

- Polsby, Nelson W. (1963). *Community Power and Political Theory*, New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Poulantzas, Nicos (1982). *Political Power and Social Classes*, London: Verso.
- Sayer, Andrew (1998). "Abstraction: A Realist Interpretation", pp. 120-143 i Margaret Archer et al. (ed.), *Critical Realism*, London: Routledge.
- Sayer, Andrew (2000). *Realism and Social Science*, London: Sage.
- Thomsen, Jens Peter Frølund (2000). *Magt og indflydelse*, Århus: Magtudredningen.
- Torring, Jacob (1999). *New Theories of Discourse*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Ward, Hugh (1987). "Structural Power: A Contradiction in Terms?", *Political Studies*, vol. xxxv, pp. 593-610.

Sakkunnigutlåtanden över sökande till professuren i statsvetenskap, särskilt förvaltning, i Umeå

Honoured by your decision to appoint us to consider the applications for the Chair in Political Science, particularly Public Administration, we would like to submit our appreciation of the qualifications of the three candidates. In the first part of our report we jointly assess their merits. In the second part, each one of us presents her or his own conclusions.

Katarina Eckerberg

Katarina Eckerberg (born in 1953) completed her doctoral work in political science in 1988 at Umeå University. Her work in political science is complemented by both academic and vocational experience in environmental policy and administration. Her first university degree was in forestry. In 1996 she was awarded the title of docent in political science at Umeå.

In addition to her academic positions at Umeå University, Eckerberg has served in the Forestry Department of the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the UN, the Institution for Forestry Economics at the Forestry College in Umeå, and in a national agency, Statens naturvårdsverk.

Eckerberg's qualifications for the position of professor with special emphasis on public administration can be assessed by her pedagogical

experience in political science and public administration including curriculum development, presentation of formal courses, and advising graduate and doctoral-level students; by her professional service and leadership in the university, department, and larger academic community; and by the quality, quantity, and subject matter of her scholarly work as well as her success at obtaining external funding for research activities.

Eckerberg has had experience of teaching at all academic levels at Umeå University. Her main areas of teaching are environmental policy and administration (Global Environmental Crisis and World Policy, Environmental Policy and Administration, Research in Environmental Policy in Sweden and the EU, Environmental Protection, Policy and Marketing, Forestry, and Human Ecology). She has accumulated about 1700 lecture hours of experience in teaching political science, environmental policy, and courses in research methods at the B, C, and D levels with high assessments for teaching from her students. Her advanced course syllabi demonstrate a broad knowledge of the important work in political science and research methods. She has served as academic advisor to about 15 graduate students and eight doctoral students at Umeå University. Her case provides evidence of pedagogic creativity in that she has developed university courses and course materials (Global Environmental Crisis and World Policy and Environmental Policy and Administration in Sweden and the EU). She has also collaborated with the Baltic University Programme to produce university-level course material for students in environmental policy.

She has demonstrated significant administrative leadership. For example, she was key participant in the steering group that led to the creation of a new environmental college, Umeå Miljöhogskola, and involved a cooperative effort between Umeå University and Sweden's Agricultural University (Lantbruksuniversitetet, SLU). Since 1997 she has had primary responsibility for carrying out the Political Science Department's East European program and served as acting professor in international relations. More recently, she has been a member of the administrative leadership of the Department of Political Science and was selected to serve as deputy prefect in December 1999. She developed an English language summer program, Training of Young Environmental Administrators that brought Russian practitioners to Umeå in 1999. She is acknowledged as a significant contributor to the development of the Summer University for Eastern European Students from 1991 to 1998, a joint venture of Umeå University and Folkuniversitetet. Her administrative skills have also been demonstrated through organizing different international research seminars and conferences and by being able to carry those collaborations forward into published results. Additionally, evidence of external recognition of her expertise in the field is indicated by funding to develop courses for institutions outside Sweden and invitations to teach abroad.

Eckerberg identifies two main threads in her scholarly research. One involves empirical studies of environmental issues. The second focuses on theoretical work examining decision processes. Much of her work is published in English by international journals or presses. Typical of public administration scholarship, Eckerberg's research has relevance for practitioners and policy makers, as well as academics.

Eckerberg has produced a steady flow of research publications since obtaining her doctoral degree in 1986 and has continued to produce journal articles and book chapters since she obtained the title of docent in 1996. Since 1996, she has produced one edited volume, three articles in journals (two of which are co-authored), and six book chapters. During the same period, she produced seven conference papers and research re-

ports that were distributed as scholarly proceedings.

Her most recent journal articles were placed in relatively new international English-language journals, two of which focus on environmental issues, *Local Environment* and *Environmental Politics*. *Environmental Politics* is a refereed British journal that is widely read by scholars in the field of environmental policy. *Local Environment* is a more recent peer-reviewed journal focusing on the timely topic of sustainability. The contents of both these journals are contained in scholarly international citation and abstracting services and widely available. She has also published in the wellknown British *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management* (1996, 1988) and *Forest Ecology and Management*, published in Amsterdam. Her forthcoming book chapter is contained in a publication by a prestigious university press, Oxford University. Her co-edited book, *From the Earth Summit to Local Agenda 21: Working Towards Sustainable Development*, is published by a respected environmental advocacy press and reviews of the work have been published in two international journals: *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management* and *Journal of the American Planning Association*. All her recent book chapters are in non-Swedish press publications, contributing to her international reputation as a scholar and the potential impact of her work. Her research has been supported by government agencies in Sweden, the Nordic council, and international sources. Although her earlier environmental research mainly built on the work of other Swedish scholars with some references to other Nordic work, her more recent studies draw on a broader base of international scholarship.

Eckerberg's dissertation, *Environmental Protection in Swedish Forestry: A Study of the Implementation Process*, was published in an international series and led to several published articles as well. Her dissertation has been positively assessed by experts in environmental policy for demonstrating solid scholarship and making an original contribution to the field. This work explores the policy implementation process and the utility of vertical models of policy implementation (top down or bottom up) mainly de-

veloped by scholars writing in the 1980s. In other works, for example, "Environmental Planning: dreams and realities," she employs different decision-making models for local environmental protection, including the rational model. Her more recent studies consider network-based and intergovernmental models of policy making and policy implementation. Her work has become more sophisticated over time, drawing on a wider body of scholarly research and theoretical models and typically employing comparative analyses based on case analyses carefully developed by Eckerberg and her collaborators. The subject area of her research has expanded beyond forestry management and protection to become broadly based in the environmental field. She addresses a range of issues that experts have characterized as of great significance and she has done some pioneering work in the emerging area of sustainability. At the same time, her work has become increasingly international, developing and building on case studies from outside Sweden and including examples from other Nordic and Baltic countries. In a recent collaborative work, she serves as co-editor of a series of international case studies representing eight European countries. These comparative analyses of policy implementation processes make an important contribution to the policy analysis literature.

Eckerberg's 1997 article, "Comparing the Local Use of Environmental Policy Instruments in Nordic and Baltic Countries," is a good example of the nature of her research. The study is based on six local cases drawn from four Nordic and two Baltic countries. The cases represent at-risk situations where pressure for policy implementation exists. The piece begins by outlining the policy analysis framework and available policy instruments (categorized as economic, regulatory, and communicative). She provides a brief description of the situation in each case. A common contextual factor across the case studies is that successful policy implementation is believed to be dependent upon changing the behavior of local farmers whose current methods are contributing to the environmental crisis. The analysis goes well beyond a descriptive portrayal of practices in each of the six cases exam-

ined. Eckerberg shows how Nordic and Baltic states can be distinguished in the policy instruments and structures for policy making they employ. She finds, for example, that Nordic governments are less likely to use regulatory instruments than Baltic governments and that Norway successfully employed economic incentives to change farmers' behavior. In all cases, however, communication was the most frequently used policy instrument. An observation made from the Baltic cases is that the establishment of national policies for environmental protection is meaningless in the absence of local capacity or resources to implement those policies. But the study also shows that policy failures occur in the Nordic countries despite farmers' efforts at compliance demonstrating the significance of political, administrative, and economic factors noted in the original model. Eckerberg draws on her understanding of the situational and contextual factors in the national cases to explain the different external factors operating in each case and to explore alternatives available to policy makers.

Eckerberg's co-edited book with William Lafferty (Oslo University), *From the Earth Summit to Local Agenda 21: Working Towards Sustainable Development*, uses a common descriptive protocol for eight different countries to catalogue strategies employed to implement Local Agenda 21 of the 1992 UN Conference on Environment and Development, which recognizes that the participation of local authorities is critical to the solution of global environmental problems. The case study chapters emphasize links between environmental impacts and socio-economic pressures and between local issues and global problems. Based on the information presented in the case study chapters, the co-editors develop a typology organizing the cases into three categories: pioneers, adapters, and late-comers. The last chapter attempts to explain why countries fall into the different categories and reveals the editors' understanding of the conditions, resources, and political pressures in different national cases. Although the editors present the book as a descriptive study, they set a comparative-analytical framework to lay the foundation for further conceptual and theoretical work.

Two published reviews of the work are testimony to its relevance to scholarly research and practice. From the compiled information on the six descriptive categories selected for the study [(1) existing requirements for addressing environmental concerns in local decision making, (2) the role of countries in helping to develop Agenda 21 prior to the Earth Summit, (3) the response of national governments and (4) local communities to Local Agenda 21, (5) the participation of non-governmental organizations, and (6) the effects of specific Local Agenda 21 initiatives] they show that significant variation exists among the cases studied and suggest that these variations may explain patterns for implementing the policies put forward in Agenda 21. Additionally, the authors suggest that two factors may serve as preconditions to the success of Agenda 21 policy implementation efforts. These are the establishment of a national environmental policy and the degree of local autonomy for Local Agenda 21 action. They hypothesize that the greater the level of local autonomy and the more well established the environmental policy tradition, the more likely that the policies contained in Agenda 21 will be implemented. The model, however, as the editors note, cannot account for certain peculiar variations such as why Germany, with high municipal autonomy and early establishment of environmental policy traditions, is a laggard case, and why the UK, with low municipal autonomy and late establishment of environmental policies is further ahead in Local Agenda 21 implementation. This effort also demonstrates her wide professional contact network and her ability to advance collaborative research.

Her single-authored chapter, "Sweden: Progression Despite Recession" (forthcoming Laferty and Meadowcraft (eds) *Bringing Rio Home: National Responses to Sustainable Development in High-Consumption Societies*, Oxford University Press), not only disentangles and identifies the different forces affecting Sweden's efforts to implement and monitor environmental policy but also offers an insightful analysis of the development and consequences of contemporary political reform in Sweden for the implementation of internationally-sanctioned en-

vironmental policies. In the same vein, her chapter "National and Local Policy Implementation as a Participatory Process," (in Rolén, ed., *International Governance on Environmental Issues*, 1997) examines classic issues in public administration including the sources and flow of political power, the relative importance of actors at the grassroots and other levels, the effects of different political structures, and the consequences of political decentralization. The piece develops themes common to her other work that policy formulation and implementation processes run both from the top down and bottom up and that participation of local actors is a critical ingredient in successful policy initiatives.

Eckerberg's work uses different aspects of environmental policy as a context for examining policy instruments and the policy implementation process. It clearly falls within the approaches that political scientists in general and public administration scholars in particular traditionally take to study public policy formulation and policy implementation. In recent years, her status as an international scholar has grown substantially. This is evident from the expansion of her research to include examples from other Nordic, Baltic, and European countries, her leadership role in collaborations with international scholars, and her ability to place her work in international publications. At the same time, her recent scholarly work demonstrates that the scope, breadth, and complexity of her research in environmental policy and policy analysis have developed significantly since she attained the status of docent.

Anders Lidström

Anders Lidström (born in 1953) has his basic university training from Umeå University (1977), and he holds a Master of Social Science from INLOGOV, Birmingham University (1983) and a PhD in Public Administration from Umeå University (1992). He has held various positions as a research assistant (forskningsassistent), instructor (universitetsadjunkt) and lecturer (universitetslektor). He also has been employed by a political youth organization and by

the county council of Västerbotten; he has been a member of that county council from 1983, and serves since 1998 as its chairman. He was approved as a docent in Political Science at Umeå University in 1999. Since 1999 he is a lecturer at the Department of Political Science at Umeå University.

Lidström has been active in the leadership of a major research program on Democracy under Change, financed by the Swedish parliament. He has been responsible for coordination, administration and economy of the program. He has taught classes and advised students, primarily in public administration, at all levels of education at the university from 1982-83 onwards. He has been an expert in the Swedish Ministry for Local Government and in the EU Committee of Regions. Lidström has sent in 14 publications for evaluation, three of those are in the process of publication.

Lidström's 201-page doctoral thesis from 1991 is an analysis of the concept of discretion, which the author sees as very central for an understanding of the development of the Swedish welfare state. Local government Education Committees are analyzed in an inter-governmental implementation perspective. The aim of the author is to get beyond formal (legal) uses of concepts, so such an approach is discarded, and a review of the concept is carried out, leading to a definition of "scope for choice available to actors in formally subordinate positions vis-à-vis their superiors" (organizations or individuals). This understanding is put in perspective by a discussion of the concept of autonomy, which is seen as a broader phenomenon linked to e.g. resources, and to a broader societal setting.

Seven hypotheses are put forward, relating to systemic and organizational features, and to qualities of the actor, including gender. In brief, discretion will vary in spite of the existence of one legal framework, and factors like the control system, local values, and resources (size) play a role along with the experience and gender of the actors. Three national surveys of the chairs and chief officers of local government education committees, and later the treasury officers, were carried out, and followed by in-depth interviews of 28 actors. The formal analysis of the survey

data indicates that the characteristics of the control system and features of the individual actors were more important in determining the degree of discretion, while factors linked to the local setting were of less importance. The in-depth interviews supported this finding, and also suggested that basic values and beliefs were of importance.

The research results are interesting, but they might have been compared with results from other research areas, such as studies about the professions. Teaching in local schools might also have been included in the possible effects discretion at the committee level has on the actual job done. But within its limits, which the author is well aware of, this study is well carried out and the thesis is well written.

The second major work, *Skola i förändring* (Schools in Transition), co-authored with Christine Hudson, may be regarded as a follow-up on the doctoral thesis. The impact of teaching is still left out of focus, but more in-depth analysis of the implementation process is provided. The analysis is characterized as a pilot study, and an approach for more research is sketched out. The data comes from four local governments and have mainly been generated by in-depth interviews, desk analysis of files, and observations. The theoretical framework is roughly comparable to the one of the dissertation, but with more attention to organization theory, in particular contingency theory and Donald Schon's ideas about dynamic conservatism. The study might have benefited from an update of Schon's work (with Martin Rein) on policy reflection as well as Schon's work on the reflective educational practitioner earlier in the 1990s, in which four-by-four conceptual ways of thinking are replaced by more dynamic theoretical lenses.

The conclusion is that the decentralized school system has the ability to adapt to almost any local perspective. The one remaining barrier is the labor market agreements that the schools cannot influence because negotiations are not local. The authors note that these freedoms seem to further middle class norms and individualism, a point also made in an article co-authored with Gunnell Gustafsson in an international anthology, but they do not follow up on the consequences for

the school system or the children. Within the limits of the design, the work is well done, but a quest for possible local diversity is not helped much by strong analytical delineations which tend to force the world outside into opposites that may not have much sounding out there.

The third major work *Kommunsystem i Europa* (Municipal systems in Europe) is basically an inventory of 30 systems of local government in Europe: organizational structure, inter-governmental regulation, tasks, finance, democratic performance and expectations for the future. Europe is sub-divided into six local government systems: North European, British, Mid-European, Napoleonic, East European and Post-Soviet. The book is based on a large literature and has several analytic chapters. Compared with most other treatments of the subject this book is notable for a systematic, comprehensive and readable, but still brief analysis. One may wonder, however, what the ultimate aim of the analysis would be. The author discusses the inductive, the deductive and the ideal type approach, apparently with an ambition that a deductive analysis should be carried out at some point of time, but an ideal type analysis also appears to be attractive to systematize the details of empirical variance. The main points of the concluding chapter are found in an article published in the *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis*, bringing the ideas of the author to an international audience. More details of the local government systems in Denmark, Sweden and Finland have been published in English as chapters in a larger publication on *Local and Regional Democracy in the EU*. Lidström also published a research design article regarding central-local relations in an international anthology on the welfare state, stressing the need for focusing on the local actor.

Given the comparative experience of the author, the work-under-completion should be read with particular interest. Here we would expect to see the fruits of an academic career ripen. Along with Christine Hudson, Anders Lidström has a comparative analysis coming out in the form of an edited book. They still need to write the final comparative analytical chapter. But in the introduction, the framework for the com-

parative analysis is sketched out. The relations between an upper and a lower level of government are in focus, and the question is the scope for action at the lower level, but the upper level has been expanded from the state level to the international level. We are now dealing with a comparative analysis, and the hypothesis carrying the discussion is that under present-day globalizing trends, convergence between local education systems should be expected, i.e. a move towards similarity between Sweden and Britain. The themes are played out: To what extent are school policies meeting the demands for parental choice and individualism; what role does the schooling system play in local economic development; and how does local school leadership play its new and presumably strengthened role in a decentralized power structure? The general framework for the study is based on four pillars. The first is the globalized economy and the penetration of national borders; the second is the emergence of the knowledge society and the consequences for the production systems and the work force; the third is the challenges of the established organized polity, the emergence of governance meaning new forms of influence channels; the fourth is the demographic changes in ethnic and geographic terms. The authors do not suppose that these conditions apply in general or unilateral ways, there is scope for national and local variance.

Lidström is author or coauthor of three other chapters and the conclusion of this volume. Draft versions of two are presented, one chapter is a previously published article from *Scandinavian Political Studies*. The article confirms the abilities of the author to do quantitative analysis, the drafts have interesting partial analyses but one would like to see them developed into more coherent patterns. The conclusion has not yet been written. All in all, we have a potentially interesting comparative analytic book, but since the questions asked are rather comprehensive, one would like to see the study accomplished.

Summing up, Lidström has a broad range of experience as university educator, having taught at all levels. He has had some experience from practical leadership of a research program. He is doing solid empirical research, mainly on Swe-

den, and he is emergent as a comparative analyst. He has shown a very good understanding of various analytical tools and theoretical/heuristic devices, but readers looking for a choice between those are somewhat let down. Lidström has produced solid work within comparative local government. His policy analyses are in empirical terms restricted to local education systems, and the findings in terms of theory or substantial policy analysis are limited. His focus has squarely been on discretion, and quite a few approaches have been used, but still the subject is treated in an inconclusive way. Focus has been on the formal decision makers, and the final link of the chain in deciding the quality of education—the schools—has been included only in recent work. Even then, the teacher, with possibly considerable scope for interpretation of general rules of education, is left out of focus. Given Lidström's interest in discretion and its consequences for teaching programs, this could be seen as a weakness in his research design.

Tommy Möller

Tommy Möller (born in 1952) obtained an undergraduate degree from the Universities of Linköping and Uppsala 1981, a doctorate in political science from the University of Uppsala in 1986 and has been granted the honorary degree of docent by the same university in 1997. He is presently lecturer in political science at the University of Stockholm.

Möller's *pedagogic* experience is extensive. He has spent one year teaching civics at a secondary boarding school and has taught political science at all university levels, particularly to undergraduates where his total teaching time amounts to 2.400 hours. He has also been responsible for the compulsory introductory course for graduate students and has begun to accumulate experience as adviser, opponent and examiner for doctoral theses. Along with one co-author, he published a text-book on parties and organisations which is widely used in undergraduate instruction. He has also produced case materials for an undergraduate seminar on the rules, forms and processes of politics.

Möller also has some noteworthy *non-academic merits*. He has worked as a political assistant and adviser for a political party both at the local and national levels. He is a much solicited commentator about Swedish politics on radio and television and is also a frequent contributor to the national press, with stints as a regular columnist in one political magazine and a big daily newspaper. He was employed as principal secretary to a government enquiry on referenda and has also had other functions for government committees. He is vice chairman of an independent body backed by Swedish insurance companies which i.a. supports research on the elderly in the labour market, pensions, value shifts and the financing and organisation of geriatric care.

Turning now to his *research*, we note that Möller has produced three major works on his own, another one that can be largely attributed to him and two books co-authored with other colleagues. He has also co-edited one volume and published a significant number of book chapters and articles in academic journals.

In his dissertation, Möller deals with the process of rapprochement between the non-socialist parties preceding the formation of the Fälldin Government in 1976. Since the Farmers' Union (later Centre Party) had long co-operated with the Social Democrats until the rupture of their coalition in 1957, and continued to be on friendly terms with the Government long afterwards, there was a great deal of internal controversy before this party unambiguously placed itself in the "bourgeois" camp. The Liberal Party, too, was quite sensitive to being identified too closely with the Right Party (later Moderates) for fear of losing the support of its middle class voters. The 1960's and early 1970's saw several attempts to give an independent identity to the "new middle" by establishing closer co-operation between the Liberals and the Centre Party. Meanwhile, the Moderates who had no significant electorate to lose on this issue oscillated between two different answers to its traditional tactical dilemma: would a consensus-oriented "light blue" line be more attractive or should the party present the more vocal opposition suggested by its "dark blue" faction?

Möller undertakes to analyse co-operation and opposition strategies in this period taking as his theoretical point of departure the assumption that political parties are utility-maximisers pursuing the highest possible degree of goal-attainment. He calls this “the rationalist approach” but, fortunately, does not let this rather simplistic conceptual frame distort his nuanced analysis. Instead, he guides us with a good grasp of the motives, considerations and intentions of the actors through the labyrinth and many dead-ends of non-socialist co-operation from 1957 to 1976. What for natural reasons falls outside his inquiry are the many policy decisions in which one or several of the opposition parties decided to support the government. Distinguishing their interest in short-term policy-making and policy outcomes from their interest in medium-to-long-term party structure and alliance formation is one of the trickiest challenges in studies of party strategy. Within his chosen area of research, however, Möller succeeds quite well and demonstrates considerable empathy with the inclinations and objectives of the leadership of the three political parties.

A second major study deals with user and client attitudes to child care and care for the elderly. Möller and his associates interviewed 120 respondents in a University town and a sparsely populated rural area in Northern Sweden about their expectations and assessment of the services provided by local authorities. They furthermore asked the respondents about their efforts to influence service delivery and their appreciation of the response to client demands.

Similar fields have been tilled before, e.g. by Birgersson (1975) who noted the existence of a “service paradox”: the more a community invested in social services, the higher was the level of voter and user dissatisfaction. Möller subjects this thesis to a thoughtful re-examination and adds many new nuances to the picture. Though his data do not entirely confirm the commonly held view that people with higher education are better placed to exert pressure on those responsible for public service delivery, he suggests interesting distinctions between more and less pretentious citizens and makes perspicacious observations on the processes and determinants of de-

mand-formation and client satisfaction. Clearly, there is a both a generation effect and a contextual aspect at play here: while the earlier studies were carried out towards the end of the great expansion phase of the welfare state, Möller covers a period in which local and regional authorities have had to make savings and cut-backs in face of mounting financial challenges.

The themes of satisfaction and dissatisfaction —mainly the latter—recur in the Möller’s most recent work which examines Swedish voters’ attitudes toward elected officials. Again, his empirical data are drawn from in-depth interviews, but this time a wider geographical sample has been used. The conclusions of the study are quite depressing to anyone concerned about the future of democracy: although there are few ideas about alternative systems of government or demands for strong leadership among the respondents, there is a considerable disdain for the political class and a very low rating of both its moral and intellectual qualities. At the same time, the author advises us not to accept all opinion surveys pointing in this direction at face value. When he undertook to discuss the characteristics of politicians in some greater details with respondents signalling a negative view, a significant number of them modified their positions. Möller’s own conclusion is that a negative attitude to politicians may be considered to be the socially acceptable answer but does not necessarily reflect the considered opinion of the respondents.

The empirical part of this book is preceded by an impressive theoretical survey of previous research. What seems strikingly absent in these studies is sufficient attention to the structural determinants of popular appeal. Just as tax collectors and traffic guards handing out parking tickets may not be the best placed to win popularity contests because of the very nature of their professional duties, so politicians will of course suffer from the fact that they make a wide range of decisions that create dissatisfaction with different groups of voters. Since the backdrop for such decisions is also by necessity election campaigns in which more or less vague promises are given in many directions so that majorities can be attained, there is also a recurrent cycle of hope

and disappointment influencing the attitudes toward political leaders and parties. For further progress along the lines that Möller has so ably pursued in this book, such structural determinants and cyclical variations of voter discontent might merit more reflection. As it stands, however, the book is already an important contribution to Swedish political science and has the potential of stimulating the on-going and a much-needed discussion on the future of democracy.

In the report SOU 1997:56 on referenda, Möller has carried the main responsibility for the first six chapters which contain an analysis of the place of referenda in democratic systems, a typology of referenda, and a survey of the constitutional rules and practical experience in the Nordic countries, eleven other European countries, Australia, Chile, Brazil and some American states. The report goes on to analyse the debate on referenda in Sweden, the various reforms and the conduct of the five referenda organised between 1922 and 1994 (on prohibition, right hand traffic, supplementary pensions, nuclear power and membership in the European Union). Finally, the report turns to the arguments pro and con, assessing the impact of referenda on the vitality and legitimacy of the democratic system and the cohesion of the political parties.

Möller has also been involved in assessing the first Swedish election where the voters were given the chance to express their preference for any one candidate on the party ballot, thus opening the possibility for changing the rank-ordering of the candidates established by the local and regional nomination bodies of the different political parties. As it turned out, the final outcome was affected in few instances and only in the smaller constituencies. In a volume co-edited with Sören Holmberg (to which Möller has also contributed one paper of his own), he and his co-editor rightly qualify this debut as a half-hearted step in the direction of person-oriented elections.

While this study focused on a single election, another government commission afforded Möller and his co-author Gullan Gidlund the opportunity to demonstrate their aptitude for longitudinal analysis. In their study of local party elites, they rely both on their own 1998 question-

naire study and on data from similar studies in 1979 and 1990. Accordingly, they are able to establish a pattern of evolution that confirms the growing difficulties of local political party organisations to recruit members and remain centres of vital political activity. The analysis is lucid and the results tie in nicely with the conclusions of other Möller studies of the growing gap between citizens and the political sphere. Similar inferences can be drawn from further inquiries into contemporary Swedish politics, e.g. the interesting co-authored essay on the development from member parties to voter parties and the evaluation of the 1998 election. Finally, it should be added that Möller has covered “political parties” in a co-authored text-book for undergraduates on parties and organisations.

In conclusion, Möller stands out as an energetic, productive and efficient researcher with considerable breadth in his choice of topics and methods. He is a lucid and thoughtful writer and has, at a relatively young age, established himself as a leading academic commentator on Swedish politics. He is well versed in the literature on comparative government and has a proven competence to co-operate with other scholars.

We now turn to the conclusions for which we have used our respective mother tongues.

Peter Bogason:

Ved min sammenfatning af ansøgernes kvalifikationer lægger jeg til grund, at der er tale om et professorat i statskundskab med henblik på offentlig forvaltning. Det fortolker jeg således, at en ansøger for at være kvalificeret skal have en betydelig forskningsproduktion i offentlig forvaltnings temaer i både snæver og bred forstand, det er ikke nok at have produceret inden for statskundskab bredt og så have en mindre produktion i offentlig forvaltning. Det er afgørende faktisk at have leveret mere endegyldige forskningsresultater, det er ikke nok at være en lovende forsker. Man skal desuden have god undervisningserfaring inden for området samt have erfaring i forskningsledelse.

Katarina Eckerberg har en omfattende erfaring i såvel undervisning som forskningsadministra-

tion. Hun har publiceret i miljøpolitik og i beslutningstagen med et klart sigte imod den internationale forskningsverden, uden at negligere det svenske publikum. Hun har i sin karriere siden docentbedømmelsen vist en fortsat evne til at publicere nationalt og internationalt. Hun har været midlertidig professor, og hun er på det grundlag kvalificeret til et professorat i statskudskab med særlig henblik på offentlig forvaltning.

Anders Lidström har en omfattende erfaring inden for undervisning, og en knapt så omfattende erfaring i forskningsadministration. Man noterer sig hans erfaring i politiske tillidshverv og praktisk administration. Han har publiceret i en profil, der dels omhandler det administrative skøn med særlig henblik på skolen, dels omhandler kommunal forvaltning. Hans produktion viser en stadig forbedring, men jeg savner endnu et mere endegyldigt punktum, hvor resultater præsenteres for et internationalt publikum. Jeg finder ham derfor endnu ikke kvalificeret til et professorat i statskudskab med særlig henblik på offentlig forvaltning.

Tommy Möller har en omfattende erfaring i undervisning og aktiviteter, der knytter universitet og omverdenen sammen, men ikke så meget forskningsadministration. Hans forskning retter sig altovervejende imod andre felter i statskundskaben end offentlig administration, og jeg kan derfor ikke bedømme ham som kvalificeret til et professorat i statskundskab med særlig henblik på offentlig forvaltning.

Samlet finder jeg kun een kandidat kvalificeret til professoratet:

Katarina Eckerberg

Peter Bogason

Daniel Tarschys:

Vid en sammanvägning och jämförelse av de sökandes meriter står tre frågor i förgrunden.

Den första frågan gäller den allmänna professorskompetensen. Härför krävs omfattande erfarenheter av såväl undervisning som egen forskning, gärna kompletterad med forsknings-samarbete. Vad avser undervisning anser jag att

samtliga sökande kan uppvisa en tillräcklig meritering. Självfallet blir det här huvudsakligen fråga om en bedömning av ”pappersmeriter” eftersom den förebrogta dokumentationen inte tillåter någon ingående kvalitetsvärdering, men på basis av redovisad undervisningstid, organiserade kurser och viss annan dokumentation vågar jag mig ändå på en positiv bedömning av samtliga tre.

Vad gäller forskningen brukar ribban för professorskompetens läggas vid tre större vetenskapliga arbeten av god halt, eller om man så vill tre doktorsavhandlingar. På samma sätt som sammanläggningsavhandlingar är tillåtna vid avläggandet av doktorsexamen är det inte helt nödvändigt, om än önskvärt, att den fortsatta forskningen är sammanfattad i större sammanhållna framställningar. Avgörande i detta sammanhang är sådana bedömningsgrunder som djup, ambitionsnivå och perspektivrikedom.

Samtliga tre sökande kan enligt min mening uppvisa en så omfattande och högkvalificerad vetenskaplig produktion och undervisningserfarenhet att de bör bedömas som allmänt professorskompetenta. Möller har en presterat en så pass omfattande, intressant och mångsidig forskning att han med god marginal passerar den angivna ribban. Eckerberg har visserligen inte fullbordat tre större vetenskapliga arbeten, men hennes samlade produktion är så mångsidig och högklassig att den allmänna kompetensen bör anses säkrad. Lidström har arbetat vidare inom ett område som ligger nära avhandlingsarbetet och därutöver gjort fina insatser inom det närliggande fältet lokalt självstyre. Hans meritering är avsevärt smalare än de båda övrigas, men även här kan en samlad bedömning av omfång, djup och kvalitet leda till slutsatsen att det föreligger en allmän professorskompetens.

Den andra frågan gäller den särskilda kompetensen till en professur med inriktning på offentlig förvaltning. Här råder omvända förhållanden mellan de sökande. Som minimikrav bör enligt min mening uppställas att åtminstone ett större arbete (eller motsvarande) ska ha utförts inom det relevanta forskningsområdet. Möller, vars huvudsakliga produktion hör hemma inom politik, partiväsen och författningsfrågor, glider med sin studie om klienter inom barnomsorgen

och äldreomsorgen med knapp marginal över denna ribba, medan däremot såväl Eckerberg som Lidström har presterat huvuddelen av sin forskning inom området offentlig politik, planering och förvaltning och även uppvisar en avsevärt bredare och djupare orientering om teori-diskussion och metodik i hithörande frågor.

Den tredje frågan gäller så den inbördes placeringen av de tre sökande. Den är mot bakgrund av det anförda inte helt enkel att besvara. Samtliga tre sökande framträder som såväl effektiva som lovande forskare. De pedagogiska erfarenheterna framstår på papperet som tillfredsställande, men jag har inte underlag för att på den grunden göra någon rangordning. Alla tre har utöver det anförda också i sammanhanget värdefulla sidomeriter; jag tänker härvid på Eckerbergs skogs- och miljövetenskapliga kompetens liksom på Lidströms och Möllers erfarenheter av praktiskt politiskt arbete.

Möller har en påtaglig talang för popularisering och syntetiserande framställning av centrala politiska forskningsfrågor som gjort honom till en ofta anlita kommentator. Sådana egenskaper är viktiga för att föra ut statsvetenskapens resultat i en vidare krets.

Eckerberg har presterat en rad utmärkta arbeten inom det miljöpolitiska området och har där en särskild styrka genom sin flersidiga bakgrund.

Liksom Lidström har hon en utpräglat internationell orientering och därmed goda förutsättningar för forskningssamarbete med andra länder. Att Möllers skrifter är nästan uteslutande på svenska har visserligen en koppling till de ämnen han intresserat sig för, men jag ser likväl detta som en betydande svaghet i hans meritering.

Hade det varit fråga om en professur i allmän statsvetenskap hade det på basis av forskningens omfång och variationsrikedom inte berett någon större svårighet att utpeka Möller som den främste kandidaten. Med den specialinriktning som tjänsten har givits är det mera tveksamt om denna bedömning kan vidmakthållas, men jag har funnit att hans försteg betingat av den mångsidiga produktionen ändå är så pass påtagligt att han bör sättas i första rummet. Förutsättningen för denna värdering är dock att universitetet är berett att fästa ett betydande avseende vid läro-

stolsrubriceringens förra del. Vill man i stället lägga en stark accent på den senare delen blir det däremot svårt att bortse från Möllers begränsade meritering inom förvaltningsområdet.

Nästa fråga blir då relationen mellan Eckerberg och Lidström. Båda framstår som framgångsrika forskare, väl kvalificerade på resp. forskningsområde. Vid en tidigare konkurrens har Eckerberg satts före Lidström. Hon har en större bredd i sitt vetenskapliga arbete och en mer omfattande internationellt publicerad produktion. Även Lidström har emellertid meriterande erfarenheter av vetenskapligt samarbete och ett antal arbeten publicerade i vetenskapliga tidskrifter. Han är väl orienterad i den organisationsteoretiska och förvaltningsvetenskapliga litteraturen. Såväl Eckerberg som Lidström uttrycker sig väl på ledig engelska och synes ha goda förutsättningar att delta i ett fruktbart vetenskapligt samarbete över gränserna. Kvalitetsmässigt håller de båda en hög nivå. Med hänsyn till Eckerbergs mer omfattande produktion och bredare täckning av olika relevanta områden finner jag att hon bör ges ett klart försteg framför Lidström.

På de förutsättningar som angivits ovan beträffande professurens inriktning blir min rangordning alltså följande:

1. Möller
2. Eckerberg
3. Lidström.

Daniel Tarschys

Lois R. Wise:

Our charge is to review three applicants for a professorship in political science — with a specialization in public affairs and administration (förvaltningspolitik). According to the stated evaluation criteria, we are asked to give weight to research quality over research quantity, to pedagogic competency, to the candidates' level of skill in the leadership of research collaborations and skill in developing and leading academic organizations and staff, as well as evidence of the candidates' experience as leaders of research investigations. I take as a starting point

that to qualify for this professorship, applicants must have experience in advising and supervising doctoral and other graduate students in public affairs and administration, and must be qualified to mentor and evaluate upcoming colleagues in the field of public affairs and administration. An applicant for professor of political science with special expertise in public administration must have a good knowledge of the critical literature in that field. My evaluations of the three candidates against these criteria follow in alphabetical order, after which I give my ratings.

Eckerberg's current research can be characterized as involving comparative studies in the area of environmental policy implementation and administration published in English in ranked international journals and prestigious edited volumes. Although the body of work cannot be described as extensive, it gains weight by merit of having been largely subjected to peer review, by being published outside Sweden and the Nordic area, by employing comparative analyses, and by being placed in peer reviewed journals and publications with good reputations. She has participated in and led studies involving scholars from different lands and thus meets the criteria of demonstrated leadership in research activities and international scholarship.

Among the factors that distinguish her case as an educator are her experience as an advisor to doctoral students and her success in developing both courses and course materials for university education, her demonstrated leadership in developing significant institutional partnerships that benefit the department of political science and university community, and her experience serving in university administration. In recent years, she has maintained her level of research productivity while advancing the quality of her research and making substantial contributions in the areas of curriculum development and university service producing what can be characterized as a well-balanced case for promotion. By merit of her accomplishments in the areas designated critical, Eckerberg is deemed qualified to serve as professor of political science with special competence in public affairs.

Lidström's teaching is in the core areas of public administration and management, his syllabi

demonstrate a knowledge of the important international works in the area of public administration and management and he has developed courses for university education. He has limited administrative experience and service to the university having joined the department's leadership group in 1999. His research focuses on the key public administration topics of bureaucratic discretion and administrative organization, mainly in the area of education but also involving an international study describing municipal systems in Europe. With the latter he has started to engage in cross-national research but he has yet to acquire experience in leading a research study involving multiple collaborators. He published one article in refereed international journals in both 1998 and 1999 but his published research is mainly found in edited volumes and government-sponsored reports. His research is developing in a promising way but evaluation of his scholarship is impeded by the fact that three major works targeted for recognized international presses remain in progress and the analytical contribution of his accomplishments since earning the title of docent cannot be assessed. He is not yet qualified for this professorship.

Möller has taught political science courses at all university levels and developed text books and case study material, important indicators of teaching competence, but there is no evidence of any pedagogical experience in public administration or knowledge of the basic literature that a public administration curriculum would embrace. He lacks experience supervising the work of doctoral students. He has some practical administrative experience but lacks significant service to the university. He has not served as leader of a multi-collaborator research study. His research cannot be characterized as international. He has published a substantial volume of work, although almost all of it is in Swedish and little of it has been subjected to peer review. In more recent research he has compiled and analyzed original data, an element that was lacking in previous work. His research is developing in a promising way but still lacks a comparative component. Despite the volume of published international research in his fields of electoral and welfare state studies, he has not disseminated his

work in reviewed international journals or prestigious edited volumes. Möller's profile is not that of a person with a special competency in public administration research, education, or public affairs administration. Based on the stated criteria, I do not deem him qualified.

My evaluations are thus as follows:

Eckerberg: qualified
Lidström: not qualified
Möller: not qualified

Lois R. Wise