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Abstract

This paper examines the adaptation process of performance management systems (PMS) in some Hungarian public organizations. We focus on factors influencing organizations to implement so-called “modern” or “innovative” management models. The paper takes a case study approach to examine what role top managers and environmental-contextual factors play in the process of adaptation of management methods and knowledge. Data have been collected in three large governmental institutions over a period of one year through participative observations and analyses of the project documentation.
Introduction

The adaptation process of “modern” management techniques rooted in the practice of business organizations as well as the analysis of models and frameworks adequate for the needs of public sector have recently become the focus of researchers (e.g. Micheli–Kennerley, 2003). Application of performance management systems (PMS) in public organizations is a new phenomenon in most countries – so it is in Hungary. Public sector reforms in Western European countries and the New Public Management (NPM) movement in the English-speaking world have been influencing the Hungarian public sector only for a few years. We expect that the EU accession of Hungary plays a crucial role in the adoption of PMS, by creating demand for, and making rationale of it.

In our research project, we focus on the implementation process and impacts of PMS in Hungarian public sector organizations. When examining PMS, we concentrate both on performance expectations and on the measurement and evaluation of organizational performance. Based on academic recommendations (e.g. Kaplan–Norton, 1996, 2000), these systems should be strategy-oriented at all levels of the organization – that is, the strategy should not be just a written document having relevance only for the top management and in the long run, but a common platform that governs everyday operation.

There is a long-running debate in the strategic management literature on the relative influence of external versus internal factors in promoting organizational innovations. The institutionalist school of organization theory (Meyer-Rowan, 1977; DiMaggio-Powell, 1983) emphasizes the importance of external context in adopting new technologies and methods. On the contrary, the managerial perspective gives priority to the role of the managers in strategic changes (e.g. Currie, 2000). There are only few research studies in which both approaches are applied to understand how organizations adopt innovative management systems in public sector organizations (Young et al., 2001). In this paper, we combined the two theoretical approaches: the environmental (institutional) perspective and the managerial one. The focus of the research was the adaptation process of a modern PMS, the Balanced Scorecard in three large Hungarian public institutions.

Theoretical background and research objectives

1. Performance-oriented thinking in the public sector

Efficiency, productivity, effectiveness, goals, impacts, responsibilities – the key notions of performance-oriented thinking and performance management, which are mainly applied by private sector organizations to improve their activities. Viewed in a historic perspective, efficiency has always been an expectation for the operation of public organizations (Bouckaert, 1992), and even in Max Weber’s definition of bureaucracy rationality and efficiency are the most important elements. Public management has long been based on the ideology of efficiency (especially in the United States), however this cannot be the ultimate goal of an organization, since it only deals with the question of how things are happening (efficiency), while ignoring why (effectiveness).

Modern’ management tools include strategic management approaches, process reengineering, management accounting and control systems, total quality management, performance measurement and evaluation methods at organizational, unit, and individual levels (see e.g. Osborne-Gaebler, 1993).
Nowadays, efficiency has been replaced by *performance*, which beside efficiency embraces the ultimate goals and impacts of a particular organization too, and it is the additional responsibility of public organization to deliver services equitably. So in the public sector the term of performance often includes the *equity* as well. In the last 15 years, both the *philosophy* and the *tools* of performance management, successfully applied in the business sector, have increasingly spread in public organizations.

This change of term “performance” in the public organizations can be explained by impacts of New Public Management (NPM) movement, so it is worth examining the present trends of the public sector developments for the better understanding of the context of our research.

Over the 1980’s there was a move in the public sector of Western European countries and the U.S. towards the *New Public Management*. This movement began in the United Kingdom under Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher and in the local governments of the U.S. The NPM doctrines have quickly achieved mainstream influence, and generated administrative reforms over Europe and the United States. Most of NPM attributes are generally shared by the public administration academics. Its main undisputed characteristics are [Gruening, 2001]:

- separation of politics and administration;
- accountability for performance, performance auditing, performance measurement;
- privatization, contracting out, budget cuts (market type mechanism);
- decentralization;
- strategic planning and management, competition;
- changing management style, personnel management, flexibility;
- more extensive use of information technology.

According to this list the main feature of NPM is its emphasis on economic values, objectives, and private sector management techniques. The public reforms driven by NPM have got many causes, but there is no consensus about their priorities. According to the original notion, the NPM was the consequence of the economic recession and tax revolts. Nowadays, the spreading of NPM is often explained by the increasing complexity and interdependence of the social sub-systems.

NPM movement has generated a great interest among experts and academics working in the field of researching public sector management. In the beginning of the movement NPM appeared as a universal applicable model, as the ‘one best way’ of modern public administration (e.g. Osborne-Gaebler, 1993). But now many academicians argue that the success of the NPM movement hardly depend on the institutional and cultural context of the countries and on the differences in national reform patterns (e.g. Hood, 1995).

2. *The influencing factors of adaptation of PMS*

Both the managerial and the environmental (institutional) perspectives offer important explaining factors to adaptation process of PMS. However, both schools deal with this topic very differently, so in this part we provide an overview of the key elements of these perspectives.

According to the *institutionalist school* of organization theory (Meyer–Rowan, 1977; DiMaggio–Powell, 1983), most organizations are embedded in multiple networks of social relations that include competitors, regulatory bodies etc. Normative pressures for conformity are a central element in the institutional theory. Management tools applied by organizations
will be those ones that are thought to be conform, adequate and rational by the environment. If an organization wants to secure or increase its legitimacy (which is a central issue in the public sector), it has no choice but to adopt these techniques.

Meyer, Scott, and Deal (1981) made a distinction between the technical and the institutional environment of organizations. In the technical environment there are market transactions of products and services, and organizational success can be achieved by effective and efficient coordination of work processes. In the institutional environment organizations must show conformity with institutionalized rules, which in turn provide legitimacy and support for them. Regardless of the true benefits, the methods adopted are considered to be elements of organizational success due to the ‘myth of rationality’ associated with them.

The recommendations of NPM are mainly related to the market-oriented operation of public organizations. However, the implementation of NPM-consistent methods is not necessarily driven by the primacy of technical environment. There is another way, too: if the institutional environment of an organization considers modern management techniques as desirable, then these techniques may be adopted even if this need is not present in the technical environment. In other words, organizations are said to adopt management techniques not for reasons of enhancing their performance but because the practices eventually come to be taken for granted.

According to Young et al. (2001), potential adopters are mostly likely to be influenced by adopters with similar social role or social position within a network. In networks where direct communication channels exist this influence is increased, because linkages provide ongoing information about the management innovations.

The role of public managers in adaptation processes has been discussed only in a small number of researches. In these studies the term of “public managers” are split down for top managers and middle managers. Top managers, similarly to the business sector, are seen as responsible for strategic decisions, formulating the organizational structure, and support to achieve the strategic goals. Some scholars argue (e.g. Mintzberg, 1973) that this picture of top managers’ work is a myth, their daily work is often interrupted by external interventions, and they make their decisions intuitively instead of planning in a systematic-rational way. The position of middle managers is between the top managers and frontline managers. They are responsible for translating organizational goals and intended strategies into concrete actions, and they serve as communication links between hierarchical levels of the organization. Currie (1999) argued that middle management interprets and evaluates information concerning internal and external events, which they then supply to top management.

In this paper we concentrate on the role of top managers in the adaptation process of PMS in public sector. Nelissen et al. (2000) examined the “change orientation” of top public managers in The Netherlands. They use the term of “change orientation” to emphasize that public managers in the age of NPM “need a positive attitude and behaviour towards the changing processes going on in society and in public administration particularly (…) There is a need for a public manager who leaves the position of a static bureaucrat”. But what does change orientation depend on? Many academicians discuss the demographic characteristics of top managers as indicators of the managers’ propensity to adopt changes (Hambrick, Mason, 1984). Nelissen et al. (2000) investigated not only the top managers’ demographic characteristics (age, gender, level of education), but their personality characteristics (managing style, loyalty to the organization), job characteristics (job satisfaction, and their opinion about the subordinates), their perception of future societal developments (open mind to new developments), and their perception of cultural developments as well. They found that the change orientation of top public managers depend on some demographic characteristics.
such as age, level of education. Middle-age top manager (45-55 years old) are more change-oriented than their younger and older colleagues are. And the Dutch top public managers with an academic degree tend to be more change-oriented than their non-academic colleagues. But the most significant drivers of the change-oriented behaviour are not the demographic characteristics. The most important factors in explaining differences in degree of change orientation are job satisfaction, the perception of future social development and personality characteristics.

Gurd and Thorne (2003) examined the failures of implementation of various accounting technologies in an Australian public sector organization. They found in their longitudinal case study the role of top managers as a crucial factor. At the beginning of the process the top management was totally supportive in implementing activity-based costing, but this support was not a constant, it diminished over time, and at the end top management support disappeared.

According to Boyne et al. (2001) the chief executives in local governments have only a little strategic choice related to budgetary decisions, and they have also only limited room for manoeuvres. They found that external pressure and the legacy of previous budget decisions are more important explaining factors than the top managers. In addition, they found not much change when new leaders gain responsibility.

Young et al. (2001) examined the relative importance of these two sets of factors. They found that the relative importance of top managers’ role and institutional-environmental factors changes over time as an innovation diffuses among potential adopters. The top manager factors were more important than institutional factors for influencing TQM adoption during the early phase of the diffusion process, but this changed in the latter phase of the diffusion where the institutional factors assumed relatively greater importance.

Young et al. (2001) concentrated only on the demographic characteristics of top public managers, and they found that younger and better educated top managers are more inclined to engage in change initiatives and adopt innovations, because younger managers might be more receptive to new ideas, and better educated may be more skilled. These results are similar to the findings of Nelissen et al. (2000).

Focusing on the institutionalist perspective, their study shows that normative pressures are an important force underlying the adoption of management practices in public organizations. They found that the existence of direct communication linkages between adopters and potential adopters promotes the adaptation process.

3. Multidimensional PMS

Over the last some years, academics were focusing on developing performance management systems that can provide an integrative framework for the managers of all types of organizations. Among all, the Balanced Scorecard (BSC) model developed by Kaplan and Norton (1996, 2000) has become the best known among managers and experts of business and non-for-profit organizations. Implementing Balanced Scorecard provides not only the promise of connecting strategic and operative management in a systematic way, but also the opportunity:

- to include all of the significant expectations of different stakeholders of the organization (owners-shareholders, customers and employees);
- to make strategy realization measurable; and
- to define steps and actions towards strategy realization in a controllable way.
The main objective of our research was to discover the true influencing factors behind PMSs (especially Balanced Scorecard) implementations in the Hungarian public sector. Beside this, we were also interested in the professional content of the PMS as well as the characteristics of the implementation process.

**Methodology**

According to Yin (1993) case study is an applicable research method if the field of research is broad enough and the context of the research object has significance too. Also, case studies are effective tools when the research is still in the exploratory phase and theory building is on the agenda (Eisenhardt, 1989). Our research objective (examination of influencing factors to implement PMSs in Hungarian public institutions) fulfils these criteria, so case study carried out by participative observations and interviews was selected as primary research method. As a supplementary technique, analysis of the project documentations was used to verify part of the findings (triangulation).

Due to the relatively small size of Hungary, we could identify most of the large, but still innovative public organizations with respect to our research topic. These organizations are all governmental institutions with nationwide scope of activity and good international relations.

The organizations where the authors have already finished the first round of investigation are as follows: 1) National Health Insurance Fund Administration (NHIFA), 2) Tax and Financial Control Agency (Tax Authority), 3) Hungarian Public Company for Regional Development and Town Planning (VÁTI).

**Research questions**

Our first question related to the motivation to construct a PMS (question of why). In our case studies we explored the preliminary expectations of managers and other participants, and identified internal and external factors of motivation. Special attention was paid to discover whether internal ‘change agents’ acting as strong catalysts in the process have been present or not. We applied the institutionalist view, so we analyzed both the technical and the institutional environment of these organizations. Our expectation was that the main driving forces are the legitimizing effect of the institutional environment, on the one hand, and the commitment of management (or lower level change agents) supported by a belief in ‘modern’ management tools, on the other.

Our second question focused on the methods public organizations prefer (question of what). We assumed that approaches paying attention to the complexity of stakeholders’ needs are the preferred ones, because these frameworks have the greatest legitimacy in this sector. We also expected that the institutional environment do not specify the methods to be used for strategy making and performance monitoring – only the need for “having” a strategy (in Hungary there are no “compulsory” performance management methodologies in the public sector).

In the third part of analysis, we have made a short evaluation of the implementation process itself (question of how). We expected that if the technical environment does not put a real pressure on these organizations, introduction of PMS will have only a limited impact.
Results

We identified three large Hungarian governmental institutions where in the last years BSC adaptations were started: 1) National Health Insurance Fund Administration (NHIFA), 2) Tax and Financial Control Agency (Tax Authority), 3) Hungarian Public Company for Regional Development and Town Planning (VÁTI).

The NHIFA founded in 1993 is the only health insurance within the social insurance system in Hungary. This organization administers the National Health Insurance Fund, which has an annual budget of 5610 million Euro in this year. The headquater of NHIFA is in the capital, and it has 19 offices at county level.

The Tax Authority was founded in 1987, it collects and administers all types of state taxes and incomes, and has tax and financial above all private orgs operating in Hungary. Similar to NHIFA it has offices at country level as well.

The VÁTI Hungarian Public Nonprofit Company for Regional Development and Town Planning founded in 1950 is an organization on the boundaries of nonprofit and public sectors. Its main task is regional development included management of EU programs.

In all the three organizations the adaptation process began in the last year and it has not finished yet. The characteristics of the organizations investigated, together with the main findings of the case studies are presented in Tables 1-3. In the final part of the paper we summarize the most important conclusions of the research.
Table 1: Summary table for National Health Insurance Fund Administration (NHIFA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Founded</th>
<th>Sub-sector</th>
<th>Peer institution</th>
<th>No. of emp.</th>
<th>Budget (in million €)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Health Insurance Fund Administration (NHIFA)</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Health care</td>
<td>Ministry of Health, Social and Family Affairs</td>
<td>738 (+ 3,954 in county offices)</td>
<td>2002: 77.6 (material costs: 43%, personal costs: 57%) 2003: 72.1 (material costs: 36%, personal costs: 64%) 2004: 83.3 (N.A.); Budget of Health Insurance Fund: 5610</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Main tasks**

1. to register and administer the Health Insurance Fund (Government Decree No. 75/1999 /V.21./)  
2. to direct the administrative activities of NHIFA and to control its county offices  
3. to operate and to develop a professional and budget monitoring system of health insurance

**Organizational characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization form</th>
<th>No. of units</th>
<th>No. of levels</th>
<th>Span of control</th>
<th>Top management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Functional</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4 main functions</td>
<td>Director of NHIFA, and four deputy directors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phases of the project (important events and milestones)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 0. Preparation (from the idea to strategic analysis)</th>
<th>Phase 1. Strategy formulation (from strategic analysis to written strategy)</th>
<th>Phase 2. Operationalization (from written strategy to actions and indicators)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 94-03 Some former strategy formulating projects, results: written strategies.  
03 Jan A young deputy director intended to modernize the management system.  
03 Mar Top management approved it and a working group was established. | 03 Mar Selecting methodology: BSC; Interviews & analyzing the former strategies.  
03 Apr-May Workshops about mission, and structure, dimensions, levels of strategic goals.  
03 Jun Making a questionnaire about vision & an internal strategic management dictionary. | 03 July 2 day workshop for top and middle management discussing vision, mission, strategy.  
03 Aug-Oct Indicators had been identified to strategic objectives, but no actions had been started. |

**Principal motivating effect**  
Individual ambition of a young deputy director to modernize the operating of NHIFA.

**Other motivating effects**  
- Use of modern management tools.  
- Enhance of performance-oriented thinking.  
- Improve the information system.

**Change Agents**  
A young deputy director (34 years, Economist)

**Methods used**  
Document analysis, interviews, vision discussed based on questionnaire, strategy formulation and operationalization by using BSC.

**Key outputs**  
Mission, vision, main strategic goals, specific strategic objectives, hierarchy and relations of these, some indicators.

**Organizational scope**  
The whole organization - NHIFA (in a next phase strategy formulating of county offices is planned)

**Evaluation – internal**  
Not performed yet.

**Evaluation – methodological**  
(+): Adequate management tools selected (the original structure of BSC were modified).  
(-): Implementation phase had failed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Founded</th>
<th>Sub-sector</th>
<th>Peer institution</th>
<th>No. of emp.</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tax and Financial Control Agency (TFCA)</td>
<td>(1967) 1987</td>
<td>Taxation</td>
<td>Ministry of Finance, Directorate of Revenues</td>
<td>12,121</td>
<td>2002: 332 m € (25% personal - 75% material) 2003: 306 m € (26% personal - 74% material) 2004: 224 m € (24% personal - 76% material)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Main tasks

1. Tax and financial control above all private orgs operating in Hungary.
2. Collecting and administering all types of state taxes and incomes.
3. Supporting the legislative work concerning taxation and state budgeting.

### Organizational characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization form</th>
<th>No. of units</th>
<th>No. of levels</th>
<th>Span of control</th>
<th>Top management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Functional</td>
<td>178 (incl. regions)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4 (main func. areas)</td>
<td>President, 3 Vice Presidents, CFO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Phases of the project (important events and milestones)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 0. Preparation</th>
<th>Phase 1. Strategy formulation</th>
<th>Phase 2. Operationalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1987 – 2003</td>
<td>03 Jan Kick-off the project aiming at strategy formulation (internal expert team headed by the Chief Controller). Decision about the strategy (mission, vision, strategic principles and 4 strategic projects).</td>
<td>03 Sep Kick-off the project aiming at implementing TFCA level BSC. 04 Jan Start of systematic reporting of cca. 30 top level BSC indicator. 05 Dec End of BSC implementation project (planned).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Principal motivating effect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why</th>
<th>Other motivating effects</th>
<th>Change Agents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Pressure from the peer institution to have strategy. - Personal motivation of the newly appointed president.</td>
<td>- Committed top management (newly appointed vice presidents and CFO). - Expert staff’s openness to apply new management methods.</td>
<td>- President (47, Economist) - Members of top management - Chief Controller</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Methods used

| Collecting “best practices” concerning the structure and content of strategy, formulating mission and vision, strategic action planning, BSC. | Mission statement (widespread published), vision, strategic principles, 4 strategic projects, top BSC (mostly goals, indicators and targets). |

### Key outputs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation – internal</th>
<th>Evaluation – methodological</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(+) Enthusiasm from organizational side in 2003, but skepticism after the significant cost cuts in 2004. (+) Positive feedback from the peer institution.</td>
<td>(+) Use of standard methods, top level commitment, focus on feasibility (-) Less focus on stakeholder expectations, lack of organizational deployment of strategy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3: Summary table for the Hungarian Public Company for Regional Development and Town Planning (VÁTI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Founded</th>
<th>Sub-sector</th>
<th>Peer institution</th>
<th>No. of emp.</th>
<th>Budget (in million €)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian Public Company for Regional Development and Town Planning (&quot;VÁTI&quot;)</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Regional and Urban Develop.</td>
<td>Prime Minister’s Office (PMO)</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>2002: 8 m € (70% personal - 30% material) 2003-2004: n.a.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Main tasks

1. reg. development inc. management of EU progs.
2. spatial and settlement planning
3. building and national heritage protection

#### Organizational characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization form</th>
<th>No. of units</th>
<th>No. of levels</th>
<th>Span of control</th>
<th>Top management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Divisional</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4 (inc. regional reps.)</td>
<td>Max. 9 (Dev. Division)</td>
<td>CEO, Financial Director, 2 Division Heads</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Phases of the project (important events and milestones)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 0. Preparation</th>
<th>Phase 1. Strategy formulation</th>
<th>Phase 2. Operationalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(from the idea to strategic analysis)</td>
<td>(from strategic analysis to written strategy)</td>
<td>(from written strategy to actions and indicators)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03 Summer and Fall</td>
<td>Have not started yet</td>
<td>Have not started yet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 Spring</td>
<td>Collection and study of strategic management methodologies, informal consultations with university professors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic analysis inc. mapping strategic directions with the help of a free-lancer senior consultant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Principal motivating effect

- Individual ambition of the Head of the Organization Development having a strong belief in management methodologies
- Pressure from the PMO that its satellite organization should redefine their mission
- Interest of the CEO (turned over 70) to refocus the organization before passes it to his successor
- Increasing complexity due to the “EU profile”

#### Change Agents

Head of the Organization Development unit (44, Economist)

#### Methods used

Document analysis, interviews, workshops. SWOT, stakeholder analysis. BSC is possible in the next phases.

#### Key outputs

Mission and vision, main strategic goals, table of competitive advantages and distinctive competences, strategic directions, preliminary strategic actions.

#### Evaluation – internal

(+ Systematic evaluation of the present situation.
(-) Further steps are hindered by organizational politics and the ambiguity of the inst. environment

#### Evaluation – methodological

(+ Adequate management tools selected.
Main findings and conclusion

First of all, we found that the technical environment (mainly clients who benefit from public services) have not put pressure on the sample organizations to adopt PMS. In two out of the three cases we examined, we could identify institutional pressure for strategy formulation as one of the influencing factors. However, open-minded, young and middle-age top executives with academic degree (all of them are economist) acting as change agents proved to be even more important drivers of the adaptations. It could be interpreted according to the findings of Young et al. (2001) that the Hungarian large public institutions are in an early phase of the diffusion process of PMSs, so the top managerial factors are more important than institutional factors for influencing the adoptions.

Concerning our second field of inquiry (methodologies used), Balanced Scorecard was selected (or is strongly considered) as the central model of performance management in these three cases. This methodology is regarded as “stakeholder-oriented”, so our original expectation has been fulfilled. In none of the cases higher level institutional pressure played a role in selecting the methodology, but patterns came from international benchmark institutions (in the case of the Taxation Authority and the National Health Insurance Fund Administration) and from academic institutions (in the case of VÁTI). According to the institutionalist view the existence of direct communication channels between adopters (benchmark institutions) and potential adopters promotes the adaptation process.

We expect that being part of EU institutional system, the Hungarian government organizations will be even more influenced by the ‘rational myths’ of their European peer institutions (and Brussels), what will result in more PMS implementations.

Finally, we evaluated the progress of adoption processes based on academic recommendations. None of the three organizations was able to fully implement, and start to operate an integrated PMS. As a possible explanation we suggest that the main reason is the mismatch between the technical environment the performance management methods implicitly assume and the ‘real’ technical environment of these organizations. “There is no real pressure to change, only the voice of change agents” – as one of our colleagues noted. Change agents may play a significant role in disseminating management knowledge in the Hungarian public sector, but at the moment the actual use of management methods represent more a means to increase legitimacy, and less a valuable tool for performance management.
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