

Coordination, Capacity and Legitimacy: Organizing for Climate Change, Immigration, and the Police (COCAL)

Relevance relative to the call for proposals

COCAL investigates *novel public sector coordination practices* and their implications for governance *capacity* and *legitimacy* in policy sectors that deal with “wicked problems”. COCAL highlights the importance of organizational capacity through the *coordination* of public resources, decision-making systems and governance tools, and underscores the relevance of governance legitimacy by examining perceptions, attitudes and trust relations towards such coordination arrangements. The core argument is that institutional context features at country- and sector-level affect coordination practices and thereby organizational capacity and legitimacy.

“Wicked problems” are highly complex and ambiguous policy challenges that cannot be solved within one sector or one administrative level alone, and require coordination between different actors, organizations and levels (Lægreid and Rykkja 2015). In addition, they are often highly contested and debated policy areas. COCAL investigates the use of novel coordination practices within the policy areas of *climate change, immigration and the police*, focusing on the extent and content of novel forms of coordination within the three areas, the drivers behind them, how they function in practice, and their effects on capacity and legitimacy. The project provides sector-specific analyses and cross-sectoral comparisons, contrasting Norway primarily with Sweden and other countries in selected areas.. COCAL relates directly to the DEMOS call for projects on “democratic and effective governance, planning and public administration”, and takes into account the emphasis on organizational policy tools, governance capacity, legitimacy and modes of steering in complex, multilevel settings. The project therefore responds both to the call’s general propositions and the specific thematic priority area 2: ‘Integration and sectorization’.

Research questions, conceptual clarification and status of knowledge

The main research question in the project is: *What characterizes novel coordination measures in wicked policy areas, how do we explain them, and what are the consequences of introducing such coordination tools alongside existing coordination means for governance capacity and legitimacy?* Core sub-issues and questions are:

1. *The “what” issue – mapping:* What kind of novel coordination arrangements have emerged, and what separates them from pre-existing coordination means?
2. *The “how” issue – praxis:* How do coordination arrangements function?
3. *The “why” issue – explaining:* Why have these new practices appeared?
4. *The effect issue:* What are the effects on decision-making, policy formulation and implementation, particularly with respect to governance capacity and legitimacy?

Coordination: Conceptual clarification

Coordination can be defined as the purposeful alignment of tasks and efforts in order to achieve a defined goal (Bouckaert et al. 2010). It is often considered as a workable solution to wicked problems and a potent remedy for lacking capacity and legitimacy of the public sector, (Head and Alford 2013, Lægreid et al. 2014, 2015). Choosing between different means of coordination entails prioritizations carrying different risks, however. Coordination often plays out as combinations of hierarchy, networks and markets. Networks are often constrained by hierarchy and also markets may operate in the shadow of hierarchy. Reformers may choose between equally attractive, but logically incommensurable alternatives, involving difficult prioritizations between competing values. Wicked problems involve a risk of ‘coordination underlap’: When a particular policy issue falls between the boundaries of

different government organizations it can become a responsibility of none. Or, it could involve ‘coordination overlap’: When a policy issue is of relevance for several different organizations and all want to be involved in policy making. The three selected policy areas in COCAL represent different mixes of ‘overlap’ and ‘underlap’ (Wegrich and Stimac 2014).

Coordination is a central aspect in any understanding of how larger systems handle challenges of collective action (Hood 2005). Novel coordination measures often respond to demands for more efficiency, increased capacity to cope with wicked problems, and better public sector services. They take numerous shapes and go under various names, e.g. integrated governance, joined-up government, holistic governance, new public governance, networked government, partnerships, horizontal management, collaborative public management, collaborative governance, and whole-of-government. The development of these arrangements produces complex and hybrid administrative arrangements, as they layer upon pre-established forms rather than replacing them (Christensen and Læg Reid 2009). Hybrid structures bridging between new coordination means and traditional sector-based arrangements may be a fruitful way to handle the ‘coordination paradox’, implying that vertical coordination may counteract horizontal coordination (Egeberg and Trondal 2015). However, the performance and effects of these practices are often mixed and uncertain (Læg Reid et al. 2015).

The need for improved coordination is not easily resolved (Gulick 1937). New coordination tools deliver new challenges for public administration and public policy making, and have consequences for the public at large. Governance capacity and legitimacy are linked (Olsen 2010, Ansell and Gash 2008). A well-functioning democracy needs both administrative capacity and high levels of trust in government. Democratic legitimacy refers both to the inputs and the outputs of a political system (Scharpf 1999); the input side concerns the mechanisms and procedures that link the political decisions with citizens’ preferences, while the output side concerns the effectiveness and performance of decisions and arrangements. Coordination thus rests at the heart of both capacity and legitimacy.

Coordinating challenges in climate change, immigration and the police

Levin et al. (2012) see *climate change* as a ‘super wicked’ problem. A strong central authority to coordinate efforts does not exist. Climate change policies are characterised by conflicting objectives in adaptation (coping with the adverse effects of climate change) and mitigation (preventing further escalation through emission reduction). The issue transcends structural and functional boundaries, administrative and organizational levels, and policy areas creating a crucial need for coordination across levels, sectors and between actors (Rykkja et al. 2014, Jagers 2003). It engages several policy areas with potentially conflicting goals, e.g. environmental and energy policies, transportation, infrastructure, agriculture, etc. This is evident in the Norwegian Climate Agreement, which received wide political support across established political dividing-lines. Some researchers highlight the network characteristics of the climate policy field, where policymakers, stakeholders, regulatory bodies, civil society and academic communities interact in an unusually complex matter (Sygna et al. 2013).

The immigration issue is also extremely politically salient, reflecting global shifts in terms of conflict, economy and politics, and the attention of the media and different stakeholders (Myrberg 2014). It is cross-sectoral, with links to welfare policy, foreign policy, healthcare, education, security and more, and involves public authorities at local, national and international level. The tension between societal considerations and individual cases is important and involves decision-making on different levels and policy areas. While Norwegian immigration regulation is mainly a central government issue based on standardization, integration policy is to a greater extent a local government responsibility that allows for more discretion. The coordination of immigration and integration policies is a main

challenge, which to a great extent has been allocated to different authorities and administrative levels (Christensen and Læg Reid 2009).

The Norwegian *police* has been criticized for lacking in capacity, attributed to inadequate coordination between administrative levels, regional subdivisions and in the relation to other sectors (Læg Reid and Rykkja 2014). Crime disregards sector challenges, and police work demands collaboration across sectors and policy areas: With immigration authorities, the military, customs, local emergency units, the court system, the correctional services, the prosecution authorities, child protection authorities, health and welfare authorities as well as civil society organizations. The ongoing Norwegian reform focuses on structural arrangements by strengthening the central police agency as well as merging police districts and local police organizations. The main aim is to strengthen capacity. However, decentralization might be necessary to enhance community policing, keeping the civil character of the police and the closeness to the citizens. A core challenge for coordinating the police is how to balance partly conflicting values such as purposefulness, resilience, fairness and efficiency (Westerberg 2004). While the reform focuses on changing structural arrangements, there has also been a concern about cultural problems that might constrain the performance of police.

The three policy areas face both internal and external coordination challenges. Climate change involves a tension between adaptation and mitigation policies. Questions concerning immigration implicate balancing considerations of regulating the number of incoming immigrants with the integration issue. Police work involves a tension between a need for adequate emergency response and decentralized services focusing on crime prevention. All policy areas involve key coordination challenges – horizontally between ministries and between central agencies, and vertically between ministries and central agencies, central and local government, national bodies and supranational bodies, as well as with civil society.

Coordination is crucial for governance capacity because it shapes program design and influences efficiency gains. Coordination is equally important for legitimacy since the functioning of the government apparatus influences attitudes and perceptions of citizens. Capacity and legitimacy are in demand in all three policy areas. Actors dealing with climate change need increased capacity and greater legitimacy to advance sustainability (Anguelovski and Carmin 2010). The capacity-legitimacy debate influences the immigration field; handling increased immigration is important, but so are citizen opinions about immigration and integration. In the police, there is a link between the capacities of the police and citizens' trust.

Theoretical approaches

COCAL distinguishes between descriptive and explanatory theoretical approaches. A *descriptive approach* is applied in order to map both traditional and new forms of coordination, describing their characteristics and function in practice, and aggregating these to different types (Bouckaert et al. 2010): *Hierarchy* refers to vertically integrated state structures where 'command and control' through formal regulation is the main coordination mechanism combined with top-down delegation of responsibilities. *Networks* imply horizontal relationships between mutually dependent actors where coordination is driven mainly by actor preferences. Here, steering draws on the self-organizing capacities of central actors. *Markets* are based on values of competition. Actors compete for resources, and contractual relations regulate exchange. *Hybrids* display different combinations of such coordinative means, whether structural, functional or both.

Explanatory theory is applied to examine (a) why novel coordination forms have emerged, and (b) what the consequences and implications for capacity and legitimacy are. A central assumption is that institution matter: The institutional context influences organisational choices and the selection and use of both traditional and novel coordination

means. This context differs across politico-administrative systems and policy sectors (Radaelli et al. 2012). More precisely, COCAL applies a broad organization-theory based institutional approach (Olsen 2010) combining an instrumental perspective with a sociological institutionalist and a historical institutionalist perspective (Christensen et al. 2004, Thelen and Mahoney 2012). Whereas the instrumental perspective refers to the importance of formal institutions and rational preferences of actors, the sociological and historical institutionalist perspectives emphasise the relevance of formal *and* informal institutions, as well as the bounded-rational nature of actors. This approach enables analysing the institutional conditions under which administrative policies are formulated and implemented, and the effects they have on capacity and legitimacy. They allow for studying the major motives of actors engaged in administrative policies that introduce new coordination means alongside traditional coordination practices, and how bargaining, framing and consensus building processes play out.

Object of study, research design, methods and data

COCAL studies novel coordination practices in three policy sectors – climate, immigration, and police, comparing Norway and Sweden, and contrasting with other countries in selected areas. The attention is on coordination between central government bodies, ministries and agencies, and their interactions to reach overarching policy goals. COCAL also addresses the vertical dimension, downwards to subordinate authorities and regional/local government, upwards towards supra-national bodies, and outwards to civil and private organizations. In addition, we will examine what role the Parliament plays for coordination practices within the three areas. What arrangements supplement traditional coordination practices, or combine new and existing efforts? This includes the study of specific inter-organizational planning and working groups, committees, boards, tsars, inter-agency collaboration units, task forces, lead agency arrangements, strategic units etc. Resources, mandates, competences, responsibilities, and governance tools that characterize such coordination practices and how they work is crucial information. Key dimensions will be their scope, intensity and performance; if they are structural or procedural, mandatory or voluntary, permanent or ad hoc; whether they include participants from adjacent administrative levels, policy areas or sectors; the degree of autonomy; task portfolio; goal consensus, and trust relations.

The study's main focus is on Norway, comparing coordination across policy areas. Contrasting with other countries allows for analytical control for differing, country specific institutional contexts. The development of the public sector during the 'NPM era' involved specialization and the creation of semi-independent organizations with limited functions. This development came with conflicting programmes and inadequate coordination, but with large country variations. The result was often a mismatch between organizational structures and problem structures, typical for wicked problems. In Norway, two governance doctrines are central. First, the principle of ministerial responsibility tends to enhance vertical coordination within policy areas, but constrains horizontal coordination between them. It is very effective when the problem structure follows the organizational structure, but not when it comes to wicked problems. Thus, problems of pillarization, departmentalization, tunnel visions, and silo attention will be core challenges for handling wicked issues in the areas of climate, immigration and police. Secondly, the other governance doctrine – local self-government – might enhance coordination within each local municipality, but risks producing multi-level coordination challenges between local and central government. Thirdly, the choice and assessment of different coordination practices may be politicized and up for discussion in different political fora such as in the Parliament.

Sweden is generally comparable to Norway in terms of approaches to governance but does not enforce the ministerial rule. This allows for a most similar system design, with a direct control of this vertically oriented aspect of Norwegian governance. There are also more

interesting differences between the countries concerning the three policy areas. In climate policy, Sweden tends to have strong permanent central coordinating bodies, while Norway tends to apply ad hoc, interdepartmental arrangements (Christensen and Jensen 2010). In immigration, Sweden, in contrast to Norway, has migration courts and a more centralized responsibility for integration (Myrberg 2014). Both Sweden and Norway are in the process of implementing major police reforms. Sweden established a new central police agency in 2015 and reduced 21 police districts to 7. Centralization and merging of police districts is also a main element in the Norwegian police reform. Further research in the project will reveal contrasting and similar issues concerning coordination in other countries such as Germany, representing a larger, continental and federal state with a rather different administrative structure.

The three policy sectors represent the empirical baseline of the project. We start with descriptions of coordination practices in the three sectors, and move to investigate praxis and implications for capacity and legitimacy. The comparative approach runs parallel and gradually becomes more significant as the project moves to the explanatory approaches.

| Descriptive framework: Governance type | Sector (all with wicked problems) | Mapping | Praxis | Governance capacity | Governance legitimacy |
|---|--|---|---|--|--|
| Network Market Hierarchy Hybrids | Climate change | What types of coordination take place? | How does coordination function in practice? | What are the effects of new coordination measures for governance capacity? | What are the consequences for governance legitimacy? |
| | Immigration | | | | |
| | Police | | | | |
| Data and methods | Mixed-method design → | Desk studies, document analysis, literature reviews | Document analysis, interviews | National statistics, media coverage, document analysis | Focus groups, survey and panel data, media coverage |
| Explanatory framework | Descriptive and explanatory theoretical approaches (instrumental and sociological institutionalist and historical institutionalist perspectives) | | | | |

The project employs a *mixed-method design* by combining qualitative and quantitative methods. COCAL will perform in-depth case studies in the three selected areas, employing document analysis and interviews with reform agents, stakeholders and administrative executives. Quantitative methods will involve statistical analysis of relevant survey and panel data displaying administrative perceptions and citizen's attitudes.

The *mapping analysis* relies on a combination of document studies and interviews, as well as a review of existing literature concerning the three policy sectors in Norway and Sweden. The analysis of the effects of coordination practices on *capacity* is based upon existing quantitative datasets measuring government performance in the three policy areas, as well as on qualitative assessments through document analysis and interviews with key informants. Performance accumulates multiple and often ambiguous meanings. Performance indicators are related to input, process, outputs and outcomes, and to efficiency (the relation between outputs and inputs/process) or effectiveness (the relation between outcomes and input/process). Our ambition is to investigate performance with a specific focus on efficiency. Performance as capacity focuses also on the quality of achievements. Our focus will be mostly on activities and output assessed for the relevant authorities' own goals as well as citizen's trust and satisfaction with government and public services. This means that we apply a broad concept of performance also going beyond efficiency looking at impacts on legitimacy, knowledge, trust, interests and power relations. Relevant indicators for our purposes will be budget allocations, staff numbers, the use of external/internal expertise in decision-making, governance indicators for example from the OECD and the World Bank,

data from the Climate Change Performance Index¹, data on the numbers of immigrants (different categories), residence and asylum permits, out-transportations, crime rates, as well as expert-based indicators such as the data on Quality of Government from the University of Gothenburg. Both Norway and Sweden have advanced systems of performance management, which are easily accessible and yields plentiful information on the performance and activities of public sector organizations. Annual reports from the authorities, reports in budget documents, and in the overall processes and procedures of agency management (*Etatsstyring*) and management dialogue (*Styringsdialog*) between ministries and subordinate agencies and bodies will be relevant sources. In 2016, the *Norwegian Survey of State Administration* will be repeated, covering the ministries and central agencies including the three sectors under study in COCAL. Relevant themes include patterns of contact and influence between different actors in the central administration. Moreover, Statistics Norway provides detailed information on public sector priorities and development, and specific databases such as StatRes and KOSTRA are directly geared towards documenting performance. Structural developments can also be traced through the *Norwegian State Administration Database*, which also holds datasets based on surveys and archives.

The analysis of the effects of coordination practices on *legitimacy* is based upon existing quantitative survey data evaluating citizens' satisfaction with and trust in government. There are several relevant surveys and datasets, e.g. the *Inhabitant Survey* conducted by Difi and the *Norwegian Citizen Panel* conducted by the University of Bergen. Both these surveys include themes such as trust in government, as well as evaluative questions on a wide range of topics and sector-specific sub-themes, including climate, immigration and police. Finally, COCAL will draw on data from previous research projects and collaborations, as well as international datasets such *ISSP: The Role of Government* (2016), the *European Social Survey* and *Eurobarometer* when/where applicable.

Project organization, research network and work packages

COCAL employs a team of highly competent scholars in the field of political science and public administration and with a strong reputation in conducting and running big externally funded comparative international research programs. The *core team* has a longstanding experience of working together in previous joint research efforts. The project is led from the Uni Research Rokkan Centre by senior researcher Lise H. Rykkja. Together with Rykkja, senior researcher Simon Neby (Uni Rokkan), Professor Per Lægveid and associate professor Julia Fleischer (the Department of Administration and Organization Theory, University of Bergen) are core researchers. Professor Tom Christensen from the Department of Political Science, University of Oslo also participates part time. The project will recruit a two-year *post doc* whose work will be dedicated to one of the focused policy areas.

The project has three confirmed *partners* in Sweden: Professor Sverker Jagers, Luleå University of Technology (working on climate change), associate professor Gunnar Myrberg, Uppsala University (working on immigration issues) and associate professor Ivar I. Westerberg, Södertörn University College (working on police issues). The project will further employ an *expert advisory board* including highly renowned international capacities in public administration and coordination. The board will be consultative and corrective. It will meet twice during the project, and individual members will also participate in joint activities (conferences, workshops and seminars). Members are: Professor Werner Jann, Potsdam University; professor Tiina Randma-Liiv, Tallinn University of Technology; professor Brian Head, University of Queensland; professor Chris Ansell, University of California, Berkeley; and professor Eva Heidbreder, Dusseldorf University.

¹ The Climate Change Index is provided by Germanwatch in collaboration with the Climate Action Network Europe: <https://germanwatch.org/en/11390>

COCAL incorporates four work packages, ensuring a defined focus as well as a workable distribution of tasks among the project participants. WPs 1, 2 and 3 are structured along the three policy areas covering all research questions and phases of the project. WP 4 is specifically dedicated to the overall comparison across countries and sectors and ensures common endeavours and joint efforts in the final stages of the project. The following table summarizes the project organization:

| | Work Package 1: Climate policies | Work Package 2: Immigration | Work Package 3: The police | Work Package 4: Triangulation |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| WP contents | Case studies (literature analysis, media analysis, expert interviews), quantitative analyses (survey, existing data), triangulation of findings | Case studies (literature analysis, media analysis, expert interviews), quantitative analyses (survey, existing data), triangulation of findings | Case studies (literature analysis, media analysis, expert interviews), quantitative analyses (survey, existing data), triangulation of findings | Triangulation from all three policy areas, and formulation of cross-sectoral conclusions. Comparative contrasting between country, formulating cross-country conclusions |
| Core group: PhD Lise Hellebø Rykkja, project leader (Uni Research) | Participant researcher | | WP leader | Co-led by Rykkja and Neby |
| PhD Simon Neby (Uni Research) | WP leader | | | Core group shared responsibility |
| Prof. Per Læg Reid (UiB) | | | Participant researcher | |
| Associate prof. Julia Fleischer (UiB) | | WP leader | | |
| Prof. Tom Christensen (UiO) | | Participant researcher | | |
| NN – two year postdoc | | | Specific focus | |
| International partners: Sverker Jagers (Luleå University) | Specific focus | | | Partner participation |
| Gunnar Myrberg (Uppsala University) | | Specific focus | | |
| Anders Ivarsson Westerberg (Södertörn University College) | | | Specific focus | |
| Expert advisory group: | Prof. Chris Ansell (UC Berkeley), Prof. Brian Head (University of Queensland), Prof. Eva Heidbreder (Dusseldorf University), Prof. Werner Jann (Potsdam University), Prof. Tiina Randma-Liiv (Tallinn University of Technology). | | | |
| WP deliverables | A minimum of three peer reviewed articles per WP | | | One edited volume |

WP 1: Climate policies is led by Simon Neby. It concentrates on the mix of cooperation practices relating to climate change policies in three countries, departing from the perspectives introduced to Norwegian policy through NOU 2010:10. The WP will address the particular challenge of coordinating adaption and mitigation efforts spanning across sectors, political-administrative levels and institutional settings. The mapping and description of this area will particularly underline the role of multi-level settings, but is also expected to involve several network arrangements trying to solve coordination problems across policy sectors. Professor Sverker Jagers from Sweden and Lise H. Rykkja will participate in this WP.

WP 2: Immigration is led by Julia Fleischer. The WP concentrates on an extremely politically salient policy area. Both in Norway and the contrasting countries, immigration issues are high on the political agenda, and plentiful demands for action involve different political considerations that have diverging administrative implications as well as consequences for potential immigrants. In addition to the mapping exercise, the investigation of how novel coordination practices within this policy area work and might be explained, grasping the

importance of political salience for coordination is especially relevant. Julia Fleischer will lead this WP. The Swedish partner is Gunnar Myrberg. Tom Christensen will participate in this WP.

WP 3: The police is led by Lise H. Rykkja. The WP taps directly into current administrative policy debates concerning centralization and decentralization in Norway. It is also an issue with particular importance since the terrorist attacks in Oslo and at Utøya in 2011. The police reform will be implemented from 2016-2020 and provides an opportunity to investigate the introduction of novel coordination practices as they unfold. The police is organized around a formal and strict regulatory regime where hierarchical forms of coordination are especially important. The Swedish partner is Anders I. Westerberg. Per Lægreid will participate in this WP. The post doc position will primarily be dedicated to this WP.

WP 4: Cross-sectoral and cross-country analysis is co-led by Lise H. Rykkja and Simon Neby. The WP will execute the project's comparative ambitions. This implies conducting analyses that move beyond individual countries and generalizing knowledge from the comparisons across countries. WP 4 will further draw connections between the three policy areas. All core researchers and international partners will engage in this work package.

Strategic considerations and adjacent resources

The Uni Research Rokkan Centre and the Department of Administration and Organizations Theory, University of Bergen have an extended strategic emphasis on public administration and public policy research. In addition, the three sectors in question correspond well with the three partners' empirical orientation. Public administration as a discipline is a stronghold of both the Department of Administration and Organization Theory and the Rokkan Centre, and the partner institutions.

Firstly, COCAL builds on the COCOPS project, funded by EU's 7th Framework program from 2011-2014. This project studied administrative reforms in ten European countries, involving 11 universities. Per Lægreid was Norwegian partner and responsible for a work package on emerging coordinating arrangements, based on a survey to top civil servants in Europe and comparative case studies of coordinating arrangements. Lise H. Rykkja was project manager on this work package (Lægreid et al. 2014). A *second* highly relevant project is the comparative European project "Reforming the welfare state; Democracy, accountability and management" (funded over the VAM program), which studied how reforms influences accountability relations in immigration, welfare administration and hospitals in Norway, Denmark and Germany. Per Lægreid was project leader of this project and Simon Neby was project manager (Christensen and Lægreid, forthcoming). A *third*, ongoing project relevant for COCAL is "Organizing for internal security and crisis management: Building governance capacity and legitimacy", funded through SAMRISK II. This project focuses on five European countries. How to organize for better coordination in societal security and balance governance capacity and legitimacy is a core research problem (Christensen et al. 2015). The project is led by Per Lægreid with Lise H. Rykkja as project manager. *Lastly*, an important impetus for mapping of central governmental organizations comes from the work of the COBRA/CRIPO network (COST Action IS0601). Per Lægreid served as vice-chair in this network. Its main objective is to increase knowledge about current trends in public sector organization and it concentrates on describing and explaining the institutional design of agencies, their bureaucratic autonomy, and managerial and steering relationships with their political principals (Verhoest et al. 2012; Lægreid and Verhoest 2010).

Relevance and benefit to society

COCAL results will be highly relevant to contemporary public sector challenges with regards to both the thematic focus (governance, coordination, capacity and legitimacy) and the policy areas of climate change, immigration and the police. Administrative policy and public sector reforms in particular lack reliable data about the effects and implications of novel government coordination arrangements. COCAL will improve the knowledge-base for policy making in the relevant policy sectors and contribute to improve the means-end knowledge. This proves valuable and useful knowledge for decision-makers and practitioners.

Environmental impact

The project will not have any direct negative influences on the environment.

Ethical perspectives

COCAL adheres to all standards established by the National Committees for Research Ethics in Norway, as specified in the Guidelines for Research Ethics in the Social Sciences, Law and Humanities. The Data Protection Official for Research, NSD will be notified, should the project receive funding. We do not expect to encounter any project-specific ethical challenges within the thematic, analytical or methodological framework of the project.

Gender issues (Recruitment of women, gender balance and gender perspectives)

The core research group in Bergen consists of two women and three men and the project leader (Rykkja) is female. Both main researchers (Rykkja and Neby) have recently finished their postdocs, which underlines the project's ambitions to promote mid-level career experience. The project will recruit a postdoc, particularly asking for female applicants. In assembling the expert advisory group and research partners, explicit care was taken to ensure balanced gender representation – although subordinated to demands for expertise and competence. The project's analytical and methodical approaches and thematic interests are gender neutral.

Dissemination and communication of results

COCAL project results will be published in well reputed scholarly journals and books focusing on public administration and policy. The project participants have a strong international publication record. The project will publish at least nine scientific articles and one edited volume from an international publisher. These deliverables will be directly related to the outcomes of the 4 work packages. Also, working papers will be published by the Uni Rokkan Centre and made digitally available as the project progresses.

The project has an overall comprehensive plan for scientific dissemination and communication with users to promote collaboration and strengthen communication between the research community and the field of practice. Please see the electronic application form for further details.

Communication with users

A diversified dissemination strategy will be applied to reach a large audience of practitioners and policy-makers. Communications with user groups relevant for the project such as political and administrative executives, civil servants and civil society organizations will be done through keynotes and presentations at relevant government conferences, seminars and workshops in ministries and central agencies. Also, the Norwegian Political Science Association, the Nordic Administrative Association, different interest organizations, civil servants unions and political parties will be relevant arenas. Interviews and chronicles in mass media and reviews in newspapers and magazines and online forums will be provided. Dissemination will also be done through incorporation of findings in executive teaching and

regular student courses. Cooperation with the Norwegian Ministry of Local Government and Modernization and Central Agency for Public Management will be central. The project will give access to data for practical use and for official reports on government reorganization processes. The data on the Norwegian central government organizations will be stored and made accessible from NSD.

Budget and project plan - please see grant application form.

References

- Anguelovski, I. and J.A. Carmin (2010) "Something borrowed, everything new: innovation and institutionalization in urban climate governance". *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, 3/3, pp. 169-175.
- Ansell, C. and A. Gash (2008), "Collaborative Governance in Theory and Practice", *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18 (4):, 543-71.
- Bouckaert, G., B.G. Peters and K. Verhoest (2010). *The Coordination of Public Sector Organizations*. London: Palgrave.
- Christensen, J.G. and L. Jensen (2010). "The Executive Core and Government Strategy in the Nordic Countries". Working Paper. University of Aarhus.
- Christensen, T., M. Egeberg, P. Læg Reid and K.A. Røvik (2004). *Organization Theory and the Public Sector*. London: Routledge.
- Christensen, T. and P. Læg Reid (2008). "The Challenge of Coordination in Central Government Organizations: The Norwegian Case". *Public Organization Review. A Global Journal*, 8 (2): 97-116.
- Christensen, T. and P. Læg Reid (2009) "Organising immigration policy: The unstable balance between political control and agency autonomy". *Policy & Politics*, 37 (2):2, 161-177.
- Christensen, T. and P. Læg Reid (2010): "Complexity and Hybrid Public Organizations. Theoretical and Empirical Challenges". *Public Organization Review*, 11(4):407-423.
- Christensen, T. and P. Læg Reid (Forthcoming). *The Ashgate Research Companion to Accountability and Welfare State Reforms in Europe*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Egeberg, M. and J. Trondal (2015). "Why strong coordination at one level of government is incompatible with strong coordination across levels". Working paper, Oslo: ARENA.
- Gulick, L. (1937). "Notes on the Theory of Organization", in L. Gulick and L.F. Urwick (eds), *Papers on the Science of Administration*, New York: Institute of Public Administration.
- Head, B.W. and J. Alford (2013). "Wicked Problems: Implications for Public Policy and Management". *Administration & Society*, online first: doi: 10.1177/0095399713481601
- Hood, C. (2005). "The Idea of Joined-Up Government: A Historical Perspective", in V. Bogdanor (ed.), *Joined-Up Government*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jager, S. and J. Strippel (2003). "Climate governance beyond the state". *Global Governance*, 9 (3): 385-399.
- Levin, K., B. Cashore and S. Bernstein (2012). "Overcoming the tragedy of super wicked problems: constraining our future selves to ameliorate global climate change". *Policy Sciences*, 45/2, pp. 123-152.
- Læg Reid, P., K. Sarapuu, L.H. Rykkja and T. Randma-Liiv, eds. (2014). *Organizing for coordination in the public sector. Practices and lessons for 12 European countries*. Aldershot: Ashgate
- Læg Reid, P., K. Sarapuu, L.H. Rykkja and T. Randma-Liiv (2015). "New Coordination Challenges in the Welfare State". *Public Management Review* 17 (7): 927-939.
- Læg Reid, P. and L.H. Rykkja (2015). "Organizing for 'wicked problems'. Analyzing coordination arrangements in two policy areas: Internal security and the welfare administration". *International Journal of Public Sector Management* (forthcoming, Issue 6).
- Læg Reid, P. and L. H. Rykkja (2014) "Diagnose og medisin etter terrorangrepet: Kultur eller struktur?" In A.L. Fimreite, P. Lango, P. Læg Reid and L.H. Rykkja, eds (2014). *Organisering, samfunnssikkerhet og krisehåndtering*. 2. edition. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget
- Læg Reid, P. and K. Verhoest, eds. (2010). *Governance of Public Sector Organizations*. London: Palgrave.
- Mahoney, J. and K. Thelen (2010). *Explaining Institutional Change*. Chambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Myrberg, G. (2014). "Organizing Refugee Reception. The case of the Swedish Introduction Reform". Paper presented at ECPR Joint Sessions, Salamanca, 10-15 April 2015.
- Olsen, J.P. (2010). *Governance through institution-building*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Radaelli, C.M., B. Dente and S. Dossi (2012). "Recasting Institutionalism: Institutional Analysis and Public Policy". *European Political Science*, 11/4, pp. 537-550.
- Rykkja, L.H., S. Neby and K. Hope (2014). "Implementation and governance: Current and future research on climate change policies". *Public Policy and Administration*, 29/2, pp. 106-130.
- Scharpf, F.W. (1999). *Governing in Europe: effective and democratic?* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sygnal, L., K. O'Brien and J. Wolf (2013). *A Changing Environment for Human Security: Transformative Approaches to Research, Policy and Action*. London, Earthscan.
- Verhoest, K., S. Van Thiel, G. Bouckaert and P. Læg Reid, eds. (2012). *Government Agencies*. London: Palgrave.
- Wegrich, K. and V. Stimac (2014). "Coordination capacity". In M. Lodge and K. Wegrich, eds. *The Problem Solving Capacity of the Modern State*. Oxford: Oxford University press.
- Westerberg, A.I. (2004). *Papperspolisen* (The paper police). PhD dissertation. Stockholm: Stockholm School of Economics.