

Dictionary on Public Administration Management

Edited by
Irena Bačlija Brajnik



Univerza v Ljubljani
Fakulteta za družbene vede

DICTIONARY ON PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION MANAGEMENT

Edited by Irena Bačlija Brajnik

Authors (listed alphabetically):

Begič Lara, Bošnjak Špela, Del Ciotto Erika, Dimitrov Ian, Espin Clara, Filli Matej, Krašovec Martin, Kresevič Denis, Lamovšek Gal, Mille Manon, Petrič Blaž, Petrović Kristina, Podkrajšek Anja, Sergeeva Anastasia, Suprun Yuliya, Šoštarec Kaja

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Published by: Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ljubljana

For the publisher: Monika Kalin Golob, the Dean

Design: Tanja Radež

First Edition

Ljubljana, 2021

Accessible at: <https://knjigarna.fdv.si>

Kataložni zapis o publikaciji (CIP) pripravili v Narodni in univerzitetni knjižnici v Ljubljani

COBISS.SI-ID=52352515

ISBN 978-961-235-954-6 (pdf)

Foreword

This dictionary on public administration management was created at the same time as a need for students to find descriptions of the main public administration management specialised terms in one place and as an output of the Public Administration Management course at the university programme Political Science—Studies of Democracy and Governance (academic year 2020/21) at the University of Ljubljana. After introducing students to the rich and ever-expanding field of administrative sciences, students autonomously decided on three keywords they explored and for which they wrote definitions. To foster their academic capability, there were two-stage anonymised peer review processes that mimicked the norm of academic publishing. As a professor of the course, I edited and followed the process, honouring individual authors' styles and encouraging strict reviewing processes. Therefore, authors of keywords are rightfully listed as authors of this contribution.

This is the end result of this process, which can serve as an addition when studying public administration management. There is a gap in understanding the main terminology. Of course, here, only a fraction of public administration management terminology is presented, but we tried to capture the main buzz words. This subject dictionary also serves as an example of excellent students' work, and how trusting the professionalism of young intellectual minds is a solid investment in the future.

Associate Professor
Irena Bačlija Brajnik, Ph.D.

Accountability

is by definition an obligation of responsibility through which administrators in the public sector are held liable for their actions, which must be in line with general principles of democracy and ethics. According to Fox and Meyer (1995), accountability is usually understood as the basic commitment of government officials to answer for results in achieving goals set beforehand to either legitimate institutions or the public who elected them. Accountability is always between two different parties—the responding one (under question) and the authority (expecting answers). The process of accountability can be explained in three points: first, transparency (all information must be available), then discussion (present all facts and reasons), and lastly, conclusion (and possible consequences for answering officials, for example, a warning, demotion or even loss of job). In practice, this means that all public officials are supposed to complete tasks to the best of their ability, experience, and efficiency. The key idea of accountability is to ensure a ‘checks and balances’ system in the public administration system, where everyone realises they are held accountable for their actions and that consequences are there in case of wrongdoing. With democratisation and progress of representative types of government, accountability has earned needed relevance—and that is because there is no direct participation by the people, so public administrators or elected officials are expected to work hand-by-hand with common values and core principles of democratic framework. However, considering that accountability derives strong roots from traditions and thus varies from country to country, it ultimately depends on a country’s constitutional and legal foundation.

Administrative decentralisation

is the transfer of the execution of administrative tasks to territorial state bodies. The term territorial organisation of the state administration mainly refers to the territorial distribution of the state administration. With territorial decentralisation, the state divides the efficient execution of administrative tasks and, above all, a more rational operation of the administration into the entire country territory. The state is obliged to distribute administrative services evenly over its entire territory. For this reason, there is a need for state authorities, which are just a ‘territorial substitute’ for central authorities. The entire territory of each country is divided into

individual territorial units that enforce the decisions of the central authorities. Administrative decentralisation can also be called deconcentration, which according to the main body of literature (e.g. Ozmen, Schneider, Rondinelli) refers to the central government that distributes responsibility of each territorial organisation within a specific policy. The central government may delegate some of its powers relating to the decision-making and execution of decisions to the heads of individual territorial units. Administrative decentralisation is not the only form of administrative territorialisation; it is also important to highlight political decentralisation, which by no means the same. Administrative decentralisation should be understood differently as political decentralisation—it is the transfer of decision-making on public affairs to local authorities and also (according to Schneider) refers to the degree to which central governments allow non-central government entities to undertake the political functions of governance, such as representation.

The main advantage of administrative decentralisation is the spatial distribution of the state administration and, consequently, the efficient execution of administrative tasks on the entire territory and the cheaper operation of the administration. On the other hand, it is difficult control, new organisational requirements (coordination, professional assistance) are needed, and there is the possibility of the influence of local factors on the implementation of administrative tasks.

Agencification

is a process of regulatory and administrative competencies' transfer from the government to semi-autonomous organisations, called 'agencies', that are not established in the governmental structure. The main characteristic that sets agencies apart from any other form of administration is that its officials do not have political mandate, though the leadership is appointed by state organs. The aim of the agencification is cutting costs, improving service quality, and leading to efficiency and innovativeness. Additionally, it is aimed at replacing the government units with politicians at the top by the agencies with managers as leaders. However, it does not lead to total removal of political actors, since the political responsibility for agencies' actions still remains. According to C. Hood, agencification involves the separation of the purchasing and providing functions within public insti-

tutions. In other words, it provides the permanent organisational separation of policy implementation from the policy formulation, which is still a prerogative of politicians. Such a split gives users a bigger influence on the decision-making process, emphasises their interests more, and reduces transaction costs. In addition, it tries to solve the principal-agent problem (information asymmetry: the principal knows less but expects his task will be done in his own interests; however, the agent has much more information and that's why he can complete the task in his own interests). Agencification, as a conception of disaggregation and creation of task-specific organisations, is one of the structural reforms introduced by New Public Management (NPM). That notion appeared practically for the first time in the 1980s in the United Kingdom, where Margaret Thatcher decided to realise the 'Next Steps' initiative that would make agencies carry out the executive functions of government within government's set policy. This project inspired other countries to follow the trend of decentralisation and to implement this part of New Public Management (NPM) reforms, making agencies a popular organisational form nowadays. The critics argue that agencification eventually does not guarantee higher efficiency, as scientific studies show that there's no strong co-relation with improving performance level. Process can also lead to different unintended effects, such as fragmentation, loss of coordination and political control, lower levels of financial performance and accountability, and reduced quality of public services. Moreover, a trend towards de-agencification and re-centralisation to deal with the mentioned problems has been recently observed in some countries.

Bureaucracy

is a system of administratively organising large numbers of people who have to work together. In other words, it is a series of organisational principles and practices that are designed to maximise human compliance. Every country, company, or organisation in the public and private sector relies on bureaucracy to function. The term 'bureaucracy' originally comes from France, where it was first mentioned in 1764 and literally means 'rule by desks/offices,' which highlights the often-impersonal nature of bureaucracies. The first to study bureaucracy and contribute to its popularisation the most was German sociologist Max Weber (1864–1920), who defined bureaucracy as a rational form of organisation and in his opinion it is the

purest form of legal system of authority. Rational or legal authority means a situation in which impersonal laws and rules are formed and obeyed because there is a proper authority. According to him, bureaucracy was necessary in an industrial society, and he believed that public and private companies could not function successfully without bureaucratic control. In his theory, Weber also described the characteristics of bureaucracy, which are hierarchy (defined chain of command), specialisation (division of labour), merit system (selection and promotion based on qualification), separation between professional and private, well-defined written rules and regulations, rationality, and consistency. Weber's model of rational bureaucratic organisation reflects the social situation in Europe at the time, but it quickly established itself as the universal, ideal type of organisation. It has most significantly contributed to the functioning of the public sector in the 20th century. Nevertheless, bureaucracy mostly had a negative connotation. The reason for this is that bureaucracy is a system in which formalism and blind adherence to regulations dominate, without a sense of their meaning and regardless of people's actual needs in concrete situations. It is characteristic of ruthless social systems and due to its inhumane tendency, subordinates' demands to the state and administrative apparatus. A high degree of formality and paperwork also results in unnecessary delays in decision-making, wastage of time, effort and money, which is not ideal for efficiency.

A civil servant

is a person hired by a government of a state, in accordance with civil service law. The civil servant works in the public sector: he is responsible for setting up the administration of the country and its various services. It varies according to individual countries who are counted as civil servants (university personal, medical personal, military, etc.). They can work at the local, national, federal, and international levels. The status of civil servant was born in China during the imperial era to select the most competent persons to carry out administrative tasks within the State Bureaucracy. It came to Europe during the 18th century after the birth of the modern state. It is at the heart of the British Empire that this function first developed with the creation of the East India Company.

The civil servant must defend the public interest, not his personal interest, and treat all citizens equally. Civil servants can be recruited through the

merit system, i.e. based on their skills (for most of them), or through the spoil system, i.e. based on their political affiliation (for high-grade civil servants). Except those recruited for their political affiliation, civil servants must be politically neutral in their functions (Durkheim & G. Koubs). They are not subject to private labour laws, but to specific rules that vary from country to country: based on administrative law and jurisprudence (Germany, France), standards and recommendations from commissions of inquiry (UK), or a mix of the two (USA). There is a country-specific classification that determines their responsibilities, status, salaries and benefits. In general, civil servants recruited for their skills have greater protection than private employees against dismissal so that they can carry out their actions without political pressure. Civil servants are not directly responsible for their actions: the administration will be taken responsible for the actions of its agents (there are exceptions). Recently, the limit between civil service legislation and labour law has been blurred by NPM and the introduction of evaluation and competition in the management process.

Customer/Consumer

are terms, often interchangeably used and confused with one another, because an individual can synchronously play both roles. A customer is considered an individual, an organisation or a business that is defined through the act of buying the offering of the seller, for themselves or someone else, via monetary exchange or a financial transaction. At this point, we have to emphasise that the financial exchanges in public administration represent involuntarily imposed obligations of a citizen, who consequently takes on the role of a customer. If they are using the bought product, service, or goods for themselves, they're also considered consumers. In public administration, the distinction between these two terms is more difficult to impose. NPM reforms proposed to governments a more market-oriented approach as a crucial element for promoting competition between service providers as a way of avoiding market failure. NPM advocates therefore spoke in terms of customers and customer-driven government, while New Public Service spoke of citizens and citizen participation. As part of this new focus, Nancy C. Roberts characterises the citizen as both consumer and customer in a political and market economy. Citizens were viewed as active participants in a dialogue between the government as the provider (of a service, product or goods) and the public as customers. Among oth-

ers, one of the key authors in the public administration field, Hindy L. Schachter, credits Osborne and Gaebler for their articulation of the citizen as customer metaphor, yet warns that casting people as customers may undermine both their inclination to voice problems to government and government's openness to hearing them. The idea of citizens as customers (and consumers) took hold with governments because the programmes they imposed in the 1960s and 1970s were evaluated as ineffective and NPM put an emphasis on consumer sovereignty, which was supposed to enhance the performance of public markets via so-called customer/consumer satisfaction surveys.

Corruption

comes from the word corrupt, which means guilty of fraudulent or deceitful processes, as payoff; corruption is exploitation of someone or something for personal gain. It can be explained as a trade-off, where a subject or a customer uses its sources or something of value to get quicker and more out of a service that cannot be accessed by other customers in the same situation. Corruption is an elusive term that differs historically and geographically. Its historical presence is extensive, which is why we cannot precisely place it on a chronological scale. Nevertheless, corruption has transferred from trade affairs to relations between the government and the public. As of its transfer, it remains a solid issue in public administration. The use of the term has become popular in the early 1990s, as globalisation has helped it flourish in governments and economies around the world. Corruption can also be understood or recognised as extortion, bribery, nepotism, and politicisation. Corruption can occur in the public and private sectors. It often involves large sums of money or items of higher value and actors that usually make rules, policies, or executive decisions. Actors can be individuals, companies, or organisations. We can categorise corruption into two sections: grand corruption, which usually takes place in the public sphere's higher levels as well as private business, and petty corruption, which usually affects a specific person and its contact with an official. In some countries, what might be known as corruption (bribery of public officials), it can be seen as a cultural appropriation in others. Corruption with public officials can occur in many ways, but the three main types are 1) taking a bribe to survive; when the wages of servants cannot guarantee survival; 2) getting a promotion or reaching a higher rank; it presents itself as

an opportunity to get higher status or position; and 3) favouritism; to help or give advantage to someone you know (family members, friends, etc.). With the introduction of the merit system, it has started an offset from potentially corrupt relations in the spoil system. This is also connected with bureaucratic organisation, which with its own highly organised and formal operations prevents corruption. In the future, higher accountability and systematic sanctioning mechanisms can reduce corruption in public administration, but if we employ a higher rate of discretion, then some examples of corruption can still be detected.

Cutback management

is a process connected to cut back, which is a reduction or discontinuance, usually referring to finances (saving money). The term '*cut-back management*' was first introduced by Levine (1978) and emerged in the literature in the early 1980s. It became relevant again after 2008 and can be applied to both private and public sector organisations. According to Levine (1978), cutback management is '*managing organisational change toward lower levels of resource consumption and organisational activity*'. Levine also defined these as processes and actions executed by managers when institutions they are leading have insufficient budgets. In practice, decision makers are caught between lower budgets or limited funding and increased demands for public services. Authors through time have offered different views on the term and its conceptualisation through two strategies: traditional (also 'alpha') and new (also 'beta'). Bombyk and Chernesky (1986) defined traditional style based on power and force, whereas new style is more about participation and joint decision-making. These strategies, also defined as '*managing with less*', are mostly implemented at the local level, where services are provided on a day-to-day basis. Traditional strategies are usually across-the-board cuts (which affect everyone in the organisation) and targeted measures such as systematic priority setting, diversifying programmes, not filling vacant positions, improving working practices and productivity, adapting changes to clients' needs, etc., while new strategies include added consideration about staff needs, acquiring power over the task environment (networking), altering the organisational domain (for example merging), and more nonlinear measures (which do not necessarily affect all). The alpha approach is, according to Weatherley (1984), top-down and rational (quantitative), and beta is bottom-up

and value-based (qualitative). Ingraham and Barrileaux (1983) reflected different approaches in practice and came to conclusion that in times when cutback strategies have to be applied, motivational rewards such as promotions and raises, and threats like demotions and firing are not relevant and successful. What they suggested is that methods of cooperated decision-making and decentralisation of authority to lower levels is more appropriate during cutbacks, as well as strategies that are efficient when it comes to managing with less during times of increased demands of public services (for example, utilising slower processes, realising employee needs, and generally adapting to funding reductions). In addition, depending on the type of situation and crisis managers have to deal with, these strategies can turn out to be short-time measures or result in long-lasting or even permanent.

Discretion

in public administration is the ability of civil servants who possess decision authority in a bureaucracy to make compelling decisions that indirectly affect processes for which they are in charge; it is particularly noticeable in separation-of-powers ('checks and balances') systems. One of the definitions according to Lipsky (1980) is that it is *'public officer's own judgement or intuition to make decisions, especially where the rules, regulations and procedures appear grey or such usage becomes imperative due to a context-dependent situation'*. Discretion in public administration can be viewed from two perspectives: macro and micro. Macro-perspective is when a public agency has complete freedom to make their own judgement and choices, and micro-perspective concerns individual civil servants who make decisions according to specific circumstances. Discretion comes from different sources; organisations in public administration are granted legal power to exercise authority to fulfil set goals, and civil servants have independence to decide by themselves when to use their powers. In terms of the legality of discretion, in practice civil servants are usually always able to justify their actions even when there is no legal basis for them. Usage of discretion is especially necessary when a civil servant is put in a position where he needs to act quickly and take immediate action in order to resolve a problem. However, even though sometimes civil servants are not under scrutiny about their actions, abuse of discretion is a legal ground of reviewability, and abuse of powers can be punished and even pursued in court.

Division of labour

is a way of improving the productive powers of labour and is one of the ways managers try to increase productivity of workers. The concept of dividing labour has existed since the beginning of human history and has been talked about in the past from the likes of Plato, Petty, Smith, Durkheim, etc. In the organisational form, Max Weber characterised an ideal organisation as being specialised. Frederick W. Taylor considered specialisation one of the core principles of his idea of scientific management. Managers would use division of labour as a method to increase productivity and minimise costs. Henri Fayol was also one of the supporters of specialisation, since he emphasised that specialisation brings the minimalisation of wastage, which is the key to success for organisations. Fayol also theorised that the division of work is a principle present in nature.

Division of labour means that instead of one worker producing a product all by himself from start to finish, he is highly trained or specialised in a certain subtask to make the product. This means that the production is split into many simple parts, and each part is taken by different workers, who specialise in the production of a specific part. This way of dividing labour is ideal for large-scale production, and it increases labour productivity enormously. A worker specialising in a certain subtask improves his dexterity due to repetition of the task, which leads to higher productivity. One of the reasons for productivity gain is that there are savings in time it takes for the repetition of each task. The downsides of specialisation can be lower motivation and boredom, where quality suffers as well as productivity can lower. Many times, the workers have poor working conditions as well as long hours of repetitive work, which can lead to conflicting situations. Specialisation can also lead to a lack of product variety for consumers. Division of labour is also used in the structures of public administration, with the creation of new directorates and agencies that are specialised in certain tasks.

Efficiency

is a measure of an ability to make an operation with the most possible profitable results, achieving them through the lowest possible costs and minimum time, efforts or resources spent. If improving public administration processes without damaging other aspects is still possible, it means

that work is not efficient enough. 'Efficiency' should not be confused with 'effectiveness' (a degree of success in achieving the expected results), because the first conception is one of the central points in NPM. It is aimed at obtaining the greatest output, achieving the results in the most optimal way with no interference of the external factors. For the first time, the notion gained very close attention only in the 1980s when the time for NPM came, though it was mentioned in all previous management theories. Often conception is narrowed down to its three main types. The first is allocative efficiency, which happens when the most rational and timely allocation of resources occurs. The second is productive efficiency, when the lowest possible costs provide to the intended results. The third one, the most widespread in defining, which is often substituted with the whole notion, is technical efficiency, where the most possible outputs are achieved with given inputs. The vision of efficiency in NPM is criticised by its sceptics for aiming only at one objective without attention to external effects. Concentrating on the spending of resources as little as possible provides to the detriment of quality and also other factors. That's how it eventually leads to taking the shortest path and the cheapest means for the goal achievement. According to D. Waldo, it is not enough to pursue efficiency for its own sake. In certain situations, the manager should sacrifice it to advance other goals.

Evaluation

is implemented to improve individual and organizational performance in public administration. It's generally recognised within the public administration as advantageous in its consequences, creating motivation and increasing performance of employees. It appeared in the school of public choice in the United States in the 1960s, based on the idea that civil servants functioned in the same selfish and rational way as those in the private service, so the state must also adopt this rationalist and evaluative approach to its employees. Traditional performance appraisals were recently criticised because of their lack of interest or inefficiency. It evolved with NPM attached to public administration, introducing competitiveness into the system. Performance Evaluation Integrated System follows a new perspective, adopting the Management By Objectives method defined by Peter Drucker in 1954, determining precise objectives (which may be quantitative and/or qualitative) to be achieved in a given period.

Evaluation is increasingly decentralised. However, an individual evaluation seems difficult because of the organisational or external dimension of the performance of many public services and the lack of information. This evaluation system is gradually replacing the model of lifelong employment and progression indexed to seniority. It has consequences for career development, payroll, and job security. It can consist of objective agreements, performance contracts, self-or team-evaluations, and evaluations directly made by citizens. It's part of customer-oriented service: users of the public actions are treated like they would be as customers in private companies. It is part of a global reform of the public sector. Evaluation and public reform have been closely linked since the last 50 years, but there are still some difficulties in studying them together in the same field of study. It involves quantity objectives (increase in performance and productivity), quality objectives (beneficiary satisfaction), and external or social criteria. It can create confusion and frustration for those evaluated, and requires constant improvement of evaluation systems to be better accepted: they have to be used to develop indicators that are useful to improve performance. According to some authors (Meyer & Gupta), evaluation can be counterproductive: there is a 'performance paradox' according to which performance indicators do not necessarily lead to strongly improved performance. Moreover, the assessment method may vary, which makes comparisons complex. Evaluation methods need to be scalable to adapt to the changing political and social context, clear for everyone, and done only when variables are available and secure.

Governance

is a concept used to describe a modernised understanding of the role of the state in public administration. The concept which became prominent after the 1980s and 1990s public sector reforms conducted via the implementation of private sector approaches and methods in the public sector means a shift from classic hierarchic bureaucracy towards a greater use of networks, partnerships, markets, public-private joint ventures and the voluntary sector—one of the crucial activities is forming strategic coalitions with actors in the external environment as it is believed that the state is increasingly dependent on other organisations to function properly. Hughes presents it as the idea of different forms of governing that are not by definition in the formal government's hands. Often referred to as 'governance without gov-

ernment', governance sees power as something more than just centralised authority of the modern-day nation state. The concept of rowing has been replaced with the concept of steering, which means, as Peters puts it, that governments make policy, set priorities and define goals (*steering*), while other actors take care of the implementation and the provision of public goods and services (*rowing*). Public officials' roles have been diminished, as external actors have gained more power and, subsequently, there is less political control over the public service. The latter could be considered problematic, because it makes accountability (i.e., the requirement to justify or explain your decisions to those who conferred powers onto you) less clear and harder to achieve. Governance essentially aims at governing better, including all stakeholders, strengthening institutions of civil society, making government more open and responsive, and it also advocates for the blending of the public and private, both values and resources. At this point, it is worth noting that, as Peters and Pierre emphasise, governance is a product of political theory and is heavily influenced by political culture. This means that in different countries, governance will be developed and enacted in different ways.

Hierarchy

is the core principle of classical organisation theory. For Max Weber, the key principle of hierarchy was authority and chain of command, where lower offices are subordinated to the higher offices in a given organisation. Weber also thought that every organisation needs a system that provides order and structure for that organisation to function properly. If there are no systematic organisation principles, that arrange power relations between employees in an organisation, this organisation would have a hard time performing well. There probably wouldn't be any division of labour, no structure of command, there wouldn't be any coordination and all the employees would act autonomously. Basically a lawless and chaotic state of organisation, which would most certainly be inefficient and dysfunctional, because there is no rational system that ensures order. Hierarchy is just that. It is a system of organisation, which arranges power relations between employees of a given organisation. It is based on structural inequality using different levels of authority, usually in vertical links. The chain of command is very traditionally oriented from top to bottom, so that tasks are delegated from the higher levels of command to the lower levels. Because

of this structure, the upper levels of hierarchy have more responsibilities and more decision-making powers. We can easily visualise this system as a pyramid, where all parts of organisation, except one, are subordinate to a single other entity. Pyramidal structure is also the consequence of different numbers of individuals assigned to each level. The lowest number of individuals is at the top of the hierarchy, and then with every lower level the number of individuals increases, so that the bottom of hierarchy has the most individuals of all levels of organisation. A hierarchical system of organisation is also the most popular in large organisations. Almost all state organisations are organised on hierarchical principles. It is also used in the private sector and big corporations. In many organisations, the principle of hierarchy is used for more efficient management. Hierarchy makes organisations more stable, and it speeds up the problem-solving process. With the emergence of NPM, this traditional view of hierarchy changed. The proponents of NPM argued that hierarchical organisations are not efficient enough and that they should be more decentralised, less hierarchical and therefore more flexible. However, Thomas Diefenback found that NPM reforms, where implemented, did not 'flatten' the hierarchy but paradoxically created additional layers of management. This affirms that hierarchy as a principal is still at the core of public administration.

Human Resource Management (HRM)

includes a wide variety of activities to satisfy the interests of the whole organisation and the interests of the workers. It manages workers inside a company to increase production and relationships. The roots of HRM can be found deep in pre-historic times. At that time, tasks between people were divided as they are now in modern organisations. People got their tasks based on their skills, age, or status. HRM was also introduced in ancient times when people had similar tasks as people in pre-historic times. This development of HRM continued later in the industrial revolution. A lot of new machinery was introduced to the workers, so each one of them got a specific job. Many authors have written a lot about HRM. However, the modern view of HRM first gained importance in 1981. It became an important factor for the efficient growth of organisations when industry trends started changing in the competitive world of the free market. HRM is focused on employees. In theory, the feelings and attitudes of the workers affect their work, the amount of salary is not the most important factor

and the employees need to have group norms and values (for example good working conditions). It is also believed that an organisation will thrive if its employees thrive as well. To increase the profit of public organisations and ensure good public services, civil servants have to be satisfied. Civil servants must feel comfortable in the organisation and be treated well, and this can be achieved by giving them benefits, such as giving an award or a prize to the best ones, giving them support and safety at work, and also legal and managerial rights. Profit can also be increased by selecting qualified workers with knowledge and abilities and then focusing on them, coaching them, giving them on-the-job training, and putting them in condition to have enough preparation, more knowledge, and more skills. Therefore, the organisation aims to achieve success through workers. If workers are not generating profit and are not willing to cooperate to increase profit, they could be sanctioned. HRM is carried out to ensure greater ingenuity, motivation, creativity, efficiency, and effectiveness of the individual at work, and on the other hand to increase the efficiency, effectiveness, and competitive advantage of the organisation and at the same time increase customer satisfaction.

Leadership

is an ability or a strategy that is used by a person of superior level, higher employment status or seniority that leads a group of people that are working together. The person who gets an official leading working title or uses this ability is called a leader. Every group, institution, and company needs to have a leader or leaders, depending on the hierarchical scale of the unit. The most recognised use of leadership and its interpretation relies mostly on its use in ancient Greece and its city-states. There, it was most often associated with the economic stability of the city-state and leading warfare. Leadership is often connected with political actors who have higher status in their political party or in government, such as party leaders, ministers, prime ministers, and presidents. Political leadership gives higher priority to political processes and outcomes, but in public administration, the leadership of public managers is more focused on implementation of policies, quality of service, achievement of goals, and their mandate purpose. According to Max Weber (1964), we have to unite three concepts of legitimate authority—traditional, legal-rational, and charismatic—to achieve effective leadership. Still, his approach comes with a proposition

of dehumanisation of the bureaucracy that devalues the use of leadership; civil servants lose their sense of transition from following to leading. In this example, civil servants, even if they have some characteristics or could use leadership in some cases, are mostly just keeping the services working properly unlike higher or elected officials, who are by definition seen as leaders who have to make big and decisive decisions; they have to supervise the work of entire institutions. Public administration is not ideal; therefore, civil servants have to take the lead, so implementation is possible, as there can be inconsistent or incomplete leadership from executives. Still, we can also witness the problem in public administration when we see the stagnation of leaders' morale and their leadership ability or their level of participation, because there are a lot more predetermined work tasks, stricter rules, system instability and higher accountability than in the private sector.

Lean management

was first introduced in the late 1940s in the Toyota production system in which they used the lean method to get rid of processes that didn't bring any value to the end product. The Toyota company became successful after World War II after Japanese factory owners adopted a lot of American techniques regarding production and quality. Toyota also encouraged its employees to be a part of the production process. Lean management is about working together, sharing responsibilities, and empowering all employees by giving them power. The main goal of lean management is to improve work processes, purposes, and people. With lean management, responsibility and leadership are shared, so the spotlight is not on only one individual. With that, it helps build a stable organisation that can constantly evolve and is quicker at finding and identifying problems, therefore quickly removing them. In lean management, there are eight forms of waste that need to be fixed/changed/dealt with. These are defects (efforts caused by rework, scraps, and incorrect information), overproduction, waiting (wasted time waiting for the next process), non-utilised talent (underutilising people's talents, skills, and knowledge), transportation (unnecessary movements of products and material), inventory (excess products and material not being processed), motion (unnecessary movements by people), and extra processing (more work or higher quality than it required by the customer). Lean management is based on respect

for people and on continuous improvements. When lean management is used, big changes can be seen in productivity, efficiency, the time spent working and cost efficiency. With resource optimisation mentioned above (costs, customer service, quality), lean management creates value for the customer. The main goal of lean management is to make the customer happy; in the public sector, the customers are citizens.

Managerialism

was introduced by James Burnham in his book, 'The Managerial Revolution', in 1941 to explain the fact that from now on, it is the managers, and no longer the owners of the capital, who are responsible for the organisation. Managerialism is an ideology that manages organisations and institutions with the use of professional managers and managerial techniques in all areas of society. Managerialism is the basic principle of advanced industrial societies and can be seen as a set of management ideas. It consists of trust in what value professional managers bring with their concepts and methods, so that the managers are the central figure and beyond the top social position of the society. Managerialism can be linked to neoliberalism, hierarchy, control, accountability, measurement, and the importance of tightly managed organisations and not to individuals, because managerialism sees organisations as the most important part in what builds a society, and not so much the people and their needs and wishes and may lead to a society that neglects the individual. Managerialism is about giving business managers decision-making power and taking it away from those who are 'operational' experts (when managing a hospital, the decision-making power is in the hands of the managers and not the doctors). Or it can also be seen as an ideology that is action-oriented in a way that influences our opinion and justifies our actions. The managerialist approach expects managers to improve efficiency, cut costs, and strengthen organisational performance. Managerialization—the process of putting managerial ideas into practice—is accomplished by applying specific techniques as practical measures. Robert Locke and J.C. Spender believe that managerialism is an answer to people's resistance in society and workers' refusal to accept managerial regimes, as it takes away owners' right to decision-making and stops workers from resisting managerialism (for example, the remaking of the Welfare State in the UK).

Managing

is a dynamic task or work process of an individual (manager), responsible for planning, organising, leading, and controlling an organisation (POLC). These four key functions originate from renowned management theorist Henri Fayol's (1841–1925) 14 principles of management. They are based on timely decision-making, covering a range of possible actions, analysing the adequacy of measures according to internal and external circumstances of the organisation, and the final classification of measures according to performance and standards criteria, followed by final selection and realisation. Planning is divided into strategic, tactical, and operational planning. Strategic plans often have long time frames and are typically based on the organisation's mission included in the founding act of the organisation. The development of tactics for implementation of the strategic plan takes place within tactical planning, which is usually intermediate range. Finally, operational planning is designed to develop action steps that support the previous plans and is usually short-range oriented. Organising mostly refers to the structure of an organisation, which consists of job design decisions such as departmentalisation and allocation of human resources. Leading involves influence managers used to inspire action taken by others. It is connected to controlling, which ensures that performance does not deviate from the standards. The effectiveness of this function is evident only through monitoring the actual performance against the established performance standards and taking corrective action when necessary. However, this function does not imply that managers should attempt to control or manipulate personnel. The process of managing therefore starts with setting a plan that evolves into organising resources according to the proposition. The manager then leads employees to work towards the set goals, while controlling everything by monitoring and measuring the effectiveness of the scheme. Managing is therefore a key activity of managers, concerned with planning and taking action upon the policies set by the administration. Support of implementation of public policy is common to both administration and managing, but the administration is responsible for policy development while managers are complementarily responsible for policy implementation. The dynamism of the systematic process is reflected in the multitude of skills (technical and conceptual as well as HRM skills), the knowledge and experience of the manager,

and the use of various resources (human, material, financial) to meet the services of the organisation and achieve its goals. Effective management is based on a set of quick problem identifications followed by the implementation of appropriate action, therefore finding solutions for the best use of resources to achieve the goals of an organisation.

The merit system

is a system of recruitment of civil servants. This system is based on recruitment according to professional criteria and not political criteria, which is typical for the spoil system. The merit system was first introduced in 1883 in the United States in the Pendleton Civil Service Reform Act and was confirmed by the Civil Service Reform Act (1978), which legalises this system. The Pendleton Act was adopted with two fundamental goals, namely, to remove politics and political influence from the administration and to provide competent and professionally trained civil servants. The merit system aims to employ the best civil servants; thus, there is a bigger chance for increasing the quality of public services and to be more democratic and ensure equal access to every position for everyone that has the capacities to do so. It also aims to reduce nepotism and corruption. Woodrow Wilson demonstrated an ideal civil servant as capable, hardworking, loyal, and selfless. Civil servants are recruited because of their capabilities and knowledge; for this reason, they are permanently employed; therefore, the merit system is ensuring the sustainability of employment. A candidate should have competence and expertise for the job they are applying to in public administration. Civil servants have a duty to be subjective, objective, and also politically and professionally responsible. Hence, it is possible that the civil servants' productivity is lower because of their commitment and they have to perform tasks that do not always correspond with their own ideology. Loyalty to elected political authorities can also be low. It should be noted that there is still some recruitment based on the spoil system for high-ranking officials. Merit system ensures, even when major political changes happen, continuous operation of the administrative system and because of that is more appropriate for democratic states and countries in a democratic transition.

Nepotism

happens when people are not hired because of their knowledge, skills, or experience, but are employed only because of their friendship or kinship status; therefore, jobs are assigned to relatives. In politics, nepotism is when a person comes in the office and gains political power due to their (blood) relation with other politicians. Political nepotism can also be seen in public administration, where people close to the political leaders are appointed to high positions in public administration organisations. Nepotism has existed since the start of human society. It was first introduced several thousand years ago when society was divided into three groups: tribe, clan, and caste. This type of nepotism can still be found in Africa and the Middle East today. Secondly, in the antics, nepotism was popular among the highest class of citizens. Only a few groups of people had civil rights and the right to vote. After that, nepotism was popular in medieval Europe, where religion had a strong impact on peoples' lives. It mostly began to appear in the Renaissance papal state, and it was then that nepotism took on the meaning we know today. During that period, popes employed their nephews who were not qualified for work. The term nepotism also comes from the Latin word 'nepos', which means nephew. Later on, Max Weber determined the elements of bureaucracy in which he included the merit system. That means that leaders or employees should be qualified for the job; therefore, the job cannot be assigned to someone because of acquaintances. This was a step towards reducing nepotism. Nepotism in public administration has negative consequences for the country and society because civil servants are not competent and professionally trained. When a relative of a public servant is employed and has important duties such as public tender duties, personnel decision-making, or some other administrative duties, a problem arises. Often when nepotism is introduced in public administration, we can also find a conflict of interests between civil servants because of personal considerations. The professionalism of administrative work is reduced, as it is not necessary that competent and expert civil servants are recruited. As a result, it causes instabilities in the political system. Nepotism is also one of the biggest tools for corruption in public administration, but it is very difficult to prove it. The key precondition for effective and efficient public administration without corruption is to avert nepotism in recruitment procedures.

New Public Management

(NPM) designates a new form of public administration, which seeks to borrow logics of the private sector to improve the performance of the public sector and the cost/efficiency ratio of the public service (Hood, 2011). Introduced in New Zealand in order to characterise the reforms initiated in the 1970s and the 1980s during the neoliberal turn, NPM has been implemented as a solution to the failures and inadequacies of the previous public administration, which was not efficient enough, too rigid and corrupt and was leading to distrust from publics (Dunleavy & Hood, 1994). NPM involves many reforms, such as organisational restructuring, budgetary reforms, or privatisations, for example. These reforms can be divided into five categories (Hammerschmidt, 2019): agencification (development of agencies), contracting out (to outsource to someone outside the public administration and therefore generally from the private sector), public sector downsizing (to reduce the number of employees, notably through layoffs), service users as customers (citizens are now in a client relationship with the state, which needs to provide the best public service at the lowest cost), and finally, flexibility of employment practices (work rationalisation). The aim of these numerous reforms is to improve cost efficiency, service quality, equal access to services and policy coherence and coordination. All these measures don't have the same efficiency: contracting out can be, for example, less effective (Hammerschmidt, 2019). In order to measure the scope and effectiveness of the public policies implemented, the public administration may also set up an evaluation; that is why we can speak of the culture of results due to NPM. NPM is therefore a real revolution and modernisation of the management of public administration. It can be considered an enterprise of rationalisation and the introduction of greater pragmatism in the management of public administrations. However, if NPM denies (or minimises) any difference in nature between public management and private management, the State cannot function as a company because the public sector cannot be based on profit but on the public benefit of the citizens and the government's flexibility is not the same as the private sector.

Outsourcing

is a management tool often used in different types of organisations, which represents organisations hiring outside specialised sources offering a ser-

vice to the organisation. Hiring a party outside of the organisation is a way of trying to cut costs in the organisation's processes as well as increasing efficiency. Since the classical approach to organisations was that they should be self-sufficient, and all work should be done inside the organisation, outsourcing came to life gradually, with market development and growing needs from organisations and consumers. When organisations could no longer meet their needs, they demonstrated a desire to outsource. Private and public organisations shifted to outsourcing more and more, firstly focusing on increasing productivity and decreasing cost, and later on began outsourcing as a way to compete on the market, be more innovative, and have access to growth and improvement in various areas of their expertise. The goods and services, now being executed by sources outside of the government, were historically executed by public servants and organisations. Outsourcing is common in public organisations, as certain aspects of public processes operate better when implemented by an outside source found via public tender. As has been proven in private organisations, outsourcing is efficient in improving flexibility of organisations as well as cost reduction. Government outsourcing includes goods and services that were used and financed by the government, and it refers to moving functions from the public to the private sector for the public's best interest, as well as the efficiency of the government. However, there are several cons when it comes to outsourcing, especially when it comes to natural monopolies, such as obtaining and selling water and being privatised, resulting in higher prices of public goods. Some critics argue that outsourcing can add to inequalities when we are talking about wealth and economic classes, since it shifts jobs to lower-income areas, since the foreign pay rate is lower. But there are also quite a few pros, since outsourcing can rapidly increase the quality of public organisation processes and can expand good consumer choice. Outsourcing to lower-income areas can also be seen as beneficiary, since more people are being employed and benefit from it. Outsourcing also encourages slight competition between providers, making public tenders a field of innovative ideas from different parties. The recommendation of outsourcing within a particular part of a public institution depends on the characteristics of the service, as well as market conditions. Outsourcing is a relative novelty and is an integral part of NPM. Industrialised countries that have followed the lead of NPM have implemented outsourcing

in public services, improving efficiency and cutting costs, which includes employment reduction in the public sector.

Politicisation

comes from the word to politicise that translates into making a topic, event, or issue into something political. Politicisation is a process usually found in government administration, where the leading political party uses its connections to guarantee employment to people with the same political agenda. It was first used in 1932, in Soviet Russia, where it was used to set the political framework of the growing country. It is a mechanism of wider level, that can implement and raise leading government power, but can be used on a lower level too, as some public servants can help out the ones who come from the same political field or receive a favour—bribe; this act is often consequently depicted as corruption; it can often be mistaken or be linked with politicisation. The government would strive to keep politics out of public administration, but it still continues to endanger its function, as it becomes exclusive to a certain sector of individuals and their groups with sound political connections and inter-relationships. The pre-existing correlation or relationship between a government official and politics usually coexists with other mechanisms that can develop into different formats, based on various government types. With politicisation, we can notice the development of corruption, insubordination of employees, ineffectiveness, etc. The use of politicisation can cripple the power of the administration, as it can work in both ways. It could strengthen the institution for the leading government, but at the same time it could affect public officials' neutrality and public administration effectiveness. Politicisation is mainly targeted at officials that have or hold significant power either in forming, implementing, or influencing public policies. When there is a change in power, the use of politicisation can be witnessed in all government and public administration; the change in employee lists, or changing leading public officials, can disturb the stability of a system and even hurt the effectiveness of public institutions. With a higher value or perception of politicisation, the bureaucracy loses its capacity, performance standards and professional values, which it needs to effectively work for or towards its users, the citizens.

The private sector

is that part of the economy which, in contrast to the public sector, the economic activity takes place through private companies that are not controlled by the state and are run by individuals for profit. The essence of the public sector is in satisfying the public interest, while in the private sector it is about satisfying the needs of individual consumers. Private administrations are business and commercial activities, and public administrations are a political process. Both sectors are customer service oriented and open to change (technology and workforce). In the private sector, the principles of a market economy apply (private ownership, freedom of choice, self-interest, optimised buying and selling platforms, competition, and limited government intervention), and the value and performance of a company are reflected in the market. The basic orientation of companies is to find ways to offer the consumer in exchange more value than the competition offers. The competitive advantage may stem from a clearly defined component of the product or service, which means greater value in the eyes of the consumer, or simply from the competitive weakness of other organisations. The clear goal of the private sector is to make a profit for private benefit. Another important feature of the private sector is that employees' salaries do not flow from the state budget and that there is competition in the labour market and employment. Sometimes the public and the private sectors work together to promote shared interests. Private businesses tend to leverage state assets and resources while owning, operating, financing, and developing public services and facilities. For example, a private firm pays a state a fee to operate a freeway in exchange for revenues from tolls.

Public administration

is a system of authorities who are implementing public policies and ensuring that citizens have access to public goods. Public administration performs tasks of public importance and provides the society with essential public goods that they cannot be provided by themselves from the private market. Public administration provides users with various services such as mail delivery, water, waste collection, lighting of public spaces, primary health care, etc. Every employee in public administration has certain roles and responsibilities, as well as the means and procedures to achieve a certain goal in the organisation. Within the public administration, civil servants operate within a special administrative system—the civil service

system, which does not include political officials. The civil service system within the public administration as we know it today emerged in 1883 in the United States with the so-called Pendleton Act, which aimed to remove political influence from the administration and to provide more competent and professionally educated civil servants. At this point, it is important to point out two main principles of public administration, which are legitimacy and efficiency. Public administration is a part of the executive branch of the government, which means it covers two closely related subjects—the government (as a political body) and the public administration (which is often difficult to separate from its political context).

Public agencies

are one of the forms of non-governmental administration. The basic idea is to reallocate a certain part of the management of public affairs from the competence of the government and its bodies and to transfer it to organisations that are not an integral part of the state apparatus and are more or less independent from it. Other similar forms include—public service providers, public institutes, social insurance funds, public funds, public enterprises—those organisations which are funded from the state budget. Public agencies were first implemented with one of NPM reforms in the United Kingdom in the 1980s and soon spread to other countries with similar legal systems, such as Australia and Canada. In Slovenia and Central Europe in general, no common tradition of such organisations can be found. One of the indicators of that is already in the naming, as we can find different names for them in literature, for example parastatal administrative institutions, independent regulatory bodies, independent administrative agencies, administrative agencies or public agencies. As independent administrative institutions, public agencies are the result of growing complexity in society. They emerged in situations where the management of different activities, mostly public utilities and infrastructure activities, required the coordination of public and private interests. Public agencies were expected to bring the following improvements: more economical use of public funds, greater efficiency and quality of task implementation, greater user orientation, a shift away from day-to-day politics interference, and a greater degree of legitimacy in decision-making. Greater autonomy and specialisation of these organisations and their focus on the user should therefore contribute to the state making ‘more with less’ and at

the same time reduce the problem of individuals' distrust in the functioning of public sector institutions. On the other hand, critics would argue that by removing certain functions from direct administrative control, it is possible that organisational capability within government is weakened and that these losses of capability may outweigh potential gains in efficiency.

Public enterprise

is a business organisation founded and controlled either by the state or a local authority that provides (*sells*) goods and services to the public. Tornielli explains that the emergence of the first versions of public enterprises can be traced back to the Renaissance, when mining and the production of metal were considered strategic sectors due to defence concerns and thus owned and controlled by the state. However, such public entities were not very common at that time. Public enterprise evolution then reached its peak after World War II, but went into decline after the economic crises of the 1970s and 1980s and due to the emergence of concepts such as NPM. Public enterprise can be partially or fully owned by state or local authorities; in some countries, it can be majority (but never fully) owned by private actors, as there are no limits to the share of ownership. However, this is not problematic, as the founders of public enterprises retain special rights that they can exercise regardless of the share of ownership. Brezovšek, Haček and Kukovič explain that public enterprises are run by directors appointed (and discharged) by state or local authorities through public tender. They emphasise that when there is no competition present, there are no sufficient incentives for the optimal utilisation of resources. This is especially important for the following section. Some public enterprises are founded in areas that are state-sensitive, meaning they are of too great importance to be left to the private sector, as they tend to be monopolistic by default and operate in a space without competition and market pressures. Meant here are public utilities that provide citizens with access to electricity, gas, water, sewerage, and telecommunications. This kind of public enterprise is also most common. Very common, but operating in a slightly competitive space, are public enterprises that provide public transportation and postal services. These two areas are subject to some competition, but are still predominantly in the domain of state or local authorities due to their non-profitable business schemes. Less common today are public enterprises operating in fully competitive markets in

areas of finance (e.g. banks, insurance companies), transport (e.g. airlines), energy (e.g. oil companies, coal mines), industry (e.g. vehicle production), agriculture (e.g. food, alcohol, tobacco), and so forth. If poorly managed, these can be a heavy burden for state or local authorities. If well managed, however, they can fill the state or local budget with their profits.

Public goods

or collective goods are collective products provided by state or local authorities through a system of public administration that is subject to collective consumption. They are usually provided and funded through taxes by the state or a local authority because the market fails to supply them or under-supplies them. In their study, Vincent and Elinor Ostrom claim public goods can also be provided by nature (e.g. the air we breathe). It is important to note here that nature plays no active role in this 'provision' – clean air, water and environment are *natural* public goods available for people's collective consumption and they are a given, as long as they are taken care of and not degraded. Each individual, as well as state and local authorities, is responsible for the latter. Public goods are not the same as public services, for they are two separate categories with fundamentally different attributes and unlike private goods (also referred to as individual goods), their usage is not based on a payment—they benefit all users whether they have paid a price. Public goods are: a) *non-excludable*, which means that if provided for one person, they are provided for everyone and thus, nobody can be excluded from enjoying their benefits; b) *non-rivalrous* (nondepletable) in consumption, which means that consumption by one does not restrict the consumption available to others—enjoyment by one does not diminish the amount of the good left for others; and c) *non-rejectable*, which means they cannot be rejected. Oftentimes, public goods are also immeasurable, their allocation depends on the political process and individuals don't have the capability to decide on the goods' quality, which are other important features that distinguish them from private goods. Public goods include, but are not limited to, infrastructure (e.g. street lighting, sidewalks, cycling paths, roads), environmental protection (e.g. national, regional parks), defence (e.g. national defence, flood defence), urban planning (e.g. city parks, public restrooms) and so forth. Nevertheless, some public goods could be described as *semi-public* or *quasi-public* as they can become rivalrous—if there is limited space and too many consumers

decide to use the good at the same time (e.g. beaches, parks), and excludable—if there are tolls or charges to be paid (e.g. highways, tunnels) in consumption.

Public sector performance

is the orientation of the public sector to achieve goals like a private organisation could do, but creating efficient outputs related to contributing to policy objectives. Performance is focused on outcomes and outputs, not just inputs, and it is guided by New Public Management (NPM) following these three key points: performance improvements require a and oriented culture to increase outputs; public sector organisation need to start from management based on targets and it has to be checked; public sector organisations need a hierarchical organisation to decentralise power. The characteristics that make public sector performance different from the private one are: task of serving citizens; it is driven directly or indirectly by politicians, to reflect the interest of citizens; the state is rigid during the process of decision; it has the task of giving in equal measure and to manage resources; sometimes it is poorly founded; citizens are often poorly informed and suspicious about the government. Related to NMP, it works following in different measures four topics: cost efficiency, service quality, policy coherence and coordination, and equal access to services. NMP reforms were made to make the performance more efficient and less expensive and with two most important tasks: to prove a systematic identification of NPM elements and to analyse consequences. In particular, nowadays it is applied to all public sectors: government and similar organisations, regional and local governments, higher education institutions, health services and the criminal justice system.

The Public Service Market (PSM)

represents a field of output decisions that are the result of demand and supply forces. For Hayek, the market represents an information processing machine that aggregates the preferences of individuals and consequently the prices that would bring balance to supply and demand. As economist Xenia Dassiou explained, the nature of goods in the public service market often differs from those in private and utilities markets, as the former are typically merited goods whose users do not internalise the social benefits

of their choices and where the user-pays principle does not always apply. In utility markets, the goods are typically purchased by the user who pays the price, and the providers meet their demands. In contrast, the user in PSM is not necessarily the buyer, and they typically do not pay for it. The goods (or services) are, unlike utilities, free (for example health) or fixed (for example universities). Julian Le Grand named these markets quasi-markets, which represent markets that have been opened to the 'market mechanism' through the introduction of competition and user choice over the last 40 years. Public choice is considered to view government from the standpoint of markets and customers, which serves as a practical effort to reduce government and make it less costly. Choice can be made by an agent on behalf of the user, which raises whether the agent makes the decision to promote the interests of the principal, who is in this case the service user. The creation of markets where services (typically merit goods) are characterised by large positive externalities in their consumption has given rise to a number of market failures, which are economic situations defined by an inefficient distribution of goods and services. It can also be defined as a state disequilibrium in which the quantity supplied does not equal the quantity demanded. The failure might manifest through asymmetry of information, for example, where an individual makes a decision that positively affects their life but negatively affects their community or a group. Such market failures justify state (government) or regulatory intervention with measures such as limited funding or vouchers, for example, in order to establish balance of the market.

Public services

are one of the institutes of the state and are created for the benefit of all citizens. Public services are also an activity through which public goods are provided - the provision of which is in the public interest. The main goal of public services is to make public goods and public services accessible to all citizens on equal terms and not to make a profit. According to the main body of literature (e.g. Duguit), the people in power must provide public services. If public services cannot be provided in any other way, they must be provided by coercive instruments, because every delay in public service management leads to a) disorder in society and b) the end of society. Public service can be understood in an organisational (of crucial importance is the organisation that must provide a public service)

and in functional meaning (public service content; for example, waste collection). We should also distinguish between the material and formal concept (the key is the organisation that provides the public service) of public service. Public services have become a more open system through reforms of NPM, and mobility between individual sectors has increased significantly. Market flow and mobility between the public and private sectors have increased. There is no need to emphasise that the quality of public services certainly varies greatly between the countries. Perhaps we can distinguish between two types of governing—welfare state and neoliberalism. In a welfare state, the national government plays the most important role in the protection of the social well-being of its inhabitants. On the other hand, neoliberalism is often associated with a reduction of funds for the social affairs of residents.

Scientific Management

is a concept developed by inventor and engineer Frederic Winslow Taylor (1856–1915). The main goal of scientific management was to develop a scientific method that would replace the practice of managers, who at that time had very little to do with factory activities. Basically, the supervisor took full responsibility for the production of the company. The workers just used the tools at their disposal and adopted the method of work that best suited them. Taylor highlighted the fact that even though managers have useful and reliable information about the efficiency and capacity of their machines, they do not have this kind of information about their employees. With this, he highlighted two problems, namely, how to increase work efficiency and how to encourage the worker to work more diligently. To increase the efficiency of the work, he proposed a procedure that took place by selecting the most skilled workers for the study, carefully observing their motions, and accurately measuring the time required for each motion. With the obtained results, they were able to identify redundant workers and managed to take advantage of fast motions and avoid slow and unnecessary ones. To introduce this new method of work into practice, they began training individuals to perform motions accurately, and consequently production increased significantly. Given the success of this method, Taylor made two more suggestions for raising employee motivation. The first represented the idea of dividing work into tasks, as the average worker would be more satisfied with a job if he were

given a defined task every day and a certain amount of time in which to perform the task. With the set standard, the employee can monitor his progress, and this gives him satisfaction. Second, Taylor advocated adequate pay for workers. Employees work to the best of their ability only if they are provided with a large and lasting increase in their income. The desire for higher income would thus be expressed in greater efficiency at work. To sum it up, the principles of scientific management, according to Taylor, are: standardisation (one best form of work to be introduced as a standard); skilled workers (with the shortest possible training time); maximising specialisation (achieved by reducing the number and variety of work tasks); and a systematic and accurate description of each task.

A spoil system

is a system in which civil servants are recruited based on their allegiance or personal links to the ruling party. They are replaced each time there is a change of ruling party, which implies a high turnover. This system was born during Andrew Jackson's presidency in the United States in the 19th century. For him, this system arises from the legitimacy of the election of one party to the power and permits better accessibility to the public function for everyone. The term is famous since senator William Macy's speech in 1832 where he said: '*To the victor belongs the spoils of the enemy*'. A new government places its followers in administrative positions, thus ensuring their loyalty and incorporating profiles from civil society or the private sector with innovative ideas. The goal is to protect the government from possible opposition to the administration and permit optimal coordination between them. This system also still exists in France for high-ranking civil servants, or in Germany (after a pre-selection, the minister freely chooses the civil servant). It is in contrast to the merit system, where civil servants are recruited based on their skills, outside any personal relationship, to avoid possible side effects and have competent civil servants. These systems can be combined: merit system for majority of civil servants serving in low-politicised positions, and spoil system for the most politicised positions. This system has several side effects: incompetence, conflict of interests, and corruption. It's also criticised because it is defined by partisan interests, yet civil servants must work for the general interest. It was reduced with the Pendleton Civil Service Act but still exists today in the USA for some civil servants, like those in the White

House (Executive Office of the President of the United States) following the Pre-Election Presidential Transition Act (2010) and Presidential Transitions Improvements Act (2014). The check and balances system has put in place a necessary validation of one-third of these officials by Congress to avoid such problems.

System theory

is an interdisciplinary concept that addresses interrelated and interdependent structures—systems. This theory springs from natural sciences and is suitable for the constitution of public administration and management. It suggests that a system consists of a variety of elements that are bonded and function together. System theory argues that the open system approach is key, considering that the environment works closely with each element that constructs the system. The approach highlights the limitations public administrations face and proposes a comprehensive analysis of the system as a whole in its environment. System theory divides organisations that work through an open system that consists of inputs (resources, materials, capital, information, technology), transformational processes (employee work activities, management activities, operations methods), outputs (products or services, financial results, information, human results), feedback (results from outputs influence inputs), and the environment (internal and external factors that affect the system). The theory is based on effectiveness that reflects long-term growth or sustainability. When all elements of a system work together, this creates a state of homeostasis, which provides growth. Systems theory explains the effectiveness of organisations through their adaptability to external environments, which can be static or dynamic, meaning that some are more and some less predictable, which range from static to dynamic, meaning some environments are more predictable than others. The concept of system theory can be used in implementing protocols for regular feedback to the organisation. This theory is also adaptable when trying to understand the role of research and feedback in creating a strategy in public management. Public management should be studied and approached as a whole, inspecting all elements of its work areas, which will result in a better understanding of organisation processes, their compatibility and providing better results.

Taylor Frederic Winslow

was an American mechanical engineer and management consultant in the 19th century, also known as the founding father and the backbone of scientific management along with H. L. Gantt, F. B. Gilbreths, H. Emerson, C.G. Barth, H. K. Hathaway and M. Cooke. Scientific management theory is considered to be the beginning of the management profession. Taylor analysed the work of the workers in the steel works company, where he worked as an engineer. He was interested in making the work as efficient as possible, with specialisation of the work force for each step of the production process. He was also studying the work process of the workers very closely, to optimise them on the micro level to speed up the work. Taylor's studies became known as the time and motion study. His goal was to standardise the work, with the one best way that he would find most efficient for production. His method was the least amount of time that it took to perform each task of production and the fewest number of motions required for each task. He would then train the workers to this standard, the ones that were more productive would be paid more, those who did not meet up to his new set standard would be fired. Taylor implemented the position of a manager that would divide the work in steps. This way of managing a factory is known as Taylorism. The result of his work was boost in productivity, automatisation, and more work done with fewer people, but there were downsides such as deskilling, demotivating, and dehumanising workers. Even today, the task-oriented optimisation of work is highly used in almost all industries.

Transparency

represents the visibility and publicly open operation of certain organisations and their work, especially when government work and decision-making processes are available to the public. This provides an important insight into the work of the public sector, as it provides increased trust in the government from the public. Transparency is a key element of public organisations, as organisations strive to build a certain level of transparency, which leads to trust from the viewers of its services on all levels of its operations. It is a principle that is used in the public sector highlighting democratic and liberal measures for informing the public as well as acknowledging their part in the democratic society. Transparency also provides the credibility of public authority and serves as a key tool for the communication of poli-

cymakers and their intentions. There are different levels of transparency, which vary from only notifying the public that a change has been made or a decision has been accepted to full inclusion of the public in the decision-making process. Levels of transparency signify the openness and honesty of the sector towards the citizens. By analysis and observation of public sector communication and information provided, we can determine how transparent they are about their work and motives. Along with the globalisation processes, the modern media and digital press, transparency has become more relevant than ever before, and it has become a pressing matter when it comes to citizens choosing their leaders. Transparency can also work as a factor in eliminating corruption, encouraging honesty and loyalty to the citizens. It signifies the importance of clear and accountable roles in the public sector and offers responsibility when it comes to making decisions as well as the usage of positions of power. The relationship between trust and transparency is more straightforward in public services, where people have higher trust in administrations that are more transparent. Of course, the levels of transparency differ because public sector processes can be difficult to understand. This results in complexity of transparency, which can sometimes act as an illusion of openness, while the processes behind it are not fully disclosed to the public. Public sectors must act towards citizens the best intentions, while remaining certain levels of transparency, as well as integrity and accountability. Meaning, they take responsibility for their actions and act as a truthful source of providing information.

Trust (in Public Administration)

is a psychological state when a person has confidence in the public institutions that is reflected in the acceptance of their decisions. It is an outcome of feeling organisations' reliability and being provided with results that meet expectations. It also comes from an optimistic belief that the risk and uncertainty of possible unintended consequences of public organisations' decisions, betrayal or violation from the side of the organisations will be avoided. Conception should not be confused with 'reputation', which in turn means positive or negative beliefs about different aspects of institutions. Trust is one of the most important problems in Public Administration. This issue is a consequence of the asymmetry of the relationship between a person and a public institution because people's knowledge of bureaucratic operations is limited and there is often little transparency and

accessibility of such actions. That is why trust implies that a person is willing to become vulnerable due to giving a possibility to the public institution of carrying out the whole decision-making process and providing results without interference from the side of that person. Trust in public organisations is very important, since it makes the public system stable and durable, encourages civil servants to work better and is required for the successful functioning of organisations. It can be achieved when they act in people's best interests by conducting their work effectively and in accordance with professional standards, but also if such work is done based on the principles of fairness, responsiveness and responsibility. However, it is very hard to gain trust, especially since New Public Management leaves more space for negative consequences like nepotism or power abuse. That provides to the higher level of corruption, breaking the law and not complying with obligations, which leads to the loss of trust in institutions. At the extreme point, when there is no trust at all, the rule of law is undermined, organisations lose any legitimacy for a person, which results in trying to deal with any issues bypassing public organisations.

Weber Max

(1864–1920) was a German sociologist and political economist who lived at the end of the 19th century. It was a time when traditional irrational values (rituals, God) were undermined by the rationalism of modernity. He also saw this process unfolding in organisations, and that's how he developed an ideal form of administration called bureaucratic theory. In his time, there were still traditional modes of operation in managing organisations. He believed that the existing approaches for managing had really obvious problems, especially around the area of authority. Traditional authority was not based on competence but on nepotism. Employees were hired or fired for a variety of non-organisational reasons, such as their religion, sex, and relation or family connections. The decision-making was isolated in the hands of a few people, and it was very unlikely that they were going to be the most qualified people to run the organisation. He thought that this was a big disadvantage and favoured a more rational approach to doing things. Bureaucracy is a key part of the transition from the traditional to the modern state, which would make organisations more rational and efficient. It's composed of a hierarchy of positions with an extremely clear

chain of command. Bureaucratic organisation also offers rigid division of labour so that every person in hierarchy has its own role and acts like a 'cog in the machine'. Organisations, according to Weber, should run by formal rules and policies, which would make them more efficient. Also, an important characteristic of Weber's bureaucracy is the principle of qualification, where all workers in bureaucracy are selected through merit as opposed to nepotism. Finally, all relations between civil servants and citizens are impersonal and formal; everybody had to be treated equally, regardless of their personal characteristics. For Weber, this was an ideal form of administration, which should be applied to the public as well as the private sector. He believed bureaucracy in its ideal form was the most efficient and rational way to run an organisation. Despite that, Weber still had some second thoughts about this highly rational approach of doing things. He predicted that this process of rationalisation would lead to a technically ordered, rigid, and dehumanised society. In the end, Weber's ideas inspired many scholars and are still very relevant in every branch of social sciences.

The welfare system

is a system that designates all the measures implemented by the state in the social field in order to guarantee the well-being, protection, and assistance of its population in the face of social risks. Social risks represent all the situations that can cause a decrease in resources or an increase in expenditure, such as old age, unemployment, maternity, illness, invalidity, or death. Welfare systems offer a variety of help through coupons, health care assistance, unemployment compensation, educational assistance, or even disaster relief.

This term was first conceptualised by thinkers such as Chancellor Bismarck in Germany at the end of the 19th century and Lord William Beveridge in England with his 1942 report. The bismarckian system, also called the 'insurance system,' is financed by social contributions, protection is compulsory, and benefits are paid to individuals who are insured against such risk. The beveridgean system, also called the 'assistance system,' is on the other hand financed by taxes, and benefits are paid to individuals who need them. The objectives of the welfare system fall into two categories: material objectives, such as guaranteeing the survival of individuals with large families or sick and elderly people, and social objectives, such as reducing

inequalities in terms of life risks. The welfare system consists of an 'extension and deepening' (Rosanvallon) of the sovereign functions of the state, known as justice, police, and diplomacy.

The quality of the welfare system and its scope vary depending on the country, so we cannot speak about a unique welfare system but a plurality of welfare systems. Nevertheless, it is possible to distinguish three main models of the welfare system (Esping-Andersen, 1990): the social-democrat or universalist model, the corporatist-conservative model and the liberal or residual model. Foremost, the social-democrat model guarantees a high level of social protection and an important offer of public and social collective services. Implemented, for example, in Sweden, this model is financed by taxes (beveridgean inspiration), and its aim is to ensure the equality of all citizens through social redistribution. On the other hand, the corporatist-conservative model is financed by social contributions (bismarckian inspiration) and is focused on salaried work. Implemented, for instance, in Germany, its aim is the maintenance of the employee's income, so an employee can receive social protection when they can no longer keep working and lose at least part of their income. Finally, the liberal or residual model is a mixed system combining voluntary private insurance and tax-financed measures that benefit the poorest portion of the population. Implemented in particular in the USA, there is no obligation of insurance in this model.

Work flexibility

refers to the flexibility of the labour factor, which is with the capital one of the two main means of production. It also refers to the organisation of a company, allowing it to be able to adapt itself to fluctuations in its environment and its demand. During the post-war economic boom, the model of workforce management was highly regulated, and workers had many social guarantees. However, with the growth of unemployment and the neoliberal turn of the years 1980–1990, this model was questioned. Therefore, work flexibility emerged as one of the key concepts of human resources theory to tackle the issues that both public and private sectors were facing. We can distinguish two major forms of labour flexibility: quantitative flexibility and wage flexibility. In the first case, the company or the public administration can vary its volume of labour, in particular

by employing the precarious labour market through the offer of fixed-term and temporary contracts when it needs additional labour, but also by varying the annual working time, by outsourcing and subcontracting, or by requiring employees to be flexible so that they can change jobs at no additional cost. In the case of wage flexibility, the company or the public administration can vary wages based on performance. The base salary is therefore generally low, and employees can receive bonuses if the context allows and if they have been sufficiently productive. If labour flexibility was mainly conceptualised for the private sector, presented as a solution to the rigidities of the market (minimum wages, holidays, regulatory working time, etc.), the public sector borrowed the concept with the advent of the New Public Management, experiencing a form of work rationalisation with both internal and external work flexibilisation in order to gain reactivity and efficiency (Jacquot & Nosbonne, 2004). If work flexibility is one of the major reforms taken under NPM and is often presented as a source of freedom for employees and an improvement in productivity, this could also be at the origin of the development of precariousness, causing an explosion in the number of 'working poor', inducing negative effects on the morals of unskilled workers and employees in general, with stress, fatigue and instability (Guest, 2004). To remedy this, public administration could associate this flexibility with a guarantee of occupational safety for workers by granting them long and substantial compensation when they are made redundant: we speak of 'flexicurity' (Rasmussen, 1990). This model was in particular implemented in Denmark from the 1990s and combines three elements: work flexibility, social security and active labour market policy.



Univerza v Ljubljani
Fakulteta za družbene vede