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ABSTRACT

The paper presents a comparison between selected documents as part of the performance measurement systems of three ministries in seven different countries. The ongoing research points to highlight how in different countries, belonging to different administrative traditions, central public administrations measure performance according to the areas of organizational performance identified by the Italian Legislative Decree no. 150/2009. Three research questions have been identified. Historical institutionalism and path dependence theory are used as theoretical background for this analysis. The methodology used is based on the analysis of performance documents published and available on the selected administrations institutional website. The results show that the Legislative Decree no. 150/2009 is in line with similar international experiences introducing homogenously performance management in central public administrations and that Anglo-Saxon countries have a greater attitude to make publicly available and accessible documents relating to performance measurement system and that these documents provide information on more areas of performance and integrate this information with indicators.

THE ADMINISTRATIVE REFORM NARRATIVE

“Performance is not a unitary concept, within an unambiguous meaning. Rather, it must be viewed as a set of information about achievements of varying significant to different stakeholder” (Bovaird, 1996 p147). According to Bouckaert and Halligan (2008) measuring performance is “the systematic collection of data through observation and registration of performance related issue”. Performance measurement permits to define ‘ex ante’ connection between objectives, resources, processes and results allowing accountability of public administrations (Bouckaert and Halligan, 2008) and permits ‘ex post’ to evaluate achieved results and to improve organizational efficacy and efficiency (Dunsire, 1986). Radin (2006) defines performance as “a simple and value-neutral way to monitor and improve government”. The use of the word ‘government’ on behalf of ‘governance’ seems very interesting in this definition especially taking into account last decade academic debate over governance without government and the importance of networks (Rhodes, 1997; Peters, 1993; Rhodes, 1994; Peters and Pierre, 1998). The focus of the most pervasive public administration reform in last decades has been the introduction of performance measurement and management in the public sector (Brudney, et al. 1999; Moynihan, 2008; Moynihan and Pandey, 2010).

The Legislative Decree no. 150/2009, inspired by new public management theory and principles (Hood, 1991; Osborne and Gaebler, 1992) has paved the way for a comprehensive revision of a lot of aspects related to the Italian civil service model. The Legislative Decree no. 150/2009 fits in a broader public administration reform process that took its first steps at the beginning of 20th century last decade. In particular, the Legislative Decree no. 29/1993 moved its first steps towards the separation between politics and management and the privatisation of working relationships within the public sector. The Legislative Decree no. 286/1999 reformed the external audit system and introduced an internal audit system comprised of four different audit procedures. Other reforms comprise the followings: Law no. 142/1990, Legislative Decree no. 165/2001, Law no. 145/2002. The objectives of the reform introduced by the Legislative Decree no. 150/2009 are on one hand to improve the delivery of services according to citizens’ needs and expectations and on the other hand to improve efficiency and productivity within the public sector.

The main innovations that the Legislative Decree no. 150/2009 has introduced are:

1. performance management;
2. performance appraisal;
3. reinforcement of the selection mechanisms for economic and career incentives;
4. reinforcement of managers’ role;
5. reform of collective bargaining provisions aligning them with those regulating the private sector;
6. reform of the disciplinary proceedings.

The Decree applies directly to all central public administrations and to their executive agencies, for other levels of government (regional and local level), due to the constitutionally guaranteed autonomy, the reform applies only in terms of principles.

The Decree gives special emphasis on performance management. Central public administrations are due to develop the so called performance cycle, in accordance to the economic and financial planning. This performance cycle contains the phases of planning, monitoring and reporting. In particular, the definition and allotment of objectives that need to be achieved linked to specific performance indicators and targets and their connection to financial resources are part of the planning phase. It follows the monitoring phase with the activation of any corrective action, if needed, and the evaluation of the organizational performance, individual performance appraisal and the use of performance related pay systems. Reporting phase to all public administrations stakeholders closes the performance cycle and sets the basis for the following year performance cycle.

Regarding the performance cycle the decree identifies eight areas of organizational performance:

1. the implementation of the policies and the final satisfaction of collective needs;
2. the implementation of plans and programs, in accordance with phases and timing, quantity and quality standards defined and the expected level of consumption of resources;
3. the level of customer satisfaction;
4. the modernization of the organization and the improvement of professional skills and competencies of civil servants and the ability to carry out plans and programs;
5. the qualitative and quantitative development of relations with citizens, stakeholders, users of delivered services, including the development of forms of participation and collaboration;
6. the efficient use of resources;
7. the quality and quantity of goods and services provided;
8. the achievement of the objectives of promoting equal opportunities.

To ensure performance documents quality, understandability and reliability, administrations are due to publish each year a formally three-years-long document, named Performance Plan, that defines the strategic and operational objectives and defines performance indicators for the whole organization and for single sub-units. At the end of each year administrations are due to publish another document called formally Performance Report that shows the level of performance achieved regarding each objective that the administration had previously defined. The so called Performance Plan is structured taking into account the eight area of performance previously defined.

For further research it seems important to define a broader theoretical background on performance measurement that allow to understand how this reform and the areas it encompass could support the shift from performance administration towards performance management system (Bouckaert and Halligan, 2008).
LITERATURE REVIEW

The theoretical approach underneath the development of this research project is neoinstitutionalism also referred as new institutionalism. According to Barzelay and Gallego (2006), literature on public management during the 1980s and the 1990s was predominantly focused on the ideological, doctrinal and rhetorical aspects of public management reform. In the last decade a disciplinary turn as occurred, though. As part of this trend the literature on public management reform has started to resemble the political science sub disciplines of comparative politics and public policy studies; thus, neoinstitutionalist approaches have been used to analyze institutional and policy change (Barzelay and Gallego, 2006). Within the neoinstitutionalist framework, at least three different analytical approaches have appeared over the last fifteen year (Hall and Taylor, 1996): historical institutionalism, rational choice institutionalism and sociological institutionalism. Historical institutionalism is closely associated with a distinctive perspective on historical development (Hall and Taylor, 1996). In particular, the use of historical institutionalism approach becomes relevant in illustrating the findings of this research. Historical institutionalism proposes an image of social causation that is ‘path dependent’ in the sense that it rejects traditional postulate that same operative forces will generate same results everywhere in favour of a view that effects of such forces will be mediated by the contextual features of a given situation often inherited from the past (Hall and Taylor, 1996). Moreover and strictly connected to historical institutionalism, is the fact that institutions may follow path-dependent patterns of development in which initial choices may determine future historical trajectories and once a particular path is chosen, it precludes other paths, even if these alternatives might, in the long run, have proven to be more efficient or adaptive (Krasner, 1988). Moreover historical institutionalism and path dependence theory explain how institutions, historical events or institutional structures follow periods of continuity interrupted by crises when substantial institutional change takes place and moves historical development onto a new path (Krasner, 1984; Hall and Taylor, 1996).

Comparative studies on performance measurement and management systems among countries are well developed. Among the others, is a comparative study of executive agencies in four European Union member states (Finland, the Netherlands, Sweden and the United Kingdom) done by Pollitt (2006). The focus is on how and to what extent performance indicators influence top management of agencies and the degree to which performance data were used by ministries as steering instruments. The research uses an historical institutionalist perspective combined with a model that identifies primary task characteristics as a source of significant variation (Pollitt, 2006). The results of the analysis show that the task of the analyzed executive agencies and the characteristics of the analyzed countries have an influence on the actual implementation of performance measurement systems and on performance management. However, the author recognizes that performance measurement in the analyzed countries has become almost universal and that, even if performance management is growing steadily, it varies in form and force among different countries and different tasks (Pollitt, 2006). Another important contribution that uses the historical institutionalism approach is the one proposed by Knill (1999) that analyzes the differences between Germany and United Kingdom recent public administration reforms. The comparative studies is not focused on performance measurement reforms but on public sector reform in general. The author concludes that developments in the German public sector indicates a picture of high continuity; on the other hand in the United Kingdom recent developments in the public sector reveals the high structural potential to reform administrative structures and practices in Britain (Knill, 1999). Pollitt and Bouckaert (2000) with their contribution want “to develop typologies and more specific theories which will classify and explain specific patterns and trends” identifying a pattern among Anglo-Saxon countries which is not present in those countries of non Anglo-Saxon tradition. Another comparative study is the one conducted by Jhonsen et al. (2006) on Scandinavian countries highlighting the existence of a “Nordic prospective”.
The proposed literature review permit to identify the variables of this research study: in particular, an independent variable and a dependent variable have been identified. The independent variable is the analyzed country and ministries, identified according to the four different administrative traditions; the dependant variable is the performance management/measurement system adopted in each of this country.

Defining the research questions is probably the most important step to be taken in a research study. Research questions should have both substance and form (Yin, 1994, p. 7). This study aims to answer to three research questions:

- **RQ1.** The first research question concerns the relevance of each of the eight areas of organizational performance in documents that are made available on the institutional website of the selected public administrations. The aim is to understand whether the experience of other countries’ central administrations about the design and development of performance management has led to systems that clearly identifies objectives for each of the areas of performance measurement.

- **RQ2.** The second research question, corollary to the first, goes to investigate a second theme: measurability. The objective is to determine whether for each of the eight areas, that were identified by the Legislative Decree no. 150/2009, the analyzed administrations provide performance indicators. The issue of measurability is one of the most debated topics in literature either at central or local level (Faucett and Kleiner, 1994; Mascarenhas, 1996; Mckevitt and Lawton, 1996; Klott, 1999; De Lancer Julnes, 2001; Hoque, 2008).

**RQ3.** The third research question aims to understand the relation between performance measurement systems and the administrative tradition. The aim of this research question is to investigate whether the administrative tradition can influence or facilitate the adoption and implementation of performance measurement systems. In particular, whether the administrative tradition allows a higher degree of availability of performance documents on the institutional websites of the analyzed countries.

**METHODOLOGY**

Case studies are used in many situation including public administration research (Yin, 1994, p. 1). Case study research method is an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context; when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident; and in which multiple sources of evidence are used (Yin, 1984, p. 23). According to Yin (1994, p. 39) this research paper belongs to the fourth type of case studies design: multiple-case embedded which means that more than one critical case (seven countries) is used in order to answer to the three research questions identified and that research design is based on multiple units of analysis (embedded) (three ministries for each of the chosen seven countries). An embedded design, however, also has some pitfalls: the major one occurs when the case study focuses only on the subunit level and fails to return to the larger unit of analysis (Yin, 1994, p.44). This pitfall, however, does not occur in this analysis. Citing Stake (1994, 1995) the proposed analysis belongs to the second type of case study analysis: collective studies. Collective studies are a part of instrumental cases in which more than one case per time is analyzed. The object of this paper is
performance measurement in a selection of three central government administrations belonging to
different administrative traditions. The selected countries are: United Kingdom, Australia, Canada, United
States of America, France, Germany and Finland. These countries offer a sample of the four different
administrative traditions: the Napoleonic one, the Anglo-Saxon, the one from Northern Europe and the
Germanic one. To the first administrative tradition belongs France; to the second United Kingdom,
Australia, Canada and the United States of America; Finland belongs to the third type and Germany to the
Germanic/continental Europe one. Bouckaert and Halligan (2008) have developed an analytical framework
in order to analyze performance measurement/management system based on three dimensions:
measurability, incorporation of performance information into documents and use of performance
information. The term measurability refers to the collection and processing of performance related data.
Incorporation refers to the inclusion of performance data and information into documents and decision
making processes. The use of performance information is vital in order to improve results, decisions and
responsibilities related to the organizational performance. Depending on the features that these three
dimensions assume, four ideal-types of performance measurement that differ in terms of depth and span
of performance are identified: performance measurement, management of performances, performance
management and performance governance. Table 1 show the differences among the four ideal-types in
terms of measurability, incorporation and use of performance information.

Insert Table 1 about here

These ideal-types are useful in order to make comparisons among countries and to make evidence of the
evolution of performance within a country. According to this model, France and Germany belong to the
performance measurement ideal-type; Finland to the management of performances ideal-type and all the
Anglo-Saxon countries to the performance management ideal-type. In this paper central public
administration is defined as a government department headed by a ministry. The selection of the three
central administrations has been gradually made adopting the following criteria: the comparability between
administrations and the nature of the main function of the organizations: production of goods and services,
regulatory activities and transfer activities (Borgonovi, 1984). The chosen ministries are: Ministry of
Environment (regulation), Ministry of Interior (production of goods and services) and Ministry of Transport
(transfer). Another criterion that could have been used, but that in the end was discarded, is the one
proposed by Mascarenhas (1996) based on a classification of all public functions depending on the degree
of difficulty in measuring output and outcome. According to the analysis proposed by Mascarenhas (1996)
the amenability to performance measurement is higher for the Ministry of Interior and for the Ministry of
Environment; the Ministry of Transport is less amenable to performance measurement. The production
model of performance highlights, among others, the dimensions of input, output and outcome. Performance
management can cover the whole chain from input to output (Van Dooren, et al. 2010) or what Bouckaert and Halligan (2008) define as span of performance. In particular, the eight areas of
performance identified by the Legislative Decree can be traced back to the span of performance in the
model of Bouckaert and Halligan (2008). The implementation of the policies and the final satisfaction of
collective needs (first area of performance) and the level of customer satisfaction (third area of
performance) are meant to measure the outcome of public administrations. The second area of
performance identified by the Legislative Decree no.150/2009 is the implementation of plans and
programs, in accordance with phases and timing, quantity and quality standards defined and the expected
level of consumption of resources and embraces the dimensions of input, processes and output. The fourth
and sixth area of performance encompass the input and the process dimension. The qualitative and
quantitative development of relations with citizens, stakeholders, users of delivered services, including the development of forms of participation and collaboration (fifth area of performance) embraces the dimension of output and outcome. The quality and quantity of goods and services provided refers to the output dimension. The last area of performance identified by Legislative Decree no. 150/2009 refers to the achievement of the objectives of promoting equal opportunities and can be considered transversal to all the proposed dimensions. Errore. L’origine riferimento non è stata trovata. synthesises the connection between the eight areas of performance and the dimension of the span of performance.

Insert Figure 1 about here

Regarding the methodological approach used in the development of this paper, the research was made taking as reference the contents of a selection of performance documents available on the website of each of the three selected central government administrations. There is an implicit assumption in this research underneath the theme of availability of performance information on the institutional websites of the analyzed administration. This assumption considers the availability of performance information important because it induces a change in the behaviour of both citizens and managers. The availability produces this effect at two levels. Internally, the availability of performance information might lead public managers change their behaviour in terms of use and incorporation of performance information their decision-making process (Bouckaert and Halligan, 2008; Moynihan, 2009). Externally, the incorporation of performance information on publicly available documents affects both managers, for the reasons already defined, and citizens who work as potential busters to the firsts: if citizens know performance information and indicators, managers are more willing to use them (Bouckaert and Halligan, 2008; Moynihan, 2009). In this sense, Cunningham and Harris (2005) highlight how the monitoring and reporting phases lead to a perceived performance improvement by citizens. On the other hand, this assumption seems to be in contrast with Halachimi (2002; 2005) that states, after a close examination of the elements that influence productivity and those that influence accountability, that there should be different sets of indicators according to the purpose they are used for: to increase productivity or to guarantee external accountability. The analysis of the documents has been made considering whether have been defined objectives for each of the eight areas of performance management and whether for each defined objective have been defined performance indicators. The results that will be presented in this paper are based on the analysis of just those documents that have been published on the institutional website of the selected administrations. This analysis is about the availability of performance information in the documents published on the selected administration websites. In order to answer to the first research question a scale to measure relevance has been designed. According to Stevens (1946) the scale used to represent the phenomenon of this paper is a nominal scale. The scale is comprised of three levels: relevant, partially relevant and not relevant. An area, in order to be considered relevant, is required to provide explicit and specific objectives in the analyzed documents; whether objectives are generally defined, the area is considered partially relevant; whether no objectives are defined the area is considered not relevant. A similar scale has been defined in order to answer to the second research question. The scale is comprised of three levels: measurable, partially measurable and not measurable. An area, in order to be considered measurable, is required to provide explicit and specific indicators and target for each of the defined objectives; whether indicators are poorly defined or are made available but not specifically linked to an objective, the area is considered partially measurable; whether no indicators are defined the area is considered not measurable. The analysis was carried out during the fourth quarter of 2010 and it is referred to planning and reporting documents available during that period on the institutional websites of the analyzed administrations. Those
documents comprise the objectives and indicators for the year 2010 or the level of performance achieved in 2009.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The table below shows the results of the analysis regarding the first and the second research question. This table is a synthesis of the analysis conducted on the selected three central administrations. This synthesis has been possible, as it will be shown and discussed more precisely later, because differences between each of the analyzed ministries are not particularly marked.

Insert Table 2 about here

The first research question investigates the relevance of each of the eight areas of performance identified by the Legislative Decree 150/2009. The aim is to understand whether the experience of other countries’ central administrations about the design and development of performance management has led to systems that clearly identifies objectives for each of the areas of organizational performance. Errore. L’origine riferimento non è stata trovata. can be analyzed either taking into account the horizontal dimension which shows each of the eight areas or the vertical dimension which shows each of the seven countries analyzed. The first result to be highlighted regards the first area of performance measurement which is the implementation of the policies and the final satisfaction of collective needs. This is relevant in six out of seven analyzed countries except Germany, where the documents that describe strategic objectives of the three ministries are concise and limited to certain public policies. Analyzing the case of Australia this finding is in line with a previous research conducted on four Australian departments, in which Hoque (2008) highlights that government outcome definition had a positive influence on the introduction of performance measurement systems in the public sector. The relevance of the second area of performance follows the relevance of the first area analyzed: in particular six out seven countries consider relevant the implementation of plans and programs, in accordance with phases and timing, quantity and quality standards defined and the expected level of consumption of resources. In the Canadian case, the public availability in the planning documents of objectives and planned activities seems to be limited. Out of the possible reasons, this result is due to the functions attributed to Canadian ministries: the main activities are planning, programming and transferring funds to executive agencies or other governmental levels that are responsible to deliver services to citizens. However, it is not possible to state if this is due to the Federal form of government because, on the other hand, the United States make available to their citizens all the information regarding this area. The level of customer satisfaction seems to be relevant only in those countries of Anglo-Saxon tradition. Regarding the modernization of the organization and the improvement of professional skills and competencies of civil servants and the ability to carry out plans and programs there is no a single path but each nation can be considered by itself. On the other hand, the quality and quantity of goods and services provided is relevant just in the United Kingdom and the area of equal opportunities seems to be relevant once again in the United Kingdom and in Australia. Analyzing the vertical dimension of Table 2, two are the main results to highlight: the United States of America and Germany. In the case of United States it considers relevant five out of six area of performance, just the seventh area is partially relevant and the area of equal opportunities which is not relevant. On the contrary, in Germany six out of the eight areas are not relevant, the other two are partially relevant.
The second research question investigates the theme of measurability. The objective is to determine whether for each of the eight areas identified by the Legislative Decree no. 150/2009 the analyzed administrations provide performance indicators. This second research question can be analyzed highlighting, as done for the first one, either the horizontal dimension and the vertical one. Starting from the horizontal dimension, the primary consideration that needs to be done is that to similar levels of relevance correspond similar level of measurability. In particular, the first area of performance is measurable in five out of seven countries and is partially measurable in Finland and not measurable in Germany. About the implementation of plans and programs in the United Kingdom and in Canada the objectives that are described in the planning and programming documents not always come along with specific indicators. The reason of this situation is due to the fact that in these countries, executives agencies or other governmental level are responsible to deliver services to public. The analyses of executive agencies planning and programming documents does not reveal a higher degree of measurability: in many cases it was not possible to find performance indicators. Speculatively, five out seven countries do not provide specific indicators and target for the area of equal opportunities. This area is only measurable in the United Kingdom and partially measurable in Australia. The qualitative and quantitative development of relations with citizens, stakeholders, users of delivered services, including the development of forms of participation and collaboration is measurable just in Canada and partially measurable in the United States, not in other countries. Canada and the United States are countries where the tradition of participation of citizens and other stakeholders is a basic feature of the national culture and of the administrative tradition. The fourth area is measurable just in Australia and in the United States of America. The results regarding Australia seem to be in line with Klott (1999) that, in an analysis on local public administration in Australia, identified that increasing adoption of performance measurement systems and non-financial indicators was due to a growing emphasis of central government regarding organizational change and accountability. The area concerning the efficient use of resources is not or partially measurable in four out of seven countries. The reason why such an important area is not so well developed is related to the particular nature of the activities carried out by the central public administrations. These organizations implement public policies by transferring funds to other public administrations or executive agencies or directly to citizens, businesses and other economic entities. If this is the main activity, it seems quite likely that the dimension of efficiency that prevail is the financial one. Analyzing the vertical dimension the United States and Canada are those countries that provide indicators and targets in five out of eight areas of performance, meanwhile in Germany seven out of the eight areas of performance are not measurable.

According to the documents published on the institutional websites of the administrations focus of this analysis, the relevance and measurability of the areas of performance management seem to be homogenous among different administrations even if each single administration can develop specific programs or initiatives. This might express the fact that performance management has been implemented in central public administrations through systemic reform at national level and this is true regardless the administrative tradition of a country. The Legislative Decree no. 150/2009 which has introduced the reform in the Italian public administration, is, thus, in line with similar international experiences introducing homogenously performance management in central public administrations. Moreover the results regarding Germany and the United Kingdom seem in line with the research done by Knill (1999). In particular, the results presented in this paper further highlight that Germany is characterized by an “administrative continuity that refers not only to the pattern of ongoing adaptation, but also to the persistence of long-established structures, principles and procedures” (Knill, 1999).

Finally, the results highlight that the definition of measures and indicators that can represent at a glance the entire performance of a public administrations seems unrealistic. In particular, according to Steward e
Walsh (1994) not every aspect of a public administration performance can be measured with the same accuracy and thus is important to be aware about those aspects of performance that are neglected. The risk is to design and implement performance measurement systems that are too focused on those aspects that are measurable pretending to have an intrinsic coherence and objectivity (Steward & Walsh, 1994).

The last research question (RQ3) investigates whether exists a relationship between the analyzed performance measurement systems and the administrative tradition. The answer to this question can be definitively affirmative showing that in those countries of Anglo-Saxon tradition all areas of performance measurement defined by the Legislative Decree 150/2009 are at the most both relevant and measurable. Furthermore it can be said that in those countries of Anglo-Saxon administrative tradition or public interest, central public administrations makes much more available documents and information about their performance; the information included in those documents covers more areas of performance measurement, as defined in the Legislative Decree 150/2009; finally, those documents include indicators that allows to measure performance according to previously defined targets.

CONCLUSIONS

As it was shown in previous analysis and according to historical institutionalism and path dependence theory as in the contribution of Krasner (1984) and Hall and Taylor (1996), the administrative tradition (Knill, 1999; Pollitt and Bouckaert, 2000; Pollitt, 2006) and the culture (Hofstede, 2001; Lynn et al. 2001; Mouritzen and Svara, 2002) have an influence on the availability of performance documents that allow to identifies the relevance and measurability of performance information. The results of the proposed analysis show the existence of two particular paths: Anglo-Saxon countries and other countries of this analysis. In particular, the reason why Anglo-Saxon countries follow a different path can be traced back to a substantial institutional and political change (Krasner, 1984; Hall and Taylor, 1996) occurred at the end of the seventies of the 20th century when in the United Kingdom and in other Anglo-Saxon countries moved historical development onto a new path (Krasner, 1984; Hall and Taylor, 1996). As previously illustrated, the availability of more performance information might induce a change in the behaviour of both citizens and managers. In their work, Bouckaert and Halligan (2008) identify four ideal-type in order to give a sense to the combination of measurement, incorporation and use of performance indicators. The authors explain how shifts from an ideal-type to another occur but not why. Present research give a new attention on the issue of availability as tool to improve performance management and as a trigger for the shift from an ideal type to a more meaningful one (Bouckaert, 1993).
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**ANNEX I. Figures**

*Figure 33 – Legislative Decree no. 150/2009: area of performance according to the span of performance*

![Diagram of Legislative Decree no. 150/2009](image)

Source: adjusted from the production model of performance

**ANNEX II. Tables**

*Table 1 – Four ideal types of managing performance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Performance Administration</th>
<th>Managements of Performances</th>
<th>Performance Management</th>
<th>Performance Governance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.Measuring</td>
<td>Administrative data registration, objective, mostly input and process</td>
<td>Specialised performance measurement systems</td>
<td>Hierarchical performance measurement systems</td>
<td>Consolidated performance measurement system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.Incorporating</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Within different systems for specific management functions</td>
<td>Systemically internal integration</td>
<td>Systemically internal and external integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.Using</td>
<td>Limited: reporting, internal, single loop</td>
<td>Disconnected</td>
<td>Coherent, comprehensive, consistent</td>
<td>Societal use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Limitations</td>
<td>Ad hoc, selective, rule based</td>
<td>Incoherence</td>
<td>Complex, perhaps not sustainable as a stable system</td>
<td>Uncontrollable, unmanageable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Bouckaert and Halligan (2008)
Table 2 – Findings of the analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas</th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>Canada</th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>US</th>
<th>France</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Finland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative tradition</td>
<td>Anglo-Saxon</td>
<td>Anglo-Saxon</td>
<td>Anglo-Saxon</td>
<td>Anglo-Saxon</td>
<td>Napoleonic</td>
<td>Germanic</td>
<td>Scandinavian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. implementation of the policies and outcome</td>
<td>relevant; measurable</td>
<td>relevant; measurable</td>
<td>relevant; measurable</td>
<td>relevant; measurable</td>
<td>relevant; partially relevant; measurable</td>
<td>relevant; partially measurable</td>
<td>relevant; partially measurable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. implementation of plans and programs</td>
<td>relevant; not measurable; partially measurable</td>
<td>relevant; measurable</td>
<td>relevant; measurable</td>
<td>relevant; measurable</td>
<td>not relevant; not measurable; measurable</td>
<td>relevant; not measurable; measurable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. customer satisfaction</td>
<td>relevant; not measurable; measurable</td>
<td>relevant; partially measurable</td>
<td>relevant; measurable</td>
<td>not relevant; not measurable; measurable</td>
<td>not relevant; not measurable; measurable</td>
<td>not relevant; not measurable; measurable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. modernization of public administration</td>
<td>not relevant; not measurable</td>
<td>relevant; partially relevant; measurable</td>
<td>relevant; measurable</td>
<td>relevant; partially relevant; measurable</td>
<td>partially relevant; not measurable; not measurable</td>
<td>not relevant; not measurable; not measurable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. relation with citizens and stakeholders</td>
<td>not relevant; not measurable</td>
<td>relevant; partially relevant; not measurable</td>
<td>relevant; not measurable; partially measurable</td>
<td>not relevant; not measurable; not measurable</td>
<td>not relevant; not measurable; not measurable</td>
<td>not relevant; not measurable; not measurable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. efficient use of resources</td>
<td>relevant; not measurable; measurable</td>
<td>partially relevant; not measurable; measurable</td>
<td>partially relevant; not measurable; measurable</td>
<td>relevant; partially relevant; not measurable; measurable</td>
<td>not relevant; not measurable; partially relevant; measurable</td>
<td>not relevant; not measurable; partially relevant; measurable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. quality and quantity of goods and services provided</td>
<td>relevant; measurable</td>
<td>partially relevant; measurable</td>
<td>partially relevant; not measurable; measurable</td>
<td>partially relevant; partially relevant; measurable</td>
<td>not relevant; partially relevant; not measurable; not measurable</td>
<td>partially relevant; not measurable; measurable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. promotion of equal opportunity</td>
<td>relevant; not relevant; measurable</td>
<td>not relevant; partially measurable</td>
<td>not relevant; not measurable; measurable</td>
<td>not relevant; not measurable; measurable</td>
<td>not relevant; not measurable; measurable</td>
<td>not relevant; not measurable; measurable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: authors