

# Contents

<i>List of Figures and Tables</i>	vii
<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	viii
<i>Notes on the Contributors</i>	x

Introduction: Using Public Sector Performance Information <i>Steven Van de Walle and Wouter Van Dooren</i>	1
--	---

## Part I Bureaucracy

1 Nothing New Under the Sun? Change and Continuity in the Twentieth-Century Performance Movements <i>Wouter Van Dooren</i>	11
2 Advocacy and Learning: An Interactive-Dialogue Approach to Performance Information Use <i>Donald Moynihan</i>	24
3 Performance Information and Performance Steering: Integrated System or Loose Coupling? <i>Per Lægreid, Paul G. Roness and Kristin Rubecksen</i>	42
4 Performance Measurement Beyond Instrumental Use <i>Patria de Lancer Julnes</i>	58
5 Comparing Performance across Public Sectors <i>Geert Bouckaert and John Halligan</i>	72
6 Hitting the Target and Missing the Point? Developing an Understanding of Organizational Gaming <i>Zoe Radnor</i>	94
7 Performance Management Systems: Providing Accountability and Challenging Collaboration <i>Kathryn G. Denhardt and Maria P. Aristigueta</i>	106

# PROOF

vi *Contents*

## **Part II Politics and Society**

8	Determinants of Performance Information Utilization in Political Decision Making <i>Jostein Askim</i>	125
9	UK Parliamentary Scrutiny of Public Service Agreements: A Challenge Too Far? <i>Carole Johnson and Colin Talbot</i>	140
10	Performance Information and Educational Policy Making <i>Åge Johnsen</i>	157
11	Rational, Political and Cultural Uses of Performance Monitors: The Case of Dutch Urban Policy <i>Dennis de Kool</i>	174
12	Reporting Public Performance Information: The Promise and Challenges of Citizen Involvement <i>Alfred Tat-Kei Ho</i>	192
13	Publishing Performance Information: An Illusion of Control? <i>Steven Van de Walle and Alasdair Roberts</i>	211
	Epilogue: The Many Faces of Use <i>Harry Hatry</i>	227
	<i>Bibliography</i>	241
	<i>Index</i>	265

# Introduction: Using Public Sector Performance Information

*Steven Van de Walle and Wouter Van Dooren*

## **Use – a neglected issue in performance measurement research**

Martha S. Feldman, a distinguished student of the role of information in organizations and in decision making starts her seminal book *Order without Design* by writing about her experiences undertaking fieldwork for a research project in the US Department of Energy:

When I explained to the members of this office that I was interested in how the policy office produces information and how it was used, I was met time and again with the response that the information is not used.

(Feldman, 1989: 1)

Does this reflect officials' cynicism, or does it really mean that information is not used in organizations, or should the notion of "use" be enriched to reflect its many dimensions and subtleties?

Although the practice of performance measurement is at least a century old, we witnessed a remarkable revival with the advent of New Public Management (NPM). Performance measurement is at the core of this doctrine, which propagated, amongst other things, managerial freedom based on output controls (Hood, 1991). In recent decades, performance measurement and NPM have become Siamese twins, both in thinking and in practice. There has been a growing disillusionment with NPM and this has reflected on performance measurement. The question then is: is there a future for performance measurement beyond NPM? The contributions in this volume seek the answer to this question in a redefinition of how performance information is used.

# PROOF

## 2 *Performance Information in the Public Sector*

In decades of research on performance information in the public sector, it was often assumed that the mere availability of performance information would lead to its use by decision makers. While the production of performance information has received considerable attention in the public sector performance measurement and management literature, actual use of this information has traditionally not been very high on the research agenda. One reason for this neglect is that the use of performance information has long been considered as unproblematic in the performance measurement cycle. Another reason may be a cynical presumption that politicians don't use performance information; citizens don't understand it and don't bother about it; and that public managers don't trust it or don't take it seriously.

While the link between performance measurement and the use of this information in decision making is often assumed, actual use is often the weak spot in performance information systems. Much of the evidence on whether performance information is actually used in decision making is still rather anecdotal (de Lancer Julnes and Holzer, 2001), and opinion on whether performance measurement actually matters for decisions is divided (Askim, 2007a; Ho, 2006; Moynihan and Ingraham, 2004; Pollitt, 2006b).

Patterns of performance information use are different at the various stages of the decision-making process (Melkers and Willoughby, 2005). There are also important sectoral differences, meaning that performance information is more embedded in some policy sectors than in others (Askim, 2007a; Davies, Nutley and Smith, 2000; Van Dooren, 2004). Individual organizations have different organizational cultures, impacting on the use of performance information (Moynihan, 2005a: 204), and large differences exist between countries in patterns of use of performance information (Pollitt, 2005).

### **End-users: managers, politicians and citizens**

In this volume, we focus on the "end-users" of the information generated by performance measurement systems: once the information exists, how is it then read, analyzed, and used in future decisions or in shaping public organizations? How does this information have an influence on organizational routines, on decisions, on the people in the organization, on the politicians steering these organizations, or on the citizens using the services of these organizations?

There are different types of end-users. There are managers and other public employees who make operational or strategic decisions. There

are politicians who decide about budgets, who steer agencies, and who have to legitimize their policies. There are citizens who want to see how their taxes are being used, and who want to be informed about how the public services they use are performing.

## **Why use performance information?**

In the rational decision-making model, the role of performance information is rather straightforward: Neat performance information contributes to the attainment of neatly defined organizational goals. The rational decision-making model fails to recognize that performance information may actually amplify ambiguity rather than reduce it. There is at the same time too much information creating overload and cognitive problems, and too little information to control all aspects of public services. As a result, the same information may lead to entirely different outcomes. Use (or indeed non-use) is not a linear process, and performance information systems may be more loosely coupled than their outward appearance suggests.

Performance measurement and management is in fact a very multi-faceted phenomenon. Use is therefore also quite diverse. Robert Behn (2003) listed eight different purposes of performance measurement (evaluate, control, budget, motivate, promote, celebrate, learn, improve), and each of these purposes has its own logic and determinants. An analysis of whether and how performance information is actually used in the public sector has to take the different types of use into account. When we analyze how performance information is used to improve front-line service delivery, we are in fact studying a phenomenon that is fundamentally different from a situation where performance information is used for advocacy or accountability purposes. Performance information and its use by public organizations, politicians and citizens can be studied as an instrument for service improvements. But it can also be studied as a symbol in the wider policy process or as a social phenomenon reflecting societal change.

## **Definitions of use**

When policy makers say they “don’t use” performance information, what does this, then, actually mean? Does it mean they generally do not sit down with a 200-page performance report and a cup of coffee? This is quite likely. Henry Mintzberg, when studying managers, showed that managers did not generally get their information from reading

reports, but by talking to other people (Mintzberg, 1975). Likewise, the conclusion of the (all in all, scarce) research on how politicians use performance information, appears to be that performance reports are neither read nor valued (Pollitt, 2006b; ter Bogt, 2004).

Such an approach to “use” would be very narrow. Policy makers cannot possibly mean that performance information has no effect whatsoever on their decisions, or on their way of looking at organizations. The use of performance information is probably less formalized than the existence of performance reports or league tables suggests. Decision makers engage in a “problemistic search” and seek out supplementing sources of information, rather than just relying on one predefined set of information (Cyert and March, 1963).

Carol Weiss’s research on how program evaluation outcomes influence policy provides us with alternative ways of looking at use (see, e.g., Weiss, 1979; Webber, 1991). One alternative way is the symbolic use of performance information, where the information is used for persuasive or legitimation purposes. Another – more difficult to study – use of information is conceptual use, whereby information supports general enlightenment. Rather than being used in a straightforward and direct way, performance information permeates or “creeps” into the organization’s mindset (Weiss, 1980). Such an approach does more justice to the incomplete and ambiguous character of much performance information.

### **A performance information community**

We have seen the development of a performance information community in the public sector and even a performance indicator industry (Hood, 1991: 9). This community consists of officials and other actors who are experienced users of performance information. They know how to interpret performance information, they know the strengths and weaknesses of performance information, they know how to data-mine the information and how to present it in an accessible and/or convincing format. They are the performance information wizards who know the magic words for talking about organizational performance and improvement. Talking about organizational performance using indicators signals competence. Yet, there is a possibility of parts of this performance information community becoming isolated from the organizational reality that is being measured. As a result, performance information becomes a production stream in the organization in its own right.

A measurement culture is not necessarily a performance culture. Yet, it is undeniable that the performance information mindset has changed

the way of working in the public sector. Performance information has permeated the public sector, and organizations have developed routines to deal with this information. There are of course instances where performance information is used in a conspicuous way in decision making. Performance information is then used for its legitimating or communicative value. Even more attention goes to the abuse and misuse of performance information. But we cannot reduce study of the use of performance information to a study of dysfunctions. Performance information has been around for too long to make this credible, and we have seen too many well-intentioned innovations to simply discard performance information.

### Research implications

The study of the use of public performance information, to which this book seeks to contribute, needs to move beyond the study of decision-making processes. Rare are the cases where a single discrete decision can be traced back to a well-defined set of performance indicators. Both the decision-making process and performance information are much too incoherent for this (March, 1987). Performance information is more than the generally agreed-upon colorful graphs and tables in annual reports, and organizational decisions are generally not made by a unitary decision maker at a precise point of time (Majone, 1989: 15).

The aim of this book is to demonstrate how to move beyond the technicalities of performance measurement and performance information. Studying performance information use is in essence a sociological study. It combines a focus on organizational structures for collecting, disseminating, evaluating, and using performance information, with an analysis of the cultural changes related to the increased use of performance information. The use of performance information reflects more than a mere change in the technicalities of public sector decision making. It is indicative of the continuing emergence of a performance information mindset that has influenced officials, politicians, and citizens alike.

### Overview of the book

This book grew out of a series of meetings of the *Study Group on Performance in the Public Sector* (formerly Study Group on Productivity and Quality in the Public Sector – [www.publicsectorperformance.eu](http://www.publicsectorperformance.eu)) of the European Group of Public Administration (EGPA). The Study Group had meetings during the annual EGPA conferences in Ljubljana (2004),

# PROOF

## 6 *Performance Information in the Public Sector*

Bern (2005), Milan (2006), and Madrid (2007) with calls for papers on “performance measurement and public management reform,” “the contingencies of performance measurement systems,” “utilization and non-utilization of public sector performance information,” and “measuring and comparing the performance of public sectors and public institutions.” In addition, a joint ASPA-EGPA Transatlantic Dialogue was held in Leuven in June 2006, attracting over 100 international academics discussing how to improve the performance of the public sector, and how to know that we are improving. All this resulted in series of high-quality papers.

This book is not just a collection of conference papers. During the past couple of years, the Study Group has also created an informal network of academics studying “performance in the public sector.” The chapters in this volume each take a different approach to the phenomenon of performance information use. The book is divided into two main parts. The chapters in Part I look at the use of performance information within public sector organizations and by public managers. The chapters in Part II look at the use of performance information at the intersection of these organizations with politics and society. As such, the book presents a progressive set of chapters introducing readers to a widening set of issues and approaches to the use of performance information in the public sector.

The book starts with a chapter by Wouter Van Dooren, who looks at continuity and change in twentieth-century performance movements. He shows that the concepts used by eight distinct performance movements have been remarkably stable, and that there has been a political dimension to each of these movements. The major evolution, he argues, has been the intensification of use in all corners of the public sector. That is the reason why recent movements seem to have had a more profound impact on public administration than ever before.

Performance information, says Donald Moynihan in Chapter 2, is not comprehensive or objective, but always incomplete and ambiguous. The use and interpretation of performance information therefore emerges from an interactive dialogue between actors in public organizations. Drawing from the literature of organizational learning, he investigates the potential for performance information to foster goal-based learning in the public sector.

Performance steering is often presented as a tightly integrated system, whereby performance information triggers decisions. In Chapter 3, Per Læg Reid, Paul Roness and Kristin Rubecksen use the Norwegian Management-By-Objectives-and-Results performance management

system to show how performance information and performance steering interact in practice. They find a fragmented system where organizational objectives, performance indicators, performance reporting, and performance steering are, in fact, loosely coupled.

The reason why some would argue that performance information does not matter to decisions is that they insist on a very narrow definition of information use. Patria de Lancer Julnes explains in Chapter 4 why, when studying the use of performance information, we should move beyond traditional conceptions of use as an instrumental process and refocus our attention on how information informs a dialogue.

In Chapter 5, Geert Bouckaert and John Halligan take a macro-level approach and compare the implementation of performance management frameworks in the United Kingdom, the United States, Australia, and Canada. Using four ideal types of managing performance, their comparison reveals that practice often falls short of aspirations, and that countries have followed different pathways and implementation styles.

Dysfunctions of performance information systems are often the result of undue attention to performance measurement and reporting, rather than to performance management. Zoe Radnor, Chapter 6, synthesizes the debate about organizational gaming in the public sector and presents us with a gaming typology. Knowledge about the types of gaming behavior may help us to improve performance management systems, and may be a first step towards a more normative discussion.

Kathryn Denhardt and Maria Aristigueta in Chapter 7 discuss the problem of accountability when using performance information in a collaborative public management context. Partnerships and collaboration between agencies and programs blur clear lines of accountability, and therefore change the nature and purpose of performance measurement. With its focus on social indicators and the pressures created by the publication of such indicators, this chapter immediately provides the link to the second part of the book – the use of performance information by politicians and citizens who are outside the administrative system.

Jostein Askim analyses the role of performance information in political decision making. Pessimists in the debate have argued that politicians do not actually use traditional performance information. Just as some of the other authors in this volume, Askim demonstrates in Chapter 8 that we need to broaden our scope of research and also look at other types of information use, and at the different factors influencing politicians' use of information.

In Chapter 9, Carole Johnson and Colin Talbot look at the political use of performance information, with a focus on Parliamentary scrutiny committees involved in scrutinizing government activity in the United Kingdom. They find wide variety across the committees, combined with a strong undercurrent of a lack of change in traditional forms of scrutiny.

Åge Johnsen in Chapter 10 analyses the use of performance information in making public policy, and presents a case of education policy in Norway. Using a life cycle of performance management practices, he stresses that we need to look at the politics and interests behind the use or non-use of information. Political considerations explain why avoiding low performance may be a more powerful incentive than achieving a high level of service.

In Chapter 11, Dennis de Kool uses policy monitors in Dutch urban policy to explain why we need to take political and cultural factors into account when explaining the dynamics of such monitors. Performance information is used for different purposes. Knowledge about and recognition of the interests of all actors may greatly improve the effectiveness and legitimacy of monitoring instruments.

The last two chapters extend the analysis to citizens and society. Alfred Ho, in Chapter 12, highlights the importance of involving citizens in designing and using performance information. Approaching performance measurement systems as technical issues and implementing them top-down ignores the fact that performance is not a neutral concept. Involving citizens improves accountability because it gives them the right and opportunity to define what counts as performance and what doesn't.

Through a focus on rating and ranking systems, Steven Van de Walle and Alasdair Roberts demonstrate in Chapter 13 how performance information may create an illusion of rationality, order and control. The move towards ranking services' performance is based on a number of behavioral assumptions. Rather than viewing this change as a technical innovation, we should see it as indicative of wider changes in society and as an attempt to deal with uncertainty.

In an epilogue, Harry Hatry reflects on the future of performance information in the public sector, and the central role of "use" in the changing performance measurement landscape. Using the material presented in this book, he develops a taxonomy of use and suggests how the findings may be used to further public management research and public management practice.

## Index

*Introductory Note*

References such as “178–9” indicate (not necessarily continuous) discussion of a topic across a range of pages. Because the entire volume is about “performance”, “performance information”, “performance measurement” and “performance management”, the use of these terms as entry points has been minimized. Information will be found under the corresponding detailed topics.

- accountability 7–8, 106–22, 240
  - and citizen involvement 194
  - and collaboration 106–9, 111–12, 115–16, 121–2
  - and cross-sector comparisons 73, 78, 81, 86, 88–9
  - and Dutch urban policy 175, 186
  - and educational policy-making 159, 161, 163
  - and interactive-dialogue approach 25, 36–8, 41
  - and organizational gaming 94–5, 100
  - and parliamentary scrutiny 142, 145, 152, 156
  - and performance measurement beyond instrumental use 58, 62, 65, 68, 71
  - and performance movements 21
  - and publication of performance information 211, 216, 219, 224, 226
- adaptation 55–6, 156, 164
- advocacy 3, 18, 21, 23, 24–41, 76
- affiliation 45, 51–2
- agencies
  - actors 28, 30–1, 40
  - age 51, 53–4, 56–7
  - characteristics 43, 50, 55
  - goals 28, 49, 85, 118
  - size 51, 54, 56–7
- Agency-School Collaboration Partnership (ASCP) 120
- alignment 77, 84–5, 88, 116–17, 119–20, 122, 201, 208
- ambiguity 3, 27, 29, 162
- ambulance services 96, 98, 103
- Ammons, D. 68, 192
- annual reports 5, 47, 78–86, 88, 144, 148, 151, 179, 207–8
- Aristigueta, M.P. 107, 115, 120, 217
- ASCP *see* Agency-School Collaboration Partnership (ASCP)
- aspirations 7, 72, 89, 91, 127
- assumptions
  - Dutch urban policy 176, 180–1, 183–4
  - and interactive-dialogue approach 26, 31–2, 34, 38
  - and performance steering 54
  - and political decision-making 136
  - and publication of performance information 212, 216, 218–21
- atomization of society 221–3
- Australia 7, 14, 17, 72, 75, 77–8, 80, 83–8, 91–2, 141
- autonomy 21, 35, 42, 44, 50, 52–4
- backbenchers 132–3, 138
- Balanced Scorecard 98, 157
- Balk, W. 95, 97
- Baltimore 37, 234
- behavioral assumptions 8, 217–18
- Behn, R.D. 36–7, 59, 62–3, 66, 107, 112, 115, 126, 161, 166, 224
- beliefs 25–6, 35, 55, 58, 197, 219, 224

- benchmarking
  - and citizen involvement 200
  - Dutch urban policy 175
  - and educational policy-making 162, 166, 168
  - and interactive-dialogue approach 35, 39
  - and political decision-making 127–8, 134–5, 137
- Bergesen, H.O. 164–5, 167–8
- Berman, E. 160, 192, 197
- Bevan, G. 42, 216, 223
- big cities 175–6, 189 *see also* local government
- Bouckaert, G. 13–14, 22, 42, 48, 50, 57, 72–3, 76, 79, 91, 95, 97, 107, 125–6, 159, 174–5, 228
- Bovaird, T. 62, 218
- Broad Purpose Grants 177, 187
- Brunsson, N. 27, 30, 58, 139, 167, 173
- budgeting 3, 229, 232, 237, 239–40
  - and accountability 116
  - and citizen involvement 192, 196, 204–5
  - and cross-sector comparisons 72, 77–8, 80–1, 84–5, 88–9, 91
  - and educational policy-making 161, 171
  - and interactive-dialogue approach 25–6
  - and parliamentary scrutiny 145, 154, 156
  - and performance measurement beyond instrumental use 62, 65, 69–70
  - and performance movements 15
  - and political decision-making 127
- Canada 7, 72, 74–80, 84, 86–9, 91–2, 108
- cascading indicators 89
- categorization 53, 101
- categorization error 96
- central agencies 25, 28, 30, 53, 87, 119, 130, 211, 213
- central government 137
  - and cross-sector comparisons 89, 92
  - educational policy-making 164, 171
  - Netherlands 174, 177–9, 184–91
  - and organizational gaming 94, 99
  - and parliamentary scrutiny 141
  - and performance steering 43
- chaos theory 117
- cheating 96, 99–101, 104, 216
- children 108, 120–1, 219, 234
- choice
  - and accountability 106, 109
  - and cross-sector comparisons 92
  - and parliamentary scrutiny 155
  - and publication of performance information 211–12, 218–20
  - revolution 215
- CIPA *see* citizen-initiated performance assessment (CIPA)
- CitiStat program 36, 234
- citizen-initiated performance
  - assessment (CIPA) 199–202, 204–10
- citizen input 199, 204, 207–9
- citizen performance team 201–4
- citizen representatives 199, 201, 204, 206, 208
- citizens 2–3, 5, 7–8
  - and accountability 108, 122
  - and agency: goals 49; promotion 161
  - and control 211–26
  - involvement in performance measurement 20, 60, 65, 67, 192–210, 230–1, 234–6
  - and organizational gaming 98, 102, 104
  - and politicians 130, 132
  - and transparency 13
- Citizen's Charter initiative 108
- city councils 198, 200–4, 207 *see also* local government
- clients 46, 49, 139, 172, 232–3, 239
- coalition governments 130, 165, 173
- collaborations 7, 106–22, 184, 189, 205, 208, 236
- collaborative inertia 107, 111
- collaborative structures 111, 118–19
- collegial approaches 36–7

- committees 8, 144–6, 148, 151–5
- common language 183, 225
- communities 4, 70, 230, 236
  - and citizen involvement 195, 197–9, 202, 210
  - and cross-sector comparisons 89
  - and organizational gaming 94
  - and parliamentary scrutiny 147
  - and performance movements 16, 18
  - and publication of performance information 221
- competition 75, 135, 182, 214
  - and performance steering 51, 55, 57
- complaints 203–4, 206, 210
- complex organizations 13, 127, 222
- complexities 63, 70, 94, 171, 197
- conceptual stability 16–17, 22
- concrete measurable indicators 179, 187
- consensus 24, 26, 30, 169, 202
- conservative parties 133–4, 165
- consumers 98, 102, 212, 214–15, 218, 225–6
- contemporary performance movements 11–12, 21–2
- context
  - and cross-sector comparisons 76, 81, 90
  - and educational policy-making 166
  - and interactive-dialogue approach 26, 28, 30–2, 35
  - and organizational gaming 101
  - of performance measurement 62, 70
  - and performance measurement beyond instrumental use 59–60, 68
  - and political decision-making 135
  - and publication of performance information 223–4
- control 3, 8
  - and accountability 112, 127
  - and cross-sector comparisons 77, 79, 82, 84
  - Dutch urban policy 183
  - and educational policy-making 157
  - illusion of 211–26
  - and organizational gaming 94–5
  - and performance measurement beyond instrumental use 65, 67
  - and performance movements 13
  - and performance steering 44, 52–4, 57
  - and political decision-making 129
  - and publication of performance information 211–15, 217, 219–26
  - tools 56–7, 127
- coordination
  - and accountability 106, 110–11, 113, 115–16
  - and citizen involvement 201
  - Dutch urban policy 176, 178
- core tasks 144, 147, 153–4
- cost accounting 13, 15–16, 21
- cost-efficiency 162, 192–3, 197, 205
- covenant, Netherlands 177–8, 185
- credibility 5, 28, 35, 77, 85, 196, 201
  - and performance movements 14
- critical factor indicators 181–2, 184
- critical factors 174, 179–84
- cross-sector comparisons 72–91
- cultural approach 32, 179, 182–4, 188, 190
- cultural utilization approach 183–4
- culture
  - and cross-sector comparisons 86
  - and interactive-dialogue approach 36, 38–9, 41
  - and organizational gaming 100–1
  - and performance steering 43, 53–4
- Curristine, T. 84–5
- de Haven-Smith, L. 35–7
- decision dilemmas 131–2, 134
- decision makers 2, 4 *see also* policy makers; political decision making
  - citizens as 210, 218, 224
  - exposure to performance information 137
  - informing dialogue 59

- decision makers – *continued*  
   and learning 28, 30–1, 34  
   manipulation by information providers 139  
   and performance movements 22  
   use of information for policy development 83  
   use of performance information for policy development 126–7, 157, 237  
 decision-making capacity 126–7, 139  
 decoupled performance management 167  
 decoupling, ritualistic 164, 167–8, 171  
 defensive reactions 34, 36–7, 39  
 delivery plans 79, 81–2  
 Department of Finance and Administration, Australia 83–4, 88  
 Des Moines 194, 199–201, 203–5, 207–8, 210  
 determinants of performance 125–39  
 dialogue 7  
   and advocacy 24, 26, 29, 31–4, 37  
   and citizen involvement 196  
   and parliamentary scrutiny 153  
   and performance steering 43, 47  
 disclosure 143, 214–15  
 distrust 186, 190, 197, 217–18  
 double-loop learning 32, 34, 36, 39–40  
 Dutch Urban Policy Monitor 174, 177, 184–8, 190  
 dysfunctional effects 7, 95, 97, 100, 159, 162–3, 215–16  
  
 EBP *see* Evidence-Based Policy (EBP)  
 educational policy making 157–73  
 elected officials 232  
   accountability 108, 121–2  
   and citizen involvement 196, 198–201, 204, 208  
   and interactive-dialogue approach 25, 28, 30, 33, 38, 40–1  
   and performance measurement beyond instrumental use 60, 65  
   elected politicians 125–6, 128, 195, 198  
   empowerment 89, 219–20  
   enlightenment 4, 63, 67, 69–70, 223  
   environmental pressure 54–5  
   Epstein, A.M. 210, 217, 219–20  
   equality 36, 169  
   equity 158–9, 161, 170, 193, 221  
   Evidence-Based Policy (EBP) 15–17, 22  
   evidence sessions 149–51  
   evolutions, in performance movements 6, 20, 23, 73, 215, 222–3  
   executive branch of government 17, 140, 192, 229–30, 232  
   external audiences 28, 65–6  
   external factors 20, 188, 190  
  
 FABRIC 77  
 failures 22, 227, 234  
   and accountability 109, 111, 120, 122  
   and citizen involvement 193, 195  
   and educational policy-making 160  
   and interactive-dialogue approach 27, 33–4, 36, 39  
   and organizational gaming 99  
   and performance measurement beyond instrumental use 59, 70  
   and political decision-making 129, 133, 135  
   and publication of performance information 212, 217  
 falsification 100, 104  
 federal level 25, 65, 75, 108, 111–13  
 Feldman, M.S. 1, 17, 139, 171, 181, 183  
 financial scrutiny 144–5, 154  
 Finland 168  
 formal performance information 172, 218, 220  
 formal roles 131–2, 145  
 formal rules 32–3  
 format 4, 228–9  
 formulation of goals and objectives 43, 45–6, 49, 51–2, 57

- frameworks  
 and accountability 116  
 cross-sector comparisons 72–5,  
 78, 81–2, 86, 88–9  
 Dutch urban policy 184  
 and organizational gaming 97  
 performance measurement beyond  
 instrumental use 59, 62–3, 70
- Frederickson, H.G. 50, 108–9
- frontbenchers 132–3
- gaming 94–105, 161, 215–16  
 behavior 7, 95, 98, 100, 104, 216  
 unacceptable 100–1
- GAO *see* General Accounting Office  
 (GAO)
- General Accounting Office  
 (GAO) 83, 88–90, 109, 111–13,  
 115, 118, 128, 155
- generalist demand 20–2
- Gilmour, J.B. 90
- goal attainment 46, 129–30
- goal-based learning 6, 24–5, 30, 33,  
 37, 41
- goal displacement 113, 210
- goals *see also* objectives  
 and accountability 116, 118, 120  
 and cross-sector comparisons 79,  
 83, 85  
 Dutch urban policy 178, 180, 183,  
 185, 187–8, 190  
 and interactive-dialogue  
 approach 27–8, 31–2, 34–5,  
 39–40  
 organizational 34–5, 39  
 and performance measurement  
 beyond instrumental use 66  
 and performance steering 42–6,  
 49–52  
 policy 176, 178, 181, 185–7, 190  
 and political decision-  
 making 125, 129–30  
 and publication of performance  
 information 212
- governance 31, 206, 216, 225
- government by performance 156
- Government Performance and Results  
 Act (GPRA) 14, 75, 79, 82–3,  
 87–8, 108, 112–14, 116
- GPRA *see* Government Performance  
 and Results Act (GPRA)
- Greve, H. 128, 130, 136–7
- Hacker, J.S. 219
- Halachmi, A. 127, 139, 160, 166
- Halligan, J. 85, 88
- Hardin, B. 110
- Hatry, H.P. 24, 116, 192
- health sector 151, 213–14, 216–17, 219
- hearings 114, 146–7
- Hernes, T. 163, 172
- hierarchical performance  
 measurement systems 73
- high-conflict environments 135
- high modernity 220, 223–4
- history of performance  
 measurement 11, 22
- Home Affairs Committees 151–2
- homogeneous culture 54
- Hood, C. 1, 4, 14–15, 21, 27, 42,  
 94–6, 100–2, 104, 138, 158–9,  
 175, 211, 216, 223
- hospitals 21, 103, 120, 212–13, 217,  
 219, 221–5
- House of Commons 150 *see also*  
 parliamentary scrutiny
- Huxham, C. 107, 110–11, 119
- ICT-based systems 42, 47
- ideal types 7, 72–6, 90, 92–3, 164
- ideologies 15, 29, 54, 61, 131,  
 133–4, 173
- illegal dumping 202–3, 207
- illusion of control 211–26
- implementation 7, 240  
 and accountability 104, 113  
 and cross-sector  
 comparisons 79–80, 82, 88, 93  
 and educational policy-  
 making 158–60, 162–4, 166–8  
 and interactive-dialogue  
 approach 26, 31  
 and performance measurement  
 beyond instrumental  
 use 59–60, 63  
 and performance steering 56–7  
 and publication of performance  
 information 213

- incentives 8
  - and accountability 122
  - and citizen involvement 209
  - and educational policy-making 161, 169, 172
  - and interactive-dialogue approach 38
  - and organizational gaming 95, 98
  - and performance steering 42, 44
  - and political decision-making 133–4
- incorporation of performance
  - information 74, 77–8, 80, 92
- independent variables 50, 52–5
- indicators 7, 228, 231, 236–7 *see also*
  - performance indicators
  - and accountability 119–22
  - and cross-sector
    - comparisons 76–7, 83–4, 89
  - Dutch urban policy 175, 180–7
  - and educational policy-making 161–2
  - and interactive-dialogue approach 24
  - and organizational gaming 95, 97
  - and performance measurement beyond instrumental use 64–5
  - and performance movements 11, 13
  - and performance steering 47–8, 50, 52–4
  - and political decision-making 139
  - and publication of performance information 220–2
  - of structural capacity 54, 56
- individualization 220–2
- information asymmetry 28, 126, 138
- informed choices 166, 217–18, 220
- innovation 33–4, 95, 141, 144, 162, 225
- inputs
  - and accountability 109
  - and citizen involvement 195, 205, 207–8
  - and cross-sector
    - comparisons 73–4, 76, 84
  - Dutch urban policy 178
  - and educational policy-making 159, 166
  - and organizational gaming 95
  - and parliamentary scrutiny 141, 156
  - and performance measurement beyond instrumental use 58, 65
  - and performance movements 14, 16
- institutionalization
  - and accountability 113
  - and cross-sector comparisons 80, 87
  - Dutch urban policy 183
  - and interactive-dialogue approach 32
  - and parliamentary scrutiny 143, 154
  - and performance movements 13, 20–1, 23
  - and performance steering 42
  - and publication of performance information 216
- instrumental use 58–71
- integrated monitors 179
- inter-organizational
  - benchmarking 127–8
- inter-organizational
  - collaborations 107, 109–10, 115
- interactive dialogue 6, 24–41
- intergovernmental dialogue 190
- intermediate outcomes 84, 231
- Internal Revenue Service (IRS) 113–15
- interpretation 6, 19, 24, 28–30, 100, 104, 129
- IRS *see* Internal Revenue Service (IRS)
- James, G.M. 89, 129, 143, 156
- Jenne, K.C. 35–7
- Johansson, T. 125, 136–7
- Kaplan, R.S. 34–5
- Karsten, S. 216
- Keast, R.L. 110, 116
- Landuyt, N. 35, 39
- leadership 38–9, 60–1, 119, 167, 199

- league tables 4, 95, 99–101, 105
- learning 24–41
  - and cross-sector comparisons 86
  - Dutch urban policy 178, 191
  - and educational policy-making 161, 167
  - and interactive-dialogue approach 24–5, 30–3, 35–41
  - and organizational gaming 95, 105
  - and performance measurement beyond instrumental use 62, 69
  - and performance movements 21
  - and political decision-making 133–4
  - strategic 188, 190
- learning forums 25, 33–9, 41, 168
- learning organizations 68
- left-wing parties 133–4, 165, 169
- legislative branch 229–30, 232
  - and citizen involvement 192
  - and educational policy-making 161
  - and interactive-dialogue approach 29, 40
  - and parliamentary scrutiny 140–1, 143, 156
  - and performance measurement beyond instrumental use 61
  - and performance movements 17
- Letters of Allocation 44, 46
- Liaison Committee 144
- liberal parties 133–4
- life cycle of performance management practices 8, 158–60, 163, 173
- Lipshitz, R. 32
- livability 176–7, 185
- local government 229, 236
  - and accountability 110
  - and citizen involvement 192–3, 208
  - and cross-sector comparisons 84–5
  - Dutch urban policy 174
  - and educational policy-making 161, 171
  - and parliamentary scrutiny 147
  - and political decision-making 125, 127–8, 130, 132, 135, 137, 139
- long-term development programs 177–9
- loyalties 130
- Management Accountability Framework 75, 79
- Management Advisory Committee 87
- Management by Objectives and Results (MBOR) 43–50, 52, 54–5, 57
- Management Resources and Results Structure (MRRS) 75, 78
- Managements of Performances 73–5, 88
- Mandell, M. 110, 116
- manipulation 95, 102, 139, 181, 213
- market competition 51, 54–5, 57
- Marshall, M.N. 215, 217–19
- MBOR *see* Management by Objectives and Results (MBOR)
- McGuire, M. 97–8, 103, 116
- measurement culture 4, 96, 100, 147
- measurement systems 61–2, 89, 96–7, 114
- Melkers, J.E. 2, 65, 69, 125, 132, 192
- methodology 92–3
- minimal scrutiny 149–51
- Mintzberg, H. 4, 23, 33–4
- models
  - and citizen involvement 201–2
  - and cross-sector comparisons 72, 75–6, 88
  - and educational policy-making 159
  - and interactive-dialogue approach 24
  - and organizational gaming 103
  - and performance steering 43, 56
  - and publication of performance information 213, 219
- modernization 144, 221, 223
- monitors *see* policy monitors
- motivations 25, 27, 35, 94–5, 198, 221

- movements *see* performance movements  
 MPs 145, 152–5  
 MRRS *see* Management Resources and Results Structure (MRRS)  
 multiple agencies/organizations 106, 119–20, 122  
 municipal benchmarking 135, 168  
 municipalities *see* local government
- National Audit Office 70, 77, 84, 99–100, 143, 145–6, 148  
 national government *see* central government  
 National Performance Review (NPR) 87  
 neighborhood leaders 202–3, 206  
 neighborhoods 67, 202–4, 206–7, 228, 230–1  
 Nelson, C.W. 120  
 Netherlands 72, 74, 91–2, 161, 168, 174–91  
 networking 110, 116, 118  
 networks 19, 110, 116, 118, 131, 160, 168  
 New Labour 15, 17, 142, 144  
 New Public Management (NPM) 1, 15–18, 21–3, 174–5  
   disillusionment 1  
   and managerial discretion 42  
   and political parties 134  
 New York Bureau of Municipal Research (NYBMR) 13, 16, 18, 20, 23  
 New York City 234  
 Newcomer, K. 60–1, 64–6, 68  
 NHS trusts 99  
 noise 129  
 nomenclatures 221  
 non-instrumental purposes 66  
 nongovernmental  
   organizations 119, 121, 236  
 nonprofit agencies/  
   organizations 67–8, 110, 234, 236  
 norms 27, 32–3, 38, 111, 183  
 Norton, W.W. 34–5, 143  
 Norway 6, 8  
   and educational policy-making 157–73  
   and interactive-dialogue approach 35  
   and performance steering 43–5, 50, 53, 56–7  
   and political decision-making 125–8, 130–5, 137  
 NPM *see* New Public Management (NPM)  
 NPR *see* National Performance Review (NPR)  
 NYBMR *see* New York Bureau of Municipal Research (NYBMR)
- objectives *see also* goals  
   and accountability 113  
   and cross-sector comparisons 78–9, 82  
   and educational policy-making 157, 159–61, 166  
   and organizational gaming 99  
   and performance measurement beyond instrumental use 65  
   and performance movements 12–14  
   and performance steering 42–6, 50, 52, 56–7  
   and political decision-making 142  
 OECD *see* Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)  
 opposition parties 129, 132–3, 168, 173  
 optimism 113, 125–8, 137–9  
 organic adaptation 164, 168  
 Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) 18, 108, 140–1, 154, 164  
 organizational behavior 38, 113  
 organizational boundaries 109–10, 118  
 organizational culture 2, 25, 38, 51, 54  
 organizational gaming 7, 94–105  
 organizational goals 34–5, 39  
 organizational learning 6, 25, 31–3, 36, 39, 48, 127, 168

- organizational objectives 7, 97, 109
- organizational performance 4, 36, 85, 96, 100, 126
- organizational routines 2, 33
- outcome
  - data 19, 232, 234–5
  - indicators 141, 179, 228, 230, 234, 236; and performance movements 13
  - information 80, 85, 229, 232–4, 236–9
- outcome-based budgeting 141
- outcome-based governance 141
- outcome-based government 154
- output indicators 13, 185
- outputs 228, 231–2, 234, 239
  - and citizen involvement 192, 197, 206–7
  - and cross-sector comparisons 74, 76–82, 84, 86, 88, 90
  - Dutch urban policy 175, 177–9
  - and educational policy-making 159, 162, 166
  - and interactive-dialogue approach 40
  - and organizational gaming 95, 100, 102
  - and parliamentary scrutiny 154, 156
  - and performance measurement beyond instrumental use 58
  - and performance movements 13–14, 16, 20
  - and performance steering 50
  - and political decision-making 125
  - and publication of performance information 212–13, 222
- ownership 97–8
- paralysis 160, 164, 167–8
- Parliament 17, 78–80, 82, 165, 167
- Parliamentary scrutiny 140–56
- PART scores 86, 90
- partnerships 7, 106–7, 110, 116, 194, 201, 208, 235–6
- patients 98–100, 102–3, 217, 219
- Performance Administration 73–84
- performance agreements 106, 118–19, 122
- performance budgeting 13–15, 17, 29, 44, 79–80, 82–3
- performance culture 4, 96, 100
- Performance Governance 73
- performance indicators 5, 7, 227–9, 233 *see also* indicators
  - and cross-sector comparisons 84, 88
  - and educational policy-making 157
  - and organizational gaming 94, 97, 102–3, 105
  - and parliamentary scrutiny 142, 151
  - and performance measurement beyond instrumental use 63
  - and performance steering 42–52, 56–7
- performance information *see* *Introductory Note and detailed entries*
- performance management *see* *Introductory Note and detailed entries*
- performance measurement *see* *Introductory Note and detailed entries*
- performance movements 6, 11–23, 140, 193, 222, 227, 234, 238
- performance steering 42–57
- performance teams 201, 203–4
- personal background 126, 131–2, 134
- perverting behavior 159, 162–3
- Peters, B.G. 42
- PISA *see* Program for International Student Assessment (PISA)
- Pitches, D. 99, 102–3
- Poister, T.H. 65, 113, 136, 174–5, 192
- policy goals 176, 178, 181, 185–7, 190
- policy indicators 23, 184
- policy innovation 40, 157, 163, 169, 173

- policy makers 3–4 *see also* decision makers  
     and accountability 111  
     Dutch urban policy 176, 182, 192  
     and educational policy-making 158, 161, 170, 173  
     and parliamentary scrutiny 156  
     and publication of performance information 219, 221–2
- policy monitors 8, 127  
     uses 174–91
- policy process 3, 145, 174–5, 180, 182
- policy sectors 2, 15, 21–2, 126, 131, 136–7, 176
- political behavior theory 129, 138
- political decision making 125–39
- political ideology 61, 126, 131, 133–4
- political parties *see* conservative parties; left-wing parties; liberal parties
- political utilization 181–2, 184, 186
- politicians 2–3, 5, 7, 20  
     characteristics and use of information 126–39  
     Dutch urban policy 175–6, 185, 187, 190  
     educational policy-making 161, 170–3  
     information and control 222  
     and parliamentary scrutiny 140–1
- polity 127, 132, 134–6, 139, 162, 168  
     performance 135  
     size 136
- Pollitt, C. 2, 4, 13, 22, 42, 50, 53, 55–6, 95–6, 125–6, 128, 136, 140–1, 157, 175, 223–4
- portfolio budget statements 78, 80–1
- primary schools 157, 165, 167, 169
- priorities  
     and accountability 120–1  
     and citizen involvement 198  
     and cross-sector comparisons 79–80, 82, 84, 89  
     and interactive-dialogue approach 26  
     and parliamentary scrutiny 156  
     and performance measurement beyond instrumental use 60
- problem solving 37–8
- productivity 5, 46, 58, 76, 107
- professional managers 198–9, 201, 204, 209
- professionalization 20–1, 42
- program activities 75, 78–9, 82
- program budgets 63, 229
- program evaluation 4, 60, 64, 66
- Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) 158, 165, 169–70, 173
- program management 89–90, 192
- PSAs *see* Public Service Agreements (PSAs)
- Public Accounts Committee 145–6, 155
- Public Administration Select Committee 96, 99, 147
- public discourse 166, 168, 170, 173
- public engagement 194, 197–8, 210
- public meetings 197–8
- Public Service Agreements (PSAs) 79, 81–2, 89, 140–56
- public trust *see* trust
- publication of performance information 211–26 *see also* reporting of public performance information
- pupils 159, 164–7, 169, 172
- purposes of performance measurement 3, 7, 62–6
- quality management 14–15
- quality models 14
- quality movement 14, 21
- Radin, B.A. 11, 42, 58, 90, 125, 222
- Radnor, Z.J. 95, 97–8, 103, 161, 216
- rankings 8  
     and educational policy-making 158, 162, 165–6  
     and organizational gaming 95, 98, 100  
     and publication of performance information 211–17, 219–26
- ratings 212, 214–17, 220, 224–5, 237
- rational decisions approach 3

- Dutch urban policy 174, 179–80, 190
- and educational policy-making 158
- and performance measurement beyond instrumental use 58–9
- and publication of performance information 218–20
- rational utilization 180–1, 184–5
- reassurance 67–8
- recognizability 183
- reforms
  - and accountability 115
  - and citizen involvement 192, 196, 210
  - and cross-sector comparisons 87, 90
  - and educational policy-making 164, 169–70
  - and interactive-dialogue approach 33, 39–40
  - and parliamentary scrutiny 144
  - and performance movements 23
  - and performance steering 44
  - and political decision-making 126–7
- reporting cycles 78–9, 81–2
- reporting of public performance
  - information 192–210 *see also* publication of performance information
- resource allocation 235
  - and accountability 108
  - and cross-sector comparisons 81, 83–5, 88, 90
  - Dutch urban policy 177–8
  - and interactive-dialogue approach 26
  - and performance measurement beyond instrumental use 58, 63–4, 66, 69
  - and performance steering 42–4, 48
  - and political decision-making 130
- respondents 65, 100, 153, 175, 184–5, 189, 237
- rewards 48–50, 52, 54, 57, 116, 173
- right-wing parties 133–4, 167
- ritualistic decoupling 164, 167–8, 171
- Rotterdam 175–6
- safety 176–7, 179, 184–5
- sanctions 42, 48–50, 54, 57, 213–14
- Schneider, E.C. 217, 219–20
- school performance 165–6, 170
- science of administration 12, 15, 18, 20–1
- scientific management 12–13, 15–16, 18, 20, 58
- Scott, J.C. 221
- scrutiny 8, 169
  - financial 144–5, 154
  - minimal 149–51
  - parliamentary 140–56
  - substantial 149–50
- Scrutiny Unit 145, 148, 154–5
- select committees 144, 148, 152–3, 155
- self-aligning organization 116
- Senge, P. 32, 34, 69
- separation of powers 140, 143
- single-loop learning 31–2, 34, 39
- skepticism 87, 125, 128–30, 138–9
- small agencies 54, 56–7
- Smith, P. 2, 15, 22, 95–7, 162, 196
- social indicator movement 14, 17–18, 22
- social indicators 7, 13–16, 22, 106, 119–22 *see also* indicators
- social problems 12, 121–2
- social survey movement 12, 20
- socialist parties *see* left-wing parties
- Solesbury, W. 15
- specialization 12, 20, 171
- Spending Reviews 146–7, 154
- stakeholders 233
  - and citizen involvement 196
  - and cross-sector comparisons 86, 88
  - Dutch urban policy 175–6, 181, 186
  - and educational policy-making 157, 159–62, 166–9
  - and interactive-dialogue approach 25, 28–9
  - and organizational gaming 94, 98, 102
  - and performance measurement beyond instrumental use 63, 69

- standardization  
 and cross-sector comparisons 78  
 and educational policy-making 164, 168  
 and interactive-dialogue approach 26  
 and performance movements 13  
 and performance steering 56  
 and publication of performance information 213, 220–1, 225
- standards  
 and citizen involvement 193  
 and cross-sector comparisons 77, 84  
 and interactive-dialogue approach 34  
 and parliamentary scrutiny 148, 151  
 and performance movements 13  
 and publication of performance information 221
- Stat model 36–7
- Sterck, M. 17, 79, 141, 154
- strategic learning 188, 190
- strategic outcomes 75, 78–9, 82, 84
- Streib, G. 65, 136, 192
- structural approaches 32, 36–8
- structural features 51–3, 55–6, 166
- substantial scrutiny 149–50
- surveys 44–5, 50, 84–5, 134, 152, 155, 202
- Sweden 70, 72, 74, 91–2
- symbolic tokens 223–5
- teachers 137, 163–9, 172, 222
- telephone contact 113–14
- ter Bogt, H.J. 4, 134, 136–7
- Tilburg Model of performance management 18, 196
- top-down performance management 36–7, 75
- transparency  
 and citizen involvement 208  
 and cross-sector comparisons 86, 88  
 Dutch urban policy 175  
 and educational policy-making 158–9, 161, 169, 173  
 and performance measurement beyond instrumental use 65  
 and publication of performance information 211, 215–16
- Treasury Committee 143, 146–7
- trust 2  
 and accountability 115, 119  
 and citizen involvement 193–4  
 and control 217–18, 222–3  
 and cross-sector comparisons 90  
 declining 222–3  
 and educational policy-making 171  
 employees 233  
 Netherlands 182, 186, 191  
 and political decision-making 133
- typologies 65, 96, 101–5, 136–7
- unacceptable gaming 100–1
- unintended consequences 97, 101, 104, 115 *see also* dysfunctional effects
- unions 161–2, 164–9, 172
- United Kingdom 7–8  
 and accountability 108, 111  
 and cross-sector comparisons 75–7, 79–82, 84–6, 89, 91  
 and organizational gaming 96  
 parliamentary scrutiny of PSAs 140–56  
 and performance movements 14–15, 18  
 and publication of performance information 218, 223
- United States 7, 143, 234, 236, 238  
 and accountability 108, 113, 120–1  
 and citizen involvement 192–6, 199–200, 210  
 and cross-sector comparisons 75–7, 79–84, 86–7, 91  
 and educational policy-making 160  
 and performance measurement beyond instrumental use 58, 61  
 and performance movements 11

- users 4, 228–30, 236
  - and citizen involvement 210
  - and cross-sector comparisons 89
  - Dutch urban policy 180
  - and educational policy-making 166, 172
  - and performance measurement
    - beyond instrumental use 68
  - and performance movements 19–20
  - and performance steering 46, 49
  - and publication of performance information 219–20
- variance 53–4, 56, 86, 163
- vested interests 134–5
- visibility of indicators 121–2
- waiting lists 99–100
- Weiss, C.H. 4, 58–9, 61–3, 66, 68–70, 180, 182–3
- Wheatley, M.J. 117
- Williams, D.W. 11, 13, 15–16, 21
- Willoughby, K.G. 2, 65, 69, 125, 127, 132, 192

PROOF