



NEW PUBLIC MANAGEMENT VS NEW PUBLIC GOVERNANCE: TOWARDS PROVIDING GOOD GOVERNANCE

MOHAMMED ABDULLAHI

Department of Public Administration, Federal Polytechnic, Bida.

ABSTRACT

This paper delved into existing literatures relating to contemporary public administration New public management and New public governance with a view to exploring the methods and principles applied by each. Public governance and New public management have recently remain the two dominant issues in the public service domain. The study systematically examined various works on this area. Findings revealed that the new public management continues its dominance in guaranteeing good public governance over the conventional public administration in the public service sphere. Thus, the New public management is focused on as the new wave of reorientation and reorganization needed to provide good

Introduction

Management systems have faced serious problems in recent decades, on the one hand, solidarity, coordination and exercise of power at the central level, and on the one hand, autonomy, fragmentation, separation (Hammerschmid, Van de Walle, Andrews & Mostafa, 2019). New public management permeated the public sector, bringing about numerous changes in the nature, structure and even existence of public institutions. Thirty years after its introduction and dissemination, research interest in the new public management remains unchanged to this day, as it appears to be the dominant approach in public management (Haque, 2019).

But the new millennium marks the succession of new public management by a new government administration. This paradigm shift in administration and politics This can be attributed to the fact that the concrete changes that have taken place have not left the new masses alone. These changes are related to globalization and the rapid development of information communication technology, as well as research data and results, these underscore the need to update and modernize new public governance itself with a focus on new public governance (Christensen & Laegreid, 2001, 2017). Against this background, this study attempts to reflect the New Public literature review on New Public Management and New Public Governance, two approaches that remain strong in their strengths Methods and techniques to this day. In particular, this study seeks to clarify basic principles and techniques through reflection.

New public governance compared to its previous approaches the new public management and public administration is distinct in its general conditions and conceptual framework because the concept of leadership emerges, and its refinement and redefinition of organizational and management concepts within the framework to Consider the impact of leadership theory. Data were systematically collected survey of related discourse has been formally released. The composition of this work is divided into four sections. First, on the new public management Approaches are presented and analyzed based on phases to develop key ideas. Secondly, a new public governance approach shows the key principles under which change has taken place. The process that follows the public sector and new public governance in the third section,



governance in the public service. The study add-up to the existing practical and theoretical understanding of the workings of the public service viz a viz the current reforms introduced by the New public management concept.

Keywords: new public management, public administration, public governance, public service

while an ongoing discussion of the latest theoretical schemes is presented in the fourth section for insight.

New Public Management vs Public Administration

New public management that emerged as a new "established theory" of public management was first expressed in the late 1970s, as an institutional rather than a theoretical and conceptual expression. Since then, it has witnessed intense and rapid transition from administration to management. These two terms are often used interchangeably in the field of practice as they cannot be easily distinguished. Furthermore, it has been pointed out that there is a certain ideological approach behind the use of these concepts. As for the functioning of the public service sector, it permeates the nature of public services and delivery systems service (Hood, 1990; Pollitt & Boukaert, 2000; Laegreid, 2014).

A new public administration began in America under the Reagan administration Presidency (1981-1989). However, New Public Management as a concept was systematically developed and shaped with the New Approach to Public Management in the United Kingdom of the Thatcher Government (1979-1990). Newly established trends suggest that the administration's primary responsibility is to provide quality services, not to exercise power through democratic means. Moreover, according to this approach, the role of public administration and the results of its activities are evaluated only from a qualitative point of view, with an emphasis on meeting public needs, i.e., the needs of citizens, consumers of public services. Grüning, 2001). Thus, the spread of new public management concepts since the late 1970s seems to have contributed to the emergence of new theoretical and conceptual frameworks for the whole public management phenomenon at the international level. In the most extreme cases, discussions of new models of public administration included private sector techniques that emphasized their relative superiority over traditional public administration. Proponents of this new model believe that the introduction and application of such technologies will automatically lead to increased efficiency and effectiveness of public services (Pollitt, 2007; Christensen & Laegreid, 2016).

The central idea of the New Public Management is to focus specifically on the private sector management model, to make the management of core services more practical, to remove policy implementation from strategic planning and to delegate it to senior management. and The new public management will also facilitate the segregation and division of public services into central administrative units, cost reduction management, and division of public services strengthening the role of markets, competition and contracts in awarding providing resources and services of general interest (Pollitt, 1990; Hood, 1991; Steinfeld, Koala & Curly, 2019). This fact seems to be no exception, as it is intertwined with the New Public Management. The revival of the principles of scientific management advocated in the early 20th century has led many researchers and scholars to refer to this trend in public administration as Neo-Taylorism. At the same time, the greater emphasis on the managerial aspects of organizational theory and practice, and the prioritization of functional management and systematic investigations in this area, is said to reflect Fayol's theory, also formulated in his early twentieth century was regarded. This trend in management theory and practice, and the related methods and techniques employed in the public sector system, supports the argument for the revival of Fayol's related theories embedded in the new public management discourse (Guthrie & Poursel, 2015).



After that, based on the new public management, management by other methods came to be carried out but the goal seemed to be used only by public institutions. The theory of management by objectives was proposed in the public sector 30 years before he was discovered, so this is a resurgence. The original serious theory was first presented in 1954 in Peter Drucker's Principles of Management. "Management by objectives" therefore becomes a useful tool for enhancing the status of more empowered managers and administrators, thus strengthening their role and increasing the ability to achieve the organization's overall objectives. (McMahon, 2013).

In the next stage, New Public Management turns into a kind of managerialism and this is seen by many scholars as a failure of the approach, as management techniques, tools and practices have been used excessively and uncontrolled to improve public sector institutions and the services provided. In other words, it is argued that managerialism began to undermine itself, dismantle itself, and become in need of successors, promotions, and promotions (Christensen & Laegreid, 2001; Hesse, Hood & Peters, 2003). As a result, the newly proposed forms of administration, in the sense that they are built on a series of independent assumptions and do not consist of a coherent theoretical approach, focus explicitly on the structure of the new paradigm, has generated many negative critics (Porrirt and Bukart, 2017).

These assumptions are inherently complex and multidimensional, with ideological, management and research dimensions. Furthermore, the sphere of influence of New Public Management is limited to the Anglo-Saxon, Australian, Asian and Scandinavian regions. On the other hand, in countries with a strong tradition of bureaucracy, the traditional administration retains prestige as an example of organizational structure and hierarchy of power relations, performing different functions and reporting to different authorities. In these countries, the rule of law and democratic methods, hierarchical administrative and organizational structures, and impersonal relationships continue to apply, while bureaucracies and centralized exercise of power remain government institutions. It has become a solid pillar underpinning the management of the country (Li & Chung, 2020).

As for the concept of leadership, some scholars have stressed that it is not included in the new public governance debate, and therefore is conceptually indifferent and excluded from paradigm debate. Therefore, the preferred leadership style is managerial and entrepreneurial, as the influence of new public management on public sector management is likely to be particularly strong. New Public Management fulfills leadership needs that lead to progressive and transformative leadership in the final stages of development and implementation (Morgan, Larsen, Bao, Wang, 2015; Pollitt, 2018). However, this trend is not related to new public governance approaches, but rather to the apparent paradigm shift that accompanies the emergence of new public governance. Going forward, New Public Management needs an uprising, realized through renewal, a fresh start, and the overthrow of New Public Management, and more specifically through a new paradigm that celebrates the era of New Public Governance. (Hogan & Howlett, 2015; Normand, 2018).

New Public Governance and New Public Management

The late 1990s saw the decline of New Public Management and the consequent need for New Public Management. This renewal required a gradual replacement by new public governance and signaled the transition to a new era. However, some scholars argue that this paradigm shift never happened, or has ever happened, and that new public governance emerges as a result of a restructuring process of new public management. This is not a systemic change, but one that breaks down the narrow scope of this approach by expanding its scope while maintaining the core of its ideas, principles and methods both institutionally and in practice, and this case is widely prevalent in Public Administration (Osborne, 2006; Christensen & Laegreid, 2012).

This does not mean a complete setback Andrews & Mostafa , 2019 of the new public management, this is an important approach to the role of government and the private sector in public administration, but rather an integration into a broader context that emphasizes increased stakeholder involvement in the decision-making



process. In parallel, the new environment is triggering negotiations between New Public Management and other approaches, so that principles related to risk taking and dealing with the uncertainties of the ever-changing international environment. Consistency at the methodological level has been questioned (Bogdanol, 2005; Howlett, 2019).

New public control relates to organizational changes that improve the ability to manage and accomplish tasks by delegating authority and transferring authority to another semi-autonomous organization. However, the shrinking role of government, initiated by a series of changes in the implementation of new public management ideas, was accompanied by an inability to deal with serious problems beyond administrative boundaries and organizational levels, thus the expected result. did not bring (Læg Reid & Verhoest, 2010; Pollitt & Bockert, 2011).

Note, therefore, that this approach cannot alleviate administrative problems and difficulties, leading to a strong need for alternatives or paradigm shifts, leading to a gradual transition to alternative approaches that adapt to modern complexities. need to do it. Internationally, the mid-2000s saw a shift towards implementing reforms that ushered in a new era called the 'post-new public management era'. This shift in both theory and research parallels the field of public policy-making to the need for stronger central governments and innovative community action to address transnational problems and challenges. in response to the growing demand for biomass (Christensen & Læg Reid, 2010).

Governments around the world are beginning to develop and implement new forms of horizontal policy, governance such as public-private partnerships (Osborne & Plastrik, 2000; Hodge & Greve, 2005), stakeholder collaborations (McLavery, 2002; Edelenbos & Klijn, 2005).

Other forms of civic participation are summarized under the term 'new public governance'. It emerges as a more holistic model of public policy, leading to shifting power relations. To the extent that the role of government changes dramatically, it permeates the concept of public administration (Castells, 2011).

In addition, the requirement for integrated services reinforces the need to build horizontal networks through the cooperation of various organizations. Going one step further, government needs to involve multiple actors in the policy-making and implementation process. Private actors, social organizations and citizens are key factors that can hinder or reverse political intervention in public administration (Klenk & Reiter, 2019).

Argued to set priorities when it comes to new public governance principles Achieving business goals with the same strategy as New Public Management, developing democratic governance, and managing new forms of public institutions through building administrative and political networks. It prioritizes ensuring a balance between the institutional features of public administration and identifies to some extent the factors, processes, causes and problems. The impact of government-related changes in the public sector (Christensen, 2012).

In any case, the methods and techniques developed and the practices applied are aimed at transforming organizational structures through changes in administrative roles. Thus, the concept of products provided by public authorities is gradually transforming into value-added services, a result of proper functioning and governance of public authorities and the public sector as a whole. In a sense, the new terms and conditions proposed and formulated shape the circumstances in which the need to exercise leadership and play a leading role in it arises, but whether in traditional or newly developed forms (Dickinson, 2016). At the same time, the question of old classical theories of public administration and their practices came into fore. This question will not be ignored, as administrative changes are based on further development and improvement of existing systems. This means that existing forms of new public governance are not abandoned, but are enhanced and complemented by the philosophies, ideological backgrounds and beliefs of the new public governance discourse. New public management therefore includes elements such as the need to dismantle performance management, which has been proposed as a remedial intervention for the rigid nature of new public management, with a particular focus on managing social change within the authority (Greve, Lagreid, & Rykkja, 2016). Therefore, an extended approach is proposed in which the three approaches are intertwined,



coexist and even integrated. It implements traditional bureaucratic administration, management and governance in terms of forming a complex framework of needs and priorities. In other words, this approach addresses the need for rules-based management, goals that conform to the principles of efficient and effective scientific management, and networks created by broader stakeholder cooperation and synergy. These groups are made up of both public and private sectors and operate at local, national, supranational and global levels. They are dynamically involved in security and public space (Eriksson, 2019).

As a result, changes in public administration, public management and service delivery reflect widespread changes in public policy, and methods and techniques are constantly changing. Links between central governments, institutional and non-governmental leaders, other stakeholders and civil society actors will inevitably influence the implementation of change, and managers and managers will always be held accountable. In this context, especially in such a complex framework, leadership plays a key role, with the main goal of materializing and realizing improvements in public sector authorities (Cheng, 2019).

Active stakeholder engagement in the public sector, visible through the role of the state coordinator should, in response to the new roles of companies, civil society and management, it manifests itself as a particular form of public policy. Each of the above elements interacts with the others to develop conflicting, complementary, conflicting, competitive, or even cooperative relationships, with the aim of maximizing each individual's participation and impact on the organization. (Kristiansen, Dahler-Larsen & Ghin, 2019).

However, their sphere of activity is neither pre-determined nor strictly defined, and contributes to the formation of a unique, complex and multi-layered social context. It can be attributed to quasi-pluralism. However, that doesn't mean these stakeholders will stop working that way (Torfing & Triantafillou, 2013; Haque, 2019).

Finally, at the end of the new era of public management, there is a growing interest in nature and nature governance directions for administration and administration are revealed, reflected in the 'steer rather than row' dilemma put forward or implied by some scholars (Peters, 1997; Denhardt & Denhardt, 2000; Osborne & Plastrik, 2000). As a result, the demand for new civil service services in the public sector system has resurfaced. The emerging new approaches are based on the management principles of effectiveness, efficiency and accountability, which have different meanings and importance.

New Public Governance

Denhardt & Denhardt (2000) argued that: indeed, in his first decade of the new millennium, administrators and administrators began to recognize their role as closely related to the work of entrepreneurs, preferring to steer rather than row. At the same time, their income seems to be getting smaller and smaller. Nonetheless, the next decade, the mid-2010s, will be complemented by a new leaner, reinvented government that has re-emerged through governance. It comprises trade unions, non-profit organizations, the private sector, and corporate initiatives seeking positions in the new governing environment (Panyasiri, 2018).

This shift emphasizes the public interest, which is sometimes superseded or merged with private interest, and calls for a new set of stakeholders to capture and realize innovation and improvement in the public sector. Consistent with the process of delineating roles and boundaries. As a result, many very important changes have been implemented and the public's role as a customer or consumer of public goods and services has become more active. They give the right or ability to become public service providers while maintaining their status as customers (Castells, 2011; Dickinson, 2016; Osborne et al., 2020).

These new circumstances require a restructuring of the administration. Since government seems directly related to public order, new forms of collective action and new forms of collegiality must be initiated. At the same time, it encourages the development and advancement of new approaches to public administration and fosters new public service ideas. This eliminates the need to evaluate administrative work in terms of efficiency and effectiveness, and provides a basis for evaluating the usefulness of public institutions in terms of their contribution to welfare and meeting the needs of the public (Osborne, 2018). As such, public sector



services are no longer measured solely by performance and results. Due to the ongoing debate about the ethical and political appropriateness of public service. Furthermore, successful management of an organization and effective leadership are not limited to accountability and performance to customers and stakeholders, but to providing excellent service, adhering to ethical standards, Responsibility for adhering to new public principles (Dickinson, 2016).

New public services go beyond the establishment of new forms of activity or to open up new forms of activity. Perspectives on Public Policy and Administration, Reorientation of Administration and Leadership also articulates new governance priorities. Like its predecessor, the new rather than completely replacing the underlying approach, public services change and shake the internal coherence built into the new public administration. This seems to cause an uproar and call into question the country's sovereignty. New Public Management and Governance need to reach Balance for New Approaches and its exemplary governance modes (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2015; Bryson, Crosby, & Bloomberg, 2014).

Discussion and Conclusion

This study attempted to reflect and provide insight into the organizational landscape of the public sector by systematically reviewing the current literature on new public management and new public governance. This research allowed us to trace the origins of new public services. The main purpose of the study was to outline the changes in the administrative field that led to the development of new theoretical systems. The main question, therefore, was what would happen after applying the new principles to public sector management and governance. New public management and new public governance principles, as well as basic techniques and theories, were presented.

A literature review on this subject revealed that new public management approaches are: is consistently dominant, while many scholars see New Public Governance as a successor form of governance, largely based on the evolution or reinvention of New Public Management. It can therefore be argued that new public management maintains its central position as a centralized approach to public administration in relation to the increasing status of public managers and cadres. Public administrators are responsible for addressing priorities and initiating specific policies and practices. Assign employees tasks to perform and design tasks together with employees. Furthermore, these operations must be consistent with the goals and objectives of public authorities.

Nonetheless, the centrally planned management tasks such as recontextualizing, recalibrating and reinterpreting policies once undertaken by public administrators and administrators in the new public management era have largely been replaced by innovation and risk-taking in the public sector. was found to be insufficient to promote It also aims to manage unprecedented change and global uncertainty related to unpredictable natural and social phenomena (e.g.natural disasters, terrorism, health crises, immigration and refugee crises, etc) are calling into question the status quo and, in many cases, the way public institutions work. In this case, public authorities may be at high risk as they violate regulations established to protect the field of public administration.

As a result, we can see a new approach in the sense of New Public Management. New public governance seeks to address administrative complexities. Expand the scope of public policy interpretation and application. which is extended by A framework emerges within which new public governance can evolve into complex ones.Multi-target and multi-level theoretical framework. This can be characterized as a hybrid approach that builds on and engages multiple aspects of the public.

Decision-making methods and strategies, and the need for change in public service delivery. In other words, a new public governance performance agenda focused primarily on efficiency and effectiveness has replaced the traditional bureaucratic management model. At the same time, New Public Management, which has assimilated some of its elements, goes dormant. In addition to a more comprehensive three-sectoral



approach that includes leaders, nations and institutions, it targets non-governmental organizations and gives new meaning to efficiency and effectiveness.

Therefore, the value-centered new public service approach that emerges from the transformation of public service management diverts attention from the performative nature of new public management and focuses on the control mode of new public governance exercised in reformed public administration. increase. The meanings of efficiency and effectiveness in pursuing public sector governance, and their new meanings, are therefore being redefined.

In summary, the continued transformation of the public sector regime will evolve methods of management, control and governance over time. The theory lays the foundation for exploring new perspectives in public administration and public management.

This study aims to be a useful tool in deepening our understanding of the complex structure and nature of management systems, as this issue seems to be a key issue for public policy and the role of government in today's society.

As introduced and discussed above, management systems can influence and shape contemporary administrative and governance realities. In this way, future research will enrich our theoretical and practical knowledge and explore how management and management situations are changing to respond to the changes taking place around the world. In addition, research can also seek empirical data on the impact of these changes on public service management. Further investigation may reveal how the nation is more benefits are gained by recognizing the moral and political implications that are assessed and explained in the context of new public services.

REFERENCES

- Bogdanor, V. (Ed.). (2005). *Joined-Up Government*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.5871/bacad/9780197263334.001.0001>
- Bryson, J. M., Crosby, B. C., & Bloomberg, L. (2014). Public value governance: Moving beyond traditional public administration and the new public management. *Public Administration Review*, 74(4), 445-456. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12238>
- Castells, M. (2011). *The rise of the network society*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.
- Christensen, T. (2012). Post-NPM and changing public governance. *Meiji Journal of Political Science and Economics*, 1(1), 1-11.
- Christensen, T., & Lægreid, P. (2001). New Public Management: The effects of contractualism and devolution on political control. *Public Management Review*, 3(1), 73-94. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616670010009469>
- Christensen, T., & Lægreid, P. (2002). New public management: the transformation of ideas and practice. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Christensen, T., & Lægreid, P. (2010). Increased complexity in public sector organizations: the challenges of combining NPM and post-NPM. In P. Lægreid & K. Verhoest (Eds.), *Governance of public sector organizations: proliferation, autonomy and performance* (pp. 255-278). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230290600_13
- Christensen, T., & Lægreid, P. (2012a). Administrative reforms in western democracies. In B. G. Peters & J. Pierre (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of public administration* (pp. 577-589). London: Sage Publications. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446200506.n38>
- Christensen, T., & Lægreid, P. (2016). *The Ashgate research companion to new public management*. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315613321>
- Christensen, T., & Lægreid, P. (2017). Transcending new public management: The transformation of public sector reforms. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315235790>
- Cheng, Y. (2019). Exploring the role of nonprofits in public service provision: moving from coproduction to co-governance. *Public Administration Review*, 79(2), 203-214. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12970>
- Denhardt, J. V., & Denhardt, R. B. (2015). The new public service revisited. *Public Administration Review*, 75(5), 664-672. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12347>
- Denhardt, J. V., & Denhardt, R. B. (2011). *The New Public Service: serving, not steering* (3rd ed.). Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.
- Dickinson, H. (2016). From New Public Management to New Public Governance: The Implications for a „New Public Service“. In J. Butcher & D. Gilchrist (Eds.), *The Three Sector Canberra, Australia: The Australian National University Press*. Drucker, P. (1954). *The principles of management*. New York: Harper-Collins Publishers.
- Edelenbos, J., & Klijn, E. H. (2005). Managing stakeholder involvement in decision making: A comparative analysis of six interactive processes in the Netherlands. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 16(3), 417-446. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mui049>
- Eriksson, E. M. (2019). Representative co-production: broadening the scope of the public service logic. *Public Management Review*, 21(2), 291-314. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2018.1487575>
- Greve, C., Lægreid, P., & Rykkja, L. H. (Eds.). (2016). *Nordic administrative reforms: Lessons for public management*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/978113756363-7>
- Gruening, G. (2001). Origin and theoretical basis of New Public Management. *International Public Management Journal*, 4(1), 1-25. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1096-7494\(01\)00041-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1096-7494(01)00041-1)
- Guthrie, C., & Peaucelle, J. L. (2015). *Henri Fayol, the Manager*. London: Pickering & Chatto. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315654546>



TIMBOU-AFRICA ACADEMIC PUBLICATIONS

AUGUST, 2023 EDITIONS, INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF:

AFRICAN SUSTAINABLE DEV. RESEARCH VOL.14

- Hammerschmid, G., Van de Walle, S., Andrews, R., & Mostafa, A. M. S. (2019). New public management reforms in Europe and their effects: Findings from a 20-country top executive survey. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 85(3), 399-418. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020852317751632>
- Haque, M. S. (2019). The changing foundations of public administration: from identity to modernity to diversity. *International Review of Public Administration*, 1, 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1080/12294659.2019.1632042>
- Hesse, J. J., Hood, C., & Peters, B. G. (2003). Paradoxes in public sector reform: soft theory and hard cases. Berlin: Duncker and Humblot. <https://doi.org/10.3790/978-3-428-50798-6>
- Hodge, G. A., & Greve, C. (2005). The challenge of public-private partnerships: Learning from international experience. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781845428082>
- Hogan, J., & Howlett, M. (2015). Policy paradigms in theory and practice. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137434043>
- Hood, C. (1990). De-Sir Humphreyfying the Westminster model of bureaucracy: a new style of governance?. *Government, Governance*, 3(2), 205-214. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0491.1990.tb00116.x>
- Hood, C. (1991). A public management for all seasons?. *Public Administration*, 69(1), 3-19. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9299.1991.tb00779.x>
- Howlett, M. (2019). Designing public policies: Principles and instruments. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315232003>
- Klenk, T., & Reiter, R. (2019). Post-New Public Management: reform ideas and their application in the field of social services. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 1, 3-10. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020852318810883>
- Kristiansen, M. B., Dahler-Larsen, P., & Ghin, E. M. (2019). On the dynamic nature of performance management regimes. *Administration & Society*, 51(6), 991-1013. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0095399717716709>
- Lægreid, P. (2014). Accountability and new public management. In M. Bovens, R. E. Goodin, & T. Schillemans (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of public accountability*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Lægreid, P., & Verhoest, K. (2010). Governance of public sector organizations: Proliferation, autonomy and performance. Netherlands: Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230290600>
- Li, J., & Chung, K. (2020). Decomposing Isomorphism: What Drives Similarity in the Adoption of New Public Management?. *Administration & Society*, 52(3), 375-404. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0095399718811307>
- Montana, P. J., & Charnov, B. H. (2008). *Management*. New York: Barron's.
- Morgan, D. F., Larsen, G. L., Bao, G., & Wang, X. (2015). A value-based global framework for New Public Governance. In D.F. Morgan & B.J. Cook (Eds.), *New Public Governance: a regime-centered perspective* (pp. 48-62). New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315702100>
- McLavery, P. (2002). Civil society and democracy. *Contemporary Politics*, 8(4), 303-318. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13569770216068>
- Osborne, D., & Plastrik, P. (2000). *The reinventor's fieldbook: Tools for transforming your government*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Osborne, S. P. (2006a). Introduction: The (new) Public Governance: a suitable case for treatment?. In S. P. Osborne (Ed.), *The New Public Governance? Emerging perspectives on the theory and practice of public governance* (pp.1-16). London: Routledge.
- Osborne, S. (2018). From Public Service-dominant Logic to Public Service Logic: Are Public Service Organizations Capable of Co-production and Value Co-creation?." *Public Management Review*, 20(2), 225-231. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2017.1350461>
- Osborne, S., Brandsen, T., Mele, V., Nemeč, J., van Genugten, M., & Flemig, S. (2020). Risking innovation. Understanding risk and public service innovation- evidence from a four-nation study. *Public Money & Management*, 40(1), 52-62. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09540962.2019.1621051>
- Panyasiri, C. (2018). A Comparative Analysis of Contemporary Public Management Concepts in Thailand. *Journal of Public Administration and Governance*, 8(4), 155-171. <https://doi.org/10.5296/jpag.v8i4.13708>
- Peters, B. G. (1997). Shouldn't Row, Can't Steer: What's a Government to do?. *Public Policy and Administration*, 12(2), 51-61. <https://doi.org/10.1177/095207679701200205>
- Pollitt, C. (1990). *Managerialism and the public services: The Anglo-american experience*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Pollitt, C. (2007b). The New Public Management: An overview of its current status. *Administration and Public Management Review*, 8, 110-115. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09540962.2017.1407129>
- Pollitt, C., & Bouckaert, G. (2000). *Public management reform: a comparative analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pollitt, C., & Bouckaert, G. (2011). *Public management reform: A comparative analysis - New Public Management, Governance and the neo-Weberian state*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pollitt, C., & Bouckaert, G. (2017). *Public management reform: A comparative analysis into the age of austerity*. UK: Oxford University Press.
- Pollitt, C. (2018). Performance management 40 years on: a review. Some key decisions and consequences. *Public Money & Management*, 38(3), 167-174. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09540962.2017.1407129>
- Sorenson, E. J., & Torfing, J. (2007). Theories of democratic network governance. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230625006>
- Steinfeld, J., Koala, K., & Carlee, R. (2019). Contracting for public stewardship in public-private partnerships. *International Journal of Procurement Management*, 12(2), 135-155. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJPM.2019.098549>
- Torfing, J., & Triantafyllou, P. (2013). What's in a name? Grasping new public governance as a political-administrative system. *International Review of Public Administration*, 18(2), 9-25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/12294659.2013.10805250>