KDI SCHOOL

WORKING PAPER SERIES

국 제 정 책 대 학 원

KDI School of Public Policy and Management

Post-New Public Management, Civil Service Training and Development: Insights for the Korean Civil Service

Soonhee Kim

KDI School of Public Policy and Management

KDI 국제정책대학원

KDI School of Public Policy and Management

Abstract

Leaders in the public sector face continuous challenges in improving the quality of public service and policy efficacy to respond to the challenges of sustainable development, global competitiveness, and democratic governance in the post-New Public Management era. In this context, how have advanced industrialized countries invested in civil service training programs to maintain civil service competency to strengthen sustainability and global competitiveness? How have these countries reformed civil service training programs under the continuous pressure of government reforms in this era of austerity, uncertainty, and complexity of governance? The purpose of this research is to examine these questions by conducting an exploratory, comparative study of the civil service training programs of the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, and Finland. Based on the findings of this research, the paper addresses the implications of the findings for reforming civil service training programs in South Korea, and it proposes directions for reform in the governance context of South Korea.

Introduction

Scholars and practitioners acknowledge that people in the public service are among the most important resources of government in an era of increased uncertainty and complexity in public policy and management (Bekkers, Edelenbos, and Steijn 2011; Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD] 2003; World Bank Group 2005). While many factors influence governance effectiveness, it can depend on how well civil servants play facilitating roles between state and citizens, coordinate governance processes, and deliver services. Accordingly, ongoing civil service reforms and training and development are important agendas for government, even under different political regimes (Bourgon 2008; Foster 2000; van Wart, Hondeghem, and Schwella 2015; Raadschelders, Toonen, Meer, and Van der Meer 2007). The Republic of Korea (hereafter Korea) is no exception. Civil servants in Korea face continuous demands to improve the quality of public service and policy efficacy in response to challenges of sustainable development, global competitiveness, and critical citizenship.

One factor that influenced economic and social development in Korea was the bureaucratic capacity or bureaucratic leadership, built in the 1960s and the 1970s, that delivered economic and social policy planning, implementation, and results (Choi 2012; Kong, Kim, and Yang 2013). Indeed, there were many policy tools, civil service reforms, and public management reforms at the institutional, organizational, and individual levels to enhance bureaucratic capacity and leadership competency in the executive agencies in the Korean government between the 1960s and 2012 (Kim 2007; Kong, Kim, and Yang 2013). However, despite Korean government efforts at civil service reforms over decades, the Korean government has faced ongoing challenges of governance, including sustainable

growth, global competitiveness, emergency management, and integrity of public employees. What could be the right strategy for civil service training and development (hereafter CSTD) in Korea to prepare for dealing with more complex and turbulent governance problems effectively? Are there any lessons from CSTD in the target countries that show solid global competitiveness and integrity in the civil service?

In this context, this study explores the following research questions: How do advanced countries invest in CSTD to maintain civil service competency for sustainable development and global competitiveness? How have these countries redesigned CSTD and what specific competencies have been the focus under continuous pressure of government reforms in an era of austerity, uncertainty, and complexity of governance?

To analyze these questions, an exploratory, comparative study of the CSTD in the United Kingdom (UK), the Netherlands, and Finland, which have position-based recruitment systems for the civil service, was conducted. The three countries implemented significant public management reforms during the New Public Management (hereafter NPM) movement in the 1980s and the 1990s, as well as under the financial crisis of 2008 in the post-NPM era. The Netherlands has been a member country of the European Economic Community since 1958, and Finland joined in EU in 1995. The UK joined in EU in 1973, but it is currently negotiating to leave the EU on March 29, 2019. This is called Brexit.

Scholars emphasize that more international attention to comparative studies on civil service reforms, administrative capacity, and democratic governance capacity will improve both the intellectual diversity of topics and the quality of public administration research (Van der Meer, Raadschelders, and Toonen 2015). While there are many studies of government and civil service reforms in the advanced countries, limited attention has been paid to in-

3

depth comparative study of CSTD in the post-NPM era, especially relating to government

reforms and fiscal crises among advanced, industrialized countries. The results of the study

may bring some practical insights for the other countries' CSTD reforms and offer further

research ideas in the field of public human resources management (HRM).

Based on the exploratory case study, the paper first analyzes how the governance

context of each country could affect the reforms of CSTD programs in the post-NPM era.

Second, the paper explores the CSTD reform strategies these three countries adopted to

respond to governance challenges in the post-NPM reform era, including institutional

changes, CSTD programs, and competency. The research concludes with some lessons for the

CSTD reform in the Korean government.

Civil Service Training and Development in the Post-NPM Era

Public administration scholars' attention to government reform research has been

reframed and sophisticated by focusing on a more evidence-based approach to the impacts of

NPM and increased attention to the post-NPM discourse (Christensen 2012; Bekkers,

Edelenbos, and Steijin 2014; Hood and Dixon 2015; Lodge and Gill 2011) and the NPM

model (Osborne 2006; Pollitt & Bouckaert 2017). Critically analysis of government reforms

at the global level has addressed the constraints of the NPM model of government reforms,

pursuing the value of frugality by emphasizing output steering, competition, specialization,

and private sector management tools to deal with the complexity of public policy and

management agendas in the public management research field. For instance, scholars have

stated that NPM did not contribute much to engaging in the challenges of public governance,

such as the value of resilience, integrity, collaboration, participation, learning, and openness (Osborne 2006; Pollitt and Bouckaert 2017; O'Leary 2016).

In addition, scholars and practitioners acknowledge the challenge of managing and controlling financial crises in a global context, advanced information technology, and global governance such as the EU, which are also important factors affecting the direction of public management reforms (Bekkers, Edelenbos, and Steijin 2011; Dunleavy, Margetts, Bastow, and Tinkler 2005; Hammerschmid, van de Walle, Andrews, and Bezes 2016).

These public management reform studies have a common future research emphasis on how to enhance the adaptive leadership capacity of the civil service system to deliver effective and sustainable government reforms (Egeberg and Trondal 2009; Fimreite and Lægreid 2009; Green and Roberts 2012; van der Meer, Raadschelders, and Toonen 2015; van Wart, Hondeghrm, and Schwella 2015; OECD 2015, 2017c). Overall, the discourse of post-NPM research has paid attention to the following public management agendas:

- The importance of training (including for senior civil service staff) and life-long development.
- ICT, digitalization, and smart technology: agile and anticipatory governance.
- Public values, including a public service culture, integrity, ethics, and a code of conduct.
- Controlling the civil service system by assessing the degree of centralization and decentralization.
- Coordination by managing complex multi-governance.
- Organizational networks such as combinations of hierarchy, networks, and public-private partnerships.
- Emphasis on the leadership competency of communication and boundary spanning.

These agendas for the post-NPM era indeed bring a challenge to reframing CSTD programs in advanced countries. In particular, executive leaders of OECD member countries pay attention to how to build better relations between government and civil society and how to enhance government performance when public trust in public institutions has been

reducing (OECD 2017b). Meanwhile, the global literature shows that different countries have applied common efforts to enhance public service leadership competencies (Hammerschmid, van de Walle, Andrews, and Bezes 2016; Moilanen and Salminen 2007; van Wart, Hondeghrm, and Schwella 2015). For example, common adaptive approaches to CSTD reforms may include the institutionalization of senior civil service systems (van Wart, Hondeghrm, and Schwella 2015) and increased training programs in public service ethics in EU member countries (Moilanen and Salminen 2007).

Like the variations in public management reform strategies (Pollitt and Bouckaert 2004), different countries may adopt different forms of CSTD reform under various approaches such as reframing leadership competency criteria, restructuring CSTD institutions (e.g., more in-house or outsourcing or competition between the public and private sectors), redesigning programs, and innovation in learning methods. In this context, an exploratory study of the CSTD reforms in three countries: the UK, the Netherlands, and Finland took place.

Case Studies: The UK, the Netherlands, and Finland

Based on exploratory case studies of the UK, the Netherlands, and Finland, the CSTD reforms in the era of post-NPM in each country are analyzed. The three countries show variations in the degree of public management reform under the NPM paradigm (Pollitt and Bouckaert 2011) and the impacts of NPM on government reforms (Hammerschmid, van de Walle, Andrews, and Bezes 2016). In terms of the socioeconomic conditions of these countries in general, GDP per capita in the Netherlands in 2018 ($55,185) was higher than that of Finland ($52,422), and that of the UK was $44,177 (International Monetary Fund

2018). As of 2017, the UK had a much higher population (66,022,270) than the populations of the Netherlands (17,132,850) and Finland (5,511,300) (World Bank Group 2019). The rankings of the Global Competitiveness Index by the World Economic Forum also show the Netherlands' ranking as 4th and the UK's ranking as 8th among 140 countries in 2017-2018 (World Economic Forum 2018). Finland was ranked 10th (World Economic Forum 2018).

To analyze the CSTD in the UK, the UK Cabinet Office's reports and website information regarding civil service reforms, capabilities plan, and competency frameworks from the UK Civil Service were used. Related to CSTD programs, major institutions of civil service learning, which was established in 2012, the Government Digital Service Academy, established in 2014, and the Civil Service Leadership Academy, established in 2017, are analyzed. For the Netherlands and Finland, government internal documents provided to the Korea Development Institute relating to a 2015 research project on the civil service training programs of advanced democratic countries (Kim et al. 2015) were used.

For the case of Dutch government, internal documents provided to the Korea Development Institute by the Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations and Algemene Bestuursdienst (called the ABD) are analyzed. In addition, documents provided by the Dutch Institute for Public Administration, called the PBLQ, and the Netherlands School of Public Administration, called the NSOB are analyzed. The PBLQ and the NSOB, as private institutions, have been collaborating with the Dutch government to provide cutting-edge training programs for public-sector organizations. The PBLQ offers two graduate degree programs: a Master of Public Information Management and a Master of Public Human Resource Strategy (PBLQ 2015). Through a network of five partner universities, the NSOB also offers four executive master programs and senior and top-level professional development

programs (NSOB 2015). Both institutions also provide short-term, tailor-made training programs for specific public agencies or professions. For the case of the Finnish government, documents from the Ministry of Finance, the Finnish Institute of Public Management, called HAUS, and the Finnish Innovation Fund, called SITRA are analyzed.

The United Kingdom

The UK has been actively engaged in public management reforms, emphasizing government performance dimensions of working better and costing less over the last thirty years (Hood and Dixon 2015). From the downsizing efforts of so-called bloated bureaucracy in the 1980s' Thatcher government to the focus of efficiency, implementation, privatization, and outsourcing of public services in the 1990s, the UK took a leading role in government reforms within the NPM movement (Hood and Dixon 2015; Pollitt 2013; Pedersen and Hartley 2008). Since the election of the New Labour Government in 1997, several reform directions have been emphasized in the UK, including the devolution of decision making from central government agencies to local organizations and local communities, quality of service delivery, and performance assessment (Andrews, Downe, and Guarneros-Meza 2013; Pedersen and Hartley 2008). In 1998, under the concept of public service agreements, a performance management frame including delivery targets and performance evaluation metrics at the departmental level was established (Hood and Dixon 2015).

To facilitate tangible performance of government reforms, the UK government also invested in public leadership programs with an emphasis on how to develop leadership and management capacity to deliver high-quality and reliable services in the era of networked governance of the state, the market, and civil society organizations (Benington 2001; Rodgers

et al. 2003; UK Performance and Innovation Unit 2001; UK Cabinet Office 2006; Pedersen and Hartley 2008). Since the economic downturn of 2008, the UK government has taken the direction of government reforms under the assessment of governance challenges, including sustainable economic development, decentralization, transparency, public finances (lower cost), productivity, better service delivery, digitalization, data management, flexibility, getting results, integrity, impartiality, and professional career development (UK Cabinet Office 2012).

Overall, Hood and Dixon (2015) summarize the public management reforms over three decades as the change in the UK government from a public bureaucracy state to a contract state under the expanded adoptions of privatization and outsourcing of government services, including both blue-collar work and white-collar professional service. Meanwhile, there has been continuous transformation of government office work and public service delivery through the adoption of information technology in the UK government (Hood and Dixon 2015).

The most recent governance context in the UK civil service is directly related to Brexit. Based on a referendum held on June 23, 2016, the UK decided to leave the EU, and it invoked Article 50 of the Lisbon Treaty, which gave the two sides two years to agree the terms of the split by March 29, 2019 (Institute for Government 2017). New attention has been paid to public service leadership development in the UK civil service to prepare and implement Brexit effectively (Institute for Government 2017).

CSTD: Institutional Change, Programs and Competency

As mentioned earlier, scholars have pointed out the emphasis of public values and integrity in the post-NPM era. The UK civil service is no exception. Under the Constitutional

Reform and Governance Act, 2010 (Cabinet Office 2010), the UK government further strengthened the UK civil service's continuous focus on core values with the elaboration of standards of behavior of integrity, honesty, objectivity, and impartiality (UK Cabinet Office 2010, 2012, 2015). According to *Civil Service Vision 2015-2020: A Brilliant Civil Service*, a vision was identified, and the goal of the civil service reform was set to achieve improved outcomes through effective leadership, skilled people, and great places to work (UK Cabinet Office 2016). The vision also reemphasized the civil service commitment to the values of integrity, honesty, objectivity, and impartiality (UK Cabinet Office 2016).

In terms of changing the CSTD structure, the UK civil service paid close attention to e-learning systems. The UK CSTD had been delivered and coordinated by the National School of Government in the Cabinet Office. However, the Cabinet Office decided to close the National School of Government in March 2012, due to an emphasis on austerity and modernization of training systems (UK Cabinet Office 2015; Global Government Forum 2015).

In particular, the Cabinet Office emphasized the motivation for the change from residential and classroom learning to a combined approach of face-to-face courses with online training, coaching, and other materials to support workplace learning (UK Cabinet Office 2015; Global Government Forum 2015). Based on this motivation, civil service learning was established in 2012. The Cabinet Office used civil service learning as a way of improving the cost efficiency of CSTD and minimizing its duplication (UK Parliament 2018). Civil service learning is taking its responsibility of delivering 30% of CSTD in general topics such as customer service or people management to the majority of civil servants (UK Parliament 2018). Supported by civil service learning, the 70% of CSTD relating to technical

and business-specific training is the responsibility of departments and/or professions to meet competency development needs (UK Parliament 2018).

In addition, under the UK Civil Service Reform Plan (UK Cabinet Office 2012), the CSTD programs were designed under three categories of civil service capacity, namely *setting direction*, *engaging people*, and *delivering results*. Following the plan, the Capabilities Plan was launched in 2013, and the UK CSTD got an integrated approach of actions for individual civil servant and departments (UK Cabinet Office 2013). It also established five development days a year for CSTD. CSTD programs have been developed based on annual skills review data and matched with departmental needs and culture (UK Cabinet Office 2014). According to the review of the Capabilities Plan in 2014 (UK Cabinet Office 2014), 36 departments, covering over 420,000 civil servants completed the first cross-government Annual Skills Review. Over 280,000 civil servants completed the Competency Framework Self-Assessment, and 17 professions completed in-depth maturity assessments in addition to developing action plans to strengthen their professions (UK Cabinet Office 2014).

Programs and Competency

The UK Civil Service Reform Plan, 2012 (UK Cabinet Office 2012a & 2012b) set out ten competencies under three categories of civil service capacity, namely *setting direction*, *engaging people*, and *delivering results* (see Figure 1). Each dimension of the ten competencies has been elaborated by level of position from Level 1 to Level 6 (UK Cabinet Office 2012b). As shown in Figure 1, on the setting direction capacity, three competencies of *seeing the big picture*, *changing and improving*, and *making effective decisions* were identified as core competencies. The engaging people capacity dimension emphasized three competencies: *leading and communicating*, *collaborating and partnering*, and *building*

11

capacity for all. Concerning delivering results, four competencies were identified, namely *achieving commercial outcomes*, *delivering value for money*, *managing a quality service*, and *delivering at pace* (UK Cabinet Office 2012b).

Figure 1. UK: The Civil Service Competency Framework

Source: UK Cabinet Office (2012b, p.1)

Based on the 2012 Civil Service Reform Plan, four areas of competencies of the civil service were identified: *civil service leadership*, *programme management*, *commercial skills*, and *digital skills* (UK Cabinet Office 2015; Global Government Forum 2015). As a hub of online training programs via a new portal system, civil service learning took an approach of outsourcing the design and delivery of training programs, targeting reduced costs for training programs and expanded access to a better quality of CSTD (UK Cabinet Office 2015; Global Government Forum 2015). Overall, civil service learning provided a combined approach of e-learning, online resources, and classroom courses via an emphasis on outsourcing, customized design of CSTD at the agency and professional level, and collaboration among agencies (UK Cabinet Office 2015; Global Government Forum 2015).

In addition, the civil service learning paid attention to providing a series of high-energy, high-impact workshops about change leadership skills by inviting top officials from various agencies and providing 25 professional networks for each profession (UK Cabinet Office 2015). For example, an assessment study of UK Training and Development conducted in 2014 (UK Cabinet Office 2014) showed that over 3,600 senior civil servants in Grades 6/7 attended or enrolled in Change Leaders Workshops. Targeting senior civil servants' leadership development, the UK civil service has designed an Executive Masters of Public Policy degree programme with the London School of Economics (OECD 2017c). In addition, concerning commercial skills, over 200 project leaders have enrolled in the Major Projects Leadership Academy since February 2012 (UK Cabinet Office 2014).

The Government Digital Service Academy is another institution in which the UK civil service can take CSTD on digital skills. It was originally launched by the Department of Work and Pensions in 2014, but it moved to the Cabinet Office and became part of the Government Digital Service in May 2017 as part of the digital, data, and technology profession (UK Cabinet Office 2019b; Open Access Government 2018). As part of the Cabinet Office, the job of the Government Digital Service is delivering digital transformation of government through building platforms, standards, and digital services by collaborating with departments (UK Cabinet Office 2019a). The academy has been providing classroom-based training to around 8,000 civil servants from national government, local authorities, and charities in the areas of digital and agile delivery, user-centered design, and digital leadership (UK Cabinet Office 2014).

Considering professional tracks, the Government Digital Service also designed various courses from introductions for non-IT specialists to specialized and leadership courses for

specialists and leaders in the digital service profession. The academy runs the training programs in Leeds, London, Manchester, Newcastle, and Birmingham. The main courses the academy has offered are as follows (UK Cabinet Office 2019b):

- Digital and agile awareness course and Introduction to artificial intelligence in government
- Digital and agile foundation course and Agile for teams course
- Hands on agile for leaders course and Service owner course
- Research and design in government and Digital and agile awareness for analysts course
- Working level for product managers course and Working level for business analysts course
- Working level for delivery managers course and Digital and agile awareness for policy makers course

In 2017, a Digital, Data and Technology Profession Capability Framework was developed for around 17,000 civil servants in ICT professions (UK Cabinet Office 2017a). Based on the framework, six profession categories have been established, including data (three job titles), IT operations (eleven job titles), product and delivery (five job titles), Quality assurance and testing   (three job titles), technical (nine job titles), and user-centered design (seven job titles). The role description and skill set for each job have been identified under the framework (UK Cabinet Office 2017a).

In 2018, the academy established the Emerging Technology Development Programme (UK Cabinet Office 2018). This ten-week program for learning on emerging technologies was designed to provide tailored courses to improve the existing skills of civil servants. The program offers the topics of artificial intelligence and machine learning, augmented and virtual reality, biotechnology, distributed ledgers, geospatial technology, and quantum computing. These courses are designed and delivered via partnerships with academics and industry experts (UK Cabinet Office 2018).

Concerning leadership training for the senior civil service, the Civil Service Leadership Academy, established in 2017, has been providing development programs for leadership competency to senior civil servants, Director Generals, Directors, and Deputy Directors (UK Cabinet Office 2017b). The leadership modules for individual senior civil servants and departments provided by the academy include creating a coaching culture, high-impact communications, leading people through change, advanced media skills, inclusive leadership, leading without authority, personal impact, and a series of one-to-one development opportunities (UK Cabinet Office 2017c).

Related to the recent governance challenges of Brexit, scholars at the Institute for Government (2017) stated that the following leadership competencies are essential in the UK civil service: *capacity in policy analysis and policy making* for negotiations and new policy option development, *coordination capacity* for getting expertise and insights from government and civil society to get balanced views, *legislative capacity* to prepare, draft, and manage laws with the consideration of timelines, *delivery and implementation capacity* related to developing new regulations, and setting a new *immigration system* and implementing a new system of customs checks at UK borders (Institute for Government 2017).

Finally, the UK government has assessed the impacts of closing up the National School of Government on the senior civil service capacity, and it has addressed a lack of coordinated attention to collaborative leadership across services, especially for civil servants transitioning to senior leadership roles (UK Cabinet Office 2017b; UK Public Services Leadership Taskforce 2018). In 2017, a new Centre for Public Service Leadership, providing

a coordinated CSTD for senior civil servants along with the Civil Service Learning Academy, was announced with budget support for three years (UK Cabinet Office 2017b).

The Netherlands

Under the NPM movement in Europe, the Netherlands embraced downsizing, privatization, cost-efficiency, and performance management (Kickert 2010). These reform agendas continued through the 1980s, 1990s, and 2000s. The 1980s showed a decreased size of government, increased decentralized managerial approaches, and ultimately very limited emphasis on a centralized governing approach to push public service. However, scholars pointed out that while the Dutch government institutionalized coalition governments as a way of preventing a centralization of power within the core executive, an attempt to unify personnel policy was initiated at the senior civil service level by establishing the senior civil service in 1995 (Hammerschmid, van de Walle, Andrews, and Bezes 2016; van Wart, Hondeghrm, and Schwella 2015)

The Dutch government faced several challenges in the post-NPM era. Leading governance challenges identified by scholars and practitioners were: *economic crisis*, *sustainable growth*, *fiscal deficits*, *ICT development*, *collaboration*, *managing networks*, *corruption*, and *citizen rights for asking accountability* (OECD 2017a, 2017c; MIKR 2015; Leisink, Boselie, Bottenburg, and Hosking 2013; van der Meer and Toonen 2005; Steijn and Leisink 2007). These governance challenges brought attention to a recentralized management approach such as a shared service center approach in the Dutch government (OECD 2017c; MIKR 2015). Furthermore, there has been increased emphasis on public service values, including professionalism for problem solving, competency management, integrity, and a

social dialogue approach in the aftermath of the economic crisis (Leisink, Boselie, Bottenburg, and Hosking 2013; van der Meer and Toonen 2005; Steijn and Leisink 2007) .

CSTD: Institutional Change, Programs, and Competency

Since the financial crisis of 2010, the Dutch government has implemented a downsizing of public employees and a reduction of CSTD funding. New hirings and training programs have started since 2015 (Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations [MIKR] 2015; OECD 2017c). In the context of hiring and CSTD in 2015, the most important institutional change for the Dutch government was applying strategic planning to CSTD for 2020, led by MIKR (MIKR 2015; OECD 2017c). The Dutch government has applied a hybrid approach, which has combined a new way of coordinating and collaborating in-house programs within government and selectively utilized the privatization of CSTD.

The key purpose of the strategic planning of CSTD for 2020 has been reframing and sharing resources and knowledge among sixteen in-house CSTD institutions (MIKR 2015; OECD 2017c). Its mission has been identified: "As a State Government we learn and develop in order to achieve a just, entrepreneurial and sustainable society." Under the mission, three questions are included in the reform agendas: (1) What do we want to achieve? (improvement of state performance, a positive development climate, and collective learning); (2) What and how do we want to develop? (expertise and comprehensive learning contents, learning on the job, and outside-world learning); and (3) How do we want to organize this? (flexibility, financial accountability, and minimizing duplications) (MIKR 2015).

Under the strategic plan for 2020, the Dutch government has emphasized reshaping the value of in-house training institutions through building networks for coordination and

17

knowledge sharing. The hybrid approach of collaborating with educational institutions in the private sector has been also feasible, as the Netherlands has established education institutions and solid graduate programs of public administration (MIKR 2015). Both the PBLQ and the NSOB, as education institutions in the private sector have been collaborating with faculty members from diverse universities, including Erasmus University, Leiden University, Utrecht University, and Amsterdam University (MIKR 2015).

Concerning a proactive continuing education policy, a report by OECD (2003) indicated that the Dutch government has been investing in management development programs, including seminars and peer meetings for the exchange of experience and best practices. In addition, a special program for the talent pool was launched in the autumn of 2002, and more personal training programs allow executives to develop the competencies and experience needed for a given job profile (OECD 2003). It is worthwhile to note that a modification of the Civil Service Act (*Ambtenarenwet*) in 2006 introduced an oath for new civil servants, a code for good administrative conduct, and an overall strengthening of ethics policies (Hammerschmid, van de Walle, Andrews, and Bezes 2016).

The Dutch government's commitment to integrity has been also demonstrated by establishing a Dutch National Office for Promoting Ethics and Integrity in the Public Sector (*Bureau Integriteitsbevordering Openbare Sector*) in 2006 (MIKR 2015). In addition, the Civil Service Act stressed a regular assessment of work performance for every public servant, performance-based promotion, competence management, and life-long retraining in the civil service system (Hoetjes 2015)

Programs and Competency

The Dutch government has also invested in management development programs and e-learning systems. It is important to note that the Dutch government took proactive action for talent management for future top managers of the senior civil service coordinated by the Office of the Senior Civil Service (ABD 2014a). Concerning ABD's commitment to ongoing assessment of its competency, a manager at ABD noted how institutional context such as financial crises or restructuring or outsourcing tasks affected the competency development within central government (ABD 2014a).

There are various CSTD programs delivered by the government agencies and through partnerships with the NSOB and the PBLQ in the private sector, including university public administration programs. Some examples include a candidate program, a professional government administration program, a program on leadership in a globalized arena, peer-to-peer consulting programs, development through contextual change, competency management, job as learning place, and programs under the Dutch National Office for Promoting Ethics and Integrity (NSOB 2015; PBLQ 2015).

Concerning the emphasis on civil servants' competency, the most often mentioned competency in CSTD is ethics and integrity, followed by professionalism, team spirit, and community building (NSOB 2015; PBLQ 2015). The other competency lists included in the CSTD programs are the following managerial and governance dimensions (NSOB 2015; PBLQ 2015):

- Network management and social dialogue (negotiation, deliberation, persuasion, and fluid and smart society building).
- Public-private partnership and co-creation.
- Policy coordination, public communication, and project-based learning.
- Public leadership in a globalized arena (United States and EU).
- Change management, strategic management, and social entrepreneurship.

- ICT and media management.

Concerning leadership development programs, the ABD has also invested in training for presentations and media communication (ABD 2015a, 2015b). It has adopted various methods to deliver the knowledge and skills above during the CSTD, including a case study, reflection, field trip, social experiment, and consulting. The demands of e-learning, tailor-made programs, and diversity of competency development have been also acknowledged (ABD 2015a, 2015b). This study also found that the Dutch government agencies, the NSOB, and the PBLQ all embrace more training needs for network management, communication, and connecting civil service competency to the demand for social innovation (NSOB 2015; PBLQ 2015).

Overall, the research findings on the Dutch government are that it has been engaged in reforming CSTD to enhance government for sustainability in the post-NPM era. In sum, several distinctive CSTD trends in the Dutch government are: (1) from privatization and a hybrid of reshaping in-house training institutions to coordination and collaboration for knowledge sharing among agencies beside ongoing public-private partnership or outsourcing; (2) e-learning systems; and (3) succession planning and training programs for ABD. In terms of competency management, clear attention has been paid to public integrity and ethics, transparency, and citizen rights to accountability in the civil service. Furthermore, attention has gone to network management, communication, ICT, and connecting civil service competency to the demand for social innovation.

Finland

While Finland embraced NPM reforms of downsizing, decentralization, and managing for results, there was ongoing emphasis on public service integrity during the late 1980s and early 1990s. Unlike the Dutch government, Finland has been categorized as using a neo-Weberian approach and a new public governance approach (Hammerschmid, van de Walle, Andrews, and Bezes 2016; Pollitt and Bouckaert 2011; United Nations 2006).

As a deep economic depression hit in the early 1990s, the Finnish government took decisions concerning restructuring government organizations, budget reforms, and management by results under the leadership of the Personnel Committee (Ministry of Finance [MOF] 2010, 2013;Virtanen 2014; OECD 2015; van Wart, Hondeghrm, and Schwella 2015). Since then, the era of performance and personnel reduction has continued. Under multiyear savings, the number of state employees has fallen from 215,000 in 1988 to 82,000 in 2013 (MOF 2013).

Some post-NFM governance challenges for the Finnish government are economic crises and sustainable growth, internationalization through joining the EU in 1995, silos of executive agencies, and weak capacities of coordination and collaboration (MOF 2015a). To overcome these challenges, the Finnish government has emphasized utilization of advanced ICT, preparing for the future, subjective well-being, co-production of government and community, and more attention to community empowerment (MOF 2015a). These are also consistent with research on the Finnish government and governance (Virtanen 2016; OECD 2015; van Wart, Hondeghrm, and Schwella 2015).

Finland's bid for accession to the EU in 1995 also led to a further intensification of the reform process. After joining in EU in 1995, there was a lot of training for civil servants focusing on international competencies in the EU context. The senior civil service was also established in 1997, and competency management and leadership development have been emphasized since 2008 (Virtanen 2014; van Wart, Hondeghrm, and Schwella 2015; MOF 2015a, 2015b, 2015c). The Finnish government has paid strong attention to HRM decisions based on individual performance appraisals and management by objectives and results. Since 2008, the Finnish government has provided special executive training programs for senior civil servants, and in 2009, performance-related bonuses (up to a maximum of 8% of annual basic salary) were introduced for senior civil servants (Virtanen 2014; MOF 2015b). An agency-level HRM performance evaluation system has been implemented, including analyses of size, demographics, competencies, and job satisfaction (MOF 2015b).

In addition, job rotation and tailor-made training programs have been established to meet the job-specific demands of CSTD. The culture of integrity was further strengthened when the MOF produced *Values in the Daily Job – A Civil Servant's Ethics* in 2005 (MOF 2015a).

Managing the senior civil service as a community supporting whole-of-government strategy has also taken place under the vision of creating a culture of strategic agility and sustainable wellbeing (OECD 2015a, 2015b, 2017c; SITRA 2015). Specifically, the executive leadership training sustainable economic policy was delivered to create a shared vision for sustainable well-being through financial policy in an era of austerity. The executive training program targeting sustainable well-being provided the following as core competency areas for the future: empowering individuals and communities, moving to a regenerative and

22

collaborative economy, building competencies for a complex world, and developing inclusive

and adaptive governance (OECD 2017c; SITRA 2015). The Finnish government has

emphasized adopting a life-long learning approach in the workplace as a way of creating a

well-being-oriented culture in government (MOF 2015a ; SITRA 2015).

CSTD: Institutional Change, Programs, and Competency

The most distinctive infrastructure of CSTD in Finland is on civil service ethics

(MOF 2015a, 2015b). The Finnish government ethics infrastructure consists of control

(legislation, accountability), guidance (leadership, codes, professional socialization), and

coordination (public service conditions, coordinating body), and it invests in ethics education

through civil service training programs (MOF 2015a).

In terms of CSTD institutional change, the MOF and the Prime Minister's Office

implemented an in-house consolidation of CSTD in 2010 (MOF 2015b). HAUS, a state-

owned company for CSTD, was restructured as an in-house CSTD actor under the MOF.

Loosely coupled with the MOF, the in-house model of HAUS has independent finance

management and quality competition with other private programs. HAUS, as a state-owned

company, runs flexible training programs to meet the ongoing change of training needs in the

Finnish government based on close cooperation with the MOF and other government

agencies (HAUS 2015; OECD 2017c; MOF 2015a).

What were the factors affecting this institutional change in Finland? The study found

that economic crises, downsizing, and outsourcing of personnel administration were major

forces for change in CSTD structure and programs (HAUS 2015; MOF 2015a). ICT adoption

has been also identified as a factor continuously affecting CSTD evolution in the Finnish

government (MOF 2015a). The Finnish government has been reframing CSTD in the post-NPM context by emphasizing an integrated and centralized approach for CSTD and by making training and development at the individual level an agency management agenda.

Programs and Competency

HAUS is focused on management training and leadership development programs based on assessments of managers' values, motivation, and emotional intelligence (HAUS 2015; OECD 2017c). Management training programs covering new employees, middle and senior managers, and management degree programs for 1 or 2 years have also run since 2014. HAUS has also established 2-year degree programs for junior employees. Some degree and certificate programs based on customized individual plans are also running (HAUS 2015). The Finnish government has also addressed the training role inside ministries, and *Services to the Government* by the Prime Minister's Office has a training role inside ministries (OECD 2017c).

Under a future leaders' program, succession planning for ABD has been also under way since 2008 (OECD 2017c). The curriculum also includes seminars, forums, coaching, and networks. Financed by the MOF and organized by HAUS, the program has been available to 280 senior civil servants with potential for promotion since 2008 (OECD 2017c; HAUS 2015). It covers strategic environment, future scenarios, courageous leadership, networking workshops (Parliament, local, self-government, business), and global competition seminars (HAUS 2015). HAUS utilizes various resource mobilization approaches, including outsourcing, inter-institutional programs (e.g., State Treasury, Center for Financial Personnel Administration, and Special Body for Public Procurement), cooperation with the university for R&D, and EU networks of all European civil service training institutions (HAUS 2015).

In 2017 the MOF offered a new future leaders' program with different course structures and teaching methods to increase the number of participants (OECD 2017c). The new program was designed to achieve three goals: "to strengthen professional management and strategic competencies, to strengthen the value basis and common starting points among the civil service, and to promote courageous leadership and sensitivity to the future" (OECD 2017c, p. 98).

HAUS management training programs clearly identified the following list of competencies: ICT, collective intelligence, change management, strategic management, implementation strategies, leadership, resource mobility, project and process management, and media literacy (HAUS 2015).

The future leaders' program also classifies the competency of middle-level and the senior managers. For middle-level managers, the following competency list has been emphasized: policy/program design, policy coordination, horizontal thinking, and creative problem solving. For senior managers, communication strategy, change management, strategic decision-making, ethics, public values, and wellbeing at work are emphasized (HAUS 2015).

HAUS further established traditional public administration programs that cover courses for management and leadership, including public finances, HRM, legal affairs, public procurement, EU affairs, project and process management, communication and presentation, and customer service. In addition, the competency emphasizes coaching, leadership, time management, community-building skills, and wellbeing at work (HAUS 2015). For the last ten years, CSTD in Finland has been focused on how to do more with fewer people.

Accordingly, the training program emphasizes core tasks, management and operation processes, and prioritizing (HAUS 2015; MOF 2015a).

HAUS has embraced global issues as the third core program, and it has organized specific programs for international issues that cover trends in the global scenes that are affecting management competency in the civil service (HAUS 2015; OECD 2017c). In terms of method and delivery, HAUS programs adopt various teaching tools, approaches, and pedagogies: presentations, group work, case studies, exercises, coaching and mentoring, leadership and personality assessments, literature studies, e-learning elements/video conferencing, close links to one's working environment, and working community development, interaction, and personal development plans (HAUS 2015; OECD 2017c).

HAUS has an interesting approach in its training and development programs called networking workshops. Under this method, CSTD participants receive an assignment that requires visiting and networking not only with other national government agencies, but also with other parts of society such as parliament, local government, and businesses to learn current important trends (HAUS 2015). To enhance learning effectiveness, workshop participants are selected from the different parts of the administration in the national and local governments.

Overall, in the post-NPM era, the Finnish government emphasizes civil service competency and leadership skills of public managers necessary for effective and creative problem-solving abilities to enhance the quality of life of citizens and public interests, and ultimately sustainable happiness for society (HAUS 2015; MOF 2015a; SITRA 2015). Accordingly, HRM competency values include a future-oriented attitude, foresight, flexibility, relevance, and integrity. In terms of expertise, the country has emphasized policy

research capacity to improve efficiency and effectiveness, and it has paid attention to social experiments in public policy (SITRA 2015).

Three Countries in Europe: A Comparative Perspective

This paper explores governance challenges and CSTD reforms in the post-NPM era in three countries. The study results show that these countries have adopted an ongoing, incremental CSTD reform approach to strengthening civil service competencies for problem solving in the governance context of austerity, complexity, and information. These countries are searching for new public-service competencies to balance public values and cost-efficiency and to emphasize the leadership development of the senior civil service. As shown in Table 1, the countries have a common strategy of incremental adaptations of several core CSTD concerns, which embrace the core public management and governance issues of balancing public values and cost efficiency, senior civil service leadership, public-private networks, coordination, communication, e-learning, ICT, learning at work, and life-long learning. In sum, the countries show adaptive strategies of CSTD as a way of demonstrating resilient bureaucracies (du Gay 2005) and resilient organizations (Sutcliffe and Vogus 2003).

Meanwhile, the UK and Finland, with a long tradition of emphasis on integrity, have focused on consolidated CSTD or e-learning systems for cost efficiency in an era of economic recession. In a different context of government reforms, the Dutch government has initiated a strategic approach to CSTD, which ultimately plans for an integrated and coordinated implementation of CSTD. Another similar CSTD trend is increased attention to tailor-made approaches for positions and professions, outsourcing, solution-oriented training and development, e-learning, and diverse pedagogies. The study results also show that

strengthening integrity and ethics in the public service and leadership development of ABD

have been emphasized among the countries.

Table 1. Post-NPM: CSTD Reform Strategy

The UK	Reform strategies	• Long-term commitment to 'working better' and 'costing less' • Capabilities plan for developing competency frameworks at the individual civil servant, department, and the civil service wide • E-learning system (CSL) and leadership academy for SCS (partnership with academics and experts in business) • Investment in digital transformation and digital skills (GDS Academy)
The Netherlands	Reform strategies	• Investment in leadership development of the SCS (ABD) • Strategic Plan 2020 toward an integrated and coordinated internal CSTD institutions • E-learning resource and knowledge sharing approach, & social dialogue • Markets of CSTD in the civil society established during the NPM era: competition and collaboration opportunities of CSTD
Finland	Reform strategies	• Consolidated CSTD coordination under HAUS & cost-efficiency • Adaptations to EU & OECD global contents • Long history of commitment to integrity and openness • Future leaders' development and succession planning of SCS • Communication strategy & media literacy

Insights for Innovating CSTD in the Korean Civil Service

There are several important lessons that the Korean government can take from these

research findings. First, the case countries are engaged in consolidation or recentralization of

CSTD to enhance their efficiency and effectiveness in an era of austerity. Three questions led

to the adoption of the strategic approach to CSTD in the Dutch government, namely, What do

we want to achieve? What and how do we want to develop? and How do we want to organize

this? These are all relevant questions for the Korean government. The Dutch government has

established a culture of integrity and ethics for the civil service through putting this issue on

the national agenda since the 1980s. Today, the Finnish government has a reputation for high

integrity and transparency in the global community.

Second, the flexibility of delivery of CSTD is another lesson that the Korean

government could take. For example, the HAUS case shows the Finnish government strategy

for creating a state-owned company as a way of utilizing a loosely coupled relation with the

MOF for effective delivery of customized CSTD programs. The Dutch government case shows a smart approach for utilizing diverse institutions to maximize CSTD effectiveness. For example, a government centered approach (ABD) for training has been emphasized, and partnerships with the private sector and universities for the other civil service training have also been utilized. This approach has been also adopted in Australia and New Zealand under a collaborative partnership between governments and universities with an emphasis on building strategic and adaptive management capacity, including the ability to deliver public value in challenging settings. Both countries have also focused on CSTD for future senior leaders and managers and their commitment to public service (OECD 2017).

Third, a self-directed life-long learning and employee well-being program has been emphasized as an important component of CSTD. Fourth, the countries have been paying special attention to CSTD relating to ICT, media management, public communication and presentation, network management and social dialogue, and change management. Concerning senior managers, leadership for a globalized era and ICT have also been emphasized. These areas of CSTD reflect an era of public governance and increased demands for versatile leadership competency in an era of uncertainty and complexity in governance.

Finally, the Korean government should pay attention to diverse and creative methods of CSTD programs adopted in the case countries, including a simulation approach for dealing with the media, exercises of presentation and interviews, a combination of online and offline approaches (e-learning, coaching and mentoring, etc.), personal development plans linking to the working environment, and a community development approach through field trips, social experiments, and consulting.

However, how to implement these ideas in the governance context of Korea is a challenging question for reforming CSTD. For example, consider institutional trust as an example of understanding the governance of Korea compared to these countries. According to Gallup poll survey data on public trust in government in 2015, only 28% of the survey participants indicated that they trust government in Korea (OECD 2016). As indicated earlier, the post-NPM reform agenda pays attention to coordination by managing out complex multi-governance and leadership competencies of communication and boundary spanning. Given the low level of public trust in government, CSTD reform directions in Korea should address ways to develop coordination and communication skills to foster trustful relations between citizens or communities and government agencies.

Another important governance dimension of the post-NPM era is directly related to increased expectations of public officials' commitment to integrity and anti-corruption measures. According to the corruption perception data collected in Korea by the Anti-Corruption and Civil Rights Commission, citizens had continuous concerns about integrity in the public sector from 2004 to 2018 (Anti-Corruption and Civil Rights Commission 2018). There has not been much progress in reducing public perceptions of corruption in public institutions (59% had perceptions of corruption in 2004, and 52% in 2017). After the historical moment of presidential impeachment in early 2017, the perception of corruption reduced from 52% in 2017 to 40.9% in 2018. Meanwhile, there are huge gaps between citizens' perceptions of corruption in government and civil servants' perceptions of corruption in government (Anti-Corruption and Civil Right Commission 2018). This is an important concern relating to CSTD reform in Korea, because how seriously civil servants

take the corruption issue as part of their leadership development programs could affect the effectiveness of the training programs.

Conclusion

Leaders in the public sector face continuous challenges to improve the quality of public service and policy efficacy to respond to challenges of sustainable development, global competitiveness, and democratic governance in the post-NPM era. This study has analyzed the reform of CSTD in the UK, the Netherlands, and Finland under continuous pressure from government reforms in an era of austerity, uncertainty, and complexity of governance. Based on the findings of the exploratory case studies, the paper has also addressed the implications of the findings for reforming civil service training programs in South Korea, and it has offered proposals for reform directions in the governance context of South Korea.

In sum, the study findings indicate that in the post-NPM era, governments face austerity, uncertainty, and complexity of public administration. Accordingly, there has been an incremental approach to reforming CSTD to respond to a new era of governance and the post-NPM reform. Competencies for effective coordination, collaboration, and co-production of government and communities are all emphasized as necessary civil service competencies in these countries (Wallace, O'Reilly, Morris, and Deem 2011). While the three countries have a long history of establishing a culture of integrity in government, the emphasis on strengthening the integrity of the civil service and a public service culture with public values has expanded in an era of decreased trust in government and increased critical citizenship.

Demand for an integrated and coordinated approach to CSTD has also occurred in the three countries (e.g., civil service learning and the Government Digital Service in the UK, ABD senior civil service training and the consolidated approach to CSTD in the Netherlands, and HAUS in Finland). These countries may consider the further development of a strategic approach to CSTD programs. If so, they could consider the following suggestions: (1) alignment of a whole-of-government approach with the CSTD strategies, (2) assessment of offline/e-learning outcomes, (3) senior civil service leadership and collaborative leadership, and (4) massive open online courses (online learning, national and global collaboration).

References

ABD, Office for the Senior Civil Service. (2014a). *Dutch Senior Civil Service*, Den Hagg: Office for the SCS, The Netherlands, provided to KDI in 2015.

ABD, Office for the Senior Civil Service. (2015a). *The Dutch Senior Civil Service" Talent Management for Future Top Managers*, Den Haag: Office for the SCS, The Netherlands, provided to KDI in 2015.

ABD, Office for the Senior Civil Service. (2015b). *Leadership Development: Training and Education*, Den Haag: Office for the SCS. The Netherlands, provided to KDI in 2015.

Andrews, R., Downe, J. & Guarneros-Meza, V. (2013). 'Public sector Reform in the UK: Views and experiences from senior executives.' COCOPS Work Package 3 Country Report. Retrieved from http://www.cocops.eu/wp-content/uploads/2013/06/UK_WP3-Country-Report.pdf

Bekkers, V., Edelenbos, J. & Steijn, B. (Eds.) (2011). *Innovation in the Public Sector: Linking Capacity and Leadership*. Hampshire, UK: Palgrave MacMillan.

Benington, J. (2001). "Partnership as networked governance? Legitimation, innovation, problem solving and coordination", in Geddes, M. and Benington, J. (Eds), *Local Partnerships and Social Exclusion in the European Union* (pp. 198-219), London: Routledge

Bourgon, J. (2008). The future of public service: A search for a new balance. *The Australian Journal of Public Administration, 67*(4), 390–404.

Choi, S. (2012). Comparison of civil service reform in the United States and Korea: Central personnel agencies and senior civil service systems. *The Korean Journal of Policy Studies*, 27(3),101-123.

Christensen, T. (2012). Post-NPM and changing public governance. *Meiji Journal of Political Science and Economics 1*, 1-11.

du Gay, P. (Ed.). (2005). *The Values of Bureaucracy*. NY: Oxford University Press.

Dunleavy, P., Margetts, H., Bastow, S., & Tinkler, J. (2005). New public management is dead—Long live digital-era governance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 16*(3), 467–494.

Egeberg, M. & Trondal, J. (2009). National agencies in the European administrative space: Government driven, commission driven or networked? *Public Administration 87*(4). pp. 779–790.

Fimreite, A. & Lægreid, P. (2009). Reorganizing the welfare state administration. *Public Management Review, 11*(3). 281-297.

Foster, R. (2000). Leadership in the twenty-first century: Working to build a civil society. *National Civic Review, 89*(1), 87-93.

Global Government Forum (2015). Jerry Arnott, former chief executive, Civil Service Learning, UK: Exclusive Interview. Retrieved from https://www.globalgovernmentforum.com/interview-jerry-arnott-former-chief-executive-civil-service-learning-uk/

Green, D. & Roberts, G. (2012). Impact of Postmodernism on Public Sector Leadership Practices, Federal Government Human Capital Development Implications. *Public Personnel Management, 41*(1), 79-96.

Hammerschmid, G., Van de Walle, S., Andrews, R. & Bezes, P. (2016*). Public administration reforms in Europe. The views of top public sector executives*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

HAUS (2015). Introduction of HAUS: Management Training Programmes. Helsingki: HAUS

Hoetjes, B. (2015). *Netherlands*. Retrieved from http://www1.worldbank.org/publicsector/civilservice/rsNetherlands.pdf

Hood, C. & Dixon, R. (2015). *A Government That Worked Better and Cost Less.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Institute for Government. (2017). *The Civil Service After Article 50*. London: Institute for Government.

International Monetary Fund. (2018). World Economic Outlook Database. Retrieved from https://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/weo/2018/01/weodata/index.aspx

Kickert, W. (2010). Managing emergent and complex change: The case of Dutch agencification. *International Review of Administrative Sciences, 76*(3). pp. 489–515.

Kim, J. et. al (2015). *The Civil Service Training and Developing Programs in Advanced Democratic Countries*. Sejong: Korea Development Institute

Kim, P. (2007). Transforming higher level civil service in a new age: A case study of a new senior civil service in Korea. *Public Personnel Management, 36*(2),127-142.

Kong, D., Kim S., & Yang S. 2013. *Individual Performance Appraisal System in the Government of Korea*. Knowledge Sharing Module Project Book Series, Seoul: Ministry of Strategy and Finance & KDI School of Public Policy and Management, South Korea

Leisink, P., P. Boselie, M. van Bottenburg & D. Hosking (eds) (2013), *Managing Social Issues: A Public Values Perspective*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar

Lodge, M. & Gill, D. (2011). Toward a new era of administrative reform? The myth of Post-NPM in New Zealand. *Governance: An International Journal of Policy, Administration, and Institutions, 24*(1),141–166.

Ministry of Finance (2005a), *Values in the daily job – a civil servant's ethics. A handbook for the state administration,* Helsinki: Ministry of Finance, Finland

Ministry of Finance (2015b). *State Managerial and Leadership Policy*. Helsingki: Ministry of Finance, provided to KDI in 2015.

Ministry of Finance (2015c). *Selecting Criteria for Senior Management posts in central government*. Helsingki: Ministry of Finance, provided to KDI in 2015.

Ministry of Finance (2013), *Governments for the Future. Main Report*, Helsinki: Ministry of Finance, Finland.

Ministry of Finance (2010), *Background Report on Finnish Public Governance. March,* Helsinki: Ministry of Finance. Finland

Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations in the Netherlands (2015), *What is the vison of learning and developing at the state government,* provided to KDI in 2015.

Moilanen, Timo and Ari Salminen. 2007. Comparative Study on the Public-Service Ethics of the EU Member States. Research and Studies 1/2007. Helsinki: Ministry of Finance, Finland.

NSOB (2015). Training and Development Programs at NSOB, De Haag: NSOB, provided to KDI in 2015.

NSOB (2019). Executive Education, Available at https://www.nsob.nl/en/education/

NSOB (2019). Customised Programmes. Retrieved from https://www.nsob.nl/en/education/customised-programm

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (2015). *Government at a Glance,* Paris: OECD

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (2003). *Managing Senior Management: Senior Civil Service Reform in OECD Member Countries.* Retrieved from http://www.oecd.org/gov/pem/33708901.pdf

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (2015). *Public Governance Reviews: Estonia and Finland: Fostering Strategic Capacity across Governments and Digital Services across Borders.* In series of OECD Public Governance Reviews, Paris: OECD

OECD (2017a), *National Schools of Government: Building Civil Service Capacity*, OECD Public Governance Reviews, OECD Publishing, Paris. Retrieved from

http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264268906-en

OECD (2017b), OECD Guidelines on Measuring Trust, OECD Publishing Paris, Retrieved
from http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264278219-en

OECD (2017c), *Skills for a High Performing Civil Service*, OECD Public Governance
Reviews, OECD Publishing, Paris.

OECD (2017d), *Fostering Innovation in the Public Sector*, OECD Publishing, Paris,
Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264270879-en.

O'Leary, R. (2016). "Retrofitting Collaboration Into the New Public Management: Lessons
from New Zealand." Ewha Journal of Social Sciences, 32 (1), 5-51.

Open Access Government (2018). Digital transformation, collaboration and innovation:
Making government work better for everyone. Retrieved from
https://www.openaccessgovernment.org/digital-transformation-2/51888/

Osborne, S. P. (2006). The New Public Governance? *Public Management Review*, *8*(3), 377–
387.

PBLQ 2015. Training and Development Programs for Civil Service,   De Haag: PBLQ, The
Netherlands, provided to KDI in 2015.

PBLQ 2019. About PBLQ. Retrieved from https://www.pblq.nl/about-pblq

Pollitt, C., & Bouckaert, G. (2017). *Public Management Reform: A Comparative Analysis –
Into The Age of Austerity*. OUP Oxford. Retrieved from
https://books.google.be/books?id=cEsrDwAAQBAJ

Pollitt, C. & Bouckaert, G. (2011) *Public Management Reform: A Comparative Analysis –
New Public Management, Governance, and the Neo–Weberian State.* Oxford: Oxford
University Press.

Raadschelders, J., Toonen, T., Meer, F.V. der, Van der Meer, F.M. (Eds.). (2007). *The Civil
Service in the 21st Century Comparative Perspectives*. NY: Palgrave MacMillan.

Rodgers, H., Gold, J., Frearson, M. and Holden, R. (2003), "The rush to leadership:
explaining leadership development in the public sectors", working paper, Leeds: Leeds
Business School.

SITRA, The Finnish Innovation Fund Sitra (2015). *Sustainable Well-being*, Internal
document received during the interview at SITRA.

Steijn, B. & Leisink, P. (2007). Public management reforms and public sector employment
relations in The Netherlands. *International Journal of Public Sector Management 20*(1), 34-

47.

Sutcliffe, K.M. & Vogus, T.J. (2003). Organizing for Resilience. In Cameron, K., Dutton, J.E., & Quinn, R.E. (Eds.), Positive Organizational Scholarship (pp. 94-110) San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

UK Cabinet Office (2013), Meeting the Challenge: A Capabilities Plan for the Civil Service, Cabinet Office, London.

UK Cabinet Office (2013), *Meeting the Challenge: A Capabilities Plan for the Civil Service*, www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/536961/civil_service _workforce_strategy_final.pdf.

UK Cabinet Office (2012a). The Civil Service Reform Plan, Cabinet Office, London.

UK Cabinet Office (2012b). Civil Service Competency Framework, Cabinet Office, London.

UK Cabinet Office (2013), Meeting the Challenge: A Capabilities Plan for the Civil Service, Cabinet Office, London.

UK Cabinet Office (2014). The Capabilities Plan, 2014 Annual Refresh, Cabinet Office, London

UK Cabinet Office (2015). Civil Service Learning, Cabinet Office, London. Retrieved from https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/civil-service-learning

UK Cabinet Office (2010). The Constitutional Reform and Governance Act 2010 (Commencement No. 5) Order 2011. Retrieved from https://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2011/1274/contents/made

UK Parliament (2018). The Minister and the Official: The Fulcrum of Whitehall Effectiveness. Retrieved from https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201719/cmselect/cmpubadm/497/49703.htm#_idText Anchor000

UK Cabinet Office, 2015. *Statutory Guidance: The Civil Service Code*, UK Civil Service, Caninet Office, London. Retrieved from https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/civil-service-code/the-civil-service-code

UK Cabinet Office 2016. Civil Service Vision 2015-2020. Cabinet Office, London. Retrieved from https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/a-brilliant-civil-service-vision-statement/civil-service-vision-2015-to-2020.

UK Cabinet Office (2019a). Government Digital Service, Retrieved from https://gds.blog.gov.uk/about/

UK Cabinet Office (2019b). Government Digital Service Academy. Retrieved from https://www.gov.uk/government/groups/gds-academy

UK Cabinet Office. (2019c). Government Digital Service Academy. Retrieved from https://gdsacademy.campaign.gov.uk/

UK Performance and Innovation Unit (2001). *Strengthening Leadership in the Public Sector*, Cabinet Office, London.

UK Cabinet Office (2006). *The UK Government's Approach to Public Service Reform – A Discussion Paper*, Cabinet Office, London

UK Cabinet Office (2017a). Digital, Data and Technology Profession Capability Framework, Retrieved from https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/digital-data-and-technology-profession-capability-framework

UK Cabinet Office (2017b). Civil Service Leadership Academy. Retrieved from https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/civil-service-leadership-academy

UK Cabinet Office (2017c). Guidance Core leadership development, Retrieved from https://www.gov.uk/guidance/core-leadership-development

UK Cabinet Office, Civil Service (2014). National Health Service NHS strategic financial leadership programme, Retrieved from https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/nhs-strategic-financial-leadership-programme

UK Public Services Leadership Taskforce (2018). Better Public Services Report by the Public Services Leadership Taskforce, London. Retrieved from https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/752064/6.4846_CO_CPSL-Report_A4-P_WEB_NoLogo__002_.pdf

United Nations. (2006). *Republic of Finland: Public Administration Country Profile*. Retrieved from http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/un/unpan023307.pdf

Van der Meer, F. M. and Toonen, T. A. J. (2005). Competency management and civil service professiaonlism in Dutch central government. *Public Administration, 83*(4), 839–852.

Van der Meer, F. M., Raadschelders, J., Toonen, & T. A.J. (Eds.) (2015). *Comparative Civil Service Systems in the 21st Century (2nd edition)*. NY: Palgrave MacMillan.

van Wart, M., Hondeghem, A. & Schwella, E. (Eds.) (2015). *Leadership and Culture: Comparative Models of Top Civil Servants Training*. NY: Palgrave MacMillan.
Van der Meer, F. & Toonen, T. (2005). Competency management and civil service professionalism in Dutch central government. *Public Administration*, *83*(4), 839-852.

Virtanen, T. (2014). Finland. In M. Van Wart, A. Hondeghem & E. Schwella
(Eds.), *Leadership and Culture: Comparative models of top civil servant training.* (pp. 199-215) (17 p.). Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave.

Wallace, .M., O'Reilly, D., Morris, J. & Deem, R. (2011). Public service leaders as 'change agents' from whom? *Public Management Review, 13*(1), 65–93.

World Economic Forum, 2018. *The. Global Competitiveness Report 2017-2018,* Retrieved from http://reports.weforum.org/global-competitiveness-report-2017-2018/

World Bank Group (2005). *Senior Public Service: High Performing Managers of Government.* Washington D.C.: World Bank

World Bank Group (2019). Population Data. Retrieved from
https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/sp.pop.totl