

CLASSICAL IDEAS OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION, SIMON'S CHALLENGE, AND THE OUTBREAK OF NEW PUBLIC MANAGEMENT

Kazi Mohammad Mahbobor Rahman¹

Abstract

This research paper aims to explore the question: Why has the New Public Management (NPM) emerged despite the strength of the Classical Public Administration (CPA) theories to explain the administrative science of the modern state? A theoretical and conceptual framework based on Waldo (1955) and Gruening (2001) has been presented in this paper to explore the research question by reviewing the existing literature. This article critically revisits the classical ideas of public administration, honing in on the Weberian ideal type of bureaucracy. It examines the challenges posed by Simon to the earliest ideas of public administration especially the 'ideal type of bureaucracy' compared with other scholars' works and identifies the drawbacks of the classical theories that ultimately led to the outbreak of the New Public Administration (NPA) or the NPM. This research argues that the emergence of the NPM is primarily based on classical public administration theories. Its outbreak was essential to facilitate the cooption of modern state governing instruments and techniques with the challenges arising from the changing circumstances in the modern state that are limited in the existing theories of CPA.

Keywords: Public administration, New public management, Modern state, Bureaucracy

Introduction

Public administration has significantly been transformed into a new stage of administration and management in the last few decades. Although the classical theories of administration have been the basis for shaping new ideas of administration and management, the limitations of traditional public administration theories in analysing new administrative and management issues and challenges have caused the outbreak of NPM. In the contemporary period, the NPM is an art, and it is

¹ Associate Professor of Political Science, University of Dhaka. Email: kazipoliticalscience@du.ac.bd.

getting much attention from the intellectual community and researchers.

Lorenz von Stein, a German professor, who worked in Austria in 1855 is recognized as the founder of the public administration. While, in the United States, Woodrow Wilson is regarded as the father of public administration who wrote ‘The Study of Administration’ in 1887. This publication seeks to investigate the proper and effective functions of government (Wilson 1887, 197), taking into account the cost-efficiency assessment of administration. Wilson’s study of public administration represents a new scientific approach founded on a profound differentiation between politics and administration (Ostrom & Ostrom 1971, 22). In addition to Wilson, several classical intellectuals contributed to enhance the understanding of administration and bureaucracy including Max Weber, Frederick Winslow Taylor, Mary Parker Follett and Chester Barnard. Among these intellectuals, Weber is one of the renowned founders of CPA and his idea of bureaucracy is known as the ‘legal-rational model’ or ‘Weber’s bureaucratic model’ which is according to him “an ideal type of construction” (Weber 1947, 15).

According to Pfiffner (2004, 1) the classical administrative model is greatly indebted to the administrative practices of Germany and the formulation of bureaucratic principles developed by Max Weber. Weber explicated bureaucracy with some principles and the position of the officials. Weber’s principles and Wilson’s idea of efficiency have been critically analysed by several subsequent scholars including Simon, Downs and Parkinson. Finally, this widespread and continuous criticism against CPA led to the outbreak of a new public administration which was later called the NPM.

Therefore, this research initiative systematically reviews the major traditional public administration works, focusing on the Weberian bureaucracy based on Waldo (1955) and Gruening (2001) as a theoretical framework to study the classical ideas of public administration. It studies Simon’s challenges to CPA. Additionally, this research work explores the drawbacks of the traditional administration to coopt with the challenges in modern state administration arising from the new circumstances.

This paper presents a conceptual framework to define administration, public administration, CPA, and the NPM in the first section. In this section, it also offers a theoretical framework based on Waldo (1955) and Gruening (2001). It discusses the CPA theories with a special focus on the Weberian ideal type of bureaucracy in the second section and then it examines the challenges posed by Simon to the

earliest ideas of public administration including the 'ideal type of bureaucracy.' In the fourth section, the paper discusses the drawbacks of the classical theories which lead to the outbreak of the NPA or NPM. Finally, it proposes a new method to improve the CPA.

Theoretical and Conceptual Framework

A common trend among scholars is considering administration as a 'process' (see Simmons 1970). However, some of the Scholars define administration as a "cooperative group behaviour" (Simon et al. 1991, 4). Despite scholars' initiative of defining administration from various perspectives, many of them often are uncomfortable in defining a concrete meaning of the terminology and they think it does not have explicit connotation (see Rutgers 1996). In many ways, administration is almost similar to the notion of management, and they are frequently used as synonyms of each other (see Rutgers 1996) creating an ambiguity in the concept itself. On the other hand, administration can have varied interpretations across different cultures and languages, and it may not directly align with equivalent words and concepts in other linguistic contexts (Rutgers 1996, 14) that deepens its contested use in various linguistic cultural contexts. Therefore, this paper pays attention to conceptualising the notion of 'public administration' along with an explanation of what does it mean when CPA is used, and the notion of NPM tracing it in the major works of the CPA field. Although 'public administration' is related to the idea and growth of 'administration', this paper does not focus on defining 'administration' because of the deeper ambiguity in the concept, rather it begins with the conceptualization of 'public administration.'

The term 'public administration' encompasses all collaborative actions within the executive branches of national, state, and local governments, as well as independent boards, commissions, government corporations, and other specialized agencies established by Congress and state legislatures (Simon et al. 1991, 6-7). Simon and his colleagues (1991, 6-7) define the concept of public administration considering the US context which led to creating a puzzle to understand the administration as a common phenomenon. Luton (1996) wrote a paper titled "What Does It Mean to Say, Public Administration?" Though it is "incomplete," he used to mean by public administration the "management part of government" (Luton 1996, 138). Luton (1996, 138) wrote:

When I am away from the university setting and introduce myself as someone who teaches public administration, the most common response I re-

ceive is, “What’s that?” I have a standard answer ~ the management part of government? but I know that the answer is incomplete, and serves as a sufficient clarification only in a context of superficial conversations.

Additionally, similar to the complexities of defining the idea of ‘administration,’ scholars also face difficulties in explicating the concept of ‘public administration.’ Therefore, Waldo (1955, 55) thinks there is no good definition of ‘public administration’ and his opinion is to define the concept of public administration cautiously. Waldo (1955, 2) states that when it comes to defining public administration, there is a challenge in producing a concise and clear explanation. According to him, one or two-sentence definitions may not fully capture the complexity of the concept and can lead to confusion rather than understanding (Waldo 1955, 2). He argues that this is because a comprehensive definition of public administration often involves abstract language that requires careful consideration (Waldo 1955, 2).

Moreover, the difficulty of describing ‘public administration’ is more clearly identified by Litchfield (1956). Litchfield (1956, 3) argues that the problem of defining the public administration is that “[m]ore is known about the parts of administration than about the totality.” There is very limited explanation of public administration that focuses on all of its features from broader perspectives that is in Litchfield’s (1956) word ‘totality.’ Wald (1973, 366) cites Waldo (1972) and states that “[t]he contemporary public administration paradigm is not only ill-defined in a disciplinary-scientific sense, but, as Waldo (1972, 41) points out, it is also assumed that “public administration will [in the future] be an area of stress, ferment and accelerated change.”

However, Waldo’s (1994) definition can be considered as an initiative to explain it from a comprehensive perspective. Therefore, to overcome the problem of conceptualization of ‘public administration’, this paper considers Waldo’s (1994, 4) idea who defines public administration with two notions from a more comprehensive perspective: (1) “it is the organization and management of men and materials to achieve the purposes of government” and (2) “it is the art and science of management as applied to affairs to state.” However, in defining public administration, it needs to conceptualize it from a broader perspective and specify it as a single phenomenon that is separated from many other ideas of administration. Therefore, Simmons (1970) suggests that the “definition and outer boundaries of public administration demand reexamination.” Similarly, citing Ferlie, Lynn, and Pollitt (2005) and Lynn (2005), Pollitt (2010, 5292) argues that despite intermittent

efforts to redefine public administration as an independent discipline, it continues to be a multi-faceted field. Therefore, a conceptualization of public administration is challenging as the conceptualization of the idea of ‘administration’ that should be treated as a separate entity from broader perspectives.

Despite the basic idea of public administration as it is considered in this paper is primarily based on Waldo (1994), it also considers ‘public administration’ as a specific entity and phenomenon that is separated from the idea of ‘administration’ not as tracing its origin, rather the ‘public administration’ is a distinct phenomenon that has a common structure, process and features irrespective of regions, countries, languages, and culture. The primary feature of the public administration is its process of the scientific management of state affairs by a permanent team of state officers who follow a strong sense of hierarchy and are recruited through a competitive process.

Defining classical public administration may not be a fruitful initiative because of the disagreement among scholars regarding the exact time of the development of this part of the public administration discourses and the theorists who worked during this period. However, the idea of CPA can be introduced better by introducing the theorists and the works in this subfield of public administration. A scholar (Katsamunski, 2012, 74) defines traditional or classical public administration and states that it originated in four scholastic contributions of Wilson (USA), Taylor (USA), Northcote -Trevelyan report (England) and Weber (Germany). Elkatawneh (2013) discusses CPA theories focusing on the contribution of Weber and Taylor to explain the ‘theory of bureaucracy’ and ‘scientific management’ respectively. It is commonly agreed in the existing literature that four schools including F. W. Taylor, Henri Fayol, Luther Gulick and Max Weber consist of the CPA. Nhema (2015) discusses classical theories of public administration focusing on Taylor (1911) and Weber (1947). In a broader sense, one can make a list of six scholars who developed the theories of CPA (see Table 1).

Table 1: The classical public administration scholars

Woodrow Wilson (USA): “The Study of Public Administration” (1887)

Max Weber (Germany): *Essays in Sociology* (first written or published between 1906 to 1924), English translation by H.H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills in 1946.

Frederick Winslow Taylor (USA). *The Principles of Scientific Management* (1911)

Henri Fayol (France): *General and Industrial Administration* (1949), the English translation of the 1916 work *Administration Industrielle Et Générale*

Luther Gulick and Lyndall Urwick (USA): *Papers on the Science of Administration* (1937)

Source: Prepared by the author

However, according to Katsamunska (2012, 74), Weber’s concept of bureaucracy stands as a fundamental aspect of the conventional public administration model. Therefore, this paper primarily focuses on the Weberian model of public administration in discussing classical public administration. It examines the challenges posed by the behavioural schools especially, by Simon (1946).

The origin of the idea of NPM is traced to the theories of the CPA. The concept of the NPM, in many ways, is different from the idea of CPA and public administration. As Luton (1956, 138) found that defining the concept of public administration as the “management of government” is incomplete. Additionally, Stark (2002, 137) states that the understanding of the new public management is a point of contention, as both its proponents and detractors struggle to fully comprehend its defining characteristics and the aspects that set it apart as “new.” NPM can be delineated within the discourse of public administration “as a compromise incorporating Westminster-style public-service anonymity and permanence” while excluding considerations of “merit or neutrality” (Stark 2002, 149). Alternatively, it can be expounded within the framework of “strategic management” as a progression toward amalgamating “the provider role with the payer role and the principal role with the agent role” (Stark 2002, 149). Gruening (2001) explains the idea of NPM focusing on some of its debatable and undebatable features. In his opinion, there are twenty undebatable and six debatable features of the new public management. This paper considers ten of the major indisputable attributes (see Table 2) identified by Gruening (2001) to explain new public management.

Table 2: Major indisputable features of new public management

Reduced budget
Use of vouchers
Ensuring accountability for performance and management
Enhanced privatization
Priority on customers
Decentralized administration and management
Use of strategies in planning and management
Focus on contracting out
Estrangement of politics and administration
Expanded use of information technology

Source: Prepared by the author based on the list of the undebatable and debatable attributes of new public management presented by Gruening (2001, 2)

This paper considers the idea of NPM not as a completely separate entity from the idea of public administration. Rather, it assumes that its origin is traced to the works of CPA theorists. The NPM is an update form of public administration developed based on the classical theories of public administration that uses new tools and techniques of government management administered by a team which follows a sense of hierarchy and is recruited by a competitive process.

To understand the nature of the CPA focusing on the Weberian concept, Simon's challenges to the CPA theories and the origin and rise of the NPM, this paper uses Gruening (2001) ideas and method of exploring the new public management as a phenomenon. Similar to Gruening (2001), this paper considers that a researcher can use various perspectives to unfold the origin of NPM because the rise of the NPM does not reflect the paradigmatic shift in understanding the theories of public administration. Gruening (2001,1) stated that the theoretical roots of NPM can be identified in various theoretical viewpoints. While the specific combination of NPM characteristics is novel, it doesn't signify a paradigm shift (Gruening, 2001, 1). It is unlikely that there will ever be a single paradigm for the behavioral-administrative sciences, and without a widely accepted paradigm, a paradigm shift is not truly feasible (Gruening, 2001, 1).

Additionally, based on *Hypothesis 2* ("Many of the theoretical origins and influences on NPM are not new") offered by Gruening (2001, 18), it can be assumed that the NPM was not originated only in public choice theories or managerialism rather

its origin can be traced in many classical public administration theories developed before the Second World War. The works published at the latest of the end of the Second World War identify the problems of the classical public administration theories to cope with the new circumstances.

Classical Public Administration Theories and the Weberian Legal Rational Model of Bureaucracy

“The Study of Public Administration” is the foundational article written by Woodrow Wilson and published by *Political Science Quarterly* in 1887. In this article, Wilson studied the science of administration focusing on the history of the study of administration and its subject-matter. He underscored the best way of developing this new science- the science of administration. He argues that the administrative government is required due to the increasing complexities of the social circumstances. Wilson’s article underscores the dichotomy of administration and politics and hiring educated and qualified civil servants through competitive examinations who will have extensive power to perform efficiently. His suggestion is to improve constitutional democracy by implementing the administrative method.

Another classical work is *The Principles of Scientific Management* written by Frederick Winslow Taylor published in 1911. This monograph focuses on the scientific management of an organization. The scientific management known as Taylorism is the efficient production process to enhance productivity. To achieve economic efficiency, Taylorism focuses on four principles including the scientific method, job assignment based on the skill of the workers and the division of the workload between managers and their employees.

Henri Fayol is also a classical theorist of public administration. His work *Administration Industrielle Et Générale* (1916) was translated into English in 1949 with an English title *General and Industrial Administration*. In this seminal work, Fayol explains five primary functions of modern management including planning, organizing, commanding, coordinating, and controlling. To enhance productivity, Fayol, the father of modern management, focuses on the fourteen basic principles including division of work, authority, unity of command, unity of direction, collective interest, remuneration, centralization, chain, order, equity, stability of tenure, motivation, and spirit.

Luther Gulick, a classical theorist of administration published *Papers on the Science of Administration* in 1937 as a co-editor with Lyndall Urwick. He wrote

the "Notes on the Theory of Organization" (1937) and "Science, Values and Public Administration" (1937). He prescribes POSDCORB, a theoretical work devised to design an organization of administration and management. The seven principles that Gulick suggests for scientific administration are planning, organising, staffing, directing, coordination, reporting, and budgeting. In summary, all the classical theorists of public administration underscore the scientific administration and management to enhance efficiency and productivity.

According to Pfiffner (2004, 1), the conventional framework of public administration is significantly influenced by Max Weber's explanation of bureaucracy. Weber's famous work, *Essays in Sociology* "containing essays first written or published between 1906 and 1924" (Mitzman 2014) explicates a broad idea of public administration. He explains the principles of bureaucracy (see Table 3) and the position of the officials. He also explicates the causes of the bureaucracy, quantitative and qualitative development of the administrative tasks, technical advances of bureaucratic organizations, the concentration of the means of administration, "the levelling of social differences, the permanent character of the bureaucratic machine" and the rationalization of education and training (Gerth & Mills 1946, 196-244). This legal-rational model of bureaucracy is featured by six principles including the principle of "fixed and official jurisdiction area", "office hierarchy and of graded authority", "written documents", specialized office management, "full working capacity of the official", and office management based on more or less stable and exhaustive general rules (Weber 1946). Schedler and Proeller (2010) summarised the characteristics of the Weberian model of bureaucracy which include: an inflexible order of competency, an integrated hierarchy with accurately defined rights and duties, the distinction between private and official spheres, distinctive qualifications, full-time jobs and precise rules. But, Stillman (2005), argues that it is difficult to summarise the copious ideas developed by Weber, and therefore, he is interested in focusing on the Weberian concept of three ideal types of authority: traditional, charismatic and legal-rational. According to Stillman (2005, 51), the third type of authority, the legal-rational authority "forms the basis for Weber's concept of bureaucracy." This legal authority is defined by Weber (Weber 1947, 15) as a continuous structure of official responsibilities governed by regulations and a designated area of expertise. Accordingly, the principle of hierarchy refers to the notion that each lower office is under the superior office and the officials at the lower rank have the right to petition to the higher authority for their complaints (Weber 1947). According to Pfiffner (2004, 1), Weber stressed the necessity of top-down control systems with clear lines of authority, where decisions and directives

originate from the highest levels and cascade down through a structured chain of command that entails a management framework in which each manager and worker is answerable to a superior within the organizational hierarchy.

Table 3: Principles of Weberian ideal type of bureaucracy

1. Rationality and logic
2. Strong sense of hierarchy
3. Expertise
4. Rules-based decision making
5. Formalization
6. Specialization of labour

Source: Prepared by the author based on Weber (1947).

Weber also discusses the position of the official. According to him, for the above-mentioned principles, two types of positions of the official are perceptible: external and internal. In the Weberian model, office holding is dependent on talent which is determined by special examination, faithful supervision, impersonal and functional loyalty. For this excellent official holding, bureaucrats enjoy high-value social honour which is assured by an established order of precedence. Officials are appointed by the higher authority, especially by political authority who are responsible to the people through election. The public bureaucrats are appointed for a lifetime tenure based on a fixed salary. Officials are also assured of a bureaucratic career promoting them from lower rank to higher rank which also reflects the distinctive position of the Weberian model of bureaucracy.

The Proverbs of Public Administration and Simon's Challenge to the Traditional Public Administration

In response to the ideal type of bureaucracy and the Wilsonian idea of efficiency, several scholars have written valuable critical papers. Herbert Simon is one of them who makes a prodigious assessment of the understanding of the traditional study of public administration. Simon in his *Administrative Behaviour*, “a devastating critique of the field” (Henry 1992, 25) explicated the traditional idea of the administrative principles and argued that there is a deficiency of rational consistency among these principles which he called the Proverbs (see Ostrom & Ostrom 1971). The paper entitled as “the Proverb of Administration” written by Simon (1946) also summarised the existing common principles of public administration. Although his summary is largely based on the argument of the

efficiency established by Woodrow Wilson, the principles he mentioned are very much similar to the principles developed in the Weberian legal-rational model. In analysing the earliest theories of administration, he considers the arguments described by Gulick, Wallace, Beson and Taylor. Simon argues that there is no linear correlation between the efficiency and the principles of the administration especially specialization, hierarchy and limiting the span of control, grouping of the workers discussed in the earlier works.

Simon Critically analyses the four principles of the administration (see Table 4). In his paper, he first analyses the principle of specialization with some instances. He argues the efficiency of administration does not hinge solely on specialization; instead, specialization emerges as an intrinsic and inescapable attribute of all collective endeavors, regardless of the efficiency or inefficiency of that effort (Simon 1946, 151).

Table 4: Simon’s critical analysis of the four principles of administration
<div><div>1. Specialization does not lead to efficiency in administration; it is a required feature.</div><div>2. The unity of command contrasts with specialization because different experts make different decisions.</div><div>3. The space of control contradicts the specialization and the unity of command due to the production of red tapism.</div><div>4. Organization of purposes is inconsistent with the principle of specialization that leads to a trade-off in the organization of process.</div></div>

Source: Prepared by the author based on Simon (1946)

Similarly, he critically explains the principle of the unity of command. According to him, this principle disagrees with the principle of specialization because the decisions of the organization are taken by different experts. According to him, the utilization of authority allows for a higher level of expertise to be attained in decision-making, which would not be achievable if every worker had to make all the decisions on which their work is based (Simon 1946, 152). Also, the span of control which Simon (1946, 153) calls “the third incontrovertible principle” leads the contradiction to other two principles: the unity of command and the specialization. Presenting an alternative proposal for a small health department, he explains how this principle is producing excessive red tapism and weak control over employees. According to him, the fourth principle: organization by purpose,

process, clientele and places is also “internally inconsistent” with the principle of specialization. He explains how the advantages of the organization of purposes lead to a trade-off in the organization of the process. According to Simon, the discussion of the traditional public administration based on efficiency and principles lacks a comprehensive theoretical framework and empirical data and he identifies this situation as an impasse of administrative theory.

Simon explains a two-step approach to administrative theory building which includes the description of issues necessary for the administrative situation and the criteria to weigh these issues. Simon underscores the operationalization of the conceptual framework for this new approach. According to Simon (1946, 160), the initial studies in public administration primarily focused on conceptualizing authority, control, centralization, and activity without giving sufficient attention to operational definitions of these terms. Since the discussion of the administrative organization is limited to the functions and the formal structure of the authority, Simon (1946) is interested in another type of organizational influence including the system of communication. Simon’s approach to the study of public administration should define the concept of efficiency rather than the principle considering the determinants of efficiency including skills, values and knowledge. Simon’s second step towards the new approach of administrative discussion is to set a complete and wide-ranging list of criteria to assess the administrative organization. In this regard, public administration theories must also be concerned about the weights of these criteria. To this end, he is also interested in considering Taylor’s idea of technological conditions of efficiency.

Drawbacks of Classical Public Administration and the Emergence of New Public Administration or Management

Similar to Simon’s critical analysis, from the very beginning of the study of administration especially after the publication of Wilson’s paper, the scholars critically assessed the theories and models of CPA that finally led to the emergence of the new public administration or management. All the classical scholars are criticised by successive scholars from different angles. Finally, based on the suggestions as the feedback of the criticisms, a new road to the emergence of the NPM was inevitable. Scholars critically assessed the idea of efficiency, politics-administrative dichotomy, principles of bureaucracy especially hierarchy and the span of control, effectiveness, budgeting and administrative techniques. For example, Waldo in his book, *The Administrative State* (1948), rejected the classical idea of the politics-administrative dichotomy (see Overeem 2012). Dahl argued

that the advancement of general principles of administration was impeded by the conflicts of values vying for dominance within organizations, the variations in individual personalities, and the differing social frameworks across various cultures (see Dahl cited by Henry 1992, 26). Waldo (1948) disagreed with the idea of incontrovertible principles of administration because of the discrepancies of approach used in defining them, and the limited focus on "the values of economy and efficiency" that heavily influenced the field's "thinking" (see Waldo 1948 cited by Henry 1992, 26). According to Henry, the most challenging assessment of the principles came from Simon (1946), which has already been discussed in the earlier section of this paper. Schedler and Proeller (2010, 14) criticised Weber's legal-rational model and according to them, this model "with the focus on the points listed above is reaching its limits in today's increasingly dynamic environment [...] The stability which Weberian bureaucracy deliberately aimed to achieve and preserve has lost its significance for the equality of administration." They also added that the formal control mechanism of the legal-rational model has been replaced by Taylorism, which is now altered by the concept of the representation of public administration.

Proposal to Improve the Classical Public Administration

Along with Simon's proposal, scholars from different corners provide the guidelines to overcome the drawbacks of classical public administration. At the very beginning, Goodnow and White (1900) suggested for politics-administration dichotomy (see Henry 1992), Taylor (1911) focused on the principles of scientific management (see Stillman 2005) which "emphasized tight control of work processes and careful planning by managers" (Pfiffner 2004, 2). Gulick and Urwick (1937) proposed seven principles as POSTCORB (Henry 1992). Simon (1947) recommended for "more human process of decision making" (Henry 1992, 27) focusing on some vocabulary building. Frederickson (1971, 368) extensively criticised the initiatives of the previous architects and according to him, the previous scholars were attentive to building a new public administration creating some new vocabularies and consequently, "there is little that is really new in so-called new thinking." Henry (1992, 27) argued that "[b]y mid-century the two defining pillars of public administration- the politics/administration dichotomy and the principles of administration- had been abandoned by creative intellects in the field." Simon's understanding of public administration as the "pure science" was criticised by the following intellectuals, and they proposed to understand the theories of public administration from a political science perspective (Henry 1992). From 1950 to 1970, scholars tried to define the bureaucracy as a 'government bureaucracy',

and they studied public administration from a comparative perspective which was initiated by Riggs (see Henry 1992). Frederickson started to build a new public administration focusing on the idea of 'social equity' instead of the classical focus on the "efficient, economical and coordinated management [...] top level management" (Frederickson 1971). In contrast to the 'policy-administration dichotomy', Frederickson's New Public Administration underscored the involvement of the administrators in both policy making and policy execution concerning good management and social equity. Regarding hierarchy, he advocated for a modified hierarchical system and proposed for 'project or matrix technique' or group-decision-making model'. Another radical initiative to improve public administration was introduced by Ostrom (1973) who advocated for a democratic administrative paradigm characterises "diverse-decision making centres, 'popular participation', and 'fragmented, overlapping, decentralized authority'" (Stillman 2005, 23) which is the reverse of the Wilson-Weber paradigm that includes "single centred administration, hierarchical structures and sharp separation of politics and administration" (Stillman 2005, 23). At the end of the century, reinventions highlighted the entrepreneurial spirit, the communarians on the community and citizenship, the VPI refounders on the theoretical rebuilding of the whole field, interpretivists on subjective and intersubjective relations (Stillman 2005).

However, in a recent work, Schedler and Proeller (2010) criticising the classical public administration provide a comprehensive guideline to improve it. According to them, public administration should be changed in the following directions:

1. From the administrative apparatus to the service provider,
2. From the implementer of political decisions to the field of policy-making;
3. And finally, a change from a pattern of regulation to the market completion.

The above directions have already been followed in shaping the public administration approach and theories that suggest a shift in public administration that is called NPM or post-NPM. Thus, NPM has emerged from the CPA and facilitate both academics and researchers to understand the public administrative and management processes more accurately in the context of the contemporary circumstances. This outbreak of the NPM also facilitate the state and non-state administrators and managers to provide service to the customers efficiently and effectively that increase the satisfaction of the service receivers or customers in the new context of the modern state evolution in the 20th century.

Conclusion

“The bureaucratic model of administration...is increasingly revealing itself as weak and dysfunctional in today's changed environment” (Schedler & Proeller 2010, 24).

After a century of the Wilson-Weberian paradigm, the initiative to improve the theories and models of public administration has been continuing. However, no initiative (except a very few) completely ignores the importance of Wilsonian efficiency or Weberian legal-rational models especially hierarchy or legal-rational authority. Most of the debate centred on how more efficiency or effectiveness can be achieved or how the Weberian principles can be employed with flexibility. Due to the greater change in governmental and non-governmental functions, the Wilsonian-Weberian paradigm is not dysfunctional but it is still trying to adapt to the changing circumstances for greater efficiency and democratic participation. The initiatives of the scholars are really to this end. Nevertheless, there is still an anxiety in addressing the accountability and efficiency that sharply show the distinction between the CPA and the NPM (Pfiffner 2004, 8). Weber addressed this tension focusing on the hierarchical control in the bureaucracy, Wilson on the politics-administration dichotomy and Taylor on the strict management control. Although currently, the public administration is underscoring governance and privatization with a more focus on the outcome rather than the process (Kalimullah et.al 2012) to address all the issues including accountability and efficiency from a holistic approach, it is not an absolute resolution to address all the problems of the CPA in the eyes of the NPM and the post-NPM. The theories and approaches developed as the NPM and the post-NPM needs to be carefully checked to explain the governmental and non-governmental administration and management in the modern state developed since the 21st century contexts of technological advancement and democratic crisis. Hence, it needs to be rechecked the utility of the CPA approaches and theories to be used along with the NPM approaches and theories to understand the modern administration and management growing in the contexts of the 21st century.

References

- Elkatawneh, H. (2013). Classical Theories of Public Administration. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 1-8. DOI: 10.2139/ssrn.2248449.
- Fayol, H. (1949). *General and Industrial Administration*. Translated by Coubrough, J. A. London: Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons.
- Frederickson, G. (1971). Toward a New Public Administration. In Frank E. Marini (Ed.), *Toward a*

- New Public Administration: The Minnowbrook Perspective* (pp.315-327). Scranton: Chandler Publishing Company.
- Gerth H. H. & Mills C. W. (1946). *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. New York: Oxford University Press. Accessed February 12, 2015. <https://archive.org/details/frommaxweberessa00webe>.
- Gruening, G. (2001). Origin and Theoretical basis of New Public Management. *International Public Management Journal*, 4(1), 1-25.
- Gulick, L. and Urwick, L. (1937). *Papers on the Science of Administration*. New York: Institute of Public Administration.
- Henry, N. (1992). *Public Administration and Public Affairs*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Kalimullah, N. A., Alam, K. M. A. & Nour, M. M. A. (2012). New Public Management: Emergence and Principles. *BUP JOURNAL*, 1 (1), 1-22.
- Katsamunsk, P. (2012). Classical and Modern Approaches to Public Administration. *Economic Alternatives* 1, 74-81.
- Litchfield, E. H. (1956). Notes on a General Theory of Administration. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 1 (1), 3–29. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2390838>.
- Luton, L. S. (1996). What Does It Mean to Say, ‘Public’ Administration? *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, 18 (1), 138–46.
- Mitzman, A. (2014). Max Weber: German Sociologist. *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Accessed February 12, 2015. <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/638565/Max-Weber/7815/Works>.
- Nhema, A. G. (2015). Relevance of Classical Management Theories to Modern Public Administration: A Review. *Journal of Public Administration and Governance*, 5 (3), 165-179. Doi:10.5296/jpag.v5i3.8337.
- Ostrom, V. & Ostrom, E. (1971). Public Choice: A Different Approach to the Study of Public Administration. *Public Administration Review*, 31(2), 203-216.
- Ostrom, V. (1973). *The Intellectual Crisis in American Public Administration*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.
- Overeem, P. (2012). *The Politics-Administration Dichotomy: Towards a Constitutional Perspective*. New York: CRC Press.
- Pfiffner, J. P. (2004). Traditional Public Administration versus The New Public Management: Accountability versus Efficiency. In Benz, A., Siedentopf, H. & Sommermann, K.P. (Eds.) *Institutionenbildung in Regierung und Verwaltung: Festschrift für Klaus König* (pp. 443-454). Berlin: Duncker & Humboldt.
- Pollitt, C. (2010). Envisioning Public Administration as a Scholarly Field in 2020. *Public Administration Review*, 70, S292–94.
- Rutgers, M. R. (1996). The Meaning of Administration: Translating Across Boundaries. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 5(1), 14-20. <https://doi.org/10.1177/105649269651005>
- Schedler K. & Isabella P. (2010). *Outcome-Oriented Public Administration: A Responsibility-Based Approach to the New Public Management*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, Inc.
- Simmons, R. H. (1970). Public Administration: The Enigma of Definition. *Social Science*, 45 (4), 202–07.
- Simon, H. A. (1946, reprinted 1992). The Proverbs of Administration. In Shafritz J. M. and Hyde, A.

- C. (Eds), *Classics of Public Administration* (pp. 150-163). Pacific Grove: CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.
- Simon, H. A., Thompson, V.A. & Smithburg, D. W. (1991). *Public Administration*. New Jersey: Transactions Publishers.
- Stark, A. (2002). What Is the New Public Management? *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, J-PART, 12 (1), 137–151.
- Stillman, R. J. (2005). *Public Administration: Concepts and Cases*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Taylor, F. W. (1911). *Principles of Scientific Management*. New York and London: Harper & Brothers.
- Wald, E. (1973). Toward a Paradigm of Future Public Administration. *Public Administration Review*, 33(4), 366–72.
- Waldo, D. (1955). *The Study of Public Administration*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company Inc.
- Waldo, D. (1994). What is Public Administration? In Rosenbloom, D. H., Goldman, D. D. & Ingraham, P. W. (Eds.), *Contemporary Public Administration*, (pp. 3-15). New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Waldo, D. (1948). *The Administrative State: A Study of the Political Theory of American Public Administration*. New York: Roland Press Company.
- Weber, M. (1946, reprinted 1992). Bureaucracy. In Shafritz, J. M. & Hyde, A. C. (Eds.), *Classics of Public Administration* (pp.51-56). Pacific Grove, Calif.: Brooks/Cole.
- Weber, M. (1947, reprinted 1994). The Essentials of Bureaucratic Organization: An Ideal Type of Construction. In Rosenbloom, D. H., Goldman, D. D. and Ingraham, P.W. (Eds.), *Contemporary Public Administration* (pp. 15-22). New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Wilson, W. (1887). The Study of Administration. *Political Science Quarterly*, 2 (2), 197-222.

