

The Governance of Wicked Issues: A European Cross-Country Analysis of Coordination for Societal Security

Tom Christensen • Ole Danielsen • Per Lægreid • Lise H. Rykkja



Uni Research Rokkan Centre, The Stein Rokkan Centre for Social Studies, runs a publication series consisting of two parts, Reports and Working Papers. The Director of the Uni Research Rokkan Centre together with the Research Directors form the editorial board of the publication series.

The Report series includes scientific papers, such as final reports on research projects. The manuscripts are accepted by the editorial board, normally after a peer review.

The Working Paper series includes working papers, lecture transcripts and seminar papers. The manuscripts published as Working Papers are approved by project managers.

ISSN 1503-0946

Uni Research Rokkan Centre
Nygårdsgaten 5
5015 Bergen
Phone +47 55 58 97 10
Fax +47 55 58 97 11
E-mail: rokkansenteret@uni.no
<http://rokkan.uni.no/>

The Governance of Wicked Issues: A European Cross-Country Analysis of Coordination for Societal Security

TOM CHRISTENSEN, OLE DANIELSEN, PER
LÆGREID AND LISE H. RYKKJA

STEIN ROKKAN CENTRE FOR SOCIAL STUDIES

UNI RESEARCH, BERGEN

SEPTEMBER 2014

Working paper 6 – 2014

Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Abstract | 3 |
| Foreword | 4 |
| Introduction | 4 |
| Coordination through hierarchy versus networks: theoretical elaborations | 5 |
| Coordination through hierarchy – a structural-instrumental perspective | 6 |
| Coordination through networks – a cultural perspective | 6 |
| Blending the perspectives: Towards hybrid coordination regimes? | 8 |
| Research design | 9 |
| Coordination structures for societal security | 10 |
| Coordination behavior, culture and quality | 15 |
| Coordination behavior | 15 |
| Coordination culture | 18 |
| Coordination quality | 18 |
| Relations between coordination behavior, culture and quality | 20 |
| Discussion | 23 |
| Conclusion | 26 |
| References | 27 |
| Appendix | 31 |

Abstract

This paper analyzes structures and behavior instigated to achieve coordination within the area of societal security in six European countries: Germany, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Denmark, Sweden and Norway. We distinguish between two modes of coordination: hierarchy and networks. A structural-instrumental and a cultural organizational perspective are applied to explain the main approaches present in the different countries. The theoretical argument is assessed by examining data on formal organizational structures and survey-data gathered among relevant top level administrative executives on coordination behavior and quality. The findings indicate the emergence of hybrid coordination structures combining both hierarchical and network features, thus lending support to a view of societal safety organizations as composite systems combining seemingly contradictory organizational principles developing through institutional layering. In terms of coordination behavior our findings reveal that reforms in the policy-area have yielded only modest impacts, thus indicating a de-coupling between policy and practice.

Foreword

This paper is written as part of the research project *Organizing for Societal Security and Crisis Management: Building Governance Capacity and Legitimacy (GOVCAP)*, funded by the Norwegian Research Council under the SAMRISK II Program. It was presented on the SOG panel on «Organizing for internal security and crisis management» at the IPSA World Conference in Montreal, July 19-24 2014

Introduction

Societal safety¹, internal security or crisis management can be characterized as typically «wicked problems» that cut across different sectors and levels, and trigger a need for coordination across functional and organizational boundaries (Boin, Hart, Stern and Sundelius 2005; Fimreite, Læg Reid, Lango and Rykkja 2014, Head 2008). Consequently, policymakers, regulators and administrators alike have invested considerable time and energy into establishing formal and informal structures that can be activated in order to facilitate coordinated responses to crisis-situations, combining stability and flexibility.

This paper examines existing organizational structures instigated to achieve coordination within the policy area of societal safety, looks at what coordination mechanisms top level civil servants within the policy area use in practice, and how they evaluate these instruments. A main aim is to describe and analyze how such coordination structures vary and affect coordination behavior, and how coordination behavior is related to the assessment of coordination quality, compared across six European countries. We ask how tight or loose coupling there is between a) formal structural arrangements, b) actual coordination mechanisms used by top civil servants, c) their role identifications and d) their perception of coordination quality.

Coordination is an endemic concern in public administration (Bouckaert, Peters and Verhoest 2010). According to Gulick (1937), organizational specialization triggers coordination challenges almost by default, with different principles of specialization triggering specific challenges of coordination. As public administration has become an increasingly multi-actor and multi-level entity, coordination across levels of government and across policy sectors remains salient. Increased cross-boundary working has been seen as a response to the enhanced need for coordination in a fragmented political-administrative system (Flynn, , Blackman and Halligan 2014). A renewed interest in coordination is triggered by recent trends and reforms within the public sector across Europe. In particular, there has been an increased emphasis on inter-organizational coordination, brought on in part by the post-New Public Management (NPM) reform measures, trying to counter-act NPM-oriented features of increasing specialization and a tendency to seek solutions to important policy problems within separate sectors or «silos»

¹ Societal safety is a particular Norwegian concept developed over the last decade, defined as: “The society’s ability to maintain critical social functions, to protect the life and health of the citizens and to meet the citizens’ basic requirements in a variety of stress situations” (Olsen, Kruke and Hovden 2007). In the following, we use this concept to cover both internal security and crisis management.

(Christensen and Lægreid 2007). These reform elements have more recently been accompanied by a new orientation towards partnerships and cooperation via networks, often relying on inherently soft measures devised to «nudge» different organizations towards moving in the same direction or to overcome the «silozation» (Christensen and Lægreid 2011, Lægreid et al. 2014a). The softer measures and emphasis on horizontal coordination of post-NPM have been paralleled by centralization-efforts through more hierarchical instruments and emphasis on vertical coordination, typically under the rubric of «reassertion of the center» (Dahlstrøm, Peters and Pierre 2011, Christensen et al. 2007, Lægreid, Rykkja and Nordø 2013).

These seemingly contradictory modes of coordination are reflected in the area of societal security. When crises materialize, different cross-cutting network arrangements are often employed in order to forge coordination. However, crises also tend to trigger a demand for leadership and central direction and a pressure towards clarifying responsibilities and chains of command through hierarchical structures (Danielsen 2013a, Rykkja and Lægreid, forthcoming). Different countries and their political-administrative systems might choose different strategies and organizational design in the face of severe crises, reflecting fundamental structural arrangement and cultural traditions. Some of these choices may be based on perceptions of coordination quality. Departing from these observations the current paper analyses coordination structures and their impact on coordination behavior and perception of quality in six European countries: Germany, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Sweden, Denmark and Norway.

Our theoretical approach draws on organizational and institutional theory. We distinguish between a *structural-instrumental* and a *cultural* perspective on coordination behavior (Christensen et al. 2007), and employ survey-data gathered among administrative executive leaders working in the policy-area of societal security in order to assess the theoretical argument. Our theoretical framework is elaborated in further detail in the next section. Thereafter, we present and discuss our research design. The empirical analysis proceeds in two steps. In the first part, we present key features of the coordination structures characterizing the countries being examined. In the second part, we consult the survey-data from these countries in order to assess our theoretical expectations on coordination behavior and perceived quality. The empirical results are then re-assessed in light of our analytical departure point, as the paper concludes.

Coordination through hierarchy versus networks: theoretical elaborations

Drawing on institutional and organizational theory, we want to highlight the importance of both formal and informal aspects that may forge coordination.

Coordination through hierarchy – a structural-instrumental perspective

From a structural-instrumental point of view, emphasis is on the manner in which the formal-normative structure of public administration influences decision-making processes by channeling attention, shaping frames of references and attitudes among decision-makers acting under the confines of bounded rationality (Egeberg 2012; March and Simon 1993; Scott 2003). Coordination relates to vertical specialization and how authority and patterns of accountability and control emanate from one's position in the formal hierarchy. This perspective on public administration is linked to the Weberian conceptualization of the bureaucracy as an administrative technology characterized by hierarchy, specialization, and management by rules. A common distinction is between *internal bureaucratic hierarchical control*, implying the referring of issues upwards to superior bodies and positions in the administrative hierarchy; and *external political hierarchical control*, which implies referring issues between levels upwards to political and executive bodies (Bouckaert et al. 2010, Lægreid et al. 2014a). The principle of ministerial responsibility, a main government doctrine across parliamentary systems, builds on this hierarchical approach. In general, in many countries this tends to result in strong line ministries with well-built capacities for vertical coordination, but rather weak horizontal coordination (Hood 1976). Overall, we will expect countries with Westminster political systems and homogeneous administrative apparatuses to score higher on both vertical and horizontal coordination, while political-administrative systems with minority coalition governments and more fragmented administrative structures probably will score lower.

In terms of how structural-instrumental factors impact on coordinating behavior, and assuming that there is a link between coordination behavior and the quality of coordination, we will expect that civil servants who frequently refer issues upwards in the hierarchy, and to political actors, will tend to value vertical coordination positively. Conversely, we will expect that frequent upwards-referral of issues will yield negative effects on coordination downwards vis-à-vis local and regional bodies.

Coordination through networks – a cultural perspective

The cultural perspective emphasizes the embedding of political-administrative systems in historically evolved, and distinct, informal properties that provide direction for, and give meaning to, organized activities (Selznick 1957). Individual and organizational decision-making are seen as oriented towards logics of appropriateness with an associated view of individual agency as rule-following and oriented towards confirming roles and identities (March and Olsen 1989, 2006). Such rules may confirm, but also contradict, the behavioral implications of formal normative structure. Rules may both enable and constrain action, as is emphasized through the notion of «path-dependency» (Krasner 1988). Such informal properties do not by themselves imply inertia, however. Rules are elaborated, and thus

further developed and potentially changed, as they are applied in a routine fashion by bounded rational actors vis-à-vis shifting environments (March 1981).

The siloization and sectorization associated with NPM-reforms have been sought countered by a reform-discourse emphasizing the importance of partnerships and collaboration across departmental boundaries, which also presuppose changing cultural attitudes (Christensen and Lægreid 2007, 2011). Such cultural attributes marking a step away from previous NPM-oriented norms may be particularly important in «wicked» problem-areas involving multiple actors, transboundary, complex, ambiguous and uncertain issues. Societal security and crisis management have such features that may need network arrangements to help mediate departmental conflicts or interests crosscutting policy areas. However, the prospects for forging coordination through such intermediate institutional arrangements can be expected to depend on their degree of cultural compatibility with established identities and political-institutional legacies (cf. March and Olsen 1989).

Network-like administrative arrangements are well-known formal-structural components in most central administrative systems (Christensen et al. 2012). But they are also *intermediate institutions* devised to forge coordination between different actors when the instigation of a hierarchical mode of coordinating is a less viable option. Our emphasis is on how various informal network-based structures – rather than more formal hierarchical structures – may facilitate (but also complicate) coordination.

Again, assuming that there is a link between coordination behavior and the quality of coordination, and in line with our cultural understanding of network-administrative arrangements, we examine whether administrative executives reporting that network-mechanisms are frequently employed (e.g. setting up cross-cutting work- or project groups etc.) tend to evaluate horizontal coordination more positively. Moreover, we examine the extent to which public sector executives emphasize the importance of cooperation between different public sector actors and the extent to which they evaluate policy-coherence and coordination positively. We expect that administrative executives that identify with a «collaborative culture» (in that they emphasize the importance of getting different organizations to work together and finding joint solutions to common problems) will be more inclined towards valuing horizontal coordination better than those that do not.

Different national political-institutional legacies may be important with respect to explaining variations in coordination behavior (Painter and Peters 2010; Charron, Dahlstrøm and Lapuente 2012). For instance, the *Rechtstaat*-orientation of the German administrative system implying a strong Weberian administrative culture may render vertical internal coordination easier, but will at the same time produce significant horizontal coordination problems. In a similar fashion, the strong consensus-orientation and collaborative decision making style of the Nordic countries might further horizontal coordination and also further coordination with local and regional government, as well as with stakeholders outside government.

Blending the perspectives: Towards hybrid coordination regimes?

Thus far we have elaborated two *contrasting* modes of coordination and linked them to two equally contrasting perspectives on public sector organizations. The distinction is analytical, however, and we may expect both structural-instrumental and cultural factors to offer relevant insights when we observe how coordination-policies implicate coordination-behavior. This implies that the distinction between hierarchical and network-administrative modes of coordination is rather subtle.

The use of network-administrative structures may hold particular promises for typically wicked policy-problems. In practice, however, governance-networks do not by themselves resolve coordination problems nor does the establishment of network-administrative arrangements necessarily imply that hierarchies are no longer operative or that all participants are essentially given an equal voice, i.e. there are dynamics between hierarchy and networks (Provan and Kenis 2008). Often secondary affiliations such as network arrangements with part-time participants complement primary affiliation linked to the officials' main positions in the hierarchy (Egeberg 2012). While networks are usually understood as somewhat loose, open-ended and essentially «flat» modes of governance, networks may also be embedded and operative in the «shadow of hierarchy» (Héritier and Lehmkuhl 2008). Alternatively, once such intermediate institutional forms are established, the emergence of shared informal attributes may also represent a potential buffer against attempts to assert or re-assert hierarchical control (Danielsen 2013b).

Thus, we may observe various *hybrid* coordination arrangements to be operative in the governance of societal security (Boin, Busuioac and Groenleer 2013), implying that a mixture of different factors must be taken into account when explaining coordination-behavior in the policy-area of societal security (Moynihan 2005). The notion of a «lead agency» as an intermediate form between traditional hierarchy and networks is mainly drawn from US government arrangements, where a lead agency is responsible for organizing the interagency oversight of the day-to-day conduct of policy related to a particular operation. The lead agency typically chairs an interagency working group established to coordinate policy related to this operation and normally determines the agenda, ensures cohesion among the involved agencies, and is responsible for implementing decisions. But it is also associated with a traditional hierarchical approach to coordination as the agency's function is to impose control on others within a network (Boin et al. 2013). This mixed-system design can be linked to an understanding of public administration as constituted on a diverse repertoire of coexisting, overlapping, and potentially competing, organizational principles (Olsen 2010). A further important analytical task is then to establish the *relative* importance of various factors in this mixture of different organizational principles as well as how the mix of organizational principles plays out across different political-institutional settings.

Research design

Our comparative strategy is adhered to a «mixed systems» design, wherein we include cases that are similar and different along both dependent and independent variables (Frendreis 1983). The aim is to compare cases that are both similar and different. Hence, we have included countries that differ along important political-institutional background-variables but nonetheless share some key characteristics. The most important one being the fact that all countries are mature Western European parliamentary democracies with a bureaucratic state infrastructure that have implemented reforms in the policy-area of societal security during the last 15 years (Danielsen 2013a). They differ, however, in administrative tradition (Painter and Peters 2010). UK belongs to an Anglo-American meritocratic tradition with no legal basis for the state; Norway, Sweden and Denmark belong to a Scandinavian collaborative tradition with big professional welfare states; and Germany and the Netherland represent a Germanic *Rechtstaat* tradition with special interlocking coordination problems in Germany as a result of the federalist system (Knill 2001, Scharpf 2008).

The paper benefits from several sources of empirical information. We draw on available official documentation and information derived from the websites of the relevant central-government institutions in the countries being analyzed, in combination with secondary material, in order to provide an overview of the coordination structures that have been established in this policy-area². We follow up by employing survey-data in order to analyze how the organizational specialization of the policy-area impacts on practice, by utilizing indicators on coordination behavior as well as perceptions of the quality of coordination in the surveyed officials' dossier. The survey was conducted in 2012 among European top administrative executives in central ministries and agencies in 16 countries as part of the comparative COCOPS-project.³ Here, we employ data from top civil servants who work in the policy-area of «justice, public order and safety», which can be considered to be most relevant «sector» to survey for our purposes, meaning trying to tie country coordinative structures closer to top administrative executives' coordinative perceptions in the field. All in all, 248 officials in this policy area answered the questionnaire in the six selected countries: 80 from Germany, 39 from the United Kingdom, 49 from The Netherlands, 48 from Sweden, 13 from Denmark and 19 from Norway.⁴

Our quantitative analysis employs indices that depict 1) Coordination behavior, 2) Collaborative culture, 3) Coordination quality.

² This descriptive analysis employs data utilized in a previously conducted mapping-study (Danielsen 2013a) and is supplemented with recently published material from the large-scale comparative ANVIL project (see www.anvil-project.net).

³ The overall response rate was 40 % in Sweden, 29 % in the Netherland, 28 in Norway, 23 % in Germany, 19% in Denmark and 11 % in UK. See www.cocops.eu for more information. The research leading to these results received funding from the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme under grant agreement No. 266887 (Project COCOPS), Socio-economic Sciences & Humanities

⁴ 21 % respondents were from ministries and 60% from central agencies, 20 % came from the 'lander' level in Germany. 44 % were in top positions, 38 % worked in the second highest positions and 18 % came from the third highest level.

1. *Coordination behavior*: Here we employ a survey question covering the use of different hierarchical and network-administrative arrangements with respect to coordination.
2. *Collaborative culture*: Here we use survey-items covering the extent to which the executives emphasize the importance of (i) finding joint solutions and (ii) working together across boundaries as basic values in their work.
3. *Quality of coordination*: Here we employ subjective evaluations of horizontal and vertical coordination within own policy area, as well as between policy areas, state and local/regional level and with international and with private/civil society actors (Christensen and Læg Reid 2008). In addition, we examine responses to the question of whether perceived quality of policy coherence and coordination has deteriorated or improved over the past five years.

The data-sources employed in this paper provide a rich empirical backdrop against which the theoretical arguments outlined above can be assessed. Our focus on the central administrative level implies that we are only observing a small but important part of the comprehensive repertoire of public sector organizations involved in this policy-area.⁵ Also, the fairly modest number of observations implies that conclusions must be drawn with caution. Nevertheless, we find that our data suffice to adequately illuminate how the organizational specialization of this policy-area impacts on practice.

Coordination structures for societal security

The countries included in this study have all implemented reforms in the area of societal security over the past 15 years. In the following, we will provide a brief overview of the coordination structures that have been set-up in these countries, as a backdrop for the subsequent analysis of coordination practices.

In *Germany*, crisis management is very much a decentralized affair and mainly handled by the state-administrations. At the federal level, the Federal Chancellery may assume responsibility for overarching political coordination (Hegemann and Bossong 2013: 15). The Ministry of the Interior is the key resort-ministry in this policy-area. It performs a critical function with respect to leading the coordination of federal ministries and central agencies in crisis-situations. Under this ministry, two central agencies perform key tasks in the policy-area, of which the Federal Office of Civil Protection and Disaster Assistance (BBK), formed in 2004⁶, comes closest to performing tasks that assist in the coordination of capacities in the policy-area (Hegemann and Bossong 2013: 14). The German system of civil protection is based on a rather fragmented legislative framework and Germany's model of federalism

⁵ See the aforementioned ANVIL-project for a more comprehensive overview of the policy-area, including regional and local organizational capacities.

⁶ This was a re-establishment, as it can trace its origins to the Federal Agency for Civil Protection, established in 1957 (http://www.bbk.bund.de/EN/FederalOffice/Chronicle/chronicle_node.html).

⁷ The other agency is the Federal Agency for Technical Relief (*Bundesanstalt Technisches Hilfswerk*), which provides more hands-on support in crisis-situations upon request from the responsible bodies.

with its limitations on the operational capabilities of federal actors. The responsibility for crisis-preparedness is spread across ministerial domains and, moreover, that the various federal ministries are responsible for having in place capacities that can be activated in crisis-situations⁸. Coordination between the federal resort-areas is primarily performed via an intermediate forum, the Inter-ministerial Committee for National Crisis Management, where the Ministry of Interior is the lead organization. Finally, BBK as well as its parent ministry perform important tasks with respect to coordination between federal and state levels (Hegemann and Bossong 2013: 14-15).

In the *United Kingdom*, as well, the bulk of operational crisis management is decentralized, with critical functions handled by fire and police authorities as well as local authorities (Fanoulis et al. 2014: 12; Kapucu 2009). Strategic management is, however, rather centralized. The crisis organization at the central-governmental level is based on the idea of lead government departments (LGDs) and overarching coordination is managed through the Cabinet Office via a directly subordinated Civil Contingencies Secretariat (CCS), established in 2001. The lead-organization function circulates between resort ministries depending upon where a crisis emerges (Westerberg and Nilsson 2011). The CCS sorts administratively under the Ministry of the Interior. Its main tasks involve strengthening national preparedness vis-à-vis different threats by coordinating with other bodies within and outside the government offices. In major crises, the CCS reports to a Security and Intelligence Coordinator and acts as a secretariat for the home secretary vis-à-vis the Civil Contingencies Committee, which is the overarching network-administrative-structure activated in crisis-situations. The inter-ministerial Cabinet Office Briefing Room (COBR) has been designated as the key political crisis management facility in incidents of «national significance», i.e. in situations demanding concerted action across resort-areas, and joins up different parts of the central and local crisis-organizations (Kapucu 2009). The COBR, then, can be seen as representing a network-administrative coordination regime under central direction, particularly as it is also involved in deciding on LGDs in crises of major magnitude (Fanoulis et al. 2014: 13).

Turning to *The Netherlands*, a similar picture emerges in that the bulk of operational crisis management is handled at regional and local levels but where central governmental institutions perform important coordinating functions. Recent reforms have aimed to strengthen the national crisis organization. Concerning the organization at the central level Dutch resort ministries host designated departmental crisis centers that are coordinated during crisis-situations via the Ministerial Committee for Crisis Management (politically) and an the Interdepartmental Crisis Management Committee (administratively). A designated National Crisis Centre facilitates coordination (i.e. through information-gathering and communication) between resort-areas in cross cutting crises (Kuipers and Boin 2013: 10). Operational crisis management at the central level takes place via the National Operational Coordination Centre, which manages the coordination between central governmental institutions and the local level (ibid: 14). In addition, a tailor-made agency, the National Coordinator for Security and Counterterrorism (NCTV), was

⁸http://www.bbk.bund.de/SharedDocs/Downloads/BBK/EN/booklets_leaflets/Flyer_Civil_Protection_in_Germany.pdf?_blob=publicationFile (slide 7).

established in 2011⁹. The agency is subordinated to the Ministry of Security and Justice and consolidates administrative capacities for crisis preparedness within a single institutional structure. The establishment of the NCTV can arguably be interpreted as a step towards a lead-agency approach to crisis management. The ministry, on its part, has been strengthened as part of this consolidation and enjoys delegated powers to intervene and act in other ministries' domains if and when a serious terrorist threat occurs¹⁰.

In *Sweden*, the idea of a lead agency was an important topic in structural reforms in the policy-area during the 2000s and ultimately led to the creation of a designated crisis-preparedness agency in 2009, the Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency (MSB)¹¹. The MSB sorts administratively under the Ministry of Defense and has been delegated the responsibility for crisis-preparedness, including that of being a contact point for international cooperation in the policy-area. However, despite its concrete mandate, its competence is limited and the national crisis-organization is predominantly a networked affair (Bakken and Rhinard 2013; Westerberg and Nilsson 2011). The overarching political responsibility for the policy-area rests with the government, but the prime minister and his staff play key coordinating roles. First of all, a group for strategic coordination composed by junior ministers and directed by the prime minister's junior ministers draws up the overall strategy for the Government Chancellery in crisis situations and mediate between ministries in case of disagreements. A designated Crisis Management Chancellery, which sorts directly under the Prime Minister's Office, has as its chief objective the coordination of crisis-response within the national crisis organization. It thus also functions as an internal contact-point during emergency-situations. Finally, the organization assists a designated senior official at the Prime Minister's Office who reports directly to the prime minister's junior ministers and performs specific coordination-related tasks¹². In Sweden too, however, operational crisis management is significantly decentralized and locates key tasks to actors at local and regional levels (Bakken and Rhinard 2013: 11).

In *Denmark*, a similar agency was created in 1993 as part of the enactment of a new «Preparedness Act». The Danish Emergency Management Agency (BRS) sorts under the Ministry of Defense¹³. Section 5 of the preparedness act designates it as the lead organization for these purposes. The overarching political-administrative responsibility for crisis preparedness at the central state level rests with the minister of defense. The ministry hosts the «Office of Emergency Management», which oversees the activities of the BRS in addition to setting overall targets for the national preparedness policy. Even though the Danish system appears to also feature elements of a lead agency model, the national crisis organization activates several resort areas and the ministries and central agencies operative therein. Thus, network-administrative arrangements loom large at the interface between

⁹ https://english.nctv.nl/organisation_en/who_is_nctv/the_organisation

¹⁰ https://english.nctv.nl/themes_en/themes-a-z/Legislation/national/Extended_powers.aspx.

¹¹ It was not entirely new, however. The MSB was created through a merger of a designated crisis preparedness agency created in 2002 as well as the State Rescue Services and the Board for Psychological Defense (Bakken and Rhinard 2013: 13).

¹² www.regeringen.se/sb/d/1477/a/108973

¹³ <http://brs.dk/omstyrelsen/historie/Pages/Historie.aspx>

different resort-areas. At the central administrative level, we find the National Operative Staff (NOST) and the International Operative Staff (IOS). The NOST is chaired by the Danish National Police and coordinates nation-wide incidents, including securing communication vis-à-vis the public in crisis situations through a designated Central Operative Communications Preparedness¹⁴. At the central political level, the government can activate the Danish National Emergency Organization in particularly severe crises, which consists of three layers. At the highest level we find the government's sub-committee for security, which consists of the prime minister, and the ministers of economic affairs, foreign affairs, defense and justice. Secondly, a civil servants' preparedness group has been set up, which consists of department executives from the aforementioned ministries plus executives from the central intelligence services. Finally, a crisis preparedness group consisting of representatives from the above-mentioned ministries plus the ministry of health, the Danish National Defense Command, the Danish National Police and BRS takes care of questions primarily related to overall preparedness planning¹⁵.

Turning to *Norway* the structure set up to ensure societal safety, crisis preparedness and management is frequently described as fragmented (Fimreite et al. 2014). The lead coordinating entity is the Ministry of Justice and Public Security (Rykkja and Læg Reid 2014). In the case of a major crisis the ministry takes on a lead coordinative role. A Government Emergency Management Council (GEMC) and a Government Emergency Support Unit (GESU) have administrative coordinating and support functions during a crisis. Residing under this ministry is the Directorate for Civil Protection and Emergency Planning, established in 2003. Its main function is to be the overarching capacity for national preparedness plans, assist the ministry and provide efficient crisis management and communication at all levels. It is paralleled by the National Security Authority, which reports to the same resort-ministry in civil matters. Thus, in Norway too, the policy-area activates the competences of several political-administrative actors and network-administrative arrangements that have been established in order to foster better coordination.

Following the 2011 terrorist attacks in Oslo and at Utøya, the capacities and preparedness of the Ministry of Justice and Public Security became heavily criticized, prompting a reform of the policy-area. A resolution launched in 2012 (St. meld. 209, 2011-2012) aimed to clarify the ministry's responsibilities and lead function. The resolution established that the ministry should take the lead in all national crises unless the GEMC decided otherwise. The GESU was strengthened and made a permanent unit under the ministry. Moreover, a Civil Situation Centre was established within the ministry to facilitate the functioning of the lead ministry. Finally, the ministry was furthermore partly restructured. GESU now resides under a new Department for Crisis Management and Security within the ministry. The development in Norway has gone somewhat further in the direction of a lead-agency based crisis organization and this function can furthermore be

¹⁴ <https://www.politi.dk/da/service/menu/baggrund/beredskab.htm>

¹⁵ http://brs.dk/beredskab/idk/myndighedernes_krisehaandtering

seen as permeating the network-administrative structures that have been established, and re-organized, to forge coordination across ministerial domains.

The overview illustrates, first, that over the last 10-15 years there has been a significant reorganization and reshuffling activity going on in the formal arrangements in this policy area in all the selected countries moving towards an all-hazard approach (Bossong and Hegeman 2013). Second, we have revealed a potential tension between the need for local action and flexibility during a crisis, and the need for central control, authority, leadership and planning (Kettl 2003). Third, we have also revealed a potential tension between existing lines of specialization by sector and efforts to establish cross-boundary arrangements (table 1) in the area of the national crisis organizations (Fimreite et al. 2014). Generally the internal security and crisis management structure mirror the regular political-administrative structure. A lead agency model tends to be more frequently used as a supplementary and intermediate form between traditional hierarchy and networks, but the actual content of this organizational type seems to vary from country to country. There is no development towards a 'one-size-fits-all' approach.

Table 1: Overview of key institutions and intermediate coordination-structures

| | Key institutions | Key intermediate coordination structures | Overall coordination features |
|-----------------|---|--|--|
| Germany | Federal Office of Civil Protection and Disaster Assistance, Ministry of the Interior | Inter-ministerial Panel on National Crisis Management, federal-regional coordination | Decentralized, federative system with interlocking coordination problems, ministerial responsibility |
| United Kingdom | Cabinet and the Civil Contingencies Secretariat | Cabinet Office Briefing Rooms | Rather centralized at strategic level, ministerial responsibility |
| The Netherlands | National Coordinator for Security and counterterrorism, Ministry of Security and Justice | Ministerial Committee for Crisis Management,, National Crisis centre, National Operational Coordination Center | Rather centralized at strategic level, ministerial responsibility combined with network arrangements |
| Denmark | Danish Emergency Management Agency, Ministry of Defense | Danish National Emergency Organization, NOST/IOS | Ministerial responsibility with network arrangements, rather centralized, |
| Sweden | Prime Minister's Office, Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency | Crisis Management Chancellery | Rather centralized, no ministerial responsibility, strong central agencies |
| Norway | Ministry of Justice and Public Security, Directorate for Civil Protection and Emergency Planning, National Security Authority | The Government Emergency Management Council | Rather centralized and fragmented with some network arrangements, ministerial responsibility, strong line ministries |

This is to be expected in a policy-domain that by default combines different overarching principles of specialization. The consolidation of key functions within single institutional

structures has not significantly challenged the principles of parity, prescribing that the organization in crisis situation should be as similar to ordinary organization as possible, and the principle of responsibility, prescribing that each public organization is responsible for crisis management within its own portfolio, that loom large in the overall specialization of the policy-area. The observations illustrate that coordination is aspired neither through hierarchical nor network-administrative features alone, but rather that reforms in this policy-area have resulted in a hybrid institutional setup. Different principles tend to be applied in tandem, indicating some merging trends between hierarchy and networks (O’Leary and Bingham 2009). This might enhance coordination but might also create tension.

We now leave the formal arrangements and try to illuminate how they operate in practice by addressing the experienced coordination behavior of top civil servants in this policy area, their coordination culture and their perceived coordination quality along different dimensions.

Coordination behavior, culture and quality

Coordination behavior

In order to assess how coordination structures impact on practice, we use several indices that provide insights on coordination behavior among administrative executives. We concentrate on the policy-area of «justice, public order and safety», i.e. the policy-area in which most of the capacities discussed above are located. Our analysis starts by examining the extent to which reforms in the policy-area aimed at furthering collaboration and cooperation among different public sector actors are deemed important. More specifically, the executives were asked «How important is collaboration and cooperation reforms as a reform trend in your policy area?» A large majority of the respondents (77 %) considered this to be the case and particularly so in Norway (88 %) and the Netherlands (89 %), whereas the Danish respondents saw such reforms as less important (44 %) (Table 2). 31 % of the top civil servants meant that the reforms in this policy area were mainly crisis or incident driven. Especially this was the case in the Netherland (42 %) but not so much in Germany (19 %) and Sweden (21 %). Only 23 % said that they were strongly planned¹⁶.

¹⁶ The values on this variable were from 1 (crisis and incident driven) to 10 (planned). Answers 1–3 is here seen as crisis and incident driven and 7–10 as planned.

Table 2: «How important is collaboration and cooperation as a reform trend in your policy-area?». N (average): 226.

| | Important | Indifferent | Not important |
|-----------------|-----------|-------------|---------------|
| Germany | 76 | 13 | 12 |
| UK | 72 | 17 | 11 |
| The Netherlands | 89 | 12 | 4 |
| Sweden | 75 | 14 | 12 |
| Denmark | 44 | 22 | 33 |
| Norway | 88 | 6 | 6 |
| Overall | 77 | 12 | 11 |

* Based on a 7-point scale: 1-3: important; 4: indifferent; 4-7: not important.

By and large, collaboration and cooperation were accorded significant weight by administrative executives in this policy-area. Thus, it is relevant to go further and look closer into how the executives typically act when they experience overlaps with other organizations, i.e. situations that the collaboration and cooperation reforms can be seen as primarily targeting (Table 3).

The general picture is that top civil servants tend to refer issues upwards within the administrative hierarchy when experiencing overlaps and potential conflicts of interest with other organizations. The establishment of cross-cutting collaborative working-groups tends to be supplemented with the initiation of crosscutting policy-arrangements or programs. The idea of setting up a lead organization is favored by roughly one third of the respondents. Conversely, setting up more permanent special-purpose bodies or consulting with private sector or civil society organization, does not appear to be a particularly common response.

Table 3: When my organization's responsibility or interests conflict or overlap with that of other organizations, my organization typically ...» N (average): 200

| | Disagree | Indifferent | Agree |
|---|----------|-------------|-------|
| Refers the issues upwards in the administrative hierarchy | 27 | 17 | 55 |
| Refers the issue to political actors and bodies | 44 | 18 | 38 |
| Sets up special purpose bodies (more permanent) | 69 | 13 | 18 |
| Sets up cross-cutting work- or project groups | 32 | 23 | 45 |
| Sets up cross-cutting policy-arrangements | 45 | 20 | 35 |
| Sets up a lead organization | 50 | 18 | 32 |
| Consults stakeholders in private sector/civil society | 63 | 14 | 23 |
| Consults experts | 53 | 20 | 28 |

* Based on a 7-point scale: 1–3: disagree; 4: indifferent; 4–7: agree.

There are important variations between countries with respect to how the coordination-measures are applied (Tabel A1). Referring issues upwards is least common in Norway and Sweden. Referring cases to the political hierarchy is most common in the Netherlands and least frequent in the UK and Denmark. Cross-cutting working groups appear to be more popular in the Netherlands and Norway, and far less used in the UK. Conversely, cross-cutting policy-arrangements are not particularly prevailing in Germany and Norway, but often used in Sweden. Germany, along with the UK, also tends to frequently apply a lead organization model, but this is less common in Norway and the Netherlands. Consultation with stakeholders in the private and voluntary sector, finally, is less used in Denmark and the UK, but is a fairly well-used tool in the UK. If we look at the figures overall, a main impression is that a variety of coordination-arrangements are being used in all of the countries, a finding that echoes a main insight from our descriptive overview of coordination-arrangements at the central state level. It also shows that a systematic pattern is difficult to find in this instance.

The figures presented alone do not necessarily tell us much about how they are interrelated in practice, i.e. the extent to which network-administrative arrangements supplement or compete with more hierarchy-based coordination tools. A simple correlation-analysis reveals that there are no statistical relation between the use of hierarchical instruments and network arrangements.

With respect to different network-administrative arrangements, we observe significant positive correlations between setting up cross-cutting work and project groups, setting up cross-cutting policy-arrangements, consulting experts and stakeholders in the private and voluntary sectors and the importance attached to the use of collaboration and coordination reforms (Pearson's R between .16 and .60). This indicates that the network instruments may be overlapping or complementary rather than alternative measures.

Coordination culture

Thus far we have focused on the actual use of different coordination-instruments among administrative executives in the portfolio of justice, public order and safety. Consistent with our analytical framework, however, we will also pay closer attention to those informal attributes that sustain, support and potentially contradict established coordination arrangements, such as shared norms, values and the forging of a common culture. Here, we use top civil servants' role-identities and their attitudes towards different policy-objectives as relevant proxies of administrative culture.

Overall, the surveyed officials display strong common role identifications. 80 % of the officials agree or strongly agree that finding joint solutions to solve problems of public concern is an important part of their role-identification, while 79 % report that getting public organizations to work together is an important component of this role-identification. Getting public organizations to work together is a particularly important value in Norway (94 %) and Sweden (90 %), but not that strongly valued in the UK (64 %). Finding joint solutions to solve problems of common concern does not vary much between the different countries. We also find that role-identification is a multi-dimensional concept, and these two indices are only a part of a larger repertoire of administrative values. Achieving results, being able to implement laws and rules impartially, providing expertise and professional knowledge as well as the efficient use of resources are all rated higher than working together and finding joint solutions.

Coordination quality

The question of how perceptions of coordination quality relates to coordination behavior is central. The survey data includes perceptions on coordination quality within own policy area (ranging from «very poor» to «very good») and on manner in which the performance of public administration has developed over the last five years considering policy coherence and coordination (ranging from «deteriorated significantly» to «improved significantly»). Table 4 reveals how administrative executives within the sector perceive the state of affairs along these two dimensions.

Table 4: Assessment of the quality of coordination along different dimensions . N (average): 202.*

| | Good | Indifferent | Poor |
|--|----------|-------------|--------------|
| Vertical coordination/within own policy-area | 59 | 22 | 19 |
| Horizontal coordination/across policy-areas | 37 | 27 | 36 |
| With regional/local governments | 40 | 31 | 30 |
| With international/supranational bodies | 37 | 24 | 38 |
| With private sector/civil society actors | 43 | 32 | 25 |
| | Improved | Indifferent | Deteriorated |
| Quality of policy coherence and coordination | 33 | 38 | 30 |

* «Poor»/«Deteriorated»: values 1–3; «Indifferent»: value 4; «Good»/«Improved»: values 5–7.

Overall, coordination was not considered as particularly good. Vertical coordination within own policy area was considered as good by most of the respondents, while horizontal coordination across policy areas and with international and supranational bodies was seen as rather poor (Table 4). Coordination with local and regional bodies and with stakeholders fell somewhere in between.

A closer look at the interrelations between the various dimensions reveals that they were overlapping rather than alternative. Poor assessment along one dimension tends to be accompanied by other dimensions being rated poorly as well. The correlation between all five dimensions was statistically significant (Pearson's R ranging between .34 and .68). This was also the case between improved policy-coherence and coordination and internal vertical/horizontal coordination (Pearson's R= .25 and .26 respectively) as well as coordination with private sector and civil society stakeholders (Pearson's R= .20).

All in all, the executives report a rather mixed pattern regarding the quality of policy coherence and coordination. One third saw improvement, one fourth reported deterioration, and 32 % did not report any changes either way. This reveals an interesting paradox: On the one hand, coordination and collaboration was seen as an important contemporary reform trend. On the other, the officials reported few significant improvements in the quality of coordination over the last five years.

The vertical coordination within own policy-area is perceived as best in the Netherlands and Sweden and poorest in Germany and Denmark (Table 5). Denmark scores low on horizontal government coordination between policy-areas. Coordination downwards vis-à-vis regional and local bodies seem to be best in Germany and Sweden and most challenging in Norway and the Netherlands. Coordination outwards vis-à-vis stakeholders in the private and voluntary sectors appear to be best in the Netherlands and Denmark and most difficult in Sweden and Norway. Coordination upwards towards international and supranational bodies, finally, does not vary much between the six countries. Generally, the administrative executives in Denmark and the Netherlands are

most positive in their assessment of the policy-coherence and coordination in their own policy-area over the past five years, while Norwegian and Swedish are remarkably less inclined towards reporting improvements in their policy-domain.

Table 5: Assessment of coordinating quality by country. N (average): 244*

| | GER | UK | NED | SWE | DEN | NOR |
|--|-----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Vertical coordination/ within own policy-area | 45 | 52 | 67 | 76 | 40 | 59 |
| Horizontal coordination/ between policy-areas | 39 | 33 | 38 | 41 | 20 | 33 |
| With local and regional bodies | 53 | 33 | 24 | 50 | 39 | 20 |
| With supranational / international bodies | 40 | 36 | 30 | 44 | 37 | 41 |
| With private/ civil society stakeholders | 42 | 48 | 52 | 34 | 50 | 33 |
| Quality of policy coherence and coordination | 24 | 41 | 57 | 12 | 86 | 19 |

* The figures are percentages that report good coordination or improved policy-coherence and coordination (values 5–7 on a scale 1–7 where 1 was «very poor» and 7 was «very good»).

Relations between coordination behavior, culture and quality

We now turn to the relation between coordination culture and perceptions on coordination quality, on the one hand, and between coordination behavior (the use of different coordination arrangements) and coordination quality on the other. To this end, we employ a bivariate and a multivariate analysis (Table A2).

Overall, the correlations between the variables are not very strong (Pearson's R between .01 and .27). Most are not statistically significant – although this may be explained by a low N . The bivariate analysis of coordination quality and coordination behavior reveals that referring issues upwards in the administrative hierarchy is not correlated with perceived coordination quality. The same is the case for referring issues to political bodies and establishing special purpose organizations. However, typical network arrangements, such as setting up cross-cutting work- or project groups, are positively and statistically significantly correlated with perceptions of coordination quality with private and civil society stakeholders and overall policy-coherence and coordination performance (Lægheid, Rykkja, Sarapuu and Ramnda Liiv 2014b). This indicates that those who frequently use these instruments also tend to value coordination within these areas more positively. The latter is also the case for another typical network arrangement: setting up cross-cutting policy-arrangements. Doing so is also positively correlated with perceptions of coordination

upwards within the vertical dimension. Setting up a lead organization is positively correlated with the perception of coordination with local and regional bodies, and consulting stakeholders in the private and civil society sector tends – not particularly surprisingly – to go hand in hand with a positive view of the coordination between public and private bodies.

Coordinating culture and adherence to a role-identity emphasizing coordination («finding joint solutions» and «getting public organizations to work together») seems furthermore to have an impact on perceptions of coordination quality. Getting public organizations to work together correlates positively with internal coordination, both vertically within own policy-area and horizontally between different policy-areas, as well as with stakeholders in private and civil society sectors. Finding joint solutions to solve problems of common concern has a positive impact on the officials' perception on the quality of coordination vis-à-vis local and regional bodies. Thus, having a strong joint coordinating identity seems to enhance the perception of coordination quality both internally and externally, as well as vertically and horizontally, although not when it comes to coordination with international bodies.

A multivariate regression analysis reveals that the effects of most of the variables factoring in various coordination arrangements do not hold when controlled for other variables (Table 6). The only statistically significant relationship in the model is between consulting stakeholders in the private and voluntary sector and the perceived quality of coordination vis-à-vis these actors. Cultural factors matter also in this model. This concerns not only the impact of national political-institutional idiosyncrasies, which we account for by employing admittedly crude country-dummies, but also those indices that we have employed in order to factor-in a collaborative culture. First of all, we observe a significant effect of finding joint solutions to solve problems of public concern on coordination vis-à-vis local and regional bodies and also that getting people to work together yields a positive effect on internal coordination both vertically and horizontally (Lægneid et al. 2014b). Concerning country-differences, we can also observe that the Dutch respondents report more improvement when it comes to policy coherence and coordination over the past five years than executives in the five other countries. Finally, German administrative executives perceive vertical coordinating quality within their own policy-area as less good compared to their European colleagues.

Table 6: Multivariate regression analysis. Beta-coefficients.

| Coordination quality | Vertical | Horizontal | Local/ regional bodies | Inter- /supra- national | Private/civil society | Coherence/ Coordination |
|---------------------------------------|----------|------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| Coordination behavior | | | | | | |
| Cross-cutting work groups | | | | | .09 | .09 |
| Cross-cutting policy arrangements | .13 | | | | | .13 |
| Lead organization | | | .15 | | | |
| Consult civil society/ private sector | | | | | .19* | |
| Coordination culture | | | | | | |
| Finding joint solutions | | | .20** | | | |
| Working together | .15* | .18** | | | | |
| Countries | | | | | | |
| Germany | -.28** | -.04 | | -.04 | | |
| UK | .01 | .02 | -.11 | -.13 | .01 | .09 |
| The Netherlands | -.06 | -.04 | -.17 | -.15 | .09 | .24** |
| Scandinavia* | | | -.17 | | .01 | .04 |
| R ² : | .15 | .04 | .13 | .02 | .12 | .11 |
| Adjusted R ² : | .13 | .02 | .10 | .01 | .08 | .09 |
| F-value: | 5.816 | 1.866 | 4.102 | 1.713 | 3.037 | 4.650 |
| Sign. of F: | .000 | .118 | .002 | .166 | .055 | .011 |

*: sign: .05; **: sign: .01.

The regression analysis only includes variables with significant bivariate correlations

Discussion

Our descriptive analysis of *coordination structures* demonstrates that no single principle of organization appears to permeate the institutional specialization of societal security governance in the countries we analyze. Neither is there necessarily any convergence around a common model for organizing civil security capacities. There may have been a tendency towards streamlining national crisis-organizations towards institutions that have the coordination of other central administrative bodies as a main task, reflecting fragmentation and specialization. However, this does not imply a convergence towards an all-encompassing lead agency model wherein all relevant activities are transferred to such tailor-made institutions. Instead, to the extent that the notion of a lead agency is relevant to apply vis-à-vis national crisis organizations at an operational level, it primarily refers to a *function* that seems to circulate between existing organizations depending upon where the crises materialize. Major crises will inevitably release coordinating pressures in as much as they seldom are confined to one resort-area alone. The emergence of tailor-made agencies as well as intermediate coordinating arrangements at the central state level supplement, rather than replace, those patterns of responsibility and accountability that characterize the central administrative apparatus in «normal» times. It might also be the case that it is difficult to have strong horizontal coordination at both the central and the subordinate level at the same time (Egeberg and Trondal 2009).

Our analysis of *coordination behavior* demonstrates the relative importance of various approaches to coordination on the perceived *quality* of the coordination. Overall, the relation between the two is not very strong. It seems that the use of horizontal and network-based arrangements might enhance perceptions of coordination quality. Those who frequently use these instruments tend to value coordination within these areas more positively. Frequent use of the hierarchy does not seem to be related to perceptions of coordination quality, however.

With respect to our theoretical departure point, the empirical results primarily support a cultural perspective underlining the importance of administrative culture and country differences that might be linked to different administrative traditions in Scandinavia, Germany, the Netherland and UK, but also to some extent network arrangements. Administrative tradition does not, however, determine coordination behavior and it needs to be understood as one of several factors affecting coordination (Painter and Peters 2010). In contrast, our expectations drawn from a structural–instrumental perspective regarding the use of hierarchal arrangements find limited support, reflecting the complex task of coordination across levels and sectors for leaders. A main conclusion is that there does not appear to be a strong systematic relationship between organizational arrangements and perceived quality of coordination. By and large, this corresponds with a main finding in the previously mentioned ANVIL-project (Bossong and Hegemann 2013). What kind of coordination mechanism one chooses is therefore not necessarily related to how one evaluates the quality of coordination.

It might be the case that our measure of coordination behavior and quality is not quite developed enough to capture such a relation, or that these relations are too subtle to

capture through survey data alone. However, if it indeed is so that the two are not related, this could indicate that executives are more tradition-bound than initiative-seekers and that they tend to follow established rules and routes (paths) rather than new ones based on evaluation of what seems to work. This needs further analysis and more sophisticated data to be fully answered, however. It would be particularly interesting to see whether these assessments and relations are affected by actual crises, for instance. We would expect variation according to types of crises – whether it is a narrow or a transboundary crisis, whether it is small or big, if it is characterized as routine or unexpected, and whether it is man-made or characterized as a natural crisis (Christensen, Læg Reid and Rykkja, Forthcoming). In this paper we have mainly addressed the strategic level, but it might be useful to distinguish more clearly between operational and strategic level when describing the formal structure and also between emergency preparedness and crisis management when it comes to coordination arrangements and quality.

Looking at the empirical material in combination, our observations indicate that national crisis organizations are composite and tend to combine various elements that may be contradictory but nonetheless coexist (Olsen 2007). Rather than purifying a single organizational recipe, hybrid systems emerge in which hierarchical and collegial measures supplement, but also partly challenge each other. Different public sectors often rely on such mixed arrangements, reflecting that most «pure» organizational arrangements are ideal types perhaps serving more as heuristic devices than as real world phenomenon (Pollitt and Bouckaert 2011). The development of these structures within the area of societal safety may also be a case of what Streeck and Thelen (2005) call *institutional layering*, a result of a process where new institutional elements are added to existing ones over time. As a result of institutional layering, power relations between different actors may change over time, as may definitions of problems and policy alternatives (March and Olsen 1996).

Looking at national variety and the combination of different features, a complex picture appears. Overall, Germany has more decentralized structures for strategic crisis management than the Scandinavian countries, the Netherlands and UK¹⁷. Germany faces especially coordination problems along the hierarchical dimension indicating interlocking coordination problems due to the federalist model (Scharpf 1988). The Netherlands score higher on importance of network coordination tools and consultations as well as the improved quality of policy coordination and coherence. The variety within the Scandinavian group is bigger than would be expected from the Scandinavian model.

A key strength of such mixed systems is that the balancing between different and potentially conflicting principles releases flexibility and may facilitate further change or adaption. However, the opposite may also be the case, as conflicting principles may balance each other out and thus create further stability (Olsen 2007: 14; Jacobsen 1960). «Stability», in this case, may imply that re-organization efforts aiming to clarify lines of demarcation and generate new overarching coordinating capacities will yield meagre operational effects in as much as they do not lead to corresponding adjustments in the

¹⁷ Unfortunately, due to a low response rate the UK findings are uncertain.

distribution of powers, competences and responsibilities characterizing the status quo. A de-coupling between policy and practice is a typical result, and the challenges sought addressed by comprehensive reorganization efforts may remain largely unresolved. Our findings indicate that both these factors may characterize the present organization and operation of coordination frameworks in European societal security governance.

Conclusion

The main focus of this paper has been to combine insights into formal structural arrangements in crisis management in six countries, the actual coordination mechanisms used by top civil servants, their role identifications (or coordination culture) and their perceptions of coordination quality. The structural variety displayed across countries, encompassing variety in centralization/decentralization, lead agencies and networks is large, and the connection of these features to coordination behavior and coordination culture is complex, loose and ambiguous. Connecting coordination quality with coordination behavior and coordination culture reveals that cultural factors are the most important for both vertical and horizontal aspects of coordination quality.

Coordination is an important current reform trend, and an administrative culture emphasizing coordination has gained a strong footing in European public administrations (Lægreid, Rykkja and Nordø 2014). Still, judgments about the impact of these reforms and new instruments are rather mixed. Efforts to enhance coordination may, based on previous studies, seem only moderately successful. A main conclusion is that there is no one best solution or correct formula for coordination that can harmonize competing interests, overcome uncertainty and ambiguous government structures and make policy choices that everyone will accept. Contemporary governmental systems in general, as well as within the area of societal safety, are characterized by interdependencies and diversity, which puts strong pressure on multi-dimensional coordination issues. Finding a workable balance between hierarchical instruments and network solutions is complicated and context-dependent, but might still be the way forward.

References

- Bakken, M. and M. Rhinard (2013): «Country study: Sweden». ANVIL-project report, available at: http://anvil-project.net/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/Sweden_v1.0.pdf (last accessed on May 7th 2014).
- Boin, A. P. 't Hart, E. Stern and B. Sundelius (2005): *The politics of crisis management*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Boin, A., M. Busuioac and M. Groenleer (2013): «Building European Union capacity to manage transboundary crisis. Networked or lead agency model?» *Regulation & Governance*, DOI: 10.1111/rego.12035
- Bosson, R. and H. Hegemann (2013): «Final analytical Report. Critical Findings and Research Outlook». ANVIL Deliverables 4.2, available at: http://anvil-project.net/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/Deliverable_4.2.pdf (last accessed on May 7th 2014).
- Bouckaert, G. B., G. Peters and K. Verhoest (2010): *The Coordination of Public Sector Organization* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Christensen, D.A., T. Christensen, P. Lægreid and T. Midtbø (2012): «Cross-border coordination activities in central government administration – combining organizational conditions and individual features», *Public Organization Review*, 12(4):367–382.
- Christensen, T. and P. Lægreid (2007): «The whole of government approach to public sector reform». *Public Administration Review*, 67, pp. 1059–1066.
- Christensen, T. and P. Lægreid (2008): «The Challenge of Coordination in Central Government Organizations: The Norwegian Case». *Public Organization Review. A Global Journal*, 8(2):97–116.
- Christensen, T., A. Lie and P. Lægreid (2007): «Still fragmented government or reassertion of the centre?». In T. Christensen and P. Lægreid (eds.): *Transcending New Public Management. The transformation of public sector reforms*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Christensen, T. and P. Lægreid (2011): «Democracy and administrative policy: Contrasting elements of New Public Management (NPM) and post-NPM». *European Political Science Review*, 3(1):125–146.
- Christensen, T., P. Lægreid, P.G. Roness and K.A. Røvik (2007): *Organization Theory and the Public Sector*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Christensen, T., P. Lægreid and L.H. Rykkja (Forthcoming): «The Challenges of Coordination in National Security Management – the Case of the Terrorist Attack in Norway» *International Review of Administrative Sciences*.
- Charron, N., C. Dahlstrøm and V. Lapuente (2012): «Now law without a state». *Journal of Comparative Economics*, 40:176–193.
- Dahlstrøm, C., B.G. Peters and J. Pierre, eds. (2011): *Steering form the centre*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Danielsen, O.A. (2013a): «Organizing for crisis preparedness in Europe: a comparative analysis of primary and intermediate institutional forms». Working-paper. Bergen: Department of Administration and Organization Theory.

- Danielsen, O.A. (2013b): *On the composite dynamics of transnational regulatory spaces*. PhD-dissertation. Bergen: Department of Administration and Organization Theory.
- Egeberg, M. (2012): «How bureaucratic structure matters: an organizational perspective». In: Peters, B. G. and J. Pierre (eds.): *The Sage Handbook of Public Administration*. 2nd edition. London: SAGE Publishing.
- Egeberg, M. and J. Trondal (2009): «National agencies in the European Administrative Space: Government driven, Commission driven or networked». *Public Administration*, 87(4):779–790.
- Fanoulis, E., E. Kirchner and H. Dorussen (2014): «Country-study: United Kingdom». ANVIL-project report, available at: http://anvil-project.net/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/United-Kingdom_v1.1.pdf (last accessed May 7th 2014).
- Fimreite, A.L., P. Lango, P. Læg Reid and L.H. Rykkja, eds. (2014): *Organisering for samfunnssikkerhet og krisehåndtering*. Second edition. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Frendreis, J.P. (1983): «Explanation of variation and detection of covariation: the purpose and the logic of comparative analysis». *Comparative Political Studies*, 16:255–272.
- Gulick, L. (1937): «Notes on the theory of organization». In: Gulick, L. and L. Urwick (eds.): *Papers on the science of administration*. New Hampshire: The Rumford Press.
- Head, B.W. (2008): «Wicked problems in public policy». *Public Policy*, 3(2):101–118.
- Héritier, A. and D. Lehmkuhl (2008): «The shadow of hierarchy and new modes of governance». *Journal of Public Policy*, 28(1):1–17.
- Hegemann, H. and R. Bossong (2013): «Country-study: Germany». ANVIL- project report, available at: http://anvil-project.net/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/Germany_v1.0.pdf (last accessed May 7th 2014).
- Hood, C. (1976): *The Limits of Administration*. London: Wiley.
- Jacobsen, K.D. (1960): «Lojalitet, nøytralitet og faglig uavhengighet i sentraladministrasjonen». *Tidsskrift for samfunnsforskning*, 1:231–48.
- Kapucu, N. (2009): «Emergency and crisis management in the United Kingdom: disasters experienced, lessons learned, and recommendations for the future» Obtainable from: <http://www.training.fema.gov/emiweb/edu/Comparative%20EM%20Book%20-%20Chapter%20-%20Emergency%20and%20Crisis%20Mgmt%20in%20the%20UK-Disasters,%20Lessons%20and%20Recomm.doc> (last accessed May 7th 2014).
- Kettl, D.F. (2003): «Contingent Coordination: Practical and Theoretical Puzzles for Homeland security». *American Review of Public Administration*, 33(3):253–277.
- Knill, C. (2001): *The Europeanization of National Administrations. Patterns of institutional Change and Persistence* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Krasner, S. (1988): «Sovereignty: an institutional perspective». *Comparative Political Studies*, 21(1):66–94.
- Kuipers, S. and A. Boin (2013): «Country study: The Netherlands». ANVIL-project report, available at: http://anvil-project.net/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/Netherlands_v1.1.pdf (last accessed May 7th 2014).

- Lægneid, P., L.H. Rykkja and Å.D. Nordø (2013): «Coordination Quality in Norwegian Central Government.. Paper presented at the EGPA Study Group on Governance of Public Sector Organizations on the EGPA Conference, 11–13 September 2013, Edinburgh, Also printed as COCOPS Working Paper no 14.
- Lægneid, P., L.H. Rykkja and Å.D. Nordø (2014): «The Quest for Coordination in European Central Government» Paper presented at panel on ‘The Challenge of Managing and Leading Public Service Organizations in the 21st Century’ at the ASPA Congress in Washington March 15–18.
- Lægneid, P., L.H. Rykkja, K. Sarapuu and T. Ramnda-Liiv, eds (2014a): *Organizing for Coordination in the Public Sector. Practices and Lessons from 12 European Countries*. Basingstoke: PalgraveMacmillan (Forthcoming).
- Lægneid, P., L.H. Rykkja, K. Sarapuu and T. Ramnda-Liiv, eds (2014b): «Coordination Challenges and Administrative Reforms». In G. Hammerschmid, S. Van de Walle, R. Andrews and P. Bezes, eds *Public Administration Reforms in Europe: The View from the Top*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- March, J.G. (1981): «Footnotes to organizational change». *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26:563–577.
- March, J.G. and J.P. Olsen (1989): *Rediscovering institutions. The organizational basis of politics*. New York: The Free Press.
- March, J.G. and J.P. Olsen. (1996): «Institutional Perspectives on Political Institutions», *Governance: An International Journal of Policy and Administration*, 9(3):247–64.
- March, J.G. and J. P. Olsen (2006): «The logic of appropriateness». In: Moran, M., M. Rein and R. E. Goodin (eds.): *The Oxford Handbook of Public Policy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- March, J. G. and H. A. Simon (1993): *Organizations*. 2nd edition. London: SAGE Publishing.
- Moynihan, D.P. (2005): «Leveraging Collaborative Networks in Infrequent Emergency Situation». Collaboration Series. IBM Centre for The Business of Government.
- O’Flynn, J., D. Blackman and J. Halligan, eds (2014): *Crossing Boundaries in Public Management and Policy*. London: Routledge.
- O’Leary, R. and L.B. Bingham (2009): *The Collaborate Public Manager*, Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Olsen, J.P. (2007): *Europe in search of political order*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Olsen, J.P. (2010): *Governance through institution-building*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Olsen, O.E., B.I. Kruke, J. Hovden (2007): «Societal Safety: Concept, Borders and Dilemmas». *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management* 15 (2): 69–79.
- Painter, M., and B.G. Peters, eds. (2010): *Tradition and Public Administration*. London: PalgraveMacmillan.
- Provan, K. and P. Kenis (2008): «Modes of network governance: structure, management and effectiveness». *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(2):229–252.
- Pollitt, C. and G. Bouckaert (2011): *Public Management Reform: A Comparative Analysis, New Public Management, Governance and the Neo-Weberian State*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rykkja, L.H. and P. Lægneid (forthcoming): «Coordinating for Crisis Management in Norway after the Terrorist Attack in 2011». In P. Lægneid, K. Sarapuu, L.H. Rykkja and T. Randma-Liiv (forthcoming):

Organizing for Coordination in the Public Sector. Practices and Lessons from 12 European Countries. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Scharpf, F.W. (1988): «The Joint Decision Trap: Lessons from German Federalism and European Integration». *Public Administration*, 66:239–278.

Scott, W.R. (2003): *Organizations. Rational, natural and open systems.* 5th edition. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Selznick, P. (1957): *Leadership in administration.* New York: Harper & Row.

Streeck, W. and K. Thelen (2005): *Beyond Continuity: Institutional Change in Advanced Political Economies.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Westerberg, A. and T. Nilsson (2011): «Att styra det oförutsedda – krisberedskapen som politikområde i internationellt ljus». Stockholm: Myndigheten för samhällsskydd och beredskap.

Appendix

*Table A1: Coordination tools by country. Percentage within policy area who agree.**

| | Germany | UK | Netherlands | Sweden | Denmark | Norway |
|---|---------|----|-------------|--------|---------|--------|
| Refers the issues upwards in the administrative hierarchy | 62 | 63 | 61 | 40 | 78 | 35 |
| Refers the issue to political actors and bodies | 40 | 13 | 50 | 36 | 11 | 29 |
| Sets up special purpose bodies (more permanent) | 15 | 13 | 29 | 17 | 11 | 6 |
| Sets up cross-cutting work- or project-groups | 38 | 25 | 59 | 45 | 40 | 53 |
| Sets up cross-cutting policy-arrangements | 21 | 38 | 43 | 52 | 35 | 24 |
| Sets up a lead organization | 52 | 50 | 11 | 26 | 33 | 12 |
| Consults stakeholders in private sector/civil society | 16 | 13 | 44 | 17 | 11 | 24 |
| Consults experts | 32 | 25 | 52 | 19 | 33 | 35 |
| (Average N) | 78 | 8 | 46 | 42 | 9 | 17 |

* Figures represent percentages that «agree» or «strongly agree» (i.e. answer 5, 6 or 7 on the 7-point scale).

Table A2: Pearson's R between coordination quality and coordination behavior.

| Coordination quality | Vertical/ within own area | Horizontal/ between areas | Local/regional | Supra-/ international | Private/civil society | Policy coherence and coordination |
|--|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| <i>Coordination behavior</i> | | | | | | |
| Administrative hierarchy | .03 | .05 | -.05 | -.08 | .01 | .10 |
| Political hierarchy | .11 | .09 | .00 | .09 | .02 | .10 |
| Special purpose org. | -.08 | -.03 | -.07 | .06 | -.08 | .06 |
| Cross-cutting work groups | .11 | .08 | .01 | .08 | .20** | .18** |
| Cross-cutting policy arrangements | .27** | .05 | .13 | -.04 | .13 | .18** |
| Lead organization | .06 | .14 | .23** | .01 | .02 | -.13 |
| Consult civil society/private sector | -.09 | .00 | .10 | -.02 | .25** | .02 |
| Consult experts | .03 | -.05 | -.06 | -.12 | .12 | .01 |
| <i>Coordination culture</i> | | | | | | |
| Finding joint solutions | .11 | .13 | .22** | -.04 | .04 | .05 |
| Getting public organizations to work together | .24** | .18** | .11 | .11 | .19** | .08 |

* : sign: .05; ** : sign: .01.