

***THE MANAGEMENT OF THE KNOWLEDGE-BASED ORGANIZATIONS:  
COMPARATIVE DIMENSIONS OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL LOGIC IN ROMANIAN  
PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION***

**Dorina Țicu, Post-PhD Fellow, Romanian Academy, Iași Branch, SOP  
HRD/159/1.5/133675**

*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 that form the organizational logic at the administrative level, starting from specific variables: the actor involved in decision-making process, the decision-making processes and the mechanisms activated, the decisional criteria, the values, the symbols, the beliefs activated by the actors from the administrative level.*

*From this point, the role of this article is to extract all the issues that form the organizational logic at the administrative level, issues that identify and create some specific features of the public management.*

**Keyword:** *management of organizations, organizational logic, public administration*

**From the definitions to the dimensions of the organizational management in public administration**

Public administration has seen increasingly confronted at least in recent years with significant changes in terms of the proper functioning, of the expectations of the citizens, of the political body, of the responsibilities, general interest manifested toward this issue being good governance, namely the management of administrative organizations.

A first definition is given by M. Dumitrescu which affirms that management is "the science which assure to all the driving of the processes and of the economic units and from other sectors of activity, in all their functions, with the first sight based on man, its motivated participation which involves solving problems under forecast report, organisation, management, decision making and control, outlining them in increasing economic efficiency (Dumitrescu, 1995, p. 48).

Another definition says that management is "the process in which the manager operates with three fundamental elements: ideas, things and people, to realize goals" (MacKensie, 1969, p. 83). The strategic management examines the size of the organisation in its environment, it specifies objectives and distinct purposes, prepares the organization to face an uncertain future (Nutt, Backoff, 1992, p. 31). The administrative institutions and civil servants are called upon to assume the formulation of strategies, objectives and priorities as an integral part of managerial activity.

The management is situated along the traditional concerns of organizations science, perceived as the science of good governance, effective discharge. It sets out as essential goal the utility and its clear, operational use. Its ambition is to define clearly the rules, the norms, more, the paths that enable the organizations to achieve the goals that they have set with maximum efficiency. It is distinguished by simple empirical practice and by the first

formulations of the organizations science through a more pronounced formalization: theoretical and conceptual dimension is essential to management, which tends to combine practice with a "representation of the reality which science wants" (Weill, 1992, p. 45). It is "a set of practices which combine the pragmatism and scientific knowledge" (Nioche, 1992, p. 24).

For management, the conduct of all administrative organizations involves four types of operations: planning, organizing, activating (resource mobilization), control (Robin, Miller, 1989, p. 69).

From this point of view, at the level of this analysis, based on these definitions and dimensions, we consider that the management of the administrative organizations involves centering on a few central dimensions: identification of the actors involved in the administrative process, decision-making processes and public decisions, as well as other values criteria of decisions selection at this level, which become potential motivators of the actors involved.

### **Methodology and sample**

The present article aims to identify a number of features of the organizational management at the administrative level, based on a quantitative study conducted within an organization in the administrative Region of North-East, namely in the City Hall of Iasi and Vaslui City Hall, using the comparison technique. The study is based on a quantitative analysis using the questionnaire as an instrument applied to the civil servants in the city of Iasi and Vaslui, the sample being made up of 161 respondents, based on, as the mechanism of construction snowball technique.

The sample has the following features. Iasi: 18,2% - men, 78,4% - women; 8% has between 21 – 30 years old, 39,8% between 31 – 40 years, 26,1% - between 41 – 50 years, 16% - over 50 years; 90,9% - Orthodox, 3,4% Catholic; 65,9% are married, 12,5% are married and divorced, 1,1% - widowers; 5,7% are high school graduates, 2,3% - post secondary school, 55,7% faculty, 34,1% - master; 20,5% has the basic specialization of technical sciences, 34,1% -economic sciences, 25% - public administration 4,5% - mathematics-computer science, 5,7% - social sciences, 1,1% legal sciences; 36,4% works in administrative direction, 11,4% - economic direction, 10,2% - budget, finances direction, 13,6% - technical direction, 5,7% - communication direction, 1,1% for european integration and uranism; 43,2% are inspectors, 26,1% conseillers, 12,5% - referents, and 4,5% - Heads of Office; 42% have a length in work between 5 – 10 years, 30,7% - over 10 years, 19,3% - up to 5 years; 26,1% has a salary of 1000 lei, 28,4% between 1001 – 1500 lei, 15,9% between 1501 – 2000 lei, 1,1% up to 2500 lei; 2,3% are member of a party, 90,9% - no; 2,3% are member of SDP.

Vaslui: 38,4% - men, 56,2% -women; 20,5% have up to 30 years, 38,4% between 31 – 40 years, 19,2% între 41 – 50 years, 15,1% - over 50 years; 93,2% - Orthodox; 58,9% are married, 26% are un married, 6,8% are divorced, 1,4% widowers; 6,8% are high school graduates, 2,7% - post secondary school, 47,9% faculty, 41,1% master graduated; 19,2% has the basic specialization of technical sciences, 28,8% economic sciences, 11% - legal sciences,

9,6% - social sciences, 20,5% - public administration, 1,4% for architecture and mathematics-computer, 1,4% psychology; 31,5% works in economic direction, 20,5% - social direction, 1,4% - european integration direction, 5,5% budget and finances direction, 8,2% - administrative direction, 16,4% urbanism direction; 42,5% are conseiluers, 15,1% - inspectors, 11% for Heads of Office and referents; 2,7% have a length in work of up to a year, 43,8% between 1 – 5 years, 21,9% 5 – 10 ani, 26% up to 10 years; 47,9% has a salary up to 1000 lei, 13,7% between 1001 – 1500 lei, 5,5% between 1501 – 2000 lei, 2,7% between 2001 – 2500 lei; 2,7% - are member of a party, 84,9% - no; 1,4% are member of SDP, 1,4% from NLP; 2,7% are not member of a party.

## Results

For the first dimension of the organizational management at the administrative level, we try to identify in a comparative manner the features of the actors of the two organisations.

At the organizational level, the actors involved refers generally to the, through them management representatives (Iași – 70,4%, Vaslui – 67,1%); the singular individuals or certain preset groups (Iași – 17%, Vaslui – 20,5%); the individuals and certain groups established during the decisional process (Iași – 9%, Vaslui – 13,6%). The group of those who make decisions is clearly set (Iași – 48,8%; Vaslui – 52%); it is not clearly set (5% for each organisation); has an identity clearly established from the start (Iași – 44,3%, Vaslui – 43,8%).

Those who takes decisions are within the institution, administrative staff (Iași – 6,8%, Vaslui – 20,5%); can be from the outside (Iași – 3,4%, Vaslui – 2,7%); they clearly define the departments within the institution (Iași – 88,6%, Vaslui – 78%). The actors of the organization are not independent (they are parts of the institution) (Iași – 84%, Vaslui – 69,8%); have some degree of freedom (Iași – 6,8%, Vaslui – 15%); they are quasi-independent (Iași – 3,4%, Vaslui – 2,7%).

The group of decisions making process have a unitary character (Iași – 15,9%, Vaslui – 12,3%); mobile (Iași – 12,5%, Vaslui – 10,9%); clear structure (Iași – 68,1%, Vaslui – 69,8%). At the organizational level, the hierarchies are recognized (Iași – 68,1%, Vaslui – 56,1%); are recognized, but are not rigid (Iași – 25%, Vaslui – 27,3%); are recognized and respected, but in practice it does not apply (Iași – 5%, Vaslui – 16,4%).

Synthesizing through a comparison the highest percentage obtained at the level of the two administrative organizations, we can highlight the following comparisons (**Table 1. Comparative characteristics of the actors involved in management process**):

**Table 1. Comparative characteristics of the actors involved in management process**

		City		Diferece
		Iași	Vaslui	
In the institution where you work who makes the decisions?	the actors involved refers generally to the, through them management representatives	70,4%	67,1%	3,3%

The group who takes decisions:	is clearly set, but there may be some changes	48,8%	52%	-3,2%
Those who take decisions:	clear outlined of in each Department	88,6%	78%	10,6%
Those who take decisions:	Are not independent (are parts of the institution)	84%	68,1%	15,9%
The group of those who take decisions:	Has a clear structure	68,1%	69,8%	-1,7%
The group decision-making hierarchies:	Are recognised	68,1%	56,1%	12%

In relation to the dimensions identified (**Table 1**), it can be seen that at the level of the two administrative organizations, were activated the same dimensions with the highest percentage, making the differences between them to appear only inside the dimensions, through the percentages obtained. It should be noted that only for two items, the percentages are higher for Vaslui city hall, otherwise, the scores obtained for Iasi are higher. Form six items observed, the differences of the three bits of percentages are over 10%, in the rest, there are up to the 3,3%.

The second dimension refers to the study of the management process of decision-making mechanisms. The steps that follow the decision-making process are: problem definition-identify the best alternative-implementation and its evaluation (Iași – 65,9%, Vaslui – 61,6%); problem definition-choosing a known alternative, already implamentate-redefining problem-implementing alternative (Iași – 19%, Vaslui – 19%); problem definition-searching for an alternative as a result of a strong bargaining-the choice of the alternative/universally accepted solution-implementation (Iași – 12,5%, Vaslui – 13,6%) (**Table 2. Steps in the decision-making process**).

**Table 2. Steps in the decision-making process**

When decisions are taken, what are the steps?	City		Difference
	Iași	Vaslui	
problem definition-identify the best alternative-implementation and its evaluation	65,9%	61,6%	4,3%
defining alternate known-redefinition-problem-practice	19%	19%	0%
define-a-choice alternative -solution recognized by all	12,5%	13,6%	-1,1%

When it is taken a decision, all matters are discussed (Iași – 73,8%, Vaslui -72,6%); some problems can be ignored in favor of others (Iași – 12,5%, Vaslui – 9,5%); the issues are imposed by the coordinator, some of them can be circumvented (Iași – 7,9%, Vaslui –

13,6%). The decision making process aims the change, even drastic (Iași – 14,7%, Vaslui – 24,6%); preservation of existing policies (Iași – 37,5%, Vaslui – 41%); the change, but not drastic (Iași – 37,5%, Vaslui – 21,9%). When a decision is taken, are evaluated: all the alternatives and then the consequences (Iași – 71,5%, Vaslui – 68,4%); the alternative that differs the least of practice (Iași – 6,8%, Vaslui – 5%); the alternative which is a priority for the group involved in decision making process (Iași – 19,3%, Vaslui – 19,3%).

The decision-making process implies that: majorities subject minorities (Iași – 40,9%, Vaslui – 43,8%); everyone involved can make decisions (Iași – 22,7%, Vaslui – 19,3%); there may be more minorities to decide (Iași – 7,9%, Vaslui – 13,6%). The decision-making process is: strategic, coherent, planned (Iași – 56,8%, Vaslui – 53,4%); not necessarily coherent, but changing (Iași – 6,8%, Vaslui – 17,8%); reglemented, but can be disjointed (Iași – 17%, Vaslui – 12,3%).

Realizing the same synthesis of larger percentages on each item separately, the conclusions are similar as in the case of the actors: the highest percentages are received at the administrative organizations level on the same items (so the organizations will have no significant differences) (**Table 3. Comparative characteristics of decision-making processes**).

**Table 3. Comparative characteristics of decision-making processes**

		City		
		Iași	Vaslui	Difference
When a decision is taken:	All the problems are discussed	73,8%	72,6%	1,2%
When you make a decision, it means:	preservation of existing policies	37,5%	41%	-3,5%
When a decision is taken, are evaluated:	all the alternatives and then the consequences	71,5%	68,4%	3,1%
The decision-making process has the following features:	is an act of strategic, coherent, planned	56,8%	53,4%	3,4%
The decision-making process involves:	The majorities subject the minorities	30,9%	43,8%	-2,9%
When decisions are taken, what steps are next?	define problem-purpose-alternative-choosing the best alternative	65,9%	61,6%	4,3%

Moreover, in this case, the difference of the percentages on each item in the side are much smaller than 4,3%. It can be asserted that there is a more salient similarity in the processes.

The third dimension involves the involvement at managerial level of the motivations and of the beliefs, and of the values activated at administrative level. In terms of the motivations and beliefs, we have identified a panel for each of the two administrative organizations, in relation to a scale of intensity (from "very little measure" in to "in very large measure"), accepting for the present analysis, only the answers classified under the highest positive intensity.

We have done a comparison of the two bits of percentages obtained for each organization in accordance with **Table 4. The hierarchy of the values - comparative sizes.**

**Table 4. The hierarchy of the values - comparative sizes**

Motivation types	Item	City	
		Iași	Vaslui
Motivations/Psychological needs	The job I do I shall daily livelihood.	42,5%	31,1%
Motivations/ Safety needs	I feel safe at the workplace.	9,2%	25,7%
Motivations /Social needs	I have created fiends at work.	24,1%	33,8%
Motivations /Assessing needs	I feel respected in the workplace.	19,5%	31,1%
Motivations / Needs of self-development	If I am well prepared, I feel I can always move forward.	16,1%	23%

As we can see, the differences are huge between the two administrative organizations. Both percentages are different for every type of needs which motivates actor involved in decision-making process and management process, also their hierarchy is one of their own of each unit. Most enabled are the motivations of psychological needs (basal), the less being those pertaining to the psychological motivations (9,2% la Iași).

The Iasi Organization's panel supposes the following hierarchy: psychological motivations - social motivations - motivations that are related to the apreciation - the motivations of self-development and motivations related to safety. For Vaslui, the order is different: social reasons-on the same place, the psychological motivations and the under-appreciated motivations - safety motivations - and motivations which cover self-development. In comparison, but outside the psychological motivations, all other types of motivations are much more assessed in Vaslui than the Iasi organization.

It is difficult, just based on these assessments, to draw such conclusions. For example, the fact that organisation of Iasi are not assessed the motivations of security, this can means that the organization is secure and then the actors involved in the process does not assess such beliefs, but we cannot sustain that other organization appears to be more uncertain, this beeing difficult to be determined. It would have been required much more internal assessments to draw such a conclusion, more then that the insecurity can be defined in different ways.

What we can say with certainty is that the internal climate of the two administrative organizations seems to be quite different, at least if we consider the line of the beliefs, motivations of actors involved at this level. In terms of values enabled at the organizational level, we follow the same procedure as in the case of: creating hierarchy of percentages after

the largest positive intensity on each individual from the each unit (**Table 5. Values. Comparative dimensions**).

**Table 5. Values. Comparative dimensions**

Item	City		Item	City	
	Iași	Vaslui		Iași	Vaslui
Utility	63,2%	43,2%	Continuity	34,5%	21,6%
Efficiency	82,8%	60,8%	Stability	41,4%	32,4%
Clarity	57,5%	39,2%	Experience	50,6%	37,8%
Brevity	39,1%	20,3%	Non-ideology	10,3%	10,8%
Novelty	18,4%	14,9%	Objectivity	47,1%	52,7%
Inequality	3,4%	9,5%	Loiality	43,7%	29,7%
Adaptability	23%	14,9%	Strategy	39,1%	29,7%
			Power	9,2%	12,2%

In this case too, the values are different for each organisation. The two organizations enables all values listed, but their development is different. As for motivations, the biggest difference between the highest and lowest value appears in Iasi (82,8% - 9,2%).

If we make an hierarchy of the first three values for each of the organizations, we have the following hierarchy: Iasi-efficient-utility-clarity, and Vaslui: efficiency-objectivity-utility. Two of the three values overlapp, revealing that both administrative organisations activates, when make decisions, the values that are related to the economic size and in this way they will make the selection of the choices or of the decisions, or of the alternatives. Moreover, neither the clarity it is not very different from objectivity, with at least one common trunk.

However, both these values in the top of the hierarchy, and the others receive different percentages that do nothing more than to bring to the surface the differences at the organizational, managerial, administrative level, after all.

## Conclusions

Starting from the quantitative dimensions of the present study, we can highlight a number of traits that are related to the organizational logic that draws the borders of administrative management.

First, the organizational management at the administrative level has a number of common traits, regardless of the particular administrative organization that we take into account: the institution's involvement as a whole or through those in leadership positions (in particular); requires a clear definition of the group decision-making and management and a recognition of roles and hierarchies; an organizational discipline and a clear delimitation of the organizational structure and of the functional dimensions. As the processes activated, at managerial level, it follows a fairly well defined roadmap (from the definition of the problems until the implementation and evaluation of the solution chosen to solve the problem), quite bureaucratic; strategic; that starts from giving attention to all problems and identification of all the alternatives from which to choose the best of them; that would be based on the particular principles, values and beliefs which are related to the economic dimension. The

actor's motivation seems to be linked to all of the economic issues, in the sense that the money motivates the actors and provide the best outcome.

Beyond these general dimensions, however, we cannot lose sight of the fact that every administrative organization develops on each size, on each item, its own relevant approaches. Every administrative organization values more or less the routine, the birocracy, supports more or less the risks, values in different ways the beliefs and its own needs, the criteria for selection of the decisions, the values-itself.

Thus, at the administrative level, the organizational management must be studied both in the view of the general mechanisms and processes, as well as of the elements of hue, because all these models developed for each structure may result in a decision that can be good for the community at a time.

### References

- Dumitrescu, M. (1995) *Introducere în Management și management general*, Oradea: Editura Eurounion SRL.
- MacKensie, A. (1969) [\*The Management Process in 3-D\*](#), *Harward Business Review*, vol. 68, nr.3. pp.80-87.
- Nioche, J.P. (1992) The War of Degrees in European Management education, *EFMD Forum*, 1, pp. 21-40.
- Nutt, P.C., Backoff, R.W. (1992) *Strategic Management of Public and Third Sector Organisations: a Handbook for Leaders*, San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Rabin, J., Miller, G.J., Hildreth, W.B. (eds) (1989) *Handbook of Strategic Management*, New York: Marcel Dekker Base.
- Weill, M. (1992) *Le Management Strategique*, Paris: Armand Collin.