

Analysis on the Universality of Public Management Models

Xingzuo Fan

University of Exeter, EX4 4SZ, Exeter, UK.

Abstract :What is eternal in the universe is change. The existence of traditional public service departments benefits from historical economic systems and social contexts. With the spread of globalization and the application of new technologies. After the 1980s management crisis, administrative reforms featuring new public management come into existence. However, the suffering and adverse responses in the reform process have often motivated people to think about whether there are a single best model and its application to the world. However, the success criteria of the model of a public entity are its ability to perform well and efficiently in the local area, and the economic conditions, political environment, history and humanities of different countries around the world is different. Meanwhile, a stable legal scheme and high-quality civil servants in developed countries offer a strong base for reforms, whereas developing countries do not have those requisites. Therefore, a single best model can be applied around the world means that this model has to be tailored to different situations around the world. It's complicated, but there can be found some key features of the good model.

Keywords: Public Management Model; Public Governance; Good Governance; Public Service

1. Introduction

What is eternal in the universe is change. The existence of traditional public service departments benefits from historical economic systems and social contexts. With the spread of globalization and the application of new technologies. After the 1980s management crisis, administrative reforms featuring new public management come into existence. However, the suffering and adverse responses in the reform process have often motivated people to think about whether there are a single best model and its application to the world. However, the success criteria of the model of a public entity are its ability to perform well and efficiently in the local area, and the economic conditions, political environment, history and humanities of different countries around the world are different. Meanwhile, a stable legal scheme and high-quality civil servants in developed countries offer a strong base for reforms, whereas developing countries do not have those requisites. Therefore, a single best model can be applied around the world means that this model has to be tailored to different situations around the world. It's complicated, but there can be found some key features of the good model. There are many criteria to determine whether public administration is successful or not. The mainstream in the current world is to achieve "good governance" (Keping, 2018). Under this standard, the public authorities in various nations differ in terms of trade-offs based on initial trials to respond to the change and moves taken to reach this norm, the practices of different countries in the world are not the same. Advantages are closely accompanied by risks during reforms. This article will first address how public administration reformers in the United Kingdom and Germany accomplish management and governance under the NPM reform and the models they adopt and the trade-offs they make. Later, I would compare the changes in developing countries with Bangladesh as an example and developed countries with Australia. In the final part, I would adopt the five elements of legality, efficiency, responsibility, transparency, and openness recommended by the World Bank as a condition for good governance. In fact, the model applied in one country is challenging to copy, and if copied, the critical inheritance of good governance norms based on the local social environment would produce adverse consequences and pay a huge price.

2. New public administration in the UK and Germany

This part aims to find various paths for improvement and trade-offs within the context of the new public administration in the UK and Germany, to indicate that the same reform direction also needs various factors in different regions to carry out reform. The public administration reform discourse originated in the UK and the US, and probably one of the first countries to implement the structural reform of new public administration was the UK. In the process of introducing a market-like structure for administrative actions, the British modernization model seeks to achieve the maximum output from the least capital input. The goal is not just to attain the "smallest country" in the context of "fewer countries (intervention)" and the mind will "internally" gain enhanced "realization" of administrative management by altering the organizational structure and business processes in the context of the utilization of modern information technology (United Nations, 2020). In all this, the corresponding "downsizing" is linked to this, the most critical aspect is that the idea of business management permeates public affairs. The thought enterprise management mainly follows the principle of "streamlined management" and "total quality management". In Germany, administrative reform in the public sector is called "administrative modernization" and has drawn interest. The typical features of this are the "internal" rationalization strategy and the "external" privatization and anti-regulation strategy. The so-called "new control mode" is based on this simple concept and is primarily used in the administration of cities and towns. Local administrative bodies must be service-oriented undertakings (Bratton, 2015). The required 'customer-oriented and quality-oriented' operational structure can be assured by the creation of autonomous operation and responsibility centers and can be enforced within the context of the budget to realize the control of the Category Core, supplemented by a monitoring framework and a financial internal examination system. It is apparent that the transition from a hierarchical implementation paradigm to a modern decentralized administrative concept has increased the achievement and economic performance of the German government (United Nations, 2020). There is a profound contrast between the idea of British modernisation and the concept of German administrative growth. Specifically, this disparity is expressed in the implementation of the idea. The concept of the "Rule of Law" is also applied in Germany, which implies that the structured and practical rules of the rule of law are of critical importance. There is also a major gap in administration between Germany and the UK. Germany also placed the legal order before the "purpose order". The public administration departments shall carry out their duties within the structure specified by the rule of law. The theory in effect is that the legal order takes priority over the "purpose order". By being enslaved to the law, the key goal is to gain systematic regulation in line with public health, so that public welfare administration can still be part of the German administration in the future (Wanters, 2019). The British modernized "New Public Administration" definition rationalizes the public service internally to increase productivity and efficacy. The prevailing one is "business management" which is to "build a more efficient but lower-cost Government". Traditionally, this concept is strongly related to the idea 'administrative management should be focused on governance rather than on legislation.' Germany's administrative conduct is still subject to the social-democratic legal structure of state values, the public administration of the nation is still geared towards public welfare, whereas the British public administration pursues the productivity of the government and reduces government spending to increase revenue (OECE, 2020). Within this idea, public administration in Germany is not an "enterprise" whereas public administration in the UK is the administrative control concept of the "business model".

3. Reform in Developing and Developed Countries

This part is to compare the administrative reforms of Bangladesh and Australia, to state that different types of countries, especially developed countries and developing countries, face different resistances to reforms, and to conclude that different countries, particularly economic and political environment gap are too big, it is difficult to implement the same model.

The administrative principle of new public administration is not the most optimal one and cannot be generalized to all areas and countries. In the past, we performed a comparative study of the principles of NPM in the UK and Germany, and noticed that the same administration concepts had varying patterns in different countries. We're bringing things forward in this section, showing the full-depth discussion and study of the effect of economic and political disparities on the

implementation of administrative models in various countries. In this section, we will undertake a comparative study of Bangladesh and Australia, which have large gaps in economic growth and the political environment.

In politics, Australia, as an independent country, has adopted a consolidated democratic paradigm at the onset, but with domestic economic stagnation and high welfare policies brought on by the fiscal crisis; the crisis of governance caused by bloated and dysfunctional government structures; the crisis of confidence caused by people's disappointments and the challenges of globalization in the world. In finance, government will strengthen spending and introduce repressive fiscal policies to reduce fiscal deficits and maintain a basic equilibrium of revenue and expenditure. In government services, privatize state-owned companies, the transition of such enterprises to private contractors and the exchange of interests between the two parties by contracts; the realization of the decentralization of government authority by the central government is to adjust the partnership between the federal government and local governments, to devolve power and responsibility to the federal government in areas such as social welfare and education. This reform is intended to decentralize the central government's authority and maximize the power of local councils to completely meet the duties and functions of local governments. The introduction of the Citizen Engagement System is a special administrative reform system in Australia. This scheme is suitable for Australia's own national circumstances and is a tremendous benefit in overcoming the lack of confidence created by the ineffectiveness of the administration. Deregulation and decentralization of administration in Australia; introduction of a maximum work contract system; enhancement of supervisory and management structures (The World Bank, 2000). Bangladesh has been struggling with administrative reforms, but they have failed.

Compared to Australia, Bangladesh's administrative reform is mostly the reshuffle of the regime. Bangladesh's regime is shifting quickly. With the transition in the regime, the bureaucracy that had been forced out of its control and strength in the early years returned to the fore and gradually became an important associate of military personnel (Ahmed and Ahmed, 1992). The advent of this condition is a reaction to the demands of "efficiency" rather than democratic ideals, common discipline rather than popular involvement, and the virtue of centralizing government (not so much the virtue of decentralization). Compared to Australia's decentralization of central government efficiency, Bangladesh's new military government has initiated several significant administrative reforms and consolidation steps to limit the influence of non-governmental organisations. In reality, this implementation facilitated the legalization and expansion of the military government and undermined the political resistance of democratic organisations. The absence of good representatives is another big difference in Australia. The negative factors that are prevalent in public administration, such as service disputes, conservatism and stagnation, can gradually be minimized to render the bureaucracy more efficient, sensitive and responsible (Solimano, 2005).

The third part is to illustrate how various countries recognize and implement good governance by explaining how to accomplish good governance, but they all revolve around the five points of legality, efficiency, responsibility, transparency and openness listed by the World Bank. It should be concluded that the best model is difficult to obtain, but certain changes can be made to pick the core and delete the dross. Good governance is a comparatively new concept and has imposed a strong impact in some of the top policy circles since the mid-1990s. This term has gained the most coverage in circles concerned with developing countries and so-called transition countries (MIRA, 2017). Many national development organizations and foreign institutions, such as the World Bank and the United Nations, are already utilizing this form. The concept of good governance is wide. It has often been blamed for including both policy content ('sound policies') and procedures ("rule of law"). Good governance is also a process of social management that maximizes public interests. The key lies in the cooperative administration of public life between government and citizens and the novel partnership between government and civil society. The implementation of the principle of good governance in the world is a general feature. The features that the competent government and good governance should have are the five factors of legitimacy, efficiency, responsibility, transparency and openness recommended by the World Bank. In addition, application of models should also be further researched based on the actual situation of the country or the purpose and requirements government want to achieve, since simply copying would render adverse impact.

4. Conclusion

The management crisis of the last century has given rise to new public governance policies, and corresponding reform measures have also been actively implemented by countries worldwide. There is no doubt that the success criteria for good governance in different regions differs due to distinctive conditions. All in all, given the many differences in political patterns, values and meanings of different countries, good governance could only be approached from a conceptual point of view (Andrews, 2008). To put it into force, there is still a long way to go.

References

- [1] ANDERSON JANNA. (2020). Many Tech Experts Say Digital Disruption Will Hurt Democracy.
- [2] Bratton H. Benjamin. (2015). The Stack.
- [3] CORDER HUGH. (2019). Pursuing Good Governance. Siber Ink CC.
- [4] KepingYu. (2018). Governance and Good Governance: A New Framework for Political Analysis. Fudan Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences.
- [5] AndrewsMatt. (2008). The Good Governance Agenda: Beyond Indicators without Theory. p379-407.
- [6] MIRA Rachid. (2017). Good Governance and Economic Growth: A Contribution to the Institutional Debate about State Failure in Middle East and North Africa. Asian Journal of Middle Eastern and Islamic Studies.
- [7] OECE. (2020). Trust in Government ETHICS MEASURES IN OECD COUNTRIES.
- [8] Solimano Andrés. (2005). Political Crises, Social Conflict and Economic Development.
- [9] The World Bank. (2000). Reforming Public Institutions and The World Bank.
- [10] Public Sector Group Poverty Reduction and Economic Management (PREM) Network A World Bank Strategy.
- [11] UddinM. AnowarS. (2010). Impact of Good Governance on Development in Bangladesh: A Study.
- [12] United Nations. (2020). ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES.
- [13] United Nations. (2020). INEQUALITY IN A RAPIDLY CHANGING WORLD.
- [14] Wanters Benedict. (2019). Strategic management in the public sector and public policy-making: friend or foe?