

# Manifestations of New Public Management in the Brazilian Judiciary: An Integrative Literature Review

**Abdon Ribeiro da Silva Neto**

Public administration, Administrator, Federal University of Rondonia, Rondonia, Brasil

**Valmir Batista Prestes de Souza**

Public administration, Professor, Department of Computer Sciences, Federal University of Rondônia, Rondonia, Brasil

**Paper Number: 240510**

<https://doi.org/10.68089/202609240510>

## **Abstract:**

**Context:** This study addresses the following research question: How does the scientific literature characterize the manifestations of New Public Management within the Brazilian Judiciary, with particular regard to its principles, practices, and management instruments? **Objectives:** Its general objective is to identify and analyze, through an integrative literature review, the manifestations of New Public Management (NPM) in the Brazilian Judiciary. The specific objectives are to identify and characterize the scientific production addressing NPM in the context of the Brazilian Judiciary; to examine the principles and features of NPM reflected in judicial management practices as reported in the literature; to map the management mechanisms, practices, and instruments associated with efficiency, performance, productivity, and results-based management; to classify the theoretical and methodological approaches adopted in the selected studies; and to identify gaps in the existing body of knowledge while indicating avenues for future research on NPM in the Brazilian Judiciary. **Research methodology:** Based on secondary sources and a structured bibliographic survey, the study draws on data retrieved from the CAPES Journals Portal, accessed through the Federated Academic Community (CAFe), as well as from Google Scholar. The final sample comprised eight scientific studies, enabling a systematic analysis of the subject. **Results:** The findings reveal at least three recurring themes across the reviewed studies: (i) NPM is not portrayed as a single or homogeneous model implemented throughout the Brazilian Judiciary; (ii) high levels of formal governance indicators do not necessarily correspond to higher levels of institutional performance; and (iii) NPM mechanisms—such as targets, performance indicators, and results-based management—coexist with mechanisms associated with New Public Governance. **Conclusions:** The study concludes that NPM does not constitute an uniform or homogeneous model; rather, it is manifested through a set of principles and management instruments that have been progressively and unevenly incorporated into judicial management structures and practices.

**Keywords:** Judiciary, Management, New Public Management, New Public Governance, Public Administration.

**Introduction:**

The analysis of New Public Management (NPM) in the Brazilian Judiciary is of considerable social, political, and economic relevance, particularly in light of the growing demand for public institutions that are more efficient, transparent, responsive, and results-oriented.

The choice of this topic is justified by the direct impact of the functioning of the justice system on the protection of rights, legal certainty, trust in institutions, and the State's capacity to respond to societal demands. In this context, procedural delays, the high volume of pending cases, the costs associated with the provision of judicial services, and performance disparities among judicial bodies make it relevant to discuss management models capable of contributing to the improvement of the Judiciary's administrative activities.

Against this background, the following question arises: How does the scientific literature characterize the manifestations of New Public Management in the Brazilian Judiciary, considering its principles, practices, and management instruments?

The basic hypothesis of this study is that the scientific literature identifies elements of New Public Management in the Brazilian Judiciary, particularly in management practices oriented toward efficiency, performance, productivity, strategic planning, and results measurement.

The political relevance of the topic also stems from the need to reconcile the autonomy of the Judiciary with mechanisms of governance, transparency, and accountability to society. From an economic perspective, judicial efficiency is also related to the proper use of public resources allocated to the operation of courts and other judicial bodies, as well as to the system's capacity to resolve disputes within a reasonable period, thereby affecting economic relations, contracts, investments, and productive activities.

At the social level, the quality of judicial service delivery directly affects access to justice and the effectiveness of fundamental rights, since delays, performance disparities, or administrative difficulties may compromise the State's response to citizens' demands. Investigating the manifestations of NPM in the Judiciary therefore makes it possible to understand the extent to which managerial practices oriented toward efficiency and performance have been incorporated into the administration of justice and what implications this process may have for the quality, legitimacy, and effectiveness of judicial service delivery.

In academic and scientific terms, the study is justified by its potential to broaden understanding of the application of NPM assumptions in a public organization with specific institutional characteristics, such as the Judiciary. Although this paradigm has been widely discussed in the Public Administration literature in relation to the Executive Branch and administrative reforms, its manifestation in judicial institutions has particular

features that require systematic investigation, especially because judicial activity cannot be analyzed exclusively on the basis of productivity, efficiency, or resource-rationalization criteria.

In this regard, an integrative literature review enables the identification, compilation, systematization, and analysis of the scientific knowledge produced on the topic, making it possible to determine which NPM principles, practices, and instruments have been associated with judicial management, which theoretical frameworks underpin these analyses, and which methodological approaches researchers have employed.

For the field of Public Administration, this investigation brings studies of managerial reforms, governance, institutional performance, and results-based management closer to the specific features of the administration of justice, thereby fostering a more comprehensive understanding of the modernization processes of the Brazilian State.

Accordingly, the general objective is to identify and analyze, through an integrative literature review, the manifestations of New Public Management (NPM) in the Brazilian Judiciary. The specific objectives are to identify and characterize the scientific literature addressing NPM in the context of the Brazilian Judiciary; identify the NPM principles and characteristics present in judicial management practices described in the literature; map the management mechanisms, practices, and instruments associated with efficiency, performance, productivity, and results-based management in the Brazilian Judiciary; classify the theoretical and methodological approaches used in the selected studies; and identify gaps in the scientific literature and indicate opportunities for future research on NPM in the Brazilian Judiciary.

### **Research Methodology**

As this is an integrative review, the analysis followed the steps described by Souza et al. (2010), according to whom the process comprises six stages: Stage 1: formulation of the guiding question; Stage 2: literature search or sampling; Stage 3: data collection; Stage 4: critical analysis of the included studies; Stage 5: discussion of the results; and, finally, Stage 6: presentation of the integrative review.

To formulate the guiding question, the PICO strategy was adapted to the field of Public Administration and judicial management, in accordance with Santos et al. (2007).

The strategy comprises the components P (Population/Problem), I (Intervention/Interest), C (Comparison), and O (Outcome). In this study, P was defined as the Brazilian Judiciary; I as New Public Management, encompassing its principles, characteristics, practices, and management instruments; and O as the identification and characterization, in the scientific literature, of the manifestations of New Public Management in the context of judicial administration. Component C was not employed because the research

does not seek to compare New Public Management with another model of Public Administration, but rather to identify and analyze its manifestations in the Brazilian Judiciary.

The study used data from secondary sources, obtained through a bibliographic survey and analyzed by means of a descriptive synthesis and thematic categorization of findings related to the manifestations of New Public Management in the Brazilian Judiciary.

The studies were identified through searches of the CAPES Journals Portal (Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel), accessed through CAFE (Federated Academic Community), and Google Scholar.

The following Portuguese-language descriptors were used to search for studies: "nova gestao publica" ["new public management"] and "judiciario" ["judiciary"], combined with the Boolean operator AND. The inclusion criterion was full-text studies in Portuguese; the exclusion criterion was studies not specifically addressing the topic. The entire available time span was considered. The searches were conducted in August 2026 and identified a total of 15 studies. After removing one duplicate and six studies unrelated to the topic, the final sample comprised eight studies.

The extracted data were synthesized and analyzed descriptively, enabling observation, description, and classification with the aim of bringing together the knowledge produced on the topic.

## Results

The final sample comprised eight scientific studies selected according to the previously established inclusion and exclusion criteria.

An examination of the publication period shows that the studies were published between 2016 and 2026. The earliest study was published in 2016 and accounted for 12.5% of the total analyzed, followed by publications from 2018 and 2020, each likewise representing 12.5% of the sample. The highest concentration occurred in 2023, with two studies accounting for 25% of the total. One study was identified in each of the years 2024, 2025, and 2026, individually representing 12.5% of the selected literature. The distribution was therefore relatively dispersed throughout the period analyzed, with a higher concentration in 2023 and a continuous presence of more recent studies between 2023 and 2026. Taken together, studies from this latter period represent 62.5% of the sample, suggesting a recent concentration of the selected literature on the topic.

Four main categories were identified regarding the methodological nature of the eight studies in the sample. Qualitative empirical studies represent 37.5% of the sample and comprise Lima et al. (2016), who conducted an organizational study using interviews and content analysis; Fruet de Moraes et al. (2023), who conducted a case study based on document analysis

and semi-structured interviews; and Melo et al. (2026), who adopted a single-case, exploratory-descriptive, and documentary design. Another 37.5% consists of theoretical-documentary, bibliographic, or normative studies: Kim and Silva (2020), whose analysis is conceptual, historical, and documentary; Veras and Almeida (2024), who conducted bibliographic, exploratory, and explanatory research; and Souza and Camargo (2025), whose study is predominantly theoretical and normative. Rossa (2018), representing 12.5% of the sample, was classified as a methodological/propositional study because it combines bibliographic research and analysis of institutional experience to formulate a proposal for judicial systems governance. Finally, Silva (2023), also representing 12.5%, is the only empirical mixed-methods study, combining quantitative and qualitative procedures through documentary research and comparison of governance and performance indicators.

Taken together, the results reveal a strong concentration of qualitative and documentary research and limited use of quantitative techniques. This suggests that scientific research on NPM in the Brazilian Judiciary remains more focused on interpreting models, practices, norms, and institutional experiences than on statistically measuring their effects on performance, efficiency, and the quality of judicial service delivery, as we can see in the table 1.

Table 1 - Distribution of studies by title, authors, year of publication, primary methodological approach, research findings, and gaps

| <b>Title</b>                                                                                                   | <b>Author<br/>s and<br/>year</b> | <b>Methodologic<br/>al approach</b>                | <b>Objective</b>                                                                                                             | <b>Findings</b>                                                                                                                                                     | <b>Gaps<br/>research<br/>agenda /</b>                                                                                                                                   |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| The paradox of Judiciary reform: clashes between New Public Management and the jeitinho organizational culture | Lima, Fraga, and Oliveira (2016) | Qualitative empirical study - organizational study | To analyze the Judiciary Reform by considering aspects of its organizational culture, based on the perception of Bahia State | The study identified areas of compatibility and, above all, tensions between the managerial model introduced by the Judiciary Reform and features of organizational | There is a need for deeper analysis of the cultural dimension of managerial reforms in the Judiciary and for avoiding the automatic transfer of NPM models developed in |

| <b>Title</b>                                                      | <b>Author<br/>s and<br/>year</b> | <b>Methodologic<br/>al approach</b>                                          | <b>Objective</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                    | <b>Findings</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | <b>Gaps<br/>research<br/>agenda</b> /                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                                                   |                                  |                                                                              | Court of Justice (TJBA) employees.                                                                                                                                                                                  | l culture. The jeitinho and formalism emerge as strategies for adapting to organizational conditions.                                                                                                                                     | Anglo-Saxon contexts. The study itself acknowledges that academic research on judicial organizational culture was limited.                                                                                                                                                             |
| Governance of judicial systems in the Judiciary of Santa Catarina | Rossa (2018)                     | Methodological/propositional study with analysis of institutional experience | To examine the application of NPM, Public Governance, and IT Governance concepts to the strategic management of judicial systems within the Santa Catarina Judiciary (PJSC) and propose their institutionalization. | The Subcommittee's experience represented progress in systems governance, but its informal operation demonstrated the need for institutionalization. The study formally proposed the creation of a Judicial Systems Governance Committee. | The study does not quantitatively test the effects of the governance structure on procedural performance or judicial quality. It opens avenues for empirically assessing whether the proposed institutionalization produces efficiency, effectiveness, and improved access to justice. |

| Title                                                                                                               | Author<br>s and<br>year  | Methodologic<br>al approach                     | Objective                                                                                                                                                           | Findings                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | Gaps<br>research<br>agenda /                                                                                                                                                                                 |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Strategic Management in the Judiciary and its advances during the first 15 years of the National Council of Justice | Pae Kim and Silva (2020) | Theoretical/documentary study                   | To analyze strategic management in the Judiciary, its impacts on judicial policies, and the advances resulting from the CNJ's activities during its first 15 years. | The CNJ's activities disseminated strategic management throughout the Judiciary. CNJ Resolution No. 70/2009 is presented as a milestone in the nationwide institutionalization of planning and a results-oriented administrative culture. The BSC supported strategy implementation and evaluation, transparency, and citizen orientation. | The analysis is predominantly institutional and normative; there is scope for empirical studies linking strategic instruments to objective outcomes in efficiency, judicial quality, and users' perceptions. |
| Governance in the Judiciary: a comparative analysis of indicators                                                   | Silva (2023)             | Master's thesis - empirical mixed-methods study | To assess the contribution of the governance and management                                                                                                         | It was not possible to affirm that adopting the governance practices disseminated                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | The author identifies the absence of econometric models; lack of open data for the CNJ                                                                                                                       |

| Title                                                                  | Authors and year                                                    | Methodological approach                  | Objective                                                                                                                                                  | Findings                                                                                                                                                                                                            | Gaps / research agenda                                                                                                                                                                                               |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                                                        |                                                                     |                                          | nt indices of the 2021 iGG to performance in the 2022 CNJ Quality Award.                                                                                   | by the Federal Court of Accounts (TCU) effectively contributed to better performance in the CNJ Award. The comparison revealed no substantial relationship between the two evaluation models.                       | Award; exclusion of state courts and state military courts; and the need for a specific judicial governance model. The study proposes long-term, objective, and measurable targets and annual monitoring by the CNJ. |
| Judiciary Intelligence Centers and New Public Governance: a case study | Fruet de Moraes, Castagna Lunardi, and Alves Ribeiro Correia (2023) | Qualitative empirical study - case study | To investigate factors capable of influencing the operation and performance of the Courts of Justice Intelligence Centers in the macro-level resolution of | The relevant factors identified were the center's composition; participation of first-instance judges; time devoted to its activities; how matters are referred; networked operation; dissemination; horizontality; | Because the study examines a single Intelligence Center, the findings cannot be generalized to all courts. The authors characterize the analysis as non-exhaustive, opening avenues for comparative studies          |

| <b>Title</b>                                                                                               | <b>Author<br/>s and<br/>year</b> | <b>Methodologic<br/>al approach</b>                            | <b>Objective</b>                                                                                                                                                                                       | <b>Findings</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | <b>Gaps<br/>research<br/>agenda /</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                                                                                            |                                  |                                                                | disputes.                                                                                                                                                                                              | and participation by external actors. The findings indicate that the centers contribute to addressing repetitive and mass litigation.                                                                                                                                                           | among centers and objective assessments of their effectiveness and performance.                                                                                                                                                                                          |
| Governance by numbers in Brazilian justice: examining the effects of quantification on judicial management | Veras and Almeida (2024)         | Theoretical/bibliographic study - critical-analytical approach | To investigate the consequences of numbers-based management in the Judiciary, particularly with regard to efficiency, the quality of judicial service delivery, and the health of legal professionals. | Management based on targets and productivity contributes to procedural speed but does not, by itself, ensure the quality of judicial service delivery. The model privileges quantitative efficiency; pressure for productivity may also pose risks to the well-being of judges and court staff. | The study identifies two gaps: the absence of suitable instruments to measure judicial quality in conjunction with productivity, and the need for substantial research on the effects of target-based management on the health and well-being of judges and court staff. |

| <b>Title</b>                                                                                        | <b>Authors and year</b>  | <b>Methodological approach</b>                                               | <b>Objective</b>                                                                                                                                                                             | <b>Findings</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | <b>Gaps / research agenda</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Public Management in the Judiciary: managers' responsibility and Corporate Public Governance        | Souza and Camargo (2025) | Theoretical/normative study                                                  | To analyze the transformation of public administration in the Judiciary, emphasizing governance, accountability, managerial responsibility, efficiency, transparency, and access to justice. | The study argues that practices inspired by NPM and Corporate Public Governance have been incorporated into the Judiciary, highlighting transparency, accountability, citizen participation, technological innovation, managerial responsibility, and the creation of public value. | The study does not present a systematic empirical assessment of the effects of the practices described. For this integrative review, this is an important limitation: research is still needed to empirically measure relationships among governance, accountability, performance, efficiency, and public value in the Judiciary. |
| "Adaptive Judiciary": co-creation and public value in the Mato Grosso do Sul State Court of Justice | Melo et al. (2026)       | Qualitative empirical study - exploratory-descriptive documentary case study | To analyze how the Mato Grosso do Sul State Court of Justice (TJMS) combines managerial                                                                                                      | The study identifies a hybrid synthesis: traditional NPM instruments - targets, management contracts,                                                                                                                                                                               | The study itself notes that research on the adaptive capacity of judicial institutions and on courts as arenas of                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |

| <b>Title</b> | <b>Author<br/>s and<br/>year</b> | <b>Methodologic<br/>al approach</b> | <b>Objective</b>                                                                                                                                                                                            | <b>Findings</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | <b>Gaps<br/>research<br/>agenda</b> /                                                                                                                                                                              |
|--------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|              |                                  |                                     | l-efficiency<br>instrumen<br>ts with<br>adaptive<br>governanc<br>e, co-<br>creation,<br>social<br>inclusion,<br>and<br>dejudiciali<br>zation,<br>thereby<br>constitutin<br>g an<br>"Adaptive<br>Judiciary." | indicators,<br>productivity,<br>and risk<br>management<br>- are<br>combined<br>with<br>networks,<br>participation,<br>active<br>listening, co-<br>creation, and<br>innovation.<br>Among other<br>outcomes,<br>the TJMS<br>achieved a<br>Demand<br>Response<br>Index (IAD) of<br>116.3% and a<br>Justice<br>Productivity<br>Comparative<br>Index (IPC-<br>Jus) of 82%,<br>as well as<br>high<br>resolution<br>rates in<br>mobile-court<br>initiatives. | collaborative<br>governance<br>remains<br>incipient. The<br>sustainability<br>of<br>partnerships<br>and state<br>capacity<br>condition the<br>results;<br>comparative<br>studies in<br>other courts<br>are needed. |

Source: Prepared by the authors.

Table 2 identifies the NPM principles and characteristics present in the judicial management practices described in the literature and presents the results of mapping the management mechanisms, practices, and instruments associated with efficiency, performance, productivity, and results-based management in the Brazilian Judiciary.

Table 2 - Analytical categorization of NPM principles and characteristics and the manifestations identified in the studies

| <b>Analytical category</b>             | <b>Manifestations identified in the studies</b>                                              |
|----------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Efficiency                             | reduced processing time, resource rationalization, procedural speed, productivity            |
| Results-based management               | national targets, strategic objectives, results monitoring                                   |
| Performance measurement                | indicators, indices, metrics, rankings/comparisons, Justice in Numbers                       |
| Strategic planning                     | National Strategy, strategic plans, macro-challenges, BSC                                    |
| Managerial accountability              | accountability, target monitoring, evaluation of managers and units                          |
| Professionalization of management      | adoption of administration, planning, and governance techniques                              |
| Citizen/user orientation               | efficient judicial service delivery, access to justice, and service quality                  |
| Technology and process rationalization | electronic proceedings, judicial systems, automation, and IT governance                      |
| Management control                     | monitoring, institutional evaluation, indicators, and administrative oversight               |
| Performance culture                    | productivity, target achievement, and emphasis on measurable results                         |
| NPM tensions/effects                   | formalism, cultural resistance, pressure for productivity, quantity versus quality           |
| Hybridization with NPG                 | networks, participation, co-creation, innovation, collaborative governance, and public value |

Source: Prepared by the authors.

## Discussion

This review found that the scientific literature identified is relatively recent, as the studies were published only from the second decade of the 2000s onward. The literature on the topic also remains limited, considering both the number of records initially identified and the number of studies selected for this review.

The matrix first shows that NPM does not appear in the literature analyzed as a single or homogeneous model implemented in the Brazilian Judiciary. The most recurrent manifestations are strategic planning, results-based management, target setting, performance measurement, indicators, productivity, efficiency, accountability, professionalization of management, and the incorporation of techniques originally developed in the private sector. Lima et al. (2016) directly demonstrate the link between the Judiciary Reform/CNJ and managerialism, whereas Kim and Silva (2020) show the institutionalization of this process through the national strategy, targets, and the balanced scorecard (BSC).

A second analytical axis concerns the quantification of judicial activity. Veras and Almeida (2024) demonstrate that targets, indicators, and productivity are particularly clear manifestations of NPM in the Judiciary, but caution that a quantitatively efficient justice system is not necessarily a qualitatively better one. Silva (2023) reaches a complementary conclusion: even high formal governance indicators do not ensure correspondence with other institutional performance indicators, because no substantial relationship was found between the results of the governance and management indices of the 2021 Integrated Public Organizational Governance and Management Profile (iGG) and the 2022 CNJ Quality Award.

A third relevant finding is the overlap of administrative paradigms. Rossa (2018) demonstrates the articulation among NPM, Public Governance, and IT Governance; Fruet de Moraes et al (2023) shift the debate toward networks, horizontality, and innovation; and the study of the Mato Grosso do Sul State Court of Justice (TJMS) explicitly presents a "hybrid synthesis" in which NPM mechanisms - targets, indicators, and results-based management - coexist with New Public Governance (NPG) mechanisms - co-creation, participation, networks, and the creation of public value (Melo et al., 2026).

## Conclusions

This integrative review concludes that the scientific literature analyzed characterizes the manifestations of NPM in the Brazilian Judiciary primarily through the incorporation of managerial principles and instruments oriented toward efficiency, performance, and results. The most recurrent manifestations include strategic planning, target setting, productivity measurement, the use of indicators, managerial accountability, professionalization of management, technological modernization, and

institutional control. The findings therefore corroborate the study's basic hypothesis that elements of NPM are present in Brazilian judicial administration, particularly in practices related to efficiency, planning, performance, and results measurement. However, the review also demonstrates that NPM is not manifested as a single or homogeneous model in the Judiciary, but rather as a set of principles and instruments incorporated gradually and unevenly into judicial management structures and practices.

The analysis of the eight selected studies further demonstrates that the effects of these practices cannot be understood exclusively through quantitative indicators of productivity and procedural speed. Although targets, metrics, and evaluation mechanisms have contributed to institutionalizing a results-oriented management culture, the studies identify important limitations in these instruments' capacity to represent the quality and effectiveness of judicial service delivery. The comparison between governance and performance indicators did not demonstrate an automatic relationship between the adoption of good management practices and better institutional outcomes, while other studies highlighted tensions related to organizational culture, pressure for productivity, and the balance between quantity and quality. At the same time, a trend toward the hybridization of management models was identified, in which instruments characteristic of NPM, such as targets, indicators, and results-based management, coexist with practices associated with NPG, such as cooperation networks, participation, co-creation, innovation, and the creation of public value. This finding suggests that the modernization of Brazilian judicial management occurs less through the complete replacement of paradigms than through the overlap and combination of different administrative logics.

As an agenda for future research, the production of empirical studies capable of evaluating the concrete effects of managerial instruments on the efficiency, effectiveness, and quality of judicial service delivery should be expanded, thereby reducing the current predominance of theoretical, documentary, and qualitative research. Comparative studies across different courts and branches of the Judiciary, longitudinal research tracking the evolution of management practices over time, and quantitative or mixed-methods investigations testing relationships among targets, indicators, productivity, quality, and justice-system users' perceptions are particularly relevant. Further analysis is also recommended regarding the effects of performance management on judges and court staff, the resistance and adaptations arising from organizational culture, and the articulation between New Public Management and New Public Governance.

Finally, future research could advance the development of indicators that incorporate not only efficiency and productivity, but also effectiveness, judicial quality, access to justice, participation, and the creation of public

value, thereby contributing to a more comprehensive understanding of the outcomes of managerial transformations in the Brazilian Judiciary.

### **Referencias:**

- Kim, R. P., & Silva, F. A. G. e. (2020). *A gestão estratégica no Poder Judiciário e seus avanços nos 15 anos do Conselho Nacional de Justiça*. *Revista CNJ*, 4(1), 207–218.
- Lima, D. M. da C., Fraga, V. F., & Oliveira, F. B. de. (2016). *O paradoxo da reforma do Judiciário: Embates entre a nova gestão pública e a cultura organizacional do jeitinho*. *Revista de Administração Pública*, 50(6), 893–912.
- Melo, O. J. de, Araujo, G. C. de, Turine, J. A. V., & Arruda, A. G. S. (2026). *“Judiciário adaptativo”: Cocriação e valor público no Tribunal de Justiça de Mato Grosso do Sul*. *Encontro Internacional de Gestão, Desenvolvimento e Inovação (EIGEDIN)*, 8(1). [periodicos.ufms.br](http://periodicos.ufms.br)
- Moraes, B. F. de, Lunardi, F. C., & Correia, P. M. A. R. (2023). *Os centros de inteligência do Poder Judiciário e a nova governança pública: Um estudo de caso*. *Synesis*, 15(1), 258–282. [seer.ucp.br](http://seer.ucp.br)
- Rossa, R. (2018). *Governança dos sistemas judiciais no Poder Judiciário de Santa Catarina*. *Revista de Direito, Governança e Novas Tecnologias*, 4(1), 72–91.
- Santos, C. M. da C., Pimenta, C. A. de M., & Nobre, M. R. C. (2007). *A estratégia PICO para a construção da pergunta de pesquisa e busca de evidências*. *Revista Latino-Americana de Enfermagem*, 15(3), 508–511.
- Silva, S. B. da. (2023). *Governança no Poder Judiciário: Uma análise comparativa entre indicadores* [Dissertação de mestrado, Universidade Católica de Brasília].
- Souza, M. T. de, Silva, M. D. da, & Carvalho, R. de. (2010). *Revisão integrativa: O que é e como fazer*. *Einstein*, 8(1), 102–106.
- Souza, R. S. de, & Camargo, M. E. (2025). *Gestão pública no Judiciário: A responsabilidade dos gestores e a governança pública corporativa*. *Revista Ibero-Americana de Humanidades, Ciências e Educação*, 11(5), 1411–1427.
- Veras, F. A., & Almeida, S. T. de. (2024). *A governança dos números na justiça brasileira: Um olhar sobre os reflexos da quantificação na gestão judiciária*. *Revista Contemporânea*, 4(7).