

THE VALUE OF SOCIAL TECHNOLOGIES IN GOVERNANCE
AND ADMINISTRATION**Antanas Buračas ***

*Mykolo romerio universiteto ekonomikos ir finansų fakulteto Bankininkystės ir investicijų katedra
Ateities g. 20, 2057 Vilnius, LT-08303
Telefonas 370 684 68242
Elektroninis paštas antanas@buracas.com*

Pateikta 2007 m. vasario 20 d., parengta spausdinti 2007 m. gegužės 7 d.

Summary. The subject is the identification and criteria of the measurement of social technologies (ST) in governance as an intellectual resource having integrated judicial and economic contents. The applied methods and indicators of governance efficiency measurement interconnected with administration quality indicators incl. administrative law regulation are discussed. Some of governance indicators are suggested for the analysis of national administration systems.

The competitive abilities of new Baltic States on the basis of comparative knowledge assessment and governance efficiency methodologies used by the World Bank Institute are discussed on the basis of the integrative international evaluations.

Keywords: governance technologies, administration efficiency, evaluation criteria.

**1. DETERMINATION OF ST AS AN
INTELLECTUAL RESOURCES**

1.1. The task of this publication is to discuss the possible socio-economic approaches to governance, in particular, opportunities and criteria helping to evaluate the effects of its mechanisms or social technologies (ST). As a ST we mean all social regulation procedures and their combinations used and helping in supporting social institutions to achieve their tasks, fulfill their functions and structures to manage social structures. In particular, we can mention such ST as state judicial infrastructure and public administration procedures including those of their legal regulation and supervision; also working and pension systems, voting and election technologies, financial management and marketing solutions and so on. I expect to evaluate below only some of criteria adaptable for determining the special STies, in particular, directly interconnected with the governance and administration efficiency but not taking into account such global ST as economic privatization, changes in centralized governance and so on.

Under this approach, the administrative legal regulation, i.e. judicial acts, their adoption and application is an important component of those ST reglamenting the innovations (but not determining their creative value within production of the GNP). In this context, the fixation of measurable components and factors of the ST becomes important indicators of the social progress as a premise for deepening the analysis of social and economic development, revealing and protecting its factors within globalization impact. At the same time, the task of identification of the specific ST and their components are rather complicated but logically decisive stage for determining their impact on the society and, in particular, also on the economy. As an example of effective ST within administration may be mentioned and detailed, in particular, the procedures of codification of the judicial acts and regulations of institutions, their functions, principles of their management, settlements and interactions, projection, coordination and control of managerial and informational technologies and procedures, and so on (cf. A. Urmonas [1]; B.L. Berger [2] a/o.). In this context the contradictions between dispositive and imperative approaches usually enlarge the bureaucratism and diminish the efficiency of administrative solutions.

* Professor, Dr. Hab., Chair of Department of Banking and Investment, Mykolas Romeris University.

1.2. The realism in the statistical evaluations of ST and, in particular, in administration practice, is to appreciate only exact possibilities to measure the costs for them; but their output is usually difficult to evaluate adequately, in part because of their long-run and *a posteriori* side effects. Some of those are especially complicated, in particular systems of administrative law being in its essence also definite ST. The evaluations of intellectual capital factors determining specific technologies and, in particular, information technologies as well as their return effect to ST are wide spreading. Most far seeking are those integrative indicators like human development or comparative knowledge indices compounding the intellectual capital measurements and ordinalistic expert evaluations. Below we will try to generalize some achievements in this field.

2. INTELLECTUAL RESOURCES INDICATORS IDENTIFYING THE ST IN GOVERNANCE

2.1. Some influential originators of the IR measurement and evaluations of their productivity, p. ex., Karl-Erik Sveiby (see: <http://www.sveiby.com>[3]), classify the structural, human and relational capital (intra-organizational relationships and linkages) components of the intellectual resources (IR) as a decisive factors of the ST.

Following infrastructural indicators would be mentioned, as an example, within the context of ST applied in the fields of administrative law (table 2.1.):

Table 2.1. The infrastructural indicators of the IR applicable to administrative law ST

	<i>Human capital</i>	<i>Structural resources</i>	<i>Relational value*</i>
<i>Intellectual assets</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. % of population with judicial education within higher education. 2. % of population using computer for profess. activity. 3. % of employment in legal activity within knowledge intensive activities. 4. Skills and experiences measured by years employed in legal activities. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Quality of national legal administration system. 2. Quality of governance at level of companies. 3. Parameters determining economic freedom (World Econ Forum). 4. Internal databases used in administration and legal activity as % of all national DB. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Registered intellect. property (patents, copyrights, design a/o authorship rights) and legal procedures reglamenting it. 2. Co-operation in innovation and software in legal administrative activity. 3. Net of loyal customers (or profitability per customer) in legal administration sectors. 4. International mobility of students (exchanges) in administration specialties.
<i>Capabilities and investments into ST</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. % of expenditures on professional legal education in all expenses for education and in GDP. 2. % of expenditures on real intellectual assets of legal administration in GDP. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Expenditures for IT (specialized DB and software for IC) in law sectors. 2. in law sectors. 4. Patents, know-how, licensees bought in law sectors. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implementation, transfer and creation of ST in administration. 2. Development of infrastructural networks in administration. 3. Joint ventures with foreign firms in the SMEs within legal administrative activity.
<i>Effects of intellectual resources</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Incomes (honorary and salaries) per hour worked in legal administration. 2. Incomes (honorary and salaries) per employee in law sectors. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. % of law companies using internet and judicial innovations for administrative business. 2. % of new enterprises in law sectors. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Changes in GDP indices interconnecting with administrative reforms. 2. Changes in GDP resulting from adaptation of the EU administrative practice.

Sources used for criteria determination: Buracas A., 1986 [4]; Sveiby K.-E., 2005 [3]; Urmonas A., 2006 [1].

From 2004, the European Commission publishes every spring the 38 structural indicators of the intellectual development and IC as the basis for the measuring progress of structural, human and relational capital (intra-organizational relationships and linkages) were separated. This system of IC indicators is presented below in a modified form (some indirect indicators not measuring the IC were not included, and few added, see table 1.1). It is based on component-by-component evaluation of some existing indicators and grouping them according to operational goals what is undoubtedly rational, aiming to deepen the analysis of knowledge society development, as a result, deserves to be studied more carefully and developed.

2.2. The evaluations of the intellectual resources (IR) and, as a result, of their return usually and mostly are based on changes in the balance sheets or stock market valuations (as a difference between their market capitalizations quoted on stock exchanges and stockholders' equity amount in the finance balance value). It measures the value of brand and/or firm's name, disposable patents, experience of management, client loyalty and other undifferentiated factors. This approach is applicable also to the ST in the administrative law sector if to ignore the reliability of data (i.e. to evaluate mostly on the expert conclusions). It means that comparisons of IC amounts in those cases are mostly based on the rankings.

The weighing of the IC in financial standards was successfully continued by the Skandia group of researchers using up to 164 measures (91 new IC metrics plus 73 traditional ones) to measure the five areas making up the Navigator model [5]. Those systems under review are serving in identifying, valuing, and leveraging the IC mostly on macro level. But their criteria are suitable to apply for evaluations of possible impact of the ST in administration activities. This is innovative approach less adaptable for the sectoral statistics of intellectual resources and their productive indicators; besides, the data concerning the Baltic States are not comparable with the EU or the OECD countries so as they are presented not in full amount (absent information on venture capital, administration and some other indicators) and they are less reliable as a result of much wider sector of the shadow economies. The best new ideas in such states, on the one side, are often patented through partners and/or published in more rich countries if not to speak about other multiple forms of brain drain through the information sector (IS) development. On the other side, many ST adopted in more developed regions of the EU are just applied directly in the administrative practice of states - new members.

2.3. When evaluating innovations a/o IC parameters and indicators of the ST in administration, is important to mention the *Knowledge assessment methodology* (KAM) developed by the World Bank group [6]. It consists in the system of 80 structural and qualitative variables to measure countries' performance on the four knowledge economy (KE) pillars:

- economic incentive;
- institutional administration,
- education and innovation,
- and information & communications technology.

The KAM was designed by the *Knowledge for development program* (WB Institute) to proxy a country's preparedness to compete in the knowledge economy. The comparisons were undertaken for a group of 128 countries, which includes most of the OECD and more than 90 developing countries [6].

Table 2.2. Comparative Knowledge Economy Indexes (KEI) in 1995-2004

Country, 2004	KEI 2004/1995	Econ. incentive regime, 2004/1995	Innovation, 2004/1995	Education, 2004/1995	ICT, 2004/1995
Estonia	8.05/7.78	7.95/7.94	7.29/7.27	8.14/7.93	8.83/7.97
Lithuania	7.26/6.05	7.24/5.20	6.46/6.21	8.32/7.10	7.01/5.70
Latvia	7.06/5.72	6.98/5.64	6.12/3.79	8.11/7.18	7.02/6.26
Poland	6.94/6.38	6.70/4.84	6.15/6.23	8.32/7.96	6.60/6.51
Belarus	4.93/4.94	1.06/1.88	5.836.77	7.64/7.93	5.20/3.16

Source: *Knowledge for Development* (K2D), WB Group, 2006 [6]. Knowledge index measures a country's

ability to generate, adopt and diffuse knowledge; population weights the key variables.

The changes of KE indexes and main their ingredients as an illustration on the statistics of new Baltic States and some of their neighbours are presented in the tables 2.2 and 2.3. The data show the closing approach of economic incentives and innovation parameters between the new Baltic States, between them and Poland within this period; Belarus also accelerated its development in this context (table 2.2) but KEI as an aggregated index do not changed and not ameliorated its position like in the Baltics and Poland.

3. THE EFFECTIVENESS OF GOVERNANCE AS ST WITHIN ADMINISTRATION

3.1. The international researches on improving of governance and controlling corruption within 1996-2005 were initiated by the WB Institute and based on multicriterial approaches and strategic evaluations. They are also suggesting the identification of the effectiveness of the ST in the administration systems. The last evaluations were based on responses from many international institutions, over 120,000 citizens, enterprises and experts worldwide, provided by 25 different organisations worldwide. As an example, below are presented the values of main indicators of governance for selected Baltic countries comparing them with neighbouring Poland and Byelorussia (cf. table 3.1).

Table 3.1. Governance Effectiveness (Eastern Europe & Baltics region, end 2005)

Indicators by countries	VA	PS	GE	RQ	RL	CC
Estonia	84	67	83	91	75	80
Lithuania	73	77	76	83	64	64
Latvia	73	74	73	79	61	66
Poland	84	54	71	72	60	61
Belarus	5	45	11	6	15	19

Source: Kaufmann D.a/o. [7]. VA - voice and accountability, the extent to which a country's citizens are able to participate in selecting their government, as well as freedom of expression, freedom of association, and free media. PS - political stability, perceptions of the likelihood that the government will be destabilized or overthrown by unconstitutional or violent means, including political violence and terrorism. GE - governance effectiveness, the quality of public services, the quality of the civil service and the degree of its independence from political pressures, the quality of policy formulation and implementation, and the credibility of the government's commitment to such policies. RQ - regulatory quality, the ability of the government to formulate and implement sound policies and regulations that permits and promotes private sector development. RL - rule of law, the extent to which agents have confidence in and abide by the rules of society, and in particular the quality of contract enforcement, the police, and the courts, as well as the likelihood of crime and violence.

CC – control of corruption, the extent to which public power is exercised for private gain, including both petty and grand forms of corruption, as well as “capture” of the state by elites and private interests. For further details, see: www.govindicators.org.

Such ST in administration interconnected with determination of governance of competence, esp. in the administrative institutions or financial management, also the quality of civil right protection and court decisions, the quality of contract enforcement - in problematic and conflict situations with some dysfunction effects -, merit of special attention so as help to create analytical and evaluation systems of wide profile.

From the data presented, it is possible to evaluate, according to the international experts, the distance between Belarus and Baltic States administration effectiveness that started last 15 years about from the same level of social development but on the basis of different ST of administration. Especially impressive it becomes in fields of governance effectiveness and regulatory quality, also voice and accountability. At the same time, Baltic States by most of indicators now lead against Poland long years being ahead of them.

The composite indicators of the governance effectiveness in Lithuania, in some degree characterizing the suitability of the ST in administration incl. administrative law, according to the WB Institute evaluations, are presented within table 3.2.

Table 3.2. The Changes of Governance Indicators for Lithuania in 1996-2005

Governance Indicator	Year	Percentile Rank (0-100)	Estimate (-2.5 to + 2.5)	Standard Error	Number of surveys/polls
Voice and Accountability	2005	73.4	+0.90	0.11	10
	2004	77.3	+0.98	0.11	11
	1996	69.2	+0.71	0.19	4
Political Stability/No Violence	2005	76.9	+0.88	0.22	8
	2004	77.4	+0.85	0.21	10
	1996	57.5	+0.44	0.36	3
Government Effectiveness	2005	76.1	+0.85	0.14	11
	2004	75.1	+0.72	0.13	12
	1996	55.2	-0.16	0.19	4
Regulatory Quality	2005	83.2	+1.13	0.17	11
	2004	84.7	+1.18	0.17	11
	1996	58.8	+0.28	0.28	5
Rule of Law	2005	63.8	+0.46	0.13	14
	2004	64.9	+0.53	0.12	15
	1996	52.2	-0.19	0.17	6
Control of Corruption	2005	64.0	+0.26	0.13	11
	2004	67.6	+0.36	0.13	12
	1996	53.7	-0.12	0.29	3

Source: Kaufmann D. a/o. [7], op. cit.

All the parameters show the unquestionable progress in applying the administrative procedures and technologies in the social practice of Lithuania within 1996-2005 and some stability of most of the evaluations if to compare 2004 and 2005. It can be interpreted as a sign of the applicability of those criterial approaches for the comparative tasks when evaluating other aspects and/or components of the administrative ST in the researches to be continued in this field.

3.3. Comparative long-run changes of some governance indicators most important in the aspect of the administrative technologies evaluations are presented in the table 3.3 (for the group of Baltic States and Poland). The percentile rank of *regulatory quality* does not changed substantially in Estonia, its estimate – about 20 points, but standard error declined twice. In Lithuania the estimate grew 4 times and in Latvia – 2.5 times, in Poland – twice. As a result of different rates of growth, Baltics overcome Poland level of estimates and percentile rank in this income group.

The estimates of *voice and accountability* in Estonia grew 1.5 times and percentile rank – about 13 points, the estimates in Latvia grew twice and percentile rank – about 10 points, in Lithuania and in Poland the estimates grew less but to about the same level the standard error declined twice. The estimates of *government effectiveness* in Estonia grew twice and its percentile rank – about 10 points, the estimates in Latvia also grew twice and percentile rank – about 30 points. Much more significant the estimates grew in Lithuania – about 5 times and the percentile rank – about 21 points; in Poland they grew less but to about the same level. The standard error estimates declined in all cases.

3.4. Not less interesting are the sources and components measuring the governance in selected countries on the basis of metatheoretic approaches helping to integrate criteria used by different authoritative institutions including international ones. The influential attempts in this connection were presented methodologically determining the intellectual resources in sources mentioned above by K. Sveiby [3], Scandia [5] and WB [6] Groups, a/o as well as in other publications by G. Roos [14], a/o international teams [11], [12].

Below in the annexes there are opportunities to compare the criteria used for the governance evaluations by some authoritative institutions, such as *World Economic Forum* (appendix 1, 1a, also <http://www.eiu.com>; <http://www.ifc.org/ifcext/economics.nsf/Content/IC-WBESConditions>), and applied by them ST, like *Global Insight's Business Conditions and Risk Indicators* (cf. <http://www.globalinsight.com>). Only specialized information or technologies on particular governance indicators such as *Global E-Government Index* (op.cit., p. 62) were chosen from some specific institutions (p.ex., from *Freedom House* when calculating detailed information on press and other mass media).

Table 3.3. The Changes of Main Governance Components for Selected Countries, 1996-2005*

Country	Income Category	Year	Regulatory Quality			Rule of Law		
			Estimate	Percentile Rank (0-100)	Standard Error	Estimate	Percentile Rank (0-100)	Standard Error
ESTONIA	Upper Middle Income	2005	+1.43	91.1	0.16	+0.82	75.4	0.12
		2004	+1.45	90.1	0.16	+0.88	80.3	0.12
		2003	+1.45	91.1	0.16	+0.74	70.7	0.13
		2002	+1.40	87.7	0.17	+0.72	70.7	0.13
		2000	+1.24	89.2	0.31	+0.63	69.7	0.14
		1998	+0.95	83.7	0.30	+0.44	64.4	0.19
		1996	+1.23	90.2	0.28	+0.30	63.2	0.17
LATVIA	Upper Middle Income	2005	+1.03	78.7	0.17	+0.43	61.4	0.13
		2004	+1.05	79.8	0.17	+0.45	63.9	0.12
		2003	+1.01	78.8	0.17	+0.49	64.9	0.13
		2002	+0.90	76.4	0.18	+0.36	63.0	0.13
		2000	+0.46	66.0	0.34	+0.09	56.3	0.15
		1998	+0.63	69.0	0.30	-0.04	56.7	0.19
		1996	+0.45	68.6	0.28	+0.14	58.9	0.17
LITHUANIA	Upper Middle Income	2005	+1.13	83.2	0.17	+0.46	63.8	0.13
		2004	+1.18	84.7	0.17	+0.53	64.9	0.12
		2003	+1.09	82.8	0.17	+0.52	66.3	0.13
		2002	+1.01	80.3	0.18	+0.41	63.5	0.13
		2000	+0.50	68.5	0.34	+0.18	59.1	0.14
		1998	+0.14	48.8	0.30	+0.07	59.6	0.19
		1996	+0.28	58.8	0.28	-0.19	52.2	0.17
POLAND	Upper Middle Income	2005	+0.82	72.3	0.16	+0.32	59.9	0.12
		2004	+0.77	73.9	0.16	+0.41	62.5	0.11
		2003	+0.54	67.5	0.16	+0.51	65.9	0.12
		2002	+0.62	69.5	0.17	+0.51	65.4	0.12
		2000	+0.64	72.4	0.31	+0.54	68.3	0.13
		1998	+0.75	76.4	0.23	+0.49	65.9	0.17
		1996	+0.38	63.2	0.22	+0.42	65.6	0.15

Source: cf. [9], [10]. *Regulatory ability* of the government is measured by its might to formulate and implement sound policies and regulations. The *rule of law* is measured by quality of contract enforcement, the police adequacy, and the court decisions rationality.

The situation of *rule of law* is about similar, however the estimates in Estonia for upper middle incomes grew more than 2.5 times and percentile rank – 12 proc. About the same growth was in Latvia and Lithuania (the percentile rank in this income group was less stable but at about the same level). On the contrary to this trend, the estimates and percentile rank in Poland mostly declined. The standard error of evaluations declined in all the countries.

* By percentile rank estimates for middle income groups.

Table 3.4. The Changes of Additional Governance Components for Selected Countries, 1996-2005 *

Country	Income Category	Year	Voice and Accountability			Government Effectiveness		
			Estimate	Percentile Rank (0-100)	Standard Error	Estimate	Percentile Rank (0-100)	Standard Error
ESTONIA	Upper Middle Income	2005	+1.05	84.1	0.12	+1.03	82.8	0.14
		2004	+1.10	84.1	0.11	+0.95	78.9	0.13
		2003	+0.99	78.7	0.12	+1.04	81.8	0.14
		2002	+0.97	78.7	0.14	+0.82	77.5	0.14
		2000	+0.89	74.4	0.16	+1.04	82.3	0.19
		1998	+0.78	71.0	0.19	+0.45	71.8	0.26
		1996	+0.72	71.2	0.19	+0.53	73.8	0.19
LATVIA	Upper Middle Income	2005	+0.89	72.9	0.12	+0.68	73.2	0.14
		2004	+0.96	75.8	0.11	+0.64	72.7	0.14
		2003	+0.94	75.4	0.13	+0.74	75.1	0.15
		2002	+0.86	74.4	0.14	+0.71	73.7	0.14
		2000	+0.84	71.0	0.17	+0.29	65.6	0.20
		1998	+0.73	69.6	0.19	+0.24	67.0	0.26
		1996	+0.46	62.5	0.19	-0.34	44.8	0.19
LITHUANIA	Upper Middle Income	2005	+0.90	73.4	0.11	+0.85	76.1	0.14
		2004	+0.98	77.3	0.11	+0.72	75.1	0.13
		2003	+0.99	79.2	0.12	+0.77	77.0	0.14
		2002	+0.85	73.4	0.14	+0.64	72.2	0.14
		2000	+0.96	77.3	0.17	+0.46	68.9	0.19
		1998	+0.86	72.9	0.19	+0.20	66.0	0.26
		1996	+0.71	69.2	0.19	-0.16	55.2	0.19
POLAND	Upper Middle Income	2005	+1.04	83.6	0.11	+0.58	71.3	0.13
		2004	+1.13	86.0	0.11	+0.60	71.3	0.13
		2003	+1.05	82.1	0.12	+0.65	72.7	...

Note: cf. [9], [10]. *Voice and accountability* indicator measures the effectiveness of election procedures and so on. The *governance effectiveness* indicator measures the quality of public services, the quality of the civil service and the degree of its independence from political pressures, the quality of policy formulation and implementation, and the credibility of the government's commitment to such policies.

It is important to mention when comparing composite criteria of governance that the opinion of the influential institutions coincides mentioning the intensity (in original determined as a quality) of bureaucracy between decisive ones (appendix 2). Important is also application of such criteria as stability and efficiency of government, public spending structure, also global e-government, management of state debt and some of less measurable social variables, as trust in government or decentralization, legislative and executive transparency.

The differences in criteria used for evaluation of governance are suggestive for the methodological pur-

poses when widening their application in the interconnected fields and ST.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Social technologies and, in particular, those applied in the administration systems, might be interpreted as an intellectual resources integrating important judicial features. In this context, the measurable structural indicators of these ST may be applied for the evaluation of their efficiency, comparative impact on the macroeconomic development and so on helping to expert more deeply the globalization processes.

2. The assessments of knowledge and governance indexes applied for comparative international evaluations by the research groups of the World Bank Institute are not only interesting by themselves but also as a methodological ground. Important are the results of integrating the cardinal and ordinal evaluations into ST when evaluating very complicated processes of governance esp. comparing them by scaling on the wide international level.

* By percentile rank estimates for middle income groups.

3. Some of the criteria used in the evaluations of the administrative ST may be successfully applied within other fields, p.ex., for the detailed analysis of the efficiency of the intellectual resources in the education or other sectors.

LITERATURE

1. **Urmonas A.** *Socialinių technologijų konceptualių modelių pritaikymo paieška teisėje*. Pranešimo MRU konferencijoje *Socialinės technologijos administracinėje teisėje* (2006 m. spalio 10 d) rankraštis.
2. **Berger P. L., Luckmann Th.** *Socialinės tikrovės konstravimas* Vilnius: Pradai, 1999.
3. **Sveiby K.-E.** *Methods for Measuring Intangible Assets*, 2004 <http://www.sveiby.com/Portals/0/articles/IntangibleMethods.htm>
4. **Buračas A.** *Metaeconomics and Social Preferences*. Moscow-New Dehli, 1987.
5. **Measuring Intellectual Capital at Skandia Group**. www.fpm.com/script/UK/Jun93/930602.htm
6. **Knowledge for Development (K2D)**, WB Group 2006. <http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/WBI/WBIPROGRAMS>
7. **Kaufmann D., Kraay A., Mastruzzi M.** *Governance Matters V: Governance Indicators for 1996-2005*. <http://www.worldbank.org/wbi/governance/govmatters5>.
8. **Good A.** *Canadian International Development Agency: Corporate Managing for Development Results*, 2006. <http://www.mfdr.org/sourcebook/7-2CanadianInternational.pdf>
9. **Indicators for the Information Society in the Baltic Region** (2005). Nordic Council of Ministers. Copenhagen. <http://www.norden.org/pub/uddannelse/IT/TN2005577.pdf>
10. **Information Technologies in Lithuania, 2005**. Vilnius <http://www.stat.gov.lt/lt/catalog/viewfree/?id=141>.
11. **The Intellectual Capital of the European Union. Measuring the Lisbon agenda**. Holland University, 2004. www.intellectualcapital.nl/artikelen/ICofEU2004.pdf.
12. **Intellectual Capital for Communities in the Knowledge Economy: Nations, Regions, Cities and Emerging Communities**, 2006. info.worldbank.org/etools/library/latestversion.asp?145273
13. **Andriessen D. G., Stamma C. G.** *The Intellectual Capital of the European Union / Measuring the Lisbon Agenda*, 2004. <http://www.intellectualcapital.nl/artikelen/ICofEU2004.pdf>.
14. **Roos G.** *An Intellectual Capital Primer*, 2003. http://www.euintangibles.net/library/localfiles/Roos_AnIntellectualCapitalPrimer.PDF

VADYBOS IR ADMINISTRAVIMO SOCIALINIŲ TECHNOLOGIJŲ (ST) VERTĖ

Antanas Buračas *

Santrauka

ST vadyboje atskleidžiamos per jose taikomų intelektinio kapitalo (IC) komponentų identifikavimą, jų sąveiką ir implikaciją, tarp jų ir administravimo bei teisės reguliatorių.

* Mykolo Romerio universiteto Ekonomikos ir finansų valdymo fakulteto Bankininkystės ir investicijų katedros vedėjas prof. habil. dr.

Aptariamos IC efektyvumo bei vadybos socialinių matavimų sistemos padeda tiksliau įvertinti administravimo technologijų (tarp jų teisinio reglamentavimo ir jo infrastruktūros išteklių) poveikį socialiniams pokyčiams. Žinių vadybos prioritetai XXI a. daug kur dar apsiriboja teisine intelektinio turto bei jo apsaugos samprata, būdinga XX a. autorių teisių normoms, ir tai iškreipia svarbiausių išmatuojamų struktūrinių socioekonominių pokyčių tendencijas, mastus, pažangos mechanizmus. Pristatomos ir diskutuojamos originalios kai kurių kriterijų bei rodiklių sistemos, taikytinos vertinant intelektinius išteklius vadyboje ir administravime, jų prioritetai ir probleminės kryptys, plėtojamos Pasaulio Banko instituto ir kitose tarptautinėse studijose. Nustatyta, kad, pvz., per pastarąjį dešimtmetį (1996–2005) Baltijos valstybių svarbiausių vadybos sudedamųjų (administracinio reguliavimo kokybės ir veiksmingumo, įstatymų poveikio) išmatuotos reikšmės akivaizdžiai pagerėjo (tuo tarpu išmatuotų rodiklių standartinė paklaida sumažėjo).

Tikslinga plačiau tirti skirtingų intelektinės bei socialinės plėtros vertybių ir jų taikymo vadybos bei administravimo ST suderinamumo prielaidas, jų teisinį reglamentavimą, atsižvelgiant į tarptautinių lyginamųjų studijų patirtį. Pripažįstama, kad jau naudojamos tarptautinėje praktikoje vadybos bei administravimo ST rodiklių vertinimo metodikos gali būti modifikuotos bei plačiau pritaikytos administracinio reguliavimo ir jo veiksmingumo vertinimams Baltijos šalyse.

Pagrindinės sąvokos: vadybos technologijos, administravimo veiksmingumas, vertinimo kriterijai.

Voice and Accountability

Firms are usually informed clearly and transparently by the Government on changes in policies affecting their industry

Newspapers can publish stories of their choosing without fear of censorship or retaliation

When deciding upon policies and contracts, Government officials favor well-connected firms

Extent of direct influence of legal contributions to political parties on specific public policy outcomes

Effectiveness of national Parliament/Congress as a law making and oversight institution

Political Stability

The threat of terrorism in the country imposes significant costs on business

New Governments honor commitments of previous Governments

Likelihood of dramatic changes in institutions

The highest power is always peacefully transferred

Government coups or political instability as an obstacle to development (GCSA)

Tribal conflict as an obstacle for business development (GCSA)

Government Effectiveness

Competence of public sector personnel

Quality of general infrastructure

Quality of public schools

Time spent by senior management dealing with government officials

Public Service vulnerability to political pressure

Wasteful government expenditure

Strength and expertise of the civil service to avoid drastic interruptions in government services in times of political instability (GCSA)

Government economic policies are independent of pressure from special interest groups.

Source: <http://www.weforum.org>

Regulatory Quality

Administrative regulations are burdensome

Tax system is distortionary

Import barriers as obstacle to growth

Competition in local market is limited

It is easy to start company

Anti monopoly policy is lax and ineffective

Environmental regulations hurt competitiveness

Cost of tariffs imposed on business

Government subsidies keep uncompetitive industries alive artificially

Complexity of Tax System

Domestic banks are protected from foreign competition

Barriers to entry in banking sector are very high

Interest rates are heavily regulated

Private sector participation in infrastructure projects is not permitted

Costs of uncertain rules, laws, or government policies (GCSA)

Transfer costs associated with exporting capital as an obstacle to business (GCSA)

General uncertainty on costs of regulations as an obstacle to business (GCSA)

Openness of public sector contracts to foreign investors (GCSA)

Policies for dividend remittances as obstacles to development (GCSA)

Dominance of state owned or state controlled enterprises (GCSA)

State interference in private business (GCSA)

Regulatory discretionality (GCSA)

Price controls as an obstacle to business development (GCSA)

Regulations on foreign trade as an obstacle to business development (GCSA)

Foreign currency regulations as an obstacle to business development (GCSA)

Rule of Law

Common crime imposes costs on business

Organized crime imposes costs on business

Money laundering through banks is pervasive

Money laundering through non-banks is pervasive

Quality of Police

Insider trading is pervasive

The judiciary is independent from political influences of government, citizens, or firms

Legal framework to challenge the legality of government actions is inefficient

Intellectual Property protection is weak

Protection of financial assets is weak

Illegal donation to parties are frequent

Private businesses are more likely to settle disputes outside courts.

Compliance with court rulings and /or arbitration awards (GCSA)

Legal system effectiveness at enforcing commercial contracts (GCSA)

Citizens' willingness to accept legal means to adjudicate disputes rather than depending on physical force or illegal means (GCSA)

Percentage of firms which are unofficial or unregistered / Tax evasion

Control of Corruption

Public trust in financial honesty of politicians

Extent to which legal contributions to political parties are misused by politicians

Diversion of public funds due to corruption is common

Frequency of bribery in the economy

Frequent for firms to make extra payments connected to: public utilities, tax payments, loan applications, awarding of public contracts, influencing laws, policies regulations, decrees, getting favourable judicial decisions

Extent to which firms' illegal payments to influence government policies impose costs on other firms

Extent to which influence of powerful firms with political ties impose costs on other firms

Source: <http://www.weforum.org>

Appendix 2. Comparisons of Main Criteria Fixing Governance Component

Representative Sources

- DRI** A14 *Government Instability*: An increase in government personnel turnover rate at senior levels that reduces the GDP growth rate by 2% during any 12-month period.
Government Ineffectiveness: A decline in government personnel quality at any level that reduces the GDP growth rate by 1% during any 12-month period.
Institutional Failure: A deterioration of government capacity to cope with national problems as a result of institutional rigidity that reduces the GDP growth rate by 1% during any 12-month period.
- EGV** A13 Global E-government
- EIU** A9 Quality of bureaucracy
Excessive bureaucracy / red tape
- GCS** A28 Public Spending Composition
Quality of general infrastructure
Quality of public schools
Time spent by senior management dealing with government officials
- MIG** A21 Quality of Bureaucracy.
- PRS** A23 *Bureaucratic Quality*. Measures institutional strength and quality of the civil service, assess how much strength and expertise bureaucrats have and how able they are to manage political alternations without drastic interruptions in government services, or policy changes.
- WMO** A15 *Policy consistency and forward planning*: How confident businesses can be of the continuity of economic policy stance - whether a change of government will entail major policy disruption, and whether the current government has pursued a coherent strategy.
Bureaucracy : An assessment of the quality of the country's bureaucracy. The better the bureaucracy the quicker decisions are made and the more easily foreign investors can go about their business.

Non-representative Sources

- ADB A1 Management of public debt
Policies to improve efficiency of public sector
Revenue Mobilization
Budget Management
- AFR A2 Based on your experiences, how easy or difficult is it to obtain household services (like electricity or telephone)?
Based on your experiences, how easy or difficult is it to obtain an identity document (like birth certificate, passport)?
Government handling of health services
Government handling of education
- ASD A3 Civil service
Revenue Mobilization and Budget Management
Management and Efficiency of Public Expenditures
- BPS A5 How problematic are telecommunications for the growth of your business
How problematic is electricity for the growth of your business.
How problematic is transportation for the growth of your business.
- BRI A6 Bureaucratic delays
- BTI A4 Consensus Building
Governance Capability
Effective Use of Resources
- CPIA A8 Management of external debt
Quality public Administration
Revenue Mobilization
Budget Management
- FHT A11 *Government and Administration*: Government decentralization, independent and responsibilities or local and regional governments, and legislative and executive transparency are discussed.
- LBO A20 Trust in Government
- WCY A18 Government economic policies do not adapt quickly to changes in the economy
The public service is not independent from political interference
Government decisions are not effectively implemented
Bureaucracy hinders business activity
The distribution infrastructure of goods and services is generally inefficient
Policy direction is not consistent