

RESEARCH ARTICLE

WWW.PEGEGOG.NET

Engineering the Transition toward the 'Entrepreneurial University' in Algeria: The Impact of New Public Management (NPM) Tools on Deconstructing Weberian Structures

Dr. MABRAK Adel

Faculty of Law and Political Science , Hamma Lakhdar University of El Oued, Algeria

Email: Adel.mabrak28@gmail.com

Received: 11/05/2025 accepted: 20/09/2025 Published: 06/01/2026

Abstract:

This study examines the radical shift in public administration management philosophy, moving from the traditional Weberian bureaucratic model to the New Public Management (NPM) paradigm, focusing on the Algerian university experience as a case study of this transformation. The research aims to explore the various contexts that legitimized the emergence of the "Entrepreneurial University," which adopts private sector mechanisms to achieve efficiency and effectiveness. The results indicate that the Algerian university has engaged in an ambitious process of "indigenization" of this model, manifested through comprehensive digitalization via the "PROGRES" system, the valorization of intellectual property, and the promotion of entrepreneurship through "Diploma-Startup" projects. Nevertheless, this process faces structural challenges related to "functional schizophrenia" and "cultural resistance to job security," necessitating a transition from "digitizing procedures" to "digitizing decisions" to ensure a sustainable transformation toward a value-producing academic institution.

Keywords: New Public Management (NPM), Weberian Bureaucratic Model, Entrepreneurial University, Digitalization, Efficiency

Introduction:

Contemporary administrative thought is witnessing a radical transformation in the "paradigm" of public governance, manifested in the historical decoupling between "legal rationality" which derives its legitimacy from the sanctity of texts and hierarchical hierarchy, and "managerial rationality" which pledges its legitimacy to the extent of the ability to innovate added value and fulfill the claims of "customer/user". This philosophical shift is what legitimized the emergence of new public management (NPM) as a "violent" response to the predicament of the "welfare state" whose budgets have become bloated under the weight of "overload", and whose institutions have sunk into "procedural congestion" that transformed laws into idolatrous ends that aborted the spirit of initiative.

And at the heart of these transformations, the university institution is no longer merely an isolated "pedagogical portico", but has functionally transformed into an "entrepreneurial university" governed by

equations of economy, competence, and effectiveness. And within this path, the Algerian university has engaged in a process of "indigenization" sometimes coercive and sometimes ambitious; to undermine the legacy of hardened Weberian bureaucracy, replacing "the sovereignty of paper" with "the fluidity of the digital", and the logic of "consumptive spending" with the doctrine of "investment in intellectual property" and entrepreneurship.

And despite the strategic momentum towards indigenization, the Algerian experience still suffers from "functional schizophrenia"; where the ambition of the "entrepreneurial university" collides with the mental sediments of "absolute job security", and in which the demands of "competitive quality" contest with the constraints of "social and free function".

Based on the above, we pose the following main problematic: **"Has the Algerian university been able to transition from the 'Weberian model' towards the 'entrepreneurship model'?"**

And from this problematic the following sub-questions branch out:

- What are the contexts that made new public management a universal paradigm that cannot be transcended?
- What are the organizational ailments that prevented the complete identification of the Algerian university with the requirements of efficiency?
- What are the requirements for promoting the efficiency of management at the Algerian university?

To answer the main problematic and sub-questions, we construct the following basic hypothesis: "The Algerian university has been able to achieve a gradual and tangible transition from the 'Weberian model' towards the 'entrepreneurship model', driven by comprehensive digitalization strategies and orientation towards entrepreneurship".

And we formulate the following sub-hypotheses:

- The First Hypothesis: New public management (NPM) emerged as a global paradigm for decoupling legal rationality from managerial rationality.
- The Second Hypothesis: "Functional schizophrenia" and "cultural resistance to job security" hinder the complete identification of the university with the requirements of economic efficiency.
- The Third Hypothesis: Promoting the requirements of indigenizing the entrepreneurship model in the Algerian university increases management efficiency.

And in order to meet the requirements of the study, the following research plan was adopted:

Introduction

First Axis: General Framework of New Public Management

First: Contexts of the Emergence of New Public Management

Second: Theoretical Approaches to New Public Management

Third: The Relationship of New Public Management to Governance

Fourth: The Most Important Tools of New Public Management

Second Axis: Requirements for Indigenizing the New Public Management Model in the Algerian University Institution

First: Manifestations of Localizing the NPM Model in the Algerian University

Second: Brakes on Indigenization and Obstacles to Transition towards the New Managerial Paradigm in the Algerian University

Third: Requirements for Enhancing the Efficiency of Management at the Algerian University

Conclusion

First Axis: General Framework of New Public Management

The essence of contemporary administrative reforms lies in the attempt to decouple "legal rationality" from "managerial rationality".

- In "legal rationality": I manage because I possess legal authority.

- In "managerial rationality": I manage because I achieve added value and meet the needs of the user (customer).

This historical transformation is what legitimized the emergence of New Public Management (NPM) as an alternative to the Weberian model, where the state no longer contented itself with being a "guardian of laws", but became required to be an "effective manager" of society's resources (Hood, 1991, p. 4).

First: Contexts of the Emergence of New Public Management

The causes of NPM emergence are usually classified within four major contexts (Pollitt, 1990, p. 26):

1. The Economic Context: Crisis of Fiscal Efficiency (Fiscal Crisis)

Some consider NPM a "child of crisis" and not merely an administrative development, as it was a response to:

- The depletion of welfare state resources: reaching a state of "Overload" where public budgets were no longer capable of financing expanding services.

- Public Choice Theory: whose pioneers (such as: James Buchanan) argued that bureaucrats seek to maximize their budgets and personal interests instead of the public good, which leads to "structural waste" (Buchanan & Tullock, 1962, p. 18).

- Globalization and competitiveness: forcing countries to cut public costs and taxes to attract investments, which necessitated reducing the size of government.

2. The Political Context: Ideological Shift towards "New Liberalism"

The emergence of NPM is connected to the rise of the "New Right", and this is manifested in:

- Redefining the role of the state: the transition from the "interventionist state" that ensures welfare from cradle to grave, to the "regulatory state" that merely establishes the legal framework for competition.

- Crisis of legitimacy: erosion of citizen's confidence in public institutions as a result of failure to provide services commensurate with paid taxes, which generated political pressure demanding "results-based accountability" (Osborne & Gaebler, 1992, p. 12).

3. The Organizational Context: Critique of Weberian Bureaucracy (Bureau-Pathology)

Researchers focused on what is called "diseases of bureaucracy", such as:

- Procedural congestion: where laws and regulations become "an end in themselves" instead of being a "means" to serve the citizen.

- Absence of organizational flexibility: rigid hierarchical structures were no longer able to adapt to "complex and changing environments" (VUCA Environment).

- Information asymmetry: where bureaucrats possess knowledge power that makes it difficult for elected politicians to monitor them effectively, which necessitated new monitoring tools (KPIs) (Hood, 1991, p. 11).

4. The Technological and Social Context: Information Revolution and Change in Expectations

- Modern management technology: the digital revolution provided "technical tools" (such as: ERP decision support systems) that made it possible to monitor decentralized performance, which was not available in the era of traditional bureaucracy.

- Evolution of consumer psychology: the shift of collective mentality from the "subject citizen" who

receives service as a grant, to the "citizen customer" with high expectations, influenced by the quality of services in the private sector (such as: banks and communications) (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2000, p. 552).

Second: Theoretical Approaches to New Public Management

New public management is considered a revolution in concepts of public administration, as it emerged as an alternative to the traditional bureaucratic model in the late seventies and eighties. The core idea in it is borrowing management methods from the private sector and applying them in the public sector to achieve higher efficiency. (Pollitt, 1990, p. 11)

1. Christopher Pollitt's Approach: (Christopher Pollitt)

Pollitt sees that new public management is not merely an administrative technique, but rather an "ideology" aimed at modernizing the public sector. He defines it as: "a set of beliefs and practices that assumes that improving the quality of public services requires adopting methods and techniques of the private sector, with strong emphasis on results instead of procedures" (Pollitt, 1990, p. 43).

Pollitt considers that new public management is a phenomenon with two levels:

A) At the upper level, there exists a general theory that emphasizes that the public sector can be improved through the application of concepts and values that the business sector relies upon;

B) At the lower level, new public management expresses a set of concepts and practices which includes:

- The shift in attention in management and administration systems

from concern with inputs and processes towards outputs and results.

- The shift towards measurement and quantitative methods, especially in the form of performance indicator systems and clear standards.

- Priority for flexible, flat, straightforward, small and more specialized organizational forms instead of ministries or broad, multi-functional hierarchical departments.

- Widespread dissemination of "contracts or quasi-contractual relationships" instead of hierarchical and formal relationships.

- Widespread reliance on market mechanisms to provide government electronic services, such as: competitiveness, public sector tables for competition, payment for performance.

- Emphasis on service quality and customer orientation (Pollitt, 1990, pp. 55-56).

- Blurring the boundaries between the public sector, the profitable private sector and the voluntary sector.

- Change in the priorities of global values, from justice and security towards efficiency and effectiveness, competition, and payment for performance.

- Concern with treating users of public services as consumers and applying quality improvement techniques such as total quality management.

2. Hood's Approach (Christopher Hood):

Christopher Hood is considered the first to coin the term "NPM" in 1991. He defined it as an approach that focuses on "administrative professionalism" (Hood, 1991, p. 3).

Christopher Hood identified seven basic principles:

- Direct and professional management.

- Explicit performance measures and standards.

- Greater focus on control of outputs.

- Shift towards fragmentation of administrative units.

- Increased competition in the public sector (Hood, 1991, pp. 4-5).

- Adoption of private sector methods in administrative practices.

- Discipline and rigor in the use of resources.

3. Osborne & Gaebler's Approach (Osborne & Gaebler):

The basic principle of new public management as defined by Osborne or Gaebler lies in managing government as an "enterprise" (Entrepreneurial Government), and introducing the spirit of enterprise into public management (Osborne & Gaebler, 1992, p. 19), and focusing on concepts and approaches such as seeking performance, evaluating results, standardizing processes, assessing stakeholders, creating an incentive mechanism while developing oversight. David Osborne and Ted Gaebler mentioned in their book "Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector". When the eighties of the last century were drawing to a close, "Time magazine" asked on its cover: Is

government dead?, because confidence in the American federal government fell to record lows, whose leaders continued to argue about the same old choices, between providing fewer services or imposing higher taxes despite the recessions of 1990 or 1991. Yet new types of public institutions were slowly, quietly, and away from the centers of public spotlight beginning to emerge, institutions that are agile, decentralized, and innovative, and that are also flexible, adaptable and quick to learn when circumstances change, and use competition, customer choice, and other non-bureaucratic mechanisms, to do things in a creative and effective manner as much as possible.

David Osborne and Ted Gaebler called for a governmental restructuring, leading to the invention of the entrepreneurial government that encourages competition among service providers, empowers citizens to remove control from the hands of bureaucracy, and place it in the hands of the community, and it measures how well its agencies perform, and does not focus on

inputs but on the results achieved, and is guided by its goals and missions, not by its rules, and it redefines those dealing with it as customers, and provides them with choices, and it focuses its energies on making money instead of merely spending it (Osborne & Gaebler, 1992, pp. 25-27), and it removes the central character from authority and adopts collective participatory management, and it also prefers market mechanisms to bureaucratic administration.

Theoretical approaches to new public management have multiplied, yet they all intersect in being an administrative paradigm that seeks to transfer private sector mechanisms to public administration. It can be procedurally defined as: "a management system aimed at achieving maximum efficiency (Efficiency) and effectiveness (Effectiveness) through re-engineering the role of the state, and transforming it from the role of 'direct manager' to the role of 'monitor and motivator' based on results accountability."

Comparison between Traditional Administration and New Public Management (Mauri & Muccio, 2012, p. 94):

Aspect of Comparison	Traditional Public Administration (Weberian)	New Public Management (NPM)
Basic Objective	Compliance with laws and procedures	Achievement of results and efficiency
Organizational Structure	Hierarchical, centralized, bureaucratic	Flat, decentralized, independent units
Method of Work	Government monopoly of services	Competition and outsourcing
Citizen Relationship	Citizen as beneficiary (Subject)	Citizen as customer (Customer)
Control	Control of inputs (budget)	Control of outputs (performance)

Third: The Relationship of New Public Management to Governance

The classification of "Rhodes (R.A.W. Rhodes)" is considered one of the most famous academic classifications that deciphered the ambiguity of the term "Governance", as he distinguished between six (06) basic "uses" (or meanings) that show how the concept of state and public sector management evolved (Rhodes, 1996, pp. 653-654):

"The Minimal State": Here governance means reducing the size of government intervention, and relying on privatization and market mechanisms to provide public services at the lowest cost.

"Corporate Governance": Refers to the rules and systems that ensure transparency, accountability and integrity within organizations (whether public or private) to achieve balance of interests.

"New Public Management": Where governance is understood as the process of introducing private sector management methods (such as competition and focus on results) into the heart of public administration.

"Good Governance": Related to standards set by international organizations (such as: the World Bank), and includes rule of law, combating corruption, and administrative transparency.

"Socio-Cybernetic Systems": Governance is understood here as an interactive system that links the state and society, where the state does not have exclusive decision-making but shares with other social stakeholders in directing policies.

"Self-Organizing Networks": Which are the highest forms of governance according to Rhodes, where independent networks of actors (institutions, associations, private sector) form to manage their affairs and coordinate among

themselves without the need for direct central intervention from the state.

Fourth: The Most Important Tools of New Public Management

Some view "new public management" (NPM) as a "toolkit" (Toolkit/Boîte à outils) borrowed from the private sector to be applied in the public sector, and does not rise to the level of political theory, but rather offers a set of "procedural means" that the public manager can choose from to improve performance (Pollitt, 1990, p. 27), and the most important of these tools include:

1. Management by Objectives (MBO):

Instead of monitoring the employee in "how he spends his time", the focus is on "what he accomplished".

- The Tool: Specific, measurable, and time-bound objectives are set (SMART Goals).

- The Result: The focus shifts from compliance with procedures to achieving final results. (Osborne & Gaebler, 1992, p. 138)

2. Dashboard (Dashboard / Tableau de Bord):

It is a control tool that allows the public manager to monitor the performance of the institution in real time.

- The Content: It includes key performance indicators (KPIs) such as: the rate of citizen satisfaction, the cost of service per person, and the duration of file processing.

- The Importance: It helps in making quick decisions based on real numbers not on impressions (Hood, 1991, p. 11).

3. Internal and External Contracting (Contractualization):

The state deals with its administrative units or with the private sector through "efficiency contracts".

- **Administrative Contracts:** The ministry grants the institution manager "autonomy" in exchange for his commitment to achieving certain results.

- **Outsourcing:** Assigning non-sovereign tasks (such as: maintenance, catering, or programming) to private companies to reduce administrative costs (Rhodes, 1996, p. 655).

4. Balanced Scorecard:

Used to expand the perspective of public administration from merely "saving money" to other dimensions (Kaplan & Norton, 1996, p. 75):

- **The Financial Dimension:** Are we using the budget efficiently?

- **The Citizen (Customer) Dimension:** Is the citizen satisfied with the service?

- **The Internal Operations Dimension:** Are our procedures fast and smooth?

- **The Learning and Growth Dimension:** Are employees developing and acquiring new skills?

5. Benchmarking:

The public institution compares its performance with other institutions (whether public or private) that are considered "best in class".

- **The Objective:** To identify performance gaps and adopt "best practices" applied globally.

Also prominent is the tool of "Agencification", by which large bureaucratic structures are broken down into "agencies" or small flexible administrative units that enjoy management autonomy, in addition to "digitalization" as a fundamental lever for electronic governance (Pollitt, 1990, p. 56).

And despite the strength of these tools, their application in the public sector faces difficulties, mentioned by Pollitt and others, such as (Pollitt, 1990, pp. 124-126):

- **Difficulty in measuring outputs:** How do we measure "quality of education" or "security" accurately as we measure the number of cars produced in a factory?

- **Cultural resistance:** Employees accustomed to job security and routine may reject a performance-linked incentive system.

- **Multiple Objectives:** The public institution is sometimes required to pursue contradictory objectives (provide cheap service + high quality + employ a large number of people).

Second Axis: Requirements for Indigenizing the New Public Management Model in the Algerian University Institution

The university in modern conceptions is the locomotive of development, which imposes on it the necessity of transcending the logic of rigid "legal rationality" which confines its role to guarding systems, towards "managerial rationality" that places efficiency and achieving added value at the forefront of its priorities (Pollitt, 1990, p. 43). This paradigmatic

transition requires imposing the principles of new public management (NPM) on the university system, to transform it from merely a routine "administrative facility" that consumes resources, into an agile and decentralized "entrepreneurial institution", possessing the ability to adapt to complex variables (Clark, 1998, p. 5), and replacing the logic of compliance with procedures with the logic of accountability for results and outputs (Osborne & Gaebler, 1992, p. 151).

First: Manifestations of Localizing the NPM Model in the Algerian University

The following is a review of the most important manifestations of this trend with reinforcement by digital indicators and adopted mechanisms:

1. The Student as "Customer" and the Effectiveness of Professional Integration:

This transition represents the most prominent semiotic and practical transformation in the modern university:

- **Quality of Service:** The student is no longer viewed as a "passive recipient" of knowledge, but as a "strategic customer" who buys an educational service and has the right to evaluate its quality (Pollitt, 1990, p. 12).

- **Competitiveness:** Universities are forced to compete with each other to attract "customers" (outstanding students) by improving infrastructure and updating curricula in accordance with the job market.

- **Professional Development Centers (CDCs):** Centers were established to connect graduates with the economic environment, measuring "the rate of professional integration" as a

criterion for the success of open specialties.

2. Re-engineering Financing and the Wager of "Financial Autonomy":

The search for self-financing sources is a cornerstone of NPM philosophy to reduce total dependence on public budgets:

- **Activating Advisory Units:** Universities were encouraged to establish research offices (Bureaux d'études) that provide paid advisory services to the economic sector, which allows the transformation of knowledge into a direct financial resource and the embodiment of the concept of "making money instead of spending it".

- **Valorizing Intellectual Property:** The Algerian university recorded a qualitative leap in the number of patent applications, as official estimates (for the 2023-2024 period) point to exceeding 2000 patent applications.

- **The "Certificate - Startup Company" Project:** This mechanism aims to transform graduation theses into economic projects, and has resulted in granting a "Label" stamp to more than 800 innovative projects, which consecrates the university as an entrepreneurial business incubator (Clark, 1998, p. 5).

3. Comprehensive Digitalization and Reducing "Procedural Congestion":

The digital revolution in the Algerian university is considered the most prominent "technical tool" for monitoring decentralized performance and transcending "diseases of bureaucracy":

- The "PROGRES" System and Electronic Governance: The digitalization of pedagogical and administrative paths for 1.7 million students allowed for reducing time waste and ensuring "transparency in results" instead of "complicating processes".

- The "Zero Paper" Strategy: Aims to improve the quality of service provided to students as "strategic customers", through issuing hundreds of thousands of secure digital certificates via QR code, which eliminated traditional administrative slackness (Hood, 1991, p. 11).

4. Benchmarking and Results Accountability:

The Algerian university has adopted explicit performance indicators (KPIs) to measure its efficiency compared to international standards:

- Culture of International Scientific Publication: Standards shifted from merely teaching to the logic of "publish or perish" (Publish or Perish), which contributed to improving the visibility of Algerian researchers in global databases such as (Scopus).

- Positioning in Global Rankings: The (Times Higher Education) classification was adopted as an international "dashboard" (Dashboard), where Algeria ranked first in Africa and the Maghreb with 23 classified university institutions in 2024.

5. Consecrating "Contractuality" as a Tool for Regulating Efficiency:

In application of the principle of transition from "management of procedures" to "management of results", the Ministry of Higher

Education and Scientific Research has adopted contractual mechanisms that link resources to objectives:

- Program Contracts (Contrats-Programmes): "Efficiency contracts" are concluded between university institutions and the supervising ministry, where financing is determined based on the achievement of quantitative and qualitative objectives related to training outputs and research quality.

- Institutional Project (Projet d'Établissement): Each university is committed to formulating a five-year strategic plan (Rhodes, 1996, p. 655) that defines its development priorities, and the performance of the university rector is evaluated as a "chief executive officer" (CEO) based on the extent to which this plan is implemented.

And despite the efficiency benefits, critics of NPM such as Pollitt argue that imposing this model on the university may lead to:

- Commodification of Knowledge: Transforming science into a commodity subject to profit and loss logic.

- Erosion of Academic Freedom: Pressure on researchers to focus on "profitable research" or "easy-to-publish" research instead of philosophical or deep theoretical research.

- Emergence of New Bureaucracy: Instead of reducing paperwork, NPM sometimes led to an increase in "control and evaluation papers" (Audit Society) (Pollitt, 1990, pp. 124-126).

Second: Brakes on Indigenization and Obstacles to Transition towards the New

Managerial Paradigm in the Algerian University

It appears that the university under new public management has descended from its isolated "ivory tower", and has transformed into an "economic engine" governed by the trilogy (economy, efficiency, effectiveness). A university "directed" towards the job market, "competing" for resources, and "accountable" for results (Clark, 1998, p. 14). And despite the gains achieved, particularly in the fields of digitalization and entrepreneurial business, the process of indigenization of this model faces fundamental challenges:

- **Cultural and Organizational Resistance:** The model collides with administrative mentalities imbued with "bureaucratic culture" for decades, where "job security" is still viewed as an absolute right unrelated to performance indicators or productivity, which impedes the activation of incentive and accountability systems (Pollitt, 1990, p. 124).

- **The Duality of "Free Education" and "Quality":** The Algerian university faces dual pressure; the commitment to the social function of the state (democratization of education and its free provision) on one hand, and the demands of economic efficiency imposed by NPM on the other hand, which may lead to a conflict of priorities between "quantity" and "quality" (Osborne & Gaebler, 1992, p. 162).

- **The Danger of "Commodification" and Erosion of Academic Freedom:** The concern emerges that excessive focus on "profitable research" or "immediate

market response" may lead to the marginalization of basic and human sciences, and transform knowledge into commodities subject only to profit and loss logic (Pollitt, 1990, p. 131).

- **The Gap between Digitalization and Performance Improvement:** Despite the technical success of the "zero paper" policy, digitalization in some aspects is still "digitalization of procedures" and not "digitalization of decision-making", which means bureaucratic mentality remains within electronic frameworks (Hood, 1991, p. 15).

Third: Requirements for Promoting Management Efficiency at the Algerian University

Based on the above, a series of challenges can be posed to ensure the efficiency of this transition:

1. Structural and Organizational Requirements:

- **Consecrating Functional Autonomy:** The actual transition from central administrative dependency to "self-autonomy", which allows faculties flexibility in managing their financial and human resources, replacing strict "pre-audit" controls with "post-audit" controls based on evaluation of outputs and results (Pollitt, 1990, p. 56).

- **Activating "Smart Efficiency Contracts":** Concluding performance agreements between the ministry and university institutions, going beyond quantitative indicators (number of students) to qualitative indicators (such as quality of scientific publication, impact of research on local industry, and graduate employment rate), which

embodies the principle of "results accountability" (Osborne & Gaebler, 1992, p. 155).

2. Human Requirements:

- Establishing a "Meritocracy" System: Real implementation of the principle of "pay for performance", where promotions and grants are linked to the extent of the professor's or employee's contribution to achieving the objectives of the "institutional project" previously planned, in accordance with administrative professionalism (Hood, 1991, p. 4).

- Investment in "Change Management": Launching extensive training programs to qualify university elites on skills of "strategic leadership" instead of "administrative management", to break the barrier of psychological resistance to change (Clark, 1998, p. 147).

3. Technical Requirements:

- Managerial Vigilance and Benchmarking: Establishing a national observatory for vigilance that monitors university performance according to international NPM standards, which stimulates positive competitiveness between Algerian institutions to improve their global ranking (Mauri & Muccio, 2012, p. 97).

- Integration of Digitalization and Decision-Making: Developing information systems (such as: PROGRES) to become tools for "decision support" (Decision Support Systems) and crisis prediction, instead of merely being electronic repositories of administrative data (Hood, 1991, p. 13).

Conclusion:

At the conclusion of this study, it becomes clear that the adoption of the new public management paradigm (NPM) is no longer an option, but has become a strategic necessity imposed by the crisis of efficiency in traditional administrative models. This research attempted to trace the path of transition of the university from the space of "administrative facility" consuming resources to the space of "entrepreneurial institution" producing value, with focus on the experience of the Algerian university as a model for this transformation.

First: Research Conclusions

- Functional Transformation: The study proved that new public management brought about a rupture with the culture of "compliance with procedures", replacing it with "culture of performance"; where the university became accountable based on its scientific and economic outputs, and not merely on the extent of its procedural discipline.
- Digitalization as a Lever for Transparency: It was shown that the digital transformation (PROGRES system as a model) in the Algerian university was not merely a technical update, but was an effective tool for reducing bureaucratic congestion and promoting electronic governance and immediate accountability.
- Indigenization of the Model: The results showed that the process of indigenizing NPM in Algeria recorded a qualitative leap in indicators of "entrepreneurship and business" and "visibility of scientific research", but still faces resistance

resulting from sediments of traditional organizational culture.

Second: Recommendations

Based on the above, the research recommends the necessity of transition from "digitalization of procedures" to "digitalization of decision-making", and deepening the financial and academic autonomy of faculties which allows them actual competition. It also emphasizes the importance of establishing an "incentive system" organically linked to individual and institutional performance indicators (KPIs), to ensure the sustainability of the transition towards the entrepreneurial university.

And the real wager for the Algerian university today remains in its ability to balance between "requirements of economic efficiency" imposed by the new model, and between "scientific and social mission" that represents the essence of its existence; so that the pursuit of profitability and effectiveness does not become the goal of "commodification of knowledge" that empties knowledge of its value and human dimensions.

Third: Horizons of the Study

And this study remains open to other research horizons, the most prominent of which is perhaps "measuring the impact of these managerial transformations on the quality of pedagogical training."

References:

1. Buchanan, J. M., & Tullock, G. (1962). *The calculus of consent: Logical foundations of constitutional democracy*. University of Michigan Press.
2. Clark, B. R. (1998). *Creating entrepreneurial universities:*

Organizational pathways of transformation. Pergamon Press.

3. Denhardt, R. B., & Denhardt, J. V. (2000). The new public service: Serving rather than steering. *Public Administration Review*, 60(6), 549–559.
4. Hood, C. (1991). A public management for all seasons?. *Public Administration*, 69(1), 3–19.
5. Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (1996). *The balanced scorecard: Translating strategy into action*. Harvard Business School Press.
6. Mauri, A. G., & Muccio, S. (2012). The public management reform: From theory to practice. The role of cultural factors. *International Journal of Advances in Management Science*, 1(3), 91–100.
7. Osborne, D., & Gaebler, T. (1992). *Reinventing government: How the entrepreneurial spirit is transforming the public sector*. Addison-Wesley.
8. Pollitt, C. (1990). *Managerialism and the public services: The Anglo-American experience*. Basil Blackwell.
9. Rhodes, R. A. W. (1996). The new governance: Governing without government. *Political Studies*, 44(4), 652–667.