

Volodymyr Nakonechnyi, ScD in Public Administration

Kharkiv Regional Institute of Public Administration of the National Academy of Public Administration under the President of Ukraine

METHODOLOGY OF PUBLIC CITY MANAGEMENT: STRUCTURE AND BASIC PRINCIPLES

In this article the analysis of the management structure and the basic principles of city management are made using the public administration methodology. The concept of "human relations" and systemic and situational approaches are applied. The basic principles of public administration in the EU countries are studied and the ways of their implementation in the city management in Ukraine have been outlined. The best world city management models are presented. The phases of city management are classified. An algorithm for forming an effective city management structure is described: grounding of the fundamental scientific principles in large-scale management systems constructing; ensuring the implementation of the principle of organicity of the structures interconnection on different hierarchical levels to maintain rational subordination and subject coordination; taking into account the requirements of the current legislation regarding the formation and functions of the organizational structures of management and functions of separate units; taking into account the circumstances, specific requirements and capabilities of each particular entity.

Keywords: public administration, city management, paradigm of public administration, democratic governance, management structure, principles of city management.

The structure in the science of public administration is seen as a general, relatively stable, variable in space and time, way of interconnection of the system elements and their relations. The structure of public administration consists of general or system-wide principles (systemacy, diversity, uniqueness, legality, separation of powers, democracy, transparency, legal order, scientific substantiation, etc.) and organizational and technological principles (structural-target, structural-functional and structural-organizational)¹. In the understanding of the management structure there is a number of approaches distinguished as a priority. In the context of the classical approach, emphasis is focused on the formal structure, meaning it is based on rational logical behavior. The management structure is perceived from the point of view of the power hierarchy of government without taking into account certain personal factors. The concept of human relations focuses on the informal aspects of a particular organization (interpersonal relationships, social problems of employees, etc.) that influence the formation of structural schemes. As part of a system approach, the significance of different subsystems relationship and interconnection channels becomes important. From the point of view of the situational approach, unsustainable schemes of structural unit construction are denied, since there is a need to create managerial structures for each particular situation in the context of the dynamics of socio-political changes.

The paradigm of public administration in today's dynamic conditions requires a new reflection, which is conditioned by the need for structuring the growing multidimensional problems of society². This requires "the transition in managerial thinking to the categories of operating with influences and intentions, the growth of needs for analytical strategic procedures for new social technologies"³. Consequently, in the public-management discourse, the problem of the formation of optimal strategic approaches regarding the structuring of social problems is becoming of importance⁴.

¹ Кузнецов, А.О. (2011). *Структура. Енциклопедія державного управління. Т. 2.* Київ. 601.

² Наконечний, В.В. (2012). Типологізація міст: управлінський вимір. *Державне будівництво, 2.* <<http://www.kbuara.kharkov.ua/e-book/db/2012-2/doc/2/14.pdf>>

³ Бережний, Я. В. (2012). Державне управління і нові управлінські технології. *Наук. вісник Академії муніципального управління. Серія «Управління», 1, 72*

⁴ McNamara, C. (2008). Strategic Planning (in nonprofit or for-profit organizations). Authenticity Consulting, LLC. <http://www.managementhelp.org/plan_dec/str_plan/str_plan.htm>.

Therefore, when forming an effective city management structure, it is necessary to take into account the following positions:

–to be based on the fundamental scientific principles of developing the structures of large systems management;

–to ensure the implementation of the principle of organicity of the interconnection of different hierarchical level structures in order to maintain rational subordination and substantive coordination;

–to take into account the requirements of the current legislation regarding the formation and functions of the management organizational structures and the functions of individual units;

–to take into account the real circumstances, specific requirements and capabilities of each particular managerial entity, which causes the differences in organizational and structural control schemes of the same name and functions¹.

Based on the historical, economic, political and other conditions of the formation of administrative structures in the city, one can speak of the variance of these structures, their difference from each other. This is evidenced both by historical and contemporary European practice.

In the modern era, according to V.M.Babayev, the model of city management should be correlated with the methods of decision-making and their implementation at the local level². Methods of decision making and their implementation are mainly determined by the generalized principles of elements interaction in the city's socio-political system. Today it is decided to allocate such basic models of city management: Anglo-Saxon, Iberian, French (continental), and combined³.

The Anglo-Saxon model of management is predominantly distributed in the United Kingdom, the United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. It is characterized by the following features: significant autonomy of the municipal government; absence of central government representatives at the local level and absence of control through central ministries, courts, etc.; appointment of officials to local authorities by election; the powers of the municipal government bodies are determined in accordance with the positive principle of legal regulation.

For the Anglo-Saxon model of management, the following organizational forms of city management are inherent:

a) "council – a weak mayor" – a classic example of implementation of the representative democracy principle at the local level, which in some way serves as an analogue to the rule of parliament. However, unlike the parliament, the local elective council is not a legislative body, but a representative and managerial body. The local council is currently endowed with both normative and executive powers;

b) "council – a strong mayor" – an organizational form of government that has a certain dualism in the organization of power at the local level. Currently, the mayor is elected by the city community, he has the right to veto decisions of the council, his/her competence includes the preparation of recommendations on rule-making activities of the council. In addition, the mayor is responsible for drawing up and executing the city budget, he/she alone forms the administration and distributes powers among the municipal authorities. In relations with other territorial communities and central authorities, it is the mayor who is empowered to represent the interests of the city community;

c) "council – manager" – the essence of this organizational form of management is the presence of the institute of the chief administrative officer who, being a politically neutral figure, is a professional in the field of municipal management⁴. This representative is appointed and dismissed by the council. The council, in turn, is elected by residents of a particular city. The competence of the appointed administrator includes coordinating the activities of the municipal authorities, preparing the city budget. The activities of the appointed manager, his/her relationship with the council are determined by the terms of the contract;

d) "council – commission" – an organizational form of management that involves the election the board of commissioners by the city community, and acts as an executive body of municipal self-government. This council consists of three to seven persons, who head certain departments. At the moment, the election of a senior official (such as the head of the city administration) is not foreseen, although one of

¹ Лесечко, М. (2009). Управління великими містами в Україні. *Демократичне врядування. Науковий вісник*. <http://www.nbu.gov.ua/e-journals/DeVr/2009_3/fail/+Lesechko.pdf>.

² Бабаєв, В.М. (2010). *Управління великим містом: теоретичні і прикладні аспекти*. Харків, 106.

³ Бабаєв, В.М. (2011). Сучасна модель управління містом. *Енциклопедія державного управління, том 5*, 397-398.

⁴ Неліпа, Д.В. (2011). Менеджер міста. *Енциклопедія державного управління. Харків, Т. 5*, 173-174.

the commissioners is vested as a mayor. However, this mayor has no real powers, performing only representative functions;

e) *mixed forms* of municipal management are characterized by significant diversity (for example, the combination of two organizational forms of management: "council – manager" and "council – strong mayor").

The Iberian model of management has become widespread in Brazil, Portugal, Mexico, Spain. In the context of the basic principles of this model, management is carried out by representative municipal authorities elected by the city community and by relevant key officials. Officials, appointed by the central government as representatives of state power, have the right to control the activity of the council. They are both chairpersons of the councils and their executive bodies at the same time

The French (continental) management model is distributed primarily in continental Europe, the French-speaking countries of Africa, and most Latin American countries. It is characterized by a high degree of centralization, the presence of vertical subordination. As part of this model, there is a combination of municipal self-government and direct government governance on the ground. The powers of the municipal government are determined in the context of the negative principle of legal regulation.

The combined management model has become widespread in Germany, Austria, Ukraine, and the Russian Federation. This model of management is characterized by certain features of the Anglo-Saxon and French (continental) models.

In the context of the basic characteristics of the French (continental) and combined management models, the organizational forms of city management mostly widespread in Europe are distinguished:

a) *magistrate* and *quasi-magistrate* organizational forms of management in a certain way resemble the organizational form of management "council – weak mayor" (Anglo-Saxon model). Being a definite continental analogue of the system of the supremacy of a representative body, such an organizational form of government has its distinction, which consists in bicameralism (the presence of two presiding officers). That is, in addition to the "great council" (city assembly), there is also a "small council" (magistrate), which holds the main powers;

b) *the quasi-bicephal* organizational form of management is one of the most common models of municipal governance in continental Europe. It is presented by two main types, which can be conventionally referred to as "German" and "French". In contrast to the previous magistrate organizational form of management, it is remarkable for the principle of bicameralism.

The process of city management is influenced by a variety of factors, in particular: *demographic* (population growth and density), *socio-political* (introduction of new laws and regularities in the social sphere, establishing relations between public authorities and the population, the formation of civil society, the growth of the territorial community role), *economic* (transition to the market, functioning of different forms of ownership, creation of enterprises of various organizational and legal forms of management, formation of relations between the state and businesses, new intergovernmental relations), etc.¹

Monitoring, control and assessment are very important for management. If this process is considered in time, it is possible to distinguish three phases of its course².

1. The Preliminary Phase. At this stage, there is a decision on the need to create and implement development programs. An overview and analysis of major development issues are also conducted to identify potential development goals, actors and partners, problem-critical development issues that require more detailed study or communicative efforts.

2. The Strategic Phase. This phase is characterized by the final determination of development goals for a certain period, as well the executors and partners. The strategy of development is formed and the tasks and results for each of the actors, means and methods of communication, control, etc. are defined.

3. The Implementation Phase. At this stage, implementation of a particular development strategy (under constant control) is realized. After completion, the evaluation of the results is carried out.

The development of modern cities is associated with a complex of various problems, which, according to S. Yagutkin, requires new approaches in city management technologies. The main objective of

¹ Когут, І.Я. (2009). Велике місто як об'єкт управління і публічного врядування (на матеріалах міста Львова). *Теорія та практика державного управління*, 3 (26). <<http://www.kbuapa.kharkov.ua/e-book/tpdu/2009-3/index.html>>

² Протас, В.М. (2009). Управління стратегічним розвитком міста. <<http://www.kbuapa.kharkov.ua/e-book/apdu/2009-2/index.html>>

modern city management technologies is to overcome the negative trends inherent to the post-Soviet economy. In addition, the importance of diagnosing and preventing potential social conflicts becomes important¹. The main tasks of modern city management technologies are as follows:

- monitoring of a constantly changing social environment;
- identification of disproportions in the development of the urban economy;
- diagnostics of potential conflicts among different social groups of the city population;
- upbringing of tolerance;
- setting up a set of measures that will promote the dynamic development of society.

To carry out the above mentioned tasks, a system of complex administrative, legal, economic and socio-psychological measures should be used.

In order to effectively develop the city, there is a need for agreement between different social groups of city residents and a management system in relation to priority areas of development, which requires the use of a public-private partnership mechanism². The use of the public-private partnership mechanism has become widespread in various countries around the world, in particular, with regard to the implementation of projects in the field of public infrastructure, social and municipal services. For example, public-private partnership tools at the city level can be used in the following areas: housing and communal services; disposition and utilization of garbage; ecology; real estate (construction and maintenance of public buildings); public order and safety; telecommunications, etc. In this context, effective interaction between municipal authorities and non-governmental organizations becomes important.

Consequently, when forming an effective city management structure, it is necessary to take into account the following positions: to be based on the fundamental scientific principles of building the structures of large systems management; to ensure implementation of the principle of organicity of the interconnection of different hierarchical level structures to maintain rational subordination and substantive coordination; to take into account the requirements of the current legislation regarding the formation and functions of the organizational structures of management and the functions of individual units; to take into account the real circumstances, the specific requirements and capabilities of each particular subject of management, which causes the differences in organizational and structural control schemes of the same name and functions.

References:

1. Babayev, V.M. (2010). *Upravlinnya velykym mistom: teoretychni i prykladni aspekty* [Management of a big city: theoretical and practical aspects]. Kharkiv. [in Ukrainian]
2. Babayev, V.M. (2011). Suchasna model upravlinnya mistom [Modern model of a city management]. *Encyklopediya derzhavnogo upravlinnya* [The encyclopedia of public administration] Kharkiv, no. 5, 397–398. [in Ukrainian]
3. Bereznyj, Ya.V. (2012). Derzhavne upravlinnya i novi upravlins'ki tekhnologiyi [Public administration and new managerial technologies]. *Nauk. visnyk Akademiyi muncypalnogo upravlinnya. Seriya „Upravlinnya”* [The Scientific Bulletin of the Academy of Municipal Administration. Series «Administration»], no. 1. [in Ukrainian]
4. Zaporozhecz, S.A. (2011). Upravlinnya rozvytkom mista v konteksti publichno-pryvatnogo partnerstva [Management of the city development in the context of public-private partnership]. *Derzhavne upravlinnya v Ukraini: istoriya derzhavotvorennia, vyklyky ta perspektyvy: 11-ta Mizhnar. nauk. konf. aspirantiv ta doktorantiv z derzhavnogo upravlinnya* [Public administration in Ukraine: history of state making, challenges and prospects: the 11-th International scientific conference of postgraduates and candidates for doctor's degree on public administration] Odesa, 3 cherv. 2011. Odesa: ORIDU NADU, 272. [in Ukrainian]
5. Kogut, I.Ya. (2009). Velyke misto yak obyekt upravlinnya i publichnogo vryaduvannya (na materialax mista L'vova) [A big city as an object of management and public administration (on the materials of the city of Lviv)]. *Teoriya ta praktyka derzhavnogo upravlinnya* [Theory and practice of public administration], no. 3 (26). <<http://www.kbuapa.kharkov.ua/e-book/tpdu/2009-3/index.html>>. [in Ukrainian]
6. Kuznecov, A.O. (2011). Struktura [Structure]. *Encyklopediya derzhavnogo upravlinnya* [The encyclopedia of public administration]. Kyiv, no. 2, 601. [in Ukrainian]
7. Kucz, G.M. (2011). *Transformacijnyj potencial liberalizmu v politychnomu prostori* [Transformational potential

¹ Ягуткин, С.М. (2009). Технологии управления социально-экономическими процессами в современных городах России. *Научные ведомости*, 16 (71), 102.

² Запорожець, С.А. (2011). Управління розвитком міста в контексті публічно-приватного партнерства. *Державне управління в Україні: історія державотворення, виклики та перспективи: 11-та Міжнар. наук. конф. аспірантів та докторантів з державного управління*, Оdesa, 3 черв. 2011 р. Оdesa ОРІДУ НАДУ, 231-233.

- of liberalism in political space]: avtoref. dys. na zdobuttya nauk. stupenya dokt. polit. nauk: specz. 23.00.02 «Politychni instytuty ta procesy» [thesis for PhD degree in Political science. Chernivtsi: Cherniveczkyj nacionalny` universy`et imeni Yu. Fedkovy`ha, 36. [in Ukrainian]
8. Kucz, Yu.O. (2011). Yakist nadannya upravlinskyx poslug yak chynnyk efektyvnosti miscevog upravlinny` [Quality of provision of managing services as a factor of local self-government efficiency]. *Derzhavne budivnyctvo* [State construction], no. 2. Kharkiv. <<http://www.kbuapa.kharkov.ua/e-book/db/2011-2/doc/4/03.pdf>>. [in Ukrainian]
9. Lesechko, M. (2009). Upravlinny`a velykymy mistamy v Ukrayini. Demokratychno vryaduvanny`a [Big city management in Ukraine. Democratic governing]. *Naukovyj visnyk* [The scientific bulletin]. Lviv. <http://www.nbu.gov.ua/e-journals/DeVr/2009_3/fail/+Lesechko.pdf>. [in Ukrainian]
10. Nadolishnij, P.I. (2007). Konceptciya demokratychnogo uryaduvanny`a: sutnist i problemy formuvanny`a ta realizacyi [Concept of democratic governing: content and problems of formation and implementation]. *Aktualni problemy derzhavnogo upravlinny`a* [Actual problems of public administration], no. 2 (30), 46-56. [in Ukrainian]
11. Nakonechnyj, V.V. (2012). Typologizaciya mist: upravlinskyj vymir [City classification: managerial world]. *Derzhavne budivnyctvo* [State building], no. 2. <<http://www.kbuapa.kharkov.ua/e-book/db/2012-2/doc/2/14.pdf>>. [in Ukrainian]
12. Nelipa, D.V. (2011). Menedzher mista [City manager]. *Encyklopediya derzhavnogo upravlinny`a*. [The encyclopedia of public administration] Kharkiv, no. 5, 173-174. [in Ukrainian]
13. Protas, V.M. (2009). Upravlinny`a strategichny`m rozvy`tkom mista [Management of city strategic development].. <<http://www.kbuapa.kharkov.ua/e-book/apdu/2009-2/index.html>>]. [in Ukrainian]
14. Sirojch, Z.S. (2009). *Demografichni ta socia`no-ekonomichni problemy rozvytku misy`x aglomeracij* [Demographic and socio-economic problems of urban agglomerate development]. Kyiv, 32. [in Ukrainian]
15. Jagutkin, S.M. (2009). Tehnologii upravlennija social`no-jekonomicheskimi processami v sovremennyh gorodah Rossii [Technologies of management of socio-economical processes in contemporary Russian cities]. *Nauchnye vedomosti* [The scientific news], no. 16 (71), 98—103. [in Russian]
16. McNamara, C. (2008). *Strategic Planning (in nonprofit or for-profit organizations)*. Authenticity Consulting, LLC. <http://www.managementhelp.org/plan_dec/str_plan/str_plan.htm>. [in English]
17. OECD (2011). <http://www.oecd.org/home/0,2987,en_2649_201185_1_1_1_1_1_1_1.00.html>. [in English]