

Section: Public administration in Ukraine: traditions, innovations and post-war prospects

Yakymchuk A.Y., Dr hab., Professor, Kherson State Agrarian and Economic University, Kropyvnytskyi, Ukraine, University of Information Technology and Management in Rzeszow, Poland, alinayakim@ukr.net, ayakymchuk@wsiz.edu.pl

NEW MANAGERIAL PRACTICES IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION UNDER MULTICRISIS THREATS: INTERNATIONAL EXPERIENCE

Introduction. The contemporary global environment is increasingly shaped by overlapping crises – armed conflicts, economic volatility, pandemics, and climate change. This phenomenon, often described as a polycrisis, creates unprecedented challenges for public administration systems [1; 2]. Governments must respond rapidly, allocate scarce resources efficiently, and maintain public trust.

In such conditions, the formation of a new managerial paradigm becomes essential – one that prioritizes flexibility, resilience, and citizen-centered governance [3]. This article examines the transformation of public administration in the context of multicrisis threats, including war, economic instability, and social disruptions. It argues that traditional bureaucratic governance models are insufficient under such conditions and highlights the emergence of adaptive, resilient, and innovation-driven management approaches. The study provides examples of countries that have successfully navigated wartime crises and presents a comparative analysis of public expenditure and governance strategies.

Modern public administration is evolving through the integration of several approaches [4; 5; 6]:

- adaptive governance – the ability to respond to uncertainty;
- digital governance – leveraging technology and data;
- resilient governance – maintaining functionality during crises;
- collaborative governance – engaging multiple stakeholders.

This transformation implies a shift: from hierarchy → to networks; from control → to coordination; from stability → to adaptability. War represents one of the most extreme forms of crisis, forcing governments to: centralize decision-making

while maintaining flexibility; reallocate budgets toward defense and recovery; ensure continuity of public services; strengthen national resilience. Importantly, wartime governance often accelerates innovation and institutional reform.

Countries that have experienced wars and major crises often become unexpected examples of rapid transformation and innovation. Israel, after multiple military conflicts, managed to build a highly responsive public administration system. One of its key strengths is the close connection between military and civilian sectors, which supports fast coordination in emergencies [4; 5; 6]. The country also developed advanced digital tools for crisis management and emergency response. The main lesson from Israel is clear: when pressure is high, systems often become more innovative and capable of making fast, effective decisions.

South Korea is another powerful example. After the devastation of the Korean War, the country followed a long-term development strategy led by the state. It invested heavily in education, science, and technology, while also building strong and efficient public institutions. Today, it is one of the world's leading advanced economies [6 7; 8]. The key message from South Korea's experience is that a clear long-term vision, combined with strong governance, can completely transform a country after war.

Rwanda, after the tragic genocide in 1994, focused on rebuilding trust and stability. The government restructured public administration, introduced strict anti-corruption measures, and adopted digital governance solutions to increase transparency [2; 3; 4; 9]. Rwanda's experience shows that restoring trust between the state and society is essential for successful recovery after a deep crisis.

Germany, after World War II, rebuilt itself by designing a strong federal governance system based on transparency and the rule of law. At the same time, it focused on economic recovery through the social market economy model, which combined free markets with social protection [8; 9]. The German case highlights how well-designed institutions are crucial for long-term stability and prosperity.

Ukraine, under ongoing war conditions, is also demonstrating remarkable resilience. The country has significantly accelerated digital transformation, expanding

e-government services and improving public access to information. Despite constant challenges, public administration continues to function, and citizen engagement has increased [1; 9]. The key lesson from Ukraine’s experience is that digitalization plays a critical role in maintaining state resilience even in extreme and unstable conditions.

Table 1. Comparative Analysis of Public Expenditures and Governance Priorities

| Country | Post-war priority | Public expenditure focus (% of budget approx.) | Key governance innovation |
|-------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| Israel | Security & innovation | 20–30% defense | Integrated security governance |
| South Korea | Economic growth | 15–20% education & industry | Developmental state model |
| Rwanda | Institutional rebuilding | 10–15% governance reform | Anti-corruption systems |
| Germany | Economic recovery | 20–25% social policy | Federal governance model |
| Ukraine | Resilience & defense | 30–40% defense & recovery | Digital public services |

Source: on the data of [2; 3; 4; 5; 6; 7; 8; 9].

The table provides a comparative overview of post-war priorities, public expenditure allocation, and governance innovations across selected countries. First, it shows that countries such as Israel and Ukraine allocate a significantly higher share of their budgets to defense, reflecting ongoing or persistent security challenges [1]. In contrast, South Korea prioritizes long-term economic growth by investing heavily in education and industrial development. The case of Germany illustrates a balanced approach, where substantial resources are directed toward social policy to ensure stability and welfare after conflict. Meanwhile, Rwanda emphasizes institutional rebuilding, allocating resources to governance reforms and anti-corruption measures. The table also highlights that despite different priorities, all countries focus on strengthening state capacity in response to crisis conditions. Another important observation is that governance innovations differ significantly, ranging from digital transformation to federal institutional design and integrated security systems. Overall, the comparison demonstrates that effective recovery strategies depend not only on financial allocation but also on the strategic direction and quality of governance reforms.

Based on international experience, new public management in crisis conditions includes: agility and adaptability (rapid decision-making, flexible policy design); data-driven governance (real-time analytics, evidence-based decisions); digital transformation (e-services; automation of processes); transformational leadership (vision-driven leadership, motivation and trust-building); citizen-centered approach (service orientation, public engagement). Modern public officials must develop strategic thinking under uncertainty, digital and analytical skills, crisis management capabilities, communication and trust-building skills, innovation-oriented mindset.

Conclusions. The experience of countries that have undergone wartime crises demonstrates that crises, while destructive, can serve as powerful catalysts for transformation. The formation of new managerial practices in public administration requires a shift toward flexibility, innovation, and resilience. Governments that successfully adapt are those that: embrace digital transformation, invest in human capital, build trust with citizens and adopt adaptive governance models. In the context of ongoing global instability, such transformation is not optional – it is essential for survival and sustainable development.

References

1. Якимчук А.Ю., Валюх А.М., Пахаренко О.В. Стратегія інформаційного забезпечення управління еколого-економічною безпекою України в умовах військово-політичної нестабільності. Монографія. Рівне: НУВГП, 2020. 154 с.
2. USAID. (2023). Civil Society Sustainability Index for Central and Eastern Europe and Eurasia.
3. World Bank. (2024). World Development Indicators. <https://databank.worldbank.org/source/world-development-indicators>.
4. Міністерство цифрової трансформації України. Портал відкритих даних. URL: <https://data.gov.ua>.
5. Freedom House. (2023). Nations in Transit: Ukraine. https://freedomhouse.org/sites/default/files/2023-05/NIT_2023_Digital.pdf
6. Salamon, L. M., & Sokolowski, S. W. (2016). Beyond Nonprofits: Re-conceptualizing the Third Sector.
7. Transparency International. (2023). Corruption Perceptions Index.
8. OECD. (2021). Civic Space in the Eastern Partnership.
9. United States Government. Data.gov Portal. URL: <https://www.data.gov>.