

THE NEW PUBLIC GOVERNANCE?

Emerging perspectives on the theory
and practice of public governance

Edited by Stephen P. Osborne

First published 2010
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN
Simultaneously published in the USA and Canada
by Routledge
270 Madison Ave, New York, NY 10016
*Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group,
an informa business*

© 2010 Stephen P. Osborne

Typeset in 10/12pt Times NR MT by Graphicraft Limited, Hong Kong
Printed and bound in Great Britain by TJ International Ltd,
Padstow, Cornwall

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or
reproduced or utilized in any form or by any electronic, mechanical,
or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including
photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or
retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available
from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data
The new public governance? : emerging perspectives on the theory
and practice of public governance / edited by Stephen P. Osborne.
p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

1. Public administration. 2. Public-private sector cooperation.
3. Organizational change. I. Osborne, Stephen P., 1953–

JF1351.N44 2009

352.01–dc22

2009027964

ISBN10: 0-415-49462-1 (hbk)
ISBN10: 0-415-49463-X (pbk)
ISBN10: 0-203-86168-X (ebk)

ISBN13: 978-0-415-49462-5 (hbk)
ISBN13: 978-0-415-49463-2 (pbk)
ISBN13: 978-0-203-86168-4 (ebk)

INTRODUCTION

The (New) Public Governance: a suitable case for treatment?¹

Stephen P. Osborne

Introduction

More than a decade has passed since the publication of Christopher Hood's influential piece that codified the nature of the *New Public Management* (NPM) paradigm (Hood 1991). At that time it seemed likely, certainly within the Anglo-American research community, that this paradigm would sweep all before it in its triumphal recasting of the nature of our discipline – in theory and in practice. A hundred-odd years of the hegemony of Public Administration (PA) in the public sphere seemingly counted for nothing in this momentous shift. Since then, though, the debate on the impact of the NPM upon the discipline, and indeed about whether it is a paradigm at all (Gow and Dufour 2000), has become more contested.²

This introductory chapter is intended to move this debate forward. It considers, somewhat provocatively, that the NPM has actually been a transitory stage in the evolution from traditional Public Administration to what is here called the *New Public Governance*.³ A note upon terminology is important here. The term “public policy implementation and public services delivery” is used here to denote the overall field of the design and implementation of public policy and the delivery of public services. Within this, Public Administration, the NPM and the New Public Governance (NPG) are then denoted as policy and implementation *regimes* within this overall field – thus neatly skirting the above, rather redundant, argument as to whether these regimes are actually paradigms or not.

The argument advanced here is that public policy implementation and public services delivery have passed through three design and delivery regimes: a longer, pre-eminent one of PA, from the late nineteenth century through to the late 1970s/early 1980s; a second one, of the NPM, through to the start of the twenty-first century; and an emergent third one, of the

NPG, since then. The time of the NPM has thus in fact been a relatively short-lived and transient one between the statist and bureaucratic tradition of PA and the embryonic plural and pluralist tradition of the NPG. The remainder of this chapter will first expound upon the extant natures of PA and the NPM. It will then explore the nature of public governance and the NPG before considering the new challenges that it poses for both the theory and the practice of public policy implementation and public services delivery.

Inevitably, such a tripartite regime model is a simplification – elements of each regime can and will coexist with each other or overlap. Many network governance systems often operate in the shadow of, or in spite of, the dominant regime of hierarchy – for example, both PA and public governance contain strong, if differentiated, elements of hierarchy (Klijn 2002). The intention here is to tease out three “archetypes”, in the Weberian tradition, that will assist and promote analysis and discussion of the conceptual and practical development of public policy implementation and public services delivery.

It must be emphasized that this book is not meant to propose “the NPG” as a new paradigm of public services delivery. It is neither that normative nor that prescriptive. The question mark in the title is deliberate. Rather, this book is a critical examination of the concept of “public governance”. Offering a range of perspectives, the book questions whether or not public governance is a new paradigm for the delivery of public services in the twenty-first century, and offers a range of critical perspectives upon it – both in theory and in practice.

In entering into this discussion, it is useful to bear in mind a distinction made by Dawson and Dargie (1999) in their work on the NPM. They urge the necessity to differentiate between the NPM as a political ideology, as an academic field of study and as a body of managerial practice. The latter two elements are of especial importance and need to be held distinct. The analysis of the workings and impact of any regime is distinct from the normative assertion of “how best” to manage within it.

The shadow of the past . . .

Public Administration

The key elements of PA⁴ (Hood 1991) can be defined as

- The dominance of the “rule of law”;
- A focus on administering set rules and guidelines;
- A central role for *the bureaucracy* in making and implementing policy;
- The “politics-administration” split *within* public organizations;

- A commitment to incremental budgeting; and
- The hegemony of the professional in public service delivery.

Developing out of the early years of the public sector in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, PA, as an academic field of study, has been a strongly “grounded”, rather than theoretical, discipline in the UK – the classic early statement being Robson 1928 – and at variance with its cousins in mainland Europe and the US, which are more firmly located within administrative theory.

As a field of practice, it reached its high point in the UK in the 1945–79 era of the welfare state, when the state was confidently expected to meet all the social and economic needs of the citizenry, “from the cradle to the grave”. PA was to be the instrument of this brave new world, with a focus on administrative procedures to ensure equality of treatment. Predictably, perhaps, such a vision was doomed to failure – public needs inevitably outstripped the public resources available to meet them. In the latter days of their hegemony both the welfare state and PA came under increasing fire – first from their academic critics (for example, Dunleavy 1985) and eventually from the political elite (see Misra 1984 for an overview of these critiques). Most damagingly, Chandler (1991) argued that PA had now entered terminal decline as a discipline, whilst Rhodes (1997) asserted that it had become a “bystander” to the practice of public policy implementation and public services delivery. This paved the way for the rise of the NPM.

New Public Management (NPM)

The spread of the NPM, from the late 1970s onward, saw the growth of a new discourse of public policy implementation and public services delivery. In its most extreme form, this asserted the superiority of private-sector managerial techniques over those of PA, with the assumption that the application of such techniques to public services delivery would automatically lead to improvements in the efficiency and effectiveness of these services (Thatcher 1995). The key elements of the NPM can be summarized as:

- An attention to lessons from private-sector management;
- The growth both of hands-on “management” – in its own right and not as an offshoot of professionalism – and of “arm’s length” organizations where policy implementation was *organizationally distanced* from the policy-makers (as opposed to the “interpersonal” distancing of the policy-administration split within PA);
- A focus upon entrepreneurial leadership within public service organizations;
- An emphasis on inputs and output control and evaluation, and upon performance management and audit;

- The disaggregation of public services to their most basic units and a focus on their cost management; and
- Within the Anglo-American and Australia/New Zealand regions at least, the growth of use of markets, competition and contracts for resource allocation and service delivery within public services.

In the research community, this led to a focus upon the management of public services and of public service organizations (PSOs) as a distinct field separate from the public policy process – public management as opposed to public administration. At a practical level, it led to the evolution of management as a coherent and legitimized role and function within PSOs, in contrast to (and often in conflict with) the traditional professional groupings within PSOs.

In the years since it first contested the territory of public policy implementation and public services delivery with PA, though, the nature and/or success(es) of the NPM have been questioned on a range of grounds (see McLaughlin et al. 2002 for an overview of these critiques). Critics have argued *inter alia* that:

- The NPM is not one phenomenon or paradigm, but a cluster of several (Ferlie et al. 1996) – and has a number of distinct personae, dependent upon the audience, including ideological, managerial and research-oriented personae, as discussed by Dawson and Dargie (1999) above;
- The geographic extent of the NPM is limited to the Anglo-American, Australasian and (some) Scandinavian arenas, whilst PA continues to remain dominant elsewhere (Kickert 1997; see also Hood 1995);
- The nature of the NPM itself is also geographically variegated – with, for example, the British and American variants actually being quite distinct from each other in their focus and locus (Borins 2002);
- In reality, the NPM is simply a subschool of PA that has been limited in its impact by the lack of a real theoretical base and conceptual rigor (Frederickson and Smith 2003);
- The benefits of the NPM are at best partial and contested (Pollitt and Bouckaert 2004); and
- That the NPM was a “disaster waiting to happen” (Hood and Jackson 1992) and was a failed paradigm (Farnham and Horton 1996).

Similarly, in the dedicated textbooks on this topic, one will find both advocates of the NPM (Hughes 2002) and critics (Flynn 2002).

The NPM has been criticized most devastatingly for its *intraorganizational focus* in an increasingly plural world and for its adherence to the application of outdated private-sector techniques to public policy implementation and public services delivery – and in the face of evidence about their inapplicability (Metcalf and Richards 1991).

The state of the art

Increasingly, then, both PA and the NPM have begun to look like partial theories, at best. The strength of PA is in its exploration of the essentially political nature of public policy implementation and public services delivery, and of the complexities and nuances of the public policy making and implementation process. However, the extent to which the implementation studies literature within PA has been able to unpack the differential influences upon public policy implementation has been disappointing. There is a tendency for implementation to be seen simply as a “black box” with no apparent will to explore the complex subprocesses of the management of the outputs of the policy process – public services themselves (Schofield 2001; Hill and Hupe 2003). At worst, public managers and management are portrayed as the villain(s) of the piece, thwarting the resolve of their political masters and often subverting the intentions of new policy to their own ends.

By contrast, the strength of the NPM has been in its ability to address precisely the complexities of this “black box”, now recodified as the management of change and innovation (Osborne and Brown 2006). However, it has suffered with an equally limiting tendency to see the public policy process as simply a “context” within which the essential task of public management takes place. In its most extreme form, the NPM has even questioned the legitimacy of public policy as a context for public management, arguing that it imposes unreasonable democratic constraints on the management and provision of public services (Meier 1997). Most damagingly, though, is the argument that the NPM is limited and one-dimensional in its ability to capture and contribute to the management and governance of public services and of PSOs in an increasingly fragmented and interorganizational environment (Rhodes 1997).

The argument made here is hence that both PA and the NPM fail to capture the complex reality of the design, delivery and management of public services in the twenty-first century. Given such criticisms of both paradigms, therefore, it is time to question whether there is a pressing need now for a more sophisticated understanding of public policy implementation and public services delivery – one that moves beyond the sterile dichotomy of “administration versus management” and that allows a more comprehensive and integrated approach to the study, and practice, of public policy implementation and public services delivery. The intention in this volume is to explore whether the NPM has the potential or actuality to be this overarching theoretical framework for the study and the practice of public services delivery.

... And the shadow of the future

The New Public Governance (NPG)

At the outset, it is important to be clear, once more, about two points. First, that the NPG is being presented here neither as a normative new paradigm to supersede PA and the NPM nor as “the one best way” (Alford and Hughes 2008) to respond to the challenges of public policy implementation and public services delivery in the twenty-first century. Rather it is being presented both as a conceptual tool with the potential to assist our understanding of the complexity of these challenges and as a reflection of the reality of the working lives of public managers today.

Second, “governance” and “public governance” are not new terms – they come with considerable prior theoretical and/or ideological baggage. Critics have differentiated three broad schools of governance literature: corporate governance, “good” governance, and public governance.

Corporate governance is concerned with the internal systems and processes that provide direction and accountability to any organization. In public services it has most often been concerned with the relationship between the policy-makers and/or trustees of public organizations and the senior managers given the task of making these policies a reality (for example, Cornforth 2003).

“*Good*” governance is concerned with the promulgation of normative models of social, political and administrative governance by supranational bodies such as the World Bank (Leftwich 1993; Rhodes 1997). Invariably this has placed a premium upon market-based approaches to the allocation and governance of public resources (see, for example, Osborne and Kaposvari 1997).

Public governance, which is the focus here, can itself be broken down into five distinct strands:

- *Socio-political governance*, concerned with the over-arching institutional relationships within society. Kooiman (1999) argues that these relationships and interactions must be understood in their totality in order to understand the creation and implementation of public policy. In this approach, government is no longer pre-eminent in public policy but has to rely upon other societal actors for its legitimacy and impact in this field.
- *Public policy governance*, concerned with how policy elites and networks interact to create and govern the public policy process. Marsh and Rhodes (1992), Börzel (1997) and Klijn and Koppenjan (2000), building upon the work of Hanf and Scharpf (1978), are good examples of such explorations of the workings of policy communities and networks. Most recently, Peters (2008) has explored “meta-governance” instruments

as a way by which to reassert political direction within multi-stakeholder policy networks.

- *Administrative governance*, concerned with the effective application of PA and its repositioning to encompass the complexities of the contemporary state. Thus, for example, Salamon (2002) uses governance almost as a proxy term for the generic practice of public policy implementation and public services delivery, whilst Lynn et al. (2001) also use it as a catch-all term to try to create a holistic theory of public policy implementation and public services delivery in conditions of the “hollow state” (Milward and Provan 2003). More provocatively, Frederickson (1999) contends that governance, taken together with the theory of “administrative conjunction”, is in fact a way to reposition PA as the continuing pre-eminent discipline for the realities of the modern world.
- *Contract governance*, concerned with the inner workings of the NPM, and particularly the governance of contractual relationships in the delivery of public services. In this vein, Kettl has argued that public agencies in the modern contract state have become “responsible for a [public service delivery] system over which they [have] little control” (Kettl 1993: 207; see also Kettl 2000).
- *Network governance*, concerned with how “self organizing inter-organizational networks” (Rhodes 1997; see also Kickert 1993) function both with and without government to provide public services. In contrast to public policy governance, this is focused upon those networks that implement public policy and deliver public services (for example Denters and Rose 2005; Entwistle and Martin 2005).

All of these theoretical perspectives on governance make an important contribution to our understanding of public policy implementation and public services delivery. The intention here is to argue that, from being an element within the PA and NPM regimes of public policy implementation and public services delivery, public governance has become a distinctive regime in its own right – the NPG. The intention here is to suggest and explore a distinctive niche for the NPG that captures the realities of public policy implementation and public services delivery within the plural and pluralist complexities of the state in the twenty-first century.

Working with the above definitions of public governance, therefore, and building upon the insights of Peters and Pierre (1998), it is argued here that it is possible, indeed desirable, to develop a theory of the NPG that does capture these realities and complexities. This theory is not integral to PA or to the NPM but is rather an alternative discourse in its own right. It is predicated upon the existence of a *plural state* and a *pluralist state*, and it seeks to understand the development and implementation of public policy in this context.⁵

As outlined above, therefore, PA is situated firmly within the political studies discipline. Influential theorists include Woodrow Wilson (1887) and William Robson (1928). It has at its core a concern with the unitary state, where policy making and implementation are vertically integrated as a closed system within government. It focuses upon the policy making and implementation cycle, with an assumption that effective PA is comprised of the successful implementation by public managers of policies decided “up stream” in this system by democratically elected (and, it is implicitly assumed, accountable) politicians. Because of its vertically integrated nature, hierarchy is the key resource-allocation mechanism for PA, with a focus upon vertical line-management to ensure accountability for the use of public money (Day and Klein 1987; Simey 1988). The value base is one based in an explicit assumption of the hegemony of the *public sector* for the implementation of public policy and the delivery of public services.

Some writers, of course, have long recognized the fallibility of the PA paradigm without entirely dismissing it as a framework for the design and delivery of public services. The theory of “street level bureaucrats” (Lipsky 1979), for example, seeks to explain the breakdown of the “policy-maker-administrator” divide in conditions of resource shortage, but without dismissing in its entirety the framework of PA for the provision of public services (see also Schofield 2001 for a good overview of this range of arguments).

By comparison, the NPM⁶ is a child of neo-classical economics and particularly of rational/public choice theory. Influential writers include Tiebout (1956) and Niskanen (1971). It is concerned with a disaggregated state, where policy making and implementation are at least partially articulated and disengaged, and where implementation is through a collection of independent service units, ideally in competition with each other. The key role of the state here is regulation, often within a principal-agent context (Vickers and Yarrow 1988). Its focus is almost wholly upon *intraorganizational processes and management*.⁷ Drawing upon open rational systems theory, it models the production of public services as an intraorganizational process that turns inputs into outputs (services) within a mediating environment, and with an emphasis upon the economy and efficiency of these processes in producing public services. As already noted, it assumes competitive relationships between the independent service units inside any public policy domain, taking place within a horizontally organized marketplace – and where the key resource-allocation mechanism is a variable combination of competition, the price mechanism and contractual relationships, depending upon which particular variant of the NPM one chooses to expound. Its value base is formed around “the logic of accounting” and is contained within its belief that this marketplace, and its workings, provides the most appropriate place for the production of public services. An extreme form of this argument is made by Pirie (1988).

In contrast to both of the above, the NPG, if it is to be situated as a paradigm of public services delivery, is rooted firmly within institutional and network theory, and draws much from the influential work of Ouchi (1979), Powell (1990), Powell and DiMaggio (1991), and Nohria and Eccles (1992). It posits both a *plural state*, where multiple interdependent actors contribute to the delivery of public services, and a *pluralist state*, where multiple processes inform the policy-making system. Drawing upon open natural systems theory, it is concerned with the institutional and external environmental pressures that enable and constrain public policy implementation and the delivery of public services within such a plural and pluralist system. As a consequence of these two forms of plurality, its focus is very much upon inter-organizational relationships and upon the governance of processes, stressing service effectiveness and outcomes that rely upon the interaction of PSOs with their environment. The central resource-allocation mechanism is the inter-organizational network, with accountability being something to be negotiated at the interorganizational and interpersonal level within these networks (Osborne 1997). Importantly, such networks are rarely alliances of equals but are rather riven with power inequalities that must be navigated successfully for their effective working. Hence the value base in such networks is often dispersed and contested.

The NPG is thus both a product of and a response to the increasingly complex, plural and fragmented nature of public policy implementation and service delivery in the twenty-first century. Its key elements in relation to PA and the NPM are summarized in Table 1.1.

Now, significant work has already taken place that might legitimately be said to fall within the boundaries of the emergent regime of the NPG. This includes work upon the nature and governance of the policy process (Klijn and Koppenjan 2000, 2004), the issue of “managing outward” for PSOs and managers (Moore 1995; O’Toole et al. 2005), the development of key management skills in an interorganizational context (Getha-Taylor 2008), expanding the nature and impact of accounting within PSOs to embrace a more holistic approach to their environment (Ball and Seal 2005; Marcuccio and Steccolini 2005), and the governance of interorganizational relationships themselves (Hudson 2004; Huxham and Vangen 2005). Invariably, though, the focus has been at the organizational rather than the service system level.

However, it has become increasingly apparent that the public policy implementation and public services delivery research agenda, certainly within the UK, is one where its parameters and questions have been set within the previous regimes – and particularly within that of the NPM. This research agenda is asking the old questions about public policy implementation and public services delivery. These questions are epitomized within the ESRC Public Services Programme in the UK. This program has been important for the research community and has produced some outstanding research findings. Nonetheless, as a research agenda, it is characterized precisely by these “old

Table 1.1 Core elements of the NPG, in contrast to PA and the NPM

Paradigm/key elements	Theoretical roots	Nature of the state	Focus	Emphasis	Resource allocation mechanism	Nature of the service system	Value base
Public Administration	Political science and public policy	Unitary	The political system	Policy creation and implementation	Hierarchy	Closed	Public sector ethos
New Public Management	Rational/public choice theory and management studies	Regulatory	The organization	Management of organizational resources and performance	The market and classical or neo-classical contracts	Open rational	Efficacy of competition and the marketplace
New Public Governance	Institutional and network theory	Plural and pluralist	The organization in its environment	Negotiation of values, meaning and relationships	Networks and relational contracts	Open closed	Dispersed and contested

INTRODUCTION

questions” of intraorganizational efficiency and effectiveness. These old questions can be summarized as:

- How do we manage public policy implementation to ensure that the political will is carried out in practice? (*the policy implementation question*)
- How do we ensure organizational and individual service performance? (*the audit and targets question*)
- How do we ensure that individual PSOs can work in partnership most effectively? (*the partnerships question*)
- How do we hold public managers accountable? (*the scrutiny question*)
- How do we “incentivize” staff for optimal productivity? (*the rewards question*)
- How do we ensure organizational sustainability? (*the change and innovation question*)

The argument here is that, if we are going to develop the NPG as a conceptualization of public policy implementation and public services management, it is necessary to move toward an integrated body of knowledge about the NPG. This requires our research community to start asking a series of “new questions” about the fundamentals of the NPG. These questions are focused upon the underlying principles of public services delivery in the plural and pluralist state and upon the public service system, rather than upon individual PSOs. These new questions are, it is argued here, sevenfold:

- What should be our basic unit of analysis in exploring public policy implementation and public services delivery – and what are the implications of this for theory and practice? (*the fundamentals question*)
- What organizational architecture is best-suited to delivering public services in the plural state? (*the architectural question*)
- How do we ensure sustainable public service systems – and what does sustainability mean? (*the sustainability question*)
- What values underpin public policy implementation and services delivery in such systems? (*the values question*)
- What key skills are required for relational performance? (*the relational skills question*)
- What is the nature of accountability in fragmented plural and pluralist systems? (*the accountability question*)
- How do you evaluate sustainability, accountability and relational performance within open natural public service delivery systems? (*the evaluation question*)

It should be emphasized that these new questions are not a simple replacement for the old ones. The imperative for effective intraorganizational and

service management remains – and so the “old questions” still remain pertinent. However, such effectiveness by itself will not engender the delivery of successful public services in the contemporary plural and pluralist state. In order to contribute to such delivery, the NPG needs to encompass *both* an active research agenda that will explore the efficacy and limitations of the regime *and* a developing body of capable and beneficial managerial practice within this plural and pluralist context. These questions will be returned to in the conclusions of this present volume, with a discussion of their implications both for a research agenda and for policy practice.

Structure of this book

This volume is in five parts. The first part will provide a series of theoretical perspectives upon public governance and question the applicability of the concept of the “NPG”. Parts 2–5 will then explore the nature of public governance in a series of key, and indeed overlapping, areas: inter-organizational collaboration, contractual relationships, interorganizational networks for services delivery, and public policy networks. The conclusions to the volume will then consider the implications of public governance for public services delivery research over the next decade and beyond.

Notes

- 1 This chapter builds upon and expands the arguments made previously by this author in two prior pieces: S. Osborne (2006) “The New Public Governance?”, *Public Management Review*, 8 (30): 377–88, and S. Osborne (2009) “Delivering Public Services: Are We Asking the Right Questions?”, *Public Money and Management*, 29 (1): 5–7.
- 2 As one mainland European colleague remarked somewhat humorously to this author recently, the tradition in the UK is to see every change of national government as the start of a new paradigm of public management and administration.
- 3 Ever since Hood’s influential essay on the New Public Management, there has been a tendency to herald every shift in public services provision as the “New Something-or-other”. Whilst there are clear limitations to this approach, it is nonetheless the one adopted here – primarily to differentiate it from the other diverse approaches to “governance” and “public governance” discussed below.
- 4 Brint Milward has made the point in a personal communication to this author that there is an inevitable national variance in the nature of public administration, and of the other regimes. The “politics–administration” split, for example, is perhaps a particularly European, and especially British, emphasis within PA. Moreover, all the elements are liable to buckle under extreme stress – the incrementalism of PA was clearly put on hold during the two world wars of the twentieth century, for example.
- 5 These concepts of the *plural state* and *pluralist state* are reviewed further below.
- 6 NPM, as discussed here, is very much the market-driven variant that emphasized the efficacy of interorganizational competition in the delivery of public services.

It is the model prevalent across the UK, the US, and Australia and New Zealand in particular. An alternative version, which is common across mainland Europe, does not place such an emphasis upon external competitive environment. Rather, it emphasizes contractual mechanisms *within* rather than *without* government (Schrijvers 1993).

- 7 Though Ostrom and Ostrom (1971) do offer a more explicitly *interorganizational* approach to public choice theory as a basis for the NPM.

References

- Alford, J. and Hughes, O. (2008) “Public Value Pragmatism as the Next Phase of Public Management”, *American Review of Public Administration*, 36 (2): 130–48.
- Ball, A. and Seal, W. (2005) “Social Justice in a Cold Climate: Could Social Accounting Make a Difference?”, *Accounting Forum*, 29: 455–73.
- Borins, S. (2002) “New Public Management, North American Style”, in K. McLaughlin, S. Osborne and E. Ferlie (eds) *The New Public Management: Current Trends and Future Prospects*, London: Routledge.
- Börzel, T. (1997) “What’s So Special about Policy Networks? An Exploration of the Concept and Its Usefulness in Studying European Governance”, *European Integration online Papers (EIoP)*, 1 (16), <http://eiop.or.at/eiop/texte/1997-016a.htm>.
- Chandler, J. (1991) “Public Administration: A Discipline in Decline”, *Teaching Public Administration*, 9: 39–45.
- Cornforth, C. (ed.) (2003) *The Governance of Public and Non-profit Organisations. What Do Boards Do?*, London: Routledge.
- Dawson, S. and Dargie, C. (1999) “New Public Management: An Assessment and Evaluation with Special Reference to Health”, *Public Management Review*, 1 (4): 459–82.
- Day, P. and Klein, R. (1987) *Accountabilities*, London: Tavistock.
- Denters, D. and Rose, L. (2005) *Comparing Local Governance*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Dunleavy, P. (1985) “Bureaucrats, Budgets and the Growth of the State”, *British Journal of Political Science*, 15: 299–328.
- Entwistle, T. and Martin, S. (2005) “From Competition to Collaboration in Public Services Delivery: A New Agenda for Research”, *Public Administration*, 83 (1): 233–42.
- Farnham, D. and Horton, S. (eds) (1996) *Managing the New Public Services*, Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Ferlie, E., Ashburner, L., Fitzgerald, L. and Pettigrew, A. (1996) *The New Public Management in Action*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Flynn, N. (2002) *Public Sector Management*, London: Prentice Hall.
- Frederickson, G. (1999) “The Repositioning of American Public Administration”, *Political Science and Politics*, 32: 701–11.
- Frederickson, G. and Smith, K. (2003) *The Public Administration Primer*, Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press.
- Getha-Taylor, H. (2008) “Identifying Collaborative Competencies”, *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 28 (2): 103–19.
- Gow, J. and Dufour, C. (2000) “Is the New Public Management a Paradigm? Does It Matter?”, *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 66 (4): 573–97.

- Hanf, K. and Scharpf, F. (eds) (1978) *Interorganizational Policy Making*, London: Sage.
- Hill, M. and Hupe, P. (2003) "The Multi-layer Problem in Implementation Research", *Public Management Review*, 5 (4): 471–90.
- Hood, C. (1991) "A Public Management for All Seasons?", *Public Administration*, 69: 3–19.
- Hood, C. (1995) "The New Public Management in the 1990s: Variations on a Theme", *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 20 (2–3): 93–109.
- Hood, C. and Jackson, M. (1992) "The New Public Management: A Recipe for Disaster", in D. J. Parker and J. W. Handmer (eds) *Hazard Management and Emergency Planning: Perspectives on Britain*, London: James and James.
- Hudson, B. (2004) "Analysing Network Partnerships: Benson Re-visited", *Public Management Review*, 6 (1): 75–94.
- Hughes, O. (2002) *Public Management and Administration*, Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Huxham, C. and Vangen, S. (2005) *Managing to Collaborate*, London: Routledge.
- Kettl, D. (1993) *Sharing Power: Public Governance and Private Markets*, Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.
- Kettl, D. (2000) *The Global Public Management Revolution*, Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.
- Kickert, W. (1993) "Complexity Governance and Dynamics: Conceptual Explorations of Public Network Management", in J. Kooiman (ed.) *Modern Governance*, London: Sage.
- Kickert, W. (1997) "Public Governance in the Netherlands: An Alternative to Anglo-American 'managerialism'", *Public Administration*, 75 (4): 731–52.
- Klijn, E.-H. (2002) "Governing Networks in the Hollow State: Contracting-out, Process Management or a Combination of the Two", *Public Management Review*, 4 (2): 149–66.
- Klijn, E.-H. and Koppenjan, J. (2000) "Public Management and Policy Networks: Foundations of a Network Approach to Governance", *Public Management Review*, 2 (2): 135–58.
- Klijn, E.-H. and Koppenjan, J. (2004) *Managing Uncertainties in Networks*, London: Routledge.
- Kooiman, J. (1999) "Social-political Governance: Overview, Reflections and Design", *Public Management Review*, 1 (1): 67–92.
- Leftwich, A. (1993) "Governance, Democracy and Development in the Third World", *Third World Quarterly*, 14: 605–24.
- Lipsky, M. (1979) *Street Level Bureaucracy*, New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Lynn, L., Heinrich, C. and Hill, C. (2001) *Improving Governance: A New Logic for Empirical Research*, Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- McLaughlin, K., Osborne, S. and Ferlie, E. (eds) (2002) *The New Public Management: Current Trends and Future Prospects*, London: Routledge.
- Marcuccio, M. and Steccolini, I. (2005) "Social and Environmental Reporting in Local Authorities: A New Italian Fashion?", *Public Management Review*, 7 (2): 155–76.
- Marsh, D. and Rhodes, R. (1992) *Policy Networks in British Government*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Meier, K. (1997) "Bureaucracy and Democracy: The Case for More Bureaucracy and Less Democracy", *Public Administration Review*, 57 (3): 193–9.

- Metcalf, L. and Richards, S. (1991) *Improving Public Management*, London: Sage.
- Milward, B. and Provan, K. (2003) "Managing the Hollow State: Collaboration and Contracting", *Public Management Review*, 5 (1): 1–18.
- Mischra, R. (1984) *The Welfare State in Crisis*, Brighton: Wheatsheaf.
- Moore, M. (1995) *Creating Public Value: Strategic Management in Government*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Niskanen, W. (1971) *Bureaucracy and Representative Government*, Chicago, Ill.: Aldine-Atherton.
- Nohria, N. and Eccles, R. (eds) (1992) *Networks and Organizations: Structures, Form and Action*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Business School Press.
- Osborne, S. (1997) "Managing the Coordination of Social Services in the Mixed Economy of Welfare: Competition, Cooperation or Common Cause?", *British Journal of Management*, 8: 317–28.
- Osborne, S. and Brown, K. (2006) *Managing Change and Innovation in Public Service Organizations*, London: Routledge.
- Osborne, S. and Kaposvari, A. (1997) "Towards a civil society? Exploring its meanings in the context of post-communist Hungary" in *Journal European Social Policy*, 7(3): 209–222.
- Ostrom, V. and Ostrom, E. (1971) "Public Choice: A Different Approach to the Study of Public Administration", *Public Administration Review*, 31: 203–16.
- O'Toole, L., Meier, K. and Nicholson-Crotty, S. (2005) "Managing Upward, Downward and Outward: Networks, Hierarchical Relationships and Performance", *Public Management Review*, 7 (1): 45–68.
- Ouchi, W. (1979) "Markets, Bureaucracies and Clans", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 25: 129–41.
- Peters, G. (2008) *The Two Futures of Governing: Decentering and Recentering Processes in Governing*, HIS Political Science Series Paper 114, Pittsburgh, Pa.: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Peters, G. and Pierre, J. (1998) "Governance without Government? Rethinking Public Administration", *Journal of Public Administration – Research and Theory*, 8: 227–43.
- Pirie, M. (1988) *Privatization: Theory, Practice and Choice*, London: Wildwood House.
- Pollitt, C. and Bouckaert, G. (2004) *Public Management Reform: A Comparative Analysis*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Powell, W. (1990) "Neither Market nor Hierarchy: Network Forms of Organization", *Research in Organizational Behaviour*, 12: 295–336.
- Powell, W. and DiMaggio, P. (1991) *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*, Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press.
- Rhodes, R. (1997) *Understanding Governance*, Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Robson, W. (1928) *Justice and Administrative Law*, London: Macmillan.
- Salamon, L. (2002) *The Tools of Government: A Guide to the New Governance*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Schofield, J. (2001) "Time for a Revival? Public Policy Implementation: A Review of the Literature and an Agenda for Future Research", *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 3 (3): 245–63.
- Schrijvers, A. (1993) "The Management of a Larger Town: Outcome Related Performance Indicators and Organizational Control in the Public Sector", *Public Administration*, 71: 595–603.

INTRODUCTION

- Simey, M. (1988) *Democracy Rediscovered: A Study in Police Accountability*, London: Pluto Press.
- Thatcher, M. (1995) *The Downing Street Years*, London: HarperCollins.
- Tiebout, C. (1956) "A Pure Theory of Local Expenditures", *Journal of Political Economy*, 64 (5): 416–24.
- Vickers, J. and Yarrow, G. (1988) *Privatization: An Economic Analysis*, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Wilson, W. (1887) "The Study of Administration", *Political Science Quarterly*, 2.