

Public Organizations Management

Vol. 14(4), (Series 56): 87-100/ 2026

 <https://doi.org/10.30473/ipom.2026.13565>

E-ISSN: 2538-600X

P-ISSN: 2322-522X

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

The Resource Budgeting Paradigm: A Conceptual Framework for Enhancing Organizational Productivity and Reducing Resource Waste

Ali Ghorbani*

Assistant Professor, Department
of Business Administration,
Payame Noor University, Tehran,
Iran.

*Correspondence

Ali Ghorbani

E-mail: Ghorbani02@Pnu.ac.ir

Receive Date: 20/July/2026

Revise Date: 02/Sep/2026

Accept Date: 14/Oct/2026

How to cite

Ghorbani, A. (2026). The
Resource Budgeting Paradigm:
A Conceptual Framework for
Enhancing Organizational
Productivity and Reducing
Resource Waste. *Public
Organizations Management*,
14(4), 87-100.

EXTENDED A B S T R A C T

Introduction

Effective resource management is a fundamental challenge for contemporary organizations because productivity and organizational performance depend not only on the amount of resources available but also on how resources are allocated, accessed, consumed, and controlled. In many organizations, budgeting systems primarily focus on financial resources, cost forecasting, and the investigation of variances after expenditure has occurred. However, organizational resources extend beyond financial budgets and include time, human resources, overtime, raw materials, energy, spare parts, equipment, and production capacity. The absence of an integrated framework for managing these resources may contribute to unjustified allocation, unnecessary consumption, higher operating costs, and lower resource efficiency. This paper develops the concept of the Resource Budgeting Paradigm as a conceptual framework for governing access to, allocation of, and consumption of organizational resources, with the aim of improving productivity and reducing waste.

Theoretical Foundations: The proposed framework draws critically on Parkinson's Law, economic scarcity, lean management, the Theory of Constraints, and management control. Parkinson's Law provides a starting point for examining the possibility that the availability of additional time or resources may, under certain circumstances, encourage the expansion of activities and consumption. The economic concept of scarcity highlights the importance of prioritization and opportunity costs. Lean management emphasizes the identification and elimination of non-value-adding activities, while the Theory of Constraints draws attention to bottlenecks and the performance of the system as a whole. Management control and budgeting literature further highlight the importance of goal setting, variance monitoring, accountability, and reliable information. Nevertheless, these theoretical foundations do not establish that reducing resources or imposing restrictions will invariably improve productivity. Accordingly, the central proposition of the Resource Budgeting Paradigm is not indiscriminate resource reduction or artificial scarcity, but the introduction of rational, transparent, and needs-based rules governing resource allocation and use.

Methodology

This paper is conceptual and theoretical in nature. It draws on conceptual reflection on professional lived experience and a critical synthesis of relevant literature. The initial development of the idea was informed by professional experience across more than 100 public and private organizations in East Azerbaijan Province, Iran. This experience provided a contextual basis for identifying resource-allocation challenges and formulating the proposed framework. However, these organizations should not be interpreted as a statistical sample or as a set of systematically investigated cases following a uniform research protocol. The paper does not claim that structured interviews, systematic coding, or formal empirical analysis of field data were conducted. The conceptual development process involves defining the resource-management problem, connecting it to relevant theoretical perspectives, formulating operational principles, and developing a conceptual model and testable propositions. Consequently, the findings are conceptual rather than empirical, and the proposed relationships require validation in future research.

Findings

The main outcome is a framework built around five core principles: purposeful constraints, staged allocation, accountability, managerial scarcity, and continuous review. Purposeful constraints involve setting resource limits in accordance with actual needs, organizational objectives, performance standards, and operational risks. Staged allocation means releasing resources in line with actual progress and the achievement of defined milestones, provided that safety requirements and operational continuity are not compromised. Accountability establishes clear responsibility for resource consumption, explanations of deviations, and the results achieved through allocated resources. Managerial scarcity refers to the deliberate governance of access and the prioritization of requests according to value, opportunity cost, and strategic importance. Continuous review enables resource limits and allocation rules to be revised in response to performance, changing conditions, and organizational learning. The proposed model consists of four conceptual layers. The first is the governance framework, comprising organizational objectives, actual needs, priorities, risks, and performance standards. The second contains the five operational principles. The third consists of mediating mechanisms, including activity prioritization, greater consumption transparency, reduced unnecessary use, operational learning, and allocation adjustment. The fourth identifies expected outcomes: lower resource waste, improved resource efficiency, higher productivity, and stronger organizational performance. These pathways represent theoretical propositions rather than empirically established causal relationships. The framework covers eight resource domains: time, financial resources, human resources, overtime, raw materials, spare parts and equipment, energy, and production capacity. Relevant indicators may include cycle time and delays, cost per unit of output, labor productivity, overtime relative to planned working hours, material consumption and scrap rates, production downtime caused by shortages, energy consumption per unit of output, and capacity utilization. The selection of indicators should reflect the nature of each resource, operational conditions, and data quality.

Discussion and Conclusion

The proposed contribution lies in integrating the allocation, control, and accountability of financial and non-financial resources within a common conceptual framework. The paradigm may inform the design of operational resource-budgeting systems, consumption-monitoring mechanisms, and resource-related decision-making in manufacturing and service organizations. In steelmaking and other

energy-intensive industries, potential applications include managing raw materials, energy, workforce levels, overtime, spare parts, equipment downtime, and production capacity. However, lower consumption alone should not be treated as evidence of success. Inappropriate restrictions may reduce product quality, increase safety risks, cause shortages of critical components, or interrupt production. Therefore, cost and productivity indicators should be assessed alongside quality, safety, delivery reliability, and operational continuity. The principal limitation of the paper is that the proposed framework has not yet undergone independent empirical validation.

The Resource Budgeting Paradigm extends resource management beyond the allocation of financial budgets and post-consumption control toward an integrated approach to defining needs, allocating resources, monitoring consumption, establishing accountability, and evaluating the value generated. It seeks to balance resource discipline with operational flexibility. Further development requires a systematic literature review, documented qualitative research, content validation of the proposed principles, and empirical testing of the propositions across different industries.

KEY WORDS

Resource Budgeting Paradigm; Organizational Productivity; Resource Allocation; Purposeful Constraints; Waste Reduction; Lean Management; Managerial Accountability.

