Abstract

The Mark O. Hatfield School of Government at Portland State University has engaged in public service leadership development work and graduate degree offerings in several international settings for over a decade. Over a 12-year period multiple programs have been been coproduced with partners in Vietnam, Japan and China. Our work in all of these settings has transformed our understanding of the transferability of general public administration practice and enlivened our understanding of the importance of contextualizing our approach to the delivery of state, local and federal agency partners in the U.S. This paper focuses on the process and outcomes of our engagements and the lessons we have derived in adapting a U.S. based MPA curriculum and professional development model to other political contexts. In particular we highlight the
Introduction and Background

One of the most striking developments in public administration education in the last ten to fifteen years has been the expanding attention to internationalization. Once treated largely as the preserve of international students, individual faculty and a handful of specialists, today “internationalization of the curriculum” has become fashionable in public administration programs just as it has across higher education in general (Jennings and White, 2005). In part this reflects reactions to transnational economies, international migration, and other considerations which link the global to the local. In part it reflects a search for additional streams of revenue to offset declining public support for higher education. And in part it reflects a sense in many institutions that an international component demonstrates leadership, foresightedness, and an external validation of program quality.

Specific manifestations of internationalization vary from institution to institution, and in practice some institutions pursue several approaches simultaneously. Programs may add courses or even specializations, develop collaborations with institutions abroad, encourage international research, recruit international students, or create international study opportunities for American students and practitioners. NASPAA’s 2004 survey of efforts to internationalize programs (J-PAE 2004: 259-262) documents the diversity of approaches and range of institutions actively engaged in such efforts.

At Portland State, the Hatfield School of Government began programmatic engagement and intentionally creating capacity for international work a dozen years ago in 2000. Prior to that many faculty engaged in international work individually or through relationships with other international organizations. Many faculty had as a part of their scholarly portfolio work in international contexts. Experiences of individual faculty provided significant insight and understanding to undertaking work in specific international contexts and the conditions needed to be successful in doing international work in more generally. Our engagements like many institutions began with individual student and faculty opportunities.

This paper focuses on the intentional programmatic development of international work over the last decade through the Center for Public Service in the Mark O. Hatfield School of Government. These programs often grew out of opportunities to work with mid-career public service professionals in short term training and education programs. Our strategy evolved to reflect our domestic approach in working with similar populations: we sought to build institutional relationships with partners who could assist in the coproduction and delivery of curriculum. Today we have significant partners in a number of countries including Vietnam, Japan and China.
Important to our experiences reported here is the institutional location of our efforts. These international engagements are rooted in our Center for Public Service (CPS), an enterprise unit within the School of Government closely linked to the Division of Public Administration. CPS delivers a variety of services, including applied research and policy analysis as well as training and professional development programs, graduate certificates and a graduate Executive MPA degree. These services are often developed in close cooperation with agency partners who help co-design the curriculum and co-produce the programs. This has been an important and enduring principle that has informed and guided our work with international academic and agency partners. CPS is an “edge” unit with faculty fully rostered in public administration but with an entrepreneurial spirit and commitment to meeting the learning needs of public service professionals. CPS has a long history, over 30 years, of inventive programs designed in collaboration with local and regional partnering institutions: agencies and organizations at all levels of government in the United States with a decidedly local and regional focus. Portland is a federal headquarters city and so CPS has an unusually robust set of programs with federal agencies and their professionals.

In the late 1990’s CPS experienced a growing number of requests to work in international settings. By early 2000, CPS decided to invest in several of these programs. As an enterprise unit, CPS was in a position to add faculty resources and staff capacity and execute agreements for such work as long as there was sufficient income from these activities to support the associated expenses. Dr. Marcus Ingle was hired to direct international programs for CPS and Dr. Masami Nishishiba was hired on a full time basis to assist in both international and domestic local government programs.

This paper reports some of the initial yield from the learning gained from this first decade of programmatic international work. First, we find that the challenges facing mid career public service leaders in other countries is similar to the challenges officials face domestically. Regardless of the international setting, officials are expected to both “deliver the goods” and “make sense” out of conflicting claims on the work they do. These dual challenges makes the exercise of discretion the chief problematic that is shared by public service professional across international settings. Second, the exercise of discretion is mediated by the institutionalized settings in which administrators operate. This necessitates a value-based orientation to governance and leadership and suggests attention to all the ways in which values are embedded in society: law, culture and organizations (Scott, 1995). Third, working in international contexts highlights the challenges of transferring practice from the American context to other settings and requires that we attend to the whole political system and constitutive elements thereof in working with partner institutions. This perhaps is the fundamental lesson. It obviously reflects new awareness in the institutionalized values we take for granted in the American system as well as those we lift up as the appropriate basis for prudential judgment in public administrators in the US and abroad.

We will organize this paper around these three “lessons learned” from our work in an international setting. In part I of this paper we will describe how the principle of administrative discretion has spawned our “co-production approach” to undertaking work with international
Part I: Administration Discretion and Coproduction: The Importance of Partnering to Integrate Theory and Practice

Partnering with agencies to co-design and co-deliver education and professional development programs has been a cornerstone of the work of our Center for Public Service. In its simplest form it is a way to recognize the important role that administrative discretion plays in promoting the public good with an opportunity to validate the role that agencies and their leaders play in this process. As globalization has increased the need for international collaboration both among nation-states and educational institutions, it has also made the co-production of knowledge, research and delivery of public services more important than it has been in the past. The traditional model in each of these domains of activity has been based on a model which separates “knowledge producers” from “knowledge appliers.” This model treats practitioners, clinicians, citizens and students as “doers” who are separate from those who are “knowers” of theory, a body of knowledge, or a set of expertise. This model is less effective today, particularly in settings characterized by “wicked problems” where there is no perfect solution or settings requiring reliance on shared power in policy making and implementation. These environments are frequently characterized by conflicting values, ambiguity about the existing set of conditions, uncertainty about the consequences of collective action, and limited resources both in time and money. These kinds of conditions call for co-production approaches to research, governance and leadership development (Battie, 2008; Morgan, 2009; Morgan, Green, Shinn, & Robinson, 2008, chapter 11; Morgan, Shinn, & Ingle, 2010; Rittel & Webber, 1973).

What is the co-production approach?

While coproduction first appeared in public administration literature in the late 1970s and early 1980s (Levine & Fisher, 1984), there has been a recent reemergence of coproduction in the public administration literature (BovaIrd, 2005; Joshi & Moore, 2004). Bovaird conceives it as an emerging paradigm within complex adaptive systems. He observes that the scope of coproduction has been extended to include the commissioning, planning, design and implementation of activities. Morgan (2009) extends this definition further to include the partners in all jointly sponsored activities:

Institutionalized coproduction consist of the processes, structures and shared values that support the provision of public service, leadership development, research and education through long-term relationships among participating partners.
This definition serves several purposes. First, it is intended to embrace the full range of activities that contribute to the creation and maintenance of the public good by those in the public, private market and nonprofit sectors. Second, it captures the wide array of motivations for undertaking coproduction, ranging from the instrumental goals of reducing costs and building public support to the more expressive goals of creating a community of shared values. Third, it is intended to serve as a vehicle for government organizations to understand, embrace, and be responsive to public values.

How does the model work?

The co-production partnership approach consists of core set of principles and practices that have evolved through trial and error with a variety of institutions in different cultural contexts. In the Hatfield School of Government’s co-production approach, these principles and practices are viewed as the “pre-conditions for a successful partnership”. They are used – in the form of a general check-list -- as part of the Hatfield School’s due diligence process for establishing a partnership to “pre-qualify a potential partner(s)”.

Co-production principles

Five key principles guide the co-production partnership approach as articulated by Professor. Morgan in the Hatfield School (Morgan, 2009):

1. Priority for a co-production approach should be given to partners who share a common purpose and to be an equal partner in the partnership process.
2. The co-production process should include the active participation and reflective learning of partner officials and key staff.
3. A co-production partnership should be grounded in a multi-level systems perspective which recognizes the importance of the partnership in relation to its context (both internal and external), and how this relationship gives rise to emergent partnership properties (e.g., new opportunities and new challenges thru time).
4. Co-produced partnerships between public sector institutions require continuous balancing of murky, grey and often contested values including cross-cultural differences (To paraphrase Prof. Morgan, “Public partnerships confront a continuous challenge of mediating competing values or competing interpretations of values at the center of one or more political systems.”)
5. Co-produced partnerships should have built-in capability to quickly understand and adapt to the changing internal and external context of both partners by use of transparent and consistent information sharing processes.

Co-production practices

The Hatfield School uses five key “co-production partnership practices” grounded in the School’s previous partnership experiences in the U.S. and abroad. These practices describe how the co-production process should be jointly designed and carried out. They are consistent with the “capacity improvement” methodology used by Booz Allen & Hamilton in its partnership with the Vietnam Ministry of Transportation from 2000 to 2002 that is grounded in research from the Asian Development Bank, the World Bank and other partnerships around the world (Booz-Allen, 2000).

A co-produced partnership should be guided by five core sets of practices:

1. The working arrangements and norms for the partnership should be based on a shared agreement of the successful partnership experience of the partners.
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2. The partnership’s strategy and action plans should be based on joint assessment and understanding of the current strengths and opportunities of both partners including additional opportunities offered by formation of a new partnership.

3. The partnership should operate as an integrated, cross-cultural team with a structured yet flexible organization and roles/responsibilities.

4. The partnership should commit to the joint use and joint transfer of the most modern knowledge, work processes and technologies.

5. The partnership should create and maintain an engaged and reflective learning environment related to both the substantive areas of work and the management of the partnership.

These co-production principles and practices formed the basis for several international partnerships including the partnership that began in 2006 between the Ho Chi Minh National Academy of Politics and Administration in Hanoi and the Mark O. Hatfield School of Government in Portland, Oregon (See Appendix I for a case analysis of this partnership).

The Case Study of a “co-production partnership” between Portland State University in Oregon, United States of America and the Ho Chi Minh National Academy for Politics and Public Administration in Hanoi, Vietnam

Vietnam has achieved remarkable socio-economic progress through its 1986 “Open market with Vietnamese characteristics -- Doi Moi” policy and its 2007 entry into the WTO. As Vietnam becomes a middle-income country, it confronts both opportunities and challenges. As resolved in the January 2011 XI Party National Congress, Vietnam must create new pathways -- including further quality improvements in socio-economic development -- for balancing high quality social and environmental development with the continuation of economic growth. Higher education plays a critical role in socializing new generations with historical wisdom and Vietnamese cultural characteristics while selectively integrating modern theory and practice. Vietnam’s State leading officials recognize that higher education partnerships with foreign institutions are required for improving the educational quality; yet there is limited evidenced-based research on how and why U.S.-Vietnamese partnerships are successful. To address this research gap, we provide a case study of an on-going “co-production partnership” between Portland State University in Oregon, United States of America and the Ho Chi Minh National Academy for Politics and Public Administration in Hanoi. The underlying question is: Is co-production, a successful educational partnership approach in the U.S., appropriate in the Vietnamese context, and if so what are the principles and practices for its effective adaptation and institutionalization?

The Vietnam setting for U.S. higher education partnerships

The 2009 Vietnam – US Higher Education Conference Report identifies several contemporary partnership challenges. First, a more transparent and supportive legal and policy framework is needed to encourage U.S. institutions to partner effectively with their Vietnamese counterparts. Second, Vietnamese institutions need to operate with greater autonomy and accountability so that long term reforms can be achieved. Third, attracting American higher education and private sector partner investments requires a realistic and mutually beneficial vision and a commitment to the principles of governance, autonomy, accountability, funding, operation, instruction, and quality. Forth, assurance of academic quality is a pre-requisite to the prudent allocation of funds to higher education institutions by the government, foundations, corporations, or other sources. Fifth, establishing an independent accreditation process would be an effective step in helping to achieve internationally accepted quality. Sixth, the accelerated acquisition of English language skills is essential. Seventh, increasing the number of Vietnamese PhD students in the United States
requires better undergraduate and M.A. preparation. In addition, reforms to create an enriched and open teaching and research environment must be enacted in Vietnamese universities in order to attract U.S. trained M.A. and PhD students to return to Vietnam to take positions in academia to strengthen the domestic research and higher education system.

These challenges point to the importance of creating and maintaining suitable and successful partnerships in the Vietnamese context. We now turn to a discussion of partnership success criteria and an explanation of the “co-production partnership” approach.

What are the criteria for successful partnerships?

The OECD defines a partnership “as an agreement to do something together that will benefit all involved, bringing results that could not be achieved by a single partner operating alone, and reducing duplication of efforts” (OECD, 2006). Partnerships have widely varying objectives, operating processes, and results. Partnership often present partners with special challenges. Levels of give-and-take, areas of responsibility, lines of authority, and overarching goals of the partnership must all be agreed to, executed and adapted over time for success to be realized.

While there is an extensive academic and popular literature on partnerships (OECD, 2006; McLean, 2011), there is a paucity of evidenced-based research which examines the specific criteria for successful partnerships. For purposes of this case study analysis, we will adapt a success framework used by the World Bank (Ingle et al, 2007). There are six criteria in our partnership success framework as described below:

1. Ownership of the partnership – Both partners consider the partnership as their own over time in terms of commitment, participation and allocation of resources
2. Relevant alignment with partner goals and priorities – There is a high degree of alignment between the partnership objectives and the policies and priorities of each partner institution.
3. Efficacy in delivering results and adapting to changes – The partnership can mobilize sufficient resources and power to effectively produce its intended results.
4. Efficiency in use of resources – The partnership represents a reasonable cost approach.
5. Appropriate implementation arrangements – The partnership is structured and organized with transparent communications and consistent practices to be operated and continuously adapted aligned with the schedule and within budget.
6. Sustainability of mutual benefits over time – The partnership includes a long term strategy and action plan.

We will use these criteria to assess the “success to date” of the on-going partnership between the Ho Chi Minh Academy and the Hatfield School of Government to develop a new “Public Leadership Discipline for Sustainable Development” in Vietnam.

How was the co-production approach applied and used?

The Hatfield School and the Ho Chi Minh Academy worked together from 2006 to 2011 on the basis of the “five co-production practices” presented elsewhere. Highlights are presented below.
Improve leadership capacity based on our shared past experiences

The working arrangements and norms for the partnership between Hatfield School and Ho Chi Minh Academy are based on a shared agreement of the successful partnership experiences of both partners. For the Hatfield School of Government, many faculties have direct experience with educational partnerships in Vietnam (Halimi et.al, 2010). For example, one faculty member began working in Hanoi in 1993 on training programs with the Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of Transportation. Beginning in 2003 and continuing, additional PSU faculties initiated partnerships with universities in Ho Chi Minh City.

The HCMA examined the history and capacity of the Hatfield School before deciding to establish the relationship. In 2007 and 2008, HCMA executive delegations – one headed by then President Le Huu Nghia – visited PSU to study the strengths of the Hatfield School’s public leadership program structure, curriculum, pedagogy and community partnerships. As the result of these visits, along with a series of in-country training workshops, both parties came to a joint agreement about ways to organize and operate the partnership.

Plan for the future based on an assessment of current strengths and opportunities

From 2007 to 2009, the Hatfield School of Government and the Ho Chi Minh Academy conducted multiple workshops and meetings to explore the strengths, strategies and mutual benefits of the partnership. For example, a joint SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats) assessment was completed in 2008. During these sessions, the two sides agreed on the co-production partnership objectives, the strategies to pursue and the intended short and long term benefits for both parties. (Neumann, 2009)

Work as an integrated project team.

In order to develop a high performing team, the Hatfield School and the Academy agreed on working arrangements and established a range of communication mechanisms. First, the two sides conducted a number of intensive working sessions in Vietnam and in the U.S. to build trust through open dialogue and discussion. This is very time consuming process but contributed to a very high level of trust and effectiveness. For example, at the beginning of every major partnership event (like our initial public leadership curriculum and active-learning pedagogy workshops in 2007) both sides agreed on a set of “specific planning premises” which served as a core set of norms and responsibilities for guiding the joint work. These premises included the values of patience, persistence, cross-cultural respect and flexibility. Second, both institutions have placed staff representatives abroad to assist the partnership through coordination, face-to-face clarification of differences and development of informal relationships. The Hatfield School has maintained continuous representation in Hanoi since 2007. From 2008 - 2011, the HCMA sent faculty members to study at the Hatfield School. These Vietnamese faculties also serve as the liaison persons between the two institutions. Third, both sides conducted weekly project meetings and shared common concerns and emerging issues in a prompt and transparent way.

Use and transfer modern work processes and technologies

To keep the information transparent and updated, the joint partnership management team decided to establish a dedicated website for the sharing of all curriculum and case documents, meeting minutes and
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reports. In addition, e-mail communications are regularly used to share information on substantive and logistical issues. Almost all decisions are vetted and agreed to by the other party before a final decision is made. Open and respectful deliberation is encouraged to understand and adapt to the unique characteristics of both partners. For example, from the beginning both sides have shared information on financial resources and how they are to be allocated for the efficient accomplishment of partnership goals.

Create and sustain an active and reflective learning environment

This project makes full use of the Hatfield School’s active “performance-learning” approach. That is, the partnership creates and maintains an engaged and reflective learning environment related to both the substantive areas of work and to the management of the partnership. In designing and delivering our public leadership education curriculum, the contents were proposed, then reviewed, then redrafted, then delivered, then further revised by both sides. In this manner of “recursive learning”, the leadership content has incorporated the political and cultural characteristics of both partners.

What are the partnership results compared to the success criteria?

In this section, we will use the criteria of successful partnership presented in the section 2.2 to assess the current results to date.

Ownership of the partnership over time

This criterion implies that both partners consider the partnership as their own in terms of commitment, participation and allocation of resources. Indeed, from the outset, both the HCMA and the Hatfield School have demonstrated their strong commitment to the partnership in terms of their official pronouncements and financial contributions. Both President Nghia of the HCMA and Hatfield School Director Tammen publically endorse the partnership. Financially, the two institutions are active in leveraging resources in addition to the Ford grants. For example, the Hatfield School has obtained several Hatfield School and Miller foundation grants that allow PSU faculty and students to travel to Vietnam and support the partnership.

Relevant alignment with partner’s goals and priorities

To meet Vietnam’s demands for world class leadership to facilitate the socio-economic development and international integration, the Academy is continuously seeking out modern, international-standard leadership education curriculum and pedagogy. This partnership is co-producing a new public leadership curriculum and pedagogy which combines modern leadership theory and practice from around the world with unique Vietnamese characteristics. The HCMA faculty who have been training in the new public leadership “EMERGE” curriculum are presently incorporating various EMERGE components into their ongoing courses and special training sessions. At the Hatfield School, the new EMERGE curriculum (with unique U.S. characteristics) is being offered in several new courses for students and public officials. The City of Portland and Oregon State have recently requested special sessions to examine the appropriateness of the EMERGE leadership framework in the U.S.

Efficacy in delivering results and adapting to changes

The HCMA-Hatfield School partnership has mobilized sufficient resources and power to reach its interim goals while adapting to the changing context over time. Specifically, the partnership has developed an international-standard EMERGE “Public Leadership for Sustainable Development” core curriculum with
Efficiency in use of resources

The partnership has embraced two mechanisms to ensure an efficient use of resources. The first mechanism is to make highly selective use of the highest costs resources (e.g., the U.S. costs) while making extensive use of lower cost resources (e.g., the Vietnamese costs). For example, all translation services are provided in Vietnam. Second, priority is given to the leveraging of resources on both sides. For example, the partnership encourages the use of professional volunteers and low cost student internships. In 2010, a PSU faculty group visited with the HCMA leadership faculty in Hanoi (at no cost to the partnership) to discuss current issues in sustainable development and active-learning pedagogy.

Appropriate implementation arrangements

The partnership has been structured and organized with transparent communications and flexible implementation arrangements so that it can be operated and maintained according to schedule and within budget. Both partners have management boards for sharing and agreeing on working norms and making partnership decisions. To date, the most important norm is the mutual respect for the political and social characteristics of each country, and an appreciation of relative strengths and limitations. To do so, we emphasize transparent and continuous communications and learning to bridge the differences of both partners. Effective communications lowers the transactional costs and facilitates the implementation and adaptation process.

Sustainability of mutual benefits over time

The partnership includes a long term strategy and action plan to link our current work to the longer term goals of both partners. Currently, the HCMA and the Hatfield School are co-developing a two new Prospectus documents – one with Vietnamese characteristics and one with U.S. characteristics – to secure additional long term financing. Both institutions are encouraging additional instructors from the HCMA to obtain leadership MA’s and PhD’s abroad. One HCMA faculty member will begin his PhD program in public policy and politics at the Hatfield School in the Fall of 2011. The HCMA has also agreed to co-sponsor (along with institutions in China, Japan and the U.S.) the Hatfield School’s 2nd international conference on “Government Performance Management and Leadership: Innovations Toward Sustainable Solutions” at Portland State University in October, 2011.

What’s working and what’s not?

Partnership features that are working

Reflecting upon our case experience to date, the co-production practices used throughout this partnership were acceptable to both partners and facilitated the achievement of many results -- albeit limited to the Phase I scope of work. Our assessment of what’s working well includes the following:

- The joint decision making process based on continuous and transparent communications. From the outset, both partners agreed to share their best ideas related to making the partnership work and to listen and pay serious attention to the suggestions of the other partner. Second, since the outset the
Hatfield School has maintained a continuous U.S. professional staff presence in Hanoi to assist with this partnership (on a part time basis).

- The levels of commitment to the partnership have remained consistently high due to the clear reciprocal benefits both in terms of the educational content, e.g., modern public leadership for wicked challenges, and the educational pedagogy, e.g., an engaged, student centered approach which is required for learning the practice the leadership and management. The continuation of the high level of commitment throughout the partnership has been aided by continuity in the core partnership team members since 2006.

- The partnership adaptation process is also working well. From the outset we agreed that both sides would need to remain flexible as conditions changed and new ideas emerged. For example, when it became apparent that it would be difficult to find sufficient HCM Academy faculty with adequate English competency to study in the Hatfield School, we agreed upon “suitable work-arounds” that aligned with local requirements.

- Finally, the leveraging of intellectual and financial resources by both partners helped to move the partnership forward. Both parties made a conscious agreement to do everything they could to find “matching resources” that would further the partnership objectives. The HCM Academy was able to augment its own faculty resources with faculty from its sub-institutes. Likewise, the Hatfield School was able to tap into sources of financing beyond the Ford Foundation to cover travel costs for student interns or take PSU students and faculty to Vietnam to work with the HCM Academy.

Globalization has created conditions across nation-state boundaries that provide a ripe opportunity for internationally coordinated research and leadership development initiatives focused on the problematic of building and maintaining the trust of the citizens in their governing institutions. With globalization, the rapid growth of information-age technology, and increased economic interdependence, it is no longer possible for political systems to build and maintain legitimacy by relying mainly on the traditional sources of “hard power” like the military, the rule of law, the civil service, political parties, and control of the flow of information to citizens. Individuals and groups now have increased capacity to link themselves together in loosely coupled networks to shape the meaning of the common good. The example of the terrorist attack on the United States on September 11, 2001 is a simple reminder of this fact. The 9/11 attack triggered a “hard power” response by the U.S. government and the expenditure of billions of dollars that significantly increased national security measures at home and abroad and provided partial justification for initiating two wars on foreign soil. But there is on-going debate as to whether these actions have made the American safer from terrorist attacks or, in the eyes of some, have been worth the price, both in terms of dollars expended and the compromise of important regime values (Napoleoni, 2010; Waldron, 2010; Weinberg & Eubank, 2011). What makes this debate different from traditional ones on the exercise of hard power by sovereign nation states is the interdependence of the global community and the waning ability of “sovereigns” to keep their sovereignty intact by relying on traditional hard power measures. This common condition faced by almost every nation in the world provides a rich opportunity for new approaches to collaborative research, education, leadership development and the delivery of public services.

**The Collaboration Imperative.** In response to the increased need and opportunity for collaboration, several universities around the world have created a consortium to improve public service performance and evaluate strategies for building citizen trust in their governments. They include the Hatfield School of Government at Portland State University, the School of Management at Lanzhou University in China, Waseda’s Okuma School of Management in Japan, the Ho Chi Minh Academy in Vietnam, and the Seoul Korea, Municipal Government and Rutgers University. All of these partner institutions share a common interest in improving public service performance by:
Developing close partnerships between educational institutions and public service agencies and their practitioners with the goal of undertaking applied research, providing technical assistance and engaging in leadership development; 
- Creating and sharing knowledge through conferences, joint research projects and co-authored publications; and 
- Facilitating practitioner, student and faculty exchanges designed to capture and share the lessons learned from one another on strategies for improving government performance.

Part II: A Value-Centered Framework for Improving Public Service Leadership and Governance

A second important “lesson learned” from our international work is the need to have it informed by the values and institutions that are unique to the setting within which we are doing our work. We sometimes call this a “regime-centered” approach to public service education and leadership development. Our work with the University of Lanzhou 2000 School of Management since has been singularly responsible for making this approach more explicit (see Morgan, Bao, Larsen and Wang 2011). In this section we draw heavily from the research and writing produced by this partnership.

In framing our international work we have drawn heavily from the public value paradigm developed at the Kennedy School of Government by Moore (1995) and Heyman (1987). They argue that there are three dimensions to public sector work that build trust: value, legitimacy and support, and operational capacity. These are pictorially represented in Figure 1 below.
directs managerial attention to the value proposition that guides the organization; legitimacy and support directs managerial attention to the question of where the support for pursuing the value will come from, and operational capacity focuses attention on the question of whether sufficient know-how and capability exist to achieve the desired result. The model provides a comprehensive strategic view of a value-centered approach for government managers and public officials. In this model leaders must pay upward attention to the authorizing environment, outward attention to the purpose to be achieved and the value to be created, and downward and inward attention to management of their organizations (Moore, 2000). To Moore’s conception we add, as shown in Figure 1, foundational societal values which infuse all leadership calculations to the extent leaders are cognizant and responsive to them—a topic we will take up next in the next section on public value-based performance management.

Public value-based performance management is important to government and its associated public sector performance because (a) it emphasizes the importance of considering value propositions—different from the generic management principles found in the Reinvention of Government of the New Public Management Movement. (b) it advocates a collaborative network view of governmental process, and (c)
the framework emphasizes the political marketplace in which the public sector operates. A public governance perspective is displayed through the interconnection of value, legitimacy and support and operational capacity. To Moore’s original tripartite Venn diagram, we have added the leadership perspective that corresponds to each of the three parts of the Venn diagram and the underlying foundational societal values which infuse all of the elements.

With the additions we have made to Moore, public value-based performance management (VBPM) can be understood as a vector originating from foundational public values from which particular public values are elicited through value-based public processes to inform and guide public value-based concrete actions. VBPM structure is therefore comprised of three interrelated parts of (a) foundational public values, (b) value-based public processes, and (c) value-based concrete actions—each influencing the other. The function of each part, respectively, is to (a) reflect deeply held foundational societal and regime values, (b) formulate and express public values, and (c) create public good and public value through material programs, projects, or delivery of services. Moore (1995) suggests that public value creation can be viewed in terms of an open system in which inputs are converted, through activities and processes, into outputs and outcomes, with the active help of co-producers and partner organizations. Figure 2, below, depicts the public value-based performance management vector juxtaposed with Moore’s public value chain. Public values arising from the vector are shown to infuse processes throughout the value chain. From this perspective, the vector can be seen as the foundational process through which public value-based performance produces public good and thus public value.

Figure 2: Synthesis of Moore’s (1995) Public Value Chain and Public Value-Based Performance Management from Bao, Wang & Larsen (2011, p 27)
The ultimate goal of public service education, research and leaderships development is enhance the capacity of governing officials to create and maintain the confidence and legitimacy of the citizens it serves. But what counts for confidence and legitimacy varies from one political system to another and varies over time with the changing contextual setting, including the challenges being faced and how that setting is perceived by its participants. For example, in an earlier day political systems were not judged by their success in mitigating the degradation of the environment. Now that is changing for governments around the world. In fact, the current emphasis on the need to take a public value-centered approach to government performance is influenced by the growing consensus across distinctly different political systems that public officials and governing systems cannot maintain the confidence of the citizens they serve simply by being effective and efficient in the delivery of public services.

Our review of the literature has resulted in the creation of an education and research framework that consists of the following four dimensions, which we believe provide the basis for undertaking international public service education, research and professional development: (a) core political and public values, (b) regime governing structures and processes, (c) leadership competencies, and (d) responsiveness to the contextual setting. We argue that high performance with respect to each of these four factors will build and maintain legitimacy and trust in government across different political systems (Morgan et al., 2010). These dimensions are summarized in Figure 3, below, and elaborated in greater detail in the sections that follow.
Core Political and Public Values

Every political system stands for something, a set of values that it holds up as the aspirational standard for measuring its achievements. For example, the United States values liberty as the primary value, in contrast to China and Vietnam, which give primacy to the value of equality. In addition to the underlying core values of a political system, there are party and ideological values that interpret these core regime values and transform them into policy platforms, policy initiatives and public programs, which take on meaning through regime structures and processes. As these programmatic activities unfold and take on reality through the work of public officials at various levels of the political system, the value and meaning
of these earlier initiatives undergo further transformation. The final stage in the value making and transforming process occurs when citizens and stakeholders participate in these programs.

Drawing from Larsen (2011), a public values-based approach to government performance has two parts, each of which draws from a different body of research and schools of thought: the institutional school that focuses on the social institutions which form and hold values and the instrumental school that focuses on creating results—the domain of organizational leadership and management. The institutional school is important for understanding how values are formed, held, and shape government actions, while the instrumental school is important for understanding how these values get successfully transformed into government performance. The discussion below simultaneously borrows from both schools. Although values and governance are treated separately, both the construction of public value and instrumental governance happen through the agency of socially constructed institutions—in the first case “social institutions that form and hold values” and in the second case “regime structures and processes”.

Taking up public values first, Figure 4 shows a progression from right to left that proceeds from the abstract notion of regime values and institutions that form and hold values in society to the situational expression of particular ideas. Society, as discussed above in 2.1, forms and holds values in a variety of social institutions. We view regime values as a more particular refinement and expression of societal values. They are formed by the political institutions from which the regime arises and are of special interest to public officials as the embedded and explicit values of the government they serve. Foundational societal values can be viewed as particular values and value sets—those formed around the importance of families for example. People, of course hold and tap into these values and become agents for giving them expression. The institutional view of value creation we have outlined here enables us to see how foundational societal values take on concrete expression and how they shape and influence a narrower set of institutional values that form and shape the various structures, processes, and values of the political system.

Figure 4: The Social Construction of Public Value: From Concrete to Abstract from Larsen (2011, p. 26)
Figure 5 below enables us to see how general and abstract regime values get transformed through public administration into concrete programs, projects, and services that produce both particular public goods and create particular public problems. Each regime constructs structures and processes that reflect these values and uses them to set the standards for the exercise of political leadership and administrative discretion. More concretely and instrumentally, regimes, their agencies, and public officials create government policies and programs which result in material projects, activities, and services. These produce public benefits as well as problems. As every public official and administrator can attest, people often eagerly respond to government projects, activities, and services by vigorous expression of values. Figure 5 also illustrates how various public administration models or paradigms we presented in Figure 1 rest on a particular set of foundational societal values that set it apart from other models.

Government agencies and agents, by dint of duty, are naturally responsive to regime values, structures, and processes. Figure 5, however, shows a gap between instrumental government performance and foundational societal values. This gap is a reminder that although regime values are a partial reflection of foundational societal values, they are only a particular set of values favored by a particular regime. It is also a reminder that while all governments increasingly operate in a fishbowl, they cannot consult with citizens at every step in their deliberations and actions. To do so would paralyze government. Practically speaking, public officials know that sooner or later they will hear from people about their reactions to projects, activities and services.
The important point we want to make about Figures 4 and 5 is this: The institutional expression of foundational societal values culminates in the situational expression of values by people and the instrumental expression of government performance also culminates in the situational expression of values by people. These two different icebergs share the same tip. That is why we argue for the importance of tying the instrumental work that government does to the values that this work serves. It illustrates both how and why instrumentally connecting public values with government performance can lead to outcomes more in concert with public values and how this process itself facilitates the creation of additional values that builds legitimacy of government actions and trust in their leaders.

Although Figures 4 and 5 depict an orderly flow from abstract institutions that form and hold values to their concrete expression by governments and people, the real world is a more chaotic and uncertain place both for people who hold values and public administrators who often must respond to them.
Expression of values by particular people around government projects, activities and services can be seen as merely the tip of these two invisible icebergs of which the people expressing values are only dimly aware, if they have any awareness at all, of the institutions that formed and holds the values they are expressing. Government officials, however, through purposeful leadership and management can infuse government actions with public values at particular points in the process, thereby increasing the greater public good.

The process of socially constructing values through time creates tensions, which leaders of the political system must take into account and balance. For example, China, Vietnam, the United States and Japan, in the face of radically different histories and cultures, must balance the values of economic prosperity, individual liberty, equality and protecting the environment (Okun, 1975; Posner, 2003). How these values get balanced at any given time depends not only on which values are given primacy over others, but also on the structures and processes of political authority, the competencies of the leaders and the way in which these factors are shaped by local conditions, challenges, and contexts.

**Contextual Setting: The Emergence of “Wicked Problems”**

One of the most important reasons for the emergence of a value-centered approach to public governance is the increasing importance that sensitivity to the contextual setting plays in determining the performance of governments and their leaders. There are three dimensions to this contextual setting: (a) public values, which we have discussed above; (b) wicked problems; and (c) fragmentation. In large and diverse political systems like China, the United States, and the European Union, one of the performance challenges faced by policy makers and local political leaders is the need to align policy goals and implementation strategies with the values that are unique to the geographic setting, history, culture and other relevant contextual factors of a geographic and culturally diverse setting. In such cases, how can political systems create policy goals at the center while taking into account the various local circumstances that will ensure support for the achievement of these goals over the long haul? All governments from the local to the international level continue to experiment with various models in order to find better answers to this question, whether it comes in the form of creating citizen/neighborhood associations, decentralizing government decision making, or creating semi-autonomous governing entities and regions. All of these strategies represent variations on a public value-centered approach to governance and leadership. But there are two other contextual issues that deserve additional attention. One is the emergence of what has come to be called “wicked problems” and the other is the challenge of governing and leading in a world that has become increasingly fragmented. We will focus on the contextual characteristics of problems in this section and focus on contextual characteristics of authority structures in the sections to follow.

Government will not perform very well if its policies and leaders do not have a good understanding of the nature of the problems they are confronting. For example, you can’t fight forest fires in the same way that you fight terrorist; you can’t regulate prostitution in the same way you approach pollution or problems like “swine flu”, E-Coli or “mad-cow disease”. High performance requires that governments adapt their policy and leadership strategies to the nature of the problems they are trying to solve. Public administrators are faced by a plethora of problems, which come in every size, shape, and complexity. Some are relatively straightforward while others are confoundedly wicked (Brookes, 2008; Roberts, 2000).

Drawing from our experience, ongoing research, and our review of the literature, we have created a typology of problems summarized in Table 3. Our typology draws upon the work of both Roberts and Brookes, but emphasizes the differences between difficult problems created by complexity and difficult problems caused by conflicting values. Drawing from Larsen (2011), we have organized problems around...
a two dimensional scale. On the horizontal axis, we have ordered problems by their degree of complexity: low or high. On the vertical axis, we have ordered problems by the degree to which they are characterized by value conflicts: low or high. This results in a four-fold quadrant. In Quadrant One problems are characterized by both a low level of complexity and value conflict. Problems in Quadrant Two are characterized by low levels of value conflicts but high levels of complexity. Problems in Quadrant Three have the opposite set of characteristics: low levels of complexity but high levels of value conflict. Quadrants One and Two represent the Classical Public Administration and NPM models summarized above in Table 1. These models rely on the expertise of a specially trained cadre of professional career administrators to sort, order, plan, coordinate, develop and implement solutions to problems, both simple and complex, under the direction of elected officials. These models do not anticipate that administrators will have the lead responsibility for resolving value conflicts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complexity</th>
<th>Value Conflicts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Quadrant Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• High Complexity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Low Value Conflicts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Quadrant One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Low Complexity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Low Value Conflicts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Problems in Quadrant Four represent the most difficult challenge for governments and their leaders because they involve conflicts among competing values for which there is no easy and quick solution (Larsen, 2008b; Larsen & Wang, 2011). For example, how do officials protect the environment without compromising economic growth? How do they respond to citizen concerns about new government initiatives without increasing the costs and compromising the efficiency of operations? But these are exactly the kinds of trade-off problems that are becoming increasingly more common and for which leaders have the least training, preparation, skills and processes in place to successfully deal with them (Bao, Wang, Zhou, et al., 2011; Batie, 1990, 2008; Brookes, 2008; Roberts, 2000). We have adopted the increasingly common practice of calling these value-centered trade-off problems “wicked”. Rittel and Webber (1973) formally describe wicked problems as those that have the following attributes:

1. There is no definitive formulation of a wicked problem—they are unbounded;
2. Wicked problems have no stopping rule—indeterminate solutions;
3. Solutions to wicked problems are not true-or-false, but good-or-bad;
4. There is no immediate and no ultimate test of a solution to a wicked problem;
5. Every solution to a wicked problem is a “one-shot operation”—no opportunity for trial and error;
6. Wicked problems do not have an enumerable set of potential solutions;
7. Every wicked problem is essentially unique;
8. Every wicked problem can be considered to be a symptom of another problem;
9. The existence of a discrepancy representing a wicked problem can be explained in numerous ways. The choice of explanation determines the nature of the problem's resolution; and
10. The planner [decision-maker] has no right to be wrong.

Any solutions to wicked problems, almost by definition, are in the eyes of the beholder. As Churchman (1967) points out, one of the chief characteristics of this class of problems is that they have an “evil quality” because proposed "solutions" often turn out to be worse than the symptoms” (1967, pp. B-141) in the eyes of some of participating “behavioral”. For these reasons the problems in Quadrant Four can be fairly characterized as wicked. Problems in Quadrant One are often not exactly simple, but can always be dealt with in a straightforward manner—acknowledging that such problems may take a lot of work to resolve. Problems in Quadrant Two problems can be simply characterized as complex. Problems arising from Quadrant Three, even though there may be few moving parts, often prove to be difficult to resolve because there are value conflicts among participants that are deeply held. Because of this characteristic we have labeled Quadrant Three problems as difficult. We have summarized these different kinds of problems and their characteristics in Table 4 below.

Table 4
Problem Types Based on the Dichotomy of Complexity and Value Conflicts from Larsen (2011, p.31)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complexity</th>
<th>Value Conflicts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Quadrant Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Complex</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Quadrant One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Straightforward</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quadrant Three</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Wicked</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Difficult</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performance and Authority Structures and Processes
We have argued that correctly assessing the nature of a problem and doing so in ways that align with public values, is critical to maintaining the legitimacy and trust of citizens in their government and political leaders. But when these two tasks have successfully been completed, it is not sufficient to ensure success. A third set of factors that affects performance is the structures and processes of authority through which collective action can be initiated and sustained. Increasingly, governments do not have all of the authority structures and processes in place to solve the problems that plague citizens and public officials alike. For example, illegal immigration, pollution, economic prosperity, health-care, adequate housing, employment, etc. are the result of factors that no one governing entity can singularly control and, if it could, has the resources to act alone. This creates the need to work with other government jurisdictions, companies in the market economy, nonprofit organizations in civil society and other sovereign nation states to obtain the agreement and resources needed to succeed in meeting the performance expectations of citizens (Brookes, 2008; Crosby, 2010; Morgan, Green, et al., 2008; Roberts, 2000). In short, the authority and power to meet performance expectations and maintain legitimacy and trust has become more dispersed, thus requiring
leaders to create and operate successfully in horizontal structures of authority in addition to traditional hierarchical structures. The latter relies on hard power approaches (i.e. the military, the rule of law, the civil service, political parties, and control of the flow of information to citizens) while the former depends more on the use of soft power (i.e., persuasion, cooperation, cooptation, influence, relationships, partnerships, collaboration).

There are numerous factors that contribute to the rise of dispersed centers of power in the modern world resulting in the need to develop competencies in leading in these kinds of settings. As we pointed out in earlier sections of this paper, most governments are confronting a larger array of competing values, problems that are more “wicked”, and a greater level of interdependence among citizens and nation states for one another’s collective wellbeing (Morgan, Green, et al., 2008; Morgan et al., 2010).

**Need for New Leadership Competencies**

Legitimacy is shaped by the values and the political decision making structures and processes, but it is also shaped by the competencies of those who fill these positions and serve as the agents of the regime’s values. If leaders do not possess the knowledge and skills to design organizational structures and processes that meet the performance expectations of those who make and benefit from policy initiatives, then the legitimacy and trust in government is undermined. As we argued in the previous section, governing competencies have traditionally been judged in relationship to a given position within a hierarchical system of governing authority. But increasingly governing competencies are being judged in terms of the ability of government to create authority that operates successfully in horizontal dispersed power settings. Public officials must not only be good in doing traditional hierarchical management, but they must also be good at creating and operating in loosely constructed networks and confederations that are held together by agreement rather than rules and the exercise of hard power (Brookes, 2008; Crosby, 2010; Morgan, Shinn, & Green, 2008; Roberts, 2000; Salamon & Elliott, 2002).

One way of seeing the wide range of leadership competencies needed for high performance is to map what counts for successful problem-solving. We have used our list of problems in Tables 4 and 5 to identify some of the implications for successful leadership. Table 6 illustrates that leaders need to operate simultaneously in two worlds, one that is highly structured and rule-centered and another that is highly unstructured and relationship-centered. The Hatfield School of Government’s Center for Public Service has used this information to develop a new leadership development curriculum called, EMERGE. The curriculum is designed to better prepare leaders to operate simultaneously within vertical and horizontal structures of authority (Ingle et al., 2011; Ingle & Myint, 2011; Magis & Duc, 2011).

### Table 6: Leadership Competencies for Successful Problem-Solving from Larsen (2011, p. 34)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem Type</th>
<th>System Orientation</th>
<th>Value Orientation</th>
<th>Leadership Actions</th>
<th>Focus of Leadership Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Straightforward</td>
<td>Complex</td>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td>Wicked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mono-centric</td>
<td>Polycentric</td>
<td>Mini-centric</td>
<td>Polycentric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal focus</td>
<td>Internal focus</td>
<td>External focus</td>
<td>External focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agnostic values</td>
<td>Explicit values</td>
<td>Limited explicit</td>
<td>Unlimited explicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Value conflicts</td>
<td>Value conflicts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Output management</td>
<td>Coordination</td>
<td>Interest-based</td>
<td>Diplomacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>conflict resolution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management within an organization</td>
<td>Coordination among organizations</td>
<td>Forging collective horizontal leadership</td>
<td>Forging collective vertical and horizontal leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results of Leadership</td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>Agreement on actions</td>
<td>Agreement on the nature of the problem and its solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Unit of Analysis</td>
<td>Outputs, Transactions</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Conflict Resolution</td>
<td>Consensus building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Archetype</td>
<td>Tactical and Operational Management</td>
<td>Strategic Management</td>
<td>Strategic Leadership</td>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy of Public Administration</td>
<td>Classic Public Administration</td>
<td>New Public Management</td>
<td>New Public Governance</td>
<td>Beyond New Public Governance*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* NPM to tame complexity, NPG to tame value conflicts, Explicit framing and grounding in public values.
Part 3. A Value Centered Research Framework for Performance Governance and Leadership

The conceptual framework we have outlined in this paper provides the basis for a shared research agenda for undertaking education, research and public service professional development work across international systems. In the sections that follow we provide an illustrative list of the kinds of questions that have been spawned by our international framework and which we intend to explore in the future as part of our work with international partners work.

3. 1. Public Values

1. What is the source of public values?
2. How do the sources of public value vary from one political system to another?
3. What public values are held in common across political systems?
4. What are the processes by which government and its leaders capture and use public values that are relevant to their work?
5. What are the feedback mechanisms that enable government and its leaders to know that they are being successful in their “public value” centered approach to governance and leadership?
6. What evaluation approaches can be used to determine the effectiveness of public value-centered mechanisms that government uses?
7. How can public values best be incorporated into performance measures for public administrators?
8. Does an orientation toward public values result in improved public welfare?
9. What benefit do public administrators perceive in an orientation toward public values in leadership and management? How does this benefit compare to those perceived by elected officials.
10. What are some effective mechanisms and strategies for identifying and successfully dealing with the multiplicity of values that need to be taken into account when undertaking a given policy initiative and the ability to move forward in its implementation?

3. 2. Contextual Responsiveness and Accountability

1. What are some effective leadership and management models that enable flexibility in policy implementation?
2. How does the need for contextual responsiveness vary with the kind of problem that government is seeking to solve?
3. How and to what extent do the kinds of contextual factors affect the need for flexibility in policy implementation?
4. What are some effective mechanisms to assist policy makers in deciding how much flexibility to incorporate into policy initiatives and implementation?
5. What kinds of performance measures are useful for determining the success and effectiveness of “contextual responsiveness”?

3. 3. Aligning Public Values with the Character of Public Problems

1. Is an orientation to public values equally efficacious for all kinds of public problems?
2. What kinds of performance measures are most appropriate for the various kinds of public problems that government is trying to address?
3. How can performance measures for different kinds of problems be aggregated and used by public agencies whose missions and work require a wide mixture of problem-solving strategies?
4. What are effective strategies for developing performance measures for problems that undergo transitional change or when the perception of decision makers and affected parties is in disagreement?

3. 4. Authority Structures and Processes

1. How does a public value approach to governance and leadership operate differently at the central, provincial/state and local levels of government?

2. How should performance measures change with level of government?

3. How does a public values orientation to governance and leadership affect the boundaries between the roles of elected or appointed political officials and public administrators?

4. What is the nature of conflicts that may arise between political officials and public administrators around an orientation to public values?

5. What are the implications of “power-shared” problem-solving for the various levels of the bureaucratic and political hierarchy?

6. What are successful strategies for ameliorating value conflicts between administrators and elected officials?

7. What strategies can be used to assist administrators and elected officials embrace a public value approach to governance and leadership?

3. 5. Leadership Competencies for a Value Based Approach to Governance and Leadership

1. What competencies are needed by leaders who are required to simultaneously operate within vertical and horizontal structures of authority?

2. What are successful techniques and strategies for success in a power-shared world?

3. What are the leadership competencies needed for each of the different kinds of problems that government seeks to solve?

4. What are the competency implications of “power-shared” problem-solving for leaders at each of the different levels of the political and bureaucratic hierarchy?

5. What are the competency implications of “power-shared” problem-solving for the bureaucratic and political hierarchy?

6. What are the most effective strategies for assessing the kinds of competencies that public administrators and elected officials need to be successful in their work?

7. What are the most successful strategies for providing public officials with the competencies they need to be successful?

8. What kinds of performance measure can be developed to assess whether public officials possess and successfully use the competencies needed to be successful?

Part 4. Summary Conclusions and Path Forward

This paper has argued that the study and practice of administration has entered into a new era that requires a return to a more wholistic approach. Such an approach requires an integration of Classic Public Administration and New Public Management with New Public Governance and a Value-Based Approach to leadership and administration. Larsen (2011) conducted an analysis of the nexus between public administration and governance for each public administration paradigm. The nexus is described in terms of the role prescribed for public administrators in governance for each. The nexus shown in Table 7 below can be considered an epistemological map to which public administrators can lay claim and draw on for
insights in their pursuit of high government performance. Table 7 illustrates the kind of wholistic and integrative approach we have in mind.\(^2\)

Table 7

*The Functional Nexus between Public Administration and Governance from Larsen (2011, p.18)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition of Public Administration’s Role in Governance</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Staffing agencies based on competence rather than influence</td>
<td>Classical Public Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. General restriction of government agencies to administration rather than formulation of policy(^1)</td>
<td>Classical Public Administration, New Public Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Checks and balances to sharpen purpose and increase effectiveness</td>
<td>New Public Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Emphasis on customer (citizen) service</td>
<td>New Public Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Fostering the ability of agencies to learn and adapt</td>
<td>New Public Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Emphasis on executive branch professionalism and managerial competency</td>
<td>New Public Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Shift to a focus on nature of instruments rather than agencies and their programs</td>
<td>New Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Shift in organizational form from hierarchy to network</td>
<td>New Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Shift from public vs. private to public and private</td>
<td>New Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Shift from command and control to cooperation</td>
<td>New Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Shift from management skills to enablement skills</td>
<td>New Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Shift from sole agency provision to co-production of goods and services</td>
<td>Co-Production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Providing a constitutive role of citizen engagement in governance</td>
<td>New Public Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Emphasis on duty to serve and engage citizens</td>
<td>New Public Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Providing a constitutive role of community leadership</td>
<td>New Public Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Government performance anchored to public values</td>
<td>Public Values-Based Government Performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: \(^1\)With the exception of policy formulation and regulation process prescribed for agencies by law.

\(^2\) Our summary conclusions and path forward is drawn from the work of Bao, Wang, and Larsen (2011, pp. 31-33). It is a call to action and is reproduced below in its entirety.
The wholistic approach reflected in Table 7 suggest that a public value-based government performance management is not a slogan but a real challenge for government, its associated public sector, and its political and administrative public officials. Focusing merely on the instrumental value of performance management is not sufficient to meet the challenges faced today by governments, governance, and citizens. Government performance management cannot be treated only as an instrumental tool anymore, but must necessarily rise to the challenges of governance by connecting government performance management to public values. Based on the literature and continuing joint research by the public administration faculty and students at Portland State and Lanzhou Universities, this article explicates the structure, function, and purposes of a public value-based approach to government performance management and leadership.

The international research agenda we are calling for in this paper has never been more urgent. In many important ways, the challenges facing society and their governments today are unprecedented. We are at the gateway to the new Millennium. When we look back over time, people were dominated by natural processes of the natural world. They were, in large measure, at its mercy and were mostly on their own with only a modicum of social and governmental support. However, when we look forward, all across the Earth humankind is creating projects on a truly monumental scale. It is not an exaggeration to say we are remaking the Earth. Humankind’s activities dominate natural processes—even the climate is changing. To confound the problems, we are connected as people in newly powerful and complex ways. The patterns of production and consumption spawned by global capitalism impacts every corner of the Earth for better and worse. Global communication brings joys and sorrows from every continent into our living rooms on a daily basis. International travel and tourism is approaching a billion people per year and generating close to a trillion U.S. dollars per year in revenue (Messe Berlin GmbH, 2010). The recent global financial crisis has adversely affected most people on the planet. It is a small planet, its population is large and growing, and its carrying capacity is being threatened. Never before, in the history of humankind, has what governments and people do mattered more (Friedman, 2007).

We see, in the evolution and transition of public administration from the first efforts of nation building, through classical public administration, through new public management, through new governance, through new public governance and leadership, and newly now to public value-based government performance management, a coming of full circle to the same spirit, kinds of challenges, and fundamental issues that faced the forefathers of every nation as they engaged themselves in the business of nation building. According to our conceptualization of public value-based performance management, public officials (both political and administrative), citizens, businesses, non-governmental organizations, and academia all have an important and privileged role in helping nations rise to their challenges and secure their destiny. Only through wide engagement and collaboration orchestrated by a government through its public officials can trust, legitimacy, and sustainable development be achieved.

Public value-based government performance is an abstract concept that can ultimately be understood as a philosophy of governance. But more to the point, it can be understood as a guiding star of the leadership and management of a government’s public officials. Government performance management is no longer a vertical instrumental monument to efficiency and effectiveness, but it also is a horizontal and networked set of institutions that can breathe life into government giving it the capability to reliably and systematically create public value. For this challenge, a suite of new managerial and leadership skills need to be developed within the public sphere to help governments and its officials deal positively with the wicked problems faced by people and their governments.
Summary and Conclusions

I. Findings and results

- Yields – programmatic adaptations reflected in changes over time/ key people
- Intellectual yield: 
  a. Regime theory toward comparative polity performance
  b. American experiment via Foundations legacy and constitutive work
  c. Implications for developing administrative capacity and administrators in different “whole systems” requiring different sensibilities, instrumental behavior and sense making

Summary and Conclusion

Several themes stand out as we review this last decade of intentional engagement in international public administration education. First is the fundamental fact that context matters. The whole political system and its constitutive elements provide a basis for understanding the institutionalized values public service leaders must attend to in exercising discretion. Second, is that the engagement model characterized by collaboration and coproduction provides a pathway for such work. Finally sensitivity to both of these themes creates an opportunity to repatriate what is learned in international setting for use in domestic public administration programs. More specifically, we can offer these take aways as working propositions for future work.

- Engage in practice – This can be arranged through applied policy research, intervention in policy implementation or evaluation work. It can also be through professional development programs aimed at practicing professionals where live case study strategies are a part of the learning methods. Finally, when improved practice is seen as the appropriate measure of success, even degree programs can be views as action research where learning is an expected outcome.
- Action Research –
- Student involvement in coproduction
- Substantive as well as literal translation –
- Commitment over time – Collaboration
- Pathway to success – Emergence of a pattern or sequence of actionable steps
References


Governmental Performance Evaluation (CCLGPE), Lanzhou University, and The Hatfield School of Government, Portland State University, Oregon, U.S.A.


Appendix I

Vietnam Case Study: Lessons Learned from Co-production
Appendix II

Summary List of Reports, Projects, and Publications

From the Partnership Between

The School of Management at Lanzhou University
The Hatfield School of Government’s Center for Public Service
and
Ho Chi Minh National Academy for Politics and Public Administration (HCMA)


McLean, Peter. 2011. “Five Key Factors in Developing Successful Partnerships”. 
Vietnamese Education Law, 2005. Achieved at: 
http://www.moet.gov.vn/?page=6.3&type=documents&view=2741