R. A. W. Rhodes
University of Tasmania

One-way, Two-way, or Dead-end Street: British Influence on the Study of Public Administration in America Since 1945

A New Look at British Public Administration

What intellectual influence, if any, have British public administration scholars had on their American counterparts since World War II? In this article, the author briefly reviews the major areas of theory and research in the British study of publication administration, further identifying important contributions by British scholars in the areas of modernist-empiricism, the new public management, regulation, policy networks and governance, and interpretive theory. Although there is a discernible American influence on British public administration, there is little British impact on U.S. public administration; nowadays it is a one-way street. Increasingly, British scholars are involved in a growing community of European public administration scholars with whom they share active, two-way connections. Recent European developments suggest that American and European public administration academics are growing further apart. Due to the immense strength of modernist-empiricism throughout American universities, plus the interpretive turn to a European epistemology of "blurred genres," these twin, traditionally self-referential, communities seem to be parting company with an attendant danger that future intellectual engagement may be a dead end.

Mapping the Terrain: Who?

To ask what influence British public administration has exerted over the intellectual development American public administration in the postwar period flies in the face of common sense. American public administration has more scholars, more graduate programs, and research funding beyond the wildest dreams of British academics. British scholars invariably will cite organization theory and policy analysis as two major influences on British public administration. Most American scholars probably could not think of a single equivalent British influence on American public administration, although they might cite the odd individual author. So, this paper tackles a nonsubject, because British public administration has had little or no influence on the intellectual development of American public administration.

American scholars may not pay attention to British theory and research, but that does not mean there has been no work of significance. This section identifies the major contributors, and the next section describes the main intellectual contributions of the postwar period. There are two subsidiary objectives. First, the body of the text focuses on key contributors and contributions. The notes provide a more comprehensive guide to the British literature for American readers. Second, the article locates the British contribution within a broader European context and suggests that the study of public administration on the two continents is best characterized as two self-referential communities, not as intellectual engagement.

There is some evidence that helps identify individual British scholars who could be categorized as "boundary spanners," that is, those individuals who manage the links between organizations, or in this case professional communities, by activating and managing networks (Williams 2002). Goodin (2009, 36, 38) analyzed the indexes of the 10 volumes of the *Oxford Handbook of Political Science* to identify subdisciplinary leaders, defined as the 1 percent of people whose names appear most often. There is no listing for public administration, but there are separate listings for political institutions and public policy. For political institutions, there are two British academics on the list of 22 with a known affiliation

> [T]his paper tackles a nonsubject because British public administration has had little or no influence on the intellectual development of American public administration. American scholars may not pay attention to British theory and research, but that does not mean there has been no work of significance.

R. A. W. Rhodes is a professor of government in the School of Government at the University of Tasmania. His recent books include *Everyday Life at the Top* (Oxford University Press, 2011), *Public Administration: 25 Years of Analysis And Debate* (Wiley-Blackwell, 2011), *The State as Cultural Practice* (Oxford University Press, 2010), and *Comparing Westminster* (Oxford University Press, 2009). He is the treasurer of the Australian Political Studies Association, life vice president of the Political Studies Association of the United Kingdom, and a fellow of the Academy of the Social Sciences in Australia. He has also been a fellow of the Royal Society of Arts and an academician of the Academy of Social Sciences in the United Kingdom. He was managing editor of *Public Administration* from 1986 to 2011 and is now consulting editor for the new editorial team.
E-mail: rod.rhodes@utas.edu.au

to public administration: R. A. W. Rhodes and Gerry Stoker. For public policy, there are three British academics on the list of 29: Christopher Hood, Christopher Pollitt, and R. A. W. Rhodes. Quite obviously, British contributors form a small minority, but these few individuals are potential boundary spanners.

Other assessments rely on judgments of reputation rather than counting citations in indexes. Nonetheless, there is a reassuring consistency. Hood itemizes several "major theoretical 'discoveries'" (1999, 297–300): Patrick Dunleavy (1991) on bureau shaping; Greenwood et al. (1980) on contingency theory; R. A. W. Rhodes (1988) on policy networks; Andrew Dunsire (1978, 1996) on the cybernetics of bureaucracy; Richard Rose on public expenditure (Rose and Davies 1994); and a miscellany of contributions under the heading of "typological work" (e.g., Hood 1983; Hood and Margetts 2007 on policy instruments). Not all of these judgments are made by academic peers. The Political Studies Association of the United Kingdom's guide to political studies was written by, and for, students. It identifies six "leading lights" in public administration—Patrick Dunleavy, Christopher Ham, Grant Jordan, R. A. W. Rhodes, John Stewart, and Gerry Stoker—and notes the "intolerable" lack of women because of the "traditional patriarchal nature of academic life" and the subject's lack of "sex appeal" (Balsom, Doyle, and MacGregor-Riley 1995, 92–93).

Finally, there is the Thomson ISI (Institute for Scientific Information) citation data. Taking the field's top British journal, *Public Administration,* few articles published before 1990 are ever cited, and none before 1986 made the top 100 articles published. For the top 40 citations since 1986, there is a familiar pattern: only five British authors had two or more articles, and they accounted for 43 percent of all citations—Patrick Dunleavy, Christopher Hood, Vivien Lowndes, R. A. W. Rhodes, John Stewart, and Kieron Walsh. There is only one American academic cited in the top 40 citations for *Public Administration.* Taking *Public Administration Review* as the equivalent leading American journal, not one article by a British author is listed in its top 40 citations nor is a single British scholar among the top 30 cited authors.[1]

The brutally simple point is that public administration is all too often parochial. American public administration may be the world leader in the field, but it does not escape this fate. As Sharman and Weller (2009) show, the overwhelming proportion of content in American political science and public administration journals is by Americans for Americans on America. The point about American parochialism often is conceded (Heady 2001; Stillman 1997). National journals in Europe are less focused; for example, in the 2000s, some 45 percent of the articles in *Public Administration* were written by authors from outside Britain, mainly from Continental Europe. In sum, the most striking feature of the citation data is that it shows America and Europe as two relatively self-contained communities. So, the 12 British boundary spanners do not span the Atlantic, although they cross the English Channel. America remains

There is only one American academic cited in the top 40 citations for *Public Administration*. Taking *Public Administration Review* [(PAR)] as the equivalent leading American journal, not one article by a British author is listed in its top 40 citations nor is a single British scholar among the top 30 cited authors. The brutally simple point is that public administration is all too often parochial.

a dead-end street for British and European public administration, while there is growing community of European scholars. So much for the broad picture. What have these individuals contributed? Turning to specific contributions, a more nuanced picture emerges.

Mapping the Terrain: What?

There is some evidence about the topics on which British scholars have made a contribution. Dargie and Rhodes (1996) and Rhodes et al. (1995) analyzed *Public Administration*'s contents for the period 1945–95. These analyses show that the journal's subject matter remained diverse, but there were five significant trends. First, between 1945 and 1969, the journal became a professional social science journal reporting empirical research. In the early years, articles had little theoretical content. They were not formally "academic" in the sense that they had no abstract, introduction, argument, subheadings, or conclusion. Authors did not engage with the academic literature. Second, between 1970 and 1989, there was significant growth in articles focused on public policy making. Third, the proportion of articles on public management increased from an average of 8 percent over the period 1970–89 to 32 percent in 1990–94. Fourth, empirical analysis in all of its forms became the dominant research method, and of the several empirical methods employed, the case study was the most important. Finally, in this period, there was an increase in the theoretical content of articles. Although the number of theoretical articles remained constant at some 4 percent to 6 percent, as Dunsire observes, "most contributors to a journal such as this [*Public Administration*], including practitioners, are aware of theoretical writings on their topics" (1995, 33). Case studies now were topped and tailed with theory. By the mid-1990s, the overall picture is that of a subject developing a stronger theoretical and empirical character.

Rhodes (2011b) updates this analysis for the period 1990–2009. From 1990 to 2004, public management was the largest single category, although it tailed off in the late 2000s. Traditional public administration pottered along. Although some classical topics, such as administrative law, almost disappeared, others aged well. Local government and the national health services continued to attract much scholarly attention. Some topics, such as accountability, staged a mini-comeback. The contents remained diverse. The journal published articles on policy areas new to its pages (e.g., sport, the police). However, there were three standout changes: theory, comparative public administration, and policy networks and governance. Theoretical articles became much more common, rising steadily to 10 percent. The increase in comparative material rose from some 23 percent to 45 percent, mainly on European public administration. There was a rapid increase in the articles on networks, interorganizational analysis, and governance, from nothing in the early 1990s to some 10 percent throughout the 2000s.

The Distinctive Contributions

Using the content analysis as a guide, this section summarizes the distinct and distinctive intellectual contributions of British public

administration under the headings of modernist empiricism, New Public Management, regulation, policy networks and governance, and interpretive theory.

Modernist Empiricism

The story starts immediately after World War II, when traditional public administration was dominant. The old order is best represented by its grand old men: William Robson (1895–1980), Norman Chester (1907–86), and W. J. M. (Bill) Mackenzie (1909–96). Their work was essentially institutional and concerned with analyzing the history, structure, functions, powers, and relationships of government organizations (see Mackenzie 1975; Rhodes 1991; Robson 1975). Robson represented that blend of institutional description and Westminster reformism so typical of the British school. "His great ability was to assemble a huge mass of data, to analyse order out of the complexity, and to argue a coherent case for change." He was "one of the Olympian Fabians, worthy company to the Webbs" (Jones 1986, 12). Chester's best books were the official history of the nationalized industries (1975) and a history of the English administrative system between 1780 and 1870 (1981). Mackenzie (1975) was admired for his lucid, nuanced essays on both British government and the study of public administration. It changed in the 1970s with the expansion of the British university system, the rapid growth of the social sciences, and the impact of American theory and methods.

British scholars remain skeptical about the American science of politics and its methods. For example, Bogdanor (1999, 149) is keen to distinguish British political science from its American counterpart and argues that the main characteristics of British political science are its aversion to the "overarching theory" and "positivism" of American political science (see also Gamble 1990, 408). The distinction is too sharp. If British political scientists were uncomfortable with the hypothesis testing and deductive methods of behavioralism, they were at ease with modernist empiricism. Modernist empiricism treats institutions such as legislatures, constitutions, and policy networks as discrete, atomized objects to be compared, measured, and classified. It adopts comparisons across time and space as a means of uncovering regularities and probabilistic explanations to be tested against neutral evidence (see Bevir 2001, 2006). British public administration scholars were all too willing to treat institutions such as legislatures, constitutions, and policy networks as discrete objects to be compared, measured, and classified. Many remain comfortable with Bryce's exhortation that "it is Facts that are needed: Facts, Facts, Facts" (1929, 1:13). What is more, their modernist empiricism overlapped with behavioralism at various junctures. Both adopted comparisons across time and space as a means of uncovering regularities and probabilistic explanations to be tested against neutral evidence. These overlaps provided a channel through which many British political scientists had their "homoeopathic doses of American political science" (Hayward 1991, 104). So, British public administration, while still favoring case studies, nonetheless expanded its toolkit to encompass quantitative methods, and there was a new methodological rigor in the subject (Gamble 1990, 413).

Theoretically, the 1970s saw the arrival of organization theory and policy studies in British public administration (Hood 1990; Rhodes 1991). Influence was a one-way street; British public administration adapted American theory and methods to local issues and institutions. The most prominent manifestations were the application of contingency theory to British central and local government (Greenwood et al. 1980; Hood and Dunsire 1981, Ranson, Hinings, and Greenwood 1980) and case studies of policy implementation (Barrett and Fudge 1981). Both exemplify modernist empiricism, and both proved to be dead-end streets as they fractured into myriad contending approaches.[2]

The brevity of these remarks should not be seen as a reflection of their importance. They were important. They are now an embedded part of how we understand public administration today. The prime example is George Boyne and the Public Management Research Group at Cardiff Business School. They have conducted a series of linked projects on the determinants of organizational performance in the public sector (for an overview, see Ashworth, Boyne, and Entwistle 2010). These projects are large surveys of public officials in English and Welsh local government, and they focus on conceptualizing and measuring performance and testing theories of the relative success (or failure) of different organizations. They adapt ideas from the generic management literature and apply them to public organizations—for example, theories of planning (Boyne and Chen 2007; Boyne et al. 2005), organizational strategy (Boyne and Walker 2004; Andrews, Boyne, and Walker 2006), and leadership (Andrews and Boyne 2010). Their work has been published in the best American journals and in collaboration with American colleagues (Boyne et al. 2005; Meier et al. 2007). However, although their modernist empiricism is a good example of joint work with American colleagues, it is also an example of the American influence on British public administration, not the other way around.[3]

Modernist empiricism is a continuing strand in British public administration. Other "revolutions" of the 1970s did not survive. Rational choice and deductive modeling may be a prominent part of American political science, but they exerted little influence over the study of British public administration. There are rare exceptions, of which the most important is Patrick's Dunleavy's (1991) analysis of bureau shaping.[4] Similarly, at one point, it looked as if the European influence of neo-Marxist state theory would be a contender.[5] Instead, it became an example of the "passive pluralism" so common in British political science, which allows new subfields, such as feminism and race, "to establish themselves *alongside* the existing fields co-existing in a patterned isolation within the same institutional framework without either genuinely engaging with each other or becoming entirely autonomous" (Collini 2001, 299–300). There was a true heavyweight champion in the ring—the New Public Management (NPM)—and patterned isolation was not its fate; it dominated the 1990s and beyond.

New Public Management

Managerialism has a long history in British public administration. As Pollitt (1993, chap. 2) shows, it did not originate in the 1980s.[6] However, it was reinvigorated in the 1980s in the guise of the NPM. In his seminal article, Hood (1991, 4) sees Australia, Britain, and New Zealand as the Anglo-Saxon heartland of NPM, not America.

> British scholars remain skeptical about the American science of politics and its methods.

NPM was not invented by Osborne and Gaebler (1992) or by the National Performance Review of 1993. Its origins lie in the dry pronouncements of the New Zealand Treasury (1987; see also Boston et al 1996), Margaret Thatcher's messianic commitment to New Right reforms (Pollitt 1993, chap. 3), and the rise of economic rationalism in Australia (Davis and Rhodes 2001; Pusey 1991). It was, and remained, a potpourri of ideas.

In Britain, its initial incarnation extolled the virtues of private sector management techniques, claiming they would increase the economy, efficiency. and effectiveness—the 3Es—of the public sector. It focused on managerialism or hands-on, professional management, explicit standards and measures of performance, managing by results, and value for money. Subsequently, it also embraced marketization or neoliberal beliefs about competition and markets. It introduced ideas about restructuring the incentive structures of public service provision through contracting out, quasi-markets, and consumer choice. The British civil service was to shrink because it had shed responsibilities to the private sector, and its function now was to negotiate and manage contracts. Thatcher introduced both of these managerial and neoliberal ideas, and both were adopted by New Labour, with a twist. New Labour had its own response to the dilemmas posed by neoliberal reforms. It introduced a third strand to managerialism, focused on service delivery, consumer choice, and joined-up government.[7] The earlier strands of managerialism had their roots in management theory and neoclassical economics. This strand drew on different types of social science, mainly new institutionalism and communitarian theory (Bevir 2005, chap. 2–3). It incorporated ideas about managing with and through networks to improve coordination and begat an expanding literature on partnerships and collaboration.

It did not take long, however, for public management to become a major area of research in public administration throughout America and Continental Europe. It would take too long to recount an already familiar history. For present purposes, the important point is that public management became a two-way street between Britain and America. The briefest glance at the contents page of the encyclopedic *Oxford Handbook of Public Management* (Ferlie, Lynn, and Pollitt 2005) demonstrates all too clearly that it is an international enterprise. Many welcomed the development, seeing it as the solution to public administration's search for a new role in the neoliberal world (Boyne 1996). Indeed, for Frederickson (2005, 301 n. 1), public administration and public management have become synonyms. The central question for this paper is whether the United Kingdom's contribution to the study of public management is important.

First, for a time, British public administration was at the forefront of applied research on such subjects as privatization, contracting, and, most notably, regulation. Second, mapping the changing ideas and institutions of public service reform led to much comparative work, most notably on the Antipodes and OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development) countries. For example, Rhodes and Weller (2001) compared management reforms in Australia, Britain, Denmark, France, Germany, the Netherlands, and New Zealand, concluding that if there was one generalization covering all six countries, it was "Antipodean exceptionalism" because the pace and extent of change in Australia and New Zealand was greater than in either Britain or Europe. Also, there were sharp differences between the Anglo-Saxon traditions of the United Kingdom and the United States and the state traditions of Continental Europe (Bevir, Rhodes, and Weller 2003).

However, the most comprehensive comparative analysis of public sector management reform was conducted by Pollitt and Bouckaert, who compared public management reform in 10 countries, revealing not only the diverse reforms and equally diverse outcomes, but also that "*the international management reform movement has not needed results to fuel its onwards march*" (2000, 132; italics in original). Indeed, as they observe, local frames of references mean that "the application of a single template for reform across the globe (or even across the liberal democracies of Western Europe, North America and Australasia) is . . . inherently improbable" (18). This conclusion is well illustrated by their discussion of the trade-offs and dilemmas of reform—for example, between improving quality and cutting costs, where the trade-off hinges on the local context (chap. 7). The book commands heavy citation because it is easily the best comparative study on the subject. And, consistent with the theme of this article, the authors are from Britain and Belgium, respectively. So, for a short time, NPM gave British public administration a leading, not a following, role. Of course, it could not, and did not, last.

Regulation

Regulation is a new term in studying British government. Previously, we talked about audit, inspection, licensing, and accountability. It was the turf of the lawyers. One of the most significant changes in British government at the end of the twentieth century was the growth of "the regulatory state" and the "audit explosion," with the consequent ubiquitous presence of the concept of "regulation" and the proliferation of disciplines studying the subject.[8] For decades, Britain exemplified club government or self-regulation by the city and the professions. Its characteristics were informality, trust, and shared understandings. However, belief in the virtues of public ownership foundered on their recurrent financial problems. Similarly, confidence in service delivery by professionals was eroded by repeated scandals. The market liberalization in the 1980s, the privatization of formerly nationalized utilities, and an interventionist state created a system of command and control regulation.

On the back of these far-reaching changes, it is not too far-fetched to suggest that there grew a British school in the study of regulation. As the editor of *Regulation and Governance* opined, "three of the five most influential people on regulation in public policy and administration were Brits: Hood, Moran and Power" (personal correspondence, October 14, 2010). Also, "most of the interesting work is outside the US and the contribution of US scholars to the field in the last two decades is minor. They held to old notions of what regulation is" (personal correspondence, November 25, 2010). The key question becomes, what are the distinctive characteristics of this school? It has its own style of working, a focus on the workings of the regulatory process, and several key concepts, including the idea of the regulatory regime.

In part, the characteristics of the British school reflect the preferred working style of its main contributors. For example, Hood argues that "[o]ne basic task for PA . . . is the prosaic but always necessary job of mapping out the detailed administrative arrangements of government and public services" (1999, 306). He also suggests that "[g]iven the multitude of approaches to public administration, . . .

it is important to do more to develop 'test sites' in which alternative approaches to understanding administrative phenomena are identified, juxtaposed and tested" (1990, 120). This combination of mapmaking with juxtaposition and testing theories distinguishes much work on regulation. Thus, Moran (2003) documents the origins of the regulatory state (see also Majone 1994). Hood et al. (1999) document the growth of waste-watchers, quality police, and sleaze-busters in the internal regulation of British government. Hall et al. (2000) test the Cartesian, bureaucratic (or rational) model of decision making, the adhocratic-chaotic model, and the bargaining-diplomatic (or political) model. Other people's theories that Hood tests regularly include, for example, Douglas (1970 and 1982) on cultural theory (see, e.g., Hood 1998; Hood, Rothstein, and Baldwin 2001).

Apart from mapping the regulatory state, the British school also explored the dynamics of the regulatory process. For example, Hall, Scott, and Hood's (2000) ethnographic study of the inner life of British telecommunications focuses on how culture regulates regulation. It did so in three ways. First, it defined the boundaries of what was thinkable. Second, the clash of micro-cultures stabilized policy, preventing any one approach from dominating. Finally, culture both incubated reforms and acted a shock absorber for alien changes. They paint a convincing picture of an organization constrained by its culture, bounded rationality in decision making, and interdependence. They stress the limits to rational regulation and prefer the idea of "collibration" or the "judicious or opportunistic manipulation of tensions among the different actors in regulatory space" (Hall, Scott, and Hood 2000, 204; see also Dunsire 1996).

Finally, the British school is associated with various attempts to reconceptualize the field, and four concepts command attention—regulatory regimes, regulatory space, the audit explosion, and metaregulation. The focus of analysis moved the formal-legal American model of public regulation of business by agencies, with its myopic focus on regulatory capture, to the comparison of regimes. Thus, Hood, Rothstein, and Baldwin compare "the complex of institutional geography, rules, practice and animating ideas that are associated with regulating" nine risk regimes (2001, 10; see also Scott 2006, 652). Second, within regimes, it is common for formal-legal authority to be shared, and the idea of "regulatory space" (Hancher and Moran 1989, 277) focuses attention not only on the resources, interests, ideas, and bargaining skills of the several actors, but also on the intermingling of public and private domains and organizations. Third, the theory of the audit explosion (Power 1997, 2005) analyzed the shift from traditional audit, with its focus on regularity and legality, to the new audit with its focus on efficiency, effectiveness, and, most significantly, performance. The explosion occurred because of political demands for greater bureaucratic responsiveness, the fiscal crisis of the state, and NPM's concern with better services. It was fueled by "a crucial supply-side factor . . . the existence of private and public sector accounting professionals" (Power 2005, 329). The consequences include greater standardization, codification, broadening audit to include performance measurement, and several pathologies, including gaming performance measures, which lead Power to describe audit as a "fatal regulatory remedy" (335). Finally, interest grows

in the idea of metaregulation: "the process of regulating regulatory regimes" (Scott 2003; 2006, 664). Scott itemizes experiments in regulator governance such as steering self-regulating systems by using enforced self-regulation and responsive regulation, and regulatory reviews (see also Ayers and Braithwaite 1992).

Levi-Faur and Gilad (2004, 112–14, 120) conclude that the British regulatory state created new state agencies, increased delegation, codified and formalized regulation, multiplied regulatory technologies, and created a system of public control implemented by a mix of public and private actors subject to metaregulation by the central state. Students of the British regulatory state have mapped these shifts, reported on the workings of the new system, and developed concepts for understanding its practices.

Policy Networks and Governance

The first wave of network governance theory is known as the "Anglo-governance school" (Marinetto 2003), which seeks to describe and explain the varieties of policy networks. It is important to recognize that there is a large and active European presence in this subfield. There are at least three other approaches to networks and governance: *Steuerungtheorie* in Germany (Mayntz 1993, 2003, Scharpf 1997), network management in the Netherlands (Kickert, Klijn, and Koppenjan 1997; Kooiman 1993, 2003; Koppenjan and Klein 2004), and, most recently, a normative literature that raises the question of whether networks and governance increase participation (Sørensen and Torfing 2005). These strands are best seen as emphases or foci, not schools of thought, as there is much interweaving of ideas and methods. The Anglo-governance school is part of this larger European community.[9]

Network governance is associated with the changing nature of the state following the public sector reforms of the 1980s and can be seen as public administration fighting back against managerialism. It evokes a world in which state power is dispersed among a vast array of spatially and functionally distinct policy networks composed of all kinds of public, voluntary, and private organizations with which the center now interacts.[10] Such networks have a significant degree of autonomy from the state—they are self-organizing—although the state can steer them indirectly and imperfectly (Rhodes 1996b, 660). In sum, for the Anglo-governance school, governance refers to governing with, and through, networks.

> The British work on networks and governance pre-dates American contributions on the subject.

The British work on networks and governance pre-dates American contributions on the subject. Salamon talks of "the revolution that no one noticed" (2002, 1, 11–14), itemizing, among other changes, the shift from hierarchy to networks.[11] Frederickson (1999, 2005) claims that network and governance theory "repositions" public administration at the forefront of political science in facing the challenges of the fragmenting, disarticulated state. Both take up a debate for American public administration that began in Britain in 1988. Similarly, when American public administration "discovered" policy networks, they displayed limited awareness of the several approaches to networks in European public administration.[12] There was no two-way street. They brought their characteristic modernist empiricist skill set to bear on networks and governance. They combined "large *N*" studies of networks[13] with an instrumental or tool view that sought to make the study of networks

relevant to public managers.[14] Their European counterparts preferred comparative case studies, although there was a shared focus on network management and the allied subjects of partnerships and collaboration.[15]

The second wave of network governance accepted the shift from bureaucracy to markets to networks, but disputed that it led to any significant dispersal of state authority. It focused on metagovernance or "the governance of government and governance" (Jessop 2000, 23; 2007). Metagovernance is an umbrella concept that describes the role of the state and its characteristic policy instruments in network governance. Given that governing is distributed among various private, voluntary, and public actors, and that power and authority are more decentralized and fragmented among a plurality of networks, the role of the state has shifted from the direct governance of society to the "metagovernance" of the several modes of intervention and from command and control through bureaucracy to the indirect steering of relatively autonomous stakeholders (Rhodes 1997a). Both metagovernance and metaregulation are "bringing the state back in (yet again)" (Jessop 2007, 54).[16] There is even an incipient instrumental or tool view of metagovernance. This toolkit includes the state setting the rules of the game for other actors; using storytelling to influence what actors think and do; steering through its distribution of resources such as money and authority; and altering the mix of both actors and governing structures; and stepping in when network governance fails (Bevir and Rhodes 2010, chap. 5; Jessop 2000, 23–24; 2003). With its focus on the role of the state and its links to neo-Marxist state theory, this strand in the literature is yet to elicit much interest from American public administration scholars.[17]

In sum, network governance has four faces. First, it provides a modernist empiricist description of public sector change, whether it is the increased fragmentation caused by the reforms of the 1980s or the search for better coordination of the 1990s. Second, it offers an interpretation or explanation of government change. It argues that hierarchical models of responsible government are no longer accurate. It tells a different story of the shift from hierarchic government to governance through networks to metagovernance. Third, it offers policy advice to public managers on how best to steer networks. Finally, it offers prescriptions on networks and democracy, and on how networks and governance could increase participation. For many, this network governance literature offers a compelling picture of the state; indeed, Marsh is concerned it "may be becoming the new orthodoxy" (2008b, 738). It also provides clear evidence of the growth of a European community of scholars.

The Interpretive Turn

Inglis (2000, 112) argues there has been a lethal attack on modernist empiricism, and that the work of philosophers such as Charles Taylor, Peter Winch, and Alasdair McIntyre means that using the methods of the natural sciences in the human sciences is "comically improper." Richard Bernstein, Clifford Geertz, and Richard Rorty could be added to a long and growing list of such critics, before mentioning the long-standing hermeneutics tradition of Continental Europe. There is a new clarion call—modernist empiricism is a dead-end street, long live "blurred genres" and "the interpretive turn."

As Geertz points out, "there has been an enormous amount of genre mixing in intellectual life" as "social scientists have turned away from a laws and instances ideal of explanation towards a cases and interpretations one" and toward "analogies drawn from the humanities" (1983, 21). Examples of such analogies include social life as game, as drama, and as text. This "refiguration of social theory represents . . . a sea change in our notion not so much of what knowledge is but of what it is that we want to know" (Geertz 1983, 34). There is a problem for public administration. As we blur genres, "the social technologist notion of what a social scientist is is brought into question" (Geertz 1983, 35). Rather, the task is not only to recover the meaning of games, dramas, and texts, but also to tease out their consequences.

There is a growing European literature on this "interpretive turn" in policy analysis, public administration and organization theory (for a survey, see Wagenaar 2011).[18] Rather than seeking to predict the best policy option or the outcomes of organizational change, this approach focuses on the looser idea of telling stories, or provisional narratives about possible futures.[19] Bevir and Rhodes (2003, 2006, 2010) are among the leading exponents of an interpretive approach in Britain and regularly use examples drawn from public administration.[20] They focus on the social construction of a practice through the ability of individuals to create, and act on, meanings. Individuals are situated in webs of beliefs handed down as traditions, and these beliefs and associated practices are changed by the dilemmas people confront. To explain individual actions, they focus on the actors' own interpretations of their beliefs and practices, and on the set of reasons that led to the particular action. To understand an institution and its processes, we must understand the beliefs and practices of its members and the traditions that inform those beliefs and practices. They use policy narratives, or stories by participants, to recover their beliefs and practices about "how things work around here." Narratives are the form theories take in the human sciences. They explain actions by reference to the beliefs and desires of actors. People act for reasons, conscious and unconscious (Bevir 1999, chap. 4, 7).

Narratives use the toolkit of political anthropology, especially observation, to recover meaning through other people's stories. Like Geertz, they use observation and interviews to write "thick descriptions," which recount "our own constructions of other people's constructions of what they and their compatriots are up to" (1993 [1973], 9). They seek to understand the webs of significance that people spin for themselves. For example, Rhodes (2011a) provides a "thick description" of life at the top of British government departments, which gets beneath the surface of official accounts and lets interviewees explain the meaning of their actions, providing an authenticity that can only come from the main characters involved in the story (see also Rhodes, 't Hart, and Noordegraaf 2007). It also highlights the centrality of storytelling among civil servants, most of whom accepted that the art of storytelling was an integral part of their work. Such phrases as "are we telling a consistent story?" and "what is our story?" abound. They do not necessarily use the term "storytelling." They talk of "getting the story straight," "getting it together," "we've got the story," "when you explain it, when you have the narrative," and "we have reached agreement on some of the main storylines." They use stories not only to gain and pass on information and to inspire involvement,

but also as the repository of the organization's institutional memory.

Is genre blurring the future for public administration? Will narratives and observation become common research tools? Is the natural science model too well entrenched? Are those colleagues of an interpretive persuasion condemned to criticize from the sidelines? It is too early to tell, but two points are already clear. A British wing of public administration is developing the approach, and they are not alone with a growing network in Europe.[21]

Conclusions

British public administration is part of a larger and growing community of European scholars (see Bouckaert and Van de Donk 2010). It is small, but has several thriving areas of research: modernist empiricism, comparative public management, regulation, policy networks, governance, and interpretive theory. In the 1990s and 2000s, it had substantial research council funding.[22] It has a cadre of distinguished professors, including Patrick Dunleavy, Christopher Hood, Christopher Pollitt, R. A. W. Rhodes, and Gerry Stoker. This cadre of senior academics engages with one another's work on an established European circuit. All are boundary spanners who have made and continue to make a distinctive and international contribution. The discipline survives, even thrives, in the twenty-first century because these leading players have mastered the "trick" of linking policy and academic relevance. They may specialize in public service delivery or other topics of the day, but they locate such topics in the broader agendas of the social and human sciences. What they do not do is exercise much, if any, influence on American public administration. Rather, we have two self-referential communities with limited intellectual engagement.

The size and prestige of the American profession means that it has a continuing influence both through modernist empiricist and its associated sophisticated toolkit and through new intellectual fashions, which almost invariably becomes everybody else's fad. Methodological rigor, especially the formal reasoning of rational choice, divides the two communities. European public administration embraces diverse traditions and methods. It differs from British public administration because its roots lie in constitutional and administrative law. But the study of the New Public Management, policy networks, and interpretive policy analysis are shared intellectual concerns, drawing British and Continental European scholars ever closer, especially in Northern Europe. The more American public administration goes down the path of empiricist, "large *N*" studies, the fewer its British and Northern European adherents, let alone adherents among the legal tradition still strong in Southern Europe.

> Care must be taken not to overstate the case for British public administration. It is a small discipline compared with the Netherlands, let alone Germany. It is minuscule compared with the giant that is American public administration, whether measured by number of scholars, graduate programs, or research funding.

> Like public administration elsewhere, British public administration does not have an agreed theoretical core, and it grapples with, but does not resolve, the divide between pure and applied research.... It also confronts the challenge of blurring genres, and perhaps Britain and the rest of Europe's greatest contribution to American public administration is yet to come....

Although the claim may err on the side of overstatement, the danger exists that American modernist empiricist public administration will be seen as a dead-end street. Also, such intellectual trends as reinventing government and public value are heavily conditioned by their American constitutional and political context. They travel poorly, and probably should not travel at all (Rhodes and Wanna 2009), yet still they attract often uncritical disciples. So, America remains the Dark Continent for British and Continental European public administration.

Of course, we will, and we should, engage with interesting ideas and practices wherever we may find them. Joint initiatives such as the transatlantic dialogue, sponsored by the European Group of Public Administration and the American Society for Public Administration, are to be welcomed. But it is a European link, and poses the question of whether there is a future for the Anglo-Saxon diaspora? Richard Stillman (2010), the editor of *Public Administration Review,* argues that the mission of his journal is to "promulgate generalist administrative ideas" to forge a "corporate identity of like-minded generalist professionals." That mission is specific to a country with no such cadre of state officials. He talks to American practitioners as the journal's primary audience. *Public Administration Review* is the local professional journal. On the other hand, European public administration is shaped by several distinct state traditions—for example, the consociational, Napoleonic, and *Rechsstaat* traditions (see Dyson 1980; Kickert 2007). Europeans can pride themselves on having a plurality of parochialisms to go with their many theories and eclectic methods!

Care must be taken not to overstate the case for British public administration. It is a small discipline compared with the Netherlands, let alone Germany. It is minuscule compared with the giant that is American public administration, whether measured by number of scholars, graduate programs, or research funding. It is challenged by American traditions of study. Its contributions to the field often are downplayed, if not ignored. It is reliant on government, especially research council research funding. There are few private foundations. There is only a small postgraduate recruitment pool with which to replace its grand old men and women. It remains profoundly unsexy; witness the droves of students in terrorism and security studies, or international relations more generally. In the recovery from the global financial crisis, it is vulnerable to changes in government policy, especially cuts in public expenditure (see Hood 2011).

Like public administration elsewhere, British public administration does not have an agreed theoretical core, and it grapples with, but does not resolve, the divide between pure and applied research.[23] Colleagues will continue to

bemoan the lack of a disciplinary core or our failure to engage with practitioners. Others will extol the virtues of the latest American intellectual fashion, and rail against British parochialism. We may have moved from order to chaos (Lundquist 1985), but that translates into diversity and controversy; it is a discipline in a melting pot of traditions. It also confronts the challenge of blurring genres, and perhaps Britain and the rest of Europe's greatest contribution to American public administration is yet to come from this interpretive turn.

Acknowledgments

Notes

1. I would like to thank Lucie Trarieux (*Public Administration*) and Michael Streeter (*Public Administration Review*), both of Wiley-Blackwell, for producing the citation data.

2. For a survey of the diversity of organization theory, see Morgan (2006). On the fragmentation of implementation studies in Britain, see Barrett (2004), Dunsire (1995), and Hill (1997).

3. Greenwood and Hinings pioneered this approach with their analysis of the changing management structures of British local government (Greenwood et al. 1980; Ranson, Hinings, and Greenwood 1980), but their subsequent work has been on the private sector—for example, on strategic organizational change and managing professional service firms (see Greenwood and Hinings 1996; Greenwood, Suddaby, and Hinings 2002).

4. See also his work with Helen Margetts on the government of information technology (Dunleavy et al. 2006a, 2006b).

5. For a historical overview, see Hall and Ikenberry (1989). For surveys of current approaches, see Hay (1996) and Hay, Lister, and Marsh (2006). The doyen of British state theory is Jessop (1990, 2007). On post-Marxism, the state, and the study of governance, see Bell and Hindmoor (2009) and Bevir and Rhodes (2010, chap. 5).

6. On the deep roots of managerialism, see Chapman and Dunsire (1971, 17) and Thomas (1978). For a more detailed discussion of today's version of managerialism, see Hood (1991) and Pollitt 1993. For a "state of the art" compendium on public management, see Ferlie, Lynn, and Pollitt (2005).

7. The Economic and Social Research Council is the major funder of social science research in the United Kingdom. In the 2000s, it funded a major research program on public service delivery and the Centre for Market and Public Organization at the University of Bristol (CMPO). On public service, see http://www.publicservices.ac.uk/index.php/category/research; on the CMPO, see http://www.bristol.ac.uk/cmpo/publications (accessed October 21, 2010).

8. The growing importance of the academic study of regulation is matched by the number of reviews of the subfield; see, e.g., Baldwin, Scott, and Hood (1998), Baldwin, Cave, and Lodge (2010), Levi-Faur and Gilad (2004), Moran (2009), Power (2005), and Scott (2006). As these several reviews make clear, there is also much intellectual exchange and overlap of themes and topics between British, European, and scholars in RegNet at the Australian National University. See, e.g., Ayers and Braithwaite (1992) and Majone (1994).

9. For reviews of the several approaches, see Börzel (1998, 2011), Klijn (1997, 2008), Marin and Mayntz (1991), Mayntz (2003), and Rhodes (1990, 2006).

10. The proponents of the "Anglo-governance school" include Rhodes (1988, 1990, 1994, 1996b, 1997a, 1997b, 1999 [1981], 2000), Richards and Smith (2002), Smith (1999), and Stoker (1998, 1999, 2000, 2004). It is reviewed in Kjær (2004) and Marinetto (2003), and there is a reply in Rhodes (2007).

11. Salamon (2002, 8, 43 n. 26) credits Frederickson (1997, chap. 3) for suggesting the use of the term "governance" to describe such changes. Kettl (2000, 24) credits it to Frederickson (1999, 19).

12. Of course, America has its boundary spanners. On networks and governance, Agranoff (2007) and O'Toole (2004) deserve an honorable mention for engaging with European colleagues. Others cite mainly American literature. For example, Goldsmith and Eggers (2004) list only four publications by British and European authors in their bibliography, and none is discussed in the text (see also Kettl 2002a, 2002b).

13. For a survey of American "large *N*" studies and more citations, see Meier and O'Toole (2005) and note the joint work with George Boyne and his colleagues at Cardiff Business School.

14. The American literature on managing networks, collaboration, and partnerships includes, e.g., Agranoff (2007), Agranoff and McGuire (2004), Ansell (forthcoming), Ansell and Gash (2007), Bingham and O'Leary (2008), Goldsmith and Eggers (2004), Kettl (2002a, 2002b), McGuire (2002), Meier and O'Toole (2005), O'Toole (1997), and Salamon (2002).

15. British work on managing networks was pioneered by Gerry Stoker; see Perri 6 et al. (2002) and Stoker (2004). Stoker's work won the Political Studies Association's "Making a Difference" Award in 2004. There is now an extensive British and European literature on managing networks, collaboration, and partnerships that includes, e.g., Goss (2001), Huxham and Vangen (2005), Kickert, Klijn, and Koppenjan (1997), Klijn (2005), Koppenjan and Klijn (2004), Lowndes and Skelcher (1998), Skelcher (2005), and Sullivan and Skelcher (2002).

16. The main texts on metagovernance are Bell and Hindmoor (2009), Jessop (2000, 2003), Kooiman (2003), and Sørensen and Torfing (2007).

17. There are always exceptions. B. Guy Peters has been a leading boundary spanner between British, Continental European, and American public administration for more than two decades; see e.g., Peters and Pierre (2003). Pierre and Peters (2000) engage with ideas of governance and the changing role of the state, although they do not explicitly mention metagovernance.

18. The European literature on policy analysis and the interpretive turn also includes, e.g., Dryzek (1993, 2006), Fischer (2003), Fisher and Forester (1993), Fischer, Miller, and Sidney (2007), Hajer (2009), and Hajer and Wagenaar (2003). On the interpretive turn in organizational analysis, see, e.g., Czarniawska (1998, 2004), Gabriel (2000), Law (1994), and Morgan (1993).

19. There is a massive literature on narratives. Alvermann (2000) provides a short introduction; see also Barthes (1966), Bevir (1999, 252–62, 298–306; 2000); Ricoeur (1981, chap. 11; 1991, chap. 6), and White (1987).

20. On the British debate about interpretive theory, see Bevir and Rhodes (2003, 2006, 2010) and the symposia debating this work in the *British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 6(2) 2004: 129–64 and *Political Studies Review* 6(2) 2008: 143–77. See also Hay (2011), Marsh (2008a), and McAnulla (2006). Interpretive theory comes in several guises, most notably the Anglo-Foucauldians on govermentality. For a review, see Bevir and Rhodes (2010, chap. 3). Most of this work does not address public administration, but relevant examples include McKinlay and Starkey (1998) and Miller and Rose (2008).

21. On American work, there is a short overview in Raadschelders (2008, 938–40); see also Farmer (1995, 2010), Fox and Miller (1995), McSwite (1997, 2002), Miller (2002), Stone (2002), and Yanow (1999). British work occasionally commands some attention in America (see, e.g., Stivers 2008). The Public Administration Theory Network (PAT-Net) attracts Australian, British, and European contributors, as does its journal, *Administrative Theory and Praxis;* see http://www.patheory.org and Harmon (2003, 168–70). For the most part, American work in this idiom attracts only cult attention.

22. As well as the research on public service delivery listed in note 7, the Economic and Social Research Council also funded the local governance, Whitehall, and devolution and constitutional change research programs. On local governance, see Stoker (1999, 2000); on Whitehall, see Rhodes (2000); on devolution, see http://www.devolution.ac.uk/Publications2.htm (accessed October 21, 2010).

23. On the state of public administration in Britain, see, e.g., Hood (1991, 1999, 2011), Osborne (2010), and Rhodes (1991, 1996a, 2011b).

References

Agranoff, Robert. 2007. *Managing within Networks: Adding Value to Public Organizations.* Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Agranoff, Robert, and Michael McGuire. 2004. *Collaborative Public Management: New Strategies for Local Governments.* Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Alvermann, Donna E. 2000. Narrative Approaches. In *Handbook of Reading Research,* vol. 3, edited by Michael L. Kamil, Peter B. Mosenthal, P. David Pearson, and Rebecca Barr, 123–39. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Andrews, Rhys, and George A. Boyne. 2010. Capacity, Leadership and Organizational Performance: Testing the Black Box Model of Public Management. *Public Administration Review* 70(3): 443–54.

Andrews, Rhys, George A. Boyne, and Richard M. Walker. 2006. Strategy Content and Organizational Performance: An Empirical Analysis. *Public Administration Review* 66(1): 52–63.

Ansell, Chris. Forthcoming. Collaboration. In *The Oxford Handbook of Governance,* edited by David Levi-Faur. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ansell, Chris, and Alison Gash. 2007. Collaborative Governance in Theory and Practice. *Journal of Public Administration Theory and Practice* 18(4): 543–71.

Ashworth, Rachel, George A. Boyne, and Tom Entwistle, eds. 2010. *Public Service Improvement: Theories and Evidence.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ayers, Ian, and John Braithwaite. 1992. *Responsive Regulation: Transcending the Deregulation Debate.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Baldwin, Robert, Martin Cave, and Martin Lodge, eds. 2010. *The Oxford Handbook of Regulation.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Baldwin, Robert, Colin Scott, and Christopher Hood, eds. 1998. *A Reader on Regulation.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Balsom, C., H. Doyle, and V. MacGregor-Riley. 1995. Public Administration: The State of the Discipline. In *The State of the Academy: New Reflections on Political Studies,* edited by Rohit Lekhi, 89–96. London: Network Press.

Barrett, Susan M. 2004. Implementation Studies: Time for a Revival? Personal Reflections on 20 Years of Implementation Studies. *Public Administration* 82(2): 249–62.

Barrett, Susan M., and Colin Fudge, eds. 1981. *Policy and Action: Essays on the Implementation of Public Policy.* London: Methuen.

Barthes, Roland. 1966. An Introduction to the Structural Analysis of Narrative. In *A Roland Barthes Reader,* edited by Susan Sontag, 251–95. London: Vintage, 1993.

Bell, Stephen, and Andrew Hindmoor. 2009. *Rethinking Governance: The Centrality of the State in Modern Society.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bevir, Mark. 1999. *The Logic of the History of Ideas.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 2000. Historical Explanation, Folk Psychology, and Narrative. *Philosophical Explorations* 3(2): 152–68.

———. 2001. Prisoners of Professionalism: On the Construction and Responsibility of Political Studies. *Public Administration* 79(2): 469–89.

———. 2005. *New Labour: A Critique.* London: Routledge.

———. 2006. Political Studies as Narrative and Science, 1880–2000. *Political Studies* 54(3): 583–606.

Bevir, Mark, and R. A. W. Rhodes. 2003. *Interpreting British Governance.* London: Routledge.

———. 2006. *Governance Stories.* London: Routledge.

———. 2010. *The State as Cultural Practice.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bevir, Mark, R. A. W. Rhodes, and Patrick Weller. 2003. Comparative Governance: Prospects and Lessons. *Public Administration* 81(1): 191–210.

Bingham, Lisa Blomgren, and Rosemary O'Leary, eds. 2008. *Big Ideas in Collaborative Public Management.* Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.

Bogdanor, V. 1999. Comparative Politics. In *The British Study of Politics in the Twentieth Century,* edited by Jack Hayward, Brian Barry, and Archie Brown, 147–79. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Börzel, Tanja A. 1998. Organizing Babylon: On the Different Conceptions of Policy Networks. *Public Administration* 76(2): 253–73.

———. 2011. Networks: Reified Metaphor or Governance Panacea? *Public Administration* 89(1): 49–63.

Boston, Jonathan, John Martin, June Pallot, and Pat Walsh. 1996. *Public Management: The New Zealand Model.* Auckland: Oxford University Press.

Bouckaert, Geert, and Win van de Donk, eds. 2010. *The European Group of Public Administration (1975–2010): Perspectives for the Future.* Brussels: Bruylant.

Boyne, George A. 1996. The Intellectual Crisis in British Public Administration: Is Public Management the Problem or the Solution? *Public Administration* 74(3): 679–94.

Boyne, George A., and Alex A. Chen. 2007. Performance Targets and Public Service Improvement. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 17(3): 455–77.

Boyne, George A., Oliver James, Peter John, and Nicolai Petrovsky. 2010. Does Public Service Performance Affect Top Management Turnover? *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 20(2): 261–79.

Boyne, George A., Kenneth J. Meier, Laurence J. O'Toole, Jr., and Richard M. Walker. 2005. Where Next? Research Directions on Performance in Public Organizations. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 15(4): 633–39.

Boyne, George A., and Richard M. Walker. 2004. Strategy Content and Public Service Organizations. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 14(2): 231–52.

Bryce, James. 1929. *Modern Democracies.* 2 vols. London: Macmillan.

Chapman, Richard A., and Andrew Dunsire. 1971. The Style of British Administration. In *Style in Administration: Readings in British Public Administration,* edited by Richard A. Chapman and Andrew Dunsire, 13–17. London: Allen and Unwin.

Chester, Norman. 1975. *The Nationalisation of British Industry, 1945–51.* London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

———. 1981. *The English Administrative System, 1780–1870.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Collini, Stefan. 2001. Postscript: Disciplines, Canons, and Publics: The History of "The History of Political Thought" in Comparative Perspective. In *The History of Political Thought in National Context,* edited by Dario Castiglione and Iain Hampshire-Monk, 280–302. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Czarniawska, Barbara. 1998. *A Narrative Approach to Organization Studies.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

———. 2004. *Narratives in Social Science Research.* London: Sage Publications.

Dargie, Charlotte, and R. A. W. Rhodes. 1996. *Public Administration,* 1945–1969. *Public Administration* 74(2): 325–32.

Davis, Glyn, and R. A. W. Rhodes. 2001. From Hierarchy to Contracts and Back Again: Reforming the Australian Public Service. In *Institutions on the Edge? Capacity for Governance,* edited by Michael Keating, John Wanna, and Patrick Weller, 74–98. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

Douglas, Mary. 1970. *Natural Symbols: Explorations in Cosmology.* New York: Pantheon.

———. 1982. *In the Active Voice.* London: Routledge.

Dryzek, John S. 1993. Policy Analysis and Planning: From Science to Argument. In *The Argumentative Turn in Policy Analysis and Planning,* edited by Frank Fischer and John Forester, 213–30. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

———. 2006. Policy Analysis as Critique. In *The Oxford Handbook of Public Policy,* edited by Michael Moran, Martin Rein, and Robert E. Goodin, 190–203. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dunleavy, Patrick. 1991. *Democracy, Bureaucracy, and Public Choice: Economic Explanations in Political Science.* Hemel Hempstead, UK: Harvester-Wheatsheaf.

Dunleavy, Patrick, Helen Margetts, Simon Bastow, and Jane Tinkler. 2006a. New Public Management Is Dead—Long Live Digital-Era Governance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 16(3): 467–94.

———. 2006b. *Digital Era Governance: IT Corporations, the State and E-Government.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dunsire, Andrew. 1978. *The Executive Process.* Oxford: Martin Robertson.

———. 1995. Administrative Theory in the 1980s: A Viewpoint. *Public Administration* 73(1): 17–40.

———. 1996. Tipping the Balance: Autopoiesis and Governance. *Administration & Society* 28(3): 299–334.

Dyson, Kenneth H. F. 1980. *The State Tradition in Western Europe: A Study of an Idea and Institution.* Oxford: Martin Robertson.

Farmer, David J. 1995. *The Language of Public Administration: Bureaucracy, Modernity and Postmodernity.* Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.

———. 2010. *Public Administration in Perspective: Theory and Practice through Multiple Lenses.* Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.

Ferlie, Ewan, Laurence E. Lynn, and Christopher Pollitt, eds. 2005. *The Oxford Handbook of Public Management.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fischer, Frank. 2003. *Reframing Policy Analysis.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fischer, Frank, and John Forester, eds. 1993. *The Argumentative Turn in Policy Analysis and Planning.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Fischer, Frank, Gerald Miller, and Mara S. Sidney, eds. 2007. *Handbook of Public Policy Analysis: Theory, Politics, and Methods.* Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

Fox, Charles J., and Hugh T. Miller. 1995. *Postmodern Public Administration: Toward Discourse.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Frederickson, H. George. 1997. *The Spirit of Public Administration.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

———. 1999. The Repositioning of American Public Administration. *PS: Political Science & Politics* 32(4): 701–11.

———. 2005. Whatever Happened to Public Administration? Governance, Governance Everywhere? In *The Oxford Handbook of Public Management* edited by Ewan Ferlie, Laurence E. Lynn, and Christopher Pollitt, 282–304. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gabriel, Yiannis. 2000. *Storytelling in Organizations: Facts, Fictions and Fantasies.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gamble, Andrew. 1990. Theories of British Politics. *Political Studies* 38(3): 404–20.

Geertz, Clifford. 1983. Blurred Genres: The Refiguration of Social Thought. In *Local Knowledge: Further Essays in Interpretive Anthropology,* by Clifford Geertz, 19–35. New York: Basic Books.

———. 1993 [1973]. *The Interpretation of Cultures.* London: Fontana.

Goldsmith, Stephen, and William D. Eggers. 2004. *Governing by Network: The New Shape of the Public Sector.* Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Goldsmith, Stephen, and Donald F. Kettl, eds. 2009. *Unlocking the Power of Networks: Keys to High-Performance Government.* Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Goodin, Robert E. 2009. The State of the Discipline. In *The Oxford Handbook of Political Science,* edited by Robert E. Goodin, 3–57. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Goss, Sue. 2001. *Making Local Governance Work: Networks, Relationships, and the Management of Change.* Houndmills, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Greenwood, Royston, and C. R. Hinings. 1996. Understanding Radical Organizational Change: Bringing Together the Old and the New Institutionalism. *Academy of Management Review* 21(4): 1022–54.

Greenwood, Royston, Roy Suddaby, and C. R. Hinings. 2002. Theorizing Change: The Role of Professional Associations in the Transformation of Institutionalized Fields. *Academy of Management Journal* 45(1): 58–80.

Greenwood, Royston, Kieron Walsh, C. R. Hinings, and Stewart Ranson. 1980. *Patterns of Management in Local Government.* Oxford: Martin Robertson.

Hajer, Maarten A. 2009. *Authoritative Governance: Policy-Making in the Age of Modernization.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hajer, Maarten A., and Hendrik Wagenaar, eds. 2003. *Deliberative Policy Analysis: Understanding Governance in a Networked Society.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hall, Clare, Colin Scott, and Christopher Hood. 2000. *Telecommunications Regulation: Culture, Chaos and Interdependence Inside the Regulatory Process.* London: Routledge.

Hall, John A., and G. John Ikenberry. 1989. *The State.* Milton Keynes, UK: Open University Press.

Hancher, Leigh, and Michael Moran. 1989. Organising Regulatory Space. In *Capitalism Culture and Economic Regulation,* edited by Leigh Hancher and Michael Moran, 271–99. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Harmon, Michael. 2003. PAT-Net Turns Twenty-Five: A Short History of the Public Administration Theory Network. *Administrative Theory and Praxis* 25(2): 157–72.

Hay, Colin. 1996. *Re-Stating Social and Political Change.* Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

———. 2011. Interpreting Interpretivism, Interpreting Interpretations: "The New Hermeneutics of Public Administration." *Public Administration* 89(1): 167–82.

Hay, Colin, Michael Lister, and David Marsh, eds. 2006. *The State: Theory and Issues.* Houndmills, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hayward, Jack. 1991. Cultural and Contextual Constraints upon the Development of Political Science in Great Britain. In *The Development of Political Science: A Comparative Survey,* edited by David Easton, John G. Gunnell, and Luigi Graziano, 93–107. London: Routledge.

Heady, Ferrel. 2001. Priorities for 2001 and Beyond. *Public Administration Review* 61(4): 390–95.

Hill, Michael J. 1997. Implementation Theory: Yesterday's Issues? *Policy and Politics* 25(4): 375–85.

Hood, Christopher. 1983. *The Tools of Government.* London: Macmillan.

———. 1990. Public Administration: Lost an Empire, Not Yet Found a Role? In *New Developments in Political Science,* edited by Adrian Leftwich, 107–25. Aldershot, UK: Edward Elgar.

———. 1991. A Public Management for All Seasons? *Public Administration* 69(1): 3–19.

———. 1998. *The Art of the State.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 1999. British Public Administration: Dodo, Phoenix or Chameleon? In *The British Study of Politics in the Twentieth Century,* edited by Jack Hayward, Brian Barry, and Archie Brown, 287–311. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2011. It's Public Administration, Rod, but Maybe Not as We Know It: British Public Administration in the 2000s. *Public Administration* 89(1): 128–39.

Hood, Christopher, and Andrew Dunsire. 1981. *Bureaumetrics: The Quantitative Comparison of British Central Government Agencies.* Farnborough: Gower.

Hood, Christopher, and Helen Margetts. 2007. *The Tools of Government in the Digital Age.* Houndmills, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hood, Christopher, Henry Rothstein, and Robert Baldwin. 2001. *The Government of Risk: Understanding Risk Regulation Regimes.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hood, Christopher, Colin Scott, Oliver James, George Jones, and Tony Travers. 1999. *Regulation Inside Government: Waste-Watchers, Quality Police, and Sleaze-Busters.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Huxham, Chris, and Siv Vangen. 2005. *Managing to Collaborate: The Theory and Practice of Collaborative Advantage.* Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

Inglis, Fred. 2000. *Clifford Geertz: Culture, Custom and Ethics.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Jessop, Bob. 1990. *State Theory: Putting the Capitalist State in Its Place.* Cambridge: Polity.

———. 2000. Governance Failure. In *The New Politics of British Local Governance,* edited by Gerry Stoker, 11–32. Houndmills, UK: Macmillan.

———. 2003. Governance and Metagovernance: On Reflexivity, Requisite Variety, and Requisite Irony. In *Governance as Social and Political Communication,* edited by Henrik P. Bang, 101–16. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

———. 2007. *State Power.* Cambridge: Polity.

Jones, G. W. 1986. Preface to *A Bibliography of the Writings of W. A. Robson,* by C. E. Hill. London: London School of Economics and Political Science.

Kettl, Donald F. 2000. Public Administration at the Millennium: The State of the Field. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 10(1): 7–34.

———. 2002a. Managing Indirect Government. In *The Tools of Government: A Guide to the New Governance,* edited by Lester M. Salamon, 490–510. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2002b. *The Transformation of Governance: Public Administration for Twenty-First Century America.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Kickert, Walter J. M., ed. 2007. *The Study of Public Management in Europe and the US: Competitive Analysis of National Distinctiveness.* Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

Kickert, Walter J. M., Erik-Hans Klijn, and Joop F. M. Koppenjan, eds. 1997. *Managing Complex Networks: Strategies for the Public Sector.* London: Sage Publications.

Kjær, Anne Mette. 2004. *Governance.* Cambridge: Polity.

Klijn, Erik-Hans. 1997. Policy Networks: An Overview. In *Managing Complex Networks: Strategies for the Public Sector,* edited by Walter J. M. Kickert, Erik-Hans Klijn, and Joop F. M. Koppenjan, 14–61. London: Sage Publications.

———. 2005. Networks and Inter-Organizational Management: Challenging Steering, Evaluation and the Role of Public Actors in Public Management. In *The Oxford Handbook of Public Management,* edited by Ewan Ferlie, Laurence E. Lynn, and Christopher Pollitt, 257–81. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2008. Governance and Governance Networks in Europe: An Assessment of 10 Years of Research on the Theme. *Public Management Review* 10(4): 505–25.

Kooiman, Jan, ed. 1993. *Modern Governance.* London: Sage Publications.

———. 2003. *Governing as Governance.* London: Sage Publications.

Koppenjan, Joop F. M., and Erik-Hans Klijn. 2004. *Managing Uncertainties in Networks: A Network Approach to Problem Solving and Decision Making.* London: Routledge.

Law, John. 1994. Organization, Narrative and Strategy. In *Towards a New Theory of Organizations,* edited by John Hassard and Martin Parker, 248–68. London: Routledge.

Levi-Faur, David, and Sharon Gilad. 2004. The Rise of the British Regulatory State: Transcending the Privatization Debate. *Comparative Politics* 37(1): 105–24.

Lowndes, Vivien, and Chris Skelcher. 1998. The Dynamics of Multi-Organizational Partnerships: An Analysis of Changing Modes of Governance. *Public Administration* 76(3): 313–33.

Lundquist, Lennart. 1985. From Order to Chaos: Recent Trends in the Study of Public Administration. In *State and Market: The Politics of the Public and the Private,* edited by Jan-Erik Lane, 201–30. London: Sage Publications.

Mackenzie, W. J. M. 1975. Public Administration in the Universities. In *Explorations in Government: Collected Papers, 1951–1968,* by W. J. M. Mackenzie, 4–16. London: Macmillan.

Majone, Giandomenico. 1994. The Rise of the Regulatory State in Europe. *West European Politics* 17(3): 77–101.

Marin, Bernd, and Renate Mayntz, eds. 1991. *Policy Network: Empirical Evidence and Theoretical Considerations.* Frankfurt: Campus Verlag.

Marinetto, Mike. 2003. Governing beyond the Centre: A Critique of the Anglo-Governance School. *Political Studies* 51(3): 592–608.

Marsh, David. 2008a. Understanding British Government: Analysing Competing Models. *British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 10(2): 251–68.

———. 2008b. What Is at Stake? A Response to Bevir and Rhodes. *British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 10(4): 735–39.

Mayntz, Renate. 1993. Governing Failure and the Problem of Governability: Some Comments on a Theoretical Paradigm. In *Modern Governance,* edited by Jan Kooiman, 9–20. London: Sage Publications.

———. 2003. New Challenges to Governance Theory. In *Governance as Social and Political Communication,* edited by Henrik P. Bang, 27–39. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

McAnulla, Stuart. 2006. Challenging the New Interpretivist Approach: Towards a Critical Realist Alternative. *British Politics* 1(1): 113–38.

McGuire, Michael. 2002. Managing Networks: Propositions on What Managers Do and Why They Do It. *Public Administration Review* 62(5): 599–609.

McKinlay, Alan, and Ken Starkey, eds. 1998. *Foucault, Management and Organization Theory: From Panopticon to Technologies of Self.* London: Sage Publications.

McSwite, O. C. 1997. *Legitimacy in Public Administration: A Discourse Analysis.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

———. 2002. *Invitation to Public Administration.* Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.

Meier, Kenneth J., and Laurence J. O'Toole, Jr. 2005. Managerial Networking: Issues of Measurement and Research Design. *Administration & Society* 37(5): 523–41.

Meier, Kenneth J., Laurence J. O'Toole, Jr., George A. Boyne, and Richard M. Walker. 2007. Strategic Management and the Performance of Public Organizations: Testing Venerable Ideas against Recent Theories. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 17(3): 357–77.

Miller, Hugh T. 2002. *Postmodern Public Policy.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Miller, Peter, and Nikolas Rose. 2008. *Governing the Present: Administering Economic, Social and Personal Life.* Cambridge: Polity.

Moran, Michael. 2003. *The British Regulatory State: High Modernism and Hyper-Innovation.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2009. Regulation. In *The Oxford Handbook of British Politics,* edited by Matthew Flinders, Andrew Gamble, Colin Hay, and Michael Kenny, 324–41. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Morgan, Gareth. 1993. *Imaginization: New Mindsets for Seeing, Organizing and Managing.* London: Sage Publications.

———. 2006. *Images of Organization.* Updated ed. London: Sage Publications.

New Zealand Treasury. 1987. *Government Management.* 2 vols. Wellington: Government Printer.

Osborne, David, and Ted Gaebler. 1992. *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit Is Transforming the Public Sector.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Osborne, Stephen P., ed. 2010. *The New Public Governance? Emerging Perspectives on the Theory and Practice of Public Governance.* Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

O'Toole, Laurence J., Jr. 1997. Treating Networks Seriously: Practical and Research Based Agendas in Public Administration. *Public Administration Review* 57(1): 45–52.

O'Toole, Laurence J., Jr., and Kenneth J. Meier. 2004. Public Management in Intergovernmental Networks: Matching Structural Networks and Managerial Networking. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 14(4): 469–94.

Perri 6, Diana Leat, Kimberly Seltzer, and Gerry Stoker. 2002. *Towards Holistic Governance: The New Reform Agenda.* Houndmills, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Peters, B. Guy, and Jon Pierre, eds. 2003. *Handbook of Public Administration.* London: Sage Publications.

Pierre, Jon, and B. Guy Peters. 2000. *Governance, Politics and the State.* Houndmills, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Pollitt, Christopher. 1993. *Managerialism and the Public Services.* 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell.

Pollitt, Christopher, and Geert Bouckaert. 2000. *Public Management Reform: A Comparative Analysis.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Power, Michael. 1997. *The Audit Society: Rituals of Verification.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2005. The Theory of the Audit Explosion. In *The Oxford Handbook of Public Management,* edited by Ewan Ferlie, Laurence E. Lynn, and Christopher Pollitt, 326–44. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pusey, Michael. 1991. *Economic Rationalism in Canberra: A Nation-Building State Changes Its Mind.* Sydney: Cambridge University Press.

Raadschelders, Jos C. N. 2008. Understanding Government: Four Intellectual Traditions in the Study of Public Administration. *Public Administration* 86(4): 925–49.

Ranson, Stewart, Bob Hinings, and Royston Greenwood. 1980. The Structuring of Organizational Structures. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 25(1): 1–17.

Rhodes, R. A. W. 1988. *Beyond Westminster and Whitehall: The Sub-Central Governments of Britain.* London: Unwin Hyman.

———. 1990. Policy Networks: A British Perspective. *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 2(3): 292–316.

———. 1991. Theory and Methods in British Public Administration: The View from Political Science. *Political Studies* 39(3): 533–54.

———. 1994. The Hollowing Out of the State: The Changing Nature of the Public Service in Britain. *Political Quarterly* 65(2): 138–51.

———, ed. 1995. *Public Administration: The State of the Discipline.* Special issue, *Public Administration* 73(1).

———. 1996a. From Institutions to Dogma: Tradition, Eclecticism and Ideology in the Study of British Public Administration. *Public Administration Review* 56(6): 507–16.

———. 1996b. The New Governance: Governing without Government. *Political Studies* 44(3): 652–67.

———. 1997a. It's the Mix That Matters: From Marketization to Diplomacy. *Australian Journal of Public Administration* 56(2): 40–53.

———. 1997b. *Understanding Governance.* Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

———. 1999 [1981]. *Control and Power in Central-Local Government Relationships.* Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.

———, ed. 2000. *Transforming British Governance.* 2 vols. London: Macmillan.

———. 2006. Policy Network Analysis. In *The Oxford Handbook of Public Policy,* edited by Michael Moran, Martin Rein, and Robert E. Goodin, 423–45. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2007. *Understanding Governance:* Ten Years On. *Organization Studies* 28(8): 1243–64.

———. 2011a. *Everyday Life in British Government.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2011b. Thinking On: A Career in Public Administration. *Public Administration* 89(1): 196–212.

Rhodes, R. A. W., Charlotte Dargie, Abigail Melville, and Brian Tutt. 1995. The State of Public Administration: A Professional History, 1970–1995. *Public Administration* 73(1): 1–16.

Rhodes, R. A. W., Paul 't Hart, and Mirko Noordegraaf, eds. 2007. *Observing Government Elites: Up Close and Personal.* Houndmills, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Rhodes, R. A. W., and John Wanna. 2009. Bringing the Politics Back In. *Public Administration* 87(2): 161–83.

Rhodes, R. A. W., and Patrick Weller, eds. 2001. *The Changing World of Top Officials: Mandarins or Valets?* Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Richards, David, and Martin J. Smith. 2002. *Governance and Public Policy in the United Kingdom.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ricoeur, Paul. 1981. *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences: Essays on Language, Action and Interpretation.* Ed. and trans John B. Thompson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 1991. *From Text to Action: Essays in Hermeneutics, II.* Trans. Kathleen Blamey and John B. Thompson. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

Robson, W. A. 1975. The Study of Public Administration Then and Now. *Political Studies* 23(1–2): 193–201.

Rose, Richard, and Phillip L. Davies. 1994. *Inheritance in Public Policy: Change without Choice in Britain.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Salamon, Lester M., ed. 2002. *The Tools of Government: A Guide to the New Governance.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Scharpf, Fritz W. 1997. *Games Real Actors Play. Actor-Centered Institutionalism in Policy Research.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Scott, Colin. 2003. Speaking Softly without Big Sticks: Meta-Regulation and Public Sector Audit. *Law and Policy* 25(3): 203–19.

———. 2006. Privatization and Regulatory Regimes. In *The Oxford Handbook of Public Policy,* edited by Michael Moran, Martin Rein, and Robert E. Goodin, 651–68. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sharman, J. C., and Patrick Weller. 2009. Where Is the Quality? Political Science Scholarship in Australia. *Australian Journal of Political Science* 44(4): 597–612.

Skelcher, Chris. 2005. Public–Private Partnerships and Hybridity. In *The Oxford Handbook of Public Management,* edited by Ewan Ferlie, Laurence E. Lynn, and Christopher Pollitt, 347–70. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Smith, Martin J. 1999. *The Core Executive in Britain.* London: Macmillan.

Sørensen, Eva, and Jacob Torfing. 2005. Democratic Anchorage of Governance Networks. *Scandinavian Political Studies* 28(3): 195–218.

———. 2007. Theoretical Approaches to Metagovernance. In *Theories of Democratic Network Governance,* edited by Eva Sørensen and Jacob Torfing, 169–82. Houndmills, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Stillman, Richard J., II. 1997. American vs. European Public Administration: Does Public Administration Make the Modern State, or Does the State Make Public Administration? *Public Administration Review* 57(4): 332–38.

———. 2010. Why *PAR* Matters: Reflecting on ASPA's Flagship Journal at 70. Stone Lecture, Annual Conference of the American Society for Public Administration, April 9–13, San Jose, CA.

Stivers, Camilla. 2008. Governance's New Spectacles. *Public Administration Review* 68(5): 941–43.

Stoker, Gerry. 1998. Governance as Theory: Five Propositions. *International Social Science Journal* 50(1): 17–28.

———, ed. 1999. *The New Management of British Local Governance.* London: Macmillan

———, ed. 2000. *The New Politics of British Local Governance.* London: Macmillan.

———. 2004. *Transforming Local Governance: From Thatcherism to New Labour.* Houndmills, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Stone, Deborah A. 2002. *Policy Paradox: The Art of Political Decision Making.* Rev. ed. New York: W. W. Norton.

Sullivan, Helen, and Chris Skelcher. 2002. *Working across Boundaries: Collaboration in Public Services.* Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Thomas, Rosamund M. 1978. *The British Philosophy of Administration: A Comparison of British and American Ideas, 1900–1939.* London: Longman.

Wagenaar, Hendrik. 2011. *Meaning in Action: Interpretation and Dialogue in Policy Analysis.* Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.

White, Hayden. 1987. *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Interpretation.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Williams, Paul. 2002. The Competent Boundary Spanner. *Public Administration* 80(1): 103–24.

Yanow, Dvora. 1999. *Conducting Interpretive Policy Analysis.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.