

MODERN PARADIGM AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION TOOLS: METHODS TO INCREASE EFFICIENCY IN UKRAINE

Myroshnychenko Alina

PhD in Public Administration, Associate Professor of State Department, Associate Professor of Department of Public Administration, Administration and Law. National University “Yuri Kondratyuk Poltava Polytechnic”, e-mail: nedilkoalinka@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0009-0004-5984-4731>

ABSTRACT

The main features of the modern model of public administration formation through an analysis of the European countries experience, in particular, considering the models of public administration in the Scandinavian, Anglo-Saxon, Napoleonic and German countries are revealed in the research article. The meaning of the concepts “deconcentration”, “delegation” and “devolution” is revealed, as well as their main characteristics and influence on the modern system of public administration. Based on the research carried out, we will form a comparative table of public administration models in European countries.

Keywords: public administration, management, local self-government, European experience, models of public administration

INTRODUCTION

In recent decades, many countries around the world have undergone large-scale reforms aimed at improving the efficiency of public administration. It is no coincidence that almost simultaneous transformations were defined as a “managerial revolution.” The search for new approaches to organize public administration system made us to refuse from the traditional type of managerial rationality (in its classical, interpretation according to Weber) and to update the processes of self-organization and self-government of social systems, as well as to increase the social efficiency of public administration. Modern concepts of new

public management and leadership focus on high-result public administration, political pluralism in the decision-making process, delegation of powers at the lower level of the management hierarchy, a more balanced division of power, responsibility and accountability, development and expansion of public participation.

New public management stipulates decentralization of management by expanding the powers and responsibilities of local governments. The main task of the government at this stage is to provide local communities with the opportunity to solve their problems and control the quality of public services provided independently. This approach is consistent with the core values of local government – autonomy (decentralized governance), democracy (civil participation) and efficiency (closeness of power to the population). The state transfers the functions of providing public services to non-state (commercial and public) organizations, reserving to itself the functions of control and development of a general strategy. Such decentralization allows ensuring greater flexibility and efficiency of management, and also stimulates competition between service providers, increasing civil and social responsibility. The only drawback of the new public management is the emphasis on the commercialization of the public sector and insufficient consideration of the role of social and political participation and interaction.

A key aspect of modern governance concepts is decentralization, which involves the transfer of powers and responsibilities from the central government to lower levels of government and to the non-governmental sector. In both cases, the process of making socially significant decisions and control over their implementation becomes closer to the population.

In recent years, decentralization has become a truly global phenomenon. It is no coincidence that the report of the World Bank and the Union of Cities and Local Governments was devoted to the problems of decentralization and local democracy. [1]. Researchers indicate the reasons for decentralization as follows: political changes that gave local communities the right to express and defend their

interests; technological changes and global integration that have redefined the boundaries of governance and self-government; finally, the difficulties of a centralized management system and the need for the participation of regional and local governments in political and economic processes.

To a large extent, decentralization affects the relationship between the central government and local self-government, but this does not mean that the changes that have taken place are voluntary. The limits of decentralization depend on the political weight, human and financial resources at the order of local authorities. In addition, decentralization of governance does not exist outside the state, it is carried out on the initiative and under the control of the central government. However, decentralization is impossible if local authorities are nothing more than executors of the central government's policies. These extreme positions limit the space of local self-government and determine its "range of possibilities." Political systems strive for the necessary balance according to the conditions in each country.

The literature distinguishes between several types of decentralization:

- administrative decentralization, in which local authorities are accountable to the central government;
- political decentralization, in which local authorities are theoretically independent from the state, endowed with powers and responsibilities;
- budgetary decentralization is associated with the transfer of resources necessary for the exercise of the transferred power and responsibility;
- finally, market decentralization, which ensures the transfer of functions of public institutions to the private sector (companies, NGOs), including planning and administration.

In order to avoid confusion, researchers recommend using the term "decentralization" to characterize relations between levels of public authorities, but not between public authorities and the economic or social sphere as a whole [1], i.e., with some nuances, the administrative and managerial approach is seen as a priority. The authors of the work "Elements in Political Science" also adhere to the

administrative scheme of decentralization interpretation. They correlate the concept of decentralization with the delegation of decision-making within the political system, where delegation is seen as an administrative technique used in both unitary and federal states [2]. However, all types of decentralization seem to be interconnected, complementing each other, thus reinforcing the general trend. Effective decentralization is impossible without real self-government at the lower levels of government and democracy as a way of exercising power.

As part of the general trend, each country has its own reasons, forms and results of decentralization. Unique to each country is its nature, genesis and evolution of relations between central and local authorities, and the basic social values reflected in them, for example: civil society in Great Britain, statehood in Germany, citizenship in France. However, the analysis of public administration reform at different times and in different circumstances made it possible to identify three main models of decentralization that appeared and were implemented in different countries: “devolution” in England, “deconcentration” in France and “delegation” in Germany.

The concept of devolution emerged in the course of events related to the struggle for Irish independence in the late nineteenth century and implied the transfer of a wide range of powers to local governments to manage internal affairs. Later, the term came to be used to refer to reforms in the second half of the twentieth century, which consisted of the transfer of a significant amount of power to the regional and local levels. Today, it is used in a broader sense, especially outside the UK, to refer to the transfer of decision-making power in some areas of public policy to subnational levels. Devolution is thus closer to a political type of decentralization, as it allows lower levels to make their own policy decisions, albeit in a limited area.

Administrative decentralization implies that local authorities are accountable to higher levels of government. This is how it is defined by the United Nations Development Program (UNDP). Administrative decentralization is more often associated with deconcentration or delegation. In political decentralization

(devolution), there are no controlled (accountable) relations with the higher authorities. Deconcentration implies the existence of a system of administrative responsibility in the management of subordinate territories, created on behalf of the central government. Deconcentration, unlike devolution, implies the management of relations and administrative hierarchy, while devolution excludes any hierarchical relations between the state and local authorities. According to the authors of the above-mentioned report, this difference gives grounds not to consider deconcentration as one of the options for decentralization at all [3].

One of the elements of deconcentration is the delegation of powers to services of territorial competence. In practice, the term "delegation" can also be used to refer to intermediate situations: state power and authority are delegated to decentralized authorities (i.e., elected rather than appointed from above) and exercised on behalf of and in the interests of the state, i.e., the decentralized authorities in this case become accountable to the state. Such situations are not considered centralization and are referred to as delegation of power and authority. In a specific case, elective legitimacy may weaken the control of a higher authority or, conversely, the scope of delegated power and responsibilities may weaken decentralization, because control is exercised by a higher authority.

Thus, in the strictest sense, decentralization is the existence of an elected government on a local scale that is distinct from the administrative power of the state, exercising its own powers and responsibilities within the framework of the law, for which it has the status of self-government under state control. In this sense, decentralization is inseparable from the idea of local self-government and democratic principles. However, the scope of powers granted is not enough to determine the level of decentralization in a particular country; the regime in which these powers are exercised and controlled by the state must also be taken into account. In a broad sense, decentralization exists in almost all countries, but in a narrow sense, in very few.

The experience of Britain, which has been at the forefront of public administration reforms, Germany, as well as France and the Scandinavian countries, allows us to see how different the preconditions, content, and results of decentralization are.

For a long time, Britain has been a model of decentralized political governance based on a culture of civil society and representation of local interests in the national government, although the position of local government in the British Constitution is ambiguous and ambivalent. As for administrative governance, two models have historically developed: "partnership" and "agency" [4].

In the "partnership" model, local governments, while having considerable autonomy in defining and implementing their policies, are equivalent with central institutions under the control of the parliament. In the "agency" model, local governments implement national policy under the control of central departments with little or no autonomy. The transfer of power from the central to the lower level (devolution) has become the most important socio-political event of recent years.

Throughout the twentieth century, the autonomy of local governments was gradually limited, becoming more and more accountable to the central government. The transition from a partnership to an agency model of relations was accompanied by increased control by the central government and administrative dependence of local authorities. Comparing the United Kingdom with the rest of Europe, researchers call it one of the most centralized states, contrary to its reputation and centuries-old traditions [5]. The center has left the territories with the least autonomy and strengthened control over them at a time when most other countries have begun to decentralize governance. But within the framework of these trends, there were opportunities to realize the potential of local governance in the new conditions, to significantly increase its efficiency and social significance. According to researchers, it was in the twentieth century that the formative characteristics and distinctive features of modern British local government were formed. M. Laughlin refers to them as: multifunctionality as responsibility for a wide range of services critical to the welfare state; inclusion in a wide network of

individual organizations, where the collective capabilities of many participants are combined to effectively solve the problem [6].

The differences in the specifics of central and local governance allowed researchers in the late 1980s to draw a seemingly paradoxical conclusion. According to R. Rhodes, modern Britain is not a unitary state, but rather a differentiated policy in which the local level plays a key role [7]. The concept of the "dual state" by P. Saunders allows to further distinguish between the functions of central and local authorities, especially in the social sphere. According to P. Saunders, the state has so distanced itself from the function of social investment that it has become mainly the function of local authorities, as well as various public organizations and public-private partnerships due to their better adaptation to solving social problems and proximity to the population [8]. The functioning of the social system without state involvement is one of the most pressing problems of liberal ideology. For example, the English historian and political scientist D. Green argues that the welfare state fulfills its social obligations less effectively than a competitive social security system that combines economic freedoms with individual responsibility and civic engagement [9].

In this context, it is important to note that governance reforms in England have always been viewed from the perspective of the ruling party and cabinet responsible for the overall political climate in the country, the proposed ideology, the concept of change and development goals. This is reflected in research approaches that allow us to go beyond the analysis of local governance during the rule of a particular political party or leader and focus on comparing contexts, for example: post-war Keynesian - the welfare state, deregulated - the economy of M. Thatcher and J. Major, mixed – the "third way" under New Labour and E. Blair. Views on local government reforms are part of political ideology and social philosophy.

At the beginning of the XXI century, local governance acquired new features, which is why there is a growing interest in it. J. Chandler defines the current importance of local governance by two important points:

- 1) the ability of local authorities to coordinate individual functions to the maximum extent possible and to choose a strategy for the development and well-being of the community as a whole;
- 2) the ability of local authorities to be the only agents representing the interests of local communities at the national level [10].

To summarize, we can say that decentralization of public administration "in English" is the devolution of central government and increased responsibility of local government while expanding and developing various forms of interaction between the state and society.

Unlike the UK, public administration reforms in Germany were conceived from the bottom up. The transformations began with the functional reforms of local self-government in the 1960s. Their content and goals were to make small and dispersed communities and districts capable of performing most of the state's tasks and powers [11]. In the 1980s, Germany, like other developed European countries, faced the legacy of the welfare state. The solution to the problem of social dependency, insecurity of pensions and social benefits was decentralization of governance. Further reforms of local government are associated with a wide range of socio-economic problems.

It is important to note that the principle of decentralization was adopted for arms by the Christian-liberal coalition – CDU/CSU and FDP – as an alternative to the social democratic course. Decentralization became the basis of the country's modernization program by reducing the influence of the state and strengthening civil society institutions [11]. At the same time, the forces represented, as a rule, by opposition political parties seek not only to take a fresh look at local self-government, but also to "fit" these views into their political program, which is supported by certain social strata and categories of the population. Innovations in the field of local self-government are less a technical management solution than a fundamental issue that affects the interests of both the main political forces and the general population. Decentralization makes it possible to redistribute functions and

responsibilities not strictly down the vertical, but in a variety of directions and configurations.

German local government reforms differ from those in the UK in that they are more gradual and focus on public participation than on the introduction of market principles in the provision of public services. However, in both Germany and Britain, the state is relieved of excessive social responsibility by transferring most social functions to local communities.

Decentralization of public administration in France has its own specifics. Although France is a unitary state, its political and administrative system remains one of the most complex in Europe, consisting of four levels: commune, department, region and state. Since 1982, the country has been undergoing a reform of local governments designed to expand local autonomy and limit administrative control by the state. Unlike the Anglo-Saxon countries, France did not carry out administrative reforms to introduce market-oriented mechanisms, reduce the cost of the state and increase the efficiency of the bureaucracy. The priorities of the reforms were to strengthen democratic principles in public administration and activate local self-government, and only then to introduce management principles. This reflected the basic values of French society – social justice, equality of citizens before the law, priority of public interest over private, which were reflected in a specific way in the strong paternalistic attitudes of citizens.

In France, there is no clear correspondence between party ideology and the direction of local government reforms. There is a general, with a few exceptions, turn towards decentralization of governance and deconcentration of government functions, and the establishment of a broad partnership between politics, business and civil society at the national, regional and local levels. However, this mainly manifested itself in the transfer of significant powers from the central to the local level. Researchers do not note any significant decentralization from the local level to the population [12].

A common characteristic of the Scandinavian countries is a combination of strong central government, weak regions, and well-developed local autonomy. The

Scandinavian model of local self-government, unlike the British and French models, emphasizes the aspects of functionality and participation. The political space is determined not only by the state but also by lower levels of decision-making, such as provinces and municipalities [12].

In the Scandinavian countries, modern local self-government is organized on the principle of agency rather than partnership, which resembles the British experience. In Sweden, the reforms of the first wave (1970s) were a transit from local self-government with features of direct democracy to a modern functionally organized representative system [13]. In Finland [14], the peculiarity of the governance reforms in the 1990s was the implementation of large-scale transformations at the local level. Just like in Sweden, they were oriented to the British experience: agency relations with broad autonomy between levels of government, introduction of market principles in the provision of public services, etc. However, commercialization and the transfer of public services to the local level had a negative impact on the social sphere, which was traditionally characterized by a high level and quality of service provision. After that, the Finnish governance reform began to focus on the German experience of gradual transformation using pilot projects.

European countries demonstrate different approaches to public administration reform, and it is only with a certain degree of conventionality that we can contrast these approaches with each other as centralization or decentralization and attribute, for example, two extreme opposite situations to England and France. Just as it is impossible to say that Germany is trending toward France, and the Scandinavian countries toward England. Indeed, as a result of the reforms in England, there is a tendency to centralize and control local interests. In France, local politicians influence the center in defending the interests of communes. But, as the researchers note, comparing the situation before and after the reforms allows us to draw ambiguous conclusions. The governance reforms in England have seen deeper changes, while in France little has changed [15].

The difference in approaches to decentralization is largely determined by the content of center-local relations and the potential of local self-government. An analysis of the reforms and current local government can also lead to different conclusions. Judging by the budget, the number of employees, the territory of municipalities, etc., Britain has a strong local government. If we proceed from the criterion of formal local autonomy and freedom from the central government, the conclusion is different. Reforms in England have led to the fact that local authorities have the most limited freedom from the central government.

It is quite difficult to form a general idea of the ideal balanced model of central-local relations, which seems to be necessary in the context of the development of a multi-level governance system in the European Union. Some researchers define the balance between central control and local autonomy by the adequacy of resources of each party to protect its policy and autonomy [8]. Other authors focus on the balance between the central government's desire to control the periphery and thus maintain the nation as an integrated whole and the demands made by the periphery to the center to maintain local autonomy (J. Chandler). However, from the point of view of historical evolution, J. Chandler's arguments seem to be the most convincing. The researcher explains the specifics of center-local relations by the peculiarities of nation-building in each individual state [7]. The modern administrative-territorial organization of nation-states is the result of centuries-old conflicts in which certain models of relations between the center and the periphery were formed. Using the factor of historical development, it is possible to determine the contribution of various forces to the formation of the nation-state. It was created through changes from the top by the national elite, or as a result of local, peripheral uprisings and revolutions, or through the consolidation of small independent states into one nation. For example, in England, national integration was achieved through a government that represented local interests, and in France - through the penetration of the state into local communities through the system of prefects [15].

Historically, local administrations in Britain have had a kind of "individuality" and this has been a constant object of criticism from the central government. In France, every commune and every department was governed by the same administrative rules and was under the same control of the state. Thus, relations between the center and the periphery were initially established in different contexts. In France, these relations were closer, not only in the administrative sense, but also in the political sense, when regional elites were recruited into national politics. In contrast to France, in Britain, these ties were less close and the autonomy of the center and periphery in relation to each other was enshrined in a constitutional convention.

Central and local relations in countries have evolved in different ways. In addition, when considering these relationships, it is necessary to distinguish between the stages of genesis and reproduction. As H. Stoker points out, depending on the emphasis – on history or the present – the research can give exactly the opposite results.

In modern conditions, these relationships acquire new features. Management reforms revealed opposite trends, including in their own traditions of political culture, as it was in England and in France. The problems faced by most European countries turned out to be similar. As researchers note, the general content of the reforms of the late twentieth century was to eliminate the circumstances limiting local government and other management structures within each political system [11].

Thus, the experience of public administration reforms in European countries has shown that the limits of decentralization are determined by the specifics of central and local relations and the potential of local self-government. Political decentralization and commercialization of public services in England, the increasing role of communes and the gradual transition to market relations in the management of Germany, administrative reforms and activation of local communities in France – all these processes reflect one or another model of decentralization, which other European countries are guided by.

Based on the analysis, we will form a comparative table of public administration models in European countries (Table 2.1).

Table 2.1.

Comparison of features of public administration models in European countries

Features of the model	Scandinavian countries (Sweden, Norway)	Anglo-Saxon countries (UK)	Napoleonic countries (France)	Germanic countries (Germany)
The level of political influence of the central government	Very low influence of central government	High influence of the central government	Significant influence of bureaucracy	
The system of law	Scandinavian legal structure	Case law	Codified law	
The model of public administration	Combination of managerial, legal and negotiation cultures and attributes in all layers of the state	The Westminster model	Hierarchical structure of the civil service	The Weberian model
Form of government	Constitutional monarchy	Parliamentary monarchy	Presidential-parliamentary republic	Parliamentary republic
Form of government	Unitary			Federal
The ratio of centralisation and decentralisation	Combining the Centre with the competences of local authorities and society	Significant impact of the Centre on the development of the state		Significant regulatory influence of the Centre
Type of administrative behaviour	Government agencies have been transformed into state-owned enterprises operating under market rules	A culture of discussion and agreement	Legal division of powers between levels of government	A combination of strictness and leniency in the application of public law

Source: compiled by the author

CONCLUSIONS

Thus, we can see that the domestic public administration system is at a turning point, since it has the features of different models and changes occurring with the implementation of reforms will be such in a few years that we will be able to

clearly say which model the public administration system belongs to in Ukraine. However, in our opinion, the French model is most acceptable in terms of Ukraine.

REFERENCES

1. Decentralization and local democracy in the world: first global report by United Cities and Local Governments, 2008. Barcelona. United Cities and Local Governments, 2009.
2. Bealey F., Chapman R.A., Sheehan M. Elements in political science. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1999.
3. Conyers, Jr. J. U.S. House Passes 3 Amendments By Rep. Conyers To Defense Spending Bill To Protect Civilians From Dangers Of Arming and Training Foreign Forces. URL: http://conyers.house.gov/index.cfm/press-releases?ContentRecord_id=0DC46F90801E-433D-B565-5E8A67C81A83.
4. Bellamy C. Administering central-local relations, 1871-1919: the local government board in its fiscal and cultural context. Manchester: Manchester University Press ND, 1988.
5. Stoker G. Comparative local governance. The Oxford handbook of political institutions. Oxford. Oxford University Press, 2006.
6. Loughlin M. Legality and locality: the role of law in central-local government relations. Oxford. Oxford University Press, 1996.
7. Rhodes R. A. W. Beyond Westminster and Whitehall: the sub-central governments of Britain. London: Taylor & Francis, 1988.
8. Saunders P. Social Theory and the Urban Question. London: Routledge, 2004.
9. Green D. J. Return to Civil Society: Social Security without State Participation / per. from Engl. M. New Publishing House, 2009.
10. Peculiarities of Applying the Methodology of Evaluation of the Financial Architecture of the National Economy / O. Rudenko, M. Zhytar, Y. Ananieva // Collective Monograph Association Agreement: Driving integrational Changes Vol. III, Accent Graphics Communications & Publishing, Canada, 2020 – P. 201-209.

11. Germany. Challenges of the XXI century. Edited by V.B. Belov. M. All the World, 2009.
12. Thoening J. C. Modernizing Sub-National Government in France: Institutional Creativity and Systemic Stability. State and local government reforms in France and Germany: divergence and convergence. Wiesbaden: Springer, 2006.
13. Chandler J. Local government in liberal democracies: an introductory survey. Ed. N. Y.; L. Routledge, 1993.
14. Civil Service. Professional Programmes (jul. 2005 – mar. 2006). National School of Government. 2005. URL: www.nationalschool.gov.uk.
15. Mabileau A. Local politics and participation in Britain and France. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press, 1989.