<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>achievement/risk taking</td>
<td>34–6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrative elites</td>
<td>see top executives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agencification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Austria</td>
<td>42–5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as core component of NPM</td>
<td>98, 123, 145, 188, 208, 269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Denmark</td>
<td>122–4, 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Estonia</td>
<td>88–9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe comparison</td>
<td>262, 264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Finland</td>
<td>130–132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in France</td>
<td>54–6, 277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Germany</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Hungary</td>
<td>98–100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Ireland</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Italy</td>
<td>188–9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Lithuania</td>
<td>107–9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the Netherlands</td>
<td>75–6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Norway</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Portugal</td>
<td>197–8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as reform trend across policy areas</td>
<td>267–70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Spain</td>
<td>208–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Sweden</td>
<td>164–5, 170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the UK</td>
<td>175–6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-Saxon countries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as open to NPM reforms</td>
<td>29, 259, 261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tradition characterized by</td>
<td>260–261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>view of public service motivation</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>see also UK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coordination</td>
<td>251–3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decentralization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activities</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effects of NPM</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of financial and staffing decisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>governance between strategy and trust</td>
<td>48–9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hybrid public management</td>
<td>47–8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impact of fiscal crisis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consolidation measures</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cutback strategies</td>
<td>233, 242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal attitudes</td>
<td>35–6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>political hierarchy</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preference for hierarchical values</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as legalistic culture</td>
<td>41–2, 274–5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>264</td>
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<td>265–6</td>
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<td>49–50</td>
</tr>
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</tr>
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<td>values</td>
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