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Abstract

The traditional paradigm is affected by the early literature of classical organization and management theory. Hence, reactive activity and systematic models of delivery are the most issues that HR focuses on. Traditional HR often tacitly focuses on closed systems that reduce group and organizational phenomena to individual behavior and, consequently, ignore the impact on the work environment. However, this paper searches the role of human resource management in competing public sector paradigms of New Public Management and New Public Service to answer the following questions: Are there differences in how human resource department should function under these two paradigms? If so, what are they? It is found that the shift of the role of public human resource is associated with the shift from traditional or Old Public Administration to the New Public Management. The New Public Management (NPM) is a result of the adaptation of the evolution of, not just administrative structures, but also managerial capacities and financial management. The New Public Service (NPS) is an approach that depends on the assumption that the relationship between the government and citizens has to be considered broadly by treating citizens as a citizen, not a customer. HR under this approach will face challenges in creating a new culture; a participatory and collaborative culture, fits exactly within the NPS assumptions.
1. Introduction

This paper aims to examine the role of human resource management in competing public sector paradigms of New Public Management and New Public Service. Explicitly, this paper tries to identify the differences in how human resource department should function under these two paradigms. In doing so, the concept and the role of human resource management (HRM) is discussed briefly throughout providing a brief decision about the evolution of the HRM theory and practice. Then, the evolution of HRM in public administration will be briefly traced to reveal the concept that HRM is affected by the evolution of public administration in terms of managerial approach and to say how HRM is a tool that helps public organizations to transition from Old Public Administration to the New Public Management (NPM) and the New Public Service (NPS) paradigms. Accordingly, how human resource departments should function under these two paradigms is also discussed.

1.1 The Concept and the Role of Human Resource Management (HRM):

Shafritz, Ott, & Jang (2011) see theory of human resource as influenced by and associated with the evolution of organization theory in term of focusing on employees. So, in their view, human resource borrows principles from organizational behavior theories; organizations exist to serve human needs and the relationship between organizations and people are intertwined. When organizations need people, ideas and talent to work and perform effectively, those people need both salaries and opportunities to develop. Thus, when the connection between job requirements and individual education and experience is solid, the expectation of higher productivity will be also increase (Latham,2007). Roughly put, behavioral scientists believe that organizational creativity is driven by employee growth and, accordingly, try to answer questions such as how organizations should enable or encourage employees to grow. In simple words, this is the function or practice of human resource management.

The evolution of human resources as a practice and theory can be seen in the alteration in definitions of human resources as a developing tool. It is defined by Nadler (1970) as “a series of organized activities conducted within a specific time and designed to produce behavioral change” (p.3). It could be noticed that the previous definition focuses on individuals and activity and could be seen as a traditional definition reflects the HR practices on that era, the seventies. However, this concept has been expanded to include not only individual development but also organization. McLagan & Suhadolink (1989) insist that HR mainly focuses on employees training, organization development as well as career development. Swanson & Holton (2001) go as far as to consider HR as a process when they define HR function as “a process for developing and unleashing human expertise through organization development and personnel training and development for the purpose of improving performance” (p.4). McLean and McLean (2001) see the function of HR as going beyond the organization, and they think HR
exists to develop employees’ work-based knowledge, work capability, satisfaction and productivity for either personal or group benefit, whether for an organization, community, or nation.

The last definition reflects the progress of human resource theory and practice whereby it is considered that the relationship between individuals and internal and external environments is intertwined and both are affected by each other. Contemporary consideration regarding HR is human capital, which is also associated with McLean and McLean’s definition. Nafukho, Hairston & Brooks’s (2004) view human capital as “[an]investment in people [that] is the change manifested at the individual level in the form of improved performance, and at the organizational level in the form of improved productivity and profitability or at societal level in the form of returns that benefit the entire society” (p.585).

It has to be said that the role of HR goes farther than developing and training employees. Timone and Goodhue (1995) see HR as an integrated use of systems, policies and managerial practices to recruit, maintain and develop employees to meet desired organizational goals. They also emphasize that the best description of the role of HR within organizations is as a scattergram due to the huge variations by organizations, global geography, and what CEO prefer HR to do. However, contemporary HR practices could be divided into four categories (Long, 2009): designing developmental programs that challenge work experiences to develop both individuals and other organization; structuring and measuring the impact of HR practices; recruiting, promoting, retaining and disciplining; managing performance in terms of designing performance-based measurements and develop reward systems. Others scholars go on to classify these practices as strategic and technical. Strategic HR practices refers to the process of developing employees to meet their organizations’ needs while technical HR practices are used for traditional personnel management practices such as recruitment selection and training (Huselid, Jackson & Schuler, 1997).

Huselid and his colleagues turn our attention to the fact that the name of human resources has changed according to its evolution and expansion of its accountabilities and practices. Silva (1997) agrees with Huselid and his colleagues in the fact that the role of HR has changed over the last hundred years. Silva states that HR function was often marginalized in terms of its significance in management practices and hierarchy. It has evolved from solving employees’ problems and focusing on employee welfare to managing people in a way so as to achieve organizational effectiveness and contribute to organizational objectives.

According to United States Government Accountability Office (GAO) (2011), the role of HR within the organization has changed gradually according to the shift concerning management and organization theory. Over the past decades, Human Resource theories have had different paradigms: the traditional paradigm, the competency paradigm, and the strategic
paradigm. While the traditional paradigm reflects classical personnel function, the competency paradigm is oriented toward organization and border activities. The third paradigm, the strategic, emphasizes ways to expand its role to be a partner in contributing to the achievement of the organization’s strategies.

Boydell & Leary (1996), state that the traditional paradigm is affected by the early literature of classical organization and management theory. Hence, reactive activity and systematic models of delivery are the most issues that HR focuses on. Mayhofer (2004) also agrees with Boydell & Leary and adds that traditional HR often tacitly focuses on closed systems that inherent from Max Weber thoughts and also considers individuals as a primary concern. He contends they tend to reduce group and organizational phenomena to individual behavior and, consequently, ignore the impact on the work environment. It has been considered that organization theory was developed simultaneously with the industrial revolution. As such, they tend to punish unfavorable behavior and reward the ones that lead to increased performance relying on Tayloristic principles. However, the new models of HR have adopted the assumptions of human revolution. Accordingly, HR professionals realize people are concerned with their relationships with others and influenced by what others do or say; fairness and justice are main concerns that employees focus on, whether throughout the Organizational process or the distribution of income and rewards. Furthermore, organizations have been influenced by these concerns and influence other organizations as well as society, and these assumptions affect HR policies and functions (Pfeffer, 2007).

Beginning in the late of 1700s, the industrial revolution was the leader in forcing the development of large factories with many workers. The main concern in that time was how to increase productivity and maximize efficiency. This approach was supported by Tailor’s framework (Daft, 2004); however, according to Vosburgh & Resorts (2007), Human Resources did not exist before the 1900s, and the responsibility of managing people was allocated to the owner of the business or the manager of the small organization. However, if the owner has to manage and hire the workers, how were public servants hired during this era?

2. Human Resource Management and Public Administration:

Particularly in public service, the evolution of HR is divided into three broad periods: the era of the “Gentleman”, the era of Spoils and the era of Merit. Rosenbloom, Kravchuk & Clerkin (2009) state that the era of the Gentleman began in 1789 and ended with the inauguration of President Jackson in 1829. This era was mostly characterized by the criterion of fitness of character. This included having high prestige in the community, possessing high integrity, coming from the upper class, and demonstrating political loyalty; technical qualifications did not matter since it was thought a leader could learn these in office. Later, Jefferson forbade public servants from participating in elections and stated that they have to be
politically neutral. According to Rosenbloom and his colleagues, the federal service during that period was honest and efficient.

In 1829, Jackson declared that federal personnel had to be reformed (Rosenbloom, 2010). He attributed this decision to the fact that the long tenure of federal administrators made them far from being responsive to public interest and affected the performance of government in addition to the upper class bias. Therefore, he established a maximum of four years in office for federal administrators, allowing the new president to distribute the “spoils of victory”. Accordingly, there was an undeniable decline in administrative performance, ethics and efficiency, and focus on political competition experienced the largest deficit in that system. The Spoils system enabled the federal administration to be more representative of the different social classes (Rosenbloom, Kravchuk & Clerkin, 2009). Rosenbloom (2010) turns our attention to the fact that public personnel administration in 1789 to 1829 was influenced highly by the ideology of the dominant political party, and this ideology defined how public employees had to be.

In the 1860s, 1870s and reform in the 1880s, commitment to a “merit” system started to develop at the federal level. Merit system means selecting public servants based on a competitive examination. The merit system was adopted to reform the “spoils system” since the new system relies on open competitive examination in selecting efficient competent and preventing patronage appointments enhancing federal performance. Moreover, it is stated that public administrators have to be politically neutral; their competence and authority emerges from their professional and technical competencies. In terms of tenure in office, in the 1890s, public employees became more protected from dismissals from the federal service. More importantly, in 1883, the Civil Service Commission (CSC) was established to police public personnel administration by rule making and investigative authority (Rosenbloom, Kravchuk & Clerkin, 2009).

By 1920, federal personnel officers were less passionate about patronage and turned their energy to achieving efficiency. Before 1931, the CSC was such a micromanaging agency that it initiated a program to centralize personnel function under its authority. Consequently, the CSC was responsible for developing job classifications, efficiency evaluations, and retirement administration. This shift lead, however, to the view of the CSC as a driving tool of ineffective personnel management since it issued restrictive rules that did not match with agency’s needs. As a result, in 1949, the Classification Act was issued to enable agencies to be responsible for public personnel function. In that sense, the CSC shifted its focusing from policing to developing broad policies for improvement of federal personnel administration (Rosenbloom, Kravchuk & Clerkin, 2009).
However, by 1978, the Civil Service Reform Act was hailed as making the federal government more efficient and effective. The reformer believed that merit is not enough in the “Merit system” because there is insufficient motivation to reward excellent performance and lack of penalties to punish unsatisfactory work. The reform was espoused with politicking throughout employee unions as well as civil rights and minority interests groups. The main achievement of this reform was the separation of several political, legal and managerial aspects. Accordingly, several agencies were established: the Merit System protection Board (MSPB) to ensure the personnel laws and regulation are followed; the Federal Labor Relations Authority (FLRA) to make rules to limit unfair labor relations practices; the Equal Employment Opportunity commission (EEOC) to ensure the Equal Employment Opportunity Act is implemented successfully since many agencies, from managerial perspectives, see this act as conflicting with a merit principle. The reform allocated the managerial function of CSC to an office of personnel management that is responsible for testing, training, operating and retirement, which necessitated implementing some new management tools such as a performance appraisal systems and merit pay systems. These days, the OPM has a new function as a policy advisor for the president of HRM initiatives and responsibility for public employees’ health and retirement benefits (Rosenbloom, Kravchuk & Clerkin, 2009).

Rosenbloom, Kravchuk & Clerkin point out federal personnel administration is viewed as a disaster area since it is centralized, overregulated and does not meet the federal agencies’ needs. In 1993, the department of agriculture called for delegation and freeing agencies from OPM and other controls; decentralization; ownership in which each agency will have its own HRM system; adaptation of the HRM system to the organizational and cultural, transformation of personnel office from paperwork (Webrian principle) to expert advisers. The Homeland Security Act reform in 2002 provided more flexibility to the federal personnel administration to develop HRM to systems that are tailored to a particular need of homeland defense. Under that shadow, each agency is expected to appoint a chief human capital officer to supervise HRM and elevate the importance of HRM to be main factor in the strategic planning and general managerial decisions in each agency.

Rosenbloom, Kravchuk & Clerkin elaborate on the evolution of HR in federal agencies, which is associated with the evolution of public administration. Explicitly, the shift of the role of public human resource is associated with the shift from traditional or Old Public Administration to the New Public Management. Ingraham & Rubaii-Barrett (2007) state that public HRM was viewed as “civil service” and “personnel” rather than as a heart management function. Particularly, its function was limited to technical concerns such as “…payrolls, arcane rules and procedures, and specifying policies and regulations for the managers in the organization – separate from management and separate from long term strategic decision making”(p.2). They state that public HR aims to maximize the value of efficiency, effectiveness
and economy throughout their traditional practices, recruitment, selection, placement, pay, and training. They are also responsible for classifying positions and designing jobs as well as linking them with the rate of pay. This process is mostly influenced by Classical Theory in terms of dividing jobs and specifying skills and responsibilities. Even though they tended to achieve clarity of job design and position classification, problems could be generated since the job is designed without regard to the employee holding it (Ricucci, 2006).

Traditionally, public personnel management is associated with workplace control and ensuring organizational adherence to policy on particular areas such as recruitment, performance appraisal and training (Bach, 2000). According to The Association of Professional Executives of the Public Service, APEX (2001), there are many reasons necessitating the importance of the reform of human resources. Further, it has recently realized that our human resources system no longer works and efficiency and flexibility are collided due to the strict traditional principles. The public service faces undeniable challenges since it has to function in a rapidly increasingly complex world. Its operations are affected not only by internal policies and procedures, but it is also influenced by a variety of external pressures that determine how it should deliver services.

3. Human Resource Management and New Public Management:

According to United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs report (2005), public organizations have been under pressure to respond to citizens’ and complex global demands. They add that such responses to these challenges have been taken as a shift of managerial approach and transformation or reforms of public administration areas. The report clarifies that responsiveness of civil servants is associated with what is often termed “professionalism”, which is assigned under the New Public Management (NPM) approach. The New Public Management is a result of the adaptation of the evolution of, not just administrative structures, but also managerial capacities and financial management in addition to technological capability to new demands. Put roughly, in their view, “it is a process of re-adjustment of State institutions and public management to the need for greater cost-effectiveness, quality, simplicity and participation in government. The need to enhance efficiency in the public sector and to cut public costs”(p.19)

Hood (1991) lists seven elements of the NPM model: tendency to increase the independence of professional public sector managers; a focus on measuring performance dependent upon developing achievable and measurable goals, objectives and indicators; focusing on outputs rather than the processes involved; devolution of the public sector into agencies that relate to each other in the sense of a user-pays principle; tendency towards increased competition with public agencies through privatization and contracting; adoption of new management techniques and practices in addition to increasing management’s ability in
terms of hiring, firing and rewarding public employees; and stresses on cost-cutting and doing more with less as a main goal.

Accordingly, in terms of managing people and the function of public personnel management, it is seen that the NPM is an essential framework that goes against the traditional procedures of civil services. In the setting of traditional public administration, Brown (2004) states that the employment system was extremely centralized since the hiring decisions, setting of personnel rules, and training were issued from central agencies. Employment in the public sector, in his view, was based on security of tenure, and the operation of an internal labor market was the main factor contributing to frame it. Additionally, recruitment was limited to the promotion of public employees from lower ranks to higher-level positions, and this process was restricted to internal public sector applicants. As seen, this classical approach could be seen as jobs designed for specific task that were exceedingly routinized, and classical payment that was based only on the job position.

Conversely, Thompson & Miller (2003) point out that the New Public Management raises the adoption of the organizational designs and managerial practices that reflect business as decentralized, smaller organizations, structured depending on standard value-creating processes, competencies, implementing high-performance HRM practices, adapting to modern information technology, “balanced responsibility budgeting and control systems, and loose alliance of networks” (p.334). According to Denhardt & Denhardt (2011), changes in human resource management (HRM) tend to adopt the wider trend to manage the public sector. In that sense, within NPM, most of the changes to HRM appear focus on reward structures, performance related/merit pay, performance contracts, appraisal and personnel deregulation. As Hood identifies many facets of the tendency towards the NPM approach, privatization is the main ramification of this tendency in the American public sector (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2011). To be more specific, the diversity of forms of privatization, contracting, vouchering and shedding services all operate by depending on markets to deliver desired services to customers (Wise, 2002). Wise points out that public manager are launching managed competition as well as contracting competitively with private organizations to enhance efficiency and effectiveness of service delivery. To satisfy public needs, customer choice is considered and public/private partnerships are created.

This demands that governments develop the competence to manage contractual relationships as well as public/private partnerships. More importantly, government is responsible for supervision of those privatized enterprises, and this fact necessitates public officials and employees to be trained in negotiation and conflict resolution solving, communication, and interaction. Also, they have to be trained in effective regulation and to know how private organizations operate (Rondinelli & Berry, 1998). Simply, it requires a different function of government, and it demands different skills, more brain cells, and fewer
muscle cells (Savas, 2000). O’Flynn (2007) pays attention to the fact that public leaders have to be able to initiate crucial actions within their own organizations and among stakeholders who have different interests. He adds that this means that traditional models of leadership could be helpful in enhancing efficiency and performance but, unfortunately, are not adequate to deal with boundary-spanning public problems in context. Accordingly, the NPM demands leaders to possess new skills, as he lists: “tolerance for ambiguity and uncertainty; recognition of omniscience (i.e. that they can never have full knowledge); maintenance of personal perspective and self-knowledge; critical reflection; and distributed leadership (i.e. within and outside the immediate organization)” (p.362). These skills have to be considered mainly in recruiting, selecting and promoting public employees.

Recruitment, selection and promotion are traditional personnel functions, but they have also been influenced by the NPM approach. Explicitly, the requirement of selecting candidates is becoming more associated with classical principles that raise the importance of knowledge, specialties, and skills. According to Rosenbloom, Kravchuk & Clerkin (2009), it is not merit and quality that affect the decision of HR but also eligibility and whether s/he is representative of a minority. Candidates have to pass several types of examinations such as performance examinations, oral and written examinations, and assessment centers that duplicate performance examinations. These traditional functions cause HR to suffer from rigid procedures, strict rules, and conflicting principles. Therefore, the NPM objects, not only to this rigidity, but also to the delay caused by those strict structures. As a result, HR adopts two approaches to enhance flexibility: direct hiring that enables public agencies to hire any qualified applicants, and categorical ranking that permits agencies to group eligible candidates according to their qualification level and selection begins with the top ranked.

It has to be said that, selection is moved from traditional processes to adopt new methods. Even though selection processes in the public sector still depends on the use of interviews, application forms or letters, managers adopt different selection methods prior to making a hiring decision such as work sample tests and psychometric test, and they prefer online testing (Cunningham & Hyman, 1999; Piotrowski & Armstrong, 2006). Cunningham & Hyman (1999) also emphasize the importance of the concept of in-tray exercises, in which candidates are asked to work their way through realistic scenarios that they might face in real life in the public sector.

The NPM approach demands more flexibility in employment and performance measurement for both managers and labor, and quantification of the results that they accomplish (Davis, 1997). Therefore, it demands evolution in public personnel management. Ricucci (2006) points out that the NPM requires human resources systems that are capable of achieving performance outcomes that are aligned with the strategic goals of the public sector organization. Under that shadow, the public HR has been responsible for: informing employees of what is expected of them, setting clear and quantitative goals with help from the supervisors;
identifying poor performance and planning to improve it; and recognizing and rewarding good performance. More importantly, performance should be appraised on the basis of a result – orientation philosophy that could be expressed in terms of outputs to be delivered in a given timescale.

Performance appraisals have attracted more attention since the 1970s as a response to the pressure for more efficiency and effectiveness (Rosenbloom, Kravchuk & Clerkin, 2009). Performance appraisals were developed to evaluate only individual performance. HR faces a dilemma: the importance of evaluating employees’ performance and the problems of subjectivity that employees usually complain about on one hand, and how to evaluate employees’ performance if there are no measurable objectives on the other hand. To avoid these problems, the performance appraisals become a combination of self-appraisal, peer rating, customer-appraisal and supervisor rating. Performance appraisals traditionally were only concerned about productivity, but by the time and the emergence of the NPM, concerns had expanded to include employee traits, such as ethical and skills and customer satisfaction (Roberts, 2003). Because the NPM is mostly concerned about customers, they usually conduct customer satisfaction surveys. Further, many performance appraisals can be more objective when they are conducted by supervisors, peers, and customers, which is called 360 degree evaluation (Rosenbloom, Kravchuk & Clerkin, 2009). There is a “balanced scores” instrument used to measure performance on a variety of factors with no ranking of relative importance (Jennings Jr, 2010).

Behn (2003) stresses the fact that the NPM focuses on performance measurement as a main part of their overall management strategy, and public managers can use performance measures to achieve different purposes. Explicitly, they implement performance measurement to “...evaluate, control, budget, motivate, promote, celebrate, learn, and improve” (p.586). He states that this complexity of purposes, unfortunately, leads to the fact that no single performance measure can be appropriate in terms of all the eight purposes. Consequently, public managers have to expand their knowledge about how to use appropriate performance measurements and how to extract information that could benefit other purposes.

Ingraham & Rubaii-Barrett (2007) see public human resource management as inhibited from doing its expected function due, not just to the bureaucratic system, but also to structural and resource constraints. Theses constraints limit the capability of most public agencies to not only recruit the necessary people but also to provide appropriate motivation and rewards. They view standardized compensation systems as an obstacle that does not distinguish between rewarding excellent performance and warning about poor performance. Selden and Jacobson (2001) also emphasize the linkage between limited resource availability and inability
to provide meaningful rewards. Additionally, because discretionary financial incentives are also constrained, rewarding employees for extra performance is also limited.

Perry (2010) states that solidity of wages in the public sector makes it even harder to attract and retain highly-skilled workers. Conversely, broadening wage inequalities in the private sector motivates highly skilled workers to prefer working in the private sector more than the public sector. In his view, even though macro-wage structures are significant for the public sector’s capacity to magnetize and retain a qualified workforce, “the effects of macro-structures, however, are poorly understood and have had little or no influence on public policy, especially the dispersion and structure of government wages” (p. 29).

The NPM raises the importance of adopting new strategies to attract new talents and maintain qualified employees. In doing so, compensation has to be based on internal equity, external equity and individual equity. While internal equity is the process of linking jobs to its match position on the hierarchical system based on specific qualifications, skills and functions, external equity is market competitiveness in which the comparison of an organization's compensation (wage and benefit) is based on market and demands the conducting of a market survey to determine the compensations and pay levels and creating a competitive pay structure. Individual equity means employees have to have a compensation system recognizing and rewarding performance (Waters & Cox, 2011).

Leavitt & Morris (2012) point out that in the late 1990s, most of the public agencies across the country were implementing new pay concepts such as focusing on external pay levels. They state that market–based pay is considered a huge shift from traditional government concentration on only internal equity. Selden (2009) states that this evolution in public compensation provides flexibility of premium pay that enables agencies to compensate employees for their extraordinary duty seen in emergencies and risky situations. However, Leavitt & Morris turn our attention to the fact that even though market-based pay provides more flexibility to adjust salaries to retain qualified employees, it is hard to implement and balance internal equity as well as external equity effectively.

In terms of individual equity, pay-for-performance is considered as a best way to reward public employees for their contributions, and it is a way to address the concept of distributive justice. Selden (2009) points out that pay-for-performance is a shift from the traditional approach that tended to be hierarchal, hiring people at the bottom of the organization then promoting them throughout well-defined job ladders without regard for linking performance to rewards. More importantly, pay- for- performance systems have been described as main and effective methods of motivating and enhancing employee productivity (Mulvaney, McKinney & Grodsky, 2012). Baker (1996) stresses that the role of HRM in the public sector that aims to generate the commitment of employees by increasing job satisfaction. In doing so,
more flexibility in pay systems is implemented as a reward for the skill levels and performance in addition to the flexibility over hours of work. Ismail and others (2011) study performance-based pay as a motivational tool for achieving and increasing organizational performance. They find that the performance-based pay is significantly correlated with job satisfaction. The study reveals the role of justice as a practical mediating between performances based pays and job satisfaction.

Moreover, skill-based pay is seen as an incentive to motivate public employees to learn new skills to be competent with an exceedingly technological public workplace. In skill-based pay systems, employees receive compensation according to which skills they possess and to the range and depth of these skills (Ledford, 1989). In that sense, they will be paid for the skills that are required, and they are able to use it for the job they are performing (Shareef, 1998). Shareef turns our attention to the fact that skill-based pay is also an essential shift from classical job-based pay plans and could be linked to pay-for-performance.

On the other hand Quality of Work Life (QWL) enacted in 1993 and enable eligible employees to enjoy flexible work schedules, telecommuting, job sharing, health and fitness program is a witness of the evolution of public human resource. That means public HR does not ignore the impact of external environments on the employees and their productivity and they, consequently, consider family-friendly policies as a good motivation. So, in that sense, public HR addresses several issues at one time; that policy enhances productivity, motivates employees, respects family responsibilities, and strengthens the relationships between workers and the society (Rosenbloom, Kravchuk & Clerkin, 2009).

On the other hand, in the early 1980s, many American scholars raised the importance of benefiting from the experience of other successful systems such as the Japanese system of management. As a result, many new systems have been adopted to oppose the traditional tenure system. Many states such as Georgia and Florida as well as federal agencies such as the Department of Homeland Security, have adopted of at-will employment as an alternative to traditional, rigid job systems (Kellough & Nigro, 2006; Rosenbloom, Kravchuk & Clerkin, 2009). Klinger & Lynn (1997) state that The NPM approach tends to reduce costs as well as increase flexibility by meeting staffing requirement at minimal levels and hiring temporary, part-time employees. In that sense, these positions will reduce costs and increase flexibility since they offer lower salaries and benefits, and employees can be hired and fired with no reference. In terms of skills, they are minimized by work simplifying and job redesigning. Klinger (1996) emphasizes a significant issue that public managers tend to contract or leased employees for jobs that need high skills to save money and maintain flexibility. Perry (2010), however, points out those at-will employment
systems have been largely negative and criticized as a quick and simplistic panacea that yields to chaos.

Silva (1997) points out that even though NPM calls for employee development, particularly in some public sectors, there are many problems facing human resource management in providing public employees with good training programs. She adds that since there is a lack of courses, information/knowledge relating to labor, training materials, skilled trainers and financial constrains, senior staff has to train new recruits and to develop themselves. Therefore, HR has to be wise and investigate where the problem is hidden and train staff with special skills to be trainers and train incoming employees.

As discussed previously, the NPM aims to reduce taxes, prevent deficiencies, and mimic economic growth in the private sector. That leads to the adoption of reduction-in-force (RIFs) in the public sector. In that sense, the least productive employees and services are cut, and some functions are terminated to private organizations. It has to be said that, in their view, NPM tends to cut managers and supervisors as a way to empower employees. In doing so, HR implements many strategies and processes such as offering buy outs, early retirement and job sharing (Rosenbloom, Kravchuk & Clerkin, 2009).

On the other hand, Sakalas & Vienazindiene (2010) state that many scholars think the evolution of public administration and the emergence of NPM ideas are directly linked with HR role in public organizations. HR role is very important to ensure successful transition from classical public administration to the NPM approach. In this context, promoting the role of HR in public organizations to play a strategic function is crucial. Ingraham & Rubaii- Barret (2007) state that a major shift in the role of HRM will be seen as a strategic tool instead of an operational task. In their view, this necessitates a considerable shift from the traditional perspective of the early years of HRM as “personnel”, seen as an operational role with its assumption of a strong need to maintain secure and stable workforce and directing, and controlling employees to a strategic role. The strategic role could be seen in the role of strategic human resource management (SHRM). Ingraham & Rubaii- Barret (2007) state that SHRM focuses on serious analysis of the jobs, employees, talents, as well as expertise necessary for carrying out significant components of the agencies’ mission and selecting those with the required skills and expertise.

As mentioned before, the NPM approach is a way to transition the role of human resources from traditional personnel to human resources management. Tshikwatamba (2003) elaborates on this concept when he emphasizes the differences between personnel management and human resources. He states that personnel administration deals with employees as employees, but HRM considers them as human beings and treats them as a resource that could be invested in, and its failures or success are determined by its ability to retain, motivate, and develop...
employees. As previously seen, the NPM emphasizes the role of leadership in dealing with new and complex issues successfully. They also play a major role in the success or failure of the HRM in public sectors. However, the following table demonstrates the differences between the role of personnel administration and human resource management and, more importantly, it can be seen that the HRM function is associated with the principles of the NPM.

**Table 1: Difference between Personnel Management and HRM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel Administration</th>
<th>Human Resource Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employees are considered as employees</td>
<td>they are regarded as a “resource”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees are expected to apply rules and obey directions and prescripts</td>
<td>Employees’ differences are considered as resourceful to the public sector. It is expected that employees will provide professional advices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Managers have no responsibility for human resource management</td>
<td>They support and cooperate with HR to manage and develop the employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional role</td>
<td>Strategic role</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

 Adopted with some adjustment from Tshikwatamba (2003,p.8)

4. **Human Resource Management and New Public Service:**

Robert Denhardt, as many researchers, does not agree with The NPM approach and criticize what is written in the public administration literature regarding managerial approaches. More importantly, Denhardt’s (2000; 2008; 2011) contribution is considered important since he provides a series of publications about the New public Service (NPS) as a new public administration approach. Denhardt & Denhardt (2000, 2011) state that the NPS approach depends on the assumption that the relationship between the government and citizens has to be considered broadly by treating citizens as a citizen, not a customer. They believe that it is difficult to decide who the customer is in the public sector since the government does not serve only the immediate customers but goes beyond that to serve waiting customers who are not in need in contemporary time but will need the service in the future. They believe that the service has to be fairly delivered to all citizens, either to those who express their demands or others. The New Public Service emphasizes the role of deliberation to promote the quality of public service that fit into public interest.

While the NPM is limited to the individual interests, the NPS focuses on the public interest and raises the importance of how to define the public interests. Denhardt & Denhardt (2011) stress building collective and shared values is the best way to achieve agreement in public interest; therefore, public administrators have to be competent in facilitating discussion, dialogue, and building trust between citizens on one hand and between citizens and administrators on the other. They have to possess the abilities to analyze solutions that are
associated not just with collective opinions, but also with norms of justice and fairness. Denhardt & Denhardt go farther by suggesting that the enhancement of the role of public managers be more strategic. They advise them to think strategically by developing strategic plans that link shared vision with strategies. After a shared vision is determined, demands should be shifted to setting goals and specifying responsibilities, actions and strategies to achieve that vision. Denhardt & Denhardt stress the importance of collaborating with all parties as one to develop shared vision and program implementation. This idea demands renewing the sense of civic responsibility and developing civic leaders.

The NPS approach adopts the concept “Serve, rather than steer” to develop its assumption that the function of public administration has to be more than rowing or implementing public policy, or steering public services provided by a third party, rather, it has to serve citizens. Denhardt & Denhardt go on to say that our world is complex and needs governments that are able to go beyond directing or establishing rules and/or incentives; it needs governments that are capable of strengthening relationships with the citizen and facilitation of collaboration between elected officials and public managers and citizens.

It has to be said that the NPS deals with people in a different manner. Explicitly, while the classical approach deals with them as employees that need strict rules to control them, the NPM considers them as human beings who are motivated by monetary incentives, rewards, and are managed differently. The NPS values people and treating humans with dignity, trust, respect for affiliation and concern for others are the main core elements for the NPS approach. In this sense, employees will be more motivated and successful if there is more respect, participation and collaboration.

There is no doubt that both the NPM and NPS aim to enhance efficiency and productivity by adopting performance measurement and reengineering. However, the NPS embraces the concept of engagement, and it is believed that the idea of rationality that is embraced by the NPM to control employees’ behavior is far from enhancing engagement. In terms of respect, according to Denhardt & Denhardt, public administrators have to treat citizens with respect, and they also have to be treated respectfully by their co-workers and managers. More importantly, in addition to facilitating more opportunities for participation in decision making and setting goals, working within teams serves as a tool to motivate employees; they go as far as to say that public administrators are extremely motivated when they feel they are making a difference and making others happy.

Denhardt & Denhardt state that entrepreneurship adopted by the NPM approach is limited to maximizing productivity, enhancing customers’ satisfaction, and increasing the sense of ownership. However, in the NPS approach, citizens own the government and, consequently,
administrators, or servants work to serve citizens and protect public resources. Public administrators also have to serve as facilitators of public dialogue and to be street-level leaders.

In terms of citizen participation as one of main values of the NPS approach, the HRM has to figure out how to improve the process of public participation. King, Feltey & Susel (1998) stress the importance of cultivating changes in administrative structures, systems, and administrative practices to facilitate citizen participation and build citizen trust. They state that the starting point to adopt successful processes is when administrators seriously think how they can have high levels of participation in their communities. Accordingly, if administrators tend to change their practices to work with citizens as partners, they will make undeniable change in the way that is commonly practiced and inhibits effective participation.

Further, NPS necessitates that public managers be collaborative and empower and support their subordinates to accomplish organizational goals and visions. This demands new skills that public administrators have to possess such as the ability to manage meetings and conflicts, how to be connected to other sources of support and assistance, and to facilitate engaging citizens and the community in the process. Denhardt & Denhardt turn our attention to the fact that public administration needs leaders more than managers-leaders who are able to inspire their followers and make them leaders too. More importantly, leadership, engagement, and working in teams are a crucial combination that generates the concept of shared leadership. Pearce & Conger (2003) point out that shared leadership is defined as an interactive process of influence and impact amongst individuals working in groups to generate the concept that each one lead another to achieve group goals and organizational desire. Kocolowski (2010) states that the main components of shared leadership are dynamic, collaborative process, distributed influence among teams, decentralized interaction, open communications, collective task completion, and social interaction.

In that sense, HRM has to consider how to implement shared leadership among employees in a public organization. They have to facilitate implementing the concept of shared leadership and be concerned with the individual and organizational factors that enable and facilitate this adaptation. Pearce & Conger (2003) emphasize the importance of individual influence and having particular characteristics and traits that generate shared leadership, and they stress that not everybody is capable of sharing leadership mutually. Sally (2002) stresses the importance of organizational factors in exerting a direct impact in the success or failure of the implementation of shared leadership. Sally states that to implement shared leadership, those co-leaders must have the same work schedules and none of them can be promoted because he/she could rule or lead alone. Therefore, as O’Tool (2002) highlights, co-leaders or managers have to be selected collectively to work efficiently as a team.

HR under this approach will face challenges in creating a new culture. A participatory and collaborative culture, as Denhardt & Denhardt (2011) emphasize, fits exactly within the NPS
assumptions. HR has to issue policies that enable employees to contribute meaningfully and to participate in setting goals and shaping their work. Policies that ensure open communications and encourage team work are also needed. The NPS demands that employees and managers have different skills with which to generate different tendencies in training programs and job requirements. Public administrators have to develop their skills in communication, group processes, and critical thinking that are important in terms of interacting with citizens. They have to possess the ability of deliberation and dialogue as well as conflict resolution. Also, these skills are not limited to managers but are extended to frontline employees.

Moreover, front-line employees as well as managers have contact with citizens from different cultures, whether in public meetings or via delivery of services; therefore, public administrators must be culturally competent as well. Satterwhite & Teng (2007) define cultural competency as “having the knowledge, skills, and values to work effectively with diverse populations and to adapt institutional policies and professional practices to meet the unique needs of client populations.” (p. 2). Thus, recruiting, selecting and promoting will be influenced by the demands of the NPS and the required skills and abilities as its main components.

Accordingly, HRM has to consider how to redesign jobs to associate with the New Public Service demands and how to recruit desired public servants who possess particular aspects. The process of selection could be the same as in the NPM in adopting online tests in addition to interviews and applications, but the scenarios and the requirements are different. Candidates have to have the ability to be leaders and the skills to work within groups. Candidates for front-line and manager positions have to be culturally competent and have communication skills and analytical skills. Moreover, candidates for managers’ positions have to have the ability to think strategically and act democratically.

The idea of citizen engagement demands transparency, sharing of information and utilizing internet and social media., HR has to facilitate and regulate these activities, online forums, and social media to connect citizens with public administrators. The NPS values also could influence performance measurement because the NPS goes beyond measuring productivity and customer’s satisfaction. Denhardt & Denhardt (2011) emphasize that performance measurement builds upon the concept that the citizen is a partner in delivering the service and share responsibility with administrators in building community and solving problems. Therefore, a citizen’s opinion is important and could be obtained through electronic, telephone-based, or written surveys and focus groups. Yet, public administrators’ performance is complicated since the quality of the service is determined by many elements such as (Denhardt & Denhardt,2011, p. 62): convenience that measures the degree of accessibility; personnel attention that measures the degree of sharing
information with citizens and ability to work together to achieve shared goals; fairness, that measures how much citizens believe that the service is provided equally; fiscal responsibility to measure the degree of how citizens believe the money is used responsibly; and citizen influence that measures the degree of how citizens feel that their demands influence the quality of service.

On the other hand, HR has to adopt participatory performance appraisal that fits well into the NPS philosophy. Robert (2003) states that participatory performance appraisal is one of the effective performance appraisals systems since it includes intrinsic motivational values, the opportunity to increases employees engagement. Moreover, HR has to adopt performance appraisals that evaluate, not only the individual, but also team work. Ingraham & Rubaii-Barrett (2007), however, state that public agencies are still suffering from a lack of mechanisms to reward teamwork and collaboration, whether within or across agencies. They attribute that to the rigid organizational and program boundaries that make it not only difficult to design, but are exceedingly difficult to implement. Zigon (1995) states that team measurement is not easy, but it could be quite achievable if the HRM adopts crucial systematic methods that demand reviewing previous performance measurements and creating performance measurements that value both individual and team work by identifying individual team-member achievement that contributes to and supports the team and weight it. He adds that most teams will demand a measurement system that allows members of the team to be aware of what is expected of them individually and how to accomplish it.

In terms of motivation, many scholars studying motivation in public agencies find that intrinsic rewards and altruism are the most common motifs that push public servants to join public services agencies (Perry & Hondeghem, 2008). Houston and Cartwright (2007) confirm that many public employees are motivated by high intrinsic compassion in helping others and feeling attached to their organization and society. Ingraham & Rubaii-Barrett (2007), however, stress the fact that the public sector has failed to include many other manifestations of motivation. In their view, the opportunities to participate in goal setting or in important programs, to challenge employees with high level of tasks, and the ability to utilize personal expertise have to be demonstrated more clearly in the public sector. As seen previously, it is easy to notice that the NPS focuses on intrinsic motivation more than extrinsic incentives and monetary rewards as seen in the NPM tendency. That demands HR to consider these issues and facilitate ways to enable employees to help others, affiliate with groups, and participate in solving problems.

In terms of compensation, organizations that adopt the NPS approach could reward their employees by proving them with more challenging tasks or to be more engaged with community to make a difference. Skill-based pay could be a best tool that is associated with
the NPS philosophy. Shareef (1998) states that the skill-based pay method could be effectively implemented in a participative culture, affirming that it can work effectively if it is combined with a high engagement approach and work teams. This new pay compensation, in his view, in coincidence with participative management facilitates the development of not only self-managing work teams but also increasing individual performance and increasing reward satisfaction.

Before this paper is concluded, it has to be said that HR in public agencies reflects the evolution of the field of public administration, and it is influenced by the philosophy of the NPM approach and the NPS as it was influenced by the classical approach. Moreover, HR is, as is public administration, not only influenced by the managerial approach whether the classical, the NPM or the NPS; it is also influenced by political and legal approaches. While political approaches raise the importance of representativeness and responsiveness, the legal approach emphasizes equity and fairness. Ingraham & Rubaii-Barrett (2007) state that equity in the public sector is interpreted in many facets: representative bureaucracy; fair treatment - all employees are equal even though they are diverse; and fair opportunity in hiring, promoting, rewarding…etc. There are many laws enacted to protect employees’ rights such as affirmative action and the Equal Opportunity Act; however, these strict rules aiming to ensure a fair workplace environment could also conflict with the value of efficiency and the principle of merit and specialization when the manager has to hire one of the minority to meet EO Act requirements instead of hiring the most qualified candidate (Rosenbloom, 2010; Rosenbloom, Kravchuk & Clerkin, 2009).

From previous discussions, it can be seen that each approach impacts the function of HR in public agencies. It is not just the function but also the importance. Explicitly, the NPM calls for decentralized HR to be more flexible and enhance its importance since its accountability is also increased. The NPM moves HR function from being merely traditional “personnel” limited to recruitment, training, disciplining to be more accountable for setting the organizational vision and goals and workplace planning in addition to the traditional actions (Jennings Jr, 2010). The NPS moves the HR to go far, and its accountability is expanded in the organization to include the community since the aim of the NPS is sharing responsibility to build the community. So, in that sense, encouraging citizens to participate, developing activities, surveying citizens and panels are some of the methods that can ensure organizational effectiveness.

5. Conclusion:

Up to here, each approach demands different skills and job descriptions. For instance, managers have to have managerial, negotiation, and communication skills, as well as knowledge in partnership, contracting and privatization. Additionally, they have to be tolerant of ambiguity, self-knowledge, and have critical reflection. For the NPS approach,
communication, conflict resolution, group processes, cultural competency, critical thinking, and the ability to deliberate and dialogue are vital. Also, these skills are not limited to managers but include frontline employees. These skills shift the way the HR professionals see the qualified candidates, evaluate employees and promote or even dismiss them. Both the NPM and NPS approaches demand adopting new and flexible methods in selecting qualified candidates such as implementing a variety of online tests.

The values of each approach influences HR functions in terms of performance appraisals, rewards and motivation structures. Since the NPM values cost-effectiveness and tend to be business like, they motivate employees through monetary incentives and compensate them throughout different monetary strategies such as pay for performance and skill-based pay. Additionally, they tend to contract out to have more flexibility and hire people with less cost in addition to cutbacks and dismissing unqualified employees. The NPM approach impacts evaluation by using individual performance appraisals with concern about customer’s satisfaction as a factor impacting the evaluation. On the other hand, the NPS values participation, collaboration and citizen engagement, and that impacts the motivation structure focusing on emotional and internist methods such as more opportunities to participate in making decisions, setting goals, working within groups, and engaging with the community to help others. The NPS values employees as citizens who have to participate, have their voice heard as well as the citizen who is considered as a partner and share responsibility in providing services. That impacts the performance measurement because it includes team work and the citizens as appraisers that evaluate the quality of the service.

It is fair to conclude that public human resource in public administration is complicated. It is not just influenced by management and organization theory as private organization but also by political, legal economic factors that conflict with each other. The permanent bureaucracy and the hierarchal control by the President and Congress on the top make it harder for HR to practice its function since accountability is hard to fully determine. Civil services with rigid structures and rules make the function of HR is only to implement the rules and police the policies. Merit principles seem superior in ensuring fairness and qualification but it is a value-laden at a higher level especially in political appointments and giving protection from termination for some civil servants. Even though many states have embraced another employment systems looking forward to gaining flexibility, there are many administrative and legal protections each one holds which also makes HR constrained and confused. More importantly, each approach holds desire to fix the deficiency of civil service and hops for how public organizations have to be. However, it has to be considered that public HRM does not underestimate the importance of implementing new motivation, providing challenging tasks and more rewards, asking employees about their expectations from their job, or participating in setting goals. However, they are constrained by rigid rules and structures and lack of a financial
budget. So, if there is a combination of flexibility, abundant budget and effective leaders that trust human resource and its role in building effective organization through investing its human capital, human resource would move from being “personnel” to a strategic role in building efficient, effective and responsive public organizations and also to move to build organizational effectiveness.
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