We all live continually in a time of change, whether in an age of innovation or in a period of decay. This is the natural ebb and flow of the human condition, and likewise that of all the institutions created and staffed by people. Even those venerable customs and structures such as the civil and administrative organizations in old countries are constantly being reinvented and reformed (Kuhlman and Wollman, 2014). Change also affects newly formed countries, even as they emerge star-like from the flux of war or civil strife; or simply because their citizens no longer wish to be linked to an autocratic regime, another nation or group of nations. Some of these resurrect ancient borders and long-smothered nations; others challenge the colonial borders bequeathed by retreating empires (Vidmar, 2012). In all these examples the core structures of the state and the way in which these link to the populace are integral to understanding the delivery of basic services such as law and security, and more sophisticated services such as higher education and innovative medicine. There is a mix of levels, from global governance and supranational, legal organizations (such as the International Court of Justice and International Court of Arbitration) through to myriad local government structures around the globe. Understanding this multi-level governance and the differentiated forms it and the constituent polities take, through surveying public administration, is a core aim of this book.

The transformation of public administration around the globe in the last 30 years shows no sign of abating and remains driven by the powerful dynamics of technical innovation, political development, globalization and economic necessity. Our understanding of how we make sense of these changes also fluctuates, as does our use of language to describe these phenomena. For example, this volume explores the concepts and
practicalities of both public administration and governance. But these remain contested in many respects. This was epitomized in a 2013 debate over the nature of ‘governance’, as considered by a group of leading scholars via the blog of the eponymous journal (http://governancejournal.net). Francis Fukuyama set that debate in motion with a paper that called for better measures to assess governance, while noting that these did not necessarily need to include democratic aspects of accountability and liberal-democratic notions of what is meant by good governance (Fukuyama, 2013). In other words, as he, scholars and political leaders from various parts of the world and different ideological traditions have argued (in different ways), good governance does not need to be democratic governance. Indeed, it may be the case that authoritarian governments can deliver good governance in the sense that it is efficient, effective and delivers good-quality public services. This perspective is anathema to those who argue that good governance is synonymous with liberal-democratic notions of accountability and transparency (Fraser-Moleketi, 2005; Halabi, 2004). Yet there are many in the global South (and elsewhere) who, while they call for public administration to deliver good governance on precisely those utilitarian grounds of efficient and effective services that have the alleviation of human misery as their desired outcome, eschew a call for Western-style democracy.

For example, since it was established in 1944, as one of the so-called Bretton Woods institutions, the World Bank’s stated mission has been to help to establish ‘a world free of poverty’. Indeed, this aim is carved in stone in the organization’s Washington headquarters and features on the Bank’s website, and many of its publications over the years state boldly (and in several different ways) that

This mission underpins all our analytical, financial and convening work in more than 145 client countries that strive to end extreme poverty and promote shared prosperity. The developing world has already attained the first Millennium Development Goal target – to cut the 1990 poverty rate in half by 2015. The 1990 extreme poverty rate – $1.25 a day in 2005 prices – was halved in 2010, according to estimates. According to these estimates, 21 percent of people in the developing world lived at or below $1.25 a day. That’s down from 43 percent in 1990 and 52 percent in 1981. This means that 1.22 billion people lived on less than $1.25 a day in 2010, compared with 1.91 billion in 1990, and 1.94 billion in 1981. Notwithstanding this achievement, even if the current rate of progress is to be maintained, some 1 billion people will still live in extreme poverty in 2015 – and progress has been slower at higher poverty lines. In all, 2.4 billion people lived on less than US $2 a day in 2010, the average poverty line in developing countries and another common measurement of deep deprivation. That is only a slight decline from 2.59 billion in 1981. (World Bank, 2014)

The situation is, however, more complicated than simply listing statistics that show the poverty levels of different countries. The Bank itself notes
that in ‘some developing countries, we continue to see a wide gap – or in some cases – widening gap between rich and poor, and between those who can and cannot access opportunities’ (ibid.). That is, the comparative rates of poverty within developing countries vary enormously, but then they do also in many developed countries. The UK’s Office of National Statistics produces annual tables and reports on comparative wealth and deprivation, such as the *Atlas of Deprivation* (2011), and similar studies in the USA demonstrate that in both of those countries the gap between a small number of wealthy individuals and a much larger proportion of poorer people is widening (United States Census Bureau, 2014). This leads to a series of rhetorical questions:

1. What is good governance?
2. What is the purpose of good governance and how do we recognize it?
3. Can we measure it?
4. What is the purpose and role of public administration?
5. Is it to simply carry out the wishes of the government and control the delivery of services deemed necessary by the government?
6. Or is it to establish institutions and procedures to alleviate inequalities of wealth and power, and deliver services that ameliorate the deprivation of poverty?
7. Can we plan these things strategically in terms of policy-making and public administration (Lusk and Birks, 2014)?
8. Or is public administration something more than any of this? Is it fundamental to the understanding of a nation’s role and status, and does it reflect the broader social and political context?

In terms of question 6, it is worth recalling the statistic that Europe, with just over 7 per cent of the world’s population and about a quarter of its economy, accounts for half the global spending on welfare; in many of the poorer member states of the EU welfare is being paid for only by virtue of the largess (or self-interest) of the richer Northern countries (Hillman, 2014). In such a scenario, when combined with the statistics on global poverty, the many and varied answers to the questions listed above incite contention.

*The International Handbook of Public Administration and Governance* is intended to provide a guide to and explanation of the concepts of and influences on governance and public administration. It cannot provide definitive answers to the above-listed questions, but it does offer a series of perspectives and observations to enable readers to evolve their own perceptions of what these concepts mean and what the institutions of government and governance are for. It is an ambitious volume replete with
contributions from eminent scholars that address the key questions of how
governments, nationally and internationally, can tackle public administra-
tion and governance challenges in an increasingly globalized world. The
international coverage of perspectives, including those from Africa, Asia,
Europe, Australia, North and South America, is a distinctive feature of
this book. It adopts contemporary perspectives of governance, including
public policy capacity, ‘wicked’ policy problems, public sector reforms,
the challenges of globalization and managing complexity. The book is in
two parts.

Part I is largely theoretical and addresses ‘Public Administration, New
Public Management and Governance: Concepts and Contestabilities’.
It begins with a scene-setting chapter by Robert Pyper that introduces
and contextualizes public administration, public management and gov-
ernance as key concepts. There is no attempt here (or anywhere in the
volume) to create a general theory of public administration, as has been
done elsewhere (Lalor, 2014); rather, Pyper provides a careful explanation
and exploration of the historical and academic context. This leads into
the original and theory-building chapter by Bouckaert. He opines that
‘governance’ as a word does not travel well between languages, but he
builds a new and beautifully constructed typology to explore the cultur-
ally defined nature of the concept. In this he confronts some of the issues
raised in this introduction, namely: whether there can be good govern-
ance without democracy; the extent of governance without government;
and the role of governance in different degrees of development. Perri 6
(Chapter 3) lays down a challenge to much of the existing usage of the
term ‘governance’ as applied to public administration. He argues that gov-
ernance theories are a merger basis for normative analysis of institutions,
and that government institutions do not govern alone, with command
being a blunt and often crude instrument. He wants to move public
administration beyond governance theory. In Chapter 4 Rhodes and
Tiernan (the former of whom 6 had disagreed in terms of multi-level
governance and other concepts) look again at the different approaches to
executive government, teasing out where the study of executive govern-
ment in political science intersects with the study of governance in public
administration. The authors question the capacity of government by con-
centrating on what they refer to as four puzzles: predominant or collabo-
rative leadership; central capability or implementation; formal or informal
coordination; and political accountability or webs of accountability. Part
I concludes with the chapter by Wolfgang Drechsler (Chapter 5), which
offers a glimpse into the paradigms of non-Western public administration
and governance, a glimpse that develops into a more sustained scrutiny in
Part II. Drechsler explores non-Western public administration, in particu-
lar the Islamic and Chinese paradigms, arguing that we can arrive more easily at good public administration if we accept that there are different contexts and (legitimately) different goals. He wrestles with the kind of issues raised by the questions posed in this introduction, and concludes that perhaps we can best advance by accepting that different places have different narratives; we can progress through different paths with different goals and (perhaps) different destinations.

Part II, ‘International Perspective of Public Administration, New Public Management and Governance’, delivers a series of country and regional specific analyses of governance and public administration, drawing upon the issues and perspectives outlined in Part I. In particular, the chapters look at change and challenges, with Robert Cameron (Chapter 6) charting the journey in South Africa from the apartheid regime to the successive administrations under the African National Congress and that movement’s embrace of new public management (NPM). As he notes, the ‘major challenge was to move from a state that provided services predominantly to a small white constituency to one that also provided decent services to the disadvantaged black majority’. The South African government opted to adopt administrative delegation, performance management and corporatization, but Cameron’s analysis suggests that these NPM techniques have not travelled particularly well and we require a more nuanced approach rooted in the domestic context of the nation to effect reform that delivers positive outcomes. Ahmed Badran (Chapter 7) takes readers to the other end of the African continent and examines public administration reform and governance in Egypt. Here, as in other emerging economies, he argues, ‘reforming state machinery and public bodies has been regarded as a means for achieving broader social and economic developmental goals’. In a strategic review of the Egyptian public sector from a political-economy perspective, he charts its development through the various welfarist and regulatory phases up to and beyond the 2011 revolution, noting the difficulties associated with meeting the competing demands upon it and the power of the elite to frustrate change. We cross continents with Donald Savoie (Chapter 8) to explore the impact of globalization and the desire of Canadian politicians to ‘grab hold of the policy-making levers and to become less dependent on career public servants for policy advice’; he notes that ‘the push to have public sector managers emulate their private sector counterparts has knocked the public service off its traditional moorings’. The impact of these reforms on Canada’s public administration has been to try to emulate the private sector, but this has not been entirely successful. This is unsurprising because, as Pyper points out in Chapter 1, the whole purpose of public administration is to do different things at different levels of transparency and accountability from private companies.
Crossing the border, Andranovich and Anagnoson (Chapter 9) deliver a magisterial review of the issues and challenges to public administration and governance in the USA. The role of the executive, contested throughout US history, its relationship to the other parts of government and to the citizenry, is explored through the prism of public administration and governance. The authors map the changing size and structures of the US public administration, focusing on the pinch points dealing with various ‘wicked’ issues. They conclude that ‘the reasons why the public sector is not functioning well in the USA are not fundamentally administrative – they are political. With the country roughly equally divided between Republicans and Democrats, between those seeking a significantly smaller government with fewer services as opposed to a larger government with a significant array of services, public administrators and executive branches are caught in the middle.’ Traversing the Darien Gap to reach Brazil, the chapter from Gomes and Secchi (Chapter 10) demonstrates again the issues confronting a country with a large public sector, a large population and huge disparities of wealth and power. But they remind us that, although much of Brazil may look like a developing or emergent economy, it is the world’s seventh-largest economy and is set to continue to grow quickly. In that sense Brazil is grappling with the challenges of economic success combined with continuing poverty. The country’s public administration is central to addressing these issues. The authors demonstrate the intricacies of a public sector that, like the country itself, is large and diverse. Unlike the policy transfer of NPM ideas in other countries, though, some of the experiments in wider public participation in policy-making and service delivery are genuinely novel. The ‘Brazilian participation experiences are unique – born, tested and improved locally. There was no inspiration from foreign literature or foreign experiences of public governance, or policy networks or co-production.’ Guillermo Cejudo (Chapter 11) takes a broader perspective and assesses public administration more regionally from a wide Latin American perspective. He explores the different trajectories that countries in the region have followed since emerging from dictatorship. The chapter debates why some democracies find it difficult to reform their public administration in ways that deliver efficient services to the widest possible clientele, while other ‘third-way’ democracies have been relatively more successful in transforming government and creating professional bureaucracies. The author provides illuminating case studies evaluating these issues, concentrating on Mexico, Chile and Argentina. His analysis again demonstrates the importance of political structures and, more significantly, political constraints in delivering positive reforms.

Krishna Tummala delivers a review of and explanation for developments in Indian public administration (Chapter 12). Like Brazil, India
Introduction is huge, accounting for 1.2 billion people and an economy that is the world’s fourth largest and still growing. It is diverse (22 constitutionally recognized languages) in terms of ethnicity, religion and geography. Yet, despite having concentrations of wealth and power, it also has deep and abiding poverty. The colonial civil service inherited from the British was transformed in the years following independence and used to construct and attempt to implement a series of five-year plans under the direction of Indian socialism. The chapter charts the development of the modern Indian public administration, but does not shrink from exposing the bleak picture framed by corruption and the illegal activities of politicians, activities that have stunted and blunted reform. Suggestions for further reform and shafts of administrative ‘sunshine’ conclude the chapter. We then cross the Himalayas for a review and analysis of the second Asian giant in the chapter by Zhichang Zhu on China (Chapter 13). This chapter resonates with the issues raised by Drechsler, with Zhu exploring the Chinese bureaucratic tradition and the impact of the historical legacy of centralized authoritarianism. Inherent to the modern reforms is the tradition, current throughout ancient and modern history, that the role of government had no boundaries. Zhu concludes by analysing the reasons for the post-Mao reforms and their mixed success, noting that, even when China borrows an idea from elsewhere, it adapts it for the specific Chinese context. This means that ‘China’s reform has displayed historical continuity as well as skilful learning from the West’.

John Halligan begins his chapter (Chapter 14) on public sector reform in Australia by noting that developing ‘government capacity to address complex and intractable problems has become increasingly a priority for Australian central government’. Australian federal and state governments have been innovative in the measures and structures developed over the last 30 years, and have been at the forefront of developing new institutions and procedures to deliver services and achieve a set of desired national outcomes from the country’s public administration. As one of the anglophone countries, Australia was quick to adapt its administrative structures during the fashion for NPM, but it was also in the lead to move on from these structures and reform them to develop capacity to deliver modern services through collaboration and shared outcomes. The second of our Australian chapters takes many of the points raised by Halligan and develops them to explore how Australia’s innovative approach to bureaucratic reform developed capacity to address and manage ‘wicked issues’, including the disadvantage experienced by Indigenous peoples. In this chapter (Chapter 15), Brian Head and Janine O’Flynn argue that the reforms led to great tensions at the heart of Australian governance, with increased contestability in terms of the sources of policy advice. One of the
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Lessons learned (and there have been many) is the need for coordination and something of a return (where applicable in a federal system) to central government exercising strategic direction.

Dion Curry, Gerhard Hammerschmid, Sebastian Jilke and Steven van de Walle contribute a chapter (Chapter 16) that examines European public sector reform via an overview of public administration in Europe. The second half of the chapter discusses key trends such as outcome/result orientation, downsizing, contracting out, transparency, openness, e-government and citizen participation, among others. The authors highlight the similarities and differences regarding these issues across European countries, pointing out the diversity of public administration origins across the continent: Anglo-Saxon, Scandinavian, Roman and Napoleonic. To illustrate these points they use several case countries: Norway, Estonia, Hungary, the Netherlands, Italy, France, Germany, Austria, Spain and the UK. Based on extensive original research, the authors chart and analyse the reforms across Europe and conclude that the nature and extent of public administration reforms vary greatly. Some of these variations follow traditional North/South, East/West divides, but since the fall of the Berlin Wall and the expansion of the EU, such distinctions are much less marked than before. The context of reform remained the most important factor, reflecting the robustness of each country’s political system in terms of good governance and also the way in which they were affected by the global financial crisis. Chapter 17, by Stanka Setnikar Cankar and Veronika Petkovšek, focuses on one of the world’s newer countries, Slovenia, which emerged from the breakup of the former Yugoslavia. As a member of the EU, Slovenia has benefited from EU assistance and has received guidance on reconfiguring its public sector, but the impact of the financial crisis had a highly damaging impact on the country and the most recent reforms have demonstrated the way in which a small country with a vulnerable economy has acted in concert with EU institutions to rebuild confidence and competitiveness. Nearly all recent reform has been driven by the belief in the need for austerity measures.

Duncan McTavish (Chapter 18) outlines the traditional configuration of UK public administration before assessing the impact of NPM reforms and the development of regulatory audit and inspection regimes. He concludes by evaluating the UK’s public administration within the new complexity of devolved administrations, the impact of the EU and broader global dynamics. The UK adoption of NPM was ‘more systemic and thorough than in other countries, and the ideational and ideological drive was clear: the accentuation of management, often transferred in from the business sector; cost control and discipline; competition; privatization and use of market mechanisms; efficiency and modernization leading to
a separation of policy and management of delivery through agencies and arm’s-length bodies’. But, as he makes clear, there has been very little systematic evaluation of the success of the reforms in terms of their stated intention: value for money; greater efficiency; effectiveness; and economy. In short, we know there has been transformative change, but we do not know if it has worked according to its original criteria, let alone more up-to-date measures, however defined.

This returns us to our original questions at the beginning of this chapter. We conclude the book (Chapter 18) with a summary of its main points and lessons to be drawn from our global journey. We draw out examples, as we see them, of good practice and good governance. While the book does not amount to a paean in praise of bureaucracy per se, we are supporters of good bureaucracy: good in terms of efficiency, effectiveness, professional merit-based appointments and, above all, integrity and broad accountability to citizens. Indeed, good governance necessitates good administrative and political institutions serving its citizenry. That is, after all, the basis of good governance and, without that, civilization, indeed humanity, cannot flourish.
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