ABMR
APPLIED BUSINESS & MANAGEMENT REVIEW

ISSN 2981-2666
abmr-journal.org
Vol. 1, No. 1 (2025), pp. 1–30

RESEARCH ARTICLE

The Evolution of Public Management Theories and Their Contemporary Applications in Policy and Research

ABSTRACT

This paper provides a comprehensive review of the evolution of public management theories and explains why these paradigms remain central to contemporary governance. It traces the shift from classical public administration rooted in Weberian bureaucracy, scientific management, and early organizational theory toward New Public Management (NPM), which promoted efficiency, performance measurement, decentralization, and market-oriented reforms. The paper then examines the rise of governance and network-based approaches as responses to NPM's limitations, emphasizing collaboration, co-production, and public value creation across public, private, and civil society actors. Finally, it analyzes how digital-era governance and e-government have transformed public administration through automation, data analytics, artificial intelligence, and participatory digital platforms, while raising new risks related to cybersecurity, privacy, inequality, and algorithmic accountability. By critically assessing the strengths and shortcomings of each paradigm, the paper argues that modern public management is increasingly hybrid, combining efficiency goals with democratic legitimacy, coordination capacity, and ethical digital innovation to address complex challenges such as climate change, public health crises, and technological disruption.

KEYWORDS Public management theories · Weberian bureaucracy · New Public Management (NPM) · Network governance · Co-production · Public value management · Digital government and e-governance.

AUTHOR

Mohamad Fadl Harake
MESOS Business School- France
GBSB Global Business School -Malta
CEREGE Research Laboratory – University of Poitiers -France
mfharake@mesos-bs.com

PUBLISHED
1 December 2025

LICENCE
CC BY 4.0

1 Introduction

1.1. The Evolution of Public Management Theories

Public management theories have undergone substantial transformation over the past century, evolving in response to changing political, economic, and socio-institutional contexts. These theories form a central intellectual foundation of public administration, influencing policy formulation, organizational structures, and the delivery of public services (Hood, 1991; Osborne, 2006). As governance systems have become increasingly complex and interconnected, the importance of public management theories in guiding effective, accountable, and responsive government operations has grown significantly.

The evolution of public management has been characterized by a series of distinct theoretical paradigms, each emerging to address the dominant administrative challenges of its time. Classical bureaucratic models, grounded in Weberian principles of rational–legal authority, hierarchy, and rule-based administration, initially dominated public sector organization (Weber, 2009. These models were later challenged by the emergence of New Public Management (NPM), which emphasized efficiency, performance measurement, managerial autonomy, and the adoption of private-sector practices within the public sector (Hood, 1991; Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2017). More recent approaches, often described as New Public Governance, stress the importance of networks, collaboration, and partnerships among public, private, and civil society actors (Osborne, 2010).

This theoretical progression reflects broader transformations in governance, including democratization, globalization, and digitalization. In particular, the rise of digital-era governance highlights the growing role of information and communication technologies in reshaping public administration, service delivery, and citizen engagement (Dunleavy et *al*., 2006). In the contemporary context, governments face complex and interrelated challenges such as climate change, economic instability, public health crises, and cybersecurity threats. Effectively addressing these issues requires not only institutional capacity but also the informed application and continuous adaptation of public management theories to enhance resilience, efficiency, transparency, and accountability in public governance (Ansell & Torfing, 2014).

1.2. The Importance of Public Management Theories in Modern Governance

Understanding public management theories is essential for policymakers, public administrators, and scholars seeking to enhance governmental effectiveness, strengthen democratic accountability, and foster meaningful citizen participation. These theories provide analytical frameworks that inform how public institutions are structured, how resources are allocated, and how governments interact with citizens, private actors, and civil society organizations (Osborne, 2010; Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2017).

One key reason for the continued relevance of public management theories lies in their contribution to improving government efficiency. Contemporary public administration must reconcile fiscal constraints with the demand for high-quality public services. Approaches such as New Public Management (NPM) emphasize performance measurement, results-oriented management, and efficiency gains through managerial reforms, while digital-era governance highlights the use of automation, data analytics, and information technologies to improve decision-making and service delivery (Hood, 1991; Dunleavy et *al*., 2006).

Public management theories also play a critical role in ensuring democratic accountability. Governance-oriented perspectives emphasize transparency, citizen engagement, and participatory decision-making as essential components of legitimate and responsive public administration. Concepts such as co-production, collaborative governance, and open government initiatives underscore the importance of involving citizens and stakeholders in policy design and service provision to maintain public trust and accountability (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Osborne, 2006).

Furthermore, public management theories assist governments in adapting to rapid societal and environmental changes. As societies confront challenges such as socioeconomic inequality, technological disruption, and climate-related risks, traditional hierarchical models of administration often prove insufficient. Emerging theoretical approaches provide frameworks for addressing these complex, cross-sectoral problems through coordination, adaptability, and network-based governance arrangements (Ansell & Torfing, 2014).

Finally, public management theories are central to driving innovation in the public sector. The increasing adoption of digital technologies, artificial intelligence, and big data analytics is transforming governmental operations and public service delivery. These theories help public administrators navigate technological innovation while addressing ethical concerns, safeguarding public values, and maintaining citizen trust (Margetts & Dunleavy, 2013; OECD, 2019).

By applying public management theories in practice, modern governments can enhance the quality and responsiveness of public services, strengthen democratic governance, and develop innovative and sustainable solutions to complex policy challenges.

1.3. Structure of the Article

This paper presents a comprehensive analysis of the evolution of public management theories, their major critiques, and their continued relevance within contemporary governance systems. The article is organized as follows.

Section 2 examines classical public administration theories, focusing on early models of public management such as Weberian bureaucracy, scientific management, and classical organizational theory. These approaches established the foundational principles of hierarchy, rationality, and formal authority that shaped public administration as an academic discipline and administrative practice.

Section 3 explores the rise of New Public Management (NPM) during the 1980s and 1990s. This section analyzes NPM's emphasis on efficiency, performance measurement, market-oriented reforms, and managerial autonomy, while also addressing its limitations and the extensive critiques concerning fragmentation, accountability, and public value.

Section 4 discusses the emergence of governance networks and collaborative public management as responses to the shortcomings of NPM. It highlights the growing importance of networked governance, public–private partnerships, and co-production models in addressing complex policy challenges that extend beyond the capacity of hierarchical state institutions.

Section 5 analyzes the digital transformation of public management, with particular attention to digital governance, artificial intelligence, and big data analytics. This section also examines the associated challenges, including cybersecurity risks, data privacy concerns, and the ethical implications of algorithmic decision-making in the public sector.

Section 6 considers the contemporary implications of public management theories for policy development and academic research. It evaluates how these theoretical frameworks continue to influence government reform initiatives, public sector innovation, and emerging research agendas in governance studies.

Overall, this structured approach provides a historical, theoretical, and practical understanding of public management, enabling policymakers and scholars to better navigate the complexities of modern governance. By critically assessing the strengths and limitations of each paradigm, the paper aims to offer insights that contribute to the design of more effective, accountable, and citizen-oriented public institutions

1 The Early Roots of Public Management

1.1 Context

The origins of public management as a formal academic and professional discipline can be traced to the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, a period characterized by rapid industrialization, expanding state functions, and increasing bureaucratization. During this era, governments faced mounting pressures to improve administrative efficiency, consistency, and legitimacy in response to growing societal and economic complexity. Early public management theories were strongly influenced by classical management principles that emphasized hierarchical authority, formal organizational structures, and standardized administrative procedures (Weber, 2009; Taylor, 1911).

A central objective of early public administration reform was the transition from patronage-based systems toward professionalized, merit-based, and rules-oriented forms of governance. Such reforms were intended to enhance predictability, impartiality, and stability in public service delivery, thereby strengthening public trust in government institutions (Wilson, 1887; Gulick & Urwick, 1970). At the same time, scholars and practitioners engaged in ongoing debates regarding the optimal organization of government functions, seeking to balance efficiency and administrative control with emerging concerns related to worker productivity, organizational adaptability, and citizen engagement.

The foundational theories developed during this formative period—most notably Weberian bureaucracy, scientific management, and classical organizational theory—established the conceptual and institutional foundations of public management. These approaches not only shaped early administrative practice but also provided the theoretical basis upon which subsequent public management paradigms evolved, including later critiques and reform movements (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2013).

1.2 Classical Management Theory and Bureaucracy

Weberian Bureaucracy and Its Impact on Public Administration

One of the most influential figures in early public administration theory was Max Weber (1864–1920), a German sociologist and political economist whose work laid the foundation for the bureaucratic model of organization. Weber's analysis of bureaucracy provided a systematic and theoretically grounded framework for understanding how governments and other large-scale organizations could operate in a rational, structured, and efficient manner under conditions of increasing administrative complexity (Weber, 2019).

Weber conceptualized bureaucracy as an *ideal type*, characterized by a set of core principles designed to promote rational–legal authority and administrative efficiency. These principles include a clearly defined hierarchical structure, in which authority is organized in a formal chain of command and each level exercises supervision over subordinate levels; the reliance on formal rules and procedures to ensure consistency, predictability, and uniformity in decision-making; and the principle of impersonality, whereby administrative actions are governed by objective criteria rather than personal relationships or discretionary favoritism (Weber, 2019).).

In addition, Weber emphasized merit-based recruitment and promotion, arguing that officials should be selected and advanced based on technical qualifications, expertise, and performance rather than patronage or nepotism. Specialization and a clear division of labor further constitute essential features of the bureaucratic model, enabling officials to develop expertise within defined areas of responsibility and thereby enhancing organizational efficiency and reliability.

Weber regarded bureaucracy as the most rational and efficient organizational form for managing complex administrative tasks, particularly within modern states. His model was intended as a corrective to the corruption, arbitrariness, and inefficiency that characterized many premodern and patronage-based administrative systems. By institutionalizing rational–legal authority, bureaucracy was viewed as a means of promoting consistency, accountability, and neutrality in public administration, while minimizing the influence of personal and political favoritism in governmental decision-making (Beetham, 2018).

Scientific Management and the Rise of Efficiency-Oriented Administration

Concurrent with the development of Weberian bureaucracy, the principles of scientific management were advanced by Frederick Winslow Taylor (1856–1915). Taylor's seminal work on time-and-motion studies sought to improve organizational efficiency through the systematic analysis and optimization of work processes (Taylor, 1911). Central to scientific management was the assumption that productivity could be maximized by applying scientific methods to the organization and execution of tasks.

Taylor's approach emphasized task standardization, whereby complex activities were decomposed into simpler, standardized components designed to minimize waste and inefficiency. Performance measurement constituted another core element, with worker output assessed through empirical observation and quantitative data to establish optimal levels of productivity. In addition, scientific management advocated strong managerial control, asserting that planning and decision-making should be centralized in the hands of managers who would rely on scientific principles rather than individual worker discretion (Taylor, 1911).

The influence of scientific management extended beyond industrial settings into public administration, particularly in the United States, where reformers viewed Taylorism as a means of improving governmental efficiency and reducing waste. Taylor's emphasis on productivity, measurement, and control shaped the design of public sector organizations, contributing to the adoption of performance assessment mechanisms and reinforcing administrative discipline within government agencies (Rosenbloom, 2022).

Another major contributor to classical management theory was Henri Fayol (1841–1925), whose administrative theory complemented both Weberian and Taylorist perspectives. Fayol identified fourteen principles of management, including division of work, authority and responsibility, unity of command, centralization, and discipline, which he argued were universally applicable across organizations (Fayol, 2013). Unlike Taylor, who focused primarily on shop-floor efficiency, Fayol emphasized the strategic and coordinating functions of management, thereby highlighting the role of managers in planning, organizing, commanding, coordinating, and controlling organizational activities.

Fayol's contributions laid important groundwork for subsequent developments in organizational theory, leadership studies, and management education. Together, the works of Taylor and Fayol reinforced a classical view of administration centered on efficiency, hierarchy, and managerial authority, which profoundly influenced early public management practices and informed later debates on administrative reform and governance.

Bureaucracy in Practice: Strengths and Limitations

The bureaucratic model emerged as the dominant approach to public administration during the early to mid-twentieth century, particularly across Western democracies. In response to expanding state responsibilities, governments adopted centralized and hierarchical organizational structures to manage the growing provision of public services, including education, healthcare, infrastructure development, and social welfare. The effectiveness of bureaucratic governance was especially evident in the implementation of large-scale public programs, such as

the New Deal in the United States and postwar reconstruction initiatives throughout Europe, where standardized procedures and centralized coordination enabled governments to mobilize resources on an unprecedented scale (Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2017).

Despite these strengths, the bureaucratic model also exhibited significant limitations. Over time, scholars and practitioners increasingly criticized bureaucracy for its rigidity, excessive formalization, and limited adaptability to changing social and political conditions. Merton (1940) famously argued that strict adherence to rules and procedures could produce unintended consequences, including inefficiency, goal displacement, and diminished organizational effectiveness. The highly centralized and rule-bound nature of bureaucratic administration often resulted in mechanistic, top-down decision-making processes that constrained innovation, reduced organizational learning, and limited opportunities for citizen participation and responsiveness to public needs

1.3 The Challenges of Bureaucratic Models

The Limits of Rigid Hierarchies and Proceduralism

One of the most significant criticisms of bureaucratic models concerns their limited capacity to respond effectively to dynamic and complex governance challenges. Public administration scholar Robert K. Merton (1940) famously argued that bureaucratic structures can produce unintended dysfunctions, most notably *goal displacement*, whereby strict adherence to rules and procedures becomes an end in itself rather than a means of achieving substantive public policy objectives.

A growing body of scholarship has identified several key shortcomings associated with bureaucratic governance. First, decision-making processes are often slow and cumbersome, as lengthy approval procedures and multiple hierarchical layers delay policy formulation and implementation. Second, excessive formalization and procedural rigidity—commonly referred to as bureaucratic red tape—can constrain organizational adaptability and discourage innovation. Third, the impersonal character of bureaucratic administration may contribute to the alienation of both public servants and citizens, weakening trust and reducing the responsiveness of public institutions to community needs (Merton, 1940; Denhardt & Denhardt, 2013). Finally, traditional bureaucratic models frequently prove ill-suited to addressing complex, multi-sectoral policy problems that require cross-boundary collaboration, rapid decision-making, and adaptive governance arrangements.

As governments progressively expanded their responsibilities in policy domains such as healthcare, education, environmental protection, and economic regulation, the limitations of classical bureaucratic administration became increasingly apparent. These challenges underscored the need for alternative approaches to public management that prioritize flexibility, responsiveness, collaboration, and human-centered administrative practices. This recognition ultimately contributed to the emergence of subsequent reform movements and theoretical paradigms, including human relations theory, New Public Management, and governance-based approaches to public administration.

The Human Relations Movement: A Shift Toward Worker Motivation and Engagement

In response to the mechanistic and impersonal characteristics of classical bureaucracy and scientific management, the human relations movement emerged during the 1930s, introducing a psychological and sociological perspective on organizational behavior. This approach marked a significant shift in public administration theory by emphasizing the human dimensions of work, including motivation, social interaction, and employee well-being, as central determinants of organizational performance.

The movement is most closely associated with the work of Elton Mayo and his colleagues, whose research at the Hawthorne Works of the Western Electric Company produced influential insights into workplace behavior (Mayo, 2003). The Hawthorne studies demonstrated that employee morale, job satisfaction, and engagement have a direct impact on productivity, challenging the assumption that efficiency could be achieved solely through task optimization and managerial control. The findings further revealed that informal social relationships and group dynamics within the workplace often exerted a greater influence on organizational performance than formal rules and hierarchical authority.

By highlighting the importance of participation, communication, and teamwork, the human relations movement directly challenged the dominance of bureaucratic and Taylorist models of administration. Its proponents argued that empowering employees, adopting supportive leadership styles, and fostering positive organizational cultures could enhance both productivity and workplace satisfaction. As a result, governments and public organizations increasingly incorporated principles of organizational behavior into administrative practice, placing greater emphasis on leadership development, employee motivation, and human-centered management as key components of effective public administration (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2013).

1.4 The Post-War Demand for More Responsive Government

The limitations of traditional bureaucratic administration became increasingly evident in the post–World War II period, as citizens and interest groups began to demand public services that were more responsive, equitable, and transparent. The expansion of the welfare state, the rise of civil rights movements, and the emergence of new and complex social challenges placed growing pressure on public institutions to operate in ways that were more inclusive, adaptable, and oriented toward service delivery rather than procedural compliance (Goodsell, 2004).

In response to these changing societal expectations, both policymakers and scholars began to search for alternative public management approaches capable of reconciling administrative efficiency with democratic accountability, citizen engagement, and responsiveness to diverse public needs. These reform pressures ultimately contributed to the emergence of New Public Management (NPM) in the late twentieth century. NPM represented a significant departure from traditional bureaucratic models, promoting market-oriented mechanisms, performance-based management, and managerial autonomy as strategies for modernizing public administration and improving governmental effectiveness (Hood, 1991; Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2017).

2 The Rise of New Public Management (NPM)

2.1 Outline

By the late twentieth century, public administration underwent a profound transformation as governments increasingly sought alternatives to traditional bureaucratic models. Persistent concerns regarding the inefficiency, rigidity, and limited responsiveness of hierarchical administrative systems contributed to the emergence of New Public Management (NPM). This paradigm shift aimed to modernize public administration by incorporating market-based mechanisms, enhancing managerial discretion, and emphasizing performance measurement and results-oriented governance (Hood, 1991).

The rise of NPM was driven by a combination of economic, political, and ideological factors. Fiscal crises in the 1970s, intensified global economic competition, and the growing influence of neoliberal ideas advocating for smaller government and market efficiency played a central role in shaping public sector reforms (Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2017). NPM gained particular prominence in countries such as the United Kingdom, the United

States, New Zealand, and Australia during the 1980s and 1990s, where governments sought to reduce public expenditure, improve service quality, and enhance accountability by adopting private-sector management practices (Osborne & Gaebler, 1992).

As governments faced increasing pressures to deliver services more efficiently while maintaining public trust, NPM offered a framework that redefined the role of the state from direct service provider to manager and regulator of public service delivery. This shift marked a significant departure from classical public administration and set the stage for ongoing debates concerning the appropriate balance between efficiency, accountability, and public value in governance

2.2 Defining New Public Management

Origins and Intellectual Foundations

New Public Management (NPM) was strongly influenced by neoliberal economic thought, particularly public choice theory, principal–agent theory, and managerialism. These theoretical perspectives emphasized market mechanisms, incentive structures, and efficiency-driven management as solutions to perceived government failure and bureaucratic inefficiency. The promotion of market-oriented governance was closely aligned with the political and economic agendas of leaders such as Ronald Reagan in the United States and Margaret Thatcher in the United Kingdom, whose reform programs prioritized privatization, deregulation, fiscal restraint, and a reduced role for the state in service provision (Hood, 1991; Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2017).

Several scholars and policymakers played a pivotal role in shaping and disseminating the principles of NPM. Christopher Hood (1991) formally coined the term "New Public Management" and identified its defining characteristics, including a focus on performance measurement, managerial autonomy, competition, and the adoption of private-sector management practices. Similarly, Osborne and Gaebler (1992) advanced the concept of "entrepreneurial government," arguing that public organizations should focus on steering rather than rowing—that is, setting strategic direction while outsourcing or decentralizing service delivery to other actors.

James Q. Wilson (2019) contributed to NPM discourse through his analysis of bureaucratic behavior and organizational performance, highlighting structural inefficiencies within public agencies and advocating management reforms oriented toward results and accountability. In addition, Pollitt and Bouckaert (2017) provided a comparative analysis of public management reforms across different political and administrative systems, demonstrating how NPM principles were adapted and implemented unevenly across national contexts.

Collectively, these scholars argued that public administration could enhance efficiency, responsiveness, and service quality by adopting managerial techniques derived from the private sector. Their work fundamentally reshaped public sector reform agendas in many countries and established NPM as a dominant paradigm in late twentieth-century public management.

Core Principles of NPM

New Public Management (NPM) is distinguished by a set of core principles that contrast sharply with the hierarchical, rule-bound characteristics of traditional bureaucratic administration. These principles collectively reflect a shift toward decentralization, performance orientation, market mechanisms, and managerial discretion within the public sector (Hood, 1991; Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2017).

A fundamental principle of NPM is the decentralization of authority and the devolution of decision-making power from central government to local authorities, semi-autonomous agencies, or executive units. The rationale underlying this approach is that governance structures closer to service users are better positioned to respond

flexibly and efficiently to local needs. Prominent examples include the creation of executive agencies in the United Kingdom under the *Next Steps* initiative and the decentralization of health and welfare services in several Scandinavian countries. Such reforms aimed to reduce bureaucratic congestion, enhance managerial accountability, and improve service responsiveness (Hood, 1991; Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2017).

Performance-based management constitutes a central tenet of NPM, emphasizing the systematic measurement and evaluation of public sector outputs and outcomes. Governments increasingly adopted quantitative performance indicators, such as key performance indicators (KPIs), to assess service efficiency and effectiveness. Performance-related pay schemes were introduced to incentivize public employees, while tools such as cost–benefit analysis and benchmarking were used to evaluate program outcomes. Through these mechanisms, NPM sought to align public sector management more closely with private-sector practices, prioritizing results and accountability over procedural compliance (Osborne & Gaebler, 1992).

Another defining feature of NPM is the reconceptualization of citizens as customers of public services. This shift emphasized consumer choice, service quality, and user satisfaction, rather than viewing service provision solely as an administrative obligation. As a result, governments implemented reforms such as e-government initiatives to streamline service delivery, citizen satisfaction surveys to inform service improvement, and one-stop service centers designed to reduce administrative complexity and improve accessibility. These measures reflected a broader effort to make public services more responsive, efficient, and user-oriented (Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2017).

The introduction of market mechanisms and competition into public service delivery represents one of the most distinctive aspects of NPM. Governments increasingly relied on outsourcing and contracting arrangements, whereby private firms were engaged to deliver services such as waste management, transportation, and healthcare. Public–private partnerships (PPPs) were employed to finance and manage infrastructure projects, while quasi-markets were established to give citizens greater choice among service providers, as seen in charter school systems and privatized healthcare models. Proponents argued that competition would drive efficiency, innovation, and cost reduction within the public sector (Hood, 1991; Osborne & Gaebler, 1992).

In contrast to traditional bureaucratic models that emphasized strict adherence to rules and procedures, NPM promoted increased managerial autonomy and flexibility. Public managers were granted greater discretion to allocate resources, design service delivery strategies, and adapt operations to local conditions, provided that performance targets were met. This results-oriented approach encouraged innovation, experimentation, and cost-effective decision-making, while reducing reliance on centralized control and procedural oversight (Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2017).

Implementation of NPM Around the World

The adoption and implementation of New Public Management (NPM) reforms varied considerably across national contexts, reflecting differences in political systems, administrative traditions, and institutional capacities. While the core principles of NPM—such as privatization, performance measurement, and managerial autonomy—were widely diffused, their application and intensity differed across countries.

In the United Kingdom, NPM reforms were pursued most aggressively under the Thatcher government. These reforms emphasized large-scale privatization, competitive tendering, and the introduction of performance-driven management systems within the public sector. The creation of executive agencies and the use of market mechanisms in service delivery reflected a strong commitment to reducing the role of the state and enhancing efficiency through competition (Hood, 1991).

In the United States, NPM-inspired reforms gained prominence during the Clinton administration through the *Reinventing Government* initiative. Influenced by Osborne and Gaebler's (1992) concept of entrepreneurial government, this reform agenda sought to make government "smaller, cheaper, and more effective" by streamlining administrative processes, decentralizing decision-making, and emphasizing performance outcomes rather than procedural compliance.

New Zealand is often cited as one of the most radical adopters of NPM principles. Beginning in the late 1980s, the country introduced extensive managerial reforms, including output-based budgeting, contractual performance agreements for senior public managers, and the separation of policy formulation from service delivery. These reforms aimed to enhance accountability and transparency by clearly specifying outputs and performance expectations (Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2017).

In Australia and Canada, NPM reforms were implemented in a more incremental and hybrid manner. Both countries adopted performance-based management systems and introduced service delivery reforms, while simultaneously preserving key elements of social welfare provision and public sector coordination. This selective adoption reflects an effort to balance efficiency-driven reforms with commitments to equity, public value, and social protection (Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2017).

2.3 Criticisms and Limitations of NPM

Despite its initial appeal and widespread adoption, New Public Management (NPM) became the subject of substantial criticism as governments increasingly confronted its unintended consequences and normative trade-offs. While NPM reforms were intended to enhance efficiency, accountability, and service quality, empirical evidence and practical experience revealed significant challenges related to fragmentation, coordination failures, democratic accountability, and the erosion of public sector values. These shortcomings prompted scholars and practitioners to reassess the limitations of market-oriented governance and to explore alternative frameworks better suited to addressing the complexity of contemporary public administration.

Marketization vs. Public Interest

Critics of New Public Management (NPM) argue that the paradigm placed a disproportionate emphasis on efficiency, competition, and market logic, often at the expense of equity, social justice, and core democratic values. Unlike private-sector organizations, public agencies are entrusted with responsibilities related to public welfare, social cohesion, and regulatory oversight—functions that cannot always be adequately captured through economic performance indicators or market-based metrics (Hood, 1991; Denhardt & Denhardt, 2015).

One major concern relates to equity and access. Market-oriented service delivery models have been criticized for disproportionately benefiting affluent or urban populations while marginalizing low-income, rural, and vulnerable groups. By prioritizing efficiency and cost-effectiveness, NPM reforms risk undermining the redistributive and inclusive role of the state, thereby exacerbating existing social inequalities (Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2017).

Another prominent critique focuses on the commodification of public services. Under NPM, essential services such as education, healthcare, and social welfare were increasingly framed as marketable goods rather than public rights. This shift challenged the principle of universal access and raised concerns about the erosion of public values, as service provision became more closely aligned with consumer choice and profitability rather than collective social outcomes (Osborne, 2006; Denhardt & Denhardt, 2015).

Collectively, these critiques highlight the normative limitations of NPM and underscore the tension between market efficiency and the broader public interest. Such concerns played a significant role in motivating the search for alternative governance frameworks that reassert the importance of public value, democratic accountability, and social equity in public administration.

Fragmentation and Lack of Coordination

While decentralization and outsourcing under New Public Management (NPM) were intended to enhance flexibility and efficiency, these reforms also produced significant coordination and accountability challenges. The fragmentation of public service delivery into semi-autonomous agencies and contracted providers often resulted in organizational silos that undermined policy coherence and system-wide efficiency (Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2017).

One major consequence of these reforms was the erosion of central oversight, which complicated governments' ability to coordinate national policies and pursue integrated, cross-sectoral objectives. As responsibilities were dispersed across multiple public, private, and nonprofit actors, ensuring consistency in policy implementation became increasingly difficult. This fragmentation frequently led to variations in service quality and access, as independently operating entities applied different standards, priorities, and performance criteria (Hood, 1991).

Moreover, the diffusion of responsibilities weakened traditional accountability mechanisms. Under NPM, contractual and performance-based arrangements often replaced hierarchical lines of authority, making it more challenging to clearly assign responsibility for outcomes and to hold service providers accountable for failures or unintended consequences. Scholars have argued that this "hollowing out" of the state blurred the boundaries of public responsibility and reduced transparency in governance processes (Rhodes, 1996; Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2017).

Collectively, these issues highlighted the limitations of decentralized, market-oriented governance and contributed to growing concerns about coordination, accountability, and democratic control in public administration.

Short-Termism and Perverse Incentives

An increased reliance on performance indicators, benchmarking, and competition under New Public Management (NPM) frequently produced unintended behavioral consequences, commonly described as "gaming the system." Rather than fostering genuine improvements in service quality, performance-based regimes often incentivized organizations to focus narrowly on meeting quantified targets, sometimes at the expense of broader public outcomes (Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2017).

In practice, this dynamic encouraged behaviors such as selective reporting, data manipulation, and the strategic reclassification of activities to satisfy performance criteria. Public organizations also tended to prioritize short-term efficiency gains that were easily measurable over long-term policy objectives related to sustainability, capacity building, and social impact. Scholars have argued that such target-driven behavior can distort organizational priorities, undermine professional judgment, and weaken public trust in performance management systems (Hood, 2006; Pollitt, 2013).

These limitations underscored the risks associated with excessive reliance on quantitative performance measurement in complex public sector environments, where outcomes are often multidimensional, contested, and difficult to measure accurately. Consequently, concerns about gaming and goal displacement further contributed to the critique of NPM and reinforced calls for more balanced approaches to accountability and performance management.

Bureaucratic Reinvention Rather than Reduction

Paradoxically, although New Public Management (NPM) was intended to reduce bureaucracy and streamline public administration, it frequently generated new forms of administrative complexity. The expansion of contract management systems, performance auditing regimes, and regulatory oversight mechanisms introduced additional procedural requirements and monitoring structures within the public sector. Rather than eliminating bureaucracy, these reforms often displaced it, creating new layers of administrative work associated with compliance, reporting, and evaluation (Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2017).

This phenomenon has led scholars to characterize NPM as a process of bureaucratic reinvention rather than bureaucratic reduction. Dunleavy et *al.* (2006) argue that the fragmentation and contractualization of public services under NPM necessitated extensive oversight and coordination mechanisms, ultimately increasing administrative burdens and transaction costs. As a result, public organizations often faced heightened managerial complexity, undermining the original objectives of simplification and efficiency.

These unintended consequences further contributed to growing skepticism regarding the capacity of NPM to deliver sustained administrative reform and reinforced calls for alternative governance models better suited to managing complexity in contemporary public administration.

3 The Emergence of Governance and Network Theory

3.1 Outline

By the late 1990s and early 2000s, growing dissatisfaction with the limitations of New Public Management (NPM) contributed to the emergence of alternative governance models that emphasized collaboration, networks, and stakeholder engagement. Unlike NPM, which largely drew on private-sector managerial techniques and market-based mechanisms, governance-oriented approaches recognized that public administration operates within complex, interdependent systems involving a diverse range of actors, including public agencies, private firms, nonprofit organizations, and citizens (Rhodes, 1997; Osborne, 2010).

This paradigm shift reflected the increasing complexity and interconnectivity of contemporary public policy challenges. Issues such as globalization, climate change, public health crises, and digital transformation transcend organizational and sectoral boundaries, rendering traditional hierarchical bureaucracies and market-driven efficiency models insufficient on their own. Governance theory therefore advanced a more decentralized, participatory, and adaptive conception of public management, one that prioritizes coordination, trust-based relationships, and collective problem-solving across networks of actors (Kickert et *al.,* 1997; Ansell & Gash, 2008).

By emphasizing collaboration and co-production, governance-based approaches sought to restore democratic legitimacy and public value to administrative practice while improving the capacity of governments to respond effectively to complex societal challenges. As such, the rise of governance theory marked a significant evolution in public management thought, moving beyond the narrow efficiency focus of NPM toward a broader understanding of governance as a shared and interactive process.

3.2 Governance and the Shift Away from NPM

Defining Governance Theory

Governance theory extends beyond the traditional functions of government to focus on the broader processes of governing, encompassing the interactions among state and non-state actors involved in decision-making, policy implementation, and public service delivery. In contrast to New Public Management (NPM), which prioritized efficiency, managerial control, and market-based competition, governance-oriented approaches emphasize collaboration, co-production, and the creation of public value through collective action (Osborne, 2010).

A central contribution to governance theory is provided by Rhodes (1996), who conceptualized governance as a shift away from hierarchical, command-and-control modes of administration toward decentralized and networked forms of coordination. Within this framework, public authority is dispersed across interconnected networks rather than concentrated within formal governmental hierarchies. Governance theory thus foregrounds horizontal relationships among actors, highlighting the importance of partnerships and policy networks that bring together public agencies, private-sector organizations, and civil society groups in pursuit of shared objectives.

Moreover, governance approaches emphasize adaptive and reflexive policymaking capable of responding to evolving societal needs and complex policy environments. By fostering trust, negotiation, and mutual dependence among diverse actors, governance theory seeks to enhance the capacity of public institutions to address multifaceted challenges that cannot be effectively managed through hierarchical control or market competition alone (Rhodes, 1996; Ansell & Gash, 2008).

Key Concepts in Governance Theory

Governance approaches are defined by a set of interrelated principles that reflect a departure from hierarchical, state-centric models of public administration toward more collaborative, participatory, and value-driven forms of governing. These principles underscore the recognition that contemporary public policy challenges require coordinated action among diverse actors and institutions operating across organizational and sectoral boundaries (Osborne, 2010).

Principle 01 – Networked Governance

Networked governance is a foundational principle of governance theory, emphasizing that governments are no longer the sole or dominant providers of public services. Instead, governing occurs through interorganizational networks that bring together a wide range of actors, including government agencies at national, regional, and local levels; private-sector organizations involved in public–private partnerships; non-governmental organizations (NGOs) engaged in advocacy and service delivery; and civil society groups representing community interests (Rhodes, 1997; Kickert et *al.*, 1997).

Unlike traditional bureaucratic models, which relied on centralized authority and hierarchical control, networked governance is based on collaboration, negotiation, and shared responsibility among stakeholders. Authority is dispersed rather than monopolized by the state, and policy outcomes emerge through interaction and mutual dependence. Global climate governance initiatives illustrate this principle, as governments, businesses, and NGOs cooperate to design and implement environmental policies that transcend national boundaries (Ansell & Gash, 2008).

Principe 02 – Co-Production of Public Services

A second key principle of governance theory is the co-production of public services, which redefines citizens as active participants in public governance rather than passive recipients of services. Co-production involves direct citizen engagement in policymaking processes, such as participatory budgeting and citizen juries; collaborative

arrangements between public authorities and private or community actors in service delivery; and technology-enabled participation through digital platforms that facilitate consultation, feedback, and collective decision-making (Osborne et *al.,* 2016).

By incorporating citizens' knowledge, preferences, and lived experiences into policy design and implementation, co-production can enhance trust, accountability, and service responsiveness. Digital participation initiatives, such as Barcelona's *Decidim* platform, exemplify how governance approaches leverage technology to enable inclusive and deliberative forms of citizen involvement in public decision-making.

Principe 03 – Public Value Management

Governance theory also shifts the focus of public management from narrow efficiency metrics toward the creation of public value. Introduced by Moore (1995), public value management emphasizes the role of public institutions in generating outcomes that reflect collective societal goals rather than solely economic efficiency or market performance. In contrast to New Public Management, which prioritized cost reduction and competition, public value management seeks to balance efficiency with democratic values, social inclusion, and ethical governance (Moore, 1995; Osborne, 2010).

Public value is assessed not only through financial indicators but also through broader criteria such as equity and social justice, sustainability and long-term societal benefits, and democratic legitimacy achieved through transparency, accountability, and public trust. As a result, governments increasingly employ public value frameworks to evaluate policies and programs beyond traditional cost–benefit analyses, ensuring that public action advances comprehensive societal well-being rather than narrow economic interests.

- **The Shift from Government to Governance**

Governance theory represents a fundamental transformation in public management approaches, marking a shift away from the assumptions underpinning traditional government and New Public Management (NPM). Whereas classical public administration relied on hierarchical bureaucracies characterized by centralized authority and rigid rules, governance approaches emphasize decentralized networks, horizontal coordination, and flexible forms of organization. Decision-making processes are no longer government-centric but instead involve collaboration among multiple actors, including public agencies, private-sector organizations, and civil society groups (Rhodes, 1997; Osborne, 2010).

In contrast to traditional models in which the state functioned as the primary or sole provider of public services, governance theory recognizes the increasing importance of partnerships and interorganizational networks in service delivery. These arrangements enable governments to draw upon the resources, expertise, and capacities of non-state actors to address complex and cross-cutting policy challenges. As a result, rigid rules and standardized procedures are increasingly replaced by adaptive, context-sensitive approaches that prioritize negotiation, learning, and mutual dependence among stakeholders.

Moreover, governance approaches signal a normative shift in the objectives of public management reform. While NPM was largely driven by efficiency, cost reduction, and performance measurement, governance theory places greater emphasis on the creation of public value. This includes considerations of equity, democratic legitimacy, sustainability, and social trust, which extend beyond narrowly defined economic outcomes. Public value–driven reforms seek to balance efficiency with broader societal goals and to enhance the legitimacy and responsiveness of public action.

As governance increasingly supplants NPM as the dominant paradigm in public management, the role of government evolves accordingly. Rather than acting primarily as a direct service provider or market regulator, the state assumes a facilitative and coordinating role. Governments are tasked with enabling collaboration, managing networks, and ensuring accountability across diverse actors, thereby steering collective efforts toward shared public objectives in an increasingly complex governance environment.

3.3 Governance in Practice

Governance theory has been widely applied across policy domains such as urban planning, environmental governance, digital transformation, and public health, demonstrating its adaptability in addressing complex and multifaceted contemporary challenges. In urban planning, governance approaches facilitate collaborative decision-making among governments, private developers, and community stakeholders, enabling more inclusive and sustainable development outcomes. In environmental policy, networked and multi-level governance arrangements are essential for managing collective-action problems such as climate change, biodiversity loss, and resource management, which transcend administrative and national boundaries. Similarly, in the context of digital transformation, governance frameworks support cross-sector coordination, data sharing, and citizen engagement in the design and delivery of digital public services. In public health, collaborative governance has proven critical for coordinating responses to crises, integrating expertise across sectors, and enhancing institutional resilience (Kickert et *al.,* 1997; Ansell & Gash, 2008; Osborne, 2010).

- **Urban Governance and Smart Cities**

Cities increasingly rely on networked governance models to address complex urban challenges such as transportation, housing provision, and digital infrastructure development. As urban systems become more interconnected and technologically sophisticated, traditional hierarchical modes of governance have proven insufficient to manage the interdependencies between public authorities, private firms, and local communities. Governance-based approaches therefore emphasize collaboration, coordination, and shared responsibility across multiple actors involved in urban policy design and implementation (Pierre, 2011; Osborne, 2010).

One prominent manifestation of networked urban governance is the rise of smart city initiatives. Cities such as Singapore, Amsterdam, and Barcelona have adopted governance models that rely on public–private partnerships to deploy digital technologies, including smart sensors, artificial intelligence–driven traffic management systems, and data-enabled urban services. These initiatives often combine technological innovation with participatory platforms that enable citizens to contribute to urban planning and decision-making processes, thereby enhancing transparency and responsiveness (Meijer & Bolívar, 2016).

In addition, collaborative urban planning has become a key feature of governance-oriented city management. Many local governments increasingly co-design policies and development projects with residents, community organizations, and private stakeholders. Through mechanisms such as participatory planning workshops, neighborhood forums, and digital consultation tools, collaborative governance seeks to ensure that urban development aligns with local needs, promotes social inclusion, and strengthens democratic legitimacy (Ansell & Gash, 2008).

Together, these governance approaches illustrate how cities leverage networks and partnerships to enhance their capacity to respond to complex urban challenges, balancing technological innovation with citizen engagement and public value creation.

- **Environmental Governance and Climate Policy**

Governance approaches are particularly critical in addressing global environmental challenges, where the scale, complexity, and transboundary nature of problems exceed the capacity of national governments acting alone. Issues such as climate change, biodiversity loss, and environmental degradation require coordinated action across multiple levels of governance and among a diverse range of public and non-state actors. Governance theory therefore provides a valuable framework for understanding how collective action can be organized beyond traditional state-centric models (Rhodes, 1997; Jordan et *al.,* 2018).

A prominent example of global environmental governance is the Paris Agreement adopted in 2015. This framework reflects a networked and multi-actor approach to climate governance, in which national governments commit to voluntary emissions reduction targets while collaborating with businesses, cities, civil society organizations, and international institutions to implement climate action. The Paris Agreement exemplifies a shift from binding, top-down regulation toward more flexible, cooperative arrangements that rely on coordination, transparency, and shared responsibility (Falkner, 2016).

In addition, multi-level climate governance has emerged as a key feature of contemporary environmental policy. Subnational actors, including regional governments, cities, and supranational entities, play an increasingly active role in developing and implementing sustainability policies aligned with global climate objectives. For example, U.S. states such as California have pursued ambitious emissions reduction and renewable energy initiatives independently of federal policy, while the European Union's Green Deal represents a comprehensive, region-wide strategy for achieving climate neutrality. These initiatives demonstrate how governance across local, national, and international levels enhances policy innovation, accountability, and resilience in addressing environmental challenges (Betsill & Bulkeley, 2006; Jordan et *al.,* 2018).

Together, these examples illustrate how governance approaches facilitate coordination across actors and levels of authority, enabling more adaptive and inclusive responses to global environmental problems than hierarchical or purely market-based models alone

- **Public Health Governance and Crisis Management**

The COVID-19 pandemic underscored the necessity of governance-based responses to complex, large-scale public health crises, as no single government entity possessed the capacity to manage such challenges independently. The pandemic revealed the limitations of hierarchical, state-centric models of crisis management and highlighted the importance of collaboration, coordination, and shared responsibility among public authorities, private-sector actors, international organizations, and civil society. Governance-based approaches proved essential for integrating expertise, mobilizing resources, and responding adaptively to rapidly evolving conditions (Ansell et *al.,* 2021).

A prominent example of collaborative global health governance is the COVID-19 Vaccines Global Access (COVAX) initiative. Coordinated by the World Health Organization (WHO) in partnership with governments, international organizations, and private pharmaceutical companies, COVAX aimed to ensure more equitable global access to vaccines, particularly for low- and middle-income countries. Although the initiative faced implementation challenges, it represented an unprecedented attempt to institutionalize solidarity, shared risk, and multilateral cooperation in global vaccine distribution (Wouters *et al.,* 2021).

At the national level, several countries adopted governance-based digital strategies to manage public health data and containment measures. For instance, South Korea and Taiwan employed digital contact tracing systems that relied on coordination among state agencies, private technology firms, and civil society actors. These approaches integrated legal frameworks, technological infrastructure, and public communication strategies to balance

effective disease control with concerns related to data privacy and public trust. Such cases illustrate how digital governance arrangements can enhance policy effectiveness when embedded within broader collaborative and accountable governance frameworks (You, 2020; Huang, 2020).

Overall, the COVID-19 pandemic demonstrated that effective public health responses depend on governance models capable of fostering cross-sector collaboration, leveraging digital tools responsibly, and maintaining public legitimacy under conditions of uncertainty and crisis.

- **Digital Governance and Citizen Participation**

Technology has facilitated the emergence of new forms of participatory governance by enabling real-time interaction between governments and citizens. Digital tools and platforms have expanded opportunities for transparency, engagement, and co-production, allowing citizens to contribute more directly to policy design, service delivery, and decision-making processes. These developments reflect a broader shift toward digitally enabled governance models that emphasize openness, responsiveness, and collaborative problem-solving (Margetts & Dunleavy, 2013; Meijer, 2016).

One prominent example of digital participatory governance is Estonia's e-governance ecosystem, particularly the X-Road platform. X-Road provides a secure, interoperable digital infrastructure that integrates public and private databases, enabling seamless interactions between government agencies and citizens. This system supports a wide range of services, including digital identity, online voting, healthcare records, and tax administration, thereby enhancing administrative efficiency while strengthening citizen trust and participation (Vassil, 2015=6).

Another illustrative case is Iceland's Better Reykjavik initiative, a crowdsourced policy development platform that allows citizens to propose, debate, and vote on policy ideas online. Through this platform, residents directly influence municipal decision-making, demonstrating how digital tools can institutionalize participatory governance and enhance democratic legitimacy at the local level. Such initiatives illustrate the potential of technology to broaden civic engagement and integrate citizen input into formal policy processes (Landemore, 2015).

Overall, these examples demonstrate how digital technologies can support participatory governance by lowering barriers to engagement, enhancing transparency, and fostering more inclusive and interactive relationships between governments and citizens. However, their effectiveness depends on complementary institutional frameworks that ensure accountability, data protection, and equitable access to digital participation.

- **Transparency, Accountability, and Trust**

Governance models place strong emphasis on transparency and accountability as essential mechanisms for counteracting corruption, enhancing institutional integrity, and improving public sector performance. Unlike hierarchical or market-driven models alone, governance-oriented approaches recognize transparency and accountability as relational and systemic processes that require the active involvement of multiple actors, including governments, civil society organizations, and international institutions (Bovens, 2007; Hood, 2010).

One prominent mechanism for enhancing transparency within governance frameworks is the adoption of open data initiatives. Governments in the United States, the United Kingdom, and the European Union have launched comprehensive open data platforms designed to improve public access to government information, promote data reuse, and enable external scrutiny of public decision-making. By making datasets on public spending, procurement, and service delivery openly available, these initiatives aim to strengthen accountability, reduce opportunities for corruption, and foster citizen participation and innovation (Janssen et *al.*, 2012).

In addition, anti-corruption agencies and watchdog organizations play a crucial role in governance-based accountability systems. Institutions such as Transparency International collaborate with governments, international organizations, and civil society to monitor corruption risks, develop integrity standards, and advocate for ethical governance practices. Through tools such as corruption perception indices, policy evaluations, and advocacy campaigns, these organizations contribute to strengthening oversight mechanisms and reinforcing norms of accountability across public and private sectors (Transparency International, 2020).

Together, open data initiatives and anti-corruption institutions illustrate how governance models seek to embed transparency and accountability within broader networks of actors and processes. By enabling oversight, participation, and ethical enforcement beyond the state alone, governance approaches enhance the legitimacy, effectiveness, and trustworthiness of public administration.

4 The Evolution to Digital Government and E-Governance

4.1 Outline

The digital revolution has profoundly reshaped public management theories and administrative practices, giving rise to digital government and e-governance as central concepts in contemporary governance. The integration of digital technologies into public administration has enabled governments to enhance operational efficiency, increase transparency, and expand opportunities for citizen engagement, while simultaneously responding to complex and rapidly evolving policy challenges in an increasingly interconnected global environment (Dunleavy et *al.,* 2006; Margetts & Dunleavy, 2013).

This transformation has been driven by significant technological advances, including artificial intelligence (AI), big data analytics, cloud computing, and blockchain technologies. These innovations have facilitated real-time decision-making, automated administrative processes, and data-driven policy design, while also enabling new forms of digital participation and service delivery. As a result, digital governance has altered traditional modes of public management by reshaping organizational structures, accountability mechanisms, and state–citizen interactions (Meijer & Bolívar, 2016).

At the same time, the expansion of digital governance presents substantial challenges and risks. Issues related to cybersecurity threats, digital inequality, and the ethical implications of algorithmic decision-making have raised concerns about privacy, transparency, and fairness in public administration. Scholars caution that without appropriate regulatory frameworks, institutional safeguards, and democratic oversight, digital technologies may exacerbate existing inequalities or undermine public trust in government (Kettl, 2015; Yeung, 2018).

Consequently, contemporary public management increasingly emphasizes the need to balance technological innovation with ethical governance, accountability, and inclusiveness. Digital government is thus not merely a technical reform but represents a broader transformation in governance that requires adaptive institutional capacity, cross-sector collaboration, and renewed attention to public values.

5 Digital Transformation and New Challenges

5.1 Defining Digital Government and E-Governance

Digital government refers to the systematic use of digital technologies to enhance governmental operations, decision-making processes, and public service delivery. It encompasses the automation of administrative functions, the application of data-driven policymaking, and the deployment of digital platforms that enable

governments to operate more efficiently while engaging citizens in innovative and interactive ways. Digital government thus represents a structural transformation in public administration, reshaping organizational processes, governance capacities, and state–citizen relationships.

Within this broader framework, e-governance is commonly understood as a subset of digital government that focuses specifically on the use of information and communication technologies (ICTs) to improve interactions between government, citizens, and businesses. E-governance initiatives aim to facilitate faster and more accessible service delivery, enhance transparency in governmental processes, and expand opportunities for participatory and collaborative decision-making. While digital government emphasizes internal administrative transformation, e-governance places greater emphasis on external engagement and democratic responsiveness.

According to Margetts and Dunleavy (2013), digital government is characterized by several defining features. First, the automation of public services plays a central role, with governments increasingly adopting artificial intelligence, machine learning, and robotic process automation (RPA) to streamline routine administrative tasks and reduce operational costs. Second, data-driven decision-making has become a core component of digital governance, as big data analytics are used to inform policy design, improve service targeting, and enhance overall administrative effectiveness. Third, digital government promotes the development of citizen-centric services by expanding access to online platforms that facilitate participation, consultation, and feedback. Finally, transparency and open data initiatives constitute a key pillar of digital government, enabling public access to governmental information and strengthening accountability through the digital disclosure of public sector activities.

Together, these characteristics highlight how digital government extends beyond technological modernization to represent a new paradigm of public management, one that integrates efficiency, transparency, and citizen engagement within digitally enabled governance systems.

5.2 Key Components of Digital Governance

The shift toward digital governance encompasses several interrelated elements that collectively transform how governments design policies, deliver services, and engage with citizens. These elements reflect the increasing reliance on digital technologies to enhance administrative efficiency, democratic participation, and urban management capacities within contemporary governance systems (Dunleavy et al., 2006; Margetts & Dunleavy, 2013).

Element 01 – Automation and Data Analytics

Automation and data analytics constitute a foundational element of digital governance. Governments increasingly deploy artificial intelligence (AI), machine learning, and advanced data analytics to automate routine bureaucratic processes and improve administrative efficiency. Predictive analytics are used in policymaking to forecast crime trends, traffic congestion, and public health risks, enabling more proactive and evidence-based interventions. In the area of public finance, digital tax filing and compliance systems, such as Estonia's e-Tax platform, have significantly reduced administrative burdens while improving accuracy and compliance rates (Vassil, 2015).

In addition, many governments now employ AI-driven chatbots and virtual assistants to handle citizen inquiries, provide real-time information, and streamline access to public services. These tools enhance service responsiveness and reduce costs, while also reshaping state–citizen interactions by offering continuous, technology-mediated engagement (Margetts & Dunleavy, 2013).

Element 02 – Citizen Engagement Through Digital Platforms

Digital governance has also transformed mechanisms of citizen engagement, expanding opportunities for participation beyond traditional, in-person channels. Online voting systems, most notably implemented in Estonia, demonstrate how secure digital infrastructures can support electoral participation and democratic inclusion. Participatory budgeting platforms adopted in cities such as Paris and Madrid allow citizens to directly influence the allocation of municipal resources through online deliberation and voting, thereby strengthening democratic legitimacy and transparency (Smith, 2009; Meijer, 2016).

Furthermore, governments increasingly utilize social media platforms, mobile applications, and digital communication tools to disseminate information, collect feedback, and issue real-time updates during emergencies. These platforms facilitate two-way communication between public authorities and citizens, enhancing responsiveness and enabling more adaptive governance practices in fast-changing environments (Kettl, 2015).

Element 03 – Smart Cities and Digital Infrastructure

The development of smart cities represents a prominent application of digital governance at the urban level. Smart city initiatives integrate digital technologies such as the Internet of Things (IoT), AI, and data analytics into urban management systems to improve transportation, public safety, environmental sustainability, and energy efficiency. Singapore's Smart Nation Initiative exemplifies this approach, employing data-driven technologies to optimize traffic management, waste collection, and energy consumption across the city-state (Meijer & Bolívar, 2016).

Similarly, Barcelona's use of IoT-based smart lighting and air quality monitoring systems demonstrates how digital infrastructure can support resource optimization and environmental sustainability. Automated traffic management systems and AI-supported surveillance technologies, implemented in cities such as Shanghai and London, further illustrate how digital governance tools are used to manage congestion and enhance public security. While these innovations offer substantial efficiency gains, they also raise important governance concerns related to privacy, surveillance, and accountability, underscoring the need for robust ethical and regulatory frameworks (Yeung, 2018).

5.3 The Expansion of Emerging Technologies in Governance

Governments are increasingly incorporating advanced digital technologies into public management systems to enhance efficiency, transparency, and effectiveness of policy. These technologies are reshaping administrative processes, decision-making structures, and governance capacities by enabling more secure transactions, data-driven policymaking, and automated administrative functions (Margetts & Dunleavy, 2013; Meijer et *al.,* 2020).

One prominent technological innovation in public management is the use of blockchain technology to support secure, transparent, and tamper-resistant transactions. Blockchain has been applied in areas such as land registries, digital identity systems, and public procurement processes, where trust, data integrity, and traceability are critical. For example, Sweden's blockchain-based property registry initiative illustrates how distributed ledger technology can improve transparency, reduce fraud, and increase efficiency in land administration (Ølnes et al., 2017).

Artificial intelligence (AI) is also increasingly employed to support administrative decision-making. AI-assisted tools enable governments to analyze large volumes of structured and unstructured data, improving forecasting, service targeting, and operational efficiency. Applications include automated eligibility assessments, resource

allocation, and risk analysis in areas such as social services, taxation, and law enforcement. While these tools offer substantial efficiency gains, they also raise concerns regarding accountability, bias, and the transparency of algorithmic decision-making (Yeung, 2018).

In addition, big data analytics play a central role in predictive policymaking, allowing governments to identify emerging social, economic, and public health trends in real time. By integrating data from multiple sources—such as administrative records, sensor data, and digital platforms, public authorities can design more proactive and responsive policies. Predictive analytics has been applied in areas including economic forecasting, urban planning, and crisis management, supporting evidence-based governance in increasingly complex environments (Kettl, 2015).

Collectively, these technological innovations highlight the growing convergence of digital transformation and public management. However, their effective use depends on robust governance frameworks that address ethical considerations, data protection, institutional accountability, and public trust.

5.4 Challenges and Risks of Digital Governance

While digital technologies offer significant opportunities for improving efficiency, transparency, and citizen engagement in public administration, they also introduce substantial risks and challenges that require careful governance. Digital transformation is not a neutral or purely technical process; rather, it raises critical issues related to inequality, security, ethics, and accountability that must be addressed to ensure that digital governance contributes positively to public value and democratic legitimacy.

- **Digital Inequality and the Digital Divide**

One of the most persistent challenges of digital governance is digital inequality, which refers to unequal access to digital technologies, infrastructure, and skills across different social groups and regions. Not all citizens possess reliable internet access or sufficient digital literacy, resulting in gaps in public service delivery and unequal participation in digital governance processes (van Dijk, 2020).

Rural and underprivileged populations are particularly affected by limited broadband infrastructure, while older adults, low-income citizens, and people with disabilities often face barriers in accessing e-government platforms. These disparities risk excluding vulnerable groups from essential public services and democratic participation. At the global level, digital transformation has also exacerbated inequalities between countries, as wealthier nations advance rapidly in digital government initiatives, while many developing countries face infrastructural, financial, and institutional constraints (UNDP, 2021).

- **Cybersecurity and Data Protection Risks**

As governments increasingly digitize administrative systems and public services, they become more vulnerable to cybersecurity threats, data breaches, and privacy violations. Cyberattacks targeting critical national infrastructure, such as healthcare systems, financial institutions, and transportation networks, can result in severe economic and social disruptions, as illustrated by ransomware attacks on hospitals and public agencies (Kettl, 2015).

In addition, breaches involving personal data undermine public trust in digital government and raise concerns about state capacity to safeguard sensitive information. Electoral systems have also become targets of cyber interference, including hacking and misinformation campaigns aimed at destabilizing democratic institutions. To

mitigate these risks, governments must invest in robust cybersecurity infrastructure, adopt strong encryption and risk management protocols, and enforce comprehensive data protection frameworks, such as the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) (European Commission, 2018).

- **Ethical and Accountability Issues in AI and Automation**

The growing use of artificial intelligence (AI) and automated decision-making systems in public administration introduces serious ethical and accountability challenges. Algorithmic systems used in areas such as predictive policing, welfare eligibility, and recruitment have been shown to reproduce or amplify racial, gender, and socioeconomic biases embedded in training data and institutional practices (Yeung, 2018).

Moreover, many AI systems operate as "black boxes," making it difficult for citizens and public officials to understand, contest, or appeal automated decisions. This lack of transparency undermines principles of accountability, due process, and administrative justice. There are also growing concerns about the expansion of AI-driven surveillance technologies, including facial recognition, which may erode civil liberties and enable intrusive forms of state monitoring (Zuboff, 2019).

- **Balancing Privacy, Security, and Surveillance**

Digital governance requires governments to navigate a delicate balance between ensuring public security and protecting individual privacy rights. While data-driven surveillance tools can support crime prevention and counterterrorism efforts, excessive or unregulated monitoring poses significant risks to civil liberties and democratic freedoms. Comparative experiences highlight divergent governance approaches, ranging from highly surveillance-oriented systems such as China's social credit mechanisms to privacy-protective frameworks such as Europe's GDPR (Kitchin, 2021).

Issues of data ownership and consent have become increasingly salient, as citizens demand greater transparency and control over how governments collect, store, and use personal data. In response, many governments and international organizations are developing ethical AI governance frameworks aimed at promoting fairness, transparency, and accountability in automated decision-making processes.

- **Future Prospects and Policy Implications**

To maximize the benefits of digital governance while mitigating its risks, policymakers must adopt a holistic and inclusive approach to digital transformation. Key policy priorities include expanding digital literacy and capacity-building programs to ensure equitable access to digital services across demographic groups; strengthening national and international cybersecurity strategies; and developing transparent AI governance and data ethics frameworks supported by independent oversight mechanisms.

Equally important is the need to design inclusive digital policies that prevent exclusion and reinforce democratic values. Digital governance should not merely enhance administrative efficiency but must also contribute to social equity, public trust, and long-term institutional legitimacy. Addressing these challenges effectively will determine whether digital transformation strengthens or undermines contemporary public governance.

6 The Relevance of Public Management Theories in Contemporary Policy and Research Contexts

6.1 Overview

Public management theories have continuously evolved in response to the increasing complexity of governance in the twenty-first century. While classical bureaucratic models once dominated public administration, contemporary challenges, including globalization, digital transformation, climate change, public health crises, and persistent social inequalities—require governance approaches that integrate efficiency with inclusivity, adaptability, and collaboration. As a result, modern public administration can no longer rely on a single theoretical framework but instead draws on a combination of New Public Management (NPM), governance theory, and digital governance.

In both policy practice and academic research, these frameworks inform how governments structure public service delivery, engage stakeholders, and leverage technological innovation to enhance effectiveness and legitimacy. The continued relevance of public management theories lies in their capacity to provide analytical tools for understanding and navigating the institutional, political, and technological transformations shaping contemporary governance.

6.2 Policy Implications

Public management theories remain highly influential in shaping contemporary policy decisions across a wide range of sectors, including public service delivery, infrastructure development, environmental governance, and digital transformation. While no single paradigm dominates, policymakers increasingly adopt hybrid approaches that combine efficiency-oriented reforms with collaborative and technology-enabled governance strategies.

- **The Lasting Influence of New Public Management (NPM)**

Despite extensive criticism, the core principles of New Public Management, such as market mechanisms, performance-based management, and decentralization, continue to shape public sector reforms worldwide. One prominent application is performance-based funding, whereby governments link financial allocations to measurable outcomes. In sectors such as education and healthcare, performance indicators are widely used to incentivize efficiency and accountability. For example, the United States Medicare program employs value-based purchasing mechanisms that reward hospitals for improved patient outcomes rather than service volume (Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2017).

Outsourcing and public–private partnerships (PPPs) also remain central to contemporary governance. Governments increasingly collaborate with private firms to finance and deliver infrastructure and public services. In the United Kingdom, the Private Finance Initiative (PFI) has been used to fund hospitals, schools, and transportation projects through long-term contractual arrangements, reflecting NPM's emphasis on risk-sharing and private-sector efficiency (Hood, 1991).

Market-oriented reforms continue to influence service provision in sectors such as transportation, utilities, and waste management. Sweden's education voucher system, which allows parents to choose among publicly funded schools, illustrates how market principles have been applied to public service delivery in pursuit of efficiency and consumer choice. Nevertheless, growing concerns regarding equity, fragmentation, and accountability have led policymakers to temper NPM reforms with governance-oriented approaches that emphasize coordination, participation, and public value.

- **Governance Theories and Collaborative Policymaking**

Governance theories emphasize that contemporary public problems are too complex for governments to address unilaterally. Instead, effective policymaking increasingly depends on multi-actor and multi-level governance arrangements that promote collaboration among public agencies, private organizations, civil society, and citizens.

Networked governance has become a defining feature of policymaking in many contexts. For example, the European Union's system of multi-level governance coordinates policy across supranational, national, regional, and local levels while engaging non-state actors in policy formulation and implementation (Hooghe & Marks, 2001). Such arrangements enhance policy coherence in areas ranging from regional development to environmental regulation.

Co-production of public services represents another key governance innovation. Citizens are increasingly involved in the design and delivery of public services through participatory mechanisms such as deliberate forums and participatory budgeting. In countries such as Brazil and Spain, participatory budgeting initiatives allow residents to vote directly on municipal spending priorities, thereby strengthening democratic legitimacy and policy responsiveness (Fung, 2015).

Governance theories are also central to climate policymaking, where transnational and networked approaches dominate. The Paris Agreement (2015) exemplifies a governance framework that brings together governments, international organizations, businesses, and civil society actors to address climate change through coordinated yet decentralized commitments (Hale, 2020). These examples reflect a broader shift toward inclusive, adaptive, and collaborative forms of policymaking.

- **The Integration of Digital Governance**

The rise of digital governance has further transformed public management and policy implementation. Governments increasingly deploy digital technologies—including artificial intelligence, big data analytics, and blockchain—to improve transparency, efficiency, and citizen engagement. Open data initiatives, such as those mandated by the United States Open Government Data Act, aim to enhance accountability by making government information publicly accessible.

Digital governance has also reshaped service delivery through e-governance platforms. Estonia's digital identity system, for example, enables citizens to access a wide range of public services online, significantly reducing administrative burdens while increasing efficiency and trust. In addition, governments have adopted crowdsourced policymaking platforms to facilitate citizen participation. Taiwan's digital democracy initiatives illustrate how online deliberation and consultation can be institutionalized within policymaking processes.

At the same time, digital governance introduces significant ethical and regulatory challenges. Issues related to data privacy, cybersecurity, and algorithmic bias require policymakers to balance innovation with accountability and democratic oversight. As a result, digital governance increasingly intersects with broader debates on public value, transparency, and rights-based governance.

6.3 Public Management Research and Development

Contemporary public management research has become increasingly interdisciplinary, integrating insights from political science, economics, sociology, behavioral studies, and information technology. This research agenda reflects the evolving nature of governance and the need to understand how institutions, technologies, and actors interact in complex policy environments.

- **Emerging Research Trends in Public Management**

One major research area concerns the role of artificial intelligence and automation in public policy. Scholars examine how AI affects bureaucratic efficiency, decision-making quality, and citizen engagement. While AI-driven automation offers potential benefits—such as reducing administrative burdens and improving policy forecasting—research also highlights risks related to algorithmic bias and discrimination. Studies of automated welfare systems in the Netherlands, for instance, reveal how algorithmic decision-making can disproportionately disadvantage vulnerable populations.

A second research focus addresses governance networks and policy effectiveness. Scholars investigate whether multi-level and networked governance arrangements improve coordination or instead exacerbate fragmentation. Research on global health governance, including the coordination between the World Health Organization, national governments, and NGOs during pandemics, illustrates both the potential and limitations of collaborative governance.

Digital transformation and bureaucratic structures constitute a third research domain. Studies explore how digital technologies reshape administrative hierarchies and accountability mechanisms, as well as their effects on citizen trust. Research on China's social credit system, for example, examines the implications of digital governance for individual freedoms and state power.

Finally, public value creation and democratic accountability have emerged as central themes in contemporary research. Scholars increasingly question how governments can measure success beyond economic efficiency and ensure meaningful citizen engagement. Research on civic technology platforms highlights how digital tools can enhance participatory governance while also raising concerns about inclusion and representativeness.

- **The Future of Co-Production in Public Management**

Co-production represents a particularly promising area of future research and practice in public management. By involving citizens, communities, and service users in the design and delivery of public services, co-production has the potential to enhance trust, efficiency, and policy responsiveness. However, successful co-production requires institutional capacity, inclusive governance structures, and sustained political commitment.

The United Kingdom's National Health Service (NHS) provides a notable example, as patients and communities are increasingly involved in healthcare planning and decision-making. While such initiatives demonstrate the potential of co-production to improve service outcomes, research also highlights challenges related to power imbalances, representativeness, and administrative coordination (Bovaird & Loeffler, 2012). Future public management research will therefore play a critical role in identifying the conditions under which co-production can be scaled and sustained effectively.

7 Conclusion

7.1 Summary of the Evolution of Public Management Theories

The evolution of public management theories over the past century reflects the dynamic political, economic, and social environments in which governments operate. From the dominance of classical bureaucratic administration to the emergence of New Public Management (NPM), governance networks, and digital governance, each theoretical paradigm has arisen in response to changing public expectations, institutional pressures, and technological developments.

Classical public administration, shaped by the works of Weber, Taylor, and Fayol, established hierarchy, formal rules, specialization, and efficiency as the foundational principles of public sector organization. These models provided stability, predictability, and administrative control, particularly during periods of state expansion. New Public Management later challenged bureaucratic rigidity by introducing market-oriented reforms, emphasizing performance measurement, decentralization, competition, and customer-oriented service delivery.

Governance theory marked a further shift by recognizing the limitations of both hierarchy and market mechanisms in addressing complex public problems. It redirected attention toward collaborative networks, partnerships, and citizen participation, emphasizing the role of multiple actors in policymaking and service delivery. More recently, digital governance and e-government have transformed public administration through the integration of artificial intelligence, big data, automation, and digital participation platforms, reshaping how governments operate and interact with citizens.

Together, these theoretical developments illustrate a continuous effort to enhance public sector efficiency, responsiveness, transparency, and legitimacy while responding to the growing complexity and interconnectedness of contemporary governance challenges.

7.2 Contemporary Relevance of Public Management Theories

Despite their historical origins, public management theories remain highly relevant in addressing today's most pressing governance challenges. Governments across the globe confront multifaceted issues such as climate change, economic inequality, digital transformation, and global public health crises. These challenges demand governance approaches that transcend traditional administrative boundaries and integrate efficiency with equity, collaboration, and adaptability.

- **The Role of New Public Management in Modern Governance**

Elements of New Public Management continue to influence contemporary public administration, particularly through performance-based funding, privatization, outsourcing, and results-oriented service delivery. Many governments still rely on competition, managerial autonomy, and performance measurement to enhance efficiency and accountability. However, sustained criticism regarding over-commercialization, fragmentation, and the marginalization of social welfare concerns has highlighted the limitations of applying market logic to inherently public functions. As a result, NPM principles are increasingly applied selectively and supplemented by governance-oriented reforms.

- **The Governance Model and Networked Public Management**

Governance theory has gained heightened relevance in addressing complex, cross-sectoral policy challenges that no single government actor can manage alone. Areas such as climate governance, pandemic response, urban development, and social policy increasingly rely on networked collaborations involving governments, private firms, non-governmental organizations, and citizen groups. These arrangements enhance policy coordination, innovation, and democratic legitimacy by fostering shared responsibility and collective problem-solving.

- **Digital Governance and Its Expanding Role**

Digital governance has become a defining feature of modern public management. The growing use of artificial intelligence, blockchain-based transparency tools, e-government platforms, and smart city technologies illustrates the expanding role of digital innovation in governance. While digital transformation offers significant

gains in efficiency, accessibility, and data-driven decision-making, it also raises serious concerns related to algorithmic bias, cybersecurity, privacy protection, and surveillance ethics. Managing these risks is essential to ensuring that digital governance strengthens, rather than undermines, democratic values and public trust.

7.3 Future Directions in Public Management

Public management stands at a critical crossroads, requiring adaptation to emerging global trends while safeguarding democratic principles and public values. Future governance models must be capable of responding to uncertainty, complexity, and rapid change.

- **Adaptive and Resilient Governance**

Governments must develop flexible and resilient governance systems capable of responding effectively to economic downturns, public health emergencies, environmental disasters, and technological disruptions. Resilience in public management entails fostering innovation, investing in crisis preparedness, and enabling rapid yet accountable policy responses under conditions of uncertainty.

- **Inclusive and Participatory Governance**

Inclusive governance will remain central to the legitimacy and effectiveness of public administration. Modern public management must prioritize citizen engagement and participatory decision-making, ensuring that marginalized communities have meaningful opportunities to influence policies and that public services are co-created with citizens. Participatory budgeting, deliberative forums, and digital participation platforms exemplify this shift toward more inclusive and democratic governance.

- **Ethical and Accountable Public Management**

The expanding use of artificial intelligence, predictive analytics, and automated decision-making necessitates renewed attention to ethics and accountability. Governments must address issues related to transparency in algorithmic governance, bias mitigation, data protection, and responsible use of surveillance technologies. Robust regulatory frameworks, independent oversight mechanisms, and clear accountability structures are essential to preventing abuses of power and maintaining public trust.

- **Integrating Human-Centered and Technology-Driven Approaches**

While digital transformation enhances efficiency and innovation, public management must remain fundamentally human-centered. This requires embedding social equity, transparency, and ethical considerations into digital public services, ensuring that technological advancements align with fundamental rights and democratic norms. Balancing technological innovation with human values will be critical in shaping sustainable and legitimate governance systems.

7.4 Final Thoughts: The Path Forward

The field of public management continues to evolve in response to the changing challenges and opportunities faced by governments worldwide. While bureaucracy, New Public Management, governance networks, and digital government each offer distinct insights, the future of public administration is likely to be characterized by hybrid governance models that integrate efficiency-driven reforms from NPM, collaborative and networked approaches from governance theory, and technological innovations from digital governance.

Ultimately, effective public management will depend on governments' ability to remain adaptable, accountable, and citizen-focused. As policymakers, researchers, and practitioners continue to refine and apply public management theories, these frameworks will play a pivotal role in shaping governance systems that are not only efficient, but also inclusive, ethical, and resilient in an increasingly complex world.

Notes

Zuboff, S. (2019). The age of surveillance capitalism. PublicAffairs.

8 References

Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2008). Collaborative governance in theory and practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 18*(4), 543–571. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mum032

Ansell, C., Sørensen, E., & Torfing, J. (2021). The COVID-19 pandemic as a game changer for public administration and leadership? The need for robust governance responses to turbulent problems. *Public Management Review, 23*(7), 949– 960. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2020.1820272

Ansell, C., & Torfing, J. (Eds.). (2014). *Public innovation through collaboration and design*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203795958

Beetham, D. (2018). *Max Weber and the theory of modern politics* (2nd ed.). John Wiley & Sons.

Betsill, M. M., & Bulkeley, H. (2006). Cities and the multilevel governance of global climate change. *Global Governance, 12*(2), 141–159. https://doi.org/10.1163/19426720-01202004

Bovaird, T., & Loeffler, E. (2012). From engagement to co-production: The contribution of users and communities to outcomes and public value. *Voluntas, 23*, 1119–1138. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-012-9309-6

Bovens, M. (2007). Analysing and assessing accountability: A conceptual framework. *European Law Journal, 13*(4), 447– 468. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0386.2007.00378.x

Denhardt, R. B., Denhardt, J. V., & Blanc, T. A. (2013). *Public administration: An action orientation* (7th ed.). Cengage Learning.

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. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mui057

Falkner, R. (2016). The Paris Agreement and the new logic of international climate politics. *International Affairs, 92*(5), 1107–1125. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2346.12708

Fayol, H. (2013). *General and industrial management* (C. Storrs, Trans.; reprint ed.). Martino Publishing. (Original work published 1916)

Fung, A. (2015). Putting the public back into governance: The challenges of citizen participation and its future. *Public Administration Review, 75*(4), 513–522. https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12361

Goodsell, C. T. (2004). *The case for bureaucracy: A public administration polemic* (4th rev. ed.). SAGE Publications.

Hale, T. (2020). Catalytic cooperation. *Global Environmental Politics, 20*(4), 73–98. https://doi.org/10.1162/glep_a_00561

Hood, C. (1991). A public management for all seasons? *Public Administration, 69*, 3–19.

Hood, C. (2006). Gaming in targetworld: The targets approach to managing British public services. *Public Administration Review, 66*(4), 515–521.

Hood, C. (2010). Accountability and transparency: Siamese twins, matching parts, awkward couple? *West European*

Politics, 33(5), 989–1009. https://doi.org/10.1080/01402382.2010.486122

Hooghe, L., & Marks, G. (2001). *Multi-level governance and European integration*. Bloomsbury Academic.

Huang, I. Y. (2020). Fighting COVID-19 through government initiatives and collaborative governance: The Taiwan experience. *Public Administration Review, 80*(4), 665–670. https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13239

Janssen, M., Charalabidis, Y., & Zuiderwijk, A. (2012). Benefits, adoption barriers and myths of open data and open government. *Information Systems Management, 29*(4), 258–268. https://doi.org/10.1080/10580530.2012.716740

Jordan, A., Huitema, D., van Asselt, H., & Forster, J. (Eds.). (2018). *Governing climate change: Polycentricity in action?* Cambridge University Press.

Kettl, D. F. (2015). *The transformation of governance: Public administration for the twenty-first century* (Updated ed.). Johns Hopkins University Press.

Kickert, W. J. M., Klijn, E.-H., & Koppenjan, J. F. M. (Eds.). (1997). *Managing complex networks: Strategies for the public sector*. SAGE Publications.

Kitchin, R. (2021). *Data lives: How data are made and shape our world*. Bristol University Press.

Landemore, H. (2015). Inclusive constitution-making: The Icelandic experiment. *Journal of Political Philosophy, 23*(2), 166–191. https://doi.org/10.1111/jopp.12032

Margetts, H., & Dunleavy, P. (2013). The second wave of digital-era governance: A quasi-paradigm for government on the Web. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A, 371*(1987), 20120382. https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2012.0382

Mayo, E. (2003). *The human problems of an industrial civilization*. Routledge.

Meijer, A. (2016). Coproduction as a structural transformation of the public sector. *International Journal of Public Sector Management, 29*(6), 596–611. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPSM-01-2016-0001

Meijer, A., & Bolí var, M. P. R. (2016). Governing the smart city: A review of the literature on smart urban governance. *International Review of Administrative Sciences, 82*(2), 392–408. https://doi.org/10.1177/0020852314564308

Merton, R. K. (1940). Bureaucratic structure and personality. *Social Forces, 18*(4), 560–568.

Moore, M. H. (1995). *Creating public value: Strategic management in government*. Harvard University Press.

OECD. (2019). *Digital government review of Sweden: Towards a data-driven public sector*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/4daf932b-en

Osborne, D., & Gaebler, T. (1992). *Reinventing government: How the entrepreneurial spirit is transforming the public sector*. Addison-Wesley.

Osborne, S. P. (2006). The new public governance? *Public Management Review, 8*(3), 377–387. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719030600853022

Osborne, S. P. (Ed.). (2010). *The new public governance?* Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203861684

Osborne, S. P., Radnor, Z., & Strokosch, K. (2016). Co-production and the co-creation of value in public services. *Public Management Review, 18*(5), 639–653. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2015.1111927

Pierre, J. (2011). *The politics of urban governance*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Pollitt, C. (2013). The logics of performance management. *Evaluation, 19*(4), 346–363. https://doi.org/10.1177/1356389013505040

Pollitt, C., & Bouckaert, G. (2017). *Public management reform* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.

Rhodes, R. A. W. (1996). The new governance: Governing without government. *Political Studies, 44*(4), 652–667. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9248.1996.tb01747.x

Rhodes, R. A. W. (1997). *Understanding governance*. Open University Press.

Rosenbloom, D. H., Kravchuk, R. S., & Clerkin, R. M. (2022). *Public administration* (9th ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003198116

Smith, G. (2009). *Democratic innovations*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511609848

Taylor, F. W. (1911). *The principles of scientific management*. Harper & Brothers.

Transparency International. (2020). *Corruption perceptions index 2020*.

UNDP. (2021). *Digital strategy 2022–2025*. United Nations Development Programme.

Urwick, L. F. (1970). Papers in the science of administration. *Academy of Management Journal, 13*(4), 361–371. van Dijk, J. (2020). *The digital divide*. John Wiley & Sons.

Vassil, K. (2016). *Estonian e-government ecosystem* (World Development Report 2016 background paper). World Bank Group.

Weber, M. (2009). *From Max Weber: Essays in sociology*. Routledge.

Weber, M. (2019). *Economy and society: A new translation* (K. Tribe, Ed.). Harvard University Press.

Wilson, J. Q. (2019). *Bureaucracy*. Hachette UK. (Original work published 1989) Wilson, W. (1887). The study of administration. *Political Science Quarterly, 2*(2), 197–222.

Wouters, O. J., et al. (2021). Challenges in ensuring global access to COVID-19 vaccines. *The Lancet, 397*(10278), 1023– 1034. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(21)00306-8

Yeung, K. (2018). Algorithmic regulation: A critical interrogation. *Regulation & Governance, 12*(4), 505–523. https://doi.org/10.1111/rego.12158