The Power of Bureaucracy

Tam Mai

Florida Atlantic University, Florida, USA

Despite different views on the existence and development of bureaucracy, bureaucracy is still powerful. The control and influence of bureaucracy in public organizations are still undeniable. This paper explains reasons for the power of bureaucracy. The history for the growth of bureaucracy and the nature of bureaucracy has created strength for bureaucracy. Values such as hierarchy, impersonality, and expertise of bureaucracy are the core mechanisms of bureaucracy. These elements make rational contributions to the development of an organization. The paper asserts that the strength of bureaucracy is undeniable. However, its power is also challenged by its own weaknesses. For instance, rules and regulations, many demands of paperwork (the files), permission, and acceptance from different agencies make bureaucracy become rigid and slow down the implementation process. Its power is more threatened by the development of networks and hollow state, which are more flexible and adapted. Nevertheless, the paper concludes that the power of bureaucracy still exists. Bureaucracy will be powerful if its weaknesses are solved. There should be more focus on dealing with the weaknesses of bureaucracy rather than finding another mechanism that can replace bureaucracy.

Keywords: bureaucracy, power, strength, weaknesses

Since bureaucracy was formed, scholars have had different view of it. Some believe that bureaucracy is so rigid and unaccountable to the public. Others argue that bureaucracy generates efficiency and stability. Regardless of criticism or compliments, it is undeniable that the role of bureaucracy is still one of the important enduring issues in public administration today. Bureaucracy is still the main mechanism in public sectors and other sectors of public administration. Bureaucracy is not the best form of administration as both strengths and shortcomings still exist. However, bureaucracy is spreading worldwide. It is of great importance to understand the power of bureaucracy. "Imagine a world without bureaucracy (...) As a form of governance, bureaucracy has had such great success in transforming the world that most citizens of industrial nations may have difficulty imagining a world without it" (Bozeman, 2000, p. 11).

This study aims to focus on the research question: Why is bureaucracy still powerful? What are the challenges to its power? The study also suggests that in order to strengthen the power of bureaucracy, it is necessary to deal with its weaknesses. Evaluating the power of bureaucracy is critical, especially for students, scholars, and practitioners of public administration, because in bureaucracy, there are still pitfalls that need to be changed and reformed. There can be different reforms of bureaucracy, but the goal of finding a mechanism to replace bureaucracy is difficult to be accomplished because of its prevailing position. However, understanding the root of powerful bureaucracy is useful to maximize its strengths and minimize its weaknesses.

Corresponding author: Tam Mai, Ph.D., School of Public Administration, Florida Atlantic University, USA; research fields: public administration, international relations, human rights, critical theory, branding, human trafficking, and empowering women.

The research paper will define the meaning of "power" and "powerful", and clearly state what power means in this research paper. Then the nature of bureaucracy will be presented. The main part of the research paper will analyze why bureaucracy is powerful. The last part will provide suggestions of how to strengthen the power of bureaucracy. The research paper concludes that despite the emergence and development of other networks which have opposite mechanism with bureaucracy and have some more advantages than bureaucracy, its power is still dominant and it is difficult to find a system to completely replace bureaucracy.

What Is Power and Powerful

There are many definitions of power. Power is the influence that brings about changes in every aspect of life. Power can be formal or informal (French & Raven, 1959). French and Raven (1959) provided six types of power: coercive power, reward power, legitimate power, referent power, expert power, and informational power. "Coercive power" refers to threatening or using punishment; "reward power" means the ability to control or mediate reward. Those who have "legitimate power" have legitimate rights to prescribe the behavior of other people. "Referent power" means that an individual has power because he/she has association with powerful people and he can use the association to create influence or make changes. "Expert power" means that power is achieved because someone has knowledge and expertise over others. "Informational power" means that the more information one has, the more power he/she achieves.

Bureaucracy has all six powers, both formal and informal power as French and Raven (1959) identified. The power of bureaucracy is the capability of establishing objectives to be "consistent with one's personal interests, skills, and aspirations" (Chackerian & Abcarian, 1984, p. 4). In order to achieve the set goals and objectives, the power of bureaucracy refers to the ability to "control over the resources" (Chackerian & Abcarian, 1984, p. 4). Powerful bureaucracy means its ability to "tame the world" (Bozeman, 2000, p. 11), which refers to its huge impact not only in one country but all countries in the world, regardless of political system, whether socialism or capitalism (Sjoberg, Vaughan, & Williams, 1984). The power of bureaucracy can be illustrated through its ideology which is "a verbal image of that part of the good society relevant to the functions of the particular bureaucracy concerned, plus the chief means of constructing that portion" (Downs, 1967, p. 237). In other words, it is the ideology of bureaucracy that shapes daily activities of administration, and gives direction for the communication within the organizations or between organizations and other outsiders.

In this paper, the power of bureaucracy is focused on the impact, influence, and expansion of bureaucracy. Power in this research paper refers to the persistence of bureaucracy withstanding time. Its power shows that despite various criticisms about its pitfalls and the emergence of other forms which challenge bureaucracy, it is impossible to find a mechanism which can completely replace bureaucracy.

The Nature of Bureaucracy

Bureaucracy has existed since the civilization period, witnessing numerous changes in society, enduring through many millennia and achieving the longest existence and growth in the world (Farazmand, 2010). Bureaucracy strongly developed after World War II because it is closely linked with the development of "an advanced industrial-urban order" (as conceived by Weber, 1947, in Katz & Danet, 1973, p. 62). Bureaucracy is a system of an organization which is controlled by rules, regulations, and hierarchical structures. The management of bureaucracy "is based upon written documents (the 'files' which are preserved in their original

or draught form)" (Weber, 1947, as cited in Shariftz & Hyde, 2004). There is a clear delineation of roles and responsibilities in the bureaucratic system. Those who are responsible for the management of office are believed to experience careful training. The official is expected to use the full capacity to work for the office regardless if "his obligatory time in the bureau may be firmly delimited" (Weber, 1947, as cited in Shariftz & Hyde, 2004, p. 51). Bureaucracy provides a career-based civil system for employees such as tenure and pension for staff. Vocation (professional values) and self-esteem rather than material bonus are used as rewards for bureaucrats. Furthermore, a bureaucratic official who is considered to be a pure figure must be appointed by his boss rather than be elected by those who govern (Weber, 1947, as cited in Shariftz & Hyde, 2004).

Rules, regulations, division of labor, and hierarchy are considered as means to produce rationality and efficiency in the bureaucratic system because they are controlled in an impersonal and standardized manner. According to Downs (1967, p. 523), bureaucracy is created by "the routinization of charisma". A person who is allured by a group of people can be promoted to be a leader of that group. As a leader, through the hierarchical system of bureaucracy, that group will generate and implement its own ideas. A bureau can be formed just simply to implement a certain kind of mission and meet the demand of a group of people. A bureau can be created by the separation from another bigger bureau. Additionally, because of survival, a bureau will find outside sources to maintain its existence and growth.

Why Is Bureaucracy Powerful

Theories of bureaucratic power are developed by two historical scholars: Weber and Marx. Both scholars have different approaches for putting bureaucracy power in different circumstances. Weber (1947) argued that the power of bureaucracy originates from its central position in the history of modernization. Meanwhile, Marx and Engels (1971) saw the power of bureaucracy in the broader perspective of class domination and conflict. Bureaucracy is situated by Marx in a society without the division of class.

> Bureaucracy is a circle no one can leave. Its hierarchy is a hierarchy of information… The universal spirit of bureaucracy is the secret…, … Bureaucracy is the imaginary state beside the real state, the spiritualism of state… Thus, everything has a double meaning, a real and a bureaucratic meaning. (Marx, 1967, pp. 185-187, as cited in Farazmand, 2002, p. 23)

The power of bureaucracy is illustrated through the inevitable expansion of bureaucracy (Weber, 1947). Bureaucracy is a social form which "was rooted in the most distinctive features of the modern world" (Weber, 1947, as cited in Beetham, 1996, p. 53). The world is shaped by bureaucratic rationality. Bureaucracy consists of structures that produce an effective system of administration.

> Purely bureaucratic type of administration… is from a purely technical point of view, capable of attaining the highest degree of efficiency and is in this sense formally the most rational known means of carrying out imperative control over human beings. (Weber, 1947, p. 337)

In an organization, there are many large areas and divisions which their actions can be coordinated by the bureaucratic system. The expertise and control of files in the bureaucratic system are monopolized.

Bureaucracy is so powerful that the anti-bureaucracy movement cannot stop the expansion of bureaucracy and even increase its power "because of its indispensability for consolidating their hold on power" (Weber, 1947, as cited in Beetham, 1996, p. 57). While Weber believes that the complex technique of modern production leads to the power of bureaucracy, Marx and Engels (1971) held the view that the power of

bureaucracy is rooted from the administrative structure which is used as a means for the purpose of class control. In the time of Marx, bureaucracy was expansive because bureaucracy is able to meet the demands of social order imposition and the requirements of capitalist production. Bureaucracy makes a great contribution to the transformation process between capitalism and socialism. Furthermore, "bureaucracy enjoyed through its monopoly of political and administrative power" (Marx & Engels, 1971, as cited in Beetham, 1996, p. 76).

Bureaucracy is powerful because it provides certain values including hierarchy, impersonality, and expertise. These elements make rational contributions to the development of an organization. "The power of bureaucracies is dependent on sustaining these values" (Chackerian & Abcarian, 1984, p. 18). The hierarchy values originate from the five basic needs of Maslow's Theory (1972): from the basic needs (physiological needs), to the needs of safety or security needs, the needs of affection and belonging, the needs of esteem, and the needs of self actualization. These needs go from the low level (basic needs) to high level (self-actualization). The next level of needs only can be achieved if the lower level of needs is accomplished, which creates the equivalent level of hierarchy. Hierarchy refers to the superior and subordinate relationship, in which subordinates expect to receive something from the superior and vice versa. Both superior and subordinates want their needs to be met through hierarchical levels.

Bureaucracy can prevent personal favors from being handed out to anyone. A bureaucratic system is the prevention of a feudal system in which power and interests are provided on the basis of blood and personal relationships rather than the regulations of law (Farazmand, 2009). Bureaucracy is much better than the patronage or patrimonial system in which the selection of officials is decided by personal relationships. The rules and regulations create independence for the nature of bureaucracy, and as a result, the bureaucratic system becomes impersonal. The impersonal decision creates the quality for organization and leads to more effective and efficient operations. In order to achieve goals, each one must make his/her own efforts or the so-called "self-improvement" rather than depend on the personal relationships. "Self-improvement is defined largely in terms of improving one's calculative ability; acting 'rationally' means acting impersonally" (Chackerian & Abcarian, 1984, p. 16). The values of impersonality are significant elements in comparison to a traditional period when decisions are attached with personal sentiment and relations. The values of expertise are demonstrated through training. Before an employee is recruited to work for an organization, he/she is trained about the skills and additional knowledge to be suitable with the position he/she will hold when working for an organization. After a period of time working for the organization, he/she is provided in-service training to improve his qualifications and meet the demand of work. It is expected that the bureaucrat must work with high enthusiasm and avoid "mixing private feelings, emotions, or interests with the conduct of organizational business" (Chackerian & Abcarian, 1984, p. 18).

Bureaucracy is powerful because it plays an important role in "maintaining and enhancing the political and economic system or regime in power" (Farazmand, 1997b, p. 63). Without bureaucracy, it is difficult for the regime in power to exercise its leadership. The hierarchical nature and the division of labor help leaders of the regime to control and manage the subordinates' work. The semi-powered nature of American bureaucracy has helped the American presidential system to survive because "it satisfy(es) diverse interest groups, therefore it cannot amass the power to engage in a coup d'etat to topple the presidential regime in power—hence the survival of the regime" (Riggs, 1993, as cited in Farazmand, 1997b, p. 64). Additionally, according to Farazmand (1997b), bureaucracy is crucial for promoting both economic and national development. For example, in the U.S., the creation and expansion of the post office in the 1930s has contributed to pushing up

the economy and consolidating the political and economic systems in the context of economic crisis. Meanwhile, in France, "the bureaucratic elite has been given real authority… It can even veto executive actions" (Farazmand, 1997b, p. 66).

Bureaucracy is powerful because it generates "operational values," which "are created in the workplace to satisfy bureaucratic ends" (McKinley, 1964, p. 129). The operational values are of great importance for bureaucracy. They are considered "primary vehicles for bureaucratic power" (Chackerin & Abcarian, 1984, p. 29). The "operational values" are related to the activities in which bureaucracy is spread out in the family, school, and polity. The institutions of family, school, and polity are places to diffuse the bureaucracy to individuals.

Despite the linkage with individuals, the operational values are not necessarily similar to the needs of each individual in an organization. The ultimate goal is how the organization can implement the bureaucratic goals. Even when the personal needs of an organization are opposite to the bureaucratic goals of an organization, the bureaucratic goals are still given the first priority. There are only two personal needs that can be taken into account and are in line with bureaucratic ends. As Thompson (1969, p. 35) said: "bureaucracies are powerful in part because they provide job security and material advancement". Although the personal needs of employees cannot be met because they are contrary with the bureaucratic ends, employees still work for bureaucratic organizations because the career-based civil system with pension and "tenure for life" (Weber, 1947) protects them from the threat and risks of changes from the outside environment, especially when they retire. Additionally, the benefits of promotion, salary increases, the high possibilities of meeting self-esteem and self-actualization are appealing factors for the power of bureaucracy.

One of the strengths of bureaucracy is to provide stability and continuity, especially against the backdrop of the unprecedented and unpredictable changes of a political system. Hardgrave (1984) and Hardgrave and Kochanek (1993) presented that in India when there was chaos, political crisis, and the instability of leadership in the 1950s and 1970s, "it was the bureaucracy that held the country together through its iron will" (as cited in Farazmand, 1997b, p. 83). Bureaucracy has assisted in consolidating the power and stability for India in this period.

Bureaucracy is attractive and powerful because it is a useful tool to manage and control a great number of people who share a given objective and pursue that objective (Denhardt & Catlaw, 2015). Its power is consolidated by its differences with non-bureaucrats. By comparing the differences between bureaucrats and non-bureaucrats, Katz and Danet (1973) held the view that bureaucrats come from large urban areas. They are not only urban citizens but were born and raised in urban areas of the Great Lakes, the Northeastern and Pacific states. Further, they are more educated than non-bureaucrats. In nature, the urban and highly educated people are more influential than others. Thus, bureaucrats can have more impact and power than non-bureaucrats. "Bureaucrats are found to value self-direction more highly than non-bureaucrats do" (Katz & Danet, 1973, p. 144). Additionally, bureaucrats are inclined to deal with more complex jobs than other non-bureaucrats who have the same level of education.

In terms of the executive branch, bureaucracy is an administrative means to effectively fulfill the means-ends relationship. As a means, bureaucracy plays an important role in influencing the positive and negative achievement of the goal. According to Gawthrop (1969, p. 1), one of the reasons for the power of bureaucracy is not because bureaucracy is a great hero who helped to save the life, but because it is impressed that "bureaucracy and the bureaucrats are terms that normally are associated with governmental functions".

Evidently, government is linked with power, control, and dominance. Thus, it is easy to understand why normally mentioning government refers to bureaucracy and vice versa. In fact, bureaucracy does not only exist in governmental agencies but in other organizations, including public and private organizations. However, bureaucracy is more popular in large and complex organizations rather than in small and simple organizations.

The power of bureaucracy is illustrated through the so-called "bureaucraticism" (Farazmand, 2010, p. 249), which means if there is any change that can threaten the status of bureaucracy, it resolutely opposes that change (Farazmand, 2010). Especially, if the changes can negatively affect the position of elites, bureaucracy will be an effective tool to struggle against the negative impact (Farazmand, 2010). If any sign of "existence, privileges or power" (Farazmand, 2010, p. 250) of bureaucracy is challenged, it will fight aggressively to the end. If the change does no harm to bureaucracy, it can co-exist with bureaucracy, but it must still be under the influence and power of bureaucracy.

What is happening in detail inside the government and large and complex organizations is not open to the public. Only the final decision is announced through the mass media. Likely, bureaucracy for many people is secretive. As a part of administration, bureaucracy always avoids the public scrutiny and debate (Merton, 1940). The concealment of bureaucratic activities in some cases makes it more powerful because normal and local people think that bureaucracy is something so abstract that normal people cannot understand fully. The secrecy unintentionally increases the supposedly "supremacy" of bureaucracy.

Bureaucracy is powerful because "bureaucracy is a control instrument and a control instrument without comparison. Control is the source of power for this type of organization" (Hummel, 1976, p. 28). The subordinates under the bureaucratic system are guided by what should be done based on the rules and regulations. The whole processes from taking action, evaluation of activities, working out solutions, and evaluating results of the bureaucratic system. Bureaucracy as control not only has power but "unparalled" power because people working in the bureaucratic environment must follow it or if they intend to oppose to it, they are only defeated (Hummel, 1976).

The power of bureaucracy is demonstrated through its ability to collect and direct power. Hummel (1976, p. 26) was optimistic to believe that "modern bureaucracy harnesses more power than any, and possibly all, of the great projects of antiquity". Bureaucracy is able to manage literally "millions" of employees to carry out big projects (Hummel, 1976, p. 26). The dominance of bureaucracy is more consolidated by "conservers" (Downs, 1967), who have worked for the bureau for a long time and are more interested in maintaining their position in the bureaucratic system. Enjoying the unilateral nature of authority, bureaucratic systems have more advantages than other competing mechanisms (Downs, 1967).

Bureaucracy is powerful because bureaucracy is politics. Bureaucracy is not only related to administration but plays an important role in politics. Politicians use bureaucracy as a means to achieve power. There is bureaucratization of politics, in which "bureaucratic power will replace political power" (Hummel, 1976, p. 193). In other words, politicians will tend to increasingly act like managers running businesses. Weber (1947, p. 43) held the view that "in the modern state the actual ruler is necessarily and unavoidably the bureaucracy…" Thus, whoever wants to hold power, he/she must be clear of bureaucracy or only by working well in a bureaucratic system, can he/she become a leader.

The power of bureaucracy is illustrated through its ability to influence the lives of the public. Street-level bureaucrats who directly work with citizens such as policemen, teachers, social workers, and public lawyers play an important role in presenting how bureaucracy works and are influential in citizen life (Lipsky, 1980).

The poorer the clients are, the more dependent they are on street-level bureaucrats because many street-level bureaucrats are involved in the work of helping the poor for example, in terms of accommodation, security, financial assistance, and health care. When there are changes of policy, street-level bureaucrats must explain with clients and help them to adjust to the influence of policy changes. As a bridge of bureaucracy, street-level bureaucrats have both formal and informal power in serving the needs and demands of both governmental agencies and citizens (Lipsky, 1980).

Since bureaucracies can be affected by politics, they do not simply provide services; they also play a political role, which increases its power. According to the bureaucratic politics of Allison (2004), governmental decisions and actions are developed based on the negotiation and bargaining among different sectors. The decisions of the government often reflect the compromise made by various bureaucratic agencies.

For American democracy, bureaucracy plays a politically important role for the President, Congress, and for both public and private agencies. Bureaucracy is used as a means to achieve power. Bureaucracy is considered to be the most representative for the American governmental system, and it is still stable in both giant and medium agencies in the American administrative and governmental system (Goodsell, 1983). Bureaucracy works well, for example, in the American system. It helps the American government to fulfill the required tasks, prevents corruption, and is suitable with those who are serious about their works. Bureaucracy is the best form in the world, which not only helps to increase efficiency and effectiveness for the American government but is also important for the whole society. Goodsell (1983) highly valued bureaucrats because they work hard and make important contributions to dealing with daily issues to meet the expectations of both citizens and governments. They work in the environment where resources are limited and "unlike the policy-making activity of elected officials, this work by bureaucrats is undramatic, hidden, ongoing, and persistent" (Goodsell, 1983, p. 41).

In the context of American politics, as Brownlow and Gulick (1937) argued, it is complex to run an effective hierarchical structure, specifically for the president. For example, since the U.S. was founded in 1789, democracy is the goal that the U.S. pursues. However, based on the Constitution of the U.S., the President already assumes the responsibility as the leader of a party, of the Congress, and of the people. "The president needs help. His immediate staff needs assistance in entirely inadequately" (Shafritz & Hyde, 2004, p. 102). As a representative institution, bureaucracy has the same design as an institution with a complex hierarchy.

The power of bureaucracy is demonstrated through its representation for citizens (Krislov, 1974). With its demographic nature, bureaucracy can represent clients if it can help to increase the interests for clients and vice versa. If the representativeness of bureaucracy increases, people may have more interests. Representative bureaucracy originated from the issue of struggling against inequality for black people and women in the U.S. Creating equal opportunities for all people is the goal that is set up in representative bureaucracy. As a diverse country with different races, ethnic identities, and genders, the representative bureaucracy is of great significance for American society. According to Krislov (1974, p. 354), "the concept of representative bureaucracy was originally developed to argue for a less elite, less class-biased civil service".

The power of bureaucrats is illustrated by its ability to challenge the principles and practices of democracy. For example, the principles and practices of democracy are challenged by bureaucrats. Equality, justice, freedom, and accountability are democratic values. Democracy provides opportunities for the participation of everyone. In a democratic system, citizens have a chance to express their voices through different languages, and have the freedom to provide different interpretations. These values and principles of democracy are

threatened by the bureaucratic system. Equality and justice, both democratic values, do not have room for development in bureaucratic system. Bureaucracy aims to "dehumanize" (Hummel, 2007). Bureaucrats are human beings who should have both logic (mind) and sense (heart or feeling); however, their behavior is based only on the logic without heart. Clients of bureaucracy are considered to be cases rather than human beings. The rules of bureaucracy have prevented bureaucrats from handling the situation in the human direction. For bureaucrats, the world outside is alien. Although they are human beings, they are ignorant of human values. They act differently in social, cultural, psychological, political, and linguistic areas. They must leave the humanness behind to ensure that they are not fired and their job is secure. "In most cases they must allow themselves to be brainwashed into new norms. To the extent they do not, the probability of failure rises" (Hummel, 2007, p. 17). As long as bureaucrats want to achieve success in their jobs, they should not become intimate with clients.

Additionally, "The language of bureaucracy" (Hummel, 2007, p. 185) is one-dimensional, threatening the practices and principles of democracy, and has both legitimate and coercive power. Outsiders—the citizens who should have opportunities to express the own language—find it difficult to understand the language of bureaucracy even if they really want to learn the language. When bureaucrats say clients should just listen and give no feedback, clients and bureaucrats are not engaged in a dialogue. The language of bureaucracy threatens the principle—"rule of people" in democracy because the languages of people are muted by bureaucrats (Hummel, 2007).

Weaknesses and Challenges to the Power of Bureaucracy and How to Deal With Them

The first weakness of bureaucracy is that in real life there are many situations that cannot follow exactly the rules and regulations of bureaucracy. Bureaucracy with its many demands of paperwork (the files), permission, and acceptance from different agencies can be rigid and slow down the implementation process. To reduce the inflexibility of rules and regulations, it is crucial to streamline the system of organization. Rules and regulations are still maintained, but they must be well arranged and convenient for implementation. Additionally, the rules for emergency situations need to be taken into consideration, because these situations require quick approval.

The granting of superior authority to a pure bureaucratic official can add to weaknesses in the bureaucratic system. If the appointment is based on the high capacity and positive qualifications of that official, there will be no problem for the organization. However, if the appointment is based on a personal or close relationship between the superior and the official, the appointment is unfair and can be harmful for the organization, especially when the qualifications and capacity of that official cannot meet the working requirements. To remove this shortcoming of the bureaucracy, it is possible to combine both appointment and election as the rule for granting superior authority for the pure bureaucratic official. One solution can be that the official is nominated by the superior leaders, but the appointment should be decided by the election of the governed through their evaluation.

One of the main tasks of bureaucracy is to implement the law. However, it is difficult to ensure that when implementing the law, bureaucrats will not abuse their power. One solution given by Madisonians who support the balance of power in American democracy is to generate the competition of political interests and separate politics from administration (the main assumption of the control of bureaucracy theory) (Frederickson & Smith, 2003). The idea of separation between politics and administration is just an ideal type because in reality it is

impossible to separate these two areas. Politics is goal and administration is a means to implement the goal. Politicians require advice from administrators to create the policy and administrators provide feedback to politicians to adjust the policy, if necessary. Thus, in order for bureaucrats to work well without abuses, the first thing is to train bureaucrats to be good employees. Bureaucrats need to be fully aware that the first priority of their work is to provide the best service to the public. They need to question whether the interests of the public are promoted through their service. If bureaucrats are only interested in their position in office, they do not deserve to provide services and cannot meet the demand and interests of the public.

The separation of politics and administration is not a solution to avoid the abuses of bureaucrats. In contrast to the control of bureaucracy theory, the capture theories "suggest that there is too much political control of bureaucracy rather than not enough" (Frederickson & Smith, 2003, p. 27). The capture theory poses another problem for bureaucracies. Individuals and groups of regulatory agencies only care about achieving the policy they prefer, but do not pay attention to public interests. Thus, without enhancing public interests, bureaucrats should not continue their jobs. In fact, the puzzle is how to prevent policy preferences, which are beneficial for regulatory agencies but not for the public. For example, the "deregulation movement of the 1970s (in the U.S.) challenged one of the theory's basic premises, namely, that the regulatory agencies serve the interests of the regulated clientele, not the public interests" (Frederickson & Smith, 2003, p. 27). Sometimes, the policy preferences are disguised, and only when their implementation is almost finished and results in consequences, can they be recognized.

Another characteristic of bureaucracy is formed by the routinization of charisma (Weber, 1947). The routine can prevent people from being creative, which leads to stagnation. Employees can feel bored with their jobs, but continue working because they believe that the career-based civil system with pension and "tenure for life" protects them from the threats and risks of the outside environment, especially when they retire. With this kind of protection, sometimes bureaucrats will not be motivated to do their job, especially when they are older, because they think even though they do not need to try harder; they will still receive a pension and tenure. They become reactive not proactive and repeat their work through days without innovations. To deal with the routinization of bureaucracy, continuous renovations are important to motivate employees. The method of work redesign through "fitting the jobs to people" and "fitting people to jobs" (Hackman & Oldham, 1980) is one way to help bureaucrats, even those who are approaching retirement, feel motivated for their jobs.

If a bureau must be faced with decline, employees of that bureau do not find a way to strengthen the operation of that bureau. Employees with lower positions will move to other bureaus, while those who have higher positions will become "conservers" (Downs, 1967). "As a result, the entire bureau will shift toward greater conserver dominance, thereby reducing its ability to innovate and the desire to expand its functions" (Shafritz & Hyde, 2004, p. 263). Thus, bureaucrats are more interested in maintaining their position rather than enhancing the operation of the bureau. They do not pay attention to innovations. How can an office develop without innovations? How can bureaucrats better serve clients without innovations?

Bureaucracy is not open for public scrutiny (Merton, 1940). The purpose of the secrecy is to prevent the private sectors or hostile political groups from intervening or criticizing. There are two sides of this issue. On the one hand, it is reasonable to keep the secrecy from competitors and hostile political groups. On the other hand, if bureaucrats do something wrong or contrary to the interests of the public, who can handle or control this issue? Who can make sure that bureaucrats are always accountable? Due to the secrecy from the public, it is difficult to control the bureaucrats' accountability. To deal with this issue, it is strongly recommended that

there should be an independent agency or structure which can control and evaluate the secrecy of bureaucracy.

Furthermore, the unilateral nature of authority in bureaucratic organizations is criticized because bureaucrats can abuse that unilateral nature to serve their own interests, while little attention is paid to the interests of the public. Barzelay (1992) suggested that to improve the bureaucratic system organizations should be "customer-driven and service-oriented" (Barzelay, 1992, as cited in Shafritz & Hyde, 2004, p. 534). In other words, serving customers well must be the first priority in the operations of bureaucratic organizations. This idea can be explained more clearly through the agency theory (Wood & Waterman, 1994, as cited in Shafritz & Hyde, 2004) in which the elected leaders play the role as "buyers" using the law to establish services while bureaucrats are "sellers" who provide services to the public. In the democracy of the U.S., according to Wood and Waterman (1994), bureaucracies "perform an integrative function... They blend demands from past democratic coalitions with those from current democratic coalitions to produce a policy output at a consistent level" (Fredickson & Smith, 2003, p. 145). Thus, bureaucracy is affected by politics and vice versa. Regardless of how influential it may be, the "customer-driven and service-oriented" approach is the ultimate goal that bureaucracies must strive to achieve.

In order to strengthen the power of bureaucracy, it is necessary to deal with weaknesses of bureaucracy. Bureaucracy can bring about efficiency; however, the vague guidance can force clients to misunderstand its implementation of paperwork and make mistakes. It will be a waste of time for both clients and bureaucrats, so the argument that bureaucracy can bring about efficiency, in this case, must be reconsidered. To recover from this shortcoming, it is necessary to build a clear agenda, strategy, or plan of action for bureaucracy. Additionally, adequate attention is needed to provide simple and obvious explanations for clients, especially with street-level bureaucrats who work daily and directly with the public.

An important idea of representative bureaucracy theory is to build a bureaucracy as an institution which develops in democratic context and is non-discriminatory to anyone, neither black nor white people (Kingsley, 1944). Bureaucracies should serve as a bridge of different agencies which compete with one another to achieve the highest interests (Waldo, 1952). Democracy should be returned to the public administration. The complex and uneasy relationship between democracy and efficiency should be acknowledged and the coexistence of both democracy and efficiency is of great significance. Using the principle of the universality of ethical rules which come from both utilitarian theories to reconcile bureaucracy and democracy (Woller, 1998). The reconciliation between bureaucracy and democracy will help to build a "good society" (without poverty, corruption, and widening gap between the rich and the poor) (Waldo, 1952), in which the knowledge, capability, morality, and accountability of bureaucrats are important.

Conclusions

In the context of globalization in the 21st century, the power of bureaucracy is still enduring despite the strong development of networks. In networks, actors must negotiate, discuss, and coordinate to reach contracts and agreements. Everything can be changed in the process of negotiation. Networks are more flexible and adaptable than bureaucracy (Milward & Provan, 2000). Through networks, it is easier for parties to contact one another, show their voices, and establish new stages of cooperation. During the process of collaboration, parties continue to learn from others and make changes so they can maintain collaboration. All parties of the network need to update information and increase their knowledge, both explicit and tacit, so they can make knowledge-based decisions (Milward & Provan, 2000).

However, these structures do not threaten the power of bureaucracy "because of hierarchy, bureaucracies are more predictable and stable over time" (Milward & Provan, 2000, p. 241). Although a hollow state can be more advantageous than bureaucracy in terms of its flexibility to adapt, its instability, and diffused accountability prevent a hollow state or networks from replacing bureaucracy. "Networks—the mainstay of the hollow state—are inherently weaker forms of social action. Because they must coordinate production jointly, networks are inherently unstable over time" (Milward & Provan, 2000, p. 241, as cited in Heinrich & Lynn, 2000). Thus, bureaucracy still plays a dominant role in the 21st century. Bureaucratic administration still develops strongly in a democratic order. Both the values and limits of bureaucracy are parallel. The power of bureaucracy will persist with time as long as the strengths of bureaucracy can be promoted and its weaknesses of bureaucracy reformed and removed.

References

Allison, G. (2004). Public and private management: Are they fundamentally alike in all unimportant respects? In J. M. Shafritz, A. C. Hyde, and S. J. Parkes (Eds.), *Classics of public administration* (5th ed.) (pp. 396-413). Belmont, CA: Thomas Wadsworth.

Barzelay, M. (1992). *Breaking through bureaucracy: A new vision for managing in government*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Beetham, D. (1996). *Bureaucracy* (2nd ed.). Minneapolis, MI: University of Minnesota Press.

Bozeman, B. (2000). *Bureaucracy and red tape* (1st ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Brownlow, M., & Gulick, L. (1937). *Administrative management in the government of the United States*. Washington, D.C.: President's Committee on Administrative Management.

Chackerian, R., & Abcarian, G. (1984). *Bureaucratic power in society*. Chicago, IL: Nelson-Hall.

Denhardt, R., & Catlaw, T. (2015). *Theories of public organization* (7th ed.). Stamford, CT: Cengage Learning.

Downs, A. (1967). *Inside bureaucracy*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown.

Farazmand, A. (1997a). From civil to non-civil administration: The biggest challenge to public administration. Proceedings from *the 1997 Annual Conference of the American Society for Public Administration (ASPA)*, Philadelphia, July.

Farazmand, A. (1997b). Bureaucracy is alive and well. *Public Administration Times 5*.

Farazmand, A. (1999). Globalization and public administration. *Public Administration Review, 59*(6), 509-522.

Farazmand, A. (2002). Organization theory: From pre-classical to contemporary and critical theories—An overview and appraisal. In *Modern organizations: Theory and practice* (2nd ed.). Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.

Farazmand, A. (2009). Building administrative capacity for the age of rapid globalization: A modest prescription for survival in the 21st century. *Public Administration Review, 69*(6), 1007-1020.

Farazmand, A. (2010). Bureaucracy and democracy: A theoretical analysis. *Public Organization Review, 10*(3), 245-258.

Frederickson, G., & Smith, K. (2003). *Public administration theory primer*. Boulder, CO: Westview.

French, J., & Raven, B. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright and Z. Alvin (Eds.), *Group dynamics: Research and theory* (pp. 150-167). New York: Harper & Row.

Gawthrop, L. (1969). *Bureaucratic behavior in the executive branch*. New York: The Free Press.

Goodsell, C. (1983). *The case for bureaucracy: A public administration polemic*. Chatham, NJ: Chatham House.

Hackman, R., & Oldham, G. (1980). *Work redesign*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Hardgrave, R. (1984). *India under pressure: Prospects for political stability (A Westview replica edition)*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Hargrave, R., & Kochanek, S. (1993). *India: Government and politics in a developing nation* (5th ed.). New York: Harcourt Brace, Jovanovich.

Heinrich, C., & Lynn, L. (2000). *Governance and performance: New perspectives*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Hummel, R. (2007). *The bureaucratic experience: The post-modern challenge*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

Hummmel, R. (1976). *The bureaucratic experience*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Katz, E., & Danet, B. (1973). *Bureaucracy and the public: A reader in official-client relations*. New York: Basic Books.

Kingsley, D. (1944). *Representative bureaucracy: An interpretation of the British civil service*. Yellow Springs, OH: The Antioch Press.

Knutson, J. N. (1972). *The human basis of the polity*. Chicago, IL: Aldine-Atherton, Inc.

Krislov, S. (1974). *Representative bureaucracy*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Lipsky, M. (1980). *Street-Level bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the individual in public services*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Marx, K. (1968). The eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte and critique of the Gotha Programme. In K. Marx and F. Engels (Eds.), *Selected works* (pp. 97-180; 319-335). Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House.

Marx, K. (1970). *Critique of Hegel's "Philosophy of Right"*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1971). *Writing on the Paris Commune*. Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House.

McKinley, G. (1964). *Social class and family life*. New York: Free Press.

Merton, R. (1940). Bureaucratic structure and personality. *Social Forces, 18*, 560-568.

Merton, R. (1957). *Social theory and social structure*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Milward, B. (1996). Symposium on the hollow state: Capacity, control, and performance in interorganizational settings. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 6*(2), 193-196.

Milward, B., & Provan, K. (2000). How networks are governed. In C. Heinrich and L. Lynn Jr. (Eds.), *Governance and performance: New perspectives*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Shafritz, J., & Hyde, A. (2004). *Classics of public administration*. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing.

Shafritz, J., & Hyde, A. (2009). *Classics of public administration* (6th ed.). Boston, MA: Wadsworth Publishing.

Sjoberg, G., Williams, N., & Vaughan, T. (1984). Bureaucracy as a moral issue. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 20*(4), 441-453.

Thompson, A. (1969). *Modern organizations*. New York: Knopf.

Waldo, D. (1952). Development of theory of democratic administration. *The American Political Science Review, 46*(1), 81-103.

Weber, M. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organizations* (trans: A. M. Parsons, T. Parsons). New York: Free Press.

Woller, G. (1998). Toward a reconciliation of the bureaucratic and democratic ethos. *Administration & Society, 30*(1), 85-109.

Wood, D., & Waterman, R. (1994). *Bureaucratic dynamics: The role of bureaucracy in a democracy*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.