kennedy School of Government, CID Working paper 202.

Holmberg, S., Rothstein, B., & Nasiritousi, N. (2009). Quality of government: What you get. *Annual Review of Political Science, 12*, 135–161. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-100608-104510

Huberts, L. (2014). *The integrity of governance: What is it, what we know, what is done and where to go* (IIAS Series: Governance and public management). Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Huberts, L., Maesschalck, J., & Jurkiewicz, C. L. (Eds.). (2008). *Ethics and integrity of governance: Perspectives across frontiers.* Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Huberts, L., & Van der Wal, Z. (2014). What is valued in politics and administration. In L. Huberts (Ed.), *The Integrity of Governance: What it is, what we know, what is done, and where to go* (pp. 79-109). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kettl, D. F. (2015). *The transformation of governance: Public administration for the twenty-first century.* Baltimore, MD: JHU Press.

Kjaer, A. M. (2004). *Governance: Key concepts.* Cambridge: Polity.

Kooiman, J. (2003). *Governing as governance.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

La Porta, R., Lopez-de-Silanes, F., Shleifer, A., & Vishny, R. (1999). The quality of government. *Journal of Law, Economics and Organizations, 15*(1), 222–279. https://doi.org/10.1093/jleo/15.1.222

Löffler, E. (2002). Defining and measuring quality in public administration. In J. Caddy & M. Vintar (Eds.), *Building better quality administration for the public: Case studies from Central and Eastern Europe* (pp. 15–34). Bratislava,

Slovakia: Network of Institutes and Schools of Public Administration in Central and Eastern Europe.

Lukes, S. (1989). Making sense of moral conflict. In N. L. Rosenblum (Ed.), *Liberalism and the moral life*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Perry, J. L., de Graaf, G., van der Wal, Z., & van Montfort, C. (2014). Returning to our roots: "Good government" evolves to "good governance". *Public administration review, 74*(1), 27–28. https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12164

Pollitt, C. (2015). Towards a new world: Some inconvenient truths for Anglosphere public administration: The IIAS Braibant lecture 2014. *International Review of Administrative Sciences, 81*(1), 3–17. https://doi.org/10.1177/0020852314544069

Rajagopal, B. (2013). Right to development and global governance: Old and new challenges twenty-five years on. *Human Rights Quarterly, 35*(4), 893–909. http://doi.org/10.1353/hrq.2013.0063.

Reynaers, A.-M. (2014a). *It takes two to tangle: Public-private partnerships and their impact on public values*. Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam, Netherlands.

Reynaers, A.-M. (2014b). Public values in public–private partnerships. *Public administration review, 74*(1), 41–50. https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12137

Rose-Ackerman, S. (2017). What does "governance" mean? *Governance: An International Journal of Policy, Administration, and Institutions, 30*(1), 23–27. https://doi.org/10.1111/gove.12212

Rothstein, B. (2011). *The quality of government: Corruption, social trust, and inequality in international perspective*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Rothstein, B., & Teorell, J. (2008). What is quality of government? A theory of impartial government institutions. *Governance: An International Journal of Policy, Administration, and Institutions, 21*(2), 165–190. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0491.2008.00391.x

Rutgers, M. R. (2008). Sorting out public values? On the contingency of value classification in public administration. *Administrative Theory & Praxis, 30*(1), 92–113. https://doi.org/10.1080/10841806.2008.11029617

Rutgers, M. R. (2014). As good as it gets? On the meaning of public value in the study of policy and management. *The American Review of Public Administration, 45*(1), 29–45. http://doi.org/10.1177/0275074014525833

Spicer, M. W. (2001). Value pluralism and its implications for American public administration. *Administrative Theory & Praxis, 23*(4), 507–528. https://doi.org/10.1080/10841806.2001.11643542

Spicer, M. W. (2005). Public administration enquiry and social science in the postmodern condition: Some implications of value pluralism. *Administrative Theory & Praxis, 27*(4), 669–688. http://doi.org/10.1080/10841806.2005.11029517.

Spicer, M. W. (2010). *In defense of politics. A value pluralist perspective*. Tuscaloosa, AL: The University of Alabama Press.

Steenhuisen, B. (2009). *Competing public values: Coping strategies in heavily regulated utility industries*. Delft University of Technology, Delft, Netherlands: Next Generation Infrastructures Foundation.

Steenhuisen, B., & van Eeten, M. (2008). Invisible trade-offs of public values: Inside Dutch railways. *Public Money and Management, 28*(3), 147–152.

Stewart, J. (2006). Value conflict and policy change. *Review of Policy Research, 23*(1), 183–195. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1541-1338.2006.00192.x

Stiglitz, J. E. (2002). *Globalization and its discontents* (Vol. 500). New York, NY: Norton.

Thacher, D., & Rein, M. (2004). Managing value conflict in public policy. *Governance: An International Journal of Policy, Administration, and Institutions, 17*(4), 457–486. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0952-1895.2004.00254.x

Trommel, W. A. (2018). *Veerkrachtig bestuur: voorbij neoliberale drift en populistische kramp*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Boom Besterkunde.

Van der Wal, Z. (2008). *Value solidity: Differences, similarities and conflicts between the organizational values of government and business*. Ipskamp Drukkers B.V: Vrije Universiteit, Enschede, Netherlands.

Van der Wal, Z. (2016). Public values research in the 21st century: Where we are, where we haven't been, and where we should go. *International Journal of Public Administration, 39*(1), 1–5. https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2015.1072219

Van der Wal, Z., Nabatchi, T., & De Graaf, G. (2015). From galaxies to universe: A cross-disciplinary review and analysis of public values publications from 1969 to 2012. *The American Review of Public Administration, 45*(1), 13–28. https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074013488822

Woods, N. (2000). The challenge of good governance for the IMF and the World Bank themselves. *World Development, 28*(5), 823–841. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-750X(99)00156-4

Yang, L. (2016). Worlds apart? Worlds aligned? The perceptions and prioritizations of civil servant values among civil servants from China and The Netherlands. *International Journal of Public Administration, 39*(1), 74–86. https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2015.1053614