

Relevance of Representative Bureaucracy in Municipality Administration in the Republic of Lithuania

Arvydas Mikalauskas

*Vytautas Magnus University, Faculty of Political Science and Diplomacy, Department of Public Administration
S. Daukanto str. 28-200, LT-44246 Kaunas, Lithuania*

E-mail: a.mikalauskas@pmdf.vdu.lt

The article has been reviewed.

Received on 17 September 2015, accepted on 9 November 2015

Abstract

The concept of representative bureaucracy is based on the significance of representativeness of bureaucracy: its sensitivity to the public interest is directly related to representativeness of public sector servants. This article clarifies the concept of representative bureaucracy as an approach that enables one to diagnose problems in the Lithuanian civil service human resources management and presents possible solutions. Primary focus is on the aspects of trust in civil servants and gender representation in the public service. Research into representative bureaucracy has highlighted the issues of human resource management that need to be addressed in municipality administration in Lithuania. The principles of representative bureaucracy are also relevant to local autonomy because of both, the possibility to involve residents into handling administrative issues (via active communication of civil servants) and efficiency of bureaucracy itself.

Keywords: representative bureaucracy, civil servants, equal opportunity, gender.

Introductory remarks

The processes of democratization, technological progress, initiatives of international organizations and some countries, possibilities provided by globalization, demographic and economic problems, as well as many other challenges and dilemmas obligate countries to constantly look for optimal solutions in public sector management. Rapid transformations in human resources management of the last several decades have pointed to intensive searches for potential opportunities. One of them is the idea of representative bureaucracy, which is particularly popular in multicultural countries. It is precisely in multicultural democratic states (regardless of the diversity of their administrative traditions and

awareness-raising ideas of representative bureaucracy at political level) where the issue of the equality of social, economic and other components becomes particularly pronounced and where solutions (even if they are debatable) are proposed by representative bureaucracy (Von Maravic, Peters, Schröter, 2013; Von Maravic, Peters, Schröter, 2015).

This concept is based on the significance of the representativeness of bureaucracy: bureaucracy's sensitivity to the public interest is directly linked to the representativeness of public sector servants, i.e. how uniformly their statistical composition reflects the demographic trends of society or an administrative unit.

The aim of this article is to clarify the concept of representative bureaucracy as an approach which allows to diagnose problems in the Lithuanian civil service human resources management and provide possible solutions. Primary focus is on the aspects of trust in civil servants and gender representation in the public service.

Research methods: scientific literature and document analysis, quantitative analysis of secondary statistical data (provided by the Civil Service Department) which characterise the Lithuanian public service and servants, the legal framework which illustrates the interaction between human resources management in the public service and the principle of equal opportunities.

It is important to note that the Lithuanian civil service is centrally managed, therefore, while discussing it at municipal level, it is possible to operate under general public service legislation, as well as, partially, statistical data.

The concept of representative bureaucracy: theoretical approach

The concept of representative bureaucracy rejects Max Weber's principle of bureaucracy's neutrality and the politics-administration dichotomy, on the contrary, it emphasises the growing measures of public sector servants' discretion. Servants are not only objective policy implementers and service providers, so it is particularly relevant to ask who fills administrative positions in the public sector and how those holding them can ensure equal distribution of society's values. The mechanisms of protecting the public interest are also evaluated in a diametrically opposite manner in representative bureaucracy regulations: the public interest is protected not by depersonalised "faceless" bureaucracy but by public servants who share the same values and worldviews as those whom they represent (Groeneveld, Van de Walle, 2010). It is assumed that the congruence of values is decided by social, political and geographic experiences, i.e. similar socialization processes provide for opportunities to form similar attitudes. Personal values of a servant in decision making also represent society's values. It is important to emphasise that the influence is reciprocal, and public servants can instil the country's values in their social environment (Pivoras, 2002).

The diversity of the administrative apparatus which represents typical citizens is a necessary condition for bureaucracy to properly react to society needs, contrary to political institutions, which focus almost only on the dominant social classes. The significance of the attitudes of the latter became particularly relevant in Western democracies in the second half of the 20th century, as concerns about the expanding power of bureaucracy and social conflicts rose, and society attitudes changed as well.

The developed concept of representative bureaucracy, which ensures democratic values (e.g., equal opportunities, social mobility, participatory governance), provides opportunities for various roles of public organisations and the stability of a democratic society, reduces the tension between democratic institutions and bureaucracy, and improves efficiency supplying public sector services. Representativeness is also understood as an effective form of bureaucracy control (Andrews, Boyne, Walker, 2006).

The author of the representative bureaucracy theory is said to be J. Donald Kingsley, a British researcher whose work of the mid-20th century focused on problems of social classes. However, the most intense development and implementation of the theory took place in the USA, where it centred mostly around racial issues. This concept, which has

become relevant in almost all Western democratic countries, has been subjected to more cross-cutting analysis in recent decades, involving dilemmas related to religion, ethnicity, disability, gender, sexual orientation, etc. Synthesis of academic articles unveils the dominance of gender and racial problems (Pitts, Wise, 2010). However, the demographic factors in any particular country have their own specificity, so in each of them attention to the aforementioned components could be unevenly distributed. For instance, the linguistic factor is particularly important in Canada and Belgium, whereas religious problems are highlighted in Lebanon.

Research on representative bureaucracy could also be divided according to development stages: the earliest works established sectoral disproportion of employees, the further research was directed towards interpretations of the regulations of antidiscrimination measures, and, finally, some researchers started taking interest in the impact of employee diversification on the organisations' results (Pitts, Wise, 2010).

Scientific literature dedicated to this subject is quite rich, but it could be noted that increasing amounts of attention is being paid to the methodology of research into the implementation of the concept. The latter works, that summarize and evaluate the current academic expertise, highlight variance of the meaning of the concept used and research sample problems: research tends to be fragmented as it spotlights individual, often service-oriented institutions rather than bureaucracy as a whole; there is over-reliance on quantitative research data while ignoring qualitative methods which could reveal personal experiences of servants (Kennedy, 2014). Emphasis is also placed on the need for specific research (e.g., practical management of human resources diversity, indirect representativeness, etc.), which could enrich understanding of representative bureaucracy's functionality for both the academics and the practitioners.

The research approach to representative bureaucracy in Lithuanian academic discourse has been noted only in gender studies (Gumbrevičiūtė-Kuzminskienė, 2011) and the context of introducing public administration theory (Pivoras, 2002), but has not received greater attention here either.

The concept of passive and active representativeness

Based on F. C. Mosher, who is one of the main authorities in the concept of representative bureaucracy, representation is divided into passive (sociological) and active (Meier, Hawes, 2009).

Research on passive representation analyses how segmentation of general demographic components (e.g., social class, nationality, gender, profession) is reflected in employment in the public sector. Literature dedicated to exploration of this subject is mostly based on descriptive analysis. This research direction also encompasses literature examining the factors that determine representativeness of bureaucracy and changes in the sample of that representativeness.

Taking into account various demographic characteristics, diversity of employees could be measured in various ways. *Percentage comparison* demonstrates the degree of employee diversity (e.g., the disabled) within a specific administrative unit. The *representative index* reveals the ratio of staff diversity in a specific institution and administrative territorial unit (e.g., the ratio of the number of females in a specific institution and local municipality). The *stratified ratio* demonstrates representativeness of part of a social group at different organisational levels (e.g., the ratio of ethnic minority representatives in management positions and ethnic minority representatives in the local municipal employment market) (Andrews, Boyne, Walker, 2006). In the opinion of some researchers, the staff of specific organisations should be compared to specific population to which it provides services (Kennedy, 2014). Thus, it is especially important to precisely define the characteristics of the analysed object, otherwise research data could be distorted.

Active representativeness research approach emphasises that bureaucracy represents the interests of a certain segment of the population. The officials, who come from disadvantaged or other kinds of social groups, actively exploit their positions to defend the interests of those groups (Andrews, Boyne, Walker, 2006). Therefore the behaviour of public servants themselves becomes a research object.

It has to be noted that bureaucracy representation structures started functioning long before J. Donald Kingsley (1944) used the term 'representative bureaucracy'. According to Mosher, as the executive structures such as the Ministry of Agriculture and the Ministry of Labour were established in the 19th century, bureaucratic measures were started to be used in order to represent the interests of a certain group of society (Meier, Hawes, 2009). However, the dispute over what the basis of representativeness is has not lost its relevance even today. One approach states that the foundation of active representativeness is the adequately articulated interests of specific social groups; another approach indicates that active representativeness emerges when the pre-

cedence of the interests of a particular group over the other groups is established at political level and provides it with a tangible benefit. Lately academic research has been dominated by the second approach, but other alternatives are also possible, which, it has to be said, still have not been sufficiently analysed.

Many researchers point out that passive representativeness is a necessary condition in order to ensure active representativeness. However, Mosher claims that active representativeness is possible without passive (Kennedy, 2014). Even if the composition of the staff at the highest administrative level does not reflect the diversity of the social segments of society, still, the available competences, experience and political orientation ensure bureaucracy's ability to make decisions based on wide interests, therefore, simultaneously favourable to the social groups that are not directly represented as well. It has been observed that administrators tend to favour the group whose interests they have been assigned to represent. Furthermore, socially vulnerable groups' interests tend to be advocated by other less represented social groups. Generally, the door for representativeness in organizations and entire bureaucracy is opened by not only intense activity of the less represented groups' members or their collaboration, but also by shifting organizational values and orientation towards customers and the efficiency of activities.

K. J. Meier and D. P. Hawes emphasise that, based on demographic criteria, implementation of active representativeness in the public sector is often restricted by the principles of the organization of bureaucracy itself (Meier, Hawes, 2009). Active representativeness is inhibited by the limits of the *discretion of bureaucrats*, which is defined by the principles of hierarchy of legislation. The specificity of the legal system cannot leave any freedom for the actions of bureaucracy or this freedom is minimal. For instance, the social security system clearly regulates the size of an individual's pension, therefore public sector servants have no means with which they could help citizens if they do not meet the established criteria. Likewise, the possibilities of the servant's discretion are also minimized by the strict (*Weberian*) hierarchic supervision.

Another important factor, which limits the role of the demographic criteria in the public sector, is the logic of human resource management and institutional socialization. The institution attaches higher importance not to the general demographic factors but to the individual's values and merits which allow one to measure the servant's contribution towards the organizational goals.

As mentioned previously, if favourable conditions are created in society for citizens

socialization, the servants' values should not differ from the demographic tendencies. Highlighting the possibilities of indirect representativeness as well, the institution's obligations to the principles of representative bureaucracy could be completely irrelevant.

The dimensions of representative bureaucracy

Researchers note that today the extensively developed concept of representative bureaucracy should be divided into separate dimensions with different content: bureaucracy as power, bureaucracy as equal opportunity, and bureaucracy as diversity management (Groeneveld, Van de Walle, 2010).

The concept of *representative bureaucracy as power* emphasises that bureaucracy is one of the fundamental institutions of the state, which ensures social harmony and stability of the political system. However, successful performance of these tasks is linked to certain conditions: the composition of public sector servants has to match the balance of the dominant political powers. The composition of the administrative apparatus must be changed in response to changes at political or social level so as to properly represent the interests of the rulers (but not the entire society). Otherwise administration will lose trust of politicians and population as well as the opportunity to actively take part in the political process. For the bureaucratic "corrections", the instruments of both, the patronage and the merit system, can be used.

Relevance of this approach today could be questioned, however, in the definition of the relationship between the administrative elite and politicians, the problem of loyalty remains serious and multi-faceted.

The concept of *representative bureaucracy as equal opportunity*, which was developed in the late 1960s- early 1970s, underlines the significance of representation of all social groups in the public sector. This is the foundation of bureaucracy's legality and trust in it. Based on the guidelines of democratization, the representativeness principle functioning at political level is sought to be transferred to administrative level as well. Therefore, the representativeness principle renders bureaucratic and political levels almost equal: bureaucracy is first and foremost accountable to citizens, and only later to legislators. Such changes create a favourable environment for citizens' participation in public administration decision-making. The public's involvement and initiatives increase servants' sensitivity and response to citizens' expectations.

No less concern than that over representation of less represented groups is also raised about

implementation of the equal opportunity principle in the public sector. The opportunity to pursue a job in the public sector is seen as the fundamental right of democracy. Equal opportunity policy and *affirmative action* have become the main instruments for enlarging the proportions of non-represented groups in administration. The equal opportunity approach underscores that public democracy should not be based on the dominant monoculture (for example, a white male university graduate) but, following the quota system, allow into the administrative apparatus proportionate numbers of women, national minorities and other social groups. Thus the equal opportunity approach considers representative bureaucracy from a moral perspective and evaluates it as the means to improve the state's democracy and legitimacy (Groeneveld, Van de Walle, 2010).

As the approach of representative bureaucracy developed, in about 1990 *representative bureaucracy as diversity management* in organisations became the main component, which partly cast equal opportunity into the shade. On the one hand, this component was made relevant by increase of diversity in the labour force (e.g., migration processes, more active participation of women in the labour market) but, on the other hand, the main factor was the implementation of economic logic-based private sector management elements in the public sector (e.g., popularity of the New Public Management, etc.).

Diversity, which is defined not only by sociodemographic characteristics but also encompass all criteria by which individuals differ from one another (Groeneveld, Van de Walle, 2010), is understood as an organizational value whose proper integration into human resource management ensures the organization's efficiency and effectiveness. In other words, when diversity-based human resources are formed, contributions of different employees are integrated, teamwork is encouraged, the organization's management processes and results are also optimized.

The importance of diversity is also emphasised by other theories developed in parallel: the *organisational resource theorists* stress the fact that diversity encourages increase of relevant competences; the *decision comprehensiveness theorists* emphasise that heterogeneous leadership determines more versatile and critical decisions (Andrews, Boyne, Walker, 2006).

Diversity management is also one of the most attractive measures which encourages to draw the less represented groups into the public sector. Representatives of such groups see and appreciate an actual opportunity to get employed and climb the

career ladder and expect a favourable organizational culture (Ng, Sears, 2014).

Also important is diversity's external influence: labour force diversity attracts a wider circle of customers in this way contributing to the improvement of organization's performance. In the context of public administration, this influence could be understood as reducing the gap between the organization and customers who are being served (Groeneveld, Van de Walle, 2010). In addition to that, public services related to active representation, which reflects the demographic trends, also minimize manifestation of politicisation. Significantly, the concept of bureaucracy as diversity management makes diversity relevant not due to the democratic, moral or political values but as the means to achieve organizational efficiency (e.g., while providing services).

Critique of representative bureaucracy

Many academics identify the positive impact of representative bureaucracy, e.g., the conducted research has revealed that a larger number of women in police forces influences the institution be more active in the cases of sexual violence (Kennedy, 2014). Also noteworthy are such advantages as ensurance of equal opportunity, responding to the represented groups' needs, collaboration, effective use of resources, etc.

Nevertheless, representative bureaucracy is not a panacea which solves public management problems *per se*. Implementation of this concept is related not only to the issues of costs as in certain cases of representative bureaucracy and active representativeness in particular, it can have a negative impact on achievability of organizational goals or servants' accountability. A question arises whether bureaucracy can adequately take care of the public interest and represent a specific group at the same time. If each public sector servant represents only the interests of the group he represents himself, bureaucracy as a whole will be condemned to suffer from conflicts and inefficiency (Kennedy, 2014). Therefore such a principle of bureaucracy's organization separates "winners" from "losers" and creates conditions for smaller social groups to pursue goals at the expense of other groups.

No less widely discussed is the logic of reducing the requirements for the applicants to public sector services with the aim to represent all social groups. Encouraging diversity in organizations can cause employee conflicts, miscommunication, distrust, etc. (Pitts, Wise, 2010). It has also been noted that not all social groups use the benefit of representativeness equally.

Therefore, while critique of representative democracy is often based on quite controversial research data, it highlights the limitations of this concept and underlines the importance of compromises to be made in order to implement this concept in public management. Coordination of the organization's goals, results, accountability and representativeness requires a lot of effort, it is fragile and not always possible.

Representative bureaucracy in the context of Lithuania

Local autonomy is that administrative level functioning closest to population, thus it is important that civil servants working in municipalities knew community priorities, diverse expectations of community members so that they could properly meet their daily needs, ensure high quality of provided services and solve problems. In general, local autonomy should provide public goods that correspond to consumers' interests as optimally as possible (Astrauskas, Baltušnikienė, 2009).

As mentioned before, the theoretical concept of representative bureaucracy has not received sufficient attention in the Lithuanian academic discourse. Still, while Lithuania's society is relatively homogenous, it is important to make the concept of representative bureaucracy relevant in the academic and practical discourse on public management due to both democratic and effective management criteria.

It is appropriate to specify at once that the Lithuanian civil service is organised centrally, so in discussions at municipal level one can operate under general legislation regulating the civil service and, in part, statistical data pertaining to it.

The problem of trust

First of all, attention is drawn to distrust of Lithuania's citizens in both its political or administrative institutions and the civil service. This problem has been identified in annually held representative polls of Lithuania's population commissioned by the country's Ministry of the Interior. The aim of these polls is to determine the degree of trust in the state and municipal institutions. The data of the poll conducted in 2013 attests that 41 per cent of Lithuania's residents trust in the state and municipal institutions, 36 per cent does not, and 23 per cent has no opinion (Civil Service Department, 2013).

Looking only at autonomy level, there is no significant change in statistical data. The research singled out municipal institutions, bodies and elderships and population's trust in them was measured separately. Notably, elderships located closest to the residents were more trusted than the whole municipality administration.

Table 1

Trust in municipal institutions (percentage)

	Municipalities								
	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
Trusts in them	43	46	40	34	32	47	44	46	44
Does not trust	43	41	50	53	48	42	44	41	43
Has no opinion	14	13	10	13	19	11	13	14	13
	Elderships								
	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
Trusts in them	48	52	48	46	44	50	52	53	48
Does not trust	34	33	40	38	33	36	30	29	36
Has no opinion	18	15	12	16	23	14	18	18	13

Source: Pasitikėjimo valstybės ir savivaldybių institucijomis ir įstaigomis ir aptarnavimo kokybės vertinimas (Assessment of Trust in State and Municipal Institutions and Bodies and Quality of Service. Research report). Vilnius: JSC Baltijos tyrimai (2012); Pasitikėjimo valstybės ir savivaldybių institucijomis ir įstaigomis ir aptarnavimo kokybės vertinimas (Assessment of Trust in State and Municipal Institutions and Bodies and Quality of Service. Research report). Vilnius: JSC RAIT (2012); Pasitikėjimo valstybės ir savivaldybių institucijomis ir įstaigomis ir aptarnavimo kokybės vertinimas (Assessment of Trust in State and Municipal Institutions and Bodies and Quality of Service. Research report). Vilnius: Public Opinion and Market Research Centre Vilmorus (2013).

The poll results presented in Table 1 show that during the period of 9 years (2005-2013) percentage of people who did not trust municipal institutions was between 41% and 43%, while percentage of those who did not trust elderships – between 30% and 40%.

In response to the open question why citizens do not trust institutions, the largest number of respondents mentioned bad and irresponsible work (18%), unfair and flawed laws (15%) and corruption (6%) (Civil Service Department, 2013).

The respondents were also sceptical about civil servants' work. Based on the poll data from 2010 until 2013, the ratio of respondents who evaluated

civil servants' work at municipal level positively or negatively distributed rather equally.

The number of those who thought that most municipal civil servants did their job honestly fluctuated from 39% to 34%, while those who thought contrarily – from 41% to 46%. The statement that most municipal civil servants respect people was accepted as true by 38% – 48% of the respondents, as false by 35% – 43% of the respondents. The respondents were more positive about servants' professionalism: the statement that servants knew their job well was accepted as true by at least half of the respondents.

Table 2

Assessment of state and municipal servants' work (percentage)

		2013			2012			2011			2010			2009		
		Agree	Disagree	No opinion	Agree	Disagree	No opinion	Agree	Disagree	No opinion	Agree	Disagree	No opinion	Agree	Disagree	No opinion
Know their job well	State and municipal servants	47	34	19	56	27	17	47	38	14	53	31	16	35	40	35
	Only municipality servants	50	32	18	57	26	17	52	33	15	51	30	19			
Respect people	State and municipal servants	39	43	18	42	41	17	34	51	15	36	43	21	29	47	23
	Only municipality servants	42	40	18	48	35	17	41	43	16	38	42	20			
Do their job honestly	State and municipal servants	35	43	22	37	44	19	29	55	16	34	46	20	26	47	27
	Only municipality servants	38	41	21	39	41	20	37	46	18	34	45	21			

Source: Pasitikėjimo valstybės ir savivaldybių institucijomis ir įstaigomis ir aptarnavimo kokybės vertinimas (Assessment of Trust in State and Municipal Institutions and Bodies and Quality of Service. Research report). Vilnius: Public Opinion and Market Research Centre Vilmorus (2013)

The research on civil servants' image in Lithuania revealed that servants' assessment was a bit higher than the average, however, their professional image in the overall list of professions was quite low: the civil servant's profession was ranked 10-11 out of 12 professions (Vilmorus, 2008).

This research also revealed that negative assessment of civil servants dominated. Usually the respondents criticized civil servants for protecting their own relatives and friends in the civil service, abusing their position, succumbing to the influence of political and economic interests, squandering funds. Moreover, more than half of the respondents thought that civil servants did not work enough (Vilmorus, 2008).

Representative bureaucracy regulations can, at least partially, help deconstruct and potentially solve, the dilemma of trust in civil servants. The development of the civil service in Lithuania has attested to relatively intense efforts to professionalize it. In late 20th-early 21st century (the Law on Civil Service of the Republic of Lithuania was passed in 1999), this orientation towards professionalism of the civil service was equated to the Weberian type of bureaucracy, thus, "Rechtsstaat" type of the civil service basics were implanted. Changes in priorities were demonstrated in the initiatives of the 15th Lithuanian government (2008-2012): to relate improvement of the civil service and the significance of management-related elements and attention to society needs (Pivoras, 2014).

However, it should be underscored that the civil service based on the principles of traditional public administration creates conditions for the emergence of alienation between it and the public. Specific working conditions in the public sector, requirements for distinctive employee competences, significance of the legal culture, mechanisms of administrative procedures, exclusive social security are the sources of the complexity of public sector management, the insularity of public service institutions and a possibility for distrust to arise.

Recent reforms in the Lithuanian civil service mostly aimed at making services effective and efficient. The involvement of representatives of the public or interest groups in the decision-making process has not been properly institutionalized (Non-Governmental Organisation Information and Support Centre, 2014). From the perspective of democratization, probably the most positive change in civil service management is focus on transparent civil servant selection procedures. For instance, in 2012 the order was passed enabling representatives of the public to participate as observers in the competition to a position of a career civil servant in the organization holding this competition (Žin.,

2002, No. 65–2654). This order does not consider an employee of a state or municipal institution to be "a representative of the public". That diminishes the opportunity of independent citizens who represent the public interest to participate in the work of the selection committee (Pivoras, 2014).

Nevertheless, the implemented individual changes actually have not resulted in any real leverage of the public and has not made any influence on the institution of the civil service. Possibilities are still intensively considered how to improve civil service management, but the ideas of bureaucracy's representativeness are ignored. Therefore, even though the principles of public service and public servants' activities (Žin., 1999, No. 66–2130) as well as public administration (Žin., 1999, Nr. 60–1945) ethics combine the criteria for servants' efficiency with the value of serving the public interest, they are, vividly speaking, still based on the ideas of 18th century cameralists and policists, who claimed that the apparatus of the state knew the expectations and the needs of the public better than the public itself (Izdebski, 2001).

Thus, a limited interaction between the public and administrators has likely resulted in the priority of bureaucratic institutions' values and regulations as servants make decisions within the limits of their discretion. In spite of the fact that the civil service system is oriented towards efficiency, leaving no any leverage of influence for the public, it faces problems of recognising the public interest and citizens' trust.

Gender issues

Another relevant problem regarding representative bureaucracy is the realization of the principle of equal opportunities. Lithuania's international obligations, national legislation and special programmes strengthen the principles of equality, equal treatment and anti-discrimination. Also noteworthy is the Office of Equal Opportunities Ombudsperson, which oversees how the equal rights enshrined in the Constitution are implemented and how the Law on Equal Opportunities for Women and Men is functioning (Žin., 1999, No. 48–1531). This fundamental legislation, relevant to Lithuanian civil service management, is also complemented by the Law on Civil Service, which introduces the principle of equal treatment (Budbergytė, Šakočius, Žilinskas, 2004).

Equal conditions to apply to the civil service is the constitutional right of every citizen. However, it has been concluded more than once in the jurisprudence of the Constitutional Court that the state is not obligated to accept every person to the civil service. The civil service has to be qualified, one has to be able to perform its tasks. Those who wish

to become civil servants and officers usually must have appropriate education, professional experience and certain personal characteristics. Moreover, the higher the office or the more important the field of his activity, the higher are the requirements imposed on the people fulfilling those duties (Rulings of the Constitutional Court, 1999, 2007, 2008).

Thus, the selection procedures to the civil service combine the principles of both equal opportunities and the merit system. Researchers on representative bureaucracy emphasise this barrier especially: belonging to one or another social group often determines the individual's opportunity to seek competences required in order to take up administrative or other duties (Peters, 2002). In order to retain the ethnic, gender or another kind of balance of the staff, programmes of "positive discrimination" have been adopted to ensure that the composition of public sector servants reflects the demographic characteristics.

The Civil Servant Register (Žin., 2002, Nr. 80–3440) under the the Civil Service Department, accumulates statistical data which reflect certain characteristics of civil servants: gender, age, work experience in the civil service, number of foreign languages known, etc. These data allow to evaluate an equal opportunities policy not only formally but also the degree of its implementation. For instance, gender imbalance is particularly highlighted in the Lithuanian civil service. The data provided by by the Lithuanian Civil Service Department reveal clear tendencies: percentage of males in the civil service has been consistantly decreasing, from 40% to 24–25% during the period from 2003 till 2014.

Notably, a reverse gender disproportion is present at vertical and the horizontal levels of the civil service: the positions of institution managers are dominated by male civil servants: they make up two thirds of all institution managers.

Table 3

Ratio of women and in men civil service in Lithuanian (excluding statutory employees)

	2014	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005	2004	2003
Women	22870 (76,09%)	22476 (75,69%)	22002 (75,53%)	21621 (75,08%)	21872 (74,69%)	22269 (74,22%)	22304 (73,99%)	19500 (72,83%)	17663 (71,25%)	15300 (68,74%)	15314 (60,92%)	14706 (59,98%)
Men	7186 (23,91%)	7220 (24,31%)	7129 (24,47%)	7175 (24,92%)	7411 (25,31%)	7734 (25,78%)	7840 (26,01%)	7276 (27,17%)	7127 (28,75%)	6959 (31,26%)	9825 (39,08%)	9812 (40,02%)

Source: Reports on the application and implementation of the Law on Civil Service and related legislature, 2003–2014. Civil Service Department. Available at: <http://www.vtd.lt/index.php?-1923883706>

The data presented in Table 3 reflects the general gender statistics of Lithuanian civil servants. Gender proportion has not changed significantly

compared to all municipal administration employees (both civil servants and those working under employment contracts).

Table 4

Civil servants and employees working under an employment contract in municipal institutions and bodies

	2015 01 01	2014 01 01	2013 01 01	2012 01 01	2011 01 01	2010 01 01
Women	10159 (70,20%)	9918 (69,95%)	9912 (69,53%)	9866 (69,24%)	9620 (68,70%)	9727 (68,62%)
Men	4313 (29,80%)	4261 (30,05%)	4344 (30,47%)	4382 (30,76%)	4383 (31,30%)	4448 (31,38%)

Source: Civil service in numbers. Civil Service Department. Available at: <http://statistika.vtd.lt/index.html>

The public sector is an attractive place of employment for women in almost all democratic countries for many reasons, e.g., the role in the family, relative job safety (Andrews, Ashworth, 2013). In the context of Lithuania, high numbers of women in the civil service can be, at least partly, explained by statistical data: women make up about 54% of the country's population and about 64% of

all higher school graduates (Statistics Lithuania, 2013).

Still, based on representative bureaucracy regulations, some questions arise. Are civil servant selection conditions equally favourable to all groups of the population? Is the civil service itself an equally attractive place of work to all social groups? These questions are even more relevant taking into

account the education issue. In 2014, 99.6% of civil servants had a higher education degree (90.9% from a university, 8.7% from a college) (Report on the Application and Implementation of Law on Civil Service and Related Legislature in 2014). Thus, although the Law on Civil Service sets that a candidate should have not lower than secondary education or a vocational qualification (C grade posts) (Žin., 1999, Nr. 60–1945), it is clear that persons with higher (university) education are preferred. When a meritocratic system becomes dominant (Groeneveld, Van de Walle, 2010), there is a risk that less educated persons will be insufficiently represented at administrative level (and, likely, at political level as well) and thus their interests will be reflected less in public policy. These risks raise further discussion: will public policy programmes based only on the merit principle be successfully implemented?

It has been observed that if public organizations are not obligated to react to the problems of disproportionate representation, they remain passive observers. The reverse situation is created in the countries where equality and diversity strategies are obligating, and institutions themselves actively observe and contribute to representativeness in staff composition (Andrews, Ashworth, 2013), thus, they also take into account the interests of diverse social groups.

Certain developments towards empowerment or obligation of institutions have been observed in Lithuania as well. For instance, the approved of the National Equal Opportunity of Women and Men Programme for 2015-2021 sets that: “governmental-level coordination of the implementation of equal opportunity policy for women and men in all fields of activity has been assigned to the Minister of Social Security and Labour. Every state or municipal institution or body is obliged by law to prepare and implement programmes and measures dedicated to the assurance of equal opportunities for women and men in their respective fields” (TAR, 2015, 2062).

However, the issue of representativeness in the field of human resources management in the civil service has been left to chance. The link between the diversity of servants and the indicators of democratization or the organization’s performance remains only the issue of initiative of the institution’s management or its human resources department. Also, since civil service management is almost exclusively relies on meritocracy, the possibility of these initiatives is also limited.

Concluding remarks

Modern bureaucracy has a significant influence on the political processes at its disposal but it

lacks accountability, which causes tension between bureaucracy and democratic institutions. This tension is attempted to be eased through representative bureaucracy regulation.

In contrast to most human resources management theories, representative bureaucracy approach does not ignore individual characteristics of employees; on the contrary, it makes them pertinent as a premise for effective bureaucracy. However, different approaches of this theory treat efficiency in different ways. Representative bureaucracy as power highlights the idea that political and social changes have to determine the composition of the administrative apparatus, otherwise politicians and the dominant social classes will lose the leverage of influence on public sector servants and will seek to remove them from public policy. Political influence on the administrative apparatus ensures social harmony.

The principle of representative bureaucracy as an equal opportunity evaluates efficiency based on the perspective of democratization: positions in the public sector have to be accessible to all groups that reflect the diversity of the public. In pursuit of this goal, the means of positive discrimination can be employed. The composition of administration which reflects the diverseness of the public ensures that the development of policies or the provision of services will take into account the needs and expectations of all interested parties or, at least, their opinion will be considered.

The principle of representative bureaucracy as diversity management evaluates efficiency from the perspective of activities and achievability of results by a specific organisation, i.e. as a condition which ensures benefit. Focusing on diversity, an organization creates conditions for itself to reach a wider range of customers (a citizen is seen as a customer) and, since it coordinates the diversity of experiences and competences, it can expect optimal solutions and results of activities. Diversity management becomes the basis for human resource management.

Each of these approaches of representative bureaucracy uses different means to consolidate representative bureaucracy: the first one is based on political solutions, the second one follows the importance of legislation, and the third one is guided by the significance of training.

The research on representative bureaucracy has highlighted the issues of human resource management that needs to be addressed in municipality administrations in Lithuania. It should be concluded that the Lithuanian academic discourse has not evaluated how the composition of civil servants affects trust in the civil service, results of

its activities and relationships with citizens. From the perspective of human resource management in the Lithuanian public sector, it has been noted that the most frequently discussed potential is that of representative bureaucracy as assurance of equal opportunities. The legal and institutional system ensures passive implementation of the principles of equal opportunities but administrative institutions themselves have not been enabled to actively solve arising dilemmas. The development of the civil service demonstrates efforts to combine the value principles with efficiency of activities but orientation of the civil service towards competences and results cannot compensate for its sensitivity to the expectations of the public. Thus, the improvement of the civil service does not encourage dialogue between the service and society, or mutual understanding. That is not only the problem of a lack of democracy, as the significance of diversity management as a necessary condition for efficiency of bureaucracy is becoming increasingly relevant.

The principles of representative bureaucracy are also relevant to local autonomy because of the both, the possibility to involve residents into handling administrative issues (via active communication of civil servants) and efficiency of bureaucracy itself.

References

- Andrews, R., Ashworth, R. (2013). Determinants of representation: an empirical assessment of the UK civil service. *Policy & Politics*, 43(3), pp. 429-448.
- Andrews, R., Boyne, G. A., Walker, R. M. (2006). Workforce diversity in the public sector: an evaluation of the performance of English local authorities // *Policy & Politics*, 34(2), pp. 287-306.
- Astrauskas, A., Baltušnikienė, J. (2009). Subnacionalinio valdymo struktūros ir teritorinių savivaldybių kompetencijos nustatymo teoriniai aspektai // *Viešoji politika ir administravimas*, 28, pp. 7-22.
- Budbergytė, R., Šakočius, A., Žilinskas, D. (2004). *Lietuvos Respublikos valstybės tarnybos įstatymo komentaras*. Vilnius: Lietuvos viešojo administravimo institutas.
- Groeneveld, S., Van de Walle, S. (2010). A contingency approach to representative bureaucracy: power, equal opportunities and diversity // *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 76(2), pp. 239-258.
- Gumbrevičiūtė-Kuzminskienė, D. (2011). *Lygių galimybių principo įgyvendinimas Europos Sąjungos ir Lietuvos darbo teisėje*. Daktaro disertacija. Vilnius: Mykolo Romerio universiteto leidykla.
- Izdebski, H. (2001). *Historia administracji*. Warszawa: Liber.
- Kennedy, B. (2014). Unraveling Representative Bureaucracy: A Systematic Analysis of the Literature. *Administration & Society*, 46(4), pp. 395-421.
- Konstitucinio teismo 1999 m. kovo 4 d., 2007 m. rugpjūčio 13 d., 2008 m. sausio 22 d. nutarimai. *Lietuvos Respublikos Valstybės tarnybos įstatymas su komentarais*. Available at: <http://www.vtd.lt/index.php?1251202285>.
- Lietuvos Respublikos Seimo nutarimas „Dėl Moterų ir vyrų lygių galimybių kontrolieriaus tarnybos pavadinimo pakeitimo ir Lygių galimybių kontrolieriaus tarnybos nuostatų patvirtinimo“. *Valstybės žinios*. 1999, 48–1531.
- Lietuvos Respublikos valstybės tarnybos įstatymas. *Valstybės žinios*. 1999, 66–2130.
- Lietuvos Respublikos viešojo administravimo įstatymas. *Valstybės žinios*. 1999, 60–1945.
- Lietuvos Respublikos Vyriausybės nutarimas „Dėl Konkursų į valstybės tarnautojo pareigas organizavimo tvarkos aprašo patvirtinimo“. *Valstybės žinios*. 2002, 65–2654.
- Lietuvos Respublikos vyriausybės nutarimas „Dėl Valstybės tarnautojų registro nuostatų patvirtinimo“. *Valstybės žinios*. 2002, 80–3440.
- Lietuvos Respublikos vyriausybės nutarimas „Dėl valstybinės moterų ir vyrų lygių galimybių 2015–2021 metų programos patvirtinimo“. *TAR*, 2015, 2062.
- Meier, J. K., Hawes, D. P. (2009). Ethnic Conflict in France A Case for Representative Bureaucracy? // *The American Review of Public Administration*, 39(3), 2009, pp. 269-285.
- Nevyriausybinių organizacijų informacijos ir paramos centras (2014). *Nevyriausybinių organizacijų ir valstybinio sektorių bendradarbiavimas*. Studija. Vilnius: NIPC. Available at: http://www.3sektorius.lt/docs/NVOdalyvavimasSFVPstudija_2014-03-20_15:31:07.pdf.
- Ng, E. S. W., Sears, G. J. (2014). Toward Representative Bureaucracy: Predicting Public Service Attraction Among Underrepresented Groups in Canada // *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 29 July, doi: 10.1177/0734371X14544546.
- Peters, B. G. (2002). *Biurokratijos politika*. Vilnius: Pradai.
- Peters, B. G., Von Maravic, P., Schröter, E. (2015). *Politics of Representative Bureaucracy. Power, Legitimacy and Performance*. Cheltenham, UK, Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar.
- Pitts, D. W., Wise, L. R. (2010). Workforce Diversity in the New Millennium: Prospects for Research // *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 30(1), pp. 44-69.
- Pivoras, S. (2002). *Viešojo administravimo teorijos*. Paskaitų konspektai. Kaunas: Vytauto Didžiojo universiteto leidykla.
- Pivoras, S. (2014). Valstybės tarnybos sistemos tobulinimas Lietuvoje: pasirinkimai ir požiūriai. In: Pivoras, S., Civinskas, R., Buckienė, E., *Valstybės tarnybos sistemos tobulinimas Lietuvoje: pasirinkimai, požiūriai, sandėriai* (25–40). Mokslo studija. Kaunas: Versus Aureus.
- UAB „Baltijos tyrimai“ (2012). *Pasitikėjimo valstybės ir savivaldybių institucijomis ir įstaigomis ir aptarnavimo kokybės vertinimas*. Tyrimo ataskaita. Vil-

- nius: UAB „Baltijos tyrimai“. Available at: <http://vakokybe.vrm.lt/index.php?id=307>.
25. UAB „RAIT“ (2011). *Pasitikėjimo valstybės ir savivaldybių institucijomis ir įstaigomis ir aptarnavimo kokybės vertinimas*. Tyrimo ataskaita. Vilnius: UAB „RAIT“. Available at: <http://vakokybe.vrm.lt/index.php?id=307>.
 26. Valstybės tarnyba skaičiais. Valstybės tarnybos departamentas. Available at: <http://statistika.vtd.lt/index.html>.
 27. Valstybės tarnybos įstatymo ir su juo susijusių teisės aktų taikymo ir įgyvendinimo 2003–2014 m. ataskaitos. Valstybės tarnybos departamentas. Available at: <http://www.vtd.lt/index.php?-1923883706>.
 28. Visuomenės nuomonės ir rinkos tyrimų centras „Vilmorus“ (2008). *Valstybės tarnybos įvaizdžio tyrimas*. Tyrimo ataskaita. Vilnius: „Vilmorus“. Available at: <http://www.vtd.lt/index.php?-953244154>.
 29. Visuomenės nuomonės ir rinkos tyrimų centras „Vilmorus“ (2013). *Pasitikėjimo valstybės ir savivaldybių institucijomis ir įstaigomis ir aptarnavimo kokybės vertinimas*. Tyrimo ataskaita. Vilnius: Vilmorus. Available at: <http://vakokybe.vrm.lt/index.php?id=307>.
 30. Vyrai ir moterys Lietuvoje 2013. Lietuvos statistikos departamentas. Available at: http://osp.stat.gov.lt/documents/10180/130368/Moterys_vyrai_Lietuvoje_2013.pdf.
 31. Von Maravic, P., Peters, B. G., Schröter, E. (2013). *Representative Bureaucracy in Action. Country Profiles from the Americas, Europe, Africa and Asia*. Cheltenham, UK, Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar.

Mikalas, A.

Atstovaujamosios biurokratijos (ne)aktualumas Lietuvos savivaldybių administracijose

Santrauka

Demokratizacijos procesai, technologinis progresas, tarptautinių organizacijų ir kai kurių valstybių iniciatyvos, globalizacijos teikiamos galimybės, demografinės, ekonominės problemos ir aibė kitų kylančių iššūkių bei dilemų įpareigoja valstybes nuolat ieškoti optimalių viešojo sektoriaus valdymo sprendimų. Pastaraisiais dešimtmečiais itin sparčios žmoniškųjų išteklių valdymo transformacijos liudija aktyvius potencialių galimybių paieškas, viena jų – atstovaujamosios biurokratijos idėja, ypač populiarė daugiakultūre valstybėse.

Atstovaujamosios biurokratijos koncepcija grindžiama biurokratijos reprezentatyvumo svarba: biurokratijos jautrumas visuomenės interesams yra tiesiogiai susijęs su viešojo sektoriaus tarnautojų atstovaujumu, t. y. kaip tolygiai tarnautojų statistinė sudėtis atspindi demografines visuomenės tendencijas valstybėje arba tam tikrame administraciniame vienetė. Administracinio aparato įvairovė yra būtina tinkamos reakcijos į visuomenės poreikius sąlyga – šios nuostatos svarba itin aktualizuota XX a. antroje pusėje Vakarų demokratijose, augant nerimui dėl besiplečiančių biurokratijos galių, socialinių konfliktų bei kintant pačios visuomenės požiūriui.

Straipsnyje siekiama išskleisti atstovaujamosios biurokratijos koncepciją kaip priegą, įgalinančią diagnozuoti Lietuvos valstybės tarnybos žmoniškųjų išteklių valdymo problemas ir teikti galimus jų sprendimus. Pagrindinis dėmesys telkiamas į pasitikėjimo tarnautojais ir lyčių pasiskirstymo valstybės tarnyboje aspektus. Analizuojama ir sisteminama teorinė biurokratijos atstovaujamosios problematiką gvildinanti mokslinė literatūra; pasitelkiami Lietuvos valstybės tarnybą ir tarnautojus charakterizuojantys statistiniai Valstybės tarnybos departamento teikiami duomenys; analizuojama žmoniškųjų išteklių valdymą valstybės tarnyboje ir lygių galimybių principo sąveiką iliustruojanti teisinė bazė.

Pastaraisiais dešimtmečiais ši koncepcija visose demokratinėse Vakarų valstybėse aktualizuota koncepcija akademinėse diskurse analizuojama įvairiais pjūviais, įtraukiant religijos, etnines, negalios, lyties, seksualinės orientacijos ir kitas dilemas, vis daugiau dėmesio teikiama koncepcijos realizavimo tyrimų metodologijai. Akademiinių straipsnių sintezė leidžia konstatuoti atliktų tyrimų fragmentiškumą – dėmesio centre atsiduria pavienės, dažnai į paslaugų teikimą orientuotos institucijos, bet ne biurokratija kaip visuma; pernelyg pasitikima kiekybiniais tyrimų duomenimis, ignoruojami kokybiniai metodai. Lietuvos akademinėse diskurse atstovaujamosios biurokratijos tyrimo prieiga tėra pastebima lyčių studijose (Gumbrevičiūtė-Kuzminskienė, 2011) ir viešojo administravimo teorijų pristatymo kontekstuose (Pivoras, 2002), tačiau išsamesnio dėmesio kol kas nesulaukė. Pabrėžtinai specifinių tyrimų poreikis, galintis praturtinti atstovaujamosios biurokratijos funkcionavimo suvokimą ir tarp akademių, ir tarp praktiškų.

Atstovaujamosios biurokratijos koncepcijoje skiriamas *pasyvusis* (sociologinis) ir *aktyvusis* atstovaujamosios: *pasyviojo* atstovavimo tyrimų kryptis analizuoja, kaip bendrųjų demografinių dėmenų (socialinės klasės, tautybės, lyties, profesijos) segmentaciją atspindi viešojo sektoriaus užimtumas; *aktyviojo* atstovavimo tyrimo prieiga akcentuoja, kad biurokratija atstovauja tam tikro gyventojų segmento interesams: tarnautojai aktyviai naudojami savo pozicijomis, gindami socialinių grupių, iš kurių patys yra kilę, interesus (Andrews, Boyne, Walker, 2006).

Pastebima, kad, vadovaujantis demografiniais kriterijais, *aktyviojo* atstovaujamosios realizavimas viešajame sektoriuje dažnai yra apribotas biurokratijos organizavimo principų, žmoniškųjų išteklių valdymo logikos, institucinės socializacijos. Institucija asmens vertybes ir nuopelnus, leidžiančius įvertinti tarnautojo indėlį siekiant

organizacijos tikslų, laiko svarbesniais nei bendrieji demografiniai veiksniai. Atstovaujamosios biurokratijos prieiga neignoruoja individualių darbuotojų charakteristikų, atvirksčiai – jas aktualizuoja kaip efektyvios biurokratijos prielaidą. Tiesa, skirtingos šios koncepcijos prieigos efektyvumą traktuoja nevienodai, todėl atsiranda skirtingo turinio dimensijų.

Atstovaujamoji biurokratija kaip galia (angl. *Representative bureaucracy as power*) pabrėžia, esą politinė įtaka administraciniam aparatui užtikrina socialinę darną: politiniai, socialiniai pokyčiai turi lemti administracinio aparato sudėtį, priešingu atveju politikai ir dominuojančios socialinės klasės netektų svėrų daryti įtaką viešojo sektoriaus tarnautojams ir stengtųsi juos nušalinti nuo viešosios politikos.

Atstovaujamoji biurokratija kaip lygių galimybių principas (angl. *Representative bureaucracy as equal opportunity*) efektyvumą vertina remdamasi demokratizacijos perspektyva: pareigos viešajame sektoriuje turi būti pasiekiamos visoms visuomenės įvairovę atspindinčioms grupėms, o siekti šio tikslo galima pasitelkus pozityvios diskriminacijos priemones. Visuomenės daugialypiškumą atspindinti administratorių sudėtis užtikrina, kad, formuojant politiką ar teikiant paslaugas, bus atsižvelgta į visų interesantų poreikius ir lūkesčius.

Atstovaujamoji biurokratija kaip įvairovės valdymas (angl. *Representative bureaucracy as diversity management*) efektyvumą vertina remdamasi konkrečios organizacijos veiklos ir rezultatų pasiekiamumo perspektyva: organizacija, orientuodamasi į įvairovę, sudaro sąlygas pasiekti platesnį klientų ratą, o derindama patirčių ir kompetencijų įvairovę, gali tikėtis optimalių sprendimų ir veiklos rezultatų. Įvairovės valdymas tampa žmogiškųjų išteklių valdymo pagrindu.

Kiekviena iš šių atstovaujamosios biurokratijos prieigų teikia skirtingas priemones atstovaujamajai biurokratijai įtvirtinti: pirmoji vadovaujasi politiniais sprendimais, antroji – teisės aktų svarba, trečioji – mokymų reikšmingumu.

Atstovaujamosios biurokratijos tyrimų prieiga išryškina spęstinas žmogiškųjų išteklių valdymo problemas Lietuvos savivaldybių administracijose. Tenka konstatuoti, kad Lietuvos akademiniam diskurse nėra įvertinta, kaip valstybės tarnautojų sudėtis lemia pasitikėjimą valstybės tarnyba, jos veiklos rezultatus, santykius su piliečiais. Vertinant Lietuvos viešojo sektoriaus žmogiškųjų išteklių valdymo požiūriu, pastebėtina, kad dažniausiai svarstomos atstovaujamosios biurokratijos kaip

lygių galimybių užtikrinimo perspektyvos. Teisinė ir institucinė sistema užtikrina pasyvų lygių galimybių principų realizavimą, tačiau pačios administracinės institucijos nėra įgalinamos aktyviai spręsti kylančias dilemas.

Atstovaujamosios biurokratijos nuostatos bent iš dalies gali padėti dekonstruoti, o potencialiai – ir spręsti, pasitikėjimo valstybės politinėmis, administracinėmis institucijomis ir tarnautojais problemas, itin aktualias lietuviškajam diskursui. Tradicinio viešojo administravimo principais grindžiama valstybės tarnyba suponuoja galimybes rasti jos ir visuomenės susvetimėjimui: specifinės darbo sąlygos viešajame sektoriuje, reikalaujamos savitos darbuotojų kompetencijos, legalistinės kultūros svarba, administracinių procedūrų mechanizmai, išskirtinės socialinės garantijos lemia viešojo sektoriaus valdymo sudėtingumą, valstybės tarnybos instituto uždarumą, sąlygas rasti nepasitikėjimui.

Kita Lietuvai aktuali atstovaujamosios biurokratijos problema – lygių galimybių principo realizavimas. Nors Lietuvos tarptautiniai įsipareigojimai, nacionalinė teisė, vykdomos specialiosios programos įtvirtina lygybę, lygiateisiškumo ir antidiskriminacinius principus, valstybės tarnyboje itin ryškus lyčių disbalansas. Valstybės tarnybos departamento teikiamų ataskaitų duomenys atskleidžia aiškias tendencijas: vyrų nuošimtis valstybės tarnyboje nuolat mažėja, tačiau tarp įstaigų vadovų dominuoja tarnautojai vyrai – jie užima 2/3 įstaigų vadovų postų. Atstovaujamosios biurokratijos principai rekomenduoja taikyti pozityvios diskriminacijos programas, turinčias užtikrinti, kad viešojo sektoriaus tarnautojų sudėtis atspindėtų demografines charakteristikas.

Pastaraisiais metais vykdytos Lietuvos valstybės tarnybos reformos daugiausia orientuotos į tarnybos racionalizavimo ir efektyvinimo problemas, tačiau pavieniai pokyčiai iš esmės neteikia jokių realių svėrų visuomenei aktyviau veikti valstybės tarnybos institutą. Valstybės tarnybos orientavimas į kompetencijas ir rezultatus negali kompensuoti jos jautrumo visuomenės lūkesčiams. Ir toliau intensyviai svarstomos valstybės tarnybos valdymo tobulinimo galimybės, ignoruojant biurokratijos atstovaujamosios idėjas, todėl neskatinamas valstybės tarnybos ir visuomenės dialogas, tarpusavio supratimas. Tai nėra tik demokratijos stokos problema, vis aktualesnė tampa įvairovės valdymo kaip būtinos biurokratijos efektyvumo sąlygos svarba.

Pagrindiniai žodžiai: atstovaujamoji biurokratija, valstybės tarnautojai, lygių galimybių, lytis.