

UDC: 35:002.8

Rodchenko Igor Patronymic,

post-graduate student, Interregional Academy of Personnel Management, Ukraine, 02000, Kyiv, Str. Frometovskaya, 2, tel.: (093)

871 00 48, e-mail: info@erosi.org

ORCID: 0000-0003-1240-761X

Родченко Ігор Юрійович,

аспірант, Міжрегіональна Академія управління персоналом, Україна, 02000, м. Київ, вул. Фрометівська, 2, тел.: (093)

871 00 48, e-mail: info@erosi.org

ORCID: 0000-0003-1240-761X

Родченко Игорь Юрьевич,

аспірант, Межрегиональная Академия управления персоналом, Украина, 02000, г. Киев, ул. Фрометовская, 2, тел.: (093)

871 00 48, e-mail: info@erosi.org

ORCID: 0000-0003-1240-761X



METHODS OF OBJECTIVIZATION OF SELF-ORDERING IN THE SYSTEM PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Abstract. Identified and analyzed the main methods of objectification self-ordering, in public administration, including installation of the ordered state of the primary disorder structures and processes of operation and maintenance of its evolution.

Keywords: public administration, evolution, structure and ordering processes Self-ordering, ways.

СПОСОБИ ОБ'ЄКТИВІЗАЦІЇ САМОВПОРЯДКУВАННЯ В СИСТЕМІ ДЕРЖАВНОГО УПРАВЛІННЯ

Анотація. Визначено та проаналізовано основні способи об'єктивізації самовпорядкування в системі державного управління, серед яких встановлення її впорядкованого стану з початкової невпорядкованості структур та процесів функціонування та забезпечення її еволюційного розвитку.

Ключові слова: державне управління, еволюційний розвиток, впорядкованість структур та процесів, самовпорядкування, способи.

СПОСОБЫ ОБЪЕКТИВИЗАЦИИ САМОУПОРЯДОЧЕНИЯ В СИСТЕМЕ ГОСУДАРСТВЕННОГО УПРАВЛЕНИЯ

Аннотация. Определены и проанализированы основные способы объективизации самоупорядочения в системе государственного управления, среди которых установление ее упорядоченного состояния с начальной неупорядоченности структур и процессов функционирования и обеспечение ее эволюционного развития.

Ключевые слова: государственное управление, эволюционное развитие, упорядоченность структур и процессов, самоупорядочения, способы.

Target setting. The issue of self-ordering in social systems is given considerable attention in the scientific literature. At the same time, the research of this process does not lose relevance, since the problems of synergetic have been the subject of consideration of scientists in different scientific areas. This issue has not only scientific, but also practical interest. That is why the rapid development of the science sector "Public Administration" also requires special attention to this issue.

Analysis of recent publications on issues. Different aspects of the self-ordering processes in social systems relevant to the subject matter of this article were considered in the writings of I. Prigogine, A. Prigogine, G. Schedrovitsky and other well-known scholars, and also reflected in the Encyclopedic Dictionary of Public Administration [1–6].

The purpose of the article. The purpose of this article is to identify and analyze the main methods of objectification self-ordering in public administration.

The statement of basic materials. Science and practice of public administration proceeds from the fact that public administration must have a scientific

ally sound character. This implies that in the process of such management, account is taken of objective knowledge of phenomena, processes and objects. Such knowledge is the laws and the laws principles. These positions will be taken into account when considering the main ways of objectifying self-regulation in the system of public administration.

In the objectification of self-order in the public administration system, we mean the provision of an objective process to such a process. For this, let us turn to the laws and principles established by well-known and authoritative scientists, and also to the practical experience of the functioning of such systems.

According to Ernest Haeckel, self-organization is the establishment of an ordered state in complex open systems, arises from the initial disorder of structures and processes organized in space and time, without the ordering of external influences. This is the formation of a structure through simple local interactions of system components [1].

In the Encyclopedic Dictionary of Public Administration, the principle of self-organization of systems is given, which provides for a change in the struc-

ture of the social system at the expense of its own driving forces to achieve a state of equilibrium and effective functioning. The basis of self-organization is the desire of organizations to provide a variety of reactions to external influences, necessary for the conscious realization of the achievement of its goals [5, p. 575].

Self-ordering is one of the main forms of the process of self-organization. Self-order in the public administration system, are complex open systems, should be regarded as the establishment of its orderly state from the initial disorder of the structures and processes of functioning and ensuring its evolutionary development (prevention of crisis situations, reforming, transformation, etc.). That is, we have two basic elements for overcoming the initial disorder in the public administration system, the first of which is connected with the process of functioning (statics of the system), and the second one with its stable gradual development (system dynamics).

First of all, let us consider self-ordering in the system of public administration from the point of ordering the state of its structures and processes, which is necessary for its normal functioning and the implementation of a certain mission. This provides for the organizing, coordinating, regulating and controlling influence of the system or individual government bodies on society with the purpose of achieving certain goals of the state within a specified time.

Scientist G. Shchedrovitsky proposed to characterize the activity as a system to consider such an element as the organization of “material” [2]. In fact, under the organization of “mate-

rial” in the system of public administration, it is about streamlining the state of its structures and processes. In this case, structures and processes are the same “material”, from the initial disorder of which arises the orderly state of the public administration system.

In the public administration system as in other social systems, there are certain interconnections between structures and processes. One of them is defined by the well-known principle of A. Chandler’s “strategy defines the structure”, which reflects the logic of planning achievement of objectives, namely, “goals → functions → structure” [3, p. 79]. Objectives reflect the course of action system functions – processes and tools for achieving the goals and structure – that the organizational structure (state, government, authority, organization, institution, company) that accumulates and materializes (gives the elements of the structure) these features and in itself.

Therefore, for state-management activities, the organization of the material should be evaluated not only according to the system of goals, but also the functions and structures of their implementation. When there is a breach of such an organization of the material, we are talking about the facts of organization and they can be disorganized formation and realization of the objectives, functions and structures.

In case of deviation from the set goals, there is a manifestation of the target disorganization. The latter is used in practice in control systems to determine the fact and the degree of deviation of the results obtained from the goals and their correction with a significant difference.

If there are violations of the formation and implementation of the functional field, that is the deviation of the functions system or the results of their implementation of the planned, that is the manifestation of functional disorganization.

In the event of a violation of the formation and implementation of the organizational structure, that is, its deviation from the planned, that is the manifestation of structural (morphological) disorganization.

Given the second type of relationship between structures and processes of social systems (the relationship between form and content), since the functional field reflects the content, and the organizational structure is an appropriate form of execution of this content, the target disorganization can be regarded as an integrated factor of functional and structural disorganization, since the realization of goals requires functional filling and involvement of the relevant structures.

Goals in the system of public administration play a particularly important role, since their formulation determines the concrete prospects for its development, and their implementation leads to the allocation of the field of concrete activity in the public administration system in a certain time perspective — strategic (5 years or more), operational (2–5 years) And tactical (up to one year). In accordance with the defined system of goals, certain functions and specific measures within their boundaries are selected, according to which the organizational structures are defined that will implement them.

The origin of the goals for the public administration system, above all,

has a political basis. The political forces (parties, movements) that have won the national elections (presidential and/or parliamentary) are obliged to conduct the policy for the society, with the program and slogans which they came to power. This policy is reflected in the concepts, strategies, annual state budgets adopted by the political majority. That is why these documents refer to political decisions defining the general goals, which are obligatory for realization by the whole system of public administration. Relevant goals, which are assigned to priority, are for a certain (political documents) deadline. This is the basis for carrying out the state policy — the national policy (the policy of social and economic development) and in certain spheres and sectors of public activity. Such policies are implemented, first of all, through state programs, national projects, state target programs, whose activities are primarily supported by the state budget.

Determine the causes of target disorganization, namely the deviations of goals in the system of public administration from the given.

Such a deviation can be both objective and subjective.

To the objective reasons for the target disorganization in the system of public administration should include:

- ideological backwardness from the advanced countries of the world;
- technological backwardness from the advanced countries of the world;
- lack of sufficient resources;
- lack of national ideas;
- political instability in the country;
- frequent change of the country's rate;

- lack of development strategies for the country, spheres and sectors of public activity;
- low level of innovation and creativity in determining the development goals of the country, spheres and sectors of public activity;
- violation of the cause-effect relationship setting objectives with the conditions it caused.

The need to take into account the last reason is actually indicated in reference [3, p. 77], which shows the logic model of the management process and determines the cause-effect relationship of the goals to the conditions prevailing in the management object or around it, by determining the sequence of the conditionality principles application, namely: “the principle of conditionality of the needs and motives of the object of management of the conditions prevailing in it or around it” → “the interests conditionality principle of the management object, its needs and motives” → “the objectives conditionality principle of the object of management interest”.

To subjective reasons of the target disorganization in the system of public administration should include:

- inconsistency of the actions of the authorities in their formulation and implementation;
- inadequate readiness of management objects in the implementation of the goals (various public spheres, industries, relations, territorial authorities, state and non-state enterprises, organizations, institutions);
- a large percentage of decisions on the setting and implementation of goals that are completely or partially not fulfilled due to errors inherent in

themselves (30 %) or personnel errors (30 %) [4];

- inefficient structuring of goals;
- fuzzy definition of priority objectives;
- inefficient programming;
- inefficient design;
- an unsuccessful definition of implementing organizations;
- irrational rational construction of organizational relations in the distribution of tasks;
- inadequate staff training for their implementation;
- low staff motivation for their implementation;
- weakened or poorly organized control over the implementation of decisions;
- low level of innovation and creativity in making and implementing managerial decisions;
- inefficient organization and implementation of communication links.

In fact, due to the integrated nature of the target disorganization in the public administration system, the subjective and objective causes of their occurrence extend to functional and structural disorganization.

Setting goals is a very important stage of management. As stated in the Encyclopedic Dictionary of Public Administration, the following main factors of choice are characteristic for goal-setting: a clear allocation of the main objective (mission); a moderate and justified structuring of goals, that is, a schedule of the main goal for the sub-goal, the implementation of which contributes to its achievement, as well as the timely identification of side-effects, to divert resources from the achievement of the main goal [5, p. 754, 755].

The result of the structuring of goals in the system of public administration is the hierarchy (tree) of the goals of public administration, which takes place at each of its levels (state, regional, territorial).

The goals in the public administration system should not be overestimated, because then they can not be achieved in full, not understated, because then there is an artificial inhibition of the development of the corresponding object in public administration. In the first case, the authorities' authority may be undermined as a result of non-fulfillment of promises, and in the second, due to improper activity (non-use of real opportunities) or inaction [3, p. 75].

The reasons for target disorganization can be manifested depending on the means of defining goals for society.

The setting of goals through the adoption of the concept involves the need for a clear definition of the appropriate directions of action for a certain period of time. It requires a well-balanced structuring of goals and building a hierarchy (tree) of goals.

When setting goals by adopting a strategy, we are talking about the definition of strategic objectives for the development of a management entity for a rather distant future, with their justification by SWOT analysis, in particular its strengths and weaknesses, opportunities and threats. Setting strategic goals is associated with uncertainty and requires regular viewing (for stable economies in 2–3 years, for transition economies every year).

When setting goals by defining public policy, one should proceed from the fact that it is:

a) on the medium term;

b) the priority objectives of such a policy, as a rule, are implemented through state targeted programs;

c) the latter are updated (revised and refined) every year.

When setting goals by identifying national projects, it is advisable to take into account that:

a) they are aimed at the priority solution of a certain problem of the national level;

b) are designed for 4 years;

c) require the actualization of the project tasks annually.

It is very important for the realization of the set goals to be included annually in the measures of the respective types of their production (concepts, strategies, state policy, state target programs, national projects, programs of social and economic development) to the state budget. Not including in the budget is a cessation of their implementation, and thus a violation of the goals organization system through their failure.

Functional disorganization may occur in violation of the rules and principles of the implementation of processes and the use of appropriate means. Its causes, above all, are managerial, technological and resourceful.

Managerial reasons are related to the ineffectiveness of management actions (planning, organization, motivation, control, management decision-making, communication, marketing) with the support of processes and the use of appropriate means. A well-known example of managerial functional disorganization is the duplication of functions of various authorities. This phenomenon is through a functional examination. It,

sooner or later, leads to the need for administrative, administrative-territorial or even constitutional reform.

Technological reasons are related to the ineffectiveness of the goals transformation into results, in particular with: the use of outdated ideas and technologies; slow rebuilding of enterprises, technological lines; low level of organization and productivity, etc.

Resource reasons, primarily related to: limited available resources; ineffectiveness of their use; high energy and resource capacity; lagging behind the advanced countries of the world in terms of the development and application of information technology; problems of personnel policy; an outflow of highly qualified personnel abroad with a low level of wages, etc.

Functional disorganization can also arise when the functional tools are incorrectly or partially selected and used, among them – tools, technologies, regulations, rules, instructions, rights, duties and the like.

The theory, in particular, the Law of the necessary variety, dictates one of the basic rules of functional organization, namely: the subject of management must have a variety not lower than the control object [5, p. 245]. Proceeding from this, functional disorganization in the system of government can take the form of functional loss-making or functional incompleteness. In the first case we are talking about the presence of greater functional capabilities in the subject of management, than at the control object. In the second case, it is a matter of the fact that the subject of the control does not functionally covers all the needs of the control object.

Functional unprofitableness indicates in vain expenses for performing unnecessary functions, and functional incompleteness is about the output of the functions share of the management object from under the subject of management, and then about the need to correct the situation by forming corresponding additional management functions and giving them the subject of management.

Structural disorganization is a consequence of either of the two main causes, either as a result of the lack of organization of the organizational structure, or as a result of the lack of organization of organizational relations.

Structural disorganization can arise in violation of rules and principles of organizational design and construction of organizational structures and organizational relations. The main of these rules should include the general principles of a rational management structure, which ensure the efficiency and flexibility in the work, namely: the correspondence of management links to its functions; minimization of the number of steps (links) in the management hierarchy; focusing on each step of all necessary management functions; concentration of functional units in functional units; clear allocation of the participation of each functional unit in a single management process; elimination of functions duplication; minimization of command flows from each control link [6, p. 93].

As an example of structural disorganization, the situation in the system of executive bodies in Ukraine as of the beginning of 1998 can be cited. The number of central executive bodies significantly exceeded not only European analogues, but also analogies of the

countries of the former USSR. There was a duplication of many of their functions. To change this situation for the better in Ukraine in 1998, administrative reform was launched. First of all, the number of central executive bodies, including ministries, was significantly reduced to 15. Their number and composition were largely brought into line with the standard structure of such bodies in the countries of the European Union. For 12 years after this, this structure has grown again and the next step of the administrative reform has been made – the President of Ukraine adopted Decree № 1085/2010 of December 9, 2010 [7] on Optimizing the System of Central Executive Authorities. According to this decree, 16 ministries, 28 state services, 14 agencies, 7 state inspectorates, 2 state administrations, a state commission, 2 committees, 2 funds and others were established.

Consider self-regulation in the system of public administration from the standpoint of ensuring its evolutionary development. In this case, the organization of “material” should be understood as the consistent gradual improvement of the basic characteristics and indicators of such systems (efficiency, cost effectiveness, efficiency, democracy, innovation, planning, resilience to change, staff readiness, etc.). Under these conditions, we are talking about the egalitarian nature of the evolutionary development of the state administration system.

The disorganization of the evolutionary development of such systems is manifested in the violation of the consistency development, the lack of innovation, the cessation of the basic characteristics improvement and indica-

tors, the deterioration of the latter, the inhibition of development, stagnation and disintegration. Disorganization of evolutionary development includes possible situations and the creation of situations that can lead to crises (political, economic, social, humanitarian, environmental, constitutional and others).

It is very important to understand what is happening in the system of government, in fact, immediately transferred to the relevant objects of public administration. If the subject of management ceases to develop in the modern globalized world, then in the corresponding object of management, similar processes will most likely pass. This circumstance and the conditions for coming to crisis situations are the most menacing consequences of the disorganization of evolutionary development.

The overcoming of disorganization of the evolutionary development of public administration systems is usually achieved by a wide range of revenues, depending on the situation. Among them, reform, anti-crisis management, propagation, creation of reserves, etc. Particular attention is paid to monitoring, to monitor and assess the degree of threat to evolutionary development.

Conclusions. The article considers and analyzes the main ways of objectifying self-order in the system of public administration. Among them is the establishment of its orderly state from the initial disorder of the structures and processes of functioning and ensuring its evolutionary development. To assess the orderliness of structures, processes, evolutionary development, the criterion of their organization was used. Classification of the main types

of disorganization and their analysis, in particular target, functional, structural disorganization, as well as disorganization of the evolutionary development of the public administration system is carried out.

REFERENCES

1. *Reshenye* "Myrovykh zahadok", sformulovannykh v kontse 19 veka Ernestom Hekkelem, s. 22–25 [Elektronnyj resurs]. — Rezhym dostupu: docs.podelise.ru/docs/index-2782.html?page=22
2. *Schedrovytskyj H. P.* Fylosofyia. Nauka. Metodolohyia / H. P. Schedrovytskyj. — M. : Shk. kul't. polityky, 1997. — 656 s.
3. *Bakumenko V. D.* Derzhavno-upravlins'ki rishennia : Navchal'nyj posibnyk / V. D. Bakumenko. — K. : VPTs AMU, 2011. — 340 s.
4. *Pryhozhyn A.* Orhanyzatsyionnye upravlencheskye patalohyy / A. Pryhozhyn // *Obschestvennye nauky i sovremennost'*. — 1998. — № 3. — S. 16–23.
5. *Entsyklopedychnyj slovnyk z derzhavnoho upravlinnia / uklad. : Yu. P. Surmin, V. D. Bakumenko, A. M. Mykhnenko ta in. / za zah. red. Yu. V. Kovbasiuka, V. P. Troshchyn's'koho, Yu. P. Surmina.* — K. : NADU, 2010. — 820 s.
6. *Bakumenko V. D.* Derzhavne upravlinnia : osnovy teorii, istoriia i praktyka : Navchal'nyj posibnyk / V. D. Bakumenko, P. I. Nadolishnij, M. M. Yzha, H. I. Arabadzhy / za zah. red. P. I. Nadolishn'oho, V. D. Bakumenka. — Odesa : ORIDU NADU, 2009. — 394 s.
7. *Ukaz Prezydenta Ukrainy "Pro optymizatsiiu systemy tsentral'nykh orhaniv vykonavchoi vlady"* vid 9 hrudnia 2010 roku № 1085/2010 [Elektronnyj resurs]. — Rezhym dostupu: <http://www.president.gov.ua/documents/12584.html>. — Zaholovok z ekrana.