

EURAM
2011



11th

1st-4th June 2011, Tallinn

Management Culture in the 21st Century

EBS, Estonian Business School (Tallinn, Estonia)



SIG: PUBLIC MANAGEMENT

The Public Management Strategic Interest Group aims at providing a wide-ranging, authoritative and internationally-focused forum to discuss major developments and key debates in the field of governance, organization and management of public administrations and public services.

TRACK 31: PUBLIC MANAGEMENT AND GOVERNANCE

Chairs: Dr Denita CEPIKU (main contact: cepiku@economia.uniroma2.it)
Prof. Jane BROADBENT, Prof. Robert FOUCHET, Prof. Marco MENEGUZZO, Prof. Riccardo MUSSARI, Prof. Reto STEINER

Abstract:

The public management area contains several species of topic: long-standing debates on foundational issues (accountability, bureaucracy, financial management and budgeting), technical issues registering innovations in techniques and methods (human resources management, quality management, contracting out) and also emerging new topics and theories (debates on networks and partnerships, the rigor – relevance gap, strategic thinking, etc.).

The borders of public management – governance, organization and management of public administrations and public services – as an academic area are frequently vague but it is nonetheless a fertile field of study especially after the public sector reforms of the eighties that have attracted management as an academic discipline to the study of public administration and contributed to move its academic base from law to political science departments to business and professional schools.

In the past decade, the academic literature has expanded to include Public Governance aspects. As public decision-making and the production of public services have undergone fundamental changes, the public sector has become more fragmented and because citizens expect different types of information and are keener to engage in policy making and service delivery. Public Governance pays a lot of attention to networks and collaboration but it also involves competition and conflict management. It raises issues such as stakeholder engagement and co-production, equity, ethics and integrity, accountability and sustainability.

The Public Management and Governance track aims at gathering papers that investigate the role of public management within public governance. Current themes include, but are not limited to: public-private partnerships and inter-organizational management, third-party policy implementation, decentralization, public sector reforms, cutback management, budget and accounting, strategic management, leadership and public entrepreneurship, human resources management, citizen participation and co-production, public value creation and social capital, ethics and trust, e-government, system thinking, performance management, quality improvement, the history of public management and administrative country traditions, etc.

The track will continue to organize activities in-between conferences and provide publication opportunities. In the 2010 EURAM conference, two special issues with The Journal of Management and Governance and The International Journal on Public Sector Performance Management were organized.

Key words: Public management – Public governance – Network management and governance – Performance management – Accountability

Sub-tracks: the Public Management & Governance track will host this year the following three sub-tracks:

- **Organizational change and public personnel management: does the management of culture really matter?** [chairs: Daniela Cristofoli, University of Lugano & Adrian Ritz, University of Bern]
- **The creation of internal markets to foster public competition** [chairs: Prof. Julio Gómez-Pomar & Prof. Jorge Onrubia, University Complutense of Madrid]
- **The Regulation and Governance of Local Utilities** [chairs: B.Antonioli Mantegazzini & T.Gianella (University of Lugano) – M.Finger (Swiss Federal Institute of Technology) – F.Marty (Sciences-Po) – A.Gilardoni (Bocconi University)]

Organizational change and public personnel management: does the management of culture really matter?

Chairs: Daniela Cristofoli, University of Lugano & Adrian Ritz, University of Bern

The management of culture is a key topic in public management and a critical issue for public managers.

Many scholars have addressed this aspect, exploring it from different perspectives: public sector organizations operate at the crossroad between the political, the economic and the social environment, in search of an equilibrium among the relative culture; the activity of public sector organizations is, typically, influenced by the classical bureaucratic culture, the managerial culture and the governance culture; public sector organizations are characterized by the presence of civil servants with different professional backgrounds and civil servants coming from different cultures, etc.

The consequences of the management of culture for the public sector organization performance is also often investigated, but with controversial results. Some scholars show how culture increases the civil servants' productivity and improve the organization's performance. Other scholars, on the other side, stress the negative effect of culture on the civil servants' motivation and the organization's results.

Few studies have taken into consideration the fact that public sector organizations are characterized by the presence, at the same time, of different "types" of culture, some of which "visible", some of which maybe "invisible" and have explored their simultaneous effect on the organization's performance and/or the civil servants' motivation and productivity. That's the aim of our panel track.

In this perspective, papers are welcome that deal with the following issues:

- What do we mean by culture in public sector organizations?
- How did the meaning of culture evolve in different Countries and over time?
- What are the consequences of culture for the mechanisms, routines, and procedures able to ensure the organization success? Are there some "cultures" more prone to support organizational change and organization success?
- How does culture affect the organizational practices and individual attitudes (eg. work productivity, civil servant commitment, civil servant motivation, leadership, etc.)? Are there some "cultures" more prone to successfully support civil servants' motivation and productivity?
- How does culture affect innovation in public sector organizations? Are there some "cultures" more prone to successfully support innovation in organizational restructuring?
- How does culture affect the use of HRM instruments and tools? Are there some "cultures" more prone to successfully support the use of HRM instruments and tools?
- How does different cultures coexist and interact in supporting organizational change, civil servant motivation and productivity, the implementation of public sector reforms and the use of managerial tools?
- How to successfully manage the interplay of cultures in public sector organizations?

Authors wanting to present a paper on other issues related to effect of visible and invisible cultures on the performance of public sector organizations and/or the civil servants' motivation and productivity should not hesitate sending a proposal to the panel chairs.

The creation of internal markets to foster public competition

Chairs: Prof. Julio Gómez-Pomar & Prof. Jorge Onrubia, University Complutense of Madrid

The introduction of market mechanisms to satisfy citizen needs is an important and increasing means for implementing public policies. This market approach -which was termed “quasi-market” development- has proliferated in many OECD countries under different implementation formulas.

The notion of quasi-market has two distinctive features: i) introduction of competition; and ii) adoption of an intermediate organizational framework for the provision of public services between the hierarchy and the polyarchic structure of the conventional markets. From a practical point of view, the government creates one quasi-market when the public production is opened to other producers, public or private, while maintaining the ability to set the conditions for access to these services. Governments can design and implement many measures to create these spaces of competition, such as purchaser-provider splitting, public tendering or voucher introduction. In short, the main objective of quasi-markets is to increase competition as the key mechanism to promote efficiency in the provision of public services.

While these mechanisms have been successfully utilized in the provision of health care services and to some extent in education, critics arise about possible inequities in access to public services as a result of excessive deregulation by governments. These problems should not be used to raise doubts about the competition, but as a spur to improve the regulation in the quasi-markets.

This track aims for papers focused in providing insights in questions like the following: Are there any other candidate sectors in which the creation of internal markets can be implemented? What new success cases are available to gain a deeper knowledge about internal markets? How can more competence be brought to the provision of public services? What are the disadvantages and risks when introducing internal competence? What problems arise in the performance monitoring of quasi-markets? Should there be limitations in the regulation of quasi-markets and what should be its scope?

The Regulation and Governance of Local Utilities

Chairs: Barbara Antonioli Mantegazzini & Tobiolo Gianella (University of Lugano) - Matthias Finger (Swiss Federal Institute of Technology) - Frédéric Marty (Sciences-Po) - Andrea Gilardoni (Bocconi University)

‘Regulation’ is an all-embracing term used in the public policy literature to cover many different political and economic issues and ideas. There is no single, universally accepted definition.

There is a growing consensus that the successful development of utility infrastructure – electricity, natural gas, telecommunications, and water – depends in no small part on the adoption of appropriate public policies and the effective implementation of these policies. Central to these policies is development of a regulatory apparatus that provides stability, protects consumers from the abuse of market power, guards consumers and operators against political opportunism, and provides incentives for service providers to operate efficiently and make the needed investments.

Because the way regulation is done plays such a vital role in infrastructure development and use, most discussions of utilities policy focus on how regulation should be done, for example, how to introduce and facilitate competition, how to provide operators with incentives for improved performance, and how regulators should involve stakeholders.

Given the growing relevance of regulatory policies, the literature on Public Administration calls for further research exploring the regulation and governance of local utilities. This is especially imperative when considering that regulation and new form of governance could be an important way to create or improve the value of firms.

The aim of the track is to contribute to the development of the theoretical and, most of all, empirical knowledge on regulation and governance of public utilities, focusing on key areas with higher interest: management, investment, value, performance, mixed companies, regulatory risk, efficiency, quality.