

ȘCOALA NAȚIONALĂ DE STUDII POLITICE ȘI ADMINISTRATIVE

ȘCOALA DOCTORALĂ MULTIDISCIPLINARĂ

Domeniul "Științe administrative"



PhD student Reli CECHE

DOCTORAL THESIS  
SUMMARY

Bucharest  
2023

**ȘCOALA NAȚIONALĂ DE STUDII POLITICE ȘI ADMINISTRATIVE**

**ȘCOALA DOCTORALĂ MULTIDISCIPLINARĂ**

**Domeniul "Științe administrative"**



**HUMAN CAPITAL IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION**

**THE ROLE OF EUROPEAN FUNDS**

**Summary**

**Scientific coordinator**

**Prof.univ.dr.Ani MATEI**

**PhD student**

**Reli CECHE**

**Bucharest**

**2023**

## Introduction

As it appears from the title of the thesis, in its structure and content, the trinomial - human capital, administrative capacity and European funds - will have the dominant weight both through the conceptualization and specific evolution of each, but also through highlighting and detailing the interactions between them in public administration.

The focus of the research will be on human capital in the public administration and the role of European funds in its development, the administrative capacity being introduced for methodological reasons in order to ensure the appropriate scientific context for understanding the characteristics, evolution and interaction of human capital and European funds within the public administration.

Since we are talking about three very topical concepts, with broad scopes and contents that cover almost the entire social, political and economic reality, we benefit from an extremely vast and diverse specialized literature.

In this context, we emphasize the fact that the research approach will consider the public administration, as part of the public sector. But, no matter how much we try to narrow the research area, the succinct presentation of the essential elements of the emergence and development of each concept of the mentioned trinomial is mandatory and gives the research the internal logic necessary for the exact understanding of the proposed purpose.

In the terminology of human capital, considered as a dematerialized expression of the human resource specific to public administration, the approach to these processes becomes persistent and, most often, the two perspectives represent different facets of the same research object.

Adopting this approach, we reiterate that, synthesizing the various conceptualizations of human capital, it refers to the collective knowledge, skills and abilities of an organization's workforce.

In the realm of public administration and services, human capital is a vital asset, with the effectiveness of government organizations largely dependent on the quality and productivity of their human capital as they must continually adapt to changing societal needs, fiscal pressures and evolving mission demands.

In public administration, as in the entire public sector, human capital management is a critical function, encompassing the processes and systems used to attract, develop and retain the

right talent, while optimizing the output and impact of each employee. In public administration, as in the entire public sector, human capital management is a critical function, encompassing the processes and systems used to attract, develop and retain the right talent, while optimizing the output and impact of each employee.

## **The content of the doctoral thesis**

### **CHAPTER I – HUMAN CAPITAL. DEFINITIONS AND CONCEPTUAL DEVELOPMENTS**

- I.1. Conceptualizations and theories regarding human capital
- I.2. Human capital – an economic perspective
  - I.2.1. The theoretical framework of the theory of economic growth
  - I.2.2. The neoclassical growth model
  - I.2.3. Solow's production growth function
  - I.2.4. The new theory of endogenous growth
  - I.2.5. Empirical evidence on the causal relationship between human capital and economic growth
  - I.2.6. Analogy between human capital and physical capital
- I.3. Human capital – a social perspective
  - I.3.1. Social capital
  - I.3.2. Human capital vs. Social capital. A structural approach
- I.4. Evaluation/measurement of human capital
  - I.4.1. The conventional approach to human capital valuation
  - I.4.2. Premises of complex indicators of human capital
  - I.4.3. Multicriteria approaches to the evaluation/measurement of human capital
    - I.4.3.1. Human Capital Index - World Bank
    - I.4.3.2. Human Capital Index – OECD
    - I.4.3.3. Global human capital index - World Economic Forum
- I.5. Conclusions

### **CHAPTER II – SPECIFIC HUMAN CAPITAL IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION**

- II.1. The European context
- II.2. Structural and dimensional characteristics of human capital in public administration
- II.3. Bureaucracy and meritocracy in the evolution of human capital
- II.4. Toward the New Weberian Bureaucracy
- II.5. Conclusions

## **CHAPTER III – EUROPEAN FUNDS AND HUMAN CAPITAL: PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION DEVELOPMENT**

### **BINOM**

III.1. Introduction

III.2. The European Social Fund – adaptive and innovative tool

III.3. European support for public administration efficiency

III.3.1. Key actions for effective administration

III.3.2. Extended administrative capacity

III.3.3. Efficiency and effectiveness – a systemic aggregation

III.3.4. Quality and performance of public administration – complementary concepts

III.4. Human capital – central element of administrative capacity and effective public administration

III.5. The theoretical model of the interaction of ESIF and public administration

III.6. Conclusions

## **CHAPTER IV HUMAN CAPITAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE CAPACITY OF THE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION:**

### **THE NATIONAL CONTEXT**

IV.1. Public administration reform - determinant of human capital in the EU

IV.2. Major initiatives to strengthen the Romanian public administration

IV.2.1. Public administration consolidation strategy (PACS) 2014-2020

IV.2.1.1. The vision and normative framework of PACS

IV.2.1.2. Compatibility analysis of PACS with the Europe 2020 Strategy

IV.2.1.3. Evaluation of the PACS impact

IV.2.2. Strategy for better regulation 2014-2020

IV.2.2.1. The European context

IV.2.2.2. Strengthening administrative capacity through better regulation

IV.2.3. Management and training of the public function. Two complementary strategies

IV.2.3.1. The European context

IV.2.3.2. Complementarity analysis of the strategies regarding the development and professionalization of the public function 2016-2020

IV.2.3.2.1. Comparative OECD-Romania aspects regarding the public function

IV.2.3.2.2. Complementarity of strategies

IV.3. Administrative capacity, human capital and European funds. An integrated analytical framework

IV.3.1. Operational programs "administrative capacity" (POCA) and "human capital" (POCU)

IV.3.2. The EIPA design model for strengthening administrative capacity

IV.3.3. Human capital in the Romanian public administration

IV.3.3.1. The specific structure of human capital

IV.3.3.2. Statistical and analytical developments regarding the public function

IV.3.4. Conclusions

## **CHAPTER V HUMAN CAPITAL AND MERITOCRACY. THEORETICAL AND EMPIRICAL MODELS AND ANALYSIS**

V.1. Meritocracy, social status and human capital

V.1.1. Meritocracy and merit

V.1.2. Individual human capital and social status

V.2. Methodology

V.2.1 Hypotheses and principles

V.2.2. The formal socio-statistical model

V.3. A complex empirical framework for the investigation of human capital in the Romanian public administration

V.3.1. Human capital from the Prefect's Institutions

V.3.1.1. Complementarity with Weberian empirical research

V.4. Conclusions

## **CHAPTER VI GENERAL CONCLUSIONS**

VI.1. Open problems

VI.2. Validation of the hypotheses

## **VII. GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY**

### **Hypotheses, research objectives and research methodology**

*Ip.1. The existence of a complex interaction between human capital and administrative capacity that determines the consolidation of an efficient public administration.*

*Ip.2. The structural funds provide support for the construction of an efficient public administration, oriented towards modern organizational goals and which capitalizes on the tradition of the Romanian public administration.*

*Ip.3. Dependence of human capital in the public administration on the administrative model of the reform.*

For the operationalization and testing of this research hypothesis, a series of research objectives were established, which consider:

*Ob.1. Highlighting the specificity of human capital in the public administration, as part of the national human capital, its dependence on the context and governance model and determining its central role in the construction and development of administrative capacity.*

*Ob. 2. The foundation and description of a model of the interaction of European funds with the public administration, as well as a theoretical, instrumental and operational framework for the consolidation of the public administration.*

*Ob.3. The theoretical and empirical determination of new tools for evaluating human capital in public administration by promoting merit systems and meritocracy in public administration.*

The entire approach benefits from the existence of a multiple paradigm for public administration research, as well as from its multidisciplinary character.

*The analyses, arguments and value judgments will also be located in fields adjacent to public administration, such as those of economics, political science or sociology.*

*The research methodology* is based on the systematic bibliographic analysis and research applicable to each chapter and following, with priority, the methodological steps in the specialized literature on this topic (Khan et al., 2003): formulating the search items, identifying the relevant works based on their notoriety, as well as the affiliation of the authors, summarizing the relevant evidence and arguments and integrating the findings into the research context.

## **The structure of the doctoral thesis**

The present work is structured in five chapters to which are added the introduction, conclusions and bibliography.

Following the arguments in the introduction, the paper benefits from a logical structure that starts from a rigorous substantiation derived from the specialized literature and other relevant studies and continues in a deductive approach to the detailed approach of each proposed objective and the validation, on this basis, of the formulated research hypotheses.

In this context, the first chapter refers to "**Human capital. Definitions and conceptual developments**" which aims to present, in a succinct and comprehensive manner, the concept of human capital from an economic and social perspective, its integration within the theory of

economic growth, but also the structural analysis of the interaction between human and social capital.

The analogy between human capital and physical capital is included in this chapter for a better understanding of the foundation and economic relevance of human capital

The last part of the chapter is dedicated to the evaluation/measurement of human capital, highlighting both conventional approaches and complex, multi-criteria indicators designed and operationalized by international institutions and organizations, such as the World Bank, OECD or World Economic Forum.

In the logical approach, associated with the achievement of the research objectives of the doctoral thesis, in this chapter the theoretical approaches prevail, but also the transition from the economic nature of human capital to the social one whose valences, determinations and impact will substantiate the following chapters regarding the specificity of human capital in public administration and its central role in strengthening the administrative capacity of public administration.

Consistent with the internal logic of the research approach that I referred to previously, in the second chapter "**The specifics of human capital in public administration**" some of the characteristics of human capital in public administration are presented and detailed.

As part of the national human capital, this specific capital will also benefit from the level and the quality of education provided by the national education system, but it will also have a number of specific characteristics.

Although we do not insist on this aspect, we must mention that, first of all, the specifics of the human capital in question is given by the normative framework of the public function existing at the national level.

We specify, in this context, that a series of values that are specific to the human capital in the public administration also derive from the membership of the national public administration in the European Administrative Space.

From another perspective, the chapter presents and details the possible impact of bureaucracy and meritocracy theories on the organization and management of human resources in public administration

The presentations, on this topic, have, however, a high degree of generality, so that, in the following chapters, when necessary, they will be concretized at the level of the Romanian public administration.



The development of an efficient public administration has as its main pillars human capital and the support offered by European funds. In this context, in the third chapter "**European funds and human capital: binomial of public administration development**" the context and framework of public administration development under the impact of European funds is presented. Thus, it is stated that the issue of public administration development was and is the object of the application of European financing instruments, especially the European Structural and Investment Funds (ESIF).

The most relevant objective pursued for the public administration is its efficiency, a process that has as a mandatory condition the development of the administrative capacity and, in this framework, of the human capital in the public administration.

We can therefore speak of a complex process of interaction between ESIF and the public administration, an interaction whose central element is the human capital of the public administration.

The phrase in the title of the chapter "binomial of the development of public administration" refers to this complex interaction that involves adjacent processes and characteristics - efficiency and effectiveness, quality and performance, human capital and meritocracy - which, aggregated, lead to the development of public administration.

Within the ESIF, for the field analyzed in the paper, the most important is the European Social Fund (ESF) which, as shown in this subchapter, has acquired adaptive and innovative characteristics during its multi-decade existence.

The structure of the chapter under discussion includes six sub-chapters, four of which are intended for the conceptual and operational analysis and presentation of financing instruments, processes adjacent to the development of public administration and human capital as a central and integrative element of their interaction.

A subchapter (III.5) is dedicated to the framework theoretical model of the interaction we discussed, a model based on two theoretical backgrounds: Public Choice Theory and Neo-Weberianism. Apparently difficult to reconcile, the two theories, in our opinion, have the ability to capture as close as possible to reality both the elements of convergence of the processes managed by the two theories and the divergences that, according to experience and the study of specialized literature, are manifested in the evolution of the Romanian public administration.

The national context highlighting the main concerns, initiatives and characteristics of the Romanian public administration is presented and detailed in the fourth chapter "**Human capital**

**and the administrative capacity of the public administration. The national context"** which aims to address the evolution and characteristics of the two concepts - administrative capacity and human capital - in the context of national realities and concerns.

Such an approach is particularly important given that, in the period leading up to the present research, we note the attention and concentration of European and national bodies towards the strategic foundation and operationalization of the requirements and recommendations of the European Union for the efficiency of the Romanian public administration. This reason is also due to the association in the analysis of the concept of administrative capacity, through which we will be able to distinguish and better understand the specific characteristics and evolutions of human capital in the Romanian public administration.

Added to this is the fact that the period we are discussing also coincided with a new period of funding from the European Union, funding that included, as a priority, the specific and problematic instruments related to administrative capacity and human capital.

The continuity that characterizes the European interventions, recommendations and support was also another argument of a coherent and necessary approach for the compatibility of the Romanian public administration with the administrations of the other member states.

The structure of the chapter includes the topic of public administration reform as a determinant of human capital in the EU, highlighting the catalytic role of ESI funds for the development of administrative capacity and human capital, as well as impact, comparative, compatibility and complementarity analyzes between the fundamental strategic documents that directed the entire effort to consolidate public administration, in line with European developments.

New models of construction and assessment of administrative capacity as well as human capital are also presented.

The chapter ends with the description of an integrated theoretical, instrumental and operational model that summarizes the descriptions and approaches from the previous chapters regarding the context and purpose of the transformation of the Romanian public administration.

The last chapter, the fifth, is entitled "**Human capital and meritocracy. Theoretical and empirical modeling and analysis**" proposes a theoretical and empirical approach to some instruments and indicators specific to meritocracy, seen as a specific characteristic of the Weberian bureaucracy and, in the context of the present work, of the public administration model in Romania.

The two concepts - human capital and meritocracy - coexist in specialized literature, being in a relationship of mutual determination.

The public sector and, most often, the public administration offer eloquent examples of their interaction under the conditions of the need to increase performance and quality, professionalize the public function as well as support the processes of social innovation, adaptation or digitization.

Divided into two complementary parts, this chapter offers both a model for investigating the level of meritocracy in an institution, be it in the public sector, as well as an empirical quantitative analysis of the characteristics of human capital in the Romanian public administration.

The juxtaposition of these two parts, the first predominantly theoretical, and the second predominantly empirical, lays the foundations for a complex approach to the meritocratic evolution of human capital in public administration.

We are talking about the complexity of this gear because, as presented in the first part of the chapter, over time, the issue of meritocracy has concerned the academic and research environment. Moreover, we reiterate the appreciation of Krauze&Slomczynski (1985) according to which "meritocracy refers to a large-scale social system, presenting a positive relationship between "merit" and certain desired common values, such as: income, power, prestige".

Other arguments of the complexity under discussion derive from the determinations on the human capital in the public administration of the neo-Weberian model that interfere in the hybrid model of governance specific to the current period.

Therefore, meritocracy represents, in this chapter, the transversal concept that is present in both parts of the chapter. This observation is made concrete by the fact that this, meritocracy, constitutes a permanent benchmark both for the design of statistical models for the analysis of the characteristics of human capital and in the empirical analyzes presented for the human capital in the prefect's institutions.

The paper ends with a chapter dedicated to general conclusions that complements and integrates the partial conclusions from the structure of each chapter and with the general bibliography.

## General conclusions

In order to provide the most comprehensive and detailed picture of what is presented in the thesis, we opted for the simultaneous presentation of the conclusions both at the level of each chapter (partial conclusions) and at the end (general conclusions).

Within the latter, we will try to naturally, succinctly, also integrate the partial ones, thus ensuring the coherence and finality necessary for a doctoral-level approach.

In this context, we should start from the *complexity* of the present research.

We could even speak of a *systemic complexity*, although the content of the research did not insist on this.

The complexity derives, first of all, from the multitude and diversity of concepts used in the thesis, concepts that, interacting, lead to the initial hypothesis formulated and substantiate the structure and content of the thesis.

As it follows from the title of the thesis, the fundamental concept is that of human capital, in general, and human capital in public administration, in particular.

Human capital, as a dematerialized expression of the human resource, has known, in the last decades, important approaches and concerns. Its various specificities are in continuous expansion and develop in line with processes and interdependencies specific to economic and social development: organizational effectiveness, the development of companies and their capacity, the interdependence between the citizen and the organization or between human capital and other capital companies, etc.

Relevant aspects of human capital are also derived from its interaction with the theory of agency, the economic costs of transactions, the theory of the firm, the creation of specific knowledge and, last but not least, with the economy of the future, globalization, etc.

*Human capital in public administration is an integrante part of national human capital.*

Indeed, as shown in chapter I of the thesis, the theoretically important steps concerned investments in education and their profitability. The most commonly used starting point for evaluating the return on these investments considered the level and quality of formal education provided to citizens in different countries. Or, regardless of the field or sector in which they will be active, all citizens had access to this education and acquired, based on it, a certain level of individual human capital.

Obviously, for a field, such as that of public administration, there is the specificity necessary for its development in agreement with the evolution, as a whole, of society.

From the perspective of human capital, the specificity for public administration is obtained, most frequently, from continuous training resulting from special forms and programs offered to those who are or want to work in public administration. The in-depth understanding of the specifics of human capital in public administration cannot be separated from the general context of its approach and evolution.

In this context, two approaches are integrated and detailed in the thesis, from an economic perspective and from a social perspective of human capital.

The approach from an economic perspective coincides with the very process of conceptualizing human capital, a process in which prestigious scientists have been involved, many of whom have won the Nobel Prize for economics.

Along the way, as was natural, other perspectives were developed that led to new concepts – social capital, relational capital, political capital, etc. – which, in fact, represent new facets of human capital.

The structural and transformational characteristics of different types of capital, in relation to the context in which they are manifested, testify to this statement.

The existence and development of human capital in public administration can be described, more comprehensively, in the conditions in which we approach it in the context of administrative capacity.

*Human capital in the public administration has a central role in the development of administrative capacity.*

Administrative capacity, being a new concept used in this work, gives the public administration the necessary consistency to fulfill its mission in society. Approached, most often, in relation to a broader analysis context related to public administration, administrative capacity integrates and uses the human, material and financial resources of an institution or public authorities, in accordance with evolutionary objectives, reform, consolidation or support of other activities in society established at national, territorial or local level.

The integrative and operational role falls, as is natural, to the human resources available to the public entity, human resources to which a specific human capital is uniquely associated.

Affirming and supporting in the thesis this central role of human capital, we should also emphasize the idea of context dependence of human capital in the sense that its level, size and performance can only be understood within the framework provided by the administrative capacity.

Therefore, *public administration human capital and its administrative capacity are interdependent, in a two-way causality relationship.*

Moreover, the institutions of the European Union are also associated with this approach in multiple analysis and approach scenarios. Among them, we must note the country recommendations regarding the reform and consolidation of public administration, the thematic analysis reports regarding administrative efficiency, administrative quality and performance, etc.

This reality also justifies the inclusion in the work and the detailing of the operational concepts and aspects as they have in mind those revealed above.

Administrative capacity and the role of human capital within it can only be deeply understood in the theoretical and empirical framework provided by the efficiency of public administration and the contributions of administrative quality and performance to their growth.

Another scenario of involvement of the European Union in the issue of the evolution of human capital and administrative capacity is that of the European Structural and Investment Funds (ESIF). The way in which the European Commission approaches the two concepts is extremely comprehensive, being developed and implemented in an original logic.

Noting the continuity and finality proposed by ESIF, *in the thesis we insist on the innovative and adaptive character of these funds as well as on the content and construction of intervention methods supported by operational programs with a precise and current destination in the Romanian administrative realities.*

In this context, the human capital in the Romanian public administration benefited from logistical and financial support both as part of the human capital at the national level and as a central constituent element of the administrative capacity.

In chapter I, more precisely in subchapter I.4., a presentation is made, *in extenso*, of the evaluation/measurement of human capital.

Our insistence on this issue starts from the reality found through the research of specialized literature that, in the entire conceptual and evolutionary process of human capital, one of the most difficult problems arises in relation to how we manage to associate it with a quantitative value. The complexity and conceptual scope of human capital considerably increase the difficulty of this endeavor.

We also note the fact that important and prestigious organizations worldwide - the World Bank, the OECD, the World Economic Forum - as well as numerous scientific personalities have trained in this collective effort.

Our idea was that, by presenting these concerns and results, to extract possible aspects that could lead to a specific evaluation of human capital in public administration.

*The development and operationalization of a specific mechanism for evaluating human capital in the public administration could complement the analyzes and investigations on the human resources in the public administration in the sense of deepening them.*

Studying the numerous existing reports related to the public office, I found that, from the analyzes related to Romania, the qualitative elements that really relate to the evaluation of the capital in the public administration are missing.

The conceptualization and operationalization of such analyzes would also justify a terminological and methodological change, in the evaluation and reporting mechanism related to the public function in the sense of the introduction of human capital management as a constitutive element of administrative capacity. Such an approach associated with an innovative vision of administrative capacity could even lead to a paradigm shift.

Of course, this presumptive paradigm shift in the evaluation of human capital in the public administration must be accompanied by several other elements.

If we analyze the literature and specialized studies related to the reform of the public administration and, implicitly, the public function and its management, we will find the following:

- *The formulated and partially operationalized reform strategies propose objectives that derive, most often, from guidelines and recommendations of the European Commission or thematic research groups with which it cooperates.*

Although there is no single model of national public administrations, the recommendations I mentioned derive from the reports and synthesis studies carried out in cooperation with the OECD, the World Bank, etc. or from experiences and good practices of "robust" administrations of states with a recognized administrative and democratic tradition.

The strategic elements of national administrative culture and tradition are, as a rule, in the background.

- The specialized literature, primarily that of the political sciences, discusses, analyzes and promotes different administrative models which, by capitalizing on recognized socio-political studies and analyses, try to respond better to the need for the public administration to provide effective support for the economic and social development processes of a state.

The respective models in turn induce new theories of public management, governance and administration in general, regarding the role of market mechanisms in public governance,

centralization/decentralization, regulation/deregulation, limits of political involvement in administration, etc.

- *The administrative capacity of the public administration will have to, under the conditions of a strategic approach, internalize the stated strategic principles and find their own mechanisms for achieving them.*

This fact, without a doubt, implies the creation and affirmation of a specific human capital that, in turn, acquires the principles and values of the assumed strategy.

These considerations, to which others can be added, induce the need for the political leadership of a state to opt, based on comprehensive analyses, for a certain administrative model, well-grounded theoretically and empirically, which, capitalizing on national administrative traditions and culture, will provide a clear, long-term direction of public administration reforms.

Most often, as shown in the thesis in chapter II, these models are hybrid, taking specific elements from different theories or administrative models, public management, etc.

In this context, in the same chapter II, when discussing the specifics of human capital in public administration, theoretical references are made to the bureaucratic models, especially Max Weber's, found in the specialized literature, and an attempt is made to distinguish within them a certain specificity of the human resource in administration that is different from other sectors of activity.

- *Thus, at present, I return to the so-called "merit systems" to which, including, recent analyzes invoked in the thesis, refer and are based on three basic principles:*
  - *selection based on open and competitive qualifications exams;*
  - *political neutrality;*
  - *the relative security of the mandate.*

In this context, in subchapter II.2. it notes a series of recent recommendations by which the OECD "describes how a professional and merit-based public sector, dedicated to public service values, contributes to public integrity".

*A conclusion, in agreement with the finality of our research approach, we obtain by adapting OECD assessments, namely "even if a merit system is quasi-generalized, its application must be renewed to keep up with the changing requirements of public services".*

Discussions on this or other related topics are numerous and extensively presented in sub-chapters II.3. and II.4.



The membership of a state to one or another of the models is usually achieved by taking into account the administrative tradition and administrative structure. In such a classification, *Romania is placed among the Central and Eastern European states, with an administrative tradition focused on restoring the rule of law and with a decentralized unitary administrative structure and a strong local government.*

Some of the recognized and often cited authors in the doctoral school are Pollitt&Bouckaert (2011) and who, referring to the various administrative models, remark "governments seem to like to have their own version, both internally, which shows internal originality and uniqueness, and externally, as a "product" that would be considered, internationally, as a model for public management reforms".

Related to the two authors cited as we present in the thesis, *they opt for the Neo-Weberian State (NWS) which, in essence, is an attempt to modernize the traditional bureaucracy, making it more professional, efficient and citizen-friendly.*

Inspired by strong Western European administrative models, this model also has particularities. Thus, according to the "tradition of public administration" criterion, *Romania is in the category of "states in transition" where the dominant model, with high impact, is Weberianism associated with the New Public Management, with a low impact.*

*The symbiosis of the two dominant models, with differentiated impact, leads to the existing support, in the Romanian public administration, of the NWS characteristics.*

These characteristics, which I returned to in the paper, in chapter IV, determined that the *interaction between human capital and European funds was designed and carried out on clear objectives, constituting a binomial of the development of public administration.*

We reiterate the fact that, in the thesis, there is the assessment and documentation that the European Social Fund represents an "adaptive and innovative instrument", an assessment based on its history and objectives during the existence of the EC/EU.

*At the same time, the European Social Fund represents a "support for the efficiency of public administration", the appreciation derived both from its objectives and priorities and from the focus on what we call "efficient administration". Thus, in the programmatic documents of the EU, the European Social Fund supports "investment in the structures, human capital and systems and tools of the public sector, orienting it towards more efficient organizational processes, modern management, motivated and qualified civil servants".*

In this context, one can speak of an "extended administrative capacity" that fully realizes the administrative dimension of the state's capacity.

We owe the "extended" attribute, in the opinion of some established authors, both to globalization, which requires the expansion of administrative capacity to face the world context of intense competition, complexity and uncertainty, as well as to new meanings that the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development brings to administrative capacity.

And for this, the specialized literature invokes "the need for an extremely meritocratic and technocratic bureaucracy" which is supported precisely by human capital, its specificity and technocratic characteristics.

In achieving its objectives, the administrative capacity refers relevantly to various forms of human capital, converted into political capital, social capital, etc.

Based on these, *the thesis elaborates and presents a systemic model of administrative capacity, in which the central role belongs to human capital.*

We consider the evaluation of the role of European funds in the development of the human capital of the public administration in a theoretical and empirical framework that synthesizes and integrates what has been discussed so far.

Thus, invoking two theoretical backgrounds related to management and public governance, *the paper proposes a complex model based on the "Theory of public choice" and "Neo-Weberianism", as well as the Theory of public goods and services from the interaction of which will result important characteristics of human capital in public administration, characteristics that will be strengthened through the instruments offered by European funds.*

As we also show in subchapter III.5., *we owe the option for this theoretical framework to the realities of the evolution and models of public administration in South-East Europe, the presence and persistence of Weberian characteristics in the past and present of Romanian public administration.*

From the perspective of the evolution of human capital in public administration, we consider, for example, *"professional bureaucracy" as an important characteristic of neo-Weberianism, understanding by this, that the civil servant will be a professional manager, oriented towards satisfying the needs of citizens/public service users.*

The entire public administration, designed in turn as a public service, will have to pursue the achievement of this objective regarding the human capital specific to the public administration.

Under the impact of European funds, concentrated in the 2014-2020 programming period on administrative capacity, the Romanian administrative area acquired new strategic and operational images.

In this context, from the multitude of strategies, activities, projects, etc. that happened quickly during the mentioned period and in the years that followed, *in the thesis we focused, first of all, on the relevant aspects of a strategic nature, analyzing the Strategy for the consolidation of the public administration, the Strategy for a better regulation, the Strategies for the development and professionalization of the public function.*

Even if the impact analyzes of the strategies do not give us an eloquent picture of the new Romanian public administration, the elements derived from their complementarities at the internal level but also at the European level with the Europe 2020 Strategy lead us to the conclusion of the initiation of a dynamic and coherent process in the transformation towards an efficient public administration in Romania.

In the interaction between the development of the specific human capital of the public administration and the specific operational programs supported through the ESF, the previously stated strategies had a directing and catalytic role, leading the interventions and programs towards objectives jointly assumed by the national authorities and those of the European Union.

The analyzes regarding the statistical evolution of the Romanian civil service in the period 2012-2021 gained new content valences by *introducing and estimating the educational composition of the human capital, a composition which, together with other indicators, can provide a quantitative evaluation of what was previously called "merit" in the public office.*

*In order to provide a synthesis model for this interaction, I proposed, at the end of the IVth chapter, a theoretical, instrumental and operational framework for the consolidation of the Romanian public administration, a framework that has as its background the two theories: public choice and neo-Weberianism, and as vehicles of connection and transfer between inputs and ends, the previously mentioned strategies.*

*Deepening the analysis of the strategies in the context of the two background theories, major activities and projects from the two strategies that are the subject of one or the other of the theories are presented.*

As I showed in the introduction of the thesis, one of the most serious limitations of this research refers to the absence of empirical data, and when they exist, they are incomplete and uneven.

Therefore, the fifth chapter, which in our intention was conceived as a predominantly empirical chapter, contains applicable theoretical models and, only to a small extent, empirical analyzes relevant to research. Theoretical models, as well as empirical research, are dominated by the idea that meritocracy represents one of the strategic priorities of the formation and evolution of human capital in public administration.

*In this context, the content of the chapter is synthesized using studies by some recognized authors, mentioned in the Vth chapter, as well as reports/deliverables made, by World Bank experts, within the projects on the management and development of the public function, related to POCA.*

*In this context, in subchapter V.1., the statistical analysis and operational research model used is intended to provide an answer to the question "How far/close are we to meritocracy?"*

*The model was adapted to the research requirements formulated in this thesis, being completed with a consistent part regarding the relationship between human capital and meritocracy.*

Regarding the empirical research, they are based, on the one hand, on the existing structure and foundation within a survey among civil servants carried out by the World Bank, as an integral part of the SIPOCA 136 project "Development of a Unitary Management System of Human Resources in the Public Administration" and, on the other hand, empirical results extracted according to the research interests of this paper.

*In a first instance, this study was synthesized and proposed as an empirical framework model for the investigation of human capital in the Romanian public administration.*

*The argument for this option is that the study is compatible with the theoretical framework and models developed in the doctoral thesis. The study mentions and uses bibliographic resources that are also found in the thesis, and the variables chosen and described are also compatible with the merit systems invoked and developed in the thesis.*

Moreover, in our processing we considered the description of the content of each variable so that we can obtain empirical data usable in a more detailed analysis, from the perspective of human capital, at the level of the prefect's institutions in Romania.

This second scenario, in which the mentioned study was used, provided consistent empirical data for *the introduction into the sociological analysis of the variables - merit, career and salary - usable in a new and complementary instrument dedicated to the "quality of the bureaucracy" which is called the "Weberian scale".*

Described in Rauch&Evans (2000), the Weberian scale is already an established tool that provides relevant summary indicators of human capital in Weberian public administration.

*Regarding the results for the human capital in the prefect's institutions, we appreciate that the values associated with the variables of merit, career and salary are relevant for the initiation of more detailed analyzes regarding the level and quality of the human capital within them.*

## **Bibliografie generală**

1. Academia de Studii Economice(ASE), Catedra de Economie și Politici Economice (2001), *Dicționar de economie*, Editura Economică;
2. Adler, P.S. & Kwon, S.-W. (2002), *Social Capital: Prospects for a Concept*, Academy of Management Review, No.27, pp.17-40;
3. Agenția Națională a Funcționarilor Publici (ANFP) (2022), *Raport privind managementul funcțiilor publice și al funcționarilor publici pentru anul 2021*, [anfp.gov.ro/R/Doc/2022/Anunturi?Raport%20mgm%202021\\_30.05.2022.pdf](https://anfp.gov.ro/R/Doc/2022/Anunturi?Raport%20mgm%202021_30.05.2022.pdf);
4. Ahadi, S. & Jacobs, R.L. (2017), *A Review of the Literature an Structural On-the-Job Training and Directions for Future Research*, Human Resource Development Review, vol.16(4), pp.323-349, Sage.
5. Alexiou, C. (2009), *Government Spending and Economic Growth: Econometric Evidence from South- Eastern Europe (SEE)*, Journal of Economic and Social Research, No.11(1), pp.1-16;
6. Ancoin, P. (1990), *Administrative Reform in Public Management: Paradigms, Principles, Paradoxes and Pendulums. Governance*, An International Journal of Policy and Administration, vol.3, No.2, pp.115-137;
7. Asensio, M., Evaristo, C.&Martins, M.(2021), *CAF Challenges to Promote Public Sector Capacity*: Lisboa: DGAEP;
8. Ashton, D. & Green, F. (1996), *Education, Training and the Global Economy*, Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar;
9. Baker, W. (1990), *Market Networks and Corporate Behaviour*, American Journal of Sociology, No.96(3), pp.589-625;

10. Balint, T., Bauer, M. W. & Knill, C. (2008), *Bureaucratic change in the European Administrative Space: The Case of the European Commission*. *West European Politics*, vol.31, No.4, pp.677-700;
11. Barro, R.J. & Lee, J.W. (1993), *International Comparisons of Educational Attainment*, *Journal of Monetary Economics*, No.32(3), pp.363-94;
12. Bartoli, A. (2008), *The Study of Public Management in France: La spécificité du modèle français d'administration*, in Kickert, W. (ed.), (2008), *The Study of Public Management in Europe and the US: A Comparative Analysis of National Distinctiveness*, Abingdon, Routledge;
13. Bassani, C. (2008), *The Influence of Financial, Human and Social Capital on Japanese Men's and Women's Health in Single and Two – Parents Family Structures*, *Social Indicators Research*, No.85(2), pp.191-209;
14. Bassi, L.J. & McMurren, D.P. (2006), *Employers' Perspectives on the Roles of Human Capital Development and Management in Creating Value*, OECD Education Working Papers No.18, OECD;
15. Beaud, M. & Dostalev, G. (1995), *Economic Thought Since Keynes, A History and Dictionary of Major Economists*, Routledge, London;
16. Becker, G. S. & Chiswick, B. R. (1966), *Education and the Distribution of Earnings*, *American Economic Review*, vol.56, pp.358-369;
17. Becker, G. S. (1964), *Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis, with Special Reference to Education* (2nd ed.), National Bureau of Economic Research, New York;
18. Becker, G. S. (1975), *Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis, with Special Reference to Education*, 2nd ed., National Bureau of Economic Research;
19. Becker, G. S. (1993), *Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis, with Special Reference to Education*, third edition, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press;
20. Becker, G.S. (1962), *Investment in Human Capital: A Theoretical Analysis*, *Journal of Political Economy*, pp.9-49, <https://doi.org/10.1086/258724>;

21. Benhabib, J.F. & Spiegel, M.M. (1994), *The Role of Human Capital in Economic Development Evidence from Aggregate Cross-Country Data*, *Journal of Monetary Economics*, No. 34(2), pp.143-73, [https://doi.org/101016/0304-3932\(94\)90047-7](https://doi.org/101016/0304-3932(94)90047-7);
22. Blair, M. M. (2011), *An Economic Perspective on the Nation of Human Capital*, in Burton-James, Alan & Spender, J.-C., (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Human Capital*, Oxford University Press, pp.49-70;
23. Blankenau, W.F., Simpson, N.B., & Tomljanovich, M. (2007), *Public Education Expenditures, Taxation, and Growth: Linking Data to Theory*, *American Economic Review*, No.97(2), pp.393-7, <https://doi.org/101257/aer.97.2.393>;
24. Bossaert, D., Demmke, C., Nomden, K.F., & Polet, R. (2001), *Civil Services in the Europe of Fifteen: Trends and New Development*, European Institute of Public Administration, O.L. Vrouweplein 22, Maastricht, the Netherlands;
25. Bouckaert, G. (2023). *The neo-Weberian State: From ideal type model to reality?*, *Max Weber Studies*, vol.23, No.1, pp.13-59;
26. Bourdieu, P. (1986), *The Forms of Capital*, in J.G. Richardson (ed.), *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, New York: Greenwood, pp.241-258;
27. Bourgon, J. (2007), *Responsive, responsible and respected government: Towards a New Public Administration Theory*, *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, No.73(1), pp.7-26;
28. Bowman, M. J. (1966), *The Human Investment Revolution in Economic Thought*, *Sociology of Education* (Spring), pp.111-137;
29. Boyne, G. (1999), *Viewpoint: Editorial: Markets, Bureaucracy and Public Management*, *Public Money & Management*, vol.19:4, pp.1-2;
30. Brandsen, T. & Kim, S. (2010), *Contextualizing the meaning of public management reforms: a comparison of the Netherlands and South Korea*, *International Review of Administration Sciences*, vol.76, No.367;
31. Brine, J. (2002), *The European Social Fund and the EU Flexibility, Growth, Stability*, London: Sheffield Academic Press;
32. Budeja, I. (2013), *The Effect of EU Structural Funds on the Maltese Public Administration*;

33. Burt, R.S. (2000), *The Network Structure of Social Capital*, Research in Organizational Behaviour, No.22, pp.345-423;
34. Burton-Jones, A & Spender, J.C. (eds), (2011), *The Oxford Handbook of Human Capital*, Oxford University Press;
35. Călinoiu, C. & Vedinaș, V. (1999), *Teoria funcției publice comunitare*, Editura Lumina Lex, București, România;
36. Cepiku, D. & Mititelu, C. (2010), *Public Administration reforms in transition countries: Albania and Romania between the Weberian model and the New Public Management*, Transylvanian Review of Administration Sciences, No.30(E), pp.1-23;
37. Charron, N., Dahlstrom, C., Fazekaz, M. & Lapuente, V. (2017), *Careers, Connections, and Corruption Risks: Investigating the Impact of Bureaucratic Meritocracy on Public Procurement Processes*, The Journal of Politics, vol.79, No.1, pp.1-362;
38. Charron, N., Dahlstrom, C.F. Lapuente, V. (2015), *Measuring Meritocracy in the Public Sector in Europe: a New National and Sud-National Indicativ*, QoG Working Paper Series 2015:8;
39. Christensen, T. & Laegreid, P. (2011), *Complexity and hybrid public administration-theoretical and empirical challenges*, Public Organization Review, No.11(4), pp.407-423;
40. Cingolani, L. (2018), *The role of state capacity in development studies*, Journal of Development Perspectives, vol.20(1/2), pp.88-114;
41. Ciora, A.C. (2016), *Natura transformatoare a Spațiului Administrativ European, în Matei, A. (ed.), (2016). Extinderea Spațiului Administrativ European. Procese și bune practici*, Editura Economică, București, pp.53-74;
42. Coleman, J.S. (1988), *Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital*, The American Journal of Sociology, vol.94, Supplement: Organizations and Institutions: Sociological and Economic Approaches to the Analysis of Social Structure, pp.595-5120;
43. Coleman, J.S. (1990), *Foundations of Social Theory*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.



44. Comisia Europeană (2019), *O Europă durabilă în perspectiva anului 2030*, [commission.europa.eu/publications/sustainable-europe-2030\\_ro](https://commission.europa.eu/publications/sustainable-europe-2030_ro);
45. Council of the European Union (2021), *Council Resolution on a Strategic framework for European Cooperation in education and training towards the European Education Area and beyond (2023-2030)*, Official Journal of the European Union, C66/1-21;
46. Crook, T.R., Todd, S., Combs, J.G., Woehr, D.J. & Ketchen, D. (2011), *Does Human Capital Matter? A Meta-Analysis of the Relationship Between Human Capital and Firm Performance*, *Journey of Applied Psychology*, No.96(3), pp.443-456;
47. Dadley, L. (2007), *Bureaucracy: Perspectives*, in Berman, E & Rabin, J. (eds.), (1993). *Encyclopedia of Public Administration and Public Policy*, (second edition), Taylor & Francis, New York, London, pp.221-225;
48. Dae-Bong, K. (2009), *Human Capital and its Measurement*, *3rd OECD World Forum on "Statistics, Knowledge and Policy", Charting Progress, Building Visions, Improving Life*, Korea, Busan, pp.27-30;
49. De la Fuente, A. & Ciccone, A. (2002), *Human Capital in a Global and Knowledge-based economy, Final report*, [https://europa.eu.int/comm/employment\\_social/news/2002/jnl/report\\_final.pdf](https://europa.eu.int/comm/employment_social/news/2002/jnl/report_final.pdf);
50. De Tocqueville, A. (1832, 1969), *Democracy in America*, New York: Harper;
51. Dehart-Davis, L. (2009), *Green Tape: A Theory of Effective Organizational Rules*, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, vol.19, No.2, pp.361-384;
52. Demmke, C. & Moilanen, T. (2013), *Government transformation and the future of public employment*, Peter Lang, Frankfurt;
53. Denhardt, J.V. & Denhardt, R.B. (2011), *The New Public Service: Serving, Not Steering*, 3rd Edition, Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe;
54. Denison, E.F. (1966), *The Sources of Economic Growth in the United State and the Alternatives Before US*, New York: Committee for Economic Development;
55. Denison, E.F. (1967), *Why Growth Rates Differ: Postwar Experience in Nine Western Countries*, Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution;

56. Devarajan, S., Swaroop, V. & Zou, H.F. (1996), *The Composition of Public Expenditure and Economic Growth*, Journal of Monetary Economics, No.37(2), pp.313-44, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3932\(96\)900039-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3932(96)900039-2);
57. Dewey, J. (1900), *The Psychology of the Elementary Curriculum, The Elementary School Record*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp.233-5;
58. Di Bartolo, A. (1999), *Modern Human Capital Analysis: Estimation of U.S., Canada and Italy Earning Functions*, Working Paper No212;
59. Dinero, D. (2005), *Training within Industry: The Foundation of Lean*, Portland, OR: Productivity Press;
60. Doechsler, W. & Kattel, R. (2009), *Towards the Neo-Weberian State? Perhaps, but Certainly, Adieu, NPM!*, The NISPAcee Journal of Public Administration and Policy, Special issue: A Distinctive European Model? The Neo-Weberian State, vol.I, No.2, pp.95-99;
61. Dunleavy, P., Margetts, H., Bastow, S. & Tinkler, J. (2006), *Digital Era Governance – IT Corporations, the State and e-Government*, New York: Oxford University Press;
62. E.C. (2010a), Europe 2020. A Strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth, COM (2010), 2020;
63. E.C. (2010b), *Smart Regulation in the European Union*, Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions, Brussels, 8.10.2010, COM (2010) 543;
64. E.C. (2015b), *Better Regulation for better results – An EU agenda*, Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions, Strassbourg, 19.5.2015, COM (2015) 215 final;
65. E.C. (2018b), *A Comparative overview of public administration characteristics and performance in EV28*, Directorate-General for Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion „Support for developing better country knowledge on public administration and institutional capacity building ” (VC/2016/0492);

66. E.C. (2020c), *Education and Training Monitor 2020*, [op.europa.eu/webpub/eac/education-and-training-monitor-2020/eu/index.html](https://op.europa.eu/webpub/eac/education-and-training-monitor-2020/eu/index.html);
67. E.C. (2021b), *Supporting Public Administration in EU Member States, to Deliver Reforms and Prepose for the Future*, Commision Staff Working Document SWD (2021)101;
68. E.C. (2021c), *2021 Rule of law report-Communication and country chapters*, Directorate-General for Justice and Consumers SWD (2021) 724 final, [eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A52021SC0724](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A52021SC0724), accesat 13.05.2023;
69. E.C. (2021d), *Better regulation: Joining forces to make better laws*, Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions, COM (2021) 2019, [eumonitor.eu/9353000/1/j9vvikjm1c3gyxp/vlidkx6zl9t2](https://eumonitor.eu/9353000/1/j9vvikjm1c3gyxp/vlidkx6zl9t2);
70. E.C. (2022), *Public Administration and Governance-România*, Directorate-General for Structural Reform Support, Publications Office of the European Union, <https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2887/115621>;
71. E.C. (2023), *Big data for policymaking: fad or fast track?*, Policy Sciences, No.50(3), pp.367-382;
72. E.C. Eurostat (2017), *Implementation of ISCED 2011*, [ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/10186/6246844/Implementation-ISCED2011-EE-EN.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/10186/6246844/Implementation-ISCED2011-EE-EN.pdf);
73. E.C.(2015a), *Operational Programmes „Administrative Capacity” and „Human Capital” 2014-2020*, Smart integration, 25.02.2023, [smartintegration.ro/en/news/ce-adoptat-astazi-programele-operationale-capacitate-administrativa-si-capital-uman/](https://smartintegration.ro/en/news/ce-adoptat-astazi-programele-operationale-capacitate-administrativa-si-capital-uman/), accesat 13.04.2023;
74. E.C.(2021a), *New Cohesion Policy*, [ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/2021-2027.en](https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/2021-2027.en);
75. Ecorys (2011), *Assessment of administrative and institutional capacity building interventions and future needs in the context of European Social Fund*, Final Report, 21 March, Rotterdam/Brussels;

76. Egert, B., de la Maisonneuve, C & Turner, D. (2022), *A new Macro-economic Measure of Human Capital Exploiting PISA and PIAAC: Linking Education Policies to Productivity*, Economics Department Working Papers No.1709, OECD;
77. Emery, Y. & Gianque, D. (2014), *The hybrid universe of public administration in the 21st Century*, International Review of Administration Sciences, No.80(1), pp.23-32;
78. Eraut, M. & Hirsch, W. (2007), *The Significance of Workplace Learning for Individuals Groups and Organisations*, Oxford and Cardiff: ERSC Centre on Skills Knowledge and Organizational Performance;
79. Eurofound (2015), *ERM Annual report 2014: Restructuring in the public sector*, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg;
80. European Commission (EC), (2016), *Efficient public administration*, [ec.europa.eu/regional-policy/policy/themes/better-public-administration\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/regional-policy/policy/themes/better-public-administration_en);
81. European Commission (EC), (2017), *Quality of Public Administration: A Toolbox for Practitioners*;
82. European Commission (EC), (2018a), *60 years of the European Social Funds – Investing in people*, [bmas.de/EN/Services/Publications/37849-60-years-esf.html](https://bmas.de/EN/Services/Publications/37849-60-years-esf.html);
83. European Commission (EC), (2018c), *Measuring Public Administration: A Feasibility Study for better comparative indicators in the EU*, Directorate General for Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion, [KE-02-18-989-EN-N\(1\).pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/easip/sites/easip/files/2018/09/KE-02-18-989-EN-N(1).pdf);
84. European Commission (EC), (2020a), *What is ESF+?*, [ec.europa.eu/european-social-fund-plus/eu/what-esf](https://ec.europa.eu/european-social-fund-plus/eu/what-esf);
85. European Commission (EC), (2020b), *Progress Assessment of ESF Support to Public Administration (PAPA): the summary report*, [https://ec.europa.eu/regional-policy/sources/docoffic/official/reports/annual\\_2020/implementation\\_2020\\_report.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/regional-policy/sources/docoffic/official/reports/annual_2020/implementation_2020_report.pdf);
86. European Training Foundation (ETF) (2014), *Capacity for the development of human capital: The role of vocational education and training*,

[etf.europa.eu/en/publications-and-resources/publications/capacity-development-human-capital-role-vocational](http://etf.europa.eu/en/publications-and-resources/publications/capacity-development-human-capital-role-vocational);

87. Eurostat (2021), *Share of government employment nearly stable*, [ec.europa.eu/eurostat/cache/digpub/european\\_economy/bloc-4dhtml?lang=en](http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/cache/digpub/european_economy/bloc-4dhtml?lang=en);
88. Evans, P. & Rauch, J.E. (1999), *Bureaucracy and growth: a cross-national analysis of the effects of "Weberian" state structures on economic growth*, *American Social Review* No.64:5, pp.748-65;
89. Evans, P. (1995), *Embedded Autonomy*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press;
90. Farrell, C. & Morris, J. (1999), *Professional Perception of Bureaucratic Change in the Public Sector: GPS, Headteachers and Social Workers*, *Public Money & Management*, oct.-dec. 1999, pp.31-36;
91. Farr, J. (2004), *Social Capital: A Conceptual History*, *Political Theory*, No.32(6), pp.6-33;
92. Frederickson, H.G. (2010), *Social equity and public administration: origins, developments, and applications*, <http://books.google.com>;
93. Fukuyama, F. (1995), *Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity*, London: Hamish Hamilton;
94. Fukuyama, F. (1999), *The Great Disruption: Human Nature and the Reconstitution of Social Order*, New York: Free Press;
95. Furazmand, A. (2009), *Building administrative capacity for an age of rapid globalization: A modest prescription for twenty-first century*, *Public Administration Review*, vol.69(6), pp.1007-1020;
96. Gluc, K. (2018), *The Neo-Weberian State paradigm in the water and sewage sector in Poland*, *Public Governance*, No.4(46);
97. Goode, R.B. (1959), *Adding to the Stock of Physical and Human Capital*. *The American Economic Review*, No.49(2), pp.147-155;
98. Government of the United Kingdom (2015), *"England 2014 to 2020. European Structural and Investment Funds"*, [www.gov.uk/guidance-2014-to-2020-european-structural-and-investment-funds](http://www.gov.uk/guidance-2014-to-2020-european-structural-and-investment-funds);
99. Guvernul României (GR)(2016a), *Strategia privind dezvoltarea funcției publice 2016-2020*, Monitorul Oficial, Partea I, nr.700bis/8.09.2016;

100. Guvernul României (GR)(2016b), *Strategia privind formarea profesională pentru administrația publică 2016-2020*, Monitorul Oficial, Partea I, nr.777/4.10.2016;
101. Guvernul României (GR), (2014a), *Strategia de consolidare a administrației publice 2014-2020*, Monitorul Oficial, Partea I, Nr.834bis/17.11.2014, București;
102. Guvernul României (GR), (2014b), *Strategia pentru o mai bună reglementare 2014-2020*, Monitorul Oficial, Partea I, nr.917/17.12.2014;
103. Hague, M.S., Ramesch, M., de Oliveira Puppim & de Avila Gomide (2021), *Building administrative capacity for development: limits and prospects*, International Review of Administrative Sciences, vol.87(2), pp.211-219;
104. Halligan, J. (1996), *Australia: balancing principles and pragmatism*, in Olsen, J. & Toonen, T. (eds.), *Civil Service Systems in Comparative perspective*, Bloomington & Indiana, Indiana University Press;
105. Hammerschmid, G., Van de Walle, S., Oprișor, A.&Stimac, V.(2013), *COCOPS Policy Brief 4: Trends and Impact of Public Administration Reforms in Europe: Views and Experiences from Senior Public Sector Executives*, <https://www.cocops.eu/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/Policy-brief-wp3.pdf>;
106. Hanifan, L.J. (1916), *The Rural School Community Centre*, Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, No.67, pp.130-8;
107. Hannson, B. (2008), *OECD Measures on Human Capital and Potential Use in Educational Accounts*, Workshop on the Measurement of Human Capital, OECD;
108. Harbison, F. & Myers, C.A. (1964), *Education, Manpower and Economic Growth*, McGraw-Hill;
109. Heichlinger, A., Thij, N.&Bosse, J.(2016), *From Strengthening Administrative Capacity Building (ACB) to Public Sector Innovation (PSI): Building Blocks and Successful „Bridges”*, Eipa, EIPASCOPE\_2014\_ALH\_NTH\_BOS.pdf;

110. Heidbreder, E.G.(2011), *Structuring the European administrative space: policy instruments of multi-level administration*, Journal of European Public Policy, vol.18, No.5, pp.709-727;
111. Hippe, R. (2020), *Human Capital in European Regions since the French Revolution: Lessons for Economic and Education Policies*, Revue d'economic politique, vol.130, pp.27-50, Dalloz;
112. Hofmann, H. (2008), *Mapping the European administrative space*, West European Politics, vol.31, No.4, pp.662-676;
113. Hozler, M. & Lee, S. (2004), *Public Productivity Handbook*, CRC Press;
114. Jacobs, R.L. (2014), *Structural On-the-Job Training*, in R. Poell, T. Rocco & G. Roth (eds.), Companion Guide to Human Resource Development, London, England: Routledge, pp.272-84;
115. Jenei, G. (2009), A post-Accession Crisis? Political Developments and Public Administration and Policy, vol.I, No.2, pp.55-67;
116. Jorgenson, D.W. & Fraumeni, B.M. (1989), *The Accumulation of Human and Nonhuman Capital*, in R.E. Lipsey & H.Stone Tice (eds.), The Measurement of Saving, Investment, and Wealth, Chicago, USA: University of Chicago Press;
117. Kaneko, M. (1986), *The Educational Composition of the World's Population: A Database*, Washington D.C., World Bank, Education and Training Department, Report No.EDT 29;
118. Kellough, E. (2008), Merit System, in Berman, E & Rabin, J. (2008), Encyclopedia of Public Administration and Public Policy, CRC Press, Taylor & Francis, pp.1219-1220;
119. Kellough, E. (2019), Human Resources and Public Administration, Cambridge University Press, [cambridge.org/core/journals/ps-political-science and politics/article/human-resources-and-public-administration](https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/ps-political-science-and-politics/article/human-resources-and-public-administration);
120. Kendrick, J.W. (1978), *The Formation and Stock of Total Capital*, Columbia University Press;
121. Kenton, W. (2022), Understanding Allocational Efficiency and its Requirements. Investopedia, investopedia.com/terms/a/allocationaliefficiency.asp (accesat – mai 2021);

122. Khan, K., Kunz, R., Kleijnen, J.&Antes, G. (2003), *Five steps to conducting a systematic review*, Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine, vol.96(3), pp.118-121;
123. Kiker, B.F. (1968), *Human Capital: In Retrospect*, Columbia: University of South Caroline;
124. Kiker, B.F. (1996a), *The Concept of Human Capital*, Columbia: University of South Carolina;
125. Kiker, B.F. (1996b), *Historical Roots of the Concept of Human Capital*, Journal of Political Economy, pp.481-499;
126. Kiran, B. (2014), *Testing the Impact of Educational Expenditures on Economic Growth: New Evidence from Latin American Countries*, Quality & Quantity: International Journal of Methodology, No.48(3), pp.1181-90, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-013-9828-2>
127. Krueger, A.O. (1968), *Factor Endowments and Per Capita Income Differences among Countries*, Economic Journal, No.78, pp.641-659;
128. Kuhlmann, S. & Wollmann, H. (2014), *Introduction to Comparative Public Administration. Administrative Systems and Reforms in Europe*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, UK;
129. Laegreid, P. (2008), *The New Public Management and Beyond: Towards of Whole-o-Government or a Neo-Weberian Model?*, International Conference "Challenges of governance in South Asia", Nepal;
130. Layard R. & Saigal, J.C. (1966), *Educational and occupational characteristics of manpower: an international comparison*, British Journal of Industrial Relations, No.4(2), pp.222-266;
131. Lewin, K.M., Little, A.W. & Colclough, C.L. (1983), *Effects of Education on Development Objectives (I)*, Prospects, No. XIII(3), pp.299-311;
132. Lin, N.(2008), *A Network Theory of Social Capital*, in D. Castiglione, J.W. Van Deth & G.Wolleb (eds.), *The Handbook of Social Capital*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.50-69;
133. Loury, G. (1977), *A Dynamic Theory of Racial Income Differences, Women, Minorities, and Employment Discrimination*, No.153, pp.86-153;



134. Lucas, J.R. (1988), *On the Mechanics of Economic Development*, *Journal of Monetary Economics*, No.22, pp.3-42, [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3932\(88\)90168-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3932(88)90168-7);
135. Lynn, L.E., Jr.(2009), *What's is a Neo-Weberian State? Reflections on a Concept and its Implications*, *The NISPACE Journal of Public Administration and Policy*, Special ISSUE: a Distinctive European Model? The Neo-Weberian State, vol.I, No.2, pp.1-14;
136. Mandl, U., Dierx, A. & Ilzkowitz, F. (2008), The effectiveness and efficiency of public spending. European Commission, [http://ec.europa.eu/economy\\_finance/publications/pages/publication11902\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/pages/publication11902_en.pdf) (accesat - mai 2021);
137. Mankiv, N.G., Romer, D. & Weil, N.D. (1992), *A Contribution to the Empirics of Economic Growth*, *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, No.107(2), pp.407-437;
138. Manzoor, A. (2014), *A Look at Efficiency in Public Administration: Past and Future*, Sage Open, oct.-dec., pp.1-5;
139. Matei, A. & Ceche, R. (2018), *Assesment of Human Capital and Development. Contribution from Structural Funds, Proceedings of the 5th ACADEMOS Conference "Development, Democracy and Society in the Contemporary World"*, vol., pp.226-31;
140. Matei, A. & Ceche, R. (2023), *Human Capital and Meritocracy*, in Farazmand, A. (2023), *Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy and Governance*, Second Edition, Springer, pp.6295-6302;
141. Matei, L. & Alistar, V.T. (2009), *Funcția publică. Dimensiuni europene*, colecția „Caiete Jean Monnet”, Editura Economică, București, România;
142. Matei, L. & Flogaitis, S. (eds.), (2011), *Public Administration in the Balkans – from Weberian Bureaucracy to New Public Management. South-Eastern European Administrative Studies*, ASsee Online Series, No.1/2011;
143. Matei, L. (2001), *Management public*, Editura Economică, București, România;

144. McMahon, W.W. (1998), *Conceptual Framework for the Analysis of the Social Benefits of Lifelong Learning*, Education Economics, No.6(3), pp.309-46;
145. Meghir, C & Rivkin, S.G. (2010), *Econometric Methods for Research in Education*, Working Paper 16003, National Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge, <https://www.nber.org/pappers/w16003>;
146. Meneguzzo, M., Fiorani, G., Mititelu, C., Matei, L., Matei, A., & Germano, C. (2010). *Public Sector Modernization Trends of the Member States of European Union. Trajectories of Reforms in Italy and Romania*, MPRA Paper 27780, University Library of Munich, Germany;
147. Meyer-Sahling, J. (2009), *Sustainability of Civil Service Reforms in Central and Eastern Europe. Five Years After EU Accession*, SIGMA Papers, No.44, OECD;
148. Mincer, J. (1958), *Investment in Human Capital and Personal Income Distribution*, The Journal of Political Economy, vol.LXVI, No.4, pp.281-302;
149. Mincer, J. (1974), *Schooling, Experience, and Earnings*, National Bureau of Economic Research, New York;
150. Mullgan, C.B. & Sala-I-Martin, X. (2000), *Measuring Aggregate Human Capital*, Journal of Economics Growth Springer, No.5(3), pp.215-52;
151. Mungiu-Pippidi, A. (2015), *The Quest for Good Governance, How Societies Develop Control of Corruption*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press;
152. Nahapiet, J. & Ghoshal, S. (1998), *Social Capital, Intellectual Capital and the Organizational Advantage*, Academy of Management Review, No.23, pp.242-66;
153. Nahapiet, J. (2011), *A Social Perspective, Exploring the Links Between Human Capital and Social Capital*, in Buston-Jones & Spender (eds), (2011), pp.71-95;
154. Nakrosis, V. (2014), *Theory – based evaluation of capacity-building interventions*, in *Evaluation*, vol.20 (I), pp.134-150, Sage;
155. Nakrosis, V., Dan, S.&Gostantaite, R. (2022), *The Role of Eu Funding in EU Member States: Building Administrative Capacity to Advance Administrative*

- Reforms, *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, <https://doi.org/10.118/IJPSM-01-2022-0008>;
156. Naumann, R. & Naedenoen, F. (2013), *Restructuring in public services: more general considerations*, in Bussat, V., Carlino, J. & Triomphe, C.-E. (eds.). *Restructuring in Public Services, General considerations, job transitions and social dialogue*, European Commission, Brussels;
157. Nedomlelova, I. & Kocourek, A. (2016), *Human Capital: Relationship between Education and Labor Productivity in the European Countries*, 10th *International Days of Statistics and Economics*, Prague;
158. Nehru, W., Swanson, E. & Duvey, A. (1993), *A New Database of Human Capital Stock. Sources, Methodology, and Results*. Working Paper Series 1124, International Economics Department, The World Bank;
159. Nicolaidis, P.(2012), *Administrative Capacity for Effective Implementation of EU Law.EIPA*, [EIPASCOPE.20120710142838 PNI Eipascope2012.pdf](https://www.eipa.europa.eu/eipa-scopes/PNI_Eipascope2012.pdf);
160. Niskanen, W. (1998), *Policy Analysis and Public Choice*, Selected Papers, Edward Elgar Publishing;
161. OECD (1969), *Statistics of the Occupational and Educational Structure of the Labor Force in 53 Countries*, Paris;
162. OECD (1996), *Integrating People Management into Public Service Reform* (traducere în limba română). *Centrul de Pregătire pentru Administrație Publică (CPAP)*, Editura Economică, București, România;
163. OECD (1998), *L'Investissement dans la capital humain. Une comparaison internationale*, Centre pour recherche et l'enseignement;
164. OECD (1999), *European Principles for Public Administration*, SIGMA Papers No.27, [one.oecd.org/document/CCNM/SIGMA/PUMA\(99\)44/En/pdf](https://one.oecd.org/document/CCNM/SIGMA/PUMA(99)44/En/pdf);
165. OECD (2005), *OECD Guiding Principles for Regulatory Quality and Performance*, [oecd.org/fr/reformereg/34976533.pdf](https://www.oecd.org/fr/reformereg/34976533.pdf);
166. OECD (2010a), *Strategy and policies for Better Regulation*, OECD, [oecd.org/gov/regulatory-policy/45054477.pdf](https://www.oecd.org/gov/regulatory-policy/45054477.pdf);
167. OECD (2010b), *Institutional capacities for Better Regulation*, OECD, [oecd.org/gov/regulatory-policy/44912334.pdf](https://www.oecd.org/gov/regulatory-policy/44912334.pdf);

168. OECD (2015), *Better Regulation for better results – An Eu agenda*, Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions, Strassbourg, 19.5.2015, COM (2015) 215 final;
169. OECD (2016a), *OECD Public Governance Reviews: Romania scan*, OECD Better Policies for Better Lives, [oecd.org/gov/public-governance-review-scan-romania.pdf](https://oecd.org/gov/public-governance-review-scan-romania.pdf);
170. OECD (2016b), *Survey on Strategic Human Resources Management in Central/Federal Government of OECD Countries*, [https://qdd.oecd.org/subject.aspx?Subject=GOV\\_SHRM](https://qdd.oecd.org/subject.aspx?Subject=GOV_SHRM);
171. OECD (2017a), *Government at a Glance 2017*, Paris;
172. OECD (2017b), *OECD Recommendation of the Council on Public Integrity*, OECD, Paris, <https://legalinstruments.oecd.org/en/instruments/OECD-LEGAL-0435>;
173. OECD (2019), *OECD Recommendation on Public Service Leadership and Capability*, OECD Publishing, <https://www.oecd.org/gov/pem/recommandation-public-service-leadership-and-capability-2019.pdf>;
174. OECD (2020a), *România: OECD Scan of Institutional Mechanisms to Deliver on the SDGs*, Paris, OECD;
175. OECD (2020b), *Strengthening Governance of EU Fund under Cohesion Policy: Administrative Capacity Building Roadmaps*, [oecd-ilibrary.org/urban-rural-and-regional-development/strengthening-governance-of-eu-funds-under-cohesion-policy-9b71c8d8-en](https://oecd-ilibrary.org/urban-rural-and-regional-development/strengthening-governance-of-eu-funds-under-cohesion-policy-9b71c8d8-en);
176. OECD (2020c), *Public Integrity Handbook*, OECD, Paris, [oecd.org/corruption-integrity/reports/oecd-public-integrity-handbook-acBed8e8-en.html](https://oecd.org/corruption-integrity/reports/oecd-public-integrity-handbook-acBed8e8-en.html);
177. Olsen, J.(2003), *Towards a European administrative space?*, Journal of European Public Policy, vol.10, No.4, pp.506-531;
178. Ongaro, e. (ed.), (2019), *Public Administration in Europe*, The Contribution of EGPA, Palgrave MacMillan;

179. Osborne, S. & Gaebler, T. (1992), *Reinventing Government*, New York, Ny: Penguin Press;
180. Osborne, S. (2006), *The New Public Governance?* Public Management Review, No.8(3), pp.377-388;
181. Osborne, S. (ed.), (2010), *The New Public Governance: Emerging Perspectives on the Theory and Practice of Public Governance*, London and New York, Routledge/Taylor and Francis;
182. Osiobe, E.U. (2019), *A Literature Review of Human Capital and Economic Growth*, Business and Economic Research, vol.9, No.4, pp.1-18;
183. Ostrom, E. (1994), *Constituting Social Capital and Colective Actions*, Journal of Theoretical Politics, No.6, pp.527-62;
184. Ostrom, E. (2009), *What is Social Capital?*, in V.O. Bartkus & J.H.Davis (eds.), *Social Capital: Reaching Out, Reaching In*, Cheltenham: Edward Eigar, pp.17-38;
185. Palaric, E., Thijs, N & Hammerschmid, G. (2018), *A comparative Overview of public administration characteristics and performance in EU28*, European Commission, Directorate – General for Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion, Publication Office, <https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2767/13319>;
186. Paprock, K.E. (2006), *National Human Resource Development in Transitioning Societies in the Developing World: Introductory Overview*, *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, No.8(1), pp.12-27;
187. Pedroni, P. (2002), *Critical Value for Cointegration Tests in Heterogeneous Panels with Multiple Regressors*, Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics, No.61(S1), <https://doi.org/10.1011/1468-0084.061031653>;
188. Pepinsky, T., Pierskalla, J. & Sacks, A. (2017), *Bureaucracy and Service Delivery*, Annual Review of Political Science, vol.20, pp.249-268;
189. Perepelkin, V., Perepelkina, E. & Morozova, E. (2016), *Evolution of the Concept of „Human Capital”*, in *Economie Science, International Journal of Envionemntal & Science Education*, Vol.11, No.15, pp.7619-7658;

190. Peters, G. & Savoie, D. (eds.), (1998), *Taking stock: assessing public sector reforms*, Montreal and Kingston, Canadian Centre for Management Development and McGill-Queens's University Press;
191. Pettinger, T. (2017), *Productive and allocative efficiency. Economic Help*, <http://www.economichelp.org> (accesat – mai 2021);
192. Pierre, J. (ed.), (1995), *Bureaucracy in the modern state: an introductory to comparative public administration*, Edward Elgar, Aldershot;
193. Pigou, A. C. (1928), *A Study in Public Finance*, Macmillan, London, 1928;
194. Politt, C&Dan, S.(2011), COCOPS Policy Brief 1: The Impact of New Public Management (NPM) Reforms in Europe, [https://www.cocops.eu/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/COCOPS\\_PolicyBrief\\_1\\_newlayout.pdf](https://www.cocops.eu/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/COCOPS_PolicyBrief_1_newlayout.pdf);
195. Pollitt, C. & Bouckaert, G. (2009), *Public Management Reform: A Comparative Analysis*, Second edition, Oxford: Oxford University Press;
196. Pollitt, C. & Bouckaert, G. (2011), *Public Management Reform. A Comparative Analysis: A Comparative Analysis – New Public Management, Governance, and the Neo-Weberian State*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, Third Edition;
197. Pollitt, C. & Bouckaert, G. (2017), *Public Management Reform . A Comparative Analysis: A Comparative Analysis – Into the Age of Austerity*, Fourth Edition, Oxford University Press;
198. Pollitt, C. (2009), *An Overview of the Papers and Propositions of the First Trans-European Dialogue (TED1)*, The NISPAcee Journal of Public Administration and Policy, Special Issue: A Distinctive European Model? The Neo-Weberian State, vol.I, No.2, pp.1-6;
199. Potucek, M.(2008), The Concept of the Neo-Weberian State confronted by the multi-dimensional concept of Governance, The NISPAcee Journal of Public Administration and Policy, vol.I, No.2, pp.83-94;
200. Pritchard, A. (2002), Measuring productivity in the production of public sevicees, *Economic Trend*, No.570, pp.61-83;

201. Psacharopoulos, G. F. & Arriagada, A.-M. (1986), *The Educational Attainment of the Labor Force: An International Comparison*, Discussion Paper, Education and Training Series, Report No.EDT38, World Bank;
202. Psacharopoulos, G. F. & Petrinis, H.A. (2004), *Returns to Investment in Education: A Further Update*, Education Economics, No.12(2), pp.111-34, <https://doi.org/10.101080/0964529042000239140>;
203. Psacharopoulos, G. F. & Woodhall, M. (1985), *Education for Development: An Analysis of Investment Choices*, Oxford University Press;
204. Psacharopoulos, G. F. (1981), Returns to Education: an updated international comparison. *Comparative Education*, vol.17, No.3, pp.321-41;
205. Puică, R.-M., (2021), *Dezvoltarea regională și impactul fondurilor europene asupra sistemului administrativ din România*, Teză de doctorat (nepublicată), Biblioteca SNSPA, București;
206. Putman, R.D. (1993), *The Prosperous Community: Social Capital and Public Life*, American Prospect, No.13, pp.35-42;
207. Putman, R.P. (1995), *Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital*, Journal of Democracy, No.6(1), pp.65-78;
208. Quiggin, J. (1999), *Human Capital Theory and Education Policy in Australia*, Australian Economic Review, No.32(2), p.130-44, <https://doi.org/10.101111/1467-8462.00100>;
209. Radaelli, C. (2021), *STG Policy Papers, Policy Brief: The State of Play with the Better Regulation Strategy of the European Commission*, EUI School of Transnational Governance [cadmus.eui.eu/bitstream/handle/1814/70901/](http://cadmus.eui.eu/bitstream/handle/1814/70901/)
210. Radaelli, C.&Meuwesse, A.(2009), *Better Regulation in Europe: Between Public Management and Regulatory Reform*, *Public Administration*, vol.87, Iss.3, pp.639-654, Wiley Online Library;
211. Rainey, G. (1997), *The "How Much Process is Due?" Debate: Legal and Managerial Perspectives*, in Cooper, P.J. & Newland, C.A. (eds.), (1997), *Handbook of Public Law and Administration*, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass;

212. Randma-Liiv, T. (2008), New Public Management versus the Neo-Weberian State in Central and Eastern Europe, *NISPAcee Journal of Public Administration and Policy*, vol.I, No.2, pp.69-81;
213. Rauch, J.E.&Evans, P.B. (2000), *Bureaucratic Structure and Bureaucratic Performance in Less Development Countries*, *Journal of Public Economics*, No.75, pp.49-71;
214. Robinson, G.O. (1991), *American Bureaucracy: Public Choice and Public Law*, University of Michigan Press;
215. Rogosic, S. & Baranovic, B.(2016), *Social Capital and Educational Achievement: Coleman vs. Bourdieu*, *CEPS Journal*, vol.6, No.2, pp.81-97;
216. Romer, P. (1986), *Increasing Returns and Long Run Growth*, *Journal of Political Economy*, No.94(5), pp.1002-37;
217. Romer, P. (1989), *Human Capital and Growth: Theory and Evidence*, NBER Working Paper No.3173, <https://doi.org/103386/w3173>;
218. Romer, P. (1990), *Endogenous Technological Change*, *Journal of Political Economy*, vol.98, no.5, Part 2: The Problem of Development; A Conference of the Institut for the Study of Free Enterprise Systems, pp.71-102;
219. Romer, P. (1994), The Origins of Endogenous Growth, *The Journal of Economic Perspective*, No.8(11), pp.3-22, <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.8.1.3> ;
220. Rühelanimen, J.M. (2013), *Government Education Expenditure in the European Union During the Economic Crisis (2008-2011)*, Europe: European Union;
221. Sahota, G. S., (1978), *Theories of Personal Income Distribution: A Survey*, *Journal of Economic Literature*, vol.XVI, pp.1-55;
222. Sarris, N.(2022), *Revision of Better Regulation Guidelines&Toolbox: What's changed?*, EIPA.Maastricht, [eipa.eu/blog/revision-of-better-regulation-guidelines-toolbox-whats-changed/](https://eipa.eu/blog/revision-of-better-regulation-guidelines-toolbox-whats-changed/)(accesat 13.03.2022);
223. Schneider, B. (1987), *The Jury is Still Out on Merit Pay in Government*, *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, No.7(3), pp.3-15;



224. Schuller, T., Baron, S. & Field, J. (2000), *Social Capital: A Review and Critique*, in S. Baron, J. Field & T. Schuller (eds.), *Social Capital: Critical Perspectives*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.1-38;
225. Schuller, T., Preston, J., Hammond, C., Brasset-Grundy, A. & Bynner, J. (eds.) (2004), *The Benefits of Learning: The Impact of Education on Health, Family Life and Social Capital*, London: Routledge ;
226. Schultz, T. W. (1960), *Capital Formation by Education*, *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol.68, pp.571-583;
227. Schultz, T. W. (1961), *Investment in Human Capital*, *American Economic Review*, vol.51, No.1, pp.1-17;
228. Schultz, T.W. (1953), *The Economic Value of Education* , New York: Columbia University Press;
229. Secretariatul General al Guvernului (SGG) (2021), *Raportul privind evaluarea impactului măsurilor implementate în SCAP, 2014-2020*, Guvernul României, București, <https://scap.gov.ro/welcome/page/documente> , accesat 13.09.2023;
230. Sen, A. (1999), *Development as Freedom*, Oxford University Press;
231. Smith, P.C. & Street, A. (2005), *Measuring the efficiency of public services: the limits of analysis*, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A (Statistics in Society)*, vol.168, No.2, pp.401-417;
232. Solow, R.W. (1956), *A Contribution to the Theory of Economic Growth*, *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, No.70(1), pp.65-95, <https://doi.org/10.2307/1884513>;
233. Solow, R.W. (1957), *Technical Change and the Aggregate Production Function*, *Review of Economics and Statistics*, No.39(3), pp.312-320;
234. Spender, J.-C. (2009), *Organizational Capital: Concept, Measure or Heuristic?*, in A. Bounfour (ed.), *Organizational Capital: Modelling, Measuring and Contextualizing*, Abingdon: Routledge, pp.5-23;
235. Stiglitz, J. E. (2007), *Principes d'économie moderne*, De Boeck, France;

236. Stiles, P. & Kulvisaechana, S. (2003), *Human Capital and performance: A literature review*, The Judge Institute of Management, University of Cambridge, DTI;
237. Stonier, A.W. & Hague, D. (1972), *A Textbook of Economic Theory*, 4th Edition, Pseutice-Hall Press;
238. Swan, T.W. (1956), *Economic Growth and Capital Acumulation*, Economic Record, pp.334-91;
239. Swedberg, R. & Grannovetter, M. (2001), *Introduction to the Second Edition*, in Grannovetter & R.Swedberg (eds.), *The Sociology of Economic Life*, Cambridge, Mass: Westview Press, pp.1-28;
240. Sweetland, S.R. (1996), *Human Capital Theory: Foundations of a field of Inquiry*, Review of Educational Research, No. 66(3), pp.341-359;
241. Teachman, J.D., Peasch, K. & Carver, K. (1997), *Social Capital and the Generation of Human Capital*, Social Forces, No. 75(4), pp.1343-59;
242. Trondal, J., Bauer, M.W. & Knill, C. (2008), *Bureacratic change in the European Administrative Space: The Case of the European Commission*. *West European Politics*, vol.31, No.4, pp.677-700;
243. Uzawa, H. (1965), *Optimum Technical Change in an Aggregative Model of Economic Growth*, International Economic Review, No.6(1), pp.18-31, <https://doi.org/10.2307/2525621>;
244. van Acker, W. (2019), *Civil Service Recruitment: Recruiting the right persons the right way*, Governance Notes, No.20, World Bank;
245. van Staveren, I. & Knorringa, P. (2007), *Unpacking Social Capital in Economic Development: How Social Relations Matter*, Review of Social Economy, No.64(1), pp.107-35;
246. Veggeland, N. (2007), *Paths of Public Innovation in the Global Age: Lessons from Scandinavia, Cheltenham and Northampton, Mass*, Edward Elgar;
247. Weber, E.P. & Khademian, A.M. (2008), *Wicked problems, knowledge challenges, and collaborative capacity builders in network settings*, Public Administration Review, No.68(2), pp.334-349;

248. Weber, M. (1946), *Bureaucracy* in Gerth, H.H.& Mills, C.W. (eds.), (1946), *Essays in Sociology*, Oxford University Press: New York;
249. Weber, M. (1978), *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*, Berkeley: Univ.Calif.Press;
250. Weber, M., Shils, E. & Rheinstein, M.(eds.), (1954), *Law in Economy and Society*, Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA;
251. Williams, M.J. (2020), Beyond state capacity: *Bureaucratic performance, policy implementation and reform*, *Journal of Institutional Economics*, <https://www.cambridge.org/case/journal/journal-of-institutional-economics/article/abs>;
252. Wilson, J.Q. (1991), *Bureaucracy: What Government Agencies Do and They Do It*, New York: Basic Books;
253. Winkler, D.R. (1987), *Screening Models and Education*, in Psacharopoulos (ed.) (1987), *Economics of Education, Research and Studies*, Pergamon, pp.287-291;
254. Wolf, F. & Zohlhöfer, R. (2009), *Investing in human capital? The determinants of private education expenditure in 26 OECD Countries*, *Journal of European Social Policy*, No. 19(3), pp.230-244;
255. Woodhall, M. (2001), *Human Capital: Educational Aspects* in Smelser, N.J. & Baltes, P.B. (eds.), *International Encyclopedie of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*, vol.10, Oxford: Elsevier
256. Schuller, T. (2001), *The Complementary Roles of Human and Social Capital*, *Canadian Journal of Policy*, <https://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/5/48/1825424.pdf>;
257. World Bank(WB) (2018), *The Human Capital Project*; The Human Capital Project. ©World Bank, Washington, D.C., <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/entities/publication/27db0647-6654-52ce-93d3-b7354464b06d>;
258. World Bank(WB) (2019), *Livrabilul 1.1, Analiză de referință privind cadrul național pentru MRU și instituționalizarea acestuia*, ANFP, anfp.gov.ro;

259. World Bank (WB) (2022), *Worldwide Governance Indications*, [info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/](http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/) , accesat 10.05.2023
260. World Economic Forum – WEF (2017), *The Global Human Capital Report*;
261. Wu, X., Ramesh, M. & Howlet, M. (2015), *Policy capacity: A conceptual framework for understanding policy competences and capabilities*, *Policy and Society*, No.34(3), pp.165-171;
262. Zula, K.J. & Chermack, T.J. (2007), *Human Capital Planning: A Review of Literature and Implications for Human Resource Development*, *Human Resource Development Review*, vol. 6, No.3, pp.245-262;