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ABSTRACT

The following paper focuses on the importance of the inherited administrative culture which is believed to define the character of the administration system in the years to come. Moreover, administrative culture strongly influences the way organizations operate, including the acceptance or rejection of new policies and directives. This study highlights the power of the hegemonic cultural paradigm and the resistance it shows toward possible changes. The countries of Greece, Italy, and Spain are used as case studies, since they follow the Napoleonic administrative tradition. Additionally, these countries continue to present vivid features of the respective tradition, despite the numerous changes that have been imposed during the reform period from 1980 until 2000. The aim of this study is to put the New Public Management doctrine into a new perspective, by questioning its ability to be successfully implemented to national administrative systems and deliver positive results.
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INTRODUCTION

South Europe, especially within the last few years, has been a subject of severe criticism by the European allies for non-compliance with the European directives and for slowing down the reform process of their national administrative systems. The financial crisis that has been plaguing Europe since the late 2000s has forced countries in the South such as Greece, Italy, and Spain to drastically reform their existing administration systems in order to bridge the fiscal gap that has been characterized as threatening not just for their nation states, but also the stability of the other European Union member states.

Reform necessity is not a new thing for the South. It has been an open issue since the early 1980s when New Public Management (NPM) occurred, originating from the Anglo-American managerial model. Before moving any further, it is essential to recall
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Pollitt and Bouckaert’s (2004, p. 8) definition of what public management is: “Public management reforms consists of deliberate changes to the structure and processes of public sector organizations with the objective of getting them to run better.”

The main purpose of management reform is the creation and utilization of the resources to get the job done with minimum cost. It is useful at this point to clarify that the meaning of public administration (PA) and public management are, quite often, overlapping even though they are fairly close. However, PA addresses issues such as the implementation of law and the regulation of the relation between the state and the citizens, while public management deals with the use of resources towards a given goal. Efficiency, effectiveness, and sustainability are the main concepts of public management (Ongaro, 2009).

The majority of Western nations adopted this trend and radically changed their national administration systems, based on Weber’s notion of bureaucracy, into a managerial-oriented administration based on the three E’s: efficiency, effectiveness, and economy (Capano, 2003). On the one hand, Greek, Italian, and Spanish administrative systems were dealing with internal societal pressures due to the serious problems in their administration such as budget deficits, poor performance, and corruption, and on the other hand were coping with external pressures in order to meet the Maastricht criteria and join the Economic and Monetary Union (EMU).

Based on the above given facts, the three South European countries proceeded to radical transformation of their national administrative systems and drastic measures were taken for the modernization of administration along with the lines of NPA paradigm. Consequently, all three countries adopted the following changes: (a) decentralization of central governmental powers to the regions; (b) privatization of public entities; (c) separation of politics from administration, where the former was chosen to set the objectives and the latter to get the job done; (d) rationalization of jurisdiction, where the focus would no longer be on the influence of the input but on the control of the output; (e) introduction of a new managerial style adopted from the private sector model; (f) increase in competitiveness on the basis of national exams; and (g) accountability of performance through performance measurement methods (Gruening, 2001). Generally, it can be said that not a single sector in all three countries remained untouched in order to meet the above mentioned targets (Capano, 2003).

However, despite the radical measures taken, the outcomes of the reform initiative were not as successful as expected. One might argue that reform is a long process and results may take some time to be evident (Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2004). Nevertheless, societal actors, citizens, and the EU, had high expectations regarding the changes that this reform wave would bring to all three countries and of the impact that it would have on the administration functions of the society and economy. However, it was obvious that policy changing and policy setting alone were not sufficient to bring the results that these countries needed at the time. Political actors soon realized that change should start from the inside. Bassanini in Italy and Barroso in Spain fought to change the administrative culture instead of modifying policies.

According to Ongaro (2009), Greece, Italy, and Spain belong to the so called Napoleonic states, at least so far as it concerns the origin of each country’s basic administrative traits. Centralization and statism are the dominant features of South
Europe. The control of the state apparatus has been the main concern for all
governments instead of the actual change of the respective administration system.
Party interest and personal gain have been the first priority for politicians and decision
makers, while actions that would have proven to be beneficial for the society as a
whole have not always been pursued. The reform process in all three countries was
initiated in order to reach common targets, but the means and the problems that
occurred differed.

Distinguished scholars claim that despite the generous efforts made to change the
traits of Napoleonic state, Greece, Italy, and Spain seem to be enclaved into an old
fashioned administration system, which in a changing world has proven to be
ineffective. This view, of course, questions the strength and dynamic of the NPM. This
work attempts to provide answers in two basic research questions:
1. What are the main values that characterize the civil service in Greece, Italy,
and Spain?
2. What is the impact of NPM doctrine on the civil service systems in Greece,
Italy, and Spain?

The research is being organized into four sections. In the first section the
theoretical argument and research design of the paper are developed and two
theoretical propositions are put forward. The second section outlines the main
characteristics of the past administration systems of Greece, Italy, and Spain as well as
the complications and failures that these respective systems presented. The third
section analyzes the character of new policies established by the NPM trend and puts
administration culture into a new perspective. The fourth section consists of a
discussion related to basic issues and concepts previously outlined as well as the
general concluding remarks.

Framing the profile of the civil servants while reforming South Europe

Traditional Public Administration (PA) vs New Public Management (NPM)

PA has been an object of change in an era defined by globalization (Dwivedi &
Cow, 1999). Traditional PA, represented by the bureaucratic model of Max Weber, in
which public services are based on law, impartiality, and meritocracy seemed unable to
satisfy the increasing needs and demands of the citizens. Moreover, the necessity for
limiting expenditures in public organizations, increasing performance, and doing more
with less, led to the establishment of NPM. The new doctrine was originally initiated in
order to improve the existing administration system (Gow & Dufour, 2000).

NPM, is considered a rival of PA because it is based on a managerial approach of
administration including techniques such as privatization, contracting out,
decentralization, merit pay, management by results, customer satisfaction, and
partnership (Osborn & Gaebler, 1992). Yet, NPM is much more than a set of organized
methods and techniques. NPM implies also a whole new set of values such as
effectiveness, efficiency, economy, and flexibility that may form and define
administrative cultures when applied properly. However, in many countries NPM was
adopted and implemented as a set of strategies. Separated from the values they
represent, these strategies may result in a conflict with the existing administrative
culture and, therefore, result in unsuccessful policy making (Gow & Dufour, 2000).
Greece

PA strongly depends on the performance of its employees; therefore, its members have to be well educated, qualified, productive, and efficient. The recruiting of the proper people for the right positions depends on the recruiting practices that exist in the state apparatus. Contrary to Napoleonic model of administration which was characterized by a distinguished public unit, consisted by highly educated and trained employees, Greek public administration lacked quality. The issue of public employees was very crucial for all governments, because the public sector was appointed based on patronage and clientelistic practices instead of merits. This resulted to a centralized public administration system staffed with unqualified and incompetent employees who were hired under non transparent procedures. The lack of qualifications led to inefficiency and bad performance, creating a negative opinion of public sector in general (Spanou, 2008).

During the reform process, both major parties had tried to restore the prestige of the civil servants by establishing the National Center of Public Administration, followed by the National School of Public Administration (ENA) according to the French model which aimed at the intensive training of the appointed employees and improvement in their performance. Moreover, the rationalization of the recruiting process was an effective tool to downsize the increasing number of the employees working in public administration. However, the initiative for prestigious institutions staffed with competent people ran into strong resistance from the trade unions (Sotiropoulos, 2007; Spanou, 2008; Spanou & Sotiropoulos, 2011). Additionally, stiff party competition did not allow innovative policy to flourish while those who were initiated into the opposition parties witnessed a never-ending reform process whose outcomes were never realized (Lyritzhs, 2007; Spanou, 1996).

The perpetual desire of every respective government to control the state apparatus has led Greece to a continuous reform process which was always pursued up to the point where it would not hinder government interests. The deep statism favored the maintenance of clientelism and patronage which are turned into tools of influence of potential voters (Lyritzis, 2007; Sotiropoulos, 2004; Spanou & Sotiropoulos, 2011).

A comprehensive explanation on the extensive practice of clientelism and patronage in Greece is provided from a cultural perspective by Diamantouros (1994) in his widely cited paper “Cultural Dualism and Political Change in Post-Authoritarian Greece.” According to Diamantouros, clientelism has its root in the inherited administrative culture which is not a formation of one single tradition but the result of three state traditions: the Napoleonic, the Patrimonial, and the Sultanistic. Administration models may alter or adjust to specific needs in particular moments but always maintain the stem of the respective model (Diamandouros, 1994; Spanou, 2008). Peters (2008), a couple of years later, argued that even though administration models were formed in the past, they influence patterns of behavior in both the present and the future.

Italy

The involvement of politicians in public administration and the lack of administrative elites, similar to the French administrative system, had turned the reform process into a necessity. The opportunity appeared in the early 1990s, when a number of undesired events revealed the dissatisfaction of the Italian citizens (Mele & Ongaro, 2014).
Changing the existing administrative culture and its organizational values with integrity, equity, and transparency (OECD, 2010; Brunetta, 2009), were the major targets set by the Italian government and would only be achieved through innovative policies and simplified processes that could result in more efficient organizations (Capano, 2003).

The attention was, at first, focused on the separation of management from politics, where the politicians would set the objectives, allocate the human capital, and evaluate the performance while the management would set the methods for implementing the policies and successfully achieving the objectives set (Mele & Ongaro, 2014; Ongaro, 2009). In order to establish competent management that would deliver high quality results, the Italian government adopted the private sector's model of management (Bassanini, 2000; Ongaro, 2009).

Despite the major changes that the Italian administration system underwent, the introduction of new managerial methods was treated as an administrative procedure rather than new instruments of radical change aiming at increasing effectiveness and efficiency. Likewise, performance evaluation became a way for money distribution rather than a tool of motivation (Capano, 2003).

Within the reform frame, it was not only management that needed improvement. Public servants have also been a subject of change. Italian public personnel present the same features as Greek personnel. In Italy as well, the largest number of public employees was not appointed based on merits but on clientelistic and patronage practices. Although the national exams were a precondition for joining the public sector, a large number of people avoided this step by being appointed by politicians. This resulted in an enlarged public administration, low service quality, and increased citizen dissatisfaction (Cassese, 1993).

The issue of public sector appointments came to a head in the 1990s when the government decided to replace public contracts with those similar to the private sector (Bassanini, 2003). The privatization of public employment meant that public personnel from now on would be hired under different conditions thus constraining their privileges (Ongaro, 2009; Pintus, 2002). That is the reason why the implementation of the above initiative was not successful. Politicians, administrators, managers, and other actors strongly resisted possible change regarding the new administrative values of efficiency, meritocracy, and quality as threatening (Bassanini, 2003).

The adoption of the new innovative policies required a cultural revolution that would change the old practices of the juridical administration model to an administrative tradition that would enhance performance and service delivery, and turn citizens into satisfied customers.

Spain

When compared to Italy and Greece, Spain is closest to the Napoleonic administration model (Alba & Navarro, 2011). This is why civil servants in Spain enjoy a number of privileges. The Special Corps was established during 19th century by Maura as a group of public officials recruited and trained to occupy a series of positions within the organization (Alba & Navarro, 2011).

The Corps acquired great powers which, in the long run, proved to be disadvantageous for the state (Villoria, 2000). It enjoyed the same privileges even during Franco’s military regime, the difference being that at the time civil servants
were replaced by mostly military people loyal to the regime (Alba & Navarro, 2011; Subirats, 1990) until the state turned to professionalization (Villoria, 2000).

The governments to come inherited a highly hierarchical administrative structure, hard to change mostly due to the fact that most of its party members belonged to the same bureaucratic elite (Villoria, 2000). The early 1980s were years of radical changes for civil service. In 1982 a reform was promoted but it was very limited in content (Gallego, 2004). In 1984, Parliament passed whose main purpose was to introduce new managerial tools to increase efficiency but also to reduce the power of the corps (Alba & Navarro, 2011; Villoria, 2000). This law created the basis for the reorganization of job positions in Spanish administration. Jobs were analyzed and classified in accordance with the needs of the respective organization (Alba & Navarro, 2011). A post system was established, and only those posts placed at the lowest level of the hierarchy could be given under labor contract. Additionally, posts would not be assigned to a particular corps. One could apply for the job only when he or she fulfilled the required skills and qualifications. The corps that would perform similar duties would be merged into one; moreover, the law forced changes in the entry exams for those who desired to work for the state (Diez, 2000). In order for the government to facilitate the adjustment to the new job system, it broke the positions down to 30 grades. However, some jobs were reserved for certain elites. The effort to control public appointments was less than successful (Villoria, 2000). Finally, in order to enhance modernization and efficiency, the government chose to change the existing human resources system by turning public administration into an attractive workplace and offering incentives that would increase employee’s productivity. The law specified policy for people employed in the public administration, unified the corps, provided a list of public administration jobs, and established a career path within the Spanish public sector (Bezes & Diez, 2013).

The introduction of this law has been a radical effort to justify and modernize civil service, but its content was strongly criticized. It is strongly believed that the new elected government proceeded to the 1984 law (Ley de medida para la reforma de la Funcion Publica) with the main purpose of undermining the power of the corps, which by that time had self-financing capacity, self-governing capacity, and the veto right to political proposals threatening their interests. Yet, according to surveys, the corps had already started losing its privileges since 1965, when citizens could no longer be charged for the services provided to them. Additionally, since 1975, political actors and trade unions have begun to gain power and exert greater influence on decision making than the corps did (Diez, 2000).

Table 1. Key Features of the Politico-administrative System of Greece, Italy, and Spain (Adopted from Ongaro, 2009, p. 215-219)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Greece</th>
<th>Italy</th>
<th>Spain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Party system and executive legislature relationship</td>
<td>- Two plus party system</td>
<td>- Multi party system</td>
<td>- Two plus party system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Majoritarian conventions of governance; strong government vis-à-vis the legislature</td>
<td>- Transition (92'-07'): two level party system, characterized by layering of majoritarians, adversarial and centrifugal electoral dimension and consensual and centrifugal parliamentary dimension; trend towards increasingly stronger government vis-à-vis the legislature</td>
<td>- Majoritarian conventions of governance; strong government vis-à-vis the legislature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Relatively centralistic parties, powerful local notable</td>
<td>- Centralistic</td>
<td>- Highly centralistic parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The civil service: conception and role of the trade unions</td>
<td>- Low social status of the civil service</td>
<td>- Low status of civil service</td>
<td>- Respected social status of the civil service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Civil service as tool of employment policy</td>
<td>- Civil service as a tool of employment policy</td>
<td>- Significant role of trade unions in public employment policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Significant role of trade unions in public employment policy</td>
<td>- Trade unions as key actors in public employment policy</td>
<td>- Trade unions as key actors in public employment policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Centralistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legalism</td>
<td>- Centrality of administration law</td>
<td>- Centrality of administration law (administrative law as cultural paradigm)</td>
<td>- Centrality of administration law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corps and Grand Corps</td>
<td>- Presence of a system of corps</td>
<td>- Presence of a relatively structured system of corps - evolution of the role of the prefects</td>
<td>- Presence of a system of corps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clientelism and politicization at the bottom</td>
<td>- Extensive clientelism</td>
<td>- Extensive clientelism especially in the South</td>
<td>- Diffusion of clientelistic practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interconnections of the careers of politicians and bureaucrats and politicization at the top</td>
<td>- Large scope of politicization at the top - Careers relatively distinct</td>
<td>- Trend to increased scope of politicization at the top - careers relatively distinct</td>
<td>- Large scope of politicization at the top - Careers interconnected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
 Administrative Reforms through the Context of Organization Culture

Reform of public administration, through the context of culture, lacks attention in the academic community because culture is considered to have an abstract meaning. There is no clear evidence of what culture actually is, consequently many definitions are composed by distinguished scholars. Ferraro, for instance, in 1994 found 400 different definitions about culture (Schedler & Proeller, 2007). One of the most complete definitions about culture was created by Kroeber & Kluckhohn who argued that:

Culture consists of patterns, explicit and implicit of and for behavior acquired and transmitted by symbols, constituting the distinctive achievements of groups, including their embodiment in artifacts; the essential core of culture consists of traditional ideas and especially their attached values; culture systems may on the one hand be considered as products of actions, on the other as conditioning elements of future actions (cited in Adler 1993, p. 29).

As mentioned earlier, in the mid-1980s most European countries attempted to change their domestic administration system into a new one, more efficient and performance oriented. The implementation of NMP did not have the same impact all around Europe. In some countries the results were positive and satisfactorily while in other countries they were slow and disappointing. The main reason was considered to be the divergence of administration culture that defines every country. Models, theories, and frameworks developed to increase efficiency and effectiveness in one country may not be applicable to others (Brown & Humphreys, 1995).

Decision makers and policy setters, in many cases, prefer to avoid the idea of culture as something of low importance instead of facing up to it (Hofstede 1984). This can result in the transfer of managerial models from countries with different cultural contexts to other countries without considering the national, cultural characteristics and lacking the necessary adjustment in order to fit the cultural values, beliefs, and expectations (Brown & Humphreys, 1995). New policy implementation can result in efficient change of the administrative system when it is modified by the existing administrative culture. The so-called practices of a culture are those elements that can easily be changed, in contrast with the values of one’s culture, which require time and effort in order to achieve the anticipated change (Bouckaert, 2007; Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). Therefore, essential reform of administration systems may only occur when the values of an organization have been transformed and directed towards the desired ends. However, such a process is time consuming, and this is one of the main reasons why the outcomes of administration reforms require time to be visible.

Through the NPM doctrine, European policy attempted the transformation of an already established administration culture into something else, different and closer to the needs of the new era. Additionally, institutions are run by people who carry a certain mindset and therefore, while countries implement reforms, the process has to be adjusted as close it can to the culture of the people because they constitute the core of the institution (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005).

Hofstede’s contribution to explain the essential role that culture plays in the efficient function of an organization has been major. In his widely cited book Software of the Mind (2005), Hofstede developed a cultural model by measuring and comparing the values of the personnel of the same institution (IBM) in different countries. His
research resulted in the development of four cultural dimensions: power distance, masculinity/feminity, individualism/collectivism, and uncertainty/avoidance.

The Notion of Cultural Paradigm and Paradigm Shift

In the late 1970s, Greece, Italy, and Spain decided to work on large-scale administration reforms based on new policy principles and instruments capable of fundamentally changing the basis of the established administrative tradition. The change of administrative culture is a demanding task which requires the production of a whole new set of values and operational standards based on brand new ideas (Capano, 2003).

In order to describe the whole set of values, beliefs, and methods that define the epistemology, Kuhn (1970) introduced the concept of “paradigm.” Later on, it was broadly used in different disciplines. According to Capano (2003), each public policy sector contains a set of beliefs and values about the “things to be done” and “how” they should be done, with the former constituting the core of the paradigm. This indicates the set of actions or strategies that should be followed and the instruments chosen for the implementation of the public policy. It must be remembered that the closer one gets to the core, the greater the resistance to change.

The importance of ideas when operating reforms has been of great significance to Hall (1993):

…policymakers customarily work within a framework of ideas and standards that specifies not only the goals of policy and the kind of instrument that can be used to attain them but also the very nature of the problems they are meant to be addressing (p. 279).

Howlett & Ramesh (1998) argued that in circumstances where there is only one single idea set, without any alternatives, the idea plays a hegemonic role in the respective circumstances. On the other hand, when various idea sets exist without dominating others, an uncontrolled situation prevails. Moreover, the existence of noteworthy ideas may lead to the creation of a third type of policy community. Lastly, the existence of one dominant idea challenged by other less promising ideas may lead to a mischievous community.

Moreover, Howlett & Ramesh (1998), likewise underscore the importance of ideas among policy actors, arguing that great ideas presuppose sufficient knowledge and information about the problematic field as well as the available means to reach targeted goals. Cultural variables are essential in order to see why administration reforms vary in nature and up to what point culture has influenced reform outcomes. Capano (2003), claims that the crises/problems caused by the anomalies of the existing paradigm will not necessary lead to the replacement of the problematic paradigm unless there is already an alternative model, even in an elementary state. The lack of an alternative paradigm provides an opportunity for the institutionalized paradigm to eliminate the problems by elaborating its marginal features.

In his broadly cited paper, Hall (1993) distinguishes between two types of change: simple change and radical transformation. Policy change has been classified into three categories, each related to a higher level of change: the first order change relates to routine adjustment to known policy instruments, the second order change is related to the policy instruments used to achieve shared policy goals, and the third order change is related with the shift of the goals themselves (Baumgartner, 2012). The first and the second order change display the features of incrementalism and routinized decisions.
normally associated with the policy process. The second order change moves one step beyond, in the direction of strategic action. The third order change does not follow either the first or the second order change and is not incremental in nature but paradigmatic (Ladi, 2012). The incremental change is slow and gradual and is viewed as a marginal adaptation. Paradigmatic change is usually sudden, radical, and discontinuous (Capano, 2003), although Howlett & Ramesh (1998) claim that it can also be the other way around, depending on the presence or absence of new interests in the policy arena.

Paradigm change or incremental change, despite the conditions within which it occurs, is always relevant to the notion of time. Critical juncture, known as a historical momentum whose outcomes affect future events, is a prerequisite for policy change to arise (Capano, 2003; Howlett & Ramesh, 1998; Ladi, 2012; Pierson, 2000). Critical juncture may be an essential tool to explain why historical phenomena arose in one particular time, yet certain conditions should be met in order for change to happen, such as exogenous pressure, endogenous circumstances, or power shift (Ladi, 2012).

CONCLUSION

The success of the reform process depends on many variables. Culture is a variable that plays a determinant role, despite the fact that it has been neglected by many theorists due to its vague nature. Greece, Italy, and Spain have all adopted the basic traits of the Napoleonic administration model, resulting in different administration cultures with many common features. Culture, according to Dwivedi & Gow (1999), is not monolithic but it is part of a wider culture, that of a national one, which is constituted by political, economic, social, religious, and civil society culture. Yet administrative culture is greatly influenced by political culture and therefore depends on the behavior of the state apparatus and vice versa.

The implementation of the general principles of NPM in Greece, Italy, and Spain has been sudden and unorganized. This has forced all three countries to adopt the same policies and implement the same strategies without taking into consideration that for centuries these countries and their respective governments have been doing things in their own special way. People are not willing to give up these distinctive features and characteristics, despite the general tendency of globalization, because, according to Caiden (1998), they constitute their very own identity.

For Greece, administrative reform provided a good opportunity to improve the skills and performance of the civil service and to staff public organizations with people who have the required qualifications for the occupied position. Instead, the reform initiative had to deal with party competition, which resulted in policy discontinuity as well as the maintenance of clientelism and patronage and a means to gain votes and satisfy the existing electorate.

Italy, on the other hand, was dealing with issues of extensive corruption similar to Greece with the absence of an administrative elite. Despite the radical measures taken, such as the separation of politics from the administration, the adoption of private-based contracts, and the imposition of appointment based on merit instead of clientelism, the situation did not change as expected. The main reason was due to the fact that NPM practices were mostly treated as new administrative procedures instead of tools to improve administration functions and increase performance.
Spain, contrary to Italy and Greece, developed an administration system closest to the French model. The Corps in Spain was granted all the privileges and prestige that the French corps had acquired over the years. Moreover, the majority of the corps had great influence in the decision making process, resulting in changes not capable of creating new administration values. However, according to Hofstede’s onion model, no culture can change when the core values remain the same. Changing culture, as mentioned above, is a demanding task because it requires a whole set of new ideas.

Despite the new regulations that each respective government had introduced, changes in policy setting and practices mainly remained on paper or were poorly implemented. The initial target of the Spanish government was the changing of administrative culture through the NPM paradigm, which was considered a reasonable means to modernize administration and improve the performance of the public entities. Nevertheless, when these goals are in conflict with the existing culture and the administrative values, no positive outcome may result.

The main reason why NPM failed to bring the expected results in South Europe, was that politicians, policy entrepreneurs, and local authorities adopted NPM policies as strategies without the attached values of this new public administration doctrine. The NPM paradigm did not prove strong enough to dominate the existing administrative culture.
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