IMPROVING THE PUBLIC POLICY MAKING PROCESS IN ROMANIA

Mihaela PĂCEȘILĂ

Bucharest University of Economic Studies, Piata Romana, 6, Bucharest, Romania
pacesilamihaela@gmail.com

Abstract
The paper analyzes the opinion of specialists from Public Policy Units at central level regarding the model for improving the public policy-making process. The first and the second part of the paper contains the introduction as well as the objectives and research methodology. The third part presents the descriptive model regarding the public policy making process focusing on its characteristics. In the fourth part the validity of the model is tested by distributing a questionnaire to the policy makers at central level in order to find out if their reaction regarding the proposals made is positive.
Keywords: public policy analysis, public policy cycle, public policy making process, the validity of the policy-making model

1. INTRODUCTION

The study of public policy is a relatively new concern that has emerged in North America and Europe after the Second World War for a better understanding of the relationship between governments and its citizens (Miroiu, 2008).

At least two sources have contributed to the development of policy studies (Miroiu et al., 2002):

- The growing scale of problems that the government faced in different countries.

- The increasing concerns of researchers for studying public policy, especially in universities.

Depending on the geographic area defined as an action area for administrative institutions, some important levels influencing public policy could be highlighted (Păceșilă and Profiroiu, 2006). Therefore, we could identify at least three level:

- the international level: the international institutions play an increasingly important role in national and local policy-making process. Some accuse them of trying to replace the states as political identity, others consider the internalization a comprehensive globalization process (Balogh et al., 2004);

- the national/central level: most frequently the public policy are identified with this level. Moreover, the traditional approach in the public policy field reveals that only the central government's decisions on matters of public interest are considered public policy;

- the local level: the local policies expresses a restriction of the public policy concept. The differences between the two terms are determined by the quality of decision-makers and the geographical applicability of decisions.

In general, the definition of public policy is based on two aspects:

- „policy analysis", based on the development of methodologies for determining the results of a policy and for making comparisons between alternative policies regarding their results (Profiroiu, 2006; Karoly et al., 2011).

- „policy cycle" explains policies as a logical sequence of "steps" defining the problem, identifying alternative responses, evaluating options, decision, implementation, evaluation), namely the public policy-making process (Miroiu, 2001; Profiroiu, 2006).

Policy analysis could be performed in two ways: as a policy analysis - a research activity, often in university, mainly aimed at studying, understanding the public policy making process; as an analysis for policy - a practical activity often requested by a client, aimed at resolving a concrete problem (Miroiu et al., 2002).

The public policy process, in other words the public policy cycle is complex and involves dimensions, mechanisms and actors in a network of inter-relationships (Păceșilă, 2008). One of the most popular ways to make it easier to understand is to divide the process into several distinct stages or phases and sub-phases. In fact, the policy cycle represents a series of stages or phases (Miroiu et al., 2002).

According to the international and national literature, there are several approaches regarding the public policy cycle and its steps. It should be noted that these approaches are not applicable to any problematic situations. In fact, these models are not necessarily found in all real cases, because there is a plurality of actors, situations and problems in society.

The policy cycle covers the period of development, implementation and evaluation of public policy, regardless the change in the ruling parties. The cycle or the public policy process represents the introduction and implementation stages of a public policies (Balogh, 2013). Dividing the process in many stages aims to facilitate its understanding and increases the transparency of government action.

The policy making process is a technical and professional approach, provided by civil servants, experts from the central administration as well as independent researchers. The process aims at providing a comprehensive and structured argumentation as well as a fundamentation of all information pertaining to possible alternatives and decisions (General Secretariat of the Romanian Government, 2006). The public policies should be considered a direct tool allowing political leaders to achieve certain specific objectives from the government programs. Therefore, policy analysis should be done by civil servants and government specialists, with professional knowledge in the field.

In practice, the public policy cycle is not as simple as in theory and it does not runs through the same sequence of steps. Each step may involve repeated efforts in order to reach satisfactory results. To support an efficient policy making process, the roles and responsibilities of all actors involved should be clearly defined and good cooperation between them should be ensured. Often, the experts involved in the policy-making process are those that represents the policy during the consultation process. That is why, they should have good presentation skills as well as skills of moderating the conversation and of facilitating meetings. Finally, it should be noted that in many cases the public policy planning is continued: once the policy cycle comes to the end, a new agenda is set and the process is repeated (General Secretariat of the Romanian Government, 2006).

The central level of policy making-process is the key in this process, because the policy process is a cornerstone of good governance, supporting open government and improving the management of civil service. Therefore, it is essential that government actions aim at improving public policies at this level.

However, the local public policy making process should not be neglected. In this regard, special attention should be given to increasing the capacity of local authorities to develop and implement public policies at the local level, in close accordance with policies developed at central level.

2. OBJECTIVES AND RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this paper is to find out the opinion of Public Policy Units' experts regarding the model for improving the public policy-making process.

In this regard, the paper has the following objectives:

- Presenting the public policy concept from international, national and local perspective;

- Making a comparative analysis of the concepts policy analysis and policy cycle;

- Describing the model for improving the public policy making process;

- Testing the validity of the model by means of a questionnaire distributed to the experts involved in the public policy process at central level.

- The data collection methods used in this study were the document analysis method and the questionnaire-based survey.

3. PRESENTATION OF THE POLICY-MAKING MODEL

The need for change in Britain and the increased expectations of citizens have made it necessary to reform the public policy making process. Therefore, in 1999 the Cabinet Office published a report aiming at improving the model of the public policy making. The report focuses on the following aspects:

Long term, forward looking public policy making

The policy makers should set the objectives from the beginning and have a long term vision built in relation to to economic, social and political trends. However, long-term vision could generate problems because politicians want quick results due to pressure of the election cycle. In addition, the uncertainties discourage policy makers to look more than three years. In this context, using scenarios and building relationships with policy makers from different countries become essential.

Developments in European and International level in public policy making process

The policy makers should focus on the continuous cooperation with foreign counterparts. Exchanging information and building relationships with them could lead to progress in the policymaking process.

Change and flexibility in the public policy process

The policymaking process should be flexible and innovative. Moreover, the policymakers should continuously identify new ways for improving it; they should also be open to suggestions and have the ability to manage the difficulties and risks.

Identification of rigorous information and their efficient utilisation

Nowadays information plays a key role in all areas. Therefore, the policy makers need to use different sources of information such as expert knowledge, existing statistics, stakeholders consultation, etc. All the studies investigated should be comprehensible for policy makers.

Taking into account all the affected parties

An important role in the policy making process is held by the affected parties, namely the stakeholders. The stakeholders should be involved throughout the entire process by means of consultations (internet discussion forum, direct meetings and surveys).

The theory claims that all the factors directly or indirectly affected should be involved in the policy-making process. However, in practice there are numerous obstacles: political interests, poor visibility, limited technical capacity, political and bureaucratic system. Despite all these obstacles, the consultation process should be seen as part of the polkicy making process and stakeholders involvement should be real, not just on paper.

The institutional real, constant cooperation of institutions involved in the public policy making process

Policy makers should not be intimidated by the boundaries and objectives of the institution to which they belong. They should have a holistic vision and focus on developing a reward and incentive system.

Early evaluation

The policy makers shoud focus on systematic evaluation of early results obtained throughout the process.

Review/Update

Public policies should be continuously reviewed. In this way, policy makers are sure that they solve the real problems the society faces and that they take into account the associated side effects.

Capitalization on previous experiences

This aspect refers to the development of an evaluation program allowing policy makers to deal with changing priorities and learn from previous experiences. Moreover, it could help policy makers set clear statements of results at the beginning of the policy making process.

The characteristics mentioned above regardin the the policymaking process should be achieved by taking into account three coordinates (Profiroiu and Păceşilă, 2009):

- Vision - what is intended to be achieved in the long term.

- Effectiveness: - to what extent the objectives have been achieved.

- ▪ Continuous improvement - permanent focus on reaching effectiveness, efficiency and greater impact of public policies.

4. TESTING THE VALIDITY OF THE POLICY-MAKING MODEL IN ROMANIA

4.1. The reseach process

Since 2001 the Romanian Government has considered that the modernization of the stages in the public policy process should be performed quickly (Păceșilă, 2011).

Taking into account this situation, an improved model for changing working practices and culture of organizations involved in the public policy making process is necessary. In this context, I thought that the model presented above could be a solution. However, any model should be validated by experts before being used. In this case, the opinion of experts involved in the public policy process at central level was not only very important, but decisive. Therefore, I transposed the model into a questionnaire.

The questionnaire was distributed to the employees of ministries during July - August 2009. It was fulfilled by 61 persons from Public Policy Units within 14 ministries.

4.2. Analysis and interpretation of the questionnaire results

The questionnaire contains 17 closed questions of varying degrees of difficulty, most of them having several subsections. The questions involving or suggesting the answer have been avoided. The order of questions took into account their degree of difficulty because the author did not want that the respondents felt tired.

Data collection was performed using doctoral and work colleagues. Some questionnaires were also sent by e-mail. The quantitative data obtained have been checked and processed in SPSS. Therefore, two categories of information have been highlighted:

- ▪ information on gender and staff category;

- ▪ information about the model of the public policy making.

4.2.1. The statistics for the questionnaire

The analysis of the answers obtained points out that respondents had a positive reaction regarding the proposals made. Furthermore, the responses received lead to the following conclusions:

- Most respondents were aged between 30 and 40 years old, the number of respondents under the age of 30 or over 50 years old being reduced

- The number of female respondents is close to that of male respondents. Therefore, there is a gender balance as regards people involved in the public policy process at the central level.

- The respondents have a high education level, allowing them to adapt quickly to changes.

- The respondents graduated different specializations, from law specializations to economic, administrative and technical ones.

- The proposed principles that should underpin any public policy making process are considered important by respondents. Therefore, they understand the need for changes in the organizational culture of the public institutions involved.

- The difficulties in developing public policies are known to the respondents. However, short-term solutions are preferred; goals and objectives still remain unclear throughout the process.

- Learning from the experience of other countries as wll as cooperating with them in the public policy making process is considered significant by the respondents. In other words, people within Public Policy Units at central level understand the importance of information exchange and the role of experience in this process.

- The respondents attaches great importance to citizens consultation in the policy making process. They consider that direct meetings with citizens could help eliminate opponents and understand the way the policy will work when it will be implemented.

- The large number of respondents show that the Public Policy Units employees understand the role and importance of the model. In addition, this model could be considered a starting point in reforming public policy making process at central level.

- The respondents consider that institutional cooperation with foreign counterparts is important because it allows them widening the horizon of thinking.

4.2.2 The analysis of the relationship between two variables

I. Analysis of variance according to gender of respondents

The paper analysis the influence of gender on the questions. The interpretation is based on the coefficient of significance Sig calculated using One Way ANOVA. Descriptive statistical indicators are presented in annex, table no. 1. Variation acoording to gender.

Significant results have been obtaines because the value of α is less than 0,05 (α <0,05). Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted (gender differences significantly influence the responses), for the following statements:

A.I. The principles of public policy process

The null hypothesis (H0): There is no influence of the respondents gender on the principles of public policy process.

The alternative hypothesis (H1): There is a certain influence of the respondents gender on the principles of public policy process.

Alternative hypothesis H1 is accepted (α = 0,009), because the value of α is less than 0,05 for the institutional real, constant cooperation of institutions involved in the public policy making process.

B.I. Skills that should be held by the public policy makers

The null hypothesis (H0) indicates that there is no influence of respondents gender on the skills that should be held by the public policy makers.

The alternative hypothesis (H1) indicates the influence of respondents gender on the skills that should be held by the public policy makers.

Alternative hypothesis H1 is accepted (α =0,036) because the value of α is less than 0,05 for one of the 11 proposed skills: Cooperation with policy makers from other national and international institutions.

C.I. Factors ensuring the creation of an innovative culture within ministerial departments

The null hypothesis (H0): The statement regarding the factors ensuring the creation of an innovative culture within ministerial departments is not influenced by the gender differences of the respondents.

The alternative hypothesis (H1): The statement regarding the factors ensuring the creation of an innovative culture within ministerial departments is influenced by the gender differences of the respondents. Alternative hypothesis H1 is accepted (α =0,030) because the value of α is less than 0,05 for the following aspect: The exchange of ideas and experience with public policy makers in other countries.

TABLE NO. 1. VARIATION ACCORDING TO GENDER

A.I. ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE PRINCIPLES OF PUBLIC POLICY PROCESS ACCORDING TO AGE							
			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig. (α)
Long Term, Forward Looking Public Policy Making * Gender	Between Groups	(Combined)	0,019	1	0,019	0,087	0,770
	Within Groups		8,469	39	0,217		
	Total		8,488	40			
Developments in European and International level in public policy making process * Gender	Between Groups	(Combined)	0,049	1	0,049	0,184	0,670
	Within Groups		10,390	39	0,266		
	Total		10,439	40			
Change and flexibility * Gender	Between Groups	(Combined)	0,053	1	0,053	0,201	0,656
	Within Groups		10,191	39	0,261		
	Total		10,244	40			
Identification of rigorous information and their efficient utilization * Gender	Between Groups	(Combined)	0,008	1	0,008	0,041	0,840
	Within Groups		6,967	38	0,183		
	Total		6,975	39			
Taking into account all the affected parties * Gender	Between Groups	(Combined)	0,134	1	0,134	0,761	0,388
	Within Groups		6,890	39	0,177		
	Total		7,024	40			
The institutional real, constant cooperation of institutions involved in the public policy making process * Gender	Between Groups	(Combined)	1,531	1	1,531	7,483	0,009
	Within Groups		7,981	39	0,205		
	Total		9,512	40			
Early evaluation * Gender	Between Groups	(Combined)	0,203	1	0,203	0,956	0,334
	Within Groups		8,285	39	0,212		
	Total		8,488	40			
Review/Update * Gender	Between Groups	(Combined)	0,812	1	0,812	2,845	0,100
	Within Groups		11,139	39	0,286		
	Total		11,951	40			
Capitalization on previous experiences * Gender	Between Groups	(Combined)	0,053	1	0,053	0,201	0,656
	Within Groups		10,191	39	0,261		
	Total		10,244	40			
B.I. ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR SKILLS THAT SHOULD BE HELD BY THE PUBLIC POLICY MAKERS ACCORDING TO GENDER							
			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig. (α)
Understanding the organizational and political context * Gender	Between Groups	(Combined)	0,046	1	0,046	0,411	0,525
	Within Groups		4,344	39	0,111		
	Total		4,390	40			
Understanding relationships with key stakeholders * Gender	Between Groups	(Combined)	,023	1	0,023	0,099	0,755
	Within Groups		9,196	39	0,236		
	Total		9,220	40			
Cooperation with policy makers from other national and international institutions * Gender	Between Groups	(Combined)	1,095	1	1,095	4,744	0,036
	Within Groups		9,002	39	0,231		
	Total		10,098	40			

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig. (α)
Well-developed presentation skills * Gender	Between Groups	(Combined)	0,031	1	0,031	0,142	0,708
	Within Groups		8,457	39	0,217		
	Total		8,488	40			
The discovery of solutions, the ability to think positive, to be flexible and innovative * Gender	Between Groups	(Combined)	0,056	1	0,056	0,380	0,541
	Within Groups		5,749	39	0,147		
	Total		5,805	40			
The ability to obtain information in order to facilitate the public policy making process * Gender	Between Groups	(Combined)	0,772	1	0,772	3,194	0,082
	Within Groups		9,423	39	0,242		
	Total		10,195	40			
A basic knowledge of economics, statistics and other relevant disciplines * Gender	Between Groups	(Combined)	0,164	1	0,164	0,448	0,507
	Within Groups		14,275	39	0,366		
	Total		14,439	40			
A clear communication style and contact with clients at political, managerial and civil society level * Gender	Between Groups	(Combined)	0,412	1	0,412	1,226	0,275
	Within Groups		13,100	39	0,336		
	Total		13,512	40			
Deep knowledge of the fundamental concepts of project management * Gender	Between Groups	(Combined)	0,286	1	0,286	0,553	0,461
	Within Groups		20,153	39	0,517		
	Total		20,439	40			
Desire experimentation and risk, ability to assess the impact and risk of possible solutions * Gender	Between Groups	(Combined)	0,093	1	0,093	0,285	0,597
	Within Groups		12,785	39	0,328		
	Total		12,878	40			
Willingness to increase the knowledge throughout the entire career * Gender	Between Groups	(Combined)	0,411	1	0,411	1,351	0,252
	Within Groups		11,564	38	0,304		
	Total		11,975	39			
C.I. ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR FACTORS ENSURING THE CREATION OF AN INNOVATIVE CULTURE WITHIN MINISTERIAL DEPARTMENTS ACCORDING TO GENDER							
			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig. (α)
Attracting staff members from nongovernmental organization in public policy departments * Gender	Between Groups	(Combined)	0,137	1	0,137	0,200	0,658
	Within Groups		25,452	37	0,688		
	Total		25,590	38			
Secondment of staff members for limited periods, from ministerial departments to other institutions * Gender	Between Groups	(Combined)	0,538	1	0,538	0,505	0,482
	Within Groups		41,560	39	1,066		
	Total		42,098	40			
The exchange of ideas and experience with public policy makers in other countries * Gender	Between Groups	(Combined)	1,849	1	1,849	5,060	0,030
	Within Groups		14,249	39	0,365		
	Total		16,098	40			

Taking into account the aspects mentioned above, it should be noted that there are no major differences regarding the opinion of male and female respondents about the model for improving public policy making process. This balance between male and female, which is reflected quite clearly by applying ANOVA procedure, is extremely important. Therefore, we could mention that the characteristics and qualities of each gender cooperate harmoniously and professionally, which has a positive impact on the public policy making process at central level in our country.

Gender differences occurs in relationship, cooperation and exchange of experience with other countries. They occur because of differences in "content": although men and women are equal, they are not identical. There are clear, even physiological distinctions, especially in terms of skills. Women have a different ethics, putting value on other aspects at professional level. The studies (Wilson and Altanlar, 2009) indicate that they show a greater openness to cooperation and are more concerned about achieving the objectives than the results.

Most women have extremely well developed communication skills, intuition, attention to detail, capacity to resolve conflicts, a greater capacity for empathy. All these aspects as well as their inclination towards developing human relationships could be explained by a number of factors: the education they received, the expectations that society manifested towards them, their focus on improving communication skills and aesthetic sense.

By definition, women have an innate sense of protection which determines them to put soul into their work and to be concerned about their organization, employees, stakeholders, as if it were their own family. The empathy also helps women get a better understanding of the working environment and develop the organization for which they work.

Compared to women, men react faster, make decisions, take risks and pay more attention to the profit. Moreover, according to some surveys (Pantazi, n.d.), men are motivated by revenue, budget and profit, both at home and at work. They focus more on the tasks and on their proper fulfillment, being less interested in developing positive work relationships.

In general, men are more rational and have a more objective attitude, while women tend to be more subjective, sometimes impulsive and emotional. This feature of male proves to be beneficial when it is desired to find a rapid and effective solution. Men are more direct, but women are more diplomatic, especially in resolving a conflict situation, with a pragmatic and logical approach. Moreover, women focus on the emotional, sentimental and human side. Compared to women, men are showing more courage and detachment, taking decisions without thinking about their personal and social implications. Men have larger vision, while women manage and execute, always attentive to details.

The features listed above about male and female may explain the different ways to solve problems at work as well as the different level of importance given to certain values such as trust, cooperation, work team, etc. Moreover, men and women have different notions about collaboration, exchange of experience, partnerships. This conclusion is supported by major differences in male and female responses regarding institutional cooperation, cooperation with policy makers from other national and

international institutions, the exchange of ideas and experience with public policy makers in other countries.

Clearly, when we take into account the professional work, expectations of men and women are different. Moreover, there are a lot of differences between them as regards the approach, the communication, the way of managing, etc. However, both women and men have certain advantages which should be exploited and optimized in a supportive environment. Moreover, work is the most important task of life for both genders. There are times when other tasks become more important. Overall, they focus most of of their energy at work because achievements and recognition occur in the professional environment.

In our opinion, the harmonious blending of the genetic heritage with challenges of the contemporary society characterized by a permanent and spectacular development would lead to the adoption of decisions beneficial to public or private organizations.

II. Analysis of variance according to category of staff

The paper analysis the influence of catgory of staff on the questions. The interpretation is based on the coefficient of significance Sig calculated using One Way ANOVA. Descriptive statistical indicators are presented in annex, table no. 2. Variation acoording to category of staff.

Significant results have been obtaines because the value of α is less than 0,05 (α <0,05). Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted (differences regarding category of staff significantly influence the responses), for the following statements:

A.II. Ways to inform public policy makers

The null hypothesis (H0): The statement regarding the ways to inform public policy makers is not influenced by category of staff of the respondents.

The alternative hypothesis (H1): The statement regarding the ways to inform public policy makers is influenced by category of staff of the respondents.

The value of α (α =0,020) is less than 0,05 for point 3 of the question. Therefore, the linear relationship between the independent variable category of staff and dependent variable external research is significant.

B.II. Ways to consult with affected parties in the public policy making process

The null hypothesis (H0): The statement regarding the ways to consult with affected parties in the public policy making process is not influenced by category of staff of the respondents.

The alternative hypothesis (H1): The statement regarding the ways to consult with affected parties in the public policy making process is influenced by category of staff of the respondents.

The value of α (α =0,016) is less than 0,05 for point 1 of the question. Therefore the linear relationship between the independent variable category of staff and dependent variable surveys is significant.

CII. Factors ensuring the creation of an innovative culture within ministerial departments

The null hypothesis (H0): The statement regarding the factors ensuring the creation of an innovative culture within ministerial departments is not influenced by category of staff of the respondents.

The alternative hypothesis (H1): The statement regarding the factors ensuring the creation of an innovative culture within ministerial departments is influenced by category of staff of the respondents.

The value of α (α =0,001) is less than 0,05 for point 2 of the question. Therefore the linear relationship between the independent variable category of staff and dependent variable secondment of staff is significant.

D.II. Factors that can streamline the public policy process

The null hypothesis (H0) indicates that there is no influence of category of staff on the factors that can streamline the public policy process.

The alternative hypothesis (H1) indicates the influence of category of staff on the factors that can streamline the public policy process.

The value of α (α =0,034) is less than 0,05 for point 2 of the question. Therefore the linear relationship between the independent variable category of staff and dependent variable capitalization on previous experiences is significant.

E.II. Conditions to be fullfilled in the communication process

The null hypothesis (H0): The statement regarding the conditions to be fullfilled in the communication process is not influenced by category of staff of the respondents.

The alternative hypothesis (H1): The statement regarding the conditions to be fullfilled in the communication process is influenced by category of staff of the respondents.

The value of α (α =0,023) is less than 0,05 for point 3 of the question. Therefore the linear relationship between the independent variable category of staff and dependent variable communication should be closely related to the consultation process is significant.

TABLE NO. 2. VARIATION ACCORDING TO CATEGORY OF STAFF

A.II. ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR WAYS TO INFORM PUBLIC POLICY MAKERS ACCORDING TO CATEGORY OF STAFF							
			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig. (α)
Experts' knowledge * Category of staff	Between Groups	(Combined)	1,139	4	0,285	1,190	0,332
	Within Groups		8,617	36	0,239		
	Total		9,756	40			
Internal research * Category of staff	Between Groups	(Combined)	0,967	4	0,242	0,825	0,518
	Within Groups		10,545	36	0,293		
	Total		11,512	40			
External research * Category of staff	Between Groups	(Combined)	2,553	4	0,638	3,380	0,020
	Within Groups		6,421	34	0,189		
	Total		8,974	38			
Existing statistics * Category of staff	Between Groups	(Combined)	2,201	4	0,550	2,283	0,079
	Within Groups		8,677	36	0,241		
	Total		10,878	40			
Stakeholder's consultation * Category of staff	Between Groups	(Combined)	0,619	4	0,155	0,588	0,673
	Within Groups		9,478	36	0,263		
	Total		10,098	40			
Evaluation of previous public policy * Category of staff	Between Groups	(Combined)	0,772	4	0,193	0,906	0,471
	Within Groups		7,667	36	0,213		
	Total		8,439	40			
B.II. ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR WAYS TO CONSULT WITH AFFECTED PARTIES IN THE PUBLIC POLICY MAKING PROCESS ACCORDING TO CATEGORY OF STAFF							
			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig. (α)
Surveys * Category of staff	Between Groups	(Combined)	1,405	4	0,351	3,541	0,016
	Within Groups		3,571	36	0,099		
	Total		4,976	40			
Direct meetings * Category of staff	Between Groups	(Combined)	0,155	4	0,039	0,531	0,714
	Within Groups		2,626	36	0,073		
	Total		2,780	40			
Internet discussion forum * Category of staff	Between Groups	(Combined)	3,025	4	0,756	1,728	0,165
	Within Groups		15,755	36	0,438		
	Total		18,780	40			
C.II. ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR FACTORS ENSURING THE CREATION OF AN INNOVATIVE CULTURE WITHIN MINISTERIAL DEPARTMENTS ACCORDING TO CATEGORY OF STAFF							
			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig. (α)
Attracting staff members from nongovernmental organization in public policy departments * Category of staff	Between Groups	(Combined)	5,325	4	1,331	2,233	0,086
	Within Groups		20,265	34	0,596		
	Total		25,590	38			
Secondment of staff members for limited periods, from ministerial departments to other institutions * Category of staff	Between Groups	(Combined)	16,748	4	4,187	5,946	0,001
	Within Groups		25,349	36	0,704		
	Total		42,098	40			

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig. (α)
The exchange of ideas and experience with public policy makers in other countries * Category of staff	Between Groups	(Combined)	1,366	4	0,342	0,835	0,512
	Within Groups		14,731	36	0,409		
	Total		16,098	40			
D.II. ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR FACTORS THAT CAN STREAMLINE THE PUBLIC POLICY PROCESS ACCORDING TO CATEGORY OF STAFF							
			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig. (α)
Using methods such as "job shadowing" of operational staff by policy makers * Category of staff	Between Groups	(Combined)	3,720	4	0,930	1,739	0,165
	Within Groups		17,648	33	0,535		
	Total		21,368	37			
Capitalization on previous experiences in public policy making, implementation and evaluation * Category of staff	Between Groups	(Combined)	2,396	4	0,599	2,930	0,034
	Within Groups		7,360	36	0,204		
	Total		9,756	40			
Efficiency policy evaluation at the beginning of the process * Category of staff	Between Groups	(Combined)	0,651	4	0,163	0,611	0,657
	Within Groups		9,593	36	0,266		
	Total		10,244	40			
Regular review of existing policy to find out if they produce the desired results * Category of staff	Between Groups	(Combined)	0,996	4	0,249	0,974	0,435
	Within Groups		8,696	34	0,256		
	Total		9,692	38			
E.II. ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR CONDITIONS TO BE FULLFILLED IN THE COMMUNICATION PROCESS ACCORDING TO CATEGORY OF STAFF							
			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig. (α)
Communication should be planned from the beginning of the public policy process * Category of staff	Between Groups	(Combined)	1,219	4	0,305	1,319	0,283
	Within Groups		7,623	33	0,231		
	Total		8,842	37			
Communication should take into account the political context in which the policy is developed * Category of staff	Between Groups	(Combined)	2,105	4	0,526	1,896	0,132
	Within Groups		9,993	36	0,278		
	Total		12,098	40			
Communication should be closely related to the consultation process * Category of staff	Between Groups	(Combined)	3,279	4	0,820	3,259	0,023
	Within Groups		8,300	33	0,252		
	Total		11,579	37			
Communication should involve all the actors from the public policy process - ministers, policy makers, press officers and service providers * Category of staff	Between Groups	(Combined)	1,143	4	0,286	1,400	0,254
	Within Groups		7,345	36	0,204		
	Total		8,488	40			

Analyzing the questionnaire according to the category of personnel (Executive Director, Head of office, office manager, executive officer, public manager), it could be seen that there are significant differences between their responses, except for one point of a question. Public managers arepresent a separate category among respondents (31,71%). According to Government Emergency Ordinance no. 92 (2008), they are considered change agents for Romanian public administration. The training offered by Young Professionals Scheme (Ministerul Administrației și Internelor, 2006) has enabled public managers to work in different administrative contexts, both at central and local level.

They have been trained in order to become result oriented specialists and to better understand the mission, tasks and responsibilities of government. Their training focused on careful monitoring of results as well as on developing teamwork skills, internal, and external communication skills and coordination skills. All these aspects contributes significantly to improving the capacity planning of central institutions involved in the public policy process and the quality of public policy decisions.

Significant differences of opinion between the categories of staff refers to the field of information, methods of consulting with key stakeholders and communication process. Moreover, the different perception and vision regarding the innovative approaches, changes and improvement of the the organization's efficiency are areas where major differences of opinion may occur among employees.

Clearly, in the contemporary society the control of information, the communication and consultation process represent one of the most important advantages of power. The effective communication enables to build solid relationships with positive effects on individual and organizational performance. In fact, the lack of communication is one of the most common causes of problems between different categories of staff (Money, 2007). The innovation and the efficiency are also elements that ensure the success of an organization, regardless of the sector in which they operate, public or private. All these elements are perceived differently by employees, depending on their position within the organization, on their duties and responsibilities, on the situations more or less complex with which they must cope, on their ability to adapt to the changes within the economic, social and political environment.

Usually, people in leadership positions have wider powers, authority and responsibility, including the role of coordinating the activities of the executants. Moreover, they have a visionary personality (Abăluță, 2003; Moldoveanu and Sabie, 2009) and skills of public relations specialists. The complexity of human nature compels these people to a careful review of all members of the organization in order to implement and carry out the activities at the highest standards of performance. They are promoters of change in the organization, trying to push it in a new direction in order to increase its efficiency and adaptation it to changes in the external environment. These people are responsible for the organization's strategies and goals and enjoy freedom of choice regarding the methods for achieving the objectives. They provide the interface between the organization and stakeholders and create conditions to streamline the work of subordinates.

The life and the career of the organization's members depend to a great extent on the leaders' decisions. Most decisions are influenced by their perception of the reality, their own value system, their own attitudes. Moreover, their decisions regarding subordinates are not easy to take, because they

should meet different requirements, which vary over time depending on the nature of individual, organizational and situational factors.

On the contrary, persons in executive positions do not have to coordinate the work of others. They should meet limited individual objectives, having lower competencies and responsibilities. Their do not have to take decisions on other people. The executant is responsible for carrying out specific tasks according to his work performed.

In this regard, we highly recommend rebuilding and strengthening professional relationships between employees in order to increase the balance, satisfaction and work efficiency. Improving communication and increasing optimal functionality of boss-subordinate relationship should be also taken into account. Furthermore, the boss-subordinate relationship should be governed by the principle of human dignity, regardless of the position within the organization. The decisions concerning employees should illustrate the concern, care for them and should be always taken according to their past experience and personality.

5. CONCLUSIONS

The independent variables as well as dependent variables describing the model of the public policy making act in a complex and interconnected manner in order to understand the policy makers' opinion regarding the proposals made.

The use of data identification as independent variables in applying ANOVA allowed obtaining further information about the influence of gender and category of staff on the skills and competences of public policy makers.

The analysis performed showed that gender and category of staff do not influence significantly the answer to the questions. In conclusion, the results revealed that there are no significant differences.

REFERENCES

Abăluță O. (2003). Dezvoltarea leadership-ului în administrația publică din România în viitor. *Revista de Administrație și Management Public*. 1, 95-101.

Balogh M., Ioan H., Sorin R. (2004). *Facilitator comunitar - Ghid practic de dezvoltare locală*. Cluj Napoca: Fundația Civitas pentru Societatea Civilă.

Balogh M. (2013). *Politici publice*. Cluj-Napoca: Universitatea Babeș-Bolyai.

General Secretariat of the Romanian Government. (2006). *Manual de metode folosite în planificarea politicilor publice și evaluarea impactului*. Retrieved 17 July 2007 from

http://www.mcsi.ro/Minister/Despre-MCSI/Unitatea-de-Politici-Publice/Documente-suport/manual-de-metode-in-planificarea-pp-si-evaluarea-i

Government Emergency Ordinance no. 92 (2008). *Ordonanţa de urgenţă privind statutul funţtionarului public denumit manager public.* Bucharest: Romanian Government.

Karoly M., Șandor D.S., Gârboan R., Cobârzan B. (2011). *Analiza politicilor publice și evaluarea programelor în administrația publică*. Retrieved 02 April 2015, from http://www.apubb.ro/wp-content/uploads/2011/03/Analiza_politicilor _publice_si-_evaluarea_programelor_in_AP.pdf

Ministerul Administrației și Internelor. (2006). *Proiectul Tinerilor Profesioniști (Young Professionals Scheme)*. Retrieved 17 July 2009 from http://www. customs.ro/UserFiles/Adaptarea%20Proiectului%20Tinerilor%20Profesionisti201.pdf

Miroiu A. (2001). *Introducere în politicile publice*. București: Universitatea din București.

Miroiu A. (2008). *Ce este analiza politicilor?* Retrieved 05 February 2009, from https://adrianmiroiu.files.wordpress.com/2008/05/capitolul-2.pdf

Miroiu A., Zulean M., Rădoi M. (2002). *Politici publice*. București: Editura Politeia.

Moldoveanu G. and Sabie (Abăluță) O. (2009). Leadership - Vector of Organizational Development. *Revista de Administrație și Management Public*, 12, 110-119.

Money. (2007). *Relația șef-subaltern, parteneriat pentru profit*. Retrieved 02 April 2015, from http://www.money.ro/relatia-sef-subaltern-parteneriat-pentru-profit/

Pantazi D. (n.d.). *Femeia vs bărbatul manager*. Retrieved 20 August 2009 from http://www.mayra.ro/cariera/succes-story/femeia-vs-barbatul-manager/

Păceșilă M. and Profiroiu A. (2006). Evoluții recente privind studiul politicilor publice. *Revista de Administrație și Management Public*. 7, 56-63.

Păceșilă M. (2008). Theories and models concerning the public policy cycle at national and international level. *Theoretical and Empirical Researches in Urban Management*. 3(6), 17-30.

Păceșilă M. (2011). Testing the validity of the model for improving the public policy making processs in Romania. *Management Research and Practice*. 3(2), 46-73.

Profiroiu M. (2006). *Politici publice*. București: Editura Economică.

Profiroiu, A. and Păceşilă, M. (2009). *Model for improving the public policy making process*. Annals of Eftimie Murgu University of Reşiţa, Fascicle II-Economic Studies, Reşiţa: Eftimie Murgu Publishing House.

Report United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (1999). Report by Strategic Policy Making Team Cabinet Office, Professional Policy Making for the Twenty First Century. London: Cabinet Office.

Wilson N. and Altanlar A. (2009). *Director Characteristics, Gender Balance and Insolvency Risk: An empirical Study*. Leeds, West Yorkshire: Leeds University Business School.