

## **Revolutionizing Public Management: From Bureaucracy to New Public Governance**

Khaoula LEBKHACHI

*Laboratoire de recherche Management, Stratégie et Gouvernance (MASRAG), National School of Commerce and Management, Abdelmalek Essaâdi University, Tangier, Morocco*

Abdeslam CHRAIBI

*Laboratoire de recherche Management, Stratégie et Gouvernance (MASRAG), National School of Commerce and Management, Abdelmalek Essaâdi University, Tangier, Morocco*

---

**Abstract.** In a globalized world moving towards the disappearance of economic borders, the competitiveness of countries has become a strategic issue that is no longer merely a matter of resources but also of optimizing their use. In this context, the governance of public organizations is crucial for ensuring better decision-making, the proper functioning of operations, and effective control within these organizations. In this regard, management paradigms in public organizations have evolved, transitioning from Max Weber's traditional bureaucratic model to New Public Governance (NPG). The objective of this research is to highlight the organizational transformations within public organizations by theoretically examining the contributions, limitations, and challenges of three paradigms: bureaucracy, New Public Management (NPM), and NPG. The analysis reveals that NPG, based on collaboration, co-production, and networks, better addresses the complex challenges of the modern public sector by promoting more democratic and participatory governance.

**Keywords:** *Bureaucracy; NPM; New Public Management; Governance; Public organization.*

---

### **1. Introduction**

In a context characterized by evolving socio-economic environments, rapid changes, and increasing organizational challenges, as well as higher expectations from citizens and other stakeholders, public organizations have had to adapt their management methods to meet the demands of efficiency, transparency, and participation. This necessity has led to a transition from bureaucracy, the traditional organizational model largely inspired by the work of Max Weber. While this model established structured and hierarchical management centered on formal rules and procedures, it has often been criticized for being rigid and inefficient. These shortcomings have given rise to new paradigms, including New Public Management (NPM), which incorporates management principles inspired by the private sector to foster a culture of results and efficiency in public organizations. However, despite its innovative approach, NPM has also revealed limitations, particularly its excessive focus on quantitative performance at the expense of collaboration and citizen participation.

Faced with these limitations, New Public Governance (NPG) has emerged as an alternative. This model is based on principles of cooperation, network management, and the active participation of citizens and stakeholders in public decision-making. It represents a shift toward more inclusive public management, oriented toward the creation of public value.

The objective of this article is to provide a theoretical reflection on the evolution of public management paradigms, from the traditional bureaucratic model to New Public Governance. The aim is to analyze the foundations, contributions, and limitations of each paradigm while highlighting the challenges associated with the transition toward more participatory and collaborative governance. In other words, this study establishes a theoretical framework for understanding the fundamental transformations that have shaped public organizations, while

also opening perspectives for the development of more participatory, inclusive, and collaborative models. It offers a structured approach to analyzing paradigms and understanding their practical implications for public organizations.

In this context, the following research question is emphasized: How has the transition from traditional bureaucratic models to New Public Management, and subsequently to New Public Governance, transformed the management of public organizations?

From this perspective, our research will examine the origins and foundations of the Weberian bureaucratic model, as well as its limitations. We will then explore the emergence of New Public Management as a response to bureaucratic inefficiencies and its impact on public organizations. Finally, we will analyze the rise of New Public Governance, compare it with NPM, and conclude by defining the concepts of governance and good governance in public organizations.

## **2. From bureaucracy to new public management**

### **a. Weber's classic bureaucratic approach**

The origins of the bureaucratic model can be traced back to the formation of European nation-states in the sixteenth century. As power progressively became centralized in the hands of sovereigns, it became necessary to establish administrative authority over a group of specialized officials directly dependent on the sovereign (Rokkan *et al.*, 1999). These officials were responsible for managing justice, defense, and the collection of state taxes.

Following the great bourgeois revolutions, the transition from absolute states to legal states led to a transformation in the concept of public organization. It was no longer designed to serve the power of the sovereign but rather to uphold the law, which guaranteed the equality of all citizens.

This bureaucratic organizational model is primarily attributed to the sociologist and philosopher Max Weber. According to Weber, bureaucracy represents a rationalization of procedures. These procedures are applied by agents who must be systematically organized to achieve the objectives of the public organization.

Bureaucracy, as a rational-legal organizational model in Weber's conception, consists of a structured body of officials within a hierarchically divided system, comprising the top level (managers), administrative staff, and other stakeholders (users, customers, suppliers, etc.), whose task is to implement legislative decisions. Additionally, its purpose is to preserve the existence and sustainability of the organization to which they belong (Treiber, 2010). One of the major differences between traditional and modern organizations can be identified in the link between administrative and legislative power: adherence to procedures and hierarchy ensures the legitimacy of power (Hughes, 2017).

Without aiming to be exhaustive, we present some key principles of the Weberian bureaucratic organizational model (Mayntz, 2010; Bartoli & Blatrix, 2015):

- **Establishment of laws, regulations, and procedures in public organizations:** To protect the interests of various stakeholders, a system is created to ensure that all administrative actions follow standardized norms while minimizing inconsistencies. This system aims to regulate administrative management functions through laws, regulations, decrees, and procedures. Indeed, the public organization, in its various forms, is conceived as an entity designed to function based on this procedural and legal framework.
- **Compliance with predefined regulations:** In the bureaucratic model, civil servants are required to respect and adhere to the provisions of laws, regulations, and procedures.

- **Monitoring compliance with standards and procedures:** To ensure adherence to established rules, public organizations operating within the bureaucratic system conduct rigorous oversight to verify strict compliance with regulations and procedures. In cases of non-compliance, disciplinary measures are applied.
- **Hierarchy based on authority:** The bureaucratic model follows a hierarchical structure, where individuals in lower positions are subordinate to those in higher positions. The latter are responsible for decision-making and issuing directives to be followed.
- **Organizations serving the public interest:** Within the bureaucratic system, public organizations function exclusively to serve the public interest. Their activities do not permit the pursuit of private interests, which may conflict with public objectives.
- **Division and specialization of labor:** According to this principle, work is systematically divided and specialized, focusing on either the production of the same good or the provision of the same service. Positions are clearly defined in terms of title, category, general and specific functions, authority, and responsibilities. Additionally, work is allocated within an organizational structure that establishes procedural responsibilities. In other words, each agent is provided with the necessary resources and conditions to effectively carry out their tasks.

However, this conception of public organizations quickly revealed its limitations, particularly in distinguishing between the political and administrative spheres. Indeed, criticisms have been raised against this model, questioning the rational pursuit of the organization's objectives (Bartoli and Blatrix, 2015).

- **Formalism, rigidity, and slowness of the administrative apparatus:** When a public organization is subject to a multiplicity of standards and procedures, the system becomes overly formalistic, rigid, and slow. Every action must undergo a lengthy and cumbersome process, adhering to numerous requirements. Consequently, this model prioritizes conformity and regularity over the organization's performance objectives.
- **Excessive rigidity in change management:** The bureaucratic model is characterized by its absolute rigidity, making it resistant to change and stifling initiative and innovation. As previously emphasized, this model dictates that public organizations strictly adhere to pre-established regulations. As a result, public institutions struggle to adapt to environmental fluctuations, and operational agents lack the autonomy to take initiative or drive innovation.
- **Dysfunctionality in development and reform:** This model is not only ineffective in fostering development and change but also in generating opportunities for innovation and creativity. In developing countries, where rapid change is essential for socio-economic transformation, the traditional bureaucratic structure proves inadequate for implementing reforms. Thus, the model is often criticized for being too rigid and inflexible to drive dynamic change within public organizations.
- **Neglect of informal relationships:** The bureaucratic model overlooks informal relationships, norms, and values within organizations. It operates under the assumption that only formal bureaucracy matters, disregarding the influence of informal networks and interactions.

Weber's bureaucratic model was designed to address a specific historical context in which public organizations operated. However, over time, the social, economic, political, and cultural environment evolved rapidly, introducing new realities to which the Weberian model failed to

adapt, revealing its limitations. Consequently, there is a growing need to explore new post-bureaucratic models in the public sector.

### **b. The NPM: A new paradigm**

New Public Management (NPM) emerges, as previously demonstrated, from the inefficiencies of an overly bureaucratized public sector. It positions itself as a comprehensive reform approach that advocates transforming the entire administrative system toward an innovative management logic characterized by greater coherence, rationality, goal-oriented determination, equality, adherence to contracts and commitments to communities, decentralization, and a diminished emphasis on the concept of the sovereign state (Mahir and Cherkaoui, 2017).

In this context, the United Nations Economic and Social Council, in its 5th session in 2006, provided foundational definitions of this new managerial movement: *"For some authors, New Public Management calls for a cultural shift in public administration, which must become flexible, innovative, creative, entrepreneurial, and dynamic instead of being constrained by bureaucratic rules and procedures and focusing on means rather than results"* (Bekhechi Chouikhi and Benmansour, 2017).

Today, the concept of public management is prevalent in the countries of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and in several developing countries. NPM advocates for a public sector based on the three E's—**Economy, Effectiveness, and Efficiency**—aiming to meet citizens' expectations at a lower cost, treating them as customers (Amar and Berthier, 2007).

There are multiple definitions of NPM. In our framework, Bezes (2005, p.26) defines it as *"a heterogeneous set of ideas and methodologies inspired by economic and management theories, representing a significant intellectual influence on contemporary state reform policies."* Rather than a single, standardized system, NPM comprises multiple models whose scope and implementation vary depending on the cultural and institutional specificities of each country (Amar and Berthier, 2007).

A key distinguishing feature of NPM is its reliance on network structures to coordinate actions among multiple actors, emphasizing partnerships, cooperation, and the management of interdependencies within the public sector (Rhodes, 1997). Moreover, it promotes stakeholder engagement and citizen participation in decision-making, aiming to foster democratic and inclusive governance (Fung, 2006).

The New Public Management model encompasses diverse approaches, making it challenging to define precisely. It can be analyzed from four distinct perspectives (Gibert, 2008):

- **An art:** *"This perspective suggests that the best experts in practice are the practitioners themselves, along with those who disseminate 'best practices' in public organizations where they support change initiatives, such as consultants."* (Gibert, 2008)
- **A science:** *"This view takes an analytical approach, emphasizing the use of social sciences as a tool to study the challenges faced by public organizations."* (Gibert, 2008)
- **A movement:** Drawing on Hood's (2005) perspective, public management is also considered *"a social and perhaps quasi-religious movement that can be seen as part of a broader 'managerial' movement."* (Gibert, 2008)
- **A mode of legitimation:** According to Gibert (2008), performance serves as the dominant mode of legitimation for organizations. In other words, an organization is considered legitimate if it achieves its objectives while using relatively limited

resources. Thus, NPM is fundamentally oriented towards affirming and enhancing public sector performance.

**Table 1: Comparison of Weberian and NPM administration types**

Criteria	Weberian Administration	NPM Administration
<b>Objectives</b>	Compliance with procedures	Achieving results
<b>Organization</b>	Centralized	Decentralized
<b>Responsibility Sharing</b>	Confused	Clear
<b>Task Execution</b>	Division, specialization	Autonomy
<b>Recruitment</b>	Competitive exams	Contracts
<b>Promotion</b>	Seniority-based advancement	Merit-based advancement
<b>Control</b>	Monitoring indicators	Performance indicators
<b>Type of Budget</b>	Means-oriented	Goal-oriented

**Source: Amar and Berthier (2007)**

Primarily, the implementation of private sector methods and techniques in the public sector aims to enhance and sustain efficiency while fostering coherence, complementarity, flexibility, and continuous evaluation in public administration, ultimately making it more effective and credible (Pesqueux, 2010). This shift necessitates abandoning the *"culture of means"* that previously dominated in favor of a *"culture of results"* (Bied-Charreton, 2006). According to this author, two-thirds of the member countries of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) have already adopted this approach: *"They are now required to evaluate public action and establish annual performance programs."*

Additionally, NPM is viewed as a tool for developing cost control mechanisms and managing financial outcomes (Hood, 1991). In this context, it is also linked to the creation of new accounting tools (Gruening, 2001). The introduction and development of these tools are expected to promote learning and adaptation, facilitate corrective actions, and enhance decision-making. Furthermore, they contribute to strengthening the democratic legitimacy of the public sector (Molin *et al.*, 2017).

New Public Management encompasses the following key elements, as outlined by Hood (1991, 1995):

- **Decomposition of the public sector** into strategic units organized around "manageable" products.
- **Introduction of competition** between public organizations as well as between public and private entities.
- **Adoption of managerial techniques** from the private sector.
- **More rational use of resources**, with a focus on cost-effective alternatives for service delivery.



- **Increased control of public organizations** by visible managers with discretionary power.
- **Implementation of explicit, measurable, and controllable performance standards.**
- **Emphasis on results measurement** to assess efficiency and effectiveness.

These public management reforms are structured around three main components, with performance optimization being a central concern (Abord de Chatillon and Desmarais, 2012):

- **Managerialism:** A set of measures aimed at rationalizing public spending through cost control, cost optimization programs, resource allocation strategies, financial management information systems, and performance indicators (Boyne, 2003; Kirkpatrick *et al.*, 2005; Diefenbach, 2009).
- **Accountability:** A framework that makes individuals responsible for their performance, both financial and non-financial, using objective-driven management practices. This approach involves public agents in reform and performance enhancement through an empowerment and accountability system that holds them responsible for achieving set goals (Barberis, 1998).
- **Contractualization:** A fundamental transformation of organizational architecture, promoting increased cooperation between public organizations and various actors through partnerships, whether public or private. These expanded public-private networks give rise to a new form of governance (Boyne, 2003).

As a result, New Public Management is inspired by business management techniques and private sector cost efficiency strategies applied to public sector management. The fundamental premise of NPM is that private sector management methods can be adapted to the public sector, which is often perceived as bureaucratic, inefficient, and overly centralized. The goal of NPM is to modernize public administration by aligning it with citizens' expectations, ensuring their satisfaction by treating them as customers, while public administrators take on managerial roles (Hanafi and El-Marzouki, 2021).

### **3. The governance: A Major Stake in Public Organizations**

#### **a. From the new public management to new public governance**

Governance and New Public Management (NPM) have been widely debated in recent years across various countries, regardless of their economic status—developed or developing (Dahman, 2020). The rise of NPM has led to the emergence of new concepts such as New Public Governance (Professor, 2006), the Neo-Weberian State (Cepiku and Meneguzzo, 2011), and Digital-Age Governance (Dunleavy, 2005). Within this framework, reforms and public policies influenced by NPM have sought to redefine public sector management and governance practices by aligning them with market economy objectives and private-sector values and strategies (Gaebler, 1993).

A key development in this discourse is the positioning of New Public Governance (NPG) as an alternative—or at least a significant complement—to NPM (Torfing and Triantafyllou, 2013). NPG shares with NPM the objective of replacing rigid, hierarchical organizational structures with more flexible network-based models. However, while NPM primarily focuses on efficiency through privatization and market mechanisms, NPG shifts towards collaborative decision-making, emphasizing the participation of multiple stakeholders, including public and private actors as well as citizens (Pollitt and Bouchaert, 2004).

The expansion of New Public Governance is reflected in the rise of transversal principles that transcend traditional disciplinary boundaries (Mockle, 2022). NPG addresses the limitations of traditional public administration and NPM by promoting cooperation and resource-sharing

among diverse actors (Torfing and Triantafillou, 2013). It emphasizes collaboration, networking, and territorialization, relying on self-organized inter-organizational networks of interdependent actors, connected through long-term relationships built on trust, autonomy, and responsibility. These relationships, embedded in institutions such as associations and economic interest groups (EIGs), play a crucial role in modern governance (Pupion, 2021).

New Public Governance represents a shift in public management towards co-production between governments, citizens, and private or associative organizations to better address society's complex needs (Osborne, 2006). In this approach, citizens are no longer passive beneficiaries of public services but active co-producers involved in designing, implementing, and evaluating public policies (Bovaird, 2007). NPG aims to create public value by fostering collaborative, transparent, and accountable governance, driven by the general interest (Bryson *et al.*, 2014).

Within the public sector, public governance has gained increasing importance. As defined by the World Bank (1989), governance refers to *"the exercise of political power in managing a nation's affairs."* Similarly, the Canadian Institute on Governance describes it as *"the traditions, institutions, and processes that determine how power is exercised, how citizens can express themselves, and how decisions are made on public interest matters."*

The primary objective of public governance is to establish mechanisms for optimal resource management—human, financial, institutional, and technical—to enable the state to achieve its objectives based on participation and accountability. From this perspective, the concept of good governance emerged, focusing on evaluating the effectiveness of public policies and assessing their ability to implement and achieve public goals through the resources available. Achieving good governance requires modernizing public administration and upgrading public management tools to enhance efficiency and responsiveness (Nouredine and Ahachoum, 2023).

These two paradigms offer distinct responses to the challenges of public management. New Public Management (NPM) is better suited to environments that require rapid rationalization, emphasizing performance, efficiency, and the adoption of private sector practices. It often adopts a technocratic and market-oriented approach. In contrast, New Public Governance (NPG) is designed for contexts that demand a more inclusive and collaborative approach. It prioritizes collaboration, network-based governance, and citizen participation, fostering an integrative vision focused on the co-production of public services.

**Table 2: Comparison between new public management and new public governance**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>New Public Management (NPM)</b>	<b>New Public governance (NGP)</b>
<b>Origin and context</b>	Developed in the 1980s, influenced by neoliberalism and private sector management practices (Hood, 1991).	Emerged in the 2000s in response to the limitations of NPM, influenced by network theory and collaborative governance (Osborne, 2006).
<b>Basic Philosophy</b>	Emphasis on performance, efficiency and cost reduction through market mechanisms and privatization (Hood, 1991).	Governance based on collaboration between public, private and associative actors to solve complex problems (Osborne, 2006).
<b>Objectifs principaux</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reduce costs and improve efficiency.</li> <li>- Introduce competition and private sector practices (Gaebler, 1993).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Promote cooperation and coordination among stakeholders.</li> <li>- Strengthen citizen participation (Bovaird, 2007).</li> </ul>
<b>Management approach</b>	Results-based management with performance indicators and accountability contracts (Hood, 1991).	An approach based on network management and partnerships, where results emerge from collaborative efforts (Osborne, 2006).
<b>Role of citizens</b>	Citizens are seen as customers, consumers of public services (Gaebler, 1993).	Citizens are seen as partners and co-producers of public services (Bovaird, 2007).
<b>Coordination mode</b>	Based on market mechanisms, with contracts and subcontracting (Hood, 1991).	Coordination through networks, involving horizontal relationships between actors (Osborne, 2006).
<b>Nature of reforms</b>	Technocratic reforms, often focused on privatization and delegation of services (Hood, 1991).	Participatory reforms, seeking to integrate different stakeholders into decision-making (Bovaird, 2007).
<b>Evaluation criteria</b>	Based on quantitative measures and financial indicators (Gaebler, 1993).	Include qualitative measures and social indicators, such as citizen satisfaction (Osborne, 2006).
<b>Organizational structure</b>	Hierarchical and oriented towards goals set by management (Hood, 1991).	Based on network structures and multi-stakeholder partnerships (Osborne, 2006).
<b>Role of public managers</b>	Responsible for performance and results; they have a high degree of autonomy (managerialism) (Gaebler, 1993).	Facilitators and coordinators in networks of multiple actors (Osborne, 2006).
<b>Main criticisms</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Dehumanization and commodification of public services.</li> <li>- Excessive emphasis on profitability (Hood, 1991).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Complexity and slowness of decision-making processes.</li> <li>- Difficulties in coordinating networks (Osborne, 2006).</li> </ul>

**Source: Authors**



### **b. Governance within public organizations: Framework of definitions**

Several disciplinary fields—sociology, economics, and philosophy—have engaged with the concept of governance, both in the context of public decision-making and business management. This has led to the emergence of the term *governability*, which refers to the effective arrangements that enable the proper functioning of systems, particularly in public decision-making (Moukrite and Guedira, 2016).

Canet (2004) defines governance as "public action in networks, a relational practice of non-predefined cooperation that must always be reinvented, distancing itself from hierarchical frameworks of the past and routinized procedures." It encompasses horizontal forms of control negotiated between multiple stakeholders across various levels, contrasting with traditional top-down government regulation (Bromley, 2021). Similarly, governance involves the steering and coordination of actions, ranging from state-managed, top-down approaches to self-regulation without direct state involvement (Hamedinger, 2023).

Governance also refers to rules, processes, and behaviors that influence the exercise of power—notably at the European level—particularly in terms of openness, participation, accountability, effectiveness, and coherence. Despite its broad scope, governance remains a key element in policies and reforms related to poverty reduction, democratization, and global security (Bal and Jaouhari, 2024). This definition is considered general, as it does not target a specific domain but rather encompasses the procedures and rules governing governance itself.

Governance is also recognized as a comprehensive concept that covers all aspects of public affairs management, including economic policies and regulatory frameworks. The International Monetary Fund (IMF) integrates economic and legal aspects into its definition, highlighting governance as a central element of public management (Bal and Jaouhari, 2024). Similarly, the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) aligns its definition with that of the World Bank, but expands it to include political and socio-economic dimensions. In this view, governance is understood as the exercise of political power and the administration of societal resources for economic and social development (Bal and Jaouhari, 2024).

Originally, governance emerged in the private sector as a standard of behavior for managers and board members. Over time, the concept has expanded into multiple fields and become the subject of scientific research and debate, appearing in nearly all discussions related to development. Gradually, governance has come to symbolize profound state reforms, sometimes even questioning the role and structure of the state itself. The term first gained prominence in the corporate sphere, leading to the emergence of corporate governance, or "Corporate Governance" (Nouredine and Ahachoum, 2023).

Governance is ultimately defined by its objectives. Its application does not depend on hierarchical positioning within a given system but rather on the specific results it aims to achieve (Pitseys, 2010). In the public sector, governance represents a set of processes implemented by a governing body to oversee and guide an organization towards achieving its goals. Fundamentally, governance is the mechanism through which objectives are determined and accomplished (Khadija and Karimi, 2021).

### **c. The good governance principles in public organizations**

Governance is fundamentally centered around key principles such as efficiency, accountability, participation, and transparency (Moukrite and Guedira, 2016). In this context, good governance serves as a framework that enables organizations to effectively achieve their goals and objectives. Ensuring good governance is essential for all public sector organizations, as it enhances their performance, credibility, and responsiveness to stakeholders (Khadija and Karimi, 2021).

**Figure 1: The figure explains the principles of good governance.**



**Source: Barrett (2003)**

This model illustrates the foundations and mechanisms necessary for establishing effective governance in public sector organizations. It emphasizes a hierarchical and interconnected structure to foster trust within the organization, with each component playing a critical role in ensuring strong governance aligned with strategic objectives. Good governance explicitly integrates efficiency and performance, particularly in public institutions and banking systems, enabling organizations to maximize results while ensuring accountability to citizens (Massoud, 2013).

It is important to note that while certain governance principles emphasize continuity, innovation is not necessarily a defining factor. Moreover, the recognition and application of these principles are not universal but can be replicated across various geographical contexts (Mockle, 2022). Good governance is inherently normative, referring to ethical and responsible management that promotes transparency, participation, and accountability. It is frequently used as a benchmark for assessing governance practices in developing countries (Yacoub *et al.*, 2010). Furthermore, it emphasizes key practices such as stakeholder inclusion, participatory decision-making, and anti-corruption measures, reinforcing governance effectiveness and legitimacy (Massoud, 2013).

#### **4. Conclusion**

The evolution of public management models, from classical bureaucracy to New Public Management (NPM) and subsequently to New Public Governance (NPG), illustrates a transformative shift in public organizations driven by increasing demands for performance, transparency, and citizen participation. While Weberian bureaucracy introduced a structured and hierarchical approach to administration, it struggled to adapt to a rapidly evolving environment characterized by growing expectations for efficiency and innovation.

New Public Management marked a significant departure from traditional bureaucratic models

by incorporating private sector principles, such as management by objectives, accountability, and a results-oriented approach. However, its strong emphasis on performance indicators and economic efficiency raised concerns about the neglect of social, human, and participatory dimensions. This realization underscored the necessity for a more balanced approach to public management, leading to the emergence of New Public Governance.

New Public Governance represents a major advancement, shifting the focus toward collaborative public management that prioritizes citizen engagement and cooperation among public, private, and associative actors. It emphasizes network-based governance, the creation of public value, and a commitment to democratic and transparent decision-making processes.

However, the transition to New Public Governance is not without challenges. It requires cultural and organizational adaptations within public administrations, a redefinition of the roles of public managers, and the effective coordination of diverse stakeholder networks. Additionally, these transformations raise critical questions regarding the ability of public organizations to maintain a balance between performance, inclusivity, and accountability.

Ultimately, the evolution of public management paradigms underscores the need for hybrid models that leverage the strengths of bureaucracy, NPM, and NPG to effectively address the complex governance challenges of the 21st century. Governance today extends across diverse organizational and political structures, often overlaying more traditional forms of public action (Pitseys, 2010).

## 5. References

- Abord de Chatillon, E., & Desmarais, C. (2012). Le nouveau management public est-il pathogène?. *Management international*, 16(3), 10-24.
- Amar, A., & Berthier, L. (2007). Le nouveau management public: avantages et limites. *Gestion et management publics*, 5(1), 1-14.
- Barberis, P. (1998). The new public management and a new accountability. *Public administration*, 76(3), 451-470.
- Barrett, P. (2003). Better practice public sector governance. *a paper presented to the National Institute of Governance in Canberra*, 21, 7.
- Bartoli, A., & Blatrix, C. (2015). Management dans les organisations publiques. Défis et logiques d'action.
- Bekhechi Chouikhi, S., & Benmansour, A. (2017). La modernisation du service public maghrébin à travers les démarches qualité. *مجلة أداء المؤسسات الجزائرية*, 6(1), 23-40.
- Bezes, P. (2005). L'État et les savoirs managériaux. *Trente ans de réforme de l'Etat*, 9-40.
- Bied-Charreton, M. (2006). La culture de résultat dans le secteur public : Enjeux et perspectives. *Revue française d'administration publique*, 4(120), 623-638.
- Bovaird, T. (2007). Beyond engagement and participation: User and community coproduction of public services. *Public administration review*, 67(5), 846-860.
- Boyne, G. A. (2003). Sources of public service improvement: A critical review and research agenda. *Journal of public administration research and theory*, 13(3), 367-394.
- Bromley, P. (2021). Actorhood as governance in neoliberal world culture. In *Research Handbook on Nonprofit Governance* (pp. 165-185). Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Bryson, J. M., Crosby, B. C., and Bloomberg, L. (2014). Public value governance: Moving beyond traditional public administration and the new public management. *Public administration review*, 74(4), 445-456.
- Canet, R. (2004), Conférence prononcée dans le cadre du Séminaire « Les nouveaux modes de gouvernance et la place de la société civile », organisé par le Service aux collectivités de l'UQAM, –Montréal, Écomusée du fiermonde –16 mars 2004, Page 43

- Cepiku, D., and Meneguzzo, M. (2011). Public Administration Reform in Italy : A Shopping-basket Approach to the New Public Management or the New Weberianism? *International Journal of Public Administration*, 34(1-2), 19-25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2010.506088>
- Commission européenne pour la démocratie par le droit. (2011). Bilan sur les notions de « bonne gouvernance » et de « bonne administration ». Étude n° 470/2008. Strasbourg, France : Conseil de l'Europe.
- Dahman, O. (2020). La recherche sur la gouvernance publique dans le cadre du nouveau modèle de développement économique au Maroc. *Revue de Management et Cultures*, 5, Art. 5. <https://doi.org/10.48430/IMIST.PRSM/remac-n5.12297>
- Diefenbach, T. (2009). New public management in public sector organizations: the dark sides of managerialistic ‘enlightenment’. *Public administration*, 87(4), 892-909.
- Dunleavy, P. (2005). New Public Management Is Dead—Long Live Digital-Era Governance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 16(3), 467-494. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mui057>
- Fung, A. (2006). Varieties of participation in complex governance. *Public administration review*, 66, 66-75.
- Gaebler, T. (1993). *Reinventing government: How the entrepreneurial spirit is transforming the public sector*. Plume.
- Gibert, P. (2008). Le New Public Management : Origines, principes et critiques. *Revue française d'administration publique*, 1(125), 9-28.
- Gruening, G. (2001). Origin and theoretical basis of New Public Management. *International public management journal*, 4(1), 1-25.
- Hamedinger, A. (2023). New governance concepts for digitalization: Challenges and potentials. *AVENUE21. Planning and Policy Considerations for an Age of Automated Mobility*, 337-347
- Hanafi, A., and El-Marzouki, S. (2021). Les approches théoriques et leur portée explicative des pratiques de contrôle de gestion dans le secteur public. *International Journal of Accounting, Finance, Auditing, Management and Economics*, 2(2), 368-393.
- Hood, C. (1991). A Public Management for All Seasons? *Public Administration*, 69(1), 3-19. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9299.1991.tb00779.x>
- Hood, C. (1995). The “new public management” in the 1980s: Variations on a theme. *Accounting, organizations and society*, 20(2-3), 93-109
- Hughes, O. E. (2017). *Public management and administration*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Khadija, S. A. I. D., and KARIMI, D. (2021). Relation entre les Principes de la Bonne Gouvernance et la Performance des Organisations Publiques au MAROC. *Revue de Management et Cultures*, (6), 90-105.
- Kirkpatrick, I., Ackroyd, S., and Walker, R. M. (2005). The new managerialism and public service professions: change in health, social services, and housing (Vol. 226). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mahir, M. A., Cherkaoui, M., and Lamrani, A. M. (2017). Quelle place de la LOF dans filemanagement public moderne. *Revue du contrôle, de la comptabilité et de l'audit*, 1(3), 508-525.
- Massoud, M. (2013). Le management de la BEAC FACE aux principes de bonne gouvernance the management of the bank of central african states and principles of good governance.
- Mayntz, R. (2010). The architecture of multi-level governance. In *Multi-Level Governance* (pp. 11-32). Springer
- Mockle, D. (2022). *La gouvernance publique*. Éditions LGDJ.

- Mohamed, B. A. L., & JAOUHARI, L. (2024). Le contrôle de gestion au service de la gouvernance des collectivités territoriales. *Revue Internationale des Sciences de Gestion*, 7(3).
- Molin, M. D., Turri, M., and Agasisti, T. (2017). New Public Management Reforms in the Italian Universities: Managerial Tools, Accountability Mechanisms or Simply Compliance? *International Journal of Public Administration*, 40(3), 256-269. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2015.1107737>
- Mondiale, B. (1989). *L'Afrique subsaharienne: de la crise à une croissance durable: étude de prospective à long terme*. Banque mondiale.
- MOUKITE, Z., and GUEDIRA, M. (2016). Les pratiques de gouvernance d'entreprise au sein des établissements et entreprises publics (EEP) au Maroc: contexte et évolutions. *Revue Economie, Gestion et Société*, (5).
- NOUREDDINE, A., and AHACHOUM, F. (2023). L'impact des pratiques de la gouvernance sur la performance organisationnelle des établissements et entreprises publiques: Cas de la Région du Souss-Massa. *International Journal of Accounting, Finance, Auditing, Management and Economics*, 4(1-2), 62-80.
- Osborne, S. P. (2006). The new public governance? 1.
- Pesqueux, Y. (2010, June). Gouvernance, de quoi s'agit-il ? In *Colloque GEQC*.
- Pitseys, J. (2010). Le concept de gouvernance. *Revue interdisciplinaire d'études juridiques*, 65(2), 207-228.
- Pollitt, C, Bouckaert, G. (2004). *Public Management Reform. A Comparative Analysis*, 2nd ed., Oxford, Oxford University Press
- Professor, S. P. O. (2006). The New Public Governance? *Public Management Review*, 8(3), 377-387. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719030600853022>
- Pupion, P. C. (2021). Les valeurs du New Public Management et de la Nouvelle Gouvernance Publique, un frein ou une chance pour la gestion de crise de la Covid-19 en France? Illustration dans le cas des établissements hospitaliers. *Gestion et management public*, 9(4), 161-170.
- Rhodes, R. A. (1997). Understanding governance: Policy networks, governance, reflexivity and accountability. *Open University*.
- Rokkan, S., Urwin, D. W., Aarebrot, F. H., Malaba, P., and Sande, T. (1999). State formation, nation-building, and mass politics in Europe: The theory of Stein Rokkan. Oxford University Press.
- Torfing, J., and Triantafillou, P. (2013). What's in a name? Grasping new public governance as a political-administrative system. *International review of public administration*, 18(2), 9-25.
- Treiber, H. (2010). Weber's rationalism and modern society: Bureaucracy and its limits. *Journal of Classical Sociology*, 10(3), 237-256.
- World Bank (1989) *L'Afrique subsaharienne. De la crise à une croissance durable*. Washington DC.
- Yacoub, L., Otando, G., & Uzunidis, D. (2010). *Gouvernance mondiale, bonne gouvernance et impacts sur les économies en développement (global governance, good governance and the issue of development)* (No. 229).