FROM TRADITIONAL TO INNOVATIVE PUBLIC SERVICE: A REVIEW OF PARADIGM SHIFTS

Anil Kumar Gupta[1], Bishnu Prasad Lamsal[2]

[1,2] Nepal Administrative Staff College, Jawalakhel, Lalitpur, Nepal
[1] cdps10gupta@gmail.com; ORCID: 0000-0002-5242-7685
(Correspondence author)

Abstract. This research paper presents a comprehensive overview of paradigm shifts in public administration over time and their implications for public service delivery. The paper starts with the Old Public Administration and moves into the New Public Management. It then delves into post-NPM trends, including the New Public Service, New Public Governance, Public Value Management, Digital Era Governance, and the Whole of Government approach. Each paradigm is discussed in detail, highlighting its unique features and their effects on public service delivery. Overall, this paper makes a significant contribution to the field of public service, offering valuable insights for policymakers, administrators, service providers, scholars, and practitioners.

Keywords: public service; paradigm shift; citizens and public servants.

Introduction

Public services refer to the goods and services provided by the government, either directly or indirectly, to citizens in the interest of promoting public welfare. Public services are specifically designed to cater to the demands and expectations of citizens. The provision of public services is an indispensable function of the

government, as it facilitates national progress and advances justice and welfare in society (Pareek and Sole, 2022). The government may opt to deliver public services directly or through private or non-governmental institutions and networks. Regardless of which modality is chosen, it is the government's responsibility to ensure the smooth delivery of public services (Pokharel et al., 2017).

Citizens have the right to receive public services, and the government should provide them, serving as a means to strengthen the relationship between the state and its citizens (Gupta et al., 2023). Public services bridge the gap between the state and citizens, facilitating interaction through street-level agents of the state and promoting the welfare and well-being of the people (Pareek and Sole, 2022).

The provision of high-quality services to citizens that align with their expectations and demands is a fundamental responsibility of the government (Lamsal and Gupta, 2022). Failure to meet such expectations can erode trust and impede the establishment of democracy within a nation over time (Gupta, 2021). The quality of public services plays a crucial role in ensuring citizen satisfaction and restoring trust in the government (Pokharel et al., 2018; Pareek and Sole, 2022). It is the primary responsibility of the government to meet citizens' demands and expectations through the provision of high-quality public services (Gupta et al., 2023). Timely and seamless provision of quality public services is an indication of good service performance, while citizens facing unnecessary difficulties in accessing services indicate poor public service performance (Gupta and Shrestha, 2021).

In recent times, public service institutions have been confronted with an increasingly heightened demand for delivering highly efficient services compared to previous periods (Hailu and Shifare, 2019). These institutions are expected to uphold public values, including but not limited to effectiveness, efficiency, equity, and responsiveness in public service, with failure to do so resulting in media scrutiny, political principal examination, and citizen discontent (van den Bekerom et al., 2021). Public service institutions face a pervasive challenge as they strive to better serve their citizens. In developing nations, public sector institutions face pressure due to the rising awareness and expectations of the public, fueled by civic education, social media, and technological advancement (Pokharel et al., 2017). Citizens anticipate improved public service performance from these institutions. To meet their expectations, public services must be innovatively designed and delivered to effectively and efficiently satisfy the needs and demands of citizens. The advancement of various models of public administration has sparked global interest in reforming public service design and delivery. This paper aims to discuss the different models of public administration and provide an overview of their key attributes and implications for public service delivery.

This paper seeks to answer the question: What are the key attributes of paradigm shifts in public administration from traditional to innovative models, and how do these shifts impact the delivery of public services? By answering this question, a comprehensive understanding of the paradigm shift in public administration, transitioning from traditional to innovative approaches, and its impact on public service delivery can be gained. Furthermore, valuable insights into the distinctive features of each paradigm are provided, enabling policymak-

ers to make well-informed decisions regarding public service delivery. Moreover, this paper contributes to the existing literature, serving as a valuable resource for researchers, policymakers, and practitioners who seek to comprehend the implications of paradigm shifts for public service delivery.

Public Service: A Paradigm Shifts

The landscape of public service delivery has undergone a significant transformation with the emergence of various models of public administration. Societal changes act as driving forces behind paradigm shifts in public administration. The evolving needs, demands, and expectations of society play a crucial role in these shifts in public service delivery. As citizens become more aware, engaged, and technologically connected, their expectations for public services increase, necessitating a paradigm shift. Technological advancements have revolutionized the delivery of public services, leading to the adoption of digital technologies and e-governance platforms to improve efficiency and transparency (Rai and Gupta, 2023). Political ideologies and governance philosophies also influence paradigm shifts as leaders and governments adopt alternative models aligned with their policy priorities and approaches to governance. Since the early 1980s, the public administration system has undergone significant transformations due to the influence of market-oriented management (Elias Sarker, 2006). Economic factors, such as the rise of neoliberalism in the 1980s, have emphasized efficiency, market-based solutions, and cost-effectiveness in public services (Hood, 1989). Additionally, the interconnectedness of the global economies facilitates the exchange of ideas, best practices, and lessons learned, inspiring the adoption of innovative models as countries learn from each other's achievements and challenges.

Throughout the history of public administration, scholars and practitioners have proposed a plethora of principles, models, and theories to augment the effectiveness and efficiency of public service provision (Kularathne, 2017). Some notable paradigm shifts in public administration include the Old Public Administration, New Public Management, New Public Services, New Public Governance, Public Value Management, Digital Era Governance, and Whole of Government approaches. These paradigm shifts have significant practical implications for entire public administration systems. These implications are geared towards enhancing service delivery, improving efficiency, promoting citizen engagement, and adapting to evolving societal expectations. Through the adoption of innovative models, public administrations can effectively meet the changing needs of their citizens and provide relevant, efficient, and accountable public services. Public administration systems in different countries encounter distinct challenges and contexts. Paradigm shifts allow for the customization and adaptation of approaches to fit specific circumstances, considering local cultural, social, and economic factors. This flexibility enables public administrations to address local needs while also benefiting from global best practices. In this article, we provide a detailed discussion of paradigm shifts in public administration, elucidating their salient features and implications for public service delivery.

Old (traditional) Public Administration

The Old Public Administration (OPA), also recognized as traditional public administration, was substantially influenced by the ideas of German sociologist Max Weber. Weber emphasized top-down control through a monocratic hierarchy, where policies were formulated at the highest level and implemented through a series of offices, with each manager and worker being accountable to a superior (Pfiffner, 1999). Weberian thought was characterized by formalism, vertical hierarchies, narrow communication networks, and resistance to external influences (Wojciech, 2017). The OPA emphasized centralized control, the establishment of rules and guidelines, rule-based administration, meritocracy, a career system, impartiality, division of labour, an apolitical civil service, permanence and stability, internal regulation, separation of policy-making and implementation, and a hierarchical organizational structure (Peter, 1996; Osborne, 2006). Essentially, the OPA viewed the government as the sole independent and authoritative actor, owing to its bureaucratic, hierarchical systems and procedures governing public service (Ikeanyibe et al., 2017). Public service delivery was based on legal rational authority, jurisdiction, hierarchy, compliance, processes, and procedures, rather than focusing on outcomes and results.

In the OPA, public servants were expected to provide public services to individuals hierarchically, based on pre-determined compliance that served the public interest rather than the private interest (Robinson, 2015). Public servants played a crucial role in implementing policies that were established by higher-level authorities in the OPA paradigm. Public servants were expected to maintain an exceptional level of professionalism and impartiality in their work. The OPA valued an apolitical civil service, where public servants had to remain neutral and nonpartisan in their work, regardless of their political beliefs. This was deemed indispensable to ensure fair and objective delivery of public services without any discrimination. Public servants were held accountable for their performance by their immediate superiors and ultimately by those at the top of the organizational hierarchy.

Although the OPA was the dominant model of public administration in many countries during the 20th century, it has received criticism for its excessive bureaucracy, inefficiency, lack of responsiveness to citizen needs, and failure to achieve desired outcomes. However, professionalism, impartiality and adherence to rules and guidelines were seen as crucial to public service delivery. Critics argue that an excessive focus on processes and procedures might impede innovation and responsiveness to evolving societal needs. The hierarchical structure and resistance to external influences within the OPA may also restrict collaboration and hinder effective decision-making. These criticisms raise important questions. For instance, does the emphasis on centralized control and rule-based administration hinder the agility and adaptability of public service delivery? Does the emphasis on impersonality and division of labor limit opportunities for collaboration and innovation? Can public servants truly remain apolitical, or does it create a disconnect between the government and the diverse needs of society? These questions warrant careful consideration.

Despite the criticism of the OPA, many countries such as China, France, India, Italy, Japan, South Korea, Spain, the United Kingdom, and Nepal, among others, still adhere to the OPA model. However, the extent of its implementation varies across countries. For instance, China and France have a more centralized and bureaucratic system compared to Japan and South Korea. Furthermore, countries like the United Kingdom, and New Zealand, among others, have implemented NPM reforms (Lapuente and Van de Walle, 2020) to make their administrative systems more market-oriented and performance-based. Currently, several models of public administration have emerged to effectively meet the needs of citizens and society. Nevertheless, the OPA continues to be widely recognized as one of the most influential and renowned theories in the field, with some of its key features endured over time (Hood, 1995; Kickert, 1997), even in the ever-evolving landscape of public governance (Osborne, 2010). Lane (1994) contends that this model remains an indispensable foundation in the field of public administration, notwithstanding the introduction of various 'modern' paradigms.

While it has provided a solid foundation, the exploration of alternative paradigms and innovative approaches may be necessary to address complex and dynamic demands of contemporary governance.

New Public Management

In the late 1970s, the OPA faced significant criticism, leading to the introduction of market-based principles known as New Public Management (NPM). Christopher Hood pioneered the NPM paradigm, aiming to integrate private sector and business principles into public administration (Çolak, 2019). The initial NPM reforms were introduced in Anglo-Saxon countries, specifically the United Kingdom and New Zealand (Lapuente and Van de Walle, 2020). Subsequently, these reforms quickly expanded globally, particularly in advanced democracies within the OECD (Clifton and Díaz-Fuentes, 2011), albeit with notable variations among countries (Pollitt and Bouckaert, 2017). The NPM movement encompassed various reforms in the public sector. These reforms aimed to enhance the efficiency of public service delivery and ensure accountability for performance (Nguyen et al., 2016). NPM advocates for decentralized management, delegation of discretion, contracting for products and services, and the use of market mechanisms such as competition and customer service to achieve better results (Pfiffner, 1999). Furthermore, it promotes a client-centered approach to administration, democratic decision-making, de-bureaucratization, and decentralization of administrative procedures to improve the efficiency and humanistic quality of public services (Hughes, 2003). NPM also strives to make the public sector more competitive and result-oriented, emphasizing community empowerment and customer satisfaction through public services (Osborne and Gaebler, 1992).

Within the NPM paradigm, public servants are expected to create a performance-driven culture, emphasizing the delivery of delivering high-quality services and being responsive to citizens. They are encouraged to think creatively and adopt new technologies and management practices. However, it is essential

to consider the potential conflicts that may arise when prioritizing performance over the broader public interest. How can public servants balance efficiency, creativity and the imperative to tackle complex societal challenges and meet the diverse needs of citizens? This question is of great importance and deserves careful consideration in the framework of NPM.

Despite the widespread adoption of NPM by many countries, including the United Kingdom, Australia, and New Zealand (Halligan, 2013) to improve public service performance, criticisms of NPM in the new millennium have emerged, prompting the exploration of alternative models. These models, referred to as post-NPM trends, share some similarities to NPM but focus on specific areas (Lodge and Gill, 2011; Christensen and Lægreid, 2011; Christensen, 2012). The post-NPM trends aim to establish sustainable, effective, and up-to-date public administration, and include concepts such as new public service, new public governance, public value management, digital era governance, and whole of government approaches (Çolak, 2019; Wu and He, 2009). To effectively address the limitations and challenges identified within the NPM paradigm, it is crucial to explore how these post-NPM models can provide effective solutions. Additionally, what valuable insights can be obtained from NPM to guide the development and implementation of these alternative models? Answering these questions is of utmost importance to meet the diverse needs of citizens, tackle the complex challenges faced by society, and ensure the delivery of high-quality public services.

New Public Service

The OPA paradigm and the NPM approach to public services are considered outdated (Denhardt and Denhardt, 2003). They have been replaced by a new and innovative concept called New Public Service (NPS), which is a part of the post-NPM trends. Robert B. Denhardt and Janet V. Denhardt are the pioneers of NPS, which places citizens, communities, and civil society at the forefront of public management (Robinson, 2015). NPS is guided by seven principles that prioritize serving over steering, prioritize citizenship and public service above entrepreneurship, encourage strategic thinking and democratic behavior, focus on serving citizens instead of customers, acknowledge the complexity of accountability, and value individuals over just productivity (Denhardt and Denhardt, 2000).

Public servants are responsible to incorporate these principles into public service delivery. However, it is imperative to conduct a comprehensive assessment of the practical implications of these principles. How can public servants successfully balance between serving citizens and attaining efficient and effective public service delivery? What obstacles might emerge when prioritizing citizenship over entrepreneurship and productivity? How can democratic accountability be effectively ensured in the NPS paradigm? These questions require careful consideration and in-depth exploration.

The NPS underscores that public servants ought to assist citizens in articulating and achieving their shared objectives, rather than steering or controlling society towards new directions (Denhardt and Denhardt, 2000). Public servants

(managers) require skills that extend beyond the ability to control or direct society in the pursuit of policy solutions. It is crucial for them to emphasize brokering, negotiating, and resolving intricate problems in collaboration with citizens (Robinson, 2015). Public servants should consider legal and regulatory issues, community values, political norms, professional standards, and citizens' interests (Solong, 2017). The NPS also highlights the importance of building trust and cooperation with citizens and stakeholders, rather than simply responding to customer demands, and promoting opportunities for citizen participation in addressing societal problems (Denhardt and Denhardt, 2000; Robinson, 2015). The NPS stresses the importance of a public service ethos that is rooted in the ideals and motivations of public servants who are committed to the broader public good (Denhardt and Denhardt, 2000). In this paradigm, public servants are expected to facilitate collaboration with citizens and stakeholders through various means, including working across organizational boundaries, forging partnerships with community organizations, and engaging in dialogue with citizens to identify and address public needs and concerns. Public servants have to prioritize citizens, communities, and civil society over customers, aiming to establish trusting and cooperative relationships, encourage citizen participation in resolving societal issues, foster collaboration with citizens and stakeholders, and uphold democratic accountability. Within the NPS, public servants play an indispensable role in achieving public value, democratic accountability, and collaboration with citizens and stakeholders.

New Public Governance

The New Public Governance (NPG) paradigm emerged during the 1990s and has gained significant momentum since the early 2000s. The NPG, which is rooted in governance theory, was introduced by Osborne, and is considered the most prominent model among post-NPM trends. The development of NPG was influenced by several factors, including the growing recognition of the limitations of NPM and the need for a more collaborative and network-based approach to public service. The need for a holistic model that goes beyond the distinction between administration and management and offers a more systematic public management philosophy has led to the development of NPG (Osborne, 2006). The NPG seeks to blend the strengths of OPA and NPM by acknowledging the legitimacy and interdependence of the policymaking, implementation, and service delivery processes (Osborne, 2006). The NPG places the citizen as co-producers of policies and service delivery distinguishing the NPG from OPA and NPM (Robinson, 2015). The NPG emphasizes cost reduction, increasing the overall efficiency and effectiveness of publicly funded services, emphasizing effective partnerships among service providers and well-functioning networks linked to government funders (Vinokur-Kaplan, 2018). The NPG is value-centered, arguing that the purpose of government is to achieve the greater good rather than just increased performance, efficacy, or responsiveness in the execution of a specific program (Moore, 1994, 1995; Alford, 2002; Stoker, 2006).

The NPG paradigm espouses a pluralistic state in which multiple independent actors collaborate to provide cost-effective and efficient public services, and numerous mechanisms inform the policy-making process (Osborne, 2006). This approach enables the use of stakeholders, networks, cooperation, and alliances, emphasizing engagement and unified services, as well as new forms of co-production that prioritize a more engaged citizen model (Çolak, 2019; Ikeanyibe et al., 2017). The NPG seeks to reimagine the role of the public sector through citizen engagement and network governance (Bingham et al., 2005; Boyte, 2005), encouraging public bodies to engage a diverse array of stakeholders in formal, consensus-oriented, and deliberative collaborative decision-making processes (Berkett et al., 2013). It places a strong emphasis on inter-organizational partnerships, process governance, service efficacy, and outcomes (Osborne, 2006), setting it apart from OPA, which tends to prioritize intra-organizational processes within the government sphere over inter-organizational processes among government, private, and non-profit actors (Osborne et al., 2013).

The NPG paradigm places a strong emphasis on the indispensable role of public servants in promoting collaboration among stakeholders and delivering public services that prioritize the collective welfare of citizens. In contrast to viewing public servants as mere bureaucratic enforcers of policies and procedures, the NPG recognizes them as active participants in policy formulation, implementation and delivery services. Public servants engage in consensual and deliberative collaborative decision-making processes to ensure that policies and services are tailored to meet the needs of citizens. They are also expected to establish alliances with private and non-profit entities to improve service efficacy and outcomes, involving citizens as co-producers in policymaking and service delivery. This requires strong public relations and engagement skills on the part of public servants to foster a sense of ownership of policies and services delivered. By actively involving various stakeholders in policy making and service delivery, public servants contribute to the overall efficiency and effectiveness of services, which ultimately enhances the well-being of citizens.

The NPG has gained acceptance in numerous countries worldwide. However, the implementation of NPG varies among these nations due to their distinct political, economic, and social contexts. Successful implementation of the NPG necessitates prioritizing reforms that emphasize collaborative decision-making, citizen participation, engagement of diverse stakeholders, fostering an accountable culture, and adopting networked governance structures (Bingham et al., 2005; Boyte, 2005; Berkett et al., 2013). To achieve this, it is crucial to establish a significant level of trust, collaboration, and cooperation between stakeholders. Additionally, creating a supportive political and bureaucratic environment is vital for the NPG to thrive. Failure to meet these conditions may hinder the NPG's impact on public service delivery. By embracing collaboration, networks, and trust as foundational principles, the public sector can unlock its full potential, resulting in improved effectiveness, efficiency, and equity, ensuring the seamless delivery of high-quality public services to citizens.

Despite the significant role played by the NPG in recent years in public service delivery, it is imperative to critically examine key questions related to the

NPG. Specifically, how can public servants effectively engage citizens as co-producers and ensure their meaningful participation in policy-making and service delivery? Moreover, what challenges may arise in balancing citizen engagement with the need for cost-effectiveness and efficiency? It is also crucial to address how public servants can effectively navigate inter-organizational partnerships and ensure accountability and effectiveness in service delivery. Additionally, what measures can be implemented to address potential conflicts of interest or power imbalances among stakeholders? A thorough exploration of these questions is essential to understand the practical implications of the NPG for public service delivery.

Public Value Management

Mark Moore (1994, 1995) introduced the concept of Public Value Management (PVM), also known as the public value model, in his seminal book 'Creating Public Value – Strategic Management in Government'. It was introduced as a critique, reaction, and alternative to the previous public service approaches of OPA and NPM (O'Flynn, 2007; Coats and Passmore, 2008; Wu and He, 2009). The PVM framework emphasizes the importance of creating public value as the primary goal of public managers, akin to the private sector's focus on maximizing shareholder value (Moore, 1995). The PVM, as a form of governance, offers opportunities for extensive exchange between those who govern and the governed, providing PVM managers with the means to facilitate dialogue between these parties (Stoker, 2006; Shaw, 2013). Although public value has gained significant attention, a clear definition remains elusive (O'Flynn, 2007). According to Kelly et al. (2002), public value is generated by the government through services, rules, regulations, and other acts largely decided by the public. In contrast, O'Flynn (2005) views public value as a multi-dimensional construct that expresses the collective and politically mediated desires of the citizenry, shaped not only by outcomes but also through processes that can generate confidence or fairness. Stoker (2006) posits that public value is created through deliberation between elected and appointed government officials and key stakeholders, representing more than just the individual desires of consumers or producers of public services. This lack of consensus raises issues of how public value can be accurately measured, evaluated, and incorporated into decision-making processes for public services.

The public value serves not only as a measure of government performance, but also as a basis for informing policy decisions and shaping service delivery (O'Flynn, 2007). The PVM focuses on creating public value for and with the public through deliberation and co-production processes. These processes go beyond achieving outcomes and involve in deliberative processes to define, deliver, and assessment of public services (Knoll, 2012). Todorut and Tselentis (2015) assert that public value can be generated in a number of ways, a key aspect of which is to engage the group of people in discussions to determine their contribution and benefits in creating public value. The three primary components of public value creation, namely service, result, and trust/legitimacy, as defined by Kelly et al. (2002), are presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Components of Public Value

Component	Descriptions
Service	– Vehicle for providing public value to users through actual service experiences and the allocation of justice, equity and related values to citizens. – User satisfaction is a key determinant of public value and is influenced by several factors, including customer service, availability of information, user preferences, service use and advocacy
Outcome	– Achievement of desired end outcomes, which often overlap with services, should be considered separately as they encompass much higher value expectations. – Results are often considered by the public as a critical component of government performance
Trust/legitimacy	– Main sources that are vital to the creation of public value include not only meeting formal service and outcome targets, but also maintaining confidence and trust, as a decline in these factors could ultimately rescind the public value. – Foundation of relations between citizens and government is trust. – Services that have a direct impact on life and liberty, such as health and policing, are of utmost importance and this importance extends to other services, including social services and education

Source: Kelly et al., 2002

In the realm of public administration and policy, the government provides a multitude of services that are highly valued by the public. These services can be broadly categorized divided into three groups: services, outcomes, and trust, with some degree of although there is some overlap between them. The emphasis placed on attaining outcomes and desired results within the framework of the PVM raises questions regarding the process of determining, measuring, and attributing these outcomes to public value. Although outcomes are widely recognized as critical elements of government performance, the task of separating them from services and conducting separate assessments can be intricate and arduous. Identifying appropriate indicators and metrics to evaluate outcomes, and attributing those outcomes to specific public services, can lead to debates about causality, accountability and resource allocation. The PVM framework also places significant emphasis on trust and legitimacy as crucial components of public value. However, the factors that contribute to trust and legitimacy can vary in diverse contexts and among different stakeholders. Debates may arise regarding the establishment, maintenance, and evaluation of trust in the context of public service delivery. Moreover, the inherent tension between meeting formal service and outcome targets and maintaining trust and confidence may pose challenges and require compromises for public servants.

Satisfaction of service users is a crucial factor in achieving public value (Kelly et al., 2002). Citizens who use public services expect a level of satisfaction on par with that of the private sector. Factors such as good customer service, timely and

accurate information, and a wide range of options contribute to and influence service user satisfaction (Bojang, 2020). Adopting a public value approach allows organizations to maintain their performance and ensure citizen (customer) satisfaction with their work processes (Yotawut, 2018). The PVM reconceptualizes citizens as active agents in determining service provision and as collaborators in decisions regarding program content and objectives (Shaw, 2013). Recognizing citizens as active agents of service delivery requires careful consideration of their representation, inclusivity and the incorporation of diverse perspectives. Moreover, it may require additional resources, expertise and efforts for capacity-building. Citizen entitlement to services is a defining feature of public services, and the most essential element of such services, public value, has the potential to optimize stakeholder value enhance management, and ensure optimal service delivery (Yotawut, 2018). The PVM acknowledges that adopting a more practical approach to selecting public service providers would lead to a higher degree of public value optimization (O'Flynn, 2007). The PVM approach stresses the importance of public participation, continuous improvement, and service users' satisfaction in the provision of public services. Within the PVM framework, public servants have a vital role in implementing government policies and delivering public services that generate public value. Collaboration with citizens is essential to ensure that public services effectively meet their needs and optimize public value. To achieve this, public servants must incorporate citizens' feedback, preferences, and priorities into the design and delivery of public services through participatory and deliberative processes.

They should also prioritize the maintenance of trust and legitimacy between government and citizens by meeting formal performance and outcome targets and ensuring citizen confidence. Particularly in services that directly life and liberty, public servants must provide high- quality services to uphold citizens' trust in government. Public servants work closely with citizens to design and deliver public services, prioritize citizen satisfaction and maintain trust and legitimacy. Public participation and continuous improvement are crucial for achieving high quality services. Thus, public servants must engage citizens and continuously enhance public services to optimize public value.

Digital Era Governance

Dunleavy et al. (2005) introduced the concept of Digital Era Governance (DEG) in their scholarly article titled 'New Public Management is Dead – Long Live Digital Era Governance' published in 2005. Their proposition originated from the acknowledgment that the existing New Public Management (NPM) system falls short of achieving the desired outcomes in the areas of disaggregation, competition, and incentivization. Thus, Dunleavy et al. (2005) argue for a modification of public administration in light of these developments. The DEG ideology endorses the extensive internet culture in government and acknowledges that the proliferation of the internet brings about not just technical changes but also behavioural, cognitive, organizational, political, and cultural transformations associated with the digital revolution (Wojciech, 2017).

In DEG, digital technologies assume a pivotal role in shaping the organizational structure of government agencies. These technologies drive significant advancements in communication, organizational structures, and service delivery models, and influence citizens' expectations of interactions with service providers (Clarke, 2020). The adoption of information technology, the internet, mobile devices, and social media have transformed the management and delivery of public services (Karippacheril, 2013). Public servants now dedicate the majority of their time to computers, which facilitate all government processes, enable the delivery of public services via the internet, facilitate communication with citizens through social media, and lay the foundation for innovative government action through big data (Meijer et al., 2018). The DEG also encompasses the digitization of administrative processes. The impact of DEG activities can be classified into three key themes (Dunleavy et al., 2005), as depicted in Table 2.

Table 2

DEG Theme and Component

Theme	Components
Reintegration	Rollback of agencification, joined-up governance, re-govern-mentalization, reinstating central processes; radically squeezing production costs, reengineering back-office functions, procurement concentration and specialization, network simplification
Needs-Based Holism	Client-based or needs-based reorganization, one-stop provision, interactive and 'ask once' information-seeking, data warehousing; end-to-end service, reengineering, agile government processes
Digitization Processes	Electronic service delivery, new forms of automated processes-zero touch technologies, radical disintermediation, active channel streaming, facilitating isocratic administration and co-production, moving toward an open-book government

Source: Dunleavy et. al., (2005), p. 481.

The current trend toward DEG encompasses the integration of functions into the governmental domain, a focus on comprehensive and -oriented systems, and the advancement of administrative processes through digitalization (Dunleavy et al., 2005). In DEG, the government adopts a build-and-learn process involving citizens in the co-design of public policies and services. The DEG welcomes and incorporates citizen feedback in the delivery of public services, rendering top-down administration obsolete (Wojciech, 2017). Essentially Digital Governance, an advanced version of DEG, concentrates on two aspects: an administration and public service design framework, and a normative framework for policy-making and service delivery. The framework for governance and public service design is grounded on five principles: the provision of free public services, the use of existing digital information, one-time service delivery, the development of scalable services through competition, and isocratic (do-it-yourself) administration. The normative framework for policy-making and service delivery is based on four principles: the value of equality of outcome over process, the provision of formal

rights and real redress, the maintenance of the state's nodal obligation, and experiential learning (Dunleavy and Margetts, 2015). In essence, the DEG lays the foundation for a public service delivery system that leverages digital technology in administering services.

In the realm of DEG, the onus lies on public servants to formulate and implement digital strategies for public service delivery through digital technologies. It is their responsibility to ensure that government agencies have the necessary infrastructure, systems and processes in place to facilitate seamless and user-friendly digital service delivery to citizens. Public servants play a crucial role in designing digital services that meet the needs of citizens and incorporate user feedback into service delivery. They are also accountable for developing policies and procedures that foster the effective utilization of digital technologies in government operations. Additionally, public servants are responsible for enhancing government agencies' digital proficiency and acting as catalysts in promoting a culture of innovation and collaboration both within and beyond government agencies. Ultimately, public servants serve as critical agents of digital transformation in public administration in the digital age.

The role of DEG in delivering technology-based public services has become a top priority for almost all countries in the world in recent times. Countries are actively involved in designing and delivering technology-based public services within the framework of DEG. However, there are critical issues that are closely associated with DEG. Firstly, how can government agencies effectively bridge the digital divide and ensure equitable access to digital services? Secondly, what ethical considerations should be taken into account regarding the collection, storage, and utilization of citizen data? How can public servants adapt to the evolving landscape of digital governance? Comprehensive answers to these questions are essential to effectively address the challenges associated with the practical implications of DEG on public service delivery.

Whole of Government

In response to the NPM reform, a new wave of reform known initially as 'joined-up government' and later as 'whole of government,' emerged (Christensen and Lægreid, 2006). Addressing the issue of coordination, these reform initiatives also sought to tackle the problem of integration (Mulgan, 2005). In 1997, Tony Blair's government in Britain introduced the concept of joined-up government as a response to departmentalism, tunnel vision, and vertical silos (Christensen and Lægreid, 2006). Different countries use different terms for the concept of whole of government, such as 'joined-up government' in Britain, 'horizontal government' in Canada, 'network government' in the United States, 'whole of government' in Australia, and 'integrated government' in New Zealand (Halligan, 2007; Colgan et al., 2014). While these terms are often used interchangeably, they are sometimes considered 'fashionable slogans' (Lægreid et al., 2013). The slogans 'joined-up-government' and 'whole of government' provided new labels for the traditional doctrine of coordination in the study of public administration (Hood, 2005).

This approach is seen as a response to the siloization or pillarization of the public sector caused by the NPM reforms (Pollitt, 2003; Gregory, 2006), which aimed to eliminate independent departments or silos that operated without co-ordination. There is a growing trend towards integrated approaches to enhance interoperability and collaborative governance and move away from silo-based structures, disaggregation and organizational division (Nfissi et al., 2018). The approach addresses the issue of coordination and coherence in the context of NPM reforms, with the ultimate goal of achieving a seamless government (Colgan et al., 2014). The WOG approach, gaining global momentum, advocates for interconnectedness, coordination, and collaboration of government functions, policymaking, and service delivery. It promotes cross-office cooperation and collaboration to achieve government policy goals (Halligan, 2007), emphasizing a pragmatic working culture over formalized collaboration (Christensen and Lægreid, 2006). The WOG approach takes a comprehensive view of governance and seeks to harmonize policies and activities across diverse sectors and levels of government in pursuit of a common objective.

The WOG approach places significant importance on both horizontal and vertical cooperation to prevent contradictory policies, ensure the efficient use of limited resources, foster synergies by bringing together various policy stakeholders, and provide seamless services rather than fragmented ones (Pollitt, 2003). It represents a unified and coherent set of activities undertaken by various institutions to provide a shared solution to specific problems or issues. The approach integrates collaborative efforts among public sector agencies to achieve common objectives (United Nations, 2014). It underscores the need for unified inter- and intra-agency coordination, cooperation, and partnership in delivery of public services. Therefore, many countries worldwide have begun to incorporate this concept into their service delivery systems (Kularathne, 2017). The WOG approach enables public sector agencies to achieve results that would be unattainable if they worked in isolation. Clear goals, political commitment, feasible joint government structures, strong collaborative cultures, and incentives for collaboration are all critical factors for successful WOG implementation (Colgan et al., 2014).

Public servants have a vital responsibility to promote and ensure coherent and harmonious coordination, collaboration, and partnership among and within government agencies to effectively deliver public services. To achieve shared objectives and overcome conventional silos and departmental barriers, public servants should adopt a holistic approach to governance and an integrated working style that ensures consistency of policy and coordination between multiple government entities. They should promote cross-office cooperation, interconnectedness, collaboration, and unified inter- and intra-agency coordination for government duties, policymaking, and service delivery. In addition, public servants should encourage the efficient utilization of scarce resources by endorsing shared services and eliminating redundant activities. Moreover, they bear a responsibility to cultivate a collaborative culture by upholding transparency, openness, and mutual trust among diverse agencies. The capability of public servants to work jointly with various government agencies is fundamental to achieving collective policy goals and delivering seamless public services.

While the importance of the WOG approach is undeniable in eliminating independent departments or silos that operate without coordination and providing seamless services instead of fragmented ones, its successful implementation raises several issues. Firstly, how can government agencies effectively overcome the challenges of coordination and coherence in a complex and diverse public sector? Secondly, what strategies can be employed to ensure the efficient allocation and utilization of limited resources across multiple government entities? Additionally, how can the WOG approach strike a balance between harmonization and the preservation of diversity among government policies and activities? Addressing these issues is crucial for developing a nuanced understanding of the practical implications and potential limitations of the WOG approach in public service delivery.

Conclusion

Public service delivery has undergone paradigm shifts, which represent a transformation in the design, delivery, and appraisal of public services. Technological progress, societal changes, changing citizen expectations, policy reforms, political ideologies, and economic and external factors drive paradigm shifts in public administration and are constantly evolving.

Each paradigm has unique features and implications for public service delivery. Therefore, public service providers need to understand these paradigms and their implications to navigate the dynamic and complex landscape of public governance effectively. Public servants have a responsibility to stay up to date with global trends in public service and to incorporate them into their national context in order to create a more efficient and effective public service delivery system that meets the needs of society. Therefore, public servants should consistently appraise their public service systems to ensure that they are efficiently and effectively catering the needs of citizens and communities.

REFERENCES

1. Alford, J. (2002) 'Defining the client in the public sector: A social-exchange perspective', *Public Administration Review*, 62(3), pp. 337–346. DOI: 10.1111/1540-6210.00183

2. Berkett, N., Challenger, I., Sinner, J., and Tadaki, M. (2013) *Values, collaborative processes and indicators for freshwater planning.* Cawthron Institute. Report No. 2353. Available at: https://bit.ly/3fNTJ7s (accessed 10 July 2023).

3. Bingham, L. B., Nabatchi, T. and O'Leary, R. (2005) 'The new governance: Practices and processes for stakeholder and citizen participation in the work of government', *Public Administration Review*, 65(5), pp. 547–558. DOI: 10.1111/j.1540-6210.2005.00482.x

4. Bojang, M. B. (2020) 'Beyond new public management paradigm: The public value paradigm and its implications for public sector managers', *Journal of Public Value and Administrative Insight*, 3(2), pp. 1–10. DOI: 10.31580/jpvai.v3i2.1381

5. Boyte, H. C. (2005) 'Reframing democracy: Governance, civic agency, and politics', *Public Administration Review*, 65(5), pp. 536–546. DOI: 10.1111/j.1540-6210.2005.00481.x

6. Christensen, T. (2012) 'Post-NPM and changing public governance', *Meiji Journal of Political Science and Economics*, 1(1), pp. 1–11.

7. Christensen, T. and Lægreid, P. (2006) *The whole-of-government approach–regulation, performance, and public-sector reform.* Stein Rokkan Centre for Social Studies. Available at: https://bit.ly/3wz1Jjt (accessed 10 July 2023).

8. Christensen, T. and Lægreid, P. (2006) *The whole-of-government approach–regulation, performance, and public-sector reform.* Stein Rokkan Centre for Social Studies. Available at: https://bit.ly/3wz1Jjt (accessed 10 July 2023).

9. Christensen, T. and Lægreid, P. (2011) 'Democracy and administrative policy: Contrasting elements of new public management and post-NPM', *European Political Science Review*, 3(1), pp. 125–146. DOI: 10.1017/s1755773910000299

10. Clarke, A. (2020) 'Digital government units: what are they, and what do they mean for digital era public management renewal?', *International Public Management Journal*, 23(3), pp. 358–379. DOI: 10.1080/10967494.2019.1686447

11. Clifton, J. and Díaz-Fuentes, D. (2011) 'The OECD and phases in the international political economy, 1961–2011', *Review of International Political Economy,* 18(5), pp. 552–569. DOI: 10.1080/09692290.2011.620464

12. Coats, D. and Passmore, E. (2008). *Public value: The next steps in public service reform*. Work Foundation. Available at: https://bit.ly/3oSabYy (accessed 10 July 2023).

13. Çolak, Ç. D. (2019) 'Why the new public management is obsolete: An analysis in the context of the post-new public management trends', *Hrvatska i komparativna javna uprava: časopis za teoriju i praksu javne uprave*, 19(4), pp. 517–536. DOI: 10.31297/hkju.19.4.1

14. Colgan, A., Kennedy, L. A. and Doherty, N. (2014) *A primer on implementing whole of government approaches.* Centre for Effective Services. Available at: https://bit.ly/3yDZtcG (accessed 10 July 2023).

15. Denhardt, R. B. and Denhardt, J. V. (2000) 'The new public service: Serving rather than steering', *Public Administration Review*, 60(6), pp. 549–559. DOI: 10.1111/0033-3352.00117

16. Denhardt, R. B., and Denhardt, J. V. (2003) 'The new public service: An approach to reform', *International Review of Public Administration*, 8(1), 3–10. DOI: 10.1080/12294659.2003.10805013

17. Dunleavy, P. and Margetts, H. (2015, September) *Design principles for essentially digital governance.* Paper presented at 111th Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, San Francisco. Available at: https://bit.ly/3fjm5aK (accessed 10 July 2023).

18. Dunleavy, P., Margetts, H., Bastow, S., and Tinkler, J. (2005) 'New public management is dead – long live digital-era governance', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 16(3), pp. 467–494. DOI: 10.1093/jopart/mui057

19. Elias Sarker, A. (2006) 'New public management in developing countries: An analysis of success and failure with particular reference to Singapore and Bangladesh', *International Journal of Public Sector Management,* 19(2), pp. 180–203. DOI: 10.1108/09513550610650437

20. Gregory, R. (2006) 'Theoretical faith and practical works: De-autotomizing and joining-up in the New Zealand state sector', in: T. Christensen and P. Lægreid (Eds.) *Autonomy and regulation: Coping with agencies in the modern state* (pp. 137–161). Edward Elgar.

21. Gupta, A. K. (2021) *Citizens' trust in public and political institutions in Nepal.* Nepal Administrative Staff College. Available at: https://bit.ly/3FBIAEH (accessed 10 July 2023).

22. Gupta, A. K., and Shrestha, G. L. (2021) 'Citizen charter in Nepali public sector organizations: Does it really work?', *Policy and Governance Review*, 5(1), pp. 18–32.

23. Gupta, A. K., Bhurtel, A., and Bhattarai, P. C. (2023) 'Service users' confidence in accessing public services in Nepal: What makes differences?', *Journal of Policy Studies*, 38(1), pp. 29–43. DOI: 10.52372/jps38103

24. Hailu, A. G. and Shifare, H. G. (2019) 'Service delivery and customer satisfaction in the public service sector: An Ethiopian experience', *Public Policy and Administration Research*, 9 (9), pp. 24–37. DOI: 10.7176/PPAR

25. Halligan, J. (2007) 'Horizontal coordination in Australian government', *Journal for Comparative Government and European Policy,* 5(2), pp. 203–217. DOI: 10.1515/ZSE.2007.011

26. Halligan, J. (2013, January) *Reform of public sector governance in Australia* [Paper presentation]. Portuguese Association of Public Administration and Center for Public Administration Studies. Portugal, Lisbon. Available at: https://rb.gy/ool76 (accessed 10 July 2023).

27. Hood, C. (1989) 'Public administration and public policy: Intellectual challenges for the 1990s', *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 48(4), pp. 346–58. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-8500.1989.tb02235.x

28. Hood, C. (1995) 'The new public management in the 1980s: Variations on a theme', *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 20(2–3), pp. 93–109. DOI: 10.1016/0361-3682(93)E0001-W

29. Hood, C. (2005) 'The idea of joined-up government: A historical perspective', in: V. Bogdanor (Ed.) *Joined-up government.* Oxford University Press.

30. Hughes, O. E. (1998) 'The traditional model of public administration', *Public Management and Administration*, pp. 22–51. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-349-26896-2_2

31. Ikeanyibe, O. M., Ori, O. E. and Okoye, A. E. (2017) 'Governance paradigm in public administration and the dilemma of national question in Nigeria', *Cogent Social Sciences*, 3(1), 1316916. DOI: 10.1080/23311886.2017.1316916

32. Karippacheril, T. G. (2013) *Public service delivery in the era of digital governance.* The World Bank. Available at: https://bit.ly/3fPyWQO (accessed 10 July 2023).

33. Kelly, J. M. and Swindell, D. (2002) 'A multiple–indicator approach to municipal service evaluation: Correlating performance measurement and citizen satisfaction across jurisdictions', *Public Administration Review,* 62(5), pp. 610–621. DOI: 10.1111/1540-6210.00241

34. Kickert, W. J. (1997) 'Public governance in the Netherlands: An alternative to Anglo-American managerialism', *Public Administration*, 75(4), pp. 731–752. DOI: 10.1111/1467-9299.00084

35. Knoll, E. (2012) *The public value notion in UK public service broadcasting: An analysis of the ideological justification of public service broadcasting in the context of evolving media policy paradigms* [Doctoral dissertation]. The London School of Economics and Political Science. Available at: https://bit.ly/3vq0qTJ (accessed 10 July 2023).

36. Kularathne, D. M. N. (2017) *Implementation of whole-of-government practices in service delivery: A study on selected departments in Sri Lanka* [MA dissertation]. North South University. Available at: https://bit.ly/3bWcd4x (accessed 10 July 2023).

37. Lægreid, P., Nordø, Å. D. and Rykkja, L. H. (2013, September). *The quality of coordination in norwegian central government: The importance of coordination arrangements and structural, cultural and demographic factors* [Paper presentation]. European Group of Public Administration (EGPA) Study Group on Governance of Public Sector Organizations Conference 2013, Edinburgh, Scotland. Available at: https://bit.ly/3wBdZjC (accessed 10 July 2023).

38. Lamsal, B. P. and Gupta, A. K. (2022) 'Citizen satisfaction with public service: What factors drive?', *Policy and Governance Review,* 6(1), pp. 78–89. DOI: 10.30589/pgr.v6i1.470

39. Lane, J. E. (1994) 'Will public management drive out public administration?', *Asian Journal of Public Administration*, 16(2), pp. 139–151. DOI: 10.1080/02598272.1994.10800290

40. Lapuente, V. and Van de Walle, S. (2020) 'The effects of new public management on the quality of public services', *Governance*, 33(3), pp. 461–475. DOI: 10.1111/gove.12502

41. Lodge, M. and Gill, D. (2011) 'Toward a new era of administrative reform? The myth of post-NPM in New Zealand', *Governance*, 24(1), pp. 141–166. DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-0491.2010.01508.x

42. Meijer, A. J., Bolívar, M. P. R., and Gil-Garcia, J. R. (2018) 'From e-government to digital era governance and beyond: Lessons from 15 years of research into information and communications technology in the public sector', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 1–6. Available at: https://bit.ly/3wxoVPa (accessed 10 July 2023).

43. Moore, M. (1995) *Creating public value: Strategic management in government*. Harvard University Press. Available at: https://bit.ly/3wAC0XS (accessed 10 July 2023).

44. Moore, M. H. (1994) 'Public Value as the focus of strategy', *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 53(3), pp. 296–303. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-8500.1994.tb01467.x

45. Mulgan , G. (2005) 'Joined-up government: Past, present, and future', in: V. Bogdanor (Ed.), *Joined-up government.* Oxford University Press.

46. Nfissi, A., Mohamed, S., and Azelmad, S. (2018) 'eGovernment whole-of-government approach for good governance: Initiatives from Morocco', *African Journal of Governance and Development*, 7(2), pp. 24–34. Available at: https://bit.ly/3fmLiAW (accessed 10 July 2023).

47. Nguyen, M. P., Van Hoang, H., and Van Nguyen, D. (2016) 'Factors influencing citizens' satisfaction with public administrative services at the grassroots level case study of Tay Ho district', *VNU Journal of Science: Economics and Business*, 32 (5), pp. 90–101. Available at: https://bit.ly/3un6tao (accessed 10 July 2023).

48. O'Flynn, J. (2005, September). *Adding public value: A new era of contractual governance?* [Paper Presentation]. PAC Annual Conference – Public Administration and Management, University of Nottingham, United Kingdom.

49. O'Flynn, J. (2007) 'From new public management to public value: Paradigmatic change and managerial implications', *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 66(3), pp. 353–366. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-8500.2007.00545.x

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

51. Osborne, S. P. (2006) 'The new public governance?', *Public Management Review,* 8(3), pp. 377–388. DOI: 10.1080/14719030600853022

52. Osborne, S. P. (2010) *The new public governance? Emerging perspectives on the theory and practice of public governance.* Rutledge. https://bit.ly/3hRvmbB

53. Osborne, S. P., Radnor, Z., and Nasi, G. (2013) 'A new theory for public service management? Toward a (public) service-dominant approach', *The American Review of Public Administration*, 43(2), pp. 135–158. DOI: 10.1177/0275074012466935

54. Pareek, U. and Sole, N. A. (2022) 'Quality of public services in the era of guaranteed public service delivery', *Indian Journal of Public Administration*, 68(2), pp. 160–173. DOI: 10.1177/00195561211072575

55. Peter, B. G. (1996) *The future of governing: Four emerging models.* University Press of Kansas.

56. Pfiffner, J. P. (1999) 'Traditional public administration versus the new public management: Accountability versus efficiency', in: A. Benz., H. Siedentopf., and K. P. Sommermann (Eds.), *Institutionenbildung in Regierung und Verwaltung: Festschrift fur Klaus Konig,* pp. 443–454. Available at: https://bit.ly/34khUVS (accessed 10 July 2023).

57. Pokharel, T., Dahal, A. and Adhikari, R. (2017) *Public services in Nepal: Citizen's experiences.* Nepal Administrative Staff College.

58. Pokharel, T., Subedi, B. P., Adhikari S. H., Adhikari, R., and Gupta, A. K. (2018) *Quality of public service in Nepal: Nepal national governance survey 2017/18 thematic paper*. Nepal Administrative Staff College. Available at: https://bit.ly/34juNQ1 (accessed 10 July 2023).

59. Pollitt, C. (2003) 'Joined-up government: A survey', *Political Studies Review*, 1(1), pp. 34–49. DOI: 10.1111/1478-9299.00004

60. Pollitt, C. and Bouckaert, G. (2017) *Public management reform: A comparative analysis-into the age of austerity*. Oxford University Press.

61. Rai, S. K. and Gupta, A. K. (2023) 'Digital governance for monitoring the sustainable development goals: A case of Nepal', *Local Administration Journal,* 16(1), pp. 1–22.

62. Robinson, M. (2015) *From old public administration to the new public service: Implications for public sector reform in developing countries.* Global Centre for Public Service Excellence. Available at: https://bit.ly/3oTuHYY (accessed 10 July 2023).

63. Shaw, R. (2013) 'Another size fits all? Public value management and challenges for institutional design', *Public Management Review,* 15(4), pp. 477–500. DOI: 10.1080/14719037.2012.664017

64. Solong, H. A. (2017) 'Actualization new public service administration in public service', *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications,*7(3), pp. 505–5012. Available at: https://bit.ly/2QR0dKk (accessed 10 July 2023).

65. Stoker, G. (2006) 'Public value management: A new narrative for networked governance?', *The American Review of Public Administration*, 36(1), pp. 41–57. DOI: 10.1177/027507400 5282583

66. Todoruţ, A. V. and Tselentis, V. (2015, November) 'Designing the model of public value management', in: *Proceedings of the 9th International Management Conference*, pp. 74–78. Available at: https://bit.ly/3uhyfFi (accessed 10 July 2023).

67. United Nations (2014) *E-government for the Future we want.* United Nation.

68. van den Bekerom, P., van der Voet, J., and Christensen, J. (2021) 'Are citizens more negative about failing service delivery by public than private organizations? Evidence from a large-scale survey experiment', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 31(1), pp. 128–149.

69. Vinokur-Kaplan, D. (2018) 'New public governance, social services, and the potential of co-located nonprofit centers for improved collaborations', *Nonprofit Policy Forum*, 8(4), pp. 445–464. DOI: 10.1515/npf-2017-0040

70. Wojciech, B. (2017) 'Digital era governance: A new chapter of public management theory and practice', *MAZOWSZE Studia Regionalne*, 22, pp. 117–129. DOI: 10.21858/msr.22.08

71. Wu, X. and He, J. (2009) 'Paradigm shift in public administration: Implications for teaching in professional training programs', *Public Administration Review*, 69, pp. 21–28. DOI: 10.1111/j.1540-6210.2009.02085.x

72. Yotawut, M. (2018) 'Examining progress in research on public value', *Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences*, 39(1), pp. 168–173. DOI: 10.1016/j.kjss.2017.12.005