

Public Value Leadership in the Context of Outcomes, Impact and Reform

Introduction

Public value is not a new concept and there have been many lenses through which it has been viewed spanning a wide range of disciplinary areas (see for example Lüdeke-Freund, 2010; Mazzucatto, 2018; and Lindgreen et al., 2019). There is increasing interest in the concept of leadership and what it means to lead in, and for, a public value context. This growing interest is closely related to the need for increased accountabilities stemming from the devolution of authority and responsibility in public resource use within recent public service reform agendas.

In the UK context the importance of leadership in the creation of public value has been highlighted by Barber (2017) in his review of public value outcomes and proposal for reform set around a public value framework. Leadership is increasingly being seen as the key vehicle through which public sector organisational change can be facilitated in pursuit of public value. This emphasis is however problematic and reflective of key questions around the concept of public value leadership – who are the leaders, what are they leading and how are they leading? Further what are the boundaries of leadership action within the varying conceptions of public value leadership?

Within a surfeit of literature around the meaning of public value most scholars are concerned with interpretations of `value` and `public` (Hartley, Parker & Beashel, 2019). As Chapter 1 in this volume shows, discussions around both show the highly contested nature of the domain where interpretations may be used by governments, actors and commentators alike to meet or forward their own aims.

The concepts of leadership and public value can be viewed through two main lenses. The first lens considers the concept of public value from a leadership perspective and is based around exploring the approaches that are best suited to the achievement of public value. These contributions are akin to those that have pervaded the public management field since the global public reform agendas of the 1980s and 1990s, which highlighted the desirability, and relevance, of private management operating principles (see for example Chiapello and Fairclough, 2002). From this leadership perspective there has been relatively little literature that discussed public value leadership from a practical point of view. This is reflective of the unsettled nature of debates around what public value is and how it may be achieved.

The second lens through which public value leadership has been considered views leadership from the public management subject base (Denis, Langley & Rouleau, 2007). Here the literature is mostly concerned with `how` public value outcomes may be achieved through the roles that leaders play, in other words `what` public leaders do within the busy, changing and conflictual domain of public service provision. How public value leadership is conceptualised underpins the practice of leadership and is important in informing the development of policy to enhance public service provision. This chapter will explore the various conceptions of leadership in relation to public value creation and maintenance and examine the practice issues that impact leaders` capacity to meet public value expectations and achieve desired outcomes.

Conceptualisations of Public Value Leadership

Whichever lens is used to consider the leadership of public value, the age-old question of leadership in the public sphere, and whether this differs (or not), from that of leadership in the private sector is an important debate within the literature. We have seen this question recast in many national, and sub-national, governing systems drawing on the various understandings, assumptions and terminologies of the time. The language of the debate is further influenced by the specifics of reform agendas, political imperatives and ideologies.

Although there are two major approaches clearly identifiable in this debate, which have been variously termed the 'public administration approach' and the 'management approach', there are many individual interpretations that sit within and between these main approaches. Broader conceptions of political leadership propose that various accountabilities are key to understanding the role of leaders in the public domain and their resulting actions and behaviours. These may be useful in considering today's public value leadership even where discussions consider the political aspects of leadership only. Elcock (2001) argues, for example, that reform agendas of the 1980s and 1990s have driven a preoccupation with a narrow definition of performance based on outputs. This may not include wider benefits of public leadership activity. He argues that over this period there has been a worrying lack of debate around public value in the decisions made regarding the provision of services. In many senses this is a compounding factor in the loss of a public administration perspective in favour of a management approach in consideration of the purpose of such provision.

The importance of leadership (rather than management) in achieving what we may consider today to be public value was highlighted by Elcock (2000; 2001) and was the focus of later work (see for example, Elcock and Fenwick 2012). Through his work Elcock emphasised the need for leadership at all levels and in all types of governance, this leadership based on creativity and collective learning which he viewed as key to public service provision most likely to meet the needs of the various stakeholders in the public domain. Elcock viewed leadership as a transcender of political concerns that could ameliorate the worst excesses of political expediency. Elcock's argument is compelling however any consideration of leadership in the public domain is complicated by the fuzzy boundaries between politicians as leaders and public servants as leaders.

Moore's (1995) original exposition of the public value framework, and specifically the 'strategic triangle', does not directly address leaders or leadership but rather talks of managers in the public sector. While this may be reflective of the time, when there was generally less concern with differentiating leadership from management (and the terms were commonly used synonymously as can be seen in the description of the Kennedy Project in Moore, 1995), questions about whether public value creation is, and should be, a concern of public managers and/or leaders remains important for the public administration of today. In other words, should public value creation be the main concern of their practice and what are their respective roles in creating public value?

The development of the Public Value Approach (PVA) poses fundamental questions for leaders regarding their practice and has implications for the broader concept of leadership. In particular it raises questions around the legitimacy of public leaders in determining public value outcomes given that public servants are not directly

accountable to the public in electoral terms. From the public administration perspective, the theoretical development of PVA and its espoused meaning, has been set against the failings of the New Public Management (NPM) reform agendas in Western democracies and globally in Westminster style governance systems. These failings are well documented and can be argued to span continents (see for example Fenwick and McMillan, 2010). The work of Dunleavy (1995) on policy disasters, and of Rhodes (1996) on network governance are early contributions to the debates surrounding key issues in the unintended consequences of such reform programmes. The search for a post-NPM organising paradigm has been a major concern for public administration scholars ever since. The failure to agree such is reflective of the complexity of public service provision and of the concerns of actors involved.

Fenwick and McMillan (2010, p. 4) argue that `the search for a unifying prescription for public service reform is fraught with theoretical and practical pitfalls and is likely to be futile... actors make sense of the public sector environment through complex and/or anti-foundational responses. There is no simple or single answer in considering the future of public policy and management: the future derives from (and will be interpreted by others through) the lived experience of the actors involved and the meaning assigned to what they do`. They further propose `the inevitability of anti-foundationalism in a post-modern world...this [is] the only possible response in an environment where all previous positions, not least those associated with neo-liberalism, have failed` (2010, p. 4-5).

Key theoretical contributions that have impacted this search for an organising paradigm have included that of Moore (1995) through the development of the concept of public value and subsequent interpretations of such by Stoker (2006), Rhodes and Wanna (2007), Benington (2009) and Talbot (2009), for example. The development of public value is presented as a desirable and pervasive force in public service provision and may be considered to be an all-encompassing concept as many alternative propositions in service delivery can be considered integral elements of the public value concept as defined by Moore (see for example Rhodes` Network Governance).

Public value suggests that those charged with the provision of public services work within a strategic triangle; a system of accountabilities and strategy domains. In Moore`s original conception any preferred public service strategy should be capable of constituting public value through the production of outcomes that are deemed valuable by actors. Outcomes should be achievable within the finite resources available and be supported by all stakeholders. Public value is essentially an organising paradigm that demands an anti-foundational approach where strategy is developed `bottom-up` from interpretations of those that are closest to the situations and resultant needs of public service users - not those far removed from the realities of the society they seek to serve.

Public managers, according to Moore`s approach, have a key role in creating value through their balancing of various concerns in the strategic triangle. The triangle represents three areas of activity in service provision that must be aligned to promote public value creation and outcomes. Moore (1995) argues that public managers should identify a public value proposition that defines desired outcomes, work actively within the authorising environment to establish support for the proposition and enable the organisational capacities to achieve public value. In Moore`s conception managers must work both within organisational boundaries and beyond to achieve such. Here

they must lead provision through their melding of the concerns of actors within the domains. Importantly for Moore the main leadership task is to interpret the value placed on outcomes (and not just outputs) by the actors involved and to mediate between them to maximise the meaning and resultant perceived benefit for individuals, publics and civil society. This involves a key leadership task of gauging the significance of certain outcomes for individuals and groups within the citizenry. In this way public service leaders have to manage a moral obligation to society that distinguishes them from private sector leaders who, it may be argued, are concerned solely with the meeting of an individual's expectations within individualised contract arrangements.

Critiques of Moore's conception of public value (see for example Bryson et al., 2017) highlight a main area of contention as involving the definition and evaluation of the base concept itself. Does public value differ from, for example, public good, and further how are the public (recipients of services) to be defined? It is argued by some that public value has the benefit of building on two previous paradigms - public administration and NPM - and drawing out elements of both to create a 'double strength' paradigm (Stoker, 2006; Talbot, 2009). However, the practice of public value creation will be greatly influenced by how the citizenry choose to define themselves.

Within public value the construction of the meaning of value is one that has implications for leaders, and for the place of democracy and politics in public service provision. Benington (2009) offers a redefinition of value that goes beyond Moore's original conception and provides an alternative to the narrow performance focus therein. Benington's definition encompasses 'all that adds value to the public sphere' (p. 237) and includes aspects of political, social, economic, cultural, ecological and economic value. He further posits that public value is not a concern of the public sector acting in isolation but that necessarily outcomes are created by actors operating in the private and voluntary domains through their interactions with the public sector (and each other). For leaders, then, one of the challenges of the PVA involves influencing beyond the boundaries of public organisations through outward facing, rather than inward facing, leadership practice solely focussed on the sourcing of goods and services from other sectors. Leadership in the public sector is now broader in its concern than has previously been seen. Ayres (2019) argues that public leadership is now best represented as metagovernance and suggests that service delivery is best served through enactment of public leadership actions and behaviours that highlight process management, enabling of participation and the setting of clear service goals and boundaries. She further contends that 'many policy interventions rely on a distributed operational capacity so metagovernors also need to 'manage out' to consider and align the broader value chain of which their organizations will form only part' (p. 284).

Various conceptions of what constitutes public value have also impacted the evaluation of such and how this may in turn influence future public reform agendas. Evaluation methodologies are underpinned by a set of philosophical assumptions about how the public domain should be viewed and developed. As with other concepts in governance (for example public worth and public good) public value evaluation is largely based on qualitative indicators as reform trajectories globally try to reposition the citizen at the heart of public service provision. Such repositioning has driven a concern with the views of citizens that are more fully expressed through qualitative means. However public value and its evaluation suffer from the same issues of

strategic positioning as say Human Resource Development (HRD) where a vicious circle may develop between the consideration of impact and value in its totality versus that that can be easily measured. The difficulty for public sector leaders is simply that the more they are asked to justify resource use within governing systems that require `evidence` and `proof` of value the more they are required to use quantitative indicators that do not represent the ethos behind public value nor easily capture the `meaning` of public value for those that are the recipients of public services, and the ultimate arbiters of the value of public outcomes.

Jordan (2019) alludes to this issue in her review of value creation in the Wigan Deal, a social deal created in 2010 between Wigan Council and its publics (citizens, communities and business interests) to create better outcomes in the face of central government austerity measures and substantial funding cuts. She argues that the informal deal has worked on many levels in creating shared understandings of what value can be achieved but that the Council has yet to establish measures that consider how The Deal is working in relation to its specific objectives. Measures exist around integral elements of The Deal but there is no mechanism for overarching evaluation or for gauging the public value created. This is reflective of the difficulties in measuring a totality where many value judgements are displayed and where, as a result, proxy measures become the most appealing (and manageable) default.

Drawing from Benington`s (2009) definitional concepts above, for the practice of public value leadership, there is also the issue of the way in which public value may be successfully achieved. Working through considerations of Moore`s strategic triangle questions abound as to how leaders lead *in* a public value setting to ensure that outcomes are achieved and to develop feelings of trust and legitimacy in what they do. How does leading in a public value setting then differ from leading/managing in other domains?

Whilst the similarities and differences in leading and managing are well articulated in the leadership literature, the terms have been used synonymously in studies of public value and within the public administration literature more widely. Writing from a leadership perspective Northouse (2013) provides a meta-description of the key similarities and differences in leadership and management stating that `although there are clear differences between management and leadership, the two constructs overlap. When managers are involved in influencing a group to meet its goals, they are involved in leadership. When leaders are involved in planning, organizing, staffing, and controlling, they are involved in management. Both processes involve influencing a group of individuals toward goal attainment` (p. 14).

Building on Northouse`s definition it may be argued then that it is the way that leaders perform their tasks that differentiates them from managers, rather than a differing set of skills being employed. The foregrounding of direction setting, aligning people and maintaining motivation defines leadership beyond the planning, organising and controlling activities of managers. Hartley et al. (2019) provide a useful classification of recent conceptions of leadership in public value creation from a public administration perspective highlighting three strands of influence. The first they argue moves towards systems-centric understandings through consideration of leadership as a collaborative activity both within public organisations and across organisational networks. The second strand involves consideration of this systems-centred view of public value but highlights the different domains in which leadership takes place –

between organisations in the public, private and voluntary sectors reflecting the definition of public value leadership offered by Benington (2009) above. The third strand involves leadership with political astuteness following Hartley et al. (2015) who argue that leadership happens within public value creation but that this is not unidirectional with clearly defined, shared understandings of purpose. Thus, leadership processes involve service provision articulated through careful manoeuvring of, and through, the constellation of provider organisations to reach best-fit solutions that are those deemed most acceptable to the greatest number of stakeholders. Importantly they further identify the use of formal and informal political processes as one means through which public leaders can achieve public value outcomes.

Leading *in* a public value setting then is not the same as leading *in* the private domain or any other. While public value may be still be developing as the dominant organising perspective for public service provision, the basic long held differences between leadership and management in public and private organisations still provides a useful benchmark. This leads us to a question of *what* then is being led. Here Rhodes' contention that there is something special about leadership in the public domain resonates in his argument that leadership in the public sector has 'a dual task of collective choice and encouraging the politics of participation' (1991, p. 549). Public value concerns can only strengthen this focus.

Leaders and Leadership Practice

As Chapter 1 noted the leadership of public value creation involves promoting the co-production of services. For leaders the 'what' of leading within a public value context necessarily involves engaging in co-production not only of service provision but also of public value. As with the public value concept itself co-production is an area that has multiple theoretical bases, approaches and understandings. The practice of co-production is then not a free-standing activity but is set within varying organisational, professional and societal conventional wisdoms that each contain expectations in the form of desired outcomes and underlying assumptions which steer, and may sometimes undermine, the achievement of these desired outcomes. Filipe, Renado & Marston (2014) talk to this very issue in their investigation of co-production of healthcare in London stating that

'As a policy term, co-production benefits from retaining a degree of ambiguity. Although the lack of a strict definition can complicate efforts to get collaborations off the ground, it also allows more flexibility by expanding rather than constraining what they might entail. This challenge is not simply a problem of translational "gaps" between policy and practice: it is a matter of organisational dispositions and positions, of personal attributions, and of conflicting assumptions about what co-production is and does in the context of health care' (p. 3).

Osborne, Radnor & Strokosch (2016) outline the various theoretical approaches to co-production and highlight the tensions within this aspect of public value. Drawing on both public administration and management perspectives they define co-production as 'the voluntary or involuntary involvement of public service users in any of the design, management, delivery and/or evaluation of public services' (p. 640) and argue that recent reform agendas mean that 'co-production is intrinsic to the process of

public service delivery and is linked directly to the co-creation of value both for service users and for society` (p. 644). In recognising one design outcome of recent reforms as the recentering of the service recipient within co-production processes they determine that a key public leadership challenge concerns the creation of channels through which recipients can engage in co-production processes and activities.

Within co-production processes and activities, what is it that public leaders can do to enable achievement of such? It is argued here that one critical leadership role involves environmental scanning to consider the power relationships between stakeholders so that imbalances may be ameliorated within the processes of co-production. Most reform agendas assume that public sector organisational and system change will benefit all equally and at the specific time points when certain public value outcomes are desired and/or required. Practice suggests that there are major difficulties in achieving this (Filipe, Renado & Marston, 2017) and again then we return to the issue of who constitutes 'the public' in public value?

Benington (2009) argues that the PVA requires a rethinking of the relationship between the individual and state in service provision. He considers that using civil society as an organising base is useful in allowing public leaders to engage different communities and also to consider how best public value may be measured. Suggesting a definition of civil society by Cohen and Arato (1992) as compromising spheres of interactions between the economy and the state (however broadly that may be cast) he contends that `more active engagement with civil society, in which much public service is `co-produced` with a range of formal and informal partners rather than by the state alone, implies a need for governments to discover new ways of indirect influence on the thinking and activity of other organisations and actors` (p. 241).

Questions of, and issues around, the relationship between civil society and state are no more keenly seen than in examples of co-production in the integration of health and social care services. Involving health services and local government agencies reorganisation projects aim to create integrated joint boards across jurisdictions with the responsibility for the local health and care needs of patients. An extensive policy reform throughout the world the integration of health and social care is dependent on leaders from the various sectors involved (and this will vary across governing systems) working together to produce outcomes that have value for, and are valued by, the recipients of services.

Leadership of co-production is however fraught with difficulties and requires new mind-sets, and ways of doing, for the leaders involved. There are of course, as in any change process, procedural requirements but how these are enacted is where leaders can directly influence and reset the ways in which services are valued by recipients. This may not in itself represent a return to top-down thinking but certainly in the case of the UK, and Scotland in particular, may be seen as representing a degree of relational turn in public value thinking and practice. Generally unified leadership is seen as key to the success of integration projects (Carrochan and Austin, 2002) but the degree of unification and indeed direction of travel of any new leadership constellation is really at the core of success no matter whether viewed from a top-down or bottom-up perspective. Within health and social care integration in the Scottish context unified leadership is considered central in achieving the policy aims of the Scottish Government through the National Health and Wellbeing Outcomes where `embedding outcomes requires support to frontline practice and strong

leadership` (Scottish Government, 2015, p. 21). The Scottish Government`s Health and Social Care Delivery Plan (2016) further identifies leadership as critical and highlights the need for leadership development to `ensure that current leaders are equipped to drive the changes required in health and social care ...[and] also ensure sustainability of approach by identifying the next cohort of future leaders` (Scottish Government, 2016, p. 20).

Integration may be seen as having two key purposes clearly identified by Capitman (2003) as efficacy and efficiency. When relating these purposes to a PVA then efficacy may be taken as public value for the recipients and efficiency as representing public value for the broader civil society. The challenge for public leaders is to bring these sometimes-competing concepts together in a context where resources are always at a premium. Yet how far can public leaders really counter political masters whose purpose, it may be argued, is self-satisfying and often disguised as attempting to achieve public value?

This question is one that underlies many studies of public value creation. The power of politicians is an ever present for public leaders. Blaug, Horner & Lekhi (2006) argue that

`public value stands astride the fault that runs between politicians and public managers. It offers a new perspective on the trade-off between democracy and bureaucracy. Yet the importance it attaches to authorisation, democracy and dialogue cannot negotiate away this trade-off by simply dismissing efficiency. The public value approach must somehow locate and express public notions of value, and be viable and effective. An orientation to public value recognises both the need for efficiency and for democracy` (p. 16)

Studies of health and social care integration in the UK have shown the pervading influence of politicians and of politics. In a review of the success of the Greater Manchester experiment in health and social care devolution (colloquially known as the Devo Manc Project) Walshe, Lorne, Coleman, McDonald & Turner (2016) highlight the problems around facilitating meaningful devolution for integration concluding that

`most of the policy agenda that is being pursued in Greater Manchester reflects closely the national priorities of the government and the Department of Health and Social Care, and the NHS mandate and priorities and planning guidance of NHS England. In that sense, devolution has not been an exercise in allowing local autonomy or control over policy, but over its implementation` (p. 6)

A National Audit Office report considering health and social care integration in England also highlighted the impact of political concerns on integration success arguing that `shifts in policy emphasis and reorganisations... have complicated the path to integration (Comptroller and Auditor General (2017), p.7)

Research investigating the leadership of early health and social care integration projects identified that outcomes were often overlooked in favour of achieving the organisational change itself. For leaders the success of `joining-up` was the main means by which they were held accountable (Sandfort, 1999). Leadership actions were then focussed on creation of integrated structures, rather than on what those

structures could enable. But such an approach represents bounded, or low level, integration – of ideas and of service delivery structures rather than a higher-level systems integration. Systems integration (for example of Information Technology or Human Resources) requires leaders to let go and work in new ways. It requires organisations to break their cultures, to abandon conventional wisdoms and to undertake holistic organisational change. As Sandfort (1999) argues however such integration must be unidirectional and conducted in a timeous way as there will be no individualised organisational systems to return to.

In achieving systems integration organisational cultures provide the greatest challenge for public leaders. Unidirectional change towards new integrated boards may be hindered by the existence of strong organisational sub-cultures often based around professional identities, for example of clinicians and allied health practitioners. Integration requires a weaving together of sub-cultures which must often be achieved within a situation of power differentials between various organisational actors. So jolting and incremental change towards an integrated culture forms the new operating environment for most leaders within health and social care integration (Lyngso, Skavlan, Host & Frolich, 2014).

Managing power relationships between organisations and the possible resultant cultural discord within organisations is one of the major challenges for leaders trying to ensure public value outcomes as highlighted earlier. The complex nature of organisational cultures means that cultural integration is often approached in a prescriptive manner outlining what needs to happen to facilitate change rather than considering how this may be achieved. As culture is integrally linked to organisational context this is not an unsurprising approach however relative power bases are also at play in efforts to create integrated cultures. In health and social care integration professional tensions are common and these can translate into value judgements being made about the importance of the knowledge and practice of others (Peck, Towell & Gulliver, 2001; Scragg, 2016).

Changes in the relative power balance between integration actors is a cause of relational turn as witnessed in in examples of health and social care integration in the UK. Relational turn makes it more difficult for leaders to achieve planned change and militates against the creation of meaningful public value for all. Drawing on Moore`s original conception of the public value landscape there are three major players within today`s integration domain – politicians (at national and local level), provider organisations (public, private and voluntary) and the publics (individual recipients and the wider civil society). Relational turn, it may be argued, has now been through two phases – the first represented by the rising power of the publics in determining what services *should* be provided and how these should be manifest (examples of early stage and low level integration) and the second (examples of later stage and systems integration) by the rising power of leaders (both organisational and political) in determining what *can* be provided within the resources available. The publics are no longer in the ascendancy in the power dynamics of the integration domain in the UK.

The policy objectives of health and social care integration in the UK are aimed at the creation of patient-centric care which as Hutchinson (2015) notes `correlate[d] to improved individual outcomes as well as single points of patient contact and consistent streamlined service` (p.133). Early stage integration has been evidenced through local strategies focussing on the management of long-term conditions and on the reduction

in the reliance on institutionalised care in favour of community-based interventions. Public health service delivery has also been refocused with the main responsibility for provision being transferred to local authorities (Edwards, 2013; Hutchinson, 2015). These developments, within an overall drive to empower service recipients, allowed user voice in service decisions through for example the establishment of service user forums in provider organisations. It is also argued that moves towards strengthening regulation dissipated existing health and social care organisation's power bases (Edwards, 2013).

The salience of systems integration cannot be overstated. In particular Information Technology integration allows information to be shared in meaningful ways and for leaders to plan provision more effectively. Although such later stage integration is still developing Atherton, Lynch, Williams & Witham (2015) show the importance of transparency and trust in information sharing in their study of the linking and use of health and social care data in Scotland. Resultant robust management of the expectations of users has allowed leaders to strengthen their relative power bases in determining what provision possibilities exist at specific points within service provision processes. Certainly, there is scope for further integration as projects explore the mining of big data to enhance the effectiveness of planning processes (Buchanan, Thuemmler, Spyra, Smales & Prajapati, 2017).

Yet public leaders, and especially political leaders, are open to the influences of the pendulum of popularity and must recognise that relational turn may have an ongoing impact on *what* they are leading. Leaders may well be hindered in public value creation by their own, and their organisations, capacities and capabilities. These capacities and capabilities have been identified as primarily concerning the processes required for integrated practice. So, issues around overall aim of the integration, the respective roles and responsibilities of the actors, management of provider organisations' differing visions, willingness to share information, differing professional ideologies, building and maintenance of provision relationships and financial uncertainty, for example, are most commonly cited as influences (Cameron et al., 2014).

Integration processes also impact *how* public leaders lead, increasingly traditional top-down models of leadership and followership are cast aside in favour of practices around co-leadership and followership (West, et al., 2014; Klinga, et al., 2016). The principles of co-leadership are variously termed in the literature but as Williams (2012) notes co-leadership assumes the central positioning of tasks in defining service provision practices rather than, for example, individual organisational leadership roles. Co-leadership is structured through leaders in each principal provider organisation (usually two) leading in pairings around specific service tasks. Co-leadership also positions followers in a co-followership relationship. The advantages of such arrangements for service provision and public value creation are clear – allowing a direct link to the services provided. But equally questions of rhetoric and reality are levelled at the leadership of integration projects with what is espoused as co-leadership being far from the realities of the organisational (and professional) silo leadership evident (Ling, et al., 2012).

Recent studies of co-leadership as a vehicle for public value creation in health and social care integration highlight the barriers to co-leadership and the leadership shortcomings that lead to difficulties in achieving the ultimate goal of value for all. Stewart (2017) in his consideration of the integration project in Scotland highlights the

scepticism of leaders in co-leading and proposes that trust is a key bulwark against co-leadership. It may be that leaders are not openly, or even knowingly, hostile to such co-leadership however difficulties in co-production and service co-ordination across organisational boundaries are premised on the strength of individual organisational cultures (Fenwick and McMillan, 2013). Where cultures resist, trust is lessened.

The irony of the impact of organisational culture on co-leading for public value is that, as identified by Schneider and Barbera (2014), leadership is central to the creation and maintenance of cultures. For public leaders, there is a choice that must be made as to how far they open up to `real` co-leadership rather than either acting as one at the margins, or partially committing to, joint decision making for the services they seek to provide.

Klinga et al. (2016) argue that there are certain pre-conditions that are required to facilitate co-leadership arguing that co-leadership support and practice at the top of the integrating organisations is essential along with the co-location of leadership activity. Personal and interpersonal pre-conditions they also identify as important in impacting facilitation – here they highlight openness of leaders and an acceptance of the equal value of the two leadership parties as critical. Further, in the practice of co-leadership they argue a series of factors are important in maintaining such an approach. They highlight leader flexibility in resource allocation. Leaders are required to think beyond the boundaries of the individual organisation and to consider task (or individual user) paramount so that resources become centred rather than split according to whether the task is rooted in the health or social care domain.

Yet for many leaders the practice of co-leadership is fraught with difficulties and co-leadership rhetoric is not being replicated in their lived experiences. For example, Beswick (2014) in a study of leadership challenges in the integration of health and social care in the Scottish Highlands suggests that practice issues revolve around the lack of trust between leaders, thus impeding how they engage with integration reform processes. In particular lack of trust between leaders in co-leadership practices impacts negatively how leaders view the motives of their `partner` leaders.

Brown and Head (2017) also argue that there are tensions in leadership co-production of public value outcomes through the enduring influence of traditional models of public administration. In their study of public value leadership in the integration of services for indigenous communities in Australia they conclude that success for leaders is based on the balancing of the elements in Moore`s strategic triangle and that “public leaders need to strategically balance authorization, capability and public value creation throughout a reform process...policy failure is not necessarily a result of either policy or implementation or capacity deficiencies, but may arise as a complex interplay between all three factors” (p. 261).

Within the UK context leadership has also been highlighted as central to the achievement of public value outcomes (however these may be evaluated). Hutchinson (2015) begins to identify the `what` of leadership in terms of specific leadership competencies required rather than considering `what` public leaders are leading in terms of the process architecture of public value creation. This view is interesting as it addresses not what leaders need to do, and the perceived difficulties, but identifies where there are gaps in individual leadership skills and practice and thereby offers a new lens on issues in public value creation. Hutchison argues that `the success or

failure of a local change effort may not rest with the indicated structures, either national or local, but the ability of the key leaders to exhibit assured traits throughout implementation` (p. 137). Through enhancing the competences of leaders Hutchison contends that integration projects may be more likely to be successful and that integration may require leaders to lead differently through either engaging with new skills or enhancing skills that are less obvious, and critical, in traditional public administration approaches to service provision. Indeed, he goes further to suggest that `each local area should therefore investigate fully the leadership characteristics of the key personnel involved in the change process and question their ability to deliver organisational transformation` (p.137).

What, then, may these new, or recast, competencies be? What is it that leaders need to do differently in enabling public value creation? Research around this question foregrounds the importance of entrepreneurialism. Morse (2010) usefully draws on the notion of public value leaders as `boundary spanners` looking beyond individual organisations and formal partnerships to the wider public service domain and contends that `integrative leaders are entrepreneurs who create public value` (p. 243). In unpacking what this means for leaders then risk taking, innovativeness and pro-activity appear central to success in public value creation. Risk taking it is argued is certainly not a trait encouraged in traditional conceptions of the leadership of public services (Currie, et al., 2008).

Even where leaders may have personal traits akin to those of risk taking and innovativeness there remain issues around how these may be evaluated within a public value climate where organisational cultures are still underpinned by fear, blame and trust issues (Hutchison, 2015). Certainly, a light touch from national and local policy makers (politicians) may ameliorate some of the manifestations of fear, blame and trust but this may not be readily experienced by public leaders due to the extended accountabilities that the public value approach encourages. Interpretations of public value outcomes developed through formal and informal evaluation mechanisms act as a key influence on the ways in which public leaders choose to lead (Vedung, 2017). Leadership in public value creation is therefore a complex phenomenon and one critical to the sustainability of the public value approach.

Public Value Leadership: Challenges and Prospects

Leaders within the public value domain have to think beyond simply *what* they are leading to consider their leadership *for* public value. Sustainability of public value leadership is now a key concern both in terms of personal sustainability and the resultant outcomes leaders may achieve for their publics.

The need for sustainable leadership may be aligned with concerns highlighted by Hartley et al. (2019) in their call for studies of loss and displacement of public value so that a comprehensive view and understanding of public value may be achieved. Sustainability of public value outcomes is critical in guarding against loss and displacement through ensuring the efficient use of limited resources and reducing the need for multiple, differing and simultaneous delivery strands to reinforce value outcomes for particular publics.

Hartley et al. (2019) argue that public value is not always a 'win-win-win' situation for the politicians, organisations and publics involved and that displacement may be a more common outcome than much of the research implies. Displacement occurs where certain publics, or communities within specific publics, lose or have declining value from public services in order to provide increases in service value for publics elsewhere. Public value then is neither complete nor static – it is a moving feast of gains and losses that leaders have to manage themselves, their organisations and their publics through. Indeed leaders may themselves have to create loss and displacement realities in order to achieve higher level public value and/or value for certain publics and communities in the longer term. This is reflective of the second wave of relational turn in public value creation through integration. However success in value creation may also be an outcome of the sustainability of public leaders themselves rather than of organisational systems impacting in isolation.

Sustainable leadership is one paradigm response to the global financial crises of 2008, and the years that followed, where organisations suffered a series of shock events that tested conventional understandings of the primacy of the shareholder-first model of leadership generally espoused in the private sector. Stakeholder-first approaches to leadership were required in order to broaden the operating environments of many organisations in the private sector where their traditional markets were no longer assured. Sustainable leadership was also borne of the growing concern around the moral obligations of organisations where leaders were viewed as responsible for ensuring ethical, ecological and, to a certain extent, the emancipatory operation of business so that all stakeholders are considered and societal value created (Porter and Kramer, 2011).

The study of sustainable leadership is a developing field where the main focus moves between the organisational and individual levels of analysis. Grounded in conceptions of environmental sustainability sustainable leadership has been discussed by major proponents Avery and Bergsteiner (2011) as primarily comprising a long term vision achieved through the interplay of higher level leadership practices including trust, knowledge sharing, devolved decision making, team orientation, self-management and creating an enabling culture. Considering the multiple definitions and frameworks of sustainable leadership it is argued that there is no one best way of ensuring its achievement as 'sustainable leadership emerges from the interplay of many factors ... there is no one 'right' way within the overall sustainable leadership paradigm' (2011, p. 5).

Gerard, McMillan & D'Annunzio-Green (2017) provide a meta-conception of, and framework for sustainable leadership for organisations. They argue that sustainable leadership is an outcome of the relationships and exchanges between three dimensions – stakeholder considerations, organisational processes and the external environment. They further contend that 'the successful implementation of sustainable leadership arguably depends on an effective sustainable culture within the organisation and how this is affected by the external environment... the leadership of an organisation can hugely impact its culture. A pivotal argument here is the role and development of employees and leaders which must be central to an organisation's sustainable success. If there is not a culture of development and conservation within an organisation then the underpinnings of sustainable leadership are crucially missing' (p.133).

Given the importance of relationship building in creating public value outcomes it is important that maintenance of such is supported at the individual level through developing the sustainability of leaders. Non deliberate public value displacement is reduced when a long-term view is taken by public service providers. Casserley and Critchley (2010) have identified that sustainability of leadership and of organisations is predicated on three core individualised processes: reflection on action; psychological intelligence and psychological well-being. Psychological intelligence they argue is defined as `having a clear sense of personal purpose and an awareness of personal assumptions and motivations` (p. 290) and is reflective of the self-awareness domain in Goleman`s (1998) *Emotional Intelligence* model of competencies and skills that drive leadership performance.

For Casserley and Critchley (2010), sustainable leadership is a move away from the top-down control based view of organisational leadership where `unilateral decision making, or decision making by a small inner circle, is the norm even on business activities involving significant business risk... Moreover, it is all too easy for leaders to extend this illusion of control to believing they can predict and control the consequences of their decision making for society as a whole` (p.288). In public value creation this may help allay the concerns of many public administration scholars around placing the public servant in prime position in determining public service delivery and defining value.

In developing a sustainable leadership approach there is a need for a new way of thinking and doing in developing organisational leaders` competency and capacity (Casserley and Critchley, 2010). The traditional paradigms of leadership development advance a concern with performance, development of individual competencies, modification of behaviours, off-job training and prescriptive solutions to perceived leadership failings. In contrast sustainable leadership requires development through reflection on action, emphasis on sustainability as precondition to performance and enhancing the integration of leaders` core processes with the culture of the organisation (p. 292).

However, the underlying requirements for sustainable leadership development for public value creation are extremely difficult to enact in current service systems. Reflecting on action in dealing with real life adversity for example is predicated on the assumption that leaders have safe space in which to reflect. Where public value is determined by all service stakeholders this makes for a crowded and often conflictual leadership space where the outcomes of reflection may not always be positively received. Again, a hands-off approach by politicians is necessary so that blame does not partner reflexive leadership practices. In similar vein service performance is a pervasive influence on how public value is evaluated. Creating desirable outcomes remains the main aim of leadership action rather than a concern with how these are produced further blurring the focus on the quality of relationship between the individual leader`s core processes and organisational culture.

Given the issues raised in this chapter there is need to make sense of leadership for public value and to consider the ways in which leaders can lead for sustainable public value. Hartley et al. (2019) have provided an argument that leading for public value requires a set of competencies to be developed and enacted that may, when taken together, represent the overarching organising concept of political astuteness. Such a position clearly differentiates public value leadership from traditional shareholder

models and draws on the assertion that context is critical, this in line with a public administration view of service provision.

Political astuteness or variations thereof has long been considered an important influence on the leadership of public services. Hartley et al. (2019) argue that `political astuteness enhances value creation through improving the capability of actors to understand, manage, and coordinate various of the interests at stake...[t]here is, therefore, an argument to be made that political astuteness is an important missing ingredient linking leadership and public value in many contexts` (p. 244). It can also be argued that political astuteness is important in enhancing the sustainability of public leaders through enabling them to be more proactive and orchestrate public value creation more fully. Through removing stresses that may be an outcome of reactive leadership practices burnout may be avoided and psychological and physiological wellbeing improved. Burnout is a key challenge in improving the sustainability of leaders (Casserley and Critchley, 2010).

Investigations of political astuteness in creating public value for groups, publics and civil society suggest that there is impact on how leaders lead for public value (Hartley, Alford, Knies & Douglas, 2017; Ayres, 2019). Competencies range from the more deliberative such as network negotiation to less deliberative or `soft` type competencies reflecting attributes related to emotional intelligence such as the ability to `read` others. However, recognition of the link between leadership and political astuteness in creating public value has potential pitfalls for the practice of public value creation and sustainability of value outcomes.

Further questions are raised around the place of public servants vis-a-vis political leaders in influencing public value. The democratic position of public servants has traditionally been that of advisor to those who are democratically accountable to wider publics through the electoral process. Rhodes and Wanna (2007) question the desirability of a deliberate breaching of the boundary between decision maker and producer for democratic accountability and future governance. A bigger question that challenges fundamental values in governance is raised by the possibilities of public organisation leaders playing a higher-level role of arbiter in who should gain and in what ways from publicly funded service provision.

Second, in successful public value creation the relationships between public leaders and leaders in provider organisations outwith the public sphere require to be based on principles of co-leadership. Questions arise around the levels of political astuteness of the partner leaders and what levels are required? Further is political astuteness used by public leaders to strengthen bonds between leaders or weaken the influence of external leaders in the relationship? Recent research by Ayres (2019) suggests that political astuteness should to be available across sectors through the meta-governance of provision networks. She argues that `soft metagovernance involves utilizing social contacts and relationships to pursue network objectives and can be particularly important to metagovernors who may not be resource-rich or do not command formal authority` (p. 280) this even where leaders `employ soft metagovernance intuitively as a consequence of `happenstance` as opposed to a decisive and coordinated organizational strategy` (p. 292). However, there is still relatively little research around the possibilities of achieving metagovernance and importantly the possible unintended consequences that may ensue. Where non-

governmental leaders are engaging in metagovernance than the issues around the de-democratisation of public value creation are writ large.

Third, it raises issues around training and development for political astuteness and metagovernance. Calls for programmes to equip leaders in required skills and competences usually stop at the `need for` stage and do not consider how these may be facilitated or indeed what the focus should be. We must also remember that for those non-governmental leaders it is likely that facets of political astuteness may run counter to the skills and competences desired in their wider organisational and/or business settings. All leaders engaging in creation of public value outcomes must be aware of the ways in which outcomes may be valued by groups within, and levels of, society. However, such evaluation is a complex phenomenon impacted by issues such as rationality, recency and reflection. Vedung (2017) hints at the complicated nature of evaluation through reference to definitional issues, describing evaluation as a semantic magnet, and through breadth of public service provision where areas of activity are often interlinked and interdependent in creating public value outcomes.

For leaders evaluation of public value is a key concern as a judgement of their leadership performance. It is argued here however that leaders are not wholly divorced from how that evaluation is constructed and how value is ultimately forged in the minds of the publics concerned. Leaders are not passive recipients but are key agents influencing the evaluation process. The way that leaders influence evaluation is an output of the purpose of evaluation. Certainly, in public value creation and maintenance evaluation may lead to service improvement, termination, public policy debate or sometimes mixtures of the three, but evaluation for accountability still has a purpose and is a strong driver in evaluation processes. This is not surprising given that evaluation is usually retrospective, and publics will refer to a narrow set of meanings in evaluation which have accountability at their root. As Vedung (2017) contends `exercising evaluation for accountability reasons, that is, principals undertaking evaluation with the aim of holding their executives responsible for what they have done, is a perfectly valid purpose for evaluation` (p. 13).

Leaders impact public value evaluation through direct actions and indirectly through the shortcomings shown by various publics in the co-production and co-evaluation of services. A central influence is the advantage leaders have through professional knowledge of, and experience in, service production. Professional knowledge is something that most publics will not possess in great enough quantity to be able to map the possibilities for service provision. Obviously public leaders are part of the broader civil society but evaluation at this level is less likely to impact directly on specific and/or localised service provision but rather impacts higher level policy directions. More directly leaders legitimise evaluation methodologies and through this define the boundaries for evaluation. For publics wishing to impact public value outcomes there is a premium to expressing evaluations within accepted methodologies as bounded public value is preferable to loss or displacement as a result of difficulties in articulating value judgements clearly to providers. This is especially important in evaluations of public value for ongoing activities where improvement may be more timeously and directly impacted. Again however we return to a core concern within democratic systems of the degree to which leaders should be concerned with the evaluation of public value outcomes. Is there a moral obligation to provide quality services that meet the needs of users however these may be valued?

Conclusions

Public leadership is a complex concept in terms of both theory and practice. Many of the problems in understanding, changing and ultimately improving leadership in and for public value settings are an outcome of competing views of the role and scope of leadership, and the influence of multiple stakeholders` control over leadership actions. The capacity of public leaders, both collectively and individually, to align concerns across leadership dimensions, where each may be considered a distinct microsystem, is critical for successful and sustainable public value leadership practice.

Yet there are distinct opportunities for public leaders to positively impact outcomes for the citizenry they serve. Leaders can and do influence outcomes in the face of the contextual challenges they face through collaborative action in particular. Joined up leadership is possibly the greatest test, and yet greatest success, for leaders in service provision. This can be seen within health and social care integration where public value leaders have come together across sectors, professions and disciplines to form leadership constellations. If we consider this a positive in impacting individual outcomes and value, then the possibilities for purposeful public value leadership may be less limited than we imagine.

It is argued here then that hallmarks of public value leadership should include considerations that will strengthen leadership constellations: through personal mastery, for example sustainability and innovativeness; considerations of skills, for example negotiation and risk management and considerations of competencies, for example emotional intelligence and relationship building. Through development of hallmarks (at organisational and individual level) the practice of public value leadership may be understood more fully, and improvements defined and ultimately evaluated within the contexts in which it operates. In order to fully appreciate the affective capacity of public value leadership, and despite the need for evidence based evaluation in certain instances, those with political authority should resist the quantification of public value leadership evaluation through the development of a hands-off approach that allows those closest to the needs of civil society to provide value outcomes for that civil society.

References

- Atherton, I. M., Lynch, E., Williams, A. J., & Witham, M. D. (2015). Barriers and Solutions to Linking and Using Health and Social Care Data in Scotland. *British Journal of Social Work*, (45), 1614-1622.
- Avery, G. C. & Bergsteiner, H. (2011). Sustainable leadership practices for enhancing business resilience and performance. *Strategy and Leadership*, (39)(3), 5-15.
- Ayres, S. (2019). How can network leaders promote public value through soft metagovernance? *Public Administration*, (97), 279–295.
- Barber, M. (2017). *Delivering better outcomes for citizens: practical steps for unlocking public value*. London: HM Treasury.
- Benington, B. (2009). Creating the Public in Order to Create Public Value? *Intl Journal of Public Administration*, (32)(3-4), 232-249.
- Beswick, E. (2014). What are the leadership lessons from the integration of health and social care in the Scottish Highlands? *International Journal of Integrated Care; Annual Conf Suppl*.
- Blaug, R., Horner, L. & Lekhi, R. (2006). *Public value, politics and public Management: a literature review*. London: The Work Foundation.
- Brown, P. R. & Head, B. W. (2019). Navigating tensions in co-production: A missing link in leadership for public value. *Public Administration*, (97), 250–263.
- Bryson, J., Sancino, A., Benington, J. & Sørensen, E. (2016). Towards a multi-actor theory of public value co-creation. *Public Management Review*, 1-15.
- Buchanan, W., Thuemmler, C., Spyra, G., Smales, A., & Prajapati, B. (2017). *Towards Trust and Governance in Integrated Health and Social Care Platforms*. In C. Thuemmler & C. Bai (Eds.), *Health 4.0: How Virtualization and Big Data are Revolutionizing Healthcare* (pp. 219-231). Switzerland: Springer International Publishing.
- Cameron, A., Lart, R., Bostock, L. & Coomber, C. (2013). Factors that promote and hinder joint and integrated working between health and social care services: a review of research literature. *Health and Social Care in the Community*, (22)(3), 287-295.
- Capitman, J. (2003). Effective coordination of medical and supportive services. *Journal of Aging and Health*, (15)(1), 124–164.
- Casserley, T. & Critchley, B. (2010). A new paradigm of leadership development. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, (42)(6), 116-126.
- Chiapello, E. & Fairclough, N. (2002). Understanding the New Management Ideology: a Transdisciplinary Contribution from Critical Discourse Analysis and New Sociology of Capitalism. *Discourse & Society*, (13)(2), 185-208.
- Cohen, J. & Arato, A. (1992). *Civil Society and Political Theory*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Comptroller and Auditor General (2017). *Health and Social Care Integration*. Session 2016-17, HC1001, National Audit Office.

Currie, G., Humphreys, M., Ucbasaran, D. & McManus, S. (2008). Entrepreneurial Leadership in the English Public Sector: Paradox or Possibility? *Public Administration*, (86), 987-1008.

Denis, J-L., Langley, A. & Rouleau, L. (2007), *Rethinking Leadership in Public Organizations*. In E. Ferlie, L. E. Lynn Jr. & C. Pollitt, C. (Eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Public Management* (pp. 446-467). New York: Oxford University Press.

Dunleavy, P. (1995). Policy Disasters: Explaining the UK's Record. *Public Policy and Administration*, (10)(2), 52-70.

Edwards, N. (2013). Implementation of the Health and Social Care Act. *British Medical Journal*, (346), 2090.

Elcock, H. (2000). Management is Not Enough: we need leadership! *Public Policy and Administration*, (15)(1), 15-28.

Elcock, H. (2001). *Political Leadership*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Elcock, H. & Fenwick, J. (2012). The political leadership matrix: a tool for analysis. *Public Money & Management*, (32)(2), 87-94.

Filipe, A., Renedo, A. & Marston, C. (2017). The co-production of what? Knowledge, values, and social relations in health care. *PLoS Biol*, 15(5).

Fenwick, J. & McMillan, J. (2010). *Public Management in the Postmodern Era: an introduction*. In J. Fenwick & J. McMillan (Eds.), *Public Management in the Postmodern Era: Challenges and Prospects* (pp. 3-11). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Fenwick, J. & McMillan, J. (2013). Management development and co-production: myths and realities. *Journal of Management Development*, (32)(9), 971-983.

Gerard, L., McMillan, J. & D'Annunzio-Green, N. (2017). Conceptualising sustainable leadership, *Industrial and Commercial Training*, (49)(3), 116-126.

Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam.

Hartley, J., Alford, J., Hughes, O., & Yates, S. (2015). Public value and political astuteness in the work of public managers: The art of the possible. *Public Administration*, (93), 195-211.

Hartley, J., Alford, J., Knies, E., & Douglas, S. (2017). Towards an empirical research agenda for public value theory. *Public Management Review*, (19), 670-685.

Hartley, J., Parker, S. & Beashel, J. (2019). Leading and recognizing public value. *Public Administration*, (97), 264-278.

Hutchison, K. F. (2015). An exploration of the integration of health and social care within Scotland Senior stakeholders' views of the key enablers and barriers. *Journal of Integrated Care*, (23)(3), 129-142.

Jordan, E. (2019). *The Wigan Deal*. The Future of Government Series, Centre for Public Impact.

- Klinga, C., Hansson, J., Hasson, H. & Sachs, M. (2016). Co-Leadership – A Management Solution for Integrated Health and Social Care. *International Journal of Integrated Care*, (16)(2), 1–9.
- Lindgreen, A., Koenig-Lewis, N., Kitchener, M., Brewer, J. D., Moore, M. H. & Meynhardt, T. (Eds.) (2019). *Public Value*. London: Routledge.
- Ling, T., Brereton, L., Conklin, A., Newbould, J. & Roland, M. (2012). Barriers and facilitators to integrating care: experiences from the English Integrated Care Pilots. *International Journal of Integrated Care*, (12)(3), 1–12.
- Lüdeke-Freund, F. (2010). *Towards a Conceptual Framework of 'Business Models for Sustainability'* In J. Wever, A. Quist, J. Tukker, F. Woudstra, N. Boons & N. Beute (Eds.) *Knowledge, Collaboration and Learning for Sustainable Innovation*. Delft.
- Lyngso, A. M., Skavlan, N., Host, D. and Frolich, A. (2014). Instruments to assess integrated care: A systematic review. *International Journal of Integrated Care*, (14)(9).
- Moore, M. H. (1995). *Creating public value*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Morse, R. (2010). Integrative public leadership: Catalyzing collaboration to create public value. *Leadership Quarterly*, (21), 231–245.
- Northouse, P. (2013). *Leadership: Theory and Practice* (6th ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Osborne, S. P., Radnor, Z. & Strokosch, K. (2016). Co-Production and the Co-Creation of Value in Public Services: A suitable case for treatment? *Public Management Review*, (18)(5), 639-653.
- Peck, E., Towell, D. and Gulliver, P. (2001). The meanings of culture in health and social care: A case study of the combined trust in Somerset. *Journal of Interprofessional Care*, (15)(4), 319–327.
- Porter, M. E. & Kramer, M. R. (2011). Creating Shared Value, *Harvard Business Review*, (1).
- Rhodes, R. A. W. (1991). Theory and Methods in British Public Administration: The View from Political Science. *Political Studies*, 39(3), 533–554.
- Rhodes, R. A. W. (1996). The New Governance: Governing without Government. *Political Studies*, (44)(4), 652-667.
- Rhodes, R. A. W. & Wanna, J. (2007). The Limits to Public Value, or Rescuing Responsible Government from the Platonic Guardians. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, (66), 406-421.
- Sandfort, J. (1999). The structural impediments to human service collaboration: Examining welfare reform at the front lines. *Social Service Review*, (73)(3), 314–339.
- Schneider, B. & Barbera, K. M. (Eds.) (2014). *Oxford handbook of organizational climate and culture*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Scottish Government (2015). *National Health and Wellbeing Outcomes: A framework for improving the planning and delivery of integrated health and social care services*. Edinburgh: Scottish Government.

Scottish Government (2016). *Health and Social Care Delivery Plan*. Edinburgh: Scottish Government.

Scragg, T. (2006). An evaluation of integrated team management. *Journal of Integrated Care*, (14)(3), 39–48.

Stewart, A. (2017). *Understanding key challenges in health and social care integration in Scotland: Principal Stakeholders' Perspectives*. Edinburgh Napier University.

Stoker, G. (2006). Public value management: A new narrative for networked governance. *American Review of Public Administration*, (36), 41–57.

Talbot, C. (2009). Public Value - The Next “Big Thing” in Public Management? *Intl Journal of Public Administration*, (32)(3-4), 167-170.

Vedung, E. (2017). *Public Policy and Program Evaluation*. Oxford: Routledge.

Walshe, K., Lorne, C., Coleman, A., McDonald, R. & Turner, A. (2018). *Devolving health and social care: learning from Greater Manchester*. Manchester: The University of Manchester.

West, M., Eckert, R., Steward, K. & Pasmore, B. (2014). *Developing Collective Leadership for Healthcare*. London: The King`s Fund.

Williams, P. (2012). The role of leadership in learning and knowledge for integration. *Journal of Integrated Care*, (20)(3), 164-174.