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# THESIS SUMMARY

**Introduction**. Romania's integration into Euro-Atlantic structures, the Romanian Army had to be adapted to the standards of our allies in order to be able to cope, at the highest level, with the gradual and arduous modernization process in order to become inter-operable with our partners. This meant a process of reforming the military institution which concerned several organizational components, such as: training and training of human resources, acquisition of military equipment and techniques, modification of specific procedures, etc. All these transformations involved new approaches in the field of military management and organisation, as well as the institution's performance throughout the integration process.

The organization is a social invention designed to achieve goals through the interaction and effort of its members, because only through cooperation can people do things together that they cannot achieve on their own. In the literature there are numerous definitions of the organization, which describe organizations as social entities that appear as systems of activities created for the achievement of objectives, deliberately structured and having identifiable limits. The objectives of an organisation are: to carry out tasks, to create an optimal framework of work and to create an image, a prestige.

The military organization has a special specificity, each military organization creates over time a team spirit and a professional hubris, which are contained in the common way that its members have learned to think, feel, act. Like other organizations, the military uses a set of symbols and artifacts: uniforms, badges, medals, the rewardsystem and punishments with which it influences the behavior of the military.

Organizational culture is in fact the personality of the organization, the way it works. The existing organizational culture at the level of the Romanian Army was created over time and was influenced by history, by permanent relations with society and with citizens. Culture in the military environment is defined as consisting of widely shared attitudes, values and norms that are used to achieve goals, manage tensions arising during activities and apply coercive measures applied by military leaders. Organizational culture in the military environment has also developed in response to the environment and specific tensions in certain conflict zones, with the military operating under unique conditions characterised by situations of uncertainty, risk and stress.

Within the organizational culture, subcultures specific to different functional structures were formed: staff, decision support, combat subunits, support subunits, etc.

The idea of this work was left out of the desire to research, evaluate, highlight and propose optimal ideas and solutions for improving institutional performance in the Ministry of National Defence and how it is influenced by organizational culture.

We set out to ensure that our scientific approach and the results of the research would generate a sufficiently large inters to clarify and broaden the theoretical aspects in terms of organisational culture, the managerial activity on each organisational level aimed at achieving the performance objectives set.

Also, in order to respond to requirements of great interest and topicality for the development of scientific research in the military field, through the proposed issues, the doctoral thesis circumscribes the evolutionary trends of research of problems specific to military theory. In the current military environment, based on knowledge, the effort aimed at human progress at the individual level, respectively social progress at the organization level, puts in the foreground, in a first stage, the man with his level of training, with his intelligence, psyche, creativity and continuous professional training, and subsequntly the performing organization, which integrates employees in a unitary way. At the same time, we appreciate that the research undertaken properly studies and correlates the link between the real needs of the military environment and the specific theoretical approaches contained in this paper.

[**Objectives and directions of research**](#_Toc447579639)

The process of research action is the process of research, it is the one that gives it legitimacy and it is the one that allows the research to be validated. In order to achieve thereins of the proposed objectives, toaddress a whole range of issues with reference to:

* Current state of knowledge about organizational culture;
* Performance in public institutions;
* Institutional framework for the organization and functioning of the internal management control system;
* Particalarities of the military organization;
* Analysis of organizational culture in the military field;
* Analysis of military performance;

In order to answer the main question of a research, a certain methodology should be followed in order to identify the approach to which the researcher has appealed. In this sense, the research process pursues a scientific approach that takes into account a complex of parameters and a whole series of variables that can help to obtain an answer in accordance with the initial question of the research. In order to understand as accurately as possible an analysed phenomenon, the information it has to have a higher level of quality, but inevitably this process requires a very large amount of time. Objectivity, rigor and probity are the elements that formed the basis of the research process.

In order to credibility with the conclusions of any scientific approach, it is necessary to choose an appropriate research methodology. The research methodology is the *algorithm* that we have followed to achieve the intended goal. In order to clarify the problem investigated and its coherent treatment, in order to ensure scientific support at the best level, we followed the stages of the research, namely the preparation, conduct and completion of the research and used the specific methods of research in the field of management: bibliographic study and documentation, practical documentation, consultation of specialists, survey on the basis of interview and on a questionnaire basis. The fundamental research aimed at investigating the literature at home and abroad, respectively the legislative aspects that characterize the subject under consideration.

From an *epistemological* point ofview, we appreciate that this research replaces the *constructivist current,*which aims at interpreting the unknown reality, a construction based on a reality that can be explained.

In our scientific approach, we have designed and carried out theoretical and practical research based on the formulation of directions and objectives, formulated in order to pursue the validation or invalidation of the hypotheses formulated and to discuss the essential problems related to the organizational culture in order to increase the performance of the organization. Starting from our goal, the realization of eloquent theoretical conceptualizations and delimitations and the correct construction of the scientific methodological approach adapted to the theme, we started by studying the specialized literature, as well as laws, regulations, internal orders. We used as research methods both qualitative – semistructured interview and quantitative – the questionnaire, and within them, we used observation, data and content analysis, comparison, interpretation, description, explanation.

The doctoral thesis had as its general objective, an organizational diagnosis at the level of the Ministry of National Defence, which consisted in identifying the organizational cultural elements and evaluating institutional performance, revealing differences and similarities towards civil society in line with performance through the prism of the internal management control system, the link between culture and organizational performance in the military field.

Starting from the overall objective, four specific objectives have been deduced that give consistency to our explanatory research in the attempt to investigate the causal relationship between culture and performance.

The first specific objective involved identifying and analysing the essential knowledge of the field studied, namely that of organisational culture, organisational performance and highlighting specific features of the field of the military.

The second specific objective is to highlight the comparative defining elements of the performance evaluation system based on performance monitoring within a public institution within the internal management control system.

The third specific objective was to achieve a cultural profile for the military organisation based on the proposed 5 (five) dimensions: organisational cohesion, human resources management, military leadership, skill differences (gender) and risk tolerance.

The last specific objective involved assessing institutional performance and how it is influenced by organisational culture within the Ministry of National Defence.

The first direction meant gatering of information in the field investigation regarding the analysis compared to performance within the Internal Management Control System implemented at the level of local/county structures, in which we used as the main method of research the semistructured interview, the respondents being the leaders and managers of the IMCS within the institutions subject to the analysis.

The second direction meant the collection of data on culture and performance, for which we used the questionnaire, the sample required for the investigation being made up of colleagues working in organizations of different levels within M.N.D.

The analysis of organisations from their cultural perspective is a constantly topical issue because they, in the context of globalisation, are facing changes in human resources policies, which implies the existence and strengthening of a strong culture. The theory of the organization highlights the role of culture in its three forms, organizational, national and professional, and the first form emphasizes the common values and meanings that create the reality of organizational life and influence on organizational performance.

We would like to point out that the analyses and results presented in this research present a reality that is currently found among the military, which reflects the behavior, feelings, perceptions and expectations of the employees of the Ministry of National Defence.

In **capitol 1,** entitled **"State of current knowledge in the management of organizational cultural",** we presented theoretical studiesrelating toorganizational culture based on conceptual approaches and component elements, patterns of cultures, factors influencing culture, functions of culture.

The last sub-chapter describes the varied typology of organizational culture, established according to several heterogeneous criteria, and finally I mentioned that an organization is not identified only by one of these types of culture, andtheir level can coexist several types of cultures all contributing to the complexity of the organization's life.

In **capitol**  **2**  **"Performance indicators in the military** **system",** we presented the conceptual framework of performance, what it consists of measuring performance at the organization level and how to evaluate the performance of employees, military personnel or civilian personnel, within the ministry. I also described in sub-chapter five how to evaluate military organisations in peacetime or during military actions, in order to finally make a comparative analysis between military assessment methods and those in public institutions.

In **chapter 3** "**Performance** **in public institutions**" we presented the defining elements of internal management control within local public institutions, by reflexively addressing the four standards that can be analyzed and evaluated within the internal framework of the management of each institution: objectives, planning, performance monitoring, risk management. The importance of internal management control was highlighted in relation to the proper administration of public structures, which allowed the role and place of this in relation to the audit work in public institutions to be clarified. At the same time, we described notions of internal public audit and corporate governance, and finally stressed the importance of knowing and applying these concepts correctly in order to manage the resources of public organisations correctly and increase their performance, as well as the extremely important role of leaders in this issue.

In **chapter**  **4,** entitled  **"****Particularities of the military organization",**  we have shown several defining elements of the military environment, namely an analysis of the current security environment, system of alliance or developments of the contemporary political-military context and the management of a military organization through the prism of component systems. Next I wanted to highlight elements of the specificity of the organizational culture in the military field, the role and importanceof the action in a militantorganization.

Finally, we approached the concept of military leadership, stressing that strong trust in commanders, their attribution of authority and their transformation into role models are cultural manifestations in the military organization, and this is closely linked to the self-esteem of military leaders and strengthens their status and implicitly their claim for prestige and respect in the military institution and society. We also did an analysis of the two leadership styles in the military organization, the objectiv based leadership and the order based leadership.

1.

**Chapter**  **5**  **"Research** **methodology"** describes

1.

mixed research for which we have opted, considering that it is very useful to combine quantitative and qualitative research methods in this research. The purpose of using this concept of research through the use of mixed methods is to receive complex responses to complicated problems, which involve both incipient elements, causality and influence as well as completion by measuring performance within the internal management control system.

In the first phase of the study we proposed a comparative analysis on the implementation of the Internal Management Control System, with the aim of determining similarities and differences in institutional performance within several territorial structures in Dâmbovița County. In carrying out the comparative study I tried to focus in particular on the analysis of the differences in approaches within the institutions subject to comparison, so that we could then come to general assumptions by which we could explain the whole phenomenon.

The questionnaire was used as a tool to test the proposed hypotheses. The questionnaire is divided into three parts: one part with socio-demographic data, one with questions about organizational culture and a final part on the perception of military performance. The questions in the last two parts are closed questions with answers on a Likert scale from 1 (to a very small extent) to 5 (very largely).

Against the background **of** these realities, chapter **6** of the paper "**Performance management in the Romanian system**", presents the results of studies on the themes for which we set out to identify the main ways of improving institutional performance in the Romanian Army. The first analysis refers to the evaluation of performance through the internal management control system, the study is a comparative one. The results of the research carried out are encouraging in the sense that all the institutions analysed largely achieve the objectives undertaken, thus meeting the performance indices imposed by the organisation.

1.

Diagnosing the dimensions of organizational culture in the military field was the second analysis we did, in the research aimed at validating research hypotheses on how three of the segmentation variables influence the five dimensionsof the organizational culture. The results of the options for differences in the dimensions of the organisational culture relative to the categories of staff show that there are differences of opinion among respondents on military leadership and skills differences (gender).

In the last analysis of our research we aim to validate the research hypotheses regarding the associations between the fields of organizational culture and the four components of the military institution. From the analysis of the results we can say that the effectiveness of leadership as a predictor of individual performance, directly influences the results at the employee level, the military leader being perceived as a strong person, trained to make decisions in uncertain conditions, would be those during a crisis. A firm leadership, subject to military rigor, capable of not give in to the difficulties and inspiring confidence among subordinates, to follow him in all difficult actions is a condition of employee performance.

**Capitol**  **7,** entitled  **"Model of organizational culture and performance in the Ministry of National** **Defence",** presents the author's proposals on improving institutional performance, starting from the **RU-CO-PI model,**  which is intended to be a complementary analysis tool for the realization of the Romanian Army's strategies for improving performance and continues with a guide of organizational culture and an institutional performance guide in M.N.D. The last sub-chapter contains strategies to improve institutional performance.

The thesis concludes with the presentation of the general conclusions of the author, formulated on the basis of the bibliographic materials studied and the results of the research performed. Personal contributions, validity and limitations of research, as well as future research directions are also materialised.

The biobiographical material studied and exploited for the purpose of this scientific approach includes local and foreign reference works in the field of management, studies, normative acts and regulations relating to management in the army, laws and provisions whose provisions and/or contents delimt the theory and practice of management activity, as well as materials published in the virtual environment, on official websites of institutions, blogs and informal forums.

The preoccupations of personal study and self-improvement concerns, the specifics of the professional field in which I conduct my work and the in-depth discussions carried out in the middle of the collective and the experience gained have helped me to structure my ideas, clarify my concepts, design my doctoral research and express my opinions regarding to the steps we can take to increase performance within the Romanian Army.
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