

With Reference to Traditional Public Administration - New Public Management

Florina Popa

SR III, PhD., Institute of
National Economy,
Romanian Academy,
Bucharest, Romania

Corresponding author:

florinapopa289@gmail.com

JEL Classification: H11; H41



This work is licensed under CC BY-NC-ND 4.0.
To view a copy of this license, visit
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0>

ABSTRACT: Studies conducted on the methods and techniques of public sector administration have highlighted two basic concepts, with effects on the public administrations of the countries. In recent decades, traditional public administration, designed for a stable environment, has undergone global changes, requiring reforms in the public sector to which it had to adapt. The objective was a governance characterized by efficiency, responsibility, ethics and transparency. To meet these objectives, a solution was adopted, by some countries, of the New Public Management, implementation methods being different. (1) **The objective** of the present study is to provide a review of the transformations that the public administration had to face, to highlight the characteristic elements of each of the two forms of administration, Traditional Public Administration, New Public Management and the essential aspects that differentiate them. (2) **The methodology** of the research was the documentation, selection of ideas from the scientific specialty literature and their processing in the author's own interpretation. in order to achieve the coherence of the study. (3) **Results:** Some similarities and distinctions between the two forms of public administrative system organization based on the relevant ideas and principles of the foundation of the two models are highlighted. (4) **The significance** of the results lies in the presentation of: the context of the appearance of the two models of organization of the public administrative system, tracing the elements characteristic to them, the approach of the transformations of traditional public administration, getting through in order to move to the New Public Management, and the presentation of the aspects that differentiate them.

KEYWORDS: Public Traditional Administration, New Public Management, characteristics, comparative elements.

How to cite: Popa, F. (2026). With Reference to Traditional Public Administration - New Public Management. *World Conference on Science, Innovation and Human Progress*. Futurity Research Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21452743>

Introduction

Public administration has been around since the earliest times of human civilization, being a field in continuous development. It puts into practice policies formulated in order to achieve the needs of society, and the degree to which it manages to meet these requirements constitutes an element of success of governments (Zia Yorid Ahsan and Khan M. Zeb, 2014).

A definition formulated by Gerald E. Caiden (1982) shows that "Public administration refers to the implementation of decisions made by public authorities, the organization of coercive mechanisms to ensure the conformity of society and the relations between the community and public authorities, called collective interests [...].It encompasses the organization of public affairs, social objectives and collective decision-making, the management of public institutions, public functions and public property and public administration by officials, covering attitudes and behaviors as well as actions" (Nazmul Ahsan Kalimullah, Kabir M. Ashraf Alam M. M. Ashaduzzaman Nour, 2012 p.4, quotes Gerald E. Caiden, 1982);.

Studies conducted on the methods and techniques of public sector administration have highlighted two basic concepts, with effects on the public administrations of the countries.

One of the theories - expression of the traditional system of public governance - refers to the bureaucratic system (Weberian), based on hierarchical structure, centralization, policies and rules.

The other - the current of thought represented by the New Public Management - targets aspects such as decentralization, a flexible structure, emphasis on results and citizen participation. Against the background of this theory, in some countries, changes are manifested in the roles and responsibilities of government institutions. (Zia Yorid Ahsan and Khan M. Zeb, 2014).

Research Aim

The study aims to present some ideas and principles of the foundation of the two forms of organization of the public administrative system, respectively, traditional administration and New Public Management. Some similarities and distinctions relevant to outlining a comparative picture and observing the approach and implementation of public actions are highlighted, in relation to the challenges addressed to the economic and social life of the current stage.

Research Results

Traditional Public Administration - Characteristic Elements

Based on the principles of hierarchy and meritocracy, the traditional model of public administration emerged at the end of the 19th century as a result of bureaucratic reforms in the United Kingdom and Prussia, aimed at overcoming administrative systems in which government decisions and appointments to public positions were subject to favoritism. (Robinson M., 2015)

Its origin lies in the theoretical foundations of Woodrow Wilson and Fr. Taylor - United States of

America, the Northcote – Trevelyan report - Great Britain and M. Weber, in Germany. It is considered the best way to organize work in the public sector, being used in a wide range of countries (Katsamunskas, P., 2012). Other scientists have also contributed to the shaping of the concept, among them, Luther Gulick, Herbert Simon, Buchanan, Williamson, etc. (Zia Yoris Ahsan and Khan M. Zeb, 2014).

In expressing the principles of bureaucracy, the theory developed by Max Weber focused on hierarchical "top-bottom" control, through which policies were formed at the higher level and were executed by a series of organizations, through the hierarchical subordination of each manager or employee to his superior (Pfiffner J. P., 2004, quoting Weber M., 1946, p.95).

The model was used, for the most part, in Western countries in the 19th and early 20th centuries. An essential element is that "in modern government systems, professional bureaucrats perform the tasks of public administration and, at the same time, are separated from political mechanisms, as well as from the private sphere" (Polya Katsamunskas, 2012) quotes Hoos, J., G. Jenei and L.Vass., "Public Administration and Public Management: Approaches and Reforms", In: [Public Policy in Central and Eastern Europe: Theories, Methods, Practices], (eds.) M. Potucek, L.T. (Leloup, G. Jenei, L. Varadi, NISPAcee, 2003, p. 123).

Referring to the defining elements, some authors consider it as "an administration under the formal control of political leadership, based on a strictly model of hierarchical bureaucracy, employed by permanent, neutral and anonymous officials, motivated only by the public interest, which serves and governs citizens equally and does not contribute to politics, but only administers those policies decided by politicians" Polya Katsamunskas (2012) quotes Hughes, Owen E., "Public Management and Administration: An Introduction", 3rd ed., Palgrave Macmillan, 2003, p. 17.

The bureaucratic system is characterized by a set of rules and regulations that originate in public law (Pfiffner J. P., 2004), perceived as a "specific set of structural arrangements" (Emile Kolthoff, p 9, quoting Lammers 1983; Shafritz și Hyde 1997, 5).

Robinson Mark (2015, p.5) shows that the essential aspects of this model were formulated by McCourt (2013), who was inspired by the opinions of Minogue (2001):

- ✓ The character of continuity, predictability and governance by rules of public administration;
- ✓ Qualification and professional training are basic elements in the appointment of administrators;
- ✓ There is a hierarchy of tasks and individuals and a division of labor;
- ✓ Resources belong to the organization and not to the individuals within it;
- ✓ Public servants serve the public interest.

The theoretical foundation of the traditional administration model is Weber's theory of

bureaucracy, considered the determined form in a society and particular aspects such as the rationalization of the organization and the bureaucratic coordination of human activities, a specific element of modern organizations (Katsamunska, 2012; Kolthoff, 2007).

In studies on organizations, Weber (1946) shows the elements that characterize an ideal bureaucracy (Kolthoff E., 2007):

- the existence of administrative laws or regulations;
- The principle of hierarchical subordination - a system of subordination of lower offices to those at a higher level; in the management of the modern office, original, written documents are used;
- The management of specialized functions requires specialized training (responsibility lies with the executive and employees);
- Job management is based on general, more or less stable rules.

The above elements show that authorities make decisions based on an established legal framework by applying existing rules. (Kolthoff E., 2007)

Also, the occupation of positions in the bureaucratic organization is based on certain criteria (Polya Katsamunska, 2012, quoting Fry, Brian R., 1989, p. 31):

- ✓ Civil servants are not elected, but appointed on a contract basis. In Weber's opinion, their election would change the conditions of hierarchical subordination;
- ✓ The appointment of civil servants is based on the level of professional qualification;
- ✓ Civil servants are remunerated with a fixed salary and have guaranteed pension rights;
- ✓ Career promotion is based on merit, and seniority may also be taken into account;
- ✓ A unitary system of control and discipline of civil servants is manifested, including concrete instruments of constraint.

An important moment in the formation of administration, as a science, is represented by Woodrow Wilson's work, called "The Study of Administration" (Zia Yorid Ahsan and Khan M. Zeb, p. 428, quoting Woodrow Wilson, "The Study of Public Administration", Political Science Quarterly, Volume 2, Number 2, 1887).

He brought into discussion the politics-administration dichotomy, considering that there must be a clear separation between administration and politics. (Katsamunska, P. 2012).

In the traditional form of public administration, aspects related to hierarchy, independence and integrity, organizational structure and efficiency, based on command and control, predominate, and there is a distinction between civil servants, politicians and citizens.

Considered, in part, inefficient, the bureaucratic model attracted the initiation of reforms targeting the public service. These, however, joined to the area of the Weberian model of the public

service, with the objective of making traditional public administration more efficient and not adopting a new model entirely. (Robinson M., 2015)

The emergence of modern bureaucratic models is related to the industrial revolution and the development of modern economies. Parallel to the system identified by Max Weber, in Germany, in other industrially developed countries, a bureaucratic system developed that made an important contribution to the broad development of private or public enterprises (Pfiffner J. P. 2004).

Unlike European countries, in America, the introduction of management methods from private sector organizations into public ones was practiced in order to make the activity more efficient. In 1911, Frederick W. Taylor published the fundamental work "The Principles of Scientific Management", an important objective for that era, being the finding of management techniques from the private sector that would contribute to making the activity of the government more efficient. Thus, scientific management became an important theory, supported by officials, in search of the best means of increasing efficiency in the public sector. The elements introduced by Taylor in public administration - "standardization of work, systematic control and hierarchical organization" - underline the contribution brought to the public sector, until the 1940s, by the theory of scientific management. (Katsamunskaja, P. 2012)

Fry shows that "these three components - time and motion studies, wage incentive systems and functional organization - constitute the core of Taylor's Scientific Management" (Polya Katsamunskaja, 2012, p 77, quoting Fry, Brian R., Mastering Public Administration: From Max Weber to Dwight Waldo, Chatham House Publishers, Inc., Chatham, New Jersey, 1989, p. 60).

Traditional public administration, designed for a stable environment, has been subject to changes in recent decades, at a global level, which have called for reforms in the public sector and to which it has had to adapt. The objective was a governance characterized by efficiency, responsibility, ethics and transparency (Katsamunskaja, P., 2012).

The emergence of the New Public Management, at the end of the last century, brought changes, with reform initiatives being oriented towards the development of the activity of governments in countries with industrialized economies and, less so, for developing countries (Pfiffner J. P., 2004).

Although a multitude of transformations have taken place, there has been no unanimous opinion that the change in administration has been completed, ensuring an ideal formula for the functioning of the public sector (Peter, B. Guy, 2001). (Polya Katsamunskaja, 2012, quotes Peter, B. Guy, 2001, p. 78).

New Public Management - characteristics

The New Public Administration, from the period of the years 1960s - 1970s, emerged as a challenge to the old form of administration (criticized for the absence of a clear ideology) and had as its basic arguments participation, decentralization, and representative bureaucracy. (Katsamunskaja, P.,

2012).

Participation, in its two forms - political and organizational - signified a process of dispersing power and involving citizens in governance and, respectively, dispersing power in the organization.

Decentralization supported the involvement of citizens in governmental and organizational actions.

Representative bureaucracy signified an administration with a focus on the client and representing the client's interests.

Esveltdt (1997) (Emile Kolthoff, 2007), p 15, quotes (Esveltdt, 1997); signals the presence of the modern model of bureaucracy (Likert, 1961) (Emile Kolthoff, 2007, p.15, quotes Likert, 1961); distinct from the classic Weberian model, the difference between the two variants refers to the personality of the individual.

Thus, the modern model emphasizes respect for the individuality of the organization's members, based on appropriate management, according to which they participate in decision-making, responsibility being divided.

In contrast, the classic model of bureaucracy rejects the individual action of members of a group within the organization. (Kolthoff E., 2007)

The New Public Management, initiated in the last decades of the last century, as a new approach to public sector administration, was focused on issues of efficiency and effectiveness in the field of organizations, government procedures, and the high quality of services delivered.

The process of reforming governance, through the New Public Management, which began in the 1980s - 1990s, was taken up differently. Some countries implemented the new model, others (Western European countries) adopted modernization through which the traditions regarding the strong role of the state in society and the high status of civil servants were confirmed in a new form (Katsamunsk, P., 2012).

Modern reforms of the central administration involve the modernization of the Weberian tradition, by adding new elements to the existing ones, in the context of the market economy, as announced by Geert Bouckaert and Christopher Pollitt (Polya Katsamunsk, 2012), p. 80, quotes (Bouckaert, G., Pollitt, C., 2004, p. 99-100):

- ⇒ the transition from internal bureaucratic rules to satisfying the needs and desires of citizens, demonstrating professionalism to increase the quality and improve services;
- ⇒ increasing the role of representative democracy, through consultation procedures with reference to the expression of citizens' opinions;
- ⇒ In the process of resource management, it is important to give special interest to obtaining results, more than following the observance of procedures;

⇒ improving the public service, with an orientation towards satisfying the requirements of its users.

This reform process, which includes traditional (Weberian) and neo-elements, adopted by the countries of Continental Europe, expresses confidence in the role of the state, in the future, as well as a new approach to reforming public services; at the same time, it is a relevant aspect regarding the range of different approaches to change, which the New Public Management implies (Katsamunskia P., 2012).

The initiation of this new governance formula – the New Public Management – as shown by Yorid Ahsan Zia and M. Zeb Khan (2014), took place in the context of criticisms brought to the bureaucratic principle of organizing public administration, considered inflexible, due to the hierarchical pyramidal system of rules and decision-making, distanced from the expectations of citizens (Yorid Ahsan Zia și M. Zeb Khan, 2014, quotes Richard Parry, in C. Duncan,(ed.), 1992, p. 433).

Characteristic of the New Public Management guidelines is the emphasis on verifying results, disaggregating large organizations and decentralizing managerial authority, taking over market mechanisms that include stimulating competition, directing services to the client, as summarized by Christopher Hood (Yorid Ahsan Zia și M. Zeb Khan, 2014, quote Christopher Hood, p. 433):

- emphasis on the freedom to lead, at the level of organizations;
- performance standards and procedures, on objectives and indicators;
- The transition from practicing input controls to the form of output controls, by measuring based on performance indicators;
- the movement from large, unified management systems to disaggregating/decentralizing the units of the public system;
- practicing competition, in the public sector, with effects on reducing costs;
- taking over some management practices from the private sector (for example, short-term employment contracts);
- concern for reducing costs, efficiency in the use of resources.

(Yorid Ahsan Zia and M. Zeb Khan, 2014)

The aim is to use business practices in the public sector, so that stimulating competition in the public services sector and applying other levers of market mechanisms lead to reducing government costs.

According to some authors (Kolthoff E., 2007), there are two basic principles of the New Public Management, distinct from each other: managerialism and market orientation.

The first principle – managerialism – supports the maintenance of bureaucracy based on its reform and improvement.

The second principle - market orientation - is based on coordination through market mechanisms, the motivation being the possibility of increasing responsibility and efficiency, by increasing quality, emphasis on delegation of authority, and performance measurement (Walsh, 1995) (Emile Kolthoff, 2007, p. 14, quoting Walsh, 1995).

The assessments are that approaching business practices at the governmental level, by using procedures of the private system, implies not the elimination of bureaucracy, but its maintenance, based on the removal of deficient, unproductive elements of the public administrative system. At the same time, the remark is made, in principle, regarding the maintenance of the bureaucratic organizational system in the private sector, primarily in large companies.

The potential positive effects expected as a result of the implementation of public management reform, reported by Pollitt and Bouckaert (2004), refer to the achievement of savings in public spending, increasing the quality of public services, the efficiency of government actions and the effectiveness of policies. (Kolthoff E., 2007, p. 24)

The consequences of the New Public Management initiatives were significant changes in public sector approaches by introducing new management practices, contracting the main services through private companies and non-profit organizations, and creating executive agencies for implementation (Robinson M., 2015).

A comment on the distinctive elements between the two forms of administration approach - New Public Management and Traditional Public Administration can also be made from the perspective of other characteristic principles that show the different orientations of the two concepts and their consequences.

New Public Management emphasizes the achievement of goals and the development of a strategy, since implementation is done by setting objectives and organizing the operations necessary to achieve them. (Schilder A., 2000).

In the Traditional Public Administration paradigm, the interest given to goals and strategy is limited, usually considered absent (Osborne & Gaebler, 1992) (Ard Schilder, 2000, quoting Osborne and Gaebler, 1992); traditionally, special attention has been directed towards internal balance. Strategy development could be beneficial to the traditional model of public sector administration, contributing to the shaping of a coherent purpose of the organization.

In the context of New Public Management, the emphasis is on results and performance measurement, based on the achievement of the objectives of the chosen strategy. The model assumes personal responsibility for obtaining results. Organizational objectives, as well as those of the personnel, being concrete, create the possibility of measuring achievements through performance indicators; the information thus provided, on the achievement of goals, can be useful to the government for monitoring the implementation of policies. (Schilder A., 2000)

In contrast, traditional public administration emphasizes processes and procedures, and responsibility is related to compliance with instructions, in order to prevent errors. Tasks, being established on the basis of specific rules, there is a risk that they will not become procedures for obtaining results. In the public sector, performance evaluation is carried out haphazardly and, as Dixit (1996) (Ard Schilder, 2000 quotes Dixit, 1996) shows, its measurement shows difficulties and involves risks.

Reporting compliance with instructions is gradual; the trajectory follows the direction, from employees to managers, these to the board, and the last, to stakeholders.

The insufficient attention paid to obtaining results, in the public sector, is explained by Vickers and Yarrow, 1988:27, by (Ard Schilder, 2000 quotes Vickers and Yarrow, 1988:27):

- ✓ lack of concern of managers for maximizing profit;
- ✓ absence of valuation on the stock market (lack of trading of shares);
- ✓ non-existence of bankruptcy constraints, generated by financial problems.

Thus, through the New Public Management, the mechanisms of the private sector are established as a model, being accessible to the public sector (emphasis on results, market mechanisms, performance).

Considering the two forms of governance, synthetic, we can speak of the balance that exists between responsibility and efficiency.

- *Responsibility* means hierarchical controls, measuring achievements through the precision with which procedures are followed;
- *efficiency*: the hierarchy is dispersed, the freedom of decision is delegated, the operations of the central level (government) are executed by those outside the hierarchy; it is important to measure results and not to supervise the application of procedures. (Pfiffner J. P., 2004, Schilder A 2000.)

Through the New Public Management, the transition from traditional public administration to new managerial practices is aimed at, constituting itself as a set of techniques and methods adapted to the public sector (Lane) (Marius Petrescu, Delia Popescu, Ionuț Barbu, Roxana Dinescu, 2010, p. 411, quoting Lane). As Hood (1991) states, it is perceived as a current of thought, based on the adoption of techniques and tools from the private sector in the public sector. (Ferlie, Pettigrew, Ashburner and Fitzgerald, 1996) (Marius Petrescu, Delia Popescu, Ionuț Barbu, Roxana Dinescu, 2010, p. 411 quote Ferlie, Pettigrew, Ashburner și Fitzgerald, 1996). Its emergence signified a response to a series of problems encountered by governments around the world in the last two decades of the last century, challenges that traditional administration did not face, such as pressures to reduce spending and increase efficiency in the public sector; the development of advanced technologies; increasing competition, in the context of globalization; society's demands for increasing the quality of services.

(Nazmul Ahsan Kalimullah, Kabir M. Ashraf Alam M. M. Ashaduzzaman Nour, 2012).

Conclusions

Public administration in the 21st century is facing a series of challenges both in advanced economies and in many developing countries. Globally, the world's states must face increasingly complex problems (political, economic and social). The requirement is to find new ways to respond to new challenges.

The emergence of the New Public Management, after the 1980s, meant a new form of approach to public administration and management, an attempt to change and move away from bureaucratic traditions, hierarchical organization towards cultivating new management practices, adapted to the requirements of the market economy, with an emphasis on competition, delegation and performance.

An alternative to bureaucracy, the New Public Management favors the relaxation of the procedures of the traditional system, through actions such as:

- ✓ *fragmentation* of large bureaucratic units into smaller units, more efficient in achieving objectives;
- ✓ *delegation* of decision-making freedom to lower levels of management, to allow initiative and creativity;
- ✓ *contracting* of goods and services and stimulating competition that can lead to improved performance.

The purpose of the changes is for the methods and techniques adopted to generate the reformation of public sector organizations, increasing their competitiveness and efficiency in the use of resources and the provision of services.

The distinction between the two forms of governance is given by the balance between responsibility and efficiency.

Responsibility means hierarchical controls, measuring achievements, through the precision with which procedures are followed, and responsibility for the implementation of public policy.

Efficiency - it is important, especially the measurement of results, rather than the supervision of the application of procedures; the hierarchy is dispersed, the freedom of decision is delegated, and the operations of the central level (government) are executed by those outside the government hierarchy.

At the same time, it is worth noting that both models present elements that highlight the common interest of finding an efficient formula for managing public activities, according to their own principles.

Both branches have as an important element public policies and ways of implementing them, so as to lead to the improvement of the living conditions of society, having professional qualifications

(knowledge of public finances, leadership skills, strategic thinking, etc.).

In practical terms, the two fields, public administration and public management, form a partnership, and the efficiency of putting into practice the skills they possess determines the success in developing public policies. The assessments are that approaching business practices at the government level, by using procedures of the private system, does not imply the elimination of bureaucracy, but its maintenance, based on the removal of deficient, unproductive elements of the public administrative system. (Promberger Kurt, Rauskala Iris 2003. ; Pfiffner, 2004, Klaus Konig, A. Benz, H. Siedentopf, and K.P. Sommermann, eds., Duncker & Humbolt, 2004, Pfiffner, 2000, in J. P. Pfiffner and D. A. Brook, eds, Van Helden and Jansen 2004, 5 quoted by Kolthoff Emile, Arkupal Acharya, Schilder, Ard, 2000, NMP & Traditional Public Administration, Agarwal, Rohit, Smriti Chand, Araujo, 2001 citat de Nazmul Ahsan Kalimullah, Kabir M. Ashraf Alam, M. M. Ashaduzzaman Nour, 2012, p.5; Public Administration vs. Public Management: What's the Difference?, 2019, 2020; Sclar E. D 2000). Polya Katsamunsk, 2012.

Although a multitude of transformations have taken place, a unanimous opinion has not been reached, according to which the change of administration has been completed, ensuring an ideal formula for the functioning of the public sector (Peter, B.Guy, 2001) (Polya Katsamunsk, 2012, quotes Peter, B.Guy, 2001).

In view of the new challenges of society and the increased demands of citizens, addressed to the New Public Management, it is necessary to find out its best techniques, as well as to adopt methods and tools in relation to the situations that have arisen, which will lead to the achievement of the proposed objectives.

References

- Agarwal, R. (n.d.). *Advantages and disadvantages of decentralization*. Your Article Library. <http://www.yourarticlelibrary.com/accounting/responsibility-accounting/advantages-and-disadvantages-of-decentralisation/52903/>
- Araujo, J. F. F. E. de. (2001). Improving public service delivery: The crossroads between NPM and traditional bureaucracy. *Public Administration*, 79(4), 915-932.
- Borins, S. (1995). The New Public Management is here to stay. *Canadian Public Administration*, 38(1), 122-132.
- Burnheim, J. (1988). *Is democracy possible? The alternative to democratic politics*. Polity Press.
- Caiden, G. E. (1982). *Public administration*. Palisades Publishers.
- Chand, S. (n.d.). *Decentralisation: Meaning, advantages and disadvantages of decentralisation*. Your Article Library. <http://www.yourarticlelibrary.com/organization/decentralisation-meaning-advantages-and-disadvantages-of-decentralisation/25703/>

- Clarke, J., & Newman, J. (1997). *The managerial state: Power, politics and ideology in the remaking of social welfare*. SAGE.
- Dixit, A. (1996). *The making of economic policy: A transaction-cost politics perspective*. MIT Press.
- Dunleavy, P., & Hood, C. C. (1994). From old public administration to new public management. *Public Money and Management*, 14(3), 9-16.
- Dunn, W. N. (1994). *Public policy analysis*. Prentice-Hall.
- Esveltdt, K. (1997). *Bureaucratie bij de overheid en in de particuliere sector* [Bureaucracy in government and in the private sector] [Master's thesis]. VU University Amsterdam.
- Ferlie, E., Lynn, L., & Pollitt, C. (2007). *The Oxford handbook of public management*. Oxford University Press.
- Fitzgerald, L., Ferlie, E., Ashburner, L., & Pettigrew, A. M. (1996). *The new public management in action*. Oxford University Press.
- Fry, B. R. (1989). *Mastering public administration: From Max Weber to Dwight Waldo*. Chatham House.
- Goodsell, C. T. (1994). *The case for bureaucracy: A public administration polemic* (3rd ed.). Chatham House.
- Guy Peters, B. (2001). *The future of governing* (2nd ed.). University Press of Kansas.
- Hodgkinson, C. (1978). *Towards a philosophy of administration*. Basil Blackwell.
- Hood, C. (1991). A public management for all seasons? *Public Administration*, 69(1), 3-19.
- Hoos, J., Jenei, G., & Vass, L. (2003). Public administration and public management: Approaches and reforms. In M. Potucek, L. T. Leloup, G. Jenei, & L. Varadi (Eds.), *Public policy in Central and Eastern Europe: Theories, methods, practices* (p. 123). NISPAcee.
- Hughes, O. E. (1994). *Public management and administration: An introduction*. Macmillan Press.
- Hughes, O. E. (2003). *Public management and administration: An introduction* (3rd ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hume, L. J. (1981). *Bentham and bureaucracy*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kalimullah, N. A., Alam, K. M. A., & Ashaduzzaman, N. M. (2012). New public management: Emergence and principles. *BUP Journal*, 1(1), 1-22.
- Katsamunska, P. (2012). Classical and modern approaches to public administration. *Economic Alternatives*, (1), 74-81.
- Kolthoff, E. (2007). *Ethics and new public management: Empirical research into the effects of businesslike government on ethics and integrity*. BJU Legal Publishers.

- Lammers, C. J. (1983). *Organisaties vergelijkenderwijs: Ontwikkeling en relevantie van het sociologisch denken over organisaties* [Organizations compared: Development and relevance in sociological thinking about organizations]. Het Spectrum.
- Lane, J. E. (1994). Will public management drive out public administration? *Asian Journal of Public Administration*, 16(2), 139-151.
- Likert, R. (1961). *New patterns of management*. McGraw-Hill.
- McCourt, W. (2013). *Models of public service reform: A problem-solving approach* (Policy Research Working Paper No. 6428). The World Bank.
- McSwite, O. C. (2002). *Invitation to public administration*. M. E. Sharpe.
- Merton, R. K. (1940). Bureaucratic structure and personality. *Social Forces*, 18(4), 560-568.
- Metcalf, L., & Richards, S. (1990). *Improving public management* (2nd ed.). SAGE.
- Minogue, M. (2001). The internationalization of new public management. In W. McCourt & M. Minogue (Eds.), *The internationalization of public management: Reinventing the Third World state* (pp. 1-19). Edward Elgar.
- Minogue, M., Polidano, C., & Hulme, D. (Eds.). (1998). *Beyond the new public management*. Edward Elgar.
- Nunberg, B., & Nellis, J. (1995). *Civil service reform and the World Bank* (World Bank Discussion Paper No. 161). The World Bank.
- Osborne, D., & Gaebler, T. (1992). *Reinventing government: How the entrepreneurial spirit is transforming the public sector*. Addison-Wesley.
- Parry, R. (1992). Concepts and assumptions of public management. In C. Duncan (Ed.), *The evolution of public management: Concepts and techniques for the 1990s*. Macmillan.
- Parsons, T. (1971). *The system of modern societies*. Prentice-Hall.
- Peirce, W. (1981). *Bureaucratic failure and public expenditure*. Academic Press.
- Petrescu, M., Popescu, D., Barbu, I., & Dinescu, R. (2010). Public management: Between the traditional and new model. *Review of International Comparative Management*, 11(3), 408-415.
- Pfiffner, J. P. (2000). Government legitimacy and the role of the civil service. In J. P. Pfiffner & D. A. Brook (Eds.), *The future of merit: Twenty years after the Civil Service Reform Act*. Woodrow Wilson Center Press.
- Pfiffner, J. P. (2004). Traditional public administration versus the new public management: Accountability versus efficiency. In A. Benz, H. Siedentopf, & K. P. Sommermann (Eds.), *Institutionenbildung in Regierung und Verwaltung: Festschrift für Klaus König* (pp. 443-454). Duncker & Humblot.

- Pollitt, C., & Bouckaert, G. (2004). *Public management reform: A comparative analysis* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Pollitt, C., & Summa, H. (1997). Trajectories of reform: Public management change in four countries. *Public Money and Management*, 17(1), 7-18.
- Promberger, K., & Rauskala, I. (2003). *New public management: An introduction from the UK perspective* (Working Paper No. 6/2003). <http://www.verwaltungsmanagement.at/687/uploads/10657009510.pdf>
- Robinson, M. (2015). *From old public administration to the new public service: Implications for public sector reform in developing countries*. UNDP Global Centre for Public Service Excellence.
- Sarker, A. E., & Pathak, R. D. (2000). New public management: An analytical review. *Productivity*, 41(1).
- Schilder, A. (2000). *Government failures and institutions in public policy evaluation: The case of Dutch technology policy*. Van Gorcum.
- Sclar, E. D. (2000). *You don't always get what you pay for: The economics of privatization*. Cornell University Press.
- Shafritz, J. M., & Hyde, A. C. (1997). *Classics of public administration*. Harcourt Brace.
- Stewart, J., & Walsh, K. (1992). Change in the management of public services. *Public Administration*, 70(4), 499-518.
- Taylor, F. (1911). *The principles of scientific management*. Harper & Brothers.
- Turner, M., & Hulme, D. (1997). *Governance, administration and development: Making the state work*. Macmillan.
- Van Helden, G. J., & Jansen, E. P. (2003). New public management in Dutch local government. *Local Government Studies*, 29(2), 68-88.
- Vickers, J. (1988). *Privatization: An economic analysis*. MIT Press.
- Walsh, K. (1995). *Public services and market mechanisms: Competition, contracting and the new public management*. Macmillan Press.
- Weber, M. (1946). Politics as a vocation. In H. H. Gerth & C. W. Mills (Eds.), *From Max Weber*. Oxford University Press.
- Weiss, C. H., & Barton, A. H. (1980). *Making bureaucracies work*. SAGE.
- Wilson, W. (1887). The study of public administration. *Political Science Quarterly*, 2(2), 197-222.
- Zia, Y. A., & Khan, M. Z. (2014). A comparative review of traditional and new public administration and critique of new public management. *Dialogue*, 9(4), 428-442.