

**A MODEL FOR ANALYZING UNIVERSITY ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE IN ROMANIA**

**Daniela HARANGUȘ**

*Aurel Vlaicu University of Arad, Romania  
d\_harangus@yahoo.com*

**Dana Codruța DĂIANU**

*Aurel Vlaicu University of Arad, Romania  
cddaianu@yahoo.com*

**Abstract**

*Romanian university needs performance of European level; for achieving this desideratum are necessary change programs that can be successfully implemented only based on knowledge and an appropriate approach of the university organizational culture.*

*The purpose of this paper is to identify the cultural profile of academic organizations in Romania, aiming to determine the strengths, weaknesses, threats and opportunities for exploiting this profile in the contemporary social context, in terms of implementing organizational changes to increase academic performance.*

*The main objective of the research was to identify for the Romanian university framework of values for each cultural dimension, according to the proposed model for cultural analysis, starting from two representative models for the study of organizational culture, namely: the Fons Trompenaars model and the Geert Hofstede model.*

**Key words:** *academic performance, cultural dimensions, EU, organizational culture, university*

**JEL Classification:** *I21, I23, M14*

**I. TOOLS FOR RESEARCH THE UNIVERSITY ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE**

Theoretically, we can study the organizational culture starting from artifacts, symbols or directly observable behaviors or from elements hardly identifiable at first glance, such as basic assumptions and values. Regardless of the chosen way we can get, through logical deduction or induction methods, also to the interpretation of the other components of organizational culture, since it acts as a real system. The numerous research models of organizational culture are based on the study of values, considering them the real core of culture, core from which we can interpret concrete the other cultural elements. In the following we are going to propose such a model, but not before specifying that for a more complete analysis of organizational behavior, a model for the study of values must be completed with various other research methods that have direct impact on the directly visible substrate of culture (behavior, identification symbols, language, and so on).

In our approach we will use two structural models of values: that of Geert Hofstede – because it is the most widely used, thus providing a rich informational support, determined on empirical basis (Hofstede, G.,1980, 2001), and that of Fons Trompenaars – as it seems to be the most complete one, also including, in a much more explicit manner, sensitive issues for the contemporary society, for example orientation towards time and nature. In the following we will perform a comparative analysis, using characteristics as a reference framework.

In most structural models of values presented in the first chapter, are identified three axiological areas in which the individual can build a value system. The three area can differentiate cultures through the specific manner in which they give responses to the axiological fundamental dilemmas: interpersonal relations, considering the passage of time and the way in which the individual regards the relationship with the environment (Bibu, 2002, p. 12).

For the area of an educational organization the most important domain seems to be the one regarding interpersonal relations, the same aspect standing, in fact, also at the basis of the instructive and educational process itself.

**Table 1: Comparative presentation of the models proposed by Hofstede and Trompenaars**

Structural model of the value system		
Model/ areas and cultural dimensions	Geert Hofstede	Fons Trompenaars
	Power distance (PD) inequality between people is natural,	Universalism/ Particular (U/P) rules are the same for everyone regardless of

Interpersonal relations	those who lead have the right to impose their views	the situation/ rules must be interpreted contextually
	Uncertainty avoidance (UA) everything that is new and unknown is dangerous, must be avoided	Specific / Diffuse (S/D) roles are clearly specified according to the environment manifested at a given time and should not be mixed/ on the contrary roles are less clearly specified by the manifested by the framework at a given time
	Collectivism/ Individualism (C/I) centered on the activities of the group/ oriented on independent activities	Collectivism / Individualism (C/I) centered on the activities of the group including them/ oriented on independent activities
	Femininity / Masculinity (F/M) social roles should not be differentiated on the basis of membership to a particular gender/ roles should be clearly differentiated by gender	Neutral / Emotional (N/E) emotions cannot be expressed in public/ public expression of emotions is normal
		Assigned social status/ Achieved social status (AS/ ACS) social, status is given by a person's origin/ achieved performance assigns a person social status
Relationship with time	Long term orientation / Short term orientation it is natural to make long term plans/ long term plans are useless	Sequential time/ Synchronous time present, past and future are three separate and poorly correlated aspects of existence/ on the contrary, the past, present and future manifest simultaneously
Relationship with nature		Self orientation / Exterior orientation (SE/EO) everything depends on me. nature cannot be controlled/ control is outside me, I have to comply with the natural laws of nature

*Source: Adapted by authors after Van Vliet, V. (2015), Trompenaars Cultural Dimensions, Retrieved from ToolsHero: <https://www.toolshero.com/communication-skills/trompenaars-cultural-dimensions/>*

Even in these circumstances, to provide a more complete picture regarding the culture of the considered organizational environment we cannot neglect the other two areas, especially that in the contemporary society the relationship between men and time and the "coexistence with nature" are becoming increasingly problematic aspects.

For the area of an educational organization the most important domain seems to be the one regarding interpersonal relations, the same aspect standing, in fact, also at the basis of the instructive and educational process itself. Even in these circumstances, to provide a more complete picture regarding the culture of the considered organizational environment we cannot neglect the other two areas, especially that in the contemporary society the relationship between men and time and the "coexistence with nature" are becoming increasingly problematic aspects. These considerations require addressing all three areas, but with an emphasis on the one of interpersonal relations. The situation in question is facilitated by the two axiological models considered, because they are built so that they give themselves more space to the analysis of the problem of interpersonal relations.

In the first value domain we observe nine cultural dimensions of which five address distinct aspects of interpersonal relations, two refer to situations that are heavily interrelated and one dimension appears similar in the two models. In these conditions we consider the following architecture of the cultural dimensions of these value domains:

The collectivism/ individualism dimension we will consider as is since it appears identically in the two models. In the educational area this dimension was the most studied. In this axiological pattern, the differences in the educational environment can be observed after items such as: optimal age for learning, atmosphere for conducting classes, significance of diplomas and education, paternalistic or impartial behavior of teachers, and others.

Regarding the optimal age for learning, in collectivist societies, young people must learn often conjunctural, however, in individualistic societies is promoted lifelong learning. In collectivist cultures, students

are expected to learn what to do, in the individualistic ones they seek to learn how to do. In collectivist societies the atmosphere in which classes are conducted is one of formal harmony, in contrast, in individualistic cultures, the confrontation in learning situations can be salutary, conflicts or differences of opinions being addressed directly. Regarding the discursive relationship with the symbolic authority in the classroom: students respond when they are personally appealed in collectivist societies, but in individualistic societies, they provide an answer only when is addressed an invitation to all. Education is seen as a way of acquiring social prestige, the individual increases its chance of pertaining to high social status groups in collectivist cultures, but it is a way of ensuring material welfare and self-esteem based on competence in individualistic cultures (Cebrián, G.; Junyent, M.,2015).

The significance of diplomas is different: such as documents are considered important and exhibited in visible places for others in collectivist societies, but in individualistic societies they have a more modest symbolic value. [...] In collectivist cultures, teachers are expected to apply preferential treatment to certain students (for example, based on ethnic affiliation or at the recommendation of an influential person); while in individualistic cultures, teachers are expected to be more impartial (Gavreliuc, 2006, p. 155).

At a slightly more careful analysis we can observe that the educational aspects mentioned above with strict reference to the collectivism/ individualism pattern do not refer essentially only to this, but also to other cultural dimensions such as universalism/ particular, if we only consider the last statement "[...] in collectivist cultures, teachers are expected to apply preferential treatments to certain students [...]". This aspect suggests a strong interdependence of cultural dimensions and the fact that it would be interesting to achieve even some statistical correlations between them, starting from the data of an extensive empirical research.

To further continue our idea, we will consider the interaction between two dimensions presented distinctly in the two models, but that we believe can be combined into one, given their possible common aspects, strong interference and even diminishing their importance in the social and cultural context of the contemporary. We refer here to femininity/ masculinity and neutral/ emotional.

Primarily, we can already consider reducing the importance of the femininity/ masculinity pattern in the contemporary society, given the insertion on the labor market of women in positions inaccessible until recently. We don't consider that this weakness of the society disappeared altogether, but nobody can deny that the social aspect is no longer in 2008 at the same level of intensity that was presented in 1970/ 80, when Hofstede performed its researches and finalized its cultural analysis model. Continuing with the reasoning to the end, we can identify emotional aspects in femininity, and in masculinity we can identify neutral aspects.

In these circumstances we will call the second dimension of the complementary model neutral/ emotional, trying to grasp relevant aspects for the two sub dimensions, from now. Therefore a close to emotional score will be able to be explained as having a tendency towards tolerance to emotional expression and overlapped social roles regardless of their appurtenance to one gender or another, and a score close to neutral will be explained in an antonyms manner.

The other dimensions of the interpersonal relations' axle (power distance, uncertainty avoidance, universalism/ particular, specific/ diffuse and assigned social status/ achieved social status) we will consider them as they are, taking them as they are explained in the original models, especially that they have a direct and strong organizational impact, and we want to analyze an environment of organizational nature.

If we focus on the domain of considering the individual's relationship with time we observe two denominations and explanatory suggestions that at first sight seem to be completely distinct, but a thorough analysis reveals that they can be heavily overlapped. Thus, if the short term orientation/ long term orientation considers the present and future as temporal factors, the sequential time/ synchronous time dimension introduces in the equation also the past. In terms of observing an organizational environment we consider important the entire temporal triad, and therefore we will call the dimension of the complementary model that considers the relationship with time exactly like this, namely reporting to the time factor.

According to the last field, the relationship with nature, we have two aspects expressed by the same dimension: the actual consideration of the relationship with nature and self orientation or exterior orientation, explained from a psychological point of view through the attribution theory. In terms of organizational environment, the second aspect seems to be more important, but in the current social and economic environment we cannot neglect the first one. So we will consider this dimension exactly in the form proposed by Trompenaars and his collaborator, self orientation/ exterior orientation (Trompenaars, 1998).

Therefore, we propose the following structure of axiological model to analyze the educational organizational environment, structure that we will use in our empirical approach:

**Table 2:** Structure of the complementary analysis model of organizational values

<i>Analysis model of the value structure of academic environment</i>	
Fundamental axiological axis	Cultural and value dimension
Inter-human relations	a) Universalism/ Particular (U/P)
	b) Collectivism/ Individualism (C/I)
	c) Uncertainty avoidance (UA)
	d) Power distance (PD)
	e) Emotional/ Neutral (E/N)
	f) Specific/ Diffuse (S/D)
	g) Assigned social status/ Achieved social status (AS/ACS)
Relationship with nature	a) Reporting to the time factor
Relationship with time	a) Self orientation/ Exterior orientation (SE/EO)

*Source:* Adapted by authors after Van Vliet, V. (2015), *Trompenaars Cultural Dimensions*, Retrieved from ToolsHero: <https://www.toolshero.com/communication-skills/trompenaars-cultural-dimensions/>

Knowing, analyzing and highlighting the value structure of academic environment are indispensable both for university managers and for each individual beneficiary in the academic environment. The cultivation of strong, positive and structured models in matrix or rope networks guarantees strategic orientation indefinitely, maintaining a social climate that allows the harmonization of individual/students interests with those of the university and an appropriate dynamics to the evolutions of the factors of the competitive academic environment.

**II. THE PROPOSED OBJECTIVE AND RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

The main purpose of this research was to identify for the Romanian university framework the values for each cultural dimension, according to the proposed model for analyzing organizational culture.

Given the proposed objectives, our study involves a sampling procedure to determine the cultural profile of Romanian universities based on the questionnaire for investigating the university organizational culture.

The sample for determining the cultural profile of Romanian universities based on the questionnaire for investigating organizational culture is based on the Ranking of universities in Romania, 2012, conducted by the Executive Unit for Financing Higher Education, Research, Development and Innovation of the Ministry of National Education, (<http://uefiscdi.gov.ro/articole/2535/Clasificare-universitati-si-ierarhizare-programe-de-studii.html>)

We conducted a random sampling. The persons interviewed were those who were present the university in the day or days of the action and, of course, have agreed to participate in our study.

The actual shaping of the questionnaire was performed by answering to the following questions: "In how many universities do we apply the questionnaire?" and "To what type of university staff do we apply the questionnaire?"

The mentioned ranking presents 50 universities throughout the country. In these conditions, although we decided to use a random sample, we applied the questionnaire in seven universities, and when we chose them we considered the following criteria: geographical area in which the unit is located; profile of the university and its position in the ranking, so that we have in the sample all types of universities (classical, polytechnic or medical), from all the historical provinces of the country (Transylvania, Moldavia and Wallachia) and of every fifth of the ranking, but with emphasis on the first two to determine the culture – performance correlation.

University organizational culture has some important subcultures, of which we mention here a few: culture of teachers, culture of auxiliary personnel and culture of students. In these conditions, we are justified to apply the questionnaire to all these categories of persons, giving, however, a higher share to university teaching staff (60% teachers, 3-% auxiliary personnel and 10% students). So we followed in each university the application of 100 questionnaires, of which 66 teachers, 30 auxiliary personnel and 10 students. We decided this because it is obvious that the university teaching personnel is the most representative category of subjects for the environment in question, although we cannot neglect the importance of the other categories mentioned. We tried to keep this proportion for each university and each faculty or department, in order to fully cover the university structure in which was applied at a certain time this research instrument. So, only beyond these guidelines the construction of the sample is random.

To determine the units that have been the subject of the case studies, we considered the following criteria:

- profile of the university unit (classical, polytechnic or medical);
- positioning in the top three in that category of universities ranking;
- presence of the university among the sample units that formed the sample for determining the general culture profile.

In all phases of the study we ensured full confidentiality of responses and we followed all ethical provisions to protect the image and reputation of all units and persons surveyed.

We distributed 700 questionnaires to determine the cultural profile in seven universities, of which we recovered 667 and acknowledged as valid 645. The questionnaire used for the analysis of the cultural and value dimensions is materialized in three distinct instruments:

- questionnaire for determining the cultural and value dimensions for teachers;
- questionnaire for determining the cultural and value dimensions for auxiliary personnel;
- questionnaire for determining the cultural and value dimensions for students.

Each subject received the following instructing: "We are conducting an extensive research on the cultural aspects of the Romanian academic environment.

In this regard, please answer the following questionnaire. We specify that there are no correct or incorrect answers, we just want to find out your opinion. Please respond by referring to the university in which you operate and not a random one. We ensure confidentiality of the data. Thank you!"

Teachers and auxiliary personnel have received the questionnaire in their office and answered individually, after which we took over the questionnaire. Students responded in the classroom or seminar room, being randomly selected from different groups and from different specialties, in order to cover all the faculties of the university in which we are applying the questionnaire.

### III. PRESENTATION OF RESEARCH RESULTS

The benchmark of the research was to identify the values for each cultural dimension for the Romanian academic framework, and the results were obtained depending on the formulated working hypotheses.

The working hypothesis a) formulated was: the architecture of cultural and value dimensions of the Romanian academic framework present the following values:

- a) great power distance;
- b) high uncertainty avoidance;
- c) tendency towards particular;
- d) an average score to the collectivism/ individualism pattern;
- e) moderately to neutral tendency;
- f) emphasized specific character;
- g) tendency towards attributed social status;
- h) currently reporting to the time factor;
- i) exterior orientation.

**Table 3: Score of cultural dimensions to the entire sample compared to the theoretically possible**

<i>Cultural dimension</i>	<i>Maximum</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Minimum</i>	<i>Cultural dimension</i>	<i>General cultural profile</i>
Universalism	42	21	6	Particular	24.55
Collectivism/individualism	35	18	5	Individualism	20.23
Uncertainty avoidance	28	14	4	Uncertainty avoidance	15.83
Power distance	42	21	6	Power distance	22.63
Neutral	28	14	4	Emotional	13.76
Specific	42	21	14	Diffuse	20.88
Assigned social status	28	14	6	Achieved social status	12.35
Reporting to the time factor	42	21	14	Reporting to the time factor	21.12
Self orientation	42	14	6	Exterior orientation	16.19

*Source: Results obtained by authors after data processing*

Table 3 presents “*The general cultural profile of the Romanian university space*”, profile developed on the basis of the 645 valid questionnaires. To facilitate the observation of cultural trends of the sample, the table displays the score of the general profile in parallel with the possible theoretical scores for each cultural dimension.

Judging these theoretical parameters of the research data reveals the following general cultural profile for the Romanian university space:

- strong tendency towards universalism, here we also identify the highest score achieved;
- strong tendency towards collectivism;

- a certain tendency beyond average in uncertainty avoidance, but not so high as we expected it to be;
- sensitive tendency towards great power distance;
- neutral-emotional dimension is almost perfectly within the average;
- specific-diffuse cultural parameter is almost perfect within average;
- a slight inclination towards the achieved social status, but relatively close to the average;
- almost perfect framing in the theoretical average to the reporting to the time factor dimension, which suggests a balanced approach to the time factor with relative focus on the present;
- the sample seems self-oriented, the score presents a rather high tendency in this direction.

As we can observe, all nine cultural dimensions present scores corresponding to tendencies towards a certain cultural pattern or another, and not decisive guidance towards in a certain direction. The deviations from the average, calculated arithmetically, oscillate between (-0.24) in the neutral/ emotional dimension and (+3.55) in the universalism/ particular dimension. This aspect of the general cultural profile of the Romanian university space may suggest that Romanian universities have a still poorly defined organizational culture, a culture still developing. In these conditions, the determined framework confirms our assumptions launched since the argumentation stage of the study, where we stated that the Romanian universities do not have a well-defined organizational culture and that this should be a concern and priority development direction of universities to build a strong academic brand.

In these conditions, we can observe the confirmation of hypothesis a) that supported a high distance to power. This aspect is supported by a series of statements collected by the qualitative questionnaire on myths, statements like: "university environment is humiliating for young people", "many bosses, few people who work" and others.

*Hypothesis b)* is confirmed, the relevant score presents a tendency beyond the average in uncertainty avoidance. This score which does not express high uncertainty avoidance may be justified by the dynamic character and openness to new and innovation implied through excellence by the academic environment and the university teaching career. This statement can be supported also by the qualitative aspects revealed by our study, where we frequently find statements such as: "a university teacher is a person open to new things, always informed and looking for innovations".

Regarding *hypothesis c)* which states a tendency towards particular, we must declare its clearly invalidity, the corresponding score indicating a major universalist trend in the entire sample studied. Such a tendency is also revealed by some statements concerning the evaluation activity of university teachers: "to be impartial". "not discriminate", "to give the same attention to all students". On the other hand, the fact that in the questionnaires answered by students are found numerous statements that refer to the biased attitudes of the teacher raises us a warning signal: "is it possible that what we identified through the questionnaire is only a creed/ a desideratum and not a common practice in the contemporary Romanian university?" This aspect remains an element of meditation that could lead to the reformulation of some items of our instrument.

*Hypothesis d)*, regarding the collectivism/ individualism pattern brings us a new invalidation. Our statement that there would be a central tendency is contradicted by the score given by the sample, which presents a definite collectivist tendency. The analysis of this hypothesis from the perspective of the three subgroups of the sample (teachers, auxiliary personnel and students) reveals that the introduction of a group of students in the sample changes the data in this direction, as the other two groups present indeed a score relatively close to average, with standard deviations of (-.02) in the group of teachers and (-.06) in the group of auxiliary personnel. The students' group presents a standard deviation of (+.18).

*Hypothesis e)* which stated a moderate towards neutral tendency is invalidated, here presenting an average value of the scale. A similar aspect is presented even in *hypothesis f)*, where we anticipate an emphasized specific character and where the relative score is the average one of the scale.

Initially we tended to believe that these values of the dimensions discussed (neutral/ emotional and specific/ diffuse) are due to the higher number of female subjects in our sample, normal aspect for the university environment. Nevertheless, this explanation seems to be infirmed statistically because by calculating the standard deviation for the two categories of subjects we obtain statistically insignificant scores, as follows: in the neutral/ emotional dimension the deviation is of (+11) from a standard deviation in favor of the group of masculine subjects (hence men are more neutral, their neutrality degree is not statistically significant compared to women), and in the specific/ diffuse dimension the deviation is of (+.01) of a standard deviation in favor of the feminine group, being really irrelevant in order to consider the feminine group significantly more diffuse than the masculine one.

The analysis of *hypothesis g)* - tendency towards attributed social status, reveals another invalidation of our initial reasoning. The score indicated by our study for this cultural dimension indicates a slight attitude towards the appreciation of an achieved social status. This score can be explained by the current social trend,

where on the labor market is more important first what you can do and after what diploma you have, as well as the specific of the university environment focused, at least theoretically, on achievements and individual performances.

As we observed from the tables above, *hypothesis h*) - reporting towards present and time factor is confirmed by the almost average score reported by our study (21.12 compared to the average of 21). Such situation is also supported by a series of statements revealed by the questionnaire for investigating myths that might be corroborated with the one investigating cultural dimensions as a qualitative instrument: "we do not have a coherent long term strategy", "lack of ability to achieve effective long term strategies" and others.

*Hypothesis i*) that specifies self orientation is confirmed. The score of this dimension, relatively high (+2.19 from the average), as well as the statements collected by the qualitative part of the questionnaire stating that the elitist character and success of people from the university environment fully justify this tendency: "an elitist environments in a mediocre society", "an oasis of culture in an increasingly mercantilist society", "a university teacher is a successful man, a scientist, a real professional in a field of knowledge".

#### IV. CONCLUSIONS

The study of an organization's culture allows the identification of the way of thinking, the manifested and desirable behaviors, and employees' needs and requirements, which constitutes a major prerequisite for the foundation, development, shaping and implementing appropriate policies and management strategies. In such cases, within the organization is formed and manifested a positive emotional climate which corroborates the interests of the employees with those of the organization (Bílková D., 2015).

Knowing the organization's culture, managers can anticipate the degree of success of strategies designed for the organization's development. Similarly they can develop support strategies and policies adequate to that organization's culture and environment.

We found that, from this point of view, in Romanian universities, probably due to the "great power distance", new policies and organizational strategies are always accepted without an explicit position of academics, even if the personnel agrees with them or not and even if informally are often clamors.

The cultural audit of the organization can reveal the real and the fictional elements of an university organization. We can think here at heroes, myths and organizational habits, but more importantly before this is how the whole culture of the organization suggests managers to develop messages and to transmit them to employees, as well as the way in which the latter decode those messages and comply to them. A study of organizational culture can reveal the extent to which the perception of employees on a number of organizational elements is consistent or not with the managerial vision, thus identifying any organizational dysfunctions. "Thus is attempted a separation of facts from the elements interpreted through some interests that do not coincide with those of the organization" (Năstase, 2004, p. 167).

Unfortunately, our observations reveal that the management of Romanian universities is not concerned with how these real or fictional elements are present in the consciousness and behavior of employees. We assume that this somewhat autocratic attitude regarding employees is due to the correct perception of managers in respect of "great power distance", distance considered by most of them as natural given their status in the organization, strengthen, in most cases by a high class scientific, professional and managerial training. And yet, perhaps precisely this training would not allow such negligence.

The cultural analysis of a university organization can be a major prerequisite for improving intra-organizational and inter-organizational communication. Communication inside and outside the organization is one of the key factors for its operation. The ensemble of symbols, myths, heroes, basic assumptions in which the organization substantiates its existence facilitates or not the internal and external informational flow. In this reference framework of organizational culture some information are considered priorities, others take second place, others are distorted, and others are even ignored. Therefore it is necessary to use the channel, the most appropriate way of communication, so that managers' decisions to be received by executives unaltered and in time, achieving the purpose for which they were formulated.

Knowing organizational culture can suggest modalities to also implement organizational change programs. Cultural audit allows us not only to identify what changes are needed in the organization, and how they should be projected, but also the methodology for their effective implementation.

By correctly identifying how past experiences of employees and cultural elements of the organization build the attitudes and behaviors of the university organization's employees, can anticipate their reactions to various changes that will be required within the organization, the degree in which these attitudes and behaviors can prove to be a factor of support or breaking for change. It is known that if organizational change is not also seen as a cultural change in most cases fails.

If we consider the academic environment from our country we observe the imposition of changes on a vertical trajectory with a dominant direction from top to bottom, often without personnel training, just by simply imposing. If, in these circumstances, there were also cases in which organizational changes have not failed, sometimes fundamental changes, perhaps we can attribute their success to specific cultural aspects of "great power distance" in the Romanian university, which translates into a great respect for the superior and unconditional acceptance of its decisions. Even in these conditions, which favor somewhat the authoritarian implementation of changes, we are convinced that explaining the problems imposed by them, displaying a set of pro-change arguments by agents of change embodied in individuals with reputation and social status recognized by the academic community, would be a strategy that could greatly increase the understanding, acceptance and implementation of change. Doing so might prevent ubiquitous expressions.

The contemporary social and economic environment is extremely dynamic and competitive, conditions in which the competitive advantage in the market regarding competing organizations is an extremely important aspect for achieving the managerial objectives on medium and long term. After the Revolution of December 1989, in our country is felt the presence of such competitions not only economically, but also in education, especially at university level. The emergence of private universities, the introduction of educational fees in state universities, and, more recently, the competition imposed by foreign universities are factors that favor competition between universities.

## V. REFERENCES

1. Bibu, N. A. (2002). *Compared management – an intercultural approach, a modern approach*. Timișoara: Mirton Press.
2. Bibu, N. A. (2002). *Performance, depending on effectiveness and efficiency*. In I. Dănăiață, N.A. Bibu, & M. Predișcan, Management – theoretical bases. Timișoara: Mirton Press.
3. Bílková Diana (2015), *Financial Position of Czech Employees at the Beginning of the 3rd Millennium according to Educational Attainment* in Prague Economic Papers Vol. 24 No. 3, 2015, <https://www.vse.cz/pep/521?lang=en>
4. Bologna Process Implementation Reports 2012. Retrieved from Conference of the European Ministers of Education, [http://media.ehea.info/file/2012\\_Bucharest/79/5/Bologna\\_Process\\_Implementation\\_Report\\_607795.pdf](http://media.ehea.info/file/2012_Bucharest/79/5/Bologna_Process_Implementation_Report_607795.pdf)
5. Cebrián, G.; Junyent, M.(2015), *Competencies in Education for Sustainable Development: Exploring the Student Teachers' Views*. Sustainability 2015, 7, 2768–2786, <http://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/7/3/2768>
6. Fulge, T.; Bieber, T.; Martens, K. (2016), *Rational Intentions and Unintended Consequences: On the Interplay between International and National Actors in Education Policy*. In The Handbook of Global Education Policy; Mundy, K.E., Green, A., Lingard, B., Verger, A., Eds.; John Wiley & Sons: Malden, MA, USA, 2016; pp. 453–469.
7. Gavreluc, A. (2006), *Intercultural psychology – impact of cultural determinations on psychological phenomena*, Timișoara: West University Press
8. Hofstede, G. (1980, 2001), *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions and Organizations across Nations*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications
9. Isaic Maniu Al., Herteliu C. (2007), *A comparative look on the number of graduates from the technical and economical field. Statistics in the space of solutions*, Bucharest: ASE Publishing House
10. Korka M. (2002), *Romanian universities before integration into the European higher education*, Paideia Publishing House
11. List of Romanian universities 2012 (2013), Retrieved from Ministry of Education, Research and Youth and Sports website: [www.edu.ro](http://www.edu.ro)
12. Madsen, K.(2013), *Unfolding Education for Sustainable Development as Didactic Thinking and Practice*. Sustainability 2013, 5, 3771–3782, <http://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/5/9/3771>
13. Năstase, M. (2007), *Leaders, leadership and knowledge based organization*, Bucharest: ASE Publishing.
14. Năstase, M. (2004), *Organizational and managerial culture*, Bucharest: ASE Publishing.
15. Nicolescu L.(2002) - *Reforming Higher Education in Romania*. European Journal of Education 37, 1
16. Nicolescu O. (2007) *University Strategy: methodology and case studies*, Economic PublishingHouse, Bucharest, ISBN- 978-973-709-356-1
17. Organizational cultures in Romanian schools 2012, Retrieved from Institute of Education Sciences (IES) website: <https://www.ise.ro>
18. Phusavat K., Chansa-ngavej C.(2007) - *The role of university classification on developing standards in education*. International Journal of Management in Education 1, 4, 318 – 334
19. Ranking universities in Romania 2012 (Retrieved from Executive Unit for Financing Higher Education, Research, Development and Innovation website: <http://uefiscdi.gov.ro/articole/2535/Clasificare-universitati-si-ierarhizare-programe-de-studii.html>
20. Strat V. A. (2010), *Quality in terms of cost efficiency - a comparison between the classical method of data collection and the use of Internet-based method*. Romanian Statistical Magazine, 6, ISSN 1844-7694
21. Strat V. A. (2010), *Higher education in statistics*, Academy of Economic Studies Bucharest. The 5th International Conference on Applied Statistics - ICAS5, ISSN 2069-2498
22. Strat V. A. , Danciu A. R., (2011), *Considerations regarding market research in higher education -Seeking in using online sampling methods*. IBIMA 17th Conference proceedings, ISBN 978-0-9821489-6-9
23. Trompenaars, F. & Hampden-Turner, C. (1998), *Riding the waves of culture*. McGraw-Hill
24. Smith, P. B., Dugan, S. & Trompenaars, F. (1996), *National culture and the values of organizational employees a dimensional analysis across 43 nations*. Journal of cross-cultural psychology, 27(2), 231-264
25. Smith, P. B., Trompenaars, F. & Dugan, S. (1995). *The Rotter locus of control scale in 43 countries: A test of cultural relativity*. International Journal of Psychology, 30(3), 377-400.
26. Tilbury, D.; Wortman, D. (2012), *How is Community Education Contributing to Sustainability in Practice?* Appl. Environ. Educ. Commun. 2008, 7, 83–93, <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/15330150802502171>
27. Trends in Higher Education 2012. Retrieved from European University Association website: <https://www.eua.be>



28. Vasile Alecsandru, Danciu Aniela (2013), *The Higher Education System in Romania: -Past - Present – Future* in *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Volume 93, 21 October 2013, p. 859-863, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.09.293>
29. Van Vliet, V. (2015). *Trompenaars Cultural Dimensions*. Retrieved from ToolsHero: <https://www.toolshero.com/communication-skills/trompenaars-cultural-dimensions/>