

# Index

---

- achievement/risk taking 34–6
- administrative elites *see* top executives
- agencification
  - in Austria 42–5
  - as core component of NPM 98, 123, 145, 188, 208, 269
  - in Denmark 122–4, 127
  - in Estonia 88–9
  - Europe comparison 262, 264
  - in Finland 130–132
  - in France 54–6, 277
  - in Germany 67
  - in Hungary 98–100
  - in Ireland 145
  - in Italy 188–9
  - in Lithuania 107–9
  - in the Netherlands 75–6
  - in Norway 153
  - in Portugal 197–8
  - as reform trend across policy areas 267–70
  - in Spain 208–10
  - in Sweden 164–5, 170
  - in the UK 175–6
- Anglo-Saxon countries
  - as open to NPM reforms 29, 259, 261
  - tradition characterized by 260–261
  - view of public service motivation 32
  - see also* UK
- Austria
  - coordination 251–3
  - decentralization
    - activities 42
    - effects of NPM 48
    - of financial and staffing decisions 46
  - governance between strategy and trust 48–9
  - hybrid public management 47–8
  - impact of fiscal crisis
    - consolidation measures 236
    - cutback strategies 233, 242
  - personal attitudes 35–6
  - political hierarchy 250
  - preference for hierarchical values 279
  - public administration
    - as legalistic culture 41–2, 274–5
    - life-long tenure 42
  - public administration reforms
    - agencification 42–3, 45
    - importance of trends at policy field level 44
    - low autonomy and low managerialism 46–7
    - summary 262–3
    - transparency and open government 264
    - Wirkungsorientierung* 43, 48–9
  - public management performance 265–6
  - result-orientation 49–50
  - role perceptions/identities 27, 47–8
  - use of management tools 46–9, 57, 224, 226
  - values
    - public services 30
    - work 33
- autonomy
  - in Austria 43, 47, 49
  - balance with central control 247
  - in Finland 129
  - in France 60
  - in Germany 64, 66
  - in Hungary 99
  - in Ireland 144
  - in Lithuania 111, 113
  - in Norway 152, 154, 157, 159
  - in Portugal 201
  - in Spain 211
  - in Sweden 170, 225, 277

- bureaucracy
  - effectiveness as lead value for 29
  - management techniques?
    - compatibility 102
  - reduction
    - in Austria 43–4
    - in Denmark 122
    - in Estonia 88
    - Europe comparison 262
    - in Finland 131–3
    - in France 56
    - in Germany 67
    - in Hungary 99–100, 102–3
    - in Ireland 145
    - in Italy 189, 191
    - in Lithuania 107–9, 112–13
    - in the Netherlands 75–6
    - in Norway 153–4, 158–9
    - in Portugal 195–8, 203
    - as reform trend across policy areas 268–9
    - in Spain 209, 214
    - in Sweden 164
    - in the UK 175, 180
  - Weberian
    - hierarchy based on 29
    - importance of 2, 256
- Central and Eastern European (CEE) countries
  - borrowing from other traditions 261
  - performance management 105–6
  - role perceptions 27–8
  - value trade-offs 29–31
  - work values 32
  - see also* Estonia; Hungary; Lithuania; Serbia
- citizen orientation vs. customer focus 30–31
- citizen participation
  - in Austria 43–4
  - in Denmark 122
  - in Estonia 88
  - Europe comparison 262
  - in Finland 132
  - in France 56, 60
  - in Germany 67
  - in Hungary 99–100, 103
  - in Ireland 145
  - in Italy 189, 191
  - in Lithuania 108, 112
  - in the Netherlands 75
  - in Norway 153, 158
  - as NPG reform 266, 269
  - in Portugal 197
  - as reform trend across policy areas 267–9
  - in Spain 209, 213–14
  - in Sweden 164
  - in the UK 175–6, 180
- civil servants *see* top executives
- COBRA survey 13–15
- COCOPS research project
  - advantages of survey 23, 220, 271
  - aims of 2, 4–5, 7, 14
  - equivalence, problem of 15–17
  - funded by European Commission 7
  - and heterogeneity 275–8
  - institutions involved in 7–8
  - organisation of 18–21
  - organisational and demographic characteristics of sample 21–2
  - policy area performance 269–70
  - public administration reform trends across Europe 261–5
  - public management performance across Europe 265–6
  - and reform paradigms 274–5
  - related projects 7
  - response rates, by country 21
  - study of fiscal consolidation following economic crisis 232, 235–42
  - top executives
    - aims of 29–31
    - drivers of 31–4
    - patterns found 36–7
    - perceptions of coordination in central government 245–57
    - personal attitudes of 34–6
    - role perceptions 26–8
    - studying 14–15
    - value of perceptions and attitudes of 17–18
  - use for future public administration research 278–80
  - use of management tools 220–222, 228
  - see also individual countries*
- collaboration and cooperation

- in Austria 44
  - within coordination reforms 248, 251, 253
  - in Denmark 122–3
  - in Estonia 87–9
  - Europe comparison 262–3
  - in Finland 131–3
  - in France 55–6
  - in Germany 66–7
  - in Hungary 99
  - impact of fiscal crisis on 240
  - in Ireland 145–6
  - in Italy 189
  - in Lithuania 107–8
  - in the Netherlands 75–6
  - in Norway 153
  - as NPG reform 260, 266, 270, 274
  - in Portugal 196–7
  - as reform trend across policy areas 267–70
  - in Spain 209–10
  - in Sweden 164–5, 167, 169–70
  - in the UK 175–6
- contracting out
  - in Austria 43–4
  - as core component of NPM 98, 123, 176, 188, 208, 275
  - in Denmark 122–3, 127
  - in Estonia 88
  - Europe comparison 262, 264
  - in Finland 131–3
  - in France 55–6, 60
  - in Germany 67
  - in Hungary 98–100
  - in Ireland 145
  - in Italy 188–9
  - in Lithuania 108
  - in the Netherlands 75–6
  - in Norway 153–4
  - in Portugal 195, 197
  - as reform trend across policy areas 268–70
  - in Spain 208–9
  - in Sweden 163–4
  - in UK 174–6, 181
- cooperation *see* collaboration and cooperation
- Coordinating for Cohesion in the Public Sector of the Future *see* COCOPS research project
- coordination
  - analytical framework 245–7
  - implications 254, 256–7
  - as ‘philosopher’s stone’ for government 244
  - quality 250–252
  - reforms, hierarchy and networks 248–50
  - relations between culture, mechanisms and quality 252–5
  - and role identification 248
  - types of 246–7
  - vertical and horizontal dimensions 244–5
- customer focus
  - vs. citizen orientation 30–31
  - Europe comparison 262–3
  - as reform trend across policy areas 267–9
  - in the UK 179
- customers, treating service users as
  - in Austria 44
  - in Denmark 122
  - in Estonia 88
  - in Finland 131–2
  - in France 56
  - in Germany 67
  - in Hungary 99
  - in Ireland 145
  - in Italy 189
  - in Lithuania 108–9
  - in the Netherlands 75
  - in Norway 153–4
  - in Portugal 197–8
  - in Spain 209
  - in Sweden 164
  - in the UK 175
- Denmark
  - coordination 248, 251–3
  - decentralization of staffing and financial decisions 126
  - development towards Neo-Weberian state 119–20, 127
  - impact of fiscal crisis
    - consolidation measures 236–7
    - cutback strategies 77–8, 233
    - performance information 239
    - reforms 124

- network arrangements 250
- personal attitudes 35
- public administration reforms
  - commitment to 225–6
  - modernized and dynamic 126–8
  - pursuance of 120–121
  - and rising importance of Digital Era Governance 121–4
  - Scandinavian tradition 261
  - summary 262, 264
- public management performance 265–6
- role perceptions 27
- use of management tools 124–6, 224–5, 228
- value for money strategy 121–2
- values
  - public service 30–31
  - work 33
- Digital Era Governance (DEG)
  - combination with concept of Neo-Weberian State 119–20
  - impact on public organizations in Denmark 127–8
  - rising importance of 122–3
- digital government *see* e-government
- downsizing
  - back office functions, through Europe 235, 237, 240
  - in Denmark 122–3
  - in Estonia 88
  - Europe comparison 262–4
  - in Finland 131–2
  - in France 55–7, 60–61
  - in Germany 65, 67, 70
  - in Hungary 98–100
  - importance of 43–4
  - in Ireland 144–6, 149
  - in Italy 188–9
  - in Lithuania 107–9
  - in the Netherlands 73–5
  - in Norway 151, 153–4
  - as NPM trend 270, 275–6
  - in Portugal 197
  - as reform trend across policy areas 267–70
  - in Spain 209
  - in Sweden 164
  - in the UK 175–6, 178
- e-government
  - in Austria 44
  - in Denmark 120–122, 126–8
  - in Estonia 87–9
  - Europe comparison 262–3
  - in Finland 131–3
  - in France 55–6, 59
  - in Germany 65–7
  - in Hungary 99
  - in Ireland 145
  - in Italy 188–9
  - in Lithuania 107–8
  - in the Netherlands 75–6
  - in Norway 153–4
  - as NPG reform 274
  - in Portugal 196–7, 202
  - as reform trend across policy areas 268–9
  - in Spain 208–9
  - in Sweden 164–7
  - in the UK 175
- entrepreneurial potential 34–7
- equivalence
  - population 16–17
  - procedural/measurement 16
  - terminology and labels 15–16
- Estonia
  - coordination 248, 252–3
  - decentralization of staffing and financial decisions 91–2
  - decentralized
    - human resource management 92
    - implementation of reforms 94
    - public administration 86
  - impact of fiscal crisis
    - consolidation measures 236–7
    - cutback strategies 233
    - on reforms 87
  - network arrangements 250
  - personal attitudes 35
  - private sector experience 22
  - public administration reforms
    - country differences 274
    - implementation and main actors 90–91
    - multiple initiatives 87–90
    - outcomes and implications 93–4
    - summary 262–4
    - three waves of 85–7

- public management performance 265–6
- role
  - identification 248
  - perceptions 27
- use of management tools 85, 91–3, 224, 227
- values
  - public service 30–31
  - work 32–3
- EUPAN (European Public Administration Network) 4, 109, 202, 220
- European Administrative Space 5, 12
- extrinsic motivation 31–3, 37
- female response rates 21
- Finland
  - coordination 248, 252–3
  - decentralization of staffing and financial decisions 134–6
  - impact of fiscal crisis
    - consolidation measures 236–7
    - cutback strategies 233
    - performance information 239
  - network arrangements 250
  - personal attitudes 35
  - public administration reforms
    - active, top-down policies 131–4
    - commitment to NPM 29, 225
    - governmental steering 129–30
    - outcomes and implications 137–8
    - summary 262–4
  - role perceptions 27
  - state administration 130–131
  - use of management tools 131–2, 134–6, 224–5
  - values
    - public service 30
    - work 33
- fiscal crisis
  - consolidation measures 234–7
  - cutback strategies 232–4, 241–2
  - diversity of government responses 231–2, 241
  - effects on public management and decision-making 237–40
  - extent of, Europe-wide 231
  - in Ireland
    - extent of, and response to 140
    - influence of, and path dependence 144, 241
    - reforms in time of crisis 141–4, 148–9
- flexible employment
  - as core component of NPM 176, 208
  - in Denmark 122
  - in Estonia 88
  - Europe comparison 262
  - in Finland 131–3
  - in France 55–6
  - in Germany 67
  - in Hungary 99–100
  - in Ireland 145
  - in Italy 188–9
  - in Lithuania 108
  - in the Netherlands 75–6
  - in Norway 44, 153–4
  - in Portugal 197
  - in Spain 208–9
  - in Sweden 164
  - in the UK 175–6
- France
  - coordination 248–9, 251–3
  - decentralization
    - of financial decisions 58–9
    - policies 54
    - of staffing decisions 58
  - gradual modes of change 52–3, 61
  - impact of fiscal crisis
    - consolidation measures 236–7
    - cutback strategies 55, 233–4
    - negative growth 231
    - performance information 239
  - legalistic and traditional public administrations 274
  - LOLF (Loi organique relative aux lois de finances) 54–5, 57
  - Napoleonic tradition 53, 260, 264
  - personal attitudes 35
  - political-administrative institutions, multiple nexus of 53
  - political hierarchy 250
  - preference for hierarchical values 30, 249
  - private sector experience 22
  - public administration reforms and cost-cutting 77

- downsizing, mergers, transparency and citizen participation 55–7, 61, 264
    - importance of 54, 56, 61, 263–4, 271
    - mixed perceptions of effects of 59–60
    - openness to NPM 29, 54, 61
    - scale of activity 277
    - strong, top-down implementation of 61, 134
    - summary 262–3
    - trajectory of 54–5
    - use of management tools 57–9, 224
  - public management performance 265–6, 271
  - RGPP (Révision Générale des Politiques Publiques) 54–6, 59
  - role perceptions 27
  - similarities to Germany 226
  - values
    - public services 30
    - work 33
- Germany
- administrative system 64–6, 277
  - coordination quality 251–3
  - decentralization of staffing and financial decisions 69
  - as decentralized system 64, 66
  - impact of fiscal crisis
    - centralisation of organisation-level decision-making 239
    - consolidation measures 236–7
    - cutback strategies 233–4, 242
    - negative growth 231
  - as latecomer to public management reform 63
  - network arrangements 250
  - organicist tradition 260
  - personal attitudes 35–6
  - preference for hierarchical values 279
  - private sector experience 22
  - public management performance 265
  - reforms
    - openness to NPM 29
    - outcomes and implications 70–71
    - perceived as partial and insufficient 66–8
    - priorities in line with European developments 66
    - summary 262, 264
  - role perceptions 27
  - similarities to France 226
  - use of management tools 57, 65, 68–70, 224–7
  - values
    - public service 30
    - work 33
  - governance
    - e-governance 87, 89, 91, 269
    - Finland's system of 130
    - hierarchical vs. market models 29–31
    - Hungary's system of 97–8
    - model for public service reform 143
    - moving towards networked 74–8
    - multilevel, within Germany 277
    - network-based 256, 274
    - Proporz system 42, 48
    - between strategy and trust 48–9
    - Sweden's system of 163
    - see also* Digital Era Governance
  - hierarchical arrangements 246, 249–50, 254, 256–7
  - hierarchical values 29–31, 36–7, 279
- Hungary
- coordination 248–9
  - decentralization
    - of decision responsibilities 102
    - of staffing and financial decisions 100–101
  - FIDESZ 96, 98, 103–4
  - impact of fiscal crisis
    - consolidation measures 236–7
    - cutback strategies 233
    - negative growth 231
  - as Neo-Weberian state 98
  - network arrangements 250–253
  - personal attitudes 35–6
  - public administration reforms
    - commitment to 227
    - country differences 274
    - outcomes and implications 102–4
    - role of politics in 276
    - summary 262–4
    - top-down implementation of 134
    - trends and dynamics 98–100
  - public management performance 265

- role perceptions 27
- unique state structure 96–8
- use of management tools 100–102, 224
- values
  - public service 30–31
  - work 32–3
- internal locus of control 34–5
- interpersonal trust 35–6
- intrinsic motivation 31–3, 37
- Ireland
  - coordination 249–53
  - decentralization of staffing and financial decisions 147
  - impact of fiscal crisis
    - bail-out 231, 240–241
    - consolidation measures 276
    - cutback strategies 77, 233
    - extent, and response to 140
    - negative growth 231
    - and path dependence 144
    - performance information 239
    - power of ministry of finance 239
  - network arrangements 250
  - personal attitudes 35
  - public administration reforms
    - commitment to 225
    - influence of fiscal crisis and path dependence 144, 241
    - strong, top-down implementation of 134
    - summary 262–3
    - in time of fiscal crisis 141–4, 148–9
    - views on main dimensions of 144–6
  - public management performance 265
  - rise and fall of economy 140
  - role perceptions 27
  - use of management tools 146–8, 224–5
  - values
    - public service 30–31
    - work 32–3
- Italy
  - coordination 248–53
  - decentralization of staffing and financial decisions 188
- decentralized public collective bargaining system 187
- impact of fiscal crisis
  - conflicts between organisational units 240
  - consolidation measures 236
  - cutback strategies 233–4
  - negative growth 231
  - performance information 239
  - receipt of financial assistance 241
- personal attitudes 35–6
- politico-administrative context 185–6, 192
- public administration reforms
  - commitment to 226
  - and diffusion of managerial tools 187–92
  - Napoleonic tradition 260
  - openness to NPM 29, 61
  - summary 262
- public management performance 265
- role perceptions 27–8
- stronghold of internal administrative hierarchy 249
- use of management tools 185, 188–90, 192, 224, 226–8
- values
  - public service 30
  - work 33
- joined-up government 28, 73, 94, 244
- legalistic culture/tradition
  - in Austria 41–2, 50, 274–5
  - in France 53, 274
  - in Germany 64–6, 274–5
  - in Hungary 100, 274
  - in Spain 206, 274
- life-long tenure 42, 64
- Lithuania
  - coordination 248–53
  - decentralization of staffing and financial decisions 110
  - impact of fiscal crisis
    - consolidation measures 236
    - cutback strategies 233
    - performance information 239
  - performance management 105–8, 111–14, 227
  - personal attitudes 35

- public administration reforms
  - outcomes and implications 112–14
  - summary 262–4
  - and their perception 107–8
- public administration system 106–7
- public management performance
  - 265–6
- role perceptions 27
- use of management tools 105–6, 109–14, 224, 227
- values
  - public service 30–31
  - work 32–3
- management tools, use of
  - assessing 220–221
  - in Austria 46–9, 57, 224, 226
  - avenues for future research 279–80
  - in Denmark 124–6, 224–5, 228
  - in Estonia 85, 91–3, 224, 227
  - in Finland 131–2, 134–6, 224–5
  - in France 57–9, 224
  - in Germany 57, 65, 68–70, 224–7
  - in Hungary 100–102, 224
  - in Ireland 146–8, 224–5
  - in Italy 185, 188–90, 192, 224, 226–8
  - limited, for market-type mechanisms 228
  - in Lithuania 105–6, 109–14, 224, 227
  - in Neo-Weberian model 185
  - in the Netherlands 75, 78–81, 224–5
  - in Norway 155–7, 159–60, 224–5
  - organisational variations in 222–4
  - performance-based approach 124–6
  - in Portugal 200–201, 203, 224, 227
  - and quality of coordination within government 279
  - in Spain 57, 210–212, 224, 226–8
  - in Sweden 167–70, 224–5, 277
  - transformation of traditional tools 219
  - in the UK 79, 148, 177–81, 224
  - variations between countries 224–5, 228, 274–5
    - continental 226
    - moderniser 225–6
    - southern 226–7
    - transition 227
- managerialism
  - in Austria 46–7
  - institutionalization of, in Lithuania 109–12
  - in Italy 185, 187–92
  - in the Netherlands 74–8, 81
  - in Norway 151–2, 154–9
  - Orbán-era, in Hungary 100–102
  - in Portugal 194–6, 200–201
  - in Spain 210–212
  - in Sweden 162–4, 167–9
  - tools originating in 228
  - in the UK 177–9
- mergers
  - in Austria 43–4
  - in Denmark 122
  - in Estonia 87–90
  - Europe comparison 262
  - in Finland 131–2
  - in France 55–7, 60–61, 277
  - in Germany 66–7
  - in Hungary 99–100
  - in Ireland 145
  - in Italy 189
  - in Lithuania 108
  - in the Netherlands 75
  - in Norway 153–4
  - as NPM reform 270
  - in Portugal 197–8
  - as reform trend across policy areas 268–70
  - in Spain 209
  - in Sweden 164–5
  - in the UK 175
- Napoleonic countries
  - as more resistant to public management reform 264, 271
  - political and administrative hierarchy 250, 256
  - possible impact of NPG reforms 261
  - public administration associated with 259, 261
  - public management performance 265–6, 271
  - tradition characterized by 260
  - see also* France; Italy; Portugal; Spain
- Neo-Weberianism
  - as blend of legalistic, Weberian culture with managerial elements 50



- Denmark's development of 119–21, 127–8
- features of 98, 177
- in France 52
- in Hungary 98
- importance in Austria 45, 50
- in Ireland 146, 149
- in Italy 185, 192
- in Norway 159
- as reform paradigm 3, 274–5
- Netherlands
  - agencification 54
  - coordination 248–53
  - decentralization
    - of executive functions of ministries 74
    - of financial decisions 79
    - of staffing decisions 79–80
  - decentralized state structure 6, 73–4, 81
  - impact of fiscal crisis
    - consolidation measures 237
    - cutback strategies 233–4, 242
    - performance information 239
  - non-profit work experience 22
  - organicist tradition 260
  - personal attitudes 35–6
  - public management performance 265–6
  - quangos (ZBOs) 73–4
  - reforms
    - committal to NPM 225
    - country differences 29–30, 274
    - demanding 77
    - frequent, intensive and incremental 73–4
    - outcomes and implications 80–81
    - public administration 74–8
    - summary 262–4
  - role
    - identification 248
    - perceptions 27
  - use of management tools 75, 78–81, 224–5
  - values
    - public service 30
    - work 33
- New Public Governance (NPG)
  - features of 270
  - in Germany 70–71
  - in Ireland 149
  - in Napoleonic, organicist and Anglo-Saxon countries 261
  - as reform paradigm 3, 259–60, 274–5
  - reforms across policy areas 266, 269, 271, 279–80
- New Public Management (NPM)
  - in Austria 42, 45, 48, 50
  - characterized by disaggregation of policymaking from management 244
  - conditions for diffusion of practices associated with 276
  - core components of 98, 123, 145, 176, 188, 208
  - in Denmark 120–121, 123, 126–7
  - in Estonia 89, 93–4, 227
  - in France 54, 56
  - in Germany 64–6, 70–71
  - in Hungary 98, 227
  - in Ireland 144–5
  - in Italy 188, 191
  - as major reform trend in Western administration 240
  - management instruments 219, 225, 228
    - in the Netherlands 225
    - in Norway 156–7, 159
    - in Sweden 169–70, 225
    - in the UK 177–81, 225
  - managerialist doctrine of 144
  - as part of coordination landscape of Europe 257
  - and quality and efficiency 31
  - as reform paradigm 2–3, 259–60, 269, 274–5
  - reforms
    - assessing impact of 7, 151, 250
    - avenues for future research 278–80
    - convergence and divergence in 5–6
    - countries open to 29
    - in Lithuania 105–8, 111
    - in Norway 152, 154, 159–60, 225
    - and performance 266–7
    - pioneered in the UK 175
    - by policy area 269–71
    - in Portugal 195–8, 203
    - in Sweden 163–4, 167

- uptake by Napoleonic, organicist and Anglo-Saxon countries 261
  - and sigma-type values 29
  - in Spain 207–8
  - in Sweden 163, 165–6
  - treatment of citizens 207
  - in the UK 174, 176, 228
  - use of concept in survey 16
- new services
  - in Austria 44
  - in Denmark 122
  - in Estonia 88
  - Europe comparison 262, 264
  - in Finland 131–2
  - in France 55–6, 60
  - in Germany 67
  - in Hungary 99–100
  - in Ireland 145
  - in Italy 189
  - in Lithuania 108–9
  - in the Netherlands 75
  - in Norway 153
  - in Portugal 197
  - as reform trend across policy areas 268
  - in Spain 209
  - in Sweden 164
  - in the UK 175–6
- Norway
  - collaborative political-administrative relations 277
  - coordination 249–53
  - decentralization
    - of staffing and financial decisions 156–7
    - as state combining political and administrative 152
  - impact of fiscal crisis
    - centralisation of organisation-level decision-making 239
    - consolidation measures 236–7
    - cutback strategies 77, 233
    - negative growth 231
    - power of ministry of finance 239
  - implementation of NPM 155–7, 225
  - personal attitudes 35–6
  - private sector experience 22
  - public administration reforms
    - country differences 274
    - outcomes and implications 157–60
    - as reluctant to reform 151–3
    - retaining effective public sector 154
    - Scandinavian tradition 261
    - successful, substantive yet partial 155
    - summary 262, 264
    - well-off, transparent and digitalized 153–4
  - public management performance 265–6
  - role perceptions 27
  - use of management tools 155–7, 159–60, 224–5
  - values
    - public service 30
    - work 33
- NPG *see* New Public Governance
- NPM *see* New Public Management
- Oblimin rotation 31–2, 34
- OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development)
  - approach to studying public administration reforms 17
  - on Danish economy 120
  - on expenditure reductions 237
  - Finnish reforms following those of 134
  - on Germany 63
  - Government at a Glance* 4, 13, 80
  - promotion of management tools 220, 222
  - public governance review
    - of Estonia 87–90, 92–3, 136
    - of Finland 137–8
  - report on Ireland 141–2
  - on revenue enhancing measures 234–5
  - share of female respondents 21
  - on staff layoffs 236
  - on use of performance-related pay in the Netherlands 79
- open government *see* transparency and open government
- Orbán administration 96–8, 100–102, 104
- organicist countries 260–261
  - see also* Germany; the Netherlands

- outcome orientation *see*  
*Wirkungsorientierung*
- outcomes focus *see* results focus
- parochialism 13
- partnerships  
 in Austria 44  
 in Denmark 122  
 in Estonia 88–9, 93  
 Europe comparison 262  
 in Finland 131–3  
 in France 56  
 in Germany 67  
 in Hungary 99–100  
 in Ireland 145  
 in Italy 189  
 in Lithuania 108–9  
 in the Netherlands 75  
 in Norway 153  
 in Portugal 195–8  
 as reform trend across policy areas  
 268–9  
 in Spain 209  
 in Sweden 164  
 in the UK 175–6
- path dependence 144
- performance management  
 in Austria 46–7  
 in Denmark 120, 125–6  
 across Europe 265–6  
 in Finland 129, 134–8  
 in France 57–8, 61  
 in Germany 64, 70  
 in Italy 187  
 in Lithuania 105–8, 111–14, 227  
 in Norway 152, 157  
 in Sweden 162, 166–70
- personal attitudes 34–6
- Portugal  
 coordination 248–53  
 decentralization  
 of staffing and financial decisions  
 200–201  
 territorial 194  
 impact of fiscal crisis  
 bail-out 231  
 consolidation measures 236–7  
 cutback strategies 77, 233–4, 276  
 power of ministry of finance 239  
 power of politicians 239
- personal attitudes 35–6
- public administration reforms  
 commitment to 226, 228  
 Napoleonic tradition and  
 managerialist agenda 194–6  
 outcomes and implications 201–3  
 summary 262–3  
 top-down, cost-cutting oriented,  
 fairly unsuccessful 198–200,  
 203  
 trends 196–8
- public management performance  
 265–6
- role  
 identification 248  
 perceptions 27  
 stronghold of internal administrative  
 hierarchy 249  
 use of management tools 200–201,  
 203, 224, 227
- values  
 public service 30  
 work 33
- post-NPM reforms  
 argument on agency performance  
 112  
 components of 151, 176, 240, 245,  
 257  
 in Estonia 94  
 in Germany 66  
 in Lithuania 107, 109  
 main focus of 244–5  
 in Norway 151, 159  
 as part of coordination landscape of  
 Europe 257  
 second and third generation 3  
*see also* New Public Governance
- privatization  
 in Austria 44  
 as core component of NPM 123,  
 145, 176, 188, 208  
 in Denmark 120, 122–3, 127  
 in Estonia 86, 88, 90  
 Europe comparison 262–4  
 in France 55–6  
 in Germany 65, 67  
 in Hungary 98–100  
 in Ireland 145  
 in Italy 188–9  
 in Lithuania 108

- in the Netherlands 75–6
- in Norway 151–4, 159
- in Portugal 195–8
- as reform trend across policy areas 268–70
- in Spain 206–10
- in Sweden 164, 167
- in the UK 175–6, 178, 181
- Proporz system 42, 48
- public administration (PA)
  - comparative research in 12–14
  - perspectives for future 278–80
  - in coordination landscape of Europe 257
  - development from unitary 259–60
  - moving forward 23
  - in Napoleonic countries 259, 261
- public administration reforms
  - avenues for future research 278–80
  - convergence and divergence in European 5–6, 266–71, 273, 275, 278–9
  - evaluation limitations 4–5
  - heterogeneity among 275–8
  - kaleidoscope of 273
  - and outcomes 259–60, 270–271
  - paradigms 2–3, 259–60, 269, 274–5
  - and performance
    - across Europe 260–261
    - across policy areas 266–7
  - performance management 265–6
  - policy area performance 269–70
  - trends
    - across Europe 261–5
    - across policy areas 267–9
  - use of top executives in studies 1
- public management
  - effects of fiscal crisis on patterns of 237–40
- hybrid 47–8, 50
- performance 265–6
- reforms
  - in Denmark 120–121
  - and performance across policy areas 266–7
  - trends across policy areas 267–9
- research project *see* COCOPS
- research project
- theory and practice of 259–60
- tools 219–21, 227
- public sector executives *see* top executives
- public service motivation (PSM) 13, 31–3
- public services, priorities for 29–31
- results focus
  - in Austria 43–5
  - in Denmark 119, 122, 125
  - in Estonia 88
  - Europe comparison 262–4, 275
  - in Finland 131–3
  - in France 55–6
  - in Germany 67
  - in Hungary 98–100
  - in Ireland 145
  - in Italy 189
  - in Lithuania 107–8
  - in the Netherlands 75
  - in Norway 153, 157
  - as NPM reform 56, 107, 275
  - in Portugal 196–8, 200–201, 203
  - as reform trend across policy areas 267–70
  - in Spain 209
  - in Sweden 164
  - in the UK 175–6
- role perceptions/identities 26–8, 47–8, 246
- Sarkozy, President 54–7, 61
- Scandinavian countries
  - as affected by managerial reforms 225
  - Estonia's position 86
  - female response rates 21
  - internal coordination 252
  - interpersonal trust 36
  - NPM adopted by 259–60
  - pattern of divergence 277
  - public administration performance 113, 265–6, 271
  - tradition characterized by 261
  - view of public service motivation 32
  - work values 33
  - see also* Denmark; Finland; Norway; Sweden
- Schwartz' value circle 34–5

- Serbia
- coordination and political coherence 251–3
  - impact of fiscal crisis
    - consolidation measures 237
    - cutback strategies 233
  - as latecomer to public management reforms 227
  - network arrangements 250
  - personal attitudes 35
  - political hierarchy 250
  - public administration reforms 262, 264
  - public management performance 265
  - response rates to COCOPS research project 21
  - role perceptions 27
  - stronghold of internal administrative hierarchy 249
  - use of management tools 224, 227
  - values
    - public service 30–31
    - work 32–3
- Spain
- coordination 248–53
  - decentralization
    - management tool 210
    - of staffing and financial decisions 211–12
  - as decentralized state 206
  - impact of fiscal crisis
    - consolidation measures 236–7
    - cutback strategies 77, 233–4, 276
    - negative growth 231
    - power of politicians 239
    - pursuit of radical austerity 205
    - receipt of financial assistance 241
  - personal attitudes 35–6
  - politico-administrative context 206–7, 274
  - public administration reforms
    - little visible change 207–9
    - outcomes and implications 212–15
    - slow pace of 205
    - summary 262–3
  - public management performance 265–6
  - role perceptions 27
  - stronghold of internal administrative hierarchy 249
  - use of management tools 57, 210–212, 224, 226–8
  - values
    - public service 30
    - work 33
  - state provision, expansion into new areas *see* new services
- Sweden
- administrative model 162–3
  - coordination 248–53
  - decentralization of staffing and financial decisions 168
  - decentralized
    - human resource management 225
    - unitary parliamentary state 162, 167
  - impact of fiscal crisis
    - centralisation of decision-making 239
    - centralisation of organisation-level decision-making 239
    - consolidation measures 236
    - cutback strategies 233
    - performance information and budgetary units 239
    - power of ministry of finance 239
  - managerialism 162–4, 167–9
  - personal attitudes 35
  - private sector experience 22
  - public administration reforms
    - commitment to 226, 277
    - as follower of NPM reforms 163
    - outcomes and implications 169–70
    - summary 262, 264
    - trends 164–7
  - public management performance 265–6
  - role
    - identification 248
    - perceptions 27
  - use of management tools 167–70, 224–5, 277
  - values
    - public service 30
    - work 33
  - top executives
    - aims for public services 29–31
    - patterns found 36–7
    - personal attitudes 34–6

- role perceptions 26–8
- sample characteristics
  - education 21–2
  - employment 22
  - policy fields 22
  - response rates 21
  - work place longevity 22
- studying 14–15
  - problem of equivalence 15–17
- value of perceptions and attitudes 17–18
- work values 31–4
- transparency and open government
  - in Austria 44
  - in Denmark 122–3
  - in Estonia 86–8
  - Europe comparison 262–4
  - in Finland 131–3
  - in France 56
  - in Germany 66–7, 70
  - in Hungary 99–100, 103
  - in Ireland 145, 148
  - in Italy 187–9, 191
  - in Lithuania 107–8, 112
  - in the Netherlands 75, 81
  - in Norway 153–4, 158–9
  - as NPG reform 260, 274, 279
  - in Portugal 196–8
  - as reform trend across policy areas 269–70
  - in Spain 209–10, 213–14
  - in Sweden 164–6, 169
  - in the UK 175–6, 180
- UK (United Kingdom)
  - coordination 28, 249–53
  - decentralization of staffing and financial decisions 178–9
  - impact of fiscal crisis
    - consolidation measures 236–7
    - cutback strategies 233–4
  - negative growth 231
  - performance information 239
  - ‘Next Steps’ model 120, 188
  - personal attitudes 35
  - private sector experience 22
  - public management performance 265–6
  - public services in 173–4
  - reforms
    - Anglo-Saxon tradition 260–261
    - commitment to 226, 264
    - country differences 274
    - outcomes and implications 179–81
    - perceptions of 174–7
    - strong, top-down implementation of 134
  - retrenchment trend 206
  - role perceptions 27
  - use of management tools 79, 148, 177–81, 224
  - values
    - public service 30–31
    - work 32–3
- values
  - hierarchical 29–31, 36–7, 279
  - market 29–31, 36, 279
  - personal 34–6
  - Schwartz’ value circle 34–5
  - value trade-offs 29–31
  - work 31–4
- Weberianism 2–3, 41, 70–71, 192, 256, 274–5
  - see also* public administration
- Wirkungsorientierung* (outcome orientation) 43, 48–9
- work values 31–4
- World Bank’s Worldwide Governance Indicators 4, 126, 169