NEW PUBLIC MANAGEMENT: HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT AND THEORETICAL FOUNDATION

Rabina Pandit, Amita Kandel, Sambriddhi Ghimire and Anju Paudel
Institute of Agriculture and Animal Science, Tribhuvan University, Nepal

ABSTRACT
New Public Management is the dominating paradigm in public administration. NPM emphasizes effective innovation in the public sector, encompassing processes, products, services, and delivery systems. The notion of public administration is not a coherent theory, but rather an administrative argument based on diverse doctrines and arguments. However, it is apparent that NPM is influenced by well-established theories including managerialism, public choice theory, agency theory and decentralization. NPM implementation differs throughout nations due to variations in state ideals and administrative philosophy. Some critics argue that while NPM is a popular paradigm in developed nations, it lacks credibility in developing countries due to administrative structures. Though NPM has played a vital part in reforming administration, it has also demonstrated evident limits in most nations. It has been discovered that implementing incentive programs and using a budget to assess performance promote short-term, goal-directed behavior. As the world becomes more interconnected and complicated, public administration needs to change as well. Various promising alternatives are emerging including Digital Era Governance (DEG), Public Value Management (PVM) and Collaborative Governance, known as New Public Governance (NPG). These alternative approaches may impact future public sector changes by focusing on reintegration, need-based holism, and the digitization process. Even if NPM laid the groundwork for a more flexible and results-oriented public sector, careful innovation and constant adaptation are critical. Moreover, the model focusing on both efficiency and inclusion ensuring public administration serves as both a management system and a defender of the public interest is a need for the community.

Keywords: Administration, Doctrine, NPM, Organization, Public service.

1. INTRODUCTION
New Public Management is an approach in public administration that uses knowledge and experiences gained in business management and other disciplines to improve efficiency, effectiveness, and general performance of public services in modern bureaucracies (Vigoda, 2007). New Public Management (NPM) is a method for managing public service organizations in government agencies and public services on both a local and national level (Indahsari & Raharja, 2020). NPM is the dominating paradigm in the field of public administration (Arora, 2003).The notion of New Public Management (NPM) is crucial in public sector reform because NPM focuses on effective innovation in the public sector, including processes, products, services, and delivery systems (Wicaksono, 2019). Performance-oriented, not policy-oriented, public sector management is the main focus of New Public Management (Indahsari & Raharja, 2020). NPM is an acronym for a collection of administrative philosophies that have widespread support and dominated the agenda for public sector reform in a number of OECD countries

(Kalimullah, Alam, & Nour, 2012) (Hood, 1991). NPM aims to improve government performance by providing products and services more efficiently (Kelly, 1998).

Christopher Hood coined the term "New Public Management" in 1991(Hood, 1991) however it was a concept that was dated back a decade. The first governments to adopt NPM reforms were Ronald Reagan's in the USA and Margaret Thatcher's in the UK in 1979–1980. By the middle of the 1980s, Australia and New Zealand had followed suit. Globalization, international organizations run by the same countries, and domestic conservative and neo-liberal parties that occasionally collaborate with mainstream social democratic parties have all contributed to the reforms' international popularity, despite their undeniable Anglo-American flavor. (Christensen & Lægreid, 2013).Many governments have implemented reform initiatives since 1970 with the goal of integrating business concepts, methods, and ideals into the public sector (Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2011). This NPM movement shifted accounting, budgeting, and performance measurement methods to improve management and accountability (Connolly & Hyndman, 2006). Between 1945 and the early 1970s, the state's involvement expanded significantly due to increased expectations and demands for equality and from the 1970s, there was a growing concern over such expansion (Hyndman & Liguori, 2016). Possible causes for this include financial difficulty, societal changes, globalization, increasing competition, and changing perceptions of the state (Hyndman & McGeough, 2008). As a result, public sector management has evolved in several western nations; these changes are collectively known as NPM (Hyndman & Liguori, 2016).

The aim of this study is to explore about New Public Management as a part of public sector reform, to analyze the factors responsible for the shift of traditional bureaucratic models to NPM and to examine the successes and criticism of NPM highlighting its importance in public management.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK OF NPM

The many categorizations emphasize the 'loose and complex' character of NPM (Christensen & Lægreid, 2013). The concept of public management is not a unified theory or collection of ideas, but rather an administrative argument based on distinct doctrines and arguments (Barzelay, 2000). NPM differed from other reform groups by focusing on practical implementation rather than theoretical concepts. NPM is criticized for having a weak theoretical and philosophical underpinning. The public sector reforms in New Zealand in the middle to late 1980s, for example, involved a determined attempt to create a theoretically sound, empirically supported, and logically consistent approach to public management. Nevertheless, it is evident that NPM was inspired by well-established theories. (Christensen & Lægreid, 2013). Some of the theories are:

2.1 Managerialism

Painter (1988) quoted 'something called "management" which is a generic, purely instrumental activity, embodying a set of principles that can be applied to the public business, as well as in private business' which is important feature of managerialism. Management skills, competencies, techniques, and processes are applicable to all organizations, whether public, private, commercial, or non-profit (Pollitt, 1998).

The notion that managers can and should be granted considerable power and discretion, along with the proper delegation of decision-making duties and resources, is a second key component

of managerialism. However, this should only be done in the framework of well-defined objectives, robust performance incentives, clear and straightforward hierarchical control, and strong monitoring. Thus, the slogans 'managing for results', 'let managers manage', and 'make managers manage' are well-known. The third essential component of managerialism is a strong dependence on incentives. The belief that people react to incentives and penalties and that well-designed incentive programs may boost output for both individuals and businesses (Christensen & Lægreid, 2013).

2.2 Public Choice theory
The fundamental precept of public choice theory is that self-interest drives all human behavior (Buchanan, 1978). This does not imply that people don't care about other people but they prioritize their own interests over those of others when conflicting, thus, pursuing their goals in the most effective manner given costly knowledge (Horn, 1995). The demand side such as the inclinations and actions of voters and interest groups is given greater attention in the public choice literature than the supply side, such as the creation of government products (Mueller, 1989). Public choice theory plays a significant role in establishing the intellectual and administrative environment for NPM growth (Christensen & Lægreid, 2013).

2.3 Agency theory
Since the 1970s, agency theory has affected several academic fields, including as economics, accounting, management, political science, and sociology. The primary concept of agency theory is Principal-agent relationships should prioritize information efficiency and risk-bearing costs. Agency theory focuses on connections between principals and agents who cooperate but have different aims and risk attitudes. Agency theory addresses two issues that might arise in agency relationships. The first is an agency problem, which occurs when the principal and agent have different objectives or ambitions and the second is it is costly or difficult for the principal to confirm what the agent is truly doing. Agency theory is commonly used to explain organizational phenomena including compensation, acquisition and diversification strategies, board relationships, ownership and finance structures, vertical integration, and innovation (Eisenhardt, 1989). Agency theory significantly influenced the NPM reform agenda in the 1980s and 1990s.
Notably, agency theory inspired and supported the concepts of corporation and privatization as well as the governance frameworks for the new state-owned sectors. It affected institutional structure and governance in the 'core' public sector, especially the connection between service delivery and policy advice. Also, it resulted in the creation of publicly-owned, semi-competitive providers in policy areas like research and healthcare(Christensen & Lægreid, 2013).

2.4 Decentralization
Decentralization is considered as a means by which governments may deliver high-quality services that citizens appreciate within the framework of the NPM. The decentralization framework plays a crucial role in facilitating the transition of the public sector and the NPM construct. Decentralization leads to improved governance, more efficient public sector management, increased public participation, better resource mobilization, and market-like responsiveness to public service delivery (Hope & Chikulo, 2000).

2.5 Key Principles of NPM

NPM is linked to minimal government, de bureaucratization, decentralized governance, market-oriented public services, outsourcing, privatization, and performance management. (Kalimullah et al., 2012).

Table 1: Doctrine of New Public Management (Hood, 1991)

S.N No	Doctrine	Meaning	Justification
1	Hands-on professional management of public organization.	Managers at the top of a company have discretionary power.	Accountability necessitates explicit responsibility allocation rather than diffusion of power
2	Explicit standards and measures of performance.	Clearly stated and quantifiable goals and targets serve as success indicators.	Accountability calls for well-articulated goals, efficiency necessitates a "hard look" at objectives.
3	Greater emphasis on output controls.	Resource distribution and rewards are based on performance.	Prioritize outcomes above procedures.
4	Shift to disaggregation of units in the public sector.	Divide the public sector into corporatized divisions based on product categories and delegated budgets. Units dealing at arm's length with one another	Make units more manageable, consider splitting provision and production and using contracts or franchises both inside and outside the public sector.
5	Shift to greater competition in the public sector.	Switch to term contracts and public tendering processes.	Rivalry can lead to cheaper prices and greater quality.
6	Stress on private-sector styles of management practice.	Shift from conventional public service principles to more flexible payment, hiring, and rules.	Implement 'proven' private sector management tools in the public sector.
7	Stress on greater discipline and economy in public sector resource use.	Reducing direct expenses, increasing labor discipline, and lowering compliance costs for businesses.	Assess the public sector's resource needs and do more with less.

Different observers and promoters of NPM have emphasized various aspects of doctrine. Here, Table 1 summarizes seven overlapping concepts that are commonly mentioned in NPM discussions (Hood, 1991).

3. EVOLUTION OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION TO NPM

In the 1920s, some practitioners and academics established the science of public administration based on progressive reform triumphs, including the belief in loyal bureaucrats, honest

politicians, and the separation of politics and administration. These reformers in public administration developed a theory of organization and included management concepts. The following principles were followed: division of work, homogeneity, unity of command, delegation of authority, accountability, span of control, and the staff principle (Minogue, Polidano, & Hulme, 1998). The reformers expected public administrators to accomplish the following responsibilities inside their organizational structures: Planning, Organizing, Staffing, Directing, Coordinating, Reporting and Budgeting: POSDCORB which is, in Luther Gulick's shorthand. Reformers also argued for restructuring to improve efficiency and standardize administrative operations (Arnold, 1995). After World War II, the tenets of classical public administration were reexamined and questioned by scholars. Herbert Simon, a harsh critic, established the framework for neoclassical public administration. According to Simon, the ideas of administration are based on common sense and inconsistent proverbs, rather than science. He proposed establishing public administration based on scientific observation and inductively deduced rules of human behavior (Simon , 1990). Many researchers followed Herbert Simon's path however some scholars opposed the separation of facts and values, believing it would isolate public administration from its roots in political philosophy and the pursuit of the public interest (Sarker, 2006).

In the 1980s most Western nations were forced to concentrate on making the public sector more competitive and public administrators more responsive to citizens by providing value for money, flexibility of choice, and transparency due to change drivers, especially financial pressures. The transition from public administration to new public management involves a shift in the design of public sector organizations, making them more similar to the private sector. Public managers gain more discretionary power over staff, contracts, and money as procedural rules from the center are relaxed (Kalimullah et al., 2012). In the mid-1990s, S. Borins defined New Public Management as a normative approach to public administration providing high-quality services to citizens, increasing autonomy for public managers, rewarding performance, providing necessary human and technological resources, and appreciating virtue (Borins, 1995).

4. GLOBAL APPLICATION OF NPM
Both developing and developed nations face external pressure to align their public administrations with the NPM paradigm (Alam & Nandan, 2004). The implementation of NPM varies among nations due to differences in state ideas and administrative philosophy (Rutgers, 2001).

4.1 NPM in Developed Countries
New Zealand is an extreme example of the NPM restructuring process, where advanced neo-classical economics theory was embraced and applied to a number of conventional public sector duties. In the United Kingdom and Australia, reforms have been implemented gradually. Evidence suggests a deductive use of public choice and agency theory to guide policy and service delivery. Committed political leadership and adherence to OECD guidelines have spurred changes in Australia. In Canada, health reform has been implemented at both federal and state levels. European countries, such as Germany, France, the Netherlands, and Italy, have stronger administrative legal traditions and autonomy compared to Anglo-American systems (Ferlie & Steane, 2002).

4.2 NPM in Developing Countries

Since its beginnings in the US, UK, and other developed nations, the NPM framework has grown in popularity. Many developing nations have adopted and applied the NPM rationale into their administrative systems due to pressure from international donors (Wanyonyi, 2019). Many countries have only implemented a portion of the NPM agenda and not the complete package (Polidano, 1999). Critics argue that while NPM is a popular paradigm in rich countries, it lacks legitimacy in developing countries due to administrative institutions (Akhtar, 2016) . NPM stresses management decentralization, although in developing countries, political decentralization (delegating authority to lower levels of government) is more common. The success of NPM transfers from industrialized to developing countries is determined by aspects like as the macroeconomic environment, transparency in public policy, the availability of personnel and financial resources, and efficient national implementation (Wanyonyi, 2019) (Bhul, 2023).

In general, the NPM agenda often includes privatization and downsizing, sometimes known as retrenchment in Africa. Most developing nations have implemented economic structural adjustment programs, and these measures are frequently the initial step towards public sector reform (Polidano, 1999). While some nations have made significant progress towards privatization, others have remained stagnant. This trend looks to be shifting. However, privatization has yet to significantly impact the public sector's contribution to GDP in developing countries (Ramamurti, 1999).

Developing countries are experimenting with New Public Management approaches. Corporatization, rather than privatization or retrenchment, is the most commonly implemented initiative. This involves converting civil service departments into independent agencies or enterprises, either within or outside the civil service (Polidano, 1999). Jamaica, Singapore, Ghana, and Tanzania are among the nations experimenting with UK-style executive agencies (Brown, 1999). South Africa is likewise taking the same route. Tanzania's initiative closely resembles the UK model, with 12 agencies established in 1996 and an additional 60 candidates in the pipeline. Jamaica is progressing at a slower pace (Polidano, 1999). Corporatization enables organizations to boost pay, hire talented workers, give bonuses for hitting revenue objectives, and self-fund operations (Chand & Moene, 1999). This African variation of NPM has been used in Ghana, Kenya, Malawi, Tanzania, Uganda, and Rwanda, with exports to Pakistan. African countries, such as Ghana, Kenya, Uganda, Zambia, South Africa, Malawi, and Zimbabwe, are corporatizing their health sectors (Russell et al., 1999). Developing countries are still working to establish effective bureaucratic systems (Akhtar, 2016).

4.3 NPM Reforms Initiatives of Nepal

Following the abolition of the feudal system of government in 1951, public administration in Nepal began to develop. A party-free Panchayat System governed Nepal democratically until 1960, and the King presided over it until 1990. The Nepalese public service followed Max Weber's bureaucratic model, which includes merit-based recruitment, a hierarchical structure, a single salary scale, recruitment from outside, employee protection through rules and regulations, disciplinary actions involving a drawn-out process, promotion based on seniority and merit, and a pension plan. As the Nepalese political system transitioned from authoritarian to democratic, the public sector required considerable reforms. Nepal implemented NPM ideas through two major reform initiatives: the "Administrative Reform Commission (1991)" and the "Governance

Reforms Program (2001)". NPM-focused internal adjustments began in the early 1990s, in response to the democratic political system. Changing the state's role in relation to NPM began with reframing its purpose. In 2001, the administration implemented the "Governance Reform Program (GRP)", a completely new set of changes. GRP was established with a soft credit from the Asian Development Bank. ADB's aid requirements called for a reform package that incorporated NPM principles, gender equality, and social inclusion. Reviewing reform efforts after 1990 revealed that many of the improvements were left unimplemented and that very few were really implemented (Bhul, 2023).

The Nepalese bureaucracy's weak policy reform processes, path dependency, political unpredictability, lack of political will, power distance, and lack of citizen-centered work cultures are major barriers to reform (Gautam, 2008).

5. CRITICISM AND LIMITATION OF NPM
Similar to other management systems, NPM draws both acclaim and criticism. Critiques may be broadly divided into four groups: fatalist, hierarchist, individualist, and egalitarian.

Table 2: Critiques of New Public Management (Dunleavy and Hood, 1994)

Fatalist critique	Hierarchist critique
NPM cannot solve core issues in public administration or deliver a free lunch.	NPM has the risk of weakening systemic unity and making the public sector unmanageable.
Remedy	**Remedy**
None, however overselling management system poses a risk of fatalist attacks.	Greater central steering authority, additional consultation requirements, and OCR rather than ACR contracts
Individualist critique	**Egalitarian critique**
NPM may become a poor alternative for completely individualized contract rights.	NPM may promote corruption, benefit personal interests of high officials, and undermine accountability.
Remedy	**Remedy**
Increasing the use of real contracts over quasi contracts and privatization over corporatization.	Increased citizen empowerment, strengthened anti-corruption measures, expanded model employer roles, and stronger contract blacklists.

Table 2 represents the fatalist; individualist; hierarchist; and egalitarian critique which are from cultural theory, where they are used to capture a diverse spectrum of people's attitudes. A fatalist approach to public administration reform assumes that fundamental issues such as human error, system failures, misdirected programs, fraud, corruption, and ill intentions are unavoidable. No management system, including NPM, traditional public administration, or any other, can completely eradicate these issues. NPM is viewed by the individualist criticism as an inadequate compromise between the conventional framework of public administration and a system that is

entirely founded on legally binding agreements and individual liberties. The hierarchist perspective on NPM maintains that reformers must be careful to prevent the change process from becoming unmanageable, which would permanently impair the public service's general manageability. According to an egalitarian perspective, large-scale 'marketizing' changes might raise the danger of corruption in public services. Despite its stated goals, NPM may reduce government transparency, accountability, and accessibility for citizens (Dunleavy & Hood, 1994).

Though, NPM has played important role in restructuring of administration, it has also shown visible limitations in most countries (Lévesque, 2012). Some governments have realized in recent years that not all aspects of NPM have gone as planned (Vries, 2010). The public management reform, especially the new public management, have been heavily criticized for being incompatible with democratic principles. Since public administrators are held responsible for their own performance, politicians are able to evade accountability, leading to a widespread decline in political and democratic accountability (Kalimullah et al., 2012).The limitations of NPM reforms and innovations stem from creative tensions which have gotten less creative over time (Emery & Giauque, 2005). The friction between political (steering) and administrative (rowing) tasks, as well as the separation of bureaucracy into separate, specialized groups have resulted in two types of fragmentation: vertically between politics and administration, and horizontally between diverse and specialized autonomous groups (Van de Walle & Hammerschmid , 2011). The double fragmentation has produced a governance issue that cannot be handled via market regulation. This has resulted in a loss of political influence over strategic service management, creating a regulatory issue (Lévesque, 2012).

A fragmented system was the consequence of the NPM reforms, which placed an emphasis on vertical specialization or structural devolution in addition to the usage of "single-purpose organizations" or horizontal specialization. Post-NPM reforms, which started in the late 1990s and were pioneers of NPM in some nations, emphasized horizontal cooperation through networks, teams, and projects and vertical integration through more robust control mechanisms and greater ability for political executives. (Christensen & Lægreid, 2010). According to Boston et al. (1996), the economic assumptions behind NPM reforms were vague and conflicting regarding public sector organization. Even though NPM promotes transparency in the public sector, it can still lead to corrupt behaviors (Barberis, 1998).

According to Dunleavy et al. (2006), NPMs had completed their duty and the various elements were soon withdrawn. Instead, they consider Digital Era Governance (DEG) as the dominant alternative and describe it with three elements: 1) Reintegration, 2) Need-Based Holism, and 3) Digitization Process. Also, the Public Value Management (PVM) approach offers unique benefits compared to NPM (Indahsari & Raharja, 2020). The PVM delivery system is a different menu selected pragmatistically, whereas the ideal NPM delivery system is the private sector or public body with a clearly defined arm's length. Digital-Era Governance (DEG), Public Value Management (PVM), and Collaborative Governance, generally known as New Public Governance (NPG), provide alternatives to NPM by addressing its faults and promoting alternative conceptualizations (Greve, 2015).

6. CASE STUDIES
 Macinati (2010) carried out the case studies in two public hospitals in the same city in Italy. The hospitals were chosen according to their goals and budgetary functions. This criterion was

created to investigate and evaluate if the different budgetary objectives and roles influenced physicians' opinions and aided in the institutionalization and transformation processes. In particular, Hospital A has put in place a system of financial incentives and a budget-based management performance review for clinical managers, which sets it apart from Hospital B. Budgeting was increasingly recognized as a performance evaluation tool in budget manual of Hospital A whereas as per budget manual of Hospital B, a budget was a tool for planning and controlling hospital activity and a process of allocating resources to prioritized needs. Budgets were therefore seen as "standards for performance" and "used to evaluate managerial performance of clinicians" within Hospital A.

Document analysis revealed that both hospitals followed equivalent organizational structures and formal budget processes. Furthermore, the main players in budgeting had the same roles in each hospital. However, disparities were discovered in the budget's stated functions, particularly in influencing the conduct of clinicians and assessing and rewarding their work in Hospital A whereas planning and controlling hospital affairs in Hospital B. It has been discovered that implementing incentive programs and using a budget to assess performance promote short-term, goal-directed behavior. Hospital A's success provides more insight into how change might take place in both existing institutions and daily clinical procedures. Within Hospital A, clinicians' daily actions were predominantly affected by financial incentives to adhere to the budget.

7. CONCLUSION

One of the dominating paradigm in the field of public administration is NPM. The approach revolutionized public administration by using knowledge and experiences gained in business management and other disciplines to improve efficiency, effectiveness, and general performance of public services in modern bureaucracies. It was a game changer in the way we think about running and working with the institution. By infusing business-like principles into the government, it helped cut through red tape to make services faster and more efficient and often more customer-friendly. It emphasizes on effective innovation in the public sector, including processes, products, services, and delivery systems. It redefined how public services may run by adopting private-sector concepts and applying them creatively in government. The main purpose of NPM is to improve government performance by providing products and services more efficiently. Minimal government, de bureaucratization, decentralization, market-oriented public services, contracting out, privatization, and performance management are associated with NPM. NPM has been revolutionary, but it hasn't been without its problems. It gave greater powers to managers, focused on results rather than processes, and made public institutions more responsive to the needs of their communities.

Though NPM is popular paradigm, fragmentation, challenges to democratic accountability and overemphasis on competition are some limitation. Even though NPM improves transparency in the public sector, it can nonetheless lead to corrupt practices. **It is rather obvious that NPM cannot stand still. The more interconnected and complicated the world becomes, the more public administration will have to change with it.** What public administration needs, above all, is a balance between continuous innovation and adaptation on one hand, and respect for the core principles of public service and accountability on the other. Digital Era Governance (DEG), Public Value Management (PVM),Collaborative Governance, generally known as New Public Governance (NPG) are promising alternative concepts to NPM because as with time NPM approach become inappropriate. This alternative approaches might shape future public sector

reforms by focusing in reintegration, need-based holism and digitization process. Even if NPM set the foundation for a more flexible and results-driven public sector, careful innovation and ongoing adaptation are crucial. Communities need to develop governance models that strike a balance between efficiency and inclusion, ensuring that public administration acts as both a management system and a defender of the public interest.

Data availability statement
No data were generated in this work.

Disclosure of interest
Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

Authors' Contributions
Rabina Pandit served as the corresponding author with key responsibility in drafting, writing, and finalizing the review paper. Shiva Sundar Ghimire provided valuable advice and guidance throughout the manuscript development. Sambriddhi Ghimire and Amita Kandel have significantly helped through additional data collection and complementary writing to improve the quality of the paper.

REFERENCE

Akhtar, S. (2016). Application of new public management in developed vs developing countries.

Alam, M., & Nandan, R. N. (2004). Public sector reform and accounting change in a cultural environment. *ASBBS 7th International Conference* (pp. 53-63). American Society for Business & Behavioural Sciences.

Arnold, P. E. (1995). Reform's Changing Role. *Public Administration Review, 55*(5), 407–417.

Arora, R. K. (2003). New public management: emerging concerns. *Prashasnika, 30*(2).

Barberis, P. (1998). The new public management and a new accountability. *Public administration, 76*(3), 451-470.

Bhul, B. (2023). New Public Management Reform: Implementation Experiences of Developing Countries and Nepal. *Prashasan, 55*(1), 52-70.

Borins, S. (1995). The new public management is here to stay. *Canadian Public Administration, 31*(1), 122-132.

Brown, L. (1999). Institutional structures and capacity-building for policy formulation and implementation. *Restructuring the State: Managing Tensions Between Economic Reform and Social Equity*, (pp. 7-8). Barbados.

Buchanan, J. M. (1978). From private preferences to public philosophy: the development of public choice. In *The economics of politics* (pp. 1-20). The Institute of Economic Affairs.

Connolly, C., & Hyndman, N. (2006). The actual implementation of accruals accounting: Caveats from a case within the UK public sector. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal, 19*(2), 272-290.

Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Agency Theory: An Assessment and Review. *Academy of Management Review, 14*(1), 57-74.

Emery, Y., & Giauque, D. (2005). Paradoxes de la gestion publique. *L'Harmattan*.

Gautam, B. R. (2008). Factors affecting application of new public management oriented reforms for reforming Nepalese public administration.

Horn, M. J. (1995). *The Political Economy of Public Administration: Institutional Choice in the Public Sector.* Cambridge University Press.

Hyndman, N., & McGeough, F. (2008). NPM AND PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE PUBLIC SECTORS IN IRELAND AND THE UK. *Irish Accounting Review, 15*(2).

Kalimullah, N. A., Alam, K. M., & Nour, M. A. (2012). New public management: Emergence and principles. *Bup Journal, 1*(1), 1-22.

Kelly, R. M. (1998). An Inclusive Democratic Polity, Representative Bureaucracies, and the New Public. *Public Administration Review, 58*(3), 201-208.

Lévesque, B. (2012). *Social Innovation and Governance in Public Management Systems: Limits of NPM and search for alternatives?* Montréal, QC, Canada: Crises.

Macinati, M. S. (2010). NPM REFORMS AND THE PERCEPTION OF BUDGET BY HOSPITAL CLINICIANS: LESSONS FROM TWO CASE-STUDIES. *Financial Accountability & Management, 26*(4), 422-442.

Manning, N. (2000). *The new public management and its legacy.* World Bank Discussion Note.

Minogue, M., Polidano, C., & Hulme, D. (Eds.). (1998). *Beyond the New.* Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Mueller, D. (1989). *Public choice III.* Cambridge University Press.

Polidano, C. (1999). *The new public management in developing countries* (Vol. 13). Manchester: Institute for Development Policy and Management, University of Manchester.

Pollitt, C. (1998). (P. G. B, & D. J. Savoie, Eds.) Montreal: McGill-Queen's Press - MQUP.

Pollitt, C., & Bouckaert, G. (2011). *Public Management Reform: A Comparative Analysis- New Public Management, Governance and the Neo-Weberian State* (3rd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rutgers, M. R. (2001). TRADITIONAL FLAVORS? *Administration & Society, 33*(2), 220-244.

Sarker, A. E. (2006). New public management in developing countries. *International Journal of Public Sector Management, 19*(2), 180-203.

Simon , H. (1990). *Reason in human affairs.* Oxford: Stanford University Press.

Van de Walle, S., & Hammerschmid , G. (2011). Coordinating for Cohesion in the Public sector of the future. *COCOPS Working Paper*.

Vigoda, E. (2007). New Public Management. In *Encyclopedia of Public Administration and Public Policy.* New York.

Wanyonyi, A. W. (2019). A Systematic Review of Structure, Culture, and Demography of New Public Management (NPM) in the Developing Countries. *Developing Country Studies, 9*(12), 41-52.