

UDC 35:005.93

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32782/tnv-pub.2025.2.9>

TRANSFORMATION OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION THROUGH NEW PUBLIC MANAGEMENT

Melnyk M. I. – Postgraduate Student at the Department of Public Administration
Educational and Scientific Institute of Public Administration and Civil Service
of Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv
ORCID: 0009-0002-2716-2301

The proposed article presents an in-depth conceptual analysis of the dynamic processes of public administration transformation in the context of the emergence of the New Public Management (NPM) doctrine, which represents a heuristic alternative to traditional bureaucratic models. The author substantiates that New Public Management is not merely an instrumental project but a complex reflexive construct that integrates elements of neoliberal normativity, managerial efficiency, and the corporatized logic of modern governance. NPM emerges as a response to the existential crisis of the bureaucratic mainstream, offering an innovative vector for the modernization of state institutions.

The article traces the trend of marginalizing the traditional role of the state as the sole regulator of the public sphere, accompanied by the multiplication of decision-making centers and the delegation of managerial powers to quasi-governmental and civil society entities. This paradigmatic reversal necessitates a new politico-legal comprehension of the boundaries of state intervention and emerging formats of public accountability. This process, lacking linearity, requires not only institutional adaptation but also a transformation of the axiological foundations of administrative interaction.

In exploring the semantic palette of New Public Management, the author engages in a critical deconstruction of the established discourses of efficiency, transparency, and performance, which have become integral elements of the new administrative rhetoric. It is emphasized that changes in public administration are not solely of a technical-organizational nature but ontological, as they are rooted in transformations of societal consciousness and the normative-value horizon of contemporary society.

In conclusion, it is stated that New Public Management should be understood as a complex, multifaceted construct that demands not linear implementation but profound adaptive reflection, taking into account local context, cognitive discontinuities, and normative uncertainty that accompany the processes of institutional modernization in an era of global turbulence.

Key words: public administration, New Public Management, transformation, modernization, polycentrism, governance paradigms, institutional adaptation.

Мельник М. І. Трансформація публічного управління через новий державний менеджмент

У запропонованій статті здійснюється глибокий концептуальний аналіз динамічних процесів трансформації публічного управління в контексті становлення доктрини нового державного менеджменту, що репрезентує собою евристичну альтернативу традиційним бюрократичним моделям. Автором обґрунтовано, що новий державний менеджмент не є суто інструментальним проєктом, а виступає як складна рефлексивна конструкція, котра поєднує елементи неоліберального нормативізму, управлінської ефективності та корпоративізованої логіки модерного урядування. Новий державний менеджмент постає як відповідь на екзистенційну кризу бюрократичного мейнстріму, пропонуючи інноваційний вектор модернізації державних інституцій.

У статті простежується тенденція до маргіналізації традиційної державної ролі як єдиного регулятора публічного простору, що супроводжується мультиплікацією центрів прийняття рішень і делегуванням управлінських повноважень у бік квазідержавних та громадянських утворень. Така парадигмальна реверсія зумовлює необхідність у новому політико-правовому осмисленні меж державного втручання та новітніх форматів публічної відповідальності. Цей процес, позбавлений лінійності, потребує не лише інституціональної адаптації, але й трансформації аксіологічних засад управлінської взаємодії.

Розкриваючи семантичну палітру нового державного менеджменту, автор вдається до критичної деконструкції усталених дискурсів ефективності, прозорості та результативності, що стають елементами нової адміністративної риторики. Наголошується на

тому, що зміни в публічному управлінні є не лише технічно-організаційними, а онтологічними, оскільки вкорінені у трансформаціях суспільної свідомості та нормативно-ціннісного горизонту сучасного соціуму.

У висновку відзначається, що, новий державний менеджмент трактується як складна, багатоаспектна конструкція, котра вимагає не лінійної імплементації, а глибокої адаптивної рефлексії з урахуванням локального контексту, когнітивних розривів та нормативної невизначеності, що супроводжують процеси інституціональної модернізації в добу глобальної турбулентності.

Ключові слова: публічне управління, новий державний менеджмент, трансформація, модернізація, поліцентризм, управлінські парадигми, інституційна адаптація.

Problem statement. In the epoch of post-global hypercomplexity, marked by the deconstruction of modernist teleologies of state-building, the transformational impulses provoked by the paradigm of New Public Management necessitate a revisionist rethinking of the ontology of public administration – not merely as an administrative phenomenon but as one of axiological, civilizational, and epistemological significance. The defining markers of this emergent managerial transgression lie in an abstraction from normative-hierarchical rigor toward networked polysemanticity, thereby dismantling the classical dichotomy of «public vs. private» and replacing it with heterogeneous forms of quasi-market quasi-publicity, determined not by juridical legitimacy alone, but by the logic of functional expediency [1, p. 139]. The institutional metamorphoses induced by the implementation of New Public Management principles are far from trivial or purely technocratic in nature; rather, they provoke fundamental shifts within the structures of collective imagination concerning the nature of statehood, legitimacy, and administrative efficacy.

A retrospective analytics of state administration reveals that since the predominance of Weberian bureaucratic paradigms – which posited the rational-legal authority model as the apex of administrative probity – there has been a gradual epistemological shift toward constructivist and, at times, poststructuralist interpretations of public management. In this sense, New Public Management does not merely represent a reformist impulse, but rather a radical epistemic reconfiguration, whereby the stability and predictability of classical administrative institutions are fundamentally unsettled. Simultaneously, there is an inflation of conceptual categories, where notions such as «efficiency», «effectiveness, and «public value» undergo semantic dilution due to their excessive and uncritical deployment within modernization discourses [2, p. 153].

In this context, the issue of the immanent antagonism between the pursuit of managerial efficiency and the imperative of democratic inclusivity becomes salient. The emergence of networked governance forms – progressively gravitating toward informal, horizontal structures – is accompanied by the devaluation of mechanisms for political accountability, which, in the long term, may precipitate a legitimacy crisis of public institutions [3, p. 13]. Under these circumstances, the transformation of public governance through the lens of New Public Management must be viewed not merely as an administrative innovation, but as a deeply political and philosophical shift that implicates the anthropological foundations of the state–citizen relationship.

Analysis of recent research and publications. Contemporary academic research reflects a shift from traditional bureaucratic governance toward a digital era in which the principles of new public management play a central role. A group of scholars – M. Di Giulio, G. Vecchi, C. Andersson, A. Hallin, C. Ivory, S. Kuhlmann, J. Marienfeldt, P. Dunleavy – examine digitalization as a driving force behind administrative change, transforming governance structures, decision-making models, and the roles of public servants. These studies emphasize not only technological advancement but also

the importance of agency, the adaptation of managerial practices to new challenges, and the evolving nature of citizen engagement.

Another group of researchers, including I. I. Nikolina, A. Blyznyuk, O. Lyulyov, S. Mynenko, N. Likarchuk, O. Andrieieva, A. Bernatskyi, focuses on the practical aspects of digital transformation in public administration. Their work covers the assessment of digital capacity in government bodies, the development of project maturity, and the enhancement of transparency. Of particular note is the approach to emotional engagement with citizens through impression marketing, highlighting the need to rethink communication strategies in the public sector in alignment with the principles of the new managerial paradigm.

The aim of this article is to critically elucidate the transformative dynamics of public governance through the conceptual and institutional prism of New Public Management.

Exposition of the core material. The transformation of public administration in the context of post-industrial society is acquiring the characteristics of a paradigmatic shift, characterized by the dominance of the ideological framework of the New Public Management, which emerged as a response to the inefficiencies of the Weberian bureaucratic model. Within this context, there is an increasing dissolution of traditional dichotomies between the public and private spheres, thereby raising the issue of the convergence of managerial practices [4, p. 7]. For instance, in the Netherlands and Denmark, decentralized models of governance have been introduced that emphasize performance, competitiveness, and client-centeredness, thereby demonstrating the adaptability of national administrative systems to contemporary global challenges. Concurrently, a normative codification of managerial innovations is taking place, entailing a regulatory modification of procedural standards. As a result, new architectures of public administration are emerging, which gravitate toward institutional flexibility and strategic foresight. Simultaneously, there is an increasing reliance on indicative planning as a tool of managerial legitimation amid social ambiguity [5, p. 9]. Within the framework of the New Public Management, effectiveness becomes conceptually determined through the lens of productivity, transparency, and accountability, which, however, is often accompanied by the risks of depoliticized decision-making. In France, for example, the administrative reform initiated in 2001 (LOLF) marked the integration of results-based management tools, leading to the reconfiguration of managerial protocols based on programmatic budgeting priorities [6, p. 159]. However, it should be noted that such institutional hybridization does not necessarily guarantee improved quality of public services, as there is a discernible trend toward the excessive formalization of performance. In this regard, epistemological criticism of performance metrics becomes essential, as these often reduce the complexity of social processes to quantitative indicators. A dilemma thus arises between managerial technological rationality and political reasonableness, precluding a uniform reception of the New Public Management across different administrative contexts [7, p. 477]. Consequently, market-oriented governance models frequently intersect with counter-discourses of social justice and inclusivity. This ambivalence determines the heterogeneity of reforms within the European Union.

The systemic implementation of the principles of the New Public Management requires a reflexive analysis not only of institutional determinants but also of the cognitive matrices of governance actors, thus highlighting the complexity of this phenomenon. In Sweden, where a social-democratic model of governance has historically prevailed, the adaptation of elements of the New Public Management has taken the form of delegating powers to local communities while maintaining a high level of state regulation. As a result,

a tendency toward governance polycentrism emerges, necessitating the complication of communicative channels between administrative units [8, p. 111]. This process is accompanied by the growing role of digital technologies as tools of transparency and control, although it simultaneously raises concerns regarding the algorithmic autonomy of decision-making. The evolution of public administration is therefore not a linear process, but rather a multiplicity of developmental trajectories. Under the influence of globalization imperatives and integrative processes within the European Union, the New Public Management is evolving into something beyond a technocratic model. It becomes an ideologeme aspiring to normative universality [9, p. 173].

It is worth noting that the institutional implantation of the New Public Management does not always take root in administrative cultures characterized by hierarchical mentalities, as illustrated by the example of Greece, where numerous reform efforts have encountered the rigidity of governance practices. Here, the conflict between the normative imperative of modernization and cultural inertia becomes particularly evident, leading to a low degree of transformation. In this context, international organizations such as the OECD and the European Commission play a significant role [10, p. 321], exerting pressure on national governments through the application of indicator-based policies and conditional financing.

One of the key features of the New Public Management is the adoption of private-sector models within the realm of public governance, resulting in what may be described as a «managerial drift» toward performance-oriented operations. In the United Kingdom, for instance, the reform of the healthcare sector through the implementation of the internal market demonstrated both efficiency gains and paradoxical social consequences. Alongside increases in productivity, there was a noticeable fragmentation of services and a decline in the system's integrative capacity, illustrating the tension between economic logic and the social mission. It should also be noted that excessive reliance on performance indicators tends to distort managerial priorities, as public officials become oriented toward achieving formal targets at the expense of substantive outcomes [11, p. 19]. Consequently, the applicability of corporatist tools in the public sector becomes a matter of debate. This dilemma necessitates a reconceptualization of the boundaries of managerial efficiency within the context of democratic accountability. The New Public Management, being a flexible and controversial concept, underscores the need for a critical reassessment of the foundational principles of public administration.

From a neo-institutionalist perspective, the New Public Management may be interpreted as a tool of symbolic legitimation for reforms, carrying more normative than operational significance. The case of Italy, where a multi-level governance system is accompanied by a high degree of administrative fragmentation, demonstrates that the New Public Management often functions as a rhetorical instrument of modernization discourse. As a result, «showcase reforms» are produced which, while appearing progressive at the level of political communication, fail to bring about substantive changes in governance mechanisms. In this context, the phenomenon of simulated reforms emerges, whereby the external attributes of modernization are not accompanied by internal procedural transformations. This leads to what may be termed a «theatre of governance,» in which efficiency and transparency are performed rather than practiced [12, p. 1907]. Simultaneously, institutional entropy increases, undermining the potential for coherent long-term policy. Thus, the New Public Management may serve as a vehicle of illusory modernization, where reforms exist only within the confines of reporting structures.

Within the framework of post-neoclassical administrative discourse, the transformation of public governance through the lens of New Public Management

emerges not merely as a conceptual renovation, but as a multifaceted shift in the paradigmatic foundations of the public sphere's functioning. A comparative analysis of this phenomenon necessitates the interpretation of complexly structured administrative dispositives through the prism of institutional pluralism, cognitive polycentricity, and epistemological fragmentation. The following table serves as an analytical matrix explicating the key axiomatic contours and implicit mechanisms of state governance reform under conditions of normative diffusion and managerial heteronomy (Table 1).

The transformation of public administration through the prism of the New Public Management is not a uniform process, but rather a multifaceted phenomenon that is

Table 1

**Analytical Matrix of the Paradigmatic Transformation
of Public Governance through the Doctrine of New Public Management**

Categorical Framework	Essential Characteristics	Transformational Paradigm	Institutional-Managerial Implications
Discourse of Neo-Institutionalism	The predominance of the normative-regulatory component in public administration, manifested through hypertrophied proceduralism and institutionalized stagnation	Gradual renovation of administrative dispositives via the implementation of quasi-market rationalization principles	Intervention of extra-systemic actors into the bureaucratic paradigm structure, initiating emergent organizational configurations
Axiological Shift	Evolution of the value-normative matrix towards prioritization of outcome over proceduralism	Reorientation from legitimized hierarchy to managerial-functional adaptiveness	Desacralization of formal procedures in favor of strategic flexibility and indicative performance
Mechanisms of Endogenization	Reconfiguration of state governance through incorporation of private sector instruments	Erosion of the state's monolithicity as the sole provider of services via public-private synergies	Institutionalization of cross-sectoral partnerships as a response to the complexities of a polycrisis societal environment
Rationality of Managerial Action	Determination of actions not solely by legislative imperatives but by dynamic situationality and multilevel reflexivity	Delegation of functional competencies in favor of flexible networked structures	Repoliticization of the administrative domain through procedural and normative hybridization
Epistemological Reconfiguration	Reconceptualization of public administration as a multidisciplinary phenomenon with ontological variability	Displacement of the traditional ethico-bureaucratic imperative by cognitive polycentricity	Affirmation of an innovation- and competence-based approach to civil service as a modus of societal transformation

Source: developed by the author based on [4; 8; 10; 11; 12; 13].

continuously shaped by political, social, and cultural factors. The model of the New Public Management reveals both the potential for optimization of public processes and the danger of reductionism, wherein complex social realities are distilled into technocratic formulas. Depending on the administrative tradition, political will, and institutional capacity, the outcomes of reforms may differ drastically, necessitating a contextually grounded analysis. For this reason, scholarly inquiry into the New Public Management requires an interdisciplinary approach that accommodates the multiplicity of interpretations and methodologies [13, p. 771]. The universality of this model is inherently limited by the empirical heterogeneity of the European administrative space. In the future, it is likely that elements of the New Public.

Conclusions and prospects for further inquiry. Thus, within the framework of a critical deconstruction of linear-teleological models of public administration, New Public Management emerges not merely as an administrative innovation but rather as a profound indicator of a civilizational shift in the paradigmatic configuration of interaction between governing institutions and the social body. Its epistemological valence lies in its capacity to articulately reconfigure the very logic of political rationality, displacing it from the realm of normative universalism toward a domain of situational and context-dependent pragmatism, wherein classical attributes of statehood increasingly acquire a rudimentary or even simulacral character. In this respect, New Public Management does not so much reform the state as it recodes it – modifying the operative grammar of power and resemanticizing the institutional language of public service.

The analysis of these transformational processes reveals that the incorporation of managerial techniques into the public domain is not a neutral act of functional adaptation, but rather a heteronomous form of epistemic incursion, which precipitates the deconfiguration of the foundational principles of the public interest. Such a subversion clearly transcends the simplistic dichotomy of efficiency versus effectiveness, penetrating instead the deepest layers of administrative subjectivity and dissolving it within the amorphous structures of quasi-market rhetoric. As a result, public governance forfeits its sacralized monocentricity and assumes the traits of polyphonic multiplicity which, despite its superficial inclusivity, risks the dilution of the ethical matrix underpinning the state's ontological coherence.

In view of the aforementioned, future scholarly inquiry must be oriented toward the construction of a transdisciplinary analytical matrix that integrates a hermeneutic sensitivity to the cultural-anthropological dimensions of governance with a critical-structural deconstruction of power architectures in the era of post-institutional disarray. Particularly fertile ground for heuristic exploration lies in the study of latent mechanisms of legitimation operating within hybridized governance regimes, wherein the state simultaneously functions as a subject of law, an object of the market, and a bearer of symbolic capital. It is precisely along this trajectory that a novel paradigm of publicness may emerge – not as a compilative model, but as a synthetic form of reflexive statecraft amid epochal indeterminacy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

1. Di Giulio M., Vecchi G. Implementing digitalization in the public sector. Technologies, agency and governance. *Public Policy and Administration*. 2023. № 38(2). С. 133–158.
2. Nikolina I. I. Assessment of digitalization of public management and administration at the level of territorial communities. *Національний гірничий університет. Науковий вісник*. 2020. № 5. С. 150–156.

3. Likarchuk N., Andrieieva O., Likarchuk D., Bernatskyi A. Impression marketing as a tool for building emotional connections in the public administration sphere. *Studies in Media and Communication*. 2022. № 10(1). С. 9–16.
4. Andersson C., Hallin A., Ivory C. Unpacking the digitalisation of public services. Configuring work during automation in local government. *Government Information Quarterly*. 2022. № 39(1). С. 1–10.
5. Smeshko O. G., Ushakova E. V., Borisova T. A. Quality management of public and municipal services in the context of the digitalization of society. *Economics and Management*. 2019. № 11. С. 4–13.
6. Карасаєв С. Ю., Лікарчук Н. В. Міжнародні аспекти використання інформаційних технологій у державному управлінні. Міжнародні відносини. Теоретико-практичні аспекти. 2023. № 12. С. 151–163.
7. Dunleavy P., та ін. New public management is dead, long live digital-era governance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. 2006. № 16(3). С. 467–494.
8. Mynenko S., Lyulyov O. The impact of digitalization on the transparency of public authorities. *Business Ethics and Leadership*. 2022. № 6(2). С. 103–115.
9. Blyznyuk A. Formation the project maturity of public administration in implementation of digital transformation projects. *Journal of Information Technology Management*. 2021. Т. 13. Спецвипуск: Advanced Innovation Topics in Business and Management. С. 163–187.
10. Kuhlmann S., Marienfeldt J. Comparing local government systems and reforms in Europe. From New Public Management to Digital Era Governance. *Handbook on Local and Regional Governance*. Edward Elgar Publishing. 2023. С. 313–329.
11. Lafioune N., Poirier E., St-Jacques M. Managing urban infrastructure assets in the digital era. Challenges of municipal digital transformation. *Digital Transformation and Society*. 2024. № 3(1). С. 3–22.
12. Mishchenko A., Shevel I., Likarchuk D., Shevchenko M. The aspects of international communication. Strategic partnership of Ukraine and Turkey. *Linguistics and Culture Review*. 2021. № 5(S4). С. 1895–1913.
13. Likarchuk N., Velychko Z., Andrieieva O., Lenda R., Vusyk H. Manipulation as an element of the political process in social networks. *Cuestiones Políticas*. 2023. № 41(76). С. 769–779.

REFERENCES:

1. Di Giulio, M., Vecchi, G. (2023). Implementing digitalization in the public sector. Technologies, agency, and governance. *Public Policy and Administration*, № 38.2, P. 133–158 [in English]
2. Nikolina, I. I. et al. (2020). Assessment of digitalization of public management and administration at the level of territorial communities. *Natsional'nyi Hirnychiy Universytet. Naukovyi Visnyk*, № 5, P. 150–156 [in English]
3. Likarchuk, N., Andrieieva, O., Likarchuk, D. & Bernatskyi, A. (2022). Impression marketing as a tool for building emotional connections in the public administration sphere. *Studies in Media and Communication*, № 10 (1), P. 9–16 [in English]
4. Andersson, C., Hallin, A. & Ivory, C. (2022). Unpacking the digitalisation of public services: Configuring work during automation in local government. *Government Information Quarterly*, № 39.1, P. 1–10 [in English]
5. Smeshko, O. G., Ushakova, E. V. & Borisova, T. A. (2019). Quality management of public and municipal services in the context of the digitalization of society. *Economics and Management*, № 11, P. 4–13 [in English]
6. Karasaiev, S. U., Likarchuk, N. V. (2023). Mizhnarodni aspekty vykorystannia informatsiynykh tekhnolohii u derzhavnomu upravlinni [International aspects of the use of information technologies in public administration]. *Mizhnarodni vidnosyny: teoretyko-praktychni aspekty*, №12, P. 151–163 [in Ukrainian].

7. Dunleavy, P. et al. (2006). New public management is dead—long live digital-era governance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, № 16.3, P. 467–494 [in English]
 8. Mynenko, S., Lyulyov, O. (2022). The impact of digitalization on the transparency of public authorities. *Business Ethics and Leadership*, № 6.2, P. 103–115 [in English]
 9. Blyznyuk, A. et al. (2021). Formation the project maturity of public administration in implementation of digital transformation projects. *Journal of Information Technology Management*, 13. Special Issue: Advanced Innovation Topics in Business and Management, P. 163–187 [in English]
 10. Kuhlmann, S. & Marienfeldt, J. (2023). Comparing local government systems and reforms in Europe: from New Public Management to Digital Era Governance? *Handbook on Local and Regional Governance*. Edward Elgar Publishing, P. 313–329 [in English]
 11. Lafioune, N., Poirier, E. & St-Jacques, M. (2024). Managing urban infrastructure assets in the digital era: challenges of municipal digital transformation. *Digital Transformation and Society*, № 3.1, P. 3–22 [in English]
 12. Mishchenko, A., Shevel, I., Likarchuk, D. & Shevchenko, M. (2021). The aspects of international communication: Strategic partnership of Ukraine and Turkey. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, № 5(S4), P. 1895–1913 [in English]
 13. Likarchuk, N., Velychko, Z., Andrieieva, O., Lenda, R. & Vusyk, H. (2023). Manipulation as an element of the political process in social networks. *Cuestiones Políticas*, № 41(76), P. 769–779 [in English]
-