

RETURN TO CLASSICAL PARADIGM IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION THEORY?: A STUDY ON NEOWEBERIAN AND NEOTAYLORIST THEORY

Demokaan DEMİREL

Kocaeli University, Faculty of Political Sciences, Public Administration Department, Kocaeli, TÜRKİYE
e-mail: demokaan.demirel@kocaeli.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0001-5454-9507

Abstract: Weberian and Taylorist administrative theories can be attributed to organizational requirements that arose with the Industrial Revolution. In Weberian administration, it is believed that the legal-rational bureaucracy is best type organization, which has been characterized by making rules, having things written down, giving orders, setting up ranks, and controlling everything closely. By reviewing literatures, research will seek to establish similarities and differences in change mechanisms from Weberian administration to Neoweberian administration and Taylorism to Neotaylorism. Literature review concluded that although Neoweberian administration and Neotaylorism use different managerial approaches, they are similar dealing with efficiency and effectiveness under public service capacity. It should be noted that every approach has its pros and cons. Therefore, they must use these approaches appropriately, taking into consideration aims, culture, and external environment in organization. Different sections shed light on these approaches for today organizational problems.

Keywords: Taylorism, Neotaylorism, Weberian Administration, Neoweberian Administration, NPM.

JEL Classification: H10, H11, H19, H70, H83.

1 Introduction

Different models were introduced as society's needs evolved, hence changing public management. One cannot efficiently implement policies or account for public resources without considering various models. Learning about these models could help in determining whether development can be applied and could enhance public administration theory (Ivanova and von Scheve, 2020). In this framework, task assignment follows a hierarchical order while stressing on written documents and impersonality. Official power extends within set rules, laws, or regulations. Since its inception in late 1970s, NPM has been criticizing Weberian bureaucracy for inefficiency and red tape in public sector.

The NPM paradigm in public administration is gradually being replaced by a model known as good governance, also referred to as the Neoweberian State or the Developmental state. This approach emphasizes being opened, responsible, and reactive toward what people want, such that bureaucracy speaks for the public. Nonetheless, contemporary contexts do not witness any success on NPM even if we consider commercial efficiency standards. It is difficult to follow an organizational structure in flat hierarchies. Treating citizens

as consumers erodes their participatory rights. Civil service professionalism decreases administrative capacity. Outsourcing which is generally too expensive goes against equality as well as basic obligations on government.

1995 saw a lot of criticism against NPM. Although it was still seen as a novel approach in public management around 1995 and continued to be so through 2000, by 2005 or later it was completely ineffective as a defensive strategy (Drechsler, 2009, pp.8-10). In response to implementing challenges on modern public management in Continental Europe, Christopher Pollitt and Geert Bouckaert developed approach that is against imposing public management reforms on countries using same tactics (Çiner and Olgun, 2015, pp.206). Neo-Weberian approach, with regard to decision-making in public organizations, places emphasis on bureaucracy, rationale, and knowledge. It seeks to create working environment where efficiency can be maintained at a particular level by setting up clear rules and work control (De Vries and Nemec, 2013; Akindele, et al., 2016; Pollitt and Bouckaert, 2017; Kettl, 2022).

At the end of 19th century, F. Winslow Taylor developed his theory on “scientific management” for improving productivity of manual workers. Neoylorism is Taylorism’s new form that has emerged in recent years because of increasing complex knowledge and rise on digital technology. Neotaylorists focus on cognitive and affective in work rather than focusing on physical labor. Their main concerns are output control, standardization, and efficiency.

There is now greater focus on market, quality, flexibility, time, and citizen/user expectations. Neotaylorists believe that human rationality will eventually be replaced by automated programs with decision-making rules that have been encoded in computers due to digitalization.

Lean production and sociotechnical systems have transformed how employees are managed compared with older Taylorist systems (Niepce and Molleman, 1998). By providing public services through one unified system for many citizens at once, there are fewer delays for those waiting in line. Working hours have been extended so that staff can be involved in organizational activities 24 hours a day. It shows that Taylor’s ideas are still relevant today, even more than a century after his book publication “*Principles of Scientific Management*” (Vazquez and Purificacion, 2017, pp.509-512).

Using quantitative data, the approach breaks down roadmap into small parts for employees to set specific productivity targets. This study intends to comprehend evolution from classical Weberian-Taylorist management to Neoweberian-Neotaylorist management by analyzing their fundamental ideas. Then, it employs comparative methodology to compare and contrast both approaches. Study initially examines how Taylorism gave way to Neotaylorism and change from the Weberian state to the Neoweberian state.

2 Weberian and Neo-Weberian Administration Theories

According to Weber’s theory, bureaucracy is considered a unique management form. Bureaucratic theory is often linked to efficiency and rationality, drawing on traditional charismatic and legal authority types. Characteristics attributed to bureaucracy, such as strong organizational structure, specialization, assignment on

merits, and an impersonal and rational management model, make it a better administration form than any other. This approach prioritizes accuracy, confidentiality, unity, full accountability, and continuity (Özer, 2022, p.208). According to Weber, organizations should have hierarchies with clear authority lines and labor divisions among experts. Process must be rational to be effective and efficient. Hence, Weberian administration pays less attention to institutional policies like promoting fairness and consistency in inter-bureaucratic relationships. Such compliance prevents institutional bias. Bureaucracy, according to Weber, is an evolving and complex system having its own unique ethics set, which has become widely accepted over time. Government officials justify their actions while employing bureaucratic authorities. Bureaucratic principles recognize that politics belong to state and emphasize equal treatment on people and groups under law to prevent one-off or flexible state acts.

Different statuses, organizational cultures, and work environments form public service. Representative democracy supports the idea that public bureaucracy should be competent, neutral, and resilient to politics (Byrkjeflot, et al., 2018, pp.994-997).

According to some critics, Weber’s bureaucratic paradigm has many weaknesses. To begin with, internal control mechanisms may prevent any attempt at innovation or flexibility while, on the other hand, having very strict rules denies administrators’ freedom and makes it very difficult for them to adjust with changing social environment (Hughes, 2003). In addition, written directives orders, as suggested in Weberian theory, may lead to increased power and cultural imperialism and give too much importance to supervision.

Pollitt and Bouckaert (2017) outlined different methods for implementing this strategy, including diversification and professionalization in public administration and public services. This study is to reduce nepotism and corruption, establish defined career path for public personnel, and ensure standardized and predictable services. Public officials are evaluated on their credentials, performance, and adherence to professional norms, rather than their community ties or personal allegiances. Merit-based system mitigates likelihood that employees will favor one political party over another. Furthermore, it indicates that technical and the administrative sides on public policy are more

probable to be designed and implemented by experts having required qualification. Skilled executives who can cognitively and logically apply their specialized skills are vital inputs to efficient public policy. Public management function will become true only when public managers are protected from external side pressures, such as political influence or the need to satisfy special interests (Althaus, 2023). According to the Neoweberian approach, maintaining integrity and effectiveness critically depends on a reaffirmed emphasis on legal-rational authority. The framework within which public officials operate is established by ensuring that decisions and actions align with established norms and regulations, rather than personal ambitions or biases. The legal-rational authority concept underscores an important rule-based system in which those authorities derive their power from codified laws and regulations rather than from arbitrary or personal sources.

Therefore, it can be inferred that public administrators should still use their professional judgment, although they ought to follow laid down rules. Regulatory measures developed from standard operating procedures targeting administrative movements are employed to curb public managers' freedom that may violate their authority. However, these measures also ensure that justice is served in such cases (Aristovnik, et al., 2022; Roehl, 2023). Apart from promoting honesty and responsibility culture, this structure improves general management and decreases public service excellence.

It provides foundation for accountable, flexible, and dedicated public administration system that addresses public interests and needs (Kettl, 2022). Neoweberian state adopts fiscal measures and privatization policies to adapt economic rationality principles, transforming traditional Weberian bureaucracy through downsizing and increased efficiency. The NPM model combines both worlds – modern public management practices and classic Weberian bureaucracy. Managing society requires management to give clear instructions to society. State has to meet social aspirations in healthy economy and civil society. Among rule of law, accountability, integrity, and proactivity are among most essential values upheld by bureaucracy. Public management should mainly focus on results rather than on

procedures. To satisfy public demands more adequately, bureaucrats must be perfect managers in their roles. Although these ideas have changed as a result of criticisms on bureaucratic model, some basic principles, such as the rule of law, the significance of a professional public service in Weberian bureaucracy, and the thoroughly distinct politics areas and administration still hold true (Pitschas, 1993; Olsen, 2005; Çiner and Olgun, 2015, pp.220-221; Özer, 2017, pp.267-269). State centralization ensures that weaker governments possess administrative, political, and organizational capacity to address globalization, environmental risks, population changes, and technological advancements on national and global scales. For governmental institutions to maintain an equitable distance from all individuals and groups, uniform public services delivery is required. Legitimizing bureaucratic actions and ensuring public bureaucracy stability are crucial representative democracy functions.

When population's needs and values are taken into account, it means that legal system will promote public law and public morals; however, this is something that NPM often fails to recognize. It enables civil servants to have deep sense that they are as management professionals rather than what is captured within their immediate technical job descriptions. Neoweberianism, which focuses on agent and public value, offers a comprehensive perspective in the public sector (Dunn and Miller, 2007, pp.352-353; Ongaro, 2024).

Consequently, bureaucracy is redefined through the Neoweberian state approach, aligning with neoliberal agenda's aim on downsizing and revitalizing state. While official bureaucratic institutions are preserved, modern public service delivery systems are designed to be adaptable and responsive to public. Aim is to see individuals as public services co-producers and to rebuild representative democracy through mutual engagement with nongovernmental organizations. Neoweberian management takes democratic approach and governance system based on the rule of law, which is a characteristic of Weberian administration; however, it features, among others, such characteristics as democratic and equal service provision, successful crisis management, and considerable innovation not only for government but also for society. Even though it is still hierarchical, Neoweberianism also attaches great

importance to network and market mechanisms. However, in contrast to Weberianism, internal processes are not only focus. Latter, in fact, takes a great attention to bureaucrats who, in turn, can become professional managers that take first citizens' needs. Implementing direct citizen input and representation methods strengthens representative democracy. Moreover, it encourages results-driven management culture and attempts to solve bureaucratic inefficiency problem that is a complaint source. To achieve its objectives, it uses systems for performance monitoring, evaluation, and managing (Bouckaert, 2023).

In addition, individuals have been occupying leadership positions to improve on their management expertise. Individuals receive support through market mechanisms and increased avenues for public participation. Neoweberian administration supports neutral criteria in decision-making as opposed to personal prejudices and choices. This administration model encourages an organizational structure whereby complete chain followed and therefore each person knows who is manager in organization. Information can flow easily and for people to take responsibility within the structure. Efforts are made toward creating an open public administration to uphold its credibility and maintain citizens' confidence.

Expertise is also essential; roles are assigned based on specific knowledge and skills within organization. Rules-based decision-making is characterized by clear procedures and guidelines, promoting impartiality and consistency in decision-making processes. Formal documentation on policies and procedures ensures that organizational processes remain consistent and clear.

Public service delivery needs to show its quality and effectiveness, and this is done by connecting admin-

istration processes with results. By using efficient systems and policy realization, agreement is reached between going by law and taking a more result-oriented approach (Durant, 2000; Olsen, 2005; Gualmini, 2007; Liiv, 2008/2009; Byrkjeflot, et al., 2018). Internal control is given a great importance by administrative institutions, and they follow closely staff development policies. This model not only consolidates state's role but also emphasizes democracy, rule of law, and relations between citizens and state by enabling cooperation, cross-border institutional networks, and partnerships (Lynn, 2008/2009; Kovač and Jukić, 2016; Pollitt and Bouckaert, 2017). Concept supports governance-based state structure that approves law rules and promotes inclusion and equality aims through hierarchical, accountable, and responsible framework that actively guides markets and networks (Bouckaert, 2022, pp.26-27).

Foundation of Neoweberian state lies in establishing administrative order and spreading ethical standards within the public sector to ensure effective management, particularly in terms of NPM's emphasis on liberalization and flexibility. This interpretation supposes that the Weberian bureaucratic model – rooted in Continental Europe – serves as a framework for analyzing positive dimensions of NPM (Özer, 2022, pp.210-211). Neoweberian perspective states that modern public administration being a solution to all problems is often overvalued, while real results are very modest. Cost rises have caused public dissatisfaction, and although public administration was supposed to go better and be more efficient through implementation, expenses have increased (Pollitt, 2015; Hood and Dixon, 2015).

Table 1. Comparison of Weberian and Neoweberian State
(Source: Author's own research)

Comparison criteria	Weberian administration	Neoweberian administration
Focus	State's function	Strategic planning, state administration, and performance monitoring and assessment
Legitimacy tool	Representative democracy	Transparency, merit, participation
Legal infrastructure	Using administrative law to control citizen-state relations	Administrative law regulations: adaptable and flexible, robust for the career system
Aim	Maintaining public service bureaucracy	Using e-Government to reduce bureaucracy and strengthen the central administration's guidance role

Table 1 illustrates how state and bureaucracy involvement in public services is a central theme in the Weberian administration theory. Public policies are believed to be provided by representative democracy. Administrative law plays crucial role in the interactions between government and people. Bureaucratic services need to be stable and continuous. Neoweberian state values concepts such as performance management, strategic planning, and transparency and seeks to apply contemporary management approaches to broaden Weberian bureaucratic perspective. By allowing for flexibility in career system, bureaucracy must be able to adjust to changing administrative agenda that will boost managerial involvement within organization and public participation. Information and communication technologies should be used to prevent bureaucracy from operating routinely and to enhance central administration's directing ability, which includes planning, decision-making, policy creation, and control. In public administration reforms in Denmark, Byrkjeflot, et al. (2018, pp.1003-1004) characterize Neoweberian reform initiatives like "Tryk Politi," which involves citizens signing up for messaging service to receive updates on crimes in their area and aims to foster citizen dialogue and public consultation.

Furthermore, Neoweberian activities include assigning grades based on global rankings in higher education, offering research scholarships to students, and having middle-level university administrators participate in executive training programs for public administration. According to Ramos and Milanesi (2018, pp.8-13), Neoweberian public administration in Uruguay seeks to create a more straightforward, uniform, and adaptable career system and compensation structure. New managerial jobs were developed during bureaucratic career; however, bureaucratic resistance and a lack of political consensus prevented new career model implementation and managerial posts. Public organizations have implemented improvement initiatives under individual rather than systematic rationality because there are no explicit rules or recommendations about certain strategy. Others have criticized Neoweberian paradigm. Due to each nation's administrative traditions, Weberian style, upon which Neoweberian model is founded, cannot be implemented in different administrative cultures (Pollitt, 2008/2009, pp.10-69). A key issue concerns whether management techniques will

evolve to deliver higher levels of efficiency and effectiveness, as is difference between Weberian and new, user-friendly, and effective tendencies. Political nature in public sector, reality that aims can change quickly to political interests, and working circumstances for senior civil servants and public administrators generally, are all ignored (Byrkjeflot, et al. 2018, pp.1005-1006). The Neoweberian model is said to have been upset by ambiguities and incorrect definitions on NPM principles, even though it promotes more functional state management (Sanderson, 1988, p. 309). Thus, the NPM and Neoweberian models share following characteristics: paradigmatic qualities, uncertainty, internal contradictions, inability to halt instrumental rationality, failure to incorporate critical theorem forms, and participation-based bureaucracy (Dunn and Miller, 2007, p.345).

The state's complex structure has not been adequately addressed in a limited and technocratic approach to state development. Although Neoweberian theorists present their analyses in "value-free," it has been argued that "fragile states" are inherently political. This approach emphasizes interactions between state and society and how these interactions shape social order. In contrast to Neoweberian synthesis, which overlooks critical and intellectual perspectives on Weber's work (Lootholz and Lemay-Hébert, 2016, pp.1-8), it is essential to recognize that the state is composed of human relationships. Treiber (2023) critiques Neoweberianism for abandoning Weber's original perspective and research method concerning state theory. Consequently, it is difficult to expect that Weber's ideal type of bureaucracy would be applicable to contemporary administrative structures. Neoweberianism reduces changes in public administration to a reformist ideology rather than a strict theoretical framework. It is essential by today's criteria to have a proper approach on old theories.

3 Taylorist and Neotaylorist Administration Theory

To enhance economic efficiency, particularly productivity, workflows are analyzed and synthesized through scientific management theory, commonly referred to as Taylorism. This concept was developed by

F.W. Taylor in early 1900s and has since been implemented in workplaces and industries, significantly influencing contemporary business practices.

According to Taylorism, tasks should be divided into smaller parts; each can be done in one “best” way. Each task is overseen by only one person, and every worker must be carefully selected from candidates. That worker must then be properly trained so they can perform their job efficiently; indeed, Taylorism requires “scientific management of humans,” meaning that workers are trained and motivated by managers to do their jobs well. In other words: if you choose people correctly (and train them properly), there should be no need for “managerial control” over how they perform – because they’ll know exactly how best to do it, having been taught.

It follows that management also has important role in productivity, as Frank and Lillian Gilbreth noted: when it comes to work procedures, “workers are more likely to adopt better ones if they have been allowed to help devising them.” They think that participation helps engagement.

Proportionality principle combines Taylorism and public administration in social efficiency. They represent a positivist way about society as one thing that operates under fixed rules and that can be studied scientifically like a physical object. When these principles are implemented via reformist programs, they combine democratic and hierarchical structures (Özer, 2022, p.32).

Since the publication of Taylor’s work, other scholars who share his scientific philosophy have identified ways in which expertise and technical information could be increased, time management improved so that capital could accumulate, and staff made more competent by better training on scientific, social, and psychological studies to improve its agreement and make working conditions more efficient (Vazquez and Purificacion, 2017, pp.496-498).

Increases in productivity and “working styles” have already been felt and continue today; what is called in “managerialism” or according to Peaucelle (2000, p.454) hierarchical competence (among workers), time distribution, labor division, and mechanization in organizational structure. Basic philosophy underlying Taylorism is a belief that everything in world – human

or otherwise – can be categorized based on similarities from resources to tasks; its main strength is a focus on efficiency, reliability, usefulness, and productivity. All these principles make it a very robust system if you have enough money (for example) at your disposal that can be directed toward the employment of extra laborers and higher-level supervisory staff when present does very little add value at all.

Numerical flexibility increases but employees become more easily dispensable; constant repetition causes mysterious monotony and a lack of inventive impulses. Moreover, the central information-processing machinery conflicts with any democracy image because it must be centralized. To accompany level one control can barely cope, let alone promote its aims and objectives very well indeed. To make matters worse, those associated with scientific management appear short-sighted, given that their thoughts relate solely on tasks themselves, ignoring any organizational (i.e., whole jobs existence at top). All failures during managerial duties adversely affect latter by completely disengaging them from its assigned parts and whole functions, respectively. This disengagement resulted from the breakdown of face-to-face connections between employees and management (Özer, 2017, p.10). Taylor’s organizational model deprived workers to govern their own business, use their time autonomously, and engage in collective action. This result was attained by aligning social control demands with technical and economic logic. Employees receive standards, instructions, and safeguards due to task analyzers’ systematic expertise. As a result, employees could use their previous traditional knowledge for their work but also were not able to engage in technical knowledge. Possibilities for cross sector collaboration between various job areas were almost nonexistent. For issues related to organizations, workers are required to solve problems on their own without helping or coordinating directives (Chave and Gordon, 1982, pp.78-81).

While Taylorism is still useful that it highlights the importance of management within organizations and presents a new paradigm, the one best way method has lost importance because workers have become more involved in teamwork and use kaizen-type development and processes to solve problems together (Witzel and Warner, 2015, pp.62-63). Under Taylorism, control process becomes more costly due to flexibility loss

scale economies. Neotaylorism emerged as a strategy to address economic challenges associated with Taylorism (Pruijt, 2003, p.81).

Postmodern world distinguishes operation methods, even as they emerge from modernity remnants. Today, work is not merely explained in efficiency and rationality; it is understood as a sociocultural phenomenon that is evolving into symbolic representation on personal identity and social status (Freemantle, 1995). In 1945, some engineers from Harvard University's Department of Public Administration called for a transformation in public organizations. This demand emphasized lack of training materials and standardized procedures, which contradicted then-dominant public administration conception that emphasized adaptability, moral judgment, and each administration's specific conditions. "*Toward a New Public Administration (The Effect of Scientific Management on Public Administration)*" research paper was published in 1951. Second part of last century saw rapid growth on information technologies, which eventually led to a major change in public administration following Taylorist standards. Such changes strengthened theoretical and practical perspectives on analysis, algorithmic control, and digital evaluations (Estrago, 2023; Coccozza, 2024).

In early 1980s, new management models transformed organization, enabling public and private sectors to adopt American (modular production, personalized career paths) and Japanese (just in time production, teamwork, reduction on hierarchical levels, employee participation) approaches (Lomba, 2005, p.71). Organizations adopted essential tools such as computerization, automation, project and information management, quality circles, restructuring business process, autonomous work groups, and comprehensive quality management to achieve their objectives.

What are important features in Neotaylorist organization? First, there is extensive use to assess performance and provide feedback on how things are going; organization will set key performance indicators (KPIs) so that everyone has a specific role within it plus what needs achieving overall if goals aims to be achieve (Crowley, et al., 2010). Next, Neotaylorist organization is flexible: Employees can do more one job and often have to adapt quickly when there is a change in

their environment – this flexibility also extends downward from senior management too. Moreover, Neotaylorism asserts "continuous feedback and performance enhancement" (Peaucelle, 2000). Simply, data are used extensively; feedback turns exist so individuals know how well they are doing plus there is constant drive to do things better. Demirel, et al. (2018) highlighted three key factors when it comes to Neotaylorist organizations: They specialize on technology, which helps reduce mistakes as well as making sure employees do exactly what they're being paid for (Demirel, et al., 2018). These organizations give employees a say in how things are run and motivate them; they don't just see staff as labor units to be squeezed for maximum output but also take their sensitive into account – for example, through providing opportunities for personal growth/job enrichment. Use teamwork and provide workers with practical skills needed for their specific roles and those shared objectives which keep things working perfectly.

By allowing organizations to adjust their plans and strategies in response to feedback and changing circumstances, planning methodologies such as project management promote a more adaptable and responsive work environment. Remote work possibilities have also been maintained. The aim is to move away from traditional management style to more decentralized and networked organizational structure that can better manage current working environment, which is described as being uncertain, unpredictable, and constantly changing (Freemantle, 1995). Neotaylorism conceptualizes administrator as team leader who checks service delivery. For example, Toyota applies Neotaylorist methodology, with each team led by a permanent member. Control leader and production lines encourage effective teamwork. In addition to technical expertise, top management is granted administrative authority. In this context, group or individual incentive system is implemented alongside managerial assessments that evaluate how well employees meet system's technical, organizational, or managerial requirements (Pruijt, 2003, pp.84-88; Lomba, 2005, p.72).

Suggestion is that to improve fitting services with social needs, decision-making should be decentralized from central level to service delivery level, performance pay, giving more freedom to the managers, and

encouraging team formation to meet set targets. Eliminating unnecessary processes, uniting aims across different sectors, and encouraging public private partnerships are just some things that need to be done. This could reduce some problems we currently face. Unfortunately, it isn't just changing problems on policies or procedures: the Neotaylorist approach shows how difficult it can be to implement changes.

Neotaylorism is similar to old-fashioned Taylorism in that it centralizes power and control – often autocratically. Everything from workflow to staff behavior is tightly monitored and controlled. For example, manager might want to “micromanage” because they believe their role is to make every single decision.

Technological advances will require organizations to constantly adapt if they survive in today's world. Change could actually drive them back toward the Neotaylorist model. Problem is that old-style Taylorism was very rigid and mechanical: not at all flexible or responsive to individual needs. In other words, it did not treat workers as people but more like cogs in a machine.

NPM may cause “siloization” or “departmentalism.” This happens when departments think only about their own goals rather than cutting, which may do little to advance greater public good. We might imagine whole organization. Overly sharp focus on efficiency (e.g., cost) is a future where budgets get tighter and tighter (because senior managers think this will improve efficiency).

Staff motivation falls as follows: “Why bother doing my job well if nobody thanks me for it? I'm tired all the time.” Safety standards fall too: “Sorry, we can't help you any more: it's not within our budget” says administration. Public organizations have values. They must serve community, fairly deliver services, and uphold public interest. Top managers need some freedom if they are to run things well, but there is also catch: if everything is run for efficiency, then public values could be undermined at stroke, and this is worry for people who think about public policy. Striking balance here is not easy, but it is vital for ongoing successful public services (Lynn, 2003).

Table 2. Taylorist and Neotaylorist Administration Theory
(Source: Peaucelle, 2000, pp.457-458)

Comparison criteria	Taylorism	Neotaylorism
Focus	Economic growth, mass production, and labor productivity	Work satisfaction, productivity, and employee welfare
Sectorial area	Industrial companies	Digital companies, public and private sectors
Control	Limited to unit chiefs	Comprehensive technological tools
Mission	Job descriptions in science involving motion and time studies	Technology-driven task simplification
Tools for achieving goals	Labor division, automation, processes, and high wages	Flexibility, process reengineering, automation, and delivering unique products to audiences services

Table 2 shows a comparison on focal points, sectorial regions, staff control, job design, and goal-achieving strategies in Taylorism and Neotaylorism. In the Neotaylorism implementation method, the rigid organizational structure found in Taylorism is substituted with an organic system that focuses on adapting to situations and environments.

Numerous organizations have now embraced neotraditionalist approaches. Unlike Taylorist method, employee control is neutral. When technological tools are used, Taylorism is on motion and time study, but Neotaylorism simplifies work with technology. Neotaylorism uses employees with different skills flexibly to produce and deliver products, while Taylorism is characterized by being procedural and bureaucratic. This

change occurs as technology makes people have their ways more than before. One plan to increase effectiveness would be to cut down on lengthy red tape and merging them into one.

4 Conclusion

Public administration cannot be fully understood without considering various models because it allows one to comprehend what is good or bad in every plan so that managers and policy makers may adopt the best strategy in their cases. Opportunities for improvement in current administrative practices become evident to us through the examination of these models. Studying different public administration models enables one to determine how they may fit into or be modified for use in administrative reform processes. It also offers an intellectual structure for continuing research and evaluation.

Neoweberian theory attempts to offer a new approach to Weberian bureaucracy as the state's basic strength while considering modern public administration forms. Here, the Neoweberian state hopes that bureaucracy can transform into an inclusive structure driven by economics and goals and not by complicated procedures on government. The paradigm is further reinforced by restructuring Weber's bureaucratic model to include concepts such as accountability, transparency, service quality, service orientation, a balance between rules and performance management, and public engagement.

Labor management in the industrial society has been greatly improved by Taylorism. Taylor still has a significant impact on postmodern management methods and brings useful ideas for dealing with work styles and productivity. By meeting cost reduction and maximizing output goals, Taylor's methods enabled industrial production rises. Neotaylorist approach maintains that service delivery can obtain these customer characteristics, adaptability, and variety without any additional expenses (Peaucelle, 2000, p. 466; Rosenbloom, et al., 2022).

Neotaylorism has shaped work management and production in new postindustrial organizational structures, which are further complicated by information economies. NPM emerged after 1980 but struggled to maintain its effectiveness, criticizing Weberian bureaucracy

as inefficient and burdened with red tape processes. NPM is often criticized for being a reform package tailored to each nation without considering its unique political and administrative traditions.

In addition, this ignores important good governance principles: treating every citizen equally when giving out public services as well as considering public interest first. Neoweberian administration tries to make bureaucracy coherent, continuous, rational, and at same time social by using managerial instruments in order to meet with postmodern challenges such as efficiency, quality, speed, and orientation on aims and results. In contrast to NPM, Neoweberian approach separates public from business and rebuilds governmental machinery, giving priority to people using ICT. Modern public management encourages effective and efficient public administration development through different managerial approaches. Neoweberian and Neotaylorist approaches aim to increase organizational productivity and efficiency in organizations. Neoweberian administration suggests employee freedom, skills, and communication for better engagement and creativity. It supports adaptable working conditions that increase motivation, creativity, and flexibility among employees.

5 Declaration

The author declares no conflict of interest.

6 References

- [1] Akindele, T.S., Afolabi, A.Y., Pitan, O.O. and Gidado, O.T., 2016. *The Threads of Organizational Theory: A Phenomenological Analysis*. 6 (5):158-184, <https://doi.org/10.5923/j.mm.20160605.03>.
- [2] Rathaus, C., 2023. Public Sector Reform and Merit: Principles, Practices, and pushback, In Goldfinch, F. S. (ed.), *Handbook of Public Administration Reform*, pp.27-40, Edward Elgar Publishing.
- [3] Aristovnik, A., Murko, E. and Ravšelj, D., 2022. From Neo-Weberian to Hybrid Governance Models in Public Administration: Differences between State and Local Self-Government

- Administrative Sciences* 12 (1): 26. <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci12010026>.
- [4] Bauer, M.W. and Trondal, J., 2015. The Administrative System of the European Union In: Bauer, M.W., Trondal, J. (eds). *The Palgrave Handbook of the European Administrative System. European administrative governance*, Palgrave Macmillan, London, pp.1-31. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137339898_1.
- [5] Bouckaert, G., 2022. From NPM to NWS in Europe. *Transylvanian Review of Administrative Sciences*, Special Issue, pp.22-31.
- [6] Bouckaert, G., 2023. The neo-Weberian state: From ideal type model to reality? *Max Weber Studies* 23(1), 13-59. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1353/max.2023.0002>.
- [7] Chave, D. and Richard, G., 1982. Neo-Taylorism or worker autonomy? Reflections on Three Experiments in Work Organization *International Journal of Sociology*, 12 (4):77-89, <https://doi.org/10.1080/15579336.1982.11769809>.
- [8] Cozza, A., 2024. Understanding Organizational Culture Innovation, Transparency, Leadership, Community, Switzerland: Springer Nature.
- [9] Crowley, M., Tope, D., Chamberlain, L.J. and Hodson, R., 2010. Neo-Taylorism at Work: Occupational Change in the Post-Fordist Era. *Social Problems*, 57 3 (1):421-447, <https://doi.org/10.1525/sp.2010.57.3.421>.
- [10] Çiner, C.U. and Olgun, B., 2015. The Neo-Weberian state: A new debate for New Public Management reforms. In Ö. Köseoğlu and Z.M. Sobacı (Eds.), *The search for paradigms in public administration*, pp.205-230, Dora Publishing.
- [11] DeVries, J., 2013. Public Sector Reform: An Overview of Recent Literature and Research on NPM and Alternative Paths *International Journal of Public Sector Administration*, 26 (1):4-16.
- [12] Demirel, E., Alp, M., Taşdemir, M. and Torlak, S., 2018. An examination of the effects of digital Taylorism on labor, production, and the economy. *Journal of Social and Humanities Sciences Research*, 5(18), pp.430-438.
- [13] Dunn, W.N. and Miller, D.Y., 2007. A Critique of the New Public Administration and the Neo-Weberian State: Advancing a Critical Theory of Administrative Reform *Public Organization Review*, 7:345-358. doi.org/10.1007/s11115-007-0042-3.
- [14] Durant, F.R., 2000. Whither the Neoadministrative State? Toward a Policy-Centered Theory of Administrative Reform, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 10 (1):79-109, <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.jpart.a024268>.
- [15] Drechsler, W., 2009. The Rise and Demise of the New Public Administration: Lessons and Opportunities for South East Europe, *Central European Public Administration Review*, 7 (3):7-27.
- [16] Dreschsler, W. and Kattel, R., 2008/2009. Toward the Neo-Weberian State?: Perhaps, but Certainly Adieu, NPM. *The NISPAcee Journal of Public Administration and Policy*, 1(2): 95-101.
- [17] Freemantle, N., 1995. Taylorism in a post-modern age? *HealthServManageRes*. 8 (1):3-9. <https://doi.org/10.1177/095148489500800101>.
- [18] Estragó, A., 2023. Administration in worker cooperatives: Democracy vs. dissonance, and possible overcoming approaches, *Journal of Cooperative Organization and Administration*, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcom.2023.100216>.
- [19] Gualmini, E., 2008. Restructuring Weberian bureaucracy: Comparing managerial reforms in Europe and the United States *Public Administration*, 86(1):75-94.
- [20] Hood, C. and Dixon, R., 2013. What we have to show for 30 years of new public administration: Higher costs, more complaints, *Governance: An International Journal of Policy, Administration, and Institutions*, 28(3): 265-267.
- [21] Hughes, O.E., 2003. *Public Administration and Administration: An Introduction*, 3rd ed. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001.
- [22] Ivanova, M. and von Scheve, C., 2020. Power through empowerment? The managerial discourse on employee empowerment. *Organization*, 27 (6):777-796. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508419855709>.
- [23] Kettl, F.D., 2022. Public administration and political science: Can this marriage be saved? *Governance*, 35 (4):983-990, <https://doi.org/10.1111/gove.12724>.

- [24] Kovač, P. and Jukić, T., 2016. Development of Public Administration and its Research in Slovenia through the Lenses of Content Analysis of the International Public Administration Review *International Public Administration Review*, 14(1):75-114.
- [25] Liiv, R.T., 2008/2009. New Public Administration versus neo-weberian state in central and Eastern Europe. *The NISPAcee Journal of Public Administration and Policy*, 1 (2):69-83.
- [26] Lomba, C., 2005. Beyond the debate over Post-vs Neo-Taylorism, *International Sociology*, 20 (1):71-91.
- [27] Lottholz, P. and Hébert, L.N., 2016. Re-reading Weber, Re-Conceptualizing State-Building: From Neo-Weberian to Post-Weberian Approaches to State, Legitimacy, State Building. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, <https://doi.org/10.1080/09557571.2016.1230588>.
- [28] Lynn, L.E., 2003. Public Administration in the Twenty-First Century. Review of the Transformation of Governance: Public Administration for the Twenty-First Century America; the Tools of Government: A Guide to the New Governance, *Public Administration Review*, 63 (5):631-635.
- [29] Lynn, L.E., 2008/2009. What is a Neo-Weberian State? Reflections on a concept and its Implications. *The NISPAcee Journal of Public Administration and Policy*, 1 (2):17-31.
- [30] Niepce, W. and Molleman, E., 1998. Work Design Issues in Lean Production from a Sociotechnical Systems Perspective: Neo-Taylorism or the Next Step in Sociotechnical Design? *Human Relations* 51, 259-287. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1016992403973>
- [31] Olsen, J.P., 2005. Maybe It Is Time to Rediscover Bureaucracy. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 16 (1):1-24. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mui027>.
- [32] Ongaro, E., 2024. Integrating the neo-Weberian state and public value. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 90 (4): 830-844. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00208523241228830>.
- [33] Özer, M.A., 2022. *Bureaucracy lessons*. Gazi Publishing.
- [34] Özer, M.A., 2017. Where is New Public Management heading? Projections for Turkey. *Journal of Turkish Administration*, 90(486), pp.259-294.
- [35] Page, S., 2005. What's new about the new public administration? Administrative change in the human services. *Public Administration Review* 65 (6):713-727.
- [36] Peaculle, L.J., 2000. From Taylorism to Post-Taylorism *Journal of Organizational Change*, 13(5):452-467.
- [37] Kitsches, R., 1993. Aspects of Max Weber's Theory on Bureaucracy and NPM Approach. *The Indian Journal of Public Administration*, XIX (4):643-651.
- [38] Pruijt, H., 2003. Teams between Neo-Taylorism and Anti-Taylorism. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 24 (1):77-101.
- [39] Pruijt, H., 2000. Repainting, Modifying, Smashing Taylorism. *Journal of Organizational Change Administration*, 13 (5):439-451.
- [40] Pollitt, C. and Bouckaert, G., 2017. *Public Administration Reform: A Comparative Analysis NPM, Governance and the Neo-Weberian State*, 4. Edition, New York: Oxford University Press.
- [41] Pollitt, C., 2015. Wickedness will not wait: climate change and public administration research, *Public Money & Administration* 35 (3):181-186 <https://doi.org/10.1080/09540962.2015.1027490>.
- [42] Pollitt, C., 2008/2009. An Overview of the Papers and Propositions of the First TransEuropean Dialogue (TEDI), *The NISPAcee Journal of Public Administration and Policy*, 1 (2):9-16.
- [43] Ramos, C. and Milanese, A., 2018. The Neo-Weberian State and the Neodevelopmentalist Strategies in Latin America: The Case of Uruguay. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 0 (0):1-17. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020852318763525>.
- [44] Roehl, B., U., U., 2023. Automated decision-making and good administration: Views from inside the government machinery. *Government Information Quarterly*, 40 (4), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2023.101864>.

- [45] Rosenbloom, D., Kravchuk, R. and Clerkin, M.R., 2022. *Public Administration*. 9th edition, UK: Routledge.
- [46] Sanderson, K.S., 1988. The Neo-Weberian Revolution: A Theoretical Balance Sheet, *Sociological Forum*, 3 (2):307-314.
- [47] Treiber, H., 2023. Critical reflections on Pollitt and Bouckaert's construct of the neo-Weberian state (NWS) in their standard work on public management reform. *Theor Soc* 52, 179–212. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11186-022-09478-0>
- [48] Vidal, M., 2024. From Labour Process Theory to Organisational Political Economy: A Response to Benassi, Ikeler and Wood. *Critical Sociology*, <https://doi.org/10.1177/08969205231219209>.
- [49] Vázquez, J. and Purificación, G.M., 2017. From Taylorism to neo-Taylorism: a 100-year journey in human resource administration. *Menedzsment innovációk az üzleti és a nonbusiness szférákban*, (ed.) Márton, V., Klára, K., SZTE Gazdaságtudományi Kar Szeged, 2017, pp.496-517.
- [50] Ward, P., 2021. *Administration Theory of Max Weber: Principles of bureaucracy*, <https://nanoglobals.com/glossary/administration-theory-max-weber-bureaucracy/>
- [51] Weber, M., 1946. *From Max Weber Essays in Sociology*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- [52] Witzel, M. and Warner, M., 2015. Taylorism Revisited: Culture, Administration Theory and Paradigm Shift, *Journal of General Administration*. 40 (3):55-70.