DOI: 10.17573/cepar.2019.1.09 1.01 Original scientific article

A Comparative Research on Municipal Voluntary Tasks of Three Hungarian and Slovenian Municipalities[1]

Marianna Nagy, István Hoffman, Dorottya Papp, Evelin Burján, Kristóf B. Cseh, Tamás Dancs, Andrea Jugovics, Anita Kiss, Melitta Lévay, Lilla Matos, Csaba Molnár, Noémi Német, Dávid Ökrös, Zsolt R. Vasas

Eötvös Loránd University (Budapest), Faculty of Law, Department of Administrative Law, Hungary

nagym@ajk.elte.hu, hoffman.istvan@ajk.elte.hu, dorottyapapp93@gmail.com

https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3688-412X

https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6394-1516

https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4043-966X

Received: 7. 9. 2018
Accepted: 20. 2. 2019

ABSTRACT

The article summarizes the similarities and differences in voluntary task management of municipalities. For this purpose, we carried out empirical research in three Hungarian and three Slovenian municipalities. Our main objective was to discover which economic and social factors influence the scope of voluntary tasks in Hungary and in Slovenia. We separately analysed six sectors of municipal services, with regard to the different size of the municipalities. Likewise, we only covered the major sectors in which voluntary tasks are most likely to appear and therefore can serve as a basis for comparative analysis. The analysis gradually verified the initial hypothesis of our research that voluntary tasks management is more likely to be present in cities with larger economic powers and is remarkably profounder in municipalities of touristic importance.

Keywords: *public services, decentralisation, municipal tasks, voluntary municipal tasks, Hungary, Slovenia*

JEL: 118

1 This article is a result of the project no.6. „Public service development to enable good governance" supported by KÖFOP-2.1.2-VEKOP-16-2016-00001. The research was supported by the János Bolyai Research Scholarship of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and by the ÚNKP-18-4 New National Excellence Program of the Ministry of Human Capacities. We would like to hereby say thanks for the help and contribution to our questionnaire and research to the following officers: Imre Kecső, mayor, Kesznyéten; István Kenéz, mayor, Tamás Kovács, PhD, municipal clerk, Balatonlelle; Rebeka Szabó, deputy mayor, Tamás Tarjányi, PhD, deputy municipal clerk, Mária Bondorné Gyurcsi, head of department, Attila Czakó, PhD, head of department, Zugló, XIVth district of Budapest; Ludvik Orban, mayor, Občina Hodoš; Janez Fajfar, mayor, and Matjaž Berčon municipal director, Občina Bled; Mateja Cekić, acting municipal director, Nataša Sluga, head of department, Brigita Gajzer Pliberšek, head of department, Mojca Petek, advisor, and Tjasa Krunič, advisor, Mestna občina Maribor.

1 Introduction

Local self-government is an important dimension of contemporary good governance. Therefore, a study was conducted about the voluntary tasks of comparable municipalities in Hungary and Slovenia, where students took part within the research project co-funded by the Hungarian scientific institutions.

In our research we put an emphasis on the fact that the presence of facultative tasks serves as a tool of self-governance in the continental local government systems (Pálné Kovács, 2016, p. 585). Despite the general clause of local public affairs, the central administration gained more influence on municipal tasks due to the emerge of the "service-providing" and then the "regulatory" administration in the past few decades (Marcou and Verebély, 1993. pp. 237–240). Given a glance to European regulations determining compulsory municipal tasks, we can conclude that freedom to local service management is generally restricted. On the contrary, the central regulations regarding voluntary tasks are less overwhelming, thus, the municipalities have a broader ground for facultative task management. To add more, these are the aspects in which the municipalities can show off their own character, build a unique image.

One of the most important tools of this characterisation is the definition and provision of the facultative (non-mandatory) municipal tasks. These tasks could be analysed hardly and it is related to the freely chosen nature of these tasks. Therefore the legal regulation on the facultative task in the municipal codes of the European (continental) countries are very concise. The voluntary commitment of local affairs is allowed by these legal acts, and several restrictions and limits are stated, by which the provision of the mandatory tasks is secured (Hoffman, 2015, pp. 88-90). Therefore the main aim of our research was to do a 'pilot' research on the facultative tasks, which could be a base for an extended research.

Although the municipal tasks have an important role in the continental local government systems, this topic is just partly analysed by the literature. It is reviewed as part of the municipal tasks system, and the possibility of the voluntary task performance is analysed by the majority of the literature (Scheurerer, 2012, p. 92; Ruttkay, 2009, p. 219 and Hoffman, 2015, pp. 80–84). It is stated, that voluntary tasks are present at municipalities of bigger size and bigger economic power (Szente, 2013, p. 163), especially in the case when a municipality has a more specific character, e.g. it is a touristic destination (Vlés, 2016, p. 68). The voluntary tasks performance of the smaller municipalities could be based on tools which requires only limited financial resources but more personal activities (Nagy, 2017, pp. 24–25).

2 Methods and hypothesis

The analysis is focused on the legal regulations on facultative tasks of the local municipalities. Thus primarily the regulation on the municipal system and the municipal tasks were analysed. Beside the jurisprudential analysis, the

research also included an empirical inquiry regarding the implementation of voluntary task management.

The empirical research – which was based on the jurisprudential and financial analysis of the facultative service provision of several municipalities – was based on a *qualitative method*. Semi-structured interviews were done during the Spring and Summer of 2018. The number of the analysed municipalities were limited. The limitations were related to the pilot nature of the research and the limited resources. Therefore, we focused our research on the analysis of several characteristic municipalities in detail.

The selection of the analysed municipalities were based on our hypothesis. As we have mentioned in the introduction, our research focused on the voluntary task performance of the larger municipalities and the municipalities with specific characteristics. We also assumed that the small municipalities (with limited financial resources) could perform non-mandatory functions. The decreasing number of compulsory tasks highlighted the importance of the non-compulsory tasks; therefore, we also investigate the changes of the last few years.

Therefore, in this pilot examination, we chose a city, a small town and a village as our base of research. Following the theoretical overview, we prepared a questionnaire as a base for the pilot inquiries. We chose three Hungarian and three Slovenian municipalities to thoroughly examine the voluntary task management both as an experiment and a foundation of a wider research, pursuing the methodology described above.

When selecting the municipalities, we paid attention to include different municipality models and their characteristics to verify our hypothesis. As a result, one of the examined municipalities is in a disadvantaged region of Hungary and is in disposal of a weaker economic power. The municipality of Kesznyéten has approximately 2000 residents and is located in the district of Tiszaújváros of Borsod-Abaúj-Zemplén County (which is one of the disadvantaged regions in Hungary). Our next municipality is Balatonlelle, small town in Somogy County of approx. 5000 inhabitants with touristic importance (a town at lake Balaton, which is one of the most important touristic destinations in Hungary). Thus this town has better economic opportunities. The third municipality have been an urban municipality, the 14th district of Budapest (called 'Zugló', hereinafter Zugló), a bigger sized municipality of more than 100.000 residents.[2]

We started our empiric research in March 2018 with the examination of our chosen city-model, Zugló, the 14th (XIV) district of Budapest. In May 2018, the research group continued the work in Balatonlelle, a prominent touristic Hun-

2 In Hungary, the capital city, Budapest has a two-tier municipal system. The districts of Budapest (now Budapest has 23 districts) have the first tier of the system. These districts have self-governance and are defined as first tier municipalities. The second tier municipality, the municipality of the capital is responsible for the issues of Budapest as a single city and the functions which are related to the capital city status of Budapest. This second-tier municipality (the so-called *Fővárosi* Önkormányzat – Capital Self-Government) is responsible for the tasks of the counties in the area of Budapest (Budapest as the capital city does not belong to any county – the counties are the 2nd tier local governments in Hungary). Thus several differences can be

garian town. These results were published in the 2nd and 3rd volumes *Jegyző és Közigazgatás* in 2018 (Hoffman et al., 2018/1; Hoffman et al., 2018/2).

To verify our research, we carried out a comparative study in a neighbouring country which is similar to Hungary but also has differences compared to it. We continued our project in Slovenia during the summer of 2018, due to the fact that the similar economic power, the fragmented and the significant regional differences in the local governmental system of Slovenia implied a good comparison basis. Following the same methodology, our comparative study focused on three Slovenian municipalities of similar size and character (a disadvantaged municipality, a small town of touristic importance, and a city municipality). The empirical studies were accomplished at the municipality of Hodoš (the smallest municipality of Slovenia with its 400 residents), the municipality of Bled (which itself is a town with 5000 residents, but it has 9000 residents with the integrated settlements) as a touristic destination town and the municipality of Maribor as a bigger sized city of more than 100.000 residents.

This article presents the most important results of our comparative study as we demonstrate several similarities and differences between the Slovenian and the Hungarian voluntary task management systems. Because of the limited number of the observed municipalities, the results can be just limitedly generalised. However, the analysed municipalities can be considered as typical ones, therefore, the results can be a base for an extended research on the non-mandatory functions of the municipalities. Thus firstly, we summarize the initial settings: a brief comparison of the Slovenian and Hungarian local governmental systems. Then, we analyse the voluntary task management by each significant sector and by the different models of Slovenian and Hungarian municipalities.

3 Results

3.1 Interpretation and examination of voluntary tasks

The definition of the voluntary tasks in the local government system is yet to be universally acknowledged in academic circles. Based on the various national and international academic works, we can highlight two different point of view regarding voluntary tasks: a narrow and a wider approach. The narrow approach considers only those public affairs as voluntary which are not part of any municipality's compulsory tasks. In this sense, the voluntary and the alternative tasks are separated, hence the alternative tasks are viewed as a means to adjust the structure of local government. The group of alternative tasks consists of the objectives which are taken over by a smaller or lower level municipality from a higher level or bigger municipalities (Nagy and Hoffman, 2016, pp. 58-70). This approach is mainly widespread in countries that are based on dogmatic principals of German jurisprudence. The wider approach interprets the voluntary tasks as a combination of the alternative tasks and the tasks defined by the narrower concept. Although this approach is primari-

observed between Maribor and Zugló: although the population is very similar, but Maribor is an independent city and Zugló is just a district of a city, of the capital of Hungary, Budapest.

ly present in countries following French jurisprudence, we can find its traits in the Hungarian administrative law as well (Kilényi, 2008).

Our analysis is based on the framework of the above-mentioned interpretation. We must state that in the course of the analysis, we chose the narrower approach to voluntary tasks (Hoffman et al., 2018/3). The research focuses on the voluntary task management; however, we partly included the analysis of alternative tasks as well. Consequently, the examination of compulsory objectives where the municipalities are provided with a wide competence is only limited in our paper. In this sense, the municipal subsidies form clearly part of the compulsory tasks as prescribed by section 45 of the Act III of 1993 on the social welfare administration and social services, regardless to the fact that the content and the limits of those subsidies are ruled self-sufficiently by each municipality. Given the obligatory nature of the objective, the local municipality does not willingly take up any task, it only adjusts the provision of the compulsory tasks to the local needs (Tóth, 2016, pp. 169-172). This question has a unique importance in Zugló as the social decree of Zugló provides social care and subsidies in a broader sense exceeding the state average.

This broader task management is not covered in our research as we interpret these objectives as a compulsory task only adjusted to local needs and not as a voluntary task. For this reason, our analysis on Zugló focuses on the narrower approach of voluntary task management system. In this framework, our initial hypothesis was that voluntary tasks are present at municipalities of bigger size and bigger economic power, especially in the case when a municipality has a specific characteristic, e.g. it is a touristic destination. We can conclude that voluntary task management plays also an innovative role in the local government system, in other words, one can notice a process where facultative tasks may become obligatory. As an additional hypothesis, we present that the decreasing number of compulsory tasks highlighted the non-compulsory task; therefore, we also investigate the changes of the last few years. Following the theoretical overview, we prepared a questionnaire as a base for the pilot inquiries which we used in all our case studies.

3.2 Local self-government systems and objectives in Slovenia and Hungary: establishing core points for the research

In the course of comparative studies, the differences between the distinct models should always be taken into consideration. This principle is particularly valid when it comes to voluntary municipal tasks. On one hand, we must examine whether the local self-government system in question is based on the enumeration of municipal tasks prescribed by law or it follows the general clause of self-governance. Slovenia has a continental-like self-government system, which means that the competences of the municipalities are provided by a general clause in the Slovenian Constitution and in the respective laws. Regarding the objectives, both Slovenian and Hungarian legislation clearly separates the group of compulsory tasks – which are specified by national law – and the group of willingly chosen, voluntary tasks.

Beside the distinct municipal tasks, the Slovenian local self-governance system is familiar with the category of delegated central administrative tasks and powers, just like in the Hungarian model. The mayor and the chief office manager may undertake administrative powers and competences defined by national legislation act (Halász, 2011, pp. 800-802). The differentiated power and competences delegation is also present in the Slovenian system of compulsory tasks. In this regard, the town-level local authorities (mestna občina) are mandated to additional tasks (Setnikar-Cankar, 2011, p. 649).

The administrative body of local self-governance authorities in Slovenia are similar to the ones in Hungary: the chief decision-making body is the municipal council, whereas the mayor (župan) is charged with the operative political control who also appoints the director (direktor), the chief administrative manager of the authority (Navarro et al., 2018, p. 364). The city municipalities' administrative body consists of departments and the chief officer of these departments may be empowered with independent competences (Grad, 2012, p. 583).

Based on the above, the two municipal systems are very much alike. In addition, the Slovenian model is based on the principle of strong centralization, partly because of the small size and population of the country (Kovač, 2011, pp. 633-634). Each municipality is responsible for the essential local public services, whereas the specified professional sectors are mainly covered by the state administration (Trpin, 2003, pp. 168-170). Financially speaking, the system is relatively centralized. The municipal budget relies on state subsidies divided central taxes and partly local taxes (Oplotnik and Brezovnik, 2004, pp. 484-486).

Furthermore, in Slovenia the local self-governance system consists of only one level, despite several attempts (Setnikar-Cankar, 2011, pp. 641-643). In addition, it is relatively centralized: among 212 municipalities, 11 are defined as town-level municipality, although the socialist era's strong concentration has softened after the municipality reform of 1993/94. Consequently, Slovenian local governance units cover about 9000-10.000 residents and typically consists of several municipalities. It means that the Slovenian municipalities are equivalent to a Hungarian micro-region. And although the system is concentrated, the size of the municipalities varies. In principle, the required minimum population of the Slovene municipalities is 5000 resident but it could be established smaller municipalities for reasons related to geography, border locations, ethnic compositions, historical or economic reasons. Thus, about half of the Slovene municipalities (111) have less than 5 000 inhabitants (Grad, 2012, p. 579). The largest municipality is Ljubljana with a population more than 283.000 people, the smallest is Hodoš of 375 residents. As a result, the role of co-operation is less important as the Slovenian legislation does not oblige municipalities to co-operate, unlike the Hungarian. Sector-wise co-operation is highly recommended and concerning the local police, the role of co-operation is outstanding. Apart from this, Slovenian co-operations play an

important part in the field of regional development and regional coordination (Bačlija-Brajnik, 2018, pp. 251-253).

As for the management of compulsory tasks, the Slovenian and the Hungarian model share some resemblance. The public service provision is relatively centralised in Hungary and in Slovenia, and the municipalities are primarily responsible for basic services. The specialised services are provided mainly by the central government or by the agencies of the central government (Grad, 2012, p. 589-590 and Hoffman et al., 2016, pp. 464-465). For instance, in the public education sector Slovenian municipalities operate kindergartens, whereas in the case of other institutions, they are only responsible for providing the facilities – this model prevailed in Hungary between 2012 and 2016. Likewise, in the field of cultural management, each municipality is responsible for the basic cultural services, however, regional museums, libraries and archives are run by city-level municipalities. Those cultural establishments which bear national significance belong to the responsibility of the state administration system (Srakar et al., 2017, pp. 560-563).

Regarding the social welfare sector, Slovenian municipal tasks are relatively limited: home care and signal system, certain crisis care services and home-meal system are directly managed by the municipalities, however, they are only obliged to provide access to other social services. As we can see, the participation of municipalities in this field are much more limited compared to the Hungarian system, although these basic services contribute to the significant role of Slovenian municipalities in the social sector (Hlebec, 2017, pp. 496-505). The structure of subsidies and aids in Slovenia is more centralized than in Hungary. The income replacement and income supplement benefits are provisioned by the deconcentrated bodies of the central administration, which are also responsible for income measurement.

It is a characteristic trait of the Slovenian municipality system that we can find municipalities where an ethnic minority makes the majority of residents, therefore the municipality is bilingual, such as Hodoš which is included in our research. In Slovenia, three municipalities have the Hungarian language, and two other municipalities have the Italian language as official language. These municipalities are obliged to ensure bilingualism.

The above-mentioned differences and similarities prove that the two countries' voluntary task management models are comparable. The analysis of the Slovenian regulation is particularly interesting to our research group due to the fact that Slovenia has a centralized and concentrated system with no small-town independence as all municipalities consist of more than one town. Therefore, the Slovenian model can state how the merged municipal system works and what are the challenges, in addition to the way it appears in the field of municipal task management.

Table 1: Overview of the main frameworks of the Hungarian and Slovenian facultative (non-mandatory) municipal functions

Characterisation	Hungary	Slovenia
1. Municipal model	*Continental model* (based on the general powers of the municipalities in local public affairs).	
2. Municipal mandatory functions and relation to the central government	*Centralised municipal systems* (the municipalities are responsible for the basic services, the specialised services are organised and provided primarily by the central government or by the agencies of the central government)	
3. Municipal structure	*Two tier system: 1st tier* communities (község), towns (város), district HQ towns (járásszékhely város), county towns (megyei jogú város) and the capital and its districts (főváros és kerületei) (more than 3155); *2nd tier:* counties (19). 1st tier system is very fragmented (average population of about 3 100 people).	*One tier system:* municipalties (občina) and city municipalities (mestna občina) Fragmented, but partly merged system (212 municipalities, average population of about 12 500 people)
4. Municipal (mandatory) service provision		
3.1. Social care	Provider of the basic services (mandatory for every municipalities: home care, meals, family and children support, providing accession to other basic and specialised services), other basic services are mandatory to different municipalities (municipalities with more than 3000 inhabitants: general day care, municipalities with more than 10 000 inhabitants: general and specialised day care, municipalities with more than 30 000 inhabitants: elderly care centre, night shelter, temporary accommodation of homeless people)	Provider of basic services (primarily home care, day care, meals, family and children support)
3.2. Health care	Provider of the basic services: general practitioners, dentist, health visitor, basic emergency services, on-call dental care.	Provider of basic health care services
3.3, Education	Provider of the kindergartens (primary and secondary education is organised by central government agency)	Provider or the kindergartens, maintainer of the local institutions of primary education
3.4. Culture	Municipal community culture, municipal libraries	Municipal libraries
3.5. Public utilities	Local public utilities. local space maintenance and use	Local public utilities. local space maintenance and use

In the following we turn to the analysis of voluntary task management by each significant sector to present their main features.

3.3 Voluntary tasks in cultural sector

3.3.1 City municipalities: Zugló and Maribor

Zugló provides several community building services beyond its legal obligation. The focus here tends towards community building. This principle inspired the so-called Community Garden project, which was supported by the municipality in 2018 with a transfer of 7 million HUF (around 21200 EUR). Other voluntary tasks are realised by the municipal cultural centre and association which work in the form of a municipality owned non-profit limited company. The municipality pays attention to ensure appropriate appearances in the municipal media for local communities and associations which are believed to contribute to the process of community building. In practice, this means coverage on websites and in print as well, what is more, the municipality also supports the publishing of local books and brochures. Youth services are also part of cultural tasks in a broader sense, which are partly provided by the local community centre. Furthermore, the municipality organizes children camps, only in 2018 eleven one-week long camps were available for children which were prioritized in the municipal budget.

Maribor puts significantly more effort in the management of cultural tasks. The cultural policy of the city centers around the municipal public institution of *„Kulturno prireditveni center narodni dom Maribor"* (Cultural and National Centre of Maribor) which is home to various cultural events. One of the most famous tourist attractions is the Puppet-show Theatre of Maribor which was also one of the main venue of European Capital of Culture project in 2012. At this point, we must mention the municipal library, although the maintenance of such facility is a compulsory task, the municipality of Maribor supports the realisation of several community and reading programmes, which activity is considered voluntary as it goes beyond the tasks prescribed by respective laws.

3.3.2 Tourist destinations: Balatonlelle and Bled

Being a tourist destination also means that these municipalities adjust their voluntary task management to local tourism policies – this is even more noticeable in the cultural sector. Accordingly, Balatonlelle must bear in mind two regards at the same time respective to cultural tasks. On the one hand, during the summer holiday season, the municipality shall provide larger events and programmes for the holiday-makers. On the other hand, the cultural needs of local residents shall be fulfilled throughout the year. For the previous objective, the municipality organizes several festivals which attract notable number of tourists in the dedicated Balatonlelle Theme Park (e.g. Wine Festival, Municipality Days). During winter, there is a decrease in the number of programmes and there also a change in venue and the nature of such events – the Municipal Centre of Culture and Library hosts different programmes.

Bled, however, does not face the problem of seasonality, thus the network of cultural events does not require dual approach as the holiday season lasts throughout the year. In winter, winter sports enthusiasts arrive, in summer, the lake is occupied by bathers, whereas during spring and autumn, Bled hosts several conferences. We can observe that sports play a significant role in the management of voluntary tasks in Bled – we will detail it in the following section. Apart from sports related objectives, Bled also organizes and support festivals such as street carnivals and Medieval Days at the Castle of Bled. In addition, the municipality supports the long-time popular pop music festival, the so-called Golden Microphone.

3.3.3 Small-sized municipalities: Kesznyéten and Hodoš

Due to the disadvantaged financial situation of Kesznyéten, the municipality is restricted to the boundaries of a very low budget to spend on cultural programmes and public arts. There are basically two ways in which the municipality contributes to the modest but still existing cultural life of the village. Firstly, by maintaining the town library for five years and counting. Secondly, by supporting minor local events which – according to the mayor – they finance to the extent of 80 000 HUF (around 250 EUR) each. Such events involve the village day festival, which is co-organised by local NGOs.

The municipality of Hodoš has a special situation as its cultural tasks go hand in hand with the role the town plays in guarding their bilingual heritage. However, their main problem is not related to the limited resources, but much more to domestic mobility and the assimilation of the local Hungarian residents. The centre of the local cultural life is the Association for Culture and Tourism which functions as a tradition-guarding and social cohesion strengthening institution via the activities of local civil groups and workshops, such as the folk song and embroidery group. Apart from direct money transfers, the municipality also supports the Association by providing venues for their various events completely free of charge.

3.4 Non-mandatory municipal functions related to sports

Sports task management is interpreted in various ways in academic works. Some approach considers questions and services related to sports as a part of cultural management. This is a principle for instance in the British system where the primarily public sport facilities – which are the basis of competing sports – are examined as part of the cultural task management (Arden et al., 2008, pp. 284-285). This is an initial point for the principles which consider sport as a part of a wide-approach definition culture which also includes education services (Fechner et al., 2014, p. 20).

In different administrative systems, sports task management has different interpretations. Some scholars emphasize health care issues in the field of sports related state objectives – as sport and a healthy lifestyle is a significant element of public health care system (Davis, 2012, pp. 7-8) – whereas others see sports as a means of integration, therefore put sports in the framework of social care tasks (Epstein, 2013, pp. 199-201).

3.4.1 Sports related voluntary tasks in city-level municipalities: Maribor and Zugló

The municipality of Zugló defines the sports related voluntary tasks in municipal decree No. 33/2016 (published on 28th June). The Decree sets out the municipality's duties in a rather wide area (for instance, organizing sports events, supporting kindergarten and primary school sport activities, encouraging all residents to be involved in sports). The former objectives are carried out partly by maintenance facilities and by occasionally subsidizing local BVSC Sports Association.

The municipality of Maribor tends to support sport activities by investments, beside its compulsory tasks. These investments typically aim to maintain and improve the existing facilities. The municipality have allocated approximately 6 million euros (2 billion forints) for the renovation of the city's football stadium, it will be realised with loan from the European Investment Bank. As we can see, both municipalities turn to the maintenance and innovation of facilities in the field of supporting sports activities.

3.4.2 Voluntary task management in small-sized municipalities of touristic importance: Bled and Balatonlelle

The municipality of Balatonlelle does not carry out sports related organizing tasks, however, the local public sport is supported by the town to a large extent. Football receives a significant amount of these subsidies as the Football Division gets 80% of the yearly aid of 12 million forints granted to Balatonlelle Sports Association. The local sports association can use the sports complex which is a municipal property free of charge, furthermore, the municipality carries out other tasks to ensure the quality and the possibility of uninterrupted sports activities, such as regular maintenance of the sports field carried out by the urban management organization.

In respect to sports, the municipality does not grant scholarship for „good sportsperson", but the subsidies depicted above certainly contribute to the success of local gifted students. These pecuniary and non-pecuniary tasks have been present in the last 25 years to facilitate the involvement of the citizens of Balatonlelle in sports activities.

As for Bled, sports play a significant role due to the fact that the sports events organized in the city contribute a large amount to the municipality's budget. Accordingly, the municipality provides pecuniary support to sports associations, organizes sports events, and even maintain and improve existing sports facilities such as the ice rink and facilities regarding the aquatics of Lake Bled (mainly rowing) in addition to planning establishing new facilities. In contrast to Balatonlelle, Bled has several sports associations. The most popular sport in the municipality is ice hockey, beside a professional team, we can find sixteen more amateur associations in the city.

Similar to small municipalities, the in-country migration of locals also appears as a problem. On the other hand, these people are replaced by people coming

from other small towns, and as a result, the ¾ of the players in the team of Bled is not a local. The municipality spends a yearly amount of 200.000 euros to subsidize sports associations which is 1/5 of the budget covering voluntary tasks.

As for event organization, the rowing world championship held in Bled was the event with the biggest revenue last year (and also in the history of the municipality). On the championship, 2000 competitors have participated with 900 boats and it attracted 11.000 spectators. Due to the significant role of sports, the municipality disposes several modern sports facilities, such as athletics- and football field, rowing and skiing centre and ice rink. The latter is the most modern of Slovenia's six ice rinks and the only one facility with LED lightning in Central Europe. The lighting of the sports centre was renovated last year, whereas the central heating is being upgraded this year, and the municipal have allocated 4 million euros for the establishment of a multi-generational recreational centre which would also serve as a venue for sports events.

To summarize, we can state that although both cities support local sports activities to a large extent, Bled is in disposal of much more income than Balatonlelle, therefore Bled has more opportunities to realize these subsidies. Sports events around Lake Balaton are usually organized by other cities (e.g. neighbouring town of Balatonboglár), whilst the area of the municipality of Bled covers Lake Bled entirely, therefore there is no competition for sports events. Because of the location of Bled, the surrounding mountains provide the opportunity for the city to be involved in winter sports as well.

3.4.3 Voluntary tasks in small-sized municipalities: Kesznyéten and Hodoš

The municipality of Kesznyéten can only spare 0,05% of its yearly budget to the support of sports activities (this means approximately 500.000 HUF – around 1500 EUR). This amount covers the infrastructural tasks related to sports activities, like the maintenance of the sports field and the changing rooms). Due to lack of resources, the municipality cannot provide funding to the local sports association, therefore voluntary tasks in this field are very limited. The local sports association consists of only the football division as the handball division was cancelled due to lack of players.

As a comparison, the municipality of Hodoš is capable of supporting both the sports association and sports activities by more means. The municipality supports the budget of the local sports association by 10.000 euros per year, and by non-pecuniary subsidies. Consequently, the municipal-owned changing rooms are accessible to the members of the association, and the municipal lends their mini-van for traveling to sports events in other municipalities. Furthermore, the municipality is responsible for the maintenance of the sports field, including lawn mowing and other tasks. In 2014/2015, Hodoš also realized a huge investment of 40 000 euros for the renovation of the changing facilities which included building separate washrooms and the replacement of the roof. Besides supporting the association, Hodoš has built a fitness centre which was free for the locals to use after the opening, now it costs 5 euros per month.

Neither Kesznyéten, nor Hodoš organizes sports competitions. The latter is indirectly involved in this kind of tasks, as the sports association is capable of organizing sports events form the municipal support. To summarize, both municipalities aspire to play an active part in facilitating local sports opportunities. They also share the problem of the migration of young adults as this process decreases the number of people involved in sports.

3.5 Non-mandatory (voluntary) tasks in the field of education

As set forward before, education is strongly centralized in both countries. The maintenance and operation of kindergartens are considered as primary municipal duty; however, it is also a compulsory task to provide infrastructure for primary and secondary education in Slovenia, just like it was the case in Hungary between 2012 and 2017. As municipalities have limited compulsory tasks in the field of education, voluntary tasks have gained importance and developed a supplementary nature.

3.5.1 City-level task management: Maribor and Zugló

The Hungarian city under examination, Zugló, stands out with its innovative scholarship network regarding the education sector. These scholarships put emphasis on dynamic development instead of static results. Apart from this, the municipal also provides educational support for adults.

The city of Maribor also offers scholarships for gifted students, complementing the state network of grants. To obtain such a scholarship, the applicant must meet several requirements such as outstanding school results, Slovenian nationality and residence status. For secondary school students, the scholarship is 230 euros per month, for domestic universities, 190 euros per month, and for students studying at foreign universities 250 euros per month. Altogether, the scholarships cost 8000 euros for the municipality in 2018 and affected 36 students. The available resources are limited and in the past years, the number of students involved have decreased.

In addition, the municipality supports extracurricular activities: it provides not only foreign language and computer science education for children of 3-6 years, but also school meals. In 2018, the municipality allocated 1.3 million euros only for the latter. Furthermore, the municipality purchased computer science devices for the schools, and funds extracurricular activities like study groups. The support of disadvantaged children is operated on state-level to which the municipality also contributes.

3.5.2 Voluntary tasks in small towns: Bled and Balatonlelle

The municipality of Bled has several tasks related to the educational sector, although its counterpart for the research, Balatonlelle does not have any outstanding voluntary tasks in this sector, we seldom discovered some tasks related to the cultural sector. As there is a state level educational scholarship system in Slovenia, municipalities only provide supplementary aid to

students. In fact, Bled does not have any supplementary grants as the social, economic status of the residents and the needs of the municipality does not require such support. The residents are highly skilled, for the local economy even overqualified, thus it is a bigger question how to attract people with secondary education to town. Schools and kindergartens operate in municipal properties, a 3-phase real-estate development project worth 7 million euros is currently being executed. The budget of the local kindergarten is also mostly covered by the municipality, 82% of the resources is provided by Bled, 15% by the parents and 3% by the state.

3.5.3 Small municipalities: Hodoš and Kesznyéten

In Hodoš, the educational and care sector is in a special status which comes from the bilingualism of the municipality. Only three grades of primary education are available locally, upper grade students visit a school which is 12 km from Hodoš and provides minority education. The municipality has a kindergarten as well, currently operating with 11 children and subsidized by the municipality with a sum of 70.000 euros per year.

As part of a teacher-support programme, the municipality builds a service flat using 36 000 euros. The investment involves the old building of a post office which is no longer in use and was purchased by the municipality. Previous to this investment, the municipality provided support for teachers to commute from their residence to the school. There are no scholarships for Hungarian minority students studying at Hungarian universities as such aids are provided by the minority self-government.

There is cross-border mobility, students from Hodoš study in either Hungarian secondary schools or they go to other Slovenian towns for the same purpose. Interestingly, the cross-border mobility is not only one-way, there are families who take their children to the kindergarten in Hodoš, taking advantage of the better teacher-pupil proportion. Neither secondary school, nor university students receive any scholarship, but the municipality grants 300-400 euros for locals who have completed their higher education studies.

Kesznyéten only covers a few voluntary tasks in the education sector. The lack of teachers causes here problems as well, as the regional centre, Tiszaújváros is just 6 km away and is more attractive to teachers. In 2017, the municipality has given rewards at the end of the year to local teachers, beside the officers of the municipality.

3.6 Health services

Concerning health care services, Slovenian and Hungarian municipalities have similar compulsory duties. Mainly, they are responsible for the primary care services, however, in Slovenia, the central administration plays a more significant role regarding on-call services. In the following, we present our analysis on this matter.

3.6.1 Voluntary tasks in city municipalities: Zugló and Maribor

Both Zugló and Maribor provide various voluntary tasks in the field of health care. The municipality of Zugló facilitate the resident's access to diverse health care service (such as supporting screening tests, refunding the purchase of vaccines). Using a grant contract, the municipality gives also financial subsidies to a local pharmacy for covering the on-call service at nights and weekends.

To begin with, in Slovenia, local communities have less obligatory tasks in the field of health care than in Hungary, because Slovenia is relatively a small country and the state can provide adequate quality of health care on a central level. For this reason, Maribor typically covers the infrastructural basis for health care services. There are voluntary municipal programmes which indirectly supports the improvement of health care. Uniquely, the municipality of Maribor appoints a local health care „ombudsman" who is open for the residents' notices in his office provided by the municipality. On top of that, Maribor is the only municipality in the country which has dental service at night as well, for which the financial background is entirely provided by the municipality.

In brief, Zugló and Maribor both can cover more voluntary tasks due to their larger size. The realization of these tasks is diverse in both cities: Zugló puts emphasis on the provision of health care services, while Maribor tend to support the infrastructural background.

3.6.2 Small towns: Balatonlelle and Bled

Balatonlelle has three medical station, two covering GP services and one for dental services. Since the municipality treats the quality of health care services as a priority, these medical stations are supported by pecuniary and non-pecuniary subsidies. The local dentist was able to purchase new machines with the aid of the municipality, moreover, the municipality helps with the hazardous medical waste management.

Medical offices purchase electricity on a reduced fare, and on top of that, all medical offices are exempted from the local business tax. The essential facilities for primary care are municipal properties, in addition, the municipality provides a large amount of their equipment. Balatonlelle pays specific attention to the preservation of the municipal properties' value that is why the medical offices have been renovated in the past 3 years to provide modern and safe health care services.

According to the division between central administration and local governance, a regional public institute sustains the medical centre in Bled, though the building itself is a municipal property. Accordingly, the municipal renovated the centre using its own budget. Bled is in a peculiar position as usually every Slovenian municipality has their own medical centre, but not in Bled where all the surrounding municipalities and the visiting tourists are treated here. The large number of tourists and the quite common accidents in the

mountains led to the establishment of a well-equipped, easily accessible centre, rather than upkeeping several smaller ones on a lower level. Red Cross volunteers are also present in the city, the municipality supports their work by 5000 euros per year. This aid is spent mostly on first aid programmes, but also, it gave the possibility to purchase a defibrillator.

In a nutshell, due to the fact that the state administration of Slovenia finances the health care system, there are not many tasks covered by the municipalities, in contrast to Hungary. In the field of health care services, Balatonlelle – related to its compulsory tasks – provides a wider network of subsidies speaking of both pecuniary and non-pecuniary tasks. As a feature present in both municipalities, the maintenance and renovation of health care facilities to ensure the quality plays an important role.

3.6.3 Challanges in small-sized municipalities: Kesznyéten and Hodoš

Neither Kesznyéten, nor Hodoš uptakes more responsibilities than the compulsory objectives prescribed by law. Kesznyéten covers the obligatory on-call medical services jointly with the neighbouring municipalities within the framework of a co-operation. Hodoš does not have direct medical care, for which residents must travel 10 km to a neighbouring municipality. Supposedly, this is one of the reasons contributing to the few voluntary tasks, as if municipalities wanted to directly manage health care services, they would not be capable of ensuring the necessary equipment and the quality of the service in vain of financial support.

3.7 Social welfare services

Regarding the social welfare system, the Hungarian municipalities are obliged to cover a wider scope of compulsory tasks and competences in the field of primal social services. On the contrary, Slovenian municipalities have a much more limited role concerning task management in the social welfare sector. We can note that in Slovenia, the central administration ensures social aids, and as a consequence, municipalities undertake solely voluntary tasks.

3.7.1 City challenges: Zugló and Maribor

The municipality of Zugló undertakes a wide range of voluntary tasks in the social sector. These facultative tasks have different objectives, ranging from social situation improvement for the deprived residents to increasing the standard of living of all residents, depending on the capacity of the municipal budget.

Zugló has a great variety of activities regarding social benefits. Among the various types of aids, there are single-use/one-off (e.g. support for the start of the school year) and regular pecuniary benefit, as well. The case-by-case transitional crisis aid is a peculiar form of benefits in kind which is transferred to deprived residents twice a year, around Christmas and Easter, depending on the municipal budget. Residents in need even receive a food package before Christmas from the municipality and as another benefit in kind, the mu-

nicipality provide a set of firewood once a year. The majority of these voluntary tasks are carried out since the current municipal social regulation entered in force late February 2015. Previous to this regulation, these tasks were not part of the compulsory tasks of the municipality, their introduction was based on the local social policy principles. This was also the reason for providing a wider range of services, supplementing the compulsory competences, such as the provision of meals for children during school holidays.

There are benefits irrespective of the beneficiary's income, both pecuniary (e.g. birth aid) and non-pecuniary (e.g. greeting of young adults) which are obtained on specific occasions. The post-reimbursement of the charge of chicken pox vaccination is considered peculiar due to both its objective and the form of the voluntary task management. The support of chicken pox and pneumonia vaccination was entered in force in October 2016, while student scholarship was introduced in October 2017 and the adult-education support in January 2018.

Speaking of social services in Zugló, the „Tükörkép Műhely" (Reflection Workshop) is worth mentioning as it was founded by the municipality in January 2016, expanding the activities of the Zugló Family- and Children Care Centre by adding a beauty salon for people in need. The main objective of this project is to contribute to a successful job application of the deprived residents, but the services of the beauty parlour is open for adolescent and elderly persons in need as well.

The municipality of Zugló covers a wide scope of voluntary tasks by contracts. For instance, the municipality issues non-refundable benefits for social objectives by grant contracts. A grant contract allows the municipality to provide non-refundable aid for a local pharmacy as a compensation for ensuring night and weekend in-call service. Apart from grant contracts, the municipality also undertakes voluntary tasks by supply contracts. This is the case of a primary care service for people suffering from substance abuse carried out by a municipality-funded foundation. The municipality also subsidizes the Charity Shop of the Hungarian Red Cross, which resides in a municipal property.

Due to the limited number of compulsory tasks, Maribor undertakes several social voluntary tasks. Unlike Zugló, Maribor offers mainly personal social services. In this sense – partly through its own establishments, partly by administrative contracts – Maribor operates a temporary housing complex for families in need, upholds primary care for addicts (both for people with alcohol and drug addiction), funds a home for the elderly, and provides day care and temporary residence for the homeless residents. In Hungary, these services are compulsory tasks of municipalities of greater population, imposed by the Act III of 1993 on social administration and social welfare services (Ecsédi, 2016, pp. 346-349).

Although the municipality of Maribor is not obliged to cover these tasks, the municipality – based on local needs and resources – provides these social welfare services. Apart from infrastructural services, Maribor supports social inte-

gration programmes of the Red Cross and other social- and equality-focused NGOs. The administrative body of the municipality reflects the importance of social tasks as an independent social team works under the department responsible for human service issues. Due to the limited municipal responsibility for social benefits, we would like to mention one significant aid: Maribor offers a one-off support for the parents of new-born residents.

3.7.2 Small-towns and their solutions: Balatonlelle and Bled

The municipality of Balatonlelle has only a few voluntary tasks in the social welfare sector. The municipality introduced a one-off pecuniary aid for the new-borns which can be issued only to local residents. The request for this aid should be entered within 6 months from the child's birth. However, the municipal regulation interprets this benefit as a peculiar form of municipal support, meaning that this kind of social service is on the border between compulsory and voluntary tasks.

Bled, similarly, has limited voluntary tasks regarding the social services, but for different reasons. The average standard of living is much higher in Bled than the Slovenian average and because of that, there is no need to use resources for social services beside the social welfare services provided by the central administration. The town is obliged to take care of the elderly and the youngest residents. Beside this, the municipality offers pecuniary subsidies worth 60 000 euros per year for activities organized for the elderly and for the youth. This support can be obtained through a public application system. The municipality also supports NGOs which undertake humanitarian, social and health care objectives, the pecuniary aid can be requested through a public application system with an action plan and defined programme from a budget of 20 000 euros per year. The municipality is currently applying for the authorisation of a multi-generational centre, where they plan to establish library, sports centre, and public spaces for the elderly and the youth. The investment which is worth 4 million euros is planned to be finished in 2019.

As we can see, both towns have limited number of voluntary tasks in the social welfare sector. We can note that both municipalities support new-borns by providing a one-off pecuniary aid. In the case of Bled, the social needs do not require more voluntary tasks, instead, they focus on cultural, sports events, establishing and improving local facilities.

3.7.3 Social welfare management in small municipalities: Kesznyéten and Hodoš

Due to the limited resources, Kesznyéten provides only a few voluntary social services. As for pecuniary benefits, we can note the aid for the new-borns here as well. As we have stated before, the wider range of compulsory tasks means that the resources in the social sector are destined for the compulsory tasks in Hungary.

In Hodoš, the Home for Elderly Residents has opened in 2010. The Home of 500 m^2 and three levels is operated by an external company, but the municipal-

ity provide an aid for those elderly residents who could not afford to pay the whole cost of their care. In addition, the municipality partly funds the domestic care services for those who request the support in advance. We can find here the one-off pecuniary benefit for new-borns which amount is defined by the number of children in the same family (e.g. 150 euros for the first child, 200 euros for the second and so on). This benefit is issued irrespective to the social status of the family, the income of the family is not considered in this case.

Respective to the challenges of a small-sized municipality, Hodoš has developed an innovative solution to encourage young people to settle in the municipality. The municipality offers a construction aid of 4000 euros for new families who are willing to settle and build houses in the municipality. To obtain this support, the new building should be at least 80 m^2 and the applicant must have their permanent residency in Hodoš. If these criteria are not fulfilled, the support shall be repaid to the municipality, together with interest.

The initial hypothesis of the research have been verified regarding to the social sector: the wider range of voluntary tasks seem to be present mainly in city-level municipalities which have sufficient resources to cover not only compulsory tasks but voluntary social welfare services as well. Small municipalities tend to undertake tasks which require less money, however, all municipalities pay attention to subsidies aiming the holding and expansion of the number of residents. In our research, we discovered some innovative solutions in small-sized municipalities. In Bled and Balatonlelle, the voluntary tasks are limited as the better economic and social status are matched with the fact that the smaller population means less need for institutionalised services.

3.8 Public safety (municipal policing)

In Slovenia and Hungary the municipal policing is managed mostly by the central administration, nevertheless, both countries have municipal-level local, quasi-police bodies (Hoffman and Fazekas, 2017, pp. 545-547).

3.8.1 City police: Zugló – Maribor

The municipal public safety tasks are envisaged by a municipal regulation in Zugló, which also establishes Zugló Municipal Police Service. According to Act /2011 on Local Self-governance, districts of the capital may only cover obligatory public safety tasks within the boundaries of the district, on behalf of public spaces and municipal property. In 2018, Zugló Municipal Police Service has 49 constabulary and disposes of 342,3 million (about 1 million euros).

In Maribor, municipal public safety tasks are managed in a similar way. The difference is that the local vigilante service cannot be founded by the municipality, in other words, it is established to cover a voluntary municipal task. Usually, several municipalities form a co-operation to finance the vigilante service. Maribor is accompanied by six other municipalities in fulfilling this objective.

The members of the public safety service wear a uniform and may use pepper spray if justified. During their activities, their competences cover the control

of public spaces and parking. Speaking of finances, the co-operating municipalities define their share in advance. The budget is used for the uniform, equipment, salary of the members, plus for any facilities used during their activities. Constabularies are in contact with the state police in order to ensuring public safety and public order. When noticing any sign of misdemeanour or crime, they may hold back the delinquent for 1 hour until the arrival of the police. The constabulary is entitled to fine the delinquent in the case of misdemeanour.

3.8.2 Tourist destinations: Balatonlelle and Bled

Being a popular holiday destination also means that in Balatonlelle, public safety tasks are intensifying during the summer season. The municipal quasi-police operate under the control of the mayor during the so-called Balaton-season. The quasi-police cover their tasks within the inner area of the town, with special regard to the coastal areas. They guarantee the enforcement of the peace and quiet regulation (in several occasions, this involves making compromises with the locals and tourism hosts), but they are also responsible for preserving the public order and clean state of public spaces. The constabulary also supervise the parking regulation and they are authorised to issue fines, moreover, they supervise the marketeers. In Balatonlelle, 2 constabulary work as a public officer of the municipality who are joined by two volunteers for the summer and work daily form 6:00 to 22:00. For public safety reasons, civilian police also undertake duties in co-operation with the police, the residents and the municipality.

The municipality established CCTV throughout the town with the aim of preventing crimes. Currently, according to the Hungarian legislation, only the police and the quasi-police is authorised to use CCTV in public spaces. In Balatonlelle, the establishment of CCTV cameras was realized based on a co-operation agreement between the police and the municipality. As a result, the quasi-police also supervise the recordings, but they are only allowed to intervene in case of crime. The local police have a crime prevention department as well.

Bled is a significant touristic destination in Slovenia, therefore the town is faced with heavy tourism. Like Maribor, Bled has municipal guards, but it is operated by three neighbouring municipalities including Bled and the municipality of Bohinj which is also considered a touristic destination. The lake and the castle require special surveillance as most tourist frequent these places. For the more efficient crime prevention and the protection of tourists, the municipality hires an independent security service who realize their duties in pairs between 23:00 and 5:00 in the morning. Around priority areas such as schools, playgrounds, CCTV was established for crime prevention reasons.

3.8.3 Small-sized municipalities: without municipal police

Hodoš is a disadvantaged, small-sized municipality with a population of approx. 350 where the municipality does not undertake any voluntary public safety task. There is no need for constabulary, but even if were, the municipal-

ity could not provide the financial means. Previously, a field-guard system was in effect, but not anymore. The situation is almost the same in Kesznyéten where currently no local public safety body exists.

4 Discussion on the emphasised research results

In the Chapter 3 the main fields of voluntary municipal tasks of three Hungarian and Slovenian municipalities have been reviewed, analysed and compared. The hypotheses of the article have been verified mainly by the results of our research.

The results can be analysed by a matrix, which is based on the different type of municipalities and the by the different (voluntary) municipal tasks. First of all, it has been verified, that the larger municipalities with significant economic power performs more voluntary tasks. These non-mandatory tasks plays an important role in the local policies of these municipal units. Secondly, the small towns which have special characteristic – especially touristic destination role – have significant voluntary tasks. It has been verified, that the smaller municipalities try to perform non-mandatory tasks, as well, however, this performance has a lesser significance because the lack of resources.

The second element of the matrix was the analysis of the sectoral activities. As a result of the analysis a special pattern could be identified. The voluntary tasks performance of the larger (city) municipalities focuses on the *human public services,* especially on the (local) welfare services. The role of the locally developed social and health services are very important and several new educational services (mainly scholarships) have been introduced by these local governments. They have important local policing tasks, which is a consequence of the urban nature of these local governments. The voluntary task performance of the small towns with touristic destination focuses on the cultural services. This task performance is a Janus-faced (two-sided) one: firstly it is part of the tourism destination services and secondly their have a community-building role, as well. The services of sport and environmental policy is subordinated to the achievement of the tourism objectives. The health and education services are present, as well, but their role is limited. The municipal policing is very important in these municipalities, as well. The public safety of a community is an important element of the tourist attraction. The voluntary task performance of the small municipalities focuses on the community building. Thus the cultural tasks have a significant role, as well. Because of their limited resources, these tasks performance is based mainly on the personal activities of the local government officers and the local community. The role of the social, health and education services are limited and because of the small population and the strong interpersonal relationships of the members of the communities, municipal police units have not been organised by these local governments.

The main elements of this matrix are shown by the Table 2.

Table 2: Short overview of the analysis

Tasks	Urban (city) municipalities	Small towns (tourism destinations)	Small municipalities
Culture	Differentiated system, which provides several (non-mandatory) services	Service provision focuses partly on the attractiveness of the town. Partly the services have community-building role.	Services focus on the community building role. Less financial resources, the functions focuses on the personal activity of the community.
Sport	Maintenance of (large) facilities, supporting local sport clubs.	Maintenance of smaller sport facilities, focuses on the attractiveness of the town, supporting local sport clubs.	Maintenance of very small sport facilities, supporting local sport clubs (as part of building the local community).
Education	Municipal scholarships, municipal awards, extra services for the teachers and for the students (schoolboy/schoolgirl).	Several additional services for the teachers.	Very limited: focuses primarily to the locally employed teachers.
Social welfare services	Differentiated system with innovative, new services. Several extra services and benefits provided for the residents	Very limited: extra benefits for small children.	Limited, the main aim is preserving the residents of the village.
Health services	Differentiated system with innovative, new services. Several extra services and benefits provided for the residents	Supporting the local doctors and extra investments for the local health centres.	
Public safety (municipal policing)	Large municipal police as part of the urban services.	Municipal policing focuses on the tourism.	

5 Conclusion

The empirical analysis carried out in Hungary and Slovenia covering the significant municipality models gradually verified the initial hypothesis of our research. On one hand, voluntary tasks play an important role in most municipalities. Logically, voluntary tasks management is more likely to be present in cities of greater economic impact. On the other hand, it is a characteristic of larger cities that the majority of voluntary tasks focuses on municipal services, including welfare, cultural and sports objectives. We found that Maribor and Zugló provided similar welfare services, however, in Maribor this means a greater involvement of voluntary tasks as the number of compulsory tasks are more limited in this field. It was also interesting that tasks related to public safety were significantly present in these cities due to challenges of an urban environment.

Our other hypothesis was also confirmed as we concluded that voluntary task management is remarkably strong in municipalities of touristic importance. As far as voluntary task management is concerned in Bled and Balatonlelle, we can state that beside touristic tasks and cultural objectives, they focus on local communities as well. The touristic features also cause that municipal police have a key role in the field of voluntary tasks. Apart from these, we concluded that in the voluntary task management of small touristic towns, the proportion of social services is smaller. Similarly, other functions were related to the tourism, as well. For example, the local environment non-mandatory tasks (Fodor, 2018, pp. 79-81) were related to the town image, as well.

Regarding small municipalities, our hypothesis on the limited resources as a barrier to provide voluntary tasks have also been certified. Nevertheless, in these municipalities mainly cultural, youth and sports objectives are more important, as they not only contribute to community building and preserving the local population, but also demand less direct resource.

As a conclusion, the principle of local self-governance, appeasing local needs and being innovative are all featured when speaking of voluntary tasks. Municipalities have developed several services which may serve as a model for the central administration branch as well. Accordingly, our research might be an initial point for further investigations of voluntary task management as these fields undoubtedly constitute an important part of the principle of self-governance. We hope, the results based on this limited analysis can be a base for an extended research on the non-mandatory functions of the municipalities.

References

Arden, A., Baker, C. and Manning, J. (2008). Local Government Constitutional and Administrative Law. London: Sweet & Maxwell.

Bačlija-Brajnik, I. (2018). Inter-municipal Cooperation in Slovenia: An Intermediate Step Towards Regionalisation. In F. Teles and P. Swianiewicz, eds., Inter-Municipal Cooperation in Europe. London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 245–257.

Davis, T. (2012). What is Sports Law? In R. C. R. Siekmann and J. Soek, eds., Lex Sportiva: What is Sports Law? The Hague: TMC Asser Press, pp. 1–34.

Ecsédi, O. (2016). A személyes gondoskodás megszervezésére köteles szervek. In Hoffman I. and Mattenheim G., eds.,: Nagykommentár a szociális törvényhez. Budapest: Wolters Kluwer, pp. 344–355.

Epstein, A. (2013). Sports Law. Mason (OH, USA): South-Western.

Fechner, F., Arnhold, J. and Brodführer, M. (2014). Sportrecht. Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck.

Fodor, L. (2018). Environmental Tools of Local Governments in Hungary (an Overview). In M. Fónai, F. Pénzes and J.K. Murádin, eds., Local Environmental Problems and Answers in Hungary and Romania. Kolozsvár (Cluj-Napoca): Scientia, pp. 77–94.

Grad, F. (2012): Local Government in Slovenia. In A.M. Moreno, ed., Local Government in the Member States of the European Union: A Comparative Perspective. Madrid: INAP, pp. 577–598.

Halász, I. (2011). Szlovénia közigazgatása. In K. Szamel, I. Balázs, Gy. Gajduschek, Gy. Koi, eds., Az Európai Unió tagállamainak közigazgatása. Budapest: Complex Kiadó, pp. 787–810.

Hlebec, V. (2017). Family Care Experience in a Decentralized Social Home Care Context. Lex localis – Journal of Local Self-Government, 15 (3), pp. 495–511.

Hoffman, I. (2015). Gondolatok a 21. századi önkormányzati jog fontosabb modelljeiről. Budapest: ELTE Eötvös.

Hoffman, I., Fazekas, J. and Rozsnyai, K. (2016). Concentrating or Centralising Public Services? The Changing Roles of the Hungarian Inter-municipal Associations in the Last Decades. Lex localis – Journal of Local Self-government, 14 (3), pp. 451–471.

Hoffman, I. and Fazekas J. (2017). The Nature of the "Quasi" – Municipal Policing in Hungary with International and Historical Outlook. Lex localis – Journal of Local Self-Government, 15 (3), pp. 541–558.

Hoffman, I., Cseh, K., Jugovics, A., Molnár, Cs., Német, N. and Ökrös D.(2018/1). Fakultatív feladatok ellátása Budapest Főváros XIV. Kerületében (Zuglóban) – rövid összefoglaló az empirikus vizsgálat első eredményeiről, Jegyző és Közigazgatás, 20(2), pp. 15–18.

Hoffman, I., Cseh, K., Jugovics, A., Dancs, T., Kiss, A., Lévay, M., Német, N., Ökrös D. and Vasas, Zs. (2018/2). Fakultatív feladatok ellátása Balatonlellén – rövid összefoglaló az empirikus vizsgálat eredményeiről. Jegyző és Közigazgatás, 20(3), pp. 18–21.

Hoffman, I., Budai, B., Módos, M., Agg, J. and Juhász Zs. (2018/3). Önkormányzati feladatellátás vizsgálata a KÖFOP program keretében. Jegyző és Közigazgatás, 20(2), pp. 11–14.

Kilényi, G. (2008). A közigazgatási jog nagy kézikönyve. Budapest: Complex Kiadó.

Nagy, M. and Hoffman, I. (eds.) (2016). A Magyarország helyi önkormányzatairól szóló törvény magyarázata. Budapest: HVG-Orac.

Kovač, P. (2011). The Public Administration Reform Agenda in Slovenia – Two Decades of Challenges and Results. Hrvatska i komparativna javna uprava – Croatian and Comparative Public Administration, 11(3), pp. 627–650.

Marcou, G. and Verebélyi, I. (eds.) (1993): New Trends in Local Government in Eastern and Western Europe. Brussels: IIAS.

Nagy, M. (2017). Az önkormányzatok és az Alaptörvény. Közjogi Szemle, 10(4), pp. 16–27.

Navarro, C., Karlsson, D., Magre, J. and Reinholde, I. (2018). Mayors in the Town Hall: Patterns of Relations and Conflict Among Municipal Actors. In H. Heinelt, A. Magnier, M. Cabria and H. Reynaert, eds., Political Leaders and Changing Democracy. The European Mayor. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan pp. 359–386.

Oplotnik, Ž. J. and Brezovnik, B. (2004): Financing local government in Slovenia. Post-Communist Economies 16(4), pp. 483–496.

Pálné Kovács, I. (2016). Modellváltás a magyar önkormányzati rendszerben. In A. Jakab and Gy. Gajduschek, eds., A magyar jogrendszer állapota. Budapest: MTA TK JTI, pp. 583–599.

Ruttkay, É. (2009). Local Development and Local Government in Hungary: Challenges for a New Local Policy. In P. Blokker and B. Dallago, eds., Regional Diversity and Local Development in the New Member States. Basingstoke, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 197–227.

Setnikar-Cankar, S. (2011). Slovenia in Transition: Decentralization as a Goal. In J. Loughlin, F. Hendriks and A. Lidström, eds., Oxford Handbook of Local and Regional Democracy in Europe. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 642–663.

Scheurer, G. (2012). Population Policy and Local Government. In J. Backhaus, ed., Two Centuries of Local Autonomy. New York, Dordrecht, Heidelberg, London: Springer Science, pp. 91–98.

Srakar, A., Kodrič-Dačić E., Koman, K. and Kavaš D. (2017). Efficiency of Slovenian Public General Libraries: A Data Envelopment Analysis Approach. Lex localis – Journal of Local Self-Government, 15 (3), pp. 559–581.

Szente, Z. (2013). Hungary – Local government in Hungary: A creeping centralization? In C. Panara and M. Varney, eds., Local Government in Europe. The 'fourth level' in the EU multilayered government system. London (UK), New York (NY, USA): Routledge, pp. 151–182.

Tóth Zs. (2016). Települési támogatás. In I. Hoffman and G. Mattenheim, eds., Nagykommentár a szociális törvényhez. Budapest: Wolters Kluwer, pp. 168–175.

Tripin, G. (2003). Local Government Reform in Slovenia. From socialist self-management to local self-government. In H. Baldersheim, M. Illner and H. Wollmann, eds., Local Democracy in Post-Communist Europe. Wiesbaden: Springer VS, pp. 157–180.

Vlés, V. (2015). Inter-Municipal Cooperation and Tourism: New Local Roots. In J-C. Dissart, J. Dehez and J-B. Marsat, eds., Tourism, Recreation and Regional Development. Perspectives from France and Abroad. London (UK), New York (NY, USA): Routledge, pp. 61–76.

Appendix: The questionnaire of the semi-structured interviews

1. Does the municipality have a strategy or concept that governs facultative tasks?

1.1. If yes, in what form?

1.2. No

2. Does the municipality have a sector-specific strategy / concept?

2.1. If yes, in which sector(s)?

2.2. No

3. Does the municipality have any type of voluntary task in the social sector? (You can also indicate more than one, please provide an answer in that case)

3.1. Social welfare services: yes/no

3.1.1. If yes, then the voluntary task is:

pecuniary / non-pecuniary, material / organizational / other (please specify)

3.1.2. The municipality carries out the task

by public service / within the organization / with legal entities / other (please specify)

3.1.3. For how long the task has been carried out?

3.1.4. Was the task previously a compulsory task of the municipality?

3.1.5. How does the municipality provide the budget coverage and how much is the amount of it?

3.2. Other task(s) yes/no

3.2.1. If yes, then the voluntary task is:

pecuniary / non-pecuniary, material / organizational / other (please specify)

3.2.2. The municipality carries out the task

by public service / within the organization / with legal entities / other (please specify)

3.2.3. For how long the task has been carried out?

3.2.4. Was the task previously a compulsory task of the municipality?

3.2.5. How does the municipality provide the budget coverage and how much is the amount of it?

4. Does the municipality have any type of voluntary task in the healthcare sector? (You can also indicate more than one, please provide an answer in that case)

4.1. Substitution for healthcare institutes yes/no

4.1.1. If yes, then the voluntary task is:

pecuniary / non-pecuniary, material / organizational / other (please specify)

4.1.2. The municipality carries out the task

by public service / within the organization / with legal entities / other (please specify)

4.1.3. For how long the task has been carried out?

4.1.4. Was the task previously a compulsory task of the municipality?

4.1.5. How does the municipality provide the budget coverage and how much is the amount of it?

4.2. Other task(s) yes/no

4.2.1. If yes, then the voluntary task is:

pecuniary / non-pecuniary, material / organizational / other (please specify)

4.2.2. The municipality carries out the task

by public service / within the organization / with legal entities / other (please specify)

4.2.3. For how long the task has been carried out?

4.2.4. Was the task previously a compulsory task of the municipality?

4.2.5. How does the municipality provide the budget coverage and how much is the amount of it?

5. Does the municipality have any type of voluntary task in the education sector? (You can also indicate more, please provide an answer in that case)

5.1. Talent support yes/no

5.1.1. If yes, then the voluntary task is:

pecuniary / non-pecuniary, material / organizational / other (please specify)

5.1.2. The municipality carries out the task

by public service / within the organization / with legal entities / other (please specify)

5.1.3. For how long the task has been carried out?

5.1.4. Was the task previously a compulsory task of the municipality?

5.1.5. How does the municipality provide the budget coverage and how much is the amount of it?

5.2. „Good student/good sportman" scholarship yes/no

5.2.1. If yes, then the voluntary task is:

pecuniary / non-pecuniary, material / organizational / other (please specify)

5.2.2. The municipality carries out the task

by public service / within the organization / with legal entities / other (please specify)

5.2.3. For how long the task has been carried out?

5.2.4. Was the task previously a compulsory task of the municipality?

5.2.5. How does the municipality provide the budget coverage and how much is the amount of it?

5.3. Subsidizing camps yes/no

5.3.1. If yes, then the voluntary task is:

pecuniary / non-pecuniary, material / organizational / other (please specify)

5.3.2. The municipality carries out the task

by public service / within the organization / with legal entities / other (please specify)

5.3.3. For how long the task has been carried out?

5.3.4. Was the task previously a compulsory task of the municipality?

5.3.5. How does the municipality provide the budget coverage and how much is the amount of it?

5.4. Purchase of school supplies yes/no

5.4.1. If yes, then the voluntary task is:

pecuniary / non-pecuniary, material / organizational / other (please specify)

5.4.2. The municipality carries out the task

by public service / within the organization / with legal entities / other (please specify)

5.4.3. For how long the task has been carried out?

5.4.4. Was the task previously a compulsory task of the municipality?

5.4.5. How does the municipality provide the budget coverage and how much is the amount of it?

5.5. Other task yes/no

5.5.1. If yes, then the voluntary task is:

pecuniary / non-pecuniary, material / organizational / other (please specify)

5.5.2. The municipality carries out the task

by public service / within the organization / with legal entities / other (please specify)

5.5.3. For how long the task has been carried out?

5.5.4. Was the task previously a compulsory task of the municipality?

5.5.5. How does the municipality provide the budget coverage and how much is the amount of it?

6. Does the municipality have some type of voluntary task in the cultural sector? (You can also indicate more, please provide an answer in that case)

6.1. Organizing (local) festivals yes/no

6.1.1. If yes, then the voluntary task is:

pecuniary / non-pecuniary, material / organizational / other (please specify)

6.1.2. The municipality carries out the task

by public service / within the organization / with legal entities / other (please specify)

6.1.3. For how long the task has been carried out?

6.1.4. Was the task previously a compulsory task of the municipality?

6.1.5. How does the municipality provide the budget coverage and how much is the amount of it?

6.2. Organizing competitions yes/no

6.2.1. If yes, then the voluntary task is:

pecuniary / non-pecuniary, material / organizational / other (please specify)

6.2.2. The municipality carries out the task

by public service / within the organization / with legal entities / other (please specify)

6.2.3. For how long the task has been carried out?

6.2.4. Was the task previously a compulsory task of the municipality?

6.2.5. How does the municipality provide the budget coverage and how much is the amount of it?

6.3. Organizing annual village day / town day yes/ no

6.3.1. If yes, then the voluntary task is:

pecuniary / non-pecuniary, material / organizational / other (please specify)

6.3.2. The municipality carries out the task

by public service / within the organization / with legal entities / other (please specify)

6.3.3. For how long the task has been carried out?

6.3.4. Was the task previously a compulsory task of the municipality?

6.3.5. How does the municipality provide the budget coverage and how much is the amount of it?

6.4. Traditionalist programmes yes/no

6.4.1. If yes, then the voluntary task is:

pecuniary / non-pecuniary, material / organizational / other (please specify)

6.4.2. The municipality carries out the task

by public service / within the organization / with legal entities / other (please specify)

6.4.3. For how long the task has been carried out?

6.4.4. Was the task previously a compulsory task of the municipality?

6.4.5. How does the municipality provide the budget coverage and how much is the amount of it?

6.5. Subsidizing sports yes/no

6.5.1. If yes, then the voluntary task is:

pecuniary / non-pecuniary, material / organizational / other (please specify)

6.5.2. The municipality carries out the task

by public service / within the organization / with legal entities / other (please specify)

6.5.3. For how long the task has been carried out?

6.5.4. Was the task previously a compulsory task of the municipality?

6.5.5. How does the municipality provide the budget coverage and how much is the amount of it?

6.6. Other task(s) yes/no

6.6.1. If yes, then the voluntary task is:

pecuniary / non-pecuniary, material / organizational / other (please specify)

6.6.2. The municipality carries out the task

by public service / within the organization / with legal entities / other (please specify)

6.6.3. For how long the task has been carried out?

6.6.4. Was the task previously a compulsory task of the municipality?

6.6.5. How does the municipality provide the budget coverage and how much is the amount of it?

7. Does the municipality have any type of voluntary task in the economic development sector? (You can also indicate more than one, please provide an answer in that case)

7.1. Subsidizing SME sector yes/no

7.1.1. If yes, then the voluntary task is:

pecuniary / non-pecuniary, material / organizational / other (please specify)

7.1.2. The municipality carries out the task

by public service / within the organization / with legal entities / other (please specify)

7.1.3. For how long the task has been carried out?

7.1.4. Was the task previously a compulsory task of the municipality?

7.1.5. How does the municipality provide the budget coverage and how much is the amount of it?

7.2. Other task(s) yes/no

7.2.1. If yes, then the voluntary task is:

pecuniary / non-pecuniary, material / organizational / other (please specify)

7.2.2. The municipality carries out the task

by public service / within the organization / with legal entities / other (please specify)

7.2.3. For how long the task has been carried out?

7.2.4. Was the task previously a compulsory task of the municipality?

7.2.5. How does the municipality provide the budget coverage and how much is the amount of it?

8. Does the municipality have any type of voluntary task in the tourism sector? (You can also indicate more, please provide an answer in that case)

8.1. Support of tourism yes/no

8.1.1. If yes, then the voluntary task is:

pecuniary / non-pecuniary, material / organizational / other (please specify)

8.1.2. The municipality carries out the task

by public service / within the organization / with legal entities / other (please specify)

8.1.3. For how long the task has been carried out?

8.1.4. Was the task previously a compulsory task of the municipality?

8.1.5. How does the municipality provide the budget coverage and how much is the amount of it?

8.2. Other task(s) yes/no

8.2.1. If yes, then the voluntary task is:

pecuniary / non-pecuniary, material / organizational / other (please specify)

8.2.2. The municipality carries out the task

by public service / within the organization / with legal entities / other (please specify)

8.2.3. For how long the task has been carried out?

8.2.4. Was the task previously a compulsory task of the municipality?

8.2.5. How does the municipality provide the budget coverage and how much is the amount of it?

9. Does the municipality have some type of voluntary task in the public safety sector? (You can also indicate more, please provide an answer in that case)

9.1. Municipality police yes/no

9.1.1. If yes, then the voluntary task is:

pecuniary / non-pecuniary, material / organizational / other (please specify)

9.1.2.The municipality carries out the task

by public service / within the organization / with legal entities / other (please specify)

9.1.3. For how long the task has been carried out?

9.1.4. Was the task previously a compulsory task of the municipality?

9.1.5. How does the municipality provide the budget coverage and how much is the amount of it?

9.2. Constabulary/local rangers yes/no

9.2.1. If yes, then the voluntary task is:

pecuniary / non-pecuniary, material / organizational / other (please specify)

9.2.2. The municipality carries out the task

by public service / within the organization / with legal entities / other (please specify)

9.2.3. For how long the task has been carried out?

9.2.4. Was the task previously a compulsory task of the municipality?

9.2.5. How does the municipality provide the budget coverage and how much is the amount of it?

9.3. Vigilante service/Neighborhood Watch yes/no

9.3.1. If yes, then the voluntary task is:

pecuniary / non-pecuniary, material / organizational / other (please specify)

9.3.2. The municipality carries out the task

by public service / within the organization / with legal entities / other (please specify)

9.3.3. For how long the task has been carried out?

9.3.4. Was the task previously a compulsory task of the municipality?

9.3.5. How does the municipality provide the budget coverage and how much is the amount of it?

9.4. Other task(s) yes/no

9.4.1. If yes, then the voluntary task is:

pecuniary / non-pecuniary, material / organizational / other (please specify)

9.4.2. The municipality carries out the task

by public service / within the organization / with legal entities / other (please specify)

9.4.3. For how long the task has been carried out?

9.4.4. Was the task previously a compulsory task of the municipality?

9.4.5. How does the municipality provide the budget coverage and how much is the amount of it?

10. Does the municipality have some type of voluntary task in the agricultural, environmental sector? (You can also indicate more, please provide an answer in that case)

10.1. Directed (financial) support yes/no

10.1.1. If yes, then the voluntary task is:

pecuniary / non-pecuniary, material / organizational / other (please specify)

10.1.2. The municipality carries out the task

by public service / within the organization / with legal entities / other (please specify)

10.1.3. For how long the task has been carried out?

10.1.4. Was the task previously a compulsory task of the municipality?

10.1.5. How does the municipality provide the budget coverage and how much is the amount of it?

10.2. Other task(s) yes/no

10.2.1. If yes, then the voluntary task is:

pecuniary / non-pecuniary, material / organizational / other (please specify)

10.2.2. The municipality carries out the task

by public service / within the organization / with legal entities / other (please specify)

10.2.3. For how long the task has been carried out?

10.2.4. Was the task previously a compulsory task of the municipality?

10.2.5. How does the municipality provide the budget coverage and how much is the amount of it?

11. Does the municipality have some type of voluntary task in any other sector not mentioned before? (You can also indicate more, please provide an answer in that case)

11.1. No

11.2. Yes - please specify

11.2.1. If yes, then the voluntary task is:

pecuniary / non-pecuniary, material / organizational / other (please specify)

11.2.2. The municipality carries out the task

by public service / within the organization / with legal entities / other (please specify)

11.2.3. For how long the task has been carried out?

11.2.4. Was the task previously a compulsory task of the municipality?

11.2.5. How does the municipality provide the budget coverage and how much is the amount of it?

Yes - please specify

11.2.6 If yes, then the voluntary task is:

pecuniary / non-pecuniary, material / organizational / other (please specify)

11.2.7. The municipality carries out the task

by public service / within the organization / with legal entities / other (please specify)

11.2.8. For how long the task has been carried out?

11.2.9. Was the task previously a compulsory task of the municipality?

How does the municipality provide the budget coverage and how much is the amount of it?