



UDC 35.071.2

**DIKHAMINJIA Irma,**

Doctor of Economics, Associate Professor, Georgia

**MIMINOSHVILI Marika,**

Joint Master's Program, Lithuania/ Czech Republic

### **PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION TRENDS AND APPROACHES: NEW PUBLIC MANAGEMENT**

*Result Oriented Management (ROM) is a contemporary management philosophy and approach which focuses on the appropriate and timely achievement of relevant goal and objectives through strategic planning, systematic implementation and resource utilization, performance monitoring, measurement and reporting. The overall purpose of the system is to measure and assess performance in order to effectively manage for results at the output, outcome and impact levels. The concept and frame of New Public Management, have been making claims to being universal within the field of public administration; in fact, many of the main drivers or initiatives of this trend, have been commonly shared among all nations around the world; Likewise, NPM principles commonly recognized under the perception of «Menu» or «wide-scale formula» of techniques and methods, addressed to the idea to reach a modernization of public sector. The principles of new public management, are stated below in first instance, together with brief statements of their meaning and argumentation; and afterwards, will be develop each of those, with a specific analysis and supported by theoretical argumentation.*

**Key words:** Public Administration, New Public Management, trend, approach.

The concept and frame of New Public Management, have been making claims to being universal within the field of public administration; in fact, many of the main drivers or initiatives of this trend, have been commonly shared among all nations around the world; Likewise, NPM principles commonly recognized under the perception of «Menu» or «wide-scale formula» of techniques and methods, addressed to the idea to reach a modernization of public sector. [Marino Calogero 2010]. But even so, this stage, doesn't represent that have been found a fully proper uniformity of application. Therefore, there is no doubt about the fact that during the last past 3 decades, many developed nations have been experimenting with new public management reforms, steps also followed by developing nations. This, mainly through a path marked, by positive, beneficial and efficient outputs developed under the guidelines and contributions of the New Public Management principles frame [Arora 2003]; This, clearly supporter, by the important number of countries that have suggested the run up of these doctrines.

Likewise, the well-know «paradigm shift» from the traditional/old manner of public administration to the new public management field, was driven in an important degree, by the implication and influence of a series of doctrines or principles aimed, mainly to encourage a deeper competitive and efficient public sector stage, in terms of resources management and services delivery [Hood 1991; Kurt Promberger 2003; Mahboubeh Fatemi and Mohammad Reza B. 2012].

Within the same line, the marked contrast with the traditional model of public administration has been lighted through the background made it by the NPM principles, aimed to draw public administration bodies with important degrees of bureaucratization, contracting out columns, customer oriented approach, decentralization of activities and units, market orientation of public services, privatization, performance measurement among others features [Nazmul A. K et al 2012].

Moreover, the arrival of these doctrines into the public administration field, over the last thirty years, have become one of the most significant lines for research and practice in public sector context [Marino Calogero 2010]. The principles of new public management, are stated below in first instance, together with brief statements of their meaning and argumentation; and afterwards, will be develop each of those, with a specific analysis and supported by theoretical argumentation. Other characteristics, such as separating political decision-making from direct management and community governance, are often added to this list [McLaughlin et al. 2002, 9].

One of the basic principles of NPM is a results-oriented and customer satisfaction management, as the representatives of the tools of emphasizing on output controls.

Result Oriented Management (ROM) is a contemporary management philosophy and approach, which focuses on the appropriate and timely achievement of relevant goal and objectives through strategic planning, systematic implementation and resource utilization, performance monitoring, measurement and reporting. The overall purpose of the system is to measure and assess performance in order to effectively manage for results at the output, outcome and impact levels. It is aimed at producing credible, timely and relevant information that will enhance faster and well-informed decision-making at all policy levels (national, sector, ministry, department and individual).

Documentary search and interviews revealed that the new system was adopted because of increasing resource constraints, public demand for better quality and more and more responsive services, the need for politicians to be more people sensitive and service oriented, calls for more effective resource allocation by financial controllers, demands for efficient and effective use of limited aid funds by donors, the need for public organizations to be more transparent and accountable in their operations and the growing challenges of the globalized borderless world. A review of literature on RBM established that the system is a powerful public management tool that can help policy makers track progress and demonstrate the outcomes and impacts of a given policy, program or project.

The concept of results management is a well-established strategy and has been applied in many private and public organizations and development agencies during the 80s and 90s. In this research paper, will be synthesized the experience of Scandinavian countries, especially in case of Sweden, Norway and Finland, with establishing and implementing their results based management systems, comparing similarities and contrasting differences in approach. The main purpose of this paper is addressed to the current experience, the barriers, the effects and evaluation performance of Result Oriented Management approach.

Unlike a lot of reviews from literature that focused specifically on implementation, this paper also includes lessons learned on more operational issues such as development of indicators, data collection, analysis, monitoring and reporting. Alice in Wonderland was told that, «If you don't know where you're going, any road will get you there». This lack of direction is what results management aims to fix. It is about choosing a destination first, then deciding on the route, checking progress against a map and making adjustments, as required, in order to achieve the desired results.

Successful implementation of ROM is dependent on the organization's ability to create a management culture that is focused on results. It requires more than the adoption of new administrative and operational systems. An emphasis on outcomes requires first and foremost a results-oriented management culture that will support and encourage the use of the new management approaches. The public sector traditionally has had an administrative culture that emphasizes the management and measurement of inputs, activities and outputs whereas a results oriented culture is focused on managing for the achievement of outcomes. This means that organizations have to establish a set of desired values and behaviors, and take actions to foster these while avoiding the undesirable ones, e.g., low-balling targets, inflating results, etc.

Though it may be tempting to simply adopt a results-based management system deemed successful in another jurisdiction or organization, but practice has proved to be very ineffective. It is important that the system be developed according to the needs and situation of the users. No single system will be appropriate for every organization. As Joyce [1997, p. 53] notes: «...public agencies are not all alike. Different solutions exist for the performance measurement problem in different agencies.» The evidence suggests that customized results-based management systems are critical for success [Caiden 1998, p.45]. Even individual components such as indicators and data collection systems should be developed with the specific users in mind [Joyce 1997, p.53; Itell 1998, p.12].

Experience in OECD countries suggests that selecting an appropriate approach for implementing results-based management is also very important. «Basic approaches to implementing performance management (e.g. top-down versus bottom-up; comprehensive versus incremental; systematic versus ad hoc; de facto versus de jure) must be selected according to the needs and situations of each country» [OECD 1997, p.29]

Results Based Management systems include the following processes or phases:

(1) Formulating objectives: Identifying in clear, measurable terms the results being sought and developing a conceptual framework for how the results will be achieved.

(2) Identifying indicators: For each objective, specifying exactly what is to be measured along a scale or dimension.

(3) Setting targets: For each indicator, specifying the expected or planned levels of result to be achieved by specific dates, which will be used to judge performance.

(4) Monitoring results: Developing performance monitoring systems to regularly collect data on actual results achieved.

(5) Reviewing and reporting results: Comparing actual results vis-à-vis the targets (or other criteria for making judgements about performance).

(6) Integrating evaluations: Conducting evaluations to provide complementary information on performance not readily available from performance monitoring systems.

(7) Using performance information: Using information from performance monitoring and evaluation sources for internal management learning and decision-making, and for external reporting to stakeholders on results achieved. Effective use generally depends upon putting in place various organizational reforms, new policies and procedures, and other mechanisms or incentives.

Therefore, implementation of results-based management is a long-term process. It takes time to plan, develop indicators, and align management systems before even collecting any performance data [OECD 1997, p.29]. For example, Poate [1997, p. 54] notes that «For aid donors dealing with a two year planning cycle and five-year

implementation, results may take a decade to emerge», while Plantz, Greenway and Hendricks [1997, p. 24] suggest that «It could easily take an agency seven months or more of preparation before collecting any data, and it easily could take three to five years before the findings of a program's outcome measurement system actually reflect the program's effectiveness.» As suggested by the experience of OECD countries and development agencies, organizations have to be patient and persistent. In this type of process, building consensus and maintaining momentum is crucial to success [Poate 1997, p. 56]. This is particularly important in a highly politicized organization where the political timetable may present a formidable obstacle to long-term implementation [Newcomer 1996-97, p.32].

Though it may be verified to rush implementation, organizations have found that this only decreases the likelihood that the measurement system will be useful [Plantz, Greenway and Hendricks 1997, p.24]. The idea is to take the time to develop and implement a results-based management system that will be worthwhile and is accepted throughout the organization. For example, organizations have limited the use of indicators in certain cases until they had sufficient measurement experience. «Outcome oriented measures are given time to develop and any sanctions for not setting or reaching appropriate goals should come far down the road, after departments have experience identifying cause and effect» [Itell 1998, p.17].

Successful implementation of results-based management requires management systems that support the systematic collection, recording, analysis and reporting of performance information [Olsen 1997, p.29; Poate 1997, p.57; PricewaterhouseCoopers 1999, p.11]. For some organizations, this may mean realigning existing system in order to ensure that they collect the right information needed for decision-making.

Once results-based management is implemented, the work is not done. To ensure continued success, the performance measurement system must be monitored and improved continuously. This will translate into a responsive system that reflects the changing environment in which it operates [Poate 1997, p.56; Plantz, Greenway and Hendricks 1997, p.24; Epstein and Olsen 1996, p.41]. The system should not be static. It should reflect changes in the organization, changes to programs. It should be flexible enough to allow for revised measures to be developed by managers, who over time, have become more familiar with measurement and have gained some experience in developing indicators [Epstein and Olsen 1996, p.41, p.43]. Even the most experienced individuals will revise their measures at least once as they need time to develop. This is really the essence of a learning organization. Managers and staff learn best through trial and error and a hands-on-approach [Meier 1998, p.i; National Performance Review 1999].

Some also suggest that even before implementing new procedures, past and current systems should be reviewed to better understand why they may have failed to achieve their objectives. Learning from past mistakes and using shared experiences may help gain acceptance and consensus regarding the new initiative [Poate 1997, p.53].

#### References:

1. Bale M and Dale T (1998) «Public Sector Reform in New Zealand and Its Relevance to Developing Countries» The World Bank Research Observer; Vol 13, No 1; pp 103-121.
2. PUMA (2002a) Overview of Results-Focused Management and Budgeting In OECD Member Paris: OECD.
3. Premchand A (1983) Government Budgeting and Expenditure Control: Theory and Practice, Washington DC: International Monetary Fund.
4. Petrie M (2002) «A Framework for Public Sector Performance Contracting», OECD Journal on Budgeting 1 (3) pp 117-143.
5. Osborne D and Plastrik P (1997) Banishing Bureaucracy: the five strategies for reinventing government Harlow: Addison Wesley.
6. OECD (2002b) 'OECD Best Practices for Budgetary Transparency' OECD Journal on Budgeting 1 (3) pp 7-14.
7. OECD (1995) Government in Transition: Public Management Reforms in OECD Countries, Paris: OECD.