

Original article

DOI:10.17323/1999-5431-2025-0-5-52-70

## WEBERIAN PARADIGM, NEW PUBLIC SERVICE, AND NEW PUBLIC MANAGEMENT: BUREAUCRACY ASSESSMENT

---

**Abd. Rohman\*<sup>1</sup>, Agung Suprojo<sup>2</sup>, Cahyo Sasmito<sup>3</sup>,  
Roro Merry Chornelia Wulandari<sup>4</sup>**

<sup>1,4</sup> Faculty of Social Science and Political Science, University of Tribhuwana, Malang; St.Telaga Warna, Tlogomas, Lowokwaru, Malang, East Java, 65144, Indonesia.

<sup>2,3</sup> Tribhuwana Tunggaladewi University Postgraduate School, Malang; St.Telaga Warna, Tlogomas, Lowokwaru, Malang, East Java, 65144, Indonesia.

<sup>1</sup> Head of Community Service; abd.rohman@unitri.ac.id; ORCID: 0000-0001-6875-6902

<sup>2</sup> Dean of the Faculty of Social and Political Sciences; asuprojo@gmail.com; ORCID: 0000-0003-3833-1828

<sup>3</sup> Head of the Master's Program in Public Administration; ahyosasmito1970@gmail.com; ORCID: 0000-0001-5475-9758

<sup>4</sup> Lecturer; merry.chornelia@unitri.ac.id; ORCID: 0009-0000-5450-558X

**Abstract.** Assessing bureaucratic performance requires diverse methods and indicators, each with distinct strengths and weaknesses. The three primary approaches are New Public Management (NPM), New Public Service (NPS), and the Weberian bureaucratic paradigm with their respective perspectives on governance and administration. This study employed an observational analytical design with a cross-sectional approach, conducted in Malang, East Java, from April to July 2023. The independent variables were NPM, NPS, and the Weberian paradigm while the dependent variable was bureaucratic performance. Data were collected using a questionnaire, designed based on literature reviews to assess the influence of these paradigms on bureaucratic effectiveness. The findings demonstrate that the NPS approach exhibits a slight advantage over the other models for its strong emphasis on public service and citizen engagement. NPS promotes great responsiveness and collaboration within bureaucratic structures. This finding suggests that NPS adoption can significantly improve service delivery.

**Keywords:** bureaucracy assessment, Weberian paradigm, new public service, new public management.

**For citation:** Abd. Rohman, Suprojo, A., Sasmito, C., and Wulandari, R. M. C. (2025) 'Weberian paradigm, new public service, and New Public Management: Bureaucracy assessment', *Public Administration Issues*, 5, pp. 52–70. DOI:10.17323/1999-5431-2025-0-5-52-70

## Introduction

Performance measurement is crucial for ensuring an effective and efficient bureaucracy that successfully achieves its objectives (Van Looy and Shafagatova, 2016). In specific contexts and for particular purposes, various approaches and indicators are applicable to assess the performance of bureaucracy. Each approach (New Public Management, New Public Service, and the Weberian bureaucratic paradigm) exhibits distinct methods with its own strengths and weaknesses. The rigid bureaucracy has hindered the public from addressing administrative fulfilment in the age of disruption (Park, 2021; Henriyani, 2019; Indarti, 2021). Strict rules and procedures lead to inefficiencies within bureaucracy regarding resource utilisation, information distribution, and policy implementation (Diana, 2019; Lestari, 2019; Ramadhan, Hakim and Aditya, 2023).

According to poll data released by the Commissioner of the Indonesian Civil Service Commission, 50.76% of civil servants were involved in the politicising bureaucracy (KASN, 2021). Moreover, 62.7% of respondents stated that the position of the regional head as the Officer-in-Charge of Personnel Affairs makes it difficult for civil servants to maintain their neutrality (KASN, 2021). This situation is a cause for great concern regarding the future of the bureaucracy, which is currently striving for development. The politicisation of the bureaucracy can pose a significant threat to the integrity, professionalism, and effectiveness of the bureaucracy in performing its essential tasks (Willems, 2020). Notably, a politicised bureaucracy tends to compromise the quality of public service in favour of specific political agendas (Cejudo and Trein, 2023; Koga et al., 2023).

Furthermore, the Chairperson of the Indonesian Civil Service Commission stated that the high level of bureaucracy politicisation resulted in violations in 109 of the total 137 regions led by acting regional heads (KASN, 2021). The cases are closely related to proximity and opportunities for a better career. The belief is that attaining world-class bureaucratic reform is only possible if the bureaucracy is independent.

The research on bureaucracy has focused on three main issues: innovation (Anggraini, 2019; Syauket, Lestari and Simarmata, 2020), bureaucratic autonomy (Faedlulloh et al., 2020), and bureaucratic ethics (Ngatu and Rusmiwari, 2019). The research findings reveal that the vast geographic coverage of Musi Banyuasin District drives innovation within SAJI MUBA. The success of this innovation is closely linked to the support of the Musi Banyuasin Regent and relevant stakeholders. SAJI MUBA offers an advantage to the public with a convenient way to inquire about licensing mechanisms, requirements, procedures, and fee structures (Anggraini, 2019).

On the other hand, other research findings indicate that strengthening bureaucratic reform towards the era of Society 5.0 in Indonesia faces several challenges, including the persistence of bureaucratic pathologies, a culture of corruption, and the bureaucracy's unpreparedness to use technology and information for public service orientation towards the community (Yasa et al., 2021; Tanner et al., 2022). The lack of internalisation of ethics and morality opens up significant opportunities for moral deviations due to the loss of personal integrity among bureaucrats (Wang and Li, 2019). Moreover, the lack of personal integrity facilitates bureaucrats to violate and compromise honesty in their profession (Khanal, Gupta and Bhattarai, 2022).

Consequently, they struggle to discern the significant aspects of a case, hampering their ability to make well-informed decisions (Wijaya and Noak, 2019).

This research seeks to address the limitations of existing studies, which largely overlooked bureaucratic paradigm comparisons in improving institutional performance and service quality. It encompasses planning strategies, resource utilisation, value creation, accountability, and service guarantees. Therefore, it measures, understands, and maps government effectiveness in implementing the Weberian, NPM, and NPS bureaucratic models.

Bureaucratic incompetence in dealing with change is a major issue in the growth and efficiency of bureaucracy (Suchman, Owino and Montagu, 2021; Sukarno et al., 2021). Bureaucrats accustomed to rigid routines and procedures frequently fail to adjust to change (Muriany and Ruhunlela, 2021). They resist change because they find comfort in their old ways and are reluctant to change them. An organisational culture that does not support innovation and change hinders the ability of bureaucrats to explore new avenues (Gorzelany et al., 2021; Boufounou and Argyrou, 2022). Few young bureaucrats keep pace with the changing times, while senior bureaucrats in critical positions adhere to outdated, inefficient working methods. This affects the work ethic of the bureaucrats within the organisation.

Evaluating bureaucratic performance is a continuous activity that necessitates a commitment to monitor, assess, and improve bureaucratic operations according to established goals and expectations. The bureaucracy should function efficiently. Therefore, this research is essential for understanding the correlation between the Weberian, NPS, and NPM ideologies and bureaucratic practices. Regardless of the shift toward NPS governance and bureaucratic paradigms, it is important to employ bureaucratic paradigms to formulate approaches tailored to any region (Tamami, 2020).

## Theoretical discussion

### **New Public Management**

New Public Management (NPM) is a decentralised management system with management tools such as controlling and benchmarking that transfer the working practices of the private to the public sector (Hartati, 2020). It aims to create efficiency and effectiveness in local government performance, resulting in community well-being, known as Good Governance. The primary objectives of NPM theory are to improve efficiency, effectiveness, and performance accountability (Alamsyah, 2016). NPM is focused on management performance in the public sector rather than on policy-making. Moreover, adopting the NPM paradigm entails several consequences for governments, including the demand for efficiency, cost reduction, and competitive tendering (Lazuardi and Wahidahwati, 2022).

The principles of NPM include: a) a greater focus on management rather than policy, b) clear standards and the measurement of performance achieved, c) a stronger emphasis on controlling outcomes (output) rather than procedures, d) a shift towards increased competition within the public service sector, e) an emphasis on developing management patterns as practised in the private sector to support public service performance improvement, f) a shift towards breaking down into various smaller organisational units within the public service

sector, and g) a greater emphasis on discipline and frugality in resource utilisation (Alamsyah, 2016; Hartati, 2020; Lazuardi and Wahidahwati, 2022).

NPM emphasises professional management expertise in organisational control, measurable standards of organisational performance, and a shift from input-based control to output-based evaluation. Besides, it also promotes the decentralisation of management centralised systems to independent public sector units. Private and public contractors are treated equally, and efforts are made to increase targeted innovation, as part of the work order, driven by delegation of operational management (Krogh and Triantafillou, 2024).

### **New Public Service**

The New Public Service (NPS) is a paradigm based on notions intrinsically aligned with societal ideals (Soselissa and Puturuahu, 2021). The value system in society is dynamic and therefore calls for excellent government services (Supriyadi, 2021). NPS views the bureaucracy as an instrument of the people and emphasises that it submits to the voices of the people as long as these voices are rational and legitimate in a normative and constitutional sense. A leader within the bureaucracy is not only an economic entity, as described in the NPM theory, but also an entity with social and political dimensions that serves the public (Budiyanto, 2005; Ningtyas, 2017). The key components of NPS include: a) serving citizens (not customers), b) prioritising public interests, c) valuing citizens over entrepreneurship, d) thinking strategically and acting democratically, e) recognising that accountability is difficult; it is about service (not a control), and f) valuing individuals rather than productivity (Kusnandar, 2019).

The NPS is a concept that emphasises various elements. The first one is the theory of democratic citizenship. It requires citizen involvement in policy-making and deliberation to build solidarity and commitment to avoid conflict. The second element is the community and civil society model, which accommodates the role of civil society by building social trust, social cohesion and social networks in democratic governance. The third element is humanist organisations. It means that the state administration must focus on organisations that respect people and are responsive to human values, justice, and other social issues. The fourth element is the postmodern science of public administration, which prioritises dialogue ( discourse) over theory in solving public problems rather than adopting a one-best-way perspective (Kurniadi and Ibrahim, 2023).

The NPS views the public as citizens who possess equal public rights and responsibilities. Citizens are recipients and users of public services provided by the government, and at the same time, they are subjects of public obligations such as complying with laws and regulations, paying taxes, and defending the State. NPS perceives the public as citizens with rights and responsibilities within the broader community. The existence of an element of coercion in complying with public obligations makes the relationship between the State and the public involuntary. Therefore, public servants are responsive to the customer. They fulfil public rights and build trust and collaboration with citizens (Parulian and Syafri, 2023).

The NPS claims that the state apparatus is not the main actor in formulating what is in the public interest. Public administrators are important actors

in a broader system of government consisting of citizens, political groups, representatives of the people, and other relevant institutions. Public administrators are tasked with helping citizens articulate the public interest. Citizens are entitled to the freedom to choose at every stage of the governmental process, not only involved in general elections. Public administrators should facilitate forums for public dialogue. This argument concerns the role and responsibility of public administration, which focuses on not only economic achievement but also values that reflect public interests, such as honesty, justice, and humanity (Robinson, 2015).

The NPS argues that the public interest improves when formulated and developed by the state apparatus together with citizens. This principle has implications for the role of government and its relationship with the community. In the past, the government was responsible for managing the community through direct and controlling functions, such as regulatory functions, provision of services, setting rules and incentives. The increasingly complex life of modern society requires a shift in government roles from a controlling function to agenda-setting, facilitating, negotiating or “brokering” solutions to solve public problems (often involving a coalition of government, private and non-profit agencies). For this reason, public administrators should have not only management control skills but also negotiation and conflict resolution skills.

The main focus of the NPS is citizen involvement and community building. Citizen involvement must be present in the implementation of policies in a democratic system. Participation extends to the entire stage of policy formulation and implementation. Through this process, citizens feel involved in the government process and not only demand that the government satisfies their interests. Organisations become public spaces in which people (citizens and administrators) with different perspectives act together for the public good. Interaction and involvement with citizens who give purpose and meaning to public services (Da Silva, Emmendoerfer and Alves, 2024).

According to the New Public Service, efficiency, effectiveness and customer satisfaction are important, but the public administration must also account for its performance in terms of ethics, democratic principles and the public interest. Public administrators are not entrepreneurs in their own right who must bear the consequences or failures of their decisions. All citizens bear the risk of failure in public policy implementation. Therefore, the accountability of public administration is complex and multifaceted, encompassing many dimensions such as professional, legal, political and democratic accountability (Peters et al., 2022).

Leadership in the NPS is focused on human energy for the benefit of humanity. Public sector leadership is based on values called moral or transformational leadership. Transformational leadership serves as an aspiration and moral example for leaders, subordinates, and the public as a whole. This leadership produces actions consistent with the needs, interests, and aspirations of followers as well as actions that fundamentally change morals and social conditions. Ultimately, this leadership can move groups, organisations, and communities towards achieving higher goals. Leadership in the NPS is ‘shared leadership’, where leadership control is not centralised in the hands of superiors. Instead, it involves many individuals and groups, rather than being concentrated at the top (Parulian and Syafri, 2023).

### **Comparison of New Public Management and New Public Service**

The New Public Management paradigm emerged in the 1970s but became widely known in the 1990s and is recognised today. The NPM paradigm is grounded in liberalism ideology with a principle that running the public administration is similar to running the business sector. The goal was to replace the old model of bureaucracy – that is slow, rigid and fraught with many problems – with a more adaptive approach which can address increasingly complex and evolving problems. This shift arose because the hierarchical and formalistic bureaucratic model is no longer suitable for solving public problems in the global era. Along with the development of the NPM paradigm, David Osborne and Ted Gaebler (1992) have developed a similar concept to NPM (Gaebler, 1992).

In their concept “Reinventing Government”, Osborne and Gaebler (1992) introduced the spirit of entrepreneurship into the state administration system, according to which the public bureaucracy should steer rather than row. In this “steering” method”, the government no longer directly provides public services but leaves it to the community and market mechanisms. Therefore, the government’s role is to be a catalyst for public affairs. When it first emerged, this paradigm comprised five doctrines: deregulation in line management, the transformation of public service units into independent organisations, performance-based accountability – especially through contracts – the enforcement of competition mechanisms, such as exit contracts, and attention to market mechanisms (Vermeeren and Van der Heijden, 2022).

Osborne and Gaebler (1992) introduced 10 principles of government with an entrepreneurial spirit. The first principle is catalyst government, where the government only carries out strategic functions without interfering with the implementation or technical activities. The government acts only as a planner, visionary, and provider of strategic policies. In addition, public organisations can employ various methods to achieve their goals, selecting the most suitable approach to ensure efficiency, effectiveness, equity, accountability, and flexibility. These methods include privatisation, licensing, concessions, operational cooperation, contracts, vouchers, tax incentives, and others (Irhamudin and Dinata, 2022).

The second doctrine emphasises control by the community as a result of the empowerment by the government. Thus, the community is more capable and creative in solving problems without relying on the government. The community serves itself, but the government still ensures that the community receives its basic services. With community control, civil servants are more engaged, diligent and creative in solving problems. Finally, a competitive government that incorporates the spirit of competition in providing services to the community. Through competitive mechanisms, governments are motivated to continuously improve their performance, efficiency, and service delivery to become the most effective administrative model (Zhang, Yin and Su, 2024).

The next doctrine is mission-driven government, which can change its orientation from a rules-driven government to a mission-driven government. This means that the government does not have to follow the rules because they lead to slow responses. By being mission-driven, the government prioritises the main

task. For example, the state budget procedure follows strict protocols, but its core purpose is promoting public welfare and societal well-being.

The fifth doctrine is results-oriented government, which prioritises outcomes over inputs in its financial and operational strategies. In this model, the government is incentivised to optimise performance as recognition and rewards are based on measurable results. Therefore, this approach improves efficiency and effectiveness across public institutions. The sixth doctrine is customer-oriented government, which focuses more on meeting public needs rather than adhering strictly to bureaucratic procedures. Therefore, the government should conduct a regular survey to monitor the evolving community needs. The seventh doctrine is the entrepreneurial government, which generates profits instead of spending. This approach strives to increase the economic resources owned by government agencies by adopting relevant private work principles in public administration (Sánchez-Hernández et al., 2020).

The eighth doctrine is anticipatory government, which is oriented towards prevention. Anticipatory government is a forward-thinking government. The government seeks to prevent problems by implementing strategic planning, providing a vision for the future, and using predictive analytical tools. The ninth doctrine is decentralised government, which transforms a government driven by hierarchy into a participatory government and teamwork. This approach delegates part of the central authority to the regions by system. Therefore, employees at the regional level can directly provide services and make decisions independently for efficiency and effectiveness. The tenth doctrine is market-oriented governments, which typically use private market structures to solve problems, particularly in service delivery and regulatory control. This approach employs financial and tax incentives to encourage private organisations and community members to contribute to solving social problems (Guston, 2014). The tangible results of the NPM implementation process include five aspects: (1) savings, (2) process improvement, (3) efficiency improvement, (4) increased effectiveness, and (5) improvement of the administrative system, such as increased capacity, flexibility, and resilience. The success of NPM is highly dependent on the context and characteristics of the country and sector being addressed, the capacity of the institution, and the context of the institution itself, such as the climate and management ideology. Meanwhile, the NPS is intended to “counter” the mainstream NPM paradigm, which is based on business principles or the belief that the market is a solution to public sector ills (Pratiwi, Sobri and Putra, 2024).

The NPS theory views that bureaucracy serves as a tool of the people and must align with public will, provided that the vote is rational and legitimate normatively and constitutionally. Unlike the NPM theory, which views bureaucratic leaders as economic actors, NPS recognise them as multidimensional figures with social and political responsibilities. To improve democratic public services, the NPS promises substantial changes in bureaucratic governance. Implementing this concept requires courage and commitment from government officials because it demands time and energy to influence all applicable systems. The key tenet of this concept is that the government must actively listen to and integrate public input into decision-making processes. Although this approach presents

challenges, it involves all stakeholders. Denhardt and Denhardt's idea of the NPS emphasises that government should not operate like a corporation but serve society in a democratic, fair, equitable, non-discriminatory, honest and accountable manner. In this model, the government must guarantee the rights of citizens, and fulfil its responsibilities to the community by prioritising their interests. "Citizens First" should be the government's motto. This perspective of the NPS paradigm, according to Denhardt, is inspired by democratic political theory, especially related to the relationship between citizens and the government, and a humanistic approach in organisational and management theory (Kuswati and Yeti, 2023).

Denhardt identifies ten fundamental elements that differentiate NPM and NPS theories: 1) Epistemological basis, NPM is rooted in economic theory while NPS is based on democratic theory integrated with various approaches. NPM refers to the economic principles, often neglecting the fundamental role of public servants as an employee paid by the people to serve the people. NPS, in contrast, restores the initial function of bureaucracy by basing it on democratic theories; 2) Concept of public interest, NPM prioritises individual interests while NPS focuses on the collective interest; 3) Target of service, NPM considers users as consumers while NPS sees them as citizens; 4) Role of government, NPM positions the government as a steering force that directs society. Meanwhile, NPS reinstates the government's primary function as a servant of the people. NPS refuses the idea that government should act as a catalyst because the government exists to serve the citizens; 5) Rationality and bureaucratic behaviour, NPM follows a technical and economic rationality model while NPS is strategic rationality with dynamic dimensions (political, economic, and organisational). Bureaucrats see the problems not only from profit and loss such as in the economy model, but various aspects involved; 6) Accountability benchmarks, NPM evaluates accountability based on economic mechanisms and legal frameworks. In contrast, NPS defines accountability as an agreement between the government and the public; 7) Administrative flexibility, NPM allows broad flexibility as long as it meets economic objectives. NPS, however, advocates for flexibility according to needs and transparency; 8) Organisational structure, NPM is lean and decentralised, while NPS does not have to be lean as long as it is rational, proportional, and collaborative between external and internal leadership; 9) Mechanism for achieving goals, NPM relies on private and non-private organisations while NPS promotes a coalition between private and non-private entities to achieve the public objectives; and 10) Motivation basis, NPM is driven by an entrepreneurial mindset while NPS is guided by a commitment to serve the community (Ghosh, Rammohun and Mahavidyalaya, 2021).

### **Weberian Paradigm**

The Weberian bureaucracy emphasises the organised structuring of work (Surur, 2019). The Weberian paradigm underscores such principles as:

- a) Division of labour, which involves dividing all tasks within the organisation into several task groups, further subdivided into smaller task groups;
- b) Hierarchy of authority, where higher levels supervise each level within the hierarchy;



- c) A system of formal and written document maintenance, meaning that the bureaucratic system develops an effective archive storage system (Surur, 2019). To the greatest extent possible, all formal decisions must be archived;
- d) Regulations, procedures, and rules, meaning that a bureaucratic organisation also has clarity in task execution by developing procedures, rules, and regulations;
- e) Trained experts, where this type of organisation requires competent experts in their respective fields to make quick and accurate decisions;
- f) Impersonal relationships, indicating that emotions and sentiments can disrupt rationality and objectivity, potentially leading to nepotism and excessive favouritism (Agus, 2019; Nurhestitunggal and Muhlisin, 2020).

According to Max Weber, bureaucracy should operate in a strict vertical hierarchy system and limited communication between workers. Like machines containing spare parts with different functions, the bureaucratic system must be designed based on the division of labour with their respective work specifications. The bureaucracy must also have the characteristic that its power flow is centralised because it is considered more effective in the decision-making process and the specifications of workers. According to him, bureaucracy is a closed system because the environment is considered to interfere with organisational performance. And most importantly, regulations are the main element in the bureaucratic system (Suzuki and Hur, 2020).

Hypothesis: The New Public Service (NPS) model demonstrates significant theoretical and practical advantages over traditional New Public Management (NPM) and Weberian administrative approaches.

## Research methodology

### **Study design and sample population**

This observational analytical study employed a cross-sectional design. It was conducted in Malang, East Java, from April to July 2023. The research sample included the 13 Sub-district heads, 13 Sub-district secretaries, and 13 Assistants for General Administration of the Lowokwaru Sub-district. It also involved 13 Village heads, 13 Village secretaries, and 13 officers for community order and security affairs from all sub-districts within the Lowokwaru Sub-district. The sample and respondents in this study constituted the entire population.

### **Research variables and instruments**

The independent variables in this study encompassed the Weberian paradigm, New Public Service, and New Public Management. The dependent variable was bureaucracy. Data were collected using a questionnaire based on several points mentioned in the literature review, which covered the Weberian paradigm, New Public Service, and New Public Management. Bureaucratic assessment encompassed 12 distinct inquiries, addressing such dimensions as, but not limited to, Permenpan-RB No. 25/2020, the substantive elements of Permenpan-RB No. 25/2020, and the contents of Permenpan-RB No. 25/2020. Furthermore, the assessment delved into such aspects as the Road Map for Bureaucratic. The assessment explored several key areas, including the development of a Road Map

for Bureaucratic Reform, strengthening change management processes, streamlining and eliminating unnecessary policies, and restructuring organizational frameworks to improve effectiveness and efficiency. It also focused on optimizing bureaucratic procedures, realigning human resource allocations, enhancing accountability in bureaucratic performance, improving performance oversight, and implementing initiatives aimed at enhancing service quality.

The first questionnaire was related to the Weberian paradigm. It consisted of 6 questions, covering such aspects as clear and precise task division, strict hierarchical supervision, comprehensive document archiving, well-defined rules of operation, expert availability in every field of work, and maintaining impersonal relationships among personnel.

The subsequent questionnaire pertained to the New Public Service with 10 questions, comprising concepts such as the public role as citizens rather than customers, public interest priority, service provision over entrepreneurship, a strategic mindset among staff, democratic conduct, accountability in service provision, and values of service users, and respect rather than productivity. The third questionnaire addressed New Public Management with 9 questions. They included themes such as prioritising management over policy adherence, running bureaucracy based on clear standards, measuring bureaucratic performance achievements, highlighting output over implementation, promoting competition between units/departments for improvement, stressing private sectors in bureaucratic performance, breaking down bureaucratic tasks into smaller units, emphasising employee discipline, and adhering to the principle of employee simplicity. Each item is scored on a five-point scale from 1 to 5, corresponding to “completely disagree,” “disagree,” “somewhat agree,” “agree,” and “completely agree,” respectively.

The third questionnaire addressed New Public Management with 9 questions. They contained themes such as prioritising management over policy adherence, running bureaucracy based on clear standards, measuring bureaucratic performance achievements, highlighting output over implementation, promoting competition among units/sections for improvement, stressing private sectors in bureaucratic performance, breaking down bureaucratic tasks into smaller units, emphasising employee discipline, and adhering to the principle of employee simplicity. Each item is scored on a five-point scale from 1 to 5, corresponding to “completely disagree,” “disagree,” “somewhat agree,” “agree,” and “completely agree,” respectively.

### **Data analysis**

The authors began by re-examining the collected data to assess its relevance for further analysis. During the editing process, they checked if the questionnaires were fully answered, the written responses were legible, and the content was relevant. Next, the researchers classified the responses using numerical codes or symbols. The questionnaire included both positive and negative statements. The assessment results were then aggregated into a total score for use with the SPSS program. Following this, the coded data was transferred to a computer program table. Subsequently, data cleaning reduction was performed, eliminating any data that did not align with the study's requirements. The remaining data was processed according to the relevant variables and entered into a table for further analysis.

Descriptive statistics and frequency distributions were used to describe the characteristics of the participants. In addition, Pearson correlation (R) was used to establish a linear relationship between the Weberian, New Public Service and New Public Management paradigms and bureaucratic performance. The multivariate analysis in this study involved multiple linear regression to examine the factors influencing bureaucratic performance. The direction of the linear regression coefficient was labelled with the letter 'b'. The regression coefficient 'b' represents the extent of change in the independent variable. A larger 'b' coefficient indicates a greater impact of the change and vice versa. The direction of the change in the independent variable (X) is determined by whether the regression coefficient is positive or negative.

## Findings

The demographic characteristics of the respondents are summarised in Table 1. Of the 78 participants in this study, 55.1% were women, and the remaining participants were men. The majority of the respondents were between the ages of 40 and 49 years (51.3%), while the smallest age group comprised individuals over 50 years old (7.7%). Regarding educational background, most participants had a bachelor's degree (35.9%). The most common range of work experience was between 15 and 25 years (30.8%), with the fewest respondents having more than 25 years of experience (17.9%).

Table 1

### Demographic Characteristics

Characteristics		Frequency	Percentage
Age	Between 30 and 40 years old	32	41.0
	Between 40 and 49 years old	40	51.3
	More than 50 years old	6	7.7
Gender	Female	35	44.9
	Male	43	55.1
Education	Senior High School	13	16.7
	A 3-year Diploma (D3)	23	29.5
	A 4-year Diploma (D4)	14	17.9
	Bachelor Degree (S1)	28	35.9
Working experience	Less than five years	19	24.4
	5 to 15 years	21	26.9
	Between 15 and 25 years	24	30.8
	More than 25 years	14	17.9

**Source:** Created by the author (- hereinafter, unless otherwise indicated).

The proportional description of the application of the three paradigms, the New Public Management, New Public Service, and Weberian paradigm, is presented in Table 2:

Table 2

**Number of Items, Minimum, Maximum,  
Mean, Standard Deviation**

Item	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Weberian Paradigm	78	16	30	27.2	2.8
New Public Service	78	31	50	50.0	4.7
New Public Management	78	26	50	40.1	4.6

According to the results of the data analysis, bureaucracy with the NPS paradigm received the highest average score of 50.0. The NPM paradigm received the second-highest average score of 40.1, and the Weberian paradigm received the lowest average score of 27.2. The data shows that the bureaucracy in the Lowokwaru sub-district and its constituent villages within the Lowokwaru sub-district tend to follow the New Public Service paradigm, yet the other two paradigms remain in use.

Table 3

**Pearson Correlation**

Variables	(1)	(2)	(3)
1. Bureaucratic Performance			
2. Weberian Paradigm	0.82**		
3. New Public Service	0.85**	0.75**	
4. New Public Management	0.72**	0.70**	0.60**

*Notes:* \* $p < .05$ , two-tailed. \*\* $p < .01$ , two-tailed.

To obtain an initial understanding of the relationships between the variables, the researchers conducted bivariate correlation analyses using Pearson's  $r$  (Table 3).

As anticipated, the correlations between the independent variables and all the dependent variables, as well as between the moderating variables and the dependent variables were positive and from moderately to strongly related.

The results of the regression analyses are presented in Table 4 .

Table 4

## Regression Analysis

Variables	B (95% confidence intervals)	SE	$\beta$	t	P
Weberian Paradigm	0.36 (0.01–0.73)	0.18	0.16	1.10	0.050
New Public Service	0.78 (0.54–1.03)	0.12	0.58	6.37	<0.001
New Public Management	0.26 (0.01–0.50)	0.12	0.19	2.05	0.044

Notes:  $R^2$  adjusted = 0.808,  $R^2$  = 0.824

Based on the data presented in Table 4, the researchers observe that the regression coefficient for the Weberian paradigm variable is positive. This coefficient indicates that if the Weberian paradigm variable increases by one unit, bureaucratic performance increases by 0.36 units, suggesting a significant relationship between the Weberian paradigm and bureaucratic performance.

The regression coefficient for the New Public Service variable is also positive, which means that a higher New Public Service is associated with better bureaucratic performance. The 'b' value of 0.78 indicates that an increase in the value of the New Public Service by one unit leads to an increase in bureaucratic performance by 0.78 units. There is therefore a positive and significant relationship between the New Public Service and bureaucratic performance.

Similarly, the regression coefficient for the New Public Management variable is positive, signifying that better New Public Management is associated with higher bureaucratic performance. The 'b' value of 0.26 indicates that a one-unit increase in the New Public Management value results in a 0.26-unit increase in bureaucratic performance. Hence, there is a significant and positive relationship between New Public Management and bureaucratic performance.

## Discussion

The research findings indicate that the bureaucratic reform focuses on three bureaucratic paradigms: Weberian, New Public Management, and New Public Service, as stated in the Minister of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform's Decision Number 25 of 2020 concerning the Bureaucratic Reform Road Map for 2020–2024.

Bureaucrats have yet to embrace the shift to the NPS paradigm, citing the continued relevance of the Weberian bureaucracy (Agus, 2019). However, the highly organised and rule-dependent Weberian bureaucratic system can be less flexible in coping with changing and pressing conditions (Surur, 2019). The inflexibility of the Weberian bureaucratic system can hinder its ability to respond quickly to changing and pressing situations (Sukarno et al., 2021). Additionally, hierarchical and specialised bureaucratic systems can contribute to complex and cumbersome bureaucracies. Decision-making processes become increasingly

time-consuming since approvals require multiple hierarchical levels and adhere to rigorous procedures (Lin and Jia, 2023; Indarti, 2021; Elizabeth and Fred, 2017). This model may be overly rigid and insufficiently responsive to public needs and expectations, which could lead to public discontent with services. As a result, managing a costly and confusing bureaucracy complicates effective governance (Ramadhan, Hakim and Aditya, 2023).

The Weberian bureaucracy's emphasis on rules, procedures, and specialisation tends to inhibit creativity and innovation. Respondents believe they cannot provide ideas that depart from the existing standards. Moreover, bureaucrats frequently adhere to old practices that impede bureaucratic reforms or changes (Lestari, 2019). As a result, the Weberian bureaucracy's high hierarchical structure and specialisation can lead to a large bureaucracy and high administrative costs. Furthermore, the stability and sustainability of the Weberian bureaucracy can make the system overly inflexible and challenging to implement the necessary reforms (Faedlulloh et al., 2020).

Critics of the NPM paradigm argue that it can lead to inequity in public services since its focus on efficiency and outcomes may neglect vulnerable groups or those needing special attention (Hartati, 2020). When many government agencies or departments compete to improve efficiency and budgets, public services may be fragmented. As a result, the public may face difficulties accessing the required services due to unclear divisions of responsibility among them. Some NPM implementations have involved private contractors (privatisation) in public services to boost efficiency (Lazuardi and Wahidahwati, 2022). This approach can reduce government control over these services, potentially resulting in long-term cost increases and other issues. Significant organisational changes within the government are often required to implement NPM, including shifts in work culture, management systems, and policies. However, the transition can be costly and time-consuming (Alamsyah, 2016).

It is critical to understand that NPM is not a one-size-fits-all approach for every circumstance or type of public service (Hartati, 2020). Each country and sector must carefully examine the implementation of NPM, considering their specific challenges, needs, and impacts. Moreover, public sector reforms should strike a balance between principles of social justice, efficiency, and service quality. Furthermore, since the implementation of NPM may modify their duties and responsibilities, government employees may resist these changes. Also, some government employees may believe that their jobs are in jeopardy, or they may lose the authority they had previously. However, the New Public Service emphasises the significance of focusing on government goals. The Customer Satisfaction Approach (NPS) prioritises the satisfaction of customers or the served community, aligning public services and policies with the achievement of the desired goals and values of the community (Ningtyas, 2017). Therefore, this approach may lead to enhanced and more prompt customer service delivery, ultimately enhancing government accountability and responsiveness. It is because the government is regarded as a strategic leader in achieving missions, governing public services, and ensuring quality and accountability (Agus, 2019).

NPS measures performance based on outcomes rather than administrative procedures. This measurement enhances responsibility and accountability in achieving objectives. Moreover, NPS encourages collaboration and inter-agency cooperation in providing public services to improve productivity and efficiency (Soselissa and Puturuahu, 2021). For sustainable improvements, NPS prioritises continuous evaluation processes and learning from experience. The goal of the NPS approach is to transform the culture and practices of the public sector bureaucracy to become more citizen-oriented, responsive, and effective in achieving public service objectives. This idea is commonly used in government reforms to enhance the performance and quality of the public sector.

The NPS opposes the notion that humans are inherently lazy or selfish. Human behaviour is also driven by human dignity, a sense of belonging, concern for others, service, and public interest. Therefore, the measure of employee performance is not only an economic parameter but also the values of honesty, equality, responsiveness, and empowerment. A fundamental aspect of civil servant performance is that civil servants cannot be expected to treat the public with respect if they themselves are not treated with dignity by their leaders. Based on the principles of NPS, it can be concluded that Denhardt and Denhardt (2015) seek to challenge the mainstream pro-market model in the public administration theory (Denhardt and Denhardt, 2015). However, public organisations have a distinct *raison d'être* from business organisations, so they cannot be managed as profit-oriented institutions. Beyond economic considerations, public organisations must uphold broader values that reflect their mission. The nature and mission of public administration (publicness) is to serve citizens – not as consumers, but as individuals with the same public rights and responsibilities, regardless of their social, political, or economic status.

Despite government employees being accustomed to conventional bureaucratic methods, implementing NPS requires support. Many employees struggle to comprehend and embrace the NPS approach centred on customer satisfaction and mission orientation (Ningtyas, 2017). Resistance within the bureaucracy can impede these changes. Therefore, the government must consider these challenges and develop effective strategies to address them.

Some recommendations for the implementation of the bureaucratic reform include improving employees' understanding of the bureaucratic reform based on Regulation No. 25 of the Minister of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform of 2020, ensuring a proportional number of employees at the sub-district level based on population, involving the heads of neighbourhood and community units in the implementation, increasing government awareness at the sub-district level, enhancing public understanding of bureaucracy, avoiding the use of intermediaries for population administration and other services, and providing support for a good management information system and its components (applications and infrastructure).

The limitation of this study is that findings can only be generalised to certain areas due to the variability and preferences of stakeholders across different regions. Besides, the sample size is relatively small, only 78 respondents, which also limits the generalisability of the results.

## Conclusion

This research demonstrates that the NPS approach has a slight advantage over alternative methodologies. The NPS bureaucracy places a strong emphasis on public service. This approach prioritises community interests and needs, resulting in more responsive and tailored services that better address social demands. Besides, the NPS fosters collaboration between various stakeholders, including private, public, and civil entities, facilitating a diverse exchange of ideas, innovations, and solutions to address societal challenges. However, it must be acknowledged that it is not immune to criticism and challenges. One noteworthy issue pertains to potential ambiguities concerning roles and accountabilities, particularly in situations involving multiple stakeholders. In specific organisational contexts and varying community needs, the choice between the NPS, the NPM, or the Weberian approach should be made judiciously.

## REFERENCES

1. Agus, A. (2019) 'Patologi Birokrasi dan Agenda Strategi: Kolaborasi Pendekatan New Public Management dan New Public Service Melalui Model Citizens Charter', *Politeia: Jurnal Politik Islam*, 2(1), pp. 77–90.
2. Alamsyah, A. (2016) 'Perkembangan Paradigma Administrasi Publik (New Public Administration, New Public Management dan New Public Service)', *Jurnal politik profetik*, 4(2). DOI:10.24252/profetik.v4i2a4
3. Anggraini, T. (2019) 'Inovasi Birokrasi Pelayanan Publik di Dinas Penanaman Modal dan Pelayanan Terpadu Satu Pintu (DPMPTSP) Di Kabupaten Musi Banyuasin Studi Kasus:(Siap Antar Jemput Izin Mudah Berbantuan (SAJI MUBA))', *Politeia: Jurnal Ilmu Politik*, 11(2), pp. 44–57. DOI:10.32734/politeia.v11i2.1122
4. Boufounou, P., and Argyrou, M.D. (2022) 'Changing the organizational culture to transform the economy: The case of Greece', *Frontiers in Research Metrics and Analytics*, 7. DOI:10.3389/frma.2022.1050544
5. Cejudo, G.M., and Trein, P. (2023) 'Pathways to policy integration: a subsystem approach', *Policy Sciences*, 56(1), pp. 9–27. DOI:10.1007/s11077-022-09483-1
6. Denhardt, J. V and Denhardt, R.B. (2015) *The New Public Service: Serving Not Steering*. New York: Routledge.
7. Diana, B.A. (2019) 'Konsep E-Office Menuju Perubahan Pelayanan Birokrasi Berbasis Digital (good governance)', in: *Prosiding Seminar STIAMI*, pp. 9–15.
8. Elizabeth, B., and Fred, F. (2017) 'Decision-making processes in social contexts', *Annual Review of Sociology*, 43, pp. 207–227. DOI:10.1146/annurev-soc-060116-053622. Decision-Making



9. Faedlulloh, D. *et al.* (2020) 'Birokrasi dan revolusi industri 4.0: Mencegah Smart ASN menjadi mitos dalam agenda reformasi birokrasi Indonesia', *Jurnal Borneo Administrator*, 16(3), pp. 313–336. DOI:10.24258/jba.v16i3.736
10. Gaebler, D.O., and T. (1992) *Reinventing government: How the entrepreneurial spirit is transforming the public sector*. New York: Plume.
11. Ghosh, L.K., Rammohun, R., and Mahavidyalaya, R.O.Y. (2021) 'New public service approach in public administration', *International Journal of Creative Research Thoughts (IJCRT)*, 9(1), pp. 1862–1865. Available at: <https://www.yournoteslibrary.com/2020/12/new-public-service-approach-in-public-administration.html> (acctssed 07 February 2025).
12. Gorzelany, J. *et al.* (2021) 'Finding links between organisation's culture and innovation. The impact of organisational culture on university innovativeness', *PLoS ONE*, 16(10 October), pp. 1–21. DOI:10.1371/journal.pone.0257962
13. Guston, D.H. (2014) 'Understanding "anticipatory governance"', *Social Studies of Science*, 44(2), pp. 218–242. DOI:10.1177/0306312713508669
14. Hartati, S. (2020) 'Penerapan Model New Public Management (NPM) dalam Reformasi Birokrasi di Indonesia', *Jurnal MSDA (Manajemen Sumber Daya Aparatur)*, 8(2), pp. 65–84. DOI:10.33701/jmsda.v8i2.1293
15. Indarti, C.F.S. (2021) 'Flexibility Working Arrangement Sebagai Agenda Reformasi Birokrasi Untuk Efisiensi Kerja', *The Indonesian Journal of Public Administration (IJPA)*, 7(2), pp. 141–153.
16. Irhammudin, I., and Dinata, M.R.K. (2022) 'Public Service Model on Bureaucracy Reform in Lampung Utara', *Constitutionale*, 3(2), pp. 135–146. DOI:10.25041/constitutionale.v3i2.2406
17. KASN, H. (2021) *Hasil Survei KASN: Politisasi Birokrasi Terus Mengancam, Sebagian ASN Minta Hak Politik Dicabut*, [kasn.go.id](http://kasn.go.id).
18. Khanal, R., Gupta, A.K., and Bhattarai, P.C. (2022) 'Civil servants' integrity in public sector: the case of Nepal', *Heliyon*, 8(12), p. e12632. DOI:0.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e12632
19. Koga, N.M. *et al.* (2023) 'When bargaining is and is not possible: the politics of bureaucratic expertise in the context of democratic backsliding', *Policy and Society*, 34(5), pp. 378–391. DOI:10.1093/polsoc/puad023
20. Krogh, A.H., and Triantafillou, P. (2024) 'Developing New Public Governance as a public management reform model', *Public Management Review*, 26(10), pp. 3040–3056. DOI:10.1080/14719037.2024.2313539
21. Kuswati, and Yeti (2023) 'Development and Dynamics of State Administration in Indonesia: The Struggle of the Discourse of the "State" Administration vis a vis the "Public" Administration', *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis*, 06(04), pp. 1631–1639. DOI:10.47191/ijmra/v6-i4-37

22. Lazuardi, A.H., and Wahidahwati, W. (2022) 'Paradigma New Public Management (NPM) sebagai Kerangka Reformasi Birokrasi untuk Good Governance di Indonesia', *Fokus Bisnis Media Pengkajian Manajemen dan Akuntansi*, 21(2), pp. 209–218. DOI:10.32639/fokbis.v21i2.43
23. Lestari, R.A. (2019) 'Reformasi Birokrasi Sebagai Pelayan Publik', *Dinamika Governance: Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi Negara*, 9(1). DOI:10.33005/jdg.v9i1.1421
24. Lin, C.J., and Jia, H. (2023) 'Time Pressure Affects the Risk Preference and Outcome Evaluation', *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 20(4). DOI:10.3390/ijerph20043205
25. Van Looy, A., and Shafagatova, A. (2016) 'Business process performance measurement: a structured literature review of indicators, measures and metrics', *Springer-Plus*, 5(1), pp. 1–24. DOI:10.1186/s40064-016-3498-1
26. Muriany, T., and Ruhunlela, V. (2021) 'Reformasi Birokrasi Pelayanan Publik di Kecamatan Tanimbar Selatan Kabupaten Kepulauan Tanimbar', *PUBLIC POLICY; Jurnal Aplikasi Kebijakan Publik dan Bisnis*, 2(1), pp. 1–20. DOI:10.51135/PublicPolicy.v2.i1.p1-20
27. Ngatu, Y.E., and Rusmiwari, S. (2019) 'Pengaruh Etika Birokrasi dan Motivasi Kerja Terhadap Kualitas Pelayanan', *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik (JISIP)*, 7(3). DOI:10.33366/jisip.v7i3.1405
28. Ningtyas, T. (2017) 'New Public Service: Pelayanan Publik Berbasis Humanistik untuk Kesuksesan Reformasi Birokrasi', *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Publik Dan Kebijakan Sosial*, 1(1). DOI:10.25139/jmnegara.v1i1.283
29. Nurhestitunggal, M., and Muhlisin, M. (2020) 'Penyederhanaan Struktur Birokrasi: Sebuah Tinjauan Perspektif Teoretis dan Empiris Pada Kebijakan Penghapusan Eselon III dan IV', *Jurnal Kebijakan Pembangunan Daerah*, 4(1), pp. 1–20. DOI:10.37950/jkpd.v4i1.100
30. Parulian, M., and Syafri, W. (2023) 'Application of the New Public Service (NPS) principles in population administration services in Tangerang Regency', *Russian Law Journal*, 11(13), pp. 281–286. Available at: <https://www.russianlawjournal.org/index.php/journal/article/view/2616> (accessed 07 February 2025).
31. Ramadhan, K.R., Hakim, L., and Aditya, I. (2023) 'Patologi Birokrasi Dalam Pelayanan Administrasi E-Ktp Di Kelurahan Malaka Sari', *Community Development Journal: Jurnal Pengabdian Masyarakat*, 4(2). Available at: DOI:10.31004/cdj.v4i2.14465
32. Sánchez-Hernández, M.I. *et al.* (2020) 'Responsible job design based on the internal social responsibility of local governments', *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(11). DOI:10.3390/ijerph17113994
33. Soselissa, H.C. and Puturuahu, D. (2021) 'Penerapan Prinsip New Publik Service dalam Pelayanan STNK pada Kantor Sistem Administrasi Manunggal Satu Atap', *PUBLIC POLICY; Jurnal Aplikasi Kebijakan Publik dan Bisnis*, 2(2), pp. 315–330. DOI:10.51135/PublicPolicy.v2.i2.p315-330

34. Suchman, L., Owino, E. and Montagu, D. (2021) 'Recognizing and mediating bureaucratic barriers: Increasing access to care through small and medium-sized private providers in Kenya', *Gates Open Research*, 5. DOI:10.12688/gatesopenres.13313.3
35. Sukarno, B. *et al.* (2021) 'Kegagalan Implementasi E-Government Dinas Kependudukan dan Pencatatan Sipil Kabupaten Bekasi di Era Pandemi', *Jurnal Identitas*, 1(2), pp. 1–13. DOI:10.52496/identitas.v1i2.146
36. Surur, M. (2019) 'Birokrasi Weberian: "Proportional Approach"', *Madani Jurnal Politik dan Sosial Kemasyarakatan*, 11(2), pp. 86–104. DOI:10.52166/madani.v11i2.1601
37. Suzuki, K., and Hur, H. (2020) 'Bureaucratic structures and organizational commitment: findings from a comparative study of 20 European countries', *Public Management Review*, 22(6), pp. 877–907. DOI:10.1080/14719037.2019.1619813
38. Syauket, A., Lestari, S.P., and Simarmata, R.P. (2020) 'Inovasi Birokrasi Pemerintahan Anti Korupsi Berbasis Teknologi Informasi Dan Komunikasi (Melihat Kebijakan E-Procurement)', *Jurnal Manajemen Publik dan Kebijakan Publik (JMPKP)*, 2(2).
39. Tamami, A.I. (2020) 'Kualitas Pelayanan Di Sektor Publik Dengan Perspektif NPS', *Jurnal Penelitian Administrasi Publik*, 6(1), pp. 1–12.
40. Tanner, C., Linder, S., and Sohn, M. (2022) 'Does moral commitment predict resistance to corruption? experimental evidence from a bribery game', *PLoS ONE*, 17(1 January), pp. 1–22. DOI:10.1371/journal.pone.0262201
41. Wang, Y., and Li, H. (2019) 'Moral Leadership and Unethical Pro-organizational Behavior: A Moderated Mediation Model', *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10(November), pp. 1–19. DOI:10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02640
42. Wijaya, K.A.S., and Noak, P.A. (2019) 'Internalisasi etika birokrasi dan penguatan sistem pengendalian sumber daya manusia dalam rangka mencegah korupsi', *Jurnal Ilmiah Widya Sosiopolitika*, 1(1), p. 46.
43. Willems, E. (2020) 'Politicized policy access: The effect of politicization on interest group access to advisory councils', *Public Administration*, 98(4), pp. 856–872. DOI:10.1111/padm.12651
44. Yasa, A. *et al.* (2021) 'Penguatan reformasi birokrasi menuju era society 5.0 di indonesia', *Nakhoda: Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan*, 20(1), pp. 27–42. DOI:10.35967/njip.v20i1.139

The article was submitted: 11.01.2024;  
approved after reviewing: 23.11.2024;  
accepted for publication: 08.03.2025.