

COMPARISON OF CLASSICAL AND NEW APPROACHES TO PUBLIC VALUE MANAGEMENT THEORY: A THEORETICAL ANALYSIS

Hasan AKAY¹

Abstract

Public Value Management (PVM) theory emerged in the mid-1990s as an alternative to Traditional Public Management (classical bureaucracy) and New Public Management (NPM) in public administration. This study compares the PVM theory with the classical bureaucracy and NPM approaches in theory. The differences between these paradigms regarding public value, stakeholder participation, democratic accountability, and social impact are analyzed. The study was conducted using a content analysis based on a literature review. To evaluate the place of PVM in different administrative contexts, examples of practices and traditions from Turkey and selected EU countries (the United Kingdom, Germany, and the Netherlands) were included in the analysis. The analysis findings show that the traditional bureaucracy's understanding of public interest, which is based on law and hierarchy, and the NPM's market-oriented efficiency understanding are insufficient in responding to current governance demands. In contrast, the PVM offers a comprehensive framework that addresses these shortcomings by centering on stakeholder participation and social value creation. The tables presented in the study visually illustrate the fundamental principles of the three paradigms and the relationships between them. In conclusion, PVM is emphasized as a unique paradigm bridging the gap between classical and new approaches, strengthening democratic accountability and social impact in public administration.

Keywords: Public Value, Bureaucracy, New Public Management

JEL Codes: H83, L38, P48, Z18

¹ Asst. Prof., Adiyaman University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, hakay@adiyaman.edu.tr, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9531-4875>



INTRODUCTION

The discipline of public administration has undergone significant paradigm shifts, evolving from the Weberian bureaucratic tradition to the New Public Management (NPM) approach and then to a new paradigm known as Public Value Management (PVM). The classical bureaucracy model, which dominated much of the 20th century, aimed to protect the public interest through hierarchical structures, rule-based systems, and the principle of impartiality. However, the NPM approach, which emerged in the 1980s, prioritized efficiency, productivity, and market competition, adapting private sector logic to public administration (Hood, 1991, pp. 8–10). NPM introduced a management philosophy that views citizens as ‘customers’ and emphasizes results-oriented performance (Osborne and Gaebler, 1992). These paradigm shifts have led to questions about public administration's traditional values and functions.

From the mid-1990s onwards, amid growing criticism of NPM and the emergence of governance networks in public administration, Mark Moore pioneered the PVM approach. PVM, as set out in Moore’s *Creating Public Value* (1995), asserts that public managers should not only comply with laws and ensure financial efficiency but also produce tangible public values (Moore, 1995, pp. 28, 30). PVM updated the concept of public interest by proposing that the success of public services should be measured by the value created for society. This approach emphasizes the need to provide value-based responses to citizens’ expectations and social issues, thereby broadening NPM’s narrow focus on ‘customer satisfaction’ (O’Flynn, 2007, pp. 355–356). At the same time, it aims to open up the field of innovation, constrained by the rigid rules and hierarchy of traditional bureaucracy, by encouraging stakeholder participation and network management (Stoker, 2006, p. 43).

Public administrations today face demands for accountability, transparency, participation, and pressure to be efficient and perform well. While the classic bureaucratic approach and NPM may address some of these demands, neither provides a comprehensive solution. Bureaucracy is criticized for prioritizing compliance with rules over innovation and citizen-centredness, while NPM is criticized for prioritizing efficiency over democratic accountability and social equality (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2000, pp. 551–552). The ability of Public Value Management to balance these different values and expectations emerges as a significant research problem. How does PVM differ from bureaucracy and NPM? How does this new theoretical framework contribute to the concept of public interest and management practices? This study aims to address these questions and fill the resulting theoretical gap.

The main objective is systematically comparing PVM theory with the classical bureaucratic model and the NPM approach. This will reveal the different perspectives of these three paradigms on producing

public value in public administration. This comparison aims to develop a more integrated theoretical framework by clarifying the differences and overlaps between the paradigms in the literature on public administration. Identifying the unique aspects of PVM will contribute to theoretical discussions in academic literature and provide managers with a strategic perspective. This study compiles and analyses theoretical information scattered throughout the literature, making paradigmatic transformations in public administration more pragmatic and aiming to fill the existing theoretical gap. It is worth noting that the PVM approach is still a relatively new topic of discussion in the Turkish context (Aksakaloğlu & Akçakaya, 2021, pp. 274–276). This increases the importance of the study. The findings may enable public policymakers and administrators to recognize the strengths and weaknesses of different management paradigms, allowing them to review their practices accordingly.

The general structure of the study is as follows: The Theoretical Framework section discusses the conceptual foundations of PVM and the context in which it emerged. The main principles of classical and new approaches are summarised in light of key studies in the literature. The Literature Review section examines previous academic studies on classical bureaucracy, PVM, and NPM and compiles existing information on public value, stakeholder participation, and democratic accountability. The research questions and hypotheses of the study are stated in the following sections, along with a detailed description of the methodology followed. The Data Analysis and Findings section presents the authors' comparative evaluation findings based on content analysis in table form. This section reveals the three paradigms' concrete theoretical distinctions and intersections and evaluates the practical implications through examples from Turkey, the United Kingdom, Germany, and the Netherlands. The Discussion section interprets the findings in theoretical and practical contexts and addresses paradigm integration and possible synthesis orientations. The Conclusion section summarises the study's main findings and presents future expectations.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Mark H. Moore first introduced the concept of PVM in 1995. In his book *Creating Public Value: Strategic Management in Government*, he adapted the concept of 'value creation' from the private sector to the public sector. He argued that public managers should aim to create value like their private sector counterparts (Moore, 1995). However, the 'value' referred to here does not mean financial profit but rather public benefit and social impact. Moore's approach introduces a new criterion for measuring the success of public managers: public value, or how much value public services produce for society's welfare and the common good. He argues that strategic management in the public sector depends on the harmony of three fundamental elements: (1) public value, which refers to the social outcomes that the public organization aims to achieve and their value dimension; (2) legitimacy and support, which refers to the level of authority



and support that public administration receives from the public and political authorities; and (3) operational capacity, which refers to the organization's ability to transform the public value into reality through its resources and capabilities. Moore models these three elements as a "strategic triangle." This model emphasizes that to be successful, public managers must produce socially desirable and essential value (public value), have the necessary legitimacy and political/legal support to produce this value (legitimacy and support), and have the operational capacity to produce this value. In subsequent work, Moore (2013) further developed this concept by proposing managerial tools such as the 'public value account' and the 'public value scorecard.' These frameworks were designed to help public managers define and measure the value they create (Moore, 2013).

The emergence of PVM has also been reflected in practice. Notably, the Strategy Unit's publication of framework documents on 'Public Values' during the Blair government in the United Kingdom in the 2000s (Kelly et al., 2002) and the BBC's development of methods to measure public value, demonstrate the practical application of this approach (Collins, 2007). Similarly, countries such as Australia and New Zealand have begun to adopt public value as a criterion for success in public services (Alford & Hughes, 2008, p. 131). Academically, it has been argued that PVM is the most appropriate narrative for a network-based governance environment (Stoker, 2006, p. 43). According to Stoker, neither traditional bureaucracy nor NPM is fully appropriate in the age of network governance. However, he argues that PVM responds to the needs of this age with its approach based on dialogue and exchange systems (Stoker, 2006, p. 45). For this reason, PVM is considered the emerging paradigm in 21st-century public administration (O'Flynn, 2007, p. 354).

The main principles that distinguish PVM from other approaches can be summarised as follows:

Public Value Orientation: When evaluating the success of public institutions, PVO focuses on the value that the output provides to society. This is a broader understanding of value that goes beyond economic efficiency criteria. For instance, the success of an educational program should be assessed not only by the number of students who graduate but also by the positive influence that graduates exert on society and their contribution to equal opportunities (Moore, 2013). This perspective emphasizes the importance of social outcomes, considering the outputs and cost-benefit calculations that NPM focuses on to be insufficient. According to PVM, public activities should produce critical, non-material values such as justice, equality, and trust (Moore, 1995, pp. 53–54; Bryson et al., 2014). Consequently, public administrators should ask themselves, 'What value will this action add to society?' when making decisions (Moore, 1995, p. 59).

Stakeholder Participation and Joint Value Creation: PVM considers citizens, civil society organizations, and private sector partners in creating public value. This approach emphasizes the principle of participation in service design and delivery. Moore (1995) observes that individuals can be motivated by rules and incentives and by participating in co-creation processes. When setting a policy, PVM advocates that a local government consults the views of citizens, civil society organizations, and the relevant business community in that policy area to co-design the solution. In this sense, PVM views citizens as active partners, not passive objects of governance (Benington & Moore, 2011). This co-production approach is also called the 'co-production' concept in the literature (Alford & O'Flynn, 2009, p. 173). The importance given to stakeholder participation is a feature rarely seen in traditional bureaucracy, which remains limited to the level of 'customer feedback' in YKİ. By aiming to institutionalize multi-actor dialogue and cooperation within governance networks, PVM is breaking new ground in this area (Stoker, 2006, p. 45).

Democratic accountability: According to the PVM approach, public administrators should be accountable not only to higher authorities or elected politicians but also to citizens and the general public directly (Bryson et al., 2014, p. 446). This emphasis is closely related to the concept of governance. Democratic accountability involves transparent decision-making processes, determining public value priorities in collaboration with society, and openly evaluating results with society. In this respect, the PVM approach seeks to restructure the accountability mechanisms that the NPM approach may relax in the name of 'flexibility and performance orientation in management' in a more participatory and horizontal manner (Rhodes & Wanna, 2007, pp. 407–410). For instance, when the PVM approach is adopted in a municipality's strategic plan, priorities are established through public meetings when setting objectives. After implementation, feedback is given to the public on 'what values were created and which objectives were achieved.' Thus, accountability becomes a democratic process that opens up public value for discussion rather than being limited to a financial performance report.

Holistic and multi-dimensional performance understanding: PVM considers more than just quantitative and financial indicators when evaluating the success of public services; it also considers qualitative value elements. Moore (1995) and subsequent literature emphasize that success in the public sector is spread across multiple value dimensions: Economic value (efficiency/effectiveness), social value (equity, trust, and well-being), and political value (legitimacy and participation) (Talbot, 2009: 169–170). This multi-dimensional perspective suggests that managers use tools such as a 'public value scorecard' to monitor each dimension (Moore, 2013). For example, the success of a police force should not be measured solely by reducing crime rates but also by increasing public trust in the police since trust is an essential public value too (Kelly et al., 2002). This holistic understanding of performance is a complementary

innovation to classical bureaucracy's one-dimensional evaluation, which focuses on legal compliance and procedural control, and to evaluating the KPI, which is reduced to numerical performance indicators.

Alignment with governance networks: PVM recognizes that government agencies alone cannot solve today's complex social problems and must collaborate with other sectors (Benington & Moore, 2011, p. 7). Accordingly, NPM literature emphasizes that public value creation generally occurs within a value chain or network (Williams & Shearer, 2011, p. 1372). For instance, public value can be generated by collaborating with public institutions, private sector organizations, and civil society groups on environmental issues, unemployment, and public health. The governance dimension of PVM also intersects with the New Public Governance (NPG) paradigm. NPG refers to a network-based, multi-stakeholder governance model (Osborne, 2006, pp. 384–386). The relationship between PVM and NPG has frequently been discussed in literature, with some arguing that PVM provides content for NPG. In contrast, others argue that PVM can be seen as a normative framework for NPG (Bryson et al., 2014, p. 447). Both approaches form part of the transition from government to governance, focusing on shared objectives and blurring the boundaries between the state, the market, and society. In this context, PVM offers public administrators a vision for integrating the capacities of different sectors (Moore, 2013; Bryson et al., 2014).

Within the framework of the above principles, NPM has introduced significant innovations to the paradigm of public administration. However, this approach is also subject to criticism and controversy in some respects. From a theoretical perspective, examining the strengths and weaknesses of NPM and its relationship with other approaches would be beneficial.

One of NPM's strengths highlighted in the literature is its potential to reduce citizens' alienation from governance. Focusing on stakeholder participation and joint value creation encourages citizens to make decisions. This, in turn, reinforces trust and legitimacy in public services (Alford & O'Flynn, 2009, p. 182). Bryson et al. (2014, p. 445) also note that NPM supports innovation in the design and delivery of public services by increasing democratic participation. This gives rise to a more inclusive governance model called 'Public Value Governance.' PVM also offers a flexible framework that allows for the balancing of different social values. Rather than taking an approach based solely on economic rationality, managers can also include dimensions such as social justice, environmental sustainability, and cultural values in their agenda (Jørgensen & Bozeman, 2007, p. 358). In this sense, PVM encourages innovation in public policies by enabling public managers to adopt a broader perspective.

In response to this situation, the PVM theory has also been criticized. Firstly, the 'public value' concept is challenging to define and measure. Rhodes and Wanna (2007, p. 408) argue that the discourse of

public value could provide an all-encompassing conceptual framework, leaving managers with excessive discretion and posing a risk to democratic accountability. According to this criticism, public administrators who decide what constitutes the public interest may engage in social engineering as ‘Platonic guardians,’ as the concept of public value opens up a subjective area that is not sufficiently concrete. Similarly, measuring public value is difficult. Talbot (2009, pp. 168–169) states that developing concrete indicators to measure ‘public value’ is very complex in practice and that, therefore, administrators may experience uncertainty when using this concept. For example, measuring the public value of a cultural arts program may not be as straightforward as measuring the effectiveness of a vaccination campaign.

Another weakness relates to the challenges of implementation. The stakeholder participation and network management required by PVI may not always be achievable. Coordinating the efforts of public institutions, civil society, and the private sector can be time-consuming and complex due to their differing motivations and interests. O’Flynn (2007, pp. 361–362) notes that PVM expects managers to take on new roles such as ‘mediator’ and ‘facilitator,’ which may lead to conflicts within existing bureaucratic structures and performance systems. Participatory processes are time-consuming and can be discouraging for managers under pressure to deliver concrete results in the short term. Additionally, not every citizen group may be involved in the process, raising the question, ‘Whose values will be prioritized?’ Another concern regarding accountability is the risk of responsibility becoming diluted within a multi-stakeholder structure. In network structures, it may be unclear who will take responsibility in the event of failure (Rhodes & Wanna, 2007, p. 415).

NPG is a perspective that emphasizes the delivery of public services through networks in collaboration with civil society and the private sector (Osborne, 2010). PVM is mainly compatible with NPG; some researchers regard PVM as the normative basis of NPG (Bryson et al., 2014, p. 446). The difference between the two approaches is that PVM offers managers a more strategic and operational framework, whereas NPG focuses more on governance structures. While NPG literature emphasizes multi-level governance, network coordination, and trust, PVM literature focuses on value, performance, and outcomes. However, both paradigms move beyond the classical ‘command-and-control’ model, highlighting non-hierarchical, horizontal management forms (Osborne, 2006, p. 381). PVM makes an important contribution to NPG by reminding us that governance networks are not merely a matter of process but also purpose. The question is: what are these networks for? The answer is to create public value. Thus, PGM adds a teleological dimension to NPG (Benington and Moore, 2011, p. 12).

In conclusion, the PVM theory offers hope for addressing contemporary issues in public administration, but its weaknesses require careful application. While theoretically distinct from classical

bureaucracy and NPM, PVM does not seek to replace these previous approaches completely but rather assumes a complementary and transformative role (O'Flynn, 2007, p. 361).

LITERATURE REVIEW

This section systematically examines key academic studies and discusses the classical bureaucratic model, NPM, and PVM. The aim is to reveal the perspective of each approach on the concept of public interest, the role of citizens, and accountability mechanisms, which align with the main trends in the literature. It also discusses applications and academic discussions in Turkey and other European countries.

Classical Bureaucracy and Public Interest

The origins of classical public administration literature can be traced back to Max Weber's theory of bureaucracy. According to Weber's ideal-type bureaucracy model, legal-rational authority is assumed to achieve both efficiency and justice by consistently applying specific rules and procedures. Fundamental to Weberian bureaucracy is the selection of civil servants based on merit, clear job descriptions within a hierarchical structure, and the dominance of written rules and regulations. Within this framework, the public interest aligns with the impartial provision of services by legal objectives. According to the bureaucratic model, public interest is defined as a situation in which the interests of the state and the common good of society coincide and are guaranteed by law (Aydın, 2012). In the classical model, applicable legal rules and the public benefit they aim to achieve are the main guides for decision-makers. Adherence to a continuous legal framework takes precedence over managers' personal values or the immediate demands of society.

In the literature, classical bureaucracy prevailed as the 'orthodoxy' of public administration, particularly between the 1950s and 1970s (Henry, 1975). The principle of separating politics and administration, which emerged in Wilson's influential 1887 article, also underpins this model: elected politicians define the public interest (in politics), while appointed bureaucrats impartially implement it (in administration). Thus, the bureaucratic model assumes the role of the public interest's impartial guardian (Appleby, 1945). The literature contains both praise and criticism of this model. On a positive note, Weberian bureaucracy has emphasized that it prevents arbitrariness in the public sector by providing predictability, equal treatment, and expertise, thus protecting the public interest. However, critics argue that the bureaucratic model leads to excessive rigidity and inefficiency due to its focus on following rules and prioritizes citizen satisfaction (Merton, 1940; Crozier, 1964). After the 1970s, intense debates emerged in the literature on public administration about the difficulty of bureaucracies in responding to changing social

needs. Frederickson (1971) claimed that the classical model was inadequate regarding social equality and service quality and allowed the needs of the lower classes to be ignored.

The classical bureaucracy's approach to public value has been examined indirectly in the literature because the term 'public value' is not featured in this model's literature. Instead, 'public interest' or 'public benefit' have been used. In the 1930s, the idea that safeguarding the public interest was a fundamental managerial responsibility was debated, but it was acknowledged that this remained an abstract ideal. Classical bureaucracy viewed the definition of public interest as the role of politics, not management, and expected managers to implement the defined public interest impartially and competently (Simon, 1947). Consequently, literature on bureaucracy has not emphasized the individual values of administrators or their interaction with the public. This has contributed to low citizen satisfaction and the perception of bureaucracy as detached from the public (Crozier, 1964). Crozier's analysis of bureaucracy in France shows that rule-based structures can become insensitive to citizens' needs, hindering the service of the public interest.

The relationship between Weberian bureaucracy and the 'public interest' has also been discussed in Turkish literature. In particular, the Turkish public administration tradition, influenced by the centralized, bureaucratic structure inherited from the Ottoman Empire, has long exhibited characteristics closely aligned with Weberian ideals. In Turkey, the principle that public officials 'cannot pursue any purpose other than the requirements of service and the public interest' has been enshrined in the provisions of the administration of both the 1961 and 1982 Constitutions. However, this shows that although the principle of public interest is accepted at the institutional level, it has not prevented the bureaucracy from experiencing problems of inefficiency, fragility, and politicization in practice (Ömürgönülşen & Öktem, 2009). Criticism of the classical model in Turkey became more pronounced in the 1990s with the rise of reform discourse, paving the way for new approaches.

New Public Management (NPM) and the Value Paradigm

Since the 1980s, NPM, which originated in Anglo-American countries, has signaled a radical transformation in public administration (Hood, 1991). At the core of NPM lies the idea of adapting private-sector management techniques for use in the public sector. In his article, Hood (1991, pp. 4–5) states that this approach has seven basic doctrines: Free management, where managers have more discretion than in professional management; Clear performance standards and criteria Focus on outputs and outcomes; Decentralisation (the separation of service units into autonomous structures) Introduction of competitive elements (internal and external market mechanisms) Use of private sector management techniques Discipline and fiscal restraint in resource use In light of these doctrines, NPM has introduced the concepts



of flexibility, competition and customer focus, as an alternative to the procedural and cumbersome structure of classical bureaucracy.

The NPM approach to public value largely centers on economic value and efficiency. Although the term ‘public value’ is rarely used in NPM literature, the underlying assumption is that, like the private sector, the public sector should produce value for society. This is often measured using quantitative indicators such as efficiency, savings, and service quality. In their book *Reinventing Government* (1992), Osborne and Gaebler argue that governments should be ‘doers, not directors’, meaning that the state should direct the market and society to find cheaper and more effective solutions rather than producing services. In this approach, citizens are customers, and their satisfaction is essential. However, rather than encouraging active citizen participation, the focus is on determining citizens’ preferences through market mechanisms (e.g., surveys and optional service packages in public services). Thus, NPM can be summarised as a value formula: public interest = customer satisfaction + efficiency gains (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2000, p. 550).

The NPM approach occupies a significant place in the literature. While many case studies have sought to document the positive effects of NPM-style reforms on performance (in New Zealand and the UK, for example), critical studies have highlighted the disadvantages of NPM. More (1987) argues that the contractual arrangements and privatization wave brought about by NPM have weakened the accountability mechanisms necessary for protecting the public interest. Furthermore, various examples have shown that conflicts can arise between profit motives and the public interest. Bozeman (2007) highlights the social risks of reducing public values entirely to market values, emphasizing that decisions in the public sphere based solely on economic criteria can result in a ‘loss of public value.’

The concept of ‘value’ is most frequently discussed in NPM literature in the context of values and ethics. Jørgensen and Bozeman (2007) examine how the values of public managers have evolved alongside NPM. There are concerns that NPM’s focus on economic rationality has marginalized traditional public service values such as justice, equality, and honesty (Jørgensen & Bozeman, 2007, pp. 366–369). In their article, Denhardt and Denhardt (2000) introduced the concept of ‘New Public Service,’ advocating the ‘citizen-centered service’ ideal as an alternative to the ‘market in governance’ approach of NPM. They argue that citizens are partners in governance rather than customers and that the role of public administrators is to strengthen the public and its values rather than merely satisfy customers (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2000, p. 553). This critical perspective highlights that NPM’s narrow understanding of values overlooks the democratic citizenship dimension.

In the context of Turkey, NPM-style reforms were introduced in the 2000s (Karcı, 2015). Studies of this process in the public administration literature have examined how the rule-based, centralized tradition of the Turkish bureaucracy interacted with NPM's flexible, performance-oriented approach. In Turkey, concepts such as decentralization, privatization, marketization, customer orientation, and performance management entered public administration after 1980, with numerous legal regulations attempting to adopt NPM principles (Boztepe, 2018; Okcu et al., 2020; Uysal, 2020). The Public Financial Management and Control Law (No. 5018), introduced in 2003, incorporated NPM tools such as strategic planning and performance-based budgeting into legislation. Additionally, it has been argued that YKİ applications pose a risk of prioritizing private interests over the public good in certain areas (Bilmez, 2025).

While the national literature defines NPM as a paradigm that revolutionizes efficiency and customer focus in public administration, it also highlights the tension this approach creates with the public nature and democratic values inherent in public services. This tension has led to new approaches, such as Public Value Management, in the literature since the 2000s.

Public Value Management Literature

The concept of PVM first gained prominence in academic literature in the early 2000s. Although the concept was first introduced by Moore in his 1995 study, academic discussions did not gain momentum until the 2000s. The concept of public value has developed particularly in Anglo-Saxon countries such as the United States, the United Kingdom, Australia, and New Zealand. A theoretical and practical accumulation has been observed in these countries over the last twenty years. Indeed, the work of Moore at the Harvard Kennedy School in the United States and the applications of the Cabinet Office's Strategy Unit in the United Kingdom have popularised PVM. In 2002, Kelly et al. prepared an official UK report titled *Creating Public Value*, which proposed a public value framework for reforming public services and made an essential contribution to the literature. The report argued that success in the public sector should be measured by efficiency and an increase in public value. It is recommended that managers incorporate criteria such as citizen satisfaction, public trust, and social justice into performance evaluations.

The literature identifies four sub-approaches to PVM (Aksakaloğlu & Akçakaya, 2021, p. 275):

- (1) The public value framework (Moore's strategic triangle and related tools);
- (2) The public values framework (e.g., Bozeman's public values theory and inventory and analysis of public values);

(3) The essence of public value (e.g., philosophical and theoretical discussions of ‘what is public value’ debates);

(4) public value pragmatism, as termed by Alford and Hughes — an approach that considers PVM from the perspective of practical benefit rather than ideological conflict. These distinctions demonstrate the multidimensional nature of PVM discussions in the literature. In his work, *Public Values and the Public Interest*, Bozeman (2007) defines the concept of ‘public values’ as a list of values widely accepted throughout society and questions the compliance of public institutions with these public values when making decisions. This is a different yet complementary perspective to Moore’s performance-oriented approach. Bozeman’s approach uses tools such as ‘public value mapping’ to analyse which values conflict in a particular policy area and how decision-makers can strike a balance (Jørgensen & Bozeman, 2007).

Conversely, some researchers, such as Meynhardt (2009), have adopted a psychological approach to public value. According to Meynhardt (2009), public value ultimately exists in the minds and experiences of individuals. It is defined as the value a person attributes to the actions of a public organization (Meynhardt, 2009, pp. 199–200). According to this approach, public value is evaluated in the context of basic human needs (e.g., security, relationships, and self-actualization), and public service is considered valuable to the extent that it addresses these needs. Meynhardt’s studies in Germany and Switzerland have developed measurements such as the ‘Public Value Atlas’ through public opinion polls, which rank the contributions of companies or public institutions to society. This can be seen as a measurement-focused contribution to the PVM literature.

Another prominent theme in the PVM literature is the connection between public value management and leadership. In their article ‘Public Value Governance,’ Bryson et al. (2014) emphasize that creating public value requires collective leadership, and leaders who can mobilize different actors around common goals will succeed. They also emphasize the importance of using public value to guide strategic planning. This approach suggests that public managers should align their vision and mission statements with measurable goals based on public value.

In Turkey, literature on PVM is still limited, but interest is growing. The first comprehensive studies addressing the concept of public value in the Turkish language emerged in the 2010s. Public value was discussed as a new criterion for evaluating public policies, and the public value perspective was subsequently examined in practice, particularly in evaluating e-government services (Karkın & Janssen, 2014). Aksakaloğlu and Akçakaya attempted to contribute to the literature theoretically by stating that the literature on PVM is new and fragmented in Turkey and that the theoretical foundations, especially the

critical theory dimension, have not been discussed sufficiently in this field (Aksakaloğlu & Akçakaya, 2021). Furthermore, by examining public value in light of critical theory, they attempted to establish links with Habermas's theory of the public sphere. This study reveals that the PVM approach is not only a pragmatic reform proposal but also has a normative and critical dimension and can contribute to democratizing the public sphere.

Interest in PVM varies across countries in the European context. The United Kingdom was one of the first countries to implement PVM. The BBC and some municipalities have developed strategies based on this approach. Some municipalities have recently focused on public value in performance evaluation in the Netherlands, and the Union of Netherlands Municipalities Successful Local Government: Creating Public Value (van der Torre & Douglas, 2017, pp. 1–3). While the concept of public value attracts academic attention in Germany, it is mostly discussed in practice through the concept of 'Gemeinwohl' (common good). However, initiatives such as Meynhardt's work have also popularised the idea of measuring the contribution of public institutions and companies to public value. In this context, the relationship between the Neo-Weberian State (NWS) approach and the PVM in Germany and other continental European countries is worth mentioning. Pollitt and Bouckaert (2011) argue that the NWS model, which emerged after NPM in Europe, blends traditional bureaucracy's rule of law preservation aspects with modern management techniques. In the NWS, emphasis is placed on citizen orientation and service quality; however, unlike the NPM, this is not market-oriented but rather based on modernization and public values (Pollitt and Bouckaert, 2011, p. 120). Indeed, the PVM can provide a conceptual basis for NWS's goals of serving citizens and preserving public values. In countries adopting the NWS approach, such as the Netherlands, Norway, and Germany, 'public value components' are incorporated into public service quality assessments (Jørgensen and Bozeman, 2007).

A literature review shows that PVM emerged with the claim of filling an essential gap in public administration theory and has been addressed with different emphases in various geographical areas. Classical bureaucracy literature has inherently addressed the concept of public interest but has neglected governance dynamics; NPM literature has brought efficiency and customer focus but has neglected the diversity of values and democratic participation. The PVM literature, on the other hand, can be read as an effort to bridge these two extremes, that is, to create an effective yet legitimate and participatory public administration paradigm (Alford & Hughes, 2008, p. 132). This literary framework also shapes the research questions of the article.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

In light of the theoretical background and literature review, the main research questions and related hypotheses on which this study focuses are presented below.

Research Questions:

Question (Q) 1: How do the approaches of Public Value Management (PVM) differ from those of classical bureaucracy and New Public Management (NPM) in public administration about public interest/value, stakeholder participation, accountability, and social impact? In other words, how do these three paradigms differ conceptually in these dimensions?

Q2: What shortcomings in the classical and new paradigms did the PVM approach emerge in reaction to? How does PVM address criticisms of traditional bureaucracy and NPM?

Q3: In countries with different administrative traditions (e.g., Turkey's more bureaucratic structure compared to the UK's NPM tradition), how is the PVM approach being adopted or implemented? What can we learn from the examples of Turkey and selected EU countries about the practical relevance of PVM?

Q4: Does the PVM paradigm itself have any weaknesses or limitations? What are the main challenges in applying this approach, and how can tensions arising from the legacy of classical bureaucracy or MDA be overcome?

Hypotheses:

Hypothesis (H) 1: The PVM approach takes a broader view of the public interest than bureaucracy and a more balanced view than NPM. Specifically, it is hypothesized that PVM democratizes the law- and procedure-oriented conception of public interest held by bureaucracy and expands the customer-oriented conception of value held by NPM in favor of social values. This hypothesis involves testing whether PVM constitutes a new paradigm, as the literature claims. The elements of participation and multidimensionality are expected to be evident in the PVM definition of the public good.

H2: PVM has the potential to address criticisms of both traditional bureaucracy and NPM in an integrative manner. It is hypothesized that PVM blends the flexibility and innovation missing from bureaucracy with the equity and legitimacy missing from NPM. According to this hypothesis, PVM is a 'bridging' paradigm, retaining both order and legal accountability from bureaucracy and performance and results orientation from NPM while synthesizing them around public value.

H3: The applicability of PVM varies depending on the administrative culture. It is hypothesized that, in countries with a strong neo-Weberian tradition, such as Turkey, PVM may be limited in practice, even if it attracts conceptual attention. In contrast, in countries with a strong NPM tradition, such as the United Kingdom, PVM has become widespread in certain sectors, such as local governments and cultural services. Similarly, it is envisaged that PVM can be integrated into the ‘Gemeinwohl’ discourse in countries such as Germany. In contrast, it can be used to evaluate local policies in countries with a strong governance emphasis, such as the Netherlands.

H4: Although the PVM approach is theoretically superior, hybrid models often emerge due to difficulties in its practical application. This hypothesis suggests that PVM does not replace old paradigms on its own; rather, the practice of public administration in a country evolves into a combination of bureaucracy, NPM, and PVM. In Turkey, for example, strategic planning and performance management stem from NPM, legal compliance monitoring continues in the tradition of bureaucracy, and citizen participation initiatives are increasing under the influence of PVM. In this case, PVM may create an integrative layer within the system rather than dominating it entirely.

The above research questions and hypotheses determine the direction of the study. The most suitable method and analysis design was chosen to answer these questions and examine the hypotheses, and the study was shaped accordingly.

METHOD

This study is qualitative and theoretical. A literature review was first conducted to answer the research questions, after which the obtained information was synthesized using conceptual comparison and content analysis methods. This section explains the study’s methodology, the data sources used, and the analysis techniques employed.

The study is designed as a comparative theoretical analysis. Three main public administration paradigms (classical bureaucracy, New Public Management, and Public Value Management) were compared within the framework of predetermined theoretical dimensions. These dimensions correspond to the following areas identified as necessary by the literature review: (a) public interest/value understanding; (b) stakeholder participation and the role of citizens; (c) accountability mechanisms; (d) performance and results orientation (efficiency/effectiveness); and (e) emphasis on social impact and equity. These dimensions provided an analytical framework for analyzing paradigmatic differences in line with our research questions.



The data for the study were primarily obtained from literature publications. To this end, articles published in peer-reviewed national and international journals, academic books, official reports, and policy documents were reviewed. Keywords for each paradigm were identified and analyzed in depth. For classical bureaucracy, for example, the focus was on Weber's definition of bureaucracy and subsequent interpretations. For NPM, the focus was on foundational works such as Hood (1991) and Osborne and Gaebler (1992), as well as reviews such as Pollitt and Bouckaert (2011). For PVM, the focus was on frequently cited literature such as Moore (1995, 2013), Stoker (2006), O'Flynn (2007), and Bryson et al. In the Turkish context, official strategy documents (e.g., the 2003 'Change in Management' report), laws (e.g., Law No. 5018), and Turkish academic studies (e.g., Tekin, 2017; Boztepe, 2018; Uysal, 2020; Aksakaloğlu & Akçakaya, 2021) were reviewed.

The reviewed literature was subjected to content analysis based on the dimensions above. To this end, the documents were systematically read, and relevant passages were coded based on predefined themes (e.g., 'citizen role,' 'value definition,' and 'accountability type'). Manual coding was performed without using qualitative data analysis software; however, a summary was drawn up for each paradigm, and key concepts were tabulated. It was found, for example, that the most frequently emphasized value elements in bureaucracy paradigms were 'order, equality and procedural fairness,' 'efficiency, competition, and customer satisfaction' were prominent in NPM studies, and 'participation, social benefit, cooperation, and trust' were frequently repeated in PVM literature. These findings were supported with concrete quotations.

The findings obtained for each paradigm due to coding and content analysis were compared using a comparative table. Table 1 presents a non-quantitative but organized comparison of the three paradigms regarding specific dimensions. In this table, the literature on each paradigm is summarised.

As one of our research questions concerns the status of PVM in different administrative traditions, we examined several cases from different countries in light of the literature and secondary data. Turkey, the United Kingdom, Germany, and the Netherlands were selected in this context. This selection was based on the premise that each country represents a distinct administrative culture: traditional centralized bureaucracy, NPM pioneer and practitioner, rule of law and neo-Weberian tradition, and consensus-driven governance model, respectively. By analyzing reform documents, the findings of previous research, and current debates in these countries, we reached the conclusions summarised in Table 2. These findings were supported by relevant literature sources and were used for secondary data analysis within the scope of the research.

FINDINGS

The findings of the literature review and content analysis are presented in a structured manner. First, classical bureaucracy, NPM, and PVM paradigms are analyzed comparatively along certain dimensions. To this end, Table 1 summarizes the three paradigms in terms of critical dimensions. In addition, the findings of the selected country cases are presented in Table 2, and the paradigmatic situation in different contexts is analyzed.

Comparative Analysis of Paradigms

Table 1 below compares the bureaucratic model, New Public Management (NPM), and Public Value Management (PVM) approaches regarding key conceptual dimensions. This table is a compilation of findings from the literature and is intended to clarify paradigmatic differences.

Table 1: Comparison of public administration paradigms regarding basic dimensions (bureaucracy, NPM, PVM)

Size / Feature	Traditional Bureaucracy (Weberian)	New Public Management (NPM)	Public Value Management (PVM)
Public Good / Understanding of Value	Compliance with law and procedure; public good is the common good as defined by the state (static)	Economic rationality; value measured by customer satisfaction and productivity (narrow)	Societal benefit; creating multidimensional public value (economic, social, just) (broad)
Role of the Citizen	Passive citizen; does not participate directly in decision-making processes, follows the rules	Customer; determines value in the market with their preferences, gives feedback	Partner and stakeholder; participant, co-producer, partner in the value creation process
Accountability	Hierarchical and legal; accountability to top management and the law, procedural control	Market and performance oriented; accountability to contract, performance targets (results oriented)	Democratic and multifaceted; transparent accountability to the public, stakeholders and political authority (dialog-oriented)
Organizational Structure and Functioning	Hierarchical, centralized; strict job descriptions, process-oriented	Decentralized, competitive; market-like mechanisms, flexible contracts	Networked and flexible; cross-sector collaboration, cross-organizational teams



Performance Criteria	Input and process-oriented; legal compliance, compliance with procedures, internal efficiency	Output and result oriented; cost effectiveness, quantitative performance indicators, customer satisfaction	Results + Impact-oriented; societal outcomes, increased value, multidimensional performance (e.g. social trust, equity)
Values Highlight	Impartiality, equality, order, continuity, legal justice	Efficiency, effectiveness, quality, competition, innovation (market values)	Participation, justice, trust, common good, citizen satisfaction + collective well-being
Typical Slogan	"Rule of law, impartial bureaucracy"	"Manage like the private sector; the customer is always right"	"Creating public value; managing together and achieving together"

Table 1 summarises the findings of the content analysis of this study, comparing the Traditional Weberian Bureaucracy, NPM and PVM paradigms across basic dimensions. Based on this table, the following assessments can be made: In bureaucratic paradigms, ‘public good’ is a goal defined within the framework of the law. In NPM, ‘value’ is seen as an economic outcome, whereas in PVM, public value is a multidimensional criterion to be considered in both process and outcome. The role of the citizen evolves from that of an obedient citizen in a bureaucratic model to a demanding customer in an NPM model to a contributing partner in a PVM model. Thus, the progression from Weberian bureaucracy through NPM to PVM represents a paradigmatic shift from an emphasis on rule-bound compliance and economic efficiency toward a broader focus on collaborative governance, multi-dimensional public value and an active, participatory role for citizens.

Accountability mechanisms are:

- upward in the bureaucratic model (accountability to superiors and legal authorities);
- downward in the NPM, but in the language of the market (citizen satisfaction surveys and performance reports);
- omnidirectional and more dialogic in the PVM (to the public, elected officials, and stakeholder groups).

Regarding organizational structure and functioning, bureaucracy is hierarchical, NPM is market- and decentralized, and PVM is network-based. The networks of the PVM symbolize the co-creation of value by different institutions and sectors.

Performance criteria are inputs and processes in the bureaucratic model, outputs in the NPM model, and expand to include impact in the PVM model. In other words, the PVM suggests considering the actual



social impact of a policy (i.e., its impact on quality of life), which is unclear in the other models. In terms of values, the bureaucratic model emphasizes equality and order, the NPM emphasizes efficiency and quality, and the PVM adds democratic values such as participation and trust.

Comparison of Public Interest and Value Concepts

In the bureaucratic paradigm, public interest is the state's *raison d'être* and ultimate purpose. In this approach, public interest is viewed as an 'unchanging' phenomenon, and administrators are responsible for protecting it. Although NPM does not use the term 'public good' much, it instead expresses the concept of 'value' in terms of customer satisfaction and economic efficiency. For an NPM manager, adding value to public goods means providing efficient services at lower costs and increasing citizen satisfaction. In contrast, the PVM views the concept of the public good as dynamic and negotiated; public value is defined through interaction with society, and priorities may change over time. For instance, in the PVM approach, when a municipality asks, "What is the public value in the city?" the answer is sought through neighborhood meetings, surveys, and stakeholder workshops. Perhaps the most important public value for one city is "safe living spaces," while for another, it may be "cultural richness." In other words, public value in the PVM approach is sensitive to local and situational contexts.

This assessment aligns with general trends in the literature. For example, Denhardt and Denhardt (2007) emphasized that creating public values in partnership with citizens is as important as efficiency, adopting the slogan 'serve, not direct' in the New Public Service approach (which overlaps with PVM). This demonstrates the balanced approach to values in PVM. Similarly, Alford and Hughes (2008, p. 135) argue that the pragmatism of public administration in the post-NPM era should consider efficiency and participation together.

Comparison of Stakeholder Participation and Democratic Accountability

In the bureaucratic model, the concept of stakeholder participation is almost non-existent. Citizen participation is limited to voting in elections; otherwise, the bureaucracy implements policies within its area of expertise. Accountability is also bureaucratic and legal rather than democratic. In other words, civil servants are accountable to their superiors and the law, not the public. Accountability mechanisms have been delegated to politicians. This situation has also been analyzed in the literature as the accountability paradox. Although the bureaucrat is not directly accountable to the public, they must protect the public interest.

In the NPM approach, citizen feedback and participation mechanisms increase somewhat, but this participation is usually market-mediated. For instance, public services use complaint lines, surveys, and optional service packages to ensure citizens' preferences are reflected in their governance. However, in decision-making processes, participation takes the form of customer satisfaction measurement rather than governance. Accountability mechanisms are also based on performance reports and output indicators. Even if these are made public, they do not guarantee the democratic nature of the process, as they focus on results. Additionally, NPM envisages a mechanism of accountability based on 'voting with one's feet' (i.e., opting out of an unwanted service) through the establishment of competition between service providers (Hirschman's exit mechanism). However, the voice mechanism is weak.

In PVM, however, stakeholder participation is essential. It encourages citizens and other stakeholders to participate at every stage of the policy cycle, from design to implementation and evaluation. This can involve setting up joint decision-making structures, organizing citizen panels and forums, or adopting co-production models for public services. For instance, some local UK governments have introduced neighborhood assemblies and citizens' charters in line with PVM principles. These participatory mechanisms also support democratic accountability. In other words, accountability in PVM involves consulting with citizens before and after decisions and publishing annual reports. This concept is referred to in the literature as 'accountability through engagement' (Bovens, 2007). The PVM aims to bridge the gap between those in power and the public through transparency and dialogue.

This is also referred to in the literature as 'accountability through engagement' (Bovens, 2007). Through transparency and dialogue, PVM aims to bridge the gap between those in power and those governed.

Our data analysis supports this model, which was drawn from the literature. For instance, Bryson et al. (2014) contend that, for PVM to be successful, multi-actor forums and deliberative mechanisms must be established to enable public administrators to comprehend citizens' value preferences directly. Stoker (2006) also suggests that, in the spirit of network governance, PVM should emphasize skills such as 'empathy and relationship building'. These skills indicate a new style of management that is more relationship-oriented than account-oriented.

Comparison of Social Impact and Results-Oriented Approach

In the bureaucratic model, the concept of social impact is often implicit. Rather than explicitly measuring or emphasizing the social impact of their work, bureaucratic administrations assume that the



public will benefit in the long run if they follow the right processes. For instance, a bureaucracy may prioritize ensuring that a social policy intervention is carried out within its legal mandate over how much poverty it reduces in practice. This has also been criticized for focusing on procedural correctness rather than appropriateness.

NPM aimed to address this issue by introducing a results-oriented approach. For NPM, outputs and outcomes matter. However, NPM's understanding of results is limited to short-term performance targets. In other words, did a unit perform the target number of transactions at the end of the year? Did a hospital treat a certain number of patients? Did a school's test scores improve? And so on. While this is a significant advance, NPM often defines results using quantitative indicators. NPM has a mixed record for addressing social impact in all its dimensions. For example, a municipality may privatize its waste collection service and reduce costs (a good NPM result). Still, essential factors may be overlooked if the long-term impact on environmental awareness or citizen satisfaction is not considered.

PVM combines a results orientation with a social impact orientation. In PVM, the success of a policy is measured by the actual change in the lives of those affected by it. While this is a challenging area to measure, the PVM literature emphasizes this conceptually. Williams and Shearer (2011), for example, argue that public value assessment should pay particular attention to impacts — the final link in the input-output-outcome chain — because it is here that public value truly emerges (Williams & Shearer, 2011, pp. 1372–1374).

This approach encourages public managers to think broadly and in the long term. For example, a health directorate that adopts the PVM approach considers the number of treatments provided each day and the region's overall level of health, the expansion of preventive services, and the public's increased health literacy. These are all critical factors in terms of public value.

Our analysis shows that the literature increasingly highlights the social impact dimension of PVM. For instance, a 2019 OECD report explores how public value can be generated through innovation in the digital era, emphasizing user impact and societal value (OECD, 2019). Similarly, Douglas and van der Wal (2018) argue that approaches such as Social Return on Investment (SROI) in evaluating public projects contribute to impact measurement.

The following table summarises these findings and shows how selected country cases reflect these paradigms. Table 2 below compares the relative weight and exemplary application of the bureaucracy, NPM, and PVM paradigms in Turkey, the UK, Germany, and the Netherlands.



Table 2: Status of public administration paradigms in Turkey and selected European countries.

Country	Bureaucratic Tradition and Current Situation	NPM Reforms and Impacts	PVM Approach and Trends
Turkey	<p>Strong tradition of centralized bureaucracy; legal-rational framework is very important. Civil service system based on Weberian principles. Accountability is mostly hierarchical/legal. Digitalization and transparency in the bureaucracy have increased in recent years, but participation is limited.</p>	<p>1990s-post 1990s PRI reforms (strategic planning, performance budgeting, transparency laws). Privatizations and decentralization moves in the 2000s. Law 5018 increased performance orientation. However, a complete NPM transformation was not achieved culturally, efficiency partially increased, but citizen satisfaction was mixed.</p>	<p>The concept of PVM is only recently being discussed academically (Aksakaloğlu and Akçakaya, 2021). In practice, some municipalities have initiatives such as participatory budgeting and city councils that are in line with PVM. Citizen feedback has started to be received in e-government services. In general, PVM is not yet practiced in a holistic way, but the rhetoric of "governing with the people" is occasionally on the agenda.</p>
United Kingdom	<p>Professional bureaucracy rooted in the Westminster system, but with flexible practices even as far back as the 1980s. Bureaucrats are politically neutral and permanent, and the public interest concept is "impartial implementation of the decisions of the people's representatives". Although the central administration was strong, the initiative of local governments was limited.</p>	<p>As the birthplace of the NPM, extensive reforms were implemented: Under Thatcher in the 1980s, privatization, agencyization (Next Steps agencies), compulsory competitive tendering were introduced. In the 1990s, PFI/PFI and performance management were adopted. The result: Efficiency increased, costs fell, but inequality and accountability problems in some public services were discussed.</p>	<p>"The concept of 'Public Value' came to the fore especially in the 2000s with the Blair government (Kelly et al., 2002). The BBC implemented measures of public value from 2004 onwards. Citizen panels and participatory budgeting pilots started in local governments. Strategy documents centered on public value were prepared. Today, in the UK, PVM has become a framework for policy making, particularly in the areas of culture, media and local services (Bryson et al., 2014).</p>

Germany	<p>Typical of Weberian bureaucracy with a long tradition of "Rechtsstaat" (rule of law). The high status of civil servants, strict hierarchy and adherence to legal procedures are very strong. The concept of the common good is referred to as "Gemeinwohl" and means the common good provided by the rule of law. Even local governments are strictly bound by the legal framework.</p>	<p>Since the 1990s, elements of NPM have been tested in municipalities under the name "Neue Steuerungsmodell" (New Governance Model). There were performance budgets, citizen satisfaction surveys and some privatization. At the federal level, however, NPM was limited; bureaucracy remained the main structure. Efficiency projects (time/cost reductions) were implemented, but culturally marketization proceeded cautiously.</p>	<p>The concept of PVM is not directly prevalent but overlaps with the "Gemeinwohl" perspective. The work of Timo Meynhardt (2009) defined public value as a psychological common good; in Germany, projects such as GemeinwohlAtlas measure the contribution of companies and institutions to society. At the administrative level, citizen participation has been a growing theme in recent years (citizen dialogues, local forums), which supports the PVM approach. Nevertheless, German public administration has yet to adopt PVM as a holistic policy framework and discusses it mostly at the academic level.</p>
Netherlands	<p>Relatively flexible and consensus-oriented bureaucracy (polder model). Although bureaucracy is traditional, civil society and consultation mechanisms are strong. The understanding of the common good can be interpreted as "social consensus determined by joint decisions".</p>	<p>After the 1980s, the Netherlands gradually implemented elements of New Public Management. Many services were decentralized and transferred to the market or semi-autonomous funds. Contract management and performance indices were used. But even when market mechanisms were implemented, the consensual tradition led to collaborative NPM rather than fierce competition.</p>	<p>The Netherlands was an early adopter of practices close to the PVM approach. Local governments support community initiatives and carry out projects to create shared value. In 2016, the Union of Netherlands Municipalities (VNG) organized the "Successful Local Government: Generating Public Value" research program in 2016 (van der Torre & Douglas, 2017: 3). Many municipalities are implementing pilots (social impact bonds, co-design workshops) to increase public value in areas such as employment, housing and environment. Therefore, in the Netherlands, PVM is an increasingly important perspective in practice.</p>

As shown in Table 2, traces of traditional, new and value-oriented approaches are present in different combinations in each analyzed country. In countries with a strong neo-Weberian tradition, such as Turkey and Germany, NPM reforms have been implemented. Still, bureaucratic culture continues to dominate, while Corporate Accountability and Ethics (PVM-related values) remain on the agenda to a limited extent. In countries with an Anglo-Saxon administrative culture, such as the United Kingdom, the NPM paradigm

has deeply influenced public administration; however, the principles of PVM have recently begun to be adopted, particularly at local levels and within sectors such as public broadcasting. In a governance-oriented culture like that of the Netherlands, elements of NPM and PVM are practiced together in harmony – the search for efficiency is balanced with participatory values. These findings suggest that no single paradigm completely replaces all others and that hybrid management models are emerging. In conclusion, rather than a wholesale replacement of one paradigm by another, contemporary public administration in these countries is characterized by context-specific hybrid models that blend elements of bureaucratic tradition, market-oriented management and public value governance.

Summary of Findings

In light of the above analysis, the main findings of our research can be summarised as follows:

PVM theory broadens the traditional bureaucratic interpretation of ‘public good = legal compliance’ by transforming the concept of ‘public good’ into ‘public value,’ defined in collaboration with stakeholders. Consequently, the social common good becomes a value that is not only prescribed by law but also agreed upon and experienced by various segments of society. This allows non-quantitative values such as justice, trust, and quality of life to be incorporated into managerial objectives.

PVM accepts the output/outcome-oriented performance approach of NPM but reinforces it with democratic participation and multidimensional impact analysis. While a culture of efficiency and performance are strengths of NPM and are also seen as necessary in PVM, they are not the sole measure of success. For instance, the success of a public program is evaluated based on achieving performance targets, stakeholder satisfaction, and long-term social impact (Williams & Shearer, 2011, pp. 1371–1372).

As a product of the era of governance networks, PVM places stakeholder participation at the centre of the governance process. Rather than the hierarchical bureaucracy and market-oriented citizen relations of NPM, PVM promotes co-production and collaborative governance. This requires citizens, civil society organizations (CSOs), and the private sector to be involved through appropriate mechanisms, from designing to delivering public services. Our findings show that, in cases where PVM practices have been successfully implemented (in some UK municipalities and local initiatives in the Netherlands), stakeholder engagement has yielded tangible results and increased public trust.

However, no one paradigm seems to have completely replaced the other, and a blend of paradigms is emerging in contemporary public administration practices. Overall, these findings support our research hypotheses. We found that PVM differs significantly from classical and new approaches (H1) while



complementing their shortcomings (H2). The country's case studies also confirm that PVM implementation varies according to administrative culture (H3). Furthermore, the emergence of hybrid models in practice (H4) aligns with the literature's assessment that public administration paradigms evolve rather than undergo sharp breaks (Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2011).

In Turkey, strategic planning (NPM) is a legal requirement. Ethics committees, transparency laws (bureaucratic values), and citizen satisfaction surveys (PVM/NPM) have also been conducted in recent years. In the UK, private sector logic dominates many areas (NPM), while central government continues to oversee performance (bureaucracy), and citizen assemblies are becoming increasingly common at the local level (PVM). This hybrid situation raises the possibility of paradigm integration, which is discussed in the next section.

Overall, these findings support our research hypotheses. We found that PVM differs significantly from classical and new approaches (H1) while complementing their shortcomings (H2). The country's case studies also confirm that PVM implementation varies according to administrative culture (H3). Furthermore, the emergence of hybrid models in practice (H4) aligns with the literature's assessment that public administration paradigms evolve rather than undergo sharp breaks (Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2011).

DISCUSSION

In light of the above findings, it is possible to conclude paradigmatic integration and transformation in the field of public administration. Rather than replacing previous approaches, PVM can be considered an integrative framework with the potential to combine the best aspects of these approaches.

Paradigm Integration: Synthesis of Old and New

Research has shown that the classical bureaucratic, NPM, and PVM approaches are not entirely separate from each other but rather intertwined in the practice of public administration. This is consistent with the 'Neo-Weberian State' approach, which is also emphasized in the literature (Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2011). The Neo-Weberian State adopts the results-oriented and citizen-oriented aspects of NPM while preserving the tradition of the rule of law of bureaucracy. PVM takes this synthesis one step further by adding the missing dimension of participation and shared values. The resulting model can thus be seen as a fusion of the three approaches: Rule of law and equity (bureaucracy) + efficiency and competitiveness (NPM) + participation and shared values (PVM).



This integration emphasizes the concept of balance in public administration. Successful implementation of CCA requires carefully balancing bureaucratic principles with market-oriented techniques and governance methods. For instance, excessive prescriptivism can stifle flexibility, excessive market logic can undermine social justice, and excessive participation can result in indecision or a loss of efficiency. Public managers, therefore, require a ‘toolkit’ that can balance these three dimensions. The Public Value Governance model proposed by Bryson et al. (2014) attempts to achieve this: It proposes a governance model that incorporates the legal accountability of traditional public administration, the performance management of NPM, and the stakeholder engagement of PVM.

The research findings suggest that the most significant contribution of PVM is perhaps its ability to bring together the debates on efficiency and democracy, which have long existed as separate strands within the literature on public administration. By rejecting the dichotomy of ‘efficient or democratic governance?’, PVM offers an approach in which the goals of efficient and democratic governance are complementary (O’Flynn, 2007, pp. 363–364). This is because effective stakeholder engagement enhances decision quality and implementation effectiveness, while effective services strengthen trust in government and thus democratic legitimacy. PVM theoretically underpins this bidirectional relationship.

Implications for Practice and Policy

The findings imply that the principle of ‘one size does not fit all’ applies in public administration, which is essential for practitioners, staff, and politicians to understand. Each country or organization will have a combination of management paradigms that suit its circumstances. However, the PVM framework provides managers with universal principles: Measure, Participate, and Balance. Measure: Continuously assess performance and value (efficiency, output, impact, etc.). Participate: Involve stakeholders in decision-making and implementation. Balance: Balance legal requirements, financial targets, and societal values.

The PVM approach has invigorated public administration reforms in countries like Turkey. Some reforms from the 2000s, such as strategic planning and performance programs, remained largely theoretical. One reason was that these tools were viewed as technical exercises unrelated to society. The SREA provides an approach that gives strategic planning and performance programs real meaning: The strategic plan should reflect the organization’s goals as well as the value priorities of stakeholders, and the performance program should include expenditure and output targets as well as indicators of contribution to public value (Moore, 2013). Concrete recommendations can be developed for such practices. For instance, ministries and municipalities could conduct a public value analysis instead of a traditional situation analysis as part of their

strategic planning processes. Asking, "What value does this organization create for society, and how can this value be increased?" would put PERS into practice.

Another policy implication relates to redesigning accountability mechanisms. Current systems incorporate performance reporting in the style of NPM and annual reports in a more bureaucratic style. A PVM approach might involve adding public value reporting. Indeed, the 'Public Value Scorecard' proposed by Moore (2013) is just such a tool, providing managers with a framework to track the value created by their organizations. In practice, some countries are taking steps in this direction. For instance, some public institutions in Canada have begun publishing a 'public value statement'. Similarly, municipalities in Turkey could be encouraged to include 'social impact targets' in their performance programs.

CONCLUSION

This paper thoroughly analyzes PVM theory, comparing it with classical bureaucracy and NPM approaches at a theoretical level. PVM emerged in response to criticisms of NPM and the demands of the network governance era. The findings suggest that PVM provides a framework that fills the gaps left by previous paradigms. The PVM blends the emphasis on law and equality of bureaucracy with the focus on efficiency and performance of NPM, combining these with democratic participation and shared value creation.

The theoretical analysis clarified the differences between the three paradigms regarding the definition of the public good, the role of citizens, accountability, organizational structure, performance criteria, and core values (see Table 1). PVM's unique feature in these dimensions is that it places citizens at the center of governance and makes success multidimensional. As seen in the literature and examples, when PVM is applied, public managers are guided in their decision-making by legal obligations, financial indicators, tangible impacts on society, and stakeholder feedback. This can strengthen innovation, legitimacy, and trust in public services (Stoker, 2006; Moore, 2013).

However, the study also revealed that PVM should be viewed as a synthesis of paradigms. Rather than establishing a new order, it aims to transform the existing one. In this context, the success of PVM in practice will depend on its implementation. If PVM's principles remain on paper, if participation processes are merely for show, or if the concept of 'public value' is used vaguely, critics of PVM may be vindicated (Rhodes & Wanna, 2007). Nevertheless, if implemented appropriately and with commitment, PVM has the potential to create a more responsive, accountable, and effective governance model in public administration.

In conclusion, this theoretical analysis of public administration provides essential academic and practical insights. Managing public value means considering outcomes and impacts rather than just outputs, people and stakeholders rather than just rules, and fairness and trust rather than efficiency. PVM has emerged as the term for this broad vision in the public sector. A comparative analysis of PVM with classical bureaucracy and NPM encourages us to avoid one-dimensional approaches and consider multiple perspectives. The tables and cross-country comparisons presented in the article provide insight into how theoretical concepts are reflected in practical management. This study aims to clarify the position of PVM in the literature and illuminate the relationships between classical and new paradigms. Ultimately, successful public administration requires the law of bureaucracy, the intelligence of NPM, and the spirit of PVM. In the future, governance models integrating these three dimensions will be at the heart of academic debates and reform agendas. The Public Value Management approach is currently the most comprehensive expression of this quest for integration.

AUTHOR STATEMENT

The author declares that all contributions to this manuscript were made solely by the author. The author also declares that there are no conflicts of interest.

REFERENCES

- Aksakaloğlu, Y., & Akçakaya, M. (2021). The “critical theory” basis of the public value approach. *Third Sector Social Economy Journal*, 56(1), 272–289. <https://doi.org/10.15659/3.sektor-sosyal-ekonomi.21.02.1531>
- Alford, J., & Hughes, O. (2008). Public value pragmatism as the next phase of public management. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 38(2), 130–148. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074008314203>
- Alford, J., & O’Flynn, J. (2009). Making sense of public value: Concepts, critiques, and emergent meanings. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 32(3-4), 171–191. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01900690902732731>
- Appleby, P. H. (1945). *Big democracy*. Alfred A. Knopf.
- Aydın, N. (2012). Meritocracy in Weberian bureaucracy and a cross-section of Turkish public bureaucracy: ‘the irony of politics in bureaucracy’. *Journal of Turkish Court of Accounts*, (85), 51-67.
- Başbakanlık (2003). *Change management for change in management*. Publications of the Prime Ministry of the Republic of Turkey.
- Benington, J. & Moore, M. H. (2011). Public value in complex and changing times. In J. Benington & M.H. Moore (Eds.), *Public value: Theory and practice* (pp. 1-30). Plgrave Macmillan.

- Bilmez, N. (2025). New public service approach and democratic public administration discourse. *Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam University Journal of Social Sciences*, 22(1), 316-329. <https://doi.org/10.33437/ksusbd.1518626>
- Bovens, M. (2007). Analysing and assessing public accountability: A conceptual framework. *European Law Journal*, 13(4), 447-468. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0386.2007.00378.x>
- Bozeman, B. (2007). *Public values and public interest: Counterbalancing economic individualism*. Georgetown University Press.
- Boztepe, M. (2018). New public administration and its effects on the traditional public personnel regime. *Afyon Kocatepe University Journal of Social Sciences*, 20(3), 191-210. <https://doi.org/10.32709/akusosbil.425043>
- Bryson, J. M., Crosby, B. C., & Bloomberg, L. L. (2014). Public value governance: Moving beyond traditional public administration and the new public management. *Public Administration Review*, 74(4), 445-456. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12238>
- Collins, R. (2007). *The BBC and public value*. The Work Foundation.
- Crozier, M. (1964). *The bureaucratic phenomenon*. University of Chicago Press.
- Denhardt, R. B., & Denhardt, J. V. (2000). The new public service: Serving rather than steering. *Public Administration Review*, 60(6), 549-559. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0033-3352.00117>
- Denhardt, R. B., & Denhardt, J. V. (2007). *The new public service: Serving, not steering (Expanded ed.)*. M. E. Sharpe.
- Frederickson, H. G. (1971). Toward a new public administration. In F. Marini (Ed.), *Toward a new public administration: The minnowbrook perspective* (pp. 309-331). Chandler.
- Henry, N. (1975). Paradigms of public administration. *Public Administration Review*, 35(4), 378-386. <https://doi.org/10.2307/974540>
- Hood, C. (1991). A public management for all seasons? *Public Administration*, 69(1), 3-19. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9299.1991.tb00779.x>
- Jørgensen, T. B., & Bozeman, B. (2007). Public values: An inventory. *Administration & Society*, 39(3), 354-381. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0095399707300703>
- Karcı, Ş. M. (2015). Public administration and democratization reform in Turkey in the 2000s under the influence of global dynamics. *Akdeniz Journal of Economics and Administrative Sciences*, 15(30), 40-64.
- Karkın, N. (2012). A new criterion in the formulation of public policies: The concept and critique of public value. *KAYFOR 10 Proceedings Book*. TODAİE Publications.
- Karkın, N., & Janssen, M. (2014). Evaluating websites from a public value perspective: A review of Turkish local government websites. *International Journal of Information Management*, 34(3), 351-363. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2013.11.004>

- Kelly, G., Mulgan, G., & Muers, S. (2002). *Creating public value: An analytical framework for public service reform*. UK Cabinet Office, Strategy Unit.
- Merton, R. K. (1940). Bureaucratic structure and personality. *Social Forces*, 18(4), 560–568. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2570634>
- Meynhardt, T. (2009). Public value inside: What is public value creation? *International Journal of Public Administration*, 32(3-4), 192–219. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01900690902732632>
- Moe, T. M. (1987). Interests, institutions, and positive theory: The politics of the NLRB. *Studies in American Political Development*, 2(2), 236–299. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0898588X00000416>
- Moore, M. H. (1995). *Creating public value: Strategic management in government*. Harvard University Press.
- Moore, M. H. (2013). *Recognizing public value*. Harvard University Press.
- O’Flynn, J. (2007). From new public management to public value: Paradigmatic change and managerial implications. *The Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 66(3), 353-366.
- OECD. (2019). *Public value in public service transformation*. OECD Observatory for Public Sector Innovation.
- Okcu, M., Usta, S., & Ceyhan, H. (2020). Changing public administration understanding and bureaucratic culture. *KMU Journal of Social and Economic Research*, 22(39), 291–311.
- Osborne, D., & Gaebler, T. (1992). *Reinventing government: How the entrepreneurial spirit is transforming the public sector*. Addison-Wesley.
- Osborne, S. P. (2006). The new public governance? *Public Management Review*, 8(3), 377–387. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719030600853022>
- Osborne, S. P. (Ed.). (2010). *The new public governance? Emerging perspectives on the theory and practice of public governance*. Routledge.
- Ömürgönülşen, U., & Öktem, M. K. (2009). Is there any change in the public service values of different generations of public administrators? The case of Turkish governors and district governors. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 88(1), 137–156. doi: 10.1007/s10551-009-0107-x
- Özer, M. A., & Çiftçi, A. (2023). Paradigm shift in public administration following the new public management approach and a situation analysis from Turkey’s perspective. *Yıldız Social Sciences Institute Journal*, 7(1), 25-38.
- Pollitt, C., & Bouckaert, G. (2011). *Public management reform: A comparative analysis – new public management, governance, and the neo-weberian state* (3rd Ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Rhodes, R. A. W., & Wanna, J. (2007). The limits to public value, or rescuing responsible government from the Platonic guardians. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 66(4), 406–421. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8500.2007.00553.x>



- Simon, H. A. (1947). *Administrative behavior: A study of decision-making processes in administrative organization*. Macmillan.
- Stoker, G. (2006). Public value management: A new narrative for networked governance? *The American Review of Public Administration*, 36(1), 41–57. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074005282583>
- Talbot, C. (2009). Public value – The next “big thing” in public management? *International Journal of Public Administration*, 32(3-4), 167–170. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01900690902749500>
- Tekin, Ö. F. (2017). Examination of public financial management and control law no. 5018 in the context of new public management principles. *Selcuk University Journal of Social and Technical Research*, 14, 199-218.
- Uysal, Y. (2020). An assessment of the change and transformation of public services from classical public administration to new public management and post-NPM. *International Journal of Management and Administration*, 4(7), 112–130.
- van der Torre, L., & Douglas, S. (2017). Discovering public value in local government: A framework for assessing and comparing the public value creation of municipalities. Paper presented at the *IRSPM Conference, Budapest*.
- Williams, I., & Shearer, H. (2011). Appraising public value: Past, present and futures. *Public Administration*, 89(4), 1367–1384. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9299.2011.01942.x>