

## **The Methodological Analysis of Complexity of New Public Governance Institutionalization**

**Prof. dr. Alvydas Raipa**

*Kaunas University of Technology, Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of Public Administration, K. Donelaičio g. 20, LT-44239 Kaunas, alvydas.raipa@ktu.lt*

### **Annotation**

The article analyzes modern steps of public governance process evaluation as managerial practice and academic field of research. Essential theoretical-methodological research projections are focused to explain, determine conditions, internal and external factors of new public governance as new historical construct of public administration. Using meta-analysis methodology the article's aims are: to detail new public governance indicators and features, to introduce the position of world famous public governance theorists, related with theoretical and practical problems of performance management, implementation innovations in public sector and the development of public governance democratization ideology. The article identified decomposition elements of inter-sectoral integration, socially oriented new public governance tendencies and trends.

**Keywords:** new public governance, innovations of governance, structural changes and elements of governance, performance management, inter-sectoral integration.

### **Introduction**

The analyzed problem is actual and important for public sector methodological researchers and for practitioners, so the goal of the author of this article is to analyze new public governance as the new and more democratic, also humanistic, socially oriented form of governance.

Nowadays public governance is a process, when public managers are shaping directions and focus on a fundamental movement for change. These actions to change the directions, ways, methods, models and procedures are characterized as global in goals and local in methodology of policy implementation. Depending on the level of governance the movement of changes is going to be based on inter-sectoral integration, various systems of networks of public sector organizations and civil servants. Separate problems of identification new public governance structure are analyzed in the research of B. Guy Peters, St. Osborne, J. E. Lane, T. Christensen, G. Bouckaert, I. Halligan and other authors.

The governance evolution and changes in the junction of 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> centuries has various sys-

tems, indicators, dimensions and elements. Many of changes are characterized as products of governmental reforms or innovations in sophisticated public governance, as the conclusion of natural development of society, requiring a more comprehensive methodology for better public policy formation and implementation, modern structural and cultural features of organizations, directly related with efficiency and productivity.

The main goal analyzed in the article is to research, to define and detail, to determine the complexity of a new public governance construct, to separate the main factors of global changes, to forecast and establish directions for higher level of responsibility, to higher level of strategy humanization and policy democratization in the context of public sector development in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

Research methodology: meta-analysis, content analysis, comparative analysis, theoretical modeling, classification.

### **The structure of new public governance**

One of the most popular methodological discussions in the context of the nowadays stage of governance is related to the question about new public management impact on strategic planning in public sector. The strategic nature of new public governance is defined by modern state financial-economic possibilities, quality characteristics of all resources coordination, inter-sectoral interaction of effective new planning, supply of information technologies for all kinds and levels of organizations, organizational behavior and the levels of governors and managers competency. All the listed circumstances and conditions for effective new strategic public governance institutionalization in the activity of public structures can be linked into scientific – systemic determinants. G. Mulgan and M. Potuček define plethora of accents in the strategic nature projections of new public governance as stable government, political support, creation of structures of strategic policy formation incremental character of policy implementation (Mulgan, 2004, p. 32-59).

One of the most famous public governance researchers of the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century Y. Dror had in mind H. Simon's efficiency evaluation of democracy and governance interaction, given already in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, as the essential common disturbances for the setting of strategic new public governance. As it is known H. Simon represented the world struck by post war hardships and he kept the goals, criteria of governance efficiency as priorities, but he understood the democratization of governance rather limitedly; he did not separate it from common-democratic – classical traditions of democracy, principal citizen rights, freedom guaranty and other traditions, focusing the main attention on the technologies of decision processes, the search of social assumptions, the dominant of rational paradigm on the whole, seeking to include them into the context of democratic process development. H. Simon in his conceptions of administrative state and administrative man widely used psychological way of behavior of organization members, which was by no means his biggest income into the 20<sup>th</sup> century public governance strategic thinking, attempts of institutionalization (Simon, 2003, p. 111-112, 238-290).

Y. Dror reforms the context of H. Simon's efficiency and democratic governance dichotomy stating that governance attempts to seek for efficiency perspective even today meets the fundamental tasks of governance democratization, i.e. citizens, their group interests, in the conditions of new public governance seek for the earlier participation in decision making. However, most often their participation finishes in the places of ballot when they elect those who become real factual decision makers (Dror, 2004, p. 15). In the ideology of new public governance, strategic governance is perceived, firstly, as presumption of public organizations' effective activity and as instrumentation in theoretical perceptions of the last several decades, which have gone through the rises and falls of its interest (as well as other forms and systems which develop the possibilities of governance improvement), i.e. the stages of systemic evolution influencing the purpose of strategic governance functions and technologies; even the changing of principles and of course, methodological searching for strategic governance improvement and constructions of theoretical perceptions (Raipa, 2010, p. 151).

Y. Dror accents a wider spectrum of disturbances of new public governance ideology strategic development both in theoretical and in practical context which actually resulted mostly from a lot of already mentioned problems of democratic governance and its efficiency possibilities dichotomy (Dror, 2004, p. 15).

Forming the application of new public governance more intensive development and possibilities, efforts are defined to improve political elite prepared-

ness; the importance of democratic process development, the perception of problems of various society structural parts (including elite); long term strategic regulations to achieve social-intellectual creativity; the accent of innovative significance in the processes of public governance processes and connected with them the necessary strategic structural reform preparation; institutionalization of central and local government, processes of market, civil society and legal state strategic tasks aiming for new higher quality - new public governance parameters. Saying in other words today as earlier, in the practice of public governance there are nothing more constant than changes and reforms (Kettl, Fesler, 2009, p. 113).

The development of public governance in global society (as science and practice) is becoming one of the central spheres of interaction, collisions and integration of all the mentioned processes; as the changes in public governance (policy and administration) are made by globalization environment. Together, theoretical attitudes of public governance, which are formed at the basis of most social sciences, can help to control more universal methodological, socio-economic, cultural-ideological projections that orient to new humanistic, socially oriented tendencies of public governance and fixing of vectors in the practical activity of modern public organizations.

The changes of public governance in scientific literature are understood as the formation of new public management paradigm in 9<sup>th</sup>-10<sup>th</sup> decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century; and they dominated as incremental evolvement of the whole theoretical doctrines to new public governance; today, they have many decomposition determinants which can hardly be named as reliable paradigm construction of scientific views; because theoreticians today can only satisfy themselves by the first generalizations of consequences and results of the mentioned evolvement, sparse complex research of these processes. In today's practice, society's position is even more oriented to ensuring of more liberal values, such as solution alternatives and activity, the freedom of choice and rights, the control of governance structures, the increase of their social responsibility.

New public management as a theory was formed having in mind good practice of public governance of western states (first of all the United Kingdom and the USA), variety of liberal thought, ideological doctrines of market, which were the basis of permanent evolvement of weberian-wilsonian traditional public administration forms to new public management. Good practice from the USA and the United Kingdom that was based on the wider implementation of market methods in the public sector, activity marketization fought its way with difficulty. Recently the archives of the United Kingdom government

institutions have been given publicity which testify that around 1980s M.Thatcher's government had to put enormous efforts to reform the public sector trying to apply the elements of the future new public management, implementing new ways of giving governance and public services (Bovaird and Loeffler, 2009, p. 9-11).

One of the main distinctive features of new public management is its complex structure as it reforms management ideology, its multi-dimension and its evolutionary continuing nature. In other words, if we accept the doctrine statement about permanent character of weberian-wilsonian administration evolution to new public management, this could mean, that new public management must inevitably continue and ensure the permanent nature of public governance reforms, with the help of systemic monitoring it could do constant re-inventory of activity processes and management technologies, encourage continuous discussions and raise the level of argumentation. This could mean that social practice of public governance is and must be constantly researched and reformed consciously, i.e., being strengthened by subjective activity (citizens, political parties, society organizations) dimension, in the same way strengthening the quality of governance processes and it should include citizens as consumers into assurance of public services quality standards; i.e., the dimension of public services mutual creation appears (state institutions and citizens-consumers interaction) (Peters, 2002, p. 35).

The realization of governance processes decentralization tendencies of various levels (national and sub national) widened policy and management nets possibilities of theory postulates as well as net structures practical creation and its activity efficiency, realization scopes of management methodologies (the whole system of constructs, models, methods and activity procedures), when the essential aim is the final result – criteria of efficiency, criteria of better service of customers supplying services. Most of these processes and tendencies played a very important role in improving of state functions – regulation, distribution, and in educating management abilities of organizations and their personnel. New public management is also understood as permanent contracts, development of market elements, and their improvement, i.e., the growth of entrepreneur governance level, all including mechanism of competition, which is developed in public sector, etc. (New Public Management. 2005, p. 110-111; 163; 195).

### **The context of public government reforms and changes**

The concluding few years of the past decade served to once again call attention to the limitations

of the “governance era”. New Public Management doctrine represents private sector role model in governance as fully equal, private sector as partner to government in terms of the guiding of contemporary society. Instead, these events remind us that it is still the public sector, which must establish the framework and the environment that is required for an effective private sector, which dominated in “governance era” – New Public Management era. As mentioned by A. Rosenbaum, firstly, it was recognized that the deregulation of housing, banking and financial services sector facilitated the crisis. Secondly, the response of the most severely effected countries, at least initially, was the exact opposite of that which they have been preaching for the past two decades. A. Rosenbaum noted that the significant expansion of government activity over past few years proved to be very effective as a means to moderate the economic disaster brought on by deregulation aspect of the “government movement”, which is a very large problem of public sector governance, related with difficulties faced by a large number of the most prominent private sector corporations of North Europe and the United States (Rosenbaum, 2011, p. 158-159). The indicators of modern new public governance, which reflect integration and internationalizing changes, formal and non formal structures, the regulation and deregulation tendencies of society social processes, and the elements which reflect these social stratification processes – all these can be named in the following way: in all social life spheres the interaction of formal and non formal structures has grown; inter-sectoral (of all three society sectors) integration; the transformation of horizontal and vertical connections in organizational systems in various social life spheres; the expressive changes of direct and recurrent connections, their multidimensional changes in various social life fields; the changes of various systems levels, the changes oriented to the development of generalized systemic connections (regional, interregional, inter-sector, combined structures) (Melnikas, 2011, p. 254-256).

The context of reforms that have been implemented in the public sector over the past several decades have had a very wide range of motivation. The changes that have been institutionalized in governance had different styles of reform. The fundamental consequence of various reforms has been to move governing out of the center of the conventional, politically driven public sector and to empower a range of public servants and administrators including all level of employees and members of public sector and a lot off members of civil society, participants of public policy formation and implementation (Peters, 2010, p. 36).



One of the reasons, determining successful development of public sector reforms, is the growing gap between practitioners and academicians, with the former being interested in usable knowledge (as fundamental key of innovations) while the latter are concerned with advancing science. Such distance between practitioners and academicians, between public sector governance practice and scientific research is not only American phenomena where in 1970's 32 percent of articles in 10 public administration journals were written by practitioners. Since then, practitioners' authorship in PAR has declined quite sharply, to less than 7 percent. This is not only American reality, because comparable declines have been reported in the UK and the Netherlands. The main conclusion in the recession period should be to find new forms of involvement academicians as consultants in public governance, organizational reforms, service-learning initiatives. It may be co-authoring articles, so as to inform both practice and scholarship, because the past few years in the world economic, financial spheres have provided public sector practitioners with the most significant challenges. Recession changes political landscape, the need of new quality of public decisions appears, the role of inter-sectoral integration, involvement community in public participation increases, public organizations and public servants responsibility grow. Social economics has the elements that influence decision-making, new possibilities and forms of control and measurement efficiency public structures, including such forms of new activity – performance management, new level of public private partnership depending on our governmental organizations cultures, on all processes of changes and transformations (Hartman, Raadschelders, 2011, p. 25).

Changes taking place over the last two decades in all levels of government have been in the world transformational, the administrative model of governance that guided administrators for more than a century to introduce a new type of governing - new kinds of public managers. Actions to change the way governments are determined as global and local in scope. For example, more than 5000 participants attended the 2005 global Forum of Reinventing Government at Seoul. The main problem of forum discussions was how to reform the governance (Mcnabb, 2008).

One of the most popular spheres of multi-sectoral integration in public private partnership (PPP) can be described as the increasing use of institutional hybridization and the move from government to governance. Hybrid organization approach includes:

- concessions,
- strategic equity as well as management partnership,

- PPP's,
- privatization (partial or full),
- flotation of State Owned Enterprises (SOEs) (initial and secondary),
- securitization.

Though the PPP concept is often confused with privatization proper, it shares commonality with privatization in that PPPs also entail the introduction of private sector management and/or ownership of what traditionally has been the role of the government. PPP is an institutional and contractual partnership arrangement between the government and a private sector operator to deliver a good or a service to the public, with the following distinctive elements:

- A true partnership relationship (i.e. alignment of objectives through the alignment of the incentive structures facing the public and private partners.
- A sufficient amount of risk transfer to the private operator to operate efficiently. This entails that the risk is allocated to the party best suited to carry it.

The main innovation directions in realizing PPP is the perceiving efficiency of the private sector and inefficiency of the public sector. Theoretical view of PPP forms includes three kinds of efficiency: allocative efficiency, i.e., the use of resources so as to maximize profit and utility; technical efficiency; and x efficiency, i.e., the prevention of a wasteful use of inputs (Burger, 2009, p. 82-83).

New public governance as the inter-organizational interaction among public, private and nongovernmental sector constructions became the intense scientific discussion object already at the beginning of 21<sup>st</sup> century. Inter-organizational interaction, partnership, understanding unite various organizational net interaction forms and means, which have the aim – to connect all the possible governance potential, resources, reform practice solving society economic, social (unemployment, busyness, social responsibility of institutions) problems, involving the bigger quantity of interests groups, structures, social-political units, and estimating the preparation of personnel, using expert systems and expertise (McQuaid, 2010, p. 353-365).

For the assessment of new public governance inter-organizational interaction certain indexes and indicators are necessary. Theorists formulating new public governance inter sector integration, net interaction, multidimensional link indexes refer to certain factors and conditions, carry out exhaustive analysis of trends and tendencies. Among such factors or conditions are listed the specific nature of various sector activity and environment, legal aspects of inter-sector integration, possibilities of practical integration,

social-economic, cultural, ideological values of separate sector organizations, planning of organizational behavior changes, the reliability and competence level of various assessment forms (control, audit structure activity); the position of society as the essential organization activity assessor (Klijn, 2010, p. 305-307).

Analyzing modern public governance change processes we can see that the greatest attention is paid to normative procedures of technological maintenance. Nevertheless, as it was already mentioned before, the most often met obstacle in dealing with changes, their implementation improving inter-sector integration (due to underestimated, or sometimes not noticed features of organizational activity) is becoming the common culture of organizations first of all perceiving it as institutionalized values (Hill, Lynn, 2009, p. 192).

The society expects results from public sector institution activity, effective means governing all kinds of resources. Therefore the criteria of public governance assessment are very important, which can help to distinguish social dimensions in the structure of public governance.

Citizens' participation is connected first of all with political, democratic rights, with their active participation in general creation of public value what allows to make a presumption about real representative bureaucracy possibilities in interaction with civil institutions, business structures seeking to harmonize the development of one or other side. Defining citizens only as customers or consumers does not encourage fast democratization of governance processes. We can see that today when analyzing the results of implementation of new public governance doctrine, which reveals many dysfunctions of this public governance formation – the greatest part of which is one or other way linked with social society aims and problems realizing them (Groeneveld, Walle, 2010, p. 252-253).

Social structures that compose the social system are the complex part of systemic elements and act according to the principles of mutual interaction, inter-organizational interaction, networks. This is a really complex thing, which requires constant monitoring of this system estimating the conditions and subjective factors that influence the opportunities of this mechanism. Social systems, successful functioning of social networks, their mutual interaction today is one of the most important conditions of public governance evolution to more improved governance forms (Bourgon, 2010, p. 119-121).

Social network may be named as new type management – political networks as well, less connected with hierarchical understanding of bureaucracy sys-

tem with fewer features of formalized activity, and they are more dynamic systems than the static systems listed in the classical system theory. Therefore social networks as systems (or subsystems) can be temporal, structural makings which perform the functions of expert temporary commissions, institutions, committees, which act realizing both general and specific aims of interests groups. Social networks performing in such conditions and carrying certain general or special tasks or functions develop and improve themselves as social systems and subsystems – saying in other words the functions they execute enable and compel the structures to improve institutionally and increase the effectiveness of their activity (Lin, 2003, p. 39-39).

### **Innovations of new public governance**

Historically, the public sector has been a major source of innovations in organization, technology and ideas themselves. Many innovations do not work very well. It means that innovations do not necessarily lead to the quantity and quality improvement of public products and services and we should anticipate that a substantial proportion of innovations and reforms will fail, at least to some degree. But, no one can actually say anything against innovations. Innovation is not just a concept, although it is currently a very fashionable concept with a strongly positive normative overtone. Public governance innovations in the 21<sup>st</sup> century have a specific local and historical context and can be studied more from an evolutionary rather than from revolutionary perspective. Measurement and assessment of innovative activity serves to reveal the failure and establish a basis for its solution. There is no widely accepted or common definition of what counts as an “innovation”. Popular definitional variety includes some determinations and indicators of “innovation”, as product innovation, service innovation, governance innovation, rhetorical innovation (Pollitt, 2011).

Innovation in public governance is directly concerned with reforms and changes as the process of reorganization and modernization of public sector. A key instrument for public sector changes process is preparing more comprehensive public programs and projects. There are a lot of kinds and directions of public sector modernization. It is very important to distinguish between reform and change in public organizations. By reform, we mean active and deliberate attempts by political and administrative leaders to change structural or cultural features of organizations; change is what actually happens to such features, change is often a gradual process in organizations, taking place in the course of routine activities and in small increments, but sometimes it can take

the form of abrupt and powerful upheavals, the potential which has been built up over a longer period of time. It means that many gradual changes have no background in reforms. Viewed from a negotiation-based instrumental perspective, differences in carrying out the reform may stem from resistance to organizations leader's plans for change from actors inside or outside the organization. A cultural perspective usually uses as its point of departure the actual organizational changes or elements of stability over time, where the degree of change and stability is measured against the existing cultural characteristics (Christensen, Laegreid, Roness and Revik, 2007, p. 122-123).

Innovations in public sector reform should not only be concerned with the improvement of the efficiency, efficacy and coherence. Not only economic values play an important role in public governance, but also political values like liberty, equity and social security as well as legal values like the rule of the law. The popularity of the reform of innovations in public sector and results that have been achieved and have been listed by the OESD point at an interesting value-driven battle within public administration; a battle between "management" on the one hand and "politics" on the other, which also influences the current innovation agenda of public governance. The modernization agenda and goals of public governance have rather informal focus, while the ultimate test for the modernization and innovation of public administration in the way in which governments are able to respond to changing social, cultural and economic conditions and the „wicked“ policy problems which result from them. In the start of the 21<sup>st</sup> century internal and external environment of public administration is determined as a tension between the front stage rhetoric of new public management doctrine and new practices of government (Bekkers, 2005, p. 3-19).

Innovations in public sector of the 21<sup>st</sup> century are defined as "good governance", "good organization", "good policy". All these definitions nowadays comprise the construct of new public governance doctrine. Public sector theorists do a lot attempting to identify main elements and indicators of new public governance (Raipa, 2011, p. 167-168).

The problems that rise for modern public governance in the social sphere and their complexity systemically form new, more complex in quality circumstances to accept decisions, different social problems. Nevertheless, in modern governance most social problems are entangled into a net clew of problems which require specific knowledge, possibilities, resources, and of course time from governance specialists. The factor of time often does not allow to use the best of the most popular – incremental solution model universally, that lets us even having the

deficit of knowledge, resources and abilities solve problems partly and with minimal expenses; gradually satisfying the social needs and expectations of society groups, solving complex often risky problems and even more often the whole streams or complexes of problems. The structures of public governance, governors must master seeing the complex problem streams, strategic variety of solutions possibilities, experience of problem linking and separating them, the net way of problem solution, understanding of one's own social responsibility (for being responsible for linking of social structures and developing clientelism), i.e. the development of society self organization and self regulation processes (Duit and Galaz, 2008).

Social responsibility is connected with the growing role of public (citizens) participation. New Public Governance assumptions mean that community of all kinds nowadays is more often intended in cultural development toward egalitarian participation and interaction. But community role in cultural development presents different sorts of difficulty if the development of community trends towards incommensurability. Communitarian ideology background includes assumptions, that all citizens must be involved into policy formation and implementation, because the involvement itself is essential to the development of their potential as humans, i.e., communitarianism assumes universality that everyone will be able to communicate from their different-yet-similar views. Explaining of New Public Governance doctrine it is important to bring an answer to a question – what is better – to have participation or not? We should agree that it is better to have citizens' participation, try to increase the level of it, but in reality responsible communitarian participation seems ever more absent and lacking, perhaps altogether inaccessible. When community is reduced to as series of otherwise atomized individuals brought together usually by the coincidence of their consumptive activity, the community does not develop political skills. Political experience and various skills always can promote participation quality dimensions (Miller, Fox, 2007, p. 79-80). The modern stage of public governance is very complicated and raises many questions for theorists and practitioners; also causing various often appearing systemic-structural problems that most often have dynamic (very changeable) and rarely static characteristics of problem systems.

### **Performance management in new public governance**

The changes and reforms of public sector in the last twenty years and nowadays are determined by two aspects – the role of market and performan-

ce management in the public organizations. The role of marketization of public sector is analyzed in thousand of studies, addressing research of NPM doctrine and elements of transforming public sector. Public organizations performance management sometimes is understood as original paradox, phenomenon, lacking coherent meta and mega analysis, without exact and wide determinations or used as direct synonym of management oriented results, but not often performance management is analyzed as systemic phenomenon or widespread occurrence. The performance focuses not only on the impact on the key public management functions and components (HRM, finance, strategy, etc.), but also changes the nature of policy formulation and implementation in the public sector itself.

A broad and generic definition of performance-based public management is taking/allocating responsibility for the performance as a system and being accountable for its results. By taking this broad definition of Ch. Pollitt and G. Bouckaert as a point of departure, major and basic mechanisms in public governance are being redefined in theory and practice. In its ideal type of definition – which does not of cour-

se exist in reality (although elements are presents in number of countries) – this may result in:

- the financial function rotating from a horizontal to a vertical dimension and linking financial and other information;
- guidance and steering: from ex ante to ex post;
- new interactions between parts of the organization, and between the organization and environment;
- cascading down of organizational objectives to almost an individual level.

Performance management has to be located within a broad construction of organizational life, which recognizes that performance management can not be considered in isolation from other factors that make up public management and the more general public administration system (Bouckaert, Halligan, 2008, p. 1-2). The evolution typologies of performance management understanding and possibility of various types of measurement public sector performance management results are summarized and presented in Table 1.

1 Table

#### Four ideal types of managing performance

Ideal type	Performance Administration	Management of Performances	Performance Management	Performance Governance
<u>Measurement/measuring</u> Type of measurement	Mechanistic and closed	Internally interactive and closed	Internally interactive and open	Internally and externally open
Design of measurement system	Ad hoc schemes by internals	Organized through management functions: standard schemes by staff and consultants	Imported standard models (benchmarking) by staff and consultants	Designed standard models (benchmarking) by involving stakeholders, staff and consultants.
Span of measurement	Limited and selective: efficiency and productivity: input, activity, output.	Organizationally determined: economy, efficiency and effectiveness: input, activity, output, effect, outcome.	Organization and policy based: economy, efficiency and effectiveness: input, activity, output, effect, outcome.	Full span: economy, efficiency, effectiveness and trust: input, activity, output, effect, outcome, trust.
Depth of measurement	Micro	Micro and meso	Micro and meso	Full depth: micro, meso and macro
Criteria of indicators	Technical (valid and reliable)	Technical and functional	Technical, functional and internally legitimate	Technical, functional internally and externally legitimate
Specific dimension of measurement	Quality is considered as constant	Quality requires separate focus	Quality gets integrated focus	Quality is systemic
Dysfunctionalities of measuring	No pathologies awareness	Starting concern for pathologies	Systemic reactive focus on pathologies	Systemic proactive focus on pathologies
<u>Incorporation/incorporate</u> Level of incorporation	Static	Comparatively static	Dynamic	Hyper dynamic



Degree of incorporation	Disconnected, isolated	Connected per management functions, not consolidated	Internally consolidated	Externally consolidated
Use General use	Limited and technical	Disconnected policy and management cycles	Integrated policy and management cycles	Societal use
Main reporting focus	Internal hierarchy	Internal managerial functions	Internal management, external political	Management political and societal
Learning by using (standards)	Single loop learning	Single and separate double loops	Single and integrate double loop	Single, double and meta
Accountability for performance	Administrative	Managerial	Managerial and political	Managerial, political and societal
Potential value added of performance	Limited	Single improvement	Integrated improvement	Systemic
Potential dysfunctions of performance	Unawareness of major dysfunctions	Incoherent and suboptimal use of information	Negative cost-benefit analysis	Uncontrollable and unmanageable system

(Bouckaert G., Halligan J. (2008). *Managing Performance. International Comparisons*. London: Routledge, p. 222-223).

Implementation of public governance reforms in the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> and in the start of 21<sup>st</sup> centuries produced a number of significant problems in governance, including emerging style of growing governing form the center that can be described as meta-governance, and can be explained as more conventional components of the governance process. On the other hand meta-governance can be understood as summarizing needs for some delegation and devolution of governing with the need for greater central direction. The nation of meta-governance is that a number of organizations and processes within the public sector have attained a substantial level of autonomy – a condition often described as a governance – and that there may be a need to impose some control over these components of governing. Such understanding meta-governance means balancing mechanism which includes the maintaining the virtues that have been produced by delegated and devolved forms of governing, while providing central direction and control. Governing has always involved some balancing of control and autonomy for public organizations, and for individual public servants, but that balance becomes more apparent when decisions must be made about reassessing greater management controls over devolved systems (Peters, 2010, p. 37).

Nowadays new public governance is rather the collection of political, ideological, economic, management means the impact of which to the efficiency of new public governance is not sufficiently audited and estimated.

## Conclusions

1. The implementation of modern public governance is being formed by the administration evolution from new public management to new public governance. New public management ideology represents private sector role model as part of public-private partnership vision. Many theorists explaining new public management as main reason of deregulation housing, banking and financial sector facilitated the works and results recession.

2. The analysis of performance management typologies can help us understand better the role of changes and innovations, types and mechanism, criteria, indicators and specific dimensions of performance management measurement possibilities, related with incorporation degree, accountability and control structures, potential value and dysfunctions of performance.

3. The changes in organizations' structure design determine various inter-sector interaction forms – network interaction, hybrid mixed organizations, new attitudes for cooperation forms, less formalization in public policy making and implementing procedures, rational use of all kinds of public resources, better allocating responsibility (at first social responsibility) between partners of inter-sector integration, new forms of interaction between the organizations and environment stakeholders, i.e., to institutionalize higher level of political, management and non-governmental coordinating functions.



## References

1. Bouckaert, G., Halligan, J. (2008). *Managing Performance. International comparisons*. London. Routledge.
2. Bourgon, J. (2010). The History and Future of National Building? Building Capacity for Public Results. *International Review of Administrative Science*, Vol.76, No 2, 197–218.
3. Bekkers, V. (2011). Innovation in the Public Sector. Ed. By V. Bekkers, J. Edelenbos, J. Steijn.
4. Bovaird, T., Loeffler, E. (2009). *Public Management and Governance*. London: Routledge.
5. Burger, Ph. (2009). The Dedicated PPP Unit of the South African National Treasury. *Policy, Finance and Management for Public–Private Partnership*. Ed. By Akintoye A., Beck M. Chichester. Black Well Publishing Ltd.
6. Christensen, T., Laegreid, P., Roness, P., Revik, K. A. (2007). *Organization Theory and the Public Sector: Instrument, Culture and Myth*. London: Routledge.
7. Dror, Y. (2004). Strategic Brain for Central Government. In M. Potuček (Eds.), *The Capacity to Govern in Central and Eastern Europe*, Bratislava: NISPAcee, 15–27.
8. Duit, A.; Galaz, V. (2008). Governance and Complexity: Emerging Issues for Governance Theory. *Governance. An International Journal of Policy, Administration, and Institutions*. 21(3): 311–335.
9. Groeneveld, S., Van de Walle, St. (2010). A Contingency Approach to Representative Bureaucracy: Power, Equal Opportunities and Diversity. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, Vol. 76, No. 2) 239–258.
10. Hartman, J., Raadschelders, J. (2011). Practitioners and Academicians: about Gap, Authorship and Bridges. *PA Times*. Washington DC. August–September.
11. Hill, K., Lynn, L. (2009). *Public Management. A Three Dimensional Approach*. Washington: D. C. CQ Press,
12. Kettl, D. F., Fesler, J. W. (2009). *The Politics of Administrative Process*. Washington: D. C. CQ Press.
13. Klijn, E. (2010). Trust in Governance Networks: Looking for Conditions for Innovative Solutions. and Outcomes. In St. Osborne (Eds.), *The New Public Governance*, London: Routledge, 301–321.
14. Lin, N. (2003). *Social Capital: A Theory of Social Structure and Action*. Cambridge University Press.
15. McNabb O. E. (2008). *The New Face of Government*. New York. CRC Press. Preface XV.
16. McQuaid, R. (2010). Theory of Organization Partnership: Partnership Advantages, Disadvantages and Success Factor. In St. Osborne (Eds.), *The New Public Governance*. London: Routledge, 127–161.
17. Melnikas, B. (2011). Nauji iššūkiai biurokratijai: internacionalizavimo procesai, tinklaveika, tarpsektorinė konvergencija. *Biurokratija demokratinėje visuomenėje*. Ats. red. A. Raipa. Kaunas: Technologija.
18. Miller, H. T., Fox, Ch. J. (2007). *Postmodern Public Administration*. New York. M. E. Sharpe, JUC.
19. Mulgan, G. (2004). Strategy in Government: The United Kingdom Experience. In M. Potuček 21. (Eds.), *The Capacity to Govern in Central and Eastern Europe*, Bratislava: NISPAcee, 31–59.
20. *New Public Management*. (2005). K. McLaughlin and St. P. Osborne, E. Ferlic (Eds.). London: Routledge.
21. Peters, G. B. (2002). *Biurokratijos politika*. Vilnius: Pradai,
22. Peters, G B. (2010). *Meta-Governance and Public Management. In The New Public Governance? Emerging perspectives on the theory and practice of public governance*. London: Routledge.
23. Pollitt, Ch. (2011). Innovation in the Public Sector: An Introductory Overview. *Innovation in the Public Sector. Linking Capacity and Leadership*. Ed. By V. Bekkers, J. Edelembos and B. Steijn. UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
24. Raipa, A. (2011). Naujojo viešojo valdymo indikatorių diagnozavimo galimybės. *Viešojo politika ir administravimas*. 10 (2). p. 167–168.
25. Raipa, A. (2010). Strateginis valdymas: Metodologinės paieškos. *Viešojo politika ir administravimas*, 32: 151–153.
26. Rosenbaum, A. (2011). *The Post-Governance World: Constituting Challenges, New Opportunities. In Public Administration in a Global Context*. IASIAAT50. Bruxelles: Bruylant.
27. Simon, H. (2003). *Administracinė elgsena*. Vilnius: Knygiai.

Raipa A.

## Naujojo viešojo valdymo institucionalizavimo metodologijos kompleksinio analizė

Santrauka

Viešojo valdymo evoliucija šiandien yra itin dažnai analizuojamas reiškinys tiek globaliu, tiek nacionaliniu, tiek organizaciniu aspektais. Pagrindinė tyrimų prieiga dažniausia yra sisteminis tyrimo lygmuo su galimybė analizuojamus reiškinius identifikuoti remiantis mezo-, makro-, metaanalizės dimensiniais parametrais.

Naujasis viešasis valdymas straipsnyje interpretuojamas remiantis daugelio žymiausių viešojo sektoriaus tyrinėtojų (Rosenbaum, Lane, Guy Peters, Osborne ir kt.) iš-

skirtais naujojo viešojo valdymo kaip naujosios viešosios vadybos evoliucijos indikatoriais, tam tikrais struktūriniais elementais. Tačiau mokslinis problemos ištirtumo lygmuo šiandien nėra pakankamas, nes solidesni darbai, analizuojantys kompleksinį naujojo viešojo valdymo indikatorių identifikavimo siekį, neretai remiasi ne tik faktologiniais argumentais, bet ir vadinamuoju „prielaidų analizės“ metodu.

Viešojo valdymo evoliucijoje išgalinti naujojo viešojo valdymo sąvoka pamažu išstumia tradicinio viešojo administravimo, naujojo viešojo administravimo, naujosios viešosios vadybos terminus. Straipsnyje akcentuojami viešojo valdymo pokyčiai šiuolaikiniame visuomenės raidos etape yra struktūriškai įvertinami ir klasifikuojami, pabrėžiama jų vieta sprendžiant daugelį ankstesnių viešojo administravimo etapų suponuotas problemas, tokias kaip viešojo sektoriaus skaidrumo ir atsakomybės lygmenys, nepakankamas dėmesys sprendžiant valdymo demokratizacijos ir piliečių dalyvavimo problemoms, politikos tikslus, balansuojant prioritetus ir kt.

Straipsnyje, remiantis mokslinėmis išvadomis ir prielaidomis, naudojant metaanalizės ir prognozavimo metodikų teikiamas galimybes, siekiama išskirti galimus šiuolaikinio naujojo viešojo valdymo kompleksinius elementus. Čia išryškėja pagrindinė autoriaus pozicija, fiksuojanti platesnes naujojo viešojo valdymo galimybes ir naujosios viešosios vadybos teikiamas rekomendacijas viešojo sektoriaus reformų ideologijai formuoti, t. y. moderniai ideologijai, išpažįstančiai ne tik prioritetinį laisvosios rinkos ideologijos pobūdį.

Autorius iš dalies sutinka su straipsnyje cituojamų autorių pozicija, kad naujasis viešasis valdymas kažin ar gali būti vertinamas kaip nauja viešojo administravimo paradigma (tai parodys ateitis), iš esmės pakeičianti naująją viešąją vadybą. Naujasis viešasis valdymas kartu yra ir nauja naujosios viešosios vadybos institucionalizavimo stadija. Tiek ideologiniu, tiek praktiniu (institucionalizavimo) požiūriu naujasis viešasis valdymas koegzistuoja kartu su naująja viešąja vadyba. Būtina pažymėti, kad tradicinės strateginio valdymo, viešosios politikos formavimo, įgyvendinimo, vertinimo ir kontrolės procesų stadijos iškelia naujus, gerokai aukštesnius reikalavimus viešųjų organizacijų vadovams ir darbuotojams, valstybės tarnautojams.

Nors naujasis viešasis valdymas nėra pakankamai išanalizuotas, tačiau jo praktinis institucionalizavimas įvairiose šalyse vyksta nevienodai dėl įvairių priežasčių: pasaulinės ekonominės situacijos, veiklos efektyvumo ir

demokratijos procesų plėtros dichotomijos, globalių ir vietinių vertybių bei centralizuoto ir decentralizuoto valdymo prioritetų skirtingo teorinio suvokimo ir praktinio taikymo. Autorius taip pat akcentuoja minėtų priežasčių evoliucinį atsiradimą ir sukeltų pasekmių sprendimų evoliucinį pobūdį naudojant politinius-normatyvinius svertus, geriausias demokratinio valdymo plėtros charakteristikas, šiandien įgaunančias institucinių, vadybinių ir politinių tinklų sampratą, vis stiprėjančias tinklaveikas ir tarpsektorinės integracijos, partnerystės tarp įvairių valdžios lygių ir tinklų bei veiklos sektorių tendencijas.

Autoriaus nuomone, sprendžiant minėtas naujojo viešojo valdymo praktines institucionalizavimo problemas, negalima pasikliauti tik abstrakčiais teoriniais teiginiais ar laisvomis įvairių teorinių postulatų ir modelių interpretacijomis, nors kartais tai atrodo itin patraukliai, tam suteikiama „iššūkių priėmimo“, „amžiaus strategijų“, tariamo inovatyvumo pobūdis. Šiandien ganėtinai aišku, kad globalizacijos suponuoti procesai – centralizacijos ir decentralizacijos, vertybių ir organizacijų kaitos būtinumas – negali būti išsprendžiami mechaniškai, t. y. manant, kad pakanka parengti arba pasinaudoti jau esamais vadybiniais, organizacijų vidinę veiklą ir sąveiką su išore, jų aplinką reguliuojančiais modeliais. Pasaulinė ekonominė krizė, depresija ir recesinė situacija leidžia teigti, kad straipsnyje suformuluotos problemos turi kompleksinį pobūdį. Jų sprendimai reikalauja kompleksiško, organizacijų veiklos vadybos, jų atsakomybės prieš bendruomenę ir visuomenę apskritai. Nauji sprendimai, į kurių rengimą fokusuoja naujasis viešasis valdymas, reikalauja platesnio supratimo, išmintingesnės organizacijų lyderių ir vadybininkų korpuso veiklos, piliečių ir interesų grupių įtraukimo į valdymo sprendimų rengimą ir įgyvendinimą, naujų postbiurokratinės kontrolės formų, galinčių įtvirtinti viešumą ir skaidrumą, išvengti grupinių interesų ir korupcijos padarinių, žlugdančių piliečių pasitikėjimą valstybės institucijomis.

**Pagrindiniai žodžiai:** naujasis viešasis valdymas, valdymo inovacijos, besikeičianti valdymo struktūra ir elementai, veiklos valdymas, tarpsektorinė integracija.