

Professor Ranko Orlic, University of Belgrade, Serbia
Associate Professor Dejan Jelovac, Gea College of Entrepreneurship, Ljubljana, Slovenia

CULTURAL BASES OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION VALUES IN COUNTRIES OF FORMER YUGOSLAVIA: CASE OF SERBIA AND SLOVENIA

Lasting slavery and bad government can confuse and deform comprehension of the people in such extent that common sense and right judgment become thinner and weaker and completely perverted. Such disordered people is unable to distinguish not only good from evil but its benefit from obvious damage.

Ivo Andrić

A b s t r a c t

The article is aimed to analyze empirical aspects of social and cultural bases of values in the examples of Slovenia and Serbia as well as in newly formed countries arisen after the disintegration of former Yugoslavia. Namely, we are focused on how the political and cultural forces affected the shaping of values in Slovenia, which has historically been under the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy rule until 1918, and in Serbia, which was shaped for 500 years within the Ottoman Empire. While Slovenia geographically belongs to the region of central Europe, on the other hand Serbia is moored in the Balkans and is therefore tied to South-East Europe. In the article we venture in comparative analysis of similarities and dissimilarities resulting in the emergence of specific values, through which these environments have become recognizable. Within the framework we analyze also the religious affiliation of their population (Catholic, Orthodox and Islamic) as a factor which has affected the build up of the public administration system values. We would also not ignore the period of socialist self-management, which developed a 'humane and atheist' system of values, as it usually declared about itself, and tried to establish a new system of unifying values as opposed to the previous periods and systems, which had mainly acted in divergence and to a disuniting effect. Special attention is dedicated to analyzing the conversion of old values that occurred during the period of post socialist transition, starting from 1991; therefore a vacuum in values emerged because regimes and holders of old values in Slovenia and Serbia were deposed from their pedestals almost overnight, while new values had not yet been formed or properly promoted. Such a hard transitional shock was reflected in the field of public administration in a specific manner: in view of the fact that lustration was not accomplished, old staff (who had stayed unmoved in their positions in most cases), were forced opposite to their convictions, to act in the spirit of the new age, on the orders of their new bosses, in a different way, such that was neither clear nor acceptable to them. It grew into chaos whereas public servants and administration officers found their ways from case to case relying on their feeling how to act correctly in solving particular claims from citizens and enterprises. Such improvisation led to some claims being settled without any problems by one administrative unit while the same claim had no chances of settlement in another. Therefore the article concludes it is necessary to keep at least those values that will reflect the citizens' cultural identity. Although living within the social system in transition, citizens and other public subjects believe that their cultural affiliation and shaping in a particular culture will be reflected in the value system that is represented and promoted by the public administration in their respective countries.

Key words: values, culture, public administration, changes, quality, post-socialist transition

Introduction

In the broadest sense, culture can be grasped as any man's intervention to some natural phenomenon modified to such degree that fits in with some social relation. In the narrower sense, *culture is a set of values that encompasses some social situation*. Administrative culture can be comprehended as value milieu encircling the work of public administration. As spiritual phenomenon, culture must be expressed in some material signs, i.e. in men's behavior at the final instance. Manners, practices and code of ethics, custom and fashion too, are viable expressions of administrative culture. Administrative culture is a part of culture in general. It is influenced by many factors among which political, economical, historical, religious and traditional ones are the most important. Therefore, it is normal that different administrative cultures can exist simultaneously even in the same country.

Our starting position is that values have inter-subjective existence. There are value judgments that have universal human character and refer to the highest ranges of humanism in mutual relations. That is the strongest argument for thesis about inter-subjectivity of values and value judgments. Values are valid only in relation to subjects and not *by themselves*. Therefore, value systems are modified by changing the subjects themselves, i.e. by changing social consciousness of particular communities. It is proper for dogmatists to ascribe absolute values to one exclusive normative system and that is regularly normative system of one closed social group (bureaucracy) and not society as a whole. Normally, there is a hierarchy in value systems: values of one social group are more human than values of the other one. But even in such systems, without exception, there are enduring elements that survive for certain.

Moral values are those types of human actions that satisfy peculiar class of human needs – need for social harmony, cooperation, social approval of some types of behavior and disapproval of some other ones and, above all, a need, deeply rooted in each individual, to integrate and give meaning to his/her entire behavior by certain interiorized, tightly accepted norms. Values depend on man since in the world without man nothing is good or evil. Criticizing Bentham's utilitarianism in *Capital*, Marx pointed out the difference between "human nature in general and human nature modified in each historical epoch." Universal and particular are at odds in each period of crises and degeneration of one society. At least two symptoms indicate that discrepancy: (1) members of dominant group stop to live in accordance with their own moral rules –demoralization, cynicism and hypocrisy are widely spread; (2) strong opposition is being emerged and members of this new *group in merging* (Sartre's term) start to criticize predominant group and actual social system from universal human standpoint; at the same time new moral is arising that comprises all traits of general moral basis and new moral requests of group in merging (revolutionary group). Prevailing moral in one society is the apology of essential interests and *modus vivendi* of predominant group.¹ In order to prove former hypothesis we are going to use Jørgensen/Bozeman typology as a useful means for detection public administration values in normative plane as well as in actuality, taking into consideration Serbian and Slovenian case.

¹ Marković, Mihailo – *Filozofski osnovi nauke*, Beograd: SANU, 1981, ss. 267-278.

1. Serbian case

1.1. Historical background

If we want to consider actual situation with regard to public values in Serbia, we have to go back to the Middle Ages when Serbian state had reached its zenith. Emperor Dušan wanted to subordinate feudal state to clearly defined ideal of legal (constitutional) monarchy. General written law (Code) was stronger than squire's arbitrariness or old-fashioned customs. It was even stronger than the emperor's whim. Judges had to work *sine ira et studio* and without fear of emperor (articles 171,172). Bribery among priests, who were doing great deal of public services, was forbidden (article 25). Instead of *princeps legibus solutus est*, Dušan's Code introduced *princeps legibus alligatus*. *Leges generales* got greater weight than particular decrees of the sovereign. It was really something new for the XIV century (1349). According to Jørgensen/Bozeman typology², we can see rudiments of values in the category *Relationship between public administration and citizen*, i.e. **legality** at the first place and in the category *Behavior of public sector employees*, i.e. **honesty** and **integrity**, if we look at priests as public servants.

After the Kosovo battle (1389), Serbs lost their state and fell into slavery that lasted nearly for five centuries. In that period negative and even hostile attitude against any administration prevailed. Nothing good could come from sultan. The head of the administration in Istanbul knew for such an attitude and used very refine methods to rule. Administrators at the lowest level – *aghas* – did their job of keeping Christian Turkish subjects in obedience and collecting taxes by sophisticated ruling techniques. They offered preferences to people who were ready to accept Islam (their descendants call themselves *Bošnjaci* today). On the other hand, people knew for the bribability of aghas and solved great deal of their problems by *ducats*. Flatterers had been common too. Administration had done nothing to introduce itself as a service of citizens because there had been no citizens but *raja* - people deprived of rights of any kind. But even at that time some moral principles existed in ordinary life and were kept on by Orthodox Church. Most of them had their origin in The New Testament and they were transmitted through popular poetry and proverbs (Better die with honor than live shame; If you wish to know a man, give him authority; Moderation in all things; If reach, be not elated, if poor, be not dejected; No man is an island; Virtue joins man to God; The law has a long arm; Better suffer ill than do ill; Great honors are great burdens; Honesty is the best policy; No man can serve two masters; A lie has no legs; Truth will come to light; Tell the truth and shame the devil; etc.).

Civil society started to grow after the rebellion against the Turks in the middle of the XIX century. French Revolution and *Declaration of Human Rights* had great influence on the growth of democracy in Serbia. Constitution from 1835, called *Sretenjski ustav*, clearly defined rights and duties of Prince, State Council, Parliament and other authorities and

² Jørgensen, Torben Beck and Bozeman, Barry – *Public Values: An Inventory*, Administration & Society, 2007, 39, pp. 354-381.

proclaimed **equality** of citizens and personal freedom (articles 111, 112). State Council had to take care about **legality** and **justice** (articles 47, 48). State Council was also entitled to punish each public official who had done against his duties (article 56). Ministers were **accountable** and had to be careful with money or resources (**parsimony**), (article 64). They had right to express their opinions openly (**openness**), veraciously (**ethical consciousness**)) and without hypocrisy (**integrity**) and had no responsibility for expressed opinions (freedom of speech) (articles 71, 72, 73). Meritocracy (**professionalism**) was established – each citizen had an open door to all ranks in Serbia if he was capable and worthy of them (article 116). Moreover, citizens were not obliged to serve to public official except in erecting public buildings and with fair compensation in that case (**equity, fairness**) (article 124). Forests were public good and nobody had right to pollute or devastate them (**sustainability, voice of the future**) (article 129). It could be said that ethics included man's relation to nature and not only to other people. Special chapter was devoted to rights of public officials. They were **accountable** for their work and had to work with accuracy (**reliability, timeliness**) (article 132). Prince appointed public officials and their office was for life (article 133). They could make a career and couldn't be fired without being proven guilty (article 133). However, if some official was under suspicion, the superior was entitled to suspend him and during the time of suspension he had the right only to a half of salary (article 134). It was forbidden for public officials to take part in any kind of trade or craft under their name - conflict of interests (**moral standards, honesty, integrity**) (article 138). Because of its liberal aspirations, the Constitution from 1835 was thorn in the flesh of great powers (Turkey, Russia and Austria) who demanded its abolition. It happened only a month after its passing. In fact, they were frightened by the democratic reforms in their own countries.³

Failure of the Constitution from 1835 provoked abdication of Prince Miloš Obrenović and the period of Council's or civil servants' oligarchy began. Members of the Council couldn't be toppled without consent of *Porte*. New prince, Aleksandar Karađorđević, tried to lessen the role of the Council but didn't succeed. Oligarchy had challenged people's resistance and liberal youth, still weak, made a union with bureaucrats and returned former prince Miloš Obrenović. The parliament got only advising role and Serbia was led into the period of enlightened absolutism by Prince Mihailo, Miloš' son. Total centralization of administration was introduced and police discipline reached climax. Prince Mihailo was assassinated (1868)⁴ and regency tried to establish constitutional monarchy. That period is known as constitutionality without parliamentarianism. Ministers were accountable to king and not to parliament. However, according to the new Constitution (1869), State Council got right to solve complaints against minister's decisions. Actually, it took over the role of Administrative Court in *protecting the rights of individuals* – some kind of **legality** was present in *relationship between public administration and citizens*. New king, Milan Obrenović, enacted new Constitution (1888) and Serbia came into period of parliamentarianism. However, king

³ Denković, Dragaš – *Uticaj Francuske revolucije u Srbiji pre ujedinjenja (1804-1914)*, u: Francuska revolucija – ljudska prava i politička demokracija nakon dvjesto godina, JAZU, Zagreb, Globus, 1991, s. 439.

⁴ It is to be noted that one of main liberals in that time, Jevrem Grujić, whole winter read the history of French Revolution to see how monarch could be thrown off.

Milan resigned and new king, Aleksandar Obrenović, revoked the Constitution from 1888 and restored the Constitution from 1869. He enacted new Constitution (1901) but it was an unsuccessful attempt to change old-fashioned institutions with modern and free-minded ones. King Aleksandar Obrenović was assassinated in 1903 and Serbia went into period of parliamentarianism where monarch nominated ministers only from the parliamentary majority. Constitution from 1903 proclaimed all the rights and freedoms of citizens which had had in mind French Declaration of Human Rights, especially freedom of teaching (article 21) and freedom of speech (article 22). That parliamentary and democratic period of Serbian political history was interrupted by the World War I. It is obvious that principles of French Declaration of Human Rights had great influence not only in the time of liberation war against Turkish slavery but also later on in political battle for establishment democratic and parliamentary social order. "As a child who learns to go on foot stumbling, so modern Serbia learned to go on its foot and its way through a hundred years of tottering, fumbling in the darkness, stumbling and falling, after a whole range of costly paid experiences and got wounds..."⁵

After the World War I, Serbia brought its sovereignty into the new state: The Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenians (1918), later Yugoslavia. The new state was burdened with nationalistic clashes (even murders between the members of the Parliament) and the king was compelled to enact *octroyed* Constitution. Naturally, Serbs, as majority people, occupied great deal of positions in public administration. It was the case especially in army where the highest positions in headquarters were reserved for Serbs, victors from the World War I. It stands to reason that other two nations, Croats and Slovenians, experienced public administration as strange and imposed. King Aleksandar Karađorđević was assassinated by Croatian terrorists in France (1933), vice-regency established dictatorship and governed the state until the World War II. That period was really turbulent and it hardly could be said that there were public values in action. Civil society that had to be main source and support of public values hadn't got enough time for growth.

Endeavors to establish civil society in Yugoslavia had been going on through the first half of the XX century and were interrupted by the World War II. After the War, new communist regime abolished monarchy, restricted private property and practically set aside civil society. It was thought that federative republic would be a solution for nationalistic cleavages. Communists tried to establish new system of *unifying values* through building humanistic and atheistic model (especially during self-management socialism, 1950-1980) in contrast to previous periods and systems which operated divergently and disunited in the first place. Formally, public administration was called people's administration (like *militia* = people's police) but practically it was composed of regime supporters who were willing to follow commands (read: members of communist party). One of main conditions for service in public administration was membership in Communist Party. It was called *moral-political suitability*.

However, nationalistic clashes, inherited from former regime, hadn't been solved. Moreover, they became worse because some nations came on for the first time:

⁵ Skerlić, Jovan – *Srbija – njena kultura i njena književnost*, **Pisci i knjige**, knj. V, Beograd, 1923, s. 18.

Macedonians and Muslims for instance. The latest were composed of people (mostly Serbs) who accepted Islam. Giving national status at the followers of one religion (Islam) was one of the causes of later civil war. Nationalistic conflicts were suppressed by so called *proportional representation* in government bodies. According to the Constitution from 1974, Serbia as federal unit had been divided to three parts: “Serbia minus provinces” and two provinces (Vojvodina and Kosovo&Metohija). It must be noted that Vojvodina was in the kingdom of Austria-Hungary and had developed (with German pedantry and discipline still present in the mind of people) public administration before the World War I. Provinces got the status of federal units and had equal rights in decision-making at the highest levels of government. Such a solution had been justified by striving to give broader rights to the members of national minorities (Hungarians and others in Vojvodina and Albanians in Kosovo&Metohija). Even the languages of these national minorities were introduced as official languages in public affairs. In fact, it was the result of compromise at the top of Communist party (League of Communists) where Slovenian and Croatian delegates tried to diminish the role of Serbia in the federal state (a brilliant example of *divide et impera* in action).

Having proclaimed universal values (**equity, justice, solidarity** etc.), communists succeeded to convince people to believe that public administration was their own, although only at the beginning. Generally, they proclaimed that they were the *only bearers of public values* and preached their own, communist morality. One-party system didn't allow different opinions even in the moral sphere. The church was separated from the state and minimum of morality provided by religion vanished slowly. Gradually, communists forgot their primary mission and inaugurated *nomenclature* occupied by its selfish interests. They thought the state was milk-cow with milking as its only purpose. **Majority rule** transformed in farce. There were elections with 98% voters who went to the polls. People voted because of fear and not because they really had their own candidates. Under such circumstances, bribery, corruption and flattering became normal phenomena in the state-citizen relationship. Nepotism was frequent too. Indoctrination through educational system was enormous: people were instructed to believe the state was everything and the individual was nothing. It is symptomatic that editors-in-chief in mass media (directly nominated by Central Committee of Communist Party) created public opinion by filtrating practically every information. Human rights had been attacked vigorously. For a while people started to feel public administration wasn't their own but rather a strange one. What was even worse, for the sake of its own privileges, nomenclature became the main provoker of civil war. Not only socialism didn't succeed as an economic system but also it didn't prove its moral superiority that made it attractive. Instead of *market economy's inequality, blood-thirsty etc.*, it brought much more inequality, corruption and bureaucratic tyranny. Somewhere on the road to communism the final reasons had been forgotten. It was forgotten that human emancipation presupposed moral renaissance of man. In such *moral vacuum* Yugoslavia met challenges of transition.

1.2. Transition

Transition could be conceived as “controlled transformation of illiberal state into liberal one” and as an “attempt to create or re-create civil society by gradual, if often dramatic change.”⁶ Unfortunately, this process took form of civil war in former federal Yugoslavia which was decomposed to six parts. Serbia, as a constitutive part, was trying to keep from decay of federal state but nationalistic forces were so strong that such endeavours were futile. Finally, the last federal union between Serbia and Monte Negro decayed and Serbia started as an independent state again. Meanwhile, recidivists of the former nomenclature tried to retain their privileged status. In spite of formally proclaimed pluralistic political system, it was really a dictatorship of one party made up of former communists. Naturally, under those circumstances it could hardly be a word about public values. Prospect came with revolution in 2000. People decided to dethrone president Milošević and a new promising period began. New authorities started with great promises and ambitions. All great principles of French revolution were recalled again (more than two hundred years later!). The government with Prime Minister Đinđić was faced with the following problems: “weak mechanisms for cross-ministerial coordination; a lack of capacity for strategy and policy development; a rule-oriented, risk-averse administrative culture; wide-spread problems of motivation; far-reaching politicization; a strong centralization of decision-making authority; and shortage of administrative equipment and infrastructure.”⁷ Between two options – radical or gradual reform of public administration – the government decided on the last one. Following the start of the transition, the government was left with *administrative system that was both irrelevant and inadequate for providing the framework-setting role that public administration is expected to perform in market economy.*⁸ Unfortunately, Prime Minister Đinđić was assassinated in 2002 and administration reform was hampered.

Not only the transition in Serbia brought the change of dictatorship into a liberal state but it was the cause of changing public sector values, too. “Ethical standards in parts of the civil service deteriorated severely during the Milošević era. Steps were taken to redress the situation after his fall. An Anti-Corruption Council was set up in 2001, and a Law on Public Procurement was adopted in 2002. In other respects, progress was slower. The Ministry of Finance worked out a draft Law on conflict of interests, as well as proposals for Anti-corruption program and a Code of ethics for civil servants. However, none of these schemes were approved by the Government.”⁹ Public administration which used to work in rigid, hierarchical culture had to adopt adaptive culture in its work. Changes in the environment were so fast that any other method of work was impossible. New government longed for the **efficacy** and **effectiveness** of public administration; especially it has been pointed out that the efficacy of public administration had to be observed in the

⁶ Dahrendorf, Ralf – *Transitions – Politics, Economics and Liberty*, **Scandinavian Journal of Management**, Vol. 6, No. 1, 1990, pp. 4,5.

⁷ Eriksen, Svein and Dag Soloumsmoen – *Unfinished Transition – Serbian Public Administration Reform 2001- 2004*, Statskonsult, Oslo, 2005, p.37.

⁸ Verheijen, A.J.G. – *Public Administration in Post-Communist States*, in: Peters, B. Guy & Pierre, John – **Handbook of Public Administration**, London: Sage, 2005, p. 490.

⁹ Eriksen, Svein and Dag Soloumsmoen – *Ibidem*, pp. 54-55.

same way as the efficacy of administration in private enterprises (theory of New Public Management). Thus **efficacy** emerges as inseparable from the gradually transforming state which also transforms its own administration into one capable to provide not only the power but also the service to its citizens. In such transformed society, public administration also suffered transformations and to some extent was under the influence of dominant social values. Unfortunately, that mission of public administration seems impossible. Substitution of ministers and *public functionaries* wasn't enough. Old personnel, retained from the ex regime was not willing to suffer change. They used to work in their own way demonstrating *imperium* (read: arrogance) in each case. Of course, there were some improvements in the work of public administration, especially at the level of local municipalities. But they were sporadic and directed mostly to correct make-up of public administration. However, political instability was the cause of slowing down administration reform.

Attempts to install new public values in society have been held back to normative plane. The Constitution of the Republic of Serbia (2006) guaranteed rule of law (**legality**), (articles 3,198), forbade conflict of interests (article 6), forbade discrimination of any kind (articles 15, 21), protected human rights and freedoms (**altruism, human dignity**) (articles 23-81), guaranteed **majority rule** in political decision making (article 105), guaranteed **democracy** and **will of people** by referendum (article 108), presupposed **accountability** of government and ministers (article 124), introduced ombudsman for **protection of individual rights** (article 138), guaranteed independence of administration and courts (articles 136, 149). The Law on public administration (2005, 2007) presupposed independence and **legality** of public administration (article 7, 71), **professionalism, impartiality** and political neutrality (article 8, 84), **effectiveness** (article 9), **equal treatment, human dignity** (article 10, 82), **openness** and **responsiveness** (article 11), **self-development of employees** (article 20), **accountability** in *relationship between public administrators and politicians* (article 63), **dialogue, responsiveness, user democracy** and **citizen involvement** (articles 76, 77, 79), affirmative action (article 5a).

One special feature of public administration is its separation from the rest of the society. Traditionally, it had the task to provide **legality** and **stability** of the society on condition that it had to perform its role with reasonable allowance and without any care about profitability of its function. These views are quite opposed to the principles of functioning of the contemporary administration. Many responsibilities in economic area compel administration to change the methods of its work. Citizens, i.e. users of administration, require faster work of administration (**timeliness**), **conscientiousness** in work (**professionalism, honesty, moral standards, integrity**), flexible administration (**adaptability**) capable to adapt itself to the need for more efficacy and ready to enforce new methods in performing its activities. There isn't only a demand for the enforcement of new techniques in the work of public administration but also for the new style in its behavior. Staying in front of such a challenge, public administration must tend to avoid forming of an isolated pyramid with technocracy at the top and bureaucracy at the base.

Changes in the public sector values ought to make a new consciousness about public officials. In the beginning people easily believed that public officials existed not only for their own sake but also for the sake of the citizens (**legality, equity, dialogue, user orientation**), (Wasn't it the same after the World War II?). They have been assisted to public officials to correct the injustices of the former regime. For example, they pointed out that the buildings were illegally built when it was obvious that building licensees were obtained from the bribe. In order to speed up correcting the injustices of the former regime, government also gave greater discretion to public officials. According to the new Law on University, deans of state colleges are entitled to revise the elections of professors who suffered under the former regime.

Public administration is usually evaluated with reference to ethical or unethical conduct of public officials. Citizens feel that requested **impartiality** and **disinterestedness** of public officials isn't enough any more. The real question in the state in transition must be the following: is it enough for public officials today to accept only Weber's principle *sine ira et studio* or they must apply the rule that is even more moral than Weber's cold and impersonal one? Even the golden rule isn't enough for the citizens' needs today. Maybe its positive interpretation would be more plausible not only for the ethical relations between public officials themselves but for the ethical relations between public officials and citizens too. In any case, commitment and devotion of public officials must be more universal if the state is going to be real *res publica*. Especially in the case where public officials have a lot of discretion to enforce the law by their own will. What criteria will they use? There are hidden dangers in golden rule and ethical theory and practice proved that very well. Remarkable example is conduct of new appointed public officials (after 2000) who changed golden rule for the talion principle, especially towards the members of former socialist or communist parties. *Lustration* had been adopted as political practice and public officials who were members of these parties were moved out (read: fired) from their positions in public administration in spite of their **professionalism**. The old wise saying that *law is for enemies and not for us* proved its validity once more again. Cynics would say it is not ethical but it is practical.

In time, the gap between normative and actual was becoming greater and greater. Scandals and corruption affairs started to shake public administration. Almost every part of public administration was caught by stealing and corruption. Excesses were labeled as *customs mafia, bankruptcy mafia, motor-road mafia, army suppliers mafia, building contractors mafia* etc. Citizens don't believe to civil servants any more. They are disappointed in new democratic regime and politicians who saw the transition as a chance for personal enrichment. *Transition is once in life* was the slogan of some politicians and elections transformed into battle for positions in boards of state-owned companies. Private interests overcame public interests. *Amour propre* is more important than *amour de soi*. It seems that the mentioned gap is unbridgeable. Public values stayed a dead letter. At this point it is appropriate to remind of Max Weber who wrote in a letter to Michels: "How much resignation will you still have to put up with? Such concepts as will of

people, genuine will of people, have long ceased to exist for me; they are fictions. All ideas aiming at abolishing the dominance of men over men are utopian.”¹⁰

2. Slovenian case

Discussion on the cultural foundations of the public administration value system in Slovenia certainly needs positioning within a historical perspective. We can only speak in the full meaning of the term - *Public Administration in Slovenia* from June 25th 1991, since only then did Slovenia start acting as a sovereign state. In fact, the same date marked the embryo of the process that led to the disintegration of Yugoslavia, a process which, during 17 years, gradually gave birth to six other independent states beside Slovenia. However, this does not exclude discussions on public administration on the territory of Slovenia at an earlier period. It is deeply rooted in the past, i.e. in the time when Southern Slavs arrived in these parts during the 7th century AD. They founded an independent state under the rule of an elected prince, chosen by the assembly of free men¹¹. During the 8th Century the Slovenes embraced Christianity, which had, according to some sources been introduced and disseminated by Irish missionaries. From approx. 820 AD to 1806 AD, territories of present day Slovenia belonged to the scope of the Holy Roman Empire. Since the end of 13th Century the Habsburgs took over the domains¹², still within the framework of the same Empire. Therefore it became their property which they ruled in a typically feudal manner. A short discontinuity in this rule occurred from 1809 to 1813 when Napoleon established the Illyrian Provinces. They were formed according to the French model of a newly formed and arising civic society after the French Revolution of 1789. Thereafter, for a short time feudalism was totally suspended in Slovenian provinces such as: Kranjska, Koroska, Istria, Goriska and Trieste. The Provinces had a governor assigned by Napoleon himself. Although each province had a centralized administration it was nevertheless divided into municipalities, which were the embryos of local government in the sense we mean today. Official languages were French and Slovenian. In 1912, Code civil was put into place.

Unfortunately, after the Congress of Vienna in 1815, Austria again re-established its rule over present day Slovenia territories and re-instituted its old administration, but this time

¹⁰ Momsen, J. Wolfgang – *The Age of Bureaucracy, Perspectives on the Political Sociology of Max Weber*, Oxford: Blackwell, 1974, p. 87.

¹¹ The State was called Caranthania. Its head was an elected Prince whose inauguration act had a special symbolic meaning. The ceremony went on as follows: first the throne is occupied by one of the free men, the prince approaches on foot. When he is near, the freeman asks: Who goes there? The prince replies it is he, the prince. The freeman asks: By what right are you coming? The prince replies: Based on the right that I am elected by free men. The freeman then withdraws from the throne, so the prince may claim it. At the same time he slaps the prince on the face to warn and remind him of who has chosen him and whom he must serve. The prince then vows to rule justly, draws his sword and wields it in all four directions of the world, to symbolize his readiness to defend the freedom of his country. This selection ritual of a Caranthian Prince was kept until the 15th century and was inspiring to Thomas Jefferson, one of America's Founding Fathers. He often took it as a historical example on how a ruler is directly chosen by the people for the people.

¹² Stajerska was taken over first in 1281, the area around Savinja in 1311, Kranjska and Koroska in 1335, Trieste in 1382, the territories once belonging to the Counts of Celje in 1456, Goriska in 1500, Tolmin in 1509, and finally, Prekmurje in 1526.

without feudal nobility assemblies. Former nobility assemblies were gradually transformed into *provincial parliaments*, during the 19th century, forming a *provincial government* headed by a provincial leader, although still greatly dependent on the central authority in Vienna and on the Emperor himself.¹³ At the same time, the power of the Roman Catholic Church was only slightly reduced. It was the time when the State was bound by the Concordat with the Vatican and could not interfere in the Church internal affairs or in religious issues. The Habsburgs considered themselves as the oldest Catholic dynasty in the world, as well as holders of the ancient tradition and protectors of the Church and faith. Slovenian provinces remained within the Austrian-Hungarian Monarchy until its final breakdown as a result of its defeat in the I World War in November 1918. The Slovenians entered as a constitutive nation in the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, established on the Uniting day of Southern Slavs, December 1st 1918. Eleven years later, it changed its name into Kingdom of Yugoslavia, a name to be kept until the end.

In 1918 the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy broke down, leading to certain changes in the state administration. The constitutional monarchy remained almost the same, only with a small difference in that its centre of authority had moved from Vienna to Belgrade. The major problem was that during a longer period, *fundamental and far reaching changes occurred in culture*. Some high government officials abandoned their positions in public administration and moved to other countries, such as Austria, while they were replaced by new staff who spoke a similar but different language (Serbian belongs to the same group of southern Slavic languages), writing in a different alphabet (Cyrillic) and having different customs, believing in a different Christian faith (Orthodox). They emerge as 'newcomers', coming from a different cultural circle. Therefore Slovenes become foreigners in their own country, as local civil servants they do not quite understand directives from the central government, because they are alien to them, stemming from a different value system and a foreign tradition. Then the first major confusion in Public Administration occurred. In order to advance their career, local civil servants must have powerful protectors in Belgrade. As Serbia had already built up a strong civil service structure, it had no necessities for new staff and therefore it allowed no one into its circle but those with strong political protection. Consequently local clerks became obedient servants to the ruling political elite and champions of their policies, while regular people in defiance of them, named them '*servants of policy*'. As the Kingdom Yugoslavia was over three times smaller than the Austro-Hungarian Empire, it meant the number of potential clerk positions was so much less in proportion. Further, while in the Empire Austrians and Hungarians were outnumbered by other nations, in the Kingdom of SHS (Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) Serbs were an absolute majority. In such a blend of new circumstances, a radical shift occurred in the civil servants' thought pattern and generally

¹³ During this period the nobility lost their privileges to administrative positions, although they still get them easier than others may. A new civil service 'caste' emerged that could earn aristocratic titles for their merits toward the monarchy. These *civil servants* would in their mind-set and their behaviour *always remain the Emperors' officers*. By their appearance they looked like the Emperor, i.e. they wore high rolled moustaches like Franz Joseph. During the Habsburg rule, the State was profoundly centralized, which had its effects on the position, role and ways of its administration. The civil servants' basic qualities were: *submissiveness, loyalty and subjugation* to the Emperor as a supreme authority. These values were strongly imprinted into the culture of civil administration and thereby into the culture of the Slovenian people.

in public administration. We could easily say that ossified bureaucratic habits remained, keeping the qualities of submission, loyalty and subjugation as highest values, however this time they were mixed with new ingredients from the Balkans – *carelessness*, and a *relaxed, laid back manner* ('take it easy'). Such a specific phenomenon, created as a crossbreed of Central European and Southern European Culture Circles in the realm of present day Slovenia at the dawn of 20th Century quickly added to the degrading of civil servants' integrity and discrediting of public administration in the newly established state of three constitutive nations. The Slovene people do not trust anymore this *mixed type of clerk*; in fact they view him as a harmful parasite, which is above all corrupted. The clerks in the former regime was deemed as a necessary burden, and in the end, he was useful because he had achieved something by obeying the law, the strict rules and procedures; in other words he acted within a framework of a *legal state* (Rechtstaat) and enabled it to live in the every day life of its citizens. In time people grew accustomed to this type of clerks and the civil service. The new clerk had to find his ways in the new confusing circumstances, to improvise and to apply 'creatively' the rules in practice. Such a clerk who walks on the edge of the law quickly loses his dignity as well as his respect with the people.

With the establishment of the Kingdom SHS, the division of administrative units in the territory of present day Slovenia changed. By the provisions of the Rapallo Peace Treaty in 1922 the whole Western part of Slovenia was assigned to Italy. The Italians made a clear sweep and replaced the complete Slovenian staff with their own. The remaining part of the territory was divided in two *districts* (Ljubljana and Maribor), which was in the spirit of the new administration system. In the territory of the whole Kingdom 33 districts were formed. All districts were strictly subjugated to central authority and in fact they had no relevant self managing powers. Within the district there were smaller 'srez' divisions and municipalities. In 1929 new divisions occurred within the government structure, introducing 9 'banovina' instead of districts, with a special status for Belgrade as capital of the country. The complete Slovenian territory became '*Dravska Banovina*'. In the whole kingdom this was nationally the most homogenous unit. The srez and municipal units remained as lower divisions in the local government until the outbreak of the World War II, in April 1941.

In May 1945 the World War II ended in Slovenia as well as the rest of Yugoslavia by the victory of the Bolshevik revolution. As a consequence it brought a *radical cut* among all other things, in the public administration. The Yugoslav government administration was constituted in 6 republics and two autonomous provinces, which were divided into districts and municipalities. Each republic had its own constitution, its parliament and government, all with a sort of apparent self-management. However, the laws and practice were fully harmonized with the central authorities. Although the new communist regime promoted a self-imposed humanistic attitude as well as Atheism, Man as its ultimate value, social righteousness and equality, brotherhood and unity of all nations, 'brightly coloured future' for each working man, nevertheless, the government apparatus was organized after the Soviet model. This meant in fact an *extended arm of repression*. This was possible for two crucial reasons. 1) Practically, all former clerks had been purged from the administration (they had either fled abroad, or were executed, denounced as traitors, sentenced as so called 'enemies of the people', 'servants of the oppressor' etc.)

and replaced by new staff who had to be ‘morally and politically suitable’; this at least meant that they had to be members of the communist party. 2) The revolution completely removed the former regime, its constitution, laws and rules of the game, and introduced new rules; first by *imitating the Soviet model*, but later on the *grounds of its own model of Yugoslav self-management* (from 1950 to the end of 1991). The process of compromising the civil servants that had started in 1918, continued after 1945 and ended in their almost complete degradation in the eyes of the people.

The first reason was that for the first time in history of public administration, civil servants, especially those in higher positions, had to be active members of the ruling party. It was the same party that had made revolution and seized the monopoly of power over a single-party ruled state, with one ideology and one leader. The consequence was that civil servants *remained totally responsible and dependent on their party, but not to their government or to their citizens for whom they should be in service*. Therefore the impression that the people are there for the administration and it is not there to serve the people. This impression is maintained in the Slovenian collective mind (above all the middle aged and older generations), although 17 years have passed since the fall of communism.

The second reason of compromising the civil servants in the eyes of the people stems from their *incompetence*, which had several issues involved. At the start, the staff had insufficient and inadequate training; many among them lacked the required abilities, skills and experience necessary for working in public service. This happened because of the artificially-induced shortage of staff i.e. due to the *radical cut* as explained above. Further, in public service, as in other spheres of society, careers could be made mainly by criteria of loyalty and merits to the party. Such clerks were convinced that their job was safe, that they were unmovable from their positions and completely protected due to the jobs they were doing ‘in the name of the party’: very often some of them were arrogant toward the citizens, scornful, rude, etc. In time they became lazy, because nothing obliged them to work or to advance professionally. They were not worried by complaints from the citizens as users of their poor services. They were afraid only of their bosses. Service users would not make complaints to their work because they know the public administration was just a transmission of party rule. Besides, rules were not clear because they had been prepared by insufficiently trained experts. This resulted in laws and regulations being too comprehensive, written unclearly, or imprecise, which made possible different, often quite varied interpretations. Another difficulty was in contradictions and so called ‘holes in the law’, which the *nomenclature* often made on purpose as an ‘escape route’, just in case. Lesser staff had no idea what this was about so they were kept in fear of making a mistake and risk of enraging their bosses. They applied the laws and regulations mainly by interpreting them against the citizens’ best interests¹⁴. Unfortunately, in this period no scientific research on public administration activities was conducted according to verified methodology; therefore today when we speak of that period, we are forced to rely on our own observations, evidence of

¹⁴ The notorious logic of bolshevism prevailed: ‘Laws are made for the enemy, while between us we can somehow make an agreement’.

individual and group witnesses and on data dispersed in memoirs and other historical sources.

2.1. Present Value System in Public Administration

If we now analyze the cultural, historical and socio-economic context of the value system which underlines the whole public sector, and especially the public administration in Slovenia, we can first notice it has emerged as a result of influences from various cultures, one monotheist religion and two major ideologies. For several centuries the major part of Slovenia was under the influence of the Central European Cultural Circle (Austria-Hungary), while the coastal part was for some time under the influence of Romanic culture (Italy). During the 19th Century there was a strong of Pan-Slavic influence, but upon forming the Kingdom of Serbs Croats and Slovenes in 1918, Liberalism became the dominant ideology in the social and political structure of the state. After the World War II, the communists took over the power and in May 1945 they proclaimed the domination of Bolshevik ideology. During the whole period, as determined above, the strongest religious influence was maintained by the Roman Catholic Church, while Protestantism achieved its influence only in a very limited historical period, from the beginning of Reformation in 1517 till the end of the Council of Trent in 1563, after which the Counterreformation started.

On June 25th 1991, when Slovenia started its independent path, which eventually lead to full membership in the EU in May 2004, in her luggage she carried all this historical heritage. This gives her some advantages today but also difficulties on the other hand. The newly formed state completely took over the old administration, not even replacing thoroughly all the chiefs in the administration Units. Thereby was formed a *hybrid* where civil servants of the communist regime and socialist economy had to perform the policy of a newly formed democratic state in a capitalist economy. This discrepancy occasionally had grotesque manifestations¹⁵ and in the late 90' it slowed down the modernization and adoption of European standards in Public Administration. Therefore, one of the former governments decided to make a substantial move in this area. »Intensive development in the area of quality in Slovene public administration was observed especially from the year 1999, when in the Ministry of Interior, then responsible for public administration, the Quality Committee began its activity, the main purpose of its activity defined as *effective, citizen friendly, recognizable and responsible public administration*” (Zurga, 2007: 45). The next government adopted the *‘Strategy for further development in the Slovenian Public Sector 2003–2005’*. In order to secure its realization, a document was adopted on December 23rd 2003, named *“Quality Policy of Slovenian Public Administration”* (Vlada RS: 2003). It started from the administration users’ needs and from values that all civil servants should respect and carry out in practice. It is all

¹⁵ According to a public hearing of a Chief in a very important and sensitive state agency, during his mandate he had an impression that he was under surveillance and that in his agency there was a parallel management system. This means the new state had indeed established its administration by the formula of the EU and toward the outside arranged its rules of activity to correspond to those in the European environment; however on the inside it was weak to break the power of the nomenclature or ‘continuity forces’ as they are called in Slovenia. This means in fact that it had not successfully overcome its heritage from the past. Such anomalies are present still today, only at a smaller scale.

about being user oriented, efficient management, partnership development, new employment in a continuous improvement process by continual education and innovations, social responsibility and orientation to results¹⁶. These values are a compass that will make orientation in practice possible to all so that Public Administration may finally start functioning as a “legal, independent as politically neutral, impartial, responsible, open and ethical body” (ibid.). According to such a formulated quality policy, all civil servants should become partners to each individual, each business or non-governmental organization as well as to all other state or international organizations. The goal with these guided and continuous improvements in Public Administration is to achieve contemporary circumstances comparable with those in Europe¹⁷, which would enable a balanced, durable and environmentally friendly social development, a growth of competition, welfare and civil rights protection. It is important to emphasize the aim to urge and motivate according to plan the personal development, competence and satisfaction of employees in Public Administration.

The Public Administration must try to coordinate its mutual activities and co-operation with the legislative and judicial authorities. Obviously, unavoidable care will be given to appropriate utilization of the budget and other resources, in a successful, efficient and frugal organization. Therefore, internationally recognized standards should be adopted in order to assess functioning in the public sector. Special care should be given to determine and follow up the accomplishment of publicly proclaimed and measurable goals, and work results. In order to raise the *quality of Public Administration*, the present government established the Ministry of Public Administration in December 2004. From its initiation, the Ministry was dedicated to „incorporating the demands and quality performance standards of Slovene public administration into the legislation and in all the strategic documents, which it prepares and/or cooperates in preparing“ (Zurga 2007: 45).

As according to general opinion, one acts most successfully on the public scene based on self example, the government started its mandate by adopting an *Ethical Codex*, vowing to comply (in its functioning) with the fundamental values such as: *human life and dignity, freedom, honesty, righteousness, solidarity and patriotism*.

2.2. Comparison of a desirable state of affairs with the current day-to-day practice

Introduction of new values, standards of activities as well as the codes of behaviour in public administration would not have its full meaning or effect if it stayed only as a mark

¹⁶ It is obvious that Slovenian government in this respect was under the influence of the so-called New Public Management in its movement away “from the traditional focus on procedural integrity to concentrate much more upon efficiency and performance measurement” (Pratchett and Wingfield, 1994: 34). Brereton and Temple argue “that this movement away from a concentration on procedural matters and towards greater concern with quality of output is defining aspect of the new public service ethos” (Brereton and Temple, 1999: 460).

¹⁷ A detailed analysis of the cultural compatibility of old and new EU member states, particularly in terms of their economic and organizational cultures, was conducted elsewhere (see Adam, Jelovac, Rek, 2008: 107-134).

on paper. Therefore the Ministry for Public Administration decided to introduce a *continuous system for quality control* to follow up services delivered to citizens by the Public Administration. The key position in this model is *to check satisfaction* of civil servants as well as citizens. To this purpose, polls are made for all employees in administrative units, to determine their satisfaction. This is made with a professionally made questionnaire given to employees on an anonymous basis, to achieve a higher reliability of results. It is interesting to check the cumulative report from 58 administrative units plus 5 branch offices of Ljubljana administrative unit dated February 11th 2008. We shall limit our remarks only to the main findings.

Starting from the fact that employees were overburdened, the investigators wanted to know how they would react if they had to work overtime. Over a half of polled civil servants (58.2%) are ready to finish their tasks after hours only to be sure they are done in time and correctly. Considering the role and importance of knowledge for the working results of public servants, three in four (74.7%) polled employees are convinced that they have enough knowledge to complete the tasks required at their workplace. From their replies it is obvious they are aware of the importance of continuous training and their permanent education. They would prefer to attend seminars on the ongoing changes in the laws. Related to changes of their working post, only less than one in four wishes to change it. Around 70% do not wish to change their work post because they are satisfied; it is suitable for them, they perform their work happily and think that they are able to do it correctly. For those who wish to change their working post, the most frequently quoted reason is that they wish to advance because they have fulfilled conditions for higher places, next reason given is that they are not enough appreciated, that work is monotonous, that they are paid inadequately and that they think they know more and can do more than what they are doing now. Related to motivation factors, on a scale from 1 to 5 with an average of 3.92, the polled employees chose the most important factor – *good mutual relationship*, while career was least important to them. Marks also show how some values such as *efficiency* and *rewards* are achieved in practice. Less than a half (43.3%) think that they are underpaid for their work. Over a third of the rest think that they would be paid the same no matter how efficient they were. Research on satisfaction included to determine how much importance they attribute to expertise when solving particular cases/ issues. Results show that less than a half (41.4%) polled employees think that their bosses would always give priority to expertise over subjective circumstances. Relating to the understanding of the administration unit's goals in the working process, the goal with an average of 3.84 selected as most important was to satisfy the customers' needs. It is interesting to point out that the least important was equity¹⁸. In the end we should quote how the employees identify individually with their administration unit. Over two thirds (69.2%) are proud to be employed in their administration unit, while 19.4% are not proud. The main reason of being proud is that they are doing their job well and are

¹⁸ This is quite understandable in a culture where since the 19th century an archetype character Servant Yerney, as described in a novel, searches hopelessly and in vain for the social and ethical equity. Looking for justice, servant Yerney started from his local municipality and in the end reached Vienna, capital of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, but still did not find justice (see, Ivan Cankar, *Hlapec Jernej in njegova pravica*, Ljubljana, 1907).

working for the people and their country. Main reason for those not being proud is that their work is not appreciated and they have low wages.

The Public Administration has a duty to find out regularly the satisfaction of its customers. It was introduced in practice two years ago based on the Decree on Amendment of the Decree on Administration Procedures (Official Gazette Republic of Slovenia, No. 30/2006). The questionnaire to be filled out by citizens at the public administration unit vows to guarantee full anonymity, service teams must process them for each month, until the 10th of next month and report the results on the internet page reserved by the Ministry for Public Administration. On a scale from 1 to 5 they express how much their expectations were fulfilled in the administration unit when solving their claims or other issues, i.e. how large is the gap between the expected and the actual status. The object of assessment includes tidiness of the premises, equipment and environment, availability and clarity of information, exemplary speed of solving the issues, performance of services according to promises, solving the claims in one place, readiness of clerks to assist the customer, knowledge of the clerk in service, trust of customers toward the clerks, willingness of clerks to intercede for the customer, clerk's diligence to satisfy the customer's needs. According to latest available results, average mark for quality was 3 (good). Discrepancy between expected and actual status in quality services showed that in most administration units *expectations were higher* than what customers actually experienced. The same result occurred with customers' expectations related to the above stated characteristics of civil servants, which are crucial to the assessment of service quality. Considering that in the former government and administration system long waiting in queues at counters in public service had become typical, it is now interesting to view data clearly showing that there have been substantial shifts in this area. Namely, 54.1% customers were served immediately upon arriving at the counter or the office; over 70% waited up to five minutes, while customers who had waited over 20 minutes were only 1.5% in total.

Although this last data may light our spirits, an overall assessment of 3 (good) is a warning that there is still open space for changes and improvements to be made in service quality. "The key to success of the 'anti-bureaucratic' process is in changing the organizational culture – i.e. the opinion of employees in Public Administration" (Virant, 2006: 32). At this point the breakthrough will be toughest, especially because the Public Administration is distinctly conservative, toward introduction of changes. "Civil servants often channel their energy into preserving the existing status, searching for reasons against making changes, rather than taking quick action to introduce the changes" (ibid., 32).

2.3. Comparison of desired status in Slovenia with Jørgensen and Bozeman inventory of Public Values

When a sub-system in developed society, such as the public sector, wishes to assess itself, it is wise to compare with others who are more advanced. In this instance we shall try to mirror the system of public sector values in Slovenia to an *inventory of public values* which are found in e.g. Jørgensen and Bozeman. Let us start in order one by one.

First let us consider things in regard of value category such as *public sector's contribution to society*. If we start from expectations that public sector must not serve partial interests but should serve society in total, to be there for everyone, then we shall not be pleased with the present status. In the case of Slovenia, values such as *common good, public interest, social cohesion, altruism* and *human dignity* are not given sufficient weight, or they have not been mentioned at all in relevant documents. In practice, part of the political elite usually tries to transform the public sector into its group's or lobby's extended arm. Only when scandals occur and hit the public through the media, it becomes obvious how much has to be done to improve the mechanisms for the promotion and implementation control of values belonging to this category in everyday life. Special attention must be dedicated to establishing a social cohesion because the Slovenian society has been the battlefield of cultural clashes for two centuries, first between liberals and clericals, then between communists and 'enemies of the people' and today between 'left' and 'right' wings, with the consequence of an evident gaping cut between two polarized and mutually opposed sub-cultures. However, the goal should be to build up a society that would not be a battlefield to warring fractions, but a world where individuals and groups are connected and united by certain relations, needs, interests etc. The public sector could play a major part in the build up of such conceived social coherence.

In view of our former empirical consideration (see 3.2.) where we detailed the values that motivate the public administration in its operation and those that are quoted in relation to the citizens, we now deem necessary to look into the 'constellations' from the inventory of Jørgensen and Bozeman, which include value categories such as (1) inter-organizational aspects of public administration, (2) behaviour of public-sector employees and (3) relationship between public administration and the citizens. The first category includes the following key values: *robustness, innovation, productivity and self development of employees*. The second category holds *accountability* as a key value. Third category is composed of the following key values: *legality, equity, dialogue, user orientation* (see Jørgensen and Bozeman, 2007: 366-369). We can first notice in relation to the above three categories that instruments used by the Slovenian public administration to determine the degree of their fulfilment in day-to-day practice do not take into account some of them in questionnaire or they are hidden within questions, relating to several values put together. This means that many of the mentioned values are not treated clearly and distinctly. We are not sure whether this is because they are not given their due significance or because they are so vaguely understood that even the questionnaire creators could not turn them into correctly articulated questions for the respondents. Take for example robustness, which is linked to related values such as *adaptability, stability, reliability* and *timeliness*. Whether the public administration is organized on the basis of robustness or not, it can not find this out, based on the questionnaire for employees and customers, because the presence of this trait in practice is not investigated. Partly, *timeliness* is explored, but in a very narrow meaning, as adequate speed of solving the cases and as length of time spent waiting at the counter. Further research should extend in the direction of stronger evaluation of robustness as an organizational value, which is essential for the functioning of public administration. If we now look at innovation, we can see that this value is linked to *enthusiasm* and with *readiness to take risks*. From both

questionnaires it is apparent that this value does not play a part in Slovenian public administration, as nobody is asking about it. Citizens are asked whether the clerk is: “tidy, fair, careful, professional and pleasant” (see Quality Barometer, Ministry of Public Administration, 2007). By evidence of G. Virant, the present Minister of public administration, shifts toward changes will be slow until the philosophy of civil servants is changed, it will be like “breaking concrete” (Virant, 2006: 32). He meant to say that the Slovenian public administration is hardened, deprived of enthusiasm and unready for innovations, risks or changes. Productivity is also a doubtful value. General public opinion is that the public administration is too large and not very efficient. Therefore the following option offered in the questionnaire for employees is not surprising: “In our administration unit, quality of the job done is more important than the scope of solved cases”. In the development of public administration it is very important to root the following typical values of *New Public Management*¹⁹ in the minds of civil servants: *productivity, efficiency, parsimony, professional attitude, business-like approach, and just-in-time philosophy*. It will be a large bite, because of the historical heritage in values such as egalitarianism, whose consequences were incarnated in the wages policy of so called ‘equal stomachs’. A third of public-sector employees today state that they are paid without regard to efficiency, most think they should all be equally paid and that productivity should not be a measure of their earnings.

In the end we wish to point out that *responsibility* and *legality* are respected values in the public administration, and that values such as *dialog* and *orientation to clients* in the last few years has been given quite a lot of attention. Generally speaking, public administration is communicating with the public more intensively, especially when introducing new kinds of services based on IT technology. Citizens are informed better and more regularly about the functioning of newly established e-administration, about simpler procedures required to open an enterprise, register a car, personal ID etc. Of course, all this is done with the goal of making the public administration more oriented toward satisfying the customers’ needs.

Conclusion

Using Jørgensen/Bozeman typology in public values research it is possible to detect public values not only in normative plane but also in actuality. Having detected presence, i.e. absence of public values in their matrix one can evaluate the degree of democratization of one political community. From the two elaborated cases, Serbian and Slovenian, it is obvious that public values emerged in times when those nations were fighting for their independence and that it has always happened in connection with the

¹⁹ Even Kickert (1997: 748) who is a harsh critic of the new public management, managerialism and entrepreneurial government “as evident trends, particularly in the American and Anglo-Saxon administrations, calling for more business-like and more market and client-oriented management in the public sector” feels the need to warn us that it is not his »intention to give the impression that business-like values such as effectiveness, efficiency, productivity, and quality and value for money, play a less important role in the public sector. On the contrary, one would expect government to pay extreme attention to these values because it is not spending its own money, but the involuntarily paid tax-payer's money. Parsimony and diligence should be highly esteemed values in the public sector« (Kickert, 1997: 749-750).

development of the civil society. Regarding public administration values, situation is better in the parts which were under the sovereignty of the Austria-Hungary monarchy. The regions which were under the Turkish sovereignty retained distrust in practically every authority.

It is also evident that public values come to existence and serve as guiding stars in revolutionary times. New, revolutionary forces exploit them and promise that they will be implemented and enforced. But soon, after taking the power, they throw off their promises and follow their selfish interests.

Furthermore, one of the reasons for slow development of public administration values and public values in general in post-socialist countries is slow development of the civil society. Relationship between civil society and the state is undoubtedly the most important question of any political system. As late as we thought that we released ourselves from the residues of quasisocialist regime which was trying to suppress this relationship by pointing out reputed identity of these in principle different parts of social system, while at the same time was providing privileges to so called *nomenclature* (bureaucrats at different levels), we fell again in Kafkaesque plot of civil society and the state from which there is no exit. People are conscious of birth pangs of any new political system, they know that it is hard to change the old habits. It is more than clear that for releasing of burden of the former regime they need time. But it seems obvious too that old mistakes should not be repeated again. In other case, we could conclude with resignation: *Nihil sub sole novum!*

It is clear that public values depend on their bearers - people who are ready to subordinate their private interests to public interest. Transition is only one step to that direction but the results are not optimistic. Normative proclaiming of public values is in vain if the behaviour of people isn't being changed. Democracy is a matter of moral renaissance of man. So, democratic forces in Serbia and Slovenia who are striving for public values in their environments need support from those states who passed through the thorny path of democratic metamorphosis.

References

Adam, Frane, Jelovac, Dejan, Rek, Mateja (2008): Economic cultural (in)compatibility: old and new EU members in comparison. In Darka Podmenik (Ed.), *Sociokulturni in organizacijski vidiki prenosa znanja*, (pp. 107-134), Ljubljana, Irsa.

Brereton, Michael and Temple, Michael (1999): The new public service ethos: an ethical environment for governance. *Public Administration*, Vol. 77, No. 3, 455-474

Dahrendorf, Ralf (1990): Transitions – Politics, Economics and Liberty, **Scandinavian Journal of Management**, Vol. 6, No. 1, 4 – 5.

Denković, Dragaš (1991): Uticaj Francuske revolucije u Srbiji pre ujedinjenja (1804-1914), u: Francuska revolucija – ljudska prava i politička demokracija nakon dvjesto godina, Zagreb: JAZU, 439.

Eriksen, Svein and Soloumsmoen, Dag (2005): Unfinished Transition – Serbian Public Administration Reform 2001 – 2004, Oslo: Statskonsult, 37.

Jørgensen, Torben and Bozeman, Barry (2007): Public Values: an inventory. *Administration and Society*, Vol. 39, No. 3, 354-381).

Kickert, Walter (1997): Public governance in the Netherlands: an alternative to Anglo-American 'managerialism', *Public Administration*, Vol. 75, 731-752.

Marković, Mihailo (1981): Filozofski osnovi nauke, Beograd: SANU, 267-278.

Ministrstvo za javno upravo /Ministry of Public Administration/ (2008): Kumulativno poročilo /Final report/.
http://www.mju.gov.si/fileadmin/mju.gov.si/pageuploads/mju_dokumenti/predpisi/MJU_DEUP/UE/doc/11022008_Kumulativa_zaposleni_v_UE.DOC

Ministrstvo za javno upravo /Ministry of Public Administration/ (2007): Barometer kakovosti /Quality barometer/ (vprašalnika za ugotavljanje zadovoljstva strank in zaposlenih).
http://www.mju.gov.si/si/delovna_podrocja/kakovost_v_javni_upravi/zadovoljstvo_strank_in_zaposlenih/

Momsen, J. Wolfgang (1974): The Age of Bureaucracy, Perspectives on the Political Sociology of Max Weber, Oxford: Blackwell, 87.

Official Gazette Republic of Slovenia /Uradni list RS/, No. 30/2006

Pratchett, Lawrence, Windfield, Melvin (1994): *The public service ethos in local government: a research report*. London, Commission for Local Democracy.

Skerlić, Jovan (1923): Srbija – njena kultura i njena književnost, **Pisci i knjige**, Beograd, knjiga V, 18.

Verheijen, A. J. G. (2005): Public Administration in Post-Comunist States, in: Peters, B. Guy & Pierre, John: Handbook of Public Administration, London: Sage, 490.

Virant, Gregor (2006): Razbijanje betona, *Prepletanje*, 01, 32-34, Združenje managerjev Slovenije, Ljubljana.

Vlada Republike Slovenije (2003): Politika kakovosti slovenske javne uprave,
http://www.mju.gov.si/fileadmin/mju.gov.si/pageuploads/mju_dokumenti/doc/politika_kakovosti.doc

Vlada Republike Slovenije (2004): Etični kodeks vlade RS. <http://www.mju.gov.si/index.php?id=194>

Zurga, Gordana (2007): Public services between quality, efficiency and public interest. In Gordana Zurga (Ed.), *Good practices in Slovene public administration*, 2nd enlarged ed., Ljubljana, Ministry of Public Administration, pp. 45-63.