

Public Administration and Public Management Research in Europe: Traditions and Trends

*Edoardo Ongaro, Sandra van Thiel, Andrew Massey, Jon Pierre
and Hellmut Wollmann*

Abstract The chapter reviews the evolution of the state of the art of research in public administration and management in Europe since WWII. It argues that a pan-European community has developed, flanking and in many respects integrating the distinct national communities that characterised the field till the 1970s/1980s. After a bibliographical review of the main themes that catalyse the interest of PA scholars, it focuses on the most researched theme in Europe, namely public management reform. The ways in which the topic has been studied before, during and after the NPM ideological wave are

E. Ongaro
Open University, Milton Keynes, UK
e-mail: edoardo.ongaro@open.ac.uk

S. van Thiel (✉)
Radboud University, Nijmegen, The Netherlands
e-mail: s.vanthiel@fm.ru.nl

A. Massey
University of Exeter, Exeter, UK
e-mail: A.Massey@exeter.ac.uk

J. Pierre
University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg, Sweden
e-mail: jon.pierre@pol.gu.se

H. Wollmann
Humboldt Universität, Berlin, Germany
e-mail: h0598bce@rz.hu-berlin.de

examined by looking into country clusters across Europe: Germanic, Anglo-Saxon, Southern European, Nordic European, and Central-Eastern European. Concluding points include the theoretical importance of context in European research, and the profile of the European scholar.

2.1 INTRODUCTION

It may be argued that in the aftermath of the Second World War national research discourses and agendas were dominant in public administration research in Europe. The French national discourse and research priorities differed from the German national discourse and research priorities, while West and Eastern German discourses differed sharply in turn, and so forth. Internationally, the discourse was influenced if not outright dominated by the American (US) scholarship, but at the national level this influence was deeply filtered and mediated by the distinctive local administrative discourses. During the 1970s, a composite European discourse and interconnected set of research agendas gained traction, when European public administration scholarship started to take shape and establish its own identity (Raadschelders 2011). A notable event in this regard is the establishment of the European Group for Public Administration (EGPA) in 1975: the pan-European community of public administration scholars had a home.

Whatever importance chance events may have had in this dynamic, some more ‘structural’ factors might have played a role. The recognition of several characteristics as distinctive of European countries and their politico-administrative systems (like parliamentary systems, consensus democracies, legalistic traditions, the nature—and sheer magnitude compared to the US—of the welfare state in Europe, and the great EU experiment which was building up a new supranational administration and a unique multi-level administrative system) made the application of American-based ideas and studies (centred on issues like the dynamics of the spoils system, the patterns of confrontation of the President vs Congress, the ways in which intergovernmental relations were studied, and the like) increasingly difficult or of limited relevance. In this light, pan-European or cross-European comparisons and scientific investigations acquired increasingly meaningfulness and significance for the scholarly community. From the 1980s on, a blossoming of European scholarship can be detected, and the trend seems to have continued. An analysis of four top international journals in 2001–2010 shows an increase in the percentage of publications (from 34 to 43%) by European scholars (Groeneveld et al. 2015). This is evidence of a growingly self-conscious European scholarly community endowed with its own research agendas, emphases in research methods, distinctive discourse(s), and usage of English as the vehicle language.

This chapter provides an overview of the development of this European scholarship. It goes without saying, for reasons of space (and knowledge) we can here only sketch some traits of this European scholarship in public

administration. We show some highlights (in our view) and we try to outline some of the key topics that have been studied over time, interconnected with the reform trajectories that occurred ‘on the ground’ in the public sector of European countries, stressing in particular the geographical differences in the themes of investigation as well as the (often implicit and tacit) premises of the scholarly discourses, where meaningful.

In the unfolding of the chapter, we at first identify through a bibliographical investigation what topics have been mostly researched by European scholars. We then focus on the topic which appeared to be the relatively most investigated one in Europe, namely public management reform, and we review how this topic features in the five main clusters of countries in which we—quite conventionally—group the discourse: Germanic countries, Anglophone countries, Napoleonic countries, Nordic countries, and central and eastern European countries. A concluding section identifies and discusses some traits of researching public administration in Europe. More lessons for future research will be developed in the concluding chapter of this handbook.

2.2 EUROPEAN SCHOLARSHIP IN PA AND PM FROM THE 1980S ON

Public administration and public management scholars in European countries study a wide variety of topics. However, we can identify some clear favourites over time. To this end we make use of two existing review studies of top international PA journals. This strategy has some limitations, as PA scholars also frequently publish in books. Moreover, top journals like JPART and PAR have a clear American bias. However, journal articles offer a clear indication of the development of PA scholarship as most authors will publish both books and articles. To solve the US bias, we will select only European contributions from the database of the review by Groeneveld et al. (2014)—to which we have kindly been granted access by the authors. This way we can reconstruct developments in PA scholarship in two, almost consecutive, time periods: the review by Rhodes (1995) describes the period 1970–1995 while Groeneveld et al. (2014) review the years 2001–2010.

In 1995, Rod Rhodes carried out a systematic content analysis of the articles in *Public Administration* over the period of 1970–1995, divided into five intervals ($N = 561$). PA is a journal that has had its predominant basis in Europe and in European scholarship. Based on the database from Groeneveld et al. (2014), we know that almost 70% of the articles in *Public Administration* have been written by European scholars. Although Rhodes noted a large variety in topics, there was a clear trend: overall, there was a strong increase in policy analysis articles until the early 1990s (from 17 articles in the 1970s intervals to 29 in the late 1980s). In the early 1990s, the tables turned and there was a strong increase in the number of articles on public management and public management reform (from 12 in early 1980s to 50 in the early 1990s), while at the same time the number of policy articles dropped.

Interestingly, this rise in public management (PM) articles occurred 10 years after the advent of the reforms inspired by what came to be known as New Public Management (NPM) in Western European countries, firstly the UK. Finally, Rhodes found a high number of articles on local government, and a strong increase in the number of comparative articles (from 9 in early 1980s to 32 in early 1990s). Perhaps this last development was indicative of an increase in interest in supranational/international governance (EU) as well, but unfortunately that was not one of the coding categories in the review study.

The rise in the number of articles on public management and management reform has continued after the 1990s, in Europe as well as more internationally. However, the interests of European scholars differ from those of scholars in other continents. An analysis of 616 articles by European scholars (taken from the Groeneveld et al. 2015, database) shows that topics that are dealt with most often by European scholars between 2011 and 2010 are as follows: public management reform (18.5%), policy-making and development (12.2%), international/supranational governance and EU (7%), and change/innovation (4.9%). These research foci differ in a statistically significant way (based on cross tabs) from the research interests of scholars from other countries (mostly the US) and continents. Researchers from elsewhere appear to be less concerned with the aforementioned topics than European scholars, and their research interest seems to be more on such themes as diversity, motivation, e-government, conflict, and financial management. Also publications on state-level research, education, and the non-profit/societal sector are less often written by European scholars than by, for example, US and Australian scholars. European scholars on the other hand write more often about health, supranational level governance (e.g. the EU), semi-public bodies, and about the interaction between different levels of government. These preferences in the choice of research topic seem to be fitting with the state traditions and characteristics of the politico-administrative systems of the home countries of the authors.

The increased interest of (European) scholars in public management topics is also reflected in the rise of the number of PM journals, such as *Public Management Review* (PMR) and the *International Journal of Public Sector Management* (IJPSM), both based in Europe, and international conferences like the International Research Symposium on Public Management (IRSPM).

In sum, public management reform, the role of supranational bodies (EU), and comparative research (addressing the question of explaining contextual influences in public management, see Pollitt 2013) have become the dominant themes in European PA research. For reasons of brevity, we will focus our discussion of the research trends across Europe on the first of these themes: public management reform. We have ordered this discussion in two ways: per country cluster (Germanic, Anglo-Saxon, Nordic, Southern European, and Central Eastern European), and over three time periods: pre-NPM, the NPM period (usually the 1980s/1990s), and post-NPM (in most cases

beginning in the 2000s). Both divisions, over space and time, are debatable and not used here as a conclusive demarcation, rather they serve as heuristic to structure this chapter and our argument. Given the width of the terrain covered, we had to adopt a broad brush and our stylised narratives do not do full justice to the differences and finer details of the features of PA research in the distinct countries (see other chapters in this handbook on for instance the South-North division, or the Central Eastern European countries for more details).

2.2.1 Germanic Countries

Germany, Austria, The Netherlands, and Switzerland are four Continental European countries characterised by a consociational, consensual, multi-party, and corporatist tradition (Painter and Peters 2010). The four countries also share the *Rechtsstaat* tradition with detailed legal regulation and comprehensive judicial review of administrative activities and reflecting Max Weber's bureaucracy model (see Rosser in this volume, and Wollmann 2000a)—although not all to the same extent (cf. König 2000). Law has therefore had a major impact on PA research in these countries, in particular in Germany, Austria, and Switzerland.

Before NPM

In Germany, the PA discourse was traditionally steeped in legal thinking and marked by the “monopoly of lawyers”, *Juristenmonopol*. The expansion of the welfare state after the second World War and reforms thereof from the mid-1970s on opened up the debate and the discipline to economists as well as to social and political scientists (such as Fritz Scharpf and Renate Mayntz), who became involved in reform commissions and put topics such as “active policy” and “steering” (*Steuerung*) on the policy agenda (Jann 2003; Wollmann 2000a, 2003). The Academy of Public Administration (*Hochschule für Verwaltungswissenschaft*) in Speyer which had been founded in 1946 with a strong legalist bent widened its inter-disciplinary perspective, notably under the influence of Fritz Morstein-Marx (who had returned from the US).

In Switzerland a similar trend can be observed (Germann 1998, 7). In 1981, the *Institut des hautes études en administration publique* (IDHEAP) in Lausanne was founded focusing on teaching and research in public administration. At the same time, the first chair on business administration (*Betriebswirtschaftslehre der öffentlichen Hand*) was created at the University of St. Gallen (see Sager/ Hurni forthcoming). Kuno Schedler, who was appointed to the established new chair in St. Gallen, was instrumental in formulating the hitherto salient “guidance and steering theory” (*Führungs- und Steuerungstheorie*) (see Schedler 2014). In sum, while academic thinking and writing on public administration was strongly imbued with (administrative) law, the discourse and research were increasingly addressing welfare state reforms, related public policies, and the (early) phase of public sector modernisation.

The Netherlands is endowed with one of the largest communities of public administration academics in Europe. Traditionally, the discipline is linked to political science rather than law. After the second World War, Dutch PA was largely influenced by works of American political scientists such as Dwight Waldo and Aaron Wildavsky (cf. Rutgers 2004), and there were many contacts between Dutch and American scholars. Public administration started out in most universities as a sub-discipline of political science but from the mid-1970s on it became an independent discipline, with the establishment of independent university departments, for example in Enschede (led by Andries Hoogerwerf) and Rotterdam (with professors like Arthur Ringeling, Walter Kickert, and Rinus van Schendelen). Most of these scholars also played a significant role in advising the government on policy and administrative reforms.

NPM period

Out of the four countries, The Netherlands was probably the first to adopt NPM ideas, from the early 1980s on (Pollitt and Bouckaert 2011). However, in neither country were reforms pursued to the same extreme extent as in the Anglo-phone countries.

Germany was a latecomer to the international NPM debate, possibly because the traditional (inter)-organisational principles (such as “agencification”, decentralisation and subsidiarity) somewhat anticipated pivotal NPM concepts (see Kuhlmann and Wollmann 2014, 219). Only towards the end of the 1990s, under the budgetary pressure caused by the high costs of German Unification, was NPM hailed and turned to for its cost-cutting potential. The (municipally financed) independent consulting agency *KGS* directed by Gerhard Banner formulated and propagated a “New Steering Model” (*Neues Steuerungsmodell*) which, drawing on the experience of the Dutch city of Tilburg (“*Tilburg Model*”, which also became a pilot for a number of other Dutch cities, Hendriks and Tops 2003), “translated” the NPM message into a German version. The “New Steering Model” which is intrinsically a managerialist concept was initially adopted and pursued “bottom-up” by the municipalities and counties (see Wollmann 2000b)—subsequently by the Länder and to a distinctly lesser degree by the federal level (see Jann et al. 2004).

Since the late 1980s, New Public Management made its entry into Austria as well (see Wimmer 2007; Promberger et al. 2004; Hammerschmid et al. 2013). On the central or federal level, an ambitious *Administration Innovation Programme* was launched in 1989 (see Bundesminister für Finanzen 1999). NPM key concepts (such as target agreements and global budgeting) have so far been applied only to some degree on the federal level, but much more at the sub-national level.

In the Netherlands, NPM-like reforms were introduced from the early 1980s. One of the most prominent reforms has been the delegation of tasks and competencies to ZBOs (*zelfstandige bestuursorganen*). These semi-autonomous public bodies were expected to operate more business-like

but remained part of the public sector (see Kickert 2006; Van Thiel 2011). Rather than an extreme course of marketisation, as was chosen in the UK by Margaret Thatcher, the Dutch cabinet preferred a strategy of ‘soft’ delegation and partnership. This became known as the Third Way. This strategy was echoed in academic publications on public private partnerships and policy networks—a topic for which the Rotterdam PA researchers became particularly well-known (see the seminal book by Kickert et al. 1997).

In sum, although national differences exist, NPM concepts became a dominant feature of the academic discourse and research in the four countries in this time period, focusing both on internal (managerialist) as well as external dimensions (in terms of agencification and partnerships). Next, the impact of the Europeanisation of the administrative space and its multi-level setting would receive growing attention from PA scholars.

After NPM

Since the mid to late-1990s, in a transition from the ‘old’ NPM to the new ‘governance agenda’ (Löffler 2003, 485), both the academic discourse and practice of public sector modernisation in the four countries have embarked upon divergent and in part contradictory directions and trajectories. The growing number of single purpose organisations has generated centrifugal dynamics that challenge the traditional elected multi-purpose (local) authorities and call for new mechanisms and forms of coordination (cf. Bouckaert et al. 2010).

In Germany’s local government, the corporatisation and outsourcing of service provision has further advanced to the point of having about half or the local government employees operating in hived off units and organisations (see Grossi and Reichard 2016). In order to retain or regain steering capacity, local governments have been creating appropriate “steering” units. Furthermore, since the 2010s municipalities have begun to reverse the outsourcing of service provisions, by re-internalising into municipal hands or by re-purchasing the previously sold assets (see Bönker et al. 2016; Wollmann 2016). A similar trend can be observed in the Dutch central government, where following critical reports by among others the Court of Audit, plans have been implemented to re-centralise ZBOs or at least increase the governmental control over them (Pollitt and Bouckaert 2011, 292). These trends have resulted in new publications about the autonomy and control of semi-autonomous agencies (see country chapters in Verhoest et al. 2012) and in a growing debate on the ‘corporate governance’ of these bodies.

A distinctly different trend in all four countries—most visibly after the 2000s—is the (re)-emergence of societal actors in the execution of public and social functions. This can in part be traced back to the fiscal austerity caused by the financial crisis, but is also evidence of a trend to post-NPM, combatting some of the negative consequences of NPM (see Wollmann 2016, for a more elaborate argument). We expect that these latter trends will dominate the research agenda for some time to come.

2.2.2 *Anglophone European Countries*

The two Anglophone countries in Europe, the UK and Republic of Ireland, have developed separate systems of Public Administration since the independence of the latter from the former in 1922 as the Irish Free State, later to become the Republic of Ireland. Yet many similarities remain, Ireland being heavily influenced by the co-joined history of the two nations, most notably the establishment of a common civil service in the nineteenth Century, a centuries old county-based local government and the use of common law in both jurisdictions. It is the UK Public service, however, that has led in terms of many of the reforms that in recent years have been appreciated in various manifestations as New Public Management, modernisation, or marketisation (Pollitt and Bouckaert 2011). We focus on the UK first, then the Irish case.

2.2.2.1 *United Kingdom*

Before NPM

By the time the Victorian period was at its height, it was apparent that a more formalised structure to the governance of the UK required a reformulation of the civil service and the public administration apparatus. Beginning with the Northcote-Trevelyan Report of 1854 that recommended a merit-based and patronage-free service (O'Toole 2006), there began a process of reform and modernisation that has continued up to the present and been globally influential. Many of the early reforms advocated by Northcote-Trevelyan could not be passed through the House of Commons into statute, so Prime Minister Gladstone used Crown prerogative via Orders in Council to establish the Civil Service Commission and set up the basic structures of the merit-based service. Much of the Report had to wait until the early twentieth Century for implementation, and it was Lord Haldane who oversaw the establishment of sundry new structures and a UK-wide centralised Whitehall machine organised by function into Ministerial 'Departments' (O'Toole 2006; Hennessy 1989). The total mobilisation of the UK economy and workforce during World War II provided a punctuation point and ensured that the country was prepared for the implementation of a full-scale cultural shift in terms of post-war politics and public administration. The Labour government nationalised large swathes of the economy and constructed a Welfare State that coordinated pension provision, a National Health Service, unemployment provision and poverty alleviation on an unprecedented scale; all of it planned and delivered from Whitehall (Hennessy 1989).

NPM and post-NPM phase

It was this consensus that was to last, in various forms, until the traumatic economic problems and industrial disputes of the 1970s ushered in 18 years of Conservative governments, initially led by Margaret Thatcher. This was followed by 13 years of Labour government that accepted and deepened the reconstruction of the public sector according to the neo-liberal public choice agenda championed by Mrs Thatcher (Massey and Pyper 2005).

The UK has probably been the keenest country in Europe to experiment with NPM, or at least has been its forerunner during the 1980s and 1990s. Path-dependency played a role, though, in the way in which the NPM unfolded. In the UK, there is not a codified constitution, indeed until the *Constitutional Reform and Governance Act* (2010) there was not even a statutory basis for the UK's civil service. The public administration of the UK grew using Crown prerogative, which is effectively ministerial prerogative based on the legal fiction that all sovereignty in the UK is derived from the Crown in Parliament. This tradition in constitutional thought and practice has had important repercussions for the UK's approach to reform as in law the Crown is indivisible and cannot therefore contract with itself. For example, the Next Steps executive agencies that were set up to emulate many of the managerial traits of the private sector were not permitted to have a formal contract with their parent department as legally they remained indivisible. Instead they were given a Framework Document that detailed their role, their relationship with the parent department and with Parliament (Massey and Pyper 2005, p. 15; Massey 1995). This meant that many of the re-engineering reforms of the kind developed in the USA could not be enacted in quite the same way in the UK, and the marketisation, agencification and competitive tendering activities that evolved between 1980 and the present day had to take full cognisance of the atavistic vestiges of feudalism in the UK's constitutional DNA.

For reform-minded ministers, these innate mores and values had a benefit. The fluidity it allowed in terms of restructuring significant constituent elements of the country's public sector without recourse to statute or legal precedent permitted a constant reforming process within and between horizontal government layers and vertical institutions. This was implemented alongside the turbulence of statute-based upheavals, such as the privatisation (and often closure) of heavy industry and monopoly utilities (Massey and Pyper 2005). The British have historically viewed government as a series of institutions invented to arrange and administer the affairs of state (Nozick 1974). Government in the British tradition is often viewed as a simple mechanism for transmitting policy decisions into the practical delivery of services; indeed until recently, there was actually a Machinery of Government division in the Cabinet Office. Its functions have now been assumed by the Economic and Domestic Affairs Secretariat of the Cabinet Office where it still issues guidance on structural change and reform of central government departments through a guidance paper entitled, *Machinery of Government Guidance* (Cabinet Office 2015).

Scholarship

The UK has been leading on scholarly accounts analysing, often with a critical stance, NPM reforms (e.g. Pollitt 1993, 2016). It has also later led in advocating post-NPM approaches (some would prefer to qualify them as 'beyond-NPM' approaches): from the strand of studies in the governance

tradition (Bevir and Rhodes 2003) to more outright calls for overcoming the NPM through the New Public Governance approach (Osborne 2010) to studies emphasising inter-organisation collaboration rather than competition (Huxham and Vangen 2005) and co-production (Bovaird and Loeffler, this handbook) or digital revolution-based novel forms of public governance (Dunleavy et al. 2006)

With regard to the location of scholarship, unlike many European countries, the UK did not possess a prestigious public sector college or school, certainly nothing that resembled the French *Ecole Nationale d'Administration* (ENA). Beginning in 1918 with the establishment of the Joint University Council by the Fabians and the Institute (later Royal Institute) of Public Administration (RIPA) by Lord Haldane in 1922, there was a brief flurry of serious scholarly work on UK public administration (Chapman 2007). But it cannot be claimed either organisation had a lasting impression or even made a strategic imprint upon public administration. Perhaps the legacy of the RIPA, which closed for good in 1992 (Shelley 1993), is its journal, *Public Administration*. Within the public sector itself, there was no long lasting attempt to establish a centre of administrative excellence informed by original impact-related research. The Civil Service College, established by the Heath Government (1970–1974) following a recommendation of the 1968 Fulton Report, was never more than a training organisation, lacking a credible research capacity even after its grand renaming as the National School of Government. It fell victim to austerity cuts and was closed in 2012. A range of private think tanks have variously contributed to public administration reform over the years, the most recent and influential being the Institute for Government, but none have matched the French ENA. It may be argued that for the period prior to NPM the public administration scholarship was a traditional Anglo-American perspective rooted in the Westminster model, viewing ministers as responsible for policy-making and answerable for all decisions in Parliament. They were advised by senior civil servants who refined advice and acted as gatekeepers, deciding who had access to power and to the high-ranking levels of the policy process. Most study was seen as a part of political science and was located in the social science faculties of UK universities. In the UK, more generally, however, it may be seen that the teaching and scholarship of Public Administration was something of a “wasteland” when compared to the continental European tradition or indeed North America, with its emphasis on Wilson, Taylor and then the reforms of the New Deal (Pollitt 2016, 16–20). The introduction of NPM changed the nomenclature, and as the study of public administration became unfashionable, it began to be labelled ‘public sector management’ and migrated in many cases to business schools where alongside political science it became a subject of intense study from the mid-1970s onwards with the work of scholars such as Hood, Rhodes, Pollitt, and Parsons amongst many others (Pollitt 2016). But the language and tools of the private sector were increasingly applied to the public sector and politicians as well as progressively public officials looked to business schools

for the answers to their problems. The post-NPM world remains locked into using business school scholarship, but increasingly it is recognised that public administration also requires the scholarship of sociology, anthropology, economics, and psychology as well as a more quantitative political science approach to understand, define and address many of the wicked issues that beset the public sector.

2.2.2.2 *Republic of Ireland*

The civil service of the Republic of Ireland was originally part of the UK civil service, but was established as a separate entity following independence in 1922. The Irish Free State Constitution agreed between London and Dublin did not provide specific recognition to the civil service. Instead, basic principles for the organisation and conditions of civil service employment were established by the Ministers and Secretaries Act 1924. It replaced the British Crown as the final authority for the work of the civil service by introducing the legal concept of a ‘corporation sole’ such that all civil service Departments operated in the name of the Minister, i.e. the Minister and his/her Department were one and the same. The Act also determined that civil servants were employed by the Minister for Finance, who could amend the terms of employment and remuneration. The new State established a Civil Service Commission and a merit-based recruitment and promotion service, so that in many ways, it continued to retain much of the ethos and outward appearance of the old British system from which it was created.

Several decades followed before administrative reform became an item of political concern (MacCarthaigh 2012) and a report published in 1969 suggested, amongst other things, a more formal separation of policy-making from administrative duties as well as more effective use of arm’s length agencies (Public Services Organisation Review Group 1969). In this, it echoed a central recommendation of the British Committee on the Civil Service (or Fulton Committee) which had finally reported in 1968. However, unlike the UK experience, the Irish reform impetus petered out during the period of the oil crises in the 1970s and it was not until the early 1990s that NPM-style reforms made their appearance in Ireland. In 1994, the product of a study visit by Irish civil servants to New Zealand and Australia was published as the *Strategic Management Initiative* that began a process of sustained civil service reform and modernisation via the *Delivering Better Government* programme in 1996 which continued through a period of rapid economic growth until 2006.

In that year, the OECD was commissioned to review and advise on a new reform trajectory and in their 2008 report recommended further reform especially in terms of better integration and coordination of service delivery and “the need for more focus on performance and value for money across government” (Boyle 2014, p. 9). But the real driver for deep reform was the fiscal crisis that engulfed the Republic from 2007 and led to dramatic steps to deal with a drop of 11% of GDP by 2010 and a rise in unemployment

from 4.6 to 13.5% (Boyle 2014, 10). The subsequent cutbacks, involving a loan programme or ‘bailout’ with the Troika of the IMF, European Commission and European Central Bank, resulted in a reduction in the public service population of 10% and a commensurate reduction in the paybill arrived at through a series of negotiated agreements with trade unions.

This was also a period of significant reform, however, driven by a newly created Department of Public Expenditure and Reform, which brought together industrial relations, reform and spending under one Ministry (Hardiman and MacCarthaigh, forthcoming). Its reform efforts largely align with the post-NPM model of reasserting traditional bureaucratic principles of common practices and standardisation with efforts to reintegrate a fragmented system through such arrangements as shared services and consolidation of procurement. While it has been a period of unprecedented change for the Irish public service, there is much in here that reflects the experience not just of the UK, but most of northern Europe (Laegreid et al. 2016).

2.2.3 *Southern Europe*

Five European countries can be clustered under the label of Napoleonic administrative tradition: France, Greece, Italy, Portugal, and Spain (Ongaro 2009, Chap. 6, 2010; Peters 2008)—although the extent to which the diffusion of the French administrative model in Southern European countries is such to warrant placing all these countries under this common umbrella is debatable. Before the rise of the NPM, a number of research approaches were engaging with the theme of administrative reforms. These research approaches were partly competing but, much more often, quite pacifically coexisting in juxtaposition.

Before NPM

In France, which historically exemplifies the strong centralised, Napoleonic State and whose extensive body of administrative law has been a frontrunner and model of administrative regulation in Continental European countries, lawyers, political scientists, and the strong school of sociologist of organisations, following the seminal works of Michel Crozier, provided complementary perspectives to the study of public administration. The administrative elite, whose members were (and are) mostly trained at one of the *Grandes Ecoles* (such as ENA) and organised in corps and grands corps, also played an active role in the discourse on administrative reforms, which was largely conducted within the association *Service Public*, where top state officials and academics meet (Clark 1998).

In Italy, the Italian School of *Economia Aziendale* (see Chap. 4, this handbook) was developing a distinctive approach to public management, centred on a strong institutionalist perspective whereby public authorities represent a distinct category of organisations, whose management systems are to be investigated in systematic relation to the distinctive institutional configuration

of this category (pioneering works here were Borgonovi 1973, 1984, which engendered a veritable school of thought in Italy). Administrative law was probably the dominant discipline, at least in terms of policy influence (which lasted over the subsequent decades, see Capano 2003); leading scholars in this stream include Sabino Cassese and Franco Bassanini, who later both served as Ministers for Public Administration of Italy during the season of NPM reforms. Political scientists were more focused on policy analysis, though the overarching centre of interest was the party system and constitutional affairs, and only later during the phase of NPM reforms attention of this community was drawn to administrative reforms.

In Greece, Portugal, and Spain, the debate on the form of public administration was dominated by the democratisation process (the three countries having all exited dictatorships in the 1970s), as well as by the process of accession to the EU. Notable in Spain in this period was the discourse on regionalisation, with the establishment of the *Comunidades Autonomas* and a significant departure from the French, centralised model (a process of limited regionalisation was also occurring in France), and in Portugal the debate on how to manage the process of absorption of the staff repatriated from the former colonies, after the demise of the Portuguese colonial system.

NPM phase

A common thread connecting these five countries during the period when NPM was at its zenith can provocatively be read by resorting to the notion of ‘the intransigent context’. Following historian of administration Fabio Rugge, we note that an intransigent context is one made up of ‘cohesive, consistent and homogeneous elements that no exogenous pattern or institution modelled in a foreign context can ever intrude into it’ (Rugge 2013, p. 45). The jurisdictions we are considering are not made of such material as to be impenetrable—indeed many NPM notions did intrude—but at least part of the discourse has been shaped in terms of the NPM embodying a form of foreign (Anglo-Saxon) colonisation that was to be resisted, partly for the very reason that its incompatibility with the national context made its introduction a doomed exercise (interestingly, not just in France but also in Italy and elsewhere the NPM was referred to in the French language, as the *Nouvelle Gestion Publique*). What can be observed on the terrain however is that many NPM ideas did find their way into the administrative systems of these countries, rather what happened is that they were appropriated and manipulated so as to fit local constituencies and internal administrative logics. In France, this occurred quite late, notably in the wake of the introduction of the *loi organique relative aux lois de finance* (LOLF) in 2001, effective from 2006, which aimed at significantly reforming the central level budgeting process and introduced a form of Management by Objectives. Only then, it seems, did NPM ideas penetrate in more depth in the French public sector, albeit selectively and rather lower down the hierarchy than at the top level of the politics-administration interface (Bezes 2009; Rouban 2007). In Italy, a spate

of NPM-inspired reforms was effected during the second half of the 1990s (Mele and Ongaro 2014; Ongaro 2009, 2011). NPM reforms took root also in Greece (Spanou and Sotiropoulos 2011), Portugal (Magone 2011), Spain (Alba and Navarro 2011). The scholarly and practitioner debate on reforms was catalysed on the issue of the compatibility with the distinctive cultural-administrative context of the then globally hegemonic (or perceived and publicly debated as such) NPM ideas.

It is during this period that a third theme became central in the scholarly debate: EU governance, Europeanisation, and its implication for policy-making in these countries. The theme of Europeanisation grew in significance in the scholarly communities of these countries partly due to the general trend that has seen this literature burgeon, partly because of the impact the EU has had on public policy in these countries (e.g. the structural funds-driven policies of regional development and social cohesion), and partly due to the phenomenon of the massive emigration of scholars from the southern countries to northern European universities, especially the UK, as well as to the US, where EU studies were historically widely developed, thanks to the very strong UK and US driven Anglophone stream of research in this field area. The topic of EU-driven influences has then further gained traction in these countries after the burst of the financial and economic crises in 2008, which engendered a series of fiscal crises and fiscal consolidation efforts in these countries, notably Greece, then Italy, Spain, and Portugal (Di Mascio et al. 2016; Ongaro 2012).

Post-NPM

With the eclipse of the dominance of the NPM discourse globally, research thrusts and key areas of concerns of researchers have (re-)become more diversified and comparative research works within the cluster flourished (Barzelay and Gallego 2010a and 2010b; Kickert 2011a, 2011b; Ongaro 2008, 2009), and the debate around evaluative criteria (focus on efficiency and effectiveness *versus* focus on transparency and legality *versus* emphasis on participation and citizen involvement/active democracy) seems to have had a turn towards less ideological contentions and more empirical research work.

2.2.4 The Nordic Countries

Public administration in the Nordic countries is much more closely aligned with the Continental European systems than with the Anglo-American “public interest” and management-oriented systems. Although *Rechtsstaat* norms loom large, the legal framework of the Nordic countries is less codified than that of the Germanic countries reviewed above. In Sweden, for instance, a specific administrative law (*Förvaltningslag*) did not come into existence until 1986. However, the legal principle of the publicity of all public documents (*offentlighetsprincipen*) dates back to 1766. Thus, there is a strong kinship between the Germanic and the Nordic administrative traditions, not least

the emphasis on legality and legal security. These similarities with the German *Rechtsstaat* ideal are rooted in notions about the strong state and collective action. Building on that legalistic tradition, Nordic and German public administrations have linkages with public law (*offentlig rätt*): constitutional law (*statsförfattningsrätt* is used in Finland, but the same term *offentlig rätt* is used in Sweden for both public and constitutional law) and administrative law (*förvaltningsrätt*).

There are also several differences. Perhaps the most immediate contrast is the absence of a strong professional community of public administration scholars in the Nordic countries; schools of public administration or functional equivalents thereof are extremely rare. The exception is the School of Public Administration at the University of Gothenburg (*Förvaltningshögskolan*) but that institution is focused primarily on local and regional government. That means that there are few, if any, institutions that foster a community of public administration scholars or an academic discourse of public administration. Training civil servants outside universities has played a role in fostering the community, but its organisation has changed over the years following often the principles of NPM. For example in Finland, HAUS Finnish Institute of Public Management was established in 1971 as a state training centre, but later it functioned as a public enterprise and since 2010 a company with 100% state ownership providing in-house training and consultancy for the Finnish state government (Virtanen 2014). An additional feature which sets the Scandinavian countries apart from much of the rest of Europe—except to some extent Germany—is the leading role of Social Democracy. Social Democracy with its ideological roots in ideas about equality and social justice tends to look critically at “the market” which in their view engenders exactly the opposite; inequality and an unfair distribution of wealth in society. The combination of *Rechtsstaat* norms about public administration, Social Democratic dominance and corporatist arrangements of interest representation which has been typical to the Scandinavian countries in the post-war period has not been fertile soil for market-based administrative reform (Green-Pedersen 2002; Laegreid and Christensen 2013).

The historical legacy looms large over the administrative practices of the contemporary state. In the Nordic region, as Knudsen and Rothstein (1994) have pointed out, we can distinguish between a West-Nordic region featuring Denmark as leading case where state formation drew on liberal democratic values. The East-Nordic region with Sweden as the best illustration, partly also Finland, was built on “paternalistic corporatism” which emanated from the four estates parliamentarism. Knudsen and Rothstein argue that these different trajectories of state formation still shape administrative practices and the role of the state. It is also easy to see, however, that there has been a fair amount of convergence between the two regions in these respects.

Through the 1960s and 1970s—with some cross-national variation—the public sector grew continuously, both in terms of organisational size, budget, and tax levels. The welfare expansion was most noticeable at the local and

regional levels of the political system where you find the bulk of the public sector employees, engaged in labour-intensive areas of public service. Economic policy at this time was strictly Keynesian which meant that there was not much pressure to balance the budget on an annual basis. The welfare state also engendered strong constituencies which prevent cutbacks in public expenditures (Pierson 1995), thus adding to the obstacles to any more extensive reform.

The NPM phase

This was the backdrop against which public management reform evolved in these countries. Given the deeply institutionalised and entrenched welfare state, addressing fiscal imbalances by cutting back in public expenditure became a difficult project, including the introduction of new systems of managing service delivery and local authorities while at the same time fending off critique from social constituencies and the opposition in parliament.

In Finland and Sweden, a severe financial crisis in the early 1990s provided both the impetus and the necessity of reform. Detailed budget appropriations and steering systems were relaxed and replaced with management towards results and objectives. Fiscal and budgetary discipline was strengthened, and NPM-inspired concepts such as privately owned entities delivering public services began to emerge.

Denmark, by contrast, had experienced much of its cutbacks already in the 1970s and 1980s and implemented extensive structural reform. Public Management reform in Denmark in general has been characterised by two broad features (Greve 2006). One such feature is how reform has been shaped by central-local relations, where local authorities enjoy significant autonomy vis à vis central government. The other feature is a rather critical view of marketisation which meant that NPM reform as a whole was only partial and more concerned with steering local authorities as autonomous agencies and less centred around introducing market mechanisms (Pedersen and Löfgren 2012).

Norway presented yet another picture. There, a significant financial crisis never materialised; neither did we witness any extensive NPM reform. While there certainly was interest in creating autonomous executive agencies, NPM concepts such as providing customers with a choice among competing providers or extensive marketisation within the public sector did not find much support in Norway (see Laegreid 2001).

The institutional legacy of Sweden's public administration—again, strongly inspired by the Germanic tradition—emphasises values typically associated with the *Rechtsstaat* model of public administration, i.e. legality, due process, transparency, legal security, equal treatment, and accountability. Well into the twentieth century, the Swedish public bureaucracy was not very different from other European administrations; it was a loyal, responsive, and elitist bureaucracy. The same principles apply equally to Finland before the introduction of NPM-related practices in the 1990s (Virtanen 2016).

Given the Scandinavians' strong beliefs in legality, we would expect the introduction of NPM-style reform to be slow and incremental. Indeed, despite the many similarities among the Scandinavian countries, Denmark, Finland, Norway, and Sweden display rather different NPM reform trajectories (Laegreid 2001; Temmes 1998). Sweden has gone farthest down the NPM road, largely due to a combination of a rationalistic tradition in policy-making, a weakening of corporatist structures, and the aforementioned financial crisis in the early 1990s which provided both opportunity and momentum for reform (Christensen et al. 2002).

Finland, too, has shown "a relatively strong inclination towards NPM" (Godenhjelm 2016). The Finnish assessment of NPM has aimed at decoupling the ideological, neo-liberal elements of such reform from its organisational and managerial aspects; a process which was facilitated by the strength of the senior civil service (Temmes 1998). This has proven to be a successful strategy in disarming the NPM critics; as Temmes (1998, 446) points out, "the professionalization of NPM has...made it easier for it to become the dominant reform among non-Anglo-Saxon countries, as this had the effect of reducing the tensions which originally surrounded the doctrine". Finland's reform policies can be characterised as Neo-Weberian rather than orthodox NPM (Virtanen 2016).

Norway has been a more "reluctant reformer"; introducing reform incrementally (Olsen 1996; Christensen and Laegreid 1998). Denmark, according to most observers, falls somewhere between the cases of Norway and Sweden in terms of their interest in NPM reform (see Greve 2006; Pedersen and Löfgren 2012).

Looking at these reform strategies comparatively, it would appear as if more extensive reform requires some external shock to upset the path dependency of public administration. *Rechtsstaat* systems such as the Scandinavian countries are less amenable to introducing NPM in an incremental fashion, though pilot projects have occurred, and blended approaches have found their way (Pollitt and Bouckaert 2011). Sweden went the farthest of the three countries in part because the financial crisis gave NPM reform momentum. In Denmark, we saw a similar development pre-NPM, where structural reform was triggered—and facilitated by severe cutbacks in public expenditure. In Norway, reform has been primarily structural; incentives for reform have been weaker and marketisation has been viewed with some degree of scepticism. The Finnish experience is more varied. There has certainly been, as mentioned, a strong interest in NPM reform, partly as a reaction to financial problems stemming from the collapse of the Soviet Union around 1990 had a deep impact on the Finnish economy.

Post-NPM

As mentioned, different types of NPM reform have been introduced nationally and sub-nationally. In central government, performance management has dominated public management. This has created an interesting situation

where the principal debates and arguments about NPM takes place at the nation-state level while subnational government pragmatically implements such reform on a grand scale. In Sweden, it was not after the 2014 elections) that the political leadership signalled that it wishes to downplay NPM and reinstate professionalism and trust as core values in the management of the public administration.

At the local and regional levels in Sweden, municipal enterprises which, while remaining in municipal ownership, were given financial and operational autonomy have increasingly shown a “hybrid” orientation in, on the one hand, remaining committed to public (“common good”) interests, while, on the other, pursuing entrepreneurial (“profit making”) objectives. Hence, “gradually the market has entered into local government and local government has entered into the market” (Montin 2016). This process has been fuelled by national legislation which urges local and regional government to open up for non-public service providers.

A pattern that comes across quite clearly as we compare the administrative reform trajectories of the Nordic countries is the resilience of institutional, cultural and normative patterns (see Greve et al. 2016; Temmes 1998). Reform concepts based on norms and values that seem to clash with entrenched norms cause friction between social behaviour and what public institutions see as their role. Market-based public sector reform seems to have had those results in the Nordic countries, particularly in the short-term perspective.

Scholarship

There is a rich variety of research stances and focuses across the Nordic countries. The first chair of Public Administration in the Nordic countries was established in 1965 in Finland, at the University of Tampere (Virtanen 2010). The chair was part of a new group of *administrative sciences* that included, in addition to PA, planning geography, public law and municipal sciences (which included politics, law and economy); governmental regulation of higher education degrees in Finland recognises administrative sciences as a separate group from business administration and social sciences (including political sciences and international relations), strengthening its academic status and affecting the institutional organisation of research. The research orientations cover all the major schools of thought of Public Administration, leaning mostly on Anglo-Saxon research traditions (Virtanen 2010), though it may be said that there is no ‘Finnish School’ of PA, rather orientations have developed locally and individually in each university resulting in somewhat fuzzy and overlapping clusters¹ Topics of European Union and multi-level governance have not gained much attention, but comparative research has covered many themes.

Shifting to the Swedish case, the academic analysis of the Swedish public administration has been characterised by two related trends. First, many public administration scholars have worked closely with practitioners in government

and the administration, as experts or commissioned researchers in huge evaluation programs funded by Royal Commissions planning reform, for instance the extensive amalgamation of local authorities between 1960 and the early 1980s in Sweden. Indeed, one could argue that the academic public administration was *too* close to the political system: the utility aspect of research took precedence over theory-driven analysis and theory development. Secondly, and to some extent related to the previous point, there has been a noticeable transition in public administration research from the study of public administration as a set of organisations towards an understanding of *the politics* of public administration (*förvaltningspolitik*) in an institutional perspective. Given the previously discussed emphasis on engagement with the reform process and, by consequence, the utility aspect of research, scholars of public administration were previously more concerned with describing *wie es eigentlich gewesen ist* ('what really happened') than to develop theory. This approach has helped better understand the complexities of steering autonomous agencies and how governments tend to exercise steering by organising (Jacobsson et al. 2015).

Researching PA in Norway has been heavily influenced by the very strong roots of PA research in organisation science, also due to the immense influence of Johan Olsen and the ties, initially personal between Olsen and March and then institutional, of the Norwegian community with the Stanford school of organisation studies. This inheritance has continued and thriven in a wide range of prominent scholars, devoted to the comparative study of public sector reforms (through key authors like Tom Christiansen and Per Laegreid) and the analysis of the administrative and organisational bases of EU governance (key authors like Morten Egeberg and Jarle Trondal) and how Europeanisation and administrative 'fusion' influence not just EU member states but also associated non-Member states.²

The rich research tradition in Denmark has developed a strong focus on democratic governance and (new public) 'governance' approaches (through key authors including Carsten Greve and Jacob Torfing), themes that are of common interest across all the Nordic countries.

2.2.5 CEE Countries

On the one hand, Central and Eastern European countries share a communist legacy, but on the other hand they are very different: they have different state traditions, history, culture, politico-administrative systems. The chapter by Nemec and De Vries in this handbook offers a more extensive overview; here we will highlight some of the most important developments in the public administrations and PA research in these countries, to enable a comparison with developments in other parts of Europe.

Before NPM

Although some reforms were undertaken in the Soviet-Union from the mid-1980s on, it was not until November 1989 when the Berlin wall fell that

the CEE countries started freeing themselves from the reign of Moskow. The first countries to do so were Poland and Hungary, then the GDR, Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia followed, and finally Romania, Yugoslavia, and Albania (the last two having historically enjoyed some more autonomy from the Soviet Union). By the end of 1991, the Soviet-Union ceased to exist. Russia formed a new alliance with some countries, such as Ukraine and Belarus, but most of the former USSR-states became independent.

These new independent states went through a number of changes, most notably (i) the implementation of a system of parliamentary democracy, often combined with a multi-party system, and (ii) the transition to a market economy and capitalism. These two transitions also became research topics for PA scholars. At first however, international publications were not written by scholars from the region, but mainly by western scholars. In PA and PM research, the emphasis lay on the transition to the market economy, for example on the role of regulation, while democratic reforms were more often subject of research by political scientists.

It is only in the mid-2000s that international academic journals based in the CEE countries themselves would appear (such as *Transylvanian Review of Administrative Sciences*, *NISPACEE journal of public administration and policy*, *Administrative Culture*). In the first editions of these journals, we still see many contributions from western scholars, but gradually CEE-scholars have come to the international fore. As a result, first-hand knowledge about the pre-NPM stage of CEE countries is limited. Later publications do describe the old situation though: centralist and authoritarian government, one-party dominance, virtually no local government, and provision of public services through a centralist apparatus characterised by bureaucracy, red tape, and patronage (see e.g. Liebert et al. 2013; Bouckaert et al. 2008; Verheijen 1999). Criticism, including independent research, was not tolerated and the line between academics and the political system was not always very clear (Verheijen and Connaughton 2003). Most PA scholars originated from the legal discipline. This would change with the introduction of New Public Management ideas.

From the 1990s on, each country followed its own path of transition. Some countries (e.g. Hungary, Poland) would return to previous principles and traditions, for example by restoring the power of local government, while other countries (e.g. the Baltic states) chose a strategy of designing a new state, undoing it from its communist legacy. State building was heavily influenced by the desire of many CEE-countries to join the European Union (Meyer-Sahling 2009). The EU *acquis communautaire* imposed several demands—many in line with the NPM that was ‘en vogue’ in western Europe, such as liberalisation, marketisation, and privatisation of several public services and the establishment of regulatory authorities to regulate the new markets. CEE-countries have implemented such reforms at a very high pace (see e.g. Van Thiel 2011, on agencification), and often without much consideration of the consequences (see various country chapters in

Verhoest et al. 2012; cf. Randma-Liiv et al. 2011). Evidence on the results of NPM reforms is scattered, showing that ‘some reforms work in some countries’ (Drechsler and Randma-Liiv 2015)—just like in western countries (Pollitt and Dan 2013). However, the implementation of NPM reforms has run into a number of additional problems in the CEE countries, most notable the lack of administrative capacity for example to adequately deal with organisations at arm’s length or to regulate the new markets (Drechsler and Randma-Liiv 2015). Ministries and regulators have not been granted enough powers, or lack educated staff.

The EU demands to adapt state structures and adopt EU regulations have led to a situation in which reforms have taken place mainly at a structural level, rather than at the cultural level. Old habits and patterns of behaviour like patronage are still present and have in some cases led to increased levels of corruption, for example following privatisations (Mungiu-Pippidi 2015), or to a lack of the knowledge and the people to carry out new tasks such as regulation. Discussions by academics on these shortcomings and the detrimental effects for the public interest have only recently begun (see e.g. Dan and Pollitt 2015, versus Drechsler and Randma-Liiv 2015).

NPM phase

As NPM reforms were often imposed by the EU, as a condition for accession, CEE countries began implementing the reforms later than most western countries (cf. Bouckaert et al. 2008). However, they caught up very quickly. The post-NPM discussion however has not yet really begun, so there is at the time when this handbook goes to press not yet a clear agenda with counter-measures against the negative effects of NPM reforms. PA researchers have pointed out specific problems that CEE countries have to deal with, in particular the need for more professionalisation of the civil service (Verheijen and Connaughton 2003) and the need to fight corruption. To that end, more research is urgently required, such as empirical evaluations of specific NPM reforms in specific countries (Drechsler and Randma-Liiv 2015)—preferably by local scholars, but who present their work to the international community (in English). Local researchers are better equipped to distinguish the specificity of each country in the CEE cluster and take differences into account. Comparative research should perhaps focus more on comparisons between specific CEE and equivalent western countries with similar state traditions (Meyer-Sahling 2009). This does require however better training and education of PA students and scholars, not only for practice (Verheijen and Connaughton 2003) but also for research.

2.3 CONCLUSION

Which picture emerges from our overview of public administration and management reforms across Europe and the research thereof? Are there any detectable trends, and are these towards convergence, divergence, or what?

And can continuing differences be spotted? Is there some kind of distinctive European approach to researching the field? In this concluding section, we highlight some elements that may form part of the answer to the above—indeed quite ambitious—questions. The concluding chapter of this handbook further elaborates on it. Here we offer a bird's eye view.

At first, European research was embedded in national discourses, and often rooted in law. However, with the rise of NPM and the introduction of new ideas, for instance from economics, European scholars became more internationally oriented. This was reflected not only in the analysis of journal publications, but also in the rise of scholars with a different disciplinary background and research focus than the traditional ones (see for example the Germanic countries) and the establishment and development of centres of research with different emphases (on public management, for example, across all the clusters of countries). We might therefore conclude that NPM has acted, to a smaller or larger extent, as a catalyst of scholarly work across Europe, bringing about a European dimension to the field of public administration and management across the continent. We promptly acknowledge that the NPM has been a global, rather than European, phenomenon, but the point we want to emphasise here is that it has provided scholars across Europe with a common object of study, a common ground on which to concentrate their research efforts (and spend research money which became available at the European level through EU funding of research at about the same time). It has, in sum, been part of the explanation for the emergence of a European discourse in public administration and management.

A second point that deserves consideration is the emphasis on the theoretical importance of context as a key trait of PA scholarship in Europe (see for example Pollitt 2013). With the benefit of the external beholder, the American scholar Kenneth Meier (2016) notices how this feature has formed and consolidated a tradition of cross-national theorising in Europe, notably with regard to such topics like the trajectories of administrative reform and the political-bureaucratic relationships. European scholars emphasise and are sensitive about the justification of their 'context' selection, by systematically tackling such questions like: what countries should we include in the study; why these politico-administrative and cultural contexts (and not others)? In view of contextual differences, what is the investigated case 'a case of' theory-wise? In sum, there seems to be an idiosyncratic relationship between the variety of administrative traditions in Europe (Painter and Peters 2010) and the heedfulness of European scholarship towards the theme of contextual influences on public management and administration (by systematically tackling the question: how does context affect public management?). The rise in comparative publications and the unrelenting popularity of case studies as research method are testament to this trait of European PA and PM research.

The popularity of comparative PA and PM³ lies in the fact that Europe is a 'natural laboratory' for this type of research. Moreover, there are a number of favourable conditions for comparative research in Europe: the presence

of a large number of high-level universities and research institutions⁴; the availability of substantive research funding at the supranational level of the European Union, a kind of funding which puts a premium on cross-country studies (books like Hammerschmid et al. 2016 or Verhoest et al. 2012 are illustrative examples of the outcomes of EU funding for comparative PA research); the presence of major learned societies in the field like the European Group for Public Administration (EGPA), providing key intellectual infrastructures for comparative, pan-European research to develop; and, as in the classic ‘last but not least’, the life-long activity of exceptionally talented and committed scholars producing top-cited publications (to mention just one example: Pollitt and Bouckaert 2011).

A third observation from the overview above is that the PA and PM community plays different roles in different countries. In some countries, scholars are setting certain trends in the reforming of public management, or at least the spin with which internationally diffusing trends get received in national settings (see for example the influence of Kuno Schedler in Switzerland) while in other countries PA scholars appear to be following rather than leading the wave of international ideological fashions and trends, confining themselves—or being confined—in their research work to analysing the implications and effects of successive dominant doctrines after they have materialised. The interrelations between scholarship and practice also vary from country to country. Particularly in the Central Eastern European countries, the boundaries between the two domains were not always clear. However, PA and PM scholarship in these countries has changed quite dramatically over the past decades, both methodologically and regarding the quality and quantity of publications. Attention for the developments in CEE countries has grown, at first by external scholars but more recently also from native scholars who have turned to publishing in English and participating in the pan-European communities.

Fourth, the increased participation of scholars from all countries in pan-European and international communities, publications and conferences has, luckily, not diverted scholars from studying national developments and cases. However, it has led to, on the one hand, higher order European discourses in public administration, and on the other hand to interconnect European approaches in research to more global trends in theory and method development.

A final consideration regards the profile of the ‘European scholar’ in public administration and management. Raadschelders (2011) sketches a picture of the highly specialised scholar in the US (focused on a specific field of inquiry and an exclusive academic career) and contrasts this figure with the European scholar as somebody who is knowledgeable across various sub-fields; a kind of wise (wo)man with the broad view of the field of public administration. Our overview seems to offer some support for this thesis. When considering the involvement of European PA scholars in policy advice and applied research, an image arises of PA scholars as scholars with a broad view, and knowledgeable across multiple areas in the field of public administration and public

management. However, there may be generational differences, as younger scholars become more specialised and ‘focused’ in their application of state of the art methods and theories. For now, though, it seems that combining the ‘scientific’ knowledge of PA with the practical knowledge of PA as art, profession, and wisdom still lies at the heart of the European scholarly representation and conception of what ‘studying public administration’ is about.

NOTES

1. So, themes of administrative policy, higher education, public organisations, management and culture can be found in Helsinki; bureaucracy, higher education, security, municipal governance, financial management and accounting in Tampere; comparative AS, ethics, and healthcare in Vaasa; healthcare and social welfare in Kuopio and Oulu; state and municipal relations, organisational behaviour and knowledge management in Lapland.
2. It is worth pointing out that Norway is not a member of the EU, though it is closely associated to it via the European Economic Area.
3. This was not the case, e.g., in the 1960s, when it was American scholarship with the likes of Riggs and others to be leading internationally.
4. Some of them score top in the world in international rankings, although we believe that research, at least in field like PA, benefits more from the variety of culturally diverse and intensely networked research institutions, rather than from concentration of scholarship in universities assessed according to the debatable and problematic notion of ‘excellence’.

Acknowledgements The authors are grateful to Christopher Pollitt for a ‘critical friend’ review of a previous version of this chapter, which has greatly helped improve it. They are also grateful to Muiris MacCartaigh and Turo Virtanen for contributions notably on the cases of Ireland and Finland, respectively.

REFERENCES

- Alba, C., & Navarro, C. (2011). Administrative tradition and reforms in Spain: Adaptation versus innovation. *Public Administration*, 89(3), 783–800.
- Barzelay, M., & Gallego, R. (2010a). The comparative historical analysis of public management policy cycles in France, Italy, and Spain: Symposium introduction. *Governance*, 23(2), 209–223.
- Barzelay, M., & Gallego, R. (2010b). The comparative historical analysis of public management policy cycles in France, Italy, and Spain: Symposium conclusions. *Governance*, 23(2), 297–307.
- Bevir, M., & Rhodes, R. A. W. (2003). *Interpreting British governance*. Brighton: Psychology Press.
- Bezes, P. (2009). *Réinventer l'Etat. Les réformes de l'administration française*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Bönker, F., Libbe, J., & Wollmann, H. (2016). Re-municipalisation revisited: Long-term trends in the provision of local public services in Germany. In H. Wollmann, I. Kopric, & G. Marcou (Eds.), *Public and social services in Europe, from public and municipal to private provision* (pp. 71–86). Basingstoke: Palgrave. (forthcoming).

- Borgonovi, E. (1973). *L'Economia Aziendale negli Istituti Pubblici Territoriali*. Milan: Giuffrè.
- Borgonovi, E. (Ed.). (1984). *Introduzione all'Economia delle Amministrazioni Pubbliche*. Milan: Giuffrè.
- Bouckaert, G., Nemec, J., et al. (Eds.). (2008). *Public management reforms in central and eastern Europe*. Bratislava: NISPAcee Press.
- Bouckaert, G., Peters, B. G., & Verhoest, K. (2010). *The coordination of public sector organizations: Shifting patterns of public management*. London: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Boyle, R. (2014). *Public sector reform in Ireland*. Dublin: Institute of Public Administration.
- Bundesministerium für Finanzen. (1999). *Verwaltungs-Innovations-Programm, Endbericht*.
- Cabinet Office. (2015). *Machinery of Government Guidance*, Cabinet Office October 2015, v. 4.1, 29 July 2016.
- Capano, G. (2003). Administrative traditions and policy change: When policy paradigms matter. The case of Italian administrative reform during the 1990s. *Public Administration*, 81(4), 781–801.
- Chapman, R. (2007). The origins of the joint university council and the background to 'public policy and administration': An interpretation. *Public Policy and Administration*, 22, 7–26.
- Christensen, T., & Laegreid, P. (1998). Administrative reform policy: The case of Norway. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 64, 457–475.
- Christensen, T., Laegreid, P., & Wise, L. C. (2002). Transforming administrative policy. *Public Administration*, 80, 153–178.
- Clark, D. (1998). The modernization of the French civil service: Crisis, change and continuity. *Public Administration*, 76(1), 97–115.
- Constitutional Reform and Governance Act*. (2010). HMG.
- Dan, S., & Pollitt, C. (2015). NPM can work: An optimistic review of the impact of new public management reforms in central and eastern Europe. *Public Management Review*, 17(9), 1305–1332.
- Di Mascio, F., Galli, D., Natalini, A., Ongaro, E., & Stolfi, F. (2016). Learning-shaping crises: A longitudinal comparison of public personnel reforms in Italy, 1992–2014. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis*, early view.
- Drechsler, W., & Randma-Liiv, T. (2015). In some central and eastern European countries, Some NPM tools may sometimes work: A reply to Dan and Pollitt's 'NPM can work'. *Public Management Review*. doi:10.1080/14719037.2015.1114137.
- Dunleavy, P., Margetts, H., Bastow, S., & Tinkler, J. (2006). *Digital era governance: IT corporations, the state and e-government*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Germann, R. E. (1998). *Öffentliche Verwaltung in der Schweiz, Bd. 1, Staatsapparat und die Regierung*. Bern usw: Paul Haupt.
- Godenhjelm, S. (2016). *Project organisations and governance* (Ph.D. dissertation). Helsinki: University of Helsinki.
- Green-Pedersen, C. (2002). New public management reforms of the Danish and Swedish welfare states: The role of different social democratic responses. *Governance*, 15, 271–294.
- Greve, C. (2006). Public management reform in Denmark. *Public Management Review*, 8, 161–169.
- Greve, C., Laegreid, P., & Rykkja, L. H. (Eds.). (2016). *Nordic administrative reforms: Lessons for public management*. London: Palgrave.

- Groeneveld, S., Tummers, L., Bronkhorst, B., Ashikali, T., & Van Thiel, S. (2015). Quantitative research in public administration analyzing its scale and development through time. *International Public Management Journal*, 18(1), 61–86.
- Grossi, G. & Reichard, C. (2016). Institutional variants of local utility services: Evidence from several European countries. In H. Wollmann, I. Kopric, & G. Marcou (Eds.), *Public and social services in Europe, from public and municipal to private provision* (pp. 297–312). Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Hammerschmid, G., Görnit, A., Oprisor, A., & Stimac, V. (2013). *Public sector reform in Germany: Views and experiences from senior executives (COCOPs)*.
- Hammerschmid, G., Van de Walle, S., Andrews, R., & Bezes, P. (Eds.). (2016). *Public administration reforms in Europe: The view from the top*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Hardiman, N., & MacCarthaigh, M. (forthcoming). State retrenchment and administrative reform in Ireland: Probing comparative policy paradigms. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis*. doi:[10.1080/13876988.2015.1103432](https://doi.org/10.1080/13876988.2015.1103432).
- Hendriks, F., & Tops, P. (2003). Local public management reforms in the Netherlands: Fads, fashions and winds of change. *Public Administration*, 81(2), 301–323.
- Hennessy, P. (1989). *Whitehall*. London: Secker and Warburg.
- Huxham, C., & Vangen, S. (2005). *Managing to collaborate: The theory and practice of collaborative advantage*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Jacobsson, B., Pierre, J., & Sundström, G. (2015). *Governing the embedded state: The organizational dimension of governance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jann, W. (2003). State, administration and governance in Germany. Competing traditions and dominant narratives. *Public Administration*, 81, 95–118.
- Jann, W. et al. (2004). *Status-report Verwaltungsreform. Eine Zwischenbilanz nach zehn Jahren* (edition Sigma).
- Kickert, W. J. M. (2006). Civil service reforms in the past. In W. Jann, M. Röber, & H. Wollmann (Eds.), *Public management, Grundlagen, Wirkungen, Kritik* (pp. 133–151). Berlin: Edition Sigma.
- Kickert, W. J. M. (2011a). Introduction: Administrative reform in Greece, Italy, Portugal, Spain. *Public Administration*, 89(3), 721–722.
- Kickert, W. J. M. (2011b). Distinctiveness of administrative reform in Greece, Italy, Portugal and Spain. Common characteristics of context, administrations and reforms. *Public Administration*, 89(3), 801–818.
- Kickert, W. J. M., & In 't Veld, R. J. (1995). National government, governance and administration. In W. J. M. Kickert & F. A. van Vught (Eds.), *Public policy and administration sciences in the Netherlands* (pp. 46–63). London: Sage.
- Kickert, W. J. M., Klijn, E.-H., & Koppenjan, J. E. M. (1997). *Managing complex networks: Strategies for the public sector*. London: Sage.
- Knudsen, T., & Rothstein, B. (1994). State building in Scandinavia. *Comparative Politics*, 26, 203–220.
- König, K. (2000). The administrative state in Germany. In H. Wollmann & E. Schröter (Eds.), *Comparing Public sector reform in Britain and Germany* (pp. 47–66). Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Kuhlmann, S., & Wollmann, H. (2014). *Introduction to comparative public administration. Administrative systems and reforms in Europe*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Laegreid, P. (2001). Administrative reforms in Scandinavia—Testing the cooperative model. In B. Noel (Ed.), *Public sector reform: A comparative perspective* (pp. 66–82). Basingstoke: Palgrave.

- Laegreid, P., & Christensen, T. (Eds.). (2013). *Transcending new public management*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Liebert, S., Condrey, S., & Goncharov, D. (Eds.). (2013). *Public administration in post-communist countries: Former soviet union, central and eastern Europe, and Mongolia*. Boca Raton, FL: CRC.
- Löffler, E. (2003). The administrative state in western democracies. In B. G. Peters, J. Pierre (Eds.), *Handbook of public administration* (pp. 478–493). California: Sage.
- MacCarthaigh, M. (2012). Politics, policy preferences and the evolution of Irish bureaucracy: A framework for analysis. *Irish Political Studies*, 27(1), 23–47.
- Magone, J. (2011). The difficult transformation of state and public administration in Portugal: Europeanization and the persistence of neo-patrimonialism. *Public Administration*, 89(3), 756–782.
- Massey, A. (1995). *The massey report, after next steps*. London: Cabinet Office.
- Massey, A., & Pyper, R. (2005). *Public management and modernization in Britain*. Palgrave: Basingstoke.
- Meier, K. (2016). Public administration in the US and Europe: A reciprocal relationship, Keynote speech at the annual conference of the European Group for Public Administration, Utrecht, The Netherlands, 24 August 2016.
- Mele, V., & Ongaro, E. (2014). Public sector reform in a context of political instability: Italy 1992–2007. *International Public Management Journal*, 17(1), 111–142.
- Meyer-Sahling, J. -H. (2009). Varieties of legacies: A critical review of legacy explanations of public administration reform in East Central Europe. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 75(3), 509–528.
- Montin, S. (2016). Local government and the market. The case of public services and care for the elderly in Sweden. In H. Wollmann, I. Kopric, & G. Marcou (Eds.), *Delivery of public and social services. From public and municipal to private* (pp. 87–102). Basingstoke: Palgrave (in preparation).
- Mungiu-Pippidi, A. (Ed.). (2015). *Government favouritism in Europe* (The Anticorruption Report, Vol. 3.). Opladen: Verlag Barbara Budrich.
- Nozick, R. (1974). *Anarchy, state, and Utopia*. New York: Basic Books.
- O'Toole, B. (2006). *The ideal of public service*. London: Routledge.
- Olsen, J. P. (1996). Slow learner—or another triumph of the tortoise? In J. P. Olsen & B. G. Peters (Eds.), *Lessons from experience*. Oslo: Scandinavian University Press.
- Ongaro, E. (2008). Introduction: Public management reform in France, Greece, Italy, Portugal and Spain. *The International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 21(2), 101–117.
- Ongaro, E. (2009). *Public management reform and modernization: Trajectories of administrative change in Italy, France, Greece, Portugal, Spain*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Ongaro, E. (2010). The Napoleonic administrative tradition and public management reform in France, Greece, Italy, Portugal, Spain. In M. Painter & B. G. Peters (Eds.), *Tradition and public administration* (pp. 174–190). Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Ongaro, E. (2011). The role of politics and institutions in the Italian administrative reform trajectory. *Public Administration*, 89(3), 738–755.
- Ongaro, E. (2012). 'L'influence de la nouvelle gouvernance Européenne sur la réforme de l'administration publique dans les états de tradition administrative napoléonienne Plaidoyer pour l'adoption d'un nouvel agenda de recherche. *Revue Française d'Administration Publique*, 141, 239–246.

- Ongaro, E., & Bellè, N. (2010). Réforme de la fonction publique et introduction de la rémunération liée aux performances en Italie: évidence empirique, interprétations et enseignements. *Revue Française d'Administration Publique*, 132, 817–839.
- Osborne, S. (2010). *The new public governance*. London: Routledge.
- Painter, M., & Peters, G. B. (2010). Administrative traditions in comparative perspective. Families, groups and hybrids. In M. Painter & G. B. Peters (Eds.), *Tradition and administration* (pp. 19–30). New York: Palgrave.
- Pedersen, J. S., & Löfgren, K. (2012). Public sector reforms: New public management without marketization? The Danish case. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 35, 435–447.
- Peters, B. G. (2008). The napoleonic tradition. *The International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 21(2), 118–132.
- Pierson, P. (1995). *Dismantling the welfare state?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pollitt, C. (1993). *Managerialism and the public service*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Pollitt, C. (2013). *Context in public policy and management: The missing link?* Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Pollitt, C. (2016). *Public management and administration*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Pollitt, C., & Bouckaert, G. (2011). *Public management reform. A comparative analysis: New public management, governance, and the neo-weberian state* (3rd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pollitt, C., & Dan, S. (2013). Searching for impacts in performance-oriented management reform: A review of the European literature. *Public RaadscPerformance & Management Review*, 37(1), 7–32.
- Promberger, K., Rauskala, I., & Cecon, F. (2004). *Public management public sector reform reforms in Austria*. (Working Paper 15/2004). http://www.verwaltungsmanagement.at/687/uploads/public_management_reforms_in_austria_15-2004.pdf.
- Public Services Organisation Review Group. (1969). *Report of the public services organisation review group (The Devlin report)*. Dublin: Stationery Office.
- Raadschelders, J. (2011). *Public administration: The interdisciplinary study of government*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Randma-Liiv, T., Nakrosis, V., & Hajnal, G. (2011). Public sector organization in central and eastern Europe: From agencification to de-agencification. *Transylvanian Review of Administrative Sciences* (special issue), 160–175.
- Rhodes, R. (1995). The state of public administration: A professional history, 1970–1995. *Public Administration*, 73, 1–15.
- Rouban, L. (2007). Public management and politics: Senior bureaucrats in France. *Public Administration*, 85(2), 473–501.
- Rugge, F. (2013). The intransigent context. In C. Pollitt (Ed.), *Context in public policy and management: The missing link?* Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Rutgers, M. (2004). *Grondslagen van de bestuurskunde: historie, begripsvorming en kennisintegratie*. Bussum: Coutinho.
- Sager, F., & Hurni, P. (forthcoming). Geschichte der Verwaltungswissenschaften in der Schweiz. In A. Ladner et al. (Eds.), *Handbuch der öffentlichen Verwaltung in der Schwei*. Zürich: NZZ Libr.
- Schedler, K. (2014). Forschungsannäherung an die managerialistische Verwaltungskultur. In K. König et al. (Eds.), *Grundmuster der Verwaltungskultur* (pp. 221–251). Baden-Baden: Nomos.

- Shelley, I. (1993). What happened to RIPA? *Public Administration*, 71(4), 471–490.
- Spanou, C., & Sotiropoulos, D. (2011). The odyssey of administrative reforms in Greece, 1981–2009: A tale of two reform paths. *Public Administration*, 89(3), 723–737.
- Temmes, M. (1998). Finland and new public management. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 64, 451–456.
- Van Thiel, S. (2011). Comparing agencification in central eastern european and western european countries: Fundamentally alike in unimportant respects? *Transylvanian Review of Administrative Sciences* (special issue), 15–32.
- Verheijen, T. (Ed.). (1999). *Civil service systems in central and eastern Europe*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Verheijen, T., & Connaughton, B. (2003). Public administration education and Europeanization: Prospects for the emancipation of the discipline? *Public Administration*, 81(4), 833–851.
- Verhoest, K., Van Thiel, S., Bouckaert, G., & Laegreid, P. (Eds.). (2012). *Government agencies: Practices and lessons from 30 countries*. Palgrave MacMillan: Basingstoke.
- Virtanen, T. (2010). Finnish PA and PA in Finnish. In G. Bouckaert & W. van de Donk (Eds.), *The European group for public administration 1975–2010: Perspectives for the future* (pp. 162–168). Bruxelles: Bruylant.
- Virtanen, T. (2014). ‘Finland’. In M. Van Wart, A. Hondeghem, E. Schwella, & V. E. Nice (Eds.), *Leadership and culture: Comparative models of top civil servant training* (pp. 167–182). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Virtanen, T. (2016). Finland: Active reformer looking for more centralisation and horizontal coordination. In G. Hammerschmid, S. Van de Walle, R. Andrews, & P. Bezes (Eds.), *Public administration reforms in Europe: The view from the top* (pp. 129–139). Cheltenham: Edward Edgar.
- Wimmer, N. (2007). Reform of public administration in Austria. Activities and perspectives. In *Croatian and comparative public administration*, 3, 635–657, Accessed <http://en.iju.hr/ccpa/ccpa/downloads.html>.
- Wollmann, H. (2000a). Comparing institutional development in Britain and Germany (Persistent) divergence or (progressing) convergence? In H. Wollmann & E. Schröter (Eds.), *Comparing public sector reform in Britain and Germany* (pp. 1–26). Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Wollmann, H. (2000b). Local government modernization in Germany: Between incrementalism and reform waves. *Public Administration*, 78, 915–993.
- Wollmann, H. (2003). Evaluation and public-sector reform in Germany. Leaps and Lags. In H. Wollmann (Ed.), *Evaluation in Public-Sector Reforms* (pp. 118–139). Cheltenham: Elgar.
- Wollmann, H. (2016). Provision of public and social services in Europe. From public/municipal and private sector provision—and reverse? In H. Wollmann, I. Kopri, & G. Marcou (Eds.), *Public and social services in Europe, from public and municipal to private provision* (pp. 313–334). Basingstoke: Palgrave. (forthcoming).

The Palgrave Handbook of Public Administration and
Management in Europe

Ongaro, E.; Van Thiel, S. (Eds.)

2018, LIII, 1302 p. 35 illus. In 2 volumes, not available
separately., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-1-137-55268-6

A product of Palgrave Macmillan UK