

Managerialism

Nino Tandilashvili

Managerialism has been a central concept in public management debates since the 1990s. It permeates both some of the global reforms carried out in the public sector, which aim to improve the performance of public organisations and services, and also a stream of scientific literature, which criticises the increasing importance of management in the functioning of public organisations.

In the scientific literature, managerialism remains a controversial concept. In contrast to other discussed concepts in public management, such as neoliberalism or New Public Management, managerialism has never been formally described. The discrepancy in the literature is based on the fact that managerialism has a multitude of manifestations in several disciplines and induces various perceptions.

The literature review identifies six different approaches to the concept of managerialism: 1) equating managerialism with *the use of private service management tools and methods in the public service*; 2) perceiving managerialism as a *class rise of managers*; 3) conceptualising managerialism as a *new organisational archetype suitable for any type of target organisation*; 4) conceptualising managerialism as a *process of commodification*; 5) associating managerialism with the *New Public Management*; and 6) differentiating between managerialism and *new managerialism*.

Table: 1 Different approaches to defining managerialism

The conceptualisation of managerialism	The central thesis of the approach	Some reference authors
The use of private service management tools and methods in the public service	The universalism of management tools. TQM, reengineering, empowerment, are solutions in themselves.	Pollitt (1990), Boje (1991, 1999), Boston et al (1991), Terry (1998), Peters (1996, 2011), Blanchot and Padioleau (2003), Dunand (2011)
The rise of the managerial class	Replacement of professionals and intellectuals by technocrats within organisations and at the level of society.	Pollitt (1990), Enteman (1993), Andrews (1998), Mulgan (1998), Hoopes (2003), Deem and Brehony (2005), Cunliffe (2009), Locke (2009)
The new organisational archetype	The triumph of organisations over individuals.	Pollitt (1990), Enteman (1993), Seth (2001), Guiggin (2003), Smets (2005), Locke (2009)
The process of commodification	The replacement of subjectivity by objectivity in social relations.	Bourguignon (2007), Gauléjac (2012)
The association of managerialism with New Public Management	The NPM is the process of public management reform, while managerialism - an ideological approach to public management.	Pollitt (1990, 1993, 2014), Hood (1995), Guiggin (2003), Meek (2003), Deem and Brehony (2005), Cunliffe (2009), Dunand (2011), Fitzsimons (2012), Fortier (2013)
The differentiation between managerialism and new managerialism	New managerialism is the process of managerialisation in the public sector exclusively, whereas managerialism applies to all types of organisation.	Clarke and Newman (1994), Terry (1998), Saint-Martin (2000), Deem (2001) Maassen (2003), Cunliffe (2009), Fitzsimons (2012), Pick et al (2012)

The conceptualisation of managerialism	The central thesis of the approach
The use of private service	Management tools, TQM, reengineering, empowerment, are

management tools and methods in the public service	solutions in themselves.
The rise of the managerial class	Replacement of professionals and intellectuals by technocrats within organisations and at the level of society.
The new organisational archetype	The triumph of organisations over individuals.
The process of commodification	The replacement of subjectivity by objectivity in social relations.
The association of managerialism with New Public Management	The NPM is the process of public management reform, while managerialism - an ideological approach to public management.
The differentiation between managerialism and new managerialism	New managerialism is the process of managerialisation in the public sector exclusively, whereas managerialism applies to all types of organisation.

The most salient point of these interpretations is that, like many terms ending in 'ism', managerialism is used in an ideological framework (Enteman, 1993; Pollitt, 1990; Trow, 1994; Meek, 2003; Deem and Brehony, 2005) and shows personal convictions of the authors. At the same time, the suffix 'ism' shows a criticism, even a pejorative attitude of the authors. Managerialism' is pejorative when it describes 'the progression of the management caste' (Locke, 2009) or an excessive number of management techniques (Dunand, 2011).

Reforms based on the ideology of managerialism aim (as stated by the reformers) to improve the performance of organisations and public services and increase their efficiency. **The objective of performance is** twofold: 1) the quality of service and delivery - quality is often understood as the transparency of activities and the speed of service; and 2) the smooth running of organisations - which can be ensured by getting rid of traditional red tape. **The goal of efficiency is** often translated into 1) economic rationality and 2) the appropriation of market values. Thus, values such as productivity, profitability or cost reduction are promoted by the concept. The culture of results and measurement in figures are also linked to the efficiency objective.

Several French reforms have had similar objectives since the end of 1990. By profoundly modifying the logic of financial management in the public sector, the Loi Organique Relative aux Lois des Finances (LOLF) is indisputably the greatest manifestation of managerialism in French public management. It is not only a budgetary reform, it is also a profound change of culture which replaces the logic of means with the logic of results. The law puts at the heart of administrative functioning the triptych 'relevance - effectiveness - efficiency', the doctrinal basis of control which offers an analysis usually conducted a posteriori (Benzerafa Alilat, et al., 2016). Finally, the LOLF, as is often the case with managerialist reforms, also has an impact on culture. The aim is to make managers accountable for achieving public policy objectives (socio-economic effectiveness), user satisfaction (service quality) at the lowest cost (efficiency). To do this, public managers have more room for manoeuvre in terms of allocating the resources at their disposal.

Bibliography

ENTEMAN Willard F. (1993), *Managerialism: The Emergence of a New Ideology*, Madison, The University of Wisconsin Press.

HOOD Christopher (2000), Paradoxes of Public-Sector Managerialism, Old Public Management and Public Service Bargains, *International Public Management Journal*, Vol.1/3 p. 1-22.

LOCKE Robert R. (2009), Managerialism and the Demise of the Big Three, *Real-world economics review*, N°51, p. 28-47.

DUNAND Christophe (2011), Dépasser un Managérialisme insoutenable, *Actualité Sociale*, N°35, p.14-16.

TANDILASHVILI Nino (2016), Le managérialisme et l'identité universitaire. Le cas de l'université française, PhD thesis in management, under the supervision of Patrick Gibert, Université Paris Nanterre.

BENZERAF A ALILAT Manel, GARCIN Laurent, GIBERT Patrick (2016), Le volet performance de la LOLF. Standardisation et résilience d'un genre entre rationalité politique et rationalité de gestion, *Revue française de gestion*, Vol. 260/7, p. 11-31.

New public management
New public management
LOLF