

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Open Access

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF METHODOLOGICAL APPROACHES TO ADMINISTRATIVE REFORM IN EASTERN AND SOUTH-EAST ASIAN COUNTRIES

Elyorbek Otajonov

Institute for Research of the Youth Problems and Training Prospective

Personnel foundation doctoral student, Uzbekistan

Abstract

This article examines the implementation of administrative reform in East Asian nations, which is an essential aspect of public administration and policy-making. The paper explores the fundamental methodologies used during these transformational processes, as well as the successful and unsuccessful examples of change in various countries in the region. Furthermore, it examines the impact of cultural, historical, and political factors on the course of these reforms. Due to the increasing complexity of public administration in Asia, it is essential to conduct a comparative analysis of the challenges faced by governments in these regions. In order to address this issue, this paper will examine selected initiatives of New Public Management (NPM) in various countries of South and Southeast Asia and analyse the cross-national differences. For this purpose, we selected four countries from South and Southeast Asia for our case studies: Singapore, Malaysia, Sri Lanka, and Bangladesh. This paper examines the complex interplay between various contextual factors, such as historical political events, party dynamics, macroeconomic circumstances, state-building traditions, the influence of international development agencies (IDAs), and the status of civil society on the nature and effect of NPM (New Public Management) initiatives in these nations.

Our analysis indicates that these contextual elements significantly contributed to the varying degrees of success achieved by Singapore and Malaysia in implementing NPM compared to Bangladesh and Sri Lanka, where the reforms did not produce the desired outcomes.

Keywords Administrative Reform; East Asia; Methodology; Public Administration; Comparative Analysis.

INTRODUCTION

East Asia is a region comprising a diverse range of countries with varying political systems and historical backgrounds. This diversity leads to different approaches to administrative reform, which aim to improve government efficiency, enhance the quality of public services, and promote transparency in administrative processes.

The impact of the New Public Management (NPM)

approach on managerial practices within Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) member countries has been significant. This transformation has been described in various ways, such as managerialism, market-based public administration, entrepreneurial government and new public management, but the underlying essence remains consistent. Essentially, NPM is a framework that incorporates a range of reforms based on the belief

that applying private sector management techniques and market-oriented mechanisms can enhance the effectiveness of public sector organisations.

ABOUT SCIENTISTS WHO STUDIED THIS TOPIC

This article examines the key methodological frameworks used by experts to evaluate and implement administrative reform in East Asian countries. It also explores the work of scholars who have studied this topic, including Francis Fukuyama and Edward M. Lee. Fukuyama has focused on issues related to public administration and institutional change, while Lee has examined the influence of culture on reform in Asia.

MAIN PART

The main part of the paper will discuss the methodologies used by researchers to analyze and implement administrative changes in East Asia, as well as the contributions of Fukuyama and Lee to our understanding of governance and reform in the region.

The initial focus of NPM was on improving the efficiency and effectiveness of public organisations. This represents a significant shift in cultural approach, as the traditional model, characterized by an emphasis on processes and regulations, is being replaced by a new paradigm that seeks to integrate modern management techniques with economic principles while upholding essential public values.

Pollitt identifies eight key components of NPM (New Public Management):

1. Reduction in costs;
2. Establishment of budget caps and increased visibility in resource allocation;
3. Disintegration of traditional bureaucratic frameworks into individual agencies;
4. Decentralization of management within governmental institutions;

5. Separation of services from procurement;

6. Implementation of market-based and quasi-market instruments;

7. Focusing on performance management, metrics, and goal-setting;

8. Implementation of fixed-term contracts, performance-related remuneration, and local decision-making with regard to salaries and working conditions.

In light of a growing emphasis on quality service delivery, standardization, and customer responsiveness, Hughes argues that New Public Management (NPM) has successfully replaced the traditional model of public administration. He posits that the public sector of the future will be characterized by managerialism in both theory and practice. Hood emphasizes the importance of replacing bureaucratic practices in the public sector with those employed in the private sector in order to ensure the effectiveness of these reforms. The widespread adoption of public management reforms based on the principles of the New Public Management model has been accompanied by some controversy among OECD countries. This approach places an unbalanced emphasis on economic and financial aspects, often to the detriment of the quality of public services and citizen engagement. The reform process has led public managers to operate in a context with fewer resources and more challenging employment conditions. In some cases, this has resulted in the loss of tenure for departmental secretaries, extended working hours, decreased control over personal lives, and decreased morale. Additionally, public managers have faced increased criticism, as there is growing doubt about their ability to effectively and efficiently deliver services.

Furthermore, Considine and Painter argue that an overreliance on private sector management techniques in the public sector may potentially

undermine existing social democratic principles and practices. This perspective adds another important dimension to the discussion on the impact of the reform process on public management. International development agencies have integrated NPM reforms as a precondition for much-needed external support. These agencies contend that this approach enhances flexibility and dynamism in the public sector in order to capitalize on globalization's advantages and attract foreign direct investment. It is widely acknowledged that effective public sector governance is essential for creating a favorable environment for attracting foreign investment.

Hughes and Teicher argue that the adoption of NPM principles in developing countries can lead to additional complexities. Some scholars warn against implementing NPM practices in such contexts, asserting that in the absence of rule-based governance and a strong legal framework, these initiatives may cause more harm than good. Despite this debate, national public management reforms have become an integral part of public sector reform in developing countries since the 1990s. This is evident in the experiences of various countries, such as Singapore, Malaysia, Sri Lanka, and Bangladesh, among others.

These countries have implemented various NPM initiatives based on their own unique circumstances. In recent years, there has been significant discussion about the multifaceted implications of NPM practices and the development of a range of theoretical frameworks for comparative analysis across OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development) nations. However, limited attention has been given to developing countries, particularly in Asia. This paper contributes to the body of knowledge by conducting a comparative analysis of New Public Management (NPM) reform

efforts in four countries: Singapore, Malaysia, Sri Lanka, and Bangladesh. The study focuses on examining the specific nature of NPM initiatives implemented in each of these countries and the influence of various contextual factors on the success of these reforms.

The implementation of New Public Management reforms in developing countries has received significant attention in recent years. Initially, governments and international development agencies took their time to recognize this trend. However, the call for market liberalization necessitated the establishment of an efficient public sector operating under a new set of regulations that facilitate private sector engagement and the corporatization of enterprises, as well as effective contract management. On the one hand, the fundamental principles of NPM support a government role limited to providing essential public services, maintaining law and order, and protecting the environment. However, more recently, discussions in developed countries have shifted to a more sophisticated perspective, focusing on how the public sector can contribute to improving "public value".

In contrast, developing countries have implemented reforms based on NPM principles with the goal of enhancing efficiency, promoting private sector involvement in the economy, and attracting foreign direct investment (FDI), instead of simply adopting the idea of "small government." Samaratunge and Hughes argue that the proposed changes within this new model are crucial and require careful political consideration. Nevertheless, the NPM framework undeniably provides valuable insights and guidance for developing countries. We now turn our attention to a comprehensive analysis of NPM reforms implemented in four countries in South and Southeast Asia.

These countries – Singapore, Malaysia – represent compelling case studies for comparative analysis, as they offer diverse experiences with NPM. All four countries have a shared historical background as former British colonies and have inherited a similar administrative model that was heavily influenced by British colonialism. They fall within the range of countries with middle-to-high per capita income levels and have democratic governance structures in place. Singapore and Malaysia in particular have achieved the status of newly industrialized countries (NICs) characterized by sustained economic growth.

These countries maintain a highly competent civil service that is in line with international standards, and benefit from strong political leadership. However, neither of these two countries can be considered to fully embrace a liberal democratic system.

Some countries operate under a one-party system, whereas others embrace pluralism. Institutional capacity, such as a well-functioning and flexible civil service, a strong legal framework, and efficient regulatory bodies, are essential for successful public sector reform. However, this capacity varies significantly from country to country. International Development Agencies (IDAs) have played a significant role in supporting institutional and structural reforms in developing countries. The aim has been to provide essential guidance and financial and technical assistance to facilitate much-needed changes. It is worth noting that this support is conditional upon certain criteria being met.

Civil society plays a crucial role in two ways:

1. As a check on government bureaucracy, ensuring accountability.
2. By promoting a culture of inclusive governance.

The specific role of civil society may vary depending on the political context.

Singapore: A Model for Modern Urban Governance

Singapore, a city-state with a population of approximately 4.2 million people as of 2004, is a case study in successful urban governance. Its unique blend of historical, political, economic, and social factors has led to the development of an exceptional governance system that has been recognized as one of the most effective in the world.

The government of Singapore, recognizing the need to transform the city from a mere trading hub into a prosperous state, implemented an open-door economic policy that encouraged the growth of the private sector and the generation of wealth. This strategy has propelled Singapore on a path of continuous modernization and economic growth. Education has been identified as a cornerstone of Singapore's cultural and social foundations, reflecting its adherence to fundamental Confucian values. Despite relatively low levels of welfare spending, social policies have often been implemented as complementary measures in order to achieve economic goals.

In 1965, Singapore separated from the Malaysian Federation. The transition from being a British colony to becoming an internally self-governing state was accompanied by a prolonged struggle between left-wing groups and the ruling People's Action Party (PAP). The PAP has retained its dominance in political and administrative circles within the country, playing a significant role in promoting economic development, as noted by George. Under the leadership of the PAP, a culture has been fostered that emphasizes respect for authority and prioritizes the nation over individual interests. The political system in Singapore embodies key principles of parliamentary democracy, such as regular elections. However, there is some debate about the extent to which this can be considered genuine democracy due to the lack of a true opposition. The PAP's policies have

effectively prevented the opposition from organizing protests, strikes, and forming labor unions.

The political landscape in Singapore is characterized by the complex web of strategies used by the PAP to maintain its grip on power, as described by Painter (2004). These strategies include intimidation, harassment of opposition figures, media control, and manipulation of the election process. Following the general elections, periods between subsequent elections become a continuous struggle against the system of a one-party state. Recognizing the limitations of multi-party politics in Southeast Asia, former Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew used his strong leadership to implement reforms aimed at establishing efficient institutions for political stability and economic growth.

The PAP (People's Action Party) leadership was challenged with balancing social development and welfare with economic goals, promoting a welfare system that emphasized self-sufficiency and family values. Singapore has adopted an export-led industrial strategy, supported by a network of legal and financial institutions aimed at attracting foreign direct investment (FDI). This policy has been explicitly incorporated into the country's development plans, and government intervention has been significant. As a member of the group of Asian newly industrialized economies (NIEs), Singapore has been a prominent example of a development state, with state-owned enterprises playing a significant role in driving its economic growth (Lee & Haque, 2006). Through foreign direct investment (FDI) inflows, Singapore has integrated its industrial sector into the global marketplace. The country firmly adheres to the principles of free market competition and trade, acknowledging that isolation is not a sustainable strategy. FDI has acted as a crucial catalyst for Singapore's economic growth, enabling it to thrive

within the increasingly interconnected global economic system.

Singapore serves as a significant driver for economic expansion and development, which has significantly impacted the evolution of its public administration. This city-state is characterized by a remarkable diversity of ethnic groups, as industrial development and economic growth have provided employment opportunities for people from different ethnic backgrounds, including those of Chinese, Malay, and Indian origin. The initiatives for reform have consistently received unwavering support from various stakeholders, including the business sector, professional organizations, foreign investors, and government officials within the country. As a result, Singapore holds a prominent position in terms of gross national product (GNP) per capita, ranking ninth globally.

Singapore has established a reputation for being a pioneer in the implementation of innovative public sector management practices. These practices involve a deliberate blend of foreign models, with a strong focus on fostering domestic innovation. The aim of this approach, as outlined by Turner in 2002, is to create a stable, efficient, and accountable government that also promotes a business-friendly environment. In order to achieve this vision, Singapore initiated a process of experimentation with new public management (NPM) approaches in the 1980s. One of the key initiatives introduced was performance budgeting. Performance indicators, such as output volume, quality, efficiency and effectiveness, were carefully designed to measure the success of government programmes. The approach to reform in the country was characterized by a deliberate hybridisation of foreign models in order to ensure their suitability to local conditions. The launch of the "Public Service for the 21st Century" (PS21) initiative in 1995 was a significant milestone in promoting a culture of excellence and continuous

improvement in the public sector. In order to attract the best talents to the public service, a dedicated government scholarship program was established at the university level. This initiative was in line with the fundamental principle of meritocracy, which is at the heart of Singapore's public administration philosophy, as emphasized by Jones.

Painter further emphasizes that these initiatives are aimed at promoting and developing the most talented individuals, with accelerated advancement for those who demonstrate exceptional potential. As these individuals reach higher positions within the organization, their compensation is among the highest globally, representing a strategic investment in building a corruption-resistant environment. To maintain this integrity, the government has implemented strict anti-corruption measures for all forms of misconduct, ensuring a disciplined approach to governance within the public sector. Transparency International has recently ranked Singapore as one of the least corrupt countries in Asia and the sixth globally in terms of transparency.

Unlike many other countries that have implemented the formal contractual framework of New Public Management (NPM), however, Singapore has chosen a different approach. Instead of relying on the National Public Management (NPM) system, Singapore has established an elite public service characterized by permanent positions. This is consistent with the nature of its highly centralized government, which does not prioritize privatization in public sector reform. Instead, it has pursued a path of "corporatization" under public ownership, converting a number of public utilities such as Singapore Airlines, hospitals, the Port of Singapore, and television and radio corporations into quasi-private entities under public ownership. This approach allows these organizations to adopt private management

practices while retaining public ownership. In addition, the high degree of integration between political and bureaucratic institutions in Singapore results in a decentralized power structure with strong institutional continuity, which ensures the continuity of government capacity without compromising its efficiency.

In the current context of globalization, there has been a paradigm shift in the understanding of the relationship between government and civil society. This shift has moved away from the traditional view of this relationship as a zero-sum game characterized by conflict, towards a more cooperative approach that recognizes the potential for collaboration. This shift is evident in the initial reactions of various sectors to this new initiative. This development also reflects the current state of affairs in public-private relations, especially in light of the government's initial statement of its intention to take a more active approach to involving civil society.

While there has been an increase in opportunities for citizens' involvement in civil society in Singapore in recent years, further measures are required to ensure that non-governmental actors can be seen as equal and responsible partners in the decision-making process.

Malaysia is a federal parliamentary democracy with a constitutional monarchy as its form of government. The country's population is approximately 26.9 million people and is composed of various ethnic groups, including Malays, Chinese, Indians, and other indigenous peoples.

Malaysia consists of 13 states and 3 federal territories, each with their own assembly and government led by a chief minister. Executive power is vested in a cabinet led by a prime minister, in accordance with the country's constitution. Members of the lower house of parliament, known as the House of

Representatives, are elected for a maximum of five-year terms and number 219 in total. Legislative authority is shared between the federal and state levels of government.

The Malaysian government has established a political and administrative system that aligns with its national objectives of achieving macroeconomic stability and promoting industrial growth. Following its independence from British colonial rule, the public service in Malaysia has undergone significant transformations. The establishment of a committee system, red book plans, briefings, field training, and community development initiatives has created a favourable environment for the ethnic Malays, commonly known as Bumiputra, to engage in political and active participation in economic and administrative activities (ADB, 1997).

To support the national goals, public administration reforms have been implemented incrementally. During the latter half of the 1960s, the main objective was to stabilise the newly formed nation while maintaining traditional public administration functions. In the 1970s, attention shifted to promoting development administration, resulting in the establishment of various public sector enterprises and statutory bodies. The Manpower Planning Unit (MAMPU) was created to lead administrative modernisation and human resource development. In the 1980s, efforts were made to restructure the public administration system in order to inject dynamism into traditional bureaucratic practices. Under the umbrella of the "Malaysia Incorporated" concept, reform measures were implemented in order to enhance the professional expertise of civil servants and foster administrative leadership. Substantial resources were allocated in order to increase the capacity and effectiveness of educational and training systems.

The evolution of trade and vocational standards

was pursued in harmony with changes in work practices across different sectors. The private sector was encouraged to contribute to national development, while the government demonstrated a flexible and pragmatic approach to its policies and initiatives. In the late 1980s, a department known as the "Productivity Management Division" was established with the goal of improving efficiency. This government body conducted surprise inspections of government entities, monitoring the standards and quality of public services. The team conducted assessments of the implementation of measures to improve productivity, and guidelines for quality control circles were developed to assist government entities in establishing such systems. These initiatives have fostered a culture of innovation and efficiency in Malaysia, promoting participatory management and improving the effectiveness of government services. Measures have been implemented to reduce costs, enhance efficiency, and eliminate unproductive practices, leading to improved service delivery.

Since its independence, Malaysia has achieved one of the most impressive economic records in Asia, with a real gross domestic product (GDP) that grew at an average annual rate of 6.5% between 1957 and 2005. The economy experienced robust growth in the early and mid-1980s, averaging nearly 8% per year. This remarkable performance was due to a combination of domestic investment and foreign investment that facilitated the diversification and modernization of the Malaysian economy. Today, Malaysia is a major global producer of electronics and electrical goods, contributing to its position as a leading economy in the region. The economic structure of Malaysia is characterized by a diversified and multifaceted economy that emphasizes services and manufacturing, which has enabled the country to achieve high-income status with an export orientation. In line with its objective of becoming a

developed nation by 2020, Malaysia has adopted a comprehensive strategy to foster sustainable economic growth and human capital development for both government agencies and the private sector.

In 2001, the Malaysian government unveiled a 10-year master plan for the financial sector and capital markets, aiming to enhance the efficiency and transparency of government agencies and government-linked companies. As part of this plan, the government implemented key performance indicators and performance-based compensation systems for managers, as described in the DFAT report (2005). These macroeconomic measures have significantly improved the standards and quality of public services, as noted in Yusoff (2005). Furthermore, the establishment of a mandatory client charter for each government ministry and guidelines for defining performance indicators in government agencies has fostered a collaborative relationship between the government and businesses, as emphasized by EIU (2006), Karim (1995), and Shafie (1996).

The government has established a successful partnership with public officials in order to enhance administrative accountability and ensure the smooth implementation of innovative programs and policies. Through this collaboration, there has been a steady effort to introduce new values, principles, and approaches aimed at improving the quality of public services. The Development Administration Circulars set out strategies to enhance quality and implement a "client charter". The commitment of top management to change is evident in their policy decisions and program designs, as noted by Rahshanjani and Alam (1997).

The policy of "Malaysia Incorporated", introduced in 1983, acted as a catalyst for establishing collaborative relationships between public and private sectors in policy formulation and

implementation. Inspired by the successful Japanese development model, Malaysia sought to foster cooperation between public and private entities, promoting a culture of information sharing and shared responsibility for social, economic, and administrative advancement. This policy shift, known as "Look East", fundamentally transformed the public administration landscape in Malaysia. Under this initiative, innovative systems, methodologies, and procedures were implemented in order to enhance efficiency and effectiveness in public service delivery (ADB, 1997).

The Look East policy, implemented in Malaysia, was accompanied by a heightened emphasis on Islamic values within the government. Efforts were made to eradicate corrupt practices among officials. Consultative forums were established to assist in reshaping the attitudes and values of government employees towards the concept of Malaysia Incorporated (Tilman & Tilman, 1997).

In response to the 1997 Asian financial crisis, the Malaysian government implemented a series of measures to enable the nation's economy to weather the financial turbulence more effectively than other regional economies (DFAT, 2005). These measures included strengthening the authority of the Office of the Auditor General, empowering it with the ability to conduct in-depth audits and inquiries into the activities of various government departments. Malaysia did not seek assistance from the International Monetary Fund (IMF) in addressing the aftermath of the financial crisis, demonstrating its resilience. Additionally, numerous state-owned enterprises were either privatized or restructured, resulting in a reduction in the size of the public sector. To further enhance efficiency and accountability, the government established dedicated task forces to identify and streamline bureaucratic processes across government agencies. Moreover, all government

entities engaging with the private sector and citizens were required to prioritize customer service. In 2004, the Malaysian government articulated a vision for revitalizing state-owned enterprises, aiming to improve their performance and gradually reduce its ownership interest. This initiative has yielded significant results through the cultivation of a new generation of entrepreneurs, the promotion of private sector-led initiatives, creation of employment opportunities, and promotion of ethnic harmony through the integration of Malays into the mainstream economy.

Malaysia has seen remarkable success in the establishment of a partnership between political leaders and government officials through various stages of administrative reform. This has led to the development of a sophisticated public management system that is capable of implementing policies for economic growth.

In order to achieve full industrialization and economic growth, the Malaysian government has made concerted efforts to implement comprehensive administrative reforms. These efforts have yielded notable achievements in terms of the development of the public sector.

None of these four countries have implemented a system of fixed-term employment contracts for public administrators, and as a result, government employees enjoy tenure. This has led to varying outcomes. In Bangladesh and Sri Lanka, the lack of a fixed-term contract system has contributed to an unaccountable and inefficient public sector, while in other countries, this approach has been more successful. On the other hand, Singapore's corporatized state structure and the "Malaysia Inc." model in Malaysia have resulted in efficient and accountable systems. This has been facilitated by well-designed macroeconomic policies and strong political leadership. Both countries have been able to tailor reform programs to their socio-

economic circumstances.

It is worth noting that civil society's role in Singapore and Malaysia is more limited compared to other countries under consideration. Conversely, electronic and print media in Sri Lanka and Bangladesh play a significant role in public policy discourse, contributing to a greater extent than in Singapore and Malaysia, where civil society organizations have less access to government records and documents. It is worth noting that corruption and inefficiency in the public sector is a significant issue in Sri Lanka and Bangladesh, to such an extent that civil society organizations sometimes need to collaborate in order to influence public opinion. Due to the lack of effectiveness of constitutional and regulatory bodies, public confidence in established accountability mechanisms is low in these countries, leaving civil society with no unified approach to influencing government decisions. This situation allows powerful political factions to exploit the situation and undermine the intentions of reform efforts.

THEORETICAL APPROACHES

Among the various methodological approaches to the study of administrative reforms, comparative analysis and institutional reform theories stand out as particularly notable. These methodologies provide distinct sets of tools for the analysis and implementation of administrative changes.

Cultural factors. Culture plays a significant role in shaping the perception and execution of reforms. Confucian traditions in countries like China and the Republic of Korea give rise to distinct systems of values and behaviors that must be taken into account when implementing reforms.

Political Contexts. The political systems and governance structures in place have a significant impact on the implementation of reform initiatives. For example, the one-party system in

China enables swift changes, while multiparty systems encounter greater challenges and require building consensus.

Studying examples. The examination of case studies provides a wealth of insight into the successful execution of administrative reforms. By analyzing the experiences of other countries, we can learn valuable lessons from both their successes and setbacks. These lessons can then be applied to our own reform efforts. Comparative analysis of various countries' experiences allows us to identify effective methods of administrative reform. For instance, Singapore has achieved success in implementing public administration reforms through its strong centralization and highly professional state apparatus. In contrast, reform efforts in Indonesia have often been hindered by corruption and bureaucratic inefficiency.

CONCLUSION

The methodological approaches to administrative reform in East Asia vary and are contingent upon the unique cultural and political characteristics of each country. A comprehensive approach that takes into account these factors is essential for successful outcomes. Examining administrative reforms in this region holds great potential for developing efficient public administration strategies. In this context, it would be beneficial to explore the works of scholars such as Frensis Fukuyama (2014), Eduard Li (2011), Devid Maggi (2017) va Kim He Son (2019) who have investigated the intricacies of cultural and administrative reforms in East Asian societies. These scholars' insights provide a solid foundation for understanding the complexity of the administrative landscape in this region.

The analysis of NPM reform initiatives in four countries in South and Southeast Asia shows that each nation's approach to implementing the principles of NPM is unique. This is shaped by

various factors, such as political history, political dynamics, macroeconomic conditions, state traditions, the role of international development agencies and the impact of civil society. In these four cases, political commitment and leadership have been identified as critical factors.

Singapore and Malaysia are examples of successful reform efforts characterized by strong political leadership and comprehensive reform programs. On the other hand, Sri Lanka and Bangladesh have adopted selective reform strategies aligned with the short-term interests of ruling elites, influenced by recommendations from international development agencies. Partisan politics have hindered comprehensive reforms in these countries. In the context of economic development, Singapore and Malaysia have implemented certain aspects of reform despite state dominance. Strong political leadership played a significant role in implementing these changes with minimal opposition from organized groups.

The experiences of New Public Management (NPM) reforms in Sri Lanka and Bangladesh suggest that the main focus was on making structural changes to the public administration framework. However, there was no significant effort to establish a rule-based governance system or develop the necessary institutional infrastructure to support NPM initiatives. As a result, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka faced significant challenges managing the transition process, making it a risky political endeavour. This implies that countries such as Bangladesh and Sri Lankalike, which lack strong leadership and effective accountability mechanisms, are unlikely to achieve successful outcomes from their NPM reforms.

REFERENCES

1. Fukuyama, Francis (2014), "Trust: Social Virtues and the Path to Prosperity", Moscow: Progress.

2. Lee, Edward M. (2011), "Culture and Modern Governance in Asia", Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press. Maggie, D. (2017). "A Comparative Analysis of Administrative Reforms in East Asia." *Journal of Public Administration*, vol. 45, no. 2, pp. 115–138.
3. Kim, H. S. (2019). "Confucianism and Governance in Korea." Seoul: Korea Institute of Management.
4. Lee, E.W. and Haque, S 'The New Public Management Reform and Governance in Asian NICs: A Comparison of Hong Kong and Singapore', *Governance* 19(4): . (2006) 605–26.
5. Lan Z. and Rosenbloom D.H. 'Editorial', *Public Administration Review* 52(6): 1. (1992) p. 45
6. Osborne D. and Gaebler T. *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector*. New York: A Plume Book. (1993)
7. Pollitt, C. and Bouckaert, G. *Public Management Reform: A Comparative Analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. (2000)
8. Pollitt, C. 'Justification by Works or by Faith? Evaluating the New Public Management', *Evaluation* 9(2). 133–54.
10. Hughes, O.E. *Public Management and Administration: An Introduction*, 2nd edn. New York: Palgrave Macmillan
11. Boston, J., Martin, J., Pallot, J. and Walsh, P. *Public Management: The New Zealand Model*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.
12. Kelly, G., Mulgan, G. and Muers, S. (2002) 'Creating Public Value: An Analytical Framework for Public Service Reform', Strategy Unit, Cabinet Office, London, available at: www.strategy.gov.uk.htm
13. Lee, E.W. and Haque, S. (2006) 'The New Public Management Reform and Governance in Asian NICs: A Comparison of Hong Kong and Singapore', *Governance* 19(4): 605–26.
14. Lee, E.W. and Haque, S. 'The New Public Management Reform and Governance in Asian NICs: A Comparison of Hong Kong and Singapore', *Governance* 19(4): 605–26.
15. Jones, D.S. 'Performance Measurement and Budgetary Reform in the Singapore Civil Service', *Journal of Public Budgeting, Accounting and Financial Management* 13(4): 485–511.
16. Painter, M. 'The Politics of Administrative Reform in East and South East Asia: From Gridlock to Continuous Self-improvement', *Governance* 17(3): 2004. 361–86.
17. Turner, M. 'Choosing Items from the Menu: New Public Management in Southeast Asia', *International Journal of Public Administration* 25(12): 493–512.
18. Koi, G. and Ooi, G.L. (eds) (2000) *State–Society Relations in Singapore*. Singapore: Oxford University Press.
19. Siddiquee, N.A. (2002) 'Administrative Reform in Malaysia: Recent Trends and Development', *Asian Journal of Political Science* 10(3): 105–30.