

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