

UDC 342.9

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32849/2663-5313/2019.12.31>

**Yaroslav Buryak,**

*Candidate of Law Sciences, Assistant at the Department of Civil Law and Process of the Institute of Law, Psychology and Innovative Education of Lviv Polytechnic National University*

## TRANSFORMATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE-LEGAL STATUS OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION ON THE BASED OF HUMAN-CENTRISM

*The article is devoted to the study of the stages of transformation of the administrative and legal status of public administration bodies on the basis of Human Center. The stages of transformation of public administration bodies are distinguished, attention is paid to the special relevance and social importance of issues related to improving the efficiency of public administration bodies, with the quality of the services provided by the state in the context of civil society development.*

*The article emphasizes that public administration should be understood as a transparent process of active engagement of three groups of "actors" – the state, representatives of civil society and entrepreneurship – in the process of making and implementing socially significant decisions and pressing problems.*

*In the context of the controversy over the traditional three-stage evolution of public administration in the study of the evolution of public administration, the last of which is ongoing today, this section provides a grounded version of the five main stages, each of which is in any way related to the search for new models of democracy, strengthening of ambivalent processes, formation of needs for new models, principles of public nature of management and mechanisms for solving socially significant problems.*

*Theoretically, the actions of the individual can and should be televised, social or public, and therefore the person, even as a public servant, cannot forget the goals, values and values of other people. But in practice, it turns out that a public servant is incapable of acting, oriented at the same time and at the goal, and at other members of society, and therefore cannot be a full member of society.*

*It should also be noted that in the first stage an administrative school of management was developed and developed. One of the main goals of which is to create universal management principles.*

*The administration should be divided into six groups of administrative operations: administrative, commercial, financial, technical and technological, accounting and security. The main subject of his research was the administrative operations group, as other groups were considered to be the object of influence of the administrative function.*

**Key words:** public administration, Human-centrism, public service, transformation of public administration, public management, civil society.

**Formulation of the problem.** Today, the problem of Human-centrism in public administration is becoming more and more urgent, as history shows the state bureaucratic mechanism is increasingly inferior to the interests of civil society due to the external globalization processes in the world due to democratic processes.

Public administration is increasingly reduced to serving not so much a bureaucratic machine, but directly to citizens as individuals. That is why, more and more, we are talking about the effectiveness of the provision of public services, which are in the interconnection of the state and the citizen.

The following objectives were set in the study of this issue:

- to characterize the research positions of scientists on the essence of public management;

- to distinguish the stages of implementation of Human Center in public administration;

- to pay attention to and analyze the scientific positions on the concept of the effectiveness of public administration, taking into account the Human Center.

**Presenting main material.** The term "public management" came into circulation about 140 years ago, and today has different translation options: "public", "public" management. In the 1970s, public administration was considered within the framework of "public administration", in the 1980s – "public policy and management", and in the 1990s – the theory of "leadership" and "renewed management". In the XXI century, these concepts found their continuation in the approaches of "present" and "managerial" management. The first approach defines "a citizen as a client,

enabling him to choose between the public and private sectors and seek the best quality of public services" [1, p. 39]. Consequently, public administration is transformed into an organization similar to that of private entities. And the second approach emphasizes the fact that public authorities operate in a political environment, so they are responsible not to clients, but to citizens. All the above theories form the conceptual basis of modern public administration, helping to improve its quality, by reducing social costs and increasing responsibility for "consumer satisfaction".

Scientists' research positions on the essence of "public administration" do not find a unified interpretation and unity of views in this regard. Some define public administration as the influence of a public authority on an object for any public interest [2, p. 9].

Others – as rulemaking, regulatory, control, organizational and other activities carried out on the basis of established rules, rules and procedures [3, p. 41].

Third, it is about managing society together with society itself [4, p. 32].

Fourth – as the management of complex network entities, consisting of many actors, such as elements of national, regional, local government, interest groups, social institutions, private organizations [5, p. 253].

In our opinion, under public administration we should understand the transparent process of active interaction of three groups of "actors" – the state, representatives of civil society and entrepreneurship – in the process of making and implementing socially significant decisions and pressing problems.

In the context of the controversy with the traditional allocation in the study of the evolution of public governance of the three stages, the last of which is ongoing to date, this section of the study provides a substantiated version of the five main stages, each of which, in one way or another, is related to the search for new models of democracy, strengthening of ambivalent processes, formation of needs for new models, principles of public nature of management and mechanisms of resolution of socially significant problems.

*The first stage (from 1880 to 1920) was public administration.* The duration of the first phase of public administration research is 40 years. The most significant representatives of this stage are W. Wilson, W. Goodnow, M. Weber, A. Fayol, and others.

Public governance as a separate scientific and educational area was first explored by W. Wilson. In his research, he insisted that there were differences between political science and public administration, despite the fact that

the latter was the direction of the former. Thus, in the essay "The Study of Administration", the author noted that the purpose of administrative science is to determine the specific activities of the government, and a set of actions for the implementation of this activities efficiently and with the least cost. He referred to the basic principles of public administration: separation of political and administrative issues; comparative analysis of political and business organizations; improving the efficiency of the civil service through the introduction of business administration practices into the work of public authorities.

The mechanism of public administration is arranged in such a way that the word of any of those who is endowed with competence and competence, authority and responsibility, regardless of whether he is a minister, mayor or junior specialist of the office, possesses the power of procedure, establishes universal, public truth [6, p. 100].

Therefore, the word embodied in "thought" should remain the main and preferred tool of public administration, which combines political and managerial dimensions and manifests their social significance [7, p. 17].

Particularly noteworthy is the work of M. Weber "On some categories of understanding sociology" ("Definition of Sociology", 1897), which developed a model of three types of action of the individual, then supplemented by two types of socially oriented actions. The principles of professional bureaucracy suggest that every official is a full member of society and capable of all types of action, including the capacity for the highest manifestation – "public action".

In theory, the actions of the individual can and should be tele-rational, social, or public, and therefore the individual, even as a public servant, is incapable of forgetting other people's goals, values, and values. But in practice, it turns out that a civil servant is incapable of action, which is oriented at the same time and to the purpose and to other members of society, and therefore cannot be a full member of society.

It should also be noted that within the first stage an administrative school of management emerged and developed. One of the main goals of which is to create universal principles of management.

A bright representative of the school – the author of the theory of administration and 14 basic principles of management Henri Fayol. In his "Theory of Administration", outlined in the paper "General and Industrial Management"», the author divided the administration into six groups of administrative operations:

administrative, commercial, financial, technical and technological, accounting and security. The main subject of his research was a group of administrative operations, as other groups were considered as the object of influence of an administrative function.

The analysis of the first stage of the development of public administration showed that it is based on the study of policy/governance contradictions, the analysis of which revealed the interdependence of policy development and governance.

*The second stage (from 1920 to 1950)* is management theory, which regulates economic relations in the space of "border" contacts between the private and public sectors.

The duration of the second phase of the public administration study is 30 years. Representatives of this stage include L. Urwick, L. Gulick, N. Simon, D. Waldo, G. Lasswell, M. Follett, E. Mayo, A. Maslow and others.

G. Lasswell in his work "Power and Personality" was one of the first to emphasize that power, on the one hand, is involved in decisions, and on the other – control over resources that have power for participants in power relations value. In his view, relations between agents of power and influence set two major "energy poles" in the "gravitational field" power communication, and the very "phenomenon of political relations arises as a result of the interaction of relations of influence and power relations".

G. Simon in the study "Administrative Behavior" developed the concept of "limited rationality" and the corresponding "satisfactory" model of managerial decision-making.

D. Waldo in his work "Administrative State" emphasized that the idea of separation of policies and governance came into conflict with the current state of affairs, while increasing the influence of the government on the process of policy formation and legislative initiative, and his area of expertise has expanded. In this regard, "the assertion that politics and governance are separate and autonomous structures or processes is obviously erroneous" [8, p. 8].

In addition, it should be noted that within this stage has developed a "school of human relations", the main representatives of which are M. Follett, E. Mayo, A. Maslow. According to the data, scientists have focused their attention on the behavior of working individuals in the organization.

At this stage, a general theory of governance, existing within the interaction between the private and public sectors, was formulated, the principles of public enterprise management were explored.

*The third stage (from 1950 to 1990)* was public policy and management. Within this stage of the development of public management theory, the greatest interest is the work of L. Dzhones, M. Crozier, C. Lindblom, W. Niskanen, P. Aucoin, F. Thompson, D. Truman, S. Hood, V. Barry, M. Oakeshott. At the heart of their work is a behavioral approach to public administration, which explains the real functioning of administrative services through behavior analysis working individuals and groups. In their work, researchers at this stage have emphasized that the basis of management science is the achievement of modern social psychology and sociology.

D. Truman in "The Governmental Process" defines the state as an institution of society through which the power is distributed resources, and society – as a plurality of interacting groups. He viewed the person as a "political animal", a member of various interest groups, representing "groups of influence over other social groups that are used to achieve their goals through governmental organizations" [9, p. 31].

The end of the 1960s was marked by the emergence of a model of "New Public Management". This model of governance was first described in detail by P. Okoin and K. Hood.

Its key areas have been borrowed in the non-state sector of the economy (introduction of competition, contract system, restructuring of the decision-making mechanism itself, pursuing state policy by increasing the degree of mobility of structures and functions, developing their adaptive ability to respond to a constantly changing environment, forming an orientation to the development of strategy). As a concept of "new state management" was formed in the 80's of the last century and is a combination of market mechanisms, as well as ideas and technologies, private sector management.

According to this concept, executive bodies are perceived as "executive agencies" that provide public services.

U. Niskanen in his work *Bureaucracy and Representative Government* proposed "to make public administration more marketable". In his view every bureau must be able to operate in a competitive environment and deal with a highly elastic demand function; so that the varieties of goods and services supplied by the bureau could be financed through government or funds, and the provision of these services was outsourced to private, profit-oriented economic institutions. In terms of a "market" approach, public administration should be entrusted with entrepreneurial management functions, which boil down to

the following provisions: public and private organizations can be managed more or less equally; management practices must be used in public administration; in the context of a new management organization, it is necessary to move from assessing the effectiveness of the management process to assessing the effectiveness of the management result; separation of commercial functions from non-commercial and policy-advisory functions from service and regulatory functions; the consumer of public services is treated as a purchaser of public services; in the organization of public services, public administration must give priority to private enterprise [10, p. 355].

Lindblom focused his attention on government and political decision-making. It should be noted that his ideas proved to be in demand not only by state organizations. The author identified two types of decision-making processes for which the image of the tree was used for visual representation: the processes of the first type (associated with the “root of the tree”) outlined a rational comprehensive methodology, in which the decision-maker starts this process with problems. He defined the processes of the second type (with “branches”) as a methodology of successive restrictive comparisons, using which, steadily, step by step, moves forward from the initial situation by a small amount. It was this type of process in *The Science of Muddling Through* that Lindblom called “the science of bringing things to a close”.

The revolutionary nature of decision-making is an important source of clear and relevant scientific ideas.

M. Oakshott developed two concepts of public administration: civic and target. These types of government are ideal theoretical constructs, so they do not occur in their pure form. However, it should be noted, that the second concept is based on the value of a person, which is determined by its contribution to the “common cause”.

Within this stage, a behavioral approach has been developed, the purpose of which is to uncover the possibility of a person in the management process. The most striking representative of the approach is the author of “Theory X and B” McGregor.

The analysis of the third stage showed a tendency to expand approaches to the study of the concept of public administration, using socio-psychological and behavioral approaches, as well as the introduction of market bases in public administration.

*The fourth stage (from 1990 to 2000)* is the concept of “renewed (self-improving, adaptable) management”. This phase of public

administration research lasted 10 years. Its representatives include T. Gaebler, D. Osborne, P. Plastrik. Scientists have dealt with the problems of rethinking government based on the prerequisites of business management.

D. Osborne and T. Gebler in “Rethinking Management. How the spirit of entrepreneurship transforms the public sector” formulated a modern theory of market transformation of the public sector and basic principles of updating public administration systems [11, p. 47].

In another joint study, “Renovating Government”, D. Osborne and T. Gebler insisted on the priority of individual choice, competition, and the use of a market model in governance.

Thus, the “economic approach” to the organization of the bureaucratic apparatus of the state, provides the most complete creation of market environment the functioning of bureaucratic organizations to improve their efficiency and to achieve the best value for money and performance in the public sector.

The work of D. Osborne and P. Plastrik entitled “Banishing Bureaucracy: The Five Strategies for Reinventing Government” summarizes the best practices of governance reforms in the public sector, recognizing the big difference between public administration and management in the private sector (a public organization operates in a political environment, while the private sector is in a market economy), and five key tools have been identified to allow the bureaucratic genome to be updated. Under the update, they understand the fundamental transformation of state systems and organizations to dramatically improve their efficiency, the volume of services provided, the adaptability to the conditions and the ability to improve. This transformation ends with a change in their tasks, incentives, reporting, authority structure.

Therefore, when upgrading the public sector associated with the creation of state-owned business organizations, it is necessary to rely on strategic levers that are in the broader system, rather than within a particular organization

They explicitly state that “the main products of any public institution are various civil services to the population. But the fact that the government cannot operate as a business does not show that it can no longer be “entrepreneurial”.

The analysis of the fourth stage of the study of public administration is characterized by a radical transformation in the understanding of the goals of public authorities, and the transition from a minimalist to a maximalist model.

A state that, in addition to solving basic tasks, undertakes many additional socio-economic functions.

*The fifth stage (from 2000 to the present) is the concept of "efficiency of public administration".* The beginning of the XXI century is characterized by the beginning of the fifth stage in the study of public administration, which continues to the present. The main representatives are G. Brebant, M. Delyagin, V. Dyakov, J.-P. Jacques, M. Castells, V. Kozbanenko, I. Kotelevskaya, O. Kirichenko, V. Lobanov, M. McFaul, S. Naumov, V. Nekrasov, E. Okhotsky, O. Pfersmann, L. Smorgunov, L. Jacobson and others.

Of particular relevance and social importance are issues related to improving the efficiency of public administration bodies, and the quality of services provided by the state in the context of civil society development.

In this regard, the research of this stage is mainly related to the study of communications, connections and interactions between representatives of public, private and public structures, since it is in this area that socially significant decisions are made and management functions are conducive to improving efficiency of public administration. In Ukraine, the reform of local self-government and territorial organization of government in Ukraine is devoted to this stage. Thus, the decree of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine "On approval of the Concept of reforming local self-government and territorial organization of power in Ukraine" stipulates that the system of local self-government does not meet the needs of society for today [12].

The functioning of local self-government bodies in most territorial communities does not ensure the creation and maintenance of a favorable living environment necessary for the full development of a person, self-realization, protection of rights, provision of high-quality bodies of local self-government bodies, institutions and organizations created by them and available administrative, social and other services in their respective territories (public services).

Within the present-day stage, the concept of efficiency is often used in connection with the notion of performance, productivity, and efficiency of functioning. With respect to public administration, efficiency is usually

associated with the achievement of the goals of the public authorities, the completeness and quality of the fulfillment of its essential functions by the state.

#### References:

1. Malkovskaia Y. Transformatsiya hosudarstva i evoliutsiya publychnoho admynstryrovaniya v usloviakh hlobalyzatsyy (aktualyzatsiya evropeiskoho opita dlia Rossyi). *Vestnyk Rossiyskogo unyversyteta druzhby narodov. Seriya: Polytolohiya*. 2006. No 8. P. 39.
2. Avramchikova N. Hosudarstvennoe y munitsypalnoe upravlenye. Krasnoiarsk : Sybyrskiy hosudarstvennyy aerokosmycheskiy unyversitet, 2008. P. 9.
3. Chyrkyn V. Publychnoe upravlenye. Moskva, 2004. P. 41.
4. Nekrasov V., Lymareva D. Hosudarstvenno-chastnoe partnerstvo v systeme publychnoho upravleniya : monohrafiya. Rostov-na-Donu: YuRY-fylyal RANKhyHS pry Prezydente RF, 2012. P. 32
5. Kurochkyn A. Ynstytutsyonalizatsiya setei v upravlenyy rossyiskoi systemoi obrazovaniya. *Polyteks*. 2005. No 2. P. 253.
6. Vulfovych R., Hymelshtein Ya. Publychnoe upravlenye: mekhanyzmi i zakonomernosty. *Upravlencheskoe konsulyrovanye*. 2009. No 3. P. 107.
7. Veber M.O nekotorykh katehoriyakh ponymaiushchei sotsyolohyy. *Yzbrannyye proyzvedeniya. / Per. s nem. Sost., obshch. red y poslel. Yu.N Davudova; Predysl. P.P. Haidenko. Moskva : Prohress, 1990. P. 17; Lasswell G. Power and Personality, 1946. P. 46.*
8. Waldo D. The Administrative State: A Study of the Political Theory of American Public Administration, 2nd ed. New York, London : Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1984. P. 8.
9. Troutman D. The Governmental Process. New York, 1951. P. 31.
10. Nyskanen V. Peresmotr Vekhy ekonomycheskoi misly. *Ekonomyka blahosostoianiya y obshchestvennyi vybor. Sankt-Peterbug : Ekonomycheskaia shkola, V. 4 2004. P. 539.*
11. Osborn D., Plastyryk P. *Upravlenye bez biurokratov: Piat stratehi obnovleniya hosudarstva / Obshch. red. y vstup. st. L.Y. Lopatnykova. Moskva : Prohress. 2001. P. 47–48.*
12. Rozporiadzhennia Kabinetu Ministriv Ukrainy vid 1 kvitnia 2014 r. No 333-r "Pro skhvalennia Kontseptsii reformuvannia mistsevoho samovriaduvannia ta terytorialnoi orhanizatsii vlady v Ukraini". URL: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/333-2014-%D1%80>.

*Стаття присвячується дослідженню етапів трансформації адміністративно-правового статусу органів публічного управління на засадах людиноцентризму. Виокремлюються етапи трансформації органів публічного управління, акцентується увага на особливій актуальності та соціальній значимості питань, пов'язаних з підвищенням ефективності діяльності органів публічного управління, з якістю надаваних державою послуг у контексті розвитку громадянського суспільства.*

У статті наголошується, що під державним управлінням слід розуміти прозорий процес активної взаємодії трьох груп «акторів» – держави, представників громадянського суспільства та підприємництва – у процесі прийняття та реалізації суспільно значущих рішень та нагальних проблем.

У контексті суперечки з традиційним виділенням у дослідженні еволюції державного управління трьох етапів, останній з яких триває дотепер, цей розділ дослідження надає обґрунтовану версію п'яти основних етапів, кожен з яких так чи інакше пов'язаний з пошуком нових моделей демократії, посиленням амбівалентних процесів, формуванням потреб у нових моделях, принципах публічного характеру управління та механізмами вирішення суспільно значущих проблем.

Теоретично дії особистості можуть і мають бути раціональними, соціальними чи публічними, і тому людина навіть як державний службовець, не може забути цілі, цінності та цінності інших людей. Але на практиці виявляється, що державний службовець не здатний діяти, орієнтуючись одночасно і на мету, і на інших членів суспільства, а тому не може бути повноправним членом суспільства.

Слід також зазначити, що на першому етапі склалася та розвивалася адміністративна школа управління, однією з головних цілей якої є створення універсальних принципів управління.

Слід розділяти адміністрацію на шість груп адміністративних операцій: адміністративні, комерційні, фінансові, технічні та технологічні, бухгалтерський облік та безпека. Основним предметом цього дослідження була група адміністративних операцій, оскільки інші групи розглядалися як об'єкт впливу адміністративної функції.

**Ключові слова:** публічне управління, публічне адміністрування, суспільна послуга, трансформація публічного управління, управління суспільством, громадянське суспільство.

