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Abstract. The article reveals the content of service-oriented reforms of public administration, identifies the key ideas and principles of service approach, as well as explores the features of the post-bureaucratic paradigm by M. Barzelay and B. Armajani and its theoretical and practical potential in the context of strengthening the state service function. The purpose of the article is to reveal the heuristic potential of the scientific ideas of B. Armajani and M. Barzelay for the service activity of the state. The relevant task is to identify the essence of the service approach to public policy, the key statements and tools of the post-bureaucratic model of public administration, as well as its opportunities in the course of service-oriented reforms of public administration, both in Ukraine and in the EU. The methodology of the research is based on a set of general scientific and special methods, in particular, systemic, structural and functional, bibliographic ones, which allow to achieve the goal and objectivity of this scientific research. It is found out that the service state relies on such principles as efficiency, effectiveness, openness and accessibility of information, accountability to citizens, citizens’ equality, political participation, consensus model of public decision making, etc. Instrumental implementation of service policy became possible through managerization, marketization, decentralization of managerial functions, devolution, management and performance auditing, deliberative practices, digitalization, etc. It is argued that the service approach to public administration can be greatly enhanced by the provisions and transformational mechanisms of the post-bureaucratic paradigm, first of all, because of its emphasis on the cultural component. The urgency of the post-bureaucratic approach is reinforced by the verification of its effectiveness in practice (Minnesota’s experience, USA).  
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Introduction. The pro-European vector of the Ukrainian state and society development was consolidated during the Revolution of Dignity, and manifested in the further steps undertaken by state officials, social activists, and NGOs with the support of the European Union and other governmental and non-governmental democratic partners. The rejection of multi-vector policy was supported by a series of effective political decisions that clarified the regulatory, organizational and institutional peculiarities of public administration reforms taking into account the EU standards in the context of Ukraine’s EU integration intentions. One of the directions of the relevant reforms was the formation of a service-oriented state, designed to provide maximum quality conditions for life and self-realization of every citizen.
The practical experience of the Western partners, which began similar reorganizations 15-20 years earlier, is undoubtedly useful. However, public policy, as a zone of high risks and responsibility, should be based not only on the generalization of the constructive consequences of service practices, but also on reliance on well-balanced and substantiated theoretical models. Among the scientific constructions that formulate principles and develop the toolkit of public service policy, are, in particular, theoretical works of T. Gaebler and D. Osborne, C. Pollitt, C. Hood, R. Denhardt, as well as M. Barzelay and B. Armajani. Unfortunately, the post-bureaucratic paradigm of the last two scholars is little researched in the context of the state service reorientation, both in Ukraine and in the EU.

**Literature review and the problem statement.** In general, the service approach to public policy is studied by such scholars as P. Klymushin, Y. Kozhenko, A. Maltsev, S. Martynov, V. Misurra, I. Pappel, D. Spasibov, E. Ferlie, etc. Post-bureaucratic theory is researched, in particular by V. Bakumenko, M. Beaver, J. Greenwood, V. Polischuk, G. Sytynk, V. Solovyov, V. Solovyi, A. Chemerys and others. But studies of the correlation of the service approach ideas and the post-bureaucratic paradigm, generally, do not exist [O’Flynn 2006; Özmen 2013; Rhodes, Milani Price 2011; Siebers 2009]. That is why the purpose of the article is to reveal the heuristic potential of the scientific ideas of B. Armajani and M. Barzeley for the service activity of the state. The relevant objective is to identify the content of the service approach to public policy, the leading provisions and tools of the post-bureaucratic model of public administration, as well as its opportunities in the course of service-oriented reforms of public administration, both in Ukraine and in the EU. The methodology of the research is based on a set of general scientific and special methods, in particular, systemic, structural and functional, bibliographic ones, which allow to achieve the goal and objectivity of this scientific research.

**Research results.** The idea of a service state appears in the United States and Great Britain in the 80's and 90's of the twentieth century under the pressure of social discontent among taxpayers who were indignant at the high costs of maintaining the state apparatus and its low efficiency. Evstifeev R. notes: "The political and administrative reforms of the late 20th century are largely connected with the recognition and acknowledgment not only of scientists and politicians, but also of ordinary citizens of the fact that the lack of effective public administration is a serious obstacle to the development of countries" [Evstifeev 2011]. Subsequently, this idea extends to other Anglo-Saxon countries and later to other democratic developed ones.

The key factors for the emergence of the idea of a service state were: the hierarchy of the public administration system, the combination of control and execution functions, the lack of motivation of civil servants to qualitatively fulfill their duties, strict adherence to the requirements and rules, bureaucratic (passive) organizational culture, budgets increase for the maintenance of a growing administrative apparatus and programs, closeness of information, neglecting of the citizen as an actor of socio-political processes, the growth of the competence level of citizens and their requirements for accountability of state agencies and own inclusiveness; economic recession, high level of politicization of public-management procedures, etc.

“"The reformers’ arguments were ultimately practical. These new forms would change public sector practice; the public sector would work more efficiently and more in line with the needs and wishes of the public” [Brunsson 2013].
The task of optimizing the activities of public institutions, making them more economical and effective, responding adequately to the demands of society, was assumed by scientists representing a single theoretical direction known as the new public management. One of its founders is Ch. Hood, who identified seven doctrinal components of the new public management: 1) professional management in the public sector (high level of autonomy of managers in management of their agency); 2) clear standards and criteria for evaluating the work (correctly defined goals and objectives that should contribute to increased efficiency and accountability); 3) expressive emphasis on initial control (prevalence of results over procedures); 4) shredding of departments in public administration (mobility and autonomy of departments); 5) increasing of competition in public sector (introduction of long-term contracts and tendering procedures); 6) introduction of private sector management practices (refusal of the bureaucracy, guaranteeing greater flexibility); 7) raising discipline and saving resources (reducing direct costs and creating a new responsible culture of employees) [Hood 1991].

Gaebler T. and D. Osborne offer an “entrepreneurial” approach to solving the main problems of the then-day system of public administration in the United States, developing ten key principles: 1) management of the public administration process, not its direct execution; 2) providing consumers with alternatives for choosing service providers; 3) competitive basis for service providers; 4) determination of tasks, not regulation of rules; 5) orientation to the results; 6) predominant role of consumerism; 7) reorientation of the civil service from the expenditure of budget funds for earning money; 8) priority of preventing problems to solving them; 9) cooperation of decentralized public-management structures; 10) introduction of market mechanisms for public sector activities [Osborne, Gaebler 1993].

In addition to purely socio-political concepts, the service approach relies on separate decisions of the neo-institutional economic theory (transaction cost and agency theories). The service state inherited from the agency theory such basic principles as the attitude to the citizen as a customer of public services; contracts signing between the client and the executor of public services; outsourcing as a mechanism for engaging third parties to provide public services on a contractual basis. “Accordingly, agency theory provides helpful guidelines on the important issue of contracting out versus in-house provision: other thing being equal, contracting out is likely to be the most efficient option when specifying, monitoring and enforcing a contract is relatively easy, whole in-house provision will be preferable where these conditions do not apply” [Boston 2013].

Transaction cost theory has a tripartite impact on the content of the state service policy. On the one hand, it contributed to the reappraisal of the best ways to organize and receive public services and provided mathematical tools for analytical studies of each particular case. On the other hand, it influenced the popularization of the practice of reengineering contractual agreements, which was to serve the more precise specification of contracts and their permanent monitoring. In addition, this economic theory has formed the basis for maintaining a range of public services purely for state institutions, respectively, creating barriers to comprehensive contracting and radical intentions in reforming the public sector.

Another important ideological inspiration of the service state was, at the turn of the centuries, a scientific construct of good governance. Unlike NPM, this approach offered not only to establish interaction between the state and a citizen as a provider and consumer of public services, but also to make them parity participants in the process of developing, providing and assessing the quality of public services. “The concept of “good governance”
erved as the theoretical basis for such refinements of the content of reforms carried out in the sphere of public administration. Its main idea is that the state should not act as the sole subject of making managerial decisions. The most important of them should be taken by it as part of a dialogue with interested civil society organizations. Moreover, the implementation of a number of such decisions may, in general, be transferred by the state on a contractual basis to interested non-governmental organizations" [Zaykovskiy 2014].

The basic principles of good governance (legality, transparency, accessibility, the right to be heard, the right to appeal, accountability, etc.) at the expense of informatization and digitalization (in particular, e-governance) became the basis for strengthening the service essence of the state. So in the context of the good governance approach, Janet and Robert Denhardt proposed a model of a new public service. It begins with the fact that the focus of public administration must be citizens, community and civil society. In this concept, the main role of civil servants is to help citizens to clearly formulate and satisfy their common interests, and not in the management of society. In an effort to address broader public needs and develop public interest-based solutions, governments need to be open, accessible, accountable, and work to serve citizens. The prevailing forms of accountability should go beyond the formal accountability of civil servants to elected officials in managing and implementing budgets and programs to accommodate a wider range of relations with citizens and communities [Denhardt 2000].

Prior to the emergence of this scientific construct, the main disadvantage of a service-oriented approach was that there was no clear systematization of the services provided by the state, the cost of these services, their efficiency, and the level of user satisfaction. In order to be able to measure, evaluate and improve services, it was necessary to find tools for reviewing the nature of services, cost, efficiency, quality of service in the form of feedback from users. With the help of IT components it became possible to inspect the entire state model in terms of its effectiveness. Accordingly, it made functioning of the state more efficient and optimal.

Consequently, the content of the service state is disclosed in activities based on such principles as cost efficiency, effectiveness, openness and accessibility of information, accountability to citizens, citizens' equality, political participation, consensus model of public decision making, etc. Instrumental implementation of service policy became possible through management, marketization, decentralization of managerial functions, devolution, management and performance auditing, deliberative practices, digitalization, etc.

In practice, the service state was implemented by US (Reaganomics) and the United Kingdom (Thatcherism) governments, subsequently supported by successors and spread to the EU. Thus, in 1991, in the United Kingdom, the Citizen's Charter was adopted, which was subsequently detailed by specialized charters in various spheres (taxes, education, health care, etc.). The charters for public services delivery were adopted in France (1992), Belgium (1993). The regulatory framework of the various EU countries was strengthened by laws and acts justifying administrative procedures (Austria, Latvia, Poland, etc.). At the general EU level, the service approach to public administration is enshrined, in particular, by the European Social Charter, the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union.

The post-bureaucratic paradigm by M. Barzelay and B. Armajani appears in 1992. According to the scientists, public administration reforms are possible under conditions of changes in the policy of public management, as well as the design of public organizations.
The policy of public management is a general course of functioning of public administration, which simultaneously affects all areas related to the public services delivery. Changes in public management policies have an impact on human resource management practices, financial management, performance management, information and communication technologies, public marketing and supply. The design of public organizations directly affects the following aspects of the public services delivery, as organizational design, privatization in many of its manifestations (outsourcing, vending of state assets), introduction of inter-organizational policies (franchising, joint venture, strategic partnership), participation of non-governmental organizations in decision-making as well as marketing of public services [Barzelay, Armajani 1992].

According to S. Borins, the post-bureaucratic paradigm "calls on organizations to be structured around maximizing the benefits of organization consumers...such actions require more attention to innovations than the rules" [Borins 2009].

Consequently, one of the key ideas of the post-bureaucratic paradigm is the perception of the citizen as a client. According to the scientists, the main task of public administration is to ensure consumer interests. The pivotal positions of the bureaucratic and post-bureaucratic paradigms are very different in their logic. The bureaucratic agency focuses on its needs and perspectives, post-bureaucratic - on the needs and prospects of clients. The former concerns the roles and responsibilities of the structural divisions, the latter - the team operation of the entire agency. The bureaucratic structure is self-identified by the number of controlled resources and performed tasks, post-bureaucratic - by the results achieved for consumers. Bureaucratic agency controls costs, post-bureaucratic - seeks to profit. The former works template, the latter varies in response to changing requirements to the service. Bureaucratic management meets standardized procedures, post-bureaucratic one serves the purposes. The bureaucracy fights for the sphere of influence, the post bureaucracy is competing for business. The bureaucratic agency declares plans and policies, while post-bureaucratic one engages consumers in communication to evaluate and develop an action strategy. The former delimits the processes of thinking and execution, the latter involves employees from the "advanced" areas to analyze ways to improve public services.

Popov V. defines the concept of M. Barzelay and B. Armajani as client-oriented one and notes that “The concept of client-oriented structures providing public services to the population is used by public officials as an instrument for identifying and solving emerging problems. At a higher level of community, this concept also presents many resources needed to develop an alternative to a bureaucratic paradigm" [ Popov 2015.].

Armajani B. and M. Barzelay proposed a clear plan for the transition from a bureaucratic to a post-bureaucratic paradigm, by developing a series of tactical steps for a corresponding transformation. The main transformational tasks are: transition from satisfaction of general interests to the results that citizens appreciate; from efficiency to quality and value; from administration to production; from control to winning compliance; from the specification of functions, powers and structures to the identification of mission, services, customers and profits; from imposing responsibility to building accountability and strengthening internal ties; from following rules and procedures to awareness and application of norms, identification and resolution of problems, continuous improvement of processes; from managing administrative systems to separating services and controls, expanding public services, encouraging collective action, applying incentives, measuring and analyzing results, and enriching feedback.
Accordingly, the service approach to public administration can be greatly enhanced by the provisions and transformational mechanisms of the post-bureaucratic paradigm. First of all, because of its emphasis on the culturological component. After all, the authors of the post-bureaucratic model of public administration emphasize the system-building nature of the type of internal culture, which may remain obsolete (bureaucratic) or become new, post-bureaucratic one. The replacement of the bureaucratic paradigm by the post-bureaucratic one, according to its founders, involves not only structural and instrumental changes, but also the development of new execution standards. The formation of a post-bureaucratic image of a civil servant is impossible without updating his / her cultural priorities and professional values.

The culture of public administration is equivalent to the value of technical changes, and the success of the latter is directly dependent on the effectiveness of the replacement of cultural-behavioral patterns of employees of state structures. However, there is a certain difficulty here, as procedural and instrumental innovations take place more quickly than cultural and value ones, but the quality of functioning of the former will be unsatisfactory until a full integration of the new culture of public administration with the system takes place, or rather, until the majority of state administrators do not realize the need and the inevitability of these transformations and make them own habit.

The renewal of the culture of public administration appears to be a priority task during administrative reforms, since it influences not only the structural component but also the revaluation of the value of resources, the way they are used, internal and external communications, the goals and functions of public administration.

The new doctrine of the culture of the post-bureaucratic format envisaged the introduction of such new practices for civil servants as exercise of judgments and authority, compliance with quality standards, exchange of information with clients, the formation of a "reasonable" staffing, and the partners consolidation. All these innovations were implemented by the Minnesota administration in the 1990’s with the participation of B. Armajani and M. Barzelay. Here, the pivotal idea of the reforms was introduction of market dynamics, which included strengthening internal bilateral communication, reviewing financial grounds, adversarial activities, overcoming legislative mistrust, and upgrading HR, information and procurement systems, which made it possible to achieve meaningful practical results. The reforms were based on several leading hypotheses: closer contacts with clients provide a better understanding of their needs; increasing of employee participation positively reflects on the knowledge, skills and aspirations of all civil servants; increasing discretionary powers gives executives and employees greater responsibility for the case; volunteering partnership allows to share knowledge, experience and other resources; usage of modern technology to increase productivity gives results; improved performance measurement provides a basis for planning and improving services, as well as providing employees with information on their implementation.

**Conclusions.** Summarizing the results of the study, we can draw the following conclusions. The post-bureaucratic paradigm by M. Barzelay and B. Armajani does not contradict the ideas and principles of the service approach, supporting the usage of market and managerial techniques for improving the service function of the state. At the same time, this paradigm can complement the service state by the post-bureaucratic model of the culture of the civil service, which, by means of the implementation of new cultural values and priorities, could help transform the bureaucrat into a functionary, manager, and
responsible employee. Further scientific researches of the chosen topic may concern the analysis of the Preconditions and conditions for conducting a constructive substitution of the bureaucratic model of culture by the post-bureaucratic one.
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