1.0 INTRODUCTION
The study and practice of public administration can be introduced from a variety of perspectives. The subject draws on the contributions of political science, law, sociology, economics, psychology and the administrative sciences, among other disciplines. This article introduces the reader to the modern “bureaucratic phenomenon”, the classic organizational model for western industrialized societies. The author outlines three distinct eras in the development of organization theory and describes how they evolved. In the process, he explains how bureaucracy is necessary for the prevention of political corruption and for the safeguarding of proper democratic procedures. On the other hand, democracy generates a dilemma for a bureaucracy: under the present rather inconsistent democratic rules, bureaucracy is expected to be both independent and subservient, both politicized and non-politicized at one and the same time. While based on Chapter 2 of Public Sector Management in Canada (Phidd, 2001), this updated text applies equally as well to countries whose public sector is built around the classic bureaucratic model.

1.0 INTRODUCTION
The study and practice of public administration can be introduced from a variety of perspectives. The subject draws on the contributions of political science, law, sociology, economics, psychology and the administrative sciences, among other disciplines. This article introduces the reader to the modern “bureaucratic phenomenon” as the classic organizational model for western industrialized societies and relates its implications particularly to the study of Canadian public administration. As such, we are concerned with theories of bureaucracy and the development of the profession of government in the twentieth century. We begin by reviewing the following issues: the emergence of the bureaucratic phenomenon in western democratic societies, Max Weber’s bureaucratic model, criticisms of the model, modifications to it, the relationship between bureaucracy and democracy, and the growth of the “administrative state.” This latter concept of the administrative state relates to the extensive growth of public sector organizations in western democratic societies, identifies the relationship between law and society and further addresses the issue of the state’s impingement on the rights and freedoms of individual citizens. In this study we are concerned with the examination of bureaucracy as an instrument of change.

In order to simplify a very complex field, we focus on three broad periods of change embracing classical, neo-classical, and contemporary schools of organizational theory. These schools represent competing ideas which some analysts have characterized as an emergence of the thesis, anti-thesis, and synthesis of organizational theories (Henderson, 1983).

The approach is applied to the development of public administration theories, the design of the modern Canadian state, and their relationship to the market economy. The early development of the Canadian state benefited from both the adoptions of bureaucratic principles, which emerged predominantly out of a European tradition and the more American tradition of scientific management, which emerged in the early 20th century. Each of these theoretical traditions has continued to influence the design of contemporary organizations and they are used as a starting point for studying Canadian public administration. Our concern in this chapter is to introduce the reader to the academic discipline of modern management and, more specifically, the occupational specialty of Canadian public administration. This is done because of a conviction that it is essential for either the student, the observer, or the practitioner to develop a basic understanding of organization theories in order to fully appreciate and properly analyze the operation of the Government of Canada.

2.0 DEFINING BUREAUCRACY
At some point in our exposure to government organizations or,
more generally, to complex organizations, we have encountered the term "bureaucracy". The word is frequently used in a pejorative sense to denote imprecision, the enforcement of excessive rules and even more negatively a form of organization, which serves as an instrument of oppression. In many instances the example of nineteenth century Prussia or Nazi Germany is cited. Yet, if we were to examine the historical roots of the term bureaucracy, it is quickly observed that the term was most frequently used initially to depict a form of social and economic organization which increased efficiency, rational studies, specialization, and division of labour. For example, Max Weber, a German sociologist, defined bureaucracy as "that form of administrative organization which was capable of attaining the highest level of efficiency!" (Weber, 1949, p. 339). On the other hand, American scholar Richard Scott suggests bureaucracy is simply, "the existence of a specialized administrative staff" (Scott, 1981, p. 24).

We observe below that Max Weber used the concept at the turn of the twentieth century, to describe what be considered to be the most efficient form of organization which had evolved to that given point in history. He identified the emergence of legal-rational in contrast to traditional and charismatic authority. It was considered to be the typical organizational form in modern industrialized societies. If that observation was correct, then the question may very well be asked, how did the negative view of bureaucracy arise?

---

### Table 2.1 Shifts in Management Thinking which Influenced Public Administration in the Twentieth Century

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis: Structure and rationale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bureaucracy Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Scientific Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Human Relations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neo-Classical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis: Behaviour and environmental relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Early management (modern structuralism)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Modern Structuralists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational change (debureaucratization)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Institutionalism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contemporary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis: Open systems, culture and complex organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Theories of organizational development and change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The systems and contingency approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Managing change in organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New Institutionalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Post modernism and the information age</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

In part, the answer rests with the relationship between theories of the market economy, the modern democratic state and the manner in which they influence behavioural patterns between the individual and the state. Various theories suggest the rise, support and sanctioning of certain economic and social relations within the capitalist state. Both Karl Marx and Max Weber explained the emergence of economic and social order within European societies. Consistent with our concern with the explanation of organizational life the Weberian model attempted to elucidate the role of rationality and legal authority in the modern European state. Seventeenth, Eighteenth, Nineteenth and Twentieth century immigration introduced similar organizational ideas to the North American continent.
2.1 What is Public Bureaucracy?  One of the most crucial arenas of institutional politics in contemporary industrialized democracies is the interaction of political executives and career civil servants. The interactions of these individuals are crucial in enabling government to perform its routine tasks and to make and implement the decisions required of a modern political system. These interactions are also important for the functioning of an effective political democracy. Public bureaucracy represents an authority system led by politicians in which decisions are made within an institutional system incorporating the following characteristics:

1. Work is divided into impersonal roles of offices.
2. Positions tend to be specialized. There is, in other words, a high degree of division of labour.
3. Career commitment is demanded from employees. The complex roles within the organizational can only be learned through long experience [training and professionalism.]
4. Careers are protected by job security and tenure.
5. Positions are filled by merit recruitment as opposed to patronage.
6. Bureaucracy is supposed to be a neutral instrument in the hands of those who command it. Authority flows from the top down within the organization.
7. The degree of discretion employees have to make decisions is minimized because policies and rules have been set by the authorities within the organization. As a consequence administration is regularized and made predictable (adapted from Dickerson & Flanagan, 1990, p. 337).

It should be noted that the bureaucratic form of organization does not apply exclusively to the public sector.

2.2 The Quest for Rationality and the Emergence of the Bureaucratic Organization  It should be noted that a highly structured, bureaucratic organization is said to produce goods and services more efficiently than those which are not so organized.

Adam Smith, considered the founder of modern economics, had earlier explained the importance of specialization and the division of labour in the production of goods and services (Smith, 1902). His analysis suggested that trade and the market mechanism may serve to enhance the exchange of goods and services between individuals, groups and regions....The Weberian approach differs in the sense that Weber focused on the role of legitimate authority in explaining individual and group relationships in society.
2.3 Weber's Authority Patterns and the Inevitability of the Rational State  

Weber developed his ideal type model by identifying three types of authority: tradition, charismatic, and legal-rational (Gerth & Mills, ch. 8). They can be distinguished on the basis of their claim to legitimacy:

2.3.1 Charismatic Authority  
The organization is based on the leader. The leaders special qualities attract the support of followers who value the benefits that association with the leader brings. The leader organizes, directs and distributes rewards. Harrison places such a leader as being at the hub of a wheel (representative of a power culture) from which decisions and co-ordination radiate outward. Organizational success depends on the single-mindedness and expertise of the leader and his/her inspired followers. Naturally problems result if the leader's capacities decline and followers' expectations are disappointed. Infighting, factionalism and succession problems emerge. Charismatic influence may live on if the leader's values and doctrines are elevated to a higher spiritual plain and integrated by followers into a way of life.

2.3.2 Traditional Authority  
Roles, customs and practices have become accepted into the ritual of life. Things happen because they have always happened that way (precedent). They have symbolic and even sacred significance. Authority and position is an inherited commodity vested in those who for reasons of birth or ritual selection represent the traditional customs e.g. the monarch/dynasty, the temple, the lord-knight-yeoman and serf, the guild master and journeyman apprentice. The roles (born into) are not challenged. Rights and duties are accepted for reasons of, “this is the way things are done.” The ideals and values of the charismatic leader are carried forward by the apostle successor. Personal servants - appointed by the leader - benefit from patronage and can become officials. Under feudalism - even they can inherit titles, demesnes and tithes subject to paying homage to the appointee leader who may withdraw or disenfranchise these rights.

Traditional values and behaviours can be found in the modern world - the authority of the father in some families is an example. Those who are totally willing to dedicate themselves to a spiritual doctrine or ideology may adopt a very powerful position-an insular reality-which cuts across secular or scientific logic. Theirs is the one right way regardless of evidence to the contrary.

2.3.3 Legal-Rational Authority  
Authority in this structure is based on purposeful reasoning and formally defined, accepted structures of rules and procedures. The power of those in authority depends on their acceptance of due legal process and qualification; ownership according to purposeful, agreed rules; appointment on technically defined grounds (merit and technical expertise); election; and membership of a decision-making group and adherence to the rules of decision-making.

Each model simplifies how authority becomes legitimized in organization. The three forms of authority patterns emerged in historical sequence and the last, the legal-rational form, was considered to be the most efficient. In Weber's historical analysis, he explained the development of modern organizational forms as an evolution from traditional authority systems and charismatic authority systems to legal-rational authority systems, which were most clearly reflected in modern industrial organizations. In essence, the phenomenon of bureaucracy epitomizes rationality in organizational relationships.
Organizations, seen either from the perspective of the society or the firm, are considered to be rational instruments of collective behaviour; that is, they are established for getting things done in accordance with strict procedures. Accordingly, not only state administrations, armies and churches, but universities, economic enterprises and political parties can be bureaucratized as well. Given this claim, some analysts have referred to the phenomenon as the bureaucratization of the world (Crozier, 1964; Michels, 1958). According to Weber, this development was the result of several causes as illustrated in Box 2.1.

According to Weber, bureaucracy developed because its rationality and technical superiority made it the most appropriate tool for dealing with the tasks and problems of complex, modern society. Because of this superiority, bureaucracy had to become more pervasive and was bound to become even more so in the future. This conclusion led others to assert that there was a law of bureaucratization.

2.4 The Features of Bureaucracy in Modern Industrialized Societies

It was from the above-mentioned historical observation that Max Weber developed his ideal type bureaucracy. He constructed a model or an ideal organization that includes the features mentioned earlier and presented in Box 2.2.

The features must be understood at different levels of analysis. First, there is the macro-level of analysis which explains the process of bureaucratization in terms of macro-socio-economic processes. At this level, we are concerned with the interplay between broad cultural, economic, political and social forces. Thus, the interplay between the seven institutional forces enumerated above should be interpreted in this way. Second, the bureaucratic model may also be used to explain interactions at the micro-level within an organization. It must be noted that in North America analysis at the micro-level is usually associated with the work of Frederick Taylor [Taylorism] and other theorists of scientific management.
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While the two approaches are complementary, the reader or research analyst must be cognizant of the level of analysis being used when discussing the phenomenon. Drawing on his knowledge of the German (especially the Prussian) and the British bureaucracies, Weber constructed a model of bureaucracy which depicted relations between society, law and the economy.

The chronology of characteristics epitomizes features which are present in the large complex organizations of the twentieth century. The expansion after, a variety of criticisms were made against the approach and the model was reformulated. Today, we cannot deny Weber’s essential proposition that bureaucracies are more efficient [with respect to goals of the formal hierarchy] than are alternative forms of organization. However, later organizational analysts have generated significant critiques and identified dysfunctional consequences of bureaucratic organization. Max Weber, himself, made one of the earliest critiques of bureaucracy from the political-power standpoint. As a liberal activist in his contemporary Prussia he regarded it as a threat to parliamentary democracy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box 2.2: Weber’s Features of Bureaucracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. each office has a well-defined sphere of competence with duties clearly marked off from those of other offices;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. offices are ordered in a hierarchy; each lower office is under the supervision and responsibility of a higher one;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. authority is restricted to official duties; beyond these, subordinates are not subject to their superiors; there is a complete segregation of official activity from private life;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. officials hold office by appointment (rather than by election), and on the basis of a contractual relationship between themselves and the organization;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. officials are selected on the basis of objective qualifications; these are acquired by training, established by examinations, diplomas or both;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. officials are set for a career: they are protected from arbitrary dismissal and can expect to maintain office permanently; promotion is by seniority, achievement or both;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. officials are entirely separated from the means of administration, hence they cannot appropriate their positions;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. activities are regulated by general, consistent, abstract rules; the generality of these rules requires the categorization of individual cases on the basis of objective criteria;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. official duties are conducted in a spirit of impersonality without hatred but also without affection; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. a bureaucratic organization frequently has a non-bureaucratic head. While bureaucrats follow rules, the non-bureaucratic head sets them. While bureaucrats are appointed, the political head usually inherits his position, appropriates it or is elected to it (Etzioni-Halevy, 1983, pp. 28–29; Blau, 1956, pp. 14–15 and pp. 36–40; Gerth &amp; Mills, ch. 8).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moreover, it serves as "a power instrument of the first order - for the one who controls the bureaucratic apparatus." The criticisms have emanated from at least two principal sources. First, there are the critics who see bureaucracy as a source of tension between the individual and the organization and/or the modern state. Second, there are those who see bureaucracy as a source of tension between two elite sources: the political elite and the bureaucratic elite (Barnard, 1962; Crozier, 1964; Knott & Miller, 1987; Mills, 1963; Merton 1960, 1967; Merton et al., 1952, V. Thompson, 1969).
3.0.1 The first criticism is concerned with the manner in which the highly rational or bureaucratic organization deprives the individual of the freedom to act in ways that are not supportive of either productivity or of individual motivation. Consequently, the human relations school, discussed shortly, considered the emphasis on bureaucracy and structure as organizational forms to be rusty, blunt and dehumanizing. The bureaucratic model is said to produce psychological conditions, which may have negative consequences on human behaviour.

3.0.2 A second criticism of the bureaucratic model relates to the development of the modern democratic state in which political leaders are elected to office but nevertheless find it necessary to be served by highly trained technical experts who are not accountable to the electorate. It was this concern which resulted in the development of the notion of a political administration dichotomy, a doctrine which, stated simply, says that politics had to do with the policies or expressions of the state whereas administration had to do with the execution of the policies. It followed that public administration was to be concerned with the governmental bureaucracy. The separate emphasis on the two distinct realms became known as the politics-administration dichotomy which has continued to influence the teaching and the practice of traditional public administration (see Henderson, 1966, p. 7—9; Henry, 1995, ch. 2). Obviously, the relationship is a most complex one, which has become one of the most intricate and controversial issues in contemporary theory and practice of public administration.

3.0.3 A third criticism abounds on the North American continent with its tradition of “rugged individualism” which did not experience the long tradition of collective institutional development found in Europe (see Macpherson, 1964). We can surmise two competing schools of thought between the merits of the individual and that of the collective. John Stuart Mill argued against both tyranny of the majority and against government intervention in restraint of “individual free agency” (Mill, 1848, p. 308; see also Mill, 1981). Any activity of the state, therefore, is any constraint imposed upon the normal freedom of individuals by the legitimate activity of the government. Mills’ was an early and perhaps extreme view but he serves to illustrate the point. In contrast, R. M. Jackson has written, “We are not really threatened by the arbitrary actions of a monarch, or of a parliament, or of the devils in Whitehall [British parliament]: the conflict is with ourselves, whether we can find and accept a balance of personal rights and communal claims” (Willis, 1970, p. 280).

3.0.4 Other Considerations The problem is fundamental to that of the individual and the society, discovering a balance of bureaucratic accountability between individual rights and collective obligations (see Barker, 1962). Charles Goodsell (1985, 1994) enumerates a list of critics of bureaucracy which includes the following:

- first, the market economists who are hostile to the government bureaucracy on grounds that competitive market and profit-based incentive systems are the only feasible means to attain economic efficiency which is their distinctive definition of the public good;
- second, the functional sociologists who despise it for the displacement of organizational goals or the placing of bureaucratic action ahead of organizational objectives;
- third, policy analysts who criticize it for the failure to deliver services; and
- fourth, the proponents of democracy who see bureaucracy as the basis for authoritarian and totalitarian governments and organizational oppression.
Above all in their view, the democratic culture is considered to be inconsistent with the bureaucratic culture. This theme was effectively developed by Warren Bennis in *Changing Organizations* (1966) and *Beyond Bureaucracy* (1993). Bennis argued that bureaucracy as an organizational form was dead because it was incapable of dealing with a rapidly changing environment. Consequently, he looked at organizations in terms of their role in effective change. This was most effectively done in his study of the planning of change and the role of leaders as agents of change. This theme was popularized later by Alvin Toffler in *Future Shock* (1970).

Many critics of bureaucracy have identified bureaucratic organizations as rigid and stable, concerned with the multiplication of rules, avoidance of uncertainty, strata isolation and parallel power positions and are incapable of dealing with change. As a result, organizational changes occur sporadically in such a culture. Long periods of stability are followed by abrupt organizational changes. Goodsell (1985) summarizes the ideologically diverse criticisms of bureaucracy in the following way:

*For political conservatives it symbolizes expensive government requiring heavy taxation and the unpleasantness of outsiders interfering in the management of one’s firm. For political liberals, bureaucracy represents the failure of government social programs to achieve miraculous results in helping the disadvantaged. Leftists find attacking bureaucracy emotionally satisfying because its supposedly insidious repression helps explain why the American masses have not revolted. Rightists lose few opportunities to flail at bureaucracy as they conjure up the imminent arrival of communist totalitarianism* (p. 13).

### 3.1 The Relationship between Bureaucracy and Democracy and the Case for Bureaucracy

One of the most important concerns in the study of public administration relates to the relationship between bureaucracy and democracy. More specifically, we are concerned with the roles of politicians and public servants in public administration. Observers of contemporary governments have been concerned with the power relationship between the two institutions, political parties [politicians] and the professional public service (Etzioni-Halevy, 1979, 1983; Goodsell, 1985, 1994; Mosher, 1968; Smith 1988). This had led to a further examination of the relationship between political institutions and the market economy. Thus, the concern with bureaucracy is related to its effect on modern democratic governments on the one hand, and its effect on the performance of a market economy on the other. As a result, the study of bureaucracy is partially a study of political economy. However, its proper understanding demands an interdisciplinary approach to the study of this most complex issue. The debate involves some analysts supporting politics over economics in the making of legitimate decision within society, hence our concern with the politics of bureaucracy and democracy.

#### 3.1.1 Bureaucracy's Threat

Is bureaucracy a threat to democracy? R. J. Jackson, D. Jackson & N. Baxter-Moore (1994) offer four concerns about bureaucracy in Canada: 1) it is unrepresentative of the general public, therefore not sensitive to the citizenry; 2) it is steered by a narrow and cohesive elite; 3) there is the concern of the growth of the state and the perception of “empire building” as the state exhibits expansionary tendencies that serve interests of administrators and not the needs of the public; and 4) in addition, concerns over financial and bureaucratic efficiency questions are extended by a lack of popular, parliamentary or government control over the bureaucracy. The authors conclude that critics regard bureaucracy as “inimical to the democratic process” (p. 373). It is equally true that the best administrative institutions could achieve little, without effective democratic support and supervision. In the context of the political economy, economic or “public choice” theories of politics have contributed powerfully to a new paradigm of “government by the market” and to the sovereignty of the individual in contrast to a more liberal political economy approach that developed over the twentieth century (Buchanan 1972, 1989; Self, 1993).
Here we can contrast the administrative state approach that relates to the growth of the modern state as 1) major employer and 2) economic and regulatory agent to the more recent popular ideology that espouses public responsibilities should be reduced. This latter school of thought, sometimes referred to as “new public management” (NPM), suggests that not only should public policies be adjusted to the pressure of economic markets, but also, that bureaucracies themselves should be remodeled and transformed according to market concepts of competition and efficiency.

3.1.2 Bureaucracy’s Vulnerability

While some analysts have argued bureaucracy’s growing pervasiveness has made it more vulnerable rather than more powerful, Etzioni-Halevy (1983) has suggested “that the growing power of bureaucracy has actually favoured democracy or is indispensable for.

Halevy (1983) suggests that political bureaucratic domination may be no less exploitative than economic domination and, hence, that exposing manipulation by state elites is no less avant-garde than uncovering the expropriation of surplus value. The author calls for further regulation of all elite power. This must be done by making the democratic rules for elite action clearer and more consistent and by making the elites’ closer adherence to such rules pay off as part of their struggle for power. Thus according to Eva Etzioni-Halevy (1983), “a powerful independent bureaucracy is necessary for the prevention of political corruption and for the safeguarding of proper democratic procedures. Bureaucracy is thus a threat to, but also indispensable for, democracy” (introduction).

3.1.3 Bureaucracy’s Pervasiveness

The case for bureaucracy is further advanced by B.C. Smith and Charles T. Goodsell. Smith (1988) proclaims there is no escape from bureaucracy; the fundamental patterns of management of the state’s activities will be bureaucratic and work will be acquitted by salaried bureaucrats. In Bureaucracy and Political Power (1988) he concludes by emphasizing that the problem of bureaucracy is in effect the problem of lay (electoral) control over professional experts, for particular political ends. While bureaucracies obviously possess political power—they could not do their jobs without it—this power is by no means unrestrained. The amount of bureaucracy in any one state ought also to be a conscious political decision.

Charles Goodsell (1994) argues that bureaucracy’s true nature is not in its perceived failures but in the understanding

There is an uneasy, though symbiotic, coexistence between bureaucracy and democracy, or even a paradoxical or self-contradictory relationship between the two: bureaucracy is necessary for democracy, yet is also a constant source of tension, friction and conflict within it. Indeed it seems that the strains bureaucracy creates for democracy grow more salient the more powerful bureaucracy becomes.
of citizens. It is here that we can best learn the quality of what government does. Goodsell goes on to say that it is important that “students” of public administration do not approach the subject as a political or theoretical plaything, but as a set of real-life institutions on which they depend for obtaining crucial services (p. 165-170). Bureaucracies simply attempt to respond to new directions received from elected officials and stand ready to advocate whatever new cause is elevated by the political process to the governmental agenda of the day. As such, our discussion thus far examines how public administration can be appreciated. In the teaching and study of public administration, this exercise in appreciation must concentrate on the interrelationship between the bureaucracy and responsible citizenship. A relationship can be enhanced, for example, by either increased voter (electoral) participation rates or by more direct public interfacing with political institutions, i.e. political parties, levels of governments, and interest groups, among others. In short, any measures to improve the administration and performance of government lie in the invigoration of democracy itself.

3.2 The Profession of Government, The Study of Public Administration and the Development of the Administrative State

The relationship between the Weberian model of bureaucracy, the profession of government and the evolution of public administration theories follows from the fact that by the end of World War II the modern state, with its expanding organizations, was identified as the classic case of a bureaucratic organization. The state depicted the characteristics of office, hierarchy, appointment by qualifications, the notion of a career, adherence to rules, and the conduct of relations by means of impersonality (neutrality). The concept of public bureaucracy became one of a number of theories of public administration. It should also be pointed out that, in the tradition of the British parliamentary system, the head of the Canadian state is non-bureaucratic. Therefore, any theory of public administration must deal with the problem of both the monarch and its representative political head of state in relation to their technical supporting staff [the professional public service]. This is representative of the evolving debate over the place of bureaucracy in the struggle for power in the modern state (see Bendix, 1956; Lane, 1995, p. 49-71).

3.3 The Profession of Government

Brian Chapman (1963), a British analyst of government, has referred to the historical development of this problem by pointing to the fact that in Europe in the late 19th century it was widely recognized that a government needed to have confidence in the support and sympathy of the senior administrators (the administrative state). In several countries this led to an unhealthy turnover at the top with successive changes of government. But despite abuses it became generally admitted that while patronage was an undesirable basis of recruitment for the bulk of the public service, there was something to be said for special arrangements for those posts which were, by their nature, partly administrative and partly political (Chapman, 1963).

It was during the late nineteenth century that the conditions of service of public officials were seriously considered as an institutional problem. The public officials laboured under two disadvantages. First, their relations with politicians were difficult. They were members of the government machine and, therefore, politicians controlling...
that machine were tempted to use them as electoral agents, or at least to expect their political support. The prospect of promotion or dismissal ensured the official adherence to the views and interests of the minister, and many minor posts were frankly filled as rewards for political services. The second disadvantage was the public official were completely dependent on their immediate administrative superiors. The principle of hierarchy weighed heavily on the lower grades but was almost as tyrannical an event at the middle and higher levels of the service. The principle behind recruitment, promotions, dismissal and discipline became an urgent question, more urgent in some countries than in others (Eisenstadt, 1965, p. 175-215). The manner in which various political systems respond to this problem is characterized as the comparative study of the higher public service.

Selected elements of the bureaucratic model point to the problem of the politics/administration dichotomy which postulates that political actors form coalitions to maximize political support for policy and gain elected office (see Buchanan and Tullock, 1962; Downs, 1957), while bureaucratic actors are concerned with principles of public service and management such as political neutrality, meritocracy, financial probity, accountability, and the commitment to serve any government well (Kaufman, 1985; Knott & Miller, 1987; March & Olsen, 1989). In the bureaucratic model, the head of the state is not regarded as a bureaucrat; albeit a monarch, a prime minister or a president. The political head is elected and relies on the expert support staff to achieve his or her political objectives. Consequently, a complex system of reciprocal needs and relationships has developed between political leaders and their technical support staff. Both the laws and the conventions which have developed depict this phenomenon. This issue constitutes a most important facet of the concern of our study. The various characteristics mentioned above are well revealed by any review of the development of public service laws in western societies. In fact, the organizational characteristics (features) of bureaucracy are found in most industrial relations laws, i.e. laws which government employer-employee relations. The above characteristics are what we identity as the public bureaucratic phenomenon. We are concerned with the extent to which the modern public service can be categorized to be consistent with the bureaucratic principles outlined by Max Weber. The public bureaucracy also expresses more articulately than any other institution the mounting tensions between the values of technological elitism and democratic mass. One American scholar, Nicholas Henry (1986), asserts that “the government bureaucracy is, in addition, the biggest conglomerate of organizations in the United States, and employs more highly educated professional people than any other American institution.” It is the study and practice of public bureaucracy that has been the focus of traditional public administration.

It should be noted that the criticisms of bureaucracy stem from the institutional characteristics which flow from Weber’s ideal type bureaucracy as presented in Box 2.2. Bureaucratic structures emphasize specialization between jobs and departments, reliance on formal procedures and paperwork, extended managerial reporting structures and clearly marked status definitions. Job demarcation is an information, interpersonal response by individual and groups which may be at odds with the organization’s objectives. Demarcation may be supported by employee preferences. It is manifested also in managerial rivalries and empire-building. If the organization becomes large and complex it bears formal and informal overheads of possible inefficiency. These characteristics provide the source of the criticisms of public bureaucracy given the fact that they can inhibit change.

4.0 DEMOCRACY IN THE CONTEMPORARY ADMINISTRATIVE STATE

The concept of the administrative state refers to the emergence of an expanded number of public sector organizations (public bureaucracies) used to achieve the democratic objectives of the modern state, albeit in science, health, education, and welfare, among other areas. Furthermore, it relates to the implications of the growth of the state in Western democracies and the consequences on rights and freedoms that is inherent in the
The rise in industrialized societies led to the expansion in the role of the state as either provider, employer and/or regulator. In effect, it led to the proliferation of public organizations, especially with respect to the progressive allocation of responsibilities between and within departments. This phenomenon of the twentieth century has been referred to as the emergence of the administrative state.

Among the factors that clearly have affected the form and content of American literature on public administration are the advent of the Great Society, the closing of the frontier and the waste of our natural resources, our tremendous wealth and our business civilization, “the corporate revolution” and the evolution of new corporate forms, urbanization, our peculiar constitutional and political system, “the second phase of the industrial revolution”, the increase in specialization and professionalism and the rise of American scholarship, and the Great Wars, the Great Prosperity and the Great Depression (p. 7).

Waldo’s approach integrates business philosophy, recruitment and training, values, professionalism, administrative culture and the role of the state in a democratic environment, as important dimensions in the study of public administration. He addresses issues such as responsibility, accountability and centralization and decentralization as perennial concerns in the study of public administration. He is also concerned with the role of science and technology in the structure and operation of the modern American state. He was concerned with public administration in a democratic environment (Waldo, 1953, 1971, 1984). This suggests that great emphasis be placed on understanding public organizations as open systems.

5.0 TOWARDS AN INTERDISCIPLINARY APPROACH: THE TRANSITION FROM CLASSICAL AND NEO-CLASSICAL TO CONTEMPORARY THEORY OF ORGANIZATION

The discussion thus far on public bureaucracy, democracy and the administrative state is intimately related to the development of broader theories of social organization and management. The historical developments aid in explaining why different approaches to problem-solving evolved at different moments in time (see Fry, 1989; Henderson, 1983; Henry, 1995; Scott, 1992, p. 96-122; Shafritz & Ott, 1992). From this perspective, the developments in organizational theory can be categorized into classical, neo-classical and contemporary stages. The approach allows us to review the marriage of public administration with the broader social sciences.
There has been a convergence of the literature from political science and economics, on the one hand, with the organizational sociology literature on the other (Hall & Quinn, 1983, p. 133-46). Consequently, there have appeared in the public bureaucracy literature studies which emphasize the influence of political and institutional environment on public sector organizations (Denhardt, 1984, 1993; Fesler & Kettl, 1991; Gortner, 1982; Heffron, 1989).

Such an interdisciplinary approach allows us to better understand the political dimensions to management theory. The evolution reflects cultural and other environmental changes, which have influenced the formulation of organizational theories. In effect, it places the emphasis on different organizational problems at different times. For example, the challenges of World Wars I and II, and the depression help to explain the development of classical principles of rigid span of control, hierarchy and stability in public organizations in the first half of the twentieth century. The post World War II period, was highlighted by state adoption of Keynesian economic principles, full employment and social security policies, and the protection and development of human and labour rights, among other issues in societal management. These policies created an expanded role for the state in society. The new challenge in public administration was how to manage “complex organizations” (see Perrow, 1986). Therefore, in the 1940s and 1950s, the neo-classical school attempted to address issues of behaviouralism, horizontal-vertical coordination and decision-making in organizations.

Contemporary organization theories developed between the 1960s and 2000 are concerned with the investigation of human behaviour in organizations and the related leadership, decision-making, and system relationships. The role of both political and administrative leadership is also perceived to perform a key role in organizational change and adaptation in the public sector (see Bennis, 1989; Mancuso, 1995; Selznick, 1949). Therefore, the contemporary study of public administration incorporates an analysis of the politics of expertise. We must also be cognizant of the power relations that are characteristic of a pluralist society whereby bureaucrats are unable to rule alone, and yet no one else can rule without them. This creates institutional difficulties including fragmented constituencies, conflicting political objectives, efficiency and effectiveness considerations, complex problems with information and communication, and with very special problems associated with accountability and responsibility. The study of public administration necessitated major formulation of organizational theories and models which attempt to address these unique management challenges.

5.1 The Concern of Classical School of Management with Structure: Scientific Management and its Critics, the Human Relations School

The bureaucratic model is concerned, above all, with structure and, as such, fits into classical organization theory given its concern with the question of how to achieve efficient production. Whether we are concerned with the characteristics of the bureaucratic model outlined earlier or with the scientific management principles discussed below, classical organization theory and the recommendations which ensued from it were aimed at achieving greater efficiency in production. Charles Perrow (1986) has noted that Max Weber’s actual writings on bureaucracy did not reach either social scientists or those concerned with business administration in North America until the late 1940s. The material was not translated and there was not much social science interest in the matter. Instead, a theory of industrial and business management was being developed by practicing managers and professors in the growing business schools of the United States drawing at times on some influential European authors such as Henry Fayol (1919, 1930). As such, the classical school of scientific management was heavily North American in origin (Follet, 1924; Gulick & Urwick, 1937; Mooney & Riley, 1939; Taylor, 1911). While the classical organizational theories were later criticized for presenting principles which were really only proverbs, organizational research and theory, have not been able to develop much better prescriptions (Perrow, 1986, p. 52). The principles have worked and are still working because they addressed themselves to very real problems of management. This literature and its European counterparts became known as classical management...
theory (see Fry, 1989; Lupton, 1983; Shafritz & Ott, 1992). The early approach to management theory was introduced by the scientific management theorists.

5.2 The Scientific Management School

The contributor most frequently cited with the development of scientific management theories is Frederick W. Taylor. It has been asserted that Taylor was not so much concerned with the organizational problems of society’s power-structure but with the practical problem of efficiency. His main unit of analysis was not society as a whole, but the individual in the workplace. As Nicos P. Mouzelis (1973) has observed, “Taylorism” as a movement must be seen in the general context of the changing structure of capitalism at the end of the nineteenth century. At that time, important technological and economic developments in the industrialized world had contributed to the proliferation and relative dominance of large-scale economic units. This, in turn, led to major emphasis on specialization and division of labour in organizational analysis.

The growing size and complexity of the enterprise and the accentuation of the division of labour created acute problems of coordination. The changes led to an increasing need for rationalization. The need for improved rationalization led to the creation of a group labeled the “mechanical engineers.” Frederick Taylor, in addition to his being a member of the American Association of Mechanical Engineers, was responsible for establishing a cohesive system of various techniques and ideas about management which had existed before his time but had never been systemized (refer to Taylor, 1911).

The basic aim of Taylorism is the increase of organizational productivity, especially on the workshop level. In order to realize this goal, Taylor advocated the empirical and experimental approach to problems of workshop management. He advocated a process which suggested that for every task in industry there is one best way of performance. In order to discover this one best way, there was a need to examine the organization in a scientific manner. From Taylor’s perspective, industrial organization, like any part of reality, is governed by definite regularities...laws which can be discovered by observation and experiment. Once these laws are known, they can be applied in the working situation to regulate the various activities and other factors of production in such a way that maximum productivity is achieved. Accordingly, scientific knowledge replaces intuition and the rule of thumb method in organizational behaviour.

Along with Taylorism, which was oriented primarily to workers’ tasks, came a host of management theories. American Luther Gulick and L. Urwick (1937) expanded on the basic principles of scientific management to include seven managerial functions: planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting, and budgeting—POSDCORB (see also Pugh, Hickson & Hinings, 1985). Thus, while the principles appeared initially to be micro-level oriented, they gradually extended beyond that sphere. By the logic of the situation, the efforts toward rationalization cannot be limited to the individual worker. Rationalization spreads outwards and upwards, until ultimately it covers and controls the whole organization. The system hinged on the relationship between management, the worker, the wage-incentive system and on cooperation. Their work led to a broader view of the management concept.
Dwight Waldo (1984) emphasized that the principles of scientific management and public administration are related aspects of a common phenomenon—a general movement to extend the methods and the spirit of science to an ever-widening range of man’s concerns (p. 49). As public administration is based on political science, which has sought to place political relationships on an objective or scientific basis, so scientific management is but a highly conscious part of a general movement to place man’s economic life, particularly production, upon a scientific basis. The scientific management principles influenced American business and public administration even at the municipal level. The development, organization and effective functioning of the Canadian public bureaucracy is a most important field of study. It is considered to be primarily concerned with the design of public organizations and, in this respect, it was influenced by the principles outlined by the classical organization theorists in general and the bureaucratic principles in particular.

5.3 The Human Relations School: A Response to Scientific Management

The human relations school shifted the focus of organizational studies from the physiological and psychological to socio-psychological and sociological variables which influenced the field of study from the 1920s to the 1950s and 1960s (see Drucker, 1954, pts. 3 & 4; Fry, 1989; Mouzelis, 1967; Roethlisberger, 1964). While such concerns continued in the tradition of Taylorism, they took much more into account and accordingly modified the machine model of organizational behaviour. The theoretical developments, in conjunction with the increasing power of the trade unions, had a considerable impact on the attitudes of employers and their employees. Under their influence, managers started to emphasize the importance of the human factor in enterprise; questionnaires were compiled with the aim of finding out about feelings and attitudes of workers and personnel in firms.

The work of the human relations school led to the slogan that the human element is the most important element in business (Barnard, 1938). On the American continent the human relations school was significantly influenced by the work of Elton Mayo of the Harvard Graduate School of Business. His work became popularly known as The Hawthorne Experiments (see Perrow, 1986, p. 79-85; Lupton, 1983, p. 33). While the Hawthorne Experiments commenced with rather narrow concerns such as changes in hours of work, rest pauses, faulty lighting and so on, the results led to a much broader concern with the organizational context.

The approach incorporated concerns such as values and beliefs—the organization as a social system, the formal and informal aspects of organization and issues such as motivation, morale, group relations and their effect on productivity. Nicos P. Mouzelis (1967), wrote on the subject of classical organizational theory, especially with respect to that group of contributors labeled the human relations school. He suggests that they experienced problems pertaining to their level of analysis. The human relations school tried to solve the major organizational problems by drawing attention to
the individual and the group level and not paying much attention to the organization as a whole. As a result, they ignored the fact that “when we move to the organizational level and consider the power structure as a whole, there are conflicts which are not due to bad communications or bad interpersonal relations, but to differences in interests—differences in the sense that what one group may gain, the other will lose and vice versa.” (p. 116). In conclusion, Mouzelis suggests that the task of the social analyst is not to hastily adopt the human relations techniques as the solution to all problems, but rather to identify the condition under which such practices are effective and the conditions under which they are not. In short, they were working towards a theory of managing people. The human relations school later shifted thinking about organization from a closed to an open model.

5.4 The Influence of Classical Organization Theories on the Study of Canadian Public Administration

The influence of classical organization theory on Canadian public administration may be briefly explained in at least three major areas.

5.4.1 First, the development of industrial relations and the managing of people. The Weberian model has been influential with respect to the changes in industrial relations laws in most western democracies. By way of illustration, we see the elimination or the reduction of patronage, especially with regard to the evolution of a professional public service (Perrow, 1986, p. 9; Aidie & Thomas, 1987, p. 195-97). It should be readily apparent that the promotion of such ideas influenced the development of laws in the modern state.

5.4.2 Second, the development of performance measurement in government. The influence of Taylorism is well reflected in the development and utilization of performance measurement techniques within the public service. In this regard, the influence of the Glassco Commission on the Organization of the Government of Canada (Canada, Glassco Report, 1962), and the influence of the Treasury Board and its Secretariat within the internal administration is worth careful examination. These principles were quickly applied to the large scale operations of the early public service, for example, the post office. The Hoover Commission in the United States and the Glassco Commission in Canada utilized the scientific management principles for outlining methods for examining productivity improvements. The techniques ranging from early concern with time and motion study to contemporary measures such as “full-time equivalents (FTEs)” and Total Quality Management (TQM) initiatives designed to measure productivity improvements in the

The scientific management school was concerned with issues such as division of labour, span of control and unity of command. These principles were gradually incorporated into the design of government in Canada and elsewhere.

5.4.3 Third, classical theory aided in the development of principles of “departmentalization” such as organizing by purpose, place, clientele, function and process. The scientific management school influenced areas such as the allocation of departmental responsibilities in government. The scientific management school was concerned with issues such as division of labour, span of control and unity of command. These principles were gradually incorporated into the design of government. Later, they would be commonly referred to as the principles of “departmentalization.” By way of illustration, J.E. Hodgetts (1973) writes: “In the traditional literature on organization theory written in the 1930s, five alternative ways of allocating work to departments were envisaged, each dependent on one unifying or common concept. The word components could be grouped together if they shared (1) common purpose, (2) clien-
tele, (3) location, (4) skill or profession, or (5) the use of common facilities or material." Typical principles which relate to organizational structure are division of labour, space, purpose, place, clientele, function and process, span of control, specialization and unity of command.

5.5 The Neo-Classical School 1930s to the 1960s: The Contributions of Chester Barnard and Herbert Simon Toward a Management Focus

Major contributors to the development of neo-classical and contemporary theories of organization were Chester Barnard and Herbert Simon. Each has made major contributions to behaviouralism and to empirical studies of organization and to the development of administrative sciences (see Fry, 1989; Lupton, 1983; Perrow, 1986; Scott, 1992). Based on their work, theorists such as Robert Merton, Philip Selznick, and Charles Perrow, among others, were able to make further contributions to the development of a structural-functionalist approach, later categorized as the neo-classical school (1930s-1960s). They highlighted administrative issues such as the following: the necessity to distinguish formal and informal relationships within organization; identified the relative merits of centralization and decentralization as requisites or organizational design; identified the significance of understanding both vertical and horizontal relationships in organizational design; and related the importance of structure to performance. Their work assisted in the gradual shift in emphasis from concern with hierarchy and competition toward increased horizontal coordination and complementarity in organizational design. The decision-making and management perspectives suggest that we develop an empirical approach to the study of public organizations.

5.6 Chester Barnard on the Functions of the Executive and Management

Chester Barnard’s work was most pioneering with respect to the cooperative role of the manager in the organization. Some major concerns of Bernard’s approach to organizing and managing are enumerated in Box 2.3.

Concurrent with the work of Elton Mayo’s Hawthorne Experiments in the 1920s, Chester Barnard, a practicing chief executive, developed new concepts for the practice of management. He modified some of the classical principles in management studies to include some concerns as the interrelationship between the manager and the worker.

5.7 Herbert Simon, Decision-making and Managing as the Focus of Organizational Analysis

The gradual use of more empirical approaches to organization theory led to an emphasis on decision-making and managing.
In his path-breaking study entitled *Administrative Behaviour: A Study in Decision-Making Processes in Administrative Organizations* (c. 1944, reprint 1965), Herbert Simon criticized the scientific management school for its concern with principles. More specifically, he was concerned with the negative aspects of the commitment to principles of organizing. Simon felt that all of the so-called principles relating to centralization, decentralization, organizing by place, purpose, process, function and clientele, the appropriate span of control and so on, were arbitrary, contradictory and, as a result, not sufficient conditions by themselves for promoting efficiency in organizations. To Herbert Simon, decision-making was synonymous with managing. A decision-maker is a person at the moment of choice. Decision-making was a process. From this perspective, executives spent a large portion of their time surveying the economic, technical, political and social environment to identify new conditions that call for innovative actions. A large part of their time is spent investing, designing and developing possible courses of action for handling new situations in which a decision is needed.

Organizations play important roles in individual decision-making and individuals join organizations so that they can effect choice. The organization restricts the range of choice for the individual. In effect, individuals join organizations that restrict the range of choice for them. Organizations provide a context for specialized decision-making. Yet, it must be recognized that in Simon’s later work he explained that the organization never totally captures the individual’s commitment, inducements notwithstanding (March & Simon, 1958; Perrow, 1986). Thus, the influence of Herbert Simon’s contribution to our understanding of the contextual dimensions of organizational behaviour cannot be overemphasized. Simon’s work assisted us in focusing on decision-making in both private and public organizations. If we are to better understand public decision-making then we must examine the internal and external environmental contexts within which political decisions are made.

In Canada, a variety of efforts were made to improve the internal decision-making structure of government, especially as it impinged on the task of central coordination. Such a concern was initially outlined by the Canadian Government’s *Royal Commission on Government Organization* which reported in the early 1960s (Canada, Glassco Report, 1962, p. 48-66). The decision-making system changed significantly between the 1960s and the 1990s. By the 1990s, a systems and contingency view of management had emerged within the central decision-making machinery of the Government of Canada. Briefly, the managerial system of any organization is primarily concerned with decision-making for planning and controlling its endeavours and it is the means of linking other primary subsystems of organizations. The environmental supersystem provides the setting within which organizations function (Johnson et al., 1963). It provides a means for establishing the system-environment interaction.

The interested reader may endeavour to examine the environmental context within which decisions are made in the Prime Minister’s Office (PMO), the Privy Council Office (PCO), Cabinet, Cabinet Committees and in selected...
governmental departments. Placed in broader societal context, organizational decision-making allows the manager to determine:

- what is the problem?
- what are the alternatives?, and
- which alternative is best? (Simon, 1962, ch. 1)

There is, therefore, the element of optimizing. However, since there are cognitive “limits to rationality”, individuals may end up choosing satisfying rather than maximizing solutions (March & Simon, 1958; Simon, 1962). Simon introduced psychological contributions to the study of public administration. His theoretical approach links the individual at the bottom of the organization to the manager or managing group at the apex of the organization inasmuch as they are all accounted for in his decision-making framework. He also provides a theory of organizational learning and organizational choice. As such, his work complements that of Chester Barnard (1938) who emphasized the relationships between the manager and the worker.


In contrast to the classical and neoclassical schools, contemporary theories and models help us to understand the manner in which organizations undergo change consistent with developments in technologies, task environments and how people interact with one another in their respective organizations. This new approach emphasized organizational development and management. The performance of institutional roles link the organization to the political community. As such, these roles are predominately political. The performance of the managerial role deals with the effective utilization of organizational resources to grapple with internal and external exigencies. The performance of technical roles is concerned primarily with productive or operational activities. If we are to view government as an open system, then we can relate Talcott Parsons’ (1960) institutional, managerial, and technical roles as interdependent sub systems within society.

6.1 New issues in the administrative sciences. The Post WWII era in general, and the 1960’s in particular, presented organizational theorists with problems of highly complex organizations, highly differentiated divisions of labour, new concerns in industrial relations such as employee rights and increasing pluralist and volatile social environment (Perrow, 1986; Thompson, 1967; see also Scott, 1992). A mature and competitive marketplace led to the importance of appropriate organizational design in enhancing performance, and ultimately an evolution toward envisaging organizations as open systems in dynamic interchange with their environments. The contemporary issues identified are frequently discussed in terms of a shift from conceptualizing organizations from closed to open systems and the endorsement of the most recent emphasis on the contingency view of organizations. The contingency view suggests that there should be some congruence between the organization and its environment and among the various subsystems within organizations. The task of the managerial system is to achieve congruence between the organization and its environment. In such a situation, the internal organizational design leads to greater effectiveness, efficiency and to greater participation and satisfaction by employees.
With respect to managerial behaviour in particular, Warren Bennis (1993) suggests the development in basic philosophy is reflected most of all in the following three areas:

1. A new concept of man, based on increased knowledge of his complex and shifting needs, which replaces the oversimplified, innocent push-button or inert idea of man.

2. A new concept of power, based on collaboration and reason, which replaces a model of power based on coercion and fear.

3. A new concept of organizational values, based on a humanistic existential orientation, which replaces the depersonalized, mechanistic value system (p. 219).

Bennis does admit to a degree of idealism in his analysis. However, we can build on his work and apply it to developments in management theory throughout the 1980s and the 1990s. We identify three distinct developments in this period.

6.1.1 Slow Economic Performance First, 1980s began with an environment of recession, slow economic performance, and shrinking corporate profits. The emerging practice of “downsizing” became the popular mantra. The first impulse of corporate leaders was to get aggressive by initiating sharp cost cutting and executing across the board layoffs. However, it soon became clear that the term “downsizing” was about as politically correct as “collateral damage” was to become during the Gulf War. The need for some means of concealment, in the form of an abstruse theory became readily apparent. Downsizing was redubbed “re-engineering” or “right-sizing.” Survivors of these exercises were told that they were now empowered. It was suggested morale could be enhanced by rewarding deserving employees with work related perks; for example, cappuccino machines in the employees’ “lounge.” In retrospect, these conclusions were not dissimilar to the findings of Mayo’s Hawthorne Experiments fifty years earlier.

6.1.2 Greater Demand for Professional Services A second effect of the new post-recession management environment was a greater demand for professional competence. The arrival of Total Quality Management [TQM] and a Competency-Based System for recruitment, development, and promotion was the next evolution in management. TQM required a sophisticated managerial skill set in the tradition of scientific method [Taylorism]. Similarly, companies structured their compensation and reward systems around competencies. Naturally, TQM and Competency-Based Systems were widely embraced by the 1990s.

6.1.3 The Leader as “Hero” A third concern of management in the 1990s would be the eclipse of the 1980’s style business leader as corporate “hero.” The era of corporate raiders, mergers and acquisitions would prove profitable in the short term but what were the long-term consequences? Following the recession, business leaders were no longer lionized as saviours leading society into the “information age.” It became apparent that the corporate sector was lacking in human dimension. Leadership needed to be redefined. Enter a new era of social psychological preaching. Noted author, Steven Covey outlined The Seven Habits of Highly Effective People (1989), a highly influential primer for allying the human and corporate in a personal, proactive way.

There have also been more process-based efforts at refining management practices—techniques such as kaizen (continuous imp-
rovement) and just-in-time inventory systems, both staples of Japanese car manufacturing. There was also General Electric’s Six Sigma system of quality control. The danger with such innovations in management is that corporate leaders will force change without first understanding the existing corporate culture. Nonetheless, we can argue that these innovations have gained a wide intellectual acceptance in the management sciences, particularly in the organizational planning and policy formulation areas of large organizational systems, e.g. the public sector. Again, some of these approaches were developed very early at the social psychological level—such as Barnard’s theory of cooperative systems and Mayo’s version of human relations.

In summary, we can outline three distinct eras in the development of organization theory and how they evolved. We have reviewed the three stages as summarized in Table 2.1. A review of the contributors presented above, suggests that organizations are complex phenomena, which have to be investigated by means of interdisciplinary techniques with an emphasis on empirical analyses.

7.0 CONCLUSION

We began our analysis of public administration with a focus on the bureaucratic phenomenon and the growth of the administrative state. We introduced Weber’s classic bureaucratic model and a discussion of the predilection towards legal-rational authority structures in Western democracies. It was postulated that bureaucracy is necessary for the prevention of political corruption and for the safeguarding of proper democratic procedures. On the other hand, democracy generates a dilemma for a bureaucracy: under the present rather inconsistent democratic rules, bureaucracy is expected to be both independent and subservient, both politicized and non-politicized at one and the same time. Bureaucracy is thus a threat to, but also indispensable for, democracy. Max Weber’s influential analysis allows us to better understand the growth of the administrative state and the relative efficiency of rational hierarchical models of organization. Bureaucracy is able to break down complex activities of society into smaller managerial tasks of service delivery. To this end, we reviewed the classical and contemporary developments in organizational theory in general and related them to the context of public sector organizations. Accordingly, the structural characteristics discussed depict modern industrialized societies. Within the expansion of the public sector in the post-World War II years, these characteristics typify the structure of the modern state bureaucracy.
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