

Eurasian  
Research Bulletin

## On Certain Problems in Assessing the Effectiveness of Executive Bodies: General Overview

**Assoc.Prof. Dr. Qakhramon  
UMIDULLAYEV**

PhD in Jurisprudence, Senior Research Fellow,  
Institute of State and Law, Uzbekistan Academy of Sciences  
E-mail: [umidullayev@internet.ru](mailto:umidullayev@internet.ru), Mob. +998 90 644 24 64

### ABSTRACT

This article discusses the problems of assessing the effectiveness of the activities of executive authorities both at the country level (the case of Uzbekistan) and at the level of municipalities. The article substantiates the need to form an attitude towards the leading role of the individual as a citizen (consumer or taxpayer) in assessing the activities of economic or state institutions as the main appraiser. The approaches currently used to assess the quality of decisions made by the authorities are analyzed. In addition, here the author tries to give his own assumption about the importance of the evaluation process in general. As stated, the assessment of the activities of state bodies is a multifaceted problem that has not yet been sufficiently studied in theoretical, methodological and practical terms. Achieving the goals set by the system for evaluating the activities of state bodies largely depends on the experience of the bodies and employees responsible for the evaluation system.

### Keywords:

Assessment process, Uzbekistan, conventional problems, system analysis, assessment of state bodies, organization, budget savings, strategies.

In recent years, a wide range of complex measures have been implemented in Uzbekistan to radically increase the efficiency of the activities of ministries, state committees, other bodies of state administration, and business associations, and to clearly define their tasks, powers, and areas of responsibility.

In addition, a deep and comprehensive critical study of the true state of affairs in sectors and regions is a number of serious issues related to strengthening the personal responsibility for the proper and responsible performance of the functional tasks assigned to the deputy heads of ministries, state committees, other bodies of state administration and economic associations. indicates the presence of deficiencies and systemic problems.

Referring to theoretical study of the problems in mismanagement in the sphere for

instance, as scholar L.G. Sokolova, who conducted scientific research on the evaluation of the activities of public administration bodies, says "Practice has shown that most of the developed and used indicators do not meet the classical requirements, for example, ease of use and understanding, statistical reliability, manageability, speed of updates, appropriateness and others" [1, P.142].

The well-known scientist I.A.Tikhomirov, who conducted a lot of scientific research on the effective organization of the activities of executive authorities, said that "there are many positive aspects as well as disadvantages of evaluating the effectiveness of the activities of executive authorities. According to him, "the legal basis for assessing the effectiveness of the authorities' activities is not free from shortcomings. In order to achieve the intended goals, amendments should be made to the

normative and legal documents adopted with the aim of achieving such goals" [2, P.452].

A.V.Volkova, who conducted scientific research in this field, in her work entitled "Upravlyaemost Gosudarstva i Grajdanskaya Sostoyatel'nost'" writes that "goals, criteria, parameters, technologies, methods of the personnel evaluation system includes the sources, procedure and participants of evaluation within the normative framework. Evaluating the effectiveness of the state authorities' activity makes it possible to determine to what extent the areas of management activity are well chosen and what results they are producing in practice. It should be noted that the majority of researchers related to the effectiveness of public administration state that it is usually very difficult to choose the criteria for evaluating the effectiveness due to the specificity of the activity results, as well as the goals and tasks set for the state bodies" [3, P.45].

A.V.Volkova, like most researchers, emphasizes the difficulty of choosing evaluation criteria. Evaluation criteria are very important in the organization of evaluation processes, and based on the authority and tasks of the evaluated body, accurate and complete determination ensures the effectiveness of the evaluation process. The many elements and complex structure of the evaluation subject means that it is necessary to consider and analyze a large number of factors.

According to A.A. Dugarova, the analysis of the works devoted to the issues of public administration efficiency showed a disparity in the understanding of the main categories of this topic. Also, researchers base various criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of governing bodies.

First of all, this testifies to the multiplicity and versatility of the object of study, that is, the state and municipal management system [4, Pp. 185-189].

The existence of many indicators in the system of evaluation of the efficiency of state bodies makes it difficult to compare the state bodies being evaluated. Another difficulty in assessing the efficiency of the state administration is determined by the level of

customer satisfaction. It is more complicated than evaluating the economic results. The following factors may impact in this process:

- the influence of external factors complicates the objectivity of the assessment;
- insufficient involvement of external (independent) experts in evaluation processes;
- solutions not provided with resources;
- solutions that ignore the time resource.

According to I.Yu. Zinchenko, the problems that have a significant impact on the decline in the quality of management decisions and, accordingly, make it difficult to evaluate them, include:

1. Inadequate coordination of activities between different structural units (disorganized management mechanism), as a result of which decisions from different structural units (vertically and horizontally) are poorly coordinated and sometimes conflicting.

2. Frequent conflicts between the set goals and their resource provision. As a result, in many cases, decisions are not implemented.

3. The conflict between official and unofficial norms and rules in the administration. For example, existing, but not officially defined norms.

Thus, before the evaluation, it is necessary to analyze how well they are prepared and whether the above criteria are taken into account and based on the adoption and implementation of certain decisions [5].

At this point, it is worth noting that most researchers are of the opinion that the opinion of the population and their level of satisfaction should be taken into account when evaluating the performance of executive authorities and regional leaders.

According to I.Yu. Chazova, the activities of state authorities, employees, heads of executive authorities have a process nature, and when evaluating the effectiveness of their activities, one should not pay full attention to achieving goals and target indicators [6, P.776].

One of the problems in assessing socio-economic efficiency at the state and regional level is related to the multiplicity of processes and objects.

According to E.A.Kapoguzov and G.K.Suleymenova, the assessment of the

efficiency of the state bodies was not carried out without problems and unexpected results. Many evaluation units have been established within government structures. As a result, the cost of providing them increased. Although the evaluation process aims to ensure accountability of public authorities, the increase in the number of audit bodies has had a negative impact [7].

According to S.V.Fateeva, the objectivity of indicators describing the quality of services rendered in various spheres of life and the satisfaction with the activities of authorities can be very doubtful, even when measured in percentages compared to the number of respondents.

The number of respondents is unlimited and can vary from ten to a thousand people. In addition, there is a possibility that the number of the most loyal (trustworthy) citizens among ten people is more. We should not forget about the socio-psychological factors of the person, which have the greatest impact on the perception of social reality and the formation of public trust in state power and local self-government bodies. Solving this problem, the highest objectivity and reliability of sociological results can be achieved by accurately determining the number of respondents who participated in the survey.

She said that taking into account the prospects and ways of development of the implementation of the system of evaluation of the effectiveness of the local state authorities, a number of problematic issues arise. It should be remembered that each region has its own characteristics and differs from each other according to various socio-economic opportunities. differs in degree. Historically, differences in the economic development of regions affect the structure of the state, the efficiency of the economy, the tactics of strategy and institutional reforms, and socio-economic policy.

The local community is aware of its problems and the resources that can be used for it. In addition, it is such a force that it provides the greatest "transparency" of costs and revenues, which creates conditions for efficient use of resources.

At the same time, some generalized evaluation indicators are not directly related to the powers of local authorities, and it is very difficult for local authorities to influence them. It is also necessary to remember that the legal basis for evaluating the effectiveness of the authorities' activities is not without flaws and that the adopted regulatory documents require additional correction in order to achieve the goals in practice. Historically, there have been differences in the strategy and tactics of socio-economic policy and institutional changes that have a significant impact on the state structure and the economic development of the regions" [8].

At this point, it is worth mentioning that the effectiveness of the civil servants working in the executive authorities depends on factors such as their personal initiative, professional training, working conditions created for them.

Monitoring and evaluation of the effectiveness of strategy and program implementation is carried out by the ministries and agencies through the annual preparation of reports. They reflect the achieved goals, results, as well as performance indicators of these bodies for the next planning period. At the same time, attention should be paid to the quality of information provided and received by various bodies for monitoring. In order to have a realistic picture of the situation, information must always be timely, complete and reliable. Without meeting these requirements, it is impossible to have an idea about the ongoing processes in public administration.

According to K.I.Apkanyeva, "to improve the evaluation of the effectiveness of the executive authorities:

- taking into account territorial differences across the country and the level of development of the regions, distance from the center, climatic conditions and characteristics, whether they are in need of a donor or subsidy;
- implementation of quality management of services provided to the population;
- Evaluation of the efficiency, level of professionalism of the worker (employee) and evaluation of the quality of the provided services;

- it will be necessary to introduce and constantly improve information systems, as well as to automate the processes of evaluating the effectiveness of activity.

These recommendations serve to ensure the objectivity of monitoring and evaluation of the activities of executive authorities. This, in turn, allows for more effective management decisions on various problematic issues at the local and regional level" [9, Pp.123-127].

V.V. Novozhilov, one of the scientists who carried out scientific research on the evaluation of the effectiveness of the executive power bodies, says that "a lot of attention was paid to the evaluation of the effectiveness of the state management bodies and this is considered a complex issue" [10, P.432].

According to E.I.Dobrolyubova, V.N.Yuzhakov, O.V.Aleksandrov, the biggest shortcoming of evaluating efficiency based on criteria is the number of main and additional indicators. In many cases, they repeat each other, there is no clear mechanism of calculation, and they do not reflect the exact situation in the fields. Many of them do not allow objective assessment of efficiency in the regions. For this reason, the following compilations and considerations have been developed by experts on improving the system.

- full implementation of result-based management in the activities of executive authorities;

- making appropriate corrections to control mechanisms that do not produce the planned effect;

- lack of indicators for calculating the important areas of activity of central (federal) and regional executive bodies;

- lack of a data collection and processing system, creation of a work efficiency determination and monitoring system;

- lack of sufficient knowledge of public servants in the field of performance management, as well as lack of motivation for performance evaluation [11, Pp.28-47].

According to R.J.Veld, the positive effects of the performance evaluation system alternate with negative effects during the long-term operation. For example, the direct connection of remuneration to the evaluation of the

government's efficiency can lead to the manifestation of efficiency in reporting documents (overwriting, distorting results), but not in real life, while serving as an incentive for "strategic actions" [12, P.36].

R.J.Veld's opinion on the system of evaluation of the effectiveness of public administration bodies can be agreed with the following.

It cannot be denied that there will be cases of "overwriting" in the process of evaluating the effectiveness of the executive state authorities. In order for the assessment system to be effective and to achieve its intended purpose, it is necessary to reduce the intervention of the human factor in the processes of the assessment system as much as possible, to fully automate the processes of entering data into the assessment system and calculating. An effective mechanism for monitoring and controlling the activities of officials responsible for the evaluation process should not be neglected.

M.W.Meyer and V.Gupta call for research into different methods of avoiding paradoxes in evaluation. Studies have shown that different countries choose different performance evaluation tools and methodologies. They choose different institutions to ensure the efficiency of public administration. Different methods give different results. But the problem of the contradiction between "evaluation" and "efficiency" is everywhere [13].

According to G.V.Atamanchuk, "Attempts to objectively evaluate the activity of state bodies and the quality of public administration in general were carried out in almost every country in the world at different historical stages. Most of the evaluations were generally critical and called on the state leaders to take measures to improve the efficiency of public administration" [14, P.12].

As seen above, there are many positive and at the same time critical opinions regarding the evaluation of the activities of state bodies.

According to D.Anvarova, who conducted scientific research in this field, "Effectiveness of public administration depends on the following factors:

- the clear purpose (task) of each state body, the clear distribution of tasks, functions

and responsibilities among the constituent departments;

- existence of mechanisms for performing functions;
- clearly planned activities;
- creation of working conditions;
- systematic work with personnel consisting of qualified specialists, effective and fair incentives (wages, awards, etc.);
- the existence of criteria for evaluating the labor productivity of civil servants;
- the possibility of identifying problems that reduce the efficiency of state bodies by developing proposals according to the evaluation results" [15].

The problem of assessing the efficiency of the state administration bodies is related to the size of the processes and the object, as well as the inclusion of many external and internal factors. Another important problem is the existence of a subjective factor. This decision is a factor that can affect the outcome.

But in many countries, in the reforms carried out to improve the activities of state bodies, attention is focused on evaluating their activities. The focus of the assessment shifted from resources to outcomes.

In our opinion, one of the main problems in assessing the effectiveness of the state administration bodies is related to the instability of the criteria and methodology for evaluating their activities. It is possible to accept the change of assessment criteria and methodology as a natural phenomenon. But it is necessary to change the evaluation criteria, add new ones, and follow the accuracy in developing the appropriate evaluation methodology. For this, it is necessary to be careful along with accurate calculation from experts in the field. Also, the ineffectiveness of evaluation processes is caused by factors such as familiarity, "adding on", inaccurate evaluation methodology, improper organization of evaluation processes.

As a conclusion, it is worth noting that, according to some analysts, it is difficult to evaluate management activities in the short term. The result of many management decisions taken at the state level can be seen in the long term. In this case, the effectiveness can be evaluated only in the long term. Also, the fact

that the economic base of the regions is not homogeneous, and the evaluation criteria are homogeneous at the national level, and that it is impossible to develop separate criteria for each region and introduce its calculation system, caused criticism.

However, the results of the evaluation of the effectiveness of the executive authorities clearly show the reasons for the shortcomings. This, in turn, creates an opportunity to eliminate shortcomings and plan the work correctly and rationally. It is possible to develop long-term planning and strategic development programs by summarizing the performance indicators of the executive authorities. These recommendations, together with the effective monitoring of the activities of the executive authorities, will allow for a more objective assessment of the activities of the state authorities and management bodies, more clearly indicate the problem areas and executive authorities. allows to make effective management decisions.

In general, the evaluation of the activities of state bodies is a multifaceted problem that is still not well studied in terms of theory, methodology and practice. Achieving the goals set by the performance evaluation system of state bodies largely depends on the experience of the bodies and employees responsible for the evaluation system. It leads to the conclusion that the evaluation system requires regular scientific research.

#### References:

1. Sokolova L.G. Osnovi Gosudarstvennogo i municipal'nogo Upravleniya: ucheb.posobie. – Irkutsk: Izd-vo BGUEP, 2015. – P. 142.
2. Tikhomirov I.A. Administrativnoe Pravo i process: Polniy kurs. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. – M.: Izd. Tixomirova M.Yu., 2008. – P. 452.
3. Volkova A. V. Upravlyaemost' Gosudarstva i Grajdanskaya Sostoyatel'nost' // Istoricheskie, Filosofskie, Politicheskie i Yuridicheskie Nauki, kul'turologiya i Iskusstvovedenie. Voprosi Teorii i Praktiki. – 2014. – No. 4-1. – P. 45.

4. Dugarova A. A. Ocenka Effektivnosti Deyatel'nosti Organov Gosudarstvennogo Upravleniya v Sovremennix Usloviyax // Vestnik Buryatskogo Gosudarstvennogo Universiteta, 2015. Vol. 2a – P. 185-189.
5. Zinchenko I.Yu. Osenka Effektivnosti Deyatel'nosti Organov Ispolnitel'noy Vlasti Sub'ektov RF // Sosial'no-Ekonomicheskie Yavleniya i Processi. 2014. No. 1. URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/otsenka-effektivnosti-deyatelnosti-organov-ispolnitelnoy-vlasti-subektov-rf> (date of application: 16.05.2021).
6. I.Yu.Chazova, M.V.Israilov. Ocenka Effektivnosti Deyatel'nosti Organov Gosudarstvennoy Vlasti. Vestnik Udmurtskogo universiteta, otdel. Ekonomika i Pravo, 29-vipusk. Izhevsk, 2019. P.776.
7. Kapoguzov Ye.A., Suleymenova G.K. Ocenka Effektivnosti Deyatel'nosti Gosudarstvennix Organov v Kontekste Strategicheskogo Menezhmenta i Organizatsionnogo Razvitiya v Respublike Kazakhstan // ARS ADMINISTRANDI. 2017. (date of application: 17.05.2021).
8. Fateeva S. V. Konseptual'nie Osnovi Ocenki Effektivnosti Deyatel'nosti Organov Ispolnitel'noy Vlasti. // Upravlenie Ekonomicheskimi Sistemami. – Kislovodsk: Kislovodskiy Institut Ekonomiki i Prava. – No.9. – 2014.
9. Apkanieva K. I. Ocenki Effektivnosti Deyatel'nosti Organov Gosudarstvennoy Vlasti v RF: Sostoyanie, Problemi i Puti Resheniya / K.I.Apkanieva. — Tekst: neposredstvenniy // Molodoy ucheniy. – 2018. – № 45 (231). – P. 123-127. – URL: <https://moluch.ru/archive/231/53607/> / (date of application: 04.05.2021).
10. Novojilov V.V. Problemi Izmereniya Zatrata i Rezul'tatov pri Optimal'nom Planirovanii. – M.: Nauka, 1972. – P. 432.
11. Dobrolyubova, Ye.I., Yujakov, V.N., Aleksandrov O.V. Vnedrenieupravleniya po Rezul'tatam v Ramkax Realizacii Administrativnoy Reformi v Rossiyskoy Federacii [Tekst] / Ye.I.Dobrolyubova, V.N.Yujakov, O.V.Aleksandrov// Voprosi Gosudarstvennogo i Munisipal'nogo Upravleniya. – 2014. No.2. – P. 28-47.
12. Veld R. J. in't. Relations between the State and Higher Education. The Hague, 1996. P. 36, 79; Veld R. J. in't. The Dynamics of Educational Performance Indicators, Ministry of Education, Culture and Science (JC&W). TheHague, 1987.
13. Meyer M. W., Gupta V. The performance paradox. Research in Organizational Behavior. No.16: 309-369.
14. See: Problemi Effektivnosti Raboti Upravlencheskikh Organov. – M., 1973. – P. 12;
15. Atamanchuk G.V. Problemi Analiza Gosudarstvennogo Upravleniya // Publichnoe i Chastnoe Pravo. – 2008. No. 1. P. 97.
16. Anvarova D. Davlat Boshqaruvini Baholash yokhud Byudjet Mablaghlari Qanday Tejaladi. // <https://huquqburch.uz>