UNIT-V

TOPIC NAME:BUREAUCRACY-FORMAL AND INFORMAL

INTRODUCTION

Bureaucracy refers to both a body of non-elected government officials and an administrative policy-making group. Historically, a bureaucracy was a government administration managed by departments staffed with non-elected officials. Today, bureaucracy is the administrative system governing any large institution, whether publicly owned or privately owned. The public administration in many countries is an example of a bureaucracy, but so is the centralized hierarchical structure of a business firm. Various commentators have noted the necessity of bureaucracies in modern society. The German sociologist Max Weber argued that bureaucracy constitutes the most efficient and rational way in which human activity can be organized and that systematic processes and organized hierarchies are necessary to maintain order, maximize efficiency, and eliminate favoritism. On the other hand, Weber also saw unfettered bureaucracy as a threat to individual freedom, with the potential of trapping individuals in an impersonal "iron cage" of rule-based, rational control.

Models of Bureaucracy
Bureaucracies are complex institutions designed to accomplish specific tasks. This complexity, and the fact that they are organizations composed of human beings, can make it challenging for us to understand how bureaucracies work. Sociologists, however, have developed a number of models for understanding the process. Each model highlights specific traits that help explain the organizational behavior of governing bodies and associated functions.

The Weberian Model
The classic model of bureaucracy is typically called the ideal Weberian model, and it was developed by Max Weber, an early German sociologist. Weber argued that the increasing complexity of life would simultaneously increase the demands of citizens for government services. Therefore, the ideal type of bureaucracy, the Weberian model, was one in which agencies are apolitical, hierarchically organized, and governed by formal procedures. Furthermore, specialized bureaucrats would be better able to solve problems through logical reasoning. Such efforts would eliminate entrenched patronage, stop problematic decision-making by those in charge, provide a system for managing and performing repetitive tasks that required little or no discretion, impose order and efficiency, create a clear understanding of the service provided, reduce arbitrariness, ensure accountability, and limit discretion.

The Acquisitive Model
For Weber, as his ideal type suggests, the bureaucracy was not only necessary but also a positive human development. Later sociologists have not always looked so favorably upon bureaucracies, and they have

developed alternate models to explain how and why bureaucracies function. One such model is called the acquisitive model of bureaucracy. The acquisitive model proposes that bureaucracies are naturally competitive and power-hungry. This means bureaucrats, especially at the highest levels, recognize that limited resources are available to feed bureaucracies, so they will work to enhance the status of their own bureaucracy to the detriment of others. This effort can sometimes take the form of merely emphasizing to Congress the value of their bureaucratic task, but it also means the bureaucracy will attempt to maximize its budget by depleting all its allotted resources each year. This ploy makes it more difficult for legislators to cut the bureaucracy's future budget, a strategy that succeeds at the expense of thrift. In this way, the bureaucracy will eventually grow far beyond what is necessary and create bureaucratic waste that would otherwise be spent more efficiently among the other bureaucracies.

The Monopolistic Model
Other theorists have come to the conclusion that the extent to which bureaucracies compete for scarce resources is not what provides the greatest insight into how a bureaucracy functions. Rather, it is the absence of competition. The model that emerged from this observation is the monopolistic model. Proponents of the monopolistic model recognize the similarities between a bureaucracy like the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) and a private monopoly like a regional power company or internet service provider that has no competitors. Such organizations are frequently criticized for waste, poor service, and a low level of client responsiveness. Consider, for example, the Bureau of Consular Affairs (BCA), the federal bureaucracy charged with issuing passports to citizens. There is no other organization from which a U.S. citizen can legitimately request and receive a passport, a process that normally takes several weeks. Thus there is no reason for the BCA to become more efficient or more responsive or to issue passports any faster. There are rare bureaucratic exceptions that typically compete for presidential favor, most notably organizations such as the Central Intelligence Agency, the National Security Agency, and the intelligence agencies in the Department of Defense. Apart from these, bureaucracies have little reason to become more efficient or responsive, nor are they often penalized for chronic inefficiency or ineffectiveness. Therefore, there is little reason for them to adopt cost-saving or performance measurement systems. While some economists argue that the problems of government could be easily solved if certain functions are privatized to reduce this prevailing incompetence, bureaucrats are not as easily swayed.

Types of Bureaucratic Organizations
A bureaucracy is a particular government unit established to accomplish a specific set of goals and objectives as authorized by a legislative body. In the United States, the federal bureaucracy enjoys a great degree of autonomy compared to those of other countries. This is in part due to the sheer size of the federal budget, approximately $3.5 trillion as of 2015.[2] And because many of its agencies do not have clearly defined lines of authority—roles and responsibilities established by means of a chain of command—they also are able to operate with a high degree of autonomy. However, many agency actions are subject to judicial review. In Schechter Poultry Corp. v. United States (1935), the Supreme Court found that agency authority seemed limitless.[3] Yet, not all bureaucracies are alike. In the U.S. government, there are four general types: cabinet departments, independent executive agencies, regulatory agencies, and government corporations.

Cabinet Departments
There are currently fifteen cabinet departments in the federal government. Cabinet departments are major executive offices that are directly accountable to the president. They include the Departments of State, Defense, Education, Treasury, and several others. Occasionally, a department will be eliminated when government officials decide its tasks no longer need direct presidential and congressional

oversight, such as happened to the Post Office Department in 1970. Each cabinet department has a head called a secretary, appointed by the president and confirmed by the Senate. These secretaries report directly to the president, and they oversee a huge network of offices and agencies that make up the department. They also work in different capacities to achieve each department's mission-oriented functions. Within these large bureaucratic networks are a number of undersecretaries, assistant secretaries, deputy secretaries, and many others. The Department of Justice is the one department that is structured somewhat differently. Rather than a secretary and undersecretaries, it has an attorney general, an associate attorney general, and a host of different bureau and division heads.

This table outlines all the current cabinet departments, along with the year they were created, their current top administrator, and other special details related to their purpose and functions.

Members of the Cabinet

Department	Year Created	Secretary as of 2016	Purpose
State	1789	John Kerry	Oversees matters related to foreign policy and international issues relevant to the country
Treasury	1789	Jack Lew	Oversees the printing of U.S. currency, collects taxes, and manages government debt
Justice	1870	Loretta Lynch (attorney general)	Oversees the enforcement of U.S. laws, matters related to public safety, and crime prevention
Interior	1849	Sally Jewell	Oversees the conservation and management of U.S. lands, water, wildlife, and energy resources
Agriculture	1862	Tom Vilsack	Oversees the U.S. farming industry, provides agricultural subsidies, and conducts food inspections
Commerce	1903	Penny Pritzker	Oversees the promotion of economic growth, job creation, and the issuing of patents
Labor	1913	Thomas Perez	Oversees issues related to wages, unemployment insurance, and occupational safety
Defense	1947	Ashton Carter	Oversees the many elements of the U.S. armed forces, including the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force
Health and Human Services	1953	Sylvia Mathews Burwell	Oversees the promotion of public health by providing essential human services and enforcing food and drug laws
Housing and Urban Development	1965	Julian Castro	Oversees matters related to U.S. housing needs, works to increase homeownership, and increases access to affordable housing
Transportation	1966	Anthony Foxx	Oversees the country's many networks of national transportation
Energy	1977	Ernest Moniz	Oversees matters related to the country's energy needs, including energy security and technological innovation
Education	1980	John King	Oversees public education, education policy, and relevant education research
Veterans Affairs	1989	Robert McDonald	Oversees the services provided to U.S. veterans, including health care services and benefits programs
Homeland Security	2002	Jeh Johnson	Oversees agencies charged with protecting the territory of the United States from natural and human threats

Individual cabinet departments are composed of numerous levels of bureaucracy. These levels descend from the department head in a mostly hierarchical pattern and consist of essential staff, smaller offices, and bureaus. Their tiered, hierarchical structure allows large bureaucracies to address many different issues by deploying dedicated and specialized officers. For example, below the secretary of state are a

number of undersecretaries. These include undersecretaries for political affairs, for management, for economic growth, energy, and the environment, and many others. Each controls a number of bureaus and offices. Each bureau and office in turn oversees a more focused aspect of the undersecretary's field of specialization. For example, below the undersecretary for public diplomacy and public affairs are three bureaus: educational and cultural affairs, public affairs, and international information programs. Frequently, these bureaus have even more specialized departments under them. Under the bureau of educational and cultural affairs are the spokesperson for the Department of State and his or her staff, the Office of the Historian, and the United States Diplomacy Center. Under Secretary of State are seven direct reports. There are also six undersecretaries, and each have several direct reports. The multiple levels of the Department of State each work in a focused capacity to help the entire department fulfill its larger goals. (credit: modification of work by the U. S. Department of State) Created in 1939 by President Franklin D. Roosevelt to help manage the growing responsibilities of the White House, the Executive Office of the President still works today to "provide the President with the support that he or she needs to govern effectively."

Independent Executive Agencies and Regulatory Agencies
Like cabinet departments, independent executive agencies report directly to the president, with heads appointed by the president. Unlike the larger cabinet departments, however, independent agencies are assigned far more focused tasks. These agencies are considered independent because they are not subject to the regulatory authority of any specific department. They perform vital functions and are a major part of the bureaucratic landscape of the United States. Some prominent independent agencies are the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), which collects and manages intelligence vital to national interests, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), charged with developing technological innovation for the purposes of space exploration, and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), which enforces laws aimed at protecting environmental sustainability. An important subset of the independent agency category is the regulatory agency. Regulatory agencies emerged in the late nineteenth century as a product of the progressive push to control the benefits and costs of industrialization. The first regulatory agency was the Interstate Commerce Commission (ICC), charged with regulating that most identifiable and prominent symbol of nineteenth-century industrialism, the railroad. Other regulatory agencies, such as the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, which regulates U.S. financial markets and the Federal Communications Commission, which regulates radio and television, have largely been created in the image of the ICC. These independent regulatory agencies cannot be influenced as readily by partisan politics as typical agencies and can therefore develop a good deal of power and authority. The Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) illustrates well the potential power of such agencies. The SEC's mission has expanded significantly in the digital era beyond mere regulation of stock floor trading.

Government Corporations
Agencies formed by the federal government to administer a quasi-business enterprise are called government corporations. They exist because the services they provide are partly subject to market forces and tend to generate enough profit to be self-sustaining, but they also fulfill a vital service the government has an interest in maintaining. Unlike a private corporation, a government corporation does not have stockholders. Instead, it has a board of directors and managers. This distinction is important because whereas a private corporation's profits are distributed as dividends, a government corporation's profits are dedicated to perpetuating the enterprise. Unlike private businesses, which pay taxes to the federal government on their profits, government corporations are exempt from taxes.
 The most widely used government corporation is the U.S. Postal Service. Once a cabinet department, it was transformed into a government corporation in the early 1970s. Another widely used government

corporation is the National Railroad Passenger Corporation, which uses the trade name Amtrak. Amtrak was the government's response to the decline in passenger rail travel in the 1950s and 1960s as the automobile came to dominate. Recognizing the need to maintain a passenger rail service despite dwindling profits, the government consolidated the remaining lines and created Amtrak.

The Face of Democracy

Those who work for the public bureaucracy are nearly always citizens, much like those they serve. As such they typically seek similar long-term goals from their employment, namely to be able to pay their bills and save for retirement. However, unlike those who seek employment in the private sector, public bureaucrats tend to have an additional motivator, the desire to accomplish something worthwhile on behalf of their country. In general, individuals attracted to public service display higher levels of public service motivation (PSM). This is a desire most people possess in varying degrees that drives us to seek fulfillment through doing good and contributing in an altruistic manner.

The term "bureaucracy" originated in the French language: it combines the French word bureau – desk or office – with the Greek word κράτος (kratos) – rule or political power. The French economist Jacques Claude Marie Vincent de Gournay (1712-1759) coined the word in the mid-18th century. Gournay never wrote the term down but a letter from a contemporary later quoted him: The late M. de Gournay... sometimes used to say: "We have an illness in France which bids fair to play havoc with us; this illness is called bureau mania." Sometimes he used to invent a fourth or fifth form of government under the heading of "bureaucracy."
— Baron von Grimm (1723-1807)[14]
The first known English-language use dates to 1818[12] with Irish novelist Lady Morgan referring to the apparatus used by the British to subjugate their Irish colony as "the Bureaucratie, or office tyranny, by which Ireland has so long been governed." By the mid-19th century the word appeared in a more neutral sense, referring to a system of public administration in which offices were held by unelected career officials. In this context "bureaucracy" was seen as a distinct form of management, often subservient to a monarchy. In the 1920s the German sociologist Max Weber expanded the definition to include any system of administration conducted by trained professionals according to fixed rules.Weber saw bureaucracy as a relatively positive development; however, by 1944 the Austrian economist Ludwig von Misses opined in the context of his experience in the Nazi regime that the term bureaucracy was "always applied with an opprobrious connotation," and by 1957 the American sociologist Robert Merton suggested that the term "bureaucrat" had become an "epithet, a Schimpfwort" in some circumstances. The word "bureaucracy" is also used in politics and government with a disapproving tone to disparage official rules that make it difficult to do things.[by whom?] In workplaces, the word is used[by whom?] very often to blame complicated rules, processes, and written work that make it hard to get something done. Socio-bureaucracy would then refer to certain social influences that may affect the function of a society.

History
Ancient
Students competed in imperial examinations to receive a position in the bureaucracy of Imperial China. Although the term "bureaucracy" first originated in the mid-18th century, organized and consistent administrative systems existed much earlier. The development of writing (c. 3500 BC) and the use of documents was critical to the administration of this[which?] system, and the first definitive emergence of bureaucracy occurred in ancient Sumer, where an emergent class of scribes used[when?] clay tablets to administer the harvest and to allocate its spoils. Ancient Egypt also had a hereditary class of scribes that administered the civil-service bureaucracy. A hierarchy of regional proconsuls and their deputies

administered the Roman Empire.[citation needed] The reforms of Diocletian (Emperor from 284 to 305) doubled the number of administrative districts and led to a large-scale expansion of Roman bureaucracy. The early Christian author Lactantius (c. 250 – c. 325) claimed that Diocletian's reforms led to widespread economic stagnation, since "the provinces were divided into minute portions, and many presidents and a multitude of inferior officers lay heavy on each territory." After the Empire split, the Byzantine Empire developed a notoriously complicated administrative hierarchy, and in the 20th century the term "Byzantine" came to refer to any complex bureaucratic structure. In China, when the Qin dynasty (221–206 BC) unified China under the Legalist system, the emperor assigned administration to dedicated officials rather than nobility, ending feudalism in China, replacing it with a centralized, bureaucratic government. The form of government created by the first emperor and his advisors was used by later dynasties to structure their own government. Under this system, the government thrived, as talented individuals could be more easily identified in the transformed society. The Han dynasty (202 BC - 220 AD) established a complicated bureaucracy based on the teachings of Confucius, who emphasized the importance of ritual in a family, in relationships, and in politics. With each subsequent dynasty, the bureaucracy evolved. In 165 BC, Emperor Wen introduced the first method of recruitment to civil service through examinations, while Emperor Wu (r. 141–87 BC), cemented the ideology of Confucius into mainstream governance installed a system of recommendation and nomination in government service known as xiaolian, and a national academy whereby officials would select candidates to take part in an examination of the Confucian classics, from which Emperor Wu would select officials. In the Sui dynasty (581–618) and the subsequent Tang dynasty (618–907) the shi class would begin to present itself by means of the fully standardized civil service examination system, of partial recruitment of those who passed standard exams and earned an official degree. Yet recruitment by recommendations to office was still prominent in both dynasties. It was not until the Song dynasty (960–1279) that the recruitment of those who passed the exams and earned degrees was given greater emphasis and significantly expanded.[34] During the Song dynasty (960–1279) the bureaucracy became meritocratic. Following the Song reforms, competitive examinations took place to determine which candidates qualified to hold given positions.[35] The imperial examination system lasted until 1905, six years before the Qing dynasty collapsed, marking the end of China's traditional bureaucratic system.

Modern
The United Kingdom
The 18th century Department of Excise developed a sophisticated bureaucracy. Pictured, the Custom House in the City of London Instead of the inefficient and often corrupt system of tax farming that prevailed in absolutist states such as France, the Exchequer was able to exert control over the entire system of tax revenue and government expenditure. By the late 18th century, the ratio of fiscal bureaucracy to population in Britain was approximately 1 in 1300, almost four times larger than the second most heavily bureaucratized nation, France. Thomas Taylor Meadows, Britain's consul in Guangzhou, argued in his Desultory Notes on the Government and People of China (1847) that "the long duration of the Chinese empire is solely and altogether owing to the good government which consists in the advancement of men of talent and merit only," and that the British must reform their civil service by making the institution meritocratic. Influenced by the ancient Chinese imperial examination, the Northcote–Trevelyan Report of 1854 recommended that recruitment should be on the basis of merit determined through competitive examination, candidates should have a solid general education to enable inter-departmental transfers, and promotion should be through achievement rather than "preferment, patronage, or purchase". This led to implementation of Her Majesty's Civil Service as a systematic, meritocratic civil service bureaucracy. In the British civil service, just as it was in China, entrance to the civil service was usually based on a general education in ancient classics, which similarly gave bureaucrats greater prestige. The Cambridge-Oxford ideal of the civil service was identical to the

Confucian ideal of a general education in world affairs through humanism.(Well into the 20th century, Classics, Literature, History and Language remained heavily favored in British civil service examinations. In the period of 1925–1935, 67 percent of British civil service entrants consisted of such graduates. Like the Chinese model's consideration of personal values, the British model also took personal physique and character into account.

France
Like the British, the development of French bureaucracy was influenced by the Chinese system.[46] Under Louis XIV of France, the old nobility had neither power nor political influence, their only privilege being exemption from taxes. The dissatisfied noblemen complained about this "unnatural" state of affairs, and discovered similarities between absolute monarchy and bureaucratic despotism.[47] With the translation of Confucian texts during the Enlightenment, the concept of a meritocracy reached intellectuals in the West, who saw it as an alternative to the traditional ancient regime of Europe.[48] Western perception of China even in the 18th century admired the Chinese bureaucratic system as favorable over European governments for its seeming meritocracy; Voltaire claimed that the Chinese had "perfected moral science" and François Quesnay advocated an economic and political system modeled after that of the Chinese. The governments of China, Egypt, Peru and Empress Catherine II were regarded as models of Enlightened Despotism, admired by such figures as Diderot, D'Alembert and Voltaire.
Napoleonic France adopted this meritocracy system [48] and soon saw a rapid and dramatic expansion of government, accompanied by the rise of the French civil service and its complex systems of bureaucracy. This phenomenon became known as "bureau mania". In the early 19th century, Napoleon attempted to reform the bureaucracies of France and other territories under his control by the imposition of the standardized Napoleonic Code. But paradoxically, that led to even further growth of the bureaucracy. French civil service examinations adopted in the late 19th century were also heavily based on general cultural studies. These features have been likened to the earlier Chinese model.

Other industrialized nations
By the mid-19th century, bureaucratic forms of administration were firmly in place across the industrialized world. Thinkers like John Stuart Mill and Karl Marx began to theorize about the economic functions and power-structures of bureaucracy in contemporary life. Max Weber was the first to endorse bureaucracy as a necessary feature of modernity, and by the late 19th century bureaucratic forms had begun their spread from government to other large-scale institutions. The trend toward increased bureaucratization continued in the 20th century, with the public sector employing over 5% of the workforce in many Western countries.[citation needed] Within capitalist systems, informal bureaucratic structures began to appear in the form of corporate power hierarchies, as detailed in mid-century works like The Organization Man and The Man in the Gray Flannel Suit. Meanwhile, in the Soviet Union and Eastern Bloc nations, a powerful class of bureaucratic administrators termed nomenklatura governed nearly all aspects of public life. The 1980s brought a backlash against perceptions of "big government" and the associated bureaucracy. Politicians like Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan gained power by promising to eliminate government regulatory bureaucracies, which they saw as overbearing, and return economic production to a more purely capitalistic mode, which they saw as more efficient. In the business world, managers like Jack Welch gained fortune and renown by eliminating bureaucratic structures inside corporations. Still, in the modern world, most organized institutions rely on bureaucratic systems to manage information, process records, and administer complex systems, although the decline of paperwork and the widespread use of electronic databases is transforming the way bureaucracies function.

Theories

Karl Marx

Karl Marx theorized about the role and function of bureaucracy in his Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right, published in 1843. In Philosophy of Right, Hegel had supported the role of specialized officials in public administration, although he never used the term "bureaucracy" himself. By contrast, Marx was opposed to bureaucracy. Marx posited that while corporate and government bureaucracy seem to operate in opposition, in actuality they mutually rely on one another to exist. He wrote that "The Corporation is civil society's attempt to become state; but the bureaucracy is the state which has really made itself into civil society."

John Stuart Mill

Writing in the early 1860s, political scientist John Stuart Mill theorized that successful monarchies were essentially bureaucracies, and found evidence of their existence in Imperial China, the Russian Empire, and the regimes of Europe. Mill referred to bureaucracy as a distinct form of government, separate from representative democracy. He believed bureaucracies had certain advantages, most importantly the accumulation of experience in those who actually conduct the affairs. Nevertheless, he believed this form of governance compared poorly to representative government, as it relied on appointment rather than direct election. Mill wrote that ultimately the bureaucracy stifles the mind, and that "a bureaucracy always tends to become a pedantocracy."

Max Weber

The fully developed bureaucratic apparatus compares with other organisations exactly as does the machine with the non-mechanical modes of production.

–Max Weber

The German sociologist Max Weber was the first to formally study bureaucracy and his works led to the popularization of this term. In his essay Bureaucracy, published in his magnum opus Economy and Society, Weber described many ideal-typical forms of public administration, government, and business. His ideal-typical bureaucracy, whether public or private, is characterized by:

hierarchical organization

formal lines of authority (chain of command)

a fixed area of activity, rigid division of labor, regular and continuous execution of assigned tasks ,all decisions and powers specified and restricted by regulations, officials with expert training in their fields, career advancement dependent on technical qualifications, qualifications evaluated by organizational rules, not individuals Weber listed several preconditions for the emergence of bureaucracy, including an increase in the amount of space and population being administered, an increase in the complexity of the administrative tasks being carried out, and the existence of a monetary economy requiring a more efficient administrative system. Development of communication and transportation technologies make more efficient administration possible, and democratization and rationalization of culture results in demands for equal treatment. Although he was not necessarily an admirer of bureaucracy, Weber saw bureaucratization as the most efficient and rational way of organizing human activity and therefore as the key to rational-legal authority, indispensable to the modern world. Furthermore, he saw it as the key process in the ongoing rationalization of Western society. Weber also saw bureaucracy, however, as a threat to individual freedoms, and the ongoing bureaucratization as leading to a "polar night of icy darkness", in which increasing rationalization of human life traps individuals in a soulless "iron cage" of bureaucratic, rule-based, rational control. Weber's critical study of the bureaucratization of society became one of the most enduring parts of his work. Many aspects of modern public administration are based on his work, and a classic, hierarchically organized civil service of the Continental type is called "Weberian civil service".

Woodrow Wilson

Writing as an academic while a professor at Bryn Mawr College, Woodrow Wilson's essay The Study of Administration[66] argued for bureaucracy as a professional cadre, devoid of allegiance to fleeting politics. Wilson advocated a bureaucracy that "is a part of political life only as the methods of the counting house are a part of the life of society; only as machinery is part of the manufactured product. But it is, at the same time, raised very far above the dull level of mere technical detail by the fact that through its greater principles it is directly connected with the lasting maxims of political wisdom, the permanent truths of political progress." Wilson did not advocate a replacement of rule by the governed, he simply advised that, "Administrative questions are not political questions. Although politics sets the tasks for administration, it should not be suffered to manipulate its offices". This essay became a foundation for the study of public administration in America.

Ludwig von Misses

This section needs additional citations for verification. Please help improve this article by adding citations to reliable sources. Insourced material may be challenged and removed. Find sources: "Bureaucracy" – news · newspapers · books · scholar · JSTOR (January 2019) (Learn how and when to remove this template message) In his 1944 work Bureaucracy, the Austrian economist Ludwig von Misses compared bureaucratic management to profit management. Profit management, he argued, is the most effective method of organization when the services rendered may be checked by economic calculation of profit and loss. When, however, the service in question can not be subjected to economic calculation, bureaucratic management is necessary. He did not oppose universally bureaucratic management; on the contrary, he argued that bureaucracy is an indispensable method for social organization, for it is the only method by which the law can be made supreme, and is the protector of the individual against despotic arbitrariness. Using the example of the Catholic Church, he pointed out that bureaucracy is only appropriate for an organization whose code of conduct is not subject to change. He then went on to argue that complaints about bureaucratization usually refer not to the criticism of the bureaucratic methods themselves, but to "the intrusion of bureaucracy into all spheres of human life." Mises saw bureaucratic processes at work in both the private and public spheres; however, he believed that bureaucratization in the private sphere could only occur as a consequence of government interference. According to him, "What must be realized is only that the strait jacket of bureaucratic organization paralyzes the individual's initiative, while within the capitalist market society an innovator still has a chance to succeed. The former makes for stagnation and preservation of inveterate methods, the latter makes for progress and improvement."

Robert K. Merton

American sociologist Robert K. Merton expanded on Weber's theories of bureaucracy in his work Social Theory and Social Structure, published in 1957. While Merton agreed with certain aspects of Weber's analysis, he also noted the dysfunctional aspects of bureaucracy, which he attributed to a "trained incapacity" resulting from "over conformity". He believed that bureaucrats are more likely to defend their own entrenched interests than to act to benefit the organization as a whole but that pride in their craft makes them resistant to changes in established routines. Merton stated that bureaucrats emphasize formality over interpersonal relationships, and have been trained to ignore the special circumstances of particular cases, causing them to come across as "arrogant" and "haughty".

Elliott Jacques

In his book "A General Theory of Bureaucracy", first published in 1976, Dr. Elliott Jacques describes the discovery of a universal and uniform underlying structure of managerial or work levels in the bureaucratic hierarchy for any type of employment systems. Elliott Jacques argues and presents

evidence that for the bureaucracy to provide a valuable contribution to the open society some of the following conditions must be met: Number of levels in a bureaucracy hierarchy must match the complexity level of the employment system for which the bureaucratic hierarchy is created (Elliott Jacques identified maximum 8 levels of complexity for bureaucratic hierarchies). Roles within a bureaucratic hierarchy differ in the level of work complexity.

The level of work complexity in the roles must be matched with the level of human capability of the role holders (Elliott Jacques identified maximum 8 Levels of human capability).

The level of work complexity in any managerial role within a bureaucratic hierarchy must be one level higher than the level of work complexity of the subordinate roles.

Any managerial role in a bureaucratic hierarchy must have full managerial accountabilities and authorities (veto selection to the team, decide task types and specific task assignments, decide personal effectiveness and recognition, decide initiation of removal from the team within due process).

Lateral working accountabilities and authorities must be defined for all the roles in the hierarchy (7 types of lateral working accountabilities and authorities: collateral, advisory, service-getting and -giving, coordinative, monitoring, auditing, prescribing).

The definition of effective bureaucratic hierarchy by Elliott Jacques is of importance not only to sociology but to social psychology, social anthropology, economics, politics, and social philosophy. They also have a practical application in business and administrative studies.

Formal Organizations and Bureaucracy
different way of thinking that came to permeate society. This new orientation transformed the way in which society is organized. As a result, formal organizations, secondary groups designed to achieve explicit objectives, have become a central feature of contemporary society. Most of us are born within them, we are educated in them, we spend our working lives in them, and we are buried by them (Volte 1995).

Formal Organizations
Prior to industrialization, only a few formal organizations existed. The guilds of western Europe during the twelfth century are an example. People who performed the same type of work organized to control their craft in a local area. They set prices and standards of workmanship (Bridgewater 1953; Volte 1995). Much like modern unions, guilds also prevented outsiders (nonmembers of the guild) from working at the particular craft. Another example of an early formal organization is the army, with its structure of senior officers, junior officers, and ranks. Formal armies, of course, go back to early history. With industrialization, secondary groups became common. Today we take their existence for granted and, beginning with grade school, all of us spend a good deal of time in them. Formal organizations tend to develop into bureaucracies, and in general, the larger the formal organization, the more likely it is to be bureaucratic. formal organization: a secondary group designed to achieve explicit objectives A central characteristic of formal organizations is the division of labor. Bureaucracies, for example, divide tasks into very small segments. Prior to capitalism and industrialization, however, there was little division of labor, and few formal organizations existed. In this woodcut of money coiners in Germany during the Middle Ages, you can see an early division of labor and perhaps the emergence of a formal organization. Society is organized "to get its job done." It does so through formal organizations and bureaucracies. The same system that can be frustrating and impersonal is also the one on which we rely for our personal welfare and to fulfill our daily needs. The society of today, however, is not the society of yesterday, nor will it be the society of tomorrow. The rationalization of society refers to a transformation in people's thinking and behavior over the past 150 years, shifting the focus from personal relationships to efficiency and results. Karl Marx attributed this transformation to capitalism, while Max Weber, who disagreed with Marx, related it to Protestant theology. As a result of rationality,

formal organizations—secondary groups designed to achieve specific objectives—have become a central feature of contemporary society. With industrialization, secondary groups have become common. Today, their existence is taken for granted. They become a part of our lives at birth and seem to get more and more complex as we move through the life course. The larger the formal organization, the more likely it will turn into a bureaucracy. Bureaucracies are defined as formal organizations characterized by five features that help them reach their goals, grow, and endure. These five features are: (1) clear levels, with assignments flowing downward and accountability flowing upward; (2) a division of labor; (3) written rules; (4) written communications with records; and (5) impartiality. Although bureaucracies are the most efficient form of social organization, they can also be dysfunctional. Dysfunctions of bureaucracies can include red tape, lack of communication between units, and alienation. Examples of these dysfunctions include an overly rigid interpretation of rules and the failure of members of the same organization to communicate with one another. According to Max Weber, the impersonality of bureaucracies tends to produce workers who feel detached from the organization and each other. According to Karl Marx, workers experience alienation when they lose control over their work and are cut off from the finished product of their labor. To resist alienation, workers form primary groups, band together in informal settings during the workday to offer each other support and validation. They also personalize their work space with family photographs and personal decorations. Not all workers, however, succeed in resisting alienation. One reason bureaucracies endure and are so resilient is because they tend to take on a life of their own through a process called goal displacement. Once a bureaucracy has achieved its original goals, it adopts new goals in order to perpetuate its existence. A classic example of goal displacement involves the March of Dimes. Originally founded to fight polio, the organization 2 was faced with being phased out after Jonas Salk discovered the polio vaccine. Rather than disband, it adopted a new mission, fighting birth defects, and, more recently, changing the mission again to the vaguer goal of "breakthroughs for babies." In addition to bureaucracies, many people in the United States become involved with voluntary organizations, groups made up of volunteers who organize on the basis of some mutual interest. But even voluntary organizations are not immune from the effect of bureaucratization. Although formal organizations provide numerous beneficial functions, they also tend to be dominated by a small, self-perpetuating elite, a phenomenon Robert Michel referred to as the iron law of oligarchy. Even volunteer and non-profit organizations are affected by the iron law of oligarchy. Sociologists use the term "corporate culture" to refer to an organization's traditions, values, and unwritten norms. Much of what goes on in corporate culture, however, is hidden. To ensure that the corporate culture reproduces itself at the top levels, people in positions of power groom other people they perceive to be "just like them" for similar positions of power. In the United States, personal achievement is central; workers are hired on the basis of what they can contribute to the organization that hires them. To counter the negative side of bureaucracies, many corporations have begun taking steps to better humanize work settings. This includes the establishment of work teams, corporate day care, employee stock ownership plans, and quality circles. There has been a great deal of research directed at comparing the Japanese corporate culture to the American corporate culture. The Japanese corporate model differs significantly from the American corporate model in the way it views work, workers, and work organizations. Although considered as superior to the American corporate culture, more recent inspection shows this to be more of a myth than a reality. Successful Japanese businesses have adopted many of the American methods. The real bottom line is that we live in a global marketplace of ideas, as well as products, with no single set of cultural values accepted as universally superior.

 Outline
I. The Rationalization of Society A. Rationality, the acceptance of rules, efficiency, and practical results as the right way to approach human affairs, is a characteristic of industrial societies.

B. Historically, the traditional orientation to life is based on the idea that the past is the best guide for the present; however, this orientation stands in the way of industrialization.

1. Capitalism requires a shift in people's thinking, away from the idea that "This is the way we've always done it," to "Let's find the most efficient way to do it."

2. Personal relationships are replaced by impersonal, short-term contracts.

3. The "bottom line" becomes the primary concern.

C. Marx said that the development of capitalism caused people to change their way of thinking, not the other way around. Because capitalism was more efficient, it

3 produced the things in greater abundance, and it yielded high profits, people changed

their ideas.

D. Weber believed that religion held the key to understanding the development of capitalism.

1. He noted that capitalism emerged first in predominantly Protestant countries.

2. In The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism Weber proposed that a set of behaviors rooted in Protestantism led to the development of capitalist activity and the rationalization of society.

3. Weber argued that because of the Calvinistic belief in predestination, people wanted to show they were among the chosen of God. Financial success in life became a sign of God's approval; however, money was not to be spent on oneself. Rather, the investment of profits became an outlet for their excess money, while the success of those investments became a further sign of God's approval.

4. Because capitalism demanded rationalization (the careful calculation of practical results), traditional ways of doing things, if not efficient, must be replaced, for what counts are the results.

E. No one has yet been able to establish which view is correct. Consequently, the two continue to exist side by side within sociology.

II. Formal Organizations and Bureaucracies

A. Formal organizations, secondary groups designed to achieve explicit objectives, have become a central feature of contemporary life.

B. Early examples of formal organizations were guilds and the army. With industrialization, secondary groups became more common. Formal organizations, especially as they increase in size, tend to develop into bureaucracies.

C. Max Weber identified the essential characteristics of bureaucracies, which help these organizations reach their goals, as well as grow and endure. These include the following:

1. a hierarchy where assignments flow downward and accountability flows upward.

2. a division of labor.

3. written rules.

4. written communications and records.

5. impersonality.

D. Weber's characteristics of bureaucracy describe an ideal type—a composite of characteristics based on many specific examples. The real nature of bureaucracy often differs from its ideal image.

E. Weber's model only accounts for part of the characteristics of bureaucracies. Dysfunctions can also be identified.

1. Red tape, or the strict adherence to rules, results in nothing getting accomplished.

2. A lack of communication between units means that they are sometimes working at cross purposes; sometimes one unit "undoes" what another unit has accomplished because the two fail to inform one another what each is doing.

3. Bureaucratic alienation, a feeling of powerlessness and normlessness, occurs when workers are assigned to repetitive tasks in order for the corporation to achieve efficient production, thereby cutting them off from the product of one's labor.

4. To resist alienation, workers form primary groups within the larger secondary organization, relating to one another not just as workers, but as people who value one another.

5. The alienated bureaucrat is one who feels trapped in the job, does not take initiative, will not do anything beyond what she or he is absolutely required to do, and uses rules to justify doing as little as possible.

6. Bureaucratic incompetence is reflected in the Peter Principle—members of an organization are promoted for good work until they reach their level of incompetence. If this principle were generally true then bureaucracies would be staffed by incompetents and would fail. In reality, bureaucracies are highly successful.

F. Goal displacement occurs when an organization adopts new goals after the original goals have been achieved and there is no longer any reason for it to continue.

1. The March of Dimes is an example of this.

2. It was originally formed to fight polio, but when that threat was eliminated, the professional staff found a new cause, birth defects.

3. With the possibility of birth defects some day being eliminated as our knowledge of the human genes expands, the organization has adopted a new slogan—breakthroughs for babies—which is vague enough to ensure their perpetual existence.

G. To the sociologist, bureaucracies are significant because they represent a fundamental change in how people relate to one another. Prior to this rationalization, work focused on human needs such as making sure that everyone had an opportunity to earn a living; with rationalization, the focus shifts to efficiency in performing tasks and improving the bottom line.

The Informal Bureaucracy

When we look at an organizational chart, the official. formal structure of a bureaucracy is readily apparent. In practice, however, a bureaucracy has patterns of activities and interactions that cannot be accounted for by its organizational chart These have been referred to as bureaucracy's other face (Page, 1946). The informal side of a bureaucracy is composed of those aspects of participants' day-to-day activities and interactions that ignore, bypass, or do not correspond with the official rules and procedures of the bureaucracy. An example is an informal "grapevine" that spreads information '(with varying degrees of accuracy) much faster than do official channels of communication, which tend to be slow. And unresponsive. The informal structure has also been referred to as work culture because it includes the ideology and practices of workers on the job. Workers create this work culture in order to confront. resist. or adapt to the constraints of their jobs. as well as to guide and interpret social relations on the job (Zavalla, 1987). Today. computer networks and e-mail offer additional opportunities for workers to enhance or degrade their work culture. Some: organizations have sought to control offensive communications so that workers will nut be exposed to a hostile work environment brought about by colleagues. but. such control has raised Significant privacy issues.