

THE JOURNEY OF NEW PUBLIC MANAGEMENT: AN ANALYSIS

Jannatul Ferdous

ABSTRACT

In the arena of public administration theory and practice New Public Management (NPM) method has been the leading paradigm. New Public Management (NPM) identifies the lacking's and failures of performance of public sector over time and the difficulties lying directly in the nature and procedures of traditional public administration and the of activities public sectors. This NPM offers the technique of restructuring of the bodies of the public sector to get there management methods nearer to business approaches. This paper, based on an overall assessment of literature such as pertinent journals, articles, books and newspapers, efforts to recognize the beginning, viewpoints and disparagements of NPM in observation of its theoretical structures.

Keywords: NPM, public administration, public sector, business methods

Introduction

'New Public Management' is currently a fairly dated tag. It was continuously a difficult and far from a constant set of thoughts, and from the first perceiving of the development it was frequently derided as a beneficial ideal for developing nations to track. The contradictory mix of thought and interest that encircled the NPM consideration in the 1980s and first 1990s gave approach to a more attentive skepticism in the late 1990s about its comprehensive applicability. Perhaps, doubt has currently secured. It is definitely familiar for weary specialists and development organization staff to continue that there is little in the NPM procedural mixture that is suitable for the politicized public segments in many developing states (Manning, 2001).

The characteristics of the traditional model of public administration can be expressed as an organization under the proper control of political leadership, centered on a severely hierarchical model of bureaucracy, operated by permanent and neutral official staff, inspired simply by public interest serving any government in the same way and they are only managing policies decided by the politicians only but not backing to policy. At all times, the term public administration denotes the study of the public segment management, as well as being a profession and an action. It is an unfortunate matter that, to express the study of public sector, there is an abundance of words. Public administration, public management and public policy are all the terms mentioning basically the same object, which is how are the organizational parts of administration, planned process facts and output products are laws, policies or services and goods. There are diverse opinions on the priority of all these terms (Hughes, 1994). The impact of NPM has had a widespread influence on how public facilities are structured and delivered aimed at (Lapsley, 2009). The detachment concerning the public authority and the delivery rises as the administration of the facilities is stimulated to a distinct organization outward to the realm of the public authority in many cases. This is for instance the case when the delivery of a public service is privatized such as put out for tender, or shifted to a corporation. It is irrespective of is the possessor of the business is public, private or mixed in nature. In general the public authority remains the prime and farthest liability for the facility and therefore has to benign the role of the service. More, when the accountability of the delivery is given to an external organization raises questions concerning how to protect liability and values of public sector along with level of service quality (Mattisson & Thomasson; 2014).

The administrative values relate three different clusters of values for example, one cluster of values gives priority to efficiency, another prioritizes trustworthiness and equality and the last one contributes importantly to the forcefulness and adepts of systems. Centered on the model of organizational influences Hood and Jackson determine that NPM as a fact of understanding of organizational design in a regime that is not entirely requiring in matters and a reasonable person might reject NPM on the grounds of honesty and justice, such as, it should offer primacy over the values of efficient task performance (Barzelay, 2001). On the other hand, NPM is an administrative philosophy concerning organizational design in government. An administrative philosophy is a chunk of a structure that envisioned to elucidate the management agenda and authoritative decisions in a given place and phase. Therefore, the notion of organizational viewpoint is a tool of political and historical analysis. The acceptance of NPM is an affair which recognized an environment of view in favor of its various doctrines. Both concepts refer to an established of doctrinal influences in spite of managerial effects suggest these arguments share similar types of justifications. Therefore, with the intention of modification in structural strategy management need to incorporate a satisfying analysis of process of doctrinal change (Kalimullah & Khan, 2011).

The Development Of Administrative Thought

In the 1920s, Public administration was on the essentials of the advanced restructuring achievements, predominantly the assumption of a trustworthy public servant, truthful political figure, and the politics-administration contradiction. These activists, the novel scientists of public administration, constructed a theory of an organization that they complemented with the notion of management. These ideologies were: the standard of unity of command, the source of division of work and specialism, the norm of equality, the source of Hierarchy regarding the delegation of authority, the opinion of span of control, the control standard and the standard of accountability (Minogue et al. 1998). The activist's likely public executives, functioning within organizational arrangements constructed on these philosophies, to implement the succeeding tasks are expressed by Luther Gulick's which short

form is POSDCORB and elaborated form is Planning, Organizing, Staffing, Directing, Coordinating, Reporting And Budgeting (Gulick, 1937). The activists as well supported restructuring to rationalize and combine administrations and to systematize administrative measures (Lee, 1995; Henry, 1975; Arnold, 1995). Academics initiated to reevaluate and query the philosophies of classical public administration later Second World War. Some of the utmost severe critics were Herbert Simon, whose effort fixed the appeal and way for the public administration of neoclassic. His thesis, titled "Administrative Behavior: A Study of Decision-Making in Administrative Organization", confined the catchphrases of the age: decisions, behavior, and organization. Simon believed that the philosophies of management are not scientific, however unreliable proverbs that were perceived from practicality (Simon, 1983). Simon's thoughts meaningfully inclined a crowd of scholars who assumed readings of behavior and choices in managerial organizations and shaped a new, more exact research methodology and terminology. This neoclassical public administration followed the collective tendencies of behaviorism, organizational functionalism, and systems theory, and working the theoretical foundations of well-being economics and the theory of decision. Yet, administrative reformers persistent to follow during this time the Reformists' principles and classical theory. However, regrettably the execution of the classical principles distressed with severe deficiencies (Gruening, 2001).

Therefore, whereas public administration in neoclassical looked to change its principles and practice, exercise constant to depend on the philosophies of the classics and on the organizational criticisms of the Reformists (Lynn, 1996; Kramer, 1987). Therefore, promoters of the neoclassical method reformed themselves to the philosophies and organizations of classical public administration and accepted them on, refining the methodical foundation for performance dimension, inspecting, planning, and the justification of influences and administrations. However the importation of the neoclassical public administration lost its suitability. Therefore, the field of public administration involved a classical track of believed, a neoclassical track of believed, and an assemblage of politically focused scholars at the end of the 1960s. Still, these separated sets did share one communal doctrine: the Liberal idea of a vigorous state and trust in objective understanding. However, other scholars were generating new styles that extremely asked this elementary trust of public-administration academics (Gruening, 2001).

Public Choice Theory And Principle

The chief of these opponent methods was public-choice theory. This method constructs on the notion that entities chase their individual objectives and act permitting to their inclinations. It adopts a diverse thought of prudence than Simon did. Since the public-choice viewpoint, rationality is not bounded linked with a theoretical best; fairly, rational behavior is while a person deeds to track his or her objectives giving to his or her understanding of the condition. Public-choice theorists reasonably improve models to describe social sensations from an agreed of traditions about entities' goals and their evidence about their circumstances (Gruening, 2001). Public choice theorists commonly contend that the greatest consequence will include a determined role for market services and a minor role in management. They debate there is a considerable form of indication that private markets are well than government or political markets, even if this opinion is constantly philosophical, and not a maxim of the theory itself. If the government role in providing things and facilities could be condensed, the economy all together would help. Besides, Markets are urged to have well instruments for accountability as contrasting to a bureaucracy accountable to not any one of the theorists of public choice. These assessments, establish a governmental reaction (Hughes, 2003). Markets do not effort better than bureaucracy in all conditions. It might be claimed that the supposition of specific judiciousness is also comprehensive and ignores any altruistic or philanthropic behaviour by government employees. The vital consequence of public choice theory is the implied enquiring of the drives of government employees in some circumstances. The principal and agent of economic theory have as well been useful to the publicly owned sector, particularly regarding its accountability. The theory was advanced for the private sector to describe the difference regularly initiate between the objectives of chiefs in private organizations and stakeholders. How the welfares of agents and principals differ and are to be apportioned with has assumed intensification to a widespread literature allocating with matters of accountability and their belongings on administrations. The 'new institutional economics' theories, principally principal/ agent theory and public choice theory, shared with a philosophical preference for market keys among many economists, have delivered some intelligent consistency to reducing the public service, along with the reorganization its administration. Besides, numerous public administration principles - promotion by seniority, the terms and conditions of public employment, the theory of bureaucracy, lifetime employment and traditional accountability - have been faced for being grounded on poor theory and as long as insufficient inducements for worthy presentation (Kalimullah et al., 2012).

THE BEGINNING OF NEW PUBLIC MANAGEMENT (NPM)

Public Administration has not ever been static as a field of study. Reasonably, from time to time it has to amend its frontiers. Public administration has to restyle in the previous few years, its viewpoint and the public administration has been switched by the term "management". However, this refinement is supposed to have limited the attention, in actual fact it has stemmed into an addition of the arena. What is frequently overlooked is that by replacing "administration" by dint of "management", through actually intensifying the traditional frontier of organizational apparatus by permitting it to have more interfaces with the private segment. This continuous interface with the private segment is introducing ideas like "managerialism", "contracting out", or "value for money" within the public segment and the consequence is the affecting away from the traditional attention of public administration, viz., organizations and actions of the public organizations. Currently, public administration is on the edge of a journey the framed of simple 'public'-ness and is allowing its presence sensed in the private segment. Therefore, the ambiguous perception of 'the running out of public administration', is actually the reawakening of the arena.

Since 1948 until about 1970, the State was extensively apparent as the essential appliance of socioeconomic progress, and actual administration was regarded as the key instrument in the construction and execution of advancement strategies and programmes. Simultaneously, insufficiencies in the organization and administration appliances at very levels of government were eminent as key difficulties to advancement in accomplishing national objectives. It was throughout this era, generally in the 1950s, that many emerging states added freedom from imperialism and looked upon the again liberated State as the key vehicle for

conveying the assistances of political and financial autonomy of their individuals. In several circumstances, States contained socialist group. Development of public administration apparatus and personnel was assumed as the State expected and faster expansion jobs, concentrating on attaining outcomes, but not on lessening associated costs and consequently attaining proficiency. Though, unsatisfactory outcomes in the execution of strategic events were progressively accepted and often ascribed to inadequate or unsuitable organizational provisions. In reaction, such practices as administrative restructuring, training programmes, monitoring and information systems and programme assessment were assumed to construct and reinforce the capability of public administration. These developments were frequently assumed with the practical help and backing of international development agencies and bilateral donors. It was assumed that developed administrative proficiency of the State apparatus would be an imperative backing factor in expansion procedures, within a central arrangement context and industrial expansion policies. This was obvious in the growing function of government and the rational that a society could yield on an inclusive method to difficulties of national progress and deal with them in a logical way simply through the State tool (UN, 2008). However, restricted to the OECD states merely, a new idea advanced which tried to swap the Progressive Public Administration (PPA) over the '80s. It essentially confronted the traditional principles of "public responsibility and public administration" (Khan, 2009).

The PPA had twofold elementary principles-distinctive public segment of the private domain and presenting "... an intricate arrangement of practical directions" to checked political and administrative decision. The New Public Management (NPM) program comes into the theoretical ground of public administration as per an adapted form of the Progressive Public Administration. It stressed on reviewing these two elementary principles-first, eliminating or decreasing the modification concerning public and private organization and second, emphasizing effect-based accountability fairly than procedure's responsibility (Hood, 1995). Principally partial by financial theories and corporate sector's organizational structure, the NPM movement advocated for-a dispersed organization arrangement through carrying a conclusion to hierarchy; inserting private segment, management practices and the worth of rivalry in the public segment; economizing and confirming appropriate use of possessions in situation of distributing service; presenting an assessable performance management scheme and a change to an active administration (Pollitt, 1995; Kernaghan, 2000).

NEW PUBLIC MANAGEMENT (NPM) - AS A CONCEPT

Grounded on the rising isolation of citizens, the in-actual performance of bureaucracy, and the rising stresses for an actual variation in action and, public policy NPM prospered.

The key hypothesis in the NPM-restructuring tendency is that more market direction in the public segment will direct to better cost-efficiency for governments, without having adverse side effects on other aims and deliberations (Ferdousi, & Qiu, 2013). This is an ethical domination of financial standards and subservience to them of several other conventionally valid standards and principles like wider political apprehensions, area strategy objectives, proficient skill, several privileges and guidelines and the welfares of social sets (Boston et al. 1996, Egeberg, 1997).

NPM is basically an awareness of general management since it discusses that all management aspects similar contests and therefore must be moving toward in comparable ways, not distinguished conferring to the type of arrangement or job. The fresh ideal of public governance tasks the traditional concepts of the inhabitant and the welfare state, the citizen as a customer, and remarking the welfare state as a market-centered distribution system (Christensen & Læg Reid, 2011).

CHARACTERISTICS OF NEW PUBLIC MANAGEMENT (NPM)

NPM as a contemporary watchword terms how management performs from the private segment are currently being functional in the public service area (Lane, 2000). The organization with traditional model and provision of public facilities, grounded on the policies of bureaucratic hierarchy, centralism, direct control, planning, and self-reliance is being substituted by a market-centered public service organization (Walsh, 1995). The vital features of NPM (Pollitt, 1994) are given below:

1. A transference in the emphasis of management arrangements and exertions from inputs and procedures on the way into productions and results.
2. A move in the direction of more dimension and magnitude, especially in the procedure of arrangements of 'performance signs' and/or clear 'principles'.
3. More common distribution of market-type instruments for the public service delivery.
4. Inclination of lean/flat, independent organizational forms and decentralization.
5. Favoring contract-like relations in place of hierarchical relations.
6. Customer and concentration on quality
7. Distorting the margins between the segments of private, public and non-profit.
8. Value based: preferring individuality and competence instead of parity and diversity.

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION VS NEW PUBLIC MANAGEMENT (NPM)

Public administration is the management and organization of men and resources to attain the determination of the regime. Its vital notion is the supporting sensible act. It is focused on the manner of public matters, the organization of the community's business and the execution of public procedures. The organization of communal programs is acknowledged for instance public administration. It is the expression of interpreting politics into realism that inhabitants see on a daily basis (Kalimullah et al., 2012). The sorts of this interfering state were obviously started out by Max Weber with solid resonances from other intellectuals. Rule-centered management, career system, impersonality, meritocracy, hierarchy and division of labor are the important features of the arrangement of Policy administration dichotomy (Peters, 1996). It is discussed by Caiden that, "Entirely responsible the unmoving influence of bureaucracy, particularly the meager performance of public bureaucracies and the day-to-day exasperations of tedious limitations, unfriendly officials, poor service, cumbrous red-tape, and corrupt performances" (Hughes,

2003). The traditional administrative ideal has been in severe disparagements for its incapability to distribute things and facilities to the people. The fresh method, specifically NPM arose to swap the traditional ideal of public management. Public administration, for instance a procedure, exists in of the activities encompassed in producing the committed or need of an administration and public policy. Therefore, it is the incessant vigorous business portion of administration, which is focused on executing the regulation as prepared by legislative organizations and inferred by courts, by the procedure of management and organization. Public administration in the widest sense, represents the effort included in the genuine behavior of governmental matters, irrespective of the specific branch of government concerned. It means in its narrowest sense, the acts of simply the executive branch.

NPM is entirely diverse in many means from Traditional model of public administration. Traditional model of public administration in the entire world is unable to take understanding of certain vigorous forces of the environment despite its remarkable demand. Consequently, NPM appeared in answer to numerous environmental forces which administrations the world over have confronted in the previous twenty years (Sarker & Pathak, 2000).

Table 1: Traditional Public Administration (TPA) vs New Public Management (NPM)

Sl. No.	Features	TPA	NPM
1	STATE ORGANIZATION	Facility delivered on an identical source functioning as a sole accumulated entity	Interference of traditional arrangements into quasi-autonomous entities
2	REGULATION OF STATE ORGANIZATIONS	Regulation through the hierarchy of continuous management	Discovers expert organization with the vibrant announcement of objective and presentation extent
3	REGULATION TO OUTPUT EXTENT	Regulation on inputs and processes	Pressure on outcomes and production regulation instead of processes
4	MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCES	Traditional standard events all over the service	Utilizing private segment style of management
5	FOLLOW DISCIPLINE IN MEANS UTILIZATION	Due procedure and political powers	Check means request and 'organize big with a small amount'

Source: Kalimullah et al., 2012; Islam, 2015.

CRITICAL AREAS OF NEW PUBLIC MANAGEMENT

The major critical issues of the reorganizations of public management, predominantly those of the new public management, remains that they are contrary to the principles of democracy. It is contended by certain that democracy necessitates bureaucracy. Democracy necessitates the rule of law, the legitimately authorized rule of markets, the protection of impartiality, and capable bureaucracies matter to regulate by order and by judicial organizations. Weber observed an arrangement of bureaucratic regulation in the contemporary state as inevitable. Democracy and Bureaucracy correspond and to deviate from the bureaucracy is to demand to arrange a fresh system of government completely. This is an immense assertion. It could be demanded that there is a widespread lessening in political responsibility, therefore in democratic answerability, as public executives are themselves answerable for outcomes, thereby permitting politicians to evade answerability (Kalimullah et al., 2012).

The public segment restructuring may decrease political answerability; if the administrator is to be more answerable, then the politician is axiomatic to be less answerable and public answerability may be concentrated through narrowing or other methods in which a purpose is provided by the private segment so there is no longer state envelopment. It might be contended that consequences are not consistently dispersed, that fairness contemplations are of slight apprehension in the reform procedure. It would require to be demonstrated that 'sensitivity, impartiality, demonstration and the rule of law' are several less appreciated than under old-style bureaucracy. It might be maintained that all that is being fixed onward is being more absorbed on how money is being paid and making unquestionable that anticipated outcomes are attained. Additionally, there would be no aim that programmes intended as being more reasonable would not be capable to be achieved by the NPM philosophies. In another way, feasibly it is the programme instead of its administration that improves reasonable consequences. There is a decrease in the scale and the possibility by of government. Though it might be demanded that cuts in government track from democratic stresses for lesser taxation, it is probable that the greater scale and the possibility of government consequences of political difficulties as uttered by democratic worth. It might be viewed as inequitable if the possibility of politics - by single standard classification, the art of the potential - is concentrated to thinner acceptable extents of Dissertation (Hughes, 2003).

NPM may be assessed for not undertaking adequate to inspire and combine the notion of teamwork or organization amongst inhabitants and the public segment and for inadequate to put on these subjects to modern administrative philosophy (Vigoda & Golembiewski, 2001). Contrasting TPA, the NPM movement emphasizes on countries as cultured clients in multifarious environments. The philosophies of NPM are well-matched with theories of political economy for instance regulative policy by administrations or the policy of shifting tasks from the government segment of the private and third segments. These philosophies, and the administrative policies originating from them, commonly encounter several societal democratic philosophies, standards, and beliefs in America, Britain, and many other Western consensuses. Public establishments were insisted to treat the community sound, not simply because of their assumed organizational answerability for eminence functioning, but as well, owing to their responsibility to marketplace directions and to financial stresses and in particular owing to their fear of dropping customers in a progressively reasonable businesslike ground. Actually, whereas NPM is a development over more classic opinions of public administration that precept inhabitants as subjects or electorates, it ensures not go far adequate into the development of the notion of dynamic teamwork amongst governments, citizens, and the public segment, which is in the spirit of autonomous civil society (Vigoda, 2002).

Henceforth, current progresses in the study of NPM have concentrated on the accountabilities of administrations and public organizations in their interface with the populations, but correspondingly have compensated far less devotion to the vigorous roles of inhabitants and to their responsibilities to the community. Best of the current NPM literature favors immense communalization of business administration performs in the public segment to deliver administrations with well apparatuses for policy execution. However, conversely, these directions and performs have not so far been assimilated with added essential concept of well consensuses—sincere teamwork and organization with populations grounded on equivalent prospects for involvement and huge participation in running communal life more efficiently. This deficiency of stress on the impression of organization and teamwork, in support of good receptive administration, may be thought an error in current NPM theory (Vigoda, 2003).

Conclusion

The culmination of the twentieth century has seen an uprising in public administration that is each moment at the turn of the nineteenth century as considerate as that which happened, once Weberian bureaucratic philosophies instigated to affect many administrations round the world. Together in developing and developed states, the NPM principle was projected as a suitable answer heading for constructing the public segment administration more effective, operative and receptive. Numerous events, for instance small administration, proficient organization, production alignment, performance-centered answerability arrangement, performance events, deliberate planning, contracting out, privatization, accrual accounting, quality administration, output planning, contract service and accordingly onward have been recommended for refining the performance of the public segment in both developing and developed states (Islam, 2015). NPM is a fresh model of public management that sets onward a different association between administrations, the public facility and the community. There have been variations in the public segment and reorganizations of an unparalleled kind. The public administration of traditional model has been swapped by a novel model of public management for a diversity of causes. The alteration to NPM contains far more than simple public service reorganization. It denotes variations to the means that public services work, variations in the room for governmental movement, variations in time-honored procedures of answerability and variations to the theoretical study of the public segment. The key transformation is one of theory, adequate; it is contended, to find a fresh paradigm. The procedure of administrative reform is not, however comprehensive; the broader things about it on, not simply the public sector, though the entire political system, still has some way to travel. The thoughts are soundly seen in theory and have concerned the provision of the administrations in most developed states. The variations shaped by NPM are nowadays possibly irreparable.

References

- Arnold, P. E. (1995). *Reform's changing role*. Public Administration Review, 407-417.
- Barzelay, M. (2001). *The new public management: Improving research and policy dialogue* (Vol. 3). Univ of California Press.
- Boston, J., Martin, J., Pallot, J., & Walsh, P. (1996). *Public management: the New Zealand model*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- Egeberg, M. (1997). Verdier i statsstyre og noen organisatoriske implikasjoner. I T. Christensen og M. Egeberg (red.) Forvaltningskunnskap. Oslo: Tano Aschehoug.
- Ferdousi, F., & Qiu, L. (2013). New public management in Bangladesh: Policy and reality. *iBusiness*, 5(03), 150.
- Gruening, G. (2001). Origin and theoretical basis of New Public Management. *International public management journal*, 4(1), 1-25.
- Gulick, L. (1937). Notes on the theory of organization. In Gulick, L. & Urwick, L. Papers on the science of administration (pp. 1-45). New York: Columbia University.
- Guy, P. B. (1996). *The future of governing: Four emerging models*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.
- Henry, N. (1975). Paradigms of public administration. *Public Administration Review*, 378-386.
- Hood, C. (1995). The "New Public Management" in the 1980s: variations on a theme. *Accounting, organizations and society*, 20(2), 93-109.
- Hughes, O. (1994). *Public Management and Administration*. New York: St Martin's Press.
- Hughes, O. E. (2003). *Public Management and Administration*. London: Macmillan.
- Islam, F. (2015). New Public Management (NPM): A dominating paradigm in public sectors. *African Journal of Political Science and International Relations*, 9(4), 141-152.
- Kalimullah, N. A. and Khan, S. M. N. H. (2011). New Public Management in Developing Countries: How far is it applicable in Bangladesh?. *Bangladesh Journal of Administration and Management*, Vol. 14.
- Kalimullah, N. A., Ashraf, K. M., & Ashaduzzaman, M. N. (2012). New public management: Emergence and principles. *Bup Journal*, 1(1), 1-22.
- Kernaghan, K. (2000). The post-bureaucratic organization and public service values. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 66(1), 91-104.
- Khan, M. M. (2009). *From government to governance: Expanding the horizon of public administration to public management*. University Press.
- Lapsley, I. (2009). New public management: The cruellest invention of the human spirit? 1. *Abacus*, 45(1), 1-21.
- Lee, E. W. Y. (1995). Political science, public administration, and the rise of the American administrative state. *Public Administration Review*, 538-546.
- Lane, J. E. (2002). *New public management: an introduction*. Routledge.
- Lynn, L. E. (1996). *Public management as art, science, and profession*. Chatham, NJ: Chatham House Publishers.

- Manning, N. (2001). The legacy of new public management in developing countries. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 67(2), 297-312.
- Mattisson, O., & Thomasson, A. (2014). The corporatization process: An owner perspective. *Public Policy and Administration Review*, 2(2), 43-58.
- Minogue, M., Polidano, C., & Hulme, D. (Eds.) (1998). *Beyond the new public management: changing ideas and practices in governance*. Edward Elgar Pub.
- Pollitt, C. (1994). Modernizing the Management of the Public Services Sector: Between Crusade and Catastrophe?. *Administrative Development Agency (November, Helsinki)*.
- Pollitt, C. (1995). Justification by works or by faith? Evaluating the new public management. *Evaluation*, 1(2), 133-154.
- Simon Herbert, A. (1983). *Reason in human affairs*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sarker, A. E. (2000). *New public management: an analytical review*. Department of Management and Public Administration, University of the South Pacific.
- Vigoda, E., & Golembiewski, R. T. (2001). Citizenship Behavior and the Spirit of New Managerialism A Theoretical Framework and Challenge for Governance. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 31(3), 273-295.
- Vigoda, E. (2002). From responsiveness to collaboration: Governance, citizens, and the next generation of public administration. *Public administration review*, 62(5), 527-540.
- Walsh, K. (1995). *Public services and market mechanisms: competition, contracting and the new public management*. Macmillan.

Jannatul Ferdous
Lecturer, Department of Public Administration,
Comilla University, Bangladesh
Email: jannat.lata@yahoo.com