

1. Introduction

Peter Leisink, Paul Boselie, Maarten van Bottenburg and Dian Marie Hosking

INTRODUCTION

This chapter introduces some of the various approaches to managing social issues. This will help to situate the later contributions and will give an idea of the positions taken in terms of the range of relevant approaches. One of the attractions of an edited volume is that it can offer a variety of perspectives from a range of authors who each demonstrate the potential of their own concepts and theories by selecting authors from different disciplinary backgrounds and who are involved in different fields of study. However, it is also necessary that the field be mapped and common reference points indicated so that readers can benefit from the diversity of the individual contributions. That is the aim of this introductory chapter.

The chapters in this volume engage with various aspects of managing social issues in relation to the possible public values that they serve. Some chapters concentrate on developing a theoretical framework by linking different theories and disciplines with regard to the creation of public value through public service motivated performance and public–private policy coordination. Others theorize and analyse cases that show how various actors in human service organizations, such as hospitals and universities, in voluntary organizations, such as sports organizations, and in private organizations make sense of the social issues faced in their daily activities, how they understand the public values involved and how they manage these. This chapter provides a theoretical background and concentrates on two general questions:

1. What are social issues and why are they labelled as ‘social’ issues?
2. What is a public values perspective and in what ways do the various approaches conceptualize public values?

SOCIAL ISSUES

Societies face complex issues. Today's issues, and the circumstances under which actors must address these, are different from what they were some decades ago, as two examples illustrate. One example is the ageing of the population, which is accompanied by an increasing demand for pensions, healthcare and care facilities for the elderly. How are we to manage the many issues related to ageing when the public budget is under severe strain, when the active labour force that contributes to providing these facilities is declining, when many older workers feel an entitlement to facilities for which they have paid during their working life, while employers continuously consider introducing new technologies and relocating production rather than implementing HR policies that would support sustainable labour participation of older workers (for example, Taylor 2008)? Another example is the growing diversity seen in Western societies and the many issues this raises, including for example that some of the indigenous population attribute their feelings of insecurity and perceived disadvantages, such as in the case of job loss or poor housing in deprived neighbourhoods, not to processes of globalization but to immigrants with an alien, often Islamic, culture and to highly educated politicians adopting a multicultural ideology. The ensuing threats to social cohesion are a consequence that affects communities from the local to the national and supranational levels.

The term 'wicked problem' was introduced by management scholar West Churchman (1967), who discussed the moral responsibility of operations research to help managers tame their 'wicked' problems. Wicked problems were contrasted to relatively 'tame' soluble problems such as those seen in mathematics or chess. Later, public policy writers began to use the term to refer to complex social issues, ones which involve many individuals and organizations with conflicting views about the problems and possible solutions, while a solution is dependent on their collaboration (Ferlie et al. 2011; Sullivan and Skelcher 2002). Sociologists regard social problems as social issues when these refer to situations that are incompatible with the values of a significant number of people who agree that action is needed to alter the situation (Rubington and Weinberg 2010, p. 4). These theoretical considerations are illustrated in the situations in the examples that we gave earlier since these are evaluated as a social problem by those who argue their position by referring to their values on health, social security and diversity, and who have different interests in the proposed solutions. As people are diverse and problems are complex, the assessments of such social issues differ strongly because different people hold different values. Consequently, many people may agree that action is needed to alter the current situation, but how these social issues should be precisely managed is a matter of controversy.

The traditional answer to such controversies by researchers in public administration is to regard elected politicians as authorized to decide how to deal with these complex social issues. Once politicians have decided that the government must take responsibility, the ‘social’ issue becomes a ‘public’ issue, meaning that the government takes responsibility for dealing with it (for example, Pierre and Peters 2000). However, there are other approaches which do not focus so much on the primacy of representative government but rather study the sensemaking of local actors and bottom-up attempts to deal with the collective issues facing them in their everyday lives.

In the examples we gave there are clearly macro-questions. For instance, a multicultural society in the historical context of a Western democracy raises the question of the relationship between state and church, and the related question as to whether civil servants are allowed to wear a *burqa* or other religious symbol while in function. It is apparent that elected politicians will have to debate and decide on such issues where the state is itself involved. However, apart from these obvious macro-questions involving politicians, there are many other manifestations of similar social issues that play out on the local level where politicians are not involved and local actors debate the issue, make claims about the values they think are at stake and argue about what should be done in the public interest as they understand this. An example is of companies that decide to offer jobs to asylum-seekers based on a combination of labour market, company reputation and social responsibility considerations. Another example is of local sports clubs that experience tensions and occasional conflicts related to an inflow of immigrant youngsters and an outflow of native youngsters. A sports club has various options to manage this process and this often leads to heated debates in which people make claims about what the sports club should do, and these are often based on public values similar to those that are discussed in parliamentary debates. The sports club will ultimately act on what its board and members – or at least a majority of them – perceive as a convergence of their social responsibility and the organizational goals.

From a public values perspective, these examples of sensemaking and actions by local actors are just as much part of managing social issues as they are a legitimate matter for parliamentary debate. One should note that the examples do not deal with the sort of value conflicts that confront people in their personal lives, but deal with value conflicts that confront actors when involved in an organizational problem connected with the collective interests of the wider community. A public values perspective is about the space available to address the tensions and fusion of organizational challenges and collective social concerns and to debate competing interests and values, leading to action to achieve what the people concerned value and to add value to the public sphere (Benington 2011; Box 2007). In essence, this book focuses on

the interrelationship between how people are organized and organize themselves (informal groups, communities, clubs, private, non-profit and public organizations) on the one hand, and how they deal with social issues on the other. The actions they undertake can take place on the local level but also on the national level without the direct authoritative involvement of government. Authorization from elected politicians is not a prerequisite for a public values perspective since other actors have an understanding of what they hold to be public values and, guided by this, they undertake action in what they believe to be the public interest.

This approach not only requires acknowledging the multilevel nature of a public values perspective (for example involving individuals, groups, organizations, communities, clubs, sectors and nations), but also notions on individuals and groups as agents of public values. In the mainstream public administration literature, individuals, groups, clubs and organizations are, often implicitly, seen as receivers of top-down public values themes. At the same time, other approaches – perhaps more commonly found in the field of organization studies – including interpretive, interactionist and social constructionist perspectives, not only address the social interactions among actors involved in shaping public values but also indicate the leeway for agency in constructing public values on all ‘levels’ and in all spheres of interaction.

There are many historical examples of social movements being the first to articulate public values that only much later were successful in gaining political legitimacy, as with the suffragettes who claimed the right of women to vote and the environmental movement that raised awareness of the public value of sustainability. Studying grassroots civil society perspectives provides another insight into the dynamics of public interest formation. This view is more sociological in nature and follows, for instance, Bourdieu (1987) in regarding public debate and political deliberation as a symbolic struggle among government, stakeholders and other actors who mobilize their resources and make use of institutional conditions in an attempt to make their view on the collective interests the legitimate view. In framing the issues that we study as ‘social issues’, we emphasize that we take a broader view on these issues than the authorized public (that is, representative government) view, while maintaining that the debates and actions on these issues are framed as much in terms of public values, and are aimed at the collective interests of the community, as is the case with parliamentary debates. To put it another way, there are many collective concerns that stakeholders have opinions about based on the public values they hold, and local action is well able to create public value in the absence of authorized governmental involvement. Although the creation of public value does not require governmental endorsement, the legitimacy of actions taken may be enhanced through support by government or public organizations.

PUBLIC VALUES PERSPECTIVES: MAPPING THE FIELD OF APPROACHES

The remarks above indicate that theoretical approaches have different views on the question whether social action can only be regarded as informed by public values and as intent on creating public value when politics and government have said so. Various theoretical perspectives within public administration recognize a relatively broad governance approach to dealing with social issues and in providing public services, such as the public value approach (for example, Alford 2009; Benington and Moore 2011a; Hartley 2011; Moore 1995). However, they maintain that the answer to the question as to what constitutes public value is the outcome of processes of political representation and deliberation (Alford 2009, pp. 11, 33; also Alford and O'Flynn 2009) and that government has a leading role in shaping what people collectively value (Benington 2011, pp. 43–4). Public administration theory in general, including the governance approaches, appears unaware of, for instance, social responsibility initiatives in the private sector and the relevance of the academic study of these developments in acquiring a public values perspective. In response, this section will take a broader view on public values and public value creation, one that is not restricted to the public administration literature but will also include relevant work from areas such as strategic management and organization studies.

We begin by noting that within the public administration field there is a line of research that studies 'public value' creation and another that studies 'public values' (plural), and that these two hardly acknowledge each other (see West and Davis 2011). Our choice of the term 'public values perspective' does not imply an exclusive preference for the second line of research. We believe that the two lines of research intersect more than is usually recognized, and that public values are ultimately made use of by politicians and social actors in concrete situations to make sense of, and legitimize, the ways in which they intend to take action towards complex social issues and the public value they think should be created. This is the function that Rubington and Weinberg (2010, p. 4) attribute to values: that is, values help in assessing social issues and in inciting social action and change if they are incompatible with the principles of a significant number of people. In a similar way, Stewart (2009) describes the function of public policy values, which she argues manifest themselves in particular areas of government action such as in designing health systems where choices in terms of the values of universality (common provision for all citizens) or choice (competitive provision) are topical. The resulting public policy is usually a compromise between different value positions. Stewart (2009, p. 14) regards public policy values as 'the valued ends embodied in, and implemented through, the collective choices we make

through policy processes'. Public values are a 'bridge between politics and policy', they first have a role in the thinking and debating about what is desirable and possible (policy formulation) and then in processes that have to do with translating thoughts into action (policy implementation) and, together, these processes create value for the public (Stewart 2009, pp. 11, 24). This view on the role of public values illustrates how public value creation and public values deliberation are linked. The following paragraphs will elaborate on these two lines of research that have developed separately within the public administration field.

The Public Value Approach

Moore (1995) argues that managerial success for public sector organizations should be assessed in terms of the public value they create. Managers should be intent on creating public value in both the short and the longer terms, which might at times mean increasing efficiency, effectiveness and fairness and, at other times, introducing a new political aspiration or meeting a new need in the organization's environment (Moore 1995, p. 10). In concrete examples of public value produced by organizations, Moore shows that the political process that decides to provide a public value, as a right that will be guaranteed by the state, will involve justification by public values. Thus, in the case he discusses (1995, pp. 38–48) on garbage collection, the justification of the government taxing citizens for garbage collection lies in the claim that garbage collection protects public health, alongside the argument that this particular good cannot be provided by the market because it is a collective good that cannot be divided up and sold to individual customers. Related to this, Moore (1995, pp. 53–4) argues that public managers can not only create value by producing things of value such as clean streets to particular clients and beneficiaries, but also by operating an institution that provides them with a platform on which to account for the public organization's performance and for the citizens to define and authorize the public value they demand beyond the authorization granted through politics.

Moore's *Creating Public Value* (1995) has been influential but also controversial. Critics (Rhodes and Wanna 2007, 2008) have argued that Moore attributes authority to public managers that is the democratic prerogative of elected politicians, while others (Alford 2008; Alford and O'Flynn 2009) have, in turn, accused these critics of misreading Moore. Recently, Benington and Moore (2011) analysed the features of Moore's public value framework in the context of the 1990s with its increasingly strong ideological preference for running government as a business. Benington and Moore (2011a, pp. 9–10) believe that, in some respects, Moore did go along with the NPM trend of looking for more responsive and effective government programmes that would

create what the public valued. In other respects, Moore's public value framework did not adopt the market as its frame of reference because it was firmly committed to the idea that the proper arbiter of public value is society as a whole – and not the customer – acting as best as it can through the processes of representative government (for example, see Moore 1995, pp. 29–31).

Benington (2011) positions his own networked community governance approach within the public value framework but expands the definition of public value so that it includes not only 'what the public values', but also includes 'adding value to the public sphere'. He argues that creating what the public values, as measured by client satisfaction, is an individual approach, whereas adding value to the public sphere does not emphasize individual interests but rather the wider public interest. He recognizes that there is often a tension between the two, and that it is part of the role of government to take the lead in shaping and responding to people's ideas of who is the public and what is collectively valued: 'this involves a constant battle of ideas and values, because the public sphere is heavily contested territory' (Benington 2011, p. 43). For Benington (2011, pp. 45–6), public value extends beyond market economic considerations and can encompass social, political, cultural and environmental dimensions of value. As an example of social and cultural values that can be included as public value, Benington suggests adding value to the public realm by contributing to social cohesion and community wellbeing; as examples of political value he offers adding value to the public realm by stimulating and supporting democratic dialogue, active public participation and citizen engagement; and as an example of environmental value he suggests adding value to the public realm by actively promoting sustainable development. Economic value includes adding value to the public realm through the generation of economic activity, enterprise and employment. Several of the examples of 'dimensions of value' that Benington gives correspond with public values that Jorgensen and Bozeman (2007) include in their inventory of public values. For instance, Jorgensen and Bozeman (2007, pp. 360–61) include 'social cohesion' and 'sustainability' in the set of values describing the public sector's contribution to society, and 'dialogue' and 'citizen involvement' in the set of values dealing with the relationship between the public administration and citizens.

Returning to Benington's use of the public value framework, it is interesting to note that he assigns public values (plural) an explicit role in the public debate:

Public value provides a conceptual framework within which competing values [*sic*] and interests can be expressed and debated, in a deliberative democratic process, by which the question of what constitutes value is established dialectically. The concept of public value allows for contest, and for diversities of values and identities, within a negotiated understanding of what it means to be part of the wider public sphere, at that time and place. (Benington 2011, p. 50)

The participants in the debate – among whom Benington includes individuals, communities and organizations – express their views on what constitutes public value and on what public value should be created by referring to and debating the public values (or dimensions of public value) that they claim to be legitimate.

The Public Values Approach

According to Jorgensen and Bozeman (2007, pp. 361–2), public values (plural) are related to the public interests to which an actor's actions should contribute. For instance, the public value of altruism implies that one should act in the interest of others. Jorgensen and Bozeman (2007, p. 354) see public values as important in both governance and public service. However, although the government has a special role as the guarantor of public values, public values are not the exclusive province of governments. According to Jorgensen and Bozeman (2007, pp. 373–4), 'public value is rooted, ultimately, in society and culture, in individuals and groups, and not just in government'. As a consequence, private citizens have obligations in relation to their society's public values. Jorgensen and Bozeman do not elaborate on what these public value obligations involve apart from compliance with the law, but one may assume that these would involve contributing to the institutional conditions that establish public values such as participation in elections and public debates, and contributing to activities that create public values such as social cohesion.

Jorgensen and Bozeman concentrate their analysis on governments and private citizens. They note (2007, pp. 373–4) that 'public values are not the exclusive province of government, nor is government the only set of institutions having public value obligations'. They suggest that 'private actors have public value obligations', which create extra-legal obligations for private actors. An example of how they see this is given in the form of voluntary organizations, such as neighbourhood associations, community groups and sports organizations, that serve a cause in the local community. One can also think of voluntary organizations that serve a particular idealistic cause of civil society such as developmental agencies or environmental and human rights organizations. In her analysis of public policy values, Stewart (2009) examines other actors and interest groups including trade unions, medical professions and feminist and environmentalist movements. Such organizations generally participate prominently in the public debate and do not hesitate to criticize governments for their lack of attention to what they consider as contributing value to the public realm. Further, as suggested by Jorgensen and Bozeman, there is no *a priori* reason to exclude private organizations, such as for-profit organizations, when it comes to public value obligations.

Based on a survey of public administration and political science literature, Jorgensen and Bozeman (2007) listed 72 public values which they then classified into seven constellations. Some of these constellations refer to the relationship between the public sector and the external environment, society and citizens. Others refer to the relationships between groups that constitute the public sector, such as between politicians and public administrators, and between public management and employees. While Jorgensen and Bozeman describe these values as pertaining to the public sector, there are some constellations of public values that cannot be regarded as exclusive to the public sector. For instance, the constellation covering the public sector's contribution to society, which includes such common-good public values as public interest and social cohesion, altruism, human dignity and sustainability, is regarded by other authors as holding equally to private organizations (see next section).

Comparing the public value and public values frameworks, one sees that the public value framework centres, as West and Davis (2011) observe, on the conditions for the production and distribution of public services. However, contrary to what West and Davis (2011, pp. 229–30) claim, the public value framework allows a role for public values in establishing 'what constitutes value' 'here and now', in a way that was elaborated upon by Benington (2011) and which is not too different from the public values approach elaborated by Jorgensen and Bozeman (2007). The normal routine of public organizations is to produce public value that 'politics' has accepted as the responsibility of government to provide (Alford 2009). In newly emerging or constantly changing instances of complex social issues, such as in the earlier examples of an ageing population and a multicultural society, one observes that government, politicians, citizens, voluntary associations and non-profit and private organizations refer to public values, contextualize them in the concrete issues they debate and use them to legitimize the kind of social actions they promote as in the public interest. Here we touch upon an issue that is underdeveloped in the public value(s) approaches, that is the notion of social responsibility that both voluntary and profit organizations may develop.

The Corporate Social Responsibility Approach

Among public administration authors, the role of private organizations in the public debate and in social action for addressing complex social issues is something of a blind spot. Attention is given to corporate attempts at agenda-setting, that is, influencing the agenda of public authorities (see also, Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith 1993), but the role of private organizations as creators of public value is underexplored apart from their role as a service provider contracted by a public authority. This situation is recognized by Benington (2011, p. 36), who acknowledges that the emergence of new patterns of

networked community governance implies a shift in governance's centre of gravity away from the state and towards civil society. Benington (2011, p. 36) elaborates on the implications as follows:

[...] the policy initiative (the definition of goals and priorities, the generation of policy ideas and options, the assessment of alternatives, the design of programmes, the forms of organization and implementation) is increasingly shared with informal networks of users, neighbourhood associations, community groups and minority ethnic organizations, as well as with more formal partners from the public, private and voluntary sectors.

However, what role the private sector can play remains unclear and indications elsewhere, such as in Benington and Moore's (2011b, p. 262) concluding remark: '[...] in the new world of governance, they [government officials] are joined by individuals in the voluntary, non-profit sector, and *even* those in the commercial, for profit sector' (our italics) suggest an acknowledgement of both civil society and private sector involvement but also that this involvement from the profit sector is unlikely. Their conclusion is also remarkable given there has been a surge of research and publications in the field of 'social issues in management' (the label used by the Academy of Management) and the central concept of corporate social responsibility.

The social responsibility concept dates back to the 1970s and builds on the open system and institutional theories of organizations (Leisink 2005). These perspectives concentrated on the relationships between organizations and their political, economic, sociocultural and technological environments. The increasing interaction between organizations and society was regarded as meaning that organizations had to comply with legal requirements but also to go beyond these on a voluntary basis. Corporate social responsibility refers to this voluntary commitment by organizations to do more than comply with legal requirements (Kaptein and Wempe 2002). What corporate social responsibility substantively involves is regarded as dynamic and contingent, but the concept of the triple bottom line introduced by Elkington (1997) provides a general operationalization in terms of the responsibilities that organizations have for profit, for the planet and for people. This concept has been adopted in various lines of research, including by authors on strategy and human resource management (Boxall and Purcell 2011; Paauwe 2004; Paauwe and Boselie 2007). The concept has also been adopted by numerous companies and many have detailed their CSR concept in their corporate codes. Kaptein and Wempe (2002, pp. 229–31) reported on an analysis of the corporate codes of some one hundred of the world's largest corporations. The responsibilities towards a range of stakeholder interests that these codes recognize as legitimate concerns for a corporate strategy refer to several public values that are similar to those listed by Jorgensen and Bozeman (2007). Table 1.1 provides examples of corporate responsibilities that

Table 1.1 Examples of stakeholders' interests recognized by corporate codes on CSR

Employees

Encouraging personal development/growth/use of talents
 Offering good terms of employment
 Creating a balance between work and private life

Society or community

Respecting human rights/dignity and promoting them wherever practicable
 Recognizing government's legitimate obligation to society
 Supporting public policies and practices that promote human development and democracy
 Supporting/participating in local initiatives that promote peace, security, diversity, and social integration

Natural environment

Preventing/limiting/reducing/controlling negative environmental impacts
 Using energy and other natural resources effectively and prudently
 Preventing/preserving natural environment or treating the environment with due care

Source: Based on Kaptein and Wempe 2002, pp. 230–31.

address various stakeholders' interests. Those regarding society and the national environment clearly resonate with Jorgensen and Bozeman's cluster of public values that address the public sector's contribution to society.

Various authors (for example, Boxall and Purcell 2011; Kaptein and Wempe 2002) elaborate on the strategic tensions confronting companies that follow from these various responsibilities, or more generally from the goals incorporated in the triple bottom line. One might argue that the pursuit of such conflicting goals limits private organizations' abilities to participate in the debate over public values and indeed to create public value. However, such a view would ignore the reality that public organizations are equally confronted with specific contexts in which public values clash, most notably the values of efficient, effective and responsive public management on the one hand with lawful, ethical and impartial management on the other (Van der Wal et al. 2011). Despite the dilemmas that flow from such conflicting demands, which may affect corporate action, these corporate social responsibilities do indicate how companies could have a role in the public debate and in social action aimed at addressing complex social issues, either passively when called upon by governments or other social actors, or actively by taking the initiative themselves.

OUTLINE OF THE BOOK

The chapters in this book offer a range of perspectives. Some take a governmental/public organization perspective, others a voluntary sector/civil society perspective, while others offer a private sector perspective and a few straddle the 'divide' and combine public and private perspectives. Most of the chapters were presented and discussed at a conference organized by Utrecht University's School of Governance. Some chapters were specifically commissioned with the view of achieving a comprehensive and balanced analysis of the specific questions this book seeks to address. These questions are:

- What values are constructed as 'public' by various public, voluntary and private organizations, and by social actors, in relation to the complex social issues that they deal with in their organizational field?
- What kinds of perceptions do various organizations and actors have of respective responsibilities and relationships among public policy, civil society and private business actors?
- How do organizational actors deal with the tensions between various public and other values with which they are confronted in addressing complex social issues?

To help create a context in which the insights offered by authors on the above questions can be fruitfully analysed, the various chapters are grouped together.

Part I Actors and Public Values in their Organizational Field

Part I of the book consists of five chapters (Chapters 2–6) that concentrate on how various actors make sense of public values in relation to the complex social issues they deal with in their organizational field. In Chapter 2, Brewer argues that public values that have traditionally guided public organizations in dealing with classic social problems, such as crime, disease and illiteracy, are no longer the meaningful touchstone they once were now that social services are increasingly provided by networks that involve non-profit and private organizations with their different value sets. Brewer suggests that new values such as good stewardship, sustainability and equity are gaining prominence and that network managers must learn how to manage towards public values. In Chapter 3, Vandenabeele, Leisink and Knies complement Brewer's analysis by elaborating on a model in which public values infuse and surround the entire process of public value creation and the public service motivation of employees. These two chapters draw strongly on the public administration and management literature. The following chapter, by van Rinsum and de Ruijter, borrows from anthropological approaches in their case study exploring the

different visions of the values that a university should serve. They show that the 'academic professional tribe' subscribe to community-oriented public values while the managerial tribe hold to organization-oriented values of accountability and efficiency. The subsequent two chapters elaborate on a bottom-up perspective by concentrating on actors in local-level practices. In Chapter 5, Grint and Holt argue that initiatives related to Big Society in the UK address social issues such as housing problems more effectively than before because the nature of these problems is local and because this approach enables local learning about what the public values. Vermeulen's Chapter 6, on the organization of social issues through sport, notes that the policy discourse on sport tends to value sport for its assumed potential to contribute to social issues such as the inclusion of youth. He argues that the focus of attention should be on local-level processes in sport in order to uncover what values are produced. Vermeulen concludes by suggesting that these values include learning to make decisions about rules and learning about the hardships of inclusion and exclusion.

Part II Social Responsibilities and Possibilities for Collective Action

In Part II, four chapters (Chapters 7–10) concentrate on the perceptions of various actors regarding the respective responsibilities and possibilities of governments, of voluntary and private organizations and of organizational actors for dealing with social issues. In Chapter 7, Spaaij describes the combination of an interventionist policy style and a pluralist governance approach taken by the Australian government to promote participation in mass sports. He analyses the problems inherent in this approach and reflects on the necessary conditions for devolving responsibilities for dealing with social issues. Chapter 8 by van Bottenburg describes a related case in the Netherlands where voluntary sports organizations have taken the lead in framing elite sport as a public value and where the government has gradually come to endorse this view. He also pays attention to the other side of the coin, namely that the government's consequent claim for responsibility over the elite sport policy and its willingness to invest public money in the elite sport system confronts sports organizations with a loss of autonomy and their self-governance. Van Berkel and Leisink, in the next chapter, examine the conceptual space that governance theories and organization studies offer for non-governmental actors to accept social responsibility for increasing labour participation and to take voluntary initiatives that pursue related public values. Finally, Chapter 10 by Claringbould and Knoppers examines the social issue of the persistent under-representation of women in top positions and analyses the causes of the apparent failure to address this complex issue despite there being laws that forbid discrimination and the commitment of organizations to promoting equity.

Part III Dealing with the Tensions Between Different Public Values

Chapters 11–14 in Part III address the question of how organizational actors deal with the tensions between the different public values they are confronted with in addressing complex social issues. In Chapter 11, Gastelaars concentrates on middle managers in public organizations who operate in the midst of contradictory claims. Gastelaars argues that they keep alive the core values that are considered crucial to their organizations' legitimacy, and that they do so in specific ways that are related to their institutional environment. A similar case of conflicting claims by various stakeholders is presented in Chapter 12, which focuses on professional football clubs that are increasingly involved in social issues. Van Eekeren analyses the various goals, ranging from increasing social awareness to earning money, that inform football clubs' corporate social responsibility (CSR) activities. He observes that the values that a club's CSR strategy serves are strongly influenced by the club manager's competences in operating in the stakeholder arena. Koster and van Dijk, in Chapter 13, focus on leaders in the very different contexts of local community facilities in Brazil and medical clinics in the Netherlands. A common feature in these different settings is that their leaders have to deal with groups that have diverging interests and who project their values onto the leaders. Koster and van Dijk suggest that leadership may operate at a point where divergent values converge and co-exist, but without being 'reconciled'. Finally, in Chapter 14, Boselie, Paauwe and Farndale study the roles undertaken by the human resource function in private organizations, where they serve at the interface of firm performance and individual and societal wellbeing. They develop a conceptual framework that elaborates on various corporate governance and risk management activities that, they argue, contribute to safeguarding an economically and socially legitimate organization. On the basis of case studies, these authors examine factors that may stimulate those public values that are essential in a particular field.

Conclusions

This book has deliberately selected instances of social issues and public value creation in diverse organizational settings, which are then written about by authors who employ different theoretical perspectives. The diversity of the cases and the theoretical perspectives is necessary to demonstrate that the awareness and sensemaking of public values related to complex social issues is not restricted to what one would see through the lens of public administration theories. These theories, just as management and organization studies do, frame their subject in a particular way. By combining these various perspectives we have been able to show the broader landscape of public value orien-

tated meaning and of actions concerning social issues. We hope that this approach has convincingly demonstrated that a public values perspective that draws on diverse disciplines and theoretical perspectives is a fruitful basis when conducting research in this field.

REFERENCES

- Alford, J. (2008), 'The limits to traditional public administration, or rescuing public value from misrepresentation', *The Australian Journal of Public Administration*, **67** (3), 357–66.
- Alford, J. (2009), *Engaging Public Sector Clients: From Service-delivery to Co-production*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Alford, J. and J. O'Flynn (2009), 'Making sense of public value: concepts, critiques and emergent meanings', *International Journal of Public Administration*, **32** (3), 171–91.
- Benington, J. (2011), 'From private choice to public value', in J. Benington and M. Moore (eds), *Public Value: Theory and Practice*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 31–51.
- Benington, J. and M. Moore (eds) (2011), *Public Value: Theory and Practice*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Benington, J. and M. Moore (2011a), 'Public value in complex and changing times', in J. Benington and M. Moore (eds), *Public Value: Theory and Practice*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 1–30.
- Benington, J. and M. Moore (2011b), 'Conclusions: looking ahead', in J. Benington and M. Moore (eds), *Public Value: Theory and Practice*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 256–74.
- Bourdieu, P. (1987), 'What makes a social class? On the theoretical and practical existence of groups', *Berkeley Journal of Sociology*, **32**, 1–17.
- Box, R. (2007), 'Redescribing the public interest', *The Social Science Journal*, **44** (4), 585–98.
- Boxall, P. and J. Purcell (2011), *Strategy and Human Resource Management*, Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Elkington, J. (1997), *Cannibals with Forks: The Triple Bottom Line of 21st Century Business*, Oxford: Capstone Publishing.
- Ferlie, E., L. Fitzgerald, G. McGivern, S. Dobson and C. Bennett (2011), 'Public policy networks and "wicked problems": a nascent solution?', *Public Administration*, **89** (2), 307–24.
- Hartley, J. (2011), 'Public value through innovation and improvement', in J. Benington and M. Moore (eds), *Public Value: Theory and Practice*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 171–84.
- Jorgensen, T.B. and B. Bozeman (2007), 'Public values: an inventory', *Administration and Society*, **39** (3), 354–81.
- Kaptein, M. and J. Wempe (2002), *The Balanced Company: A Theory of Corporate Integrity*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Leisink, P. (2005), *Organisaties and het maatschappelijk belang van personeelsbeleid*, inaugural lecture, Utrecht University.
- Moore, M. (1995), *Creating Public Value: Strategic Management in Government*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Paauwe, J. (2004), *HRM and Performance: Achieving Long-term Viability*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Paauwe, J. and P. Boselie (2007), 'HRM and societal embeddedness', in P. Boxall, J. Purcell and P. Wright (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Human Resource Management*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 166–84.
- Pierre, J. and B.G. Peters (2000), *Governance, Politics and the State*, Basingstoke and London: Macmillan Press.
- Rhodes, R. and J. Wanna (2007), 'The limits to public value, or rescuing responsible government from the Platonic guardians', *The Australian Journal of Public Administration*, **66** (4), 406–21.
- Rhodes, R. and J. Wanna (2008), 'Stairways to heaven: a reply to Alford', *The Australian Journal of Public Administration*, **67** (3), 367–70.
- Rubington, E. and M. Weinberg (2010), *The Study of Social Problems: Seven Perspectives*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sabatier, P. and H. Jenkins-Smith (eds) (1993), *Policy Change and Learning: An Advocacy Coalition Approach*, Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Stewart, J. (2009), *Public Policy Values*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sullivan, H. and C. Skelcher (2002), *Working Across Boundaries: Collaboration in Public Services*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Taylor, P. (ed.) (2008), *Ageing Labour Forces: Promises and Prospects*, Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar.
- Van der Wal, Z., G. De Graaf and A. Lawton (2011), 'Competing values in public management: introduction to the symposium issue', *Public Management Review*, **13** (3), 331–41.
- West, K. and P. Davis (2011), 'What is the public value of government action? Towards a (new) pragmatic approach to values questions in public endeavours', *Public Administration*, **89** (2), 226–41.
- West Churchman, C. (1967), 'Guest editorial: Wicked Problems', *Management Science*, **14** (4), 141–2.