



Munich Personal RePEc Archive

**Nozharov Sht., "Efficiency of human resources management in the field of cultural heritage protection", Conference Proceedings-XIII International Scientific conference "Management and Engineering '15", TU-Sofia, Volume I, 2015, pp.404-413;**

Nozharov, Shteryo

27 June 2015

Online at <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/72597/>  
MPRA Paper No. 72597, posted 21 Jul 2016 04:31 UTC

# "EFFICIENCY OF HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT IN THE FIELD OF CULTURAL HERITAGE PROTECTION"

**Asst.Prof. Shteryo Nozharov, Ph.D.,**

**Department of Economics, University of National and World Economy,  
Bulgaria, e-mail: [nozharov@unwe.bg](mailto:nozharov@unwe.bg)**

**Abstract:** The publication analyzes the possibilities of building a model for effective public administration management in the field of cultural heritage protection using 7S - model of McKinsey. Bulgaria is a country with rich cultural-archaeological heritage since Roman and Byzantine times. Significant numbers of cultural monuments are located on the territory of the country and are declared as "world cultural heritage" by UNESCO. In this regard, the failures of Bulgarian cultural heritage protection will be a threat for the world cultural heritage protection. The main objective of the study is to propose measures for development of management and control effectiveness of cultural heritage protection, carried out by the public administration (the staff of Bulgarian Ministry of culture).

**JEL Codes:** H11, H83, M54, Z11

**Keywords:** protection of cultural heritage, a model for effective management, human capital, public administration;

The effectiveness of human resources management in the field of cultural heritage protection has multi-aspect impact. On one hand, the potential of cultural tourism could not be utilized without the protection of movable and immovable objects of cultural-historic and archaeological heritage. On the other hand, the protection of cultural-historic and archaeological objects is relevant to issues, related to national identity as well as to the sustainable development in the context what is left to the future generations. This issue is of great importance also for Bulgaria, as a member of UNESCO and influences its international prestige.

Given that, the economic effects of protection, study and exposure of objects of cultural-historic and archaeological heritage could not be neglected. That is why the effectiveness of human resources management in the field of cultural heritage protection has many economic and managerial aspects, which could be considered as object and subject of scientific research.

**The main objective** of the study is to identify the hindrances that cause unsatisfied protection of Bulgarian cultural-historic heritage, due to the low effectiveness of human resources management. [1]

**The object of the paper** is the public administration that is responsible for the protection of Bulgarian cultural-historic heritage and **the subject** of the study corresponds with the functional and structural relationships and dependencies based on the model presented for management of public administration.

**The thesis** is based on the understanding that the amendment of the present model for human resources management in the field of cultural heritage protection could enhance the effectiveness of its protection, studying and exposure without any necessary financial resources or alternatively to be decreased which will lead to efficiency of the public budgetary costs in this sector.

**Restriction of the study** is the lack of enough information about human resources, employed at museums. Given that the research is focused on the central public administration that is involved in the protection of Bulgarian cultural-historic heritage at the Ministry of Culture.

**The main tasks of the study** are the following:

- to analyze the public administration impact, as a factor for Bulgarian cultural-historic heritage protection;
- to identify the weaknesses of the model for management and functioning of the public administration that is responsible for the protection of cultural-historic heritage and to propose measures for its development.

In **methodological aspect**, the system analysis is applied in the study. Based on the systematic approach, public administration is defined as a system consisting of relevant elements and exogenous and endogenous factors that impact its functioning. The main disadvantages of the system are identified and measures for their optimization are proposed.

The protection of Bulgarian cultural-historic heritage is related to the counteraction of criminal and administrative offenses that affect objects, consisting scientific, cultural and other information, which is necessary for their study and exposure.

The counteraction itself is carried out by the public administration of Ministry of Culture, Ministry of Interior and partly of the municipalities, which are outside bodies of the judicial system. The study and exposure is carried out mainly in scientific institutes, such as the National Institute for Archaeology with Museum (NAIM) at Bulgarian Academy of Science (BAS) and museums such as National History Museum (NHM), the regional historic and archaeological museums, municipal, private and other specialized museums.

This forms the present model for human resources management in the field of cultural heritage protection. In this regard, the analysis will be based on the McKinsey's „7S” model.[2] It enables the assessment and dynamic analysis of the changes in the functioning of every business or public system. Its main elements are: structure, strategy, system, skills, style, staff and shared values, but not the classical elements labor, capital, land, entrepreneurship that are applied for organizations' analysis.

The „7S” – model is based on the understanding that every organization functions optimally when the relations among these seven elements are synergistic and effective alone.

Independently of the conceptual hierarchy of the McKinsey's theory, in regard with the main object, formulated in the introduction of the study, the core issue of the system will be the human capital, discussed as “staff” in accordance with the „7S”-model and directly related to the „7S”-elements - „skill” and „style”. The implicit impact of this dynamic core of the system on its static elements (structure, strategy and system) will be revealed as well as the element “shared values” will be presented as a bounding one.

## **1. Staff**

The analysis of staff concerns defining the necessary optimal number of employees at the organization, compared to their present state. [2]

In accordance with the approved Rules by the Council of Ministers of Bulgaria, the total number of staff at the headquarters of Ministry of Culture during the last 15 years varies from 164 employees in 1999 to 147 employees in 2014, as their number is the lowest – 188 – in 2005. [3] The number of persons employed at Ministry of Culture is approximately 1% of the total number of staff at the whole public central administration of the country. [4]

The expert employees at Ministry of Culture, who are directly involved in the cultural heritage protection varies from 10 employees in the period 1999 – 2009 to 19 employees in the period 2009 – 2014, as their number is the highest in the period 2009 – 2012: 21 employees.

The staff with supporting functions in the field of cultural heritage protection and other main obligations at the headquarters of Ministry of Culture varies from 0 in 1999 to 12 employees in 2014.

In this regard the following conclusions can be made: the number of persons employed at the headquarters of Ministry of Culture, involved in cultural heritage protection as a percentage of the whole number of staff is 6% in 1999, 22% in 2009 and 21% in 2014.

As far as the data above is concerned, the Ministry's policy in this field is developed, but it does not correspond with better results in the frame of cultural heritage protection. Actually, in the period analyzed, lack of cultural heritage

protection is observed, as the criminality punishments in this field are under 1% of the total number of encroachments in Bulgaria. [5]

## 2. Skills

In the study, the element “skill” is defined as those essential skills and qualifications of staff, acquired as a result of education, training and experience, which are key factors for the present and future development of every organization. [2] Despite these key skills and qualifications, the element consists also of motivation, training and payment.

There is not enough data about the way (competition, reappointment or direct appointment) public officers are nominated at the central public administration, responsible for cultural heritage protection in the annual reports for the development of state administration for both the period analyzed (1999 – 2014) and as a whole. Such data is missing also in other public statements. In this regard, the data for the whole administration in the country, indicated in the annual reports for the development of public administration will be analogically adopted in the current research.

According to the annual report for the state administration for 2013, the most commonly applied method for nomination of public officers is *their reappointment to another position*. Approximately 1/3 of the employees are appointed in this way. The data for the previous year is the same.

Given the aforementioned, it can be concluded that at least one third of the staff at public administration, involved with cultural heritage protection are appointed without announcing a competition. This poses a risk of insufficient nomination of competent employees, who cover only the minimal requirements for the position and who will not be ranked if a competition procedure is announced.

The average monthly salary of persons employed at the central administration who do not exercise functions, related to euro funds reclamation, is 433 Euro to September 1<sup>st</sup> 2012, which is 15% more than the average monthly salary for the country. [6]

There is also not enough data for the evaluation of employees' performance, exercising functions in the field of cultural heritage protection and that is why for the analysis of the study, the general data for the whole administration will be used. According to the last updated data of the Annual report for the state administration in 2013, the largest share of maximum ratings of evaluation possess “Exceptional Performance” and “The performance exceeds the requirements” – 45% for 2013. The evaluation “The performance meets the requirements” possesses 52%. And the evaluations related to unacceptable and unsatisfied performance possess only 3%. The data for the previous year are almost the same as the deviation is 3%.

As a result, approximately half (45%) of the employees at Ministry of culture have over fulfilled their obligations, the other half of them have fulfilled their

obligations in accordance with the requirements (52%) and at the same time the criminal punishments in the field of cultural heritage protection are under 1%.

This raises some questions about the objectivity of staff performance evaluation. Actually the salaries of staff at Ministry of culture do not correspond to the results achieved.

Given the abovementioned low percentages of effectiveness of employees' performance, exercising functions in the field of cultural heritage protection, it is necessary to define what the main requirements for their qualification and education are and to identify what problems their performance ineffectiveness cause.

The main problem for the lack of sufficient minimum qualification is the absence of requirements for specialized education in the current regulations, related to the character of the position "expert in cultural heritage protection".

Such requirement has been for short adopted in 2009 in the first edition of article 16, paragraph 4 of the Law on cultural heritage, but few months later they have been revoked.

In common law, there is a requirement only for minimum degree of education – bachelor for lower positions and Master – for higher positions. [7] However, the specialty of education, such as archaeologists, architect, lawyer and etc. is not specified in the law. Such qualifications are necessary at specialized administrative-punishing bodies as the Inspectorate for cultural heritage protection at Ministry of culture. That is why, at this public body could be appointed persons such as composers, teachers, athletes, who have graduated teaching bachelor's degree or master's degree at musical academy.

As it was mentioned above, this corresponds with low effectiveness of employees' performance, involved in cultural heritage protection.

As a conclusion, there is no sufficient system for qualified personnel selection at the public administration responsible for cultural heritage protection that ensures the minimum level of staff competence so as they could fulfill their duties efficiently. These better salary payments attract many unskilled professionals who take advantage of the loopholes of the law and are appointed without announcing a competition, usually by reassignment from technical to expert position.

### **3. Shared values**

The element "shared values" in the study is defined as the view of the staff and its contribution for the development of the organization and the achievement of its main goals. [2] Key significance in this regard has also the strategy, ethical standards and company's values, which are related to the main goal of the organization.

The shared values of staff at public administration responsible for the cultural heritage protection must be oriented toward preservation of the historical memory,

national identity and scientific and cultural value of the objects that form the Bulgarian cultural heritage. [8]

In the annual report for 2013 of the Ministry of culture, it is indicated that during the whole year the inspectors, responsible for cultural heritage protection have drawn up only 12 acts for establishment of administrative violations in this area and at the same time these acts have not led to issuance of penal provisions and sanctioning of the violators.

For comparison, the inspectors, who are responsible for the copyright protection, whose number is lower than the number of inspectors, responsible for cultural heritage protection, have drawn up 180 acts for establishment of administrative violations and as a result 100 penal provision have been issued. [9]

In this regard, concerning the effectiveness of the results achieved compared to the number of persons employed, measured by real punitive and penal provisions issued for 2013, it is around zero.

Compared to the lower number and higher effectiveness of inspectors from the same public administration, responsible for the copyright protection, it can be proved that employees, responsible for cultural heritage protection are not motivated and do not share the values, targeted for their work and those which are established in the Law on cultural heritage.

#### **4. Style**

The element “style” in the study is defined as the way the directors manage the organization. [2]

The style of management could be presented by the frequency of amendments of the Rules of Ministry of culture, which defines the number and presence or absence of one or another administrative unit. For the whole analyzed fifteen years period, the structure of Ministry of culture, according to the Rules, has been amended in every two years and a half.

This means that every government makes at least one amendment of the Rules of Ministry of culture in the period of its mandate. This shows lack of sustainable management style and creates disturbances for the everyday work of the staff. Firstly it requires from them to understand the significance of each change and on the second place when the management is frequently replaced, it takes time for the staff to adapt to these changes.

The style of management could also be defined by the level of use of feedback on the effectiveness of the organization and its managers.

On the website of Ministry of culture there are only 6 annual reports for the analyzed 15 years period that sound unclear and common.

The style of management does not foresee the taxpayers to be informed how to spend their budget, ensuring the protection of the cultural heritage, related to the historical memory, national identity, international prestige of Bulgaria and cultural tourism.

## **5. Strategy**

The element “strategy” in the study is defined as the presence of long-term plan, consisting the main goals and necessary resources for their fulfillment. [2]

As a long-term strategic document in the field of cultural heritage protection is the National Strategy for the Development of Culture.

It must be underlined that till the preparation of the present study, such strategy has not been adopted yet. There is a project of this strategy since 2011, which is presented for public discussion and since then – four years this document is worked out and modified, but not adopted.

In this regard, the Law on cultural heritage for the six years since its adoption has been amended 14 times, which creates unpredictability and instability of the policy for Bulgarian cultural heritage protection. If there was a stable national strategic document, which outlines the direction for development of the law regulations, it would be much more stable and sustainable.

## **6. System**

The element “system” in the study is defined as the interrelated processes in the organization, modeled by its procedures. These processes directly impact the labor productiveness. [10]

The systematic processes for cultural heritage protection in the Ministry of culture are legally wrong established:

In accordance with article 15 of the Law on cultural heritage, the inspectors responsible for cultural heritage protection have only control functions.

On the other hand, however, the Rules of Ministry of culture (2014) impermissibly develop the Law, as in art. 23, paragraph 1, p. 2 obligate the inspectors to simultaneously perform “preliminary, current and subsequent control”, which means amalgamation of functions, conflict of interests and lack of objectivity.

On the next place, the Rules of Ministry of culture (2014) inadmissibly develop the Law, as in article 23, paragraph 1, p.3, p.14 and p.15 the inspectors are obliged to issue licenses, who in accordance with article 15 of the Law on cultural heritage must take control of themselves.

All of the mentioned above leads to absolutely wrong structuring of the systematic processes in the field of cultural heritage protection, which is a reason itself for the low effectiveness of the results in this area.

## **7. Structure**

The element “structure” in the study is defined as the way the elements of the organization refer to each other horizontally, vertically, centralized or equitably. [2]

As it was clarified in the previous section about systematic processes, directorate “Inspectorate for cultural heritage protection” at Ministry of culture,

controls its own activity while issuing licenses and at the same time carrying out preliminary, current and subsequent control over them.

On the other hand, there is a directorate “Cultural heritage” at Ministry of culture, established in accordance with article 24 of the Rules of the Ministry (2014), which neither issues licenses, nor controls their application and usage. Concerning its authority, it is clear that it works as a “luxury office” that forwards information to other departments and gives opinions on different issues that are not legal acts.

Actually this is completely wrong structure of the Ministry of culture, where one directorate (the Inspectorate) is overloaded with work and illegally amalgamates the functions of issuing licenses and controlling them, and at the same time another directorate (the Culture heritage) does not have any sufficient functions.

This explains the low effectiveness of the inspectors’ activity, who are buried in work to issue administrative licenses and to have no time to take control of them.

In order to be legal the structure of Ministry of culture, responsible for cultural heritage protection, it is necessary the Inspectorate for cultural heritage protection to have only current and subsequent controlling functions not issuing license documents, but the Cultural heritage directorate must take the functions of issuing administrative documents.

## **8. Conclusions:**

The main results of the research are the following:

- the number of staff responsible for cultural heritage protection at Ministry of culture, increases for the 15 years analyzed period, but this does not correspond with better control;

- when the number of staff responsible for cultural heritage protection is increased, the basic economic principle, concerning marginal units, must be met – each marginal unit must lead to better results and effectiveness and that is why the new employees must be nominated only if better results will be achieved;

- legal requirements for specialized qualification of staff involved in cultural heritage protection are missing, which fact explains the low effectiveness of work at Ministry of culture;

- the lack of relationship between staff performance evaluation in the field of cultural heritage protection and the results achieved, leads to lower motivation and ineffectiveness;

- the style of management is characterized with great dynamism, lack of sustainability and unpredictability;

- the absence of national strategy document for development of culture leads to instability and frequent amendment of the legal acts on cultural heritage;

-the system and structure of Ministry of culture are wrong established - the Inspectorate controls its own activity and issues license documents while the Cultural heritage directorate functions as a post-office.

The effectiveness of human resources management in the field of cultural heritage protection could be enhanced with the application of the measures proposed in the present study.

### References:

- [1] Nozharov Sht, „Economic dimensions of crime against cultural historical and archaeological heritage“, Research Papers, Publishing Complex – UNWE, Volume 1, 2015, p.125-168;
- [2] WATERMAN R.JR., PETERS T., and PHILLIPS J., “Structure Is Not Organization”, BUSINESS HORIZONS, June 1980, p.14-26;
- [3] Rules of Ministry of culture for the period 2009 – 2014;
- [4] Annual report for the development of the state administration for 2013; <http://www.strategy.bg/>
- [5] Nozharov Sht., Solarov N., Stambolova T., Stoyanov M., Balev B., “Guidelines for magistrates: Substantive legal and procedural aspects of practical work on crime related to the attack on cultural values, cultural heritage of Bulgaria”, National Institute of Justice /supported by America for Bulgaria Foundation and NGO Forum Association/, 2011;
- [6] Government decree №67/2010 for the salaries of budgetary organizations and activities;  
Government decree №46/2009 for the salaries of budgetary organizations and activities;  
Government decree №175/2007 for the salaries of budgetary organizations and activities;  
Regulation for the salaries of staff at the state administration;
- [7] Regulation for implementation of the classification of administrative positions, adopted by Government decree №129/2012;
- [8] Law on cultural heritage;
- [9] Ministry of culture, reports, <http://mc.government.bg/page.php?p=1&s=256&sp=0&t=0&z=0>, accessed on 03.2015;
- [10] Koralova, P., “Analysis of labor productivity in inland transport modes”, Conference proceedings, Borovetz, 2015, pp. III-49 – III-55, ISSN 1312-3823