

THE ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE'S PARTICULARITIES IN THE PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS FROM THE DEFENSE BRANCH – BETWEEN NECESSITIES, REQUESTS AND POSSIBILITIES

Daniel GOGOESCU¹

ABSTRACT

About the concept of the „organizational culture” were written many papers, from different approaches, in the global scientific world. It is natural to discuss about “organizational culture” in the private and public environment but it is difficult to make a simple connection with the defence branch, mainly due to the specificity of this domain. Different specialists from different periods of time tried to explain – theoretical and practical – the crystallization and adaptation/transformation process of this concept but a perfect result still does not exist. Although each approach has its own shortcomings and its important contributions, these studies served as instruments for culture's analysis and to determine – through particularization – the implications of the cultural values on employees from the public sector's organizations/institutions. The organizational culture is assumed to offer to the organization's members the feeling that they are part of the organizational identity, they have common values, needs and ideals. In the current Romanian state, where some “qualities” as individualism/egocentrism, negative emotions, false status and false motivations of interests are better valued than respect, education, ethics and morale, it is more than essential to reshape and correct the “distortions”, considering that a proper behaviour, an adequate organizational culture – especially in a public institution – could be an example for a future implementation of the correct concept in the society. Reinstating the true value of the different components of the organizational culture (system of values, implicit presumptions, heroes, honourable behaviour, manners and ceremonies) in the public institutions as a first step of an ineluctable process of a future implementation in the Romanian society will avoid negative reactions or counter-reactions to these processes. Furthermore, this kind of process will reinstate the adequate and normal scale of values, no matter if these values are spiritual, material, intellectual and affective, still taking into consideration the thinking way, psyche and individuals' personalities. All these analyses are far more important when the “distortions” were found inside the institutions from the defence branch, their impact over the society and state could have catastrophic effects.

KEYWORDS: *Management, Organizational Culture, Public Institution, Defence Institution*

JEL CLASSIFICATION: *L290; Y8*

1. INTRODUCTION

The concept of „organizational culture” has been crystallized during the time, each attempt to abstract this concept reflecting the society and state's characteristic, of the time period and of the specialist who realized it. Initially, the concept put together ideas and theories regarding the national culture, its location, the principles and rules from which it was formed and within which it exists. Taking into consideration the multitude of societies it is normal to consider the numerous representations of this concept. Each of these representations mirrored both the individuals' development and the societies which they compose, sciences such as ethnology and anthropology helping the understanding of the

¹ Craiova University, Romania, dan_gogoescu@yahoo.ca

culture concept in terms of society's development, subsequent being associated to the civilization concept. So, the British ethnologist Edmund B. Taylor¹ (1920) considered that this concept - culture – is a „...complex which align sciences, beliefs, arts, ethics, laws, traditions, and also other abilities or habits acquired by people as members of societies”. Subsequent, the concept of *culture* was definite through the dual approach of identity – individual and collective – either as a *part of development of certain abilities of the spirit through adjacent intellectual exercises and the essembly of the acquired knowledge's*, or as *essembly of the intellectual and artistic aspects of a certain civilization*.

The general accepted definition is that represents an *assembly of distinct features, spiritual and material, intellectual and affective, which characterize a society or a social group, comprehending also the modus vivendi, human fundamental rights, values systems, traditions and beliefs*. The analysis of the concept of culture highlights its evolution's stages, in the end the concept of culture disclosing the fact that each country and people have a national culture, which part one from others and which hall-mark, fundamentally, the lives of the individuals of that community. The theoretical and practical researches of different specialists mark out the fact that this concept is heterogeneous, indedded, complex and, mainly, dynamic. This last characteristic allowed the osmosis of this concept toward particularization through the express display of its multi-dimensionality, meaning the advent of the concepts of *organizational culture* and *managerial culture*.

2. THE ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

We consider there are insufficient theories regarding the relations between the concepts of *national culture* and *culture of organizations from public field*, the last one appeared as a result of the complex process of globalization but labelled by the fact that each state/community has its own system of common values, similar experiences or perceptions regarding the external environment, which are accepted and shared. The multitude of these perceptions and expressions connected with the multitude of specific communities cumbered not only the process to theory the above mentioned relation, but also the process of create a pattern of the organizational culture in public institutions. These „difficulties” were mirrored mainly in the difficulty to determine the dimensions of the concept of culture, referred to the concept of the organizational culture in private and public organizations. The most important papers in the branch literature² (Androniceanu Armenia, 2006) are those which take into consideration the extremely wide dimensions of the researches and the results originality, referred to the Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck³ (Kluckhohn F.R. & Strodtbeck F.L., 1961) approach (5 dimensions), Fons Trompenaars approach (7 dimensions) and Geert Hofstede⁴ (Hofstede G., 1984) approach (5 dimensions, during 2010 being added the sixth⁵ (Hofstede G. & Michael Minkov, 2010).

According to the Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck studies, the common issues of all societies – without taking into consideration the temporal coordinate – have in view the character of individual/ the particularities of human nature, the relation man - nature, the temporal orientation of life, the human modus Vivendi and the typology of the inter-human relations. It is almost impossible to affirm that there is a culture which considers that people are primarily good/bad and they are keeping this attribute till the end. Normally, the dynamic and adaptability to the external environment are reverberating also over the individuals, this becoming, in reality, their feature and, in certain conditions, the surviving condition in the environment where they are evolving. Regarding the typology of human relations, Klickhohn and Strodtbeck take into consideration 3 possible types: individualist, collateral and lineal. The collateral type could be assimilated with the collectivist type, and the lineal type emphasizes the relations among different generations, the most important characteristic of such group being the continuity during the time.

Fons Trompenaars realized his studies on a long period of time and on international level, succeeding to identify the practical aspects of the international affairs in terms of seven cultural dimensions (universality versus particularity, individualism versus collectivism, emotional cultures and neutral cultures, specific cultures versus diffusive cultures, status and relations with nature). The dimensions discovered by Fons Trompenaars have their applicability on practical level and a low impact in scientific environment.

The Geert Hofstede approach is considered to be the most complete and complex from the previous ones, allowing the comparison among the different cultures of the analysed states. Geert Hofstede determined the definition of national culture using different dimensions (other than those used by Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck or Fons Trompenaars): *distance from power, individualism – collectivism, masculinity – feminist, avoiding the incertitude, orientation on long term/short term*. Hence, *the distance from power* is different in a society, its size being unequal distributed in a certain hierarchical structures. This dimension is quite visible in family, school and at working place. In organizations, if the distance from power is big it meaning that managers and subordinates are on different hierarchical levels; a short distance from power will imply equality between subordinates and managers. Such situations are characteristics to the modern states where, precisely due to this closeness, the responsibility level assumed both by manager and subordinate is extremely wide. In Hofstede's vision, the dimension *individualism – collectivism* represents the *level in which a society values the personal objectives, autonomy, intimacy, commitment toward the group's rules, implication in collective activities, social cohesion and intense socialization*⁶ (Hofstede G. & Michael Minkov, 2010). Hofstede defined *individualism* as being characteristic to the societies where the connections among individuals are chaotic, the egocentrism being a slogan generally accepted, while the collectivism belongs to the societies where people are integrated from their birth in strong subgroups, where are protected during their life, in exchange for mutual loyalty. So, in an individualist culture the individuals-employees will act according to their own interest, organizing their work in such manner that their own interest will coincide with the employer's interest. Antipodal, in a collectivist culture, an employer will hire an individual as an element who belongs to a subgroup of common interests and not as a singular entity. In present, in Romania institutions/organizations, the studies showed us that this dimension is distorted, the Hofstede's definition being materialised in minor situations which we can consider them as exceptions. The negative aspects which appear in the case of this dimension, such "nepotism" or so-called "professional heirs", are more frequent than certain positive aspects determined by the fact that practicing such "nepotism" could mean to maintain the family reputation and to correct the inadequate behaviour of a family member. Furthermore, in many situations, the positive aspect is changing in negative one, keeping the family reputation being realized in the detriment of other members of society, and even of society itself (it is cultivated the individualist angle, being created an overbearing position, totalitarian, quite egocentric). The dimension of "avoiding the incertitude" is described by Hofstede as being the measure in which members of a certain culture feels threatened by doubtful/unknown situations. In the societies characterized by strong "avoid of incertitude" there are many official rules which control the rights and obligations of owners and employees. Also, in the case of Romania institutions/organizations this dimension is orientated negatively. The studies reveal that the retained rules are those concerning the possibility to assure the continuity of bribes, nepotism, power, supremacy of money and instauration of vulgarity and ill-breeding manners. The fifth dimension identified by Hofstede shows the measures in which the values are oriented toward future, the opposition to past or present (respect for traditions, fulfilment of social obligations). Unfortunately, this dimension have value to the cultures from countries with orientation to the future on long term, respectively to Asian countries and less to Romania where, during the last years, there to little positive examples in this respect. To the previous fifth dimensions, Hofstede added a sixth dimension, *indulgence versus self-restraint* (as a result of co-

author Michael Minkov's analysis of data from the World Values Survey concerning representative samples of national populations).

In fact, according to G. Hofstede, the *national culture* is like a "mind software" which guide the people's way of thinking and actions. He characterized *culture* as being *the collective programming of mind* and the *organizational culture* as the "*software of organizational practices and behaviours shared by the members of an organization*", the organizational culture depending on organization's history - natural factors and its nature - structural factors⁷ (Hofstede G. & Michael Minkov, 2010). The Hofstede contribution to the academic studies is that is making possible the disclosure of the differences among certain organizational cultures (Western, Oriental or aborigine) and, implicitly, disclosure the risks of implementing directly an imported model of organization to an aborigine organization without knowing the cultural differences appeared in the people's values system .

Subsequent to Hofstede studies, other specialists from the branch conveyed their opinions regarding the culture's dimensions, a remarkable model being those proposed by Mary Ellen Guffey, who rejoin five dimensions of culture (*inferior context – superior context, individualism, formalism, communication style and orientation in time*). The concept of *context* initial was defined by anthropologist Edward T. Hall⁸ (Hall E. T. & Hall Reed M., 1987), who endorsed that, a direct consequence of *context* is the easiness of communication within a culture. So, the cultures of *superior context* are rich, subtle and difficult to assimilate with, while the cultures of *inferior context* have direct communication, to the purpose, explicitly⁹ (Schneider S. & Barsoux J. L., 1997). The cultures of inferior context tend to be analytical, logical and orientated to action; those who send the message are assured that message is clear, objective, professional and efficient. The members of the cultures of *inferior context* incline to treasure individualism, making a display of indifference and freedom because they claim that the initiative is leading to self-accomplishment. Also, these people believe in individual actions and own responsibilities, fighting for higher liberty of their lives. The cultures of *superior context* are rather intuitive and contemplative, giving increasing attention to the words, underlying the interpersonal relations, non-verbal expressions and the physical and social coordinates, and they are more aware by the history, status and position of the person who send the message. The members of these cultures encourage the acceptance of group's values, obligations and decisions, refusing the independence because this is accompanied by competition and promote confrontations. Of course, many cultures are a mixture of these two types mentioned before. Unfortunately, in Romania, we can notice a bend for a "glide" from culture of superior context to the culture of inferior context; the elements from culture of superior context are kept within closed communities, at minimal level, becoming minorities and, implicitly, exceptions.

Time proved that each of the above mentioned approaches has its own deficiencies and contributions. Still, these approaches became instruments of culture's analysis and, subsequent, mean for determination – through singularization – of the embroilment of cultural values over the employees from the organizations/institutions from public branch, giving birth to what was called *organizational culture in the public institutions*. It is normal to consider that in a society with a strong culture this will have an awesome influence over the present institutions/organizations and, implicitly, a significant impact over their performances. In fact, the organizational culture is defined similarly to the concept of national culture¹⁰ (Copeland L. & Griggs L., 1987). From expertise, we bespeak the definition given by Linda Smircich, who stated that "*culture is a set of values, dense beliefs, conceptions and habits of mind, all shared by the members of an organization, to whom it will be presented as being accurate*"¹¹ (Smircich L., 1989).

The Romanian specialists¹² (Androniceanu A., 1999) appreciate that through *organizational culture in the public organizations can be understand the assembly of distinctive, spiritual, material, intellectual and affective features outcome from the individuals habit of mind, sentience and personality, displayed in work processes which determine significantly the mission of public organizations and their fundamental objectives*. The components of organizational culture are

similar with those of national culture, to these been added a new concept – organization's mission. The organizational culture is supposed to offer to the organisation's members a sentiment of belonging to that organization, sharing common values, needs and ideals¹³ (Schein E., 1994). Normally, the ideas of organizational culture derive from organization's core, from founder or one of its first leaders who articulate and implement certain ideas and values as a vision, philosophy or strategy. If these ideas and values lead to performances, they are institutionalized giving birth to a certain organizational culture.

3. THE ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE WITHIN THE PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS

The institutions/organizations from public branch the organizational culture have some distinctiveness due to the multitude of values and ideas which underlie at the organizational culture's background, poached from different approaches and traditional, classical theoretical patterns and determined by the state's type, form of the democracy's display, by the content of the state's general strategies and policies.

In public branch the "seeds" of the "organizational culture" concept appeared along with the implementation of classic thinking of German sociologist Max Weber regarding the bureaucratic approach of organizations from public branch, generally, and in those from public administration branch, in particular. Gradual, part of the ideas and values promoted at institutional level become benchmarks and elements of cohesion between different organizational cultures. Hereby, within the content of the concept of *organizational culture*, part of the values and ideas derived from theories and coordinates of state's policy regarding the public branch, can be also identified patterns of habit of mind, achieved by the public institution's employees during the time, aspects of their personal life being entwined with those acquired within the organization. We can notice two categories of elements which can influence the content of organizational culture in public sector: *theoretical/variable* (they change according to the historical period of time and it suppose to determine the enhancement of organizational culture's flexibility level) and those connected to *human nature* ("inherited" by the institution's employees, bearing the values of a national culture specific to the context within they were born, educated and are working).

In treatises we can find different patterns of organizational culture which could be apply to the organizations from public branch, the most frequent being Iceberg Model (Cultural Iceberg), Edgar Schein's Model and Target Model.

"Iceberg Model"¹⁴ (Daft R.L., 2000) is the most common model, all the *culture's components being split in two large categories*: visible aspects and invisible aspects. The visible aspects are those which take into consideration the individuals dressing way and *behaviour*, the *symbols*, *storiottes* and *ceremonies* jointly shared by the organization's members. The invisible aspects – most important ones – take into consideration *values*, *hidden beliefs* and the *thinking process* of the organization's members. In other words, the *modus vivendi* of the employees from public branch's organizations is essential influenced by the existent organizational culture, which was also influenced by the environment, by the changes generated in the values and ideas system of those employees. Unfortunately, this can be a possible justification of the existent far-fetched inadequate behaviour which we can find in almost all Romanian public institutions. The continuous degradation of the invisible aspects - transformed or not in frustrations - in almost all cases is materialised in relief of the public institution's employees over their clients (the society's citizens). The implications are much more catastrophic than these aspects, but they represent 90% of organizational culture from the public institutions.

The Edgar Schein Model¹⁵ (Schein E., 1999) is structured on three levels: *artefacts* (visible organizational structures and processes), *values* (strategies, objectives and philosophies), *implicit assumptions* (perceptions, thoughts of subconsciousness, origin of values and actions). A similar model to the Schein's model is composed from three levels: the level of behaviours (visible level),

level of values and attitudes (intermediate level) and level of beliefs and convictions (hidden, dens level, which come to the fore through the first two levels¹⁶ (Williams D. & Walters P., 1989)). In the case of Romanian public institutions can be maintained the observations already mentioned, regarding the implications generated by distort of the elements which compose the referred levels.

Another known model is the "Target Model" which divides the culture's levels from the point of view of the resistance to change of each level. There is a core composed by *implicit assumptions* (these being the beliefs about reality and human nature, accepted as being primarily true), the next overlapping levels being: *the level of cultural values* (common beliefs, presumptions and sentiments about what is right, normal, rational), *the level of common behaviours* (partial visible norms, easier to change than values) and *level of existent and accepted symbols*.

In the case of the public branch organizations, it is essential to realize an adequate interpretation and identification of the organizational culture, albeit is achieve accuracy due to some elements such as attention and long period of time for determination. Theoretical, a specialized public manager knows the importance of organizational culture, meaning the importance of knowing its visible and invisible aspects, the invisible aspects having (in public branch, as we mentioned before) significant implications both over the human resources behaviour and their *modus vivendi*, which is assigned to achieve optimal results.

In the case of public institutions/organizations, the hidden aspects of organizational culture are *values* and *implicit assumptions*, and the noticeable aspects are *storiottes*, *symbols*, *heroes*, *rites*, *ceremonies and rituals*, *language*, *norms* and *status*. We remind the fact that the *values* are the most important elements of organization because they mirror the personal standards both of institution's manager and its members. The organization's members are keeping the memory of their leader's behaviour and standards which influenced almost all aspects of their lives (through moral judgments, reactions toward other members of institution and assumed commitment unto personal and organization's purposes). The organizational *values* promoted by a strong public manager, competent and upstanding, will be conveyed also to the institution's employees, the assimilation level and the modality depending on each member, and they are essential due to the fact that they will be reflected in the public organization's performances. In an ideal society, the public institutions constitute their organizational values through their belief's manifestation toward the clients, reflected subsequently in the service's quality, public employee's behaviour, the attitude toward their job/work and responsibility toward the performances of the public institution (where they work). A strong manager, in the negative sense of word, without competences and integrity but situated on power/force position can promote his own values, without a significant resistance on his employee's behalf, these employees frequently adopting his values. The situation is easy to demonstrate in the Romanian society where collocations such as "I am the boss, this is how I want, you will do as I want" can be encountered in all hierarchical scale of the public institutions, ease to be observed in the public employee's behaviour and with a matched counter-reaction – negative – from their clients. The collocations endorsed by the public employees are following the pattern of their manager's collocation: "if the boss is doing in this way, why shouldn't I do the same thing ..." or "if it was done something like that till now, why we must change ...why I can't do the some thing ...". Regarding the *implicit assumption*, if they are strong, then the members of the referred organization will not allow to their actions to have a different premises.

The symbols represent other instrument for the interpretation of the organizational culture, being used to feature an idea. Some public institutions are identified precisely through their promoted symbols (Minister of Defence, Minister of Justice, and Police). *The heroes* are behavioural models of the organizations, their performance, character and support of the existent organizational culture being values which that organization would like to promote. The heroes must

be value's impersonation in an organization and models to be followed by employees, somebody who will become main impulse and support in crisis situations. Unfortunately, the researches made till now² show that, generally, in public organizations, the heroes are impalpable due to the increased level of routine, which dominate the system. Similar, *language* is another technique to influence the organizational culture and there are used certain phraseology, slogans, metaphors or other forms of language in order to convey a certain message. According to the treatise, we can find other two categories of noticeable aspects of the organizational culture: *norms* and *status*. The organizational behavioural *norms* comprehend the formal and informal norms, while the *status* will mean the position and prestige of an individual and could have a triple determination: functional, hierarchical, personal /informal. As we mentioned before, in Romanian public institutions there is a high share of the invisible aspects of organizational culture, but these could come to the fore extremely visible, strong and with massive implications over the public employee's behaviour, in the end "explaining" the very low level of public organization's performances. To these aspects could be added other negative ones such lack of information and the disinterest regarding the role and importance of organizational culture in public institutions from our country, lack of competence and desire for restoration of the deficiencies registered in the existence of its components. From our analysis, we appreciate that the current difficulties generate the tendency to stress the past mainly what regards the respect toward ancestors, traditions, values scale, but, simultaneously, there is a wish for the society's "Americanization" (where we look only to future, the past losing its importance). The desire for this "universalisation" of the Romanians generates cleavages within the Romanian society, which seems to "advocate" its particularizations. Initial, it was emphasised the relations and not the rules (a trustful person mend that person keep his given word), people being far more important than regulations. Currently, Romania is considered to have a more acute individualist character, with values which goes toward the values of neutral culture, meaning the trend to not show what they feel, a certain flatness of sentiments being highly appreciated. Along the time, Romanians were considered to belong to emotional culture, where the thoughts and sentiments were displayed both verbal and non-verbal, eloquence and transparency helping them to eliminate the tension, the emotions being easy conveyed, fluently and without inhibitions, the conduct being sprightly and the expression was scorched. The recent researches in the branch of Romanian organizational culture disclosed the fact that this concept is less known, being proponent the existence of formal norms, of authority, the aspects connected to hierarchic determination of status, bestowed by the occupied position and less by the intrinsically aptitudes of employee. Furthermore, the misapprehension and awry implementation of the *new public management* concept reflect also dysfunctions in building an adequate organizational culture, associated to this. Due to this, this concept is less approached, even avoided, having specific forms of display from a public institution to another. Denial or subjective perception of public manager/management, of the Romanian political class and public employees regarding this concept will not make him disappear; contrariwise, has a significant influence over the management process in that public institution, over the employee and employer, over the attitude toward institution and its clients. The Romanian studies regarding the low level of performances of some public institutions, the existence and, in a certain measure, the evolution of the concept of organizational culture in these institutions pointed out that, with the except of some particularities, it is not known the true meaning of concept. We could find in these institutions some models of organizational culture in primarily stage but growing on negative coordinates, with distortions of the components and evolution's dimensions.

² We used methods of sociological research: observation, document's analysis, interviews, inquires questionnaires with questions which generate one variable and multiple variables, following the pattern of previous studies in this domain.

4. ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE AND THE DEFENCE BRANCH'S INSTITUTION

The deficiencies, cleavages and negative aspects regarding the emerge, development and continuity of the organizational culture within the public institutions are far more important – as effect and implications – when that public institution has increasingly particularization/specialization. When this “specialization” points the field of ensuring the national security, the aspects regarding the development of an adequate organizational culture, from all points of view, is essential. Of course, such institution – from defence domain – implies existence of its own function norms and regulations, but without eliminating the existence of a specific organizational culture. In fact, in reality, it is presumed directly and without doubt that especially the institution from the defence field have their own organizational culture, the definition of the general concept applied to these institutions comprehending the *assembly of distinctive, spiritual, material, intellectual and affective features resulted from the individuals habit of mind, sentience and personality, displayed in the work processes and which significantly determine the mission of the organization from the defence field and its fundamental objectives*. We can notice that each term of the definition has its mirror in the existence of the defence institution, which has clear, distinctive features from those of public civil life, the rules and guide of the military activity and career meant to be palpable proofs of the organizational culture in this institution.

The components of the defence institution's *organizational culture* follows the patterns/models of *national culture*, but it is added the element of “organization's mission”, this bestowing on (in this specific case) a sentiment of proper identity to the organization's members - identified with the existence of organization itself -, common values, needs and ideals. The ideas of this organizational culture come from the organization's backgrounds, retained from founders till present, which are not bend to changes (unless there are exceptional cases) and which led to performances materialized in state defence, of national sovereignty and Romanian citizens security. The famous “Guide of military career” is a very simple and available example in this respect. Still, unfortunately, this specific *organizational culture* abided some distortions, dysfunctions and alterations, the positive aspect of the situation being the fact that these irregularities didn't touch the essence of the defence institution, which could have a catastrophically impact on the level existence itself of state.

The organization from defence domain can be approached as a *special subsystem of social system*, with specific functions and located in an interdependencies network with other component subsystems. In this respect, the action to attract human resources in the military career must be approached in the context of a rapid reaction to job market signals and the offer's adaptation to the demand's evolutions, mainly to the diversification of the forms and modalities regarding the offer's promotion about the military profession and the increase of flexibility level of military system. The particularities of the defence human domain's resources take shape into the military institution's specificity, assured by training process and by the use course of this resource. In comparison with civil economic and social organizations which select and use personnel trained by the educational institution from civil society, the military institution had its own system of recruitment, formation, specialization and use. This is the big advantage in avoiding the distortions mentioned above. Of course, some of these distortions could crept through the intermediate stages of the processes of recruitment, selection, promoting, personnel planning, training, performance's evaluation, career development, gratification system and promoting system. These distortion could be found in the civil society also, but in the case of military institution, the organizational specific culture have more implications, usually negatives, not over the military institution itself but to entire society and, more important, over the security environment of the country. All specialists consider that the most obvious changes in the evolution of the defence human resources take into consideration the adjustment of military budget, meaning the adjustment of personnel numbers despite the

profesionalization of the military personnel. Also, we must take into consideration that military institution uses, generally, the human resources recruited from civil society (without specific training for defence domain), who must be qualify in military training institutions for a long period of time.

Furthermore, the human resources structures from defence domain project the manpower so these have to be, in numbers, lower than the job position's numbers from the military institutions. The projected deficit can allow, in any moment and space, evolutions in any directions, depending by the measures enacted by leadership and personnel categories classification. This situation created a paradox, a large number of superior officers will assert lay offs, although the manpower are not allowed to decrease.

In other situation, the people selected for military career become part of the military institution but they are not "functional" in the job-positions for which they were selected, without a carefully guidance and training could appear the situation to not be apt at their job, and the position could be disband/eliminate. Of course, in order to prevent such syncope and unbalances (among different categories of personnel) the manager/leadership must control all the personnel categories. All of these considerations have a huge implication over the organizational culture, from its establishment till its final form. Also, we can mention the difficulty in drawing up the time sheet/job (common to military and civilian domain) due the pressure exerted by the future "employees" who wish to emphasize some possible characteristics of their wished-jobs in order to obtain certain privilege/prerogatives within the military institutions.

The elements which can have effect upon organizational culture in civil public branch (theoretical/variable and those connected to human nature) can be applied, without any doubt, also in the case of organizational culture from defence field, but their impact is far more diminished by the institution's specificity. Still, the strong organizational values promoted by the defence institutions leaders are shared by each member of organization from his admission in organization, their effort to convey and root inside the employees mind and behaviour being smaller than in the case of public civil institutions due to its linearity and steadiness characteristic (on long and very long term) of the military education/training process. The codes of military conduct already assign a "road" for every individual who enter in such institution, his career following precise shapes norms and going through pre-established stages.

In the Romanian defence institutions is easier to determine the representation's forms of the noticeable aspects of organizational culture such as *storiottes*, *symbols*, *heroes*, *rites*, *ceremonies and rituals*, *language*, *norms* and *status*. In the case of "*storiottes*", these are even in written forms, bolstering the cultural values and enforcing the cohesion of these organization and being perceived also as fairy tales, more or less pleasant, told by each member of organization during or after his institutional activity (military career). By contrast with public civil institutions where, due the high rhythm of changes owned the political sphere, the *storiottes* led to the birth of certain "nightmares" in which the main heroes (negative) are the politicians or their representatives, chosen or appointed in leading public positions. Similar, the *storiottes*, *symbols*, *heroes*, *rites*, *ceremonies*, *language*, *norms* and *status* are easier to be noticed, analysed, catalogue, build up and retain in the environment of defence institutions, which will facilitate the crystallization process of organizational culture specific to these institutions.

Unfortunately, the continued and persistent degradation of external environment of defence institutions, of the organizational culture from public (civil) and, partially, private institutions allowed the deterioration/distortion of some elements of organizational culture. Most visible distortions are those concerning certain values, such persistence, perseverance, parsimony and embarrassment, organization of relations through status and surveillance of their function.

The admission in structures and institutions with regional and/or global character do not brought only benefits to the defence institution's members. The renouncement to the mandatory

military service, difficulties appeared in promoting the military career, conscription, selection of professional human resources, and also the inadequate/insufficient career management have a direct and immediate impact over the fulfilment of military organization mission, with effects not quite acceptable, as we mentioned before.

Maintaining the state defence capability on high level, reducing the manpower, changing the force structures are activities which suppose to increase the role of the management system – on all level – in order to assure a high quantity and quality level of professional human resources in defence domain. The specific defence organization wishes to be “modern, flexible, adequate shaped and equipped army, deployable, capable to attend to a large range of missions on national territory or abroad, according to the diversity and complexity of its missions, (...) including to those concerning the multinational operations of crisis management and fighting against terrorism”¹⁷ (Oniciuc Corduban Ionel, 2011). In order to achieve such objective was necessary to transform fundamentally, conceptual and organizational, the institution and its management, starting from resources management (any of their types), managerial conception, the manager himself.

The studies realized in defence institutions/organization marked out the fact that not any individual who wish to follow a military career is also capable to achieve this. Furthermore, the transition of the Romanian economy toward the market economy generated a strong negative effect of erosion of traditional values (patriotism), the immediate consequence for the defence institutions being the decrease of military career amenity and, implicitly, the diminish of both environments from where selected the military personnel, but also their numbers. The decrease of birth rate simultaneously with increasing rate of elder population and appearance of more tempting offers on civil job market forced the military institution to take into consideration the reorientation of the management process, of its elements and functions in order to maintain, on high level, the institution’s performances.

If we analyze the situation of the civil personnel within the Romanian military institution (from the professional structure, usability and evolution’s possibilities in career points of views), we can observe that there were not substantial changes up against previous years, furthermore we can affirm that the situation goes worse. The difficulties appear and perpetuate also because the mix of civilian – military personnel, specific to these institutions, existing situations when the civilian posts are set up on general patten, without a precise hierarchy of these posts, sometimes without possibility to rise from the ranks. Furthermore, despite the attempt to assimilate the civilian post with the military ones through internal norms, practically, it is not kept, often being ignored, to summon this settlement determining the apparition of conflicts at working place¹⁸ (Gogoescu Daniel, 2014).

The organizational culture within the defence institutions is demure also by the deficiencies of current evolution system (in the military institution) of the civilian personnel, to which can be added the absence of the remuneration differences, based on different level of responsibility and competence, the main effect of all these distortions being a significant lack of motivation and decrease number of valuable persons, with high professional competence, existent inside on an organization or which are supposed to be employed in future. So, it was registered a high level of demission of civilian personnel with specific competences and their employment outside the military system, in domains which assure the professional gratification and, implicitly, a better remuneration. Due to the remanent pre-created images about the stability of the military institution, currently, the employment in the defence institutions is chose only by civilian personnel who have no aspirations for a superior career (they have a medium training and performance levels or have a certain age).

An adequate management should unify the organization’s need with the individual’s ones, will understand correct and complete the factors which influence the individual’s choice of a career, the stages of this career and the content of the career’s planning process, generating, in fact, the harmonization of individuals who “compose” the institution and, implicitly, the crystallization of a

complete and adequate organizational culture. The individuals who evolved in a permanent changeable social environment (in technique and technology, education and training, social and economic situation, occupations mobility or disappearance of certain specialization) have to admit the necessity of planning the career and to develop multiple eligibilities even if, usually, it is required a high level of independence in choosing a career.

After enacting some regulatory documents to regularize the employees professional evolution within the defence institutions, „getting over to an individual career management which is unitary and flexible, based on professional competence, performance and development potential, his application, is a difficult and on long period process”¹⁹ (Gogoescu Daniel, 2014). The deficiencies registered in partial application of the principle of decomposing the execution policies and inexistence of a real organizational and individual planning led to a personnel resources management which is fractional, generating the premises of a limited approach of its inventory. In these conditions is difficult to create an appropriate organizational culture or to maintain, in acceptable coordinates, the previous one. To the above mentioned deficiencies can be added those generated by the tendency of diminishing the compulsory standards when individuals want to enter in a military institution, the abusive use of the indirect channel to “form” the military personnel in incondite branches from the military organizational structure, the non-unitary settlement of the military specialities for which is called on the development on indirect channel and the evolution of the military personnel- originated from this channel - within the military hierarchy.

The invisible aspects of the organizational culture in defence institutions, which are cut up about the external distortions, concerns the dilution of the national solidarity concept, of the attitude toward the country’s defence, of the social cohesion and of the community, of the consensus and conformation to community/society norms, disappearance of perpetuation of the Romanian military traditions and values, to which we can add the false impression that this institution is not concerned by its personnel situation (current and future).

There is a characteristic of the national and organizational culture on Romanian society level which has a positive impact over the organizational culture in the defence institutions. We are talking about the existence of the *regional culture* (which starts from the national culture values and is varying in different geographical regions of the country). If, on the civilian public institutions level, this particularity highlight the cleavages among the organizational culture of the public institutions on regions (in Transylvania, the employees of the public institutions are orientated toward performance, attachment toward the organizations where they are working, respect to clients, responsibility spirit, professional conscience; in Muntenia, the public employees are more concerned in obtaining a social and professional status, by money, by development of their own welfare, the organization’s importance being on second plan; in Moldova, the public employees are orientated toward collaboration with other persons, concern by the conformation to traditions and ceremonies organization, showing hospitality, open organizational spirit, tolerance to other peoples, concerning for maintain their jobs, etc.), at the defence institutions level it is assuming that the positive aspects of regional organizational culture aspire to homogenize, supporting its development in a faster rhythm.

Altogether, the human resources management system existent in defence domain progress in a positive way, its main issue being the form to maintain the valuable personnel within the system, to eliminate the lack of “appeal” toward the military career despite the limited financial possibilities. The defence instructions transformation must be looked as a system’s systems, strongly connected, the process representing, practically, an adaptation, a “modernization – change” on the levels of doctrines, forces organization and structure, capabilities, intelligence activity, training, education, acquisitions, personnel management and budget planning, etc. Naturally, this will denote also changes on the level of organizational culture, the innate wish that these “changes” will take into consideration only the positive aspects of the concept.

CONCLUSIONS

No matter what model is used in analysis, it comes out the fact that, for the public employees, the present is more important, they being even "reluctant" to their future or the future of their public institution where they are working. Most of them consider that the future is a matter of their managers and political elites, despite the fact they feel the negative effects in a larger proportion than their leaders. In fact, the leaders consider that it is important what is happening currently, the future being pretty vague and difficult to predict. Also, the best scenarios for them imply that the public employees have a carelessness attitude.

On the level of inter-human relations in the public institutions, these do not fulfil, totally, their role to complete the structure of formal organizational relations and to strengthen cohesion of the informal groups, which are established within these institutions, going more toward the development of interest and power networks. Generally, the public employees admit that they prefer to respect the very rigid norms which exist in institutions, without taking into consideration the possible negative implications of this attitude over the final results of their activity and, implicitly, over their clients. Furthermore, there are many cases where they admit that they intercede in order to solve their friend's issues, their personal obligations, when they wish to develop relations with those persons, even if the existent general norms are affected.

They also mentioned the fact that there is a tendency to increase the individualism within the public institutions. Beside the increased level on non-implication and avoiding to take initiatives within the public institution, it started to institute – on an alarming level – the attitude of non-assuming responsibilities (individual or on group). Their justification is that the initiative is not encouraged neither stimulated, in many cases being punished. In this respect, the negative behavioural manifestation earns a higher weight in creating a distorted organizational culture within those public institutions.

The above mentioned behaviour is incompatible with the public employee's desire to accede to a higher status, they considering that the detained titles are very important. So, the above mentioned dimension *distance toward power*, in this case, is distorted, existing large hierarchical distances, the leadership style becoming authoritarian one. It is preferred the responsibility's delegation but without allowing the assumption of the positive results (only the negative will be assumed, and they are followed by punishment) or offering some possible benefits, reason for which the public employees wait till they receive an order in which is specified what to do, to receive a written document about a future assignment to be fulfilled, if this assignment differs – in its content – by the tasks which they usually have to fulfil.

All above mentioned facts determine weak connections - as intensity – among the individuals of an institution, and they are displayed, mainly, only within small groups, in informal sphere. The distortions appeared in this case bear in mind the establishment of a false organizational culture, generated by the persons employed, based on the recommendation of persons from interior/exterior or persons who belongs to a common interests subgroup (as variation from the well-known nepotism behaviour).

The reality proved that the values of the public institution's organizational culture determine, significantly, the productivity of public services and the realization's level of the provisioned objectives. These, unlike other values categories, must permanent adapt to the economic, social, legislative, political, administrative existent context, in a determined period of time. The incompatibility among the initiated changes in a public institution and the values of organizational culture represents the main reason of pitching and failure of public institution itself. In order to avoid such situations it would be better to determine the effects which the values of the public institution's culture have over the processes which are going on inside that institution, the public employees expectations and even of the political elite involved in the public management in the public institutions.

The reality confirms that there are no successful unique models of organizational culture, each public institution having its own specificity, despite the existence of certain valuable universal cultural

values, written or not. To take into consideration only these elements and eliminate or diminishing the importance of other, is huge mistake. The most obvious example, and the easier one, is that of the defence institutions. Hereby, the emphasis of the values which are specific to organizational culture, the appliance of culture in such manner to balance the general/common with the particular, the universal with the specific, means not only the success of public manager, but also of the management process from that institution.

The organizational culture and performance are, obviously, connected and the reality proves that, if an organization is changing pretty often its public managers and a part of its employees, will become open to the risk of weakening its organizational culture, referring to its road to loosing its cultural identity, which, on medium term, could affect the general balance of the public institution. Each step of the process to solve the issues generated by the changes from external environment must imply obtaining consensus for the new values, determined by the strategy, purposes, means, measurement of performance, motivation s.o. The organizational culture in public institution – even those in defence domain – can not assure the institution's stability if every change, no matters if it comes from internal or external environment, and which introduce new perceptions, habit of mind and rules of interactions, will not be adapted and particularized to the level at that institution, harmonized with the existent elements of organizational culture.

NOTES:

1. Tylor, Edward, 1920 (1871), *Primitive Culture (Researches In to the Development of Mythology, Philosophy, Religion, Art, and Custom)*, New York: J. P. Putnam's Sons, Volume 1 (Origins of culture), p.1.; quoted by Androniceanu, Armenia (2006) *Novelties in Public Management*. Ed. Universitara. Bucharest.
2. Androniceanu, Armenia (2006) *Novelties in Public Management*. Ed. Universitara. Bucharest.
3. Kluckhohn, F.R. & Strodtbeck, F.L. (1961) *Variations in Value Orientations*, Row, Peterson & Co.
4. Hofstede, G. (1984) *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work Related Value*, Sage Publications Inc, Beverly Hills.
5. Hofstede, G. & Michael Minkov (2010) *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*, 3rd Ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.
6. Idem.
7. Idem.
8. Hall, E. T. & Hall, Reed, M. (1987) *Understanding Cultural Differences*. Yarmouth: Intercultural Press.
9. Schneider, S. & Barsoux, J. L. (1997) *Managing Across Cultures*. Prentice Hall.
10. Copeland, L. & Griggs, L. (1987) *Going International*. New York. Plum Books.
11. Smircich, L. (1989) *Concepts of Culture and Organizational Analysis*. *Administrative Science Quarterly*., p.28.
12. Androniceanu, A. (1999) *Management public*. Editura Economică. Bucharest.
13. Schein, E. (1994) *Organizational Culture*. *American Psychologist* 45.
14. Daft, R.L. (2000) *Organization: Theory and Design*, South – Western College Publishing. p.205.
15. Schein, E. (1999) *The Corporate Survival Guide*, San Francisco. Jossey – Bass. p.310-315.
16. Williams, D. & Walters, P. (1989) *Changing Culture: New Organizational Approaches*. London. p.310.
17. Oniciuc Corduban, Ionel. (2011) *The management of the individual career in Romanian Army in the new regional and global security environment*. National Defence University "Carol I". Bucharest. p.6-7.
18. Gogoescu, Daniel. (2014) *Difficulties of the Individual Career Management in Defence Field – in course of publishing in military publication*.
19. Idem.

REFERENCESBook by one author

- Androniceanu, A. (1999) *Management public*. Editura Economică. Bucharest.
- Daft, R.L. (2000) *Organization: Theory and Design*, South – Western College Publishing.
- Hofstede, G. (1984) *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work Related Value*, Sage Publications Inc, Beverly Hills.
- Schein, E. (1999) *The Corporate Survival Guide*, San Francisco. Jossey – Bass.
- Tylor, Edward, (1920 / 1871) *Primitive Culture (Researches In to the Development of Mythology, Philosophy, Religion, Art, and Custom)*, New York: J. P. Putnam's Sons, Volume 1 (Origins of culture).
- Williams, D. & Walters, P. (1989) *Changing Culture: New Organizational Approaches*. London.

Book by two up to six authors

- Copeland, L. & Griggs, L. (1987) *Going International*. New York. Plum Books.
- Hofstede, Gert Jan & Minkov, Michael. (2010) *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*, 3rd Ed. New York: McGraw-Hill..
- Hall, E. T. & Hall, Reed. M. (1987) *Understanding Cultural Differences*. Yarmouth: Intercultural Press.
- Kluckhohn, F.R. & Strodtbeck, F.L. (1961) *Variations in Value Orientations*, Row, Peterson & Co.
- Schneider, S. & Barsoux, J. L. (1997) *Managing Across Cultures*. Prentice Hall.

Thesis

- Oniciuc, Corduban Ionel (2011) *The management of individual career in Romanian Army, in the new regional and global security environment*. National Defence University "Carol I". Bucharest.
- Gurgu, Ion (2007) *The Human Resources Management in Defence in the context of Romanian Armed Forces Reform. Implications over the Romanian Military Art*. National Defence University "Carol I". Bucharest

Journal article – one author

- Oniciuc Corduban, Ionel (2009) *Individual Career – priority in the Career Management Modernization in Romanian Armed Forces*, in Romanian Military Thinking Magazine, no. 3, May-June.
- Schein, E. (1994) *Organizational Culture*. American Psychologist 45.
- Smircich, L. (1989) *Concepts of Culture and Organizational Analysis*. *Administrative Science Quarterly*.

Unpublished conference paper

- Gogoescu, Daniel. (2014) *Difficulties of the individual career management in defence field – in course of publishing in military publication*. Bucharest. Romania.