

New Public Management (NPS) and Collaborative Public Management (CPM): Novel and Noble Concepts in Public Administration

Dr. Kazi S. M. Khasrul Alam Quddusi*

Abstract: In the broader context of governance intervention, humane governance, joined-up government, whole-of-government, democratic citizenship, empowered community, engaged citizens, organizational humanism, interpretive as well as critical analysis of bureaucracy and organizations, the diction shows a clear centripetal tendency towards a discourse that increasingly associates itself with a convergence that places citizens at the centre and their interests at the top. Discourse theory and postmodernism stressing the need for enhanced public dialogue reinforce the position of citizen central in the whole scheme of things. This paper is an attempt to furnish a review of recent and relevant developments in the field of governance and public administration with major emphasis on New Public Service (NPS) and Collaborative Public Management (CPM), which advocate citizenship and collaboration and reinforce the public in public administration for upholding citizens rights and ensuring better services.

The Overview

New Public Management (NPM) no doubt ruled the world for a period of time and some of its pro-efficiency connotations are no doubt noteworthy and deserve attention in their own rights. However, inherent contradictions of centralization and devolution, that is, centralizing tendencies inherent in contractualism (from economic organization theory) and the devolution tendencies of managerialism (from management theory) struck at the root to weaken its base (Christensen and Lægreid 2004, 13).

This philosophy also increasingly transformed the basic nature of State from one of rationally-based State based on parliamentary chain of governing to one of supermarket model thus turning the state into a mere service providing entity. This constantly nibbled at the core values of democracy and governance. However, NPM lost much of its vigor before taking its roots in the developing world. Even if it is there in some measure, its contextualization remains a big challenge if it is put through a cultural compatibility test (Brunsson and Olsen 1993).

* Associate Professor and Ex-Chair, Department of Public Administration, University of Chittagong, Bangladesh. Email: k khasru@gmail.com

'Joined-up Government' made a foray into the domain of NPM hegemony with its emphasis on collaboration and government's increased role in getting other sectors of the society involved. In fact, 'Joined-up Government' philosophy came as a response to the weakness of traditional public administration and fragmentation of NPM reforms. It stressed the need for more collaboration and coherence between the government and the other sectors (especially, NGOs).

Whole-of-Government (WG) approach surfaced to present a real challenge to NPM with its holistic motto (Christensen and Lægread 2007). Though WG approach does not represent a philosophical distinction like NPM insofar as coherent sets of ideas and tools are concerned, it is more an umbrella term incorporating a group of responses putting real emphasis on a strong and unified sense of values, trust, value-based management, collaboration and team-building (Ling 2002). WG approach also echoed a call to reestablish the 'common ethics' and a 'cohesive culture' values to offset the corroding values of loyalty and trust in the public domain (Norman 1995).

However, the much-needed intellectual response to NPM emanated from Denhardt and Denhardt (2000)'s through their groundbreaking stance for democratic citizenship over the concept of customer coupled with exit policies of the State. Their criticism of NPM -- for its proclivity towards being workplace values in addition to being techniques -- deserves to be discussed and analyzed in its proper perspective.

Denhardt and Denhardt's (2000) New Public Service (NPS), the flag bearer of citizenship, is based on a constellation of theories and values such as democratic citizenship, models of community and civil society, organizational humanism and discourse theory. NPS places a sledgehammer argument for the State to accept if it intends to put interests of the common citizens above the interests of a few or the privileged few. For the very existence as well as eminence as a sovereign entity, the State has to look into the well-being of the people, especially the needy.

Collaborative Public Management (CPM) appeared with a vision that sets high priorities on collaboration and network as these have become basic requirements to remain attuned to the societal changes in the society and to face up to the intractable challenges such as poverty, health care and natural disasters and so on. For negotiating these problems more efficiently and effectively, a more flexible, more adaptable, more inclusive and more agile administrative setting is required where public

managers will be required to cut across their governmental, organizational and sectoral boundaries (McGuire 2006). In the collaborative setting, a networked web of public and private actors is a *sine qua non*.

Old Public Administration: Basic Tenets

Before embarking on a comparison, it is worthwhile to ruminate over the traits of Old Public Administration. Though, there is not a single set of ideas agreed to by all concerned, there are elements of public administration theory and practice that constitute a guiding set of ideas or a normative model that we now generally associate with the old public administration. Denhardt and Denhardt (2000, 551-52) compile the tenets as follows:

- Public administration is politically neutral, valuing the idea of neutral competence.
- The focus of government is the direct delivery of services. The best organizational structure is a centralized bureaucracy.
- Programs are implemented through top-down control mechanisms, limiting discretion as much as possible.
- Bureaucracies seek to be closed systems to the extent possible, thus limiting citizen involvement.
- Efficiency and rationality are the most important values in public organizations.
- Public administrators do not play a central role in policy making and governance; rather, they are charged with the efficient implementation of public objectives.
- The job of public administrators is described by Gulick's POSDCORB (1937, 13).

New Public Service (NPS): Citizenship at its heart

In response to revolutionary thinking in the public management, public administrators were advised to "steer rather than row," and to be the entrepreneurs of a new, leaner, and increasingly privatized government (Denhardt and Denhardt 2000, 549). As a result, a number of highly positive changes were implemented in the public sector (Osborne and Gaebler 1992). However, in the rush to steer, the issue of ownership of government got subsided. In *Government Is Us* (1998), King and Stivers rightly reminded by the following conviction, The government belongs to

its citizens (Box 1998) where the message is pretty evident that public administrators should focus on their responsibility to serve and empower citizens with citizens at the heart of governmental scheme of things.

Table 1 Comparing Perspectives: Old Public Administration, NPM and NPS

	Old Public Administration	New Public Management (NPM)	New Public Service (NPS)
Primary theoretical and epistemological foundations	Political theory, social and political commentary augmented by naive social science	Economic theory, more sophisticated dialogue based on positivist social science	Democratic theory, varied approaches to knowledge including positive, interpretive, critical, and postmodern
Prevailing rationality and associated models of human behavior	Synoptic rationality, "administrative man"	Technical and economic rationality, "economic man," or the self-interested decision market	Strategic rationality, multiple tests of rationality (political, economic, organizational)
Conception of the public interest	Politically defined and expressed in law	Represents the aggregation of individual interests	Result of a dialogue about shared values
To whom are public servants responsive?	Clients and constituents	Customers	Citizens
Role of government	Rowing (designing and implementing policies focusing on a single, politically defined objective)	Steering (acting as a catalyst to unleash market forces)	Serving (negotiating and brokering interests among citizens and community groups, creating shared values)
Mechanisms for achieving policy objectives	Administering programs through existing government agencies	Creating mechanisms and incentive structures to achieve policy objectives through private and nonprofit agencies	Building coalitions of public, nonprofit, and private agencies to meet mutually agreed upon needs
Approach to accountability	Hierarchical—administrators are responsible to democratically elected political leaders	Market-driven—the accumulation of self-interests will result in outcomes desired by broad groups of citizens (or customers)	Multifaceted—public servants must attend to law, community values, political norms, professional standards, and citizen interests
Administrative discretion	Limited discretion allowed to administrative officials	Wide latitude to meet entrepreneurial goals	Discretion needed but constrained and accountable
Assumed organizational structure	Bureaucratic organizations marked by top-down authority within agencies or control or regulations of clients	Decentralized public organizations with primary control remaining within the agency	Collaborative structures with leadership shared internally and externally
Assumed motivational basis of public servants and administrators	Pay and benefits; civil service protections	Entrepreneurial spirit, ideological desire to reduce size of government	Public service, desire to contribute to society.

Source: Denhardt and Denhardt 2000, 554

Denhardt and Denhardt (2000) rightly remark that the New Public Management is not just the implementation of new techniques; it carries with it a new set of values, specifically a set of values largely drawn from the private sector. There is a long-standing tradition in public administration supporting the idea that "government should be run like a business." And, this recommendation calls for government agencies to adopt practices, ranging from "scientific management" to "total quality management," that have been found useful in the private sector. However, the crux of the issue is that the NPM takes this idea one step further, arguing that government should not only adopt the techniques of business administration, but should adopt certain business values, too. The blueprint is to become a normative model for public administration and public management.

However, as Denhardt and Denhardt (2000) assert, in making their case, proponents of NPM have often used the old public administration as a foil, against which the principles of entrepreneurship come out as clearly superior. For example, Osborne and Gaebler (1992) contrast their principles with an alternative of formal bureaucracies plagued with excessive rules, bound by rigid budgeting and personnel systems, and pre-occupied with control. These traditional bureaucracies are described as ignoring citizens, shunning innovation, and serving their own needs.

As stated above, proponents of the NPM have developed their arguments largely through contrasts with the old public administration and, in this comparison; the NPM is a sure winner. However, the better contrast should be with the "New Public Service," a movement built on work in democratic citizenship, community and civil society, and organizational humanism and discourse theory and the core of the New Public Service is that the primary role of the public servant is to help citizens articulate and meet their shared interests rather than to attempt to control or steer society (Denhardt and Denhardt 2000).

The New Public Service can lay claim to an impressive intellectual heritage, including, in public administration, the work of Dwight Waldo (1948), and in political theory, the work of Sheldon Wolin (1960). However, Denhardt and Denhardt (2000) focus on more contemporary precursors of the New Public Service, including (1) theories of democratic citizenship; (2) models of community and civil society; and (3) organizational humanism and discourse theory.

New Public Service: Seven Tenets

There are similarities that distinguish the cluster of ideas of the New Public Service from those associated with the New Public Management and the old public administration (Denhardt and Denhardt 2000). Moreover, there are a number of practical lessons that the New Public Service suggests for those in public administration. These lessons are not mutually exclusive, rather they are mutually reinforcing. Among these, the following are most compelling (Denhardt and Denhardt 2000, 553-57):

1. Serve, rather than steer: The role of the public servant is to help citizens articulate and meet their shared interests, rather than to attempt to control or steer society in new manners. Government will act, in concert with private and nonprofit groups and organizations, to seek solutions to the problems that communities face. In addition to playing more than a service delivery role, public officials will play a conciliating, a mediating, or even an adjudicating role.

2. The public interest is the aim, not the by-product: Public administrators must contribute to building a collective, shared notion of the public interest. The goal is not to find quick solutions driven by individual choices. Rather, it is the creation of shared interests and shared responsibility. Rather than simply responding to disparate voices by forming a compromise, public administrators will engage citizens with one another so that they come to understand each other's interests and adopt a longer range and broader sense of community and societal interests.

3. Think strategically, act democratically: Policies and programs meeting public needs can be most effectively and responsibly achieved through collective efforts and collaborative processes. Through involvement in programs of civic education and by developing a broad range of civic leaders, government will stimulate a renewed sense of civic pride and civic responsibility. Such a sense of pride and responsibility is to evolve into a greater willingness to be involved at many levels, as all parties work together to create opportunities for participation, collaboration, and community.

4. Serve citizens, not customers: The public interest results from a dialogue about shared values, rather than the aggregation of individual self-interests. Therefore, public servants will not only respond to the demands of "customers," but focus on building relationships of trust and

collaboration with and among citizens. In the public sector, it is problematic to even determine who the customer is, because government serves more than just the immediate client. Government will not discriminate between the ones with and without greater resources and skill in its treatment.

5. Accountability isn't simple: Public servants should be attentive to more than the market; they should also attend to statutory and constitutional law, community values, political norms, professional standards, and citizen interests. Public administrators should be influenced by and held accountable to complex constellations of institutions and standards, including the public interest, statutory and constitutional law, other agencies, other levels of government, the media, professional standards, community values and standards, situational factors, democratic norms, and of course, citizens.

6. Value people, not just productivity: Public organizations and the networks in which they participate are more likely to succeed in the long run if they are operated through processes of collaboration and shared leadership based on respect for all people. If public servants are expected to treat citizens with respect, they must be treated with respect by those who manage public agencies. Shared leadership, collaboration, and empowerment will become the norm both inside and outside the organization.

7. Value citizenship and public service above entrepreneurship: The public interest is better advanced by public servants and citizens committed to making meaningful contributions to society rather than by entrepreneurial managers acting as if public money were their own. Public administrators must not only share power, work through people, and broker solutions, they must reconceptualize their role in the governance process as responsible participant, not entrepreneur. If required, public officials will take risk and if dialogue and citizen engagement is ongoing, opportunities and potential risks can be explored in a timely manner.

Collaborative Public Management (CPM): Collaboration as its core

Two perspectives can be attributed to the newness and prominence of collaborative public management in governance. One perspective argues that societal change is a primary determinant of collaborative public management. It implies that the nascent information age calls for permeable structures in which people can link across organizational

functions and boundaries just as the hierarchical organization emerged during the agricultural age and bureaucracy dominated the industrial age (McGuire 2006).

Another perspective claims that the types of problems that government faces today cannot be addressed effectively through traditional bureaucracies. Solving apparently intractable problems such as poverty, health care, and natural disasters requires mechanisms that are more flexible, more inclusive, and more adaptable and operate with greater speed (Alter and Hage 1993) than those of conventional government organizations. These problems - often referred to as "wicked problems" - have no clear solutions, only temporary and imperfect resolutions (Harmon and Mayer 1986).

In fact, policies dealing with such complex issues will increasingly require collaborative structures for execution (O'Toole 1997). Collaborative structures may be needed in problem areas in which the public concurrently prefers more government action and less government involvement. With the contemporary increase of government's speed, the tendency of citizens to expect greater choice of services administered through less traditional government activities has also increased (Goldsmith and Eggers 2004). And, according to these arguments, collaborative public management is emergent (McGuire 2006).

Collaborative Structures

Collaborative public management takes place in various settings (Alter and Hage 1993), both in a vertical context through levels of government and in a horizontal context in which an array of public and private actors are mobilized. It also involves the distinct operations of managing upward, downward, and outward toward the networked environment (O'Toole, Meier, and Nicholson-Crotty 2005). A public manager may be simultaneously involved in managing across governmental boundaries, across organizational and sectoral boundaries, and through formal contractual obligations and sometimes it becomes difficult to distinguish where the boundary lies between these different environments (McGuire 2006).

Four types of collaborative contexts are usually seen in the governmental arena (McGuire 2006). They are: Intermittent coordination; Temporary task force; Permanent or regular coordination: Coalitions and network structures. In general, a network is a structure that involves multiple nodes - agencies and organizations - with multiple linkages. In a network

structure, there is a strong commitment to multi-organizational level goals, and resource sharing is risky and extensive. Coalitions disband after the task is completed or the problem is solved, but networks have a long, even indefinite life span because the problems they address are either long term or become redefined as the network evolves (McGuire 2006).

Not all network structures are, however, alike. Agranoff (2003) demonstrates in his study of 12 networks in various policy areas that four different types of networks can be delineated by the scope of activities undertaken within the network (McGuire 2006):

Informational networks: These involve multiple stakeholders who come together for the sole purposes of exchanging information and exploring solutions to a problem or set of problems. Any action that is taken occurs within the member agencies' home organizations.

Developmental networks: These involve information exchange combined with education that enhances the member organizations' ability to implement solutions, again at the individual organization level rather than at the network level.

Outreach networks: These not only exchange information and improve the administrative capacity of the network members but also "carve out programming strategies for clients (for example, funding packages, usable technologies) that are carried out elsewhere, usually by the partner organizations" (Agranoff 2003, 11). Although action strategies are developed in the network, action does not occur at the network level.

Action networks: It is the most extensive type of network. Unlike the other three types, action networks engage in collective action by formally adopting network-level courses of action and often delivering services.

Clearly, there is no one best way to organize for collaboration, and public managers need to give careful consideration to the decisions associated with organizing collaborative activities (Imperial 2005). Smaller, flatter structures such as networks may be best in one situation, whereas a simple partnership between two actors may be best in another. Researchers should also take great care when examining collaboration and labeling the structures. Networks are the stated unit of analysis in much of the recent empirical research, but the term is used, sometimes incorrectly, to describe many different collaborative configurations when task force or partnership would be a more accurate characterization (McGuire 2006).

CPM: Unique Skills for Collaboration

A clear distinction between hierarchies and collaborative management is not always accurate. Instead of a completely flat, self-organizing network, the presence of a lead organization, acting as system controller or facilitator, is often a critical element of effectiveness in collaborative management. Such a network administrative organization can reduce the complexity of self-governance and enhance the legitimacy of a network. The larger the network, the more difficult it is to delineate tasks, and the fewer the available network skills, the more likely that centralized forms of network governance will be adopted (Provan and Kenis 2005).

Collaborative organizations are "organizations composed of other organizations" that perform a variety of more traditional functions by institutionalizing rules, procedures, and processes into a coordinative organizational structure (McGuire 2006). Agranoff and McGuire (2001a, 2001b; McGuire 2002) distinguish collaborative management behaviors in terms of their operational differences and organize the behaviors into four different categories, activation, framing, mobilizing, and synthesizing.

Activation: It is the identification and incorporation of the right people and resources needed to achieve program goals. The right people for the effort are those who possess the policy-making resources -- finances, knowledge, information, expertise, experience, legal authority, and labor -- on which the collaborative effort depends in order to attain its goals. One important criterion for determining who becomes involved in collaboration may be that member agencies offer resources that other agencies lack.

Framing: It includes facilitating agreement on leadership and administrative roles; helping to establish an identity and culture for the network, even if it is temporary or continually changing; and helping to develop a working structure for the network i.e., committee involvement, network assignments (McGuire 2002). Strategic planning by participants in the collaboration is one important way to develop an overall purpose and framework for the collaborative effort.

Mobilizing: Mobilizing behavior on the part of a public manager is intended to induce commitment to the joint undertaking and build support from both key players outside the collaborative effort and those who are directly involved

Synthesizing: It involves engendering productive and purposeful interaction among all actors. This includes facilitating relationships in order to build trust and promote information exchange.

All organizational forms -- hierarchical or collaborative -- have a defined structure, even if that structure changes. A collaborative manager cannot rely on an organizational chart or consult history for operational guidance, as the boss in a hierarchical organization can do. However, managers in both contexts influence rules and structure daily. Although new competencies are needed for collaboration, some of these are already inherent in the public manager (McGuire 2006).

Scholars rallying round Citizenship and Collaboration

Harry C. Boyte (2005), like Denhardt and Denhardt, described the active role that citizens must play in both policy creation and in the process of democratic governance, rather than simply being consumers of public services. Donald F. Kettl (2006) identified the main problem of modern-day public administration and governance as the inconsistencies between existing administrative systems and the problems that public administration must resolve. Network reporting structures tend to be horizontal rather than vertical, which has undermined traditional hierarchies, made co-ordination more challenging and accountability difficult to ensure (Kettl 2006). Amber Wichowsky and Donald P. Moynihan (2008) discussed public sector performance management to show it can threaten democratic governance by ignoring citizenship outcomes. The authors opine that public agencies and government networks in a democratic state are responsible to their citizenry, and thus must measure how their programs affect democratic governance (Wichowsky and Moynihan 2008).

Conclusion

Government is the protector and promoter of citizens' rights. In exchange for the services from the government, the citizens will express allegiance to the government. This is loyalty in exchange for rationality. Government is not a business firm that would be engaged in mere profiteering. However, making free with public money in the name of public service is to be done away with. Governance is the way the government transacts with its constituents; this is the way the government treats its citizens. Thus, there should be sincere efforts on the part of the government to be honest and responsive towards the citizens. A government to have modicum of governance needs to be at least up and doing, if not always successful, in trying to safeguard people's basic rights. While rejuvenation of citizenship promises to bolster the aspects of citizens in the overall governance scenario, increased attention to networks and collaboration is imperative to keep pace with the challenges of this increasingly networked global arena.

Reference:

- Agranoff, Robert, and Michael McGuire. 2001a. After the Network Is Formed: Process, Power, and Performance. In *Getting Results through Collaboration: Networks and Network Structures for Public Policy and Management*, edited by Myrna P. Mandell, 11 - 29. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.
- 2001b. Big Questions in Public Network Management Research. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 11 (3): 295 - 326.
- Agranoff, Robert. 2003. *Leveraging Networks: A Guide for Public Managers Working across Organizations*. Washington, DC: IBM Endowment for the Business of Government.
- Alter, Catherine, and Jerald Hage. 1993. *Organizations Working Together*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Box, Richard. 1998. *Citizen Governance*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Boyte, H. C. 2005. Reframing Democracy: Governance, Civic Agency, and Politics. *Public Administration Review* 65 (5): 536-546.
- Brunsson, N. and J. P. Olsen. 1993. *The Reforming Organizations*. London: Routledge.
- Christensen, T. and Lægveid, P. 2004. The fragmented state - the challenges of combining efficiency, institutional norms and democracy. Working paper 3, 2004. Bergen: Stein Rokkan Centre for Social Studies.
- _____. 2007. The Whole-of-Government Approach to Public Sector Reform. *Public Administration Review* November/December: 1059-1066.
- Denhardt, Robert B. and Janet Vinzant Denhardt. 2000. The New Public Service: Serving Rather than Steering. *Public Administration Review* 60 (6): 549-559.
- Goldsmith, Stephen , and William D . Eggers. 2004. *Governing by Network: The New Shape of the Public Sector*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

- Gulick, Luther. 1937. Notes on the Theory of Organization. In *Papers on the Science of Administration*, edited by L. Gulick and L. Urwick, 1-46. New York: Institute of Government.
- Harmon, Michael M., and Richard T. Mayer. 1986. *Organization Theory for Public Administration*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.
- Imperial, Mark T. 2005. Using Collaboration as a Governance Strategy: Lessons from Six Watershed Management Programs. *Administration & Society* 37 (3): 281-320.
- Kettl, D. F. 2006. Managing Boundaries in American Administration: The Collaboration Imperative. *Public Administration Review* 66 (S1): 10-19.
- King, Cheryl, and Camilla Stivers. 1998. *Government Is Us: Public Administration in an Anti-government Era*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Ling, Tom. 2002. Delivering Joined-Up Government in the UK: Dimensions, Issues and Problems. *Public Administration* 80 (4): 615-42.
- McGuire, Michael. 2002. Managing Networks: Propositions on What Managers Do and Why They Do It. *Public Administration Review* 62 (5): 599 - 609.
- _____. 2006. Collaborative Public Management: Assessing What We Know and How We Know It. *Public Administration Review* December (Special Issue): 33-43.
- Norman, Richard. 1995. New Zealand's Reinvented Government: Experiences of Public Managers. *Public Sector* 18 (2): 22-25.
- Osborne, David and Gaebler, Ted, eds. 1992. *Reinventing Government: How The Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- O'Toole, Laurence J. 1997. Treating Networks Seriously: Practical and Research-Based Agendas in Public Administration. *Public Administration Review* 57 (1): 45 - 52.
- O'Toole, Laurence J., Kenneth J. Meier, and Sean Nicholson-Crotty. 2005. Managing Upward, Downward, and Outward: Networks, Hierarchical Relationships, and Performance. *Public Management Review* 7 (1): 45 - 68.

- Provan, Keith G., and Patrick Kenis. 2005. Modes of Network Governance and Implications for Network Management and Effectiveness. Paper presented at the Eighth National Public Collaborative Public Management Research Conference, Los Angeles, September 29 - October 1. <http://pmranet.org> [accessed August 17, 2012].
- Wichowsky, A., and D. E. Moynihan, 2008. Measuring how administration shapes citizenship: a policy feedback perspective on performance management. *Public Administration Review* 68 (5): 908-920.
- Waldo, Dwight. 1948. *The Administrative State*. New York: Ronald Press.
- Wolin, Sheldon. 1960. *Politics and Vision*. Boston: Little-Brown.