

ELEMENTS OF ORGANIZATIONAL LOGIC IN ROMANIAN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Abstract

The present analysis aims to identify the features that the study on management administrative organizations develops in a context of the knowledge-based society. From this point of view, the present article aims to identify the elements of the organizational logic at this level, variables that - in our opinion - can be found at the confluence of the concept of management, in general, with the term of management of administrative organizations (with specific models enabled with the study variables: decision making process and decision, typology and construction of the organization, management of the financial, human, information resources, etc.) and with the type of decisional models (which enables new variables such as: rational actor model, incremental model or bureaucratic organization model), all of this variables applied in the counties of North-East Region (Iași, Bacău, Botoșani, Vaslui, Focșani, Galați, Piatra Neamț, Suceava City Halls).

Key words: *management of organizations, administrative organization, organizational culture, beliefs, values*

1. Dimensions of organizational management in public administration

The organisational management of administrative institutions It is a field in its own right that can be defined as the totality of processes, interrelations, mechanisms that are established between the dimensions of the administrative structures (internal to the administrative organizations) that are designed to solve issues of public interest, to formulate and implement community strategies of development.

Also called "the public management"², it brings together „the processes and management relations which arise between the administrative system components"³.

The study of the relationships, processes, mechanisms, structures and administrative organisations derives from the evolution of the public management, as a discipline, each approach bringing with it new paradigms and new perspectives on the above mentioned dimensions.

The public management - as a scientific discipline in its own right - appeared due to the concerns of the researches existent in the field of public administration in order to identify the best techniques and methods which can be used in this field. The studies of this type started in Germany and Austria (18th century), then in Austro-Hungary (19th century), who founded the Administration of the State. In our country the study of the public management was founded in 1990, with the change of the political regime being necessary to optimise the space of administrative reforms⁴.

Regardless of the prospects that we will apply to the public management - the scientific management theories, theories of bureaucratic level, human resources, organizational development, of contingency, organizational behaviour - we can synthesize three shpes in relation to which was outlined this discipline and the studies relating to them.

¹Post-PhD Fellow SOP HRD/159/1.5/133675 Project, Romanian Academy - Iasi Branch

Aknowledgement: This paper is supported by the Sector Operational Programme Human Resources Development (SOP HRD), financed from the European Social Fund and by the Romanian Government under the contract number POSDRU/159/1.5/133675.

² A. Adroniceanu, *Public Management. Study Cases.*, Silvy Press, Bucharest, 1999, p.6.

³ A. Adroniceanu, *Public Management*, Economic Press, Bucharest, 1999, p.4.

⁴ I. Alexandru, *Structures, Mechanisms and Administrative Institutions*, Silvy Press, Bucharest, 1996, p.36.

The three approaches are: the political approach, the legal and the managerial approach approach⁵.

The political approach links the public management from the political theory. Wallace Sayre argues that democracies must manage the issue of total control, and at the administrative level, on this dimension must be build the democratic rights and the freedoms pattern: representativeness, sensitivity and responsiveness⁶. The actors involved in administrative organizations are administrative staffs, but not only, but also politicians, seeking legitimacy and representativeness in front of the masses.

The legal approach is an extremely important dimension to the public administrations. Although its role was minimized for a period, however, the administrative organisations operate in a regulatory and legislative framework, extremely well-defined. No matter what are the political, economic problems, the dimensions of the administrative law are present and influence the decision-making process and mechanisms of this type. The administrative organisations turns into bureaucracy bodies rather predictable sometimes, a way that means complying with the rules, with the legislation.

The managerial approach is closely linked to the economic theories, to the economic principles that are transposed at the administrative level. It is based on values such as efficiency, effectiveness and brings in the first stage the actor involved in the decision-making process and emphasizes the process of communication and coordination.

Without overlap public policy domain and of public administration at the public management, we consider that in order to try to determine what is the organizational logic at the administrative level, we must take over all of these three approaches from which to take the specifics of each other.

Moreover, if we overlap these three approaches on the three paradigms used in general decision-making theory, or at the level of the public policies - the rational actor model⁷, the incremental model and the bureaucratic organisation model – elements of similarity exists. Thus, the rational actor model corresponds to the managerial approach, the bureaucratic organisation model⁸ - to the political approach (with all its political and administrative implications), and the incremental model⁹ to the legal approach (that preserves the bureaucratic routine and resumes it whenever it is necessary).

From this point of view the operationalisation of these three theories it is necessary in an attempt to determine which is the organizational logic in public administration through the view of the public management.

2. Elements of organizational logic at the administrative level

Within the administrative organizations, in order to identify what is the organizational logic at this level, we must start from the public management, from the totality of processes, mechanisms which shall be determined between the structures of organizations and from the management of the structures and of the resources enabled.

From this point of view, we have identified five dimensions to trace this logic as follows:

⁵ A. Androniceanu, *International Public Management*, Economic Press, Bucharest, 1999, p.28.

⁶ W. Sayre, *Decision Making in the Federal Government*, Brookings Institution, SUA, 1979, pp. 42-48.

⁷ The rational actor model is formulated by Anthony Downs, *An Economic theory of democracy*, European Institute Press, Iasi, 2009

⁸ The incremental model is formulated by Charles Lindblom, *Public policies elaboration*, Cartier Press, Bucharest, 2003.

⁹ The model of bureaucratic organisation is formulated by Graham Allison, *The decision essence. An explanation for the boughts crisis from Cuba*, Polirom Press, Iasi, 2010.

- the decision-making mechanisms
- the characteristics and topology of the decisions
- authority, actors involved and human resource management
- the resources management
- the communication at the level of the organization.

For each of these, we carried out three models mentioned: the rational actor model, incremental and bureaucratic organization model.

The rational actor model is a model that supports the activation of administrative problems and solving them in a linear manner that enables strategic decisions to be taken following a logic of efficiency in relation with which the individual counts (see **Table 1, 2, 3 and 4**).

Table 1

The decision-making mechanisms

Rational Actor Model	Incremental model	Bureaucratic Organisation Model
a. Are involved, the singular individuals, or groups (s) clearly set out at the beginning of the process of decision	b. The singular individuals, or groups that may be involved (e) during the decision making	The institution as a whole or its representatives at the level of leadership
a. It matter the institutional process by which we take decisions.	b. It matter the resumption of the decisional process if somewhere there was an error.	c. It matter the coordination at the level of groups even if it is approaching to the routine.
a. It is searched for consensus among all	b. We are lookin for the partnership at least between some of those involved.	c. It counts the cooperation between its members, between groups.
a. The decision follows a dominant purpose.	b. The decision follows a combination of specific purposes.	c. It matters the interests of the group involved.
a. The majorities subject the minorities.	b. Everyone involved can make decisions.	c. There may be more minorities that identify with the working groups.

The incremental model involves a decision-making process which include the decisions already implemented, a dscontinuous process because they are involved political actors who activate a strong process of negotiation (**Table 1, 2, 3 and 4**).

Table 2

The typologies of the decisions

Rational Actor Model	Incremental model	Bureaucratic Organisation Model
a. The decision shall be taken according to the motivation of efficient use of resources.	b. The decision shall be taken in order to remedy the damage.	c. The decision shall be taken only because as the routines.say so, strategically.
a. Tends toward what is new.	b. It is modeled after other decisions already taken.	c. It can be well modeled after other models.
a. Is precise.	b. is unprecise.	c. Tends to be precise.
a. The authority of the decision cannot be challenged.	b. The authority of the decision cannot be challenged, but it rarely happens.	c. The authority of the decision is challenged, being often required the negotiation.

Regarding the model of bureaucratic organization, it involves the activation of a decision-making process in which the bureaucracy is recognized, the hierarchies are complied by the staff, but the differences occur in the strategies because it can be involved a lot of minor actors. However, bureaucratic routines are familiar to this model (**Table no. 1, no. 2, no.3 and no. 4**).

Table 3

The human resource management

Rational Actor Model	Incremental model	Bureaucratic Organisation Model
a. The individuals make singularly decisions, or certain groups clearly established from the beginning of the decision making process.	b. Individuals, either singular or particular groups that may be involved (s) during the decision-making process	c. Institution as a whole or its representatives in the management
a. The actors are from the institution, administrative staff.	b. May be outside the institution.	c. Are clearly separated from each department, structure, group.
a. The group that takes the decisions has a unitary character.	b. Has a mobile character.	c. Has a clear structure.
a. The hierarchies are recognized.	b. The hierarchies are recognized, but are not rigid.	c. Are recognized and respected, but in practice are impossible to be realised.

Table 4

The management of the resources and of the informations

Rational Actor Model	Incremental model	Bureaucratic Organisation Model
a. The decision is made by an economic logic: its the costs and benefits.	b. With a logic of small steps, the economic logic belongs to the interests groups in the market.	c. The logic is clearly established by the regulations.
a. The information is clearly established, respected.	b. It's not necessarily clearly established, may be violated.	c. Can be both formal and informal
a. It counts the correct information from the start.	b. The information is on the way, it is resumed where errors occur.	c. Information is strict, with no errors, but may be on the way.

From here, there were applied all these operational dimensions in order to synthesize on each dimensions identified the characteristics of the organizational logic.

3. Metodology and sample

The present study is a prescriptive one and aims to identify the mechanisms and processes that the decision-making process enables at levels of Government under the three models of decision-making: the rational actor model, the incremental model and the model of bureaucratic organization. The questionnaire uses the three models based on some items in the form of closed questions that are designed to place the respondent in a decision making model.

The research sample is composed of 648 respondents, employees of the mayoralities of cities: Piatra Neamț, Iași, Bacău, Vaslui, Suceava, Botoșani, Galați, Focșani.

The sample is representative for the population of Moldova region, the civil servants employed in institutions of the Moldovian cityhalls being quite homogeneous, meaning an average of 1,51% from the total population of civil servants of these institutions (5317). The sample is representative and it is based on probabilistic process, trying to ensure that "each element of the population has equal opportunities to sample"¹⁰. In relation to the size of the sample, the probabilistic error is most likely somewhere around 6%¹¹.

¹⁰ V. Miftode, *Treatise on sociological methodology*, Lumen Press, Iasi, 2003, p. 256.

¹¹ *Ibidem*, p. 257.

4. Results

The decision making process is outlined differently at the organizational level. Of the total valid responses - 91.5%, - 64.2% says that the decision-making process involves the following steps: define the problem - identify the purpose - makes all the alternatives - identifying the best alternative - at the end to reach the best choice; 17.6% said that the decision making process involves defining the problem - finding alternative also implemented, which is known to the actors - redefinition of the problem from this perspective - the implementation of the alternative - if it's not functional, the actors seek the alternative that does not differ by the previously ones practiced; 9.7% starting from defining the problem - looking for an alternative after a negotiation process - optimal solution, recognized by everyone based on routines - and its implementation. (see **Table 5**: Steps in decision making process).

Table 5

Steps in decision making process

		Frecvency	%	Valid %	cumulative %
Valid	define the problem - identify the purpose - makes all the alternatives - identifying the best alternative - at the end to reach the best choice	416	64,2	70,2	70,2
	defining the problem - finding alternative also implemented, which is known to the actors - redefinition of the problem from this perspective - the implementation of the alternative - if it's not functional, the actors seek the alternative that does not differ by the previously ones practiced	114	7,6	19,2	89,4
	defining the problem - looking for an alternative after a negotiation process - optimal solution, recognized by everyone based on routines - and its implementation	63	9,7	10,6	100,0
	Total	593	1,5	100,0	
Missing	97,00	55	5		
	Total	648	00,0		

26.1% declared that their job matters institutionalized process by which the decision, 25.9% support the resumption of whether an error has occurred somewhere, and 19.6% of respondents focus on coordinating work across groups even if it is close to the routine of non-response rate was 28.4%. In decision-making mechanisms activated based cooperation between members, between groups (not involving total consensus) - 40.6%, the consensus of all - 20.2%, the partnership at least of some of those involved - 10.5% . Of all respondents, 40.4% said that decision-making process is based on a dominant purpose, 15% say that what matters are the interests of the involved group, and 9.7% - a combination of private purposes. 34, 7% of respondents claim that the decision making process of the working department, the majorities subject the minorities, 19.8% say that everyone involved can make decisions, and 10.6% say that there may be more minorities that can influence the decision of the working group within the department.

In terms of the features and the types of decisions, 55.4% of respondents stated that the decision is taken by the motivation of efficient use of the resources, 10.2% said that the decision is taken to fix the damages, and 5.6% claim that decision supports daily routines. In relation to the novelty of the decision, 16% said that the decision tends to what is new, 12.2%

said that the decision is modeled after other decisions implemented, while 37% say that decisions can be new and modeled after other models. 31% say that the purpose of the decision is to achieve the greatest gain, 22.7% stated that the purpose of the decision shall identify the purpose of the group involved in decision making process. And 8.3% said that the decisions are taken if they have political support. Also, of all respondents, 30.1% said that the decision is accurate, 4.5% say that it is inaccurate, and 25.5% say that tends to accuracy. It should be noted that, in this case non-response rate is very high: 40%. 21.1% claimed that the decision can not be challenged, 36.6% declared that the authority's decision can be appealed, but it happens rarely, and 5.7% said that authority is contested decision, often requiring negotiation.

From here on, we can formulate a set of assumptions for the authority, the actors and human resource management. In general, in the administrative organization, the decisions are taken by the institution as a whole or its representatives at management level - 69.4%, 16.8% say that individuals, in singular, are involved in the decision making process, 7.9% - declare that both individuals and the groups involved in decision making process take them, non-response rate was 5.9%. 73% of respondents stated that the decision makers are clearly separated from each department or group structure, 18.1% say they are from within the institution, but are not clearly defined, in general administrative staff and 3.5% states that decision makers can be from outside. Regarding the way in which the decision-making entity builds from the perspective of the hierarchies established between decision makers, 63.1% said that the decision hierarchies are recognized by the group, 21.1% say that the hierarchies are recognized, but are rigid and 6.2% say that hierarchies are recognized and respected, but in practice this is impossible. Regarding resources management, 41.4% of respondents stated that decisions are taken by an economic logic: of the cost-benefit, 33.2% are supporting the logic of the clearly regulations established and 8% support the logic of the small steps because the economic logic belongs to thr groups of interests from the market.

In terms of communication within the organization, of the information flow, 45.5% say that in the administrative decision making process, it matters from the beginning the correct information, 15.1% say that information is in the process and it is resumed if errors occur, and 10.2% say that information is strictly, without errors, but can be changed during the process. In terms of communication within the organization, 57.7% say that it is clearly established, respected, 25.9% say that it is both formal and informal, and 6.3% say it's not necessarily clearly established, it may be violated. In general, at the institutional level, the communication can be directed from the actor to the citizen and vice versa - 42.9%, it is equal, between similar groups - 29% ot it is directed only from the actor to the citizen - 15,6%.

Conclusions

Analyzing the results identified above on each dimension, it can be observed that the rational actor model is the one that defines the logic in the administrative organizations. The main features of this model are: the decision-making is a logical route and irreversible (starts from the problem definition to its implementation and evaluation of the alternative identified above in relation to the economic criteria), the decision-making mechanisms are institutionalized, the decision tends to new, the actors are recognized as independent individuals, but yet most important, the information management requires that the information process to be clear, precise (and the communication process itself), the groups are defined individually at the level of the organization.

However, it appears a series of incremental influences or of the bureaucratic organization model at the organizational logic: the decision making process can be resumed if

it is necessary, the environment is characterized by uncertainty and the errors are not excluded, there are formal elements (strictly bureaucratic), and informal (related to non-administrative actors that can be involved in the decision making process). There is a symbiosis between the organization's economic dimension of the selection of the criteria for the decision evaluation and the compliance of the bureaucracy, of the regulation and of the specific legislation.

Beyond all these results obtained from the empirical analysis, it can be concluded at a higher level of generality that organizational logic at the administrative level can be shaped through the activation of decision theories (the rational actor model, the incremental and the bureaucratic organization model), emphasising in the main features of the rational actor model. As we specified above, the other models are activated in some measure on different dimensions, which highlights once again the evolution and the influence of existing approaches to public management level.

Acknowledgement

This paper is supported by the Sector Operational Programme Human Resources Development (SOP HRD), financed from the European Social Fund and by the Romanian Government under the contract number POSDRU/159/1.5/133675.

References

- Adroniceanu, A., *Public Management*, Economic Press, Bucharest, 1999.
- Adroniceanu, A., *Public Management. Cases Studies*, Silvy Press, Bucharest, 1999, p.6.
- Alexandru, I., *Structures, Mechanisms and Administrative Institutions*, Silvy Press, Bucharest, 1996.
- Adroniceanu, A., *International Public Management*, Economic Press, Bucharest, 1999.
- Allison, G., *The decision essence. An explanation for the boughts crisis from Cuba*, Polirom Press, Iasi, 2010.
- Downs, A., *An Economic theory of democracy*, European Institute Press, Iasi, 2009.
- Lindblom, C., *Public policies elaboration*, Cartier Press, Bucharest, 2003.
- Miftode, V., *Treatise on sociological methodology*, Lumen Press, Iasi, 2003.
- Sayre, W., *Decision Making in the Federal Government*, Brookings Institution, SUA, 1979.