

SOCIAL SCIENCE AND HUMANITIES

Manuscript info:

Received December 20, 2018., Accepted December 22, 2018., Published February 20, 2019.

ANALYSIS OF THE EXPERIENCE OF FOREIGN COUNTRIES TO IMPROVE THE EFFICIENCY OF THE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION BODIES

Abror YUSUPOV

independent researcher

National University of Uzbekistan

yusupovabror03@gmail.com



<http://dx.doi.org/10.26739/2573-5616-2019-1-16>

Abstract: Research of foreign experience allows us to identify priorities, basic areas of modernization, laying the main changes in the public sector of a number of leading countries. The systematization of the relevant areas and their comparison with the guidelines for the management of public administrations in Uzbekistan make it possible to identify the main and particular elements, justify the priority of the activities being implemented, and formulate the main priority directions and guidelines.

Kew words: administrative reforms, foreign experience, public services, quality of public administration, socio-economic development.

Recommended citation: Abror YUSUPOV. ANALYSIS OF THE EXPERIENCE OF FOREIGN COUNTRIES TO IMPROVE THE EFFICIENCY OF THE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION BODIES. 1-2. American Journal of Research P. 146-155 (2019).

The urgency of the issue of improving public administration's efficiency due to the solution of problems of socio-economic development of the states ensuring a high quality of the population's life and national security. The ongoing political and socio-economic preconceptions in Uzbekistan, aimed at further democratization and liberalization of the Uzbek society, actualize the need to improve the system of public

administration adequate to the requirements of modern democracy. Under these conditions, the analysis of domestic and foreign experience acquires relevance, among which it is possible to single out the existence of both factors determining the development of statehood and a decrease in the efficiency of public administration. Accounting for these factors is extremely important in increasing the efficiency of government in modern Uzbekistan.

Despite the large number of studies in the field of public administration efficiency, there is still no exact understanding of the essence of government itself as a social institution. "In a narrow sense, state administration is identified with the sphere of functioning of exclusively executive bodies. In the expanded interpretation it is the activity of all branches of state power, their bodies and officials for regulating public relations"[1].

There are many other definitions of the concept of administration. For example, administration is "a conscious impact of a person, social groups, specially created bodies on various objects and processes going on in the surrounding world, relations between people, carried out with the aim of achieving a certain state of objects, giving processes the desired direction, obtaining the desired, required, intended results" [2].

Another definition: "administration is a goal-setting (conscious, deliberate, thoughtful), organizing and regulating the impact of people on their own, social, collective and group activities, carried out directly (in the form of self-government), and through specially created structures (state, public associations, parties, firms, cooperatives, enterprises, associations, unions, etc.)"[3].

In general, administration is a whole system consisting of three subsystems: the control subject, the object, and the control mechanism of the control subject of the control

object. In this context, the subject of government is the government, the object is the society, the sphere of life of society, social groups and individuals taken separately, and the mechanism of government is considered to be the process of influence of government bodies on the sphere of society.

At the same time, the general tendency to increase the effective activity of the government is divided into two stages. At the first stage, the state policy is formed, the principles and values are determined, the development and decision-making, the setting of public policy objectives, management and actions to achieve the goals set. The second affects the practical side, the very process of implementing state policy, i.e. implies management measures, actions and decisions, by means of which achievement of state policy's objectives, control over their implementation, evaluation of the result obtained and adjustment of the state policy in the feedback mode [4].

At the same time, it is important to assess the effectiveness of management process' stages. Efficiency includes such evaluation criteria as: innovation, quality of working life, productivity, profit, quality, efficiency, effectiveness [5].

In this regard, it is necessary to consider some aspects of the effectiveness of government activities in the experience of foreign countries.

Studying the experience of Japan, we can highlight both positive and negative points. For example, the

principle of "small government" is introduced in their system of public administration, in accordance with which the administrative sphere is as transparent, compact and highly efficient as possible. This concept implies the introduction of restrictions on the structural and personnel growth of government institutions, the narrowing of the functions of state power and prerogatives in matters of regulating economic and public life, as well as strict control over the process of government by the society [6].

The main problems of administrative reform are considered issues of continuous and coordinated work of the government, the effectiveness of the central administration structure. Moreover, in the Japanese model of parliamentary-cabinet government, the cabinet ministers concentrate executive power and legislative power in one person. At the same time, this example did not show any special positive results, since the cabinet failed to show itself as an independent and politically strong subject in the state decision-making system. In practice, it was unable to express enough political will to implement and advance a long-term strategic course.

In the process of preparing the most important state decisions, one can note a significant strengthening of the role of the cabinet of ministers and its head.

Measures in this area are revolutionary reform, affecting the basic principles of the Japanese

model of a decision-making system. It is important that Japanese law provides for the expansion of the rights and powers of the Prime Minister in matters related to the initiation of notable political decisions, the introduction of proposals on new directions of state policy, etc.

To this end, it is envisaged that the head of the cabinet will be empowered to put forward its draft decisions of the cabinet of ministers and draft laws directly at a meeting of the cabinet of ministers without the approval of the council of administrative deputy ministers. Thus, the political initiatives of the Prime Minister ceased to undergo mandatory intra-government coordination for all such decisions, which, according to the assumptions, could significantly increase the degree of freedom of government. These prerogatives of the Prime Minister acquired particular importance in case of emergency.

The size of the office of advisers to the Prime Minister is from three to five people. The cadre powers of the prime minister were strengthened in order to ensure the independence of the head of the cabinet from the bureaucratic apparatus. The head of the cabinet also has the right to employ the necessary number of employees to work in the cabinet of ministers (the secretariat and the newly created office) to prepare a specific government solution, which, depending on the urgency and

significance of the problem, can be increased without taking into account regulatory restrictions. On a temporary or permanent basis, representatives of the non-state sphere can be involved in work in the cabinet; these are scientists, entrepreneurs, and narrow specialists in specific fields who are not bound by their status as obligations arising from their public service.

The experience of Japan represents successful administrative measures to strengthen parliamentary control over the public administration, aimed at increasing the political beginnings of the government, depreciating the influence of professional bureaucrats on the lawmaking process, and ensuring complementarity between parliament and the cabinet ministers when preparing state decisions.

In this regard, the "administrative team" was abolished, the institution of which freed the political leadership from the need to substantiate one or another step of the government at parliamentary hearings.

To increase the degree of "transparency" of state policy, its openness to public scrutiny introduced a system of direct parliamentary debates between leaders of parliamentary factions, which included the participation of the prime minister, on the main aspects of public policy. The meetings of the special inter-chamber commission established in the Parliament are shown live on

national television; the report prepared on the basis of the work is published in the media.

In this case, it is possible to note the well-established system of public responses of the head of government to the questions of opposition leaders in the British parliament, which served as a model for the Japanese government (the "Questiontime" system).

In matters of improving the efficiency of government activities, a successful breakthrough was noted in Singapore, where the result of a successful combination of political, social and economic transformations can be traced. The country shows a high efficiency of the system and mechanisms of government and maintains strong domestic political stability. There is a system of regulation of domestic political life, which takes its foundations on a deeply developed legal basis. Since the 1950 the law remains in force on internal security, allowing to detain citizens for an indefinite period without judicial sanctions.

The innovative aspect of the Singapore authorities' policy is characterized by the rejection of the principles of liberal democracy, typical of the majority of Western states. The path of an authoritarian model with a tough national leader was chosen. The country's leader acted as the main "driving force" of innovative transformations. The ancestor of the Singapore "Economic Miracle", Lee Kuan Yu, began his large-scale innovative transformations by providing the

population with a "subsistence minimum" of material well-being, and meeting its immediate needs. He managed to adapt the corporate management system to the management of the republic. In this process, emphasis was placed on human capital.

It should be noted, a high concentration of attention on the process of educating a generation of educated and confident people in their future.

This is the significant difference between the Singaporean model of development and traditional visions of innovation, where reforms are taking place in a hard market key in the interests of a narrow creative class, rather than broad sections of the population.

The point is that Singapore has chosen the path based on the concept of a meritocratic society. The Singaporean government model is based on meritocratic principles, a strict bureaucratic hierarchy and administrative impartiality. This has become the "cornerstone" in the public administration of Singapore.

Consider the example of the modern German government, which has a strong federal administration. In general, the administration is responsible for overseeing foreign affairs, transportation, the postal service, defense, tax collection, social security programs, and intelligence activities. In early times, the concept of chancellor democracy was introduced in Germany to characterize a special structure of government.

The top of the federal government is parliament. The design of the executive branch in the Federal Republic of Germany is fully oriented towards the federal chancellor. It should be noted that the Chancellor, bypassing the minister, cannot give direct instructions to officials of ministries and cannot "rule within ministries," since each German minister himself bears the leadership of his field of activity. In case of disagreement between ministers, they are resolved by the entire government office. The effectiveness of the principle of collegiality also completely depends on the leading role of the federal chancellor.

Despite the fact that in Germany, a high role is vested in the Chancellor, the head of state is the Federal President. The president is elected by a specially convened federal assembly for a term of five years. At the same time, the Head of State appoints and dismisses ministers, but only after being presented by the Chancellor.

The municipal administration of Germany includes territorial communities, which include cities and villages, which constitute the whole of Germany as a whole. At the same time, large cities develop their line of business and do not obey the districts. For example, Bremen and Hamburg have a similar status as city-lands, combining both land and community levels of government.

It should be noted that in Germany there are no elected bodies of self-government districts. The

main goal in the designation of land is to bring the state administration as close as possible to its citizens. Self-government is strictly controlled by the state, despite the fact that it has great powers of executive power.

Analyzing the Russian experience of the system of government activities, one can see the similarity in the systematization of the modernization directions of other Western countries.

"The driving motive of most administrative reforms in these countries was the awareness of the need to address one or more of the following complex tasks: improving the efficiency of the system of state bodies; the transformation of the state into a responsible employer capable of attracting a sufficient number of employees with the necessary qualifications and at the same time controlling the costs of their maintenance; increasing public confidence in the state and the private sector "[7].

In general, there are some areas of the organization of the new control system of the Russian Federation.

Firstly, the structure of the organization of public administration will be improved on the basis of positive international reform experience. In particular, the experience confirming the new trend in public administration, namely the replacement of vertical administrative structures with a horizontal network of autonomous state organizations that perform a certain range of tasks. There is also

the formation of a policy that is fixed in several major ministries, as well as the execution entrusted to all sorts of autonomous state agencies.

There is a shift in emphasis on the development of analytical and prognostic functions used in the state practice of new management methods. These methods have already proven their effectiveness in the activities of private organizations in the creation of temporary working groups, strategic planning, delegation of authority, and the formation of a corporate culture.

Secondly, the introduction of new information technologies is observed, where "not only the process of saturation of government bodies with information and computer equipment becomes an actual problem, but also the return on investment in information technologies is increasing, which in turn requires the formation of national information networks uniting local networks ministries, departments and regions "[8]. As a result, the new method of organizing the management system will make it possible to provide a simplified connection of the population with government bodies.

Thirdly, in Russia, state structures are focused on the consumer as a result of which there is a need to change the value orientations of civil servants and to concentrate their activities on serving and meeting the interests of citizens. At the same time, increasing the "transparency" of the activities of the executive bodies ensuring

openness of information. In general, the solution of the problem of improving the quality of public services and improving the process and mechanism of their provision of the public administration system is a requirement of time.

Russian researchers analyzed the main directions of foreign experience regarding the reform of the public administration system. In particular, "in terms of reducing government spending, improving operational efficiency and other improvements, including the degree of satisfaction at the political level with achievements due to the flexibility of the policy and the level of response provided by the new organization of activity" [9].

According to the results of studies such reform tasks as the:

- 1) Reduction in government spending;
- 2) Increasing abilities to the development and implementation of policies;
- 3) Improving the performance of state functions of the employer;
- 4) Improving the quality of services and building trust in government from the public and the private sector.

Analysis of the structure of government in France showed that the current state of the country belongs to the republics with mixed forms of government (parliamentary-presidential, with a predominance of presidential power).

First of all, France is characterized by the strengthening

of the role of the executive branch and the weakening of the role of parliament. The three main branches of government are represented by the head of state, the government, the parliament and the courts, which are headed by the Court of Cassation (the highest judicial body of general jurisdiction) and the State Council, the highest body of administrative justice.

The country is divided into 95 departments, which consist of communes (local governments). The term "self-government" is not used in France; instead, the name "municipal authority" and "decentralization" are widely used.

The modern French model of governance is unique in the matter of parliamentary control. The French parliament seeks to control the management spectrum of the executive branch's activities, various spheres of the social life of the country, creating all kinds of parliamentary agencies and services. At the same time, the actions of the parliament are suppressed by the Constitutional Council when it acquires broader powers to control the administration resolutely [10]

At the core of the French government model is the cult of the state and the principle of "administrative custody" in relation to society, which has changed since the 1982 reform to the principle of administrative control. It should be noted that the basis of directions for the development of French society is made up of politics, the state and its institutions. The state system of

France has formed the "French model of society", which is characterized by two features:

1. The desire to keep power at a distance and prevent its concentration;

2. Introducing impersonal rules which, while ensuring the independence of all, would protect everyone from the arbitrariness of the very same authorities [11].

In general, foreign experience shows that "administrative reform has set as its goal the transformation of the philosophy and culture of public administration in accordance with the culture of business. The methodological tool of administrative reforms was the concept of a state oriented to the consumer of services"[8].

The essence of modern concepts for improving the quality of government activities should be less "fuss and haste", but more efficiency in the transition to a better quality of public services and to the "responsible government" [12].

Considering the practice of Uzbekistan, we can note the developed and successfully applied management reform strategy. In particular, it is based on: a) decentralization of public administration, increasing the level of professional training; b) decent material and social security for civil servants; c) gradual reduction of state regulation of the economy. At the same time, the analysis of the completed stage of the country's development requires the development and implementation of

radically new ideas and principles for the further sustainable and advanced development of the country.

In this regard, and in order to improve the effectiveness of the reforms, create conditions for ensuring the development of the state and society, an Action Strategy has been developed in five priority areas of development for the Republic of Uzbekistan in 2017-2021. In this fundamental document, the improvement of the system of state and public construction is defined as one of the strategic issues [13].

Today we can note special changes in the field of openness of the activities of state authorities and administration, the introduction of modern forms of providing information relating to the rights, freedoms and legitimate interests of individuals and legal entities.

A vivid example of this is the effective activity of the People's and Virtual reception and citizens' confidence to defend their rights independently.

According to the Independent Institute for Monitoring the Formation of Civil Society, a survey was conducted among residents of Uzbekistan, where 65% of respondents say they are able to independently protect their rights [14].

Reform of the public administration system in Uzbekistan began with the improvement of the "e-Government" system, increasing the efficiency, quality of provision

and public services' availability for the population and business entities. At this time, projects have been successfully implemented aimed at improving the systems of providing electronic public services, developing the system of providing services through the "Single Window" system, existing information systems in the notary, customs, tax and other services.

Thus, the conditions for increasing the efficiency of government bodies are specific in each country. In this regard, the reforms implemented in this area of foreign countries should not be copied and applied with precision in Uzbekistan. First, it is necessary to conduct research in the country regarding the possibility and availability of appropriate conditions for the use of (adapted) foreign methods. That is, a conceptual approach is needed in this direction.

In particular, the presence (development) of a methodology for assessing the effectiveness of state authorities' work and management (1) and a list of indicators

(qualitative and quantitative) assessment of the effectiveness of the activities of public authorities and management (2).

In our opinion, at this stage, the principle of "striving for results,

and not to perfection," that is, a focus on results. In other words, it is necessary to develop conceptually sound strategic approaches to improve the effectiveness of public administration institutions. It is also important to set priorities as clearly as possible in determining the main tasks, not to mix strategic and tactical goals.

According to experts, the main purpose of the study in this area should be "clarifying the causal relationships underlying the prevalence, dynamics, stability / instability of the studied phenomena" [15], where the phenomena mean foreign experience applicable in Uzbekistan. At the same time, it is useful to study the proven positive international experience of foreign countries and use some kind of tool indicating the current trends of transformations in the public administration system.

References

1. Kozhevnikov S.A. Improving the efficiency of public administration is a key task for modern Russia. <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/povyshenie-effektivnosti-gosudarstvennogo-upravleniya-klyuchevaya-zadacha-dlya-sovremennoy-rossii>
2. Raizberg B.A. State administration of economic and social processes. Moscow, INFRA-M, 2010, p.384
3. Atamanchuk G.V. Theory of Government. Moscow, Publishing House. Omega-L, 2013, p525
4. Yakunin, V.I., Sulakshin, S.S., Bagdasaryan, V.E., Orlov, I.B., and Stroganov, S.M. The quality and success of public policies and management: a monograph. M.: Scientific expert, 2012. P 496

5. Sink D.S. Performance management: planning, measuring and evaluating, monitoring and enhancing. D.S. Sync: trans. from English / total ed. and entry. V.I. Danilova - Danilyana. - M. : Progress, 1989. - 528 p.
6. Khalikova Sh.B. The system of government in Japan <https://articlekz.com/article/10960>
7. Koval T.V. Foreign experience of administrative reforms and their application in Russia // Actual problems of economic sciences. - 2008.
8. Matveeva E.V. Modernization of public administration: foreign experience, <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/modernizatsiya-gosudarstvennogo-upravleniya-zarubezhnyy-opyt>
9. Manning N., Parison N. Reform of public administration: international experience. Per. from English - M. : All-World Publishing House, 2003.
10. Falshina N.A. From parliamentary to semi-presidential republic: Experience of France (III - V republic); Rostov - n / a., 2007. - p. 6.
11. Mukhaev R.T. The system of state and municipal government. - M. : Unity - Dana, 2012. - p. 325.
12. Pisarevsky E.L. The quality of government: problems of goal setting // Administrative law and process. Number 10, 2013. - p. 4.
13. National database of legislation of the Republic of Uzbekistan. <http://lex.uz/docs/3107042>
14. Abdukarimov G., Kholova E., Mavlanov J., Parmonov F., Seitov A. Experience of Uzbekistan in strengthening the capacity of civil society institutions, improving the legal culture and social activity of the society. Tashkent, "Science and Technology", 2017
15. Parmanov F., Seitov A., Pak P. Methodological recommendations for conducting sociological research. Tashkent, "Science and Technology", 2017