

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AND PUBLIC MANAGEMENT ORIGINAL TEXTBOOK SERIES


公共管理英文版教材系列

# Public Management<sup>and</sup> Administration: An Introduction

THIRD EDITION  
(第三版)

公共管理导论

Owen E. Hughes 欧文·E·休斯 著

 中国人民大学出版社




# Public Management<sup>and</sup> Administration: An Introduction

THIRD EDITION  
(第三版)

## 公共管理导论

Owen E. Hughes 欧文·E·休斯 著



 中国人民大学出版社

## 图书在版编目(CIP)数据

公共管理导论(第3版)/休斯著.  
北京:中国人民大学出版社,2004  
(公共管理英文版教材系列)

ISBN 7-300-05245-2/D·962

I. 公…

II. 休…

III. 公共管理-教材-英文

IV. D035

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字 (2003) 第 123461 号

公共管理英文版教材系列

**Public Management and Administration: An Introduction (Third Edition)**

**公共管理导论 (第三版)**

Owen E. Hughes 著  
欧文·E·休斯

---

出版发行 中国人民大学出版社

社 址 北京中关村大街 31 号 邮政编码 100080

电 话 010-62511242 (总编室) 010-62511239 (出版部)

010-62515351 (邮购部) 010-62514148 (门市部)

网 址 <http://www.crup.com.cn>

<http://www.ttrnet.com>(人大教研网)

经 销 新华书店

印 刷 北京东方圣雅印刷有限公司

开 本 787×965 毫米 1/16

版 次 2004 年 1 月第 1 版

印 张 20 插页 2

印 次 2004 年 1 月第 1 次印刷

字 数 321 000

定 价 28.00 元

---

版权所有 侵权必究 印装差错 负责调换

公共管理理论/第三版/影印版

## 出版说明

21 世纪,我国的公共管理学呈现良好的发展势头,在教育界、理论界、实务界等社会各界的共同努力下,公共管理专业教育正逐渐与世界同步。为了全面深入地反映国外公共行政与公共管理的发展脉络,系统完整地介绍国外公共行政与公共管理专业的经典著作和最新研究成果,让国内读者直接阅读原汁原味的英文原著,提高教学研究和实际工作水平,中国人民大学出版社引进了公共管理英文版系列教材,影印出版。

本系列教材所选书目均系国外公共行政与公共管理领域最权威的专家所著的经典著作,是国外知名大学正在使用的权威教科书,综合反映了当前本领域的理论发展现状与实际操作水平。本系列教材注重理论与实践紧密结合,对于系统培养学生思考和解决实际问题的能力大有裨益。同时,所选教材行文流畅,简洁易懂,便于阅读。

为了使读者对每本教材有一个整体了解,把握该书在公共行政与公共管理学中的地位与价值,我们特别邀请专家对每本书撰写了导读,并把目录翻译成中文,供读者阅读时参考。同时,中国人民大学出版社将于近期陆续推出本系列教材的中文版。

需要特别提及的是,我们出版这套系列教材,并不表明我们赞成这些著作中的每一个观点。这些著作都基于西方特定的行政生态,是西方公共行政与公共管理理论与实践发展的产物,读者在阅读时不应忘记“取其精华,去其糟粕”的原则。

当前,我国的高等教育改革取得了突破性的进展,其中一项切实的举措即是规定有条件的高校实行双语教学,教育部对此也有具体的要求。贯彻这一精神,满足我国高等教育国际化发展的需要,提高学生阅读专业英语资料的能力,也是我们影印出版这套公共管理教材的初衷。

中国人民大学出版社

2004 年 1 月

## 导 读

20 世纪 80 年代以来,面对政府规模的扩大、财政经济压力的加剧、社会问题和政府不可治理性的增多以及官僚主义和腐败现象的泛滥,西方主要发达国家纷纷开始了大规模的政府再造运动。政府管理的运作亦发生了相应的变化,即由传统的、官僚的、层级节制的、缺乏弹性的公共行政,向市场导向的、因应变化的、深具弹性的公共管理转变。对于这股潮流,一向有不同的称谓,如新右派、新治理、管理主义、企业型政府、以市场为基础的公共行政等,但却都可称为公共管理或“新公共管理”。对于新公共管理是否构成公共部门管理的一种新典范,存在不同的争论。有些学者主张新公共管理已成为一种新的典范,而另一些学者则反对在公共部门管理中应用典范变革的概念。

澳大利亚莫纳什大学公共管理系教授欧文·E·休斯则认为,无论是应用“典范”的普通词义,还是应用其与库恩著作相关的最新用法,“典范”这一术语都既适合于传统的行政模式,也适合于紧密相连、且被称之为新公共管理的公共管理改革。欧文·E·休斯进一步指出,建立在正式官僚制、政治与行政二分法和最佳工作方式基础上的传统行政模式已经过时,已被一种建立在经济学和私营部门管理基础之上的新公共管理模式有效地取而代之。这种变革表现为从行政模式向管理模式、从官僚制模式向市场化模式的典范变迁,这种变革也反映着政治和行政领导之间关系的一种更为现实的观点,意味着市场与政府、政府与官僚制组织、政府与公民以及官僚制组织与公民之间关系的转变。当然,欧文·E·休斯也指出,典范变迁并不是一蹴而就的,而是一个渐进过程。但是,建立在正式官僚制、政治与行政二分法和最佳工作方式基础上的传统公共行政典范终将被公共管理所取代,这是不以人的意志为转移的客观趋势。

《公共管理导论》正是欧文·E·休斯教授在对传统公共行政模式与新公共管理模式两种典范进行比较的基础上撰写的一部重要学术著作。本书的出版确立了他在公共管理领域著名学者的地位。本书曾先后于 1994 年出版了第一版、1998 年出版了第二版、2003 年出版了第三版。我们在此介绍的是本书的第三版。

与第二版相比,第三版基本上是在第二版的基础上重新撰写的,大部分内容已作了调整,并增加了新的章节;但它与前两版的基本观点是相同的,即公共管

理是一个新的典范。其中,第1章~第3章阐述了传统公共行政与新公共管理这两种竞争性理论,认为这两种完全不同的典范造成了公共服务的不同概念,而且管理与行政相比是一种范围更广、综合性更强的活动。第4章~第6章探讨了政府角色的变化。论述内容包括公共企业作用的下降与政府公共政策的模式。第7章~第12章详尽地阐述了新公共管理的特定方面——战略规划与管理、人事管理与绩效管理、财政管理、外部要素的管理以及发展中国家的管理。第13章探讨了责任以及责任如何受到改革的影响。第14章从整体上考察了人们对新公共管理的批评。

《公共管理导论》一书论点鲜明,论证充分有力,结构体系严谨,资料丰富具体,理论方面有所创新,准确反映了各国公共管理理论与实践的最新成果。它既可作为学习与了解公共管理科学的基础性、入门性读物,也可作为研究公共管理的重要参考资料,具有重要的学术研究价值。因此,该书是公共管理领域一部不可多得的重要学术著作。

当然,公共管理并非处于真空之中,而深深受到行政生态的影响,并不存在什么放之四海而皆准的最佳行政模式问题。欧文·E·休斯的这本著作是以西方国家的社会制度为背景的,其所提出的一些理论、原则与方法不可避免地带有一定的局限或不足,并不必然都适合于我国的公共管理改革实践。这一点是读者阅读本书时必须加以注意的。

张成福

2004 年元旦

# Preface

Over the past 20 years the public sectors of Western countries have undergone major change as governments try to respond to the challenges of technological change, globalization and international competitiveness. This period saw wider-ranging public sector reforms than any other period of the twentieth century and with no sign of diminution of change into the early twenty-first century. It is argued here that this period of change represents a paradigm shift from the traditional model of public administration, dominant for most of the twentieth century, to 'managerialism' or public management. The theory of bureaucracy in its governmental context is being replaced by economic theories and provision by markets.

This book provides an introduction to, and assessment of, the theories and principles of public management, particularly the public sector reforms associated with the movement most often referred to as 'the new public management' and compares and contrasts these with the traditional model of public administration. The managerial programme is an international one, with quite similar changes occurring in a range of different countries, although the extent of similarity is a point of controversy. What is more, there is common intellectual backing for these changes particularly in economic theory and the principles of private management. For this reason the book concentrates on the broad sweep of international developments rather than concentrating on individual national case studies that could obscure key issues in a mass of unnecessary detail.

The third edition is a major rewrite with little that is unchanged. Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 9, 13, 14 have been completely rewritten and Chapter 10 is new; Chapters 5, 6, 7, 11 and 12 have more minor changes. It maintains the same essential argument as the first two editions, but updates it in several areas. Events since the writing of the first edition have shown even more clearly that a major shift has been under way in the management of the public sectors around the world, although the pace of change has been greater in some countries, like New Zealand, Australia and the United Kingdom, than in others, such as the United States and Germany, although even there some signs of change are now apparent. It is also significant that public management is being adopted, in part, in a number of developing countries. It will be interesting to see to what extent public management can be successfully adopted by developing countries, a number of which have already taken significant initiatives, while others are actively seeking alternatives to the discredited traditional bureaucratic model.

The first part (Chapters 1–3) sets out the competing theories of traditional public administration and public management. The two paradigms are argued to be quite different, resulting in contrasting conceptions of the public service,

with management being shown as a wider, more comprehensive activity than administration. The second part (Chapters 4–6) considers the changing role of government, a change that is, to a large degree, behind the change in management. This includes discussion of the greatly reduced role of public enterprise and of models of public policy making for government. The third section (Chapters 7–12) sets out in more detail specific aspects of public management – strategic planning and management, personnel and performance management, financial management and managing external constituencies, as well as management in developing countries. Chapter 13 considers the important issue of accountability and how it may have been affected by the reforms, while Chapter 14 looks at some of the criticisms of the new approach as a whole, where individual earlier chapters consider some of the problems with that particular aspect.

In looking at public administration there is a well-established and recognized model with a long history and an extensive literature. Public management, particularly new public management, has now developed its own literature. There are quite extensive critiques of, in particular, the new public management, some of which make interesting points while others are clearly written by adherents to the old-style public administration, trained in its precepts, who are unwilling or unable to see anything positive in the changes. There have been extensive debates as to whether or not there is a new paradigm, or even an old one, whether or not there is a global movement of public sector reform, and even whether or not anything has changed at all.

The argument here is that there has been a major change and that this deserves the appellation of paradigm. Anyone working in public services can see that something has happened. Public management is different from traditional public administration and has been adopted widely. Regardless of critiques it is here and here to stay. There are likely to be problems of accountability, morale and ethics in the adoption of public management and it is possible some managerial changes will result in little, if any, benefit. There is, however, no reason to assume that the managerial programme will be dropped and the traditional model adopted again. There is a major theoretical shift under way affecting the public sector and the public services, which also has substantial impacts on the relationship between government, bureaucracy and citizens. As the reform programme progresses in different countries it appears more evident that the days in which formal bureaucracy and the traditional model of administration characterized government management are rapidly passing.

There are a number of people to thank. First of all I wish to thank my publisher Steven Kennedy, of Palgrave Macmillan, who was willing ten years ago to take a punt on an author from the other side of the world. Sales have been far greater than either of us expected. I also wish to thank others who have assisted me in some way with this book and its predecessors although it should be added that the arguments are mine. In the US, these include: Peter deLeon and Linda deLeon at the University of Colorado, and those I have met through



the Colorado link such as Mark Emmert and Robert Denhardt, also Delmer Dunn from Georgia and Colin Campbell, then at Georgetown, now at Vancouver. In Europe Christoph Reichard of the University of Potsdam, Neil Carter at York, Gordon Clark at Oxford, Ignacio Criado from Complutense University in Madrid, as well as colleagues at Monash, notably Gill Palmer, Deirdre O'Neill, Linda McGuire and Julian Teicher. I must also mention Colin Reaney and Karee Dahl from Singapore, whose house in France I used while writing the first edition. Most of all I wish to thank Cathy Woodward and our two girls Caitlin and Sophie, now aged six and three.

*Melbourne, 2002*

OWEN E. HUGHES

# 目 录

<b>第 1 章 变革的时代</b>	1
1.1  引言	1
1.2  一种新典范	2
1.3  一种新方法的出现	4
1.4  行政与管理	6
1.5  变革的紧迫问题	8
1.6  结论	14
<b>第 2 章 传统的公共行政模式</b>	17
2.1  引言	17
2.2  早期的行政	18
2.3  19 世纪的改革	20
2.4  韦伯的官僚制理论	21
2.5  威尔逊与政治控制	24
2.6  泰勒与管理	26
2.7  传统模式存在的问题	32
2.8  结论	43
<b>第 3 章 新公共管理</b>	44
3.1  引言	44
3.2  管理的内涵	45
3.3  一般管理的职能	45
3.4  管理途径的产生	48
3.5  公共管理改革	50
3.6  管理主义方案	51
3.7  管理的理论基础	60
3.8  对管理主义的批评	62
3.9  结论	69

<b>第 4 章 政府的角色</b>	71
4.1 导言	71
4.2 公共部门的必要性	73
4.3 作为公共政策基础的市场失灵	77
4.4 政府的工具	81
4.5 政府干预的阶段	83
4.6 政府的基本职能	88
4.7 有关政府规模的争论	90
4.8 结论	93
<b>第 5 章 公共企业</b>	94
5.1 导言	94
5.2 建立公共企业的理由	95
5.3 公共企业的类型	97
5.4 关于民营化的争论	99
5.5 控制与责任	107
5.6 结论：公共企业的未来前景	110
<b>第 6 章 公共政策与政策分析</b>	113
6.1 导言	113
6.2 公共政策、行政与管理	114
6.3 政策分析	116
6.4 经验主义方法	117
6.5 政策过程模式	119
6.6 政策分析方法的局限性	122
6.7 对批评的反应	126
6.8 政治性公共政策	127
6.9 结论	130
<b>第 7 章 战略管理</b>	132
7.1 导言	132
7.2 私营部门的战略	133
7.3 公共部门的战略	136
7.4 战略计划模式	137
7.5 战略管理	141

7.6	批评	144
7.7	结论	147
<b>第8章</b>	<b>人事管理和绩效管理</b>	149
8.1	导言	149
8.2	人事管理	150
8.3	绩效管理	157
8.4	人事和绩效改革的一些问题	160
8.5	结论	163
<b>第9章</b>	<b>财政管理</b>	165
9.1	导言	165
9.2	政府预算	166
9.3	传统的财政管理	169
9.4	财政管理和公共部门改革	171
9.5	财政改革的批判	176
9.6	结论	180
<b>第10章</b>	<b>电子化政府</b>	182
10.1	导言	182
10.2	技术和行政管理	183
10.3	电子化政府的产生	185
10.4	电子化政府的发展阶段	188
10.5	技术变革对官僚制的影响	192
10.6	电子化政府和公共管理改革	195
10.7	电子化政府的问题	196
10.8	结论	200
<b>第11章</b>	<b>管理外部要素</b>	202
11.1	导言	202
11.2	对外部关注的需要	202
11.3	传统模式中的外部关系	204
11.4	作为一种管理职能的外部关系	206
11.5	利益集团	208
11.6	政策团体	209
11.7	依靠利益集团的理论问题	212

11.8 外部要素职能的问题	215
11.9 结论	216
<b>第 12 章 发展中国家的公共管理</b>	218
12.1 引言	218
12.2 发展中国家的传统模式	219
12.3 行政模式的问题	226
12.4 公共管理改革	227
12.5 管理主义模式的问题	231
12.6 结论	235
<b>第 13 章 责任</b>	236
13.1 引言	236
13.2 私营部门的责任	237
13.3 公共部门的责任	240
13.4 传统模式中的责任	243
13.5 责任的管理主义模式	246
13.6 管理主义模式中的责任问题	251
13.7 结论	254
<b>第 14 章 结论：公共管理的新模式</b>	256
14.1 引言	256
14.2 是典范变迁吗？	257
14.3 一场全球化运动	264
14.4 管理主义的思想基础	269
14.5 对民主的影响	271
14.6 是一项持续的运动吗？	275
14.7 作为一门学科的公共管理	277
14.8 结论	281
<b>参考文献</b>	283
<b>索引</b>	295



# Contents

<i>Preface</i>	vi
1 An Era of Change	1
2 The Traditional Model of Public Administration	17
3 Public Management	44
4 The Role of Government	71
5 Public Enterprise	94
6 Public Policy and Policy Analysis	113
7 Strategic Management	132
8 Personnel and Performance Management	149
9 Financial Management	165
10 E-government	182
11 Managing External Constituencies	202
12 Public Management in Developing Countries	218
13 Accountability	236
14 Conclusion: A New Paradigm for Public Management	256
<i>References</i>	283
<i>Index</i>	295

# An Era of Change

## Introduction

There has been a transformation in the management of the public sectors of advanced countries. The traditional model of public administration, which predominated for most of the twentieth century, has changed since the mid-1980s to a flexible, market-based form of public management. This is not simply a matter of reform or a minor change in management style, but a change in the role of government in society and the relationship between government and citizenry. Traditional public administration has been discredited theoretically and practically, and the adoption of new forms of public management means the emergence of a new paradigm in the public sector.

This new paradigm poses a direct challenge to several of what had previously been regarded as fundamental principles of traditional public administration. The first of these was that of *bureaucracy*, that governments should organize themselves according to the hierarchical, bureaucratic principles most clearly enunciated in the classic analysis of bureaucracy by the German sociologist Max Weber (Gerth and Mills, 1970). Although adopted by business and other institutions, these precepts were carried out far more diligently and for longer in the public sector. Secondly, there was *one-best-way* of working and procedures were set out in comprehensive manuals for administrators to follow. Strict adherence to these scientific management principles (Taylor, 1911) would provide the single best way of operating an organization. The third principle was *bureaucratic delivery*; once government involved itself in a policy area, it also became the direct provider of goods and services through the bureaucracy. Fourthly, there was general belief among administrators in the *politics/administration dichotomy*, that is, where political and administrative matters could be separated. The administration would be an instrument merely to carry out instructions, while any matters of policy or strategy were the preserve of the political leadership (Wilson, 1941). Fifthly, the motivation of the individual public servant was assumed to be that of *the public interest*; in that service to the public was provided selflessly. Sixthly, public administration was considered a special kind of activity and, therefore, required a *professional bureaucracy*, neutral, anonymous, employed for life, with

## 2 *Public Management and Administration*

the ability to serve any political master equally. Seventhly, the tasks involved in public service were indeed *administrative* in the dictionary sense, that is, following the instructions provided by others without personal responsibility for results.

These seven seeming verities have been challenged. First, bureaucracy is indeed powerful but does not work well in all circumstances and has some negative consequences. Secondly, trying to find the one-best-way is elusive and can lead to rigidity in operation. Flexible management systems pioneered by the private sector are being adopted by governments. Thirdly, delivery by bureaucracy is *not* the only way to provide public goods and services; governments can operate indirectly through subsidies, regulation or contracts, instead of always being the direct provider. Fourthly, political and administrative matters have in reality been intertwined for a long time, but the implications of this for management structures are only now being worked through. The public demands better mechanisms of accountability where once the bureaucracy operated separately from the society. Fifthly, while there may be public servants motivated by the public interest, it now seems incontrovertible that they are political players in their own right. They may also be assumed to work for their own advancement and that of their agency, instead of being pure and selfless. Sixthly, the case for unusual employment conditions in the public services is now much weaker, especially given the changes that have taken place in the private sector where jobs for life are rare. Finally, the tasks involved in the public sector are now considered more managerial, that is, requiring someone to take responsibility for the achievement of results, instead of being regarded as administrative and with public servants merely following instructions.

Economic problems in the 1980s meant governments reassessed their bureaucracies and demanded changes. As Caiden argued, 'All blamed the dead hand of bureaucracy, especially the poor performance of public bureaucracies and the daily annoyances of irksome restrictions, cumbersome red-tape, unpleasant officials, poor service and corrupt practices' (1991, p. 74). A radical change in organizational culture is occurring, but not without cost. The new approach has problems, not the least of them the disruption to standard operating procedures and poor morale. There seemed to be a long way to go before a new results-based management could emerge, although there was no going back to the traditional model of public administration.

All these points will be discussed at greater length later, but the main point is there has been total change in a profession that saw little change for around a hundred years. It is argued that the seven verities constitute a paradigm of their own – the traditional model of public administration – and that a paradigm shift has occurred due to the problems of the traditional model.

### **A new paradigm**

There is some debate over whether or not public management, particularly the new public management, is a new paradigm for public sector management.

There are those in favour of regarding the reforms as a new paradigm (Osborne and Gaebler, 1992; Barzelay, 1992; Behn, 1998, 2001; Borins, 1999; Mathiasen, 1999; Holmes and Shand, 1995; OECD, 1998). There are others who argue against the notion of paradigm change in public sector management (Hood, 1995, 1996; Lynn, 1997, 1998, 2001, 2001a; Pollitt, 1990, 1993; Gruening, 2001; Pollitt and Bouckaert, 2000). It is argued here that, either using the ordinary meaning of the word or the more recent usage associated with the work of Kuhn (1970), the term 'paradigm' is appropriate both for the traditional model of administration and the public management reforms most commonly linked together as the new public management.

Some argue that a paradigm is a large hurdle to jump, requiring agreement among all a discipline's practitioners – a more or less permanent way of looking at the world (Lynn, 1997; Gruening, 2001). This is a misreading of Kuhn (1970). Instead of a paradigm being a generally agreed framework of all the practitioners in a field, it is actually a contested idea. It does not require agreement among all practitioners; there are often competing paradigms in the same field.

The basic paradigms for public sector management are those following from Ostrom's (1989) argument that there are two opposing forms of organization: bureaucracy and markets. The key difference between the two forms of organization is that between choice and compulsion; allowing the market to find an agreed result or having it imposed by a bureaucratic hierarchy. At this most fundamental level, bureaucracy and markets are very different; they are based on very different ways of looking at the world. In short, the traditional model of administration is based on bureaucracy; public management is based on markets.

To Behn, the traditional model of administration qualifies as a paradigm; as he continues, 'certainly, those who support traditional public administration would argue that they have a "discipline", complete with "theories, laws, and generalisations", that focus their research' (Behn, 2001, p. 231). A paradigm does not mean one set of views that everyone must agree on, rather views that exist for a time and are revealed in the discipline's practices. The traditional model of administration, derived from Weber, Wilson and Taylor, does fit this in the sense of there being, at a given time, a corpus of knowledge, textbooks and ways of approaching the trade. In a paradigmatic sense it derives from the theory of bureaucracy.

The public management paradigm has the very different underlying theoretical bases of economics and private management. As an OECD paper argues, 'this new management paradigm emphasises results in terms of "value for money", to be achieved through management by objectives, the use of markets and market-type mechanisms, competition and choice, and devolution to staff through a better matching of authority, responsibility and accountability' (1998, p. 13).

However, it is not the case that at one point in time everyone in the discipline decided that the traditional public administration paradigm had been superseded; it is more the case that paradigms change gradually. The decline of one