

From Public Administration to New Public Management: An Analysis

Amir M. Nasrullah

Department of Public Administration, University of Chittagong,
Chittagong-4331 University of Chittagong, Chittagong-4331, Bangladesh

Prologue: During the last decades or so, the economic realities in most nations of the world have been acting as catalysts in the movement towards reforms in the public sector. The worldwide recession of the 70s changed the economic and social condition in most countries. This has led to reduce financial resources at the disposal of governments resulting in a growing concern on cost consciousness and efficiency in the public sectors with increasing pressure on responsiveness and accountability in the delivery of services. In response, there have been shifts towards greater reliance on market forces, smaller role of governments and efforts to redraw the boundaries between the public and private sectors. In the face of these pressures and increasing criticism of traditional governance structures, the field of public administration is changing. Therefore, during 1980's and 1990's the emergence of a new stream of thought entered into the field of public administration. This approach was essentially different from the traditional model of public Administration (Khair, 1998).

The traditional model of public administration can be characterized as: an administration under formal control of political leadership, based on a strictly hierarchical model of bureaucracy, staffed by permanent, neutral officials, motivated only by public interest serving any governing party equally and not contributing to policy but merely administering policies decided by the politicians. The term public administration is always meant the study of the public sector, in addition to being an activity and a profession. It is unfortunate that there is a profusion of words to describe the study of public sector. Public policy, public administration and public management are terms all referring essentially to the same thing, which is how the administrative parts of government are, organized process information and product outputs an policies, laws or goods and services. There are different views on the primacy of those terms (Hughes, 1994).

Rosenbloom urge "Public Administration is the use of managerial, political and legal theories and process to fulfill legislative, executive and judicial governmental mandates for the provision of regulatory and services functions for the society as a whole or for some segments of it." This is a comprehensive, overarching definition putting within public administration every conceivable part of the public sector. (Rosenbloom, 1986) O H, Hyde and Shafritz (1991) see public management as a branch of the larger field of public administration or public affairs; the part which overviews the art and science of applied methodologies for public administrative program design and organizational restructuring, policy and management planning, resource allocation through budgeting system, financial management and audit. Some usage, particularly in the USA regards public management as a technical sub- field of public administration. For example Graham and Hays argue that students of public management are concerned with efficiency, accountability, goal achievement and dozens of other managerial and technical questions (Graham and Hays, 1991).

Different researchers have identified the movement by different names, with Lan and Rosenbloom (1992) calling it "Market based Public Administration", whereas Pollitt (1990) calls it "Managerialism", Osborne and Gaebler (1992) calls it "Entrepreneurial Government" and Hood (1991) "New Public Management". Even though known by different names what sets it apart from the traditional administration, is the concept, which lays greater emphasis on performance and transparency of administration.

The objective of this article is to discuss the evolution, growth and development of public administration i.e., the origin and the present stream of thought of public administration.

The Origin of Public Administration: Public administration as an academic discipline is barely hundred years old whereas public administration as an activity can be traced to the earliest periods of human history, since men stated living in organized society. There are references to the working to government in such writing as kautily's Arthasarstra in India the Bible, Aristotle's Politics and Machiavellis the Prince, Hazrat Mohammad's (sm) the charter of Madina etc. In European languages, the term Public administration began to creep in during the 17th century to distinguish between the absolute monarch's administration of public affairs and the management of his private household. It was a period when the church was separated from the state and the government was superimposed on all other societal institutions within a definite territory (Dutta, 1990).

Governmental administration of ancient and medieval times however differed considerably in its structure and goals from state administration in the modern era. Administration of the state in the ancient and medieval period in both the East and the West was authoritarian, patriarchal and elitist in character. Maintenance of law and order, collection of revenue and administration of justice etc., were its compulsory function, whereas welfare activities

were purely incidental or optionally undertaken. Administrators were small in number, selected entirely at the discretion of the monarch and their official status was no better than the personal servants of the king. It was only with the rise of modern welfare states and the multiplication of state functions in the 19th century that the old patriarchal, hereditary state officialdom was replaced by a public bureaucracy, recruited on the basis of public laws, performing largely within a legal framework, tasks, which were becoming more and more public oriented. The present era is that of the administrative state (Basu, 1990).

Role of the Cameralist to the Development of Public Administration: The essay "Bureaucracy" reflects the influence of the German-Austrian cameralist tradition. Cameralism was a system of political science and public administration designed to aid those absolute monarchs of the middle 1700's who were replacing the disappearing feudal relationships with their own central authority. The rise of cameralism, therefore, paralleled the rise of the absolute monarch. Cameralism was primarily concerned with developing administrative techniques for managing highly centralized states. It represented a shift from legal training to training for governmental action. The cameralists attempted to develop a science of administration through detailed and rigid managerial training of public functions to serve as the basis for managing the royal domain and broadening civil regulation.

As political economists the cameralists wrote widely on the needs for a systematic approach to public administration and eventually chairs in cameralism were established at leading universities the first being at the university of Halle in Prussia in 1727. The occupants of these academic posts sometimes held concurrent positions in the public service. Aside from its economic doctrine, based on free flow of commerce, the public administration component of cameralism stressed the development of administrative skills. University cameralist courses included formal studies in finance administration and accountancy, police science and agricultural administration. They also included the compilation of vast bibliographies that would be helpful in synthesizing data and knowledge and would provide valuable library resources for administrative students. While the writing of the cameralists were not widely read outside of Germany and Austria, their impact within those states was quite significant. The cameralists laid the groundwork for the academic study of public administration and gave impetus both to its professional status and the high prestige enjoyed by the career civil servant in the central European state (Simmons and Dvorin, 1977). The scope of public administration has been expanding since the rise of the modern welfare state. According to Caiden, "Its growing pervasiveness in the conduct of human affairs is evident in the proliferation of public laws, accumulation of huge arsenals for use by mass armies, the growth of public professionals and coverage of compulsory taxes" (Caiden, 1971). The question of gradually increasing significance of public administration in human life has been viewed from two contradictory perspectives. The anarchists suggest that the growing expansion of public functions would result in the death of individuality. They regard every extension of public administration as a threat to the growth of self-expression. The social engineers, on the other hand, hold a different view- an instrumentalist view of public administration. They look upon public administration as an instrument for building a good "society". Every extension of public administration is, therefore, welcomed as an attempt to eliminate selfish private interests (Dutta, 1990).

The Growth of Public Administration as a Separate Discipline: The growth and development of public administration as a separate discipline falls into a number of critical stages. Many factors have contributed towards the growth of the study of public administration in the USA as a separate academic discipline in the present century. The development of modern sciences and technology made an impact on the life of the people and the functioning of the government. The scientific management movement founded by Taylor gave great impetus to the study of public administration. The gradual evolution of the concept of welfare state also helped in the growth of public administration. A brief discussion on the stages of development of public administration is given below.

(a) The Politics-Administration Dichotomy Phase: This phase begins with the publication of Woodrow Wilson's article, "The study of Public Administration" Published in Political Science Quarterly in 1887. He recommended studying the administrative institutions of government. He is considered the founder of the academic discipline of Public Administration. Making a distinction between politics and administration, he argued that administration is concerned with implementation of political policy decisions. He argued that there are certain administrative processes, which could be isolated from their political environment. Politics relates to the enactment of public laws and public administration is concerned with the detailed and systematic execution of public law.

Wilson felt that public administration was essentially a field of business and therefore, needed a managerial approach. He declared that it was possible to distinguish between the political and executive functions of government; the goal he set for public administration involved both management science and political theory. Thus for him, "the field of administration is a field of business. It is removed from the hurry and strife of politics; it at most points stands apart from the debatable ground of constitutional study. It is a part of political life only as the methods of counting house are a part of the life of society as machinery is a part of the manufactured product"

(Dutta, 1990).

In the early years of the present century, the impact of the reform movement in the US government permeated American Universities, thus popularizing the study of Public Administration. As a result of the Taft Commission Report in the USA the Federal Budget and Accounting Act was passed in 1921, creating the Bureau of the Budget and institutionalizing public administration in a big way. The interaction between the government and the universities increased. In a report published in 1914 the American Political Science Association declared that one of the objectives of teaching political science was to prepare specialists for governmental positions. Thus the study of public administration gained increasing recognition in American Universities. In 1926, Leonard D. White wrote "Introduction to the study of Public Administration" which was recognized as the first textbook on the subject. This book while advocating a politics administration dichotomy, stressed the human side of administration, dealing comprehensively with administration in government (Basu, 1990).

(b) The Principles of Administration Phase: In this phase the tendency to evolve a value free science of management is marked. The central belief of this period was that there are certain principles of administration, which was the task of scholars to discover and advocate. In 1927, W F Willoughby's *Principles of Public Administration* was published. And it was recognized as the 2nd full-fledged text in this field. It showed profound impact of the management studies. Willoughby drew an analogy from business that the legislature was the board of directors, the chief executive was the managing director and the administration was defined as management, which was in turn defined as the simple application of broad policy. Leonard D. white and W F Willoughby both of them took for granted the separation of politics and administration.

Among the more significant works relevant to this phase Marry parker Follet's *Creative Experience* (1924), Henri Fayols *Industrial and General Management* (1930), James D. Mooney and Alan C. Reilay's *Principles of Organization* (1939), Gullick and Ururick's *Papers on the Science of Public Administration* (1937), all of which delineated varying numbers of overarching administrative principles. Organization theorists often dub this school of thought "administrative management" since it focused on the upper hierarchical echelons of organizations. Researchers in these streams often called 'scientific management' developed principles of efficient physical movement for optimal assembly line efficiency. The most notable literature was Fredrick N. Taylor's *Principles of Scientific Management* (1911) and various works by Frank and Lillian Gilberth (Henry, 1975). While obviously related, scientific management had less effect on public administration during its principles phase because it focused on lower-level personnel in the organization.

The "high-noon of orthodoxy" as it often has been called of public administration was marked by the publication in 1937 of Luther H. Gulick and Lyndall Urwick's "*Papers on the Science of Administration*". This landmark study also marked the high noon of prestige for public administration. Gullick and Urwick were confidantes of President Franklin D. Roosevelt and advised him on a variety of matters. Their papers were a report to the president committee on administrative science. Gullick and Urwick promoted seven principles of administration and are so doing gave students of public administration that snappy anagram POSDCORB. It was the final expression of administrative principles. It stood for:

P = Planning,
O = Organizing,
S = Staffing,
D = Directing
Co = Coordinating,
R = Reporting,
B = Budgeting.

In 1937 that was the public administration (Henry, 1975).

The Conceptual Challenges to Public Administration (1938-1947): In 1938, public administration received its first real hint of conceptual challenge. The impact of Chester I Barnard's book *The Functions of the Executives* at that time was not overwhelming. But Barnard influenced Herbert A. Simon when he was writing his devastating critique of the field, *Administrative Behavior*. Dissent from mainstream public administration accelerated in the 1940's in two mutually reinforcing directions. One objection was that politics and administration could never be separated in any remotely sensible fashion. The other was that the principles of administration were logically inconsistent (Henry, 1975).

In 1946, all the authors of the book *Elements of Public Administration* edited by Fritz Morstein Marx admitted the political nature of the public administration, political role of administrators and the existence of bureaucratize power (Dutta, 1990). The book indicated a new awareness that what often appeared to be value-free administration actually was value-laden politics. In 1950, John Merriman Gaus in his article "Trends in the theory of public

administration" that published in the Public Administration Review (summer 1950) told a theory of public administration means in our time of theory of politics also.

The principles of public administration became the object of scathing criticism in the hands of Simon. He pointed out that there could be no such thing as principle of administration in his book Administrative Behavior. At that time Robert A. Dahl wrote another article entitled, "The science of public administration: Three problems". In this article he argued that the development of universal principles of administration was hindered by the obstructions of values contending for preeminence in organizations, differences in individual personalities and social frameworks that varied from culture to culture. Simon's approach widened the scope of the subject by relating it to psychology, sociology, economics and political science. He rejected both the classical principles of administration and the politics-administration dichotomy in administrative thought and practice. Simon identified two mutually supportive streams of thought. One was engaged in the development of a pure science of administration, which required a solid base in social psychology. Another stream was concerned with the normative aspects of administration and prescription for public policy. Simon favored the co-existence of both the approaches, empirical and normative, for the growth and development of the discipline of public administration.

Robert Dahl also identified three important problems in the evolution of the science of public administration. Thus the principles of public administration were attacked. They were not scientific, but normative, not universal but culture bound. They were not grounded in evidence but based on misplaced corporate analogies and autocratic assumptions (Basu, 1990).

(c) Post War Development and Transformation: Administration came to be viewed increasingly as a unit in the process of continuous interaction between the people inside and outside the organization.

Secondly, separate studies of public and private business administration tended to merge into a single science of organization. Whose theories and concepts were to be equally applicable to both public and private administration? Organization theory experienced a remarkable growth in the post war era. Its findings concerning small group behavior, communications, human relation, leadership pattern are highly relevant to public administration. New insights in administration also came from management science theories.

Thirdly, the increasing use of the system and behavioral approaches encouraged the comparative study of administrative systems in diverse social settings and environments. New perspectives were badly needed and the impetus for study of comparative public administration and development administration.

Fourthly with the ushering in of the computer age, attempts were made to understand the decision making and problem solving processes of the human mind with the help of computers and other mechanical aids.

Lastly, public administration coincides with a general concern in the social sciences for public policy analysis. The interdisciplinary policy process and planning approach has become the most useful and relevant guide to the practical administrator in developed and developing societies (Basu, 1990). According to James Fesler, public administration is policy execution and policy formulation, public administration is Bureaucracy and public administration is public (government).

(d) Toward New Public Administration: By this time these themes directed attention toward political and policy making processes and specific public programs in public administration. Public administration was also shaken and influenced by the social turbulence and crisis-ridden period of the sixties. Since 1968 the evolving discipline of public administration has come to be enriched by the emergence of what has come to be known as the "New Public Administration Movement". The major landmarks in the growth and emergence of New Public Administration are: (Basu, 1990)

(a). The Honey Report on Higher Education for Public Service 1967, in the USA.

(b). The Philadelphia Conference on the theory and practice of public administration, 1967, in the USA.

(c). The Minnow Brook Conference, 1968, in the USA

(d). Publication of Toward a New Public Administration: The Minnow Brook Perspective, edited by Frank Marini, 1971.

(e). Publication of Public Administration in a Time of Turbulence edited by Dwight Waldo, 1971

The Honey Report undertook an evaluative study of public administration as an academic discipline. The Philadelphia conference discussed the theory and practice of public administration: Scope, objectives and Methods. The Minnow Brook conference advocated for what is known as new public administration to make the study and practice of government relevant to the needs of the emerging post-industrial society (Dutta, 1990). According to Stillman "Bored with the dry realism of the postwar behavioralists in search of new intellectual foundations for public administration caught up in the egalitarian enthusiasm of the moment and concerned with the excessive abuses of the bureaucratic authority in Vietnam and elsewhere. New Public Administration wanted to make a fresh

beginning for the field (Stillman, Quoted by Dutta, 1990). The conference indicated public administration as an instrument of status and, denying social justice to the less privileged groups. They pleaded the case for the public administration to be vitally concerned with the issues of relevance, values, social equity and social change. They gave a call for normative public administration and a reunion of administration with politics. They told public administration should coexist with politics; otherwise it will wander in quest of purpose and cohesion. They suggested a client-focused administration along with de-bureaucratization, democratic decision-making and decentralization of the administrative processes in the interest of more effective and humane delivery of public services (Dutta, 1990). The four main characteristics of new public administration are shortly discussed below:

Relevance: The traditional public administration has been interested in economy and efficiency. The New Public Administration movement pointed out that the discipline had little to say about contemporary problems and issues and was therefore becoming irrelevant. Management oriented public administration studies were found inadequate and the demand was to deal explicitly with the political environment and implications of administrative action. The New Public Administration movement demanded radical syllabi change to facilitate meaningful studies oriented toward the realities of modern day public life.

Values: New public administration rejected the value neutral position of traditional public administration. Value neutrality in public administration was declared impossibility and the discipline championed the cause of the disadvantaged sections in society. The new public administrator should be less 'generic' and public, less descriptive and more prescriptive, less institution oriented and more client impact oriented, less neutral and more normative.

Social Equity: The protagonists of new public administration clearly state that the distributive function and impact of governmental institutions should be public administration basic concern. The purpose of public action should be the reduction of economic and social disparities and the enhancement of life opportunities for all social groups inside the organization.

Social Change: To serve the cause of social equity is to activity of work for social change. This is the motto of new public administration. The attack is on the status quo and against the powerful interests entrenched in permanent institution. The participants in the Minnow Brook explored ways of institutionalizing change and remedying the bureaucratic tendencies of big organization.

(e) Criticism of New Public Administration Movement and the Rise of Public Choice School: The movement that started at Minnow Brook has been criticized as anti-theoretic, anti-positivist and anti-bureaucratic. Its positive value lies in bringing public administration closer to political science. In fact the movement has successful in integrating public administration with the basic concerns of political theory. As advocated by the new public administration movement, the client oriented, normative and socially conscious public administration is of direct relevance for the third world countries where public administration is in dire need of basic qualitative transformation. New public administration therefore, displays an intense concern for relevant societal problems (Golambiewski, 1947). It stresses ethics and values, innovation and social equality. It lays great emphasis on human relations, a creative approach to administration and social change.

Almost coinciding with this new trend was the rise of the public choice school. Led by Ostrom and others, this school argued a case for replacement of bureaucratic administration by democratic administration. The bureaucrats in their views prefer self-interest to public interests. Ostrom says, "Bureaucratic structures are necessary, but not sufficient structures for a productive and responsive public service economy" (Simmons and Dvorin, 1977).

The democratic administration paradigm suggested by Ostrom earned popular acceptance because of its forceful emphasis on democratizing administration. Ostrom argued against single centered administrative power, hierarchical administration and separation of politics from administration. He urged the need for diverse democratic decision-making structures, popular participation in administration and dispersed administrative authority based upon structures overlapping jurisdiction and fragmented organization.

Public choice theorists suggest that a variety of institutional arrangements will be required to provide different goods and services. They view the citizen as the ultimate source of administrative power because the citizen is rational consumer of public goods and services. The institutional roles and arrangements associated with bureaucratic model of administration interfere with the poorer citizens to express their preferences by limiting public choice. It is suggested that there is a need for dividing administrative power and offering it to the citizens in many terms in order to cater to the preferences of the public and to avoid the institutional weakness created by a dominant bureaucratic form. Ostrom calls upon the administrator to anticipate consequences of various institutional arrangements and the scholars create a democratic theory of administration that accentuates diversity. Writers like Downs, Tullock and Niskanen have exploded the myth of neutral and rational bureaucracy. They have developed

the theory of administrative egoism suggesting that the real life of bureaucracy is characterized by self-aggrandizement, resource manipulation and interest generally antithetical to public interest. Essentially a critique of the bureaucratic model of administration public choice school locates public administration within the domain of politics and an appropriate theory of political organization (Dutta, 1990).

(f) Toward New Public Management: Because of increasing criticism of traditional governance structure and new thinking of the scholars, the field of public administration is changing after public choice school. The present stream of thought entered into the field of public administration is New Public Management (NPM). In the USA, Lan and Rosenbloom (1992) detected the rise of a new market based public administration, which is closely associated with the entrepreneurial government advocated by Osborne and Gaebler (1993). Outside the Anglo-American literature, French scholars Belloubet Frier and Timsit (1993) attested to what they depicted as the change from an old administrative apparatus characterized by instrumentality, unity and rationality (the monocratic administration) to a 'transfigured administration through market type mechanism'. Hood (1991) abbreviates it as "Represents a transformation in the public sector and its relationship with the government and the society".

Rhodes drawing from Hood (1991) saw it in Britain as a determined effort to implement the "3Es" of economy, efficiency, and effectiveness at all levels of British government and argued (1991): "The New Public Management has the following doctrines: a focus on management, not policy and on performance appraisal and efficiency; the desegregation of public bureaucracies into agencies which deal with each other on a user-pay basis; the use of quasi-markets and contracting out to foster competition; cost-cutting and a style of management which emphasizes amongst other things, output targets limited term contracts, monetary incentives and freedom to manage."

The various names of NPM reflect differing views of what is occurring, but they do have some points in common. Firstly, it represents a major shift from traditional public administration which far greater attention paid to the achievement of results and the personal responsibility of managers. Secondly, there is an expressed intention to move away from classic bureaucracy to make organizations personal and employment terms and conditions more flexible. Thirdly, organizational and personal objectives are to be set clearly and this enables measurement of their achievement through performance indicators. Fourthly, senior staffs are more likely to be politically committed to the government of the day rather than being non-partisan or neutral. Fifthly, governmental functions are more likely to face market tests such as contracting out. Sixthly, there is also trend towards reducing government functions through privatization, in some cases quite radically. All these points are linked in that once the focus changes from process to results each successive step seems necessary. (Owen E. Hughes, 1994)

There are several conceptions of what is involved in NPM. The OECD (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development) argues many of its members are trying to make their public sectors more managerial with a common feature being the introduction of a more contractual participative discretionary style of relationship: between levels of hierarchy; between control agencies and operation units and between producing units, be they public or private. Instead of regulation administrative acting by rules and hierarchical authority the OECD claims that countries are following two broad avenues to improve production and delivery of publicly provided goods and services (OECD, 1991).

The first is; raise the production performance of public organizations to improve the management of human resources including staff development; recruitment of qualified talent and pay-for-performance; involve staff more in decision making and management; relax administrative controls while improving strict performance targets; use information technology; improve from clients and stress services quality; bring supply and demand decision together.

The second avenue is; make greater use of private sector to promote a dependable, efficient, competitive and open public procurement system for contracting out production of publicly provided goods and services and contracting in intermediate goods and services and end monopoly or other protection for supplies.

The main elements in the OECD view could be summarized as:

- i. Improving human resources including performance pay
- ii. Staff involvement in decision-making
- iii. Relaxing controls but improving performance targets
- iv. Using information technology
- v. Services clients
- vi. User charges
- vii. Contracting out and
- viii. Deregulation of monopolies (Hughes, 1994).

On the other hand, Hood (1991) summarized seven overlapping key doctrinal components of the new paradigm. These are as follows:

- i. Hands on professional management in the public sector-meaning active visible, discretionary control of organizations from named persons at the top, who are free to manage;

- ii. Setting explicit standards and measures of performance- in terms of definition of goals, targets, and indicators, preferably expressed in quantitative terms;
- iii. Greater emphasis on output control - i.e., resource allocation and rewards linked to measured performance; break up of centralized bureaucracy wide personnel management;
- iv. Shift to desegregations of units in the public sector-involving breaking up of former monolithic units, unbundling public sector into corporative units organized by products, with developed budgets and dealing with one another at "arms length" basis;
- v. Shift to greater competition in the public sector- through term contracts and public tendering procedures;
- vi. Stress on private sector-styles of management practice- involving a move away military style public service ethic to more flexible hiring, rewards and more use of public relations; and
- vii. Stress on greater discipline and parsimony in resource use by cutting direct costs raising labor discipline, limiting compliance costs in business.

Hood may differ from the OECD in his opinion as to the desiring of the managerial changes. It should be remembered that not all the above features, which are at times overlapping, are equally present in all cases. Though New Public Management has been initiated and tried in various forms in many countries like UK, Canada, New Zealand, Australia, South Africa, and Hong Kong, its effects are also being felt in developing countries like Bangladesh. Although there are criticisms regarding the universality of the concepts (Gunn 1988, Pollitt 1990), the ideas of NPM are being slowly filtered across the globe, especially by donor agencies and beginning to change the public sector worldwide. According to Hughes (1994), there are four kinds of changes, which constitute New Public Management. These are: firstly Changes to focus on outputs, secondly alteration in administrative inputs such as hiring staff by contracts, thirdly changes to the scope of governmental agencies and fourthly changing accountability relationships with political leadership and the public as public officials or managers become increasingly responsible for results.

Epilogue: The foregoing discussion amply proves that public administration has come a long way since 1879. It has established its credentials as an autonomous field of inquiry, with an ever-expanding literature and concerns, which have greatly influenced its evolution as an academic discipline. Scholars of public administration have sought to borrow a lot from other disciplines, making it truly inter-disciplinary in nature. Organizational dynamics also draws heavily on the management sciences. Public administration has faced both empirical and normative thrusts from time to time. It has also incorporated much new developments from the field of policy sciences (Basu, 1990). There are two distinct trends in the study of public administration in the USA. One stresses public i.e., political science whereas the other trend emphasizes administration i.e., organization studies. The political science branch worked on problems, such as power and legitimacy and organizational branch has studied management and efficiency (Lundquist, 1985). In addition, these are scholars who contend that public administration should be studied as a special discipline. Public administration as an autonomous discipline is essentially an American product- a product of a national culture that treats government as an integral part of the business ethos of the country. The discipline developed in the USA as a body of knowledge that would be of practical use in making government more business like.

David Hard and William Scott rightly observed, "Public administration has been challenged to emulate pressured efficiencies of business administration. Public administration responded to that challenge so enthusiastically that it lost its unique identity (Hart and Willaim, 1982). In the late 1960's, a group of scholars raised their voices of protest against the growing inability of the discipline to reorient itself to the needs of social change. They emphasized the need for bringing Public Administration closer to politics and political theory. The client oriented, normative and socially conscious public administration suggested by the scholars, is the new public administration. Public choice theorists carried toward the trend emphasizing de-bureaucratization and democratic administration. This trend is rooted in American political culture which is widely regarded as advanced capitalism blended with pluralism and principle of separation of power. The new public management in view of the recent worldwide disenchantment with the public sector, is bound to influence public administration and governance in developing countries in the long run. The challenge for developing countries therefore is to integrate the New Public Management model of changes with the indigenous based measures of changes in the public sector. What remains to be seen how developing nations integrate the positive elements of new public management into their own unique systems and brings about changes in their public sector (Khair, 1998).

References

- Basu, R., 1990. *Public Administration: Concepts and Theories*, Delhi
- Belloubet-Frier, N. and G. Timsit, 1993. *Administration transfigured: A New Administrative Paradigm?* International review of administrative Sci., 59:531-68.

- Caiden, G. E., 1971. *The Dynamics of Public Administration: Guidelines to Current Transformation in Theory and Practice*, Holt Rinehart and Winston, New York
- Dutta, P. K., 1990. *Public Administration and the State*, Delhi
- Graham, Cole Blease and Hays, Steven W., 1991. *Management Functions and Public Administration-POSDCORB Revisited*, in OH Hyde and Shafritz edited *Public Management: the Essential Readings*, USA
- Golambiewski, R. T., 1947. *Public Administration as a Developing Discipline*, Marcel Dekker Inc., New York
- Gunn, L., 1988. *Perspectives on Public Management, Managing Public Organizations: Lessons from Contemporary European Experience*, Kooiman, J. and Eliasson, K. (ed), London, Sage, and Pollitt, C. (1990), *Management and the Public Services*, Basil Blackwell Inc., Cambridge, USA.
- Henry, N., 1975. *Public Administration and Public Affairs*, Prentice Hall, NY.
- Hood, C., 1991. *A public management for all seasons?*, *Public Administration*, 69:3-19
- Huges, E. O., 1994. *Public Management and Administration*, St. Martins Press Inc., USA.
- Hart, D. and W. Scott, 1982. *The Philosophy of American Management*, *Southern Review of Public Administration*, 6:240.
- Khair, R., 1998. An unpublished paper on "New Public Management,
- Lan, Z. Y. and D. H. Rosenbloom, 1992. *Public administration in Transition?* (Editorial), *Public administration review*, 52:535-7,
- Lundquist, L., 1985. *From order to chaos's Recent Trends the study of public Administration in Lane, J. E. (edt), State and Market*, Sage, London.
- Osborne, D. and T. Gaebler, 1993. *Reinventing government: How the Entrepreneurial spirit is transforming the public sector*, London, Plume.
- Rosenbloom, David, 1986. *Public administration: Understanding Management, Politics and Law in the Public Sector*, Randome House, NY
- Simmons, R. and E. Dvorin, 1977. *Pubic Administration*, Alfred Publishing, New York, P-192.
- Steven O. H. J., C. Hyde Albert and M. Shafritz Jay (edt.), 1991. *Public management: the Essential Readings*, Chicago, USA