

Babeş-Bolyai University  
Doctoral School of Administration and Public Policy  
College of Political, Administrative and Communication Sciences

# **DOCTORAL THESIS**

Scientific coordinator:

Prof. univ. dr. HINŢEA Călin Emilian

Doctoral student:

ANDRIANU Alexandra-Bianca

Cluj-Napoca

2023

Babeş-Bolyai University

Doctoral School of Administration and Public Policy

College of Political, Administrative and Communication Sciences

# Public Management Reform in Romania – The Development of Resilient Institutions

Scientific coordinator:

Prof. univ. dr. HINȚEA Călin Emilian

Doctoral student:

ANDRIANU Alexandra-Bianca

Cluj-Napoca

2023

## Contents

1.	Introduction. Stating the Purpose of this Research.....	1
2.	Literature Review.....	14
3.	Traditional Public Administration.....	15
4.	Modern Administrative Reform.....	23
4.1.	Performance Measurement and New Public Management.....	31
4.2.	Strategic Planning and Administrative Reform.....	35
4.3.	Public Administrative Reform in Central Eastern Europe and Post-Communitic Countries.....	40
4.4.	Post-New Public Management and Hybridization.....	44
5.	Resilient Institutions and Administrative Reform.....	50
5.1.	Resilient Leaders.....	52
5.2.	Resilient Culture.....	58
6.	The Linkages between New Public Management and Resilient Institutions.....	80
7.	Romanian Context on Administrative Reform.....	89
7.1.	Strategic Planning and Management in Romania.....	96
8.	Methodology and Research Questions.....	113
8.1.	National Context on Reform. A Secondary Data Analysis.....	115
8.2.	Regional Context and Administrative Reform.....	135
9.	Primary Data Analysis.....	177
9.1.	Initial Results. General Impression.....	178
9.2.	Building and Testing the Model on Resilience and New Public Management.....	184
9.3.	Answering the Research Questions.....	194
10.	Limitations.....	209
11.	Conclusions and Recommendations.....	210
11.1.	Practical Implication.....	213
11.2.	Further Research.....	216
	References.....	218
	List of Acronyms.....	234
	List of Tables.....	236
	List of Figures and Diagrams.....	238
	Appendix 1. Summary of the research through diagrams.....	240

## Paper Summary

**Key words:** institutional resilience, new public management, administrative reform, systemic resilience, strategic planning, romanian administrative reform.

This paper wanted to see to what extent there is a linkage between New Public Management and Institutional Resilience and how exactly they influence each other. Therefore, the main question of this research is *Institutional resilience can be increased by implementing new public management approaches?* To do so, we conducted an exploratory research, where we built and tested a model through SPSS and AMOS to see if it can help us answer this question.

The argue for this is the fact that in the last years, the word “rezilience” has become the new buzzword, the new way to do things or to approach things, thus many institutions or organizations tried to introduce different strategies, to increase their resilience level and to be more prepared in the face of adversity. Not only that, but to also develop their ability to bounce also forward, not only to go back to their initial state, before the schock, meaning that they need to develop their ability to learn, adapt and implement the learning, new tricks that they have learned over the years.

Furthermore, New Public Management approaches are still considered “new”, in terms of administrative reform and in terms of the “modernization” of the public sector, alongside digitization, digitalization and other elements that are relevant and important in today’s time. We need to have clear strategies, to have a market-based approach to increase efficiency, performance and to simplify procedures. We need to create a stronger connection between citizens and public institutions, to improve their image and to promote collaboration and cooperation between public institutions and different relevant actors from their community (and not only). Thus, in a sense, these are the main ideas of this reform. In addition, NPM refers to the following types of concepts and approaches to be developed in an administrative reform: decentralization and increased autonomy, “breaking up monolithic bureaucracies into separate agencies”, introducing market mechanisms to promote competition among public institutions, being mission-driven rather than rule-driven and also customer-driven and customer-oriented, increasing responsibility and accountability, and setting explicit performance standards (Androniceanu, 2007, p. 156).

So what we did in our paper? We tried, first of all to define and identify the main characteristics, indicators and valid point for each concept, then, we tried to see to what extent they are connected

and how they can “work together” to increase the efficiency of public institutions, indirectly improving the quality of products and services delivered by them.

In order to answer the main research question, we also developed other three, meaning:

*R.Q. 1: Which are the main elements that enhance New Public Management?* For this question, we will try to see from the total of aspects that contribute to public management, according to the literature review, which are the most pregnant and influential on the presence and maintenance of this approach.

*R.Q. 2: Which are the main elements that enhance institutional resilience?* Here we will use the same method as in R.Q. 2, which will give us hints as to the recommendation we can make to improve the function of town halls and inevitably (or hopefully) increase their level of resilience in the future.

*R.Q. 3: Is there a linkage between NPM and institutional resilience?* The last research question is the one that will help us see to what extent (if any) there is a correlation between the two concepts, and thus help us answer the main question of this research, which was presented at the beginning of this section.

Henceforth, we split the paper in a way, four main sections: the first one looks at the general impression, evolution and the different forms of administrative reform, the second one looks at the general image, characteristics of resilience (in terms of culture, leadership and institutions), ending this with a chapter dedicated to pinpointing the similarities and common aspects, based on the literature review, of institutional resilience and New Public Management.

The third section is dedicated to analyze Romania from the perspectives of strategic planning, evolution of the administrative reform, the changes that shaped and influenced the way things look now, in order to give context for the fourth part, where we did a secondary and primary data analysis.

We started this analysis with addressing a predetermined problem, meaning the rapid transition from a communist to a democratic and bureaucratic country, without adapting to the current situation. Hence, many call Romania a pre-bureaucratic country and not at all a post- or managerial reform. Nevertheless, the public officials did their best to integrate and try to fit in with the other

bureaucratized countries, therefore a main important step was in 1998 when the public authorities tried to introduce concepts such as decentralization and autonomy for local services to be closer to the needs of citizens and to ensure its status as a "welfare state".

Another problem is that when the system was introduced, no one took into account the degree of bureaucratization they wanted to apply. Public managers should have taken this into account when developing the structure of public institutions - centralized forms of authority could and will cause blockages in the system and in communication networks. Another problem that needs to be addressed is related to the administrative culture of a country. Administrative reform develops over long periods of time, after years of practice and accumulated experience, and evolves in the most appropriate way to manage the actual state of a community. Meanwhile, in Romania, the changes were not at all linear, due to the fact that "the traditional administration changed over the last two centuries, change that involved the shift of several regimes, reconfigurations, transformations and adaptation of public administration, based on the external pressures that it faced" (Văduva, 2016, p. 29). Therefore, Romania lacks the stability of a long-term development, because it has been hastily adopting certain reforms one after the other and has not been given the time to adjust, nor to implement and adapt them properly to the needs of the society at that time.

This is why this subject needs to be addressed more, but in a more dedicated matter, and not in the "just tick the box and let's go home" matter, as it is done in some cases. Another aspect that needs to be mentioned and was described in chapters 2. *Literature Review*, 3. *Traditional Public Administration* and 4. *Modern Administrative Reform*. The first mentioned chapters (two and three) showcase the evolution and the different approaches on administrative reform, from the classical Weberian approach, to Henry Fayol, Frederick Taylor and Woodrow Wilson. At the same time, we addressed the challenges that the traditional public administration faced, once the industrial revolution started to fade, and the focus shifted from products, to services, and once the human resource became an important, crucial factor for an organization and not only a "machine paid to do, not to think".

Therefore, the problem with the classical approaches and the reason of why they are obsolete is related to the generalized and universal use of bureaucracy as an "excuse" for the incompetence, inefficiency, and lack of adaptation of public officials (Pollitt and Bouckaert, 2017, p. 73). As a result, "formalized bureaucratic structures are geared towards productivity and control, not

creativity and innovation" (van de Walle apud Thompson, 2014, p. 4), and can therefore be quite vulnerable in the face of adversity, creating instability and inability to take appropriate action. And this is due to the misconception or misunderstanding that ideologies from the early 1930s could work in the early to mid-1990s.

In chapter 4. *Modern Administrative Reform*, we started to present this transition, through Neo-Weberian State, New Public Management and in the subchapter 4.4. *Post-New Public Management and Hybridization* we touched the subject of reform transformation and how, in time, these different approaches started to bend, to be combined and to turn into "a different species" that absorbed different characteristics of different administrative reforms.

This change in direction and values has shifted attention from the economic and market mentality, where citizens are perceived as customers and consumerism is key, supported by competition and incentive-based performance methods, to civic engagement, to the involvement of stakeholders and partners in decision-making processes (meaning that they are not only consulted, but truly have a say in the changes being negotiated), and to making citizens active partners who directly influence the decisions and actions of public institutions, which now focus on "inter-organizational processes", but actually have a say in the changes that are negotiated), and the transformation of citizens into active partners who directly influence the decisions and actions of public institutions, which now focus on "inter-organizational processes and outcomes" (Wiesel and Modell, 2014, p. 178; Ansell and Gash, 2007, pp. 544-545; Jann, 2007, p. 26).

Henceforth, hybridization, layering and combination of different paradigms is more than welcome, even encouraged, but it must be done with a clear idea, vision and strategy in mind, otherwise it can create more problems than solving them. And again, to do so, we need good leadership, a strong organizational culture and resilient teams that can work together to achieve and implement an administrative reform, 'tailored-made' to fit the needs, wants and challenges of a community. Citizen involvement and active participation alongside stakeholders is a key aspect that should not be overlooked by public managers.

Taking all those aspects into account, we must understand how exactly, or better said, what form of administrative reform we want, and how it will influence our way of doing things, to help us nurture resilience and sustainability all together. This is what we tried to achieve in chapter 5.

*Resilient Institutions and Administrative Reform* and we wanted to see how exactly we can promote citizen engagement, experimentation, organizational learning abilities and overall a more resilient culture and leadership style (subchapters 5.2. and 5.1.) within our administrative reform.

We also believe that it is also important to see "which reforms were most responsible for building resilience" and what are the specific characteristics of each reform that had a positive contribution to enhancing institutional resilience (as a main point of discussion). And this is why, in chapter 6. *The Linkages between New Public Management and Resilient Institutions* we tried to advance our research and identify the common points. We managed to conclude that there are similarities in terms of offering a sense of purpose, a sense of belonging, to develop a plan of action, to improve the quality of the organization, exploration, diversification and experimentation, represent some of the common characteristics that we identified.

Based on this analysis on the literature review, we proceeded our research by looking at the Romanian context, in terms of administrative reform and the changes that took place over time (*chapter 7*). The conclusions were that there was a clear, spillover effect in terms of inadequate implementation of reforms, rapid changes, instability in government and inconsistency in law implementation. At the same time, we saw a "tiredness of the system" and a "I give up" attitude, due to the lack of experience, knowledge or sometimes willingness to try and really improve the system, in a way that benefits all. Also, another impediment is the level of corruption that slows the changes, and creates delays.

In chapter 8. *Methodology and Research Questions*, we developed the following indicators: leadership style, individual resilience, organizational culture, performance, organizational learning and work-life balance. We used these indicators to build and test a model using the SPSS and AMOS programs and also, we looked at the level of importance of each indicator, for Institutional Resilience and New Public Management. At the same time, we created a path-way model to see if there is a real connection between the two concepts or not. We understand and we also presented the limitation of this "experiment" and we recognize that the model should be improved if we want to repeat the test, at a regional level, to conduct a comparative analysis.

Hence, between June-November 2022 the survey was distributed to city halls in each region, reaching out to 313 city halls in total. We managed to collect a total of 260 answers nationwide,



with a response rate of 11.18%, therefore a comparative analysis was obsolete. The North-East region was the most responsive (26.15%), immediately followed by Bucharest-Ilfov (20%) and the least responsive regions were the South (6.15%), South-West (5.36%) and West (7.69%).

From the general image, we can see that at a national level, the lowest value obtained is related to the work-life balance indicator (3.43) and the highest value was obtained in teamwork (3.97), indicating a strong relation between the employees from the city halls that answered to the survey. Another aspect that should be taken into consideration is the score obtained for organizational learning (3.51) which is quite average and maybe it needs improvement in the sense of adaptability, change and flexibility, but in terms of leadership, things look promising (3.82), meaning that we have leaders that are listening to their teams, that are seen as honest, have integrity and work hand in hand with their employees.

In terms of barriers to innovation, we have some main aspects as presented in the table above, where the budgetary constraints represent the main problem for the Northeast (3.99), Southeast (3.44), South (4.38), Southwest (3.29) and Center (3.50) regions, political uncertainty is an issue for the Northeast (3.81), West (3.60) regions and for Bucharest (3.29). The other main barrier, besides those mentioned, is the lack of incentives, especially in the Northeast (3.81), South (3.88), West (3.75), Northwest (3.15), Center (3.64) and Bucharest (3.35) regions, which can lead to a lack of motivation and interest in efficient performance.

These are just some general aspects, to give the reader an idea regarding our initial findings. After this, we moved to actually building and testing our model (*subchapter 9.2.*). In order to determine the validity of the instrument and to answer the research question, first we have to realize an Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) through SPSS, then, to confirm it (or not) through a Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) through AMOS, to make sure that the correlations between the main indicators (as presented in the methodology section) are correct. Henceforth, an initial Cronbach's Alpha test of reliability was performed in SPSS and confirmed a positive relation between the indicators, with a score of 0.962. The reliability test was also confirmed by the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity, where we got a high score of 0.941, and a significance level of 0, meaning that the values are accurate, thus we can further proceed with identifying the valid factors.

Since we wanted to see to what extent our model is valid and what are the main factors extracted from it, we used the Principal Axis Factoring extraction method and extracted the following factors:

Factor 1 is formed from new public management indicators that refer to general characteristics related to the variable, in terms of feedback, outputs, opportunity, long-term vision and efforts to improve, develop or train new skills.

Factor 2 is made up of questions aimed at identifying the level of institutional resilience perceived by the respondents (it is difficult to have a precise view because this aspect is measured over time: before the adversity - during it - after it).

Factor 3 looks at the leadership style, the presence of it, the level of support employees receives from leaders, or the lack of it.

Factor 4 looks at the level of performance and the presence (or absence) of clear tools to evaluate, give feedback or increase its level. The questions that make up this factor are composed from the main idea of "Based on the last performance evaluation, which aspects have improved (or not)", in order to see the impact or usefulness of the evaluation.

From now on, we can see that we have four main factors that can be further used to test and validate the model. A mention should be made that other variables besides new public management, institutional resilience, leadership and performance were created to see if their influence is stronger or more relevant in this analysis, that is, teamwork, barriers to innovation, work-life balance, organizational culture, organizational learning. The variables were created based on EFA and the data were normalized to be able to perform regressions later in the analysis and to see, based on importance, which are the most influential on new public management and institutional resilience. After the initial validity test through exploratory factor analysis, we must also see if this model truly confirms and to test it, we will use the Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA), as mentioned earlier. This analysis is used to estimate the saturation of the items and to see to what extent our model is fitted and validated.

We ran all the necessary tests and we concluded that our model is acceptable and we have a good, positive relation between our latent variables and our indicator variables. Usually, the number of

respondents has a high impact on the validity and estimates of the variables and, in our case, we reached a decent number of respondents (260) to be able to have accurate results. Hence, the new created variables can be used in the analysis and in the following section where we answer the research questions of this paper.

Answering the Research Questions (*subchapter 9.3.*)

**R.Q. 1: Which are the main elements that enhance New Public Management?**

**R.Q. 2: Which are the main elements that enhance institutional resilience?**

In order to answer R.Q. 1 and R.Q. 2 we first need to do a regression to see which are the most influential variables, from organizational learning (OL), organizational culture (OC), performance, leadership, teamwork and work-life balance. We saw that OC, performance and OL had significant values and were correlated to our variable “New Public Management”, but also to “Institutional Resilience”, reasoning the fact that these two research questions are presented together.

After observing the significance of each individual variable, we can continue our analysis by looking at the ANOVA table and see the significance per total. In this case, we can see that indeed, the independent variables used in the analysis, collectively are influencing the dependent variables.

The last step was to use The Artificial Neural Network (ANN) to recognize and form patterns, in relation to the variables and to process the information that was introduced and based on which it learned to form correlations through synapses (inputs) and their information flow, or weights, forming outputs. We did this to see, from all our variables, which is the most influential on New Public Management and on Institutional Resilience.

For the first variable (NPM), organizational learning was the most important and influential, whereas for the latter one, organizational culture got the highest scores in terms of influence. Thus, from this perspective, we can say that we can increase both NPM and institutional resilience through performance measurement or increasing tools, through organizational learning characteristics and through a strong organizational culture.

**R.Q. 3: Is there a linkage between NPM and institutional resilience?**

After confirming the validity of the model, we answered R.Q. 3 by including the path-way model using the variables that we created. Our results showed positive relations between them (leadership, performance, public management and resilience), except the influence of Resilience over Public Management. To some extent, we can say that public management has a positive influence on building institutional resilience, but institutional resilience has a negative impact on building public management behaviors. This can be motivated by the level of instability and sometimes exaggerated flexibility and constant change, which can delay, modify or even eliminate the possibility to build long-term strategies and to also, implement, evaluate and make them sustainable. To fully confirm or infirm this, we need to further our analysis. The model also suggests that the relation (regardless if positive or negative) is quite weak, and an improvement of this model is recommended. But as mentioned, there can be an explanation for the negative influence of resilience on public management, more exactly, when we talk about resilience we talk about dynamic environments, constant change (but not for the sake of change) and on the long run, this can have a negative effect on management because the vision or strategy must be changed, thus lacking linearity, creating obstacles or delays in implementing said vision.

Lastly, we performed again an ANN analysis to see the level of importance of public management for institutional resilience and vice versa; after training the system and including in the analysis only the most relevant and impactful variables, resilience has an impact of 0.106 on public management, whereas public management has a lesser impact, of only 0.088.

Based on the literature review, the secondary and primary data analysis, we can state that new public management and public management elements are present and are influenced by other aspects, as we saw, but there is a lot of room for improvement and there are some necessary changes that need to be made, in order to enhance both public management and resilience at the same time. To answer to the general question "Institutional resilience can be increased by implementing public management approaches?", yes, it can be enhanced, as we saw earlier public management has a positive correlation with resilience, but not the other way around.

This can be argued by the fact that the latter is usually found (to a certain extent) in more "organic" environments, which are characterized by dynamism, constant change, constant alteration of the way things usually work to adapt to the external environment of the organization. Whereas "mechanical" systems are more focused on the structure, rules, processes, and overall "formality"

of the organization. This means that, in a way, organizations with set and clear public management approaches are in a way, a hybrid of the two, because we have flexibility, adaptability and openness to change, but at the same time we have a clear set of values, a clear direction and a clear way to reach said direction.

An interesting aspect that should be mentioned right from the beginning is the fact that for R.Q. 1 and R.Q. 2, performance, organizational culture and organizational learning were the most relevant indicators for both institutional resilience and NPM. This is supported by the fact that during the ANN tests, the latter indicators (OC and OL) were the most important in building and improving the points of interest of this research. This can be argued by the fact that in both cases we need an open environment that promotes change, constant learning and clear performance indicators that can simultaneously support resilience and NPM.

Moving on, the things we should consider when trying to build a resilient institution using public management tools is to integrate planning and budgeting systems that are correlated with current needs. To achieve the above, we also need to have an integrated management style by establishing clear, focused and identifiable outputs. This action can be further developed by having improved incentives for performance standards that can, to some extent, resemble resilient and more comprehensive market-based management systems.

In conclusion, if we focus more on the elements or characteristics that apply to our specific needs or shortcomings, we can increase institutional resilience, contribute positively to strengthening strategic alignments, and promote knowledge-based management along with a holistic management style that improves accountability, performance, and organizational glue. At the same time, we should continue to promote a market-based and competitive approach, to improve incentives based on results, and to have clear laws and regulations that work in favor of these values and don't end up being just another burden, as is happening in some cases right now.

## References:

1. Aall, P., 'Building Resilience and Social Cohesion in Conflict', 2019, *Global Policy*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 68-75.
2. Abdel-Maksoud, A., Elbanna, S., Mahama, H. and Pollanen, R., 'The Use of Performance Information in Strategic Decision Making in Public Organizations', 2015, *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, vol. 28, no. 7, pp. 528-549.
3. Agenția Națională a Funcționarilor Publici (ANFP), 'Rezultatul 5 – Sistemul de Management al Performanței. Livrabilul 5.1 Analiza sistemului de management al performanței', (Outcome 5 – Performance Management System. Deliverable 5.1 Analysis of the performance management system) August 2020, [Online] at [https://www.anfp.gov.ro/R/Doc/2021/Proiecte/SIPOCA%20136/Output-uri/5.1%20Performance%20Management%20analysis\\_revizuit%20RO,%20November%202005,%202020.pdf](https://www.anfp.gov.ro/R/Doc/2021/Proiecte/SIPOCA%20136/Output-uri/5.1%20Performance%20Management%20analysis_revizuit%20RO,%20November%202005,%202020.pdf), accessed on March 12, 2023.
4. Agenția pentru Dezvoltare Regională București-Ilfov (ADRBI), 'Planul de dezvoltare regională București-Ilfov 2021-2027' (Bucharest-Ilfov Regional Development Plan 2021-2027), October 2022, [Online] at <https://www.adrbi.ro/dezvoltare-regionala/planificare-regionala/pdr-bi-2021-2027/>, accessed on March 9, 2023.
5. Agenția pentru Dezvoltare Regională Centru (ADRC), 'Planul de dezvoltare regională Centru 2021-2027' (Center Regional Development Plan 2021-2027), April 2020, [Online] at <http://www.adrc centru.ro/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/4.-Strategia-de-Dezvoltare-Regionala-2021-2027.pdf>, accessed on March 9, 2023.
6. Agenția pentru Dezvoltare Regională Nord-Est (ADRNE), 'Planul de dezvoltare regională Nord-Est 2021-2027' (North-East Regional Development Plan 2021-2027), January 2023, [Online] at <https://www.adrnordest.ro/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/PDR-Nord-Est-2021-2027-ian-2023.pdf>, accessed on March 8, 2023.
7. Agenția pentru Dezvoltare Regională Nord-Vest (ADRNv), 'Planul de dezvoltare regională Nord-Vest 2021-2027' (North-West Regional Development Plan 2021-2027), February 2021, [Online] at <https://www.nord-vest.ro/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/PDR-NV-2021-2027-versiunea-feb-2021.pdf>, accessed on March 8, 2023.
8. Agenția pentru Dezvoltare Regională Sud Muntenia (ADRMuntenia), 'Planul de dezvoltare regională Sud Muntenia 2021-2027' (South Muntenia Regional Development

- Plan 2021-2027), September 2022, [Online] at <https://www.adrmuntenia.ro/index.php/planul-de-dezvoltare-al-regiunii-sud--muntenia-20212027/static/1315>, accessed on March 9, 2023.
9. Agenția pentru Dezvoltare Regională Sud-Est (ADRSE), 'Programul Operațional Regional pentru Regiunea Sud-Est 2021-2027', (The Southeast Regional Operational Program 2021-2027), June 2020, [Online] at [https://www.adrse.ro/POR\\_2021/PR\\_ADRSE](https://www.adrse.ro/POR_2021/PR_ADRSE), accessed on March 9, 2023.
  10. Agenția pentru Dezvoltare Regională Sud-Vest (ADRSV), 'Planul de dezvoltare regională Sud-Vest 2021-2027' (South-West Regional Development Plan 2021-2027), August 2022, [Online] at <https://www.adroltenia.ro/planul-de-dezvoltare-regionala-2021-2027/>, accessed on March 9, 2023.
  11. Agenția pentru Dezvoltare Regională Vest (ADRV), 'Planul de dezvoltare regională Vest 2021-2027' (Western Regional Development Plan 2021-2027), November 2020, [Online] at <https://adrvest.ro/strategia-pentru-dezvoltare-a-regiunii-vest-pentru-perioada-2021-2027-in-consultare-publica/>, accessed on March 8, 2023.
  12. Aldrich, D.P., 'It's who You Know: Factors Driving Recovery from Japan's 11 March 2011 Disaster', 2016, *Public Administration*, vol. 94, no. 2, pp. 399-413.
  13. Alvesson, M., 'Organizational Culture; Meaning, Discourse, and Identity', in Ashkanasy, N.M., Wilderom, C.P.M. and Peterson, M.F. (eds.), *The Handbook of Organizational Culture and Climate*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, Los Angeles, London, New Delhi, Singapore, Washington D.C.: SAGE Publications, 2011, pp. 11-28.
  14. Amirkhani, T., Aghaz, A. and Sheikh, A., 'An Implementation Model of Performance-Based Budgeting', 2019, *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, vol. 69, no. 2, pp. 382-404.
  15. Amundsen, S. and Martinsen, O.L., 'Empowering Leadership: Construct Clarification, Conceptualization, and Validation of a New Scale', 2014, *Leadership Quarterly*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 487-511.
  16. Andrews, R. and van de Walle, S., 'New Public Management and Citizens' Perception of Local Service Efficiency, Responsiveness, Equity and Effectiveness', 2013, *Public Management Review*, vol. 15, no. 5, pp. 762-783.

17. Andrianu, B., Neamțu, B. and Țigănașu, R., ‘Institutions and Governance’, in Bănică, A., Eva, M., Iașu, C., Nijkamp, P. and Pascariu G.C. (eds.), *The European Atlas of Resilience*, Iași: Universitatea „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”, 2021, pp. 56-67.
18. Androniceanu, A., ‘New Public Management, a Key Paradigm for Reforming Public Management in Romanian Administration’, 20017, Academy of Economic Studies, Bucharest, *Administration and Public Management Review*, no. 8, pp. 154-161.
19. Ansell, C. and Gash, A., ‘Collaborative Governance in Theory and Practice’, 2007, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, vol. 18, pp. 543-571.
20. Arnold, J. and Drasgow, F., ‘The Empowering Leadership Questionnaire: The Construction and Validation of a New Scale for Measuring Leader Behaviors’, 2000, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, vol. 21, pp. 249-269.
21. Bănică, A., Eva, M., Iașu, C., Nijkamp, P. and Pascariu G.C., *The European Atlas of Resilience*, Iași: Universitatea „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”, 2021.
22. Bell, M.A., ‘The Five Principles of Organizational Resilience’, 2002, [Online] at <https://www.gartner.com/resources/103600/103658/103658.pdf>, accessed November 15<sup>th</sup>, 2020.
23. Bensman, J., ‘Mediterranean and Total Bureaucracies: Some Additions to the Weberian Theory of Bureaucracy’, 1987, *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 62–108.
24. Beriv, M., *Governance: A Very Short Introduction*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
25. Bouckaert, G., ‘From NPM to NWS in Europe’, 2022, *Transylvanian Review of Administrative Sciences*, special issue, pp. 22-31.
26. Bourgon, J., ‘Responsive, Responsible and Respected Government: Towards a New Public Administration Theory’, 2007, *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, vol. 73, no. 1, pp. 7-26.
27. Brașov Chamber of Commerce and Industry – Brașov in numbers, 2016, [Online] at <http://www.ccibv.ro/despreBrașov/statistici>, accessed on November 19<sup>th</sup>, 2019.
28. Brașov.2030 – Strategia de dezvoltare durabilă a municipiului Brașov 2030 (Brașov’s 2030 Sustainable Development Strategy), [Online] at <http://www.Brașovcity.ro/documente/public/constructii-urbanism/Strategia->



dezvoltare/Strategia%20de%20dezvoltare%20a%20Municipiului%20Braşov.pdf,  
accessed on January 13, 2020.

29. Bresser-Pereira, L.C., 'The Structural Public Governance Model and the Implementation of the Millennium Development Goals', in Bertucci, G. and Rosenbaum, A. (eds.), *Implementing the Millennium Development Goals: Challenges and Responses for Public Administration*, New York: United Nations, 2007, pp. 29-47.
30. Bryson, J.M., 'A Strategic Planning Process for Public and Non-profit Organizations', 1988, *Long Range Planning*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 73-81.
31. Bryson, J.M., 'Strategic Planning and Management', in Peters, B.G. and Pierre J. (eds.), *The SAGE Book of Public Administration*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, Los Angeles, London, New Delhi, Singapore, Washington DC: SAGE Publishing, 2012, pp. 50-64.
32. Burnside-Lawry, J. and Carvalho, L., 'A Stakeholder Approach to Building Community Resilience: Awareness to Implementation', 2016, *International Journal of Disaster Resilience in the Built Environment*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 4-25.
33. Calogero, M., 'The Introduction of New Public Management Principles in the Italian Sector', 2010, *Transylvanian Review of Administrative Sciences*, no. 30E, pp. 30-54.
34. Cameron, K.S. and Quinn, R.E., *Diagnosis and Changing Organizational Culture Based on the Competing Values Framework*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition, San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2011.
35. Cepiku, D. and Meneguzzo, M., 'Public Administration Reform in Italy: A Shopping-basket Approach to the New Public Management or the New Weberianism?', 2011, *International Journal of Public Administration*, vol. 34, pp. 19-25.
36. Cepiku, D. And Mititelu, C., 'Public Administration Reforms in Transition Countries: Albania and Romania Between the Weberian Model and the New Public Management', in Matei, L. and Flogaitis, S. (eds.), *Public Administration in the Balkans. From Weberian Bureaucracy to New Public Management*, Bucureşti: Editura Economică, 2011, pp. 299-322.
37. Cepiku, D. and Mititelu, C., 'Public Administration Reforms in Transition Countries: Albania and Romania between the Weberian Model and the New Public Management Model', 2010, *Transylvanian Review of Administrative Sciences*, no. 30E, pp. 55-76;

38. Chakrabarty, B. and Chand, P., *Public Administration in a Globalizing World. Theories and Practice*, India: SAGE Publishing, 2012.
39. Cheung, A.B., 'The Politics of Administrative Reforms in Asia: Paradigms and Legacies, Paths and Diversities', 2005, *Governance: An International Journal of Policy, Administration, and Institutions*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 257-282.
40. Christensen, T. and Laegreid, P., 'Administrative Reforms in Western Democracies', in Peters, B.G. and Pierre J. (eds.), *The SAGE Book of Public Administration*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, Los Angeles, London, New Delhi, Singapore, Washington DC: SAGE Publishing, 2012, pp. 511-523.
41. Christensen, T. and Lægreid, P., 'Ethics and Administrative Reforms. A Study of Ethical Guidelines in the Central Civil Service', 2011, *Public Management Review*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 459-477.
42. Christensen, T. and Lægreid, P., 'Symposium on Accountability, Publicity & Transparency New Public Management: Puzzles of Democracy and the Influence of Citizens', 2002, *The Journal of Political Philosophy*, vo. 10, no. 3, pp. 267-295.
43. Colak, C.D., 'Why the New Public Management is Obsolete: An Analysis in the Context of the Post-New Public Management Trend' 2019, *Administrative Theory – Upravna Teorija (HKJU-CCA)*, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 517-536.
44. Collins, J.C., and Porras, J.I., 'Building Your Company's Vision', 1996, *Harvard Business Review*, pp. 63-77.
45. Consiliul Județean Vrancea (CJ Vrancea), 'Profilul socio-economic al Regiunii Sud-Est' (Socio-economic profile of the South-East Region), N/A, [Online] at <https://cjevranceao/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/Profilul-socio-economic-al-Regiunii-Sud-Est.pdf>, accessed on March 9, 2023.
46. Dan, S. and Pollitt, C., 'NPM can Work. An Optimistic Review of the Impact of New Public Management Reforms in Central and Eastern Europe', 2015, *Public Management Review*, vol. 17, no. 9, pp. 1305-1332.
47. Dascălu, Ș., Geambasu, O., Raiu, C.V., Azoicăi, D., Popovici, E.D. and Apetrei, C., 'COVID-19 in Romania: What Went Wrong', 2021, *Frontiers. Public Health*, vol. 9, pp. 1-3, DOI: 10.3389/fpubh.2021.813941.

48. Daskon, C.D., 'Cultural Resilience—The Roles of Cultural Traditions in Sustaining Rural Livelihoods: A Case Study from Rural Kandyan Villages in Central Sri Lanka', 2010, *Sustainability*, vol. 2, no. 4, 1080-1100.
49. de Waal, A.A., 'The Characteristics of a High Performance Organization', 2007, *Business Strategy Series*, vol. 8., no. 3, pp. 179-185.
50. Dincă, D.V. and Mihaiu, M., *20 de ani de reformă a administrației publice*, București: Economica, 2019.
51. Duit, A., 'Resilient Thinking: Lessons for Public Administration', 2016, *Public Administration*, vol. 94, no. 2, pp. 364-380.
52. Dunleavy, P., Margetts, H., Bastow, S. and Tinkler, J., 'New Public Management is Dead – Long Live Digital-Era Governance', 2005, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, vol. 16, pp. 467-494.
53. Egeberg, M., 'How Bureaucratic Structure Matters: An Organizational Perspective', in Peters, B.G. and Pierre J. (eds.), *The SAGE Book of Public Administration*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, Los Angeles, London, New Delhi, Singapore, Washington DC: SAGE Publishing, 2012, pp. 143-154.
54. Ehrhart, M.G., Schneider, B. and Macey, W.H., *Organizational Climate and Culture. An Introduction to Theory, Research and Practice*, New York, London: Routledge, 2014.
55. European Commission, 'Digital Economy and Society Index Report 2020-Digital Public Services', 2020b, [Online] at <https://ec.europa.eu/digital-single-market/en/digital-public-services-scoreboard>, accessed on June 15<sup>th</sup>, 2020.
56. European Commission, 'European Structural and Investment Funds, 2020a, [Online] at <https://cohesiondata.ec.europa.eu/programmes/2014RO05SFOP001>, accessed on June 15<sup>th</sup>, 2020.
57. European Commission, 'PSF review of the Romanian R&I System – Background report', November 2021, [Online] at [https://ec.europa.eu/research-and-innovation/sites/default/files/rio/report/PSF\\_background\\_report\\_final\\_23Nov\\_2021.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/research-and-innovation/sites/default/files/rio/report/PSF_background_report_final_23Nov_2021.pdf), accessed on March 12, 2023.
58. European Commission, 'European Social Progress Index 2016', [Online] at [https://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/information-sources/maps/social-progress/2016\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/information-sources/maps/social-progress/2016_en), accessed on March 8, 2023.

59. European Commission, 'European Social Progress Index 2020', [Online] at [https://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/information-sources/maps/social-progress/2020\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/information-sources/maps/social-progress/2020_en), accessed on March 8, 2023.
60. European Commission, Directorate-General for Internal Market, Industry, Entrepreneurship and SMEs, *Regional Innovation Scoreboard 2021*, Publications Office, 2021, DOI: <https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2873/674111>.
61. Everly, G.S., Jr., 'Building a Resilient Organizational Culture', 2011, [Online] at <https://hbr.org/2011/06/building-a-resilient-organizat>, accedes on June 20<sup>th</sup>, 2020.
62. Farrar, J.J., 'Resilient leadership', 2017, *International Journal of Emergency Services*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 238-246.
63. Fernandez, S., Resh, W.G., Moldogaziev, T. and Oberfield, Z.W., 'Assessing the Past and Promise of the Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey for Public Management Research: A Research Synthesis', 2015, *Public Administration Review*, vol. 75, no. 3, pp. 382-394.
64. Fonduri Structurale.ro, 'România, printre cele mai mici rate de absorbție la nivelul UE! La contactare suntem pe locul 10 în clasamentul statelor membre', 2019, [Online] at <https://www.fonduri-structurale.ro/stiri/22476/romania-printre-cele-mai-mici-rate-de-absorbtie-la-nivelul-ue-la-contactare-suntem-pe-locul-10-in-clasamentul-statelor-membre>, accessed on June 15<sup>th</sup>, 2020.
65. Förster, C. and Duchek, S., 'What Makes Leaders Resilient? An Exploratory Interview Study', 2017, *German Journal of Human Resource Management: Zeitschrift für Personalforschung*, vol. 31, no. 4, pp. 281-306.
66. FreeBalance, *How does the government domain change the nature of the balanced scorecard?*, 2021, [Online] at <https://freebalance.com/en/blog/pfm/how-to-apply-the-government-balanced-scorecard/>, accessed on April 21, 2023.
67. George, B., Walker, R.M. and Monster, J., 'Does Strategic Planning Improve Organizational Performance? A Meta-Analysis', 2019, *Public Administration Review*, vol. 79, no. 6, pp. 810-819.
68. Gheorghe, I., 'Weberian Public Administration Versus New Public Management in Eastern Europe: The Case of Romania', 2012, *International Journal of Public Administration*, vol. 35, pp. 695–702.

69. Goldfinch, S. and Wallis, J., 'Two Myths of Convergence in Public Management Reform, 2010, *Public Administration*, vol. 88, no. 4, pp. 1099-1115.
70. Goldfinch, S. and Yamamoto, K., 'Citizen Perception of Public Management: Hybridization and Post-New-Public Management in Japan and New Zealand, 2019, *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, vol. 78, no. 1, pp. 79-94.
71. Gray, D. and Jones, K., 'The Resilience Wellbeing of Public Sector Leaders', 2018, *International Journal of Public Leadership*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 138-154.
72. Griffiths, D., 'Resilience and Transparency in Social Systems', 2018, *Kybernetes*, vol. 48, no. 4, pp. 715-726.
73. Gucciardi, D.F., Jackson, B., Coulter, T.J. and Mallett, C.J., 'The Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC): Dimensionality and Age-Related Measurement Invariance with Australian Cricketers', 2011, *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, vol. 12., pp. 423-433.
74. Gulick, L., Urwick, L.F. (eds), *Papers on the Science of Administration*, Institute of Public Administration, New York, 1937.
75. Gunnestad, A. (2006), 'Resilience in a Cross-Cultural Perspective: How resilience is generated in different cultures, *Journal of Intercultural Communication*', 2006, [Online] at <https://www.immi.se/intercultural/nr11/gunnestad.htm>, accessed on June 20<sup>th</sup>, 2020.
76. Gupta, N., 'Artificial Neural Network', 2013, *Network and Complex Systems*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 24-28.
77. Harrison, N.E., 'Good Governance: Complexity, Institutions and Resilience', 2003, Paper Presented at the Open Meeting of the Global Environmental Change Research Community. (Montreal, Canada,) [Online] available at [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228832392\\_Good\\_Governance\\_Complexity\\_Institutions\\_and\\_Resilience](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228832392_Good_Governance_Complexity_Institutions_and_Resilience) accessed on November 4, 2022.
78. Heinrich, C.J., 'Measuring Public Sector Performance and Effectiveness', in Peters, B.G. and Pierre J. (eds.), *The SAGE Book of Public Administration*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, Los Angeles, London, New Delhi, Singapore, Washington DC: SAGE Publishing, 2012, pp. 32-49.
79. Hînțea, C. (ed.), *Case Studied in Strategic Planning*, Cluj-Napoca: Accent, 2007.
80. Hînțea, C., Hamlin, R., and Hudrea, A., *Strategic Planning in Public Administration*, 2012.
81. Hînțea, C., Hudrea, A., and Rus, D., *Public Management*, București: Tritonic, 2013.

82. Hințea, C., Sandor, S.D. and Junjan, V., 'Administrative Reform in Romanian and the European Union', 2002, *Transylvanian Review of Administrative Sciences*, no. 1, vol. 7, pp. 54-74.
83. Hințea, C.E. and Țiclău, T.C., 'Public Administration Reform in Romania after 25 Years', in Kovac, P. and Bileisis, M. (eds.), *Public Administration Reforms in Eastern European Union Member States. Post-Accession Convergence and Divergence*, Ljubljana, Vilnius: University of Ljubljana, 2017, pp. 289-426.
84. Hințea, C.E., 'Cum se construiește profilul strategic al unei comunități'(How to Build a Strategic Profile for a Local Community), 2015, *Revista Transilvană de Științe Administrative*, vol. 2, no. 37, pp. 101-119.
85. Hințea, C.E., 'Four Elements of Successful Reform', 2020, *Asia Pacific Journal of Public Administration*, vol. 42, no. 1, pp. 9-11.
86. Hințea, C.E., Profiroiu, C.M. and Țiclău, T.C., 'Strategic Planning and Public Management Reform: The Case of Romania', 2015, *Transylvanian Review of Administrative Sciences*, SI, pp. 30-44.
87. Holtorf, C., 'Embracing Chance: How Cultural Resilience is Increased through Cultural Heritage', 2018, *World Archeology*, vol. 50, no. 4, pp. 639-650, DOI: 10.1080/00438243.2018.1510340.
88. Howard, C.S. and Irving, J.A., 'The Impact of Obstacles and Developmental Experiences on Resilience in Leadership Formation', 2013, *ASBBS Annual Conference: Las Vegas*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 679-687.
89. Huang, X., Li, H., Zhang, X. and Zhang, X., "Land Use Policy as an Instrument of Rural Resilience – The Case of Land Withdrawal Mechanism for Rural Homesteads in China", 2018, *Ecological Indicators*, vol. 87, pp. 47-55.
90. Hudrea, A. and Tripon, C., 'Organizational Culture of the Public Sector. A Study of Romanian Public Organizations', 2016, *Revista de cercetare și intervenție socială*, vol. 53, pp. 97-113.
91. Hudrea, A., 'Cultură organizațională în România. O analiză a cercetărilor în domeniu' (Organizational Culture in Romania. An Analysis of Researches in the Field), 2015, *Revista Transilvană de Științe Administrative*, vol. 2, no. 37, pp. 120-131.

92. Hughes, O., 'Public Management or Public Administration?', 1992, *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, vol. 51, no. 3, pp. 286-296.
93. Hughes, O.E., *Public Management & Administration*, 5<sup>th</sup> edition, London, New York, Oxford, New Delhi, Sydney: Bloomsbury, 2017.
94. Ilie, S.M., Olaru, M.P. and Militaru, C.C., 'Strategic Planning Role in Organizations in Romania – Part of Management', 2021, "*Ovidius*" *University Annals, Economic Sciences Series*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 535-541.
95. Iordan, M., Chilian, M.N. and Grigorescu, A., 'Regional Resilience in Romania – Between Realism and Aspiration', 2015, *Procedia Economics and Finance*, vol. 22, pp. 627-635.
96. Jann, W., 'Public Administration Under Pressure – the Search for New Forms of Public Governance', in Bertucci, G. and Rosenbaum, A. (eds.), *Implementing the Millennium Development Goals: Challenges and Responses for Public Administration*, New York: United Nations, 2007, pp. 16-28.
97. Jin, M., Lee, J. and Lee, M., 'Does Leadership Matter in Diversity Management? Assessing the Relative Impact of Diversity Policy and Inclusive Leadership in the Public Sector', 2017, *Leadership & Organizational Development Journal*, vol. 38, no. 2, pp. 303-319.
98. Jones, G.R., *Organizational Theory, Design, and Change*, 7<sup>th</sup> edition, England: Pearson, 2013.
99. Kaplan, R.S. and Norton, D.P., 'Putting the Balanced Scorecard to Work', in Shaw, D.G., Schneier, C.E., Beatty, R.W. and Baird, L.S., (eds.), *The Performance Measurement, Management, and Appraisal Sourcebook*, Amherst, Massachusetts: Human Resource Development Press, 1995, pp. 66-79.
100. Keith, N. and Frese, M., 'Enhancing Firm Performance and Innovativeness Through Error Management Culture', in Ashkanasy, N.M., Wilderom, C.P.M. and Peterson, M.F., *The Handbook of Organizational Culture and Climate*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, Los Angeles, London, New Delhi, Singapore, Washington D.C.: SAGE Publications, 2011, pp. 137-157.
101. Kennedy, S.S., 'Thirty Years of Public Management Scholarship: Plenty of "How", not Enough "Why"', 2017, *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, vol. 30, no. 6/7, pp. 566-574.

102. Kettl, D.F., *The Global Public Management Revolution*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2005.
103. Kopric, I., 'Public Administration Reforms in Eastern Europe: Naive Cultural Following, Hesitant Europeanization, or Search for Genuine Changes?', in Kovac, P. and Bileisis, M. (eds.), *Public Administration Reforms in Eastern European Union Member States. Post-Accession Convergence and Divergence*, Ljubljana, Vilnius: University of Ljubljana, 2017, pp. 34-49.
104. Laegaard, J. and Bindslev, M., *Organizational Theories*, Ventus Publishing ApS, 2006, ISBN: 87-7681-769-7.
105. Ledesma, J., 'Conceptual Frameworks and Research Models on Resilience in Leadership', 2014, *Sage Open*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 1-8, DOI: 10.1177/2158244014545464.
106. Ližbetinová, L., Lorincová, S. and Caha, Z., 'The Application of the Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI) to Logistics Enterprises, Naše more', 2016, vol. 63, no. 3, pp. 170-176, [Online] at <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/The-Application-of-the-Organizational-Culture-to-Li%C5%BEbetinov%C3%A1-Lorincov%C3%A1/7e46580621fcd0a3102c687f4ad6afd9d359a577>, accessed on March 29<sup>th</sup>, 2021.
107. Lynn, L.E. Jr., 'Public Management', in Peters, B.G. and Pierre J. (eds.), *The SAGE Book of Public Administration*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, Los Angeles, London, New Delhi, Singapore, Washington DC: SAGE Publishing, 2012, pp. 17-31.
108. Lynn, L.E. Jr., *Public Management: Old and New*, New York, London: Routledge, 2006.
109. Mallak, L., 'Putting Organizational Resilience to Work', 1998, *Industrial Management*, vol. 40, no. 6, pp. 8-13.
110. Margetts, H. and Dunleavy, P., 'The Second Wave of Digital-Era Governance: A Quasi-Paradigm for Government on the Web', 2013, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society. A Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, vol. 371, no. 1987.
111. Marshall, N.A. and Marshall, P.A., 'Conceptualizing and Operationalizing Social Resilience within Commercial Fisheries in Northern Australia', 2007, *Ecology and Society*, vol. 12, no. 1.



112. Matei, L., 'Romanian Public Management Reform – Theoretical and Empirical Studies', 2009, *Civil Service*, vol. 2, pp. 7-280.
113. Matei, L., *Romanian Public Management Reform. Theoretical and Empirical Studies*, București: Editura Economică, 2009.
114. Mauri, A.G. and Muccio, S., 'The Public Management Reform: from Theory to Practice. The Role of Cultural Factors', 2012, *International Journal of Advances in Management Science*, vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 47-56.
115. McAdam, R., Hazlett, S. and Casey, C., 'Performance Management in the UK Public Sector: Addressing Multiple Stakeholder Complexity', 2005, *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 256-273.
116. McEwen, K. and Boyd, C.M., 'A Measure of Team Resilience: Developing the Resilience at Work Team Scale', 2018, *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine/American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, vol. 60, no. 3, pp. 258-272.
117. McGannon, Donald H., 'Functional Leadership', in Adair, J. (ed.), *Leadership and Motivation. The Fifty-fifty Rule and the Eight Key Principles on Motivating Others*, London and Philadelphia: Kogan Page, 2006.
118. McGrath, R.G. and Kim, J., 'Innovation, Strategy, and Hypercompetition', in Dodgson, M., Gann, D.M. and Philips, N. (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Innovation Management*, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press, 2014, pp. 397-419.
119. Meier, K.J. and Hill, G.C., 'Bureaucracy in the Twenty-First Century', in Ferlie, E., Lynn Jr., L.E. Lynn Jr., and Pollitt, C. (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Public Management*, Oxford University Press, 2007, pp. 50-70.
120. Nguyen, Q., Kuntz, J.R.C., Näswall, K. and Malinen, S., 'Employee Resilience and Leadership Styles: The Moderating Role of Proactive Personality and Optimism', 2016, *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, vol. 45, no. 2, pp. 13-21.
121. Obolensky, N., *Complex Adaptive Leadership. Embracing Paradox and Uncertainty*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, USA: Gower Publishing Company, 2014.
122. OECD, 'Strengthening the Innovative Capacity of the Government of Romania: Interim Assessment Report', 2022, [Online] at [https://gov.ro/fisiere/pagini\\_fisiere/OCDE\\_-](https://gov.ro/fisiere/pagini_fisiere/OCDE_-)

\_Raportul\_de\_evaluare\_a\_capacitatii\_de\_inovare\_a\_administratiei\_publice\_din\_Romani  
a.pdf, accessed on March 12, 2023.

123. Omalaja, M.A., and Eruola, O.A., 'Strategic Management Theory: Concepts, Analysis and Critiques in Relation to Corporate Competitive Advantage from the Resource-based Philosophy', 2011, *Economic Analysis Review*, vol. 44, no. 1-2, pp. 59-77.
124. Paul, K.B. and Fenlason K.J., 'Transforming a Legacy Culture at 3M: Teaching an Elephant How to Dance', in Schneider, B. and Barbera, K.M. (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Organizational Climate and Culture*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2014, pp. 569-583.
125. Petre, O., D&D Research, 'TOP Orașe și cartiere din Romania' (TOP cities and neighborhoods from Romania), March 26, 2018, [Online] available at: <http://www.ddresearch.ro/top-orase-si-cartiere-din-romania/>, accessed on March 15<sup>th</sup>, 2021.
126. Pollitt, C. and Bouckaert, G, *Public Management Reform. A Comparative Analysis – Into the Age of Austerity*, 4<sup>th</sup> edition, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press, 2017.
127. Pollitt, C., *The Essential Public Manager*, Maidenhead, Philadelphia: Open University Press, 2003.
128. Polzer, T., Meyer, R.E., Höllerer, M.A. and Seiwald, J., 'Institutional Hybridity in Public Sector Reform: Replacement, Blending, or Layering of Administrative Paradigms', 2016, *How Institutions Matter!*, vol. 48B, pp. 69-99.
129. Popescu, L.G., 'New Models of Regulatory Decision Making and the Public Administration Reforms. The Romanian Context', in Matei, L. and Flogaitis, S. (eds.), *Public Administration in the Balkans. From Weberian Bureaucracy to New Public Management*, București: Editura Economică, 2011, pp. 119-130.
130. Profiriu, M., Tudorel, A., Carp, R. and Dragoș, D., 'Public Administration Reform in the Perspective of Romania's Accession to the European Union', European Institute of Romania – Pre-accession impact study no. 3, pp. 3-50.
131. Profiroiu, M.C., Țapardel, A.C. and Mihăescu, C., 'Performance Analysis on the Romanian Public Administration', 2013, *Transylvanian Review of Administrative Sciences*, vol. 40, pp. 183-200.

132. Pulley, M.L., 'Leading Resilient Organizations', 1997, *Leadership in Action*, vol. 17, no. 4.
133. Puscasu, R., 'Local Administration in Romania', 2000, NISPAcee Conference, pp. 1-20;
134. Rabin J, Miller, G., and Hildreth, W.B., *Handbook of Strategic Management*, Marcel Dekker, 2000.
135. Radu, B., 'Influence of Social Capital on Community Resilience in the Case of Emergency Situations in Romania', 2018, *Transylvanian Review of Administrative Sciences*, no. 54E, pp. 73-89.
136. Radu, B., 'Influence of Social Capital on Community Resilience in the Case of Emergency Situations in Romania', 2018, *Transylvanian Review of Administrative Sciences*, vol. 54, pp. 73-89.
137. Rahman, Md.M., Liberman, L.S., Giedraitis, V.R. and Akhter, T., 'The Paradigm from Traditional Public Administration to New Public Management System in Bangladesh: What Do Reform Initiatives Stand for?', 2013, *Advances in Economics and Business*, vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 297-303.
138. Reisman, G.D., *Neuro-Organizational Culture: A New Approach to Understanding Human Behavior and Interaction in the Workplace*, Switzerland: Springer International Publishing, 2016.
139. Roșca, I.Gh. and Moldoveanu, G., 'Tandemul cultură – birocrăție organizațională în sectorul public' (Culture Tandem – Organizational Bureaucracy in the Public Sector), 2010, *Economie teoretică și aplicată*, vol. 17, pp. 5-14.
140. Rus, M. and Rusu, D.O., 'The Organizational Culture in Public and Private Institutions', 2015, *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, vol. 187, pp. 565-596.
141. Sackmann, S.J., 'Culture and Performance', in Ashkanasy, N.M., Wilderom, C.P.M. and Peterson, M.F., *The Handbook of Organizational Culture and Climate*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, Los Angeles, London, New Delhi, Singapore, Washington D.C.: SAGE Publications, 2011, pp. 188-224.
142. Sacmaroska, N.M. and Shikova, N., 'Leadership, Organizational Change and Change Management, Key Drivers for Improving Performance in the Public Administration', in Lazarević, M., Marović, J. and Kacarska, S. (eds.), *Improving*

*Performance of Public Administration: Current Experiences and Future Perspectives*, Belgrade: La Mantini d.o.o., 2015, pp. 106-124.

143. Sanchez-Runde, C., Lee, S.M. and Steers, R.M., 'Cultural Drivers of Work Behavior: Personal Values, Motivation, and Job Attitudes', in Bhagat, R.S. and Steers, R.M., *Cambridge Handbook of Culture, Organizations and Work*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009, pp. 305-333.
144. Schein, E.H., *Organizational Culture and Leadership*, 4<sup>th</sup> edition, San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2010.
145. Sciulli, N., D'Onza, G. and Greco, G., 'Building a Resilient Local Council: Evidence from Flood Disasters in Italy', 2015, *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, vol. 28, no. 6, pp. 430-448.
146. Steccolini, I., 'Accounting and the Post-New Public Management', 2019, *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 255-279.
147. Stevenson, A., *The Public Sector. Managing the Unmanageable*, London, Philadelphia, New Delhi: KoganPage, 2013.
148. Suwaj, P.J., 'Public Administration in Central and Eastern Europe', in Peters, B.G. and Pierre J. (eds.), *The SAGE Book of Public Administration*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, Los Angeles, London, New Delhi, Singapore, Washington DC: SAGE Publishing, 2012, pp. 579-592.
149. Tau, B., Du Plessis, E., Koen, D. and Ellis, S., 'The Relationship Between Resilience and Empowering Leader Behaviour of Nurse Managers in the Mining Healthcare Sector', 2018, *Curationis*, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 1-10.
150. Teeroovengadam, V., Nunkoo, R. and Dulloo, H., 'Influence of Organisational Factors on the Effectiveness of Performance Management Systems in the Public Sector', 2019, *European Business Review*, vol. 31, no. 3, pp. 447-466.
151. The World Bank – Worldwide Governance Indicators [Online] available at <https://databank.worldbank.org/source/worldwide-governance-indicators#>, accessed on January-February 2023.
152. The World Bank, 'Results of the World Bank RAS Program in Romania, 2012-2015: Changing Institutions to Achieve Development Goals', July 17, 2017.
153. Thesari, S.S., Trojan, F. and Batistus, D.R., 'A Decision Model for Municipal Resources Management', 2019, *Management Decision*, DOI: 10.1108/MD-05-2017-0500.

154. Toonen, T.A.J., 'Administrative Reforms: Analytics', in Peters, B.G. and Pierre J. (eds.), *The SAGE Book of Public Administration*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, Los Angeles, London, New Delhi, Singapore, Washington DC: SAGE Publishing, 2012, pp. 499-510.
155. Transparency International – Corruption Perception Index, [Online] available at <https://www.transparency.org/en/cpi/2012>, accessed on February 14, 2023.
156. Tudzarovska-Gjorgjevska, E., 'Improving Performance of Public Administration: Current Experiences and Future Perspectives', in Lazarević, M., Marović, J. and Kacarska, S. (eds.), *Improving Performance of Public Administration: Current Experiences and Future Perspectives*, Belgrade: La Mantini d.o.o., 2015, pp. 125-128.
157. University of Würzburg, 'The Democracy Matrix', [Online] available at <https://www.democracymatrix.com/online-analysis/matrix#/chart1/Romania/2021/core>, accessed on February, 14, 2023.
158. Uwizeyimana, D.E. and Maphunye, K.J., 'The Changing Global Public Administration and its Theoretical and Practical Implications for Africa', 2014, *Journal of Public Administration and Policy Research*, vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 90-101.
159. Văduva, S., *From Corruption to Modernity – The Evolution of Romania's Entrepreneurship Culture*, SpringerBriefs in Economics, 2016, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-26997-9>.
160. Valero, J.N., Jung, K. and Andrew, S.A., 'Does Transformational Leadership build Resilient Public and Nonprofit Organizations?', 2015, *Disaster Prevention and Management*, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 4-20.
161. van de Walle, S., 'Building Resilience in Public Organizations: The Role of Waste and Bricolage', 2014, *The Innovation Journal: The Public Sector Innovation Journal*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 1-18.
162. van Helden, J. and Reichard, C., 'Management Control and Public Sector Performance Management', 2019, *Baltic Journal of Management*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 158-176.
163. Verheijen, T.J.G., 'Comprehensive Reform and Public Administration in Post-Communist States', in Peters, B.G. and Pierre J. (eds.), *The SAGE Book of Public Administration*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, Los Angeles, London, New Delhi, Singapore, Washington DC: SAGE Publishing, 2012, pp. 524-536.

164. Vigoda, E., 'New Public Management', 2003, *Encyclopaedia of Public Administration and Public Policy*, DOI: 10.1081/E-EPAP 120011081.
165. Vintan, A.D., Cira, D.A. and Heroiu, M.I., 'Romania Systematic Country Diagnostic: Regional Development', The World Bank Group, 2018.
166. Vishwas Puttaswamy, 'Is NPM Approaches Appropriate or Not to the Needs of Developing Countries?', [Online] at [https://www.academia.edu/3401723/IS\\_NPM\\_APPROACHES\\_APPROPRIATE\\_OR\\_NOT\\_TO\\_THE\\_NEEDS\\_OF\\_DEVELOPING\\_COUNTRIES\\_](https://www.academia.edu/3401723/IS_NPM_APPROACHES_APPROPRIATE_OR_NOT_TO_THE_NEEDS_OF_DEVELOPING_COUNTRIES_), accessed October 16<sup>th</sup>, 2020.
167. Wang, H.L., 'Theories for Competitive Advantage', 2014, University of Wollongong, Australia, *THEORI Research Group*, pp. 33-43.
168. Wenzler, I., Shimshon, G. and Leigh, E., 'Drivers of Resilience and Sustainability – Lessons from Long-Living Organizations and Institutions', 2009, [Online] available at [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/259571923\\_Drivers\\_Of\\_Resilience\\_And\\_Sustainability\\_-\\_Lessons\\_From\\_Long-Living\\_Organizations\\_And\\_Institutions](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/259571923_Drivers_Of_Resilience_And_Sustainability_-_Lessons_From_Long-Living_Organizations_And_Institutions), accessed on November 4, 2022.
169. Wiesel, F. and Modell, S., 'From New Public Management to New Public Governance? Hybridization and Implications for Public Sector Consumerism', 2014, *Financial Accountability & Management*, vol. 30, no. 2, pp. 175-205.
170. Wynen, J., Verhoest, K., Ongaro, E. and van Thiel, S., 'Innovation-Oriented Culture in the Public Sector: Do Managerial Autonomy and Result Control Lead to Innovation?', 2014, *Public Management Review*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 45-66.
171. Zulean, M., Andreescu, L., Gheorghiu, R., Roescu, A.M. and Curaj, A., 'Romanian Public Administration Reform 2.0: Using Innovative Foresight Methodologies to Engage Stakeholders and the Public', 2017, DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/FS-09-2016-0047>.