



Social Sciences Indexed

**International**  
**SOCIAL MENTALITY AND**  
**RESEARCHER THINKERS JOURNAL**  
Open Access Refereed E-Journal & Refereed & Indexed  
SMARTjournal (ISSN:2630-631X)



Architecture, Culture, Economics and Administration, Educational Sciences, Engineering, Fine Arts, History, Language, Literature, Pedagogy, Psychology, Religion, Sociology, Tourism and Tourism Management & Other Disciplines in Social Sciences

2019

Vol:5, Issue:26

pp.1796-1805

[www.smartofjournal.com](http://www.smartofjournal.com)

[editorsmartjournal@gmail.com](mailto:editorsmartjournal@gmail.com)

## POST-NEW PUBLIC MANAGEMENT PARADIGM AND ITS EFFECTS ON PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

POST-YENİ KAMU İŞLETMECİLİĞİ PARADİGMASI VE KAMU YÖNETİMİ ÜZERİNE ETKİLERİ

Arş. Gör. Adnan KARATAŞ

Atatürk Üniversitesi, İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi, Kamu Yönetimi Bölümü, Erzurum/TÜRKİYE

ORCID: 0000-0003-2399-8013



Article Arrival Date : 11.11.2019

Article Published Date : 10.12.2019

Article Type : Research Article

Doi Number : <http://dx.doi.org/10.31576/smryj.392>

Reference : Karataş, A. (2019). "Post-New Public Management Paradigm And Its Effects On Public Administration", International Social Mentality and Researcher Thinkers Journal, (Issn:2630-631X) 5(26): 1796-1805

### ÖZET

Geleneksel kamu yönetimi anlayışına bir tepki olarak ortaya çıkan Yeni Kamu İşletmeciliği yaklaşımı, 1980'li yıllardan sonra kamu yönetimi alanında popüler bir yaklaşım haline gelmiştir. Bununla birlikte, 2000'li yıllardan bu yana Yeni Kamu İşletmeciliği ağır eleştirilere maruz kalmaktadır. Günümüz kamu yönetimi alanında farklı yaklaşımların ve reform anlayışlarının birlikte yer aldığı; dolayısıyla "en iyi tek yol" anlayışından ziyade katmanlara ayrılmış, karmaşık, çeşitli, zıtlıkları barındıran ve hibrit bir durumun kamu yönetimi alanının gündeminde olduğu söylenebilir. Kamu yönetimi alanında ortaya çıkan bu paradigma değişimini tanımlamak için "Post-Yeni Kamu İşletmeciliği" (Post-YKİ) kavramı kullanılmaktadır. Post-YKİ kavramı; birbirinden farklı, hatta birbiriyle çelişen ilke, değer, norm ve reform önerilerini hibritleştirmeyi hedefleyen bir tür şemsiye kavramdır. YKİ yaklaşımı, özel sektör mantığı, müşteri bakış açısı, belirgin olmayan koşullar, piyasa ve rekabet anlayışı ve sosyal devlet gibi konulardan en temel eleştirilerini almaktadır. Nitekim Post-YKİ yaklaşımının bu temel eleştiriler üzerinde şekillendiği söylenebilir.

Bu çalışmanın amacı, Post-YKİ yaklaşımının, kamu yönetiminde paradigma değişimi, reform anlayışı ve vatandaşa bakış açısı özelinde değerlendirmesinin yapılmasıdır. Bu amaçla Post-YKİ konusuyla ilgili olarak yapılan akademik çalışmalar incelenerek; Post-YKİ yaklaşımının ilgili konular hakkındaki savları tespit edilmeye çalışılacaktır. Konuyla ilgili akademik çalışmaların sayısının kısıtlı olması sebebiyle, tüm çalışmalara ulaşılmaya çalışılarak; irdelenmek istenilen hususların netlik kazanması sağlanacaktır. Diğer taraftan Post-YKİ'nin reform önerilerinden yola çıkarak; bu politika önerilerini uygulayan ülkelerdeki değişimler değerlendirilecektir. Böylelikle Post-YKİ uygulamalarının evrensel bir iddia taşımadığı yönündeki eleştiriler değerlendirilerek, yeni bir öneri ortaya atılabilecektir. Bu çalışma ulusal literatüre, konuyla ilgilenen araştırmacılara ve kamu yöneticilerine yeni düşünceler oluşturması bakımından önem taşımaktadır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Yeni Kamu İşletmeciliği, Post-Yeni Kamu İşletmeciliği, Kuram Tartışmaları

### ABSTRACT

The New Public Administration approach, which emerged as a reaction to the traditional public administration approach, has become the most popular approach in the field of public administration after the 1980s. However, the New Public Administration has been subject to heavy criticism since the 2000s. In the field of public administration, different approaches and reform approaches take place together; therefore, it can be said that a complex, diverse, contradictory and hybrid situation is on the agenda of the public administration field rather than the "best way" approach. In order to define this paradigm shift in the field of public administration, the concept of post-new public management (Post-NPM) is used. Post-NPM is a kind of umbrella concept that aims to hybridize different, even contradictory principles, values, norms and reform proposals. The main criticism issues of the NPM approach are; private sector logic, customer point of view, unclear

conditions, understanding of market and competition and social state. Actually, it can be said that the Post-NPM approach is based on these basic criticisms.

The aim of this study is to evaluate the Post-NPM approach in terms of paradigm shift in public administration, reform approach and citizen perspective. For this purpose, the academic studies on Post-NPM are examined; the arguments of the post-NPM approach on related issues will be tried to be determined. Due to the limited number of academic studies on the subject, all the studies are tried to be reached; it will be ensured that the issues to be examined are clarified. On the other hand, based on Post-NPM's reform proposals, changes in countries implementing these policy recommendations will be assessed. Thus, by evaluating the criticisms that Post-NPM applications do not carry a universal claim, a new proposal can be put forward. This study is important in terms of creating new ideas for national literature, interested researchers and public administrators.

Key words: New Public Management, Post-New Public Management, Theory Discussions

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

The developments that took place in the political, social and economic fields after the 1980s have made public administration and public services a highly debated field. Especially in the economic field, the change in policies and demands for change in line with the demands of global economic capital are sometimes theoretically and sometimes in practice. As a matter of fact, it can be asserted that these demands for change exist on the basis of theoretical debates in the field of public administration. The change in the expectations of the states with the effects of political, social and economic developments and natural disasters reveals the inadequacy or failure of the public administration mechanism that is expected to meet these demands. Accordingly, new management approaches in the field of public administration are being developed and it is proposed to close these gaps. The New Public Management (NPM) approach, which has become quite dominant in the field of public administration, has been subjected to serious criticism especially in the last 15 years. (Dunleavy, Margetts, Bastow, & Tinkler, 2006). Today, although there are new approaches that bring criticism towards this approach, some of these approaches complete the missing aspect of NPM and some of them aim to be an alternative to NPM. (J. De Vries, 2010). The high number of approaches that emerge with these objectives opens up a new door to the theory discussions in public administration. As a matter of fact, the debates on the criticisms of the NPM today bring new questions about the identity of the public administration discipline. The scenarios regarding the theoretical future of discipline gain importance at this point.

The concept (theory according to some researchers) which can be expressed as Post-New Public Management (Post-NPM) contains the discussions (Christensen, 2012; Christensen & Laegreid, 2008; Zafra-Gomez, Rodriguez Bolivar, & Munoz, 2013) as an umbrella concept (Christensen, 2012) in the current theory discussions. There has yet to be a definite case since there is a serious debate about the definition and limits of the concept (Cavalcante, 2018; Christensen & Laegreid, 2008; Dent, 2005; Jun, 2009). At this point, however, the answers to some questions need to be sought. Where are the Post-NPM discussions in public administration theory debates? Does the Post-NPM approach universally characterize public administration theory? What is the level of institutionalization of Post-NPM as a theory? What is the relationship between NPM and Post-NPM? What is the perspective of Post-NPM on alternative approaches to NPM? What are the similar and different points of Post-NPM with NPM and other approaches? What are the Post-NPM recommendations for public administration? What is the method of the theory in terms of producing and implementing public policy? What is the status of being successful in the field in which country the practices proposed by Post-NPM?

Within the scope of this study, instead of seeking satisfactory answers to all of these questions; How does Post-NPM propose a change in public administration? The literature on the movement of the question was searched and partially answers to other questions could be found in accordance with the obtained information. In this study, firstly the current position of the New Public Management approach and its critics are evaluated. Then, it is tried to determine which theoretical basis these criticisms are made or which theory brings these criticisms. Finally, information about Post-NPM,

which is the basis of the study, is given and its position against NPM and reform proposals are evaluated. Thus, it is aimed to analyze the current situation of Post-NPM discussions.

## **2. NEW PUBLIC MANAGEMENT AND CRITICISMS**

After the 1980s, a strict and bureaucratic understanding of public administration based on hierarchy was replaced; and began to leave a flexible and market-based understanding. As a matter of fact, because it expresses a shift in the traditional sense of public administration; this situation is accepted as a paradigm shift in the field of public administration (Ömürganülşen, 1997, p. 517). James Perry and Kenneth Kraemer's *Public Management: Public and Private Perspectives* (1983) points to the emergence of a new trend that includes the goal of applying private sector management techniques in public institutions. For the first time, the term "New Public Management" is presented by Christopher Hood's *A Public Management for All Seasons* (Hood, 1991). On the other hand, it is accepted that Neo-liberalism and New Right understandings are generally in the emergence of this approach. (Üstüner, 2000, pp. 24-25). With the New Right, especially as seen in Thatcher in England and Reagan in USA; There have been various criticisms about the structure, functioning and service methods of the public sector. These criticisms have had a major impact on the shrinkage of the public sector and the change of management understanding. In the same way, the advocates of neo-liberalism criticized the effect of limiting the growth and freedom of the state and advocating less state and more market conception. (Bilgiç, 2013, pp. 31-32). Purely to get clear information about the reasons and how emergence of NPM understanding and to make the subject understandable; all historical, economic, social and political factors in the emergence of the approach should be taken into consideration. (Willcocks & Harrow, 1992, p. 2). Therefore, it can be said that this new paradigm, which does not arise from a single factor, has many different and even contradictory arguments on many different issues.

It is known that NPM has multiple principles and strategies. The first is the downsizing strategy. According to this principle, which expresses a reduction in volume in public administration, a new management approach should be formed by going to reduce public administrations in cost items, making management efficient and generalizing the liabilities of management (Weikart, 2001, p. 362). In addition, NPM advocates the creation of a new management culture for flexibility, innovation, problem solving, entrepreneurship and productivity. (Galnoor, Rosenbloom, & Yaroni, 1998, p. 394). Another principle advocated by this new approach is to adapt the business management ideology to the public administration. In order to implement private sector production and service applications in public institutions, it proposes to put forward some evaluation elements such as performance management and efficiency understanding (Weikart, 2001, p. 362). Other principles and strategies advocated by his approach can be listed as follows; to transfer entrepreneurial management logic to public administration, to localize, to reduce bureaucracy, to privatize, to transfer authority, to become flexible, to improve human resource management, to utilize information technology and to develop a competitive strategy. (Tortop, İsbir, Aykaç, Yayman, & Özer, 2016, pp. 326-328).

It has been criticized that this new management paradigm has not been able to produce real solutions to the problems of the field over time and has been lacking at various points. The basis of these criticisms is that it is not possible to solve the management problems with economic techniques (Özer, 2005, p. 28). The first criticism of the NPM is from its economic perspective. As a matter of fact, instead of economic efficiency in public administration; individuals or private organizations cannot resolve alone; terrorism and global warming. Therefore, it addresses the wider social sphere and, as in the new understanding of public administration, citizens are considered to be more than customers (Hughes, 1998, p. 12). As a matter of fact, customer understanding will not be appropriate in the provision of all public services. It is argued that customer understanding cannot work especially in providing basic public services and security (Eren, 2001, pp. 215-216). The second major criticism of the NPM approach is that private sector management is not appropriate in public institutions (Tortop et al., 2016, p. 334). As a matter of fact, it is very difficult to set clear, limited, precise, prioritized and stable targets in the provision of public services and public services. It is also very difficult to measure performance in public services and to emphasize profitability in public services (Hughes, 1998, p. 73). It is accepted that the techniques applied by the private sector in the provision of public services are sometimes borrowed. However, the implementation of these techniques without adaptation to the public causes failures and thus serious criticism. Another criticism of the new public management; private sector performance management techniques include the application of organizational behavior and the socio-psychological status of employees. According to these criticisms, which can be conceptualized as New Taylorism, it is argued that Taylor continues to be the NPM in his understanding of what he calls the best way

to do a job (Hughes, 1998, pp. 74-75). Another point of criticism is that the NPM understanding cannot be fully implemented as long as the potential of politicization in public administration continues and this situation continues (Özer, 2005, p. 30). Another criticism is the NPM's inability to implement due to its unique structure of public administration. Although the NPM approach suggests that the understanding of responsibility is dominant and effective in the provision of services; While public servants are responsible, the lack of responsible politicians in this service is contrary to the logic of NPM (Hughes, 1998, p. 77). Another fundamental criticism of the NPM approach; The application of the new techniques and methods introduced by this approach in the public sector cannot be clearly demonstrated (Hughes, 1998, p. 77). The alleged universality of the NPM approach is not valid for all periods and for all public services (Hood, 1991, p. 9). As a matter of fact, this criticism brings with it the criticism that NPM can be a temporary fashion in the field of public administration.

Considering the criticisms of the approach; It is seen that what NPM theoretically advocates cannot actually act together with practice. Accordingly, a number of new approaches have been developed in order to cover the gap both in the theoretical deficiency of NPM approach and inability to fully transform into practice, or as an alternative to NPM.

Before moving on to these approaches, which can be considered as an alternative to NPM, it is useful to look at the main trends, dynamics and fundamental criticisms of public administration along with the NPM approach. In this context, the main trends that constitute the agenda of public administration in the recent period can be listed as follows (Greve, 2010, p. 7):

- ✓ Public administration cannot solve private sector or public institutions alone, rather than economic efficiency in service production and delivery; global warming, migrant smuggling and corruption.
- ✓ Public administration should focus on generating public value that will cover long-term and broad social bases rather than short-term outcomes.
- ✓ Citizens' perspective is not a customer; should be considered as stakeholder in production and service delivery.
- ✓ Beyond an efficient production based on information technologies, a structure that will enable digital age governance should be developed to support transparency, participation and democracy.
- ✓ Accountability needs to be emphasized in order to achieve longer-term results in the public sector.

When the criticisms of NPM, expectations from the public administration approach and the solutions for the problems are taken into consideration; all of these seem to be in a situation that cannot be solved by either the traditional public administration or the NPM. Consequently, new approaches have emerged that try to cover the shortcomings of the NPM approach or claim an alternative and stronger approach to this approach.

### 3. POST-NEW PUBLIC MANAGEMENT APPROACH

Since the 1980s, New Public Management has become the most popular approach and a label in the field of public administration. However, the New Public Management approach has been heavily criticized for more than 15 years. Some researchers accept that NPM is “dead” (J. De Vries, 2010; Dunleavy et al., 2006). As a matter of fact, there is an increasing tendency in recent years that a new approach called Post-New Public Management has emerged. Like New Public Management, Post-New Public Management is an umbrella term used to define and / or describe different reform trends (Christensen, 2012, p. 1; Reiter & Klenk, 2019, p. 11).

There has been a lively debate in the literature regarding the concept of Post-New Public Management. In the national literature, it is seen that studies related to the subject generally go beyond descriptive research and do not contribute to theoretical discussions. However, when the international literature is examined; The theoretical foundations of the subject and the possibility of application are examined in depth (Andersson & Liff, 2012; Christensen, 2012; Christensen & Laegreid, 2007a, 2008, 2011a, 2011b, 2017; Dent, 2005; Jun, 2009; Kinder, 2012; Lodge & Gill, 2011; Reiter & Klenk, 2019). Although the exact meaning of Post-NPM is still controversial today, this new approach usually focuses on coordination improvements, improving the network management capabilities of public managers, and improving the sensitivity, accountability and democratic responsibility of public sector organizations (Christensen & Laegreid, 2007b; Lodge & Gill, 2011).

Considering that even the concept of post-NPM is argued as a theory, it is noteworthy that this concept has much in common with the approaches (Neo-Weberian State, New Public Governance, New Public Service, etc.) that claim the end of the NPM logic (M. De Vries & Nemec, 2013; Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2004).

There are four different arguments as to why post-NPM emerged. First of all, as a change in the structural revolution, the transfer of authority under the control of the central political-administrative authority to regulators, service producing organizations or private institutions has caused criticism in the context of accountability (Christensen & Laegreid, 2008). The second factor in the emergence of this approach is that NPM draws attention to single-purpose, specialized institutions and over-places performance management, ignoring the problems of horizontal coordination and integration (Christensen, 2012). However, performance management mainly focuses on vertical coordination. The principle of “single-purpose organizations” or “stand-alone organizations” with many specialized and non-overlapping roles and functions produces too much fragmentation, lack of cooperation and coordination, and thus the possibility of efficiency and success of public-target achievement occurs. (Christensen, 2012, p. 5). The third factor is the risk of terrorist attacks and global epidemic risks that jeopardize the security of states in the international arena. Increasingly, countries bring about the necessity of more strict control and effectiveness of states due to national disasters and international threats (Christensen, 2012, p. 5). The fourth factor consists of a network of causes constructed on the failures of the NPM approach. Accordingly, although NPM focuses on less bureaucracy, more efficiency and less financial loss; It is seen that the countries that are willing to implement NPM from macro perspective in the world are not in a much better position than other countries (Christensen & Laegreid, 2007a, 2007b). At the micro level, a number of critics are thought to be effective, as there are concerns that NPMs cannot make public services more efficient, cause social inequality, and concern that less cost will lead to less quality (Christensen, 2012).

Many researchers have emphasized that in the case of the organization of public administration, vertical (re) centralization and functional integration in the horizontal dimension are characteristic of Post-NPM. (Andersson & Liff, 2012, pp. 837-838). In fact, the Post-NPM proposals for “re-centralization” and “functional integration” show a stance against NPM's understanding of “vertical specialization” and structural evolution (Christensen & Laegreid, 2011a, p. 408). Although vertical and horizontal administrative (re) integration is well received in the relevant literature, many authors stress that the real implementation of Post-NPM reforms should not be considered as a return to the classical Weberian public administration model (Zafra-Gomez et al., 2013, p. 721). It is accepted that these proposals, which can be seen as coordination improvement efforts for public organizations, are not the tools that Post-NPM can use and provide definitive solutions (Christensen & Laegreid, 2007b, p. 1063). More clearly; Although it attaches importance to coordination, the tools it uses to ensure coordination are considered to be controversial (Reiter & Klenk, 2019, p. 19). Regarding how and how to ensure coordination in public administration, it turns its direction to discussions between politics and administration in public administration.

The Post-NPM criticizes the NPM on the grounds that it considers public officials to be neutral persons who stay away from the political ambitions that serve politicians. As a matter of fact, both politicians and senior public bureaucrats lose control over the field of public administration; It is suggested that there is functional fragmentation and privatization caused by NPM in public services (Althaus & Vakil, 2013, pp. 479-480). At this point, Post-NPM is considered to be an opportunity to re-examine control in the field of public administration (Reiter & Klenk, 2019, p. 19). Post-NPM's recommendations can also be seen as a kind of cultural governance effort. It focuses on a strong and unified sense of values, cultural integration, team building, involvement of private sector organizations, trust, value-based management, cooperation and training and self-development of public officials (Christensen, 2012, p. 4).

#### 4. THE EFFECTS OF POST-NEW PUBLIC MANAGEMENT ON PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

It can be argued that the post-NPM approach has new proposals in the field of public administration and that it has various implications for how public administration should be. As a matter of fact, it cannot be said that these effects have yet to be finalized due to the ongoing theoretical discussions. In order to make these evaluations, the points of Post-NPM which are different from NPM should be determined first. So what is the superior / transcendent side of Post-NPM? It is necessary to continue the evaluations on the question (Christensen & Laegreid, 2017). The post-NPM approach may be regarded by some as part of the substitution process of the theoretical gap in public administration. However, the Post-NPM approach has been replaced by the NPM as traditional public administration; It can be considered as a process that Post-NPM will replace NPM. Today's process can be considered as an environment in which Post-NPM tries to institutionalize (Christensen, 2012, p. 5). Therefore, such a claim, rather than a hybrid theory (Köseoğlu & Sobacı, 2015) in the field of public administration, claims that Post-NPM will become a dominant paradigm based on the assumptions borrowed from alternative approaches to NPM. However, since it is appropriate to evaluate the future of public administration theory in a different context, it is tried not to approach the discussions of public administration theory very much.

In the context of theoretical discussions, the position of Post-NPM versus NPM is not clear. However, some researchers argue that NPM is now coming to an end; (Dunleavy et al., 2006) some researchers argue that this process is a gradual change and that the Post-NPM supports NPM and closes its criticism (Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2004). Therefore, according to this claim, the main purpose of the Post-NPM is to improve new functions to improve the dysfunctional aspects of the NPM, strengthen the management capacity and improve coordination in political-administrative control. The critiques of the post-NPM's main arguments for the NPM approach are as follows (Jun, 2009, p. 162):

- ✓ Role ambiguity and fragmentation as a result of structural change and decentralization in institutions
- ✓ Increasing number of single purpose organizations and vertical specialization
- ✓ Neglecting cooperation between actors
- ✓ Over-management autonomy

Lack of public service interruptions and failure to provide the same type of service

After the main criticisms developed by Post-NPM for the methods and applications of NPM, it is necessary to compare these two approaches on certain issues. It is possible to compare NPM and Post-NPM approaches under the following headings (Lodge & Gill, 2011, p. 146);

- ✓ There are differences in public bureaucracy. Post-NPM is more prone to classical public bureaucracy.
- ✓ NPM advocates being a manager in public institutions with differentiated statuses attached to a manager; Post-NPM argues that there should be managers with equal responsibilities.
- ✓ NPM tries to separate politics and management; Post-NPM advocates the unity of public services in terms of accountability.
- ✓ NPM yöneticilere çok fazla hareket alanı ve takdir yetkisi verirken; Post-NPM'de aynı şekilde takdir yetkisi vermekte fakat ciddi kısıtlamalar dâhilindedir.
- ✓ While NPM gives great importance to the leader; The post-NPM attributes a normal position to the leader.
- ✓ NPM focuses on managerial skills; Post-NPM focuses on technical skills.
- ✓ NPM stands on making a contract; Post-NPM focuses on making partnership.
- ✓ While NPM is promoted based on subjective merit in its management approach; Post-NPM has a legal process based on objective procedures.

- ✓ NPM advocates employee employment with performance-based compensation logic; Post-NPM is finding employment with fixed wages. As a matter of fact, it shares common values with the public service motivation approach.
- ✓ NPM foresees a fixed term duty period for employees and managers; Post-NPM requires a limited duty period.
- ✓ While NPM has an understanding of control through business methods; Post-NPM adopts control by the processing process.

Both the criticisms of Post-NPM and the differentiation of NPM from NPM are discussed above. Considering these criticisms and comparisons and alternative approaches arising from criticisms towards NPM as a whole; It is seen that Post-NPM has various evaluations in the field of public administration. It is possible to find these evaluations under different titles in different studies in the literature. However, they need a certain classification and order. Indeed, the main issue here is not whether I support the NPM approach or whether it is a new theory. The main point to be emphasized here; that the change in the field of public administration does not take place as proposed by the NPM (Çiner & Olgun, 2015, p. 211). Therefore, it is useful to look at Post-NPM's evaluations on public administration to determine the direction of change.

Post-NPM's first and perhaps most striking proposal, instead of NPM's understanding of citizens as customers; As in the New Public Governance approach, citizens need to be a stakeholder involved in the production and management of public services, and moreover, providing public oversight through political processes. Therefore, considering that the citizen has democratic rights, it should be considered that he is more than a customer (Reiter & Klenk, 2019, p. 21). As a matter of fact, it is not possible to see the citizens who are at the basis of the politics that provide public decisions as individuals receiving services. On the other hand, according to the idea of democracy, which is the sine qua non of today's politics starting in the ancient Greek city-states, citizens have more rights and powers than a customer.

Another tendency of Post-NPM is to establish cooperation and partnership. Accordingly, public institutions should develop partnership, cooperation and stakeholder relations in various ways with the private and third sectors (Christensen & Laegreid, 2007b; Fossetol, Breit, Andreassen, & Klemsdal, 2015). Public-private partnerships are also included in the NPM approach. However, Post-NPM's understanding of partnership, as opposed to NPM, lies beyond the provision of privatization to better serve citizens. It also emphasizes the need for greater participation of individuals in political and public decisions by proposing enhanced cooperation with the third sector (NGOs).

Another administrative tendency of Post-NPM is; It advocates the formulation, implementation and control of networks in the production and delivery of public services. (Christensen & Laegreid, 2007b; Lodge & Gill, 2011).

Another tendency is that there should be an integrated approach to public administration. More precisely, it argues that the administrative perspective of the government should be as a whole. (Cavalcante, 2018; Greve, 2010; Lodge & Gill, 2011).

Another tendency of the Post-NPM involves the establishment of a more effective accountability mechanism that can be achieved by more effective use of political and administrative controls by the citizen and the state. It advocates the need for public administration to increase public accountability and sensitivity (Cavalcante, 2018; Dunleavy et al., 2006).

Another tendency in the process of making public policy; expanding social participation channels and supporting community participation in public administration as a source of value and legitimacy (Pierre & Ingraham, 2010).

Another trend of the Post-NPM is the strengthening of coordination and control capacities to ensure consistency and compliance in public services (Lodge & Gill, 2011).

Another trend of the Post-NPM approach is the need for frequent use of E-government and IT and communication technologies to increase transparency in the public sector and ensure access and participation of citizens (Dunleavy et al., 2006).

Finally Post-NPM other tendency to achieve a strong public bureaucracy; professionalization and appreciation of state personnel with a more productive and interdisciplinary bureaucracy that is sensitive to the society (Cavalcante, 2018, pp. 891-892).

## 5. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

The Post-NPM approach, which is argued to emerge as a reaction to the negative and unsatisfactory experiences of the NPM model, which does not meet expectations in terms of economic efficiency and citizen satisfaction, cannot be said to completely separate its connection with the NPM approach. Therefore, the Post-NPM approach can be considered not only as a continuation of the NPM approach, but also as a complement to the critical aspects of NPM. In fact, this approach can be considered as an alternative and opposing approach to NPM (Reiter & Klenk, 2019). While post-NPM is presented as an alternative theory of public administration that differs from what is regarded as the main organizational model in this era of NPM approach, it should not be forgotten that the ideas in the new concept are certainly not always new. This approach always proceeds by borrowing something from previous approaches or discussions. As a matter of fact, a radical and completely new approach to an interdisciplinary discipline such as public administration does not seem to be possible at last.

In the literature, there is no information about who is the actors of Post-NPM. There are empirical examples of implementation of Post-NPM reforms, particularly in the field of health and social services. However, from a general perspective, the spread of this approach to public administration is still limited (Reiter & Klenk, 2019, p. 23).

The overall assessment of the post-NPM includes ideas for (re) centralization and reintegration from an administrative perspective, as well as a serious emphasis on cooperation and coordination. Some studies emphasize the return to the hierarchy; Post-NPM's main goal is not a return to the Weberian bureaucracy. As a matter of fact, this situation is only similar. However, despite all these evaluations and examples from various countries, (Cavalcante, 2018; Klenk & Reiter, 2019; Lodge & Gill, 2011) the use of the Post-NPM approach as a general theory of public administration, although it is of academic interest, still requires further research and development.

## REFERENCES

- Althaus, C., & Vakil, T. (2013). Political transitions: Opportunities to renegotiate the public service bargain. *Canadian Public Administration*, 56(3), 478-490.
- Andersson, T., & Liff, R. (2012). Multiprofessional cooperation and accountability pressures: Consequences of a post-new public management concept in a new public management context. *Public management review*, 14(6), 835-855.
- Bilgiç, V. (2013). Yeni Kamu Yönetimi Anlayışı. In *Kamu Yönetiminde Çağdaş Yaklaşımlar* (Vol. 3). Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.
- Cavalcante, P. (2018). Innovations in the Federal Government During the Post-new Public Management Era. *Revista de Administração Contemporânea*, 22(6), 885-902.
- Christensen, T. (2012). Post-NPM and changing public governance. *Meiji Journal of Political Science and Economics*, 1(1), 1-11.
- Christensen, T., & Laegreid, P. (2007a). NPM and beyond—leadership, culture, and demography. *Stein Rokkan Centre For Social Studies*, 1(1), 1-39.



- Christensen, T., & Laegreid, P. (2007b). The whole-of-government approach to public sector reform. *Public Administration Review*, 67(6), 1059-1066.
- Christensen, T., & Laegreid, P. (2008). NPM and beyond — structure, culture and demography. *International review of administrative sciences*, 74(1), 7-23. doi:10.1177/0020852307085730
- Christensen, T., & Laegreid, P. (2011a). Complexity and hybrid public administration—theoretical and empirical challenges. *Public organization review*, 11(4), 407-423.
- Christensen, T., & Laegreid, P. (2011b). Democracy and administrative policy: contrasting elements of New Public Management (NPM) and post-NPM. *European Political Science Review*, 3(1), 125-146.
- Christensen, T., & Laegreid, P. (2017). *Transcending new public management: The transformation of Public Sector Reform*. Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing.
- Çiner, C. U., & Olgun, B. (2015). Neo-Weberyen Devlet: Yeni Kamu İşletmeciliği Reformları İçin Yeni Bir Tartışma. In *Kamu Yönetiminde Paradigma Arayışları: Yeni Kamu İşletmeciliği ve Ötesi*. Bursa: Dora Yayınları.
- De Vries, J. (2010). Is New Public Management Really Dead? *OECD Journal on Budgeting*, 10(1), 1-5.
- De Vries, M., & Nemec, J. (2013). Public sector reform: an overview of recent literature and research on NPM and alternative paths. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 26(1), 4-16.
- Dent, M. (2005). Post-new public management in public sector hospitals? The UK, Germany and Italy. *Policy & Politics*, 33(4), 623-636.
- Dunleavy, P., Margetts, H., Bastow, S., & Tinkler, J. (2006). New public management is dead—long live digital-era governance. *Journal of public administration research and theory*, 16(3), 467-494.
- Eren, V. (2001). *Yeni Kamu Yönetimi Anlayışı Büyükşehir ve İl Belediyeleri Üzerine Bir Araştırma*. (Doktora Tezi). Sakarya Üniversitesi, Sakarya.
- Fossestol, K., Breit, E., Andreassen, T. A., & Klemsdal, L. (2015). Managing institutional complexity in public sector reform: Hybridization in front-line service organizations. *Public administration*, 93(2), 290-306.
- Galnoor, I., Rosenbloom, D. H., & Yaroni, A. (1998). Creating new public management reforms: Lessons from Israel. *Administration & Society*, 30(4), 393-420.
- Greve, C. (2010). Whatever Happened to New Public Management? Danish Political Science Association Meeting, 4-5 November.
- Hood, C. (1991). A public management for all seasons? *Public administration*, 69(1), 3-19.
- Hughes, O. E. (1998). New public management. In *Public Management and Administration* (pp. 52-80): Springer.
- Jun, J. S. (2009). The Limits of Post: New Public Management and Beyond. *Public Administration Review*, 69(1), 161-165.
- Kinder, T. (2012). Learning, innovating and performance in post-new public management of locally delivered public services. *Public management review*, 14(3), 403-428.
- Klenk, T., & Reiter, R. (2019). Post-New Public Management: reform ideas and their application in the field of social services. 85(1), 3-10.

- Köseoğlu, Ö., & Sobacı, M. S. (2015). Kamu Yönetimi Kuramının Geleceği: Yeni Kamu Yönetiminden Hibritleşmeye Doğru. In Kamu Yönetiminde Paradigma Arayışları: Yeni Kamu İşletmeciliği ve Ötesi. Bursa: Dora Yayınları.
- Lodge, M., & Gill, D. (2011). Toward a new era of administrative reform? The myth of post-NPM in New Zealand. *Governance*, 24(1), 141-166.
- Ömürgönülşen, U. (1997). The emergence of a new approach to the public sector: the new public management. *Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 52(1), 517-566.
- Özer, M. A. (2005). Günümüzün yükselen değeri: Yeni kamu yönetimi. *Sayıştay Dergisi*, 59(10-12), 3-46.
- Perry, J., & Kraemer, K. (1983). *Public Management: Public and Private Perspectives*. California: Mayfield Publishing Company.
- Pierre, J., & Ingraham, P. W. (2010). *Comparative administration change: Lessons learned*. Montreal:: McGill-Queen's Press-MQUP.
- Pollitt, C., & Bouckaert, G. (2004). *Public management reform: A comparative analysis*. USA: Oxford University Press.
- Reiter, R., & Klenk, T. (2019). The manifold meanings of 'post-New Public Management'—a systematic literature review. *International review of administrative sciences*, 85(1), 11-27.
- Tortop, N., İsbir, E. G., Aykaç, B., Yayman, H., & Özer, M. A. (2016). *Yönetim bilimi (Vol. 10)*. Ankara: Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık.
- Üstüner, Y. (2000). Kamu Yönetimi Kuramı ve Kamu İşletmeciliği Okulu. *Amme İdaresi Dergisi*, 33(3), 15-31.
- Weikart, L. A. (2001). The Giuliani administration and the new public management in New York City. *Urban Affairs Review*, 36(3), 359-381.
- Willcocks, L., & Harrow, J. (1992). *Rediscovering public services management*. London: McGraw Hill.
- Zafra-Gomez, J. L., Rodriguez Bolivar, M. P., & Munoz, L. A. (2013). Contrasting new public management (NPM) versus post-NPM through financial performance: A cross-sectional analysis of Spanish local governments. *Administration & Society*, 45(6), 710-747.