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O good old man, how well in thee appears
The constant service of the antique world,
When service sweat for duty, not for meed!
Thou art not for the fashion of these times,
Where none will sweat but for promotion,
And having that, do choke their service up
Even with the having: it is not so with thee.
(Shakespeare: As you like it. Act II, Scene III.)

1. What is ‘good governance’?

As Orlando saw it in Shakespeare’s play “As you like it” ‘good governance’ entailed servants sweating for duty, not for meed or promotion. As we will show, modern conceptions of ‘good governance’ are surprisingly close to Orlando’s view despite many years with New Public Management and Reinventing Government. ‘Good governance’ is today used by international organizations such as the World Bank, IMF, OECD, UN and the EU. These organizations use the term in very different contexts, ranging from financial assistance to developing countries to evaluating countries seeking membership in the European Union.
The OECD defines good governance as governance ‘characterised by participation, transparency, accountability, rule of law, effectiveness, equity, etc.’\(^1\) With minor variations, these values are reiterated by other international organizations. Within the OECD, the PUMA project adds technical and managerial competence and organizational capacity to the list\(^2\); the IMF stresses the importance of tackling corruption\(^3\); the World Bank finds political stability and absence of violence/terrorism worth mentioning\(^4\); The UN adds consensus orientation\(^5\); and finally, the EU accession criteria (the Copenhagen criteria) include democracy, human rights and respect and protection of minorities\(^6\). The orientation and context varies, but there is clearly a common core of public values such as transparency, accountability, effectiveness and the rule of law.

Given these official declarations of good governance from key international organizations, it is tempting to conclude that we are witnessing a set of global public values. However, *national* conceptions of good governance may very well reflect diverging political cultures and institutional heritages, as Pollitt (2001) has pointed out regarding New Public Management. The purpose of this paper is to explore national conceptions of good governance, to see whether these converge and to see whether there is a match with the international conceptions.

At the heart of good governance is the notion of public values. Public values can be defined as the ideals, articulated as principles, to be followed when producing a public service or regulating

---

citizens’ behaviour, thus providing direction to the behaviour of public servants (Beck Jørgensen and Andersen 2011). According to Bozeman (2007: 13), public values specify:

- ‘the rights, benefits and prerogatives to which citizens should (and should not) be entitled;
- the obligations of citizens to society, the state and one another; and
- the principles on which governments and policies should be based.’

The latter institutional element in the definition is important, as it indicates how values are the basic building blocks of the public sector (Beck Jørgensen 1999: 581).

Studying public values in a number of countries throughout the world represents a costly challenge if one is meant to carry out detailed studies of various value expressions, including actual behaviour. Actually, only few detailed empirical investigations have been carried out and they cover a very limited number of countries (Beck Jørgensen and Andersen, 2011). There is, however, one possible short cut: selecting and studying codes of conduct. Codes of conduct seem to be used in countries all over the world and they increasingly seem to focus on the proper role of the state, its public sector and public servants in general. We refer to such codes as codes of good governance.

In this paper, we will analyse a sample of such codes from various countries. Time and space restrictions prevent us from delving in detail into the single code and the country it represents. It is important to note that codes certainly cannot be equated with behaviour; they are statements of preferred behaviour. The code is in focus as a text, and the main purpose of the paper is to identify the public values within codes of good governance by seeking answers to the following questions:

---

7 Code of conduct and ethics code tend to be used interchangeably, see OECD (2008).
What kind of public values regarding the role of the public sector in society and the behaviour of its civil servants are displayed in national codes of good governance?

Are national codes of good governance so similar that they most likely reflect a set of global public values or do the variations between the codes suggest that they reflect unique national public values?

2. Codes of good governance – the empirical focus

Codes of conduct have been used far back in history as an instrument for socializing norms and values, whether of religious, professional or civic character. The Ten Commandments, Hippocratic Oath and Pericles’ Athenian code offer notable examples. However, the widespread use of codes in the public sector is a relatively new phenomenon. Until the mid-1990s, codes were primarily to be found in states with Anglo-American political-administrative traditions. Since that time, codes seem to have been introduced in countries throughout the world (Dwivedi and Kernaghan, 1983).

Codes express a vision of excellence. They provide ideals and values to strive for and indicate situations to be avoided (Gilman 2005). Like taking an oath (Rutgers 2009), these ideals and values are expected to refer to matters above the individual’s private life, to behaviour in one’s official capacity. As Lewis (2005: 4) explains:
The power of people in public service compared to those they serve is behind the idea that ‘public service is a public trust’ and explains why so many governmental and professional codes impose special obligations on public servants who, as temporary stewards, exercise public power and authority. Their position is neither theirs to own, nor is it theirs to keep.

A code is usually understood as a collection of rules and principles expected to be followed by a group of people. This group can be large and general, e.g. public servants, or specific such as certain public office holders, senior civil servants, as well as professions working in sensitive areas, e.g. law enforcement, judiciary, national defence, tax and custom administrations and the professions with a tradition of self-regulation like doctors and lawyers (OECD 2008).

As opposed to legal rules, codes do not specify very detailed rules. While related sanctions can be mentioned, they do not constitute the core of a code. In Pericles’ apt phrasing, codes refer to proper conduct which ‘cannot be broken without acknowledged disgrace’ (Thucydides, Book II, Chapter 6, 37). On the other hand, codes usually present a coherent sense of expected behaviour that is more detailed than abstract phrases such as ‘Righteousness exalts a nation’ (Proverbs 14:34). Code-writers therefore face the challenge of balancing:

We share the view of those who warn against unduly detailed and prescriptive rules, but we also consider that it is unreasonable to expect that the view of every Member of Parliament of what is and is not acceptable will produce without guidance a universally acceptable standard. (First Report, the Nolan Committee 1995: 38)

This also means that codes differ in specificity. They can focus on those values and principles that in general terms define the role of the civil servant, or they can focus on the application of such
values and principles in specific situations, e.g. in conflict-of-interest situations (use of official information, receiving gifts or benefits and post public employment). Some codes combine general values and standards on how to put them into practice (OECD 2008). If a code is fairly detailed, it is labelled as a compliance-based code (e.g. the Justinian Code and the US Guide to Senior Executive Service Qualifications) as opposed to the less detailed code, which is labelled as an integrity-based code (e.g. the seven principles of the Nolan Committee). 8

16 codes of good governance have been selected for this study. The selection followed two criteria. Firstly, it is crucial that the selected codes represent the national level. Therefore we have selected codes that can be classified as either general codes for the public sector as such or codes for public managers or civil servants in the public sector or in central government. Thus, codes for regional and local governments and codes for professions or very specific groups of public employees are not included.

Secondly, we have chosen codes from countries belonging to different political-administrative traditions and regions. Identified similarities despite national variations are therefore good indicators of a set of global public values. Following a usual grouping of countries (see e.g. Kickert 2005), we have chosen codes from Southern Europe (Italy and Spain), the Nordic region (Denmark and Norway), Eastern Europe (the former communist states Estonia, Poland and Romania), and the Anglo-Saxon countries (Canada, New Zealand and the UK). We have also included three countries representing unique traditions and backgrounds: Korea (Asia), South Africa (with its own distinctive political development) and Turkey (on the border between Islamic and Christian

---

8 For a general description of codes, see also Kernaghan (1980), Lawton (2001) and OECD (1996).
countries). On top, we selected two ‘model codes’ issued by the United Nations and the European Council, respectively, in order to investigate whether model codes differ from national codes.

We expect the selected codes to present contemporary public values. They are recently drafted (13 codes are issued since 2000), and the formal requirements for drafting and re-drafting are few compared to the formal legislation regulating public employee behaviour, for not to mention constitutions. The selected codes are presented in Appendix 1.

3. The Public Values Approach

When interested in identifying which values are mentioned in codes of good governance and their relative importance, we require ideas on which values might be relevant and on how to index value importance. We base these efforts on the Beck Jørgensen-Bozeman Public Value Inventory, because we not only find a list of values identified in the research literature but also a typology of public values in major value constellations (see Figure 1).

The public values in these value constellations are shown in Table 1 and further divided in sub groupings. These are the values we will be searching for in the codes of good governance.

---

9 The actual selection has been restricted as we only accepted codes written in or translated to English. This might have introduced a cultural bias.

10 The Eastern European states represent a notable exception, as they had to issue new legislation after the collapse of the Soviet regime, including new constitutions. For an analysis of the public values in the codes, legislation and constitutions in these countries, see Palidauskaite (2010).
The following steps have been taken in order to identify values and assess their importance. First, the above model was tested on a test-code in order to see whether the model could capture the entire value universe. Second, a quantitative double coding (which values are mentioned, how many times) was performed. The quantitative coding was followed by a qualitative reading of all of the codes with two purposes: a) identifying value statements communicated indirectly and b) estimating the relative importance of identified values by analysing their relational properties, i.e. proximity (neighbouring values), hierarchy (prime and instrumental values) and causality (co-values), see Beck Jørgensen & Bozeman (2007: 369-73). Finally, the importance of a given value in a given code was indexed.

This procedure does not guarantee that a cultural bias has been avoided successfully. First, the Beck Jørgensen/Bozeman typology may introduce a bias because the values in the typology were selected from Western Political Science/Public Administration literature. Second, the two authors of this paper come from the same (Western) country. Third, values are very intangible phenomena, difficult to identify and measure, and highly context-sensitive as the same value can be interpreted quite differently in different countries. We have tried minimizing the methodological problems by applying highly specific coding and by citing generously from the codes. To some extent, this gives the reader a possibility to grasp the normative world of the codes and to follow our interpretations. See Appendix 2 for a more detailed account of the methods used.
4. Public value convergence

When examining the codes, the differences at first sight appear as astonishing. The length varies from the Canadian Value and Ethics Code (43 pages, illustrated) to the Estonian Public Service Code of Ethics (1¼ pages filled with 20 very brief sentences). The language varies. The Canadian and New Zealand codes are written in an essayistic style, presenting value families, text boxes and core values addressing the citizen as well as the public servant, while the Italian code among others is quite legalistic and occasionally very specific (‘In handling cases he/she shall observe their chronological order’). The Turkish code is somewhere between a Southern European dry, legalistic style and an Anglo-Saxon literary touch. The cultural context varies. The Korean code focuses strongly on gifts, acknowledges special circumstances as congratulations and condolences and refers to religious organizations and friendly societies, thereby reflecting a civil culture and organization that hardly is Northern European. Finally, the codes communicate quite differently. The Canadian code displays a maple leaf and the Peace Tower from the Canadian parliament buildings on the front page. Norway and Denmark display a mountain stream and a spring flower, respectively. In contrast, Spain and Poland present their codes as ministerial orders.

But when examining the codes systematically, following the methods mentioned in the previous section, we get the opposite picture: national public values tend to converge and form a set of global public values. In the following sections, we begin with a brief overview and then present more detailed examples of value expressions categorized in the major value constellations.
An overview

Table 2 provides important insight into which value constellations are considered most important in codes of good governance based on the quantitative analysis. In each code, values related to public employees (constellation 6) are considered most important. This is hardly a surprise, given how the selected codes are guidelines for employee behaviour. Nevertheless, it emphasizes the importance of employee behaviour as a key to good governance. Note also that values related to the relationship between the administration and citizens or users (constellation 7) is the second or third most important category in 13 codes and that 14 codes emphasize either the contribution of the public sector to society (constellation 1) or the relationship between the administration and its immediate surroundings (constellation 4) as the second or third most important category.

In sum, the emphasis is on the public employees and their relations to the public sector environment, whether referred to in terms of society, citizens/users or immediate surroundings. Little emphasis is on how societal interests are converted to political-administrative decisions (constellation 2) or the relationship between politicians and the administration (constellation 3). While there are differences between the countries, these differences appear rather modest. Good governance worldwide seems preoccupied with the implementation or practice in the public sector.

Following the Beck Jørgensen-Bozeman scheme (2007: 360-1), the next step involves the analysis of the importance of subgroups of values within the single constellation. When combining the
quantitative analysis with the qualitative reading of the codes and the analysis of relations between values, we arrive at the picture presented in Table 3.

In the following subsections, we present examples of characteristic public value expressions from each value constellation.

**Constellation 1: The contribution of the public sector to society**

Two values appear as nodal values: *the public interest* and *regime dignity*. Several other values in the codes relate to the public interest. For example, impartiality, innovation, effectiveness, transparency, altruism, democracy and legality are mentioned as instrumental values to public interest as a prime value, and public interest is often ranked as the top value in a value hierarchy, as for example in the Spanish and South African codes:

‘Decision-taking shall always seek to satisfy the general interests of citizens and shall be based on objective considerations focused on the common interest, regardless of any other factor implying personal, family, corporate, client-based positions or any others which might collide with this principle.’ (Spain)

‘An employee […] puts the public interest first in the execution of his or her duties.’ (South Africa)
The sincerity of the public interest is sharpened in the Estonian code:

‘An official shall be prepared to make unpopular decisions in the public interest.’ (Estonia)

Regime dignity is linked to values such as reliability, trust, integrity, impartiality, democracy, ethical consciousness, legality and transparency. As stated briefly and boldly in the Introduction to the New Zealand code:

‘The strength of any government system lies in the extent to which it deserves and holds the respect of its citizens.’ (New Zealand).

A central part of regime dignity concerns the image of the public sector or the state as clarified in the Norwegian and Romanian codes:

‘The individual employee is required to perform his or her duties and behave in an ethical manner, and thus avoid damaging the State’s reputation.’ (Norway)

‘The civil servants that represent the public authority or institution at international organizations, education institutions, conferences, seminars and other activities shall promote an image favourable to Romania and to the public authority or institution they represent.’ (Romania)

*Constellation 2: Transformation of interests to decisions*
As already shown, this constellation is only weakly represented in the codes. When referred to, however, democracy is clearly the favourite. The Canadian code puts democracy up front:

‘The Public Service of Canada is an important national institution, part of the essential framework of Canadian parliamentary democracy. Through the support they provide to the duly constituted government, public servants contribute in a fundamental way to good government, to democracy and to Canadian society.’ (Canada)

Public administration and public employees are in the same way related to democracy in the preamble of the code from the European Council:

‘Considering that public administrations play an essential role in democratic societies and that they must have at their disposal suitable personnel to carry out properly the tasks which are assigned to them.’ (European Council)

*Constellation 3: Relationship between administrators and politicians*

Political loyalty is closely related to democracy, neutrality, legality and impartiality. The Danish code for chief executives underscores loyalty in this manner:

‘It is your responsibility to ensure that the management and staff of the organization are aware of and understand the political goals and intentions, and that they pursue these goals.’

(Denmark)

The Norwegian code adds the shifting political circumstances:
'Civil servants should also acknowledge that they must be capable of working under changing political regimes.’ (Norway)

The New Zealand code agrees and implicitly clarifies that despite conflicting loyalties, the minister is the most important person:

‘Public servants … are as much servants of democracy as they are of the government of the day or their fellow citizens”, which is followed by this clear principle: “Public servants are obliged to serve the aims and objectives of the Minister.’ (New Zealand)

Constellation 4: Relationship between administrators and their immediate surroundings

Constellation 4 is quite important and includes three nodal values: openness (or transparency), impartiality and neutrality. Openness is mentioned with other values such as legality, responsiveness, regime dignity and public insight and thus occurs with rather different meanings. Openness ultimately refers to (active) acceptance of external critique as found in the Norwegian code:

‘The principles of transparency and the citizenry’s scrutiny of the public service require that the general public has insight into circumstances worthy of criticism in the public service. In some cases, this means that public officials must be able to give the general public factual information about matters involving wrongdoing.’ (Norway)

Openness in this sense is obviously also linked to legality. Openness understood as being responsive is a far less popular guest in the codes. In fact, listening to the public opinion is only briefly mentioned in two codes.
Impartiality and neutrality are standard values in codes for good governance, and the two values often seem to appear as synonyms (despite not being identical). With one exception - the Danish code for chief executives - one of the two or the two together are mentioned in all codes. Impartiality (or neutrality) can be mentioned specifically, as in the European Council code:

‘The public official should act in a politically neutral manner.’ (European Council)

Or mixed up with other values, as in the Italian code:

‘The principles and contents of the present code constitute exemplary specifications of the requirements of diligence, faithfulness and impartiality that characterize the correct performance of the employee’s work obligations.’ (Italy)

The poles opposite to openness and impartiality/neutrality – secrecy and advocacy, respectively – are rarely mentioned despite the fact that secrecy is an important part of the ‘rechtstaat’ (e.g. avoiding improper access to cases concerning individual citizens), that all states handle information of a confidential nature, and that many public organizations - if not all - are established in order to defend and advocate certain values and policy purposes. It is as secrecy and advocacy are taboo values in codes of good governance.

**Constellation 5: Intraorganizational aspects of public administration**

Constellation 5 has four subgroups. The subgroup on economy values is mentioned in 15 codes. Note that not only is effectiveness considered more important than productivity, a business-like approach and parsimony; the meaning of effectiveness is also very broad and only in a few
instances linked to a modern business-like approach. What is called for is a proper, accountable use of public money and property.

The following examples from Canada, Estonia, the UN, Italy and Norway illustrate the variety of interpretations of economy values and how economy values are contextualized or related as instrumental values to other (terminal) values:

‘Public servants shall endeavour to ensure the proper, effective and efficient use of public money.’ (Canada)

‘An official shall treat property entrusted to him or her economically, expediently and prudently.’ (Estonia)

‘Public officials shall ensure that they perform their duties and functions efficiently, effectively and with integrity, in accordance with laws or administrative policies.’ (UN)

‘... he/she undertakes to carry these tasks out in the simplest and most efficient manner possible in the interests of the citizens and assumes the responsibility related to his/her duties.’ (Italy)

‘Public officials are required to use and preserve the State’s resources in the most economical and rational manner possible, and shall not abuse or waste the State’s funds. Reaching the established targets in a good and efficient manner requires striking a balance between efficiency and the use of resources, thoroughness, quality and good administrative practice.’ (Norway)
It is interesting to see how closely economy values are linked to the avoidance of corruption. This is a general feature: The context of economy values is corruption rather than micro-economic rationality. The Romanian code is – among many others – very clear on this point:

‘Civil servants shall use office time and the goods belonging to the respective public authority or institution just for carrying out activities specific to the public position held.’ (Romania)

This takes us directly to two other nodal values in this constellation: robustness and reliability. Both are important instrumental values that relate to a number of other values, such as effectiveness, legality, integrity and impartiality. An example of robustness and efficiency as co-values appears in the Danish code for chief executives:

‘It is your responsibility to ensure that the choices made and initiatives pursued in connection with organizational development and change are robust and make a genuine and constructive contribution to the organization’s efficiency and the execution of its tasks.’ (Denmark)

Although reliability is rarely mentioned directly, this value is often presented indirectly when linked to confidence, integrity or trust as shown in these examples from Great Britain and the European Council:

‘You must […] act in a way which deserves and retains the confidence of Ministers.’ (Great Britain)
‘The public official has a duty always to conduct himself or herself in a way that the public’s confidence and trust in the integrity, impartiality and effectiveness of the public service are preserved and enhanced.’ (European Council)

The latter principle from the European Council is at the same time an example of how values can be assumed to co-vary: Reliability ensures trust and confidence. High trust and confidence make it easier to act with integrity, impartiality and effectiveness.

The importance of robustness and reliability tends to rule out innovation, enthusiasm and willingness to take risks. These values can only be identified in four codes. The Canadian code mentions innovation in rather soft tones as renewal:

‘Public servants should constantly renew their commitment to serve Canadians by continually improving the quality of service, by adapting to changing needs through innovation.’ (Canada)

In contrast, South Africa states this more boldly in terms of creativity and innovation:

‘An employee […] is creative in thought and in the execution of his or her duties and seeks innovative ways to solve problems and enhances effectiveness and efficiency within the context of the law.’ (South Africa)

In general, however, the balance between predictability (robustness, reliability etc.) and unpredictability (innovation, risk taking etc.) clearly tips in favour of predictability.

*Constellation 6: Public employees*
The sixth constellation is the constellation most often addressed. All of the values in this constellation – accountability, professionalism, honesty, moral standards, ethical consciousness and integrity – are with rare exceptions mentioned in all of the codes. Here, the key values are *accountability* and *integrity*. These two values received the highest score and with only one exception are mentioned in all of the codes.

Unsurprisingly, accountability is a popular value. Accountability is an ‘open’ value that fit into many contexts and can carry many meanings (Martinsen and Beck Jørgensen, 2010). A civil servant is accountable if open to public scrutiny, if not committing mistakes, if not allowing political considerations to interfere with professional standards, if avoiding conflicts of interest, if reacting to unethical behaviour, if respecting principles of confidentiality etc. At the same time, a civil servant must also be accountable to the minister and the public.

Like accountability, integrity is used in many different contexts, but conflicts with other values are emphasized more directly. Integrity can be phrased as *professional integrity* – i.e. never allowing irrelevant considerations to influence your decisions. For example, a public employee in South Africa:

‘… does not unfairly discriminate against any member of the public on account of race, gender, ethnic or social origin, colour, sexual orientation, age, disability, religion, political persuasion, conscience, belief, culture or language.’ (South Africa)

Integrity can be labelled *economic integrity*, i.e. never letting economic interests influence your work. This is a key point in many codes. In particular, the Korean code devotes a number of rather detailed paragraphs to economic integrity:
‘A public official shall not receive money, valuables, real estate, gifts or entertainment (hereinafter referred to as ‘money and other articles’)...’ ‘A public official shall not borrow money or rent real estate from a duty-related person (excluding a relative within the third degree) ...’ ‘A public official shall not give or take money and other articles for congratulations and condolences that exceed the standards, which the head of a central administrative agency has set within the scope of general conventions, in consideration of ordinary custom after hearing the opinion of employees.’ (Korea)

Finally, integrity can be understood as political integrity, meaning that the public employee is not influenced by any political affiliations. Here, the Polish code is very restrictive, as it states that he/she:

‘... shall not manifest their political opinions and sympathies, and if he/she is a civil servant, he/she shall not arrange and belong to a political party.’
‘... shall openly keep their distance from any political influence or pressure that might lead to partiality in action and shall not engage in activities that could serve party purposes.’ (Poland)

Constellation 7: Relationship between public administration and citizen

The last constellation consists of four subgroups of values: a judicial-oriented category with roots in the classic ‘rechtstaat’, professionalism that reflects the modern state with all of its experts, dialogue with an emphasis on participation and citizen involvement, and user orientation with New Public Management-inspired customer identification. The first, judicial-oriented subgroup is undoubtedly the most important. The citizen has rights, shall be protected by the rule of law, and unfair preferential treatment shall be avoided. The Italian code is short and clear on this:
‘… the employee shall ensure equal treatment of the citizens…’ (Italy)

And also quite specific:

‘In handling cases he/she shall observe their chronological order and shall not refuse to perform actions that it is his/her duty to perform by citing generic motivations such as the amount of work to be done or lack of time.’ (Italy)

5. A set of global public values

Constitutionalism and Weberian bureaucracy as a global trend

When summing up, there seems to be little doubt that a number of specific public values can be labelled as global values in codes of good governance:

- Public interest, regime dignity
- Political loyalty
- Transparency
- Neutrality, impartiality
- Effectiveness
- Accountability
- Legality
These values have been mentioned repeatedly and there are only seven instances (in four codes) where one of these core values has not been included. Examples are transparency in the Korean code and political loyalty in the Italian code. Much the same values were found in investigations of principles and values for public servants in Central and East European countries (Palidauskaite & Lawton 2004; Palidauskaite 2010). Moreover, the values in the country codes match the values in the UN code, the European Council Model Code and in the conceptions of good governance introduced by other international organizations such as OECD, IMF and The World Bank. It is seems fair to conclude that we have identified a set of global values.

All in all, these values strongly points to the ideals of the constitutional state and Weberian bureaucracy with its conception of rational-legal authority, i.e. a classical Western conception of how the state and the public sector should be organized. In the same breath it is worth highlighting what is left out of the codes. There are very few references to more modern ideals – and realities - about a) citizen involvement, participation and user democracy; b) markets, public-private partnerships, contracting out and New Public Management; and c) networks and multilevel governance. New developments in the public sector in most countries seem to be ignored and modern reform values like innovation, risk taking and enthusiasm are marginalized. Recalling the Shakespeare quote, values in codes of good governance call for public service to be motivated by duty rather than meed and promotion.
Why do we find a set of global public values? And one could add: why these classical values in particular? We can not present well established answers to these questions but we can offer a few hypotheses worthwhile investigating further.\textsuperscript{11}

First, international cooperation on state building, administrative reform and the fight against corruption has increased significantly in the last decades through organizations such as the OECD, UN, Transparency International, UNICORN and the World Economic Forum. Through these international networks, certain norms of good governance can easily be spread around the world and thus contribute to the development of a set of global public values.

Second, some states can be heavily dependent on the goodwill of international or supranational organizations. It is remarkable that the codes from the three Eastern European countries are quite similar to the Scandinavian and Anglo-Saxon codes. One possible explanation is that the codes were drafted during their transformation from former communist states to EU member states, i.e. codes are used to handle strategic contingences.

Third, bringing bureaucracy back in has been trendy for some years.\textsuperscript{12} It is certainly not surprising if this trend is acknowledged when drafting codes of good governance. Codes of good governance are perhaps exactly reactions to what some would label as modern fashions such as citizen involvement, NPM, networks etc. Indeed, these codes may be an element in bureaucratic politics between admirers of decency and classic virtues, on the one side, and fans of performance-related pay and outsourcing on the other: a reply in an ongoing battle between legality and efficiency?

\textsuperscript{11} Admittedly, the saliency of certain values may to some extent be a result of the specific selection of codes. The selection of general codes for the public sector as such or codes for employees in more classic parts of public administration favour the presence of “the shadow of hierarchy” compared to users, networks, private partners etc.

A fourth type of answer can be found if we focus on what kind of problems these codes are supposed to pose the solution to. Corruption is a widely acknowledged problem. Some of the national codes, such as the Italian and Korean codes, address corruption directly, and corruption clearly forms the context of the two models codes - The UN and European Council codes. The latter states:

‘Convinced that corruption represents a serious threat to the rule of law, democracy, human rights, equity and social justice, that it hinders economic development and endangers the stability of democratic institutions and the moral foundations of society.’ (European Council)

The UN code is very specific on identifying corruption as the main problem when connecting corruption with political instability, insecurity, the undermining of democracy and morality, organized crime, money laundering etc. If corruption is considered a worldwide problem, it is perhaps no surprise that codes from around the world present the same type of remedy.

**Bringing national variation back in**

Although the codes clearly converge with regard to values and the preferred organizational model, there are some interesting differences. If we re-categorize our codes in groups of countries with the same administrative traditions, we find some systematic variation.

$$\text{Insert Table 4 around here}$$
Table 4 outlines a number of small but nevertheless interesting differences. First, the Scandinavian group is characterized by a stronger focus on dialogue, user-orientation and the self-development of employees. One of the Danish codes exemplifies a Scandinavian laid back spirit:

‘The daily work in public organizations is normally marked by an open dialogue and informal working relations, and the tasks are typically solved by managers and employees together after common discussion of various points of view.’ (Denmark 2)

Such sentiments cannot be found in the Southern European codes – possibly reflecting differences in administrative and political culture and level of corruption. Denmark (and the other Scandinavian countries) are high trust countries and comparatively corruption-free and can consequently afford a relaxed administrative approach.

Second, the Anglo-Saxon countries place notable emphasis on political loyalty, neutrality and impartiality in contrast to especially the Southern European countries. The differences in the political systems possibly have an impact.

Third, political history may also play a role. The Romanian and especially the Polish codes are very restrictive with regard to civil servants’ political activities; and we are reminded about the South African history of apartheid when her code specifies that an employee ‘… promotes the unity and well-being of the South African nation…’

7. Conclusion
In 14 national codes of good governance, we identified a set of apparently global public values: *Public interest, regime dignity, political loyalty, transparency, neutrality, impartiality, effectiveness, accountability and legality*, reflecting ideals from constitutionalism and rational bureaucracy. They match with the international code from UN and the model code from the European Council and the conceptions of good governance launched by OECD, IMF, the World Bank, UN and EU. Consequently, we may have identified a set of global public values. We have suggested four possible explanations of this value globalization: increased international cooperation on matters of state building and administrative reform, the need of some states to adapt strategically to external contingences, the regained popularity of Weberian bureaucracy, and a wider acknowledgement of the dangers of corruption.

However, variations in content – not to speak of language and style - can be found. National political cultures, differences in political systems and the specific political history may account for the differences between the codes of good governance. While the national codes focus on the same core values, these values are balanced and communicated differently and seem to some extent to be translated or edited into a national culture.

These findings – a step towards an explication of a global normative context - may be useful for the increasing number of public servants working in international administrative spaces. However, two warnings are suitable. First, these codes state public values at a rhetorical level. While they in some instances may reflect actual behaviour, they in other instances probably are wishful thinking. Second, the present study may be subject to a Western bias in the chosen public values approach and in the selection of countries. Therefore, future research of globalized good governance should include in-depth studies of espoused values and behaviour, add more countries to avoid a Western
bias and engage scholars from non-Western countries.
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## Appendix 1. The selected codes of good governance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Code title</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Appendix 2. Methodology

A major issue in a quantitative content analysis is securing the reliability of the analysis, which is challenged e.g. by the lack of context and the researcher’s preconceptions. In this study, we have taken the following steps to secure the reliability of the coding and analysis process. First, the model was tested on a test-code of conduct in order to see if the model could grasp the whole value universe expressed in the code. Second, a double-coding was performed by one author with a time span in between. Next, the codings were compared with particular focus on the value profiles. There was no significant difference between the two codings. Third, the co-author controlled all coding. This procedure revealed a few disagreements and a somewhat larger set of legitimate variations in the interpretation.

The following rules of thumb served as indications of value presence:

- Value X is mentioned directly
- Synonyms to X are mentioned
- Aspects of X are mentioned
- Activities leading to X are mentioned
- Prerequisites to obtain X are mentioned
- A definition of X is mentioned
- The purpose of the code is X

In a number of cases, a specified interpretation was necessary, e.g. *balancing of interests* (balancing of various considerations); *neutrality/impartiality* (often used interchangeably in codes; *robustness, accountability, reliability* (often used interchangeably in codes; accountability in particular carry many meanings, e.g. discipline, dedication, reporting about the errors of others, correcting own misbehaviour, reporting about the danger of conflicts of interest, reporting about own financial circumstances, and acting in accordance with professional standards); *professionalism* (two interpretations have been used; a) acting on the basis of expert/scientific knowledge, b) acting without any regard to irrelevant circumstances, e.g. own feelings; coding is based on words such as skills, professionalism, evidence, merit, facts, objectivity, and avoidance of own viewpoints); *moral standards, ethical consciousness* (tend to be used interchangeably in codes); *integrity* (can be
difficult to separate from moral standards; moral standards can be expressed as instrumental to integrity (co-value); legality, rule of law, justice and fairness (tend to be used interchangeably).

The coding process indicated that: a) sometimes values are used without much consideration while at other times in a very detailed and careful manner; b) some values are so close that it is difficult to see whether they are neighbouring values or synonyms; c) some values are all-encompassing (e.g. accountability, integrity), the implications being that i) the precise meaning is not clear to the writer of the code or to the interpreter, ii) the meaning can differ from one code to another or from one situation to another, and iii) the value can be used as a facade or window dressing value.

While the quantitative content analysis provides an overview of the values identified, it is thus but a rude indicator of value profiles. In order to establish more detailed information on the values and their importance in the codes, three steps were taken as part of a qualitative strategy:

*An analytical reading of the codes in their entirety*
When splitting the codes up into small pieces, as in the coding-process, meaning can be lost. The extra reading attempts to grasp indirectly communicated value statements.

*Identifying/analyzing if the coded values were primary or instrumental to other values*
This is done by studying the coded results and - one by one, code for code - establishing their internal relations (e.g. acting accountably in order to serve the public interest etc).

*Identifying/analyzing if the value has many neighbour- and co-values*
Same process as above, but focusing on neighbour/co-value relations.
Figure 1. The structure of the public values universe

- General society
- The contribution of the public sector to society
- Transformation of interests to decision

1. Politicians
2. Public administration
3. Internal function and organization
4. Public employees
5. Internal function and organization
6. Public employees
7. Citizens, users, customers
Table 1: Constellations, subgroups and public values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value constellations</th>
<th>Public values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Public sector’s contribution to society</td>
<td>- Public interest, common good, social cohesion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Altruism, human dignity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Sustainability, voice of the future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Regime dignity, regime stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Transformation of interests to decisions</td>
<td>- Majority rule, democracy, will of the people, collective choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- User democracy, local governance, citizen involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Protection of minorities, protection of individual rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Relationship between administrators and politicians</td>
<td>- Political loyalty, accountability, responsiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Relationship between public administrators and their environment</td>
<td>- Openness, responsiveness, listening to the public opinion, secrecy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Neutrality, impartiality compromise, balancing of interests, advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Competiveness, cooperativeness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Intraorganizational aspects of public administration</td>
<td>- Robustness, adaptability, stability, reliability, timeliness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Innovation, enthusiasm, risk readiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Effectiveness, productivity, parsimony, business-like approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Self-development of employees, good working environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Behaviour of public-sector employees</td>
<td>- Accountability, professionalism, honesty, moral standards, ethical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>consciousness, integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Relationship between public administration and the citizens</td>
<td>- Rule of law, legality, protection of individual rights, equal treatment,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Equity, reasonableness, fairness, professionalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Dialogue, responsiveness, user democracy, citizen involvement, citizens’ self-development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- User orientation, friendliness, timeliness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Beck Jørgensen & Bozeman (2007: 360-361).
Table 2: Indexed distribution of values on value constellations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constellation</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>ER</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>GB</th>
<th>IT</th>
<th>KR</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>NZ</th>
<th>PO</th>
<th>RO</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>TY</th>
<th>UN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The contribution of the public sector to society</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Transformation of interests to decisions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Relationship between public administrators and politicians</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Relationship between public administrators and their environment</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Intraorganizational aspects of public administration</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Behaviour of public employees</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Relationship between public administration and the citizens</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 3: The importance of value subgroups within value constellations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constellations with subgroups</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>ER</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>IT</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>PO</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public interest</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regime dignity</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority rule</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 User democracy</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection of minorities</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Political loyalty</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutrality</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitiveness</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Robustness</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-development of employees</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Accountability</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule of law</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Equity</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User orientation</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each subgroup is labelled by the first value mentioned in that subgroup. For example, subgroup “accountability” constellation 6) consists of the following values: accountability, professionalism, honesty, moral standards, ethical consciousness and integrity.

= not mentioned
* = mentioned superficially
○ = mentioned directly in several contexts
● = nodal value, mentioned several times and with strong relations to a number of other values (instrumental, neighbouring, subordinate)
Table 4: Values in codes re-categorized according to administrative tradition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative tradition</th>
<th>Scandinavian</th>
<th>Anglo-Saxon</th>
<th>Southern Europe</th>
<th>Eastern Europe</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Model codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>NZ</td>
<td>GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public interest</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Altruism</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regime dignity</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority rule</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 User democracy</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection of minorities</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political loyalty</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutrality</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competiveness</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robustness</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Innovation</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee self-development</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Accountability</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule of law</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Equity</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User orientation</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>