

PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT IN ROMANIAN LOCAL PUBLIC ORGANIZATION - AN EXPLORATORY ANALYSIS OF PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT SYSTEMS

<https://doi.org/10.47743/jopafl-2021-19-05>

Horia Mihai RABOCA

Department of Public Administration and Management,
Faculty of Political, Administrative and Communication Sciences,
Babeş-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca, Romania
raboca@fspac.ro

Abstract: *The purpose of the article is to reveal several aspects related to the main characteristics of organizational performance measurement in Romanian local public organizations and to highlight an exploratory imagine of performance measurement systems (PMS) for this institutions. Based on a sociological survey, involving a total of 90 local organization (local and territorial public institutions) from the North-West of Romania (survey covering the main local institutions within six counties from north-west of Romania), the conclusions of the article revealed the low usage level of PMS in these institutions, a limited interest manifestation by the key stakeholders. The conclusions of the article argues that performance measurement systems is still not regarded as a useful managerial tool in Romanian local public organizations, although performance measurement is a great opportunity for resources allocation, budget construction or motivating employees. The local government does not take into account these benefits and continue to provide services without counting its effectiveness. Reasons for these aspects, practical contribution of the research and future perspectives are also discussed*

Keywords *performance measurement, managerial tool, stakeholders, local public institutions, exploratory research*

Introduction

For several decades in public administration (central or local institutions) it can be noticed a strong interest towards implementing and using performance measurement systems (PMS), which (according to many experts) represent the foundation of increasing effectiveness and responsibility both for civil servants as well as for public institutions. Therefore, we can expect that the performance measurement, subsequently, the implementation of PMS is a major concern for managers and employees of public institutions (civil servants), foremost, for the elected political officials, citizens and mass-media. However, there are many institutions or public organizations that do not use this type of measurement, sometimes due to justified reasons or not (De Julnes & Holzer, 2001). In this respect, theoretical and practical studies alarmingly highlight two aspects of performance measurement in public institutions:

1. On the one hand, there is still a lack of concern and interest from public institutions in using and implementing the performance measurement systems;
2. On the other hand, implementing performance measurement systems, or even measuring the actual performance, where it exists, is done improperly, without interest and support form officials or managers of the institutions – this latter situation is putting the public institution in a state of confusion, upheaval and frustration.

Thus, paradoxically, in many public institutions (local or central), we are dealing with a PMS that do not contribute to the improvement of the institution's features – the improvement of service quality and/or increase efficiency and effectiveness of internal processes, a better distribution of budgetary funds, respectively, a more rational spending of public money. In fact, Meyer (2002), note that performance measurement rarely lives up to the expectations. From his point of view, the measurement systems become overwhelmed by a multitude of indicators, aspect which will eventually lead these systems to lose their ability to clearly highlight the performance level of the institution (the moderate from the high one). On the other hand, some studies have shown that the implementation of PMS, in some public organizations cases, is used only to meet regulatory requirements and tends to have a rather symbolic dimension, with no substantial impact on internal operations (Cavalluzzo, & Ittner, 2004, Raboca, 2015).

Regarding the use of PMS, some studies have highlighted that both the technical knowledge regarding the measurement of performances (acquired formally or informally) and the commitment of managers have a major impact on the level of use (Akbar at. al.). The purpose of the article is to examining, evaluating and analysing the different aspects related to the main characteristics of PMS in Romanian 'local government' (some of the institution from the local and territorial public administration level: (1) municipalities and town hall, (2) communes hall, (3) county councils, (4) prefectures, (5) general county public finance directorates and (6) labour and social protection directorates). In fact, the goals and objectives of the research are to highlight and elaborate an overview of performance measurement in local public organizations from Romania (the local and territorial public administration level). More precisely based on some undertaken research, the present paper will attempt to highlight:

I. The level of interest manifested by the key actors in implementing performance measurement systems (PMS). In general, local government can identify many categories of stakeholders in implementing PSM, namely: (1) heads of local public institutions; (2) heads of departments; (3) institution employees; (4) central institutions; (5) citizens (members of the local community); (6) representatives of the media; (7) businessmen and private companies;

II. The main purposes why the PMS are implemented in local public institutions;

IV. The main features of PMS (performance measurement) of local public organizations

The importance of performance measurement for public institutions

Speaking of performance measurement systems in public institutions, Robert D. Behn (2003), considers that at nowadays, due to the awareness of performance system importance for public institutions on one side, but also due to the pressure, unrest and discontent from citizens and the media, on the other side, regarding the ineffectiveness of public institutions, implementing performance measurement systems in public institutions, is the „hot topic for the governments”.

Also of interest is to ask which are the grounds and reasons for leaders and managers of public institutions (as well as employees) to measure, monitor and report institution's performance. What benefits could performance measurement bring upon local institutions? Why are the elected officials, citizens, but also the media so interested in implementing performance measurement systems in public institutions?

After all, performance measurement does not represent a value in itself, the importance and value occurs when these types of measurements are being used in a certain way, more precisely, in achieving and accomplishing certain goals and objectives. If in the private sector, the implementation of this kind of performance measurement system is useful, being considered by many experts a form and a way to survive to the external environment, could this be considered valid also for local governments? The fact that private managers, in a greater or lower extent, measure and monitor their organizations' performance, can it be considered as a strong argument for implementing a performance measurement system in public institutions?

Indisputable, most experts agree that performance measurement systems can be considered, explicitly or implicitly, managerial tools for: increasing accountability, improving organization' performances, increasing efficiency and effectiveness in delivering services (Poister 2003; Berman & Wang, 2000; Newcomer, 1997; Wholey 1999; Wholey, 2010; Nicholson-Crotty et al., 2006; Marchand & Raymond, 2008, Moxham, 2009; Kloby & Callahan, 2009; Padovani, et al., 2010; Halachmi & Holzer, 2010).

In their studies, Kopczynski and Lombardo (1999) believe that performance measurement can be used by managers mainly for: (1) recognition of high performance; (2) identification of objectives and performance targets; (3) comparison between institutions in terms of performance results, accountability, building partnership and trust. Instead, related to the reason of using performance measurement in public institutions, Behn R. D. (2003) believes that this type of measurement can serve diverse purposes based on their interests, both elected officials and citizens or even managers and civil servants. Thus, from his point of view, using performance measurement in public institutions serves primarily for managerial goals, which are illustrated as questions in in the table below (Table 1).

Table 1 The eight managerial purposes of performance measurement

Intended purpose of using performance measurement	Type of question that performance measurement can find an answer
Evaluation	How well do public institutions function and work?
Control	How can I ensure that my subordinates are working as they should?
Budget	On what should a public institution spend its money?
Motivation	How should I motivate subordinates to work on a certain standard of quality and performance?
Promotion	How can I convince decision-makers –politicians, government, media, that the institution accomplishes its tasks?
Celebration	What achievements deserve to be included in the organizational rituals in order to celebrate success?
Learning	What are the issues that can be seen as negative and which are the causes and teachings that can be drawn to be avoided in the future?
Improvement	What should be done differently to improve performance?

Source: Behn, Robert D., 2003: 588

As well, the specialist Harry P. Hatry (2006) also believes that performance measurement is crucial especially in public management. In this regard, he considers that the managers of public institutions could use performance measurement information, helping them directly for the following activities:

1. Responding to the citizens and elected officials 'requests and inquires on the assumptions of institution's responsibilities;
2. Efficient budget construction and expenditure justification;
3. Allocation of resources throughout the year;
4. Detailed examination of performance issues and alternatives to correct them;
5. Employees motivation;

Therewith, in research related to measuring performance of municipalities of Canada, Rail Pollanen (2005), points out that these measurements are used more for internal purposes such as: (1) decision - making process regarding project management; (2) resource allocation and budget construction; (3) checking how to achieve the objectives and performance target (or performance standards); (4) reporting to the elected officials or hierarchical superior body.

Last but not least, should be noted that after some experts, (Michael J. & Mucha, 2010) the main goal of the performance measurement is to highlight the comparative performance results of various public institutions (benchmarking analysis), while other authors (Carassus et al., 2012; Carassus et al., 2014) consider that the adoption of performance-oriented management by local public organizations is a great challenge for them and a major factor of change and behavioural transformation, values and way of internal and external interaction and communication, enabling the organization to meet the challenges of the turbulence and tensions of specific environment which characterize the current public sector.

However, in terms of PMS within local public institutions in Romania so far there are 2 major approaches (legislative concerns). Thus, from a legal point of view, a first approach aims to focus the efforts of public authorities on determining sets of performance indicators based on which to identify the financial performance of local authorities (Moldovan B., 2014; Oprea, F., 2013). The second approach focuses on the development and implementation of tools related to quality management in order to increase the quality of services provided (Raboca et al., 2017). In this sense, we must mention the initiative of the Romanian government (Ministry of Regional Development and Public Administration) to carry out projects, financed from European funds, which aim to develop quality management in public institutions, respectively the development of specific methodologies for monitoring and integrated evaluation of public services in Romania.

Research methodology

From a methodological point of view, analysing and evaluating issues related to PMS in local public organizations, was made through a sociological survey, involving a total of 90 local institutions from the North-West of Romania (survey covering the main local organizations within 6 counties from north-west of Romania). In terms of criteria based on which public institutions were selected for the interview, we opted to use a complex sampling scheme (table 2).

Table 2. The sampling scheme

Item no.	Institution type	The sampling scheme (number of institutions)
1	City Hall	Municipalities in the first three cities from counties (18)

2	Town Hall	The main 2 Town Halls from counties (12)
3	Communes Hall	Communes Hall from counties with a random statistical step of 4 (36)
4	Prefectures	Prefectures from the 6 counties (6)
5	County Councils	County Councils within the 6 counties (6)
6	General County Public Finance Directorates (de-concentrated entities)	General County Public Finances Directorates within the 6 counties (6)
7	Labor and Social Protection Directorates (de-concentrated entities)	Labor and Social Protection Directorates within the 6 counties (6)

Furthermore, to each institution has been sent a different number of questionnaires. The allocation of questionnaires has been done as follows: Number of organizational departments x 2 questionnaires. Thereby, each department has been assigned 2 questionnaires. One of these has been filled out by the head of the department, and the other one, by an employee of the department who fulfills several conditions such as: seniority, education, and has the birth date closest to May 1. Lastly, should be noted that, the total number of respondents is (all those interviewed and considered for data analysis is) 1300 (the response rate was 70.2% of total sent questionnaires – 1852). The level of non-responses was 29, 8%, meaning 553 questionnaires. The questionnaires were sent by post, between December (2019) - March (2020), addressed to head of institutions and public relations departments. From the total of 1300 respondents, 586 were male and 714 were female. University studies reflects the educational level of respondents, which occupies executive positions –872 respondents and leading positions – 428 respondents.

Analysis and data processing

The main stakeholders interested in implementing performance measurement systems (PMS) in local public organizations

In terms of stakeholders using PMS, the survey data reveals that only respondents that are in leading positions (the heads of local public administration, departments) are clearly interested in implementing such systems (Table 1.3). In order to analyse this aspect we used a Likert scale (5 measuring level scale).

Table 3 The main stakeholders interested in performance measurement systems

Dimension/Question	Responses' mean (scale 1-5) (1- not at all interested, 5- totally interested)
1. Leading positions respondents (head of institutions, institutions leaders)	4.19
2. Heads of local institutions departments	3.08
3. Executive civil servants	3.06
4. Central public institutions (ministries or hierarchical superior forum of the institution)	2.90
5. Citizens (members of the local community)	2.85
6. Representatives of the media	2.18
6. Businessmen and private companies	2.08

Instead, the least interested in the implementation of PMS are business people and private companies and media representatives, even central public institutions and citizens (members of the local community) are not quite interested in such implementation. Somehow disappointing, regarding civil servants, is that not all civil servants categories are quite interested in PMS. In this sense, “executive civil servants” and “heads of departments” seem to be not very interested in the implementation of PMS (taking into consideration that 3 – represents neither interested nor disinterested).

From certain points of view, it was expected that heads of local public organizations to be interested in implementing performance measurement systems, respectively, to have concerns focused towards monitoring and measuring performance. But on the other hand, giving that just only heads of local public institutions are seriously interested in implementing PMS, it drastically reduces the benefits and impact that these systems may have. After all, the more categories of stakeholders are interested in PMS, the greater are the impact and benefits of these systems.

Main reasons why performance measurement systems are implemented in local government

To analyse and explore the reasons for which PMS are used, we used two different statistical methods, namely: univariate statistical methods (statistical mean analysis) and multivariable statistical methods (multivariable linear regression equation).

On the other hand, to identify the main purposes of using performance measurement systems in local public organizations we looked, (in fact), to what extent these type of systems are use a number of 11 activities (Table 4), activities that are thought to be relevant and important for managerial activity in a public institution. In fact, by analysing the purposes why performance measurement systems are used, we wanted to see to what extent those are built as managerial tools.

Table 4 Main reasons why performance measurement systems are implemented in local government

Item no.	Question/Dimension: “Measuring/ reporting performance in your organization is used to...?”	Answers mean (1 – totally against, 5-totally agree)
1	Statistical reporting purposes (reports required by the hierarchical superior forum of the institution)	3,57
2	Improving quality of provided service	3,29
3	Improve decision making	3,12
4	Efficient problem solving of citizen’s needs	2,99
5	Setting objectives and priorities for the institution	2,98
6	Increased responsibilities for the mayor and officials	2,95
7	Improving institution’s image among citizens	2,90
8	Motivate employees	2,73
9	Comparing performance with similar organizations (benchmarking)	2,59
10	Efficient resource spending	2,45
11	Budget construction	2,41

Thus, using the univariate analysis, the survey data (analysed using mean of answers) shows that PMS are not used as real managerial tools, and is not a major concern for local government. In this respect, the results showed that PMS doesn't serve much and real to develop or efficiency internal processes or activities in the institution (answers 'mean ranges between 2, 41 and 3, 57).

Based on the results from the survey, we can assert that PMS are mainly used by local public institutions for:

- (1) Statistical reporting purposes;
- (2) Improving quality of provided service;
- (3) Improve decision making.

By contrast, local public institutions use less performance measurement systems for the following activities:

- (1) Budget construction;
- (2) Comparing performance with similar organizations;
- (3) Efficient resource spending;
- (4) Motivate employees.

In general, the image about the main purposes of using PMS is somewhat disappointing. We do not say that local public institutions do not use PMS or is not use for different purposes, but the scores obtained are extremely disappointing. In this respect, it is clearly visible that local public institutions have some concern for using the PMS in different purposes, such as improving decision-making or quality of service (although here the scores are relatively mediocre), but in the same time it is clear that there are a number of economic activities such as budgeting and or efficient resource spending, where these institutions do not use these systems. After all, the power and serious impact of PMS does not necessarily reside in the fact that it is used only in a certain field or activity but also in using cumulatively in a wide range of fields and activities. The reason why performance measurement in local institutional from Romania doesn't take into account resources allocation, budget construction or motivating employees could be a political one. If we think at budget construction inside a Local Council or County Council we can identify that the budget is made politically, being voted by the political majority inside that Council, without taking into consideration financial management scenarios or rely on a capital investment plan.

The second analysis implies a multivariate statistical analysis like multivariable linear regression equation (tables 5 and table 6). We used the statistical analysis of multivariable linear regression equation to understand and quantify the relationship between one continuous dependent variable (or criterion – in our case how PMS is used) and two or more independent variables (or predictors - in our case the main activities where PMS is used). We basically wants to see if there are differences between the way PMS is used by heads of local public institutions comparative with heads of departments in these institutions. With other words, we highlight the main objectives of performance measurement systems used by institution managers, namely: heads of the institution and heads of departments.

Table 5 Main purposes for which performance measurement systems are used by leaders of local public institutions

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients				
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.		
(Constant)		1,638	,229		7,15	,000		
Improve decision making		,301	,060	,279	5,03	,000		
Statistical reporting purposes		,128	,043	,126	2,95	,003		
Improving quality of provided service		,069	,060	,063	1,14	,052		
a. Dependent Variable: Measuring/ reporting performance in your organization is used by top management (institution managers)								
R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
,650	,422	,402	,81311	R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
				,422	30.329	4	479	,000

Therefore, regarding the use of performance measurement systems (PMS) by leaders of public institutions, data analysis results (Table 1.5) indicates two aspects:

(1) First, it is confirmed that measurement performance systems are partially managerial tools designed to increase efficiency and effectiveness of management activity in the hierarchy of public institutions;

(2) Second, the main activities that are used/employed by local public institution' leaders are those related to:

- (1) Improve decision making;
- (2) Statistical reporting purposes;
- (3) Improving quality of provided service.

Note that the power of explanation of the model is not very high (R^2 is relatively small).

Table 6 Main purposes for which performance measurement systems are used by heads of departments of local public institution

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients				
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.		
(Constant)		2,128	,190		11,21	,000		
Improve decision making		,287	,049	,255	5,84	,000		
Improving quality of provided service		,177	,043	,180	4,12	,000		
a. Dependent Variable: Measuring/Reporting performance in your organization is used by heads of departments (departments and offices)								
R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
,720	,518	,509	,86828	R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
				,518	45.546	2	568	,000

In terms of departments' heads of local public institutions, data analysis equation indicates that they use performance measurement systems in two main managerial activities, namely (Table 1.6):

- (1) Improve decision making;
- (2) Improving quality of provided service

From the point of view of this second statistical analysis, on the one hand, it is very clear that the heads of public institutions use much more PMS compared to heads of departments. On the other hand, although PMS are not being used to the real potential by heads of local public institutions or heads of departments, second statistical analysis clearly shows that in the local public institutions the management (leaders of public institutions from different hierarchical levels) used such system in 2 main direction namely: improving their decision making and quality of provided service - which is an encouraging aspect

Last but not least, the results of the second statistical analysis reveal that performance measurement systems (PMS) are still not used by the management of the local public institution (not only by the heads of institutions but also by the heads of department) to motivate their own civil servants. We consider this to be a discouraging and alarming aspect in the sense that this thing may create a serious problem with the proper implementation and use of these systems. Practically when civil servants do not clearly identify what benefits they have as a result of implementing PMS, for instance to be motivated and rewarded depending on the recorded levels of performance, they tend to feel "legitimate" to sabotage the implementation and use process of these systems. Obviously, in this case, not only the implementation process but also the process of using PMS will be considered by all civil servants (especially executives) as just another bureaucratic and routine task, which was received from "somewhere higher" and therefore not worth to be fully embraced and act in an appropriate manner. The reason or possible explanation why performance measurement in local institutional from Romania doesn't motivate could be also a political one. Here we refer to the fact that in many cases the access and allocation of resources of the local public institutions is made on political and discretionary criteria and not on the analysis of the degree of their performance. Obviously, when the access and resource allocation are made on political criteria and not on performance criteria the motivation of employees is done not on performance criteria but on political criteria.

Main features of performance measurement systems in local public institutions

In order to identify the main features of PMS of Romania local public institutions, we started from a set of 9 statements (which correspond to 9 dimensions/aspects – items) that we consider relevant and important to characterizing a performance measurement system (Table 7). In other words, we wanted to see how well PMS of local public institutions can be characterized through the 9 statements (dimensions) that are relevant to describing these systems. In same time, in order to highlight the main features of performance measurement systems, we used a univariate analysis (statistical mean analysis) and a Likert-type scale (5 measuring level scale) concerning this 9 statements (Table 7).

Table 7. Main dimensions that describe the performance measurement systems (PMS) implemented in Romanian local government

Question/Dimension: “To what extent do you agree with the following statements related to performance measurement of the institution?”	Answers mean (1-totally against, 5-totally agree)
Performance measures reflects the overall objectives that we have to fulfill	3.92
Performance measurements are mainly based on financial indicators	3.84
Performance measurements accurately and precisely reflects the performance of the institution	3.05
The performance results of the institution are reported and presented annually to the public (using reporting, posting on the institution's website, organizing public meetings)	3.02
Performance measurement focuses on what is important to be measured not on ease of obtaining data	2.90
Performance measurement includes customer satisfaction as an indicator	2.60
Performance measurement is performed frequently and continuously	2.51
We use similar measurements for comparing department's performance	2.32
Performance measurements are based on non - financial indicators	2.21

Analysis results of the 9 issues deemed relevant to characterize the PMS in local public institutions, reveals a fairly contradictory and complex image. Hence, based on the results we can state the following:

1. First, performance measurement systems, although they tend to reflect the objectives needed to be fulfilled, do not always accurately reflect the performance of local public institutions. In this respect, the results indicate that performance measurement systems, by measurements, reflect the way of accomplishing general objectives set by the institution, although it does not very much accurately reflect the performance of the institution and is not performed frequently and continuously. In same time not always the reporting of the performances of the local institutions that is annually brought to the attention of the public;
2. Secondly, performance measurements are still concentrating on financial and the fiscal perspective and less focus on non-financial aspects (like customer satisfaction). Thus, local public administration is clearly most focus more on evaluating institutional performance through financial evaluation and not non-financial indicators;
- 3.. Thirdly, local public institutions performance measurements are not taking very serious into consideration customer satisfaction as a performance indicator – an important aspect that reflects, from some point of view, the deficiency regarding the concern for the client need – the citizen, and points out the shortcoming of the good direction for the development of performance measurements;
4. On the fourth, the analysis results revealed that performance measurement systems (PMS) clearly isn't use for comparing department's performance, and definitely are not based on non - financial indicators. On the other hand, there is a clear tendency among local public institutions to measure performance based on the ease of obtaining data and not on what is important to measure.

Final remarks

The exploratory research about the local Romanian public institutions performance measurement reveals an ambiguous and complex picture concerning these measurements. From some points of view, this picture reveals that performance measurement as a concept is poorly conceptualized in local public institutions in Romania, although the use of performance measurement systems (PMS) is clearly visible.

In that sense, research findings reveal, first of all, that performance measurement for Romanian local public institutions are not, at least until now, a major concern. In this respect, many local institutions still not use frequently on a routine basis performance measurements. From certain points of view, this situation in Romanian local institutions, validates the existing trend in some countries which is highlighted by Poisert and Sreib (1999) and Pollanen (2005), regarding the widespread of non-using performance measurements in public institutions.

Secondly, research results show that a small group of local public institution key stakeholders are actually interested in performance measurement. Consequently, only the heads of local public institutions are interested in actual implementation and use of performance measurement systems, although we expect other key stakeholders to be interested in performance measurement, respectively in performance measurement systems. In this respect, citizens, media representatives and business people are less interested in this thinks.

At the same time, the fact that only leaders of local public institutions are interested in organizational performance measurements can be viewed both from a negative or positive perspective. In his respect, the positive perspective is related to the fact that indeed there is a concern among local public institutions in measuring and monitoring their performance. On the other hand, the negative perspective is related to the fact that, excluding local institution managers, the executive civil servants doesn't always use PMS, which is somehow disappointing.

Thirdly, performance measurement is still not regarded as a useful managerial tool in Romanian local public institutions. Thus, the majority local public institutions do not envision the potential benefits that could be brought by these types of measurements. In fact, the survey results show that PMS are very limited use - only to certain activities or domains (even if we are talking about head of institution or heads of departments). Of course, we do not say that local public institutions in Romania do not use PMS, but only that their use, from certain perspectives, is quite limited. Basically, performance measurement is used by local governments in Romania rather for statistical reporting, improving the quality of services provided and making decisions on highlighting certain aspects of a financial nature. Even if measuring performance is an excellent opportunity for resource allocation, or budget building or employee motivation the local administration still does not take these aspects into account.

In terms of general characteristics that involve performance measurement for local institutions, again no pleasing aspects are revealed. Basically, in terms of general characteristics, the performance measurement picture is extremely disappointing and confusing, emphasis more negative aspects than positive ones. In this sense, the only positive aspect related to performance measures is that they tend to reflect and are connected to the overall objectives that local public institutions have to reach, taking also

in consideration the financial indicators – which is not bad as a good direction for performance measurement direction. However, the fact that PMS still does not contain measurements of non-financial indicators (especially indicators of citizens' satisfaction), it does not perform frequently and continuously, are not used for comparing the department's performance and finally this systems are focuses not on what is important to be measured clearly represent a great shortcoming of these systems.

Finally, as a general conclusion, in the case of Romanian local governments, our findings did not support the fact that in these institutions there is a sequential and major development of PMS. Several elements of PMS exist, especially in measurement, while the purposes for which performance measurement are used and systematic application, from certain points of view, are very problematic. The research data confirms that on the local government level in Romania performance measurement is in its infancy and we can find performance measurements more at a theoretical level than at an implementation level. In terms of Bennett's Bouckaer and J. Halligan's ideal model of the three stages of performance measurement development (Bouckaert & Halligan, 2008), this picture of performance measurement is more negative than positive, confirming that the local government tin Romania is in its first stage of development, namely managing performance.

From some points of view, survey data clearly support the results regarding the shortcomings in measuring performance at local level reported in different states, as well as the fact that the implementation and institutionalization of this practice in local public sector remain problematic and confusing (Turc, et al., 2016; Hajnal, & Ugrosdy, 2016; Wargadinata, 2017).

One reason why performance measurement isn't use as a full managerial tool could be that many managers of local institutions (for e.g. heads of local institution and heads of departments) don't have enough managerial skills or management studies - they don't know very well the importance and how to apply to performance measurement systems as a managerial tool. Indeed, many of managers don't apply performance measurement for measuring the institutional performance because according to the „local Romania tradition of performance measurement”, institution performance is measured in numbers of votes - mandates won by heads of local institution, so basically we have to deal with a political performance measurement not with a managerial one.

References

1. Akbar, R., Pilcher, R. and Perrin, B. (2012). Performance measurement in Indonesia: The case of local government, *Pacific Accounting Review*, 24(3), 262-291, <https://doi.org/10.1108/01140581211283878>
2. Behn, R.D. (2003). Why measure performance? Different purpose requires different measures, *Public Administration Review*, Sept/Oct., 63(5), 586-606;
3. Berman, E., & Wang, X. (2001). Hypotheses about performance Measurement in Counties: Findings from a survey, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 11(3), 403-427;
4. Bouckaert, G., Halligan, J. (2008). *Managing Performance – International comparisons*, New York: Routledge;
5. Carassus, D., Favoreu, C., Gardey, D., & Marin, P. (2012). La caractérisation et le management des déviations organisationnelles liées à la mise en œuvre d'une démarche de performance publique : application au contexte public local français, *Management International*, 16(3), 112-117;

6. Carassus, D., Favoreu, C., Gardey, D., & Marin, P. (2014). Factors that Determine or Influence Managerial Innovation in Public Contexts: The Case of Local Performance Management, *Public Organization Review*, 14(2), 245–266;
7. Cavalluzzo, K.S. and Ittner, C.D. (2004), Implementing performance measurement innovations: evidence from government, *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 29(3/4), 243-67;
8. De Julnes, P., & Holzer, M. (2001). Promoting the Utilization of Performance Measures in public Organizations: An Empirical Study of Factors Affecting Adoption and Implementation, *Public Administration Review*, Nov/Dec., 61 (3), 693-704;
9. Halachmi, A., & Holzer, M. (2010). Citizen participation and performance measurement: operationalization democracy through better accountability, *Public Administration Quarterly*, 34 (3), 378-399;
10. Hatry H.P. (2006). *Performance measurement - Getting Results!*, (2nd edit). Washington DC: The Urban Institute Press;
11. Hajnal, G., & Ugrosdy, M., (2015). Use and Utilization of Performance Information in Hungary: Exemplary Cases from the Local-Government and the Higher-Education Sectors, *The NISPAcee Journal of Public Administration and Policy*, VIII (3), 23-48;
12. Holzer, M., & Kloby, K. (2005). Public performance measurement. An assessment of the state-of-the-art and models for citizen participation, *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 54, (7), 517-532;
13. Kloby, K., & Callahan, K. (2009). Aligning Government Performance and Community Outcome Measurement, *The Public Manager*, 39(3), 19-26;
14. Kopczynski, M., & Lombardo, M. (1999). Comparative performance measurement: insights and lessons learned from consortium effort, *Public Administration Review*, 59 (2), 124-134;
15. Marchand, M., & Raymond, L. (2008). Researching performance measurement systems An information systems perspective, *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 28(7), 663-686;
16. Meyer, M.W. (2002). *Rethinking Performance Measurement*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press;
17. Moldovan, Bogdan, A. (2014). Instrumente de Măsurarea a Performanțelor Financiare a Administrației Publice Locale, *Revista Transilvană de Științe Administrative*, 2(35), 71-83;
18. Moxhan, C. (2009). Performance measurement examining the applicability of the existing body of knowledge to nonprofit organizations, *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 29(7), 740-763;
19. Mucha, M.J. (2010). The State Comparative Performance Measurement Project, *Government Finance Review*, 26(1), 47-50;
20. Newcomer, K.E. (1997). *Using Performance Measurement to Improve Public and Nonprofit Programs*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass;
21. Ni Putu, S.H.M., Van Helden, G.J., & Tillema, S. (2007). Public sector performance measurement in developing countries. A literature review and research agenda, *Journal of Accounting & Organizational Change*, 3(3), 192-208;
22. Nicholson-Crotty, S., Theobald, N.A., & Nicholson-Crotty, J. (2006). Disparate Measures: Public Managers and Performance - Measurement Strategies. *Public Administration Review*, 66(1), 101-113;
23. Oprea, Florin. (2013). *Managementul financiar al colectivităților locale*. București: Editura Tritonic;
24. Padovani, E., Yetano, A., & Levy Orelli. (2010). Municipal performance measurement and management in practice: which factors matter?, *Public Administration Quarterly*, 34(4), 591-635;
25. Poister, T.H., & Streib, G.D. (1999). Performance measurement in municipal government: assessing the state of the practice. *Public Administration Review*, 59(4). 325-335;
26. Poister, T.H. (2003). *Measuring Performance in Public Administration and Nonprofit Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass;
27. Pollanen, R.M. (2005). Performance measurement in municipalities Empirical evidence in Canadian context, *The International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 18(1), 4-24;
28. Raboca, Horia. (2015). *Măsurarea performanțelor în sectorul public*. Cluj-Napoca: Editura Accent;
29. Raboca, H., Cărbunărean, F., & Dodu. M. (2017). Quality Management Systems – The Case of Romanian Local Public Institutions, *Managerial Challenges of the Contemporary Society Proceedings*, 10(2), (pp.20-29). Cluj-Napoca: Editura Accent;
30. Turc, E., Guenoun, M., Rodrigues, M.A., Demirkaya, Y., & Jérôme Dupuis, J. (2016). Performance Management and Measurement in Local Governments of the Napoleonic Administrative System: A

Comparative Analysis of France, Portugal, and Turkey, in: Kuhlmann, S. and Geert Bouckaert, G. (eds.), *Local Public Sector Reforms in Times of Crisis - National Trajectories and International*, Palgrave Macmillan, London, p.121-138;

31. Urieși, S. (2017). Efficiency of pay for performance programs in Romanian companies and the mediating role of organizational justice. *Scientific Annals of Economics and Business*, 64(1), 1-18. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/saeb-2017-0001>

32. Wargadinata, E.L., (2017). Kualitas Pengukuran Kinerja Organisasi Publik, *Sosiohumaniora*, 19(2), 86 – 94;

33. Wholey, J.S. (2010). Overcoming Challenges to Performance Measurement and Evaluation, *The Public Manager*, 39(4), 63-69;

34. Wholey, J.S. (1999). Performance-based management, *Public Productivity & Management Review*, 22(3), 288-308.



This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution - Non Commercial - No Derivatives 4.0 International License.