

PROFESSIONALIZATION OF MANAGERS - CONDITION OF THE QUALITY AND EFFICIENCY OF THE ORGANIZATION MANAGEMENT

Ion VERBONCU, Prof., PhD

Bucharest University of Economic Studies, Romania
E-mail: iverboncu@yahoo.com

Luise ZEININGER, PhD student

Bucharest University of Economic Studies, Romania
E-mail: luise.zeininger@gmail.com

JEL classification: M10, M19

Abstract

The economic, commercial and managerial success of an organization depends, to a great extent, on the professionalism of the managers who lead and manage it. We can not speak of an efficient management without professional managers. On one hand, they know management, as in have sufficient knowledge, skills and aptitudes to conduct management processes and to ensure favorable conditions for the proper functioning of the management system and its components and, on the other hand, are able to use the official authority of their positions and their personal authority, reflected by the elements mentioned above. Are the managers of Romanian organizations - private enterprises, public enterprises or public institutions - professionals? If the answer is negative, what steps should be taken to reach this stage? If the answer is positive, how do they manifest themselves in an increasingly difficult contextual environment and what is the impact of their performance on the quality and efficiency of management? Here are some possible answers to which we will try to add specialized comments. The prerequisite of our approach is that management is one of the most important - if not the most important - factors of sustainable development of an organization, as far as it is professionally practiced, by competent people.

Keywords: *professionalisation of managers, professionalisation of management, managerial methodologies, bureaucracy, managerial training, management consultancy*

1. Introduction

The Romanian and the international literature abounds in conceptual and methodological approaches of managers, their performance and their roles in the organization, in models, methods and techniques of managerial efficiency; yet, it does not provide sufficient solutions to professionalize the managers as a condition for quality and efficient management, solutions that take into account the complexity, difficulty and, in frequent situations, the novelty of their work. All organizations want professional managers and, implicitly, professional management, but how can this be achieved?

The first issue that needs clarification concerns the notion of manager. Although it seems unbelievable, there are still many management specialists (!) who believe that the manager is just the person who leads the organization, that is, the general manager or its president. Nothing could be more wrong because "manager" is the person who, by virtue of the tasks, powers and responsibilities assigned to the occupied post, carries out management processes, as in taking decisions that influence the decisions and actions of others. So, the Managers are the General Director, Chief Executives, Heads of Services, Heads of Production Section, Heads of Offices, Heads of Production Workshops, Masters, and so on, each of whom is directly involved in the

forecasting, organization, coordination, training and control-assessment of the performers' performance. These multiple positions of managers explain the intensity of certain management functions, but also the importance of the decisions taken in the organization's decision-making economy. What does a manager do? Simple: leads and manages the organization or its components, that is:

- Fundamentals and adopts management decisions in the area of:
 - prevision (setting up the objectives, shaping up the modalities of achieving them, dimensioning the resources, setting up the intermediary and final terms, obtaining competitive advantage; these aspects are found in the main „products” of prevision – forecasts, strategies, politics and programs)
 - organization (layout of the objectives, ensuring the needed processual and structural-organizational conditions, ensuring the jobs with specialised personnel, ensuring the proper informational and methodological-managerial conditions)
 - coordination (harmonizing the decisions of the subordinated personnel, based on an adequate communication managers-executants)
 - training (facilitating the personnel participation at setting up and achieving the objectives through a proper material and moral-spiritual motivation)
 - control (performing the hierarchical control, periodical and final) and evaluation (evidencing the causal analysis of the obtained results, compared with the planned objectives).
- Uses specific decisional mechanisms (decisional acts or processes), depending on the objective's nature, complexity, difficulty and the endogenous and exogeneous variables with influences on the decisional problems that are to be solved.
- Approach varied managerial tools, with varied systems, methods and techniques of management (general or specific), which facilitates substantiation and decision-making.
- Use and take advantage of adequate managerial engineering/reengineering methodologies.
- Promote varied management styles, for facilitating the active, responsible participation of the executants (to) in setting up and achieving the objectives.

In order to exercise these prerogatives and to fulfill their very important roles in the organization - substantiating and adopting decisions, monitoring their operationalization - managers must have managerial knowledge, qualities, aptitudes and professional skills, as in be competent. Their professionalism translates mainly into:

- Knowing the meaning and content of management processes and their functions and performing in relation to the specificity of the domain;
- Giving the proper consideration to each management functions, based on the roles they have in the economy of management processes and in ensuring the functionality of the organization and / or procedural or structural component directly led;
- The starting point in any endeavor they are involved is to set objectives; their final distribution of people is the result of a negotiation process, taking into account the personal and official authority of each person;
- The actions are based on a logical concatenation of the steps needed to obtain the objectives, without missing any aspect: *objectives - processes – structures- decisions - information - methods - people – results*;
- Having the ability to solve conflicts and to ensure a organizational climate that is perfect for the professional and personal fulfillment of the people;

- Mastering the configuration of the management system and the intimate functioning mechanisms of each subsystem - from the methodological managerial subsystem to the decision and information one, from the organizational subsystem to human resource management - assuming that, at their level, finds favorable conditions to fulfill the responsibilities in the organization, for an effective and efficient leadership and management of the led domain;
- They are open to change, they capitalize favoring factors and fight for the mitigation or elimination of change resistance factors;
- Having a high creative and innovative capacity to solve the problems faced in the field;
- Are prone to learning and encourage others to improve their professional condition, through the participation in training courses or continuous professional training;
- Actively engage, effective and responsible for achieving, economic and financial management performances, which is a genuine business card;
- They know what to do and how to do it!

2. The status of the issue investigated at the moment. The purpose of the research

To what extent are managers of Romanian organizations professional? It is highly difficult to formulate an exact answer, but the comments upon the causes that hinder their professionalization are judged to be necessary and justified. The causal identification of the stage reached in this field, will allow the formulation of some strategic directions / manners of professionalization of managers and management, both general and specific, depending on the typology of the organizations they refer to - the SMEs sector, public enterprises, public institutions or multinational companies with subsidiaries (daughter firms) on the territory of Romania.

Overall, *the degree of professionalization of managers* or, otherwise formulated, the degree of endowment of management positions with professional managers is progressing, but still reduced compared to exigencies.

At the level of small and medium-sized enterprises, the situation is justified from two points of view. On one hand, considering that entrepreneurs do not have sufficient management knowledge and no suitable skills and aptitude in this area, the new businesses have a rather low life. The proof is the high mortality rate among SMEs (especially micro-enterprises), the main cause being the bad administration of the entrepreneurial managers. On the other hand, there are few enterprises in this sector that have turned to management-ownership unbundling and have professional managers. Owners-entrepreneurs continue to exercise the prerogatives of the managers of their own business, a situation that tends to become more and more difficult as their dimensional characteristics are amplified, and their operation becomes more complex. The lack of trust in managers-employees, who are "good at" management, certainly reduces the managerial viability potential of these firms and, implicitly, brings appreciable financial losses.

Therefore, the causes that generate and maintain this situation in many managerial unfavorable aspects are:

- The heterogeneity of the entrepreneurial training of entrepreneurs and, after the establishment of their own businesses, managers of small and medium-sized enterprises (but especially micro-enterprises and small enterprises);

- Poor managerial education, in most situations management is exercised based on talent, flair, intuition, and less on true management knowledge;
- The previous two causes are the root of the third, namely the establishment of new businesses (firms) only on the basis of a less consistent business plan from the managerial point of view. Managerial business designing completely lacks, generating, alongside other causes, the high mortality rate in this SMEs sector;
- Insufficient management-ownership unbundling creates serious problems for SMEs, especially medium-sized businesses, in their tendency to economically perform.

Public enterprises, where the state is the majority or sole shareholder (national companies, autonomous administrations, local subordinate enterprises, insurance companies so on), are faced with other issues related to the exercise of management. Those who privatized the management (national companies like Tarom, Romanian Post, Oltenia Energy Complex, CFR Călători, CFR Marfă, defense industry companies so on) according to the 2009 legislation, are in the position to question this strategic way of professionalisation, the winning nominee managers of the selection contests being often obstructed in the fulfillment of the mandate by the occurrence and manifestation of causes such as:

- The management / mandate contracts concluded between the private manager, recruited by specialized selection companies, and state-owned firms are deficient in many aspects, but especially in the compulsory to be respected "clauses" under the terms of the contract termination; there are unanimous opinions that such clauses are always in favor of the private, foreign or Romanian manager, a situation that renders a mandate void, financially damaging to the public enterprise.
- The "mixture" private (manager) - state (the board of administration political appointed) meant a multiple aspects flawed collaboration, but especially in the economic field. In most private management companies, the mandate contract did not last for four years, as natural, but much shorter, which reinforces the belief that it is not mandatory to have private managers to get favorable results, as it is not a disaster for the companies to be managed by the state (the reality according to which "the state is the worst administrator" is being contradicted by the precarious economic and financial situation of some public enterprises with private-management - especially national companies). We hope that the regulations brought on corporate governance through the Law no. 111/2016 [7] and GD no. 722/2016 [8] are going to overcome this shortcoming, although, in connection with these issues, a serious question arises: why it took them 5 years (!) to develop methodological norms for the application of an emergency ordinance, which by nature, actually becomes operational once published in Monitorul Oficial?
- Legislative improvements promoted from 2011 to 2016, although declarative in favor of depoliticizing the management of public enterprises, are questioned in terms of their application. It is invoked the sophisticated, cumbersome procedure of recruiting and selecting the executive and non-executive directors who will ensure the management of the respective organizations, as reason for the lack of operationalization of the methodological norms, yet generalized.
- The precariousness of managerial training of managers recruited and selected by specialized firms is another important cause of the early failure of this way to streamline public enterprises. Moreover, there are specialists who directly accuse the privatization of state-owned companies of a pact with the owner (the state), the private managers being

only tools to ensure massive staff reductions and, implicitly, assume high social costs, generated by this type of personnel decisions.

- The attempt to "repolitise" the leadership of some state-owned enterprises, by exempting from corporate governance promotion an appreciable number of companies, mainly in the defense field (see www.cotidianul.ro/08/08/2017) [9]; the quoted source shows that the over 160 private managers, who have been leading public enterprises under the Government Emergency Ordinance 109/2011 on Corporate Governance, since 2012, have "disturbed" the political environment, especially in regard to obtaining the required efficiency, the situation being still unfavorable, therefore failing to achieve an economic and financial recovery. Despite some failures, it must be pointed out the reorientation towards the promotion of political clientelism in the management of national companies, autonomous governments or credit institutions, a tendency that questions all that has been built in terms of economic legislation and managerial practice, specific to public enterprises, in the past 5 years.

At the level of *public institutions* (central and local public administration, including hospitals, educational institutions, culture so on), the situation is much worse. Their leadership and management is ensured by the political level - *persons appointed or elected to positions of public dignity* and others assimilated to them, at the level of the central and local public administration, including the local elected representatives - *leading civil servants* (they are part of the body of civil servants), which represent the administrative level, with rights in the exercise of public power or *managers* recruited after competitions (hospital managers, school directors, university rectors, managers of cultural institutions, etc.) Causes of managerial precariousness in this sector, with over 4300 public authorities and institutions and employing nearly 1.2 million public servants, can be identified in:

- Excessive political immition in the exercise of management and at the level of some organizations where its presence should be a "surface" one (agencies or national authorities with publicly deconcentrated public institutions under the dual command: on one hand, subordinated to the prefect institution in the county in which it operates and, on the other hand, subordinated to the agency or national authority). "Mediocracy instead of meritocracy" seems to be the essence of managerial promotion!
- The selection of the managers of such public institutions (health, culture so on) is done through a contest, focusing on a theme that encompasses almost exclusively normative acts of general or specific character. It does not test the management knowledge, but the ability to memorize certain legislative provisions!
- The professional and managerial development of civil servants from the perspective of creating and providing reserves for the recruitment of future managers is deficient on one hand, due to the biological maturity of civil servants (39.24% are between 40 and 50 years of age and 29.31% are between 50 and 60 years) and, on the other hand, due to their reduced quantitative participation in postgraduate, masters or other forms of continuous training and career development, focused on management;
- The concept that managers in public institutions should only deal with "the implementation of laws in their area of reference", condemns those in such situations to predominantly rudimentary work, with a strong operational character;
- Legislative and political instability often leads to managerial instability, the change of managers according to the party or coalition in power being a practice encountered in Romania after 1989;

- The full manifestation of Peter's principle according to which, "in a hierarchy, each employee tends to rise to his incompetency level" (Peter, 2009).

The state in which the Romanian organizations are situated from a managerial point of view and, in particular, the causes that have generated accomplishments and unrealisations, have allowed us to substantiate some ways of professionalizing the managers and highlighting the influence they have, on the quality and efficiency of the management.

3. The methods and materials applied

Our research has been conducted at several levels. First of all, the *bibliographic documentation* provided by the study of the specialized literature on the professionalism of managers and management. It should be noted that the bibliographic sources in this field are not very numerous and the problem of professionalisation is usually treated unilaterally. Secondly, *surveys based on a questionnaire and consultance* offered to economic agents by the authors of this paper over the past few years have highlighted a number of characteristics of the Romanian managers, major atuas and malfunctions in the attempt to have a highest proportion of professional managers, but also the causes that generated them. Finally, numerous *research contracts* with the business environment have allowed important conclusions to be drawn on the managers behavior within the investigated organizations in relation to the requirements they need to respond to actively, effectively and responsibly, in substantiating and making decisions and monitoring their implementation by performers.

All of this have demonstrated a sad aspect. Managers get involved in organizational and managerial change, identify their necessity and opportunity, initiate them, support them during the operationalization, after which, in the majority of cases, they abandon! Why? Because they do not understand the mechanisms of change (whether it is managerial reengineering, restructuring, promoting strategic management, whether it is only required to promote and use a complex management tool) and does not accept that this change will bring substantive improvements in the functioning of the organization. The acceptance for change is a formal one, and adherence to it is completely lacking. The lack of knowledge or partial knowledge of the content and managerial implications of such changes reveals that managers, especially top managers, prefer the leading and management of the organization according to strict rules, procedures, norms and normatives set by "others", but above all, the overall system to which the organization belongs.

4. Results and discussions

4.1. Ways to professionalize the management

In the category of the ways to professionalize the managers and, implicitly, the management, the following are included:

- a. Stability and coherence in the management legislation of the various categories of socio-economic entities (mainly public enterprises)*

Several significant benchmarks should be taken into account when addressing the issue of the applicable regulatory framework for the organization management: *the law of the management contract* or the law of the selection of the manager (Law 66/1993) applicable to enterprises with majority or full state ownership, *the law of the private management contract*, *Government*

Emergency Ordinance on corporate governance of public enterprises (Government Emergency Ordinance 109/2011, approved with amendments by Law 111/2016), *Government Decision on Methodological Norms for the Application of GEO 109/2011* (HG 722/2016). The signals we have already referred to are not encouraging at all, since the first 5 months of 2017 have already brought remarkable changes in the list of public enterprises benefiting, at least theoretically, from professional managers (decisions of the Senate of Romania), but also unjustified deferment of the legislation on corporate governance amended provisions application (Grindeanu Government Decisions). Political instability generates legislative instability and incoherence in the implementation of some normative provisions already adopted. In this way, we go back where we left from, namely the nomination of executives or non-executive administrators on exclusive political criteria, clientele criteria, visible desynchronicities between official, formal authority of the occupied position and personal authority (occupational competence) of the persons. Romania has a normative framework mostly suitable for the promotion of professional management in such organizations, as well as in small and medium enterprises, but its application is deficient, unequal and incoherent.

b. Reassessing the role of human resource management in assuring professional managers

Through HRM recruitment, selection, evaluation, motivation, improvement and promotion, *HR management* must respond to the challenges connected to improving the organization's economic and managerial performance through substantive changes in the form and content of these activities, in order to provide the resource of truly professional managers, genuine "white collars". The university professor Alecxandrina Deaconu, believes that such changes could occur in the selection, development and reward of managers so that they can be effective in the areas of management, by taking into account the following: "In the evaluation of managers, the interest moves from results towards the efficiency of inter-human relations; career managers are selected for their managerial skills, not for their technical expertise; the increasing acceptance of the hypothesis that some competencies are genetic; the training of managers becomes more and more a profession in itself (the role of specialized consultants in the field is amplified); efficient managers will be highly valued, will be well paid and will accept mobility more easily" (Nicolescu, O., coord., 2004, p. 241-242) [3]. Starting from these questions, naturally, the question arises: Where do the Romanian organizations "feed" with managers from, considering that neither here, nor anywhere else, there are schools (faculties) to produce managers? What conditions must be imposed on candidates in the managerial selection contest in order to be able to enter a desired managerial position? Answers to such questions must be given in the light of today's realities ("good" and "very good" graduates with solid managerial training, offered to the labor market and provided by economic faculties are declining, other college graduates with a different profile than the economic one, do not learn enough management in the 3-4 years of study, the masters organized in this field fail to really provide management professionals, managers recruited from successful business people to lead and manage public enterprises do not give satisfaction for the reasons already invoked in our research, those who lead SMEs are, as a rule, entrepreneurs, creators of their own businesses, skilled in their field of reference, but less in management so on). The slogan "was born to be a boss" is not at all up-to-date, neither is the phrase "is a management guru, so it must be a boss" can no longer be accepted. The employer should consider both management knowledge acquired through an institutional training formula, usually faculty, and managerial skills and aptitudes, some native and other acquired and developed during the individual's professional life. Consequently, neither the scientific, the artistic side of competence,

nor the personal authority, should be taken into account in the calculations of the assessment of competence or the value of a future manager, but both, in a combined formula, given by the hierarchical position and the importance of the post to be exercised. Moreover, the job description, drafted and submitted in with sufficient time before the candidate applies for a management post, must contain sufficient data and information on the job specification, to which he must respond at the highest degree of possibilities, but also to the job descriptions, in order to highlight the volume, complexity and difficulty of their tasks, competences and responsibilities for the achievement of individual goals (Verboncu, Iorga, 2015) [4]. Or, if we refer to it, we notice that, in appreciable proportions, it is just an organizational document, not a management tool. Employers, at their turn, with a questionable level of managerial competence, do not provide enough arguments for those who want to work in those organizations and who can be the nursery from which one might recruit the future managers. Why? Because, when it exists, the job description is confusing, it abounds in the description of the duties to be exercised by the occupant of the post, while the authority and the responsibilities are resumed to one sentence, the individual objectives are completely absent because such cultural customs does not exist. Moreover, the management contract or mandate contract, as they were designed (as a model) more than 20 years ago, manifests almost exclusively as legal instruments, less as managerial and economic instruments. It is very true that a contract is a will of agreement between two parties, but its content must be clear enough to provide sufficient means to those who execute it on a determined period of time, in order to respect the clauses. Are there notable differences between objectives, benchmarks and performance criteria? Does not the content of the management contract create and maintain the managerial instability? The example of private managers in many public enterprises is enlightening (of the 160 private managers named in 2012, only 10% remain in that position, many of the "eliminated one" contested the dismissal in court, winning in most cases the lawsuits with the state, the main cause being the confusing contract clauses. The situation is similar to that of the contracts concluded between football teams and coaches or players. In frequent situations this contracts are damaging to employers, who have to pay enormous sums as a termination clause, in case they decide to terminate the contract unilaterally). Improving human resource management implies:

- Initiation of procurement procedures for the acquisition of professional management services;
- Improving the content of the management contract by eliminating the confusion generating elements;
- Using the job sheet as a genuine managerial tool, by accepting the inclusion of individual objectives (derived from specific objectives) and the support elements needed to achieve them, delimited and dimensioned in a permanent quantitative balance (the "golden triangle" of the organization);
- Organizing and conducting selection competitions on the basis of a methodology and topics focused primarily on testing non-legal managerial skills, qualities and aptitudes, not as it is currently happening;
- Preface any managerial selection contest by publishing the SWOT diagnostic or analysis study, through which candidates receive relevant information about the managerial and economic viability potential of the organization they are going to lead.

c. *Increasing the degree of managerial methodology*

Managerial methodologies are perhaps the most important ways of professionalizing the managers, if one takes into account the fact that managerial tools and methodologies and other methodological elements of design / redesign and maintenance of the functioning of the management system and its components ensure: a scientific manager's performance; irrespective of their hierarchical position in an organization, the imprinting of certain characteristics of order, discipline and rigor in the spheres conducted, the valorizing at a superior level the managerial competence of those who lead and manage the Romanian organizations. The approach of managerial methodologies must take into account two important aspects.

First of all, the promotion and use of *modern managerial tools*, including systems (complex methods), management methods and techniques. Obviously, the range of management tools known and treated by the specialized literature is extremely generous (over 350). The use of one or many managerial tools is dependent on the specific nature of the organization or its process and structural components, the nature of the managerial problems to be solved, the degree of knowledge of the managers in this field, the volume, complexity and difficulty of the assumed objectives so on. It should not be lacking: profit-based management, project management, diagnosis, SWOT analysis, delegation, scoreboard, mathematical decision-making methods - at public enterprises; project management, diagnosis, SWOT analysis, delegation, dashboard - to small and medium-sized enterprises and, with particularities, in public institutions. We insist on the promotion and prioritization of managerial tools focused on the setting of objectives, the creation and maintenance of appropriate conditions for their fulfillment and, finally, the evaluation of the results and, implicitly, the achievement of the objectives. This ensures a radical change in the behaviors of managers and executors, new values arise, and motivational policies tend to take into consideration the trinomial: objectives - results - rewards / sanctions.

Second, the use of various *methodological elements* in the design, redesign and maintenance of the functioning of the management system and its components (decisional, informational, organizational, human resources management): general or specific methodologies, standards, normative, procedures so on. The essence of these methodological elements is the *general methodologies* - the managerial reengineering methodology, the organizational culture improvement methodology (the organizational transformation), the strategic management methodology, as well as the *specific methodologies* - the decision redesigning methodology, the organizational redesigning methodology, the informational system redesigning methodology, methodologies for the promotion and use of each managerial tool so on. Knowing and operating them is crucial to ensuring the management processes and their functions (forecasting, organization, coordination, training and control-evaluation) are properly implemented. What is important, however, is the determination of the *need for methodologies and the specification of how to meet this need*. How? Some managers "go" for a balanced option, where methodologies are complemented by procedures, standards or normative; others focus on methodologies, as these are more rigorous, tested before in different organizations and are based on a coherent sequential approach. There are also managers who, in case they do not know the content of managerial methodologies, use other methodological elements, especially procedures, much easier to use (for example, the procedure for drafting and updating the job description), but not at all simplified. This latter situation is justified by the existence of quality management systems and, consequently, the quality manual, in its turn, a compendium of operational procedures. Unfortunately, the unjustified excess of methodology causes bureaucracy, especially at the level of public institutions! Bureaucracy is defined by the Explanatory Dictionary of the Romanian Language

(DEX, 1998) as "*the interpretation and application of laws, provisions and regulations, s.o. only in their obvious meaning, without the preoccupation to understand their spirit*". In this context, bureaucracy is manifested both as internal bureaucracy and as external bureaucracy and the characteristics of internal bureaucracy in public institutions, manifested with a high intensity, refer to (Jianu, 2009, quoting M.Weber) [1]: *the functional specialization* (the result of the division of labor, which makes each occupant of a post a specialist in accomplishing the tasks assigned to him and, in the same time, offers little chance for him to evolve equally well on a post with different tasks, competences and responsibilities; extreme functional function can lead to the "*silos effect*" or "*rusting*" of man in the post, with serious implications for labor productivity), *the authoritarian hierarchical structure*, based on a system of formal rules and regulations (the functioning of public institutions with a clear bureaucratic management is marked by rules and other formal regulations well defined and respected, sometimes even if the elements of managerial methodologies, such as procedures used in the exercise of work processes, are so strict that they often turn them into closed organizations, hardly accessible to the dialogue; the tendency to "walk" the papers from one compartment to another, from one post to another without any justification, is obvious), so are *the impersonalism and impartiality*, the authority being dependent on the organization's rules, impersonal and appropriate to the hierarchical level of a person. *Career promotion* follows, in its turn, the rule of seniority and proficiency in activity, and the *efficiency* of the organization results only from the observance of these characteristics.

From this point of view, the question is how can bureaucracy be mitigated? Here are some possible solutions:

- the correlation between the official authority circumscribed to the posts and the personal authority of the position holders; in other words, the professional exercise of management and execution posts requires a matching with their occupants through competence;
- the syncing of interest and competence at a higher level; as the interests of any organization are harmonized in a concerted form by the performance of the managers of the three organizational echelons (superior, medium and inferior), it is necessary to adequately „equip” the management posts with personnel with adequate managerial competence (managerial knowledge, skills and aptitudes) proven with official papers/diploma and results;
- redesigning the informational management component, focusing on improving the quality of information, resizing some information circuits / streams and using sophisticated information procedures;
- promoting a true "documents management"; the avalanche of all kinds of papers, some justified, others only to justify the inability of some employees to solve their tasks, calls for the amplification and intensification of the "cutting off papers" started in 2016, together with a genuine redesign of the content of those that are considered useful;
- increasing the computerization of the public institution's activities by promoting integrated IT applications; such a solution takes into account the still very low degree of electronic information processing, due to employees' reluctance to use the computer in the exercise of their tasks (fear of losing their jobs). The one-stop shop in electronic format is a possible way of solving the citizen's problems in relation to the public institution;
- enhancing the transparency of decision-making and action of civil servants;
- remodeling the organizational culture, by operating substantive changes in its manifestations forms - the system of values, behaviors, myths, histories, symbols so on;

- eliminating the legislative chaos governing the functioning of the institution and the relations with the citizens; efforts are to be made to clean up the legislation and to uniformly approach the normative provisions;
- simplifying the content and the way of applying some methodological elements (procedures, standards, normative so on).

d. Intensification of managerial training offered by professionals in the field

Continuous managerial training is another "source" of the professionalisation of managers, to the extent that the programs of continuous training and professional development (name taken from the Law of National Education, no. 1 / 2011) are carried out in consensus with the organization's needs, and in these programs effectively and actively participate those who lead and manage the organization or its structural components. It is the weak link of the process of professional and managerial training, as the insufficient financial resources allocated to the postgraduate programs in the field of management and their precariousness, their formalism, make it almost impossible to achieve the objectives assumed by human resources management in the field of managerial training and development. The formal character of training and study documents further aggravates the managerial status of Romanian organizations, departing from what is new and modern in European and international management. The salvation, even partial, comes from organizations that had accessed European funds through "human resource development" or "administrative capacity development" programs, and had organized courses similar to postgraduate courses in various fields, including management (Verboncu, Iorga, 2015) [4]. To enhance the contribution of managerial training to professionalising managers, we recommend:

- Determining the need for managerial training by types of organizations (SMEs, public enterprises, public institutions so on), sector of activity, economy;
- Organization of continuous learning and managerial training programs by specialized organizations in the field, with trainers with known managerial competence (profile faculties, training firms in which the management knowledge provider is accredited);
- Reconsider the role of the faculty in the field (where management is a discipline in the university curricula) in ensuring quality managerial training;
- Organizing and conducting managerial training at the beneficiary organization headquarters, outside work schedule;
- The rethinking of investments in human capital in the sense of prioritizing their strategic approach, in the context of promoting knowledge management;
- Establishing data banks containing the graduates of the managerial training programs, having a role in the permanent renewal of the managerial personnel of the Romanian organizations (especially public institutions and public enterprises); working with recruiting firms of private managers should become a permanent practice.

e. Reinvigorating of managerial consultancy

Managerial consultancy is considered, in the opinion of Professor George Pleșoianu, "an important actor and a professional of change ... because it promotes the rational and efficient change that gives priority to achieving the required return rate/profitability and development in correlation with market requirements". The same author considers that, on one hand, "management consultants, professionals and experienced persons, promote organizational osmosis in order to achieve favorable outcomes of change, choosing the most viable solutions, without prejudices and inadequate rules" and, on the other hand, ensure the correlation with the elements of specificity and the legislative system and especially with its restrictions, limits and shortcomings" (Petrescu

I., coord., 2014, p. 273) [6]. Management consultancy appears to be a necessity for an organization "when it reaches a critical development point, generated either by a favorable development or by an unfavorable evolution ... the continued decline in sales, the loss of market share, the difficult macroeconomic context that can bring the organization to a critical point that can be overcome only with the help of experienced specialists" (Svasta M., 2010, p. 261) [2].

f. Improving your performance

The name of a "professional manager" can not be invoked if the management service provider does not know how to streamline his own activity. The management theory and practice offers many time-management-based ways of efficiency that can be successfully used in any organization and any hierarchical level. Here we exemplify the ways and tools of work programming and organization, the ergonomics of the manager, the use of the manager's modern contributors, the effective use of the secretariat or the optimization of relations with the subordinates. There are no patterns for using the most important resources a manager has - time! There are, on the other hand, variants of solutions that must be adapted to the manager, according to the importance of the occupied position, its hierarchical position in the structural configuration of the organization, the influence of the endogenous and exogenous variables exerted on the organization and the organizational subdivision in which the manager works. The operation of such solutions will allow to mitigate or eliminate the causes that lead to the frequent overcoming of the normal working day or to its inadequate structure, the manager focusing on the effective exercise of the management processes and their functions in terms of efficiency and seriously improved efficacy.

4.2. The impact of managers' professionalization on the quality and efficiency of management

Professionalization of managers has the same impact on the quality and efficiency of management, influencing them decisively. A professional manager generates *quality* in management by:

- adopting quality decisions (scientifically funded, empowered, opportune, integrated in the organization's decisions, comprehensible);
- providing quality information (real, multilateral, synthetic, timely, so on) necessary for an adequate substantiation of management decisions;
- carefully choosing the managerial tools in relation to the nature of the decisional intervention (for the exercise of each function of the management, he uses a specific instrument);
- providing quality of the organizational and informational systems by constantly reporting to the requirements of some principles of redesign and functioning;
- ensuring the quality of the human factor by recruiting, selecting, employing, evaluating, motivating, improving and promoting professional competence.

Regarding the influences on the *efficiency* of management, they are reflected in the level of some specific indicators:

a. The efficiency of the management methodological component

- The degree of managerial methodology (number of systems, methods and management techniques used and their weight divided on management functions)

- The level of science in the performance of managers (number and share of managers who use systems, methods or management techniques to solve the problems faced by the managed field)
- The existence of global strategy and / or partial strategies
- The existence of global policy and / or global policies.

b. The efficiency of the decision-making component

- The typology of the adopted decisions, by hierarchical levels (organizational echelons) and management functions (number and weight)
- The degree of solving the organization's problems through decision-making (decision intensity), determined as a ratio between the number of decisions taken at the organization level and the number of problems it faced within a certain timeframe. Decisional intensity (Id) can be determined:

- Organizational level of management:
$$Id_1 = \frac{\text{no. adopted decisions}}{\text{no. decision problems}} 100 \quad (1)$$

- At the superior echelon level of management:
$$Id_2 = \frac{\text{no. adopted decisions}}{\text{no. decision problems}} 100 \quad (2)$$

- At the medium echelon level of management:
$$Id_3 = \frac{\text{no. adopted decisions}}{\text{no. decision problems}} 100 \quad (3)$$

- At the lowest echelon level of management:
$$Id_4 = \frac{\text{no. adopted decisions}}{\text{no. decision problems}} 100. \quad (4)$$

- The degree of decisions implementation (operational intensity), determined by the actions initiated in the field, led to the implementation of decisions. This performance indicator (Ia) is determined at the organizational level of the management and on the organizational echelons, as follows:

- The degree of decisions implementation at the organizational level:

$$Ia_1 = \frac{\text{no. applied decisions}}{\text{no. adopted decisions}} 100 \quad (5)$$

- The degree of decisions implementation corresponding to the superior echelon of management:

$$Ia_2 = \frac{\text{no. applied decisions}}{\text{no. adopted decisions}} 100 \quad (6)$$

- The degree of decisions implementation corresponding to the medium echelon of management:

$$Ia_3 = \frac{\text{no. applied decisions}}{\text{no. adopted decisions}} 100 \quad (7)$$

- The degree of decisions implementation corresponding to the lowest echelon of management:

$$Ia_4 = \frac{\text{no. applied decisions}}{\text{no. adopted decisions}} 100. \quad (8)$$

c. The efficiency of the informational system

- The degree of computerization of management (share of computer applications used in management)
- The degree of satisfaction of the informational needs of the top, middle and lower level managers (information intensity)

- The degree of satisfaction of information needs in general:

$$Ii_1 = \frac{\textit{provided informations}}{\textit{necessary information}} 100 \quad (9)$$

- the degree of satisfaction of the informational needs of the top-level managers:

$$Ii_2 = \frac{\textit{provided informations}}{\textit{necessary information}} 100 \quad (10)$$

- the degree of satisfaction of the informational needs of the middle level managers:

$$Ii_3 = \frac{\textit{provided informations}}{\textit{necessary information}} 100 \quad (11)$$

- the degree of satisfaction of the informational needs of the lowest level managers:

$$Ii_4 = \frac{\textit{provided informations}}{\textit{necessary information}} 100 \quad (12)$$

- the degree of satisfaction of the informational needs of performers:

$$Ii_5 = \frac{\textit{provided informations}}{\textit{necessary information}} 100. \quad (13)$$

d. The efficiency of the organizational management component

- The degree of flattening of organizational structure (number of hierarchical levels)
- Average hierarchical weight (no.)
- Average hierarchical weight of managers on hierarchical levels (no.)
- The degree of management positions occupied (%)
- Number of compartments (total, of which: functional and operational)
- The degree of procedural assurance of the objectives assumed for a certain period, highlights the extent to which the delimitation and dimensioning of the work processes (in functions, activities, duties and tasks), satisfies the claims imposed by the five categories of fundamental objectives, derivatives I and II, specific, individual; it can be expressed as percentage (%)
- The degree of structural and organizational coverage of the work processes involved in achieving the objectives (any procedural component must have a structurally-organizational support delimited and appropriately dimensioned to be exercised); it is expressed as percentage (%)
- The intensity of job description updates (monthly, semester, yearly so on)
- The intensity of updating the organization and functioning regulation and the organizational chart (annual, so on).

e. The efficiency of human resource management

- The attractiveness degree of the organization for the managers, specialists and workers, appreciated by:
 - Labor force fluctuation in general (%), out of which:
 - managers (%)
 - specialists with higher education (%)
 - high skilled workers (%)
- The average wage size, as compared to the average salary size of:
 - region (%)
 - sector (%)
 - national level (%)

- Number and structure of staff, correlated approached (number and %)
- Use of working time (%)
- Absenteeism (%)
- The size of the surplus or deficit of employees, total and on each structure, in relation to the organization's real needs (absolute figures)
- The number of new jobs created during (absolute figures)
- The rate of increase of the average earnings of employees in the period (%)
- The number of employees dismissed, during (%).

4. Conclusions

Our research has highlighted the fact that professionalization of managers is an important way to make management more efficient and achieving this desiderate comports action in several priority directions: from compliance with normative regulations in the field of selection, assessment, motivation and promotion of managers to improving human resource management, from managerial methodologies to training and managerial consultancy and so on. The operationalization of these directions must be carried out according to the specificity of each type of organization - small or medium enterprise, public enterprise, public institution - without the interference of the political factor and with emphasis on managerial competence proven through study diplomas and tested through serious, rigorous and carefully monitored competitions. Professional managers ensure the achievement of the objectives assumed in terms of efficiency and make the organization led and managed, a competitive, attractive organization for all stakeholder categories. Moreover, the professionalization of managers overcomes the existing cultural resistance in any entity empirically driven and reflected by three major causes: the Miorița myth ("mediocrity against meritocracy", the occupation of management positions with incompetent people or poor managerial and professional competence), the myth of the Mesterul Manole ("nothing can be built without sacrificing the weak one" or, more specifically, what the lack of strategic management really means) and the myth of the "goat of the neighbor" ("focusing on competition at the expense of its own performance").

REFERENCES

1. JIANU, Al. Considerații despre birocrație / Considerations about bureaucracy. Constantin Brâncuși University Annals, Tg. Jiu, Letters and Social Sciences Series. 2009, no. 1. ISSN 2457-4775.
2. SVASTA, M. Consultant în România / Consultant in Romania. – Bucharest: Printing House AMCOR, 2010.
3. NICOLESCU, O., coord. Managerii și managementul resurselor umane (chapter 16 signed by A. Deaconu, "Tipuri de manageri, rolul și responsabilitatea lor"). – Bucharest: Economica Printing House, 2004. 464 p. ISBN 973-709-034-9.
4. VERBONCU, I., IORGA, C. Profesionalizarea managerilor, condiție a succesului managerial și economic al organizațiilor românești / Professionalization of managers, condition of managerial and economic success of Romanian organizations. Quality-Access to Success, 2015, vol. 16, no. 149, p. 50. ISSN 1582-2559.
5. PETER, L., HALL, R. Principiul lui Peter / The Principle of Peter. - Bucharest: Humanitas Printing House, 1997. ISBN 973-28-0282-0.
6. PETRESCU, I., coord. Contribuții la conturarea unui model românesc de management / Contributions to the shaping of a Romanian management model (chapter 13, Managerul român de profesie – personalitate complexă / Romanian occupational manager - complex personality, coordinator I. Petrescu and chapter 5, Consultanța în management și dezvoltarea afacerilor în România / Business management consulting and business development in Romania, coordinator G. Pleșoianu). – Bucharest: Printing House Expert, 2014. 2290 p. ISBN 978-973-618-401-7.
7. * * * Government Emergency Ordinance no.109 / 2011 on Corporate Governance of Public Enterprises (now Law no. 111/2016), published in the Monitorul Oficial no. 883 of December 14, 2011.

8. * * * GD no. 722 / 2016 regarding the methodological norms for the application of corporate governance, Monitorul Oficial no. 803 of October 12, 2016.
9. * * * - www.cotidianul.ro/08 june 2017

Rezumat

Succesul economic, comercial și managerial al unei organizații este dependent, într-o foarte mare proporție, de profesionalismul managerilor care asigură conducerea și gestiunea acesteia. Nu putem vorbi de un management performant fără manageri profesioniști. Aceștia, pe de o parte, știu management, adică au suficiente cunoștințe, calități și aptitudini care le permit exercitarea proceselor de management și asigurarea unor condiții prielnice pentru funcționarea corespunzătoare a sistemului de management și a componentelor sale, iar pe de altă parte, sunt capabili să valorifice autoritatea oficială cu care sunt investite posturile ocupate prin operaționalizarea autorității personale, reflectate de elementele precizate mai sus. Sunt managerii organizațiilor românești – întreprinderi private, întreprinderi publice ori instituții publice – profesioniști? Dacă răspunsul este negativ, ce demersuri trebuie întreprinse pentru a atinge acest stadiu? Dacă răspunsul este afirmativ, cum se manifestă aceștia într-un mediu contextual din ce în ce mai dificil și care este impactul prestației lor asupra calității și eficienței managementului? Iată câteva posibile răspunsuri la care vom încerca să venim cu comentarii de specialitate. Premisa de la care pleacă abordarea noastră este aceea că managementul este unul din cei mai importanți – dacă nu cel mai important – factori de dezvoltare sustenabilă a unei organizații, în măsura în care este exercitat profesionist, de oameni competenți.

Cuvinte-cheie: profesionalizarea managerilor, profesionalizarea managementului, metodologizarea managerială, birocrație, training managerial, consultanță în management

Аннотация

Экономический, коммерческий и управленческий успехи организации во многом зависят от уровня профессионализма управляющих менеджеров. Невозможно говорить об эффективном управлении без профессиональных менеджеров. С одной стороны, они ведают управление, то есть обладают достаточными знаниями, навыками и способностями для управления процессами и обеспечения благоприятных условий для надлежащего функционирования системы управления и ее компонентов. С другой стороны, они способны использовать данную им официальную власть через занятые посты и вышеупомянутые элементы. Являются ли руководители румынских организаций - частных предприятий, государственных предприятий или государственных учреждений - профессионалами? Если ответ отрицательный, необходимо понять какие шаги следует предпринять для достижения надлежащего уровня? Если ответ утвердительный, то познавательна как они проявляют себя во все более сложной контекстуальной среде и каково влияние их работы на качество и эффективность менеджмента? Несколько возможных ответов будут раскрыты в этой статье. Предпосылкой нашего подхода станет размышление согласно которому управление является одним из наиболее важных - если не самым важным - факторов устойчивого развития организации, если выполняется профессионально компетентными людьми.

Ключевые слова: профессионализация менеджеров, профессионализация менеджмента, управленческие методологии, бюрократия, управленческий тренинг, консультирование по вопросам управления

Received 18.07.2017

Accepted 15.09.2017

Published 26.12.2017