Chapter 19

Research on good governance in sport

From puberty to adulthood

Frank van Eekeren

Introduction

This book marks 10 years of research into good governance in sport. The contributions in this book show that various authors from various disciplines have started to delve into the theme, and it has resulted in a rich palette of insights, ideas and criticism. Gradually, we can speak of a 'research field'; one that sees not only extensive academic publication and debate, but also one that has had a body of knowledge with a broad range of empirical findings, theories and perspectives emerge from it. At the same time, it is a research field that distinguishes itself from many others, in particular because it has a demonstrable and sometimes direct impact on practice. This means that researchers bear a great deal of responsibility. After 10 years, it is time to take stock and, on the basis of the contributions in this book, to ask ourselves at what stage of development this relatively young research field is.

The development of a research field in general is not prescribed and does not proceed in accordance with any predetermined steps. There are several ways to look at the development of a research field and the use of a specific metaphor can be helpful in sharpening the view. In this concluding chapter, I will look at the research field of good governance in sport using the metaphor of human development; from infancy through childhood, through puberty and into adulthood. Doing so, will allow me to investigate what steps are needed to further develop the research field and to bring it on its way into adulthood.

The first conclusion after reading this book may be that research into good governance in sport has transcended childhood. In the early 2010s, the pioneers took their first steps from research projects aimed at bringing about practical change in the everyday management of sport organisations, which were in turn prompted by scandals in international sport federations. Projects such as Action for Good Governance in Sport (Alm 2013) and publications on good governance principles and measurable parameters (Chappelet & Mrkonjic 2013; Geeraert 2019) were therefore aimed at practical applicability. They were also aimed at making good governance measurable, so that on one hand, sport federations would be stimulated to change (through naming and shaming where necessary) and on the

other, so that mutual comparison between sport federations would be possible. The acceptance of this academic input by practitioners is remarkably high—by no means is every scientific insight being picked up so successfully outside the academic community. At the same time, the practical impact of the pioneers' work is also understandable: the knowledge provided is based on the belief in a certain degree of manufacturability, and it provides managers in sport and government officials with guidance for their actions.

Since then, the research field has grown. It has grown in size, given the number of studies, publications, symposia and debates, but also in diversity, given the application of different scientific concepts from different disciplines. The authors in this book apply different theoretical perspectives, ranging from instrumental rationality to critical feminism, and theoretical concepts, such as ethical leadership and legitimacy work. They use these perspectives and concepts to reflect on issues at the global, national and local level: from structural changes in international sport federations, such as IOC and FIFA, and the implementation in national sport governing bodies, such as in Canada and Australia, to practical struggles at the local level in a small amateur club in the Netherlands. Much of the research in this book focuses on the content, quality and impact of structural measures and codes, as these are dominant in current practice. The contributions show that practice often proves to be unruly and implementation complicated. Based on theory and empiricism, this book exposes weaknesses and vulnerabilities of the dominant approaches. The contributions also show that there is room for other perspectives and criticism of currently dominant research approaches; an insight which is ultimately reflected in the subtitle of this book, critical reflections.

These critical reflections coupled with the growth towards full maturity can be seen as the characteristics of a research field in its puberty. In this phase of life, it is all about the question "who am I?". Puberty is a developmental stage that entails going on a search for one's own identity, even if it means some degree of rebellion, springing from the desire to develop a full-fledged personality that is independent from the community in which one grew up (Susman & Rogol 2004). For a human being, and arguably for a research field that is meant to reach maturity, this means that a (temporary) identity crisis can be part of the development as is the necessity for introspection (cf. Rutgers 2010; Waldo 1968).

In this chapter, I give a first impetus for this introspection, and I indicate a direction to take for the path to adulthood based on the contributions in this book. First of all, this requires critical reflection on the representativeness of the authors and their work for the research field as a whole. After that, the chapter analyses the similarities and differences between the authors and the ontological and epistemological perspectives they use. The chapter follows with a description of a pathway towards adulthood that does justice to the current identity and diversity of the research field and its impact on practice. The chapter ends with implications and recommendations for the relationship of the research field with its maternal sciences, other fields of science and practice.

Representativeness of the authors

In order to describe and analyse the development of the research field on the basis of this book, it is first of all, important to determine whether the authors in this book can be seen as representative of the research field as a whole. Provided that the research field is not a delineated whole or a formal entity with clearly identifiable members, it is important to determine whether the authors in this book are representative of the researchers working on this topic worldwide because representativeness determines the value of the analysis in this chapter: is it only valid for the group of authors in the book or also in a broader sense?

Representativeness here concerns both origin and personal backgrounds of the authors and their scientific disciplines. The authors in this book originated from Europe, the USA, Canada and Australia. Six of them work at the School of Governance of Utrecht University; a department that has a tradition of researching social issues in sport with a critical approach. In addition, most authors are Caucasian and are mostly either anglophone themselves or gravitate towards the anglophone community. This means that researchers from other parts of the world are not present and represented to a limited extent in the book. The authors in this book come from a variety of academic disciplines. They have a background in political sciences, sociology, anthropology, ethics, organisational sciences, public administration, management studies, law and economics. At the same time, a number of disciplines are left out of the picture. For instance, a chapter based on discourse analysis ultimately did not 'make the cut' of the book, despite the fact that discourse analysis does offer interesting opportunities to analyse the content of policy and codes and to expose how certain parts are framed. Other relevant scientific disciplines and theoretical perspectives have undoubtedly been left out of this book, as have been relevant empirical research from Africa, Latin America and Asia and unconventional Non-Western cosmologies, such as Daoism, Ubuntu and Dharma (Baggini 2018).

In part, these omissions can be traced back to the network we drew from as editors and to our invitation policy. At the same time, the book seems to reflect the current dominance in science in general and the research field of good governance in sport in particular. For instance, the underrepresentation of women in science (Catalyst 2020) is reflected in the somewhat unequal male-female ratio among the authors in this book. The existing hegemony of Western and English-speaking researchers in sport is a previously observed phenomenon (Breitbarth, Walzel & Van Eekeren 2019). Visible attention to good governance in sport and the research into it primarily takes place in so-called Western countries. This can be partly explained by the involvement and interest of Western-oriented sport organisations and governments in the topic, but also by the available financial resources in Western countries and universities for this type of research.

All in all, the authors in this book appear to be a reasonable reflection of the current field of research and therefore, statements can be made about the research field as a whole and as stands now on the basis of the authors' contributions in

this book. This is done so explicitly without condoning the mentioned hegemony. At the same time, the hegemony and the limited width of the research field can be seen as expressions of the development phase in which the field finds itself. It can be argued that it is appropriate for a research field in puberty that it relates to a relatively small peer group, while an adult research field is more broadly oriented.

Similarities and differences between the authors

The previous reflection on the composition of the research field does not imply that there is homogeneity in its approach to the subject. Although almost every chapter in this book critically observes the current dominant use of universal good governance in sport codes and related instruments, and challenges the underlying dominant theoretical perspectives of this practice, the authors differ in their perspectives and use of concepts to criticise the current practice. They use various theoretical perspectives in addition to or against the dominant approach (collected in Part I of this book) and different theoretical concepts to arrive at ideas about reform strategies (collected in Part II). According to the type of criticism they provide on the current dominant practice and theoretical approaches on good governance in sport, four groups of authors can be distinguished.

The first group of authors (with limited representation in this book) criticises the quality, reliability and validity of the codes and instruments used. This group aims to inherently improve the existing instruments by means of (technical) optimisation of indicators. The presence of multiple definitions creates difficulties in their attempt to assess what good governance really is and makes it hard to generalise the findings of good governance studies (Kjær 2004; Van Doeveren 2011). The view of this group of authors is that through a rational approach, the instrument for promoting good governance is becoming better and more refined. They often criticise the current lack of adequate methodological transparency of good governance indicators and advocate for developing methodologies that turn good governance in sport into more adequate proxies for the abstract concept of good governance.

A second group of authors, much better represented in this book, focuses not so much on the technique of the existing instruments, but criticises their content and applicability. These authors aim to provide substantive adjustments and argue that instruments should be more focused on context, process and the broader system of organisations and actors that influence good governance in sport. Just like the first group, this group of authors does not question the use of instruments with a generic set of indicators *per se*, since they are based on the common understanding that scholars should use, at least to some extent, valid concepts in a systematic way. Instead, they argue especially in favour of research on determinants, effects and interactions of good governance principles. More concretely, they advocate for a more systemic, archetypical or holistic approach to good governance indicators.

A third group of authors points to the shortcomings and missing elements in current practice and states that in addition to the use of codes and instruments, attention should be paid to other elements that influence good governance. Their reasoning often comes from a specific vision on organisational change and strategic reform, in which they question the effectiveness of codes and instruments and draw attention to less structure-oriented and more process-oriented interventions. Examples of this are the pleas to pay (more) attention to management and leadership skills, organisational culture and the implementation process.

A fourth group of authors takes it a step further and asks fundamental questions about the desirability of a universalist and instrumental approach to good governance in sport. These authors question the existence of neutral and value-free knowledge, emphasise the importance of dialogic relationships and social interaction, and point to the subjective nature of the phenomenon of good governance. They consider good governance in sport as a relative, evolving and culturally defined aspiration, while developing good governance indicators are seen as an inherently political process. Ignoring existing power relationships within and between sport organisations and governments in current approaches and, in this example, dominant Western and white male hegemony in current practice and research is very tricky for this group of authors. For them, quantification of good governance in sport and developing indicators is problematic *per se*.

Clash between ontological and epistemological perspectives

The four groups of authors mentioned are distinguished from each other according to the type of criticism they express in the present book on current practice and theoretical approaches on good governance in sport. This provides a first insight into the identity of the research field. Nonetheless, a deeper reflection into the fundamental academic principles of formulating its criticism fits the introspection necessary for a research field in search of its own identity on its way to adulthood. This deeper reflection concerns classic questions such as: which elements are seen by researchers as fundamental building blocks of reality (ontology) and what is the best way to obtain knowledge about reality (epistemology) (Bartley & Radnitzky 1987). To gain a better insight into the identity of the research field, it is important to explore the similarities and differences in ontological and epistemological perspectives between the four aforementioned groups, based on their present contributions.

In the social and political sciences, two extreme ontological perspectives can be distinguished: objectivism and subjectivism (Bartley & Radnitzky 1987; Marsh & Furlong 2002). On one extreme, objectivism assumes that social phenomena, such as good governance, exist independently of our perception of it. Taking the natural sciences as the ideal, objectivists privilege empirical, observable phenomena. A related epistemological concept is positivism, which is based on observable and quantifiable research results obtained through objective methods (Bartley &

Radnitzky 1987; Mingers 2015). Academics who reason based on this ontological and epistemological perspective will argue that the joint implementation of the right components of good governance make all the difference. It is this combination that contributes to effective and impartial decision-making free from abuses of entrusted power or personal gain. They assume that good governance can be measured objectively and theories as well as deductive research are very important in this perspective.

Objectivism and positivism have not been readily accepted in the social and political sciences for over 50 years (Giddens 1974; Mingers 2015). Many scholars and researchers have never been certain that social sciences easily arrive at true accounts of the world, as positivists suggest. As a counter-reaction, the subjectivist ontological perspective is on the other side of the ontological spectrum. It assumes that social phenomena and their meanings are continuously constructed by social actors. It implies that the social phenomena and social categories are not only produced by social interaction but that they are also constantly being revised: without social actors there would be no social phenomena, such as good governance. A related epistemological concept is social constructivism, which states that knowledge is constructed by each person in their own way, strongly influenced by the reactions and views within the social environment (Bartley & Radnitzky 1987). As a consequence, researchers who take on this perspective do not believe in a universalist approach and objective measuring instruments that are generally considered to be valid. The use of qualitative research methods is in line with this view because one works inductively and is constantly revising the theory, just as the social phenomena are constantly being revised.

Not all researchers in social sciences are comfortable with the described extremes of the ontological and epistemological spectrum. They opt for a position between the extremes and search for resolutions that cohere in comprehensive treatments of ontology and epistemology together with an alternative account of science (Bhaskar 2013). Examples of this are critical realism, which provides an ontology that allows positivism and its empirical realist ontology to be abandoned without having to accept strong social constructivism (Fleetwood & Ackroyd 2004, p. XVI), and constructivist realism, which proposes an alternative ontology that accommodates positivism and constructivism and the methods that they subtend (Cupchik 2001). These intermediate positions allow researchers to work with mixed methods.

Both extreme ontological and related epistemological perspectives are reflected in this research field, just like intermediate positions between these two. In their contributions to this book, most authors are not explicit about the ontological and epistemological perspective behind the approach they criticise or prefer—nor have they been asked to do so. It does not even mean that the position they have taken in their contribution in this book is used in all their work. Many researchers handle different ontological and epistemological perspectives and cannot be categorised. Nevertheless, it is striking that the influence of objectivism and positivism seems to have been dominant, especially in the early years of research on

good governance in sport. This can be seen in the search for objective measuring instruments and the support from practitioners in the form of developing universal good governance principles and codes. This perspective can be recognised in the first group of authors, as distinguished in the previous section. Criticism from this perspective on current research practice mainly concerns the lack of rigour.

Considering the contributions in this book, objectivism seems to no longer be dominant in the research field. The fourth group of authors, as mentioned in the previous section, criticises the idea that objective measuring is possible and that universal principles and codes make sense. In doing so, they are not so much criticising the rigor of the dominant positivist research, but its relevance. They question—often implicitly—the previously dominant paradigm and contrast it with a subjectivist perspective. According to these authors, the use of good governance principles by scholars has produced a veil of objectivity that masks considerable discretion on the part of both designers and recipients. From their perspective, good governance is a normative concept, as the adjective 'good' implies; hence its meaning is subject to political decision-making and reflects different organisational ideologies.

At the same time, not all authors can be unambiguously categorised under one of the two stances. The second and third groups of authors, as described in the previous section, seem to occupy a middle position. Some authors seem to reject positivism, yet nevertheless stick to the ideas about the requirements of theory it has espoused. They criticise the lack of consistency, the limited applicability or omissions of the current dominant approach, but do not go so far as to contrast this with a completely different ontological and epistemological perspective.

Towards adulthood

The previous descriptions and analyses of the research field raise the question of how the research field with such a diversity of researchers and perspectives can develop towards adulthood. The way forward for a research field is not unambiguous. Various research fields or fields of science, such as public administration (cf. Rutgers 2010), political sciences (cf. Bovens 2016) and organisation & management studies (cf. Fleetwood & Ackroyd 2004), grapple with the question of how they can develop further. The path to maturity of a research field is not infrequently, just like that of a human adolescent, characterised by identity crises, in which the question is who or what the research field is and where it is heading (Waldo 1968). According to Rutgers (2010), such a crisis is located precisely at the interstices of 'scope' (what exactly is the subject of study, i.e. where does good governance start and where does it end?) and 'theory' (what is the importance of theory and which theoretical concepts are helpful in this?).

The different answers to questions about scope and theory from the authors in this book imply different ideas about the path to maturity for the research field. For example, the way forward for objectivism and positivism will focus on the clearer formulation of the concept of good governance, the refinement of the

theoretical paradigm and the further sophistication of the methodology. When this is pursued, the objectively measurable reality of a comprehensive theory comes closer and closer. At the other end of the spectrum, from subjectivism and social constructivism's points of view, the further development of the research field will focus on what happens behind the veil of objectivity, and research instruments, which pay attention to context, process and power relations, should be developed and applied. Academics that occupy a position between objectivism and subjectivism will probably have views on the way forward aimed rather at broadening than deepening the research field. They will be more focused on a practical approach than on a fundamental paradigm shift.

Does this mean that the research field is in an identity crisis? This question must be answered positively when a mature research field is defined as a homogeneous community. In that case, a conflict of direction between objectivists and subjectivists will be inevitable and parallel research fields will probably occur. There is a fair chance that this will lead to (renewed) dominance of positivist research due to the ongoing demand from practice for ready-to-use solutions and instruments. As a consequence, other relevant perspectives—also for practice— will remain underexposed.

Therefore, it seems undesirable to strive for a homogeneous field of research from one ontological and epistemological perspective, or for one conceptual framework that encompasses all perspectives and refutes all criticisms. A better option therefore seems to be embracing the multiformity of the research field. When the current heterogeneity of the research field can be seen as a strength and not as an identity crisis, then it can be a powerful part of its adult identity. It also seems logical to welcome this heterogeneity among approaches, partly because good governance in sport is complex and multifaceted; and partly because different methodologies will bring different logics of inquiry, different criteria of what constitutes acceptable, valid and/or meaningful data and different insights and challenges to theory (e.g. Grix 2002; Robson & McCartan 2016). It can be argued that the research field has to be pluralistic, multi- and/or interdisciplinary if its scholars intend to understand "good governance in sport" comprehensively for both academic and practical purposes. This type of adulthood does not so much result in a coherent body of knowledge, but points at a process of continuously striving for the confrontation of diverging approaches in order to better understand some aspect of (what constitutes) good governance in sport in reality.

Conclusion and recommendations

The research field 'good governance in sport' is still relatively young. It has outgrown childhood and seems to be on its way to adulthood. It also can be described as a special research field, especially because of the great influence that its research has had on policy practice to date. There is a clear impact on sport managers and government officials, which means that researchers need to be very

aware of the consequences of their research and recommendations in practice. The introductory chapter of this book presented two key questions that needed to be answered. First, what constitutes good governance in sport and what are the instrumental and moral justifications for implementing it? Second, what are the challenges, dilemmas and risks associated with both inducing and guiding the implementation of good governance in sport and implementing specific practices in sport organisations?

The analysis in this closing chapter shows that the answers to these questions come from different academic disciplines, theoretical perspectives and a range of ontological positions, from objectivism to subjectivism, and that a wide array of research methodologies are used. This heterogeneity can be seen as an important part of the research field's identity which leads to nuance and debate as well as to different answers to the questions in the introductory chapter. We can safely argue that there are no ready-made answers to the question of definition, and neither are there blueprints for implementation. No theory or reform strategy can be seen or presented as a panacea for all issues with good governance in sport, no matter how much practice may be looking for such a remedy. This means that researchers bear a great deal of responsibility, precisely because of their impact on practice. Taking on this responsibility requires a mature field of research that stimulates and facilitates debate and nuance, one that leads to dialogue among researchers as well as between researchers and practitioners.

At the same time, the road to adulthood is not paved and is hardly discussed among good governance in sport researchers—perhaps because not everyone regards 'good governance in sport' as a research field yet. But if academics want to develop research and knowledge on the topic in general and steer the dialogue with practice, it is indispensable to relate explicitly to colleagues who study the same topic, stimulate mutual debate and as such are part of this research field. I distinguish five recommendations towards a mature research field.

First, it is recommended to embrace and stimulate the research field's heterogeneity instead of striving for homogeneity, even though it is clear that heterogeneity is complex; questions such as 'what binds the research community', 'how can researchers communicate with each other' and 'how can they make use of each other's work', are not easy to answer. When diversity is not embraced and stimulated, there will be a fair chance that this will lead to the dominance of an objectivist and positivist perspective due to the desire for unambiguously applicable instruments in practice. The dominant Western perspective plays an additional role in this potential development due to the current interest of Western oriented sport organisations and governments in good governance in sport. Other relevant perspectives will remain outside the picture, which does not do justice to the complexity of the subject. The current research field can be broadened by more explicitly inviting researchers from perspectives and disciplines that have not or hardly been heard yet. Researchers especially from non-Western countries could participate in debates on good governance in sport, and more attention could be paid to their research.

Second, on the research field's way to maturity, both single loop and double loop learning are recommended. On the one hand single loop learning is needed, which is aimed at the continuous improvement of a certain scientific methodology. This will lead to more rigour in research findings from a particular perspective. On the other hand, so-called double loop learning is needed (Argyris & Schön 1978), aimed at regularly questioning the current scientific paradigms and policy frameworks. This type of learning implies reflection on the studies' ontologies, epistemologies and methodologies, and stresses the need to reflect upon them because there is no agreed upon 'paradigm'. Ontological, epistemological and methodological consciousness helps to critically look at certain approaches and enables a better understanding of the criticism on certain approaches. It thus stimulates the academic debate and critical thinking within the research field.

Third, as a consequence of the group's diversity and its interaction with practice, it is recommended that researchers are more explicit about their disciplinary, theoretical, ontological, and epistemological viewpoints for the sake of practitioners who receive advice or criticism from academics. Researchers should explain in layman's language to an extra-academic audience of clients and policymakers or, more generally, to public opinion what the pros and cons and consequences of their perspective are. This is not easy and not all practitioners will be waiting for such reflections, but nevertheless, it is important that the extra-academic audience is enabled to interpret researchers' recommendations and criticisms.

Fourth, it is recommended that researchers make use of theoretical and practical knowledge from their maternal sciences. A mature research field does not forget the maternal disciplines from which it grew up. Researchers in sport sometimes tend to see sport research as a separate discipline and to limit themselves to sport science literature, while in its maternal sciences a lot of relevant theoretical and empirical knowledge is available that might also be also applicable in the context of sport organisations. This concerns disciplines such as sociology, anthropology, economics and law or more specific fields of science, such as public administration, political science, organisational studies, change management and human resource management.

Fifth, it is recommended that researchers in this field not only make use of theory and empiricism from maternal disciplines and specific fields of science, but also use specific knowledge from a sport context to contribute to the general theory formation in the maternal disciplines and other fields of science. Specific characteristics of the sport world, such as the hybrid character with public-private organisational features, make the knowledge acquired relevant for broader theories on (good) governance and thus applicable to other sectors. This recommendation is therefore also an appeal to this research field to engage in broader scientific circles and to publish in non-sport journals, for example.

Finally, I am coming back to the metaphor of human development to interpret the current state of affairs in this research field and to distinguish steps towards its adulthood. Although comparing the development of a research field with that of a human being is flawed in many aspects, there are interesting similarities. One is

that it is impossible to say what an adult ought to look like, just as it is impossible to describe how exactly a mature research field should look. At the same time, development-oriented steps can be distinguished which appear to be valid for both humans and research fields, such as introspection, and characteristics of an adult life can be described, such as open-mindedness. Therefore, this book with critical reflections from so many different angles and perspectives seems like a step forward towards this research fields' adulthood. In fact, perhaps this book is not so much an expression of rebellion in puberty, as first suggested in this chapter, but in all its heterogeneity it is already exhibiting a first sign of adulthood.

References

Alm, J 2013, *Action for Good Governance in International Sports Organisations*, Play the Game/Danish Institute for Sports Studies, Aarhus.

Argyris, C & Schön, DA 1978, *Organizational Learning: A Theory of Action Perspective*, Addison Wesley, Reading.

Bhaskar, R 2013, *A Realist Theory of Science*, Routledge, Oxon. doi:10.4324/9780203090732

Baggini, J 2018, *How the World Thinks: A Global History of Philosophy*, Granta Books, London.

Bartley, W & Radnitzky, G 1987, *Evolutionary Epistemology, Rationality, and the Sociology of Knowledge*, Open Court Publishing Company, Chicago.

Bovens, M 2016, 'Een pleidooi voor meer publieke politicologie', *Res Publica*, vol. 58, no. 1, pp. 102–7. doi:10.5553/RP/048647002016058001005

Breitbarth, T, Walzel, S & Van Eekeren, F 2019, "European-ness' in social responsibility and sport management research: Anchors and avenues', *European Sport Management Quarterly*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 1–14. doi:10.1080/16184742.2019.1566931

Catalyst 2020, Quick Take: Women in Academia.

Chappelet, JL & Mrkonjic, M 2013, *Basic Indicators for Better Governance in International Sport (BIBGIS): An Assessment Tool for International Sport Governing Bodies*, IDHEAP, Lausanne.

Cupchik, G 2001, 'Constructivist realism: An ontology that encompasses positivist and constructivist approaches to the social sciences', *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, vol. 2, no. 1. doi:10.17169/fqs-2.1.968

Fleetwood, S & Ackroyd, S (eds) 2004. *Critical Realist Applications in Organisation and Management Studies*, Routledge, Oxon. doi:10.4324/9780203537077

Geeraert, A 2019, 'Measuring governance: The Sports Governance Observer', in M Winand & C Anagnostopoulos (eds), *Research Handbook on Sport Governance*, pp. 29–52, Edward Elgar Publishing, Northampton doi:10.4337/9781786434821

Giddens, A (eds) 1974, *Positivism and Sociology*, Heinemann, London.

Grix, J 2002, 'Introducing students to the generic terminology of social research', *Politics*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 175–86. doi:10.1111/1467-9256.00173

Kjær, AM 2004, *Governance*, Polity Press, Cambridge.

Marsh, D & Furlong, P 2002, 'A skin not a sweater: Ontology and epistemology in political science', *Theory and Methods in Political Science*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 17–41. doi:10.1007/978-0-230-62889-2_2

Mingers, J 2015, *Systems Thinking, Critical Realism and Philosophy: A Confluence of Ideas (Ontological Explorations)*, Routledge, Oxon. doi:10.4324/9781315774503

Robson, C & McCartan, K 2016, *Real World Research*, John Wiley & Sons Inc, Hoboken.

Rutgers, M 2010, 'Theory and scope of public administration: An introduction to the study's epistemology', *Public Administration Review*, pp. 1–45.

Susman, EJ & Rogol, A 2004, 'Puberty and psychological development', in RM Lerner & L Steinberg (eds), *Handbook of Adolescent Psychology*, John Wiley & Sons Inc, Hoboken, pp. 15–44. doi:10.1002/9780471726746.ch2

Van Doeveren, V 2011, 'Rethinking good governance: Identifying common principles' *Public Integrity*, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 301–18. doi:10.2753/PIN1099-9922130401

Waldo, D (eds) 1968, *The Study of Public Administration*, 11th Edition, Random House, New York.