

PERSPECTIVES ON PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION



School of Social Sciences
Indira Gandhi National Open University

EXPERT COMMITTEE

Prof. C.V. Raghavulu Former Vice-Chancellor of Nagarjuna University, Guntur (A.P.)	Prof. Ravinder Kaur Department of Public Administration Osmania University, Hyderabad	Prof. Rajvir Sharma Maharaja Agrasen Institute of Management Studies, Delhi
Prof. Ramesh K. Arora Former Professor of Public Administration Rajasthan University, Jaipur	Prof. C.Venkataiah, Dr.B.R. Ambedkar Open University Hyderabad	Prof. Sanjeev Kumar Mahajan Department of Public Administration Himachal Pradesh University, Shimla
Prof. O. P. Minocha Former Professor of Public Administration Indian Institute of Public Administration, New Delhi	Prof. G. Palanithurai Department of Political Science and Development Administration Gandhigram Rural University Gandhigram	IGNOU Faculty Prof. Pardeep Sahnii Prof. E. Vayunandan Prof. Uma Medury Prof. Alka Dhameja Prof. Dolly Mathew Prof. Durgesh Nandini
Prof. Arvind K. Sharma Former Professor of Public Administration Indian Institute of Public Administration, New Delhi	Prof. Ramanjit Kaur Johal University School of Open Learning Panjab University, Chandigarh	Consultants Dr. Sandhya Chopra Dr. A. Senthamizh Kanal
Prof. R.K. Sapru Former Professor Public Administration Panjab University, Chandigarh	Prof. Rajbans Singh Gill Department of Public Administration Punjabi University, Patiala	CBCS (Programme Coordinators) Prof. Dolly Mathew Prof. Durgesh Nandini
Prof. Sahib Singh Bhayana Former Professor Public Administration Panjab University, Chandigarh	Prof. Manjusha Sharma Department of Public Administration Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra	
Prof. B.B. Goel Former Professor of Public Administration Panjab University, Chandigarh	Prof. Lalneihzovi Department of Public Administration Mizoram Central University	
	Prof. Neelima Deshmukh Former Professor of Public Administration, Rashtrasant Tukadoji Maharaj Nagpur University	

Course Coordinator : Prof. Alka Dhameja, Faculty of Public Administration, School of Social Sciences, IGNOU, New Delhi

Course Editor (Content, Format and Language) : Prof. Alka Dhameja, School of Social Sciences, IGNOU, New Delhi

COURSE PREPARATION TEAM

Block		Unit Writer
Block 1	Conceptual and Classical Perspectives	
Unit 1	Concept and Significance of Public Administration	Dr. Sweta Misra Senior Associate Professor, Gargi College, New Delhi
Unit 2	Scientific Management Approach	Dr. Vaishali Narula Assistant Professor, Kamla Nehru College, New Delhi
Unit 3	Administrative Management Approach	Dr. Rajvir Sharma Former Senior Consultant, Faculty of Public Administration SOSS, IGNOU, New Delhi
Unit 4	Bureaucratic Approach	Dr. R. Anitha Former Faculty, Rajiv Gandhi National Institute of Youth Development, Sriperumbudur, Tamil Nadu
Block 2	Behavioural, Systems and Socio-Psychological Perspectives	
Unit 5	Human Relations Approach	Prof. Uma Medury Faculty of Public Administration, SOSS, IGNOU, New Delhi
Unit 6	Decision Making Approach	Dr. A. Senthamizh Kanal Consultant, Faculty of Public Administration, SOSS, IGNOU, New Delhi
Unit 7	Systems and Socio-Psychological Approaches	Dr. B. Senthil Nathan HoD, Department of Public Administration, Sri Krishna College of Arts and Science, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu

Block 3 Public Policy Perspective		
Unit 8	Public Policy Approach	Dr. R.K Sapru Professor of Public Administration (Retired), Panjab University, Chandigarh
Unit 9	Policy Sciences Approach	Dr. R.K Sapru Professor of Public Administration (Retired), Panjab University, Chandigarh
Block 4 Political and Social Perspectives		
Unit 10	Ecological Approach	Dr. Sandhya Chopra Consultant, Faculty of Public Administration, SOSS, IGNOU, New Delhi
Unit 11	New Public Administration Approach	Dr. Sandhya Chopra Consultant, Faculty of Public Administration, SOSS, IGNOU, New Delhi
Unit 12	Public Choice Approach	Dr. Poornima M Assistant Professor, Council for Social Development, New Delhi
Unit 13	Public Interest Approach	Dr. Poornima M Assistant Professor, Council for Social Development, New Delhi
Block 5 Contemporary Perspectives		
Unit 14	New Public Management Approach	Prof. Uma Medury Faculty of Public Administration, SOSS, IGNOU, New Delhi
Unit 15	Good Governance Approach	Prof. Uma Medury Faculty of Public Administration, SOSS, IGNOU, New Delhi
Unit 16	Postmodern Approach	Dr. R. Anitha Former Faculty, RGNIYD, Sriperumbudur, Tamil Nadu
Unit 17	Feminist Approach	Dr. Anita Bagai Associate Professor, Department of Political Science, Lady Shri Ram College for Women, New Delhi

PRINT PRODUCTION

Mr. Tilak Raj Assistant Registrar (Pub.) MPDD	Smt. Sumathy Nair Section Officer (Pub.) MPDD	Mr. Suresh Kumar JAT/CO, SOSS
---	---	----------------------------------

February, 2020
© Indira Gandhi National Open University, 2020
ISBN: 978-93-89969-07-8

All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced in any form, by mimeograph or any other means, without permission in writing from the Indira Gandhi National Open University.

Further information on Indira Gandhi National Open University courses may be obtained from the University's office at Maidan Garhi, New Delhi-110 068 or visit University's Website <http://www.ignou.ac.in>.

Printed and published on behalf of the Indira Gandhi National Open University, New Delhi by Director, School of Social Sciences.
Cover Design Concept : Dr. Sandhya Chopra, Consultant, Faculty of Public Administration
Lasertypesetted at Graphic Printers, Mayur Vihar, Phase-I, Delhi-110091.
Printed at: P Square Solutions, H-25, Site-B, Industrial Area, Mathura - 281 005

Course Contents

	Pages
Introduction	7
BLOCK 1 CONCEPTUAL AND CLASSICAL PERSPECTIVES	
Unit 1 Concept and Significance of Public Administration	11
Unit 2 Scientific Management Approach	24
Unit 3 Administrative Management Approach	33
Unit 4 Bureaucratic Approach	50
BLOCK 2 BEHAVIOURAL, SYSTEMS AND SOCIO-PSYCHOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVES	
Unit 5 Human Relations Approach	71
Unit 6 Decision Making Approach	82
Unit 7 Systems and Socio-psychological Approaches	96
BLOCK 3 PUBLIC POLICY PERSPECTIVE	
Unit 8 Public Policy Approach	113
Unit 9 Policy Sciences Approach	129
BLOCK 4 POLITICAL AND SOCIAL PERSPECTIVES	
Unit 10 Ecological Approach	147
Unit 11 New Public Administration Approach	156
Unit 12 Public Choice Approach	165
Unit 13 Public Interest Approach	180
BLOCK 5 CONTEMPORARY PERSPECTIVES	
Unit 14 New Public Management Approach	195
Unit 15 Good Governance Approach	209
Unit 16 Postmodern Approach	223
Unit 17 Feminist Approach	241
Suggested Readings	252

COURSE INTRODUCTION

This Course is titled **Perspectives on Public Administration**. It is very important for you all to understand the nature of public administration as an academic discipline. In order to get a hold of any discipline's epistemological strength, it should be seen through its various perspectives or approaches. So, this Course assimilates the major approaches to public administration and presents them to you in a lucid manner. Starting from the Classical Approaches to the Neo-Classical and the more Contemporary Approaches of Feminism and Postmodernism, the Course deals with them all. The first four Units of the Course under Block 1 on **Conceptual and Classical Perspectives** deal with meaning, nature and scope of public administration and the different Classical Approaches. The Introductory Unit on 'Concept and Significance of Public Administration' traces the evolution of public administration till the present times by underlining the concepts of Competition State, Contracting Out, Debureaucratisation, Downsizing and so on. It discusses the relationship between public and private administration and explains the significance of public administration in developing countries.

The Block further deals with the Classical Approaches that regard workers as mere instruments towards organisational output in Units 2, 3 and 4. Scientific Management and Bureaucracy are its major components. Unit 2 on Scientific Management Approach lays focus on quality assurance and quality control as methods to improve processes and make them operationalised and standardised. Mental Revolution, Time and Motion Studies, and Centralised Hierarchy are the major concepts discussed. 'Administrative Management Approach' is Unit 3. It describes the principles of administration as enunciated by Henri Fayol, Luther Gulick, Lyndal Urwick, and Mary Parker Follet. The Unit lays emphasis on the fact that the principles propagated by Classical Theorists provided a solid foundation for modern public administration. Unit 4 titled 'Bureaucratic Approach' discusses both Pre-Weberian and Post-Weberian narratives on Bureaucracy. It talks of Weberian Approach to Bureaucracy in detail by underlining the major characteristics of Legal-rational Bureaucracy as an ideal type, as against traditional and charismatic.

Block 2 of the Course is on **Behavioural, Systems and Socio-Psychological Perspectives**. It describes the nature of Behavioural Approaches, which focus on individual needs, group behaviour, rational decision-making, organisational design and environment or context of organisations. Early experiments of Elton Mayo are explained in the Unit 5, which also critically appraises the Human Relations Approach for being confined to a few experiments and not looking at the complexity of human behaviour. Simon's value and fact dichotomy in Decision Making is described in Unit 6. It explains the different types of Decision Making such as Programmed, Non-Programmed, Organisational, Personal, Generic and Unique, as well as Routine and Strategic. It also examines the different Models of Decision-Making, which are Simon's Bounded Rationality Model, Lindblom's Incremental Model, Etzioni's Mixed Scanning Model and Dror's Optimal Model. The various Theories of Motivation and their connect with organisational outcome are described in Unit 7. It talks of organisation as a system. The views of Chester Barnard on Closed and Open Systems are discussed. The Unit analyses Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs Approach, Douglas Mc Gregor's Theory 'X' and Theory 'Y' and Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory.

Block 3 is on **Public Policy Perspective**. Unit 8 of the Block explains the meaning of Public Policy Approach. It describes the different types of Public Policy Approaches propagated by Harold Lasswell, Herbert Simon, David Easton and Yehezkel Dror. The Unit talks of the different Models of Public Policy. These are Institutional, Rational

Policy Making, Group, Elite-Mass, Political Public Policy, Strategic Planning. Unit 9 on 'Policy Science Approach' examines its nature, scope and expansion. It brings forth Lasswell's vision of Policy Sciences by discussing its multi-disciplinary, contextual, problem-oriented and normative perspectives. It also explains the new directions in Policy Sciences namely continuity of values, sustenance of relevance, policy enquiry, social network analysis and democratisation of Policy Sciences.

In Block 4 on **Political and Social Perspectives**, Units 10 to 14 deal with the environment in which public administration functions. The 'Ecological Approach' is Unit 10. Its focus is on studying the ecology of various environments of countries and designing conducive policies thereof. It explains the concept of ecology. It brings out the nature of Agraria and Industria Models that preceded the Riggsian Fused-Prismatic-Diffracted Models. Unit 11 on 'New Public Administration Approach' discusses the evolution and phases of public administration in order to position New Public Administration in its trajectory. The focus is on the outcome of deliberations of all Minnowbrook Conferences and the need for a public-oriented, goal-oriented, change-oriented and normative administration. Unit 12 on 'Public Choice Approach' describes the concepts of Methodological Individualism, Politics-as-Exchange, Institutional Pluralism, Rational Choice, Rent-Seeking, and Economic Constitutionalism. 'Public Interest Approach' is Unit 13 that elaborates the concept of Public Interest by elucidating the views of different scholars on it. It describes the current and future responsibilities towards Public Interest. It also deals with the question as to the manner in which Public Interest is pursued practically by State, judiciary and civil society in the way of Policies, Acts and Public Interest Litigation.

The last Block of the Course, that is Block 5 on **Contemporary Perspectives** talks of more recent approaches of New Public Management (NPM), Good Governance, Post-modernism and Feminism. The focus of Unit 14 titled 'New Public Management Approach' in the Block is on NPM as a reform strategy. The Unit focuses on debureaucratisation and delivering of tasks in organisation through decentralisation, delegation of authority, responsibility to various teams, customer orientation and satisfaction. As the nature of State is changing, new actors have joined hands in governance processes. Unit 15 on 'Good Governance Approach' focuses on new parametres of governance such as Participation, Rule of Law, Transparency, Responsiveness, Equity, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Accountability, and Predictability.

The central point of Unit 16 on 'Postmodern Approach' is to familiarise the learners with concepts of Modernity, Organisational Humanism, Public Administration Theory Network, Dialectic Method, Deconstruction, Deterritorialisation, Imagination, and Alterity to counter the concept of standard bureaucratic efficiency. It deals with Post-modern ideas and practices such as the Phenomenological Approach on lived experiences, Interpretive Theory, Hermeneutics, Ethnomethodology, Symbolic Interactionism, Feminist Epistemologies, and Post-structuralism, Critical Perspective, and Discourse Analysis. Unit 17 is the last Unit of the Course. Titled 'Feminist Approach', it deals with the hitherto neglected narratives of 'governance of gender' and 'gender of governance'. It elucidates the much needed debates on Gender Equality, Ethics and Justice, Patriarchal Thought Patterns, Participation of Women in Administration and Women-friendly Policies in Governance.

BLOCK 1

**CONCEPTUAL AND
CLASSICAL PERSPECTIVES**

UNIT 1 CONCEPT AND SIGNIFICANCE OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION*

Structure

- 1.1 Objectives
- 1.2 Introduction
- 1.3 Meaning of Public Administration
- 1.4 Public Administration: Nature and Scope
- 1.5 Relationship between Public and Private Administration
- 1.6 Significance of Public Administration
- 1.7 Conclusion
- 1.8 Glossary
- 1.9 References
- 1.10 Answers to Check Your Progress Exercises

1.1 OBJECTIVES

After reading this Unit, you should be able to:

- Explain the meaning, nature and scope of public administration;
- Bring out the difference between public and private administration; and
- Examine the significance of public administration.

1.2 INTRODUCTION

Public administration is vital to efficient running of the government. As a specialised academic field, it deals essentially with the machinery and procedures of government. It is the *action* part of the government. It is both an *institution* of public service and a *centre of power*. As an institution of public service, it provides services to the people and promotes public interest. As a centre of power, public bureaucracy tends to be concerned with its own privileges. In recent years, the discipline has been undergoing rapid changes and has vastly expanded its frontiers. It has evolved and is still evolving to respond to the challenges of changing times.

The onset of Liberalisation, Privatisation and Globalisation (LPG) has led to significant changes in the roles of individuals and institutions, and public administration is no exception. It represents a *paradigm shift* from the traditional model of public administration to New Public Management (NPM) model, which favours a dominant presence of market forces over the State, for effective governance and efficient delivery of goods and services.

Concepts like Competition State, managerial orientation, contracting out, debureaucratisation, downsizing etc., have started gaining prominence in many countries. The new perspective has emerged as a *management tool* for achieving developmental

goals. It has brought in reforms, which have attempted to create a new entrepreneurial, user-oriented culture in public organisations, with focus on performance measurement and autonomy to the organisations and individuals in contrast to the traditional model. In fact, *managerialism* is a ‘determined effort to implement the “3Es” of Economy, Efficiency and Effectiveness at all levels of government activities’.

Public administration, in present times, has thus become complex and is slowly moving towards enlightened public governance. In this Unit, an attempt will be made to *define* the terms ‘administration’ and ‘public administration’. It will discuss the nature, scope and significance of public administration. The Unit will analyse the *relationship* between public and private administration and bring out the significance of public administration.

1.3 MEANING OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Public administration is an aspect of a more *generic* concept of administration. Therefore, before understanding the meaning of public administration, it is necessary to understand the meaning of the word ‘administration’. Let us see what the term ‘administration’ means:

- *Defining Administration*

The English word ‘administer’ is derived from Latin word *ad + ministrare*, which means ‘to care for or to look after people, to manage affairs’. In its literal sense, the term ‘administration’ means “management of affairs”; public or private affairs. Administration is a process *permeating* all collective efforts, be it public or private, civil or military, large-scale or otherwise, and is thus universal in nature. Administration is a cooperative effort through which the laid down goals and objectives are fulfilled. E.N. Gladden in his book, ‘*An Introduction to Public Administration*’ defined administration as : a long and slightly pompous word, but it has a humble meaning, for it means, to care for or look after people, to manage affairs ... is determined action taken in pursuit of a conscious purpose”(Gladden, 1952).

Administration means organising and using men and material in order to accomplish a purpose or a goal. Administration joins groups of people who coordinate and cooperate so that the desired goals are achieved. In other words, in order to achieve the desired goals and objectives, we need to organise and direct human and material resources. It is a universal process and occurs in diverse institutional settings. Based on these settings, administration is divided into public administration and private administration. The former refers to administration, which operates in a governmental setting, while the latter refers to the administration, which operates in non-governmental setting, that is, business enterprises.

In short, administration, thus, means a cooperative effort by a group of people in order to achieve a common objective. It is the specialised vocation of managers who have skills of organising and directing men and material just as definitely as an engineer has the skill of building structures or a doctor has the skill of understanding human ailments (Sharma and Sadana,1998). In other words, it is a goal-oriented, purposive, coordinative and co-operative activity, which is undertaken by a group of people in pursuit of some common goal or goals.

Thus, there are certain distinct objectives of ‘administration’. These are:

- Goal-orientation.

- Pursuit of conscious purpose.
- Direction of human and material resources.
- Determined action.
- Cooperation for accomplishment of common goals.
- Systematic ordering of affairs.
- Calculated use of resources.
- Coordination and control of persons.
- Getting things done.

Public administration is a segment of the larger field of administration. It is simply regarded as bureaucracy, heedless to the fact that bureaucracy as a particular organisational form is not only found in the government, but also in private and third-sector organisations (Dhameja, 2003). Public administration is a discipline, which is concerned with the organisation and the formulation and implementation of public policies for the welfare of the people. It functions in a political setting in order to accomplish the goals and objectives, which are formulated by the political decision makers. It is also called governmental administration as the adjective ‘public’ in the word ‘public administration’ means ‘government’. The focus of public administration, thus, is on public bureaucracy, i.e., bureaucratic or *administrative organisation* of the government.

Features of public administration are:

- Bureaucratic decision making.
- Organisation and procedures of policy process.
- Detailed/systematic execution of law.
- Enforcement of public policy.
- Performance of civilian functions.
- Operation of administrative branch.
- Art and science of management as applied to State affairs.
- ‘What and ‘how’ of government.

On the whole, it can be said that public administration is nothing less than the whole government in action. It is an instrument through which the goals and objectives of the government are fulfilled. In other words, it is “the action part of government, the means by which the purposes and goals of government are realised’ (Chakrabarty and Bhattacharya, 2003). In fact, public administration lends itself to *two* usages: it is an activity; and it also refers to the discipline (*or subject*) of intellectual inquiry and study. Before proceeding to the nature of public administration, it becomes pertinent to define the three terms, viz., administration, organisation and management, which are used interchangeably. Though the *three* terms are used interchangeably, yet there is a specific difference in their meanings.

This *distinction* is made clear by William Schulze. According to him, “administration is the force which lays down the object for which an organisation and its management

are to strive and the broad policies under which they are to operate. An organisation is a combination of the necessary human beings, materials, tools, equipment and working space, appurtenances brought together in systematic and effective co-relation to accomplish some desired object. Management is that which leads, guides and directs an organisation for the accomplishment of a pre-determined object”. Administration, thus, is a broader concept and includes within its fold both organisation and management.

1.4 PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION: NATURE AND SCOPE

There are two broad views with regard to the **nature** of Public Administration, viz. (a) *the Managerial View*, and (b) *the Integral View*.

- **The Managerial View**

Public administration, in this context, *encompasses* only the managerial activities and not the technical, clerical and manual activities, which are non-managerial in nature. Thus, administration, according to this view, constitutes the activities of only the top persons. Herbert Simon and Luther Gulick among others support this view. Administration, according to this view is same in *all* the spheres as the managerial techniques are same in all the fields of activities. Administration has to do with getting things done with the accomplishment of defined objectives.

- **The Integral View**

According to this view, public administration encompasses within its fold all the activities, which are undertaken to accomplish the given objective. In other words, public administration is the sum total of managerial, technical, clerical and manual activities. Thus, administration, according to this view, constitutes the activities of all persons from top to bottom. Thinkers like L.D. White and Marshall E. Dimock subscribe to this view. Administration, according to this view, depends upon the subject matter of the concerned agency, that is, it differs from one sphere to another sphere.

There are two views regarding the **scope** of public administration, viz., (a) *POSDCORB View* and (b) *Subject Matter View*:

- **The POSDCORB View**

This view of the scope of public administration was advocated by Luther Gulick. He believed that administration consisted of seven elements. He summed up these elements in the acronym ‘POSDCORB’, each letter of which implies one element of administration. Luther Gulick explains these *seven* elements of administration (or functions of the chief executive) in the following way:

P — Planning: working out in broad outline the things that need to be done and the methods to be adopted for accomplishing the purpose in hand.

O — Organising: building up the structure of authority through which the entire work to be done, is arranged into well-defined subdivisions and co-ordination.

S — Staffing: appointing suitable persons to the various posts under the organisation, and the whole of personnel management.

D — Directing: making decisions and issuing orders and instructions embodying them for the guidance of the staff.

Co — Coordinating: interrelating the various parts of the work and eliminating overlapping and conflict.

R — Reporting: keeping superiors and subordinates informed of what is going on, and arranging for the collection of such information through inspection, research and records; and

B — Budgeting: all that goes with budgeting in the form of fiscal planning, accounting and control (Sharma and Sadana, *op.cit.*).

● **The Subject Matter View**

Though the POSDCORB view of scope of public administration was acceptable for quite a long time, there arose a reaction, in the course of time, against this view. It was then realised that the POSDCORB activities (techniques) can neither be the whole of public administration nor even the significant part of it. This view advocates that the problems of administration are same in all the agencies regardless of the peculiar nature of the functions they perform. Thus, it overlooks the fact that different administrative agencies are faced with different problems.

Moreover, the POSDCORB represents only the *tools* of administration, whereas the *substance* of administration is something different. The real core of administration consists of the various services performed for the people like defense, health, agriculture, education, social security, etc. These services have their own specialised techniques, which are not covered by the common POSDCORB techniques. In other words, each administrative agency has its own ‘local POSDCORB’ because of the subject matter with which it is concerned. Further, Gulick’s common POSDCORB techniques are also influenced by the subject matter of the administration.

Thus, the POSDCORB view is ‘technique-oriented’ rather than ‘subject-oriented’. It ignores the essential element involved in public administration, namely ‘knowledge of the subject matter’. This is the reason why the subject matter view of the scope of public administration arose. It lays emphasis on the services rendered and the functions performed by an administrative agency. It advocates that the substantive problems of an agency depend upon the subject matter (*i.e, services and functions*) with which it is concerned.

Therefore, the study of public administration does not only include the techniques of administration but also the substantive concerns of administration. However, the POSDCORB view and subject matter view are not mutually exclusive, but *complement* each other. They together *constitute* the proper scope of the study of public administration. As has been rightly observed, POSDCORB and subject matter are two blades of the scissors, of the instrument called public administration.

Check Your Progress 1

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answers.

ii) Check your answers with those given at the end of the Unit.

1) Discuss the meaning of public administration.

.....

.....

.....

2) Explain the nature and scope of public administration.

1.5 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE ADMINISTRATION

Public administration refers to the business of the State and is concerned with the ends and strategies of government policies, programmes and decisions. It operates in a political/ governmental setting. Private administration, on the other hand, refers to the management of business owned and operated by private individuals. It operates in the non-governmental setting, that is, business enterprises. Hence, they are also known as governmental administration and business administration respectively.

Difference between Public and Private Administration

Paul H. Appleby, Sir Josia Stamp, Herbert A. Simon and Peter Drucker are of the view that public and private administrations are two different things. The *two* types of administration can be differentiated on the following grounds:

- Public administration is public in nature. Hence, the main aim of public administration is to serve the public and to promote community welfare. It is characterised by *service motive*. The private administration, in contrast, is characterised by *profit motive*, not social service. Its objective is to maximise profit. All their efforts are directed to this end. Also, the public administration carries a greater social prestige than the private administration because of its social role.
- Public administration operates strictly according to *laws, rules and regulations*. The administrators cannot do anything contrary to, or in excess of legal power. In private administration there are *general laws*, which regulate the business. Individual business firms have considerable flexibility.
- Public administration is subjected to political direction in most *policy matters*. It is the minister who lays down the broad policy outlines under which the bureaucrats have to implement the policy. In private administration, there is no such political direction. Only in emergency situations, such political direction can be exercised. The ends which it pursues are its own and its objectives *do not* depend upon political decisions.
- Public administration has to be consistent in its treatment. In other words, the principle of *consistency of treatment* is the watch word of public administration. Its acts and decisions are regulated by uniform laws, rules and regulations. It means that in public administration, any show of discrimination, bias or partiality

will evoke public censure or legislative commotion. Administrators have to be very consistent and impartial while dealing with the public. They must give equal treatment to all the citizens without any favour or prejudice. Private administration, on the other hand, can practice *preferential treatment*. In private administration, discrimination is freely practiced in the selling of products, choice of products and in fixing the prices of the products.

- Being public, public administration is open to constant public scrutiny. The actions of the administrators are much more exposed to the *public gaze*. The achievements of administrators rarely get publicity but a little fault hits the newspaper headlines in no time. A public administrator is accountable for all the acts and the decisions through legislative oversight and judicial review. In other words, the moral and ethical standards in public administration are much higher as compared to private administration. Public gaze is minimal in private administration and it is *not* so closely watched by the media.
- The tenure of the administrators is quite *secure* as compared to the private sector employees. Apart from this, they enjoy many benefits and privileges while in job and even after retirement. This kind of privilege is *not* available to the private sector employees.
- In public administration, there is *monopoly* of government and it does not allow private parties to compete. Services like post and telegraph, railways, currency and coinage are exclusively provided by the government. Monopolism in private sector is missing. Several organisations *compete* with each other to supply the same commodity and product.
- Public administration is subjected to *external financial control*. It means that finances of public administration are controlled by the legislature. In other words, legislature authorises the income and expenditure of the executive branch. The executive cannot collect or spend money of its own will. Thus, we see that the administration and finance are separated in public administration. Private administration, on the other hand, is not subject to the principle of external financial control. It is free to manage its finances as it likes.
- The nature of functions performed by public and private administration is also different. Public administration is more *comprehensive*. It deals with the various types of needs of the people. It carries out functions, which are more urgent and vital for the very existence of the society, for example, defence and maintenance of law and order. Private administration, on the other hand, carries out less vital functions, like manufacture of cloth, supply of sugar, etc.
- Public administrators function *anonymously*. In other words, the functioning of civil service in government is characterised by the doctrine of anonymity which is the counterpart of the principle of ministerial responsibility. Thus, the minister assumes *responsibility* for the actions of the civil servants working under him. This is not so in private administration.
- Public administration differs from private administration in the *measurement of efficiency* as well. Private administration functions on a level of efficiency superior to that of public administration. Since the motive is to make profit, individuals are whole-heartedly devoted to their work and business. In other words, the resource use or profit earning (i.e., input-output relationship) is the criterion of measuring efficiency in private administration. But the same criterion cannot be applied while measuring efficiency in public administration.

Thus, public administration has acquired certain distinctive features which distinguish it from private administration. Public accountability is its hallmark; consistency of treatment its watchword; and consciousness of community service, its ideal.

Similarities between Public and Private Administration

Even though, they differ in certain respects, there are many *similarities* between public and private administration. In fact, a group of administrative thinkers like Henry Fayol, M.P. Follet, Luther Gulick and Lyndall Urwick do not make a distinction between public and private administration. They are of the view that all administration, whether public or private, is one and possess the same basic features and it is *undesirable* to separate public from private administration. There is much in common between the *two* and the difference is only of degree not of kind.

The specific *similarities* between public and private administration are as below:

- The *managerial techniques* and skills of planning, organising, coordinating, controlling, and so on are the same in both.
- Both are organised on the basis of the principles of *hierarchy*.
- Both have *uniformity in accounting*, office management and procedures, purchases, disposals, statistics, stocking, and so on.
- Both are being influenced by the *practices and standards of each other*. Thus, Pfiffner and Presthus have described the emergence of public corporation as “a halfway house between its commercial prototype and the traditional governmental department.” (Pfiffner and Presthus, *op.cit.*).
- Both have similarities so far as the *problems of organisation*, personnel and finance are concerned. The similarity between them is demonstrated by the fact that there is a mutual exchange and rotation of personnel between the two. In India, we have seen that the Administrative Staff College of India located at Hyderabad organises common training programmes for the personnel of both public and private sectors.

With the onset of globalisation and the new management perspective, the boundaries between public and private administration are getting blurred. The public sector is expected to work on the lines of the private sector. In other words, it is expected to follow the principles of three ‘E’s’ i.e, Efficiency, Economy and Effectiveness along with profitability. The informal organs such as people’s associations, community-based organisations along with formal organs of the State participate and discharge activities that were earlier in the public domain.

Apart from this, the private sector, functioning along market lines and the regulatory framework of government, undertakes functions that have been the prerogative of the public sector (Medury, 2010). We can, thus, conclude that in many ways, the differences between public and private administration are diminishing. They complement and supplement each other.

**1.6 SIGNIFICANCE OF PUBLIC
ADMINISTRATION**

Public administration has become an essential segment of modern society, which has witnessed the emergence of what administrative thinkers call as ‘Administrative State’. This means that every activity of individuals from ‘Womb to Tomb’ is regulated and

controlled by the State agencies, that is, administrative agencies. The significance of public administration is expanding day by day. The functions, which it performs have expanded in scale, range and nature and is still increasing. It is necessary for not only maintaining public order, social security, welfare and economic infrastructure but also for the delivery of goods in terms of services like safety, utilities and enforcement of contractual obligations as also for ensuring the rule of law and treating all the citizens equally. Its nature, contents and scope – all go to make it the ‘heart of the problem of modern governments’ (White, 1958).

Public administration is of utmost importance for the developing countries, which have laid down for themselves numerous plans and programmes of social and economic development. In developing democracies like India, which is striving hard to provide happiness and prosperity to its large number of grieving and impoverished population, public administration has become the instrument of *change and development* and a powerful agency for achieving national integration.

As an instrument of change, especially in countries like India, public administration has successfully implemented various development programmes like community development, poverty eradication, employment guarantee schemes, housing schemes, rural connectivity, rural electrification, health care schemes and so on. As a result, “public administration has definitely changed the face of rural India by providing the basic minimum facilities to the rural poor and improving their living conditions. As an instrument of national integration, it has played a very important role in rehabilitating the refugees after partition as also integrating the princely states with the Indian territory” (Chakrabarty and Chand, 2012).

Public administration is a great stabilising force in a society. Governments come and go but administration does not change. In this way, it provides *continuity and linkages* between the old and new programmes. In a diverse country like India, public administration becomes all the more important because it acts as a harmonising and integrating force. It has brought the people of different caste, class, community and religion on a common platform. In other words, it has created an environment where people with varied backgrounds can live together. In a way, it has also provided stability and strength to Indian democracy.

Public administration is all about *governance*. It is the heart of development. It is the interface between the market and the civil society. In the words of Frederickson (1999), public administration is moving towards theories of cooperation, networking, governance and institution — building and maintenance in response to the declining relationship between jurisdiction and public management in a ‘fragmented and disarticulated State’.

Check Your Progress 2

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answers.

ii) Check your answers with those given at the end of the Unit.

1) Bring out the relationship between public and private administration.

.....

.....

.....

.....

2) Examine the significance of public administration.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

1.7 CONCLUSION

The role of the State is undergoing a sea change. The Welfare State has been transformed to a Corporatist State. The market forces have entered in the domain, which was earlier the exclusive jurisdiction of the State bringing about a change in the role of the State. From a ‘doer’ it has become a ‘facilitator’ and a ‘regulator’. Public administration, has thus, assumed a very important role in modern society. Public administration is the basis of government, whether in monarchy or in democracy or in a dictatorship. It is the instrument for executing the laws, policies and programmes formulated by the State. It is the instrument of social change and economic development, especially in the so-called ‘Third World’ (i.e., developing countries), which are engaged in the process of social-welding and nation-building and an instrument of national integration particularly in the developing countries, which are facing the challenges of sub-nationalism, secessionism, class wars, and so on. This Unit discussed the significance of public administration by contrasting it with private administration. It also described the various perspectives/viewpoints on its meaning, nature and scope.

1.8 GLOSSARY

- Liberalisation Privatisation Globalisation (LPG)

: In 1991, India took up many steps to improve its balance of payments situation in the form of internal and external liberalisation, a fillip to privatisation and globalisation means integration of economy with the rest of world by allowing Foreign Direct Investment in economy. It calls for Liberalisation, Privatisation and Globalisation; together called LPG to tackle problems of growing inefficiency, mismanagement, rising inflation and public sector losses. Libaralisation means removal of subsidies and restriction on the flow of goods and services. Privatisation means transfer of ownership and management from public sector to private sector.
- Consistency of Treatment

: The principle of consistency of treatment is the corner stone of any organisation. If one employee is treated in a manner in a particular case, the rest of the employees in that particular case should be treated in the same manner, considering the fairness and merits of the case.

1.9 REFERENCES

- Chakrabarty, B. & Chand, P. (2012). *Public Administration in a Globalising World*. New Delhi, India: Sage Publications.
- Chakrabarty, B. & Bhattacharya, M. (Eds.) (2003). *Public Administration: A Reader*. New Delhi, India: Oxford University Press.
- Corson, J. & Harris, J. (1967). *Public Administration in Modern Society*. London, U.K: McGraw Hill.
- Dhameja, A. (Ed.) (2003). *Contemporary Debates in Public Administration*. New Delhi, India: Prentice-Hall of India Private Limited.
- Dhameja, A. & Mishra, S. (Eds.) (2003). *Public Administration: Approaches and Application*. Noida, India: Pearson.
- Frederickson, H.G. (1999). The Repositioning of American Public Administration. *Political Science and Politics*. 32(4), 701-711.
- Gladden, E.N. (2nd Edn.). (1952). *An Introduction to Public Administration*. London: Staples Press.
- Gulick, L. (1937). Science Values and Public Administration. In Luther Gulick & L. Urwick (Eds.), *Papers on the Science of Administration*. New York: Institute of Public Administration, Columbia University.
- Henry, N. (10th Edn.). (2007). *Public Administration and Public Affairs*. New Delhi, India: Pearson.
- Medury, U. (2010). *Public Administration in the Globalisation Era*. New Delhi, India: Orient Black Swan.
- Mishra, S. (2010). Book Review of Public Administration in Globalisation Era. *The Indian Journal of Public Administration*. 56(4).
- Nigro, F.A. (2nd Edn.). (1971). *Modern Public Administration*. New York, U.S: Harper International Edition.
- Pfiffner, J.M. (1946). *Public Administration*. New York, U.S: The Ronald Press Company.
- Pfiffner, J.M. & Presthus, R.V. (3rd Edn.). (1953). *Public Administration*. New York: The Ronald Press Company.
- Sharma, M.P. & Sadana, B.L. (37th Edn.). (1998). *Public Administration in Theory and Practice*. Allahabad: Kitab Mahal.
- Waldo, D. (1955). *The Study of Public Administration*. New York, U.S: Garden City.
- White, L.D. (4th Edn.). (1958). *Introduction to the Study of Public Administration*. New York, U.S: Macmillan Company.
- Wilson, W. (1953). The Study of Administration. In Dwight Waldo (Ed.), *Ideas and Issues in Public Administration*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

1.10 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS EXERCISES

Check Your Progress 1

- 1) Your answer should include the following points:
 - Public administration is a segment of the larger field of administration.
 - It is regarded as bureaucracy.
 - It is concerned with formulation and implementation of public policies.
 - It is an organisation of the government that entails goal orientation and determined action.
 - It means getting things done.
 - It includes cooperation and systematic ordering of affairs.
 - It means what and how of government.
 - It refers to operation of administrative branch.
- 2) Your answer should include the following points:
 - The managerial new of public administration includes managerial activities and not the technical, clerical and manual activities.
 - Administration has to do with getting things done.
 - Integral view encompasses its fold all activities undertaken to accomplish the given objective.
 - Scope of public administration includes POSDCORB view and subject matter view.
 - POSDCORB view focuses on planning, organising, coordinating, reporting type of techniques.
 - Subject matter view focuses on the fact that different administrative agencies are faced with different problems.
 - The real core or administration consists of various services performed by specialised experts which go beyond POSDCORB techniques.
 - Both POSDCORB and integral views complement each other.

Check Your Progress 2

- 1) Your answer should include the following points:
 - Public and private administration are different.
 - Public administration is oriented towards welfare.
 - It has a service motive.
 - It follows strict rules and laws.
 - Public administration is subjected to political direction in policy matters.
 - It has to be consistent in treatment.

- Being public, public administration is under public gaze.
- The tenure of public administrators is secure.
- Public administrators function anonymously.
- Public administration and private administration is also similar.
- Managerial skills and techniques are common to both.
- Both have similarity in accounting.
- Both are influenced by practices and standards of each other.
- Both face similar problems of organisation.

2) Your answer should include the following points:

- Every activity of an individual ‘from womb to tomb’ is regulated by Administrative State.
- Public administration is an instrument of change and development.
- It is a stabilising force in society.
- Public administration is all about governance.
- It has changed the face of rural India.

ignou
THE PEOPLE'S
UNIVERSITY

UNIT 2 SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT APPROACH*

Structure

- 2.0 Objectives
- 2.1 Introduction
- 2.2 F.W. Taylor: A Biographical Sketch
- 2.3 Principles of Scientific Management
- 2.4 Characteristics of Scientific Management
- 2.5 Taylor: An Appraisal
- 2.6 Conclusion
- 2.7 Glossary
- 2.8 References
- 2.9 Answers to Check Your Progress Exercises

2.0 OBJECTIVES

After reading this Unit, you should be able to:

- Define the term ‘Scientific Management’;
- Discuss the principles of Scientific Management;
- Explain the characteristics of Scientific Management and bring out its role in organisations; and
- Examine the advantages and drawbacks of Scientific Management.

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The theory or approach of Scientific Management emerged in the 20th century under the leadership of Fredrick Winslow Taylor. This Theory is often described as a movement, which began to influence the administration and management of organisations in those times. This is a theory, which analyses and synthesises workflows in an organisation. Even though Taylor is said to have propounded the Scientific Theory, in years to come Charles Babbage, Henry R. Towne, Fredrick Halsey and Henry Metcalfe extensively used Scientific Management methods and techniques in an organisation. The term Scientific Management was coined by Louis Brandies (1910) and was used by Taylor to give scientific techniques to make the working of an organisation efficient.

Scientific Theory of Management is also known as “Taylorism.” The Scientific Theory had a significant impact on administrative thought and practice in both industrial and government organisations. Taylor’s contribution to the Scientific Theory of Management are contained in the following books: ‘A Piece Rate System’, ‘Shop Management’, ‘Art of Cutting Metals’ and ‘Principles of Scientific Management. This Unit would

* Contributed by Dr. Vaishali Narula, Assistant Professor, Kamla Nehru College, New Delhi.

deal with the principles and characteristics of Scientific Management. It would also critically examine its advantages and drawbacks.

2.2 F.W. TAYLOR: A BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Frederick Winslow Taylor was born in Germantown Philadelphia, Pennsylvania in 1856. His first job as an apprentice was at Hydraulic Works, Philadelphia. Later, at Midvale Steel Company, F.W Taylor worked in various capacities, as a labourer, gang boss, research director and chief engineer. The birth place of Taylor's Scientific Theory of Management can be traced to 'Midvale Steel Company', which was one of the armour plates company in America. Taylor began to work in this Company at the age of 22 in 1877. Taylor observed that the workers consistently failed to give the required output of their work. He observed that there was a need to devise scientific methods for the workers to ensure required output.

In 1884, Taylor received his degree in Mechanical Engineering. In 1890, Taylor worked as General Manager of Manufacturing Investment Company in Philadelphia. He even served as Professor at The Tuck School of Business at Dartmouth College.

Papers published by Taylor are as follows:

- Piece Rate System, 1895
- Shop Management, 1903
- Art of Cutting Metals, 1906
- Principles of Scientific Management, 1911

2.3 PRINCIPLES OF SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT

Taylor, while laying the foundation of the Scientific Theory of Management, believed that the principles of management of an organisation should be based on fixed laws and Scientific Theory in an organisation focused on studying the relationship between the physical nature and the physiological nature of a worker. Scientific Approach focused on lowest level of organisation (Shop Floor). In his view, there existed 'one best way' of doing and designing the tasks. So the Theory focused on empirical analyses of various processes and at the same time worked to ensure results with efficiency and effectiveness. Taylor believed that in order to move towards effectiveness, there was a need to develop technical competence, rationalisation and specialisation in the working of an organisation.

As Taylor carried on with his study of organisation and its management, he observed that there was a tendency on the part of workers to neglect work and restrict the output. This he called "soldiering". He referred to this phenomenon on the part of workers to reduce the output when they are paid the same amount even on giving large outputs. Taylor classified soldiering into *two* types; natural soldiering and systematic soldiering, where the former referred to a habit of workers to take it easy, not being over-ambitious and the latter referred to social and organisational factors, which led to restricting of the output by workers. Taylor believed that the way to increase output of the organisation was to reduce soldiering through scientific techniques. So, Taylor in his Scientific Theory of Management believed that in order to improve the functioning of the organisation, scientific principles needed to be applied. They were also relevant to motivate the workers for increasing output.

The keystone of Taylor's managerial thought was looking into the work methods

and managerialism. Taylor, while working in his steel plant, observed that the workers decided on the output and the methods to conduct various operations. The workers, he observed, were not being managed and were selecting their own tools and techniques to conduct and carry out operations. The managerial and supervisory roles as we know of now were totally absent. The workers followed the ‘Rule of Thumb’ methods. These were methods, which were developed over years of experience and trade practices. The supervisors could only urge the workers to do more work, but could not urge or encourage their initiative towards largest output. Taylor described this method to be irrational and an inefficient arrangement towards work output. Therefore, he emphasised that there was a need to rationalise the methods of working.

F.W. Taylor observed that there was science in every work that was being done in organisations those days. The work done by the workers could be scientifically structured. This scientific understanding of the work would come to the best worker with the help of those working over him. Therefore, the workers (shop floor) with their experience required the “brain” of the foreman to conduct a task to the highest output level. Hence, Taylor emphasised on the role of management and supervisors to attain efficiency, which was a revolutionary idea in that period. His idea of inclusion of the supervisors aroused a lot of suspicion amongst the labour. It led to an emphasis on area of expertise, training and preparation of managers towards efficiency.

The Scientific Approach to Management by Taylor was a way forward to modern managerial thought and practices. In his Approach towards goal accomplishment with empirical research and evaluation, the focus was on controlled experiments with Scientific Management. The Scientific Approach in itself was considered a way towards investigation. It called for investigation into all endeavours scientifically. Thus, working towards goal accomplishment was governed by systematic methods.

Taylor and the various scientists who supported the Scientific Management Approach designed experiments directed to discover the best methods to carry out a specific task in an organisation. The Scientific Management Approach went beyond designing of technical system towards training. The focus was on devising efficient procedures. Taylor was of the view that once efficient procedures were devised, it was management’s responsibility to apply appropriate methods towards training in order to put in place the set procedures. Training focused on optimal physical and physiological conditions of workers to gain maximum output.

While laying down the approach to Scientific Management, Taylor gave the following principles of Scientific Theory of Management:

- i) The ‘rule of thumb’ needs to be replaced with science for each element of the work to be done by the worker.
- ii) ‘One best way’ of doing a particular task needs to be determined, so that it would help to determine the standard output.
- iii) As the best methods are decided scientifically, we should train, teach and develop the workers towards output.
- iv) In order to attain the required output, management should cooperate with the workers.
- v) The work should be equally divided amongst the managers and the workers. The burden of responsibility for greater output lies with both of them.

As Taylor identified these characteristics of Scientific Management, we can summarise them as follows:

- Science and not ‘rule of thumb’.
- Working together.
- Cooperation and not just individual role and responsibility.
- Maximum output in place of restricted output.
- Encouraging the development of each worker to greatest efficiency and output.

Therefore, Scientific Management, according to Taylor, involves a complete change on the part of workers, fellow workers, employees, managers and supervisors. It is important that both the workers and the managers have no conflict amongst them and that they should work towards same goals with cooperation. Thus, cooperation and not conflict is the essence of scientific management, as it aims to secure maximum output and prosperity for each employee or worker.

Check Your Progress 1

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answers.
ii) Check your answers with those given at the end of the Unit.

1) Give a brief sketch of Taylor’s early life.

2) Define ‘Soldiering’.

3) Discuss the factors that gave rise to Scientific Approach of Management.

4) What are the principles of the Scientific Management Approach?

2.4 CHARACTERISTICS OF SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT

While giving the characteristics of Scientific Management, Taylor devised certain techniques (methods) of Scientific Management. These techniques are applications, which could help an organisation to move towards the Scientific Principles. These are:

● *Functional Foremanship*

Taylor’s notion of Functional Foremanship advocated that each worker be supervised and guided by eight functional foremen (i.e. specialised supervisor). Under the idea of Functional Foremanship, Taylor observed that there was a need to have planners and planning unit. He rejected the idea of single foremanship i.e., Unity of Command under which the workers would receive orders from only one superior. So, when he gave the idea of *eight* foremen, he classified them as: (i) Order -of-Work and Route Clerk, (ii) Instruction- Card- Clerk, (iii) Time - and - Cost- Clerk; and (iv) Shop Disciplinarian. These functionaries worked with the workers. The other functionaries were responsible for execution and supervision at the shop floor. They were classified as : (i) Gang Boss, (ii) Speed Boss, (iii) Repair Boss, and (iv) Inspector. So each worker would have eight functional bosses which would smoothen the progress towards specialisation, as well as separation of planning and executive processes.

Planning Bosses	Execution Bosses
• Order-of-Work and Route Clerk • Instruction-Card-Clerk • Time and Cost Clerk • Shop Disciplinarian	• Gang Boss • Repair Boss • Speed Boss • Inspector

Source : Dhameja & Mishra, 2016.

● *Motion Study*

This was a technique devised towards standardisation of methods. This involved observation of all motions (processes) in a particular job and through this to determine the best set of motion. Thus, through the method of motion study, the objective was to design a preferable work method with proper techniques, tools, equipments, raw material in order to facilitate quick hand and body motion. Therefore, this method was directed to devise ‘one best way’ to do the work.

- **Time Study**

This technique was devised to determine standard time for completion of work through time and motion studies. It facilitated planning of daily tasks.

- **Differential Piece Rate System**

Having devised the time and motion studies, Taylor worked towards devising the methods of payment with these parameters. He suggested payment to workers by piece-meal, on the bases of standards set by the time and motion study. So, the piece rate system was guided towards motivation of workers to make more money with higher income and profits for those who worked hard. So, both the workers and the supervisors were to work with the mutuality of interest to gain economic rewards. So workers were paid a low piece rate up to a standard, a large bonus on the standard and a higher piece rate above the standard. Taylor emphasised that a worker, who after scientific selection, training and initiatives, was unable to achieve the standards should not be made to continue with work.

- **Exceptional Principle**

Under this Principle, Taylor stated that as standards have been set for work and rewards for achieving targets; the managers had to encourage exceptional work and not just focus on standard performance.

- **Other Methods**

In addition to above techniques, Taylor focused on the following techniques to serve the Principles of Scientific Management:

- i) Standardisation of all tools and methods used in trade.
- ii) Separate planning cell or department.
- iii) Instruction card for workers.
- iv) Cost saving system.

2.5 TAYLOR: AN APPRAISAL

The Scientific Approach of Management had a great impact on managerial methods and thinking, but somewhere it lacked in giving a complete theory of organisation. The main points of criticism are:

- The main focus of the Scientific Theory or Approach was on shop floor and reformulation of supervisory concept for various activities. Little attention was paid to overall administrative structures of an organisation. The focus on decision making was restricted only to shop floor level.
- The Approach viewed organisation as a mechanical system and overlooked the human element to it. It focused on efficiency of the organisation and perceived the worker as a machine. This perspective was opposed by the workers.
- The conception of motivation was also perceived and understood in terms of economic factors. It focused on material rewards for motivation away from physiological and psychological factors. This was carried forward by thinkers like Elton Mayo, Chester Bernard, M. P. Follet, who focused on behaviour of workers and their role in the organisation.

- The Approach received widespread criticism from workers and trade unions. Taylor emphasised on cooperation between workers and supervisors, which the trade unions perceived as a threat to unionism and workers’ rights.
- Scientific Management Approach was also opposed by managers. They believed that the adoption of scientific method left little space for judgement of managers. It also increased the responsibility of workers.

Check Your Progress 2

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answers.
ii) Check your answers with those given at the end of the Unit.

1) Describe the efficiency-driven mechanism of Scientific Management.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

2) Critically appraise the Scientific Management Approach.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

2.6 CONCLUSION

Even though Scientific Management Approach had some obvious limitations, it made a significant contribution to the growth of public administration as a field of study. It is this Approach, which led to the widespread acceptance of efficiency as the main purpose and goal of an organisation. The Scientific Management Approach contributed to the orientation of practitioners, executives and government officials. Various reforms such as centralisation of administrative authority, merit system, accountability and the conduct of activities of public administration blended easily with the values of Scientific Management. This Unit described all these aspects. Scientific Management movement was accepted and taken forward by management and organisations at various levels. This led to quality assurance and quality control as methods focussed on how to improve processes and make them operationalised and standardised. This Unit focussed on all these aspects.

2.7 GLOSSARY

Piece Rate Wage System : ‘Piece rate’ literally means that for each unit produced, the worker is paid separately. This wage system is based on decreasing piece rate

as the higher productivity also contributed towards restricting productivity.

- Rule of Thumb** : It refers to following of methods by the workers devised on the bases of their experience.
- Shop Floor** : This refers to the level of the organisation comprising of junior level workers.
- Soldiering** : Methods adopted by workers to reduce output.

2.8 REFERENCES

Bhattacharya, M. (2nd Ed.) (1987). *Public Administration*. Calcutta, India: The World Press Private Ltd.

Dhameja, A. & Mishra, S. (Ed.) (2003). *Public Administration: Approaches and Application*. Noida, India: Pearson.

Nigro, F.A. & Nigro, L.G. (1980). *Modern Public Administration*. New York, U.S: Harper &Row.

Golembiewsky, R.T. (1977). *Public Administration as a Developing Discipline*. New York, U.S: Marcel Dekker.

2.9 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS EXERCISES

Check Your Progress 1

- 1) Your answer should include the following points:
- F.W. Taylor was born in a German town Philadelphia.
 - His first job was that of an apprentice at Hydraulic Works, Philadelphia.
 - He worked at all hierarchical levels at Midvale Steel Company.
 - He received his degree in mechanical engineering.
 - He served as Professor at Tuck School of Business at Dartmouth College.
- 2) Your answer should include the following points :
- Workers exhibited soldiering as they were casual towards their work.
 - Workers thought that their productive nature would force management to eliminate them.
 - Non-productive wage system made workers demotivated.
 - Workers linked high productivity with low wages.
 - Taylor described two types of soldiering; natural and systematic.
 - Taylor believed that use of scientific techniques to increase output was the only way of reducing soldiering.

- 3) Your answer should include the following points:

- Taylor systematically worked towards standardising procedures in an organisation.
 - He came up with scientific principles of management that aimed at training workers, motivating them and selecting them on merit.
 - He created a science of work by bringing scientifically trained workers closer to work in an organisation.
 - He focussed on harmony, cooperation, division of work, higher wages, functional foremanship and mental revolution to increase work output most efficiently.
- 4) Your answer should include the following points:
- Application of scientific methods to work solutions.
 - Standardisation of working conditions and processes.
 - Science; not rule of thumb.
 - Harmony; not discord.
 - Development of workers to highest level of efficiency.
 - Maximum prosperity to employer.
 - Higher wages to worker.
 - Development of true science of work.
 - Scientific selection of workers.
 - Division of work and authority.

Check Your Progress 2

- 1) Your answer should include the following points :
- Functional Foremanship.
 - Motion Study.
 - Time Study.
 - Differential Piece Rate System.
 - Exceptional Principle.
- 2) Your answer should include the following points :
- Taylor’s principles improved the production processes.
 - He was criticised for giving more importance to production than people.
 - Trade unions felt threatened as they thought workers’ rights would be violated.
 - Taylor’s division of work between planning and execution was criticised.
 - Taylor’s Functional Foremanship was criticised for its confusing command system.

UNIT 3 ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT APPROACH*

Structure

- 3.0 Objectives
- 3.1 Introduction
- 3.2 Evolution of Administrative Management Approach
- 3.3 Major Contributors to the Administrative Management Approach
 - 3.3.1 Views of Henri Fayol
 - 3.3.2 Contribution of Lyndal Urwick
 - 3.3.3 Principles of Luther Gulick
 - 3.3.4 Mooney’s and Reiley’s Views on Principles of Administration
 - 3.3.5 M.P Follett on Principles of Administration
- 3.4 Administrative Management Approach: An Appraisal
- 3.5 Relevance of the Administrative Management Approach
- 3.6 Conclusion
- 3.7 Glossary
- 3.8 References
- 3.9 Answers to Check Your Progress Exercises

3.0 OBJECTIVES

After reading this Unit, you should be able to:

- Discuss the perspective and the background of Administrative Management Approach;
- Explain the major features and assumptions of the Approach;
- Describe the principles of administration as enunciated by Henri Fayol, Luther Gulick, Lyndal Urwick, James D. Mooney and Alan C. Reiley, as well as the views of Mary Parker Follett;
- Bring out the relevance of Administrative Management Approach; and
- Critically appraise the relevance of the Administrative Management Approach.

3.1 INTRODUCTION

Woodrow Wilson laid the foundations of the study of public administration as a separate discipline. This started as a part of the search for reforms in public administration in the United States. Since then many scholars and practitioners of public administration have made attempts to find out the ways and means to improve the performance of those engaged in the task of public service delivery in an efficient and economic manner. Several administrative thinkers opted for different approaches

* Contributed by Dr. Rajvir Sharma, Former Senior Consultant, Faculty of Public Administration, SOSS, IGNOU, New Delhi.

to the study of public administration. These approaches may be broadly classified into Classical, Neo-classical, Modern and Postmodern. In this Unit, we shall discuss one of the Classical Approaches, that is, Administrative Management Approach, which is also known as the ‘mechanical approach’, or the ‘principles of administration approach’.

As stated earlier, it was the reformist movement in the USA that culminated in the initiation of the studies in the field of public administration in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. As a response, developed Scientific Management Approach, mainly led by Fredrick Winslow Taylor. Some books also appeared on the theme and principles of public administration. Falling in the same tradition, began attempts for developing certain principles that would not only make public administration more efficient and cost-effective in its orientation, but also in universal application. Administrative Management Approach, an important stage in the evolution of public administration as a scientific field, attempts to find a rational way to design an organisation as a whole. It generally calls for a formalised administrative structure. In this Unit, we will trace the evolution of Administrative Management Approach. We will bring out the different perspectives as given by different scholars on this Administrative Management Approach. The Unit will also evaluate the focus and relevance of the Approach.

3.2 EVOLUTION OF ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT APPROACH

The principles of Administrative Management Approach formed a logical compliment to the Scientific Management movement. Whereas the focus of scientific management was on the performance of physical tasks, that of Administrative Management Approach was on the formal organisation structure. Accordingly, while the basic tool of analysis of Scientific Management was the time and motion study, that of the Administrative Management Approach was the formal organisation chart. The general problem addressed by the Administrative Management Approach theorists was the identification of the tasks necessary to accomplish organisational objectives and the grouping and coordination of these tasks in such a way that one maximises organisational efficiency.

The theorists sought to establish a science of administration equally applicable in the public as well as private sectors. Their analysis was of course not as systematic as that of Scientific Management. They attempted to drive specific applications from pre-ordained general principles rather than rely on generalisations built inductively. The classical model of public administration was founded on a number of conventions. Respect for the rule of law, a strict separation of politics and administration and a meritorious public service adhering to the principles of anonymity and political neutrality were a part of it.

“Efficiency was privileged at the beginning of the field as progressive era reforms sought to systematise and rationalise the administration of the public’s business” (The Efficient Public Administration by Pereto and a Well-Rounded Approach to Public Administration by Christopher Grandy). In administration science, whether public or private, the primordial goal is efficiency (Gulick, 1937; Denhardt, 2012). The search for Logical Positivism made the Administrative Management scholars believe that efficiency was a neutral quest necessary for the improvement of organisations. So, the predominant outlook in the 1920s and 1930s was the effort to achieve efficiency in the employment of resources (Silva and De Mattia, 2016).

The Administrative Management Approach evolved out of the discussion and debates about the nature of public administration, particularly with reference to its character as a Science or an Art. Are there some principles of administration or aspects of governance, which can be taken as universal or in sum can there be a scientific basis of the elements or processes that is predictable and verifiable? To provide answers to such questions, some practitioners and empiricists of administration concluded that there are or can be developed some principles that can be applied universally, irrespective of time, space or nature of government in order to ensure efficiency and economy in administration. The authors in support of this thought, points out Denhardt (2003), have stated that the basic interests in management are the same in any organisation.

Therefore, we should expect that lessons learned in one sector could be easily communicated to another or that the lessons learned in one context could contribute to general theory of organisations and this view is still predominant in studies of public administration. This Model and its definition has been widely accepted and used in the Western countries and mainly in continental Europe during the 19th century and the first half of the 20th century. A principle objective of a public organisation has been taken as efficiency and economy. So, administrative reforms were imperative for the achievement of that purpose. In its concern for these twin objectives, the public administration theorists focused on the questions of formal organisation in the 19th and early 20th centuries.

This School of Thought was led or represented by administrative thinkers like Luther Gulick, Lyndal Urwick, Henri Fayol and Mary Parker Follet. This Approach is also known as Structuralist Theory of administration. It does not discriminate between public and private administration in so far as the application of the principles is concerned. This School of Thought or Approach believes that no organisation can function without a formal structure, in where there is a clear-cut specification of the functions, responsibility and powers along with the relations of the employees with each other. Since administration is the expression of collective will and responsibilities of the people in the organisation to achieve its goals, it is the structure of the organisation that determines/regulates/moulds the behaviour and performance of the persons engaged in the organisational work in accordance with the organisational needs.

The Administrative Management Approach, as has been observed in social sciences encyclopedia, takes a deterministic view of social action since the underlying assumption is that individuals will maximise organisational efficiency independently of their own welfare and with no thought for the relationship between the collective goal and their own particular purposes. In the opinion of Urwick , the absence of organisation design will make things illogical, cruel, meaningless and inefficient. Secondly, the propounders of this Approach assume that there are some principles that can be developed and are of universal applicability. These principles are developed and evolved on the basis of long experience and experimentation in industry and in army.

Check Your Progress 1

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answers.

ii) Check your answer with that given at the end of the Unit.

1) Discuss the context and the background of the Administrative Management Approach.

.....

.....

.....

3.3 MAJOR CONTRIBUTORS TO THE ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT APPROACH

As stated in the beginning, several administrative thinkers and practitioners have contributed to the Classical Theory. We will refer to their thoughts in brief now:

3.3.1 Views of Henri Fayol

Fayol is considered as the founder of the Administrative Management Approach. He was born in 1841 and was an engineer by profession. He worked in a mining company, where he occupied the post of a managing director in 1888. It was during his tenure of managing director that the company earned huge economic gains. Fayol's theory is mainly contained in two publications, General and Industrial Management (1916) and The Administrative Theory in the State (1923).

Henry Fayol's theory of Administrative Management Approach consists of 14 important principles that can be discussed as follows:

1) *Hierarchical Structure*

This Administrative Management principle lays emphasis on the principle of hierarchical formal structure of an organisation. According to this arrangement, the organisation should be formally designed with a clear line of authority and accountability from top downwards. For instance, in a big organisation, there is at the top a Chief Executive with a number of persons immediately subordinate to him. He can, therefore, issue directions to them, and likewise, these subordinates would have the power to issue directions to their subordinates. The system would go on till it reaches the bottom.

2) *Division of Work/Labour*

The second most significant principle of organisation is a clear and well-defined division of work between different departments, branches and sections. This indicates that each unit in the organisation has a certain specific role and function to perform in order to attain the organisational goals. Take for example, a Car Manufacturing Company. The work of the organisation or company may be divided in a number of departments or divisions like Production Unit, Marketing Unit, Distribution and Maintenance Division, Finance Division and Administrative Unit. Each one of these units or divisions or departments undertakes a distinct activity leading to achieving the goals set out by the Car Manufacturing Company collectively.

The Production Department is concerned with the production of Car (including the parts and assembling of these parts), testing the structural and efficiency aspects of the car involving its operatibility and its quality is crucial so that the customers are attracted to purchase that produce more than any other cars manufactured by the other companies. Marketing Division is concerned with the Marketing and Distribution Unit with the supply of the product to the retailers/consumers. Similarly, Finance Division may be concerned with the management of finances, while Administrative Division provides administrative support to the other departments. This division of work is imperative for a focused attention by the individuals or a group on the specific tasks assigned to them.

3) ***Loyalty***

Loyalty to the organisation is the basic premise. The Principle involves giving precedence to the interests of the organisation over the interests of an individual or group of individuals. The implication is that individual or sectarian interests shall always be subordinated to the goals and interests of the whole organisation.

4) ***Payment of Fair Wages***

Payment of Fair Wages to the workers for the work or service they render or provide.

5) ***Unity of Direction***

Each department or division of an organisation concerned with the performance of its respective activities should be directed by one manager using one plan.

6) ***Unity of Command***

The meaning of the Unity of Command is that every subordinate should get orders from one and only one superior. Differently put, an employee should not be subjected to the order of more than one superior. There should be a system of mono command implying that every member of the organisation should report to one and only one leader. It is essential for avoiding confusion and manipulation in an organisation. Henry Fayol stated that “should it be violated, authority is undermined; discipline is in jeopardy, order disturbed and stability threatened.” Echoing the views of Fayol, Gulick and Urwick observed that “Man cannot serve two masters. Commenting on the relevance of Unity of Command, Gulick stated that any rigid adherence to the principle of Unity of Command may have its absurdities. But they are unimportant in comparison to the certainty of confusion, inefficiency and irresponsibility, which arise from the violation of the principle’.

7) ***Discipline***

No organisation, in the opinion of Fayol, can succeed if it lacks discipline among the workers because it is discipline that creates commonality of efforts of all workers in an organisation (Mc Namara, 2011).

8) ***Authority***

Authority is defined by Fayol as power to issue orders and secure compliance thereof. There is, further, a close relation between authority and responsibility. Authority and accountability go hand in hand. One who is vested with authority is also assigned with accountability.

9) ***Centralisation***

In the scheme of thought of Fayol, centralisation may be seen as the reduction in the role and importance of the subordinates, whereas decentralisation has a reverse connotation, i.e, increasing the importance of the role of the subordinates. At the same time, Fayol believed that the principle of centralisation is dependent for its application on the need and culture of organisation.

10) ***Order***

The principle of order implies placing people and material at the right place at the right time in order to ensure effective and efficient operation in organisation. All personnel and materials should be placed in their specific place/s.

11) *Equity*

Fayol laid emphasis on the humane behaviour of the managers towards their subordinates. This Principle indicates that there should be no discrimination between employees or to say it differently, all workers should be treated equally when it comes to the application of rules, regulations and rights. Salaries and facilities to the employees can be an exception to this principle (Shake, 2008).

12) *Stability of Tenure*

The tenure security of personnel, in the eyes of Fayol, is a condition to prevent high turnover rate. Instilling a sense of security in the minds of the employees would help them give their best to the organisation.

13) *Initiative*

It means allowing the employees to take initiative, originate ideas and carry out plans. This exerts high levels of efforts.

14) *Esprit de Corps*

Building team spirit is necessary for building harmony and unity in the organisation,. Harmony and friendly relations among workers of organisation would lead to increase in organisational performance.

Classification of Business Activities

Total activities of an industrial organisation have been put by Fayol into 6 categories, viz., Technical (2) Commercial (3) Financial (4) Accounting (5) Security, and (6) Controlling.

Fayol lists *five* elements/functions of administration as Planning, Organising, Commanding, Coordinating and Controlling, known by the acronym POCCE. Let us discuss these elements now:

- *Planning*

Management must plan and schedule every part of industrial processes; planning is an important function as it enables the managers to define what, when and how aspects of work to be done. Planning is necessary to ensure proper utilisation of physical, financial and human resources. Planning saves organisation from confusion, uncertainties, risks, wastages etc. Fayol maintained that the most rational and efficient organisations were those, which implemented a plan that facilitated unity, continuity, flexibility, precision, command and control.

- *Organising*

Management must also make certain that all of the necessary resources (raw materials, personnel etc.) come together at the appropriate time of production. It refers to the identification of activities and allocation of duties as well as classification or grouping of activities.

- *Commanding*

Management must encourage and direct personnel activity.

- *Coordinating*

Management must make certain that personnel work together in a cooperative manner.

It can also be seen as an arrangement of efforts in an order, so as to provide unity of action in the fulfillment of common objectives. Coordination, therefore, is an exercise that aims at an effective integration of efforts of all groups in organisation. In all, it is all about harmonisation of group efforts.

● **Controlling**

Manager should evaluate and ensure that personnel follow management's command. It is an act to achieve the attainment of goals of organisation through development and application of standardised measurement of the achievement or performance. It is a process that involves:

- Establishment of standards of performance.
- Measurement of actual performance.
- Comparison of actual performance with the standards and finding out deviation/s if any.
- Corrective action.

(Source : www.managementstudyguide.com/management_functions.htm)

Thus, for Fayol, the plan requires the necessary organisation of people and material, which have to be coordinated, commanded and controlled to achieve the organisational purpose. In his view, administrative ability was a very important factor in administration. Accordingly, he suggested *six* attributes to a good manager/administrator, such as: physical, mental, moral, general education, special knowledge and experience.

3.3.2 Contribution of Lyndal Urwick

Urwick completed his education from Oxford University. He was born in Japan, and served in the First World War as Lt. Col. of the British Army. Urwick was also associated with several International Management Institutes and published several books like-Management of Tomorrow, The Making of Scientific Management, Leadership in Twentieth Century Organisations, The Patterns of Management etc. He also worked as an editor of several papers on Science of Administration. He was also a well- reputed and well- renowned industrial consultant, who worked extensively for introducing Management Education in U.K, primarily in the context of the nature of administration. Urwick believed that there are *eight* principles on which an organisation can function. The important ones being:

- The Objective of the Organisation.
- Authority and Responsibility.
- Span of Control.
- Coordination; and
- Delegation among other principles.

In the scheme of thought of Urwick, an organisation is mainly a designing process. In his view, identification of activities or tasks and their classification or grouping formed the first part of that process, while the workers or personnel occupied the latter part. The principles identified by Urwick are based on his theory of organisation design. Scalar Chain or Hierarchy, he observed, formed a necessary element in the organisation structure as the lack of hierarchy would lead to "breakdown of authority". This will in turn impact the ability to get work done or receive compliance of orders

by the subordinates. In other words, the clear lines of authority running through an organisation would improve the efficiency and performance.

3.3.3 Principles of Luther Gulick

Gulick's ideas are mainly contained in the famous acronym – POSDCORB, of which each letter or alphabet explains one function. Let us discuss them now:

- ***Planning***

Planning is an integral part of an organisation, since it cannot function effectively without deciding about the what, why and how of work. It is to identify as to what work has to be done along with the rationale there of and method to be applied.

- ***Organising***

Gulick believed that no work can be performed without designing an organisation delineating formally the division of work, the power relationship involving authority and responsibility.

- ***Staffing***

It relates to proper and effective selection of employees; development of performance appraisal system, employees development including training and promotion; determining remuneration and manpower planning etc.

- ***Directing***

This function is taken as the life spark of an organisation, as it is the method by which efficient working of the employees can be ensured. Direction therefore involves supervision, motivation, leadership and communication.

- ***Coordination***

Coordination is the process by which unity of purpose and unity of action can be achieved in an organisation. It is an activity towards removal of grievances apart from establishing an environment of harmony and cooperation between employees. Coordination is also an instrument of ensuring environment free from conflict and contraction between the organisational units and individuals.

- ***Reporting***

It means keeping records, preparation of reports and conducting inspections in order to provide information upwards. This system implies also putting in place a good communication system.

- ***Budgeting***

It involves a vast number of exercise encompassing preparation and execution of budget, accounting, as well as audit for exercising control over budget.

Gulick examined the concept of departmentalisation and suggested *four* basis of organisation viz., (1) purpose required to be served or achieved, (2) process (3) people or clientele; and (4) place or territory where the work is to be executed or performed.

3.3.4 Mooney and Reiley's Views on Principles of Administration

Mooney and Reiley published their Book named 'Onward Industry' in 1931 and again republished it in 1939 under a different name of Principles of Organisation. Mooney and Reiley contributed *four* principles of organisation known as: (a) Coordinative Principle, (b) the Scalar Principle, (c) the Functional Principle; and (d) the Staff-Line Principle. However, they laid major emphasis on coordination and hierarchy in the organisation as the most deterministic principles.

3.3.5 M.P Follett on Principles of Administration

Mary Parker Follett is another significant name among the community of management thinkers. She was born in Boston, USA in 1868 and received her education from Radcliffe College, Boston and Newnham College, Cambridge, England. Her first paper was read at Newnham under the title, 'The Speaker of the House Representatives'. Her two books, 'The New State (1920) and 'Creative Experience' (1924) became quite famous. Though she was primarily a political scientist, she ventured into the other fields like social work, philosophy, organisation management, economics and law. However, most of her ideas flew from her vast experience and study of the poor and the impoverished. She addressed the organisational management issues not merely from the viewpoint of increasing efficiency through a mechanically designed structure and through the mechanical application of rules and regulations. Rather she seems to have carried the idea of humane and social-psychological dimensions of the employees in an organisation.

She devoted her mind to the issues of conflict resolution, power, authority and responsibility and leadership. She opined that in order to enhance employees' efficiency and productivity, focus of the manager needs to be on conflict resolution and giving orders. She further invested her attention in the analysis of the concept of power, which she defined as 'the ability to make things happen, to be a causal agent, to initiate change'. Differentiating between power-over and power-with, she asserted that the former implies forcing one's will over others and asserting one's right to get compliance from others. In the opinion of Follett, this method has a risk of resentment and reaction. Yet, she recognised the fact that managers use the power-over even though it has weaknesses. Interpreting it further, she observed that "power is a self-developing capacity" and can neither be delegated nor conferred.

Follett also does not treat power and authority as synonyms. Distinguishing the *two*, she defines authority as one related to the function or the job and not the position. Thus, she believed that authority is pluralistic or functional in nature. She argued that authority has to be interwoven at various levels of the organisation and, hence, authority and responsibility goes with the task or function one undertakes. Authority is defined by her as the right to exercise power. She does not favour the idea of over-concentration of authority while accepting the importance of central authority in an organisation.

Speaking about responsibility, she said that like authority, there is nothing like final responsibility. It is also functionally related and is to be seen in terms of inter-dependent, instead of isolationist, nature of tasks. No manager can pass on his functional responsibility to the other higher up in the ladder. She observed in this regard that instead of 'always running up and down a ladder of authority, adequate organisational arrangements for interweaving of responsibility are necessary, especially at the lower levels. Strand should weave with strand and then we shall not have the clumsy task of trying to patch together finished webs'.

Mary Parker Follett recognised the importance and relevance of leadership in an organisation. She observed that a good leader is one who influences and is influenced by his group. For her views on leadership, one can refer to her two published papers on leadership: ‘Leader and Expert’ and ‘Some Discrepancies in Leadership Theory and Practice’ A real leader is one, she averred, who can convince that ‘the order is integral to the situation’, instead of showing status or position by virtue of which he is to exercise power and order or command his subordinates. “Control will go”, she wrote, “to the man with the largest knowledge of that situation, to him who can grasp and organise its essential elements, who understands its total significance, who can see it through—who can see length as well as breadth—rather than to one with merely a dominating personality or in virtue of his position”(Follett, *op.cit.*) For her, a person is considered as a genuine leader is apt in solving the problems rather than being merely assertive. A leader is one who has the ability to guide and direct. In the words of Follett, “We look to him to open up new paths, new opportunities for the development of individuals, or groups, or the whole plant. He should see not only larger situations, but situations of greater value to all concerned”(Ibid.).

Besides the issues discussed above, Follett gave adequate attention to the importance of coordination in an organisation. Coordination, according to Mary Parker Follett, is one of the most important functions of a leader. Though coordination has to be effected at each level down the ladder of management, the task of the chief executive is to perform a role of a critic, judge and a participant. She observed if purchasing agent and production manager bring him different conclusions, his task is not to decide between them, but to try to unite the three different kind of experience involved—that of purchasing agent, and of production manager and his own” (Ibid.). The task of coordination involves *three* acts:

- Clear definition of objectives.
- Relating the immediate purpose to the larger one; and
- Relating separate plan to the general one.

Follett asserts that a leader should teach and train his subordinates how to control a situation themselves. Elaborating her idea of coordination, it has been observed in Dhameja and Mishra (2016) that Follett gave *four* dimensions of coordination, which involved:

- 1) Direct contact among managers, somewhat on the lines of Gangplank of Fayol.
- 2) Way of including the viewpoints by all managers and taking into view their divergence of opinion towards integration of differences or conflict through reconciliation.
- 3) A manner of relating managerial decisions to situations, clearly indicating that authority is connected to the job and not people or situations.
- 4) A continuous process, hinting at the need for organisations to change along with the changing situation.

Check Your Progress 2

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answers.

ii) Check your answers with those given at the end of the Unit.

1) Explain the POSDCORB view of Gulick.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

2) Examine some of the principles of public administration as enunciated by Fayol.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

3) Explain the views of Mary Parker Follett on Coordination.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

3.4 ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT APPROACH: AN APPRAISAL

The Administrative Management School of Study has become a subject of scrutiny and criticism at the hands of the modern management thinkers. Chiefly, it has been questioned by the Human Relations theorists, the Behaviouralist thinkers including Elton Mayo, Richard M. Cyert, Herbert Simon, Robert Dahl, Denhardt and all. The Human Relations thinkers have argued that it is not only the formal organisation chart, distribution of functions and system of work measurement, which are important, but also the feelings, values, informal group norms and family and social background of workers, which help determine organisation performance. The main elements of their objections, as observed, have been the following:

- 1) Management oriented theory does not give adequate attention to the problems of workers.
- 2) Lack of importance to informal organisation.
- 3) Concepts borrowed from military science.

- 4) Mechanical approach.
- 5) The School does not consider sociology, biology, psychology, economics etc., as relevant and included within the preview.
- 6) These principles are based on the assumptions that organisations are closed systems.
- 7) Rigid structures created by these principles do not work well under unstable condition.

The Behaviouralists like Herbert Simon have called these principles mere proverbs of administration instead of principles. The grounds on which Simon questioned this School were that there was no consistency and predictability in the so-called principles. Many of the principles are contradictory and suffer from inherent dilemmas. For example, the principle of Unity of Command contradicts the principle of Specialisation or Division of Labour and the principle of limited Span of Control contradict the principle that the number of organisational levels should be kept at a minimum. Further, the principle of specialisation is internally inconsistent; for purpose, process and place are competing modes of specialisation and to secure the advantages of any one mode, the organiser must sacrifice the advantages of the other three modes. All modes cannot be followed simultaneously while pursuing specialisation.

Denhardt and Denhardt (2012) have criticised this Approach on the following grounds:

- The Approach is limited by the positivist thought and fails to recognise alternative ways of looking at public organisations.
- The meaning of experiences or the impact that they have on society's values means inaugurating a complex study, an effort that suggests we heed to not only empirical matters associated with management of change in complex systems, but also the larger social, political and ethical contexts that involve public administration.
- The creation of a theory of public administration is not merely a matter of gathering a set of techniques applicable to specific situations.
- Despite the predominance of conventional approach, there are works with important arguments that introduce a counter point in the field. However, he admits that during roughly a century, private management has served as a model for public administration.

According to Robert Dahl, these principles are based on a few case studies, and they are not empirically tested. Robert Dahl argues that for public administration science, it is imperative that : (1) its normative values are clear; (2) Man's nature in the field of public administration is better understood and their conduct more predictable; (3) there is a corpus of comparative studies from which it is possible to identify principles and generalisations that transcend national frontiers and peculiar historical experiences (*Cited from C. Silva and De Mottia, 2016*).

These principles are stated as unconditional statements and valid under all circumstances, which is not practicable. More and more conditional principles of management are needed. Robert Dahl does not agree with the view that a principle of public administration is also valid in any other state or that the practices of public administration in a country will necessarily be successful in a socially, economically and politically different environment. So, in his view, the linkage between public

administration and its social configuration must be understood in order to understand the administrative man. Echoing the views of Robert Dahl, Dwight Waldo (Administrative State: A Study of the Political Theory of American Public Administration) contended that the values of efficiency and economy dominating the thinking of the field at that time were too narrow to give a correct view of public administration.

A principal objective of a public organisation and of administrative reforms as well, has been taken as efficiency and economy. In its concern with efficiency and economy, public administration theorists in the late 19th and early 20th century focused on the questions of formal organisation. Many organisational principles focused their origin in military and private businesses. It is maintained by some critics of that the principles of public administration are useful only as rough criteria for given organisational situations. Organisational problems differ and the applicability of rules to various situations also differs.

The Classical Theory to public administration is further criticised on the ground that it 'crowds out 'the contribution of citizens (Ostrom, 2000) in many ways'. It undervalues the role that people, families and the communities play in producing public results and creating a society worth living in. In current contemporary times, citizenship has taken a broader definition and meaning in which it is viewed as an integrating concept (Denhardt and Denhardt, *op.cit.*). According to classical thinkers, the political representative determines and carries out the political will as citizen's play no direct role once the political representatives are legitimately elected by them. However as Stone (1999) has observed, 'public interest' can be best described today as a collective enterprise involving government and many other actors. There is wide dispersal of power and authority involving the public sector, private sector and citizens.

Control and Hierarchy

Writing about Control and Hierarchy, Bourgon (2011) has remarked, 'increasingly, it is quite clear that no government controls all the level of State power that are designed to address the complex problems that people really care about. Coordinating vast operations that extend beyond the control of government is one of the trademarks of public administration in the 21st century. 'Over the last 30 years, a recurring theme in public sector reforms has been the growth of non-traditional, non- hierarchical and non-governmental approaches to service delivery'(Kettle, 2000).

Most scholars and practitioners in the classical administration period not only accepted Wilsonian propositions, they also suggested several principles of public administration keeping in mind the improvement in the efficiency and economy of operation in the public sphere.

However, the politics- administration dichotomy framework appeared to be giving way to politics-administration integration. The boundaries between politics and administration became blurred. Gulick (1937) agreed that administration has something more to do than merely implementing the policy decided by the political executive and legislature- that partake in policy making process by way of tendering expert advice and making necessary data and information available to the policy makers.

It was during the 19th and early 20th centuries that rationalism, efficiency and productivity were the main concerns of the intellectual tradition of public administration.

Beginning with Scientific Management theory developed by F. W. Taylor, the focus was on the discovery and implementation of some basic principles leading to the most efficient performance of the tasks in an organisation.

Along with Taylor’s Scientific Management model, evolved another approach to public administration known as ‘principles of administration’ originating in the works of Fayol, Urwick, Gulick, Follet and Mooney. This school of thought like Taylor’s also has as its focus in the goal of enhancing efficiency. Fayol’s theory was well-received in US and France and influenced the writings of Gulick and Urwick, prominent members of the committee constituted by President Roosevelt on administrative sciences. This is reflected in their famous work, ‘Papers on the Science of Administration’ (1937).

3.5 RELEVANCE OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT APPROACH

In spite of the criticism of the Mechanical or Classical Theory on various grounds, it cannot be denied that that this Theory remained relevant to administration and management alike not only at the time of its prescription, but holds value even after the emergence of a number of other theoretical propositions in the field of public administration. It has been revived in the New Public Management (NPM) Approach, which has come to consolidate the theory of public administration as chiefly focused on satisfying a neo-liberal perspective. Paes de Paula (2002) has stated that although post-modern administrative theories are called new, they are branches of the old schools of administration. One can see that the new organisational arrangements are actually reproductions of “administrative harmonies”. In similar vein, Denhardt has argued that although there are different theories of public organisations, the predominant work is focused on the “rational model of administration”, as well as on a dichotomous view of politics and administration. Further, the popularity of the theory is also sought for the following other reasons:

- It has provided a solid foundation for modern public administration.
- It includes the primacy of the rule of law, a commitment to due process in serving the public good.
- It includes a concern for efficiency in service delivery.
- It emphasises probity in the use of public funds.
- It lays down the basis for a strong system of accountability that runs through every level of public administration.
- Classical Theory framework has proven remarkably stable in different circumstances.
- Public organisations inherited from the 20th century were built to mass-product the public services and achieve pre-determined results. They were not expected to adapt to rapid changing circumstances and therefore were all prepared to innovate or discover new ways of fulfilling their missions.

While the ambit and the scope of the principles of administration might have expanded to include reliability and predictability; openness and transparency; effectiveness etc, in order to serve the needs of modern period, it cannot be denied that economy, efficiency and accountability form an integral part of good administration even today.

Thus, the importance and relevance of the principles might be summarised as follows:

- *Management Training, Education and Research:* These principles stress on scientific judgments and logical thinking. They serve as the basis of research and development in management studies.
- *Fulfilling Social Responsibilities:* Management principles not only act as guidelines for achieving organisational objectives but these principles also guide the managers to perform social responsibilities. For example, the principle of fair remuneration insists on adequate salary to employees and takes care of the interests of the employees.
- *Effective Administration:* Principles make the administration more effective. The efficacy of the principles of Unity of Command, Scalar Chain and Unity of Direction contributes a lot in ensuring a systematic and smooth functioning of the organisation.
- *Utility in meeting the Changing Environment:* Administrative principles train the employees at the higher level in implementing the changes in right direction and at right level in the organisation.
- *Optimum Utilisation of Resources:* The basic focus of the administrative school is on efficiency and economy in administration. Therefore, the application of the principles would bring into the functioning of the organisation the element of maximum gains with minimum costs; and
- They provide administrators/managers with useful insights into reality.

3.6 CONCLUSION

Thus, we can conclude that Administrative Theory Approach insists on formal organisation in which work is divided, arranged in order and coordinated for a given purpose. This Theory also underlines that there is no difference between public and private administration with reference to the principles and processes. These theorists believe that the principles of administration are universalistic in nature. The underlying philosophy makes the Approach atomistic, mechanistic, static, voluntaristic, rationalistic and the one that is oblivious of the impact of non- economic factors on the individual's behaviour. It may, in the end, also be pointed out that though this Theory has been subject to a number of criticisms at the hands of many scholars, it has had an impact on the studies of public administration and is relevant in the present contexts of administrative organisation even now.

Check Your Progress 3

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answer.

ii) Check your answer with that given at the end of the Unit.

1) Discuss the major grounds of criticism of Administrative Management Approach by Human Relations theorists.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

3.7 GLOSSARY

Efficiency	: It refers to competency to achieve the task or perform a function with a minimum expenditure of time, effort and resource.
Formal Organisation	: It refers to a cleanly designed formal structure containing well-identified role distribution between various units and branches of the organisation; a clear-cut line of authority and responsibility from top to bottom and Unity of Command and Direction.
Inductive Method	: It is usually called the Scientific Method. Inductive inference is based on observations and goes from the specific to the general.
Primordial	: The term is derived from Latin words, <i>primus</i> and <i>ordiri</i> , which mean first and to begin respectively. So primordial means first of all or original.
Scientific Management	: This is a Theory mainly developed by F.W Taylor highlighting the application of scientific principles and methods of doing a particular task efficiently and economically.

3.8 REFERENCES

Bourgon, J. (2011). *A New Synthesis of Public Administration Serving in the 21st Century*, Canada: McGill Queens University Press.

Denhardt, J.V. and Denhardt, R.B (2003.). *The New Public Service: Serving not Steering*, Armonk, NY: ME, Sharpe.

Dhameja, A. & Mishra, S. (Eds.) (2003). *Public Administration: Approaches and Applications*. Noida, India: Pearson.

Kettl, D.F. (2000). *The Global Public Management Revolution: A Report in the Transformation of Governance*, Washington DC: The Brookings Institutions.

Stone D. (1997). *Policy Paradox: The Art of Political Decision Making*, New York, U.S: W.W Norton.

Nhema, E. G. (2015). ‘Relevance of Classical Management Theories to Modern Public Administration: A Review’. *Journal of Public Administration and Governance*, Vol. 5, No. 3, Macrothing Institute.

Sahni, P. and V. Etakula (2010). *Administrative Theory*, New Delhi, India: PHI Learning.

Silva, C and De Mattia (2016). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/1679-395145163>

www.yourarticlelibray.comk/organisation/

3.9 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS EXERCISES

Check Your Progress 1

1) Your answer should include the following points :

- The need for a study of public administration as a separate field or discipline and to develop a science of administration.
- The belief that there are some principles that can be developed that are universally valid for application in any organisation; public or private.
- Focus on efficiency and economy in administration.
- Debate regarding the nature of public administration, i.e., whether it is a Science or Art.

Check Your Progress 2

1) Your answers should include the following points:

- Refer to Sub-section 3.3.1 containing the explanation of POSDCORB view of Gulick.

2) Your answers should include the following points.

- Enlist the 14 principles and then discuss some of them in detail like division of labour, unity of command, equity order etc.

3) Your answer should include the following points.

- The answer should refer to the fact that Follett considered coordination as one of the most important functions of leadership and mentioned the three acts involved in coordination. Viz., clear definition of objectives; relating the immediate purpose to the larger one; and relating each separate plan to the general one.

Check Your Progress 3

1) Your answer should include the following points:

- The answer should include points mentioned in Section 3.4.
- Refer to the matter given in the Section 3.5.

UNIT 4 BUREAUCRATIC APPROACH*

Structure

4.0 Objectives

4.1 Introduction

4.2 Nature of Bureaucracy

4.3 Pre-Weberian Bureaucratic Narratives

4.3.1 J.S. Mill: Considerations on Bureaucracy

4.3.2 Hegel's Perspectives on Bureaucracy

4.3.3 Marx's Views on Bureaucracy

4.3.4 The Power-Elite Concept

4.4 The Bureaucratic Approach of Max Weber

4.5 Post-Weberian Bureaucratic Narratives

4.6 The Way Forward

4.7 Conclusion

4.8 Glossary

4.9 References

4.10 Answers to Check Your Progress Exercises

4.0 OBJECTIVES

After reading this Unit, you should be able to:

- Discuss the bureaucratic approach in Pre-Weberian context with reference to modern society;
- Describe the relevance of Max Weber's Ideal type in understanding bureaucracy;
- Explain the key assumptions of Public Choice Approach to bureaucracy; and
- Examine the importance of bureaucracy in a democratic system.

4.1 INTRODUCTION

Every day citizens across the world interact with bureaucratic structures to pay remittances or renew their licenses or passports or to make an enquiry either online or offline. In contemporary society, bureaucracy has become an indispensable institution for implementing public policies; however, bureaucracy has been a fundamental institution of the State for several years, especially, in Asia and Europe. For instance, some of the traditional empires like Mauryan, Chinese, Roman and Ottoman, and pre-modern kingdoms of Mughals, Japan, China, developed a system of 'bureaucracy' that served the requirement of the ruler. Riggs (1997) points out that "...as hierarchies of appointed officials, bureaucracies were never democratic in structure or purpose, rather, they were designed to enable monarchs to administer domains under their authority, to expand those domains, and to protect them from aggressive neighbouring countries". With the emergence of representative governments, the existing functions

* Contributed by Dr. R. Anitha, Former Faculty, RGNIYD, Sriperumbudur, Tamil Nadu.

shifted its focus ‘*From ruler to the ruled*’. Unlike pre-modern bureaucracy that was obsessed with ‘personal loyalty’, the modern bureaucracy had been designed on the basis of ‘*impersonality*’, which is, uninfluenced by political and social power.

Bureaucracy is a social entity that constantly interacts with politics and society. Indeed, bureaucracy is equated with public administration and organisation and management of bureaucracy have always been the foundational premise of the discipline. The core concern of literature on bureaucracy was to conceptualise its role in relation to State, society, and economy. Initially, the study of bureaucracy was to analyse the working of administrative agencies as organisations within a governmental system with reference to two dimensions: the *external* and the *internal*. The *external* dimension includes inter-institutional relationships with chief executives, legislatures and judiciary and the *internal* dimension includes intra-institutional activities related to organisation structure and functioning of administrative agencies.

Later, with the rise of industrialised societies, there was a corresponding need to have an effective organisation that could match with the changes brought in by ‘modernity’ in terms of logic, technical efficiency, precision, authority, and rules. Many scholars like J.S Mill, Georg W.F. Hegel, Karl Marx, and Gaetano Mosca, have deliberated about bureaucracy, however, it was Max Weber who made a systematic attempt to understand its meaning in the light of capitalism. In this Unit, we shall examine the concept of bureaucracy as discussed by various thinkers and how it has helped shape the organisation, especially, public sector in contemporary times.

4.2 NATURE OF BUREAUCRACY

The study of bureaucracy as an academic pursuit finds its roots in the works of Max Weber, Woodrow Wilson, Frank Goodnow, Luther Gulick, F.W. Taylor etc. Indeed, Meier and Krause (2003) find that there has been a line of inquiry to develop generalisable theoretical principles and subsequent empirical understanding on the ‘what’, ‘how’ and ‘why’ of bureaucratic agencies. Initially, the line of inquiry was around the question: how to operate bureaucracies for a capitalist society. In the post-Second World War, the prime concern was to explore the role of bureaucratic agencies in democratic settings. In this Unit, the growth and development of bureaucracy as a social entity will be discussed along the continuum of public administration. Before studying the various perspectives of bureaucracy, let us first understand the nature of bureaucracy in brief.

Public Administration scholars, while examining the literature on bureaucracy, find *two* points of view on its nature. The *First* viewpoint recognises bureaucracy as an instrument or a mechanism that is created for efficient implementation of goals. This point of view considers bureaucracy as an epitome of rationality and as a public administration tool that specialises in service provisions. In order to perform the services that it offers to citizens (services like Aadhaar Card, ration allowance, water supply etc.), it has a cadre of qualified staff members who have been appointed for the position as prescribed by rule of law. The *second* viewpoint explores bureaucracy mainly as an instrument of power to exert control over its members or citizens either in the interest of the bureaucratic system or in favour of any vested interest. In fact, the second point of view intends to decode the process of bureaucratisation. Eisensdadt (1959) interprets bureaucratisation as “*the extension of the power of a bureaucratic organisation over many areas beyond its initial purpose*” and indicates that the two-fold aspects of bureaucracy cannot be viewed as separate and contradictory,

but rather they reveal the possibilities inherent in bureaucracy. Therefore, the problem seems to be not in determining which viewpoint is worth consideration, rather, the focus and locus could be on identifying the circumstances under which inherent tendencies like ‘bureaucratisation’ manifest in organisations.

On the organisational side, based on empirical studies, Andler (1996) presents *two* conflicting views of the attitudinal outcomes of bureaucracy with reference to Positive View (Enabler) and Negative View (Coercive). According to the Positive View, it provides adequate guidance and clarifies job responsibilities to the employees. As a result, it eases role stress and supports individuals, be and feel more effective in organisational setting. According to the Negative View (Coercive), the bureaucratic form of organisation quashes creativity due to its rigid functioning, which eventually makes the employee feel dissatisfied and demotivated. While the former (Enabler) keeps in mind the employee well-being as essential to achieve organisational goals, the latter (Coercive) uses force and punishment towards their employees. Andler (*ibid.*) finds that the bureaucratic organisation, which has less or no scope for guidance and support may be counterproductive in achieving their goals.

The above mentioned views on bureaucracy vis-à-vis Two-fold and Enabler-Coercive perspectives reveal the need to explore this phenomena through two pertinent questions; first, “*how bureaucracies can shift from inert to innovative bureaucracy?*”; and second, “*how bureaucratic organisations can shift from coercive to enabling types of bureaucracy?*”. These questions were predominant among the academia too that scholars from different intellectual streams started sharing their narratives to explore this phenomena. It is to be noted that within this intellectual stream, there was also a parallel drive to fit bureaucracy into the democratic institutions after the Second World War. In the subsequent sections, we will be discussing about Pre-Weberian, Weberian, and Post-Weberian bureaucratic narratives. Further, we will look into the implications of Bureaucratic Theory and the need for reinventing bureaucracies in today’s context. In this Unit, the terms ‘Theory’, ‘Approach’, and ‘Model’ are used interchangeably.

4.3 PRE-WEBERIAN BUREAUCRATIC NARRATIVES

It has been often cited in public administration literature that Max Weber was the foremost thinker of modern bureaucracy. But it has to be noted that prior to Weber, there were many scholars like J.S. Mill, G.W.F. Hegel, Karl Marx, etc. who had set the stage for a comprehensive discussion on bureaucracy and in examining its role in capitalist economy. In the following sub-sections, we will study some of these Pre-Weberian perspectives in brief. This will enable you to have a background understanding on the intellectual roots of bureaucracy.

4.3.1 J.S. Mill: Considerations on Bureaucracy

J.S. Mills’ Essay titled ‘Considerations on Representative Government’ (1861) was written about half a century before Weber’s publication on Bureaucracy. According to Mill, the term Bureaucracy implies direct work of government and sometimes he refers to bureaucrats as the actual governors. Mill clarifies the meaning of bureaucracy as: “the essence and meaning of bureaucracy lies when the work of government has been in the hands of governors (in this context bureaucrat) by profession”. In terms of recruitment, Mill prefers to have recruitment based on merit (competition), where the candidates’ intelligence, education, and potential governmental skills could be

tested. Citing bureaucracy as the “permanent strength of the public service” and the bureaucratic functions as highly professional in nature, Mill recommends “tests for selecting the best officers, rules for promotion, appropriate provisions for order and convenient transaction of business, good record keeping, and proper measures for responsibility and accountability”.

While exploring the relationship between representative government and bureaucracy, Mill did not isolate bureaucracy from the policy process, but viewed it as an institution of experience, skill and knowledge. Interestingly, Mill sets limit to political executive in relation to bureaucratic interference on the grounds that they lack knowledge or experience to direct the public service. However, Mill did recognise the dangers of bureaucracy such as abuse of power and limitations on human creativity. In Mill’s view, administrators engaged in corrupt practices can be removed by political executives or elected members as they are responsible for the people and scrutinising the work of administrators.

Nevertheless, in those days seldom a bureaucrat got removed from position on moral grounds. Unlike, positivist view, Mill did not consider bureaucracy as a ‘value free’ entity, rather considered its role as a ‘neutral entity’ in partisan politics. Here ‘being neutral’ is not to be mistaken as staying inert but standing out with exceptional qualities like stability, skill, knowledge and experience to mediate the process of democratic decision making. It is with this reference to bureaucracy’s role in democracy, Mill, identifies a potential role for bureaucracy in the states’ progress and citizen development. His work tried to bring a democratic spirit in exercising governance by applying multi-stakeholder approach, which included the most educated, skilled and experienced citizens, no matter whether they were elected representatives or officials.

Warner (2001) points out that Mill had “set out a remarkably succinct yet impressively comprehensive theory of bureaucracy within representative government”. From the perspective of J.S. Mill, we can understand that public bureaucracy is not just legitimate arm, but also an essential constituent of good government. Indeed, present day governance narratives on citizenship, civic participation and community governance can be attributed to the writings of J.S. Mill.

4.3.2 Hegel’s Perspectives on Bureaucracy

One of the influential thinkers who acknowledged bureaucracy as the main governing organisation in the modern State was G.W Friedrich Hegel. In his *Philosophy of Right*, published in 1821, he deliberates about how liberal States can be organised, and endorses the role of civil service as an essential element of government. Interestingly, Hegel upholds the role of civil service as a “universal class” since the end of their activities is to realise universal interest. Misra (1977) points out that Hegel raised the concept of bureaucracy to a higher level by defining it as the ‘State’s will’ and considered it as “a transcendent entity, a mind above individual minds”. Indeed, Sager (2009) observes that Hegel’s political philosophy prompted Woodrow Wilson to believe in a class of educated, morally upright public servants who would serve the common will. The organisational characteristics that Hegel envisions for a modern bureaucracy include the following features: functional division of authority, principle of hierarchy, separation of office from its incumbent, merit-based recruitment through competition, fixed remuneration, and exercise of authority in compliance to common good. Hegel believed that in an egalitarian society, a bureaucratic structure that is based on the above mentioned characteristics would nevertheless be considered

as the most appropriate administrative organisation in terms of maximum simplification, speed, and efficient handling of State affairs.

Shaw (1992) observes that several authors have observed that Hegel's Philosophy of Right draws a close similarity to Weber's understanding of bureaucracy in terms of formal characteristics, such as fixed remuneration, professionalism, office as main occupation, the separation between office and official, the merit-based recruitment, rational hierarchical structure, untied to any vested interest, and centralisation. On the level of institutional analysis. Shaw (1992) points out that Hegel's characterisation of the structural attributes of bureaucratic organisation is as comprehensive as Weber's ideal type. It can be deduced that at least partially, Weber would have derived his conceptualisation on bureaucracy from Hegel. Unlike Weber's theory of bureaucracy that is characterised by technocracy and compliance to rules, Hegel's theory of bureaucratic activity is based on practical philosophy.

With regard to politics-administration dichotomy, scholars could not find any traces of this dimension in Hegel's writings, rather, could only observe his speculations on the indispensable role of bureaucracy in a modern constitutional State. Indeed, in the case of downfall of the socialist regimes proved that *sans* democracy and modern bureaucracy there will be no provision for universal (Public Value) norms. Shaw (1992) cites that "*the task of modern bureaucracy*", according to Hegel, "*is to realise the political norms in concrete situations and to subsume the latter (political) under the universal norms*". In fact, Shaw (1992) acknowledges that Hegel's theory of bureaucracy would serve as a new means of sustaining the Constitution.

4.3.3 Marx's Views on Bureaucracy

Marx's proposition on bureaucracy was set at the backdrop of capitalist society, where the status of State in general and bureaucracy in particular was far from upholding universal interests. Power is normally understood in Marx's observations as the presence of class and its relationship to economic production in society and not the State. Hence, Marx's premise on bureaucracy could be traced from his political economy view, where power manifested from the position is held by a class in the capitalist society. In this regard, Marx viewed that bureaucracy is no less than an apparatus that exhibits the repressive character of State. Marx's cynicism on bureaucracy could be better understood in his 'Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right' in 1843, where he openly questions Hegel's basic hypothesis on political theory and idolisation of State. Hegel conceptualised bureaucracy as an insightful institution which has the capability to reflect to public interest.

However, Marx questioned the status of bureaucracy in being vocal to the problems of the masses. To illustrate, Marx while examining the features of bureaucracy, such as hierarchical and functional differentiation, asserted that it can only lead to incompetence of the incumbents. Bhattacharya (2008) summarises Marx's observation on bureaucratic incompetence as: "the superior does not know the specifics of the case, the subordinates does not know the general principles and none can appreciate the totality of a situation". Owing to the conflicting interest in capitalist society, Marx finds that the role of State is nothing more than an egotistic interest. Dwivedi (1985) observes that Marx viewed State as a partisan instrument in the enactment of intra-societal class struggles rather than a neutral umpire of such struggles. Misra (1977) points out that for Marx 'State was not an independent entity which possessed its own intellectual, ethical, and libertarian basis' and considered bureaucracy as an

instrument and agent of State that is directed and controlled by the economically dominant class.

Indeed, Marx viewed bureaucracy through a critical lens rather than theorising State bureaucracy. In Marx's own words: "The general spirit of bureaucracy is secret, mystery, safeguarded inside itself by hierarchy and outside by its nature as a closed corporation". Undoubtedly, this perspective of Marx is worth considering in the context of top-down bureaucratic model: firstly, as information and knowledge is not uniformly accessible to the incumbents, Marx cautions about the inherent tendency of bureaucracy to manipulate knowledge into secrecy and competence into mystery; secondly, he warns about bureaucrat's obsession in "...passive obedience, faith in authority, mechanisation of fixed and formal behaviour, fixed principles, attitudes, and traditions...". In a way, Marx's views could be used as an analytical framework to understand and assess the dysfunctions of bureaucracy in developing countries.

4.3.4 The Power-Elite Concept

Unlike Marx's dominant-class theory, which is based on economically dominant class, Mosca's dominant-class theory is based on '*politically dominant class*'. Mosca held the view that bureaucracy signified rule by officials. In 'The Ruling Class' published in 1939, he differentiated governments into *two* categories, namely, feudal and bureaucratic. According to Mosca, as cited by Misra (1977), Feudal State is a political organisation, where the executive functions of the State like economic, judicial, administrative, and military would be exercised by the same individuals. In the bureaucratic State, in contrast, not all executive functions would be concentrated in the bureaucracy.

In fact, Mosca defined bureaucracy "*as a political organisation with an extensive number of public services receiving their salaries from the government for the performance of 'public duties' demanding a 'greater specialisation of functions', 'a far greater discipline in all grades of political, administrative and military service'*". Further, Mosca acknowledges the bureaucratic system as a body of public officials who formed an integral part of the ruling class. Misra (1977) observes that Mosca stood as the outstanding advocate of the power-elite concept of bureaucracy who viewed bureaucracy as one of the defining features of public administration in a modern State about eight decades earlier. However, Mosca makes observations on tendency of bureaucracies to dominate, hence, recommended the mechanism of the vote, which could reflect the diverse interests of society.

Vilfredo Pareto, one of the thinkers who elaborated Mosca's theory came out with a theory of circulation of elites, which emphasises on the theory of replacement of one group of elites by another. In fact, the principle of elite circulation was intended to bring continuous interaction and assimilation of new and persisting ideas. In this context, Misra (1977) points out that Pareto emphasises the potential role of socialism as a means to the creation of a new working class elite. Scholars like Robert Michels joined this discourse and recognised the principle of elite circulation. Nevertheless, Michels was aware of bureaucratic functioning and believed that it was an instrument in the hands of politically dominant class.

Although, the concept of oligarchy (minority rule) was used by Mosca in the study of bureaucracy within public administration, it was Michels who widened its scope to all modern organisations. Misra (1977) highlights that both Michels and Mosca limited their work only to the sociology of power, administration and authority and seldom made attempts to examine this subject of bureaucracy in depth or zooming

on its political and organisational dimensions. The cumulative effect of these developments accelerated into an in-depth study on bureaucracy by Max Weber. In the next section, we will be discussing the Bureaucratic Approach as propounded by Weber.

Check Your Progress 1

- Note:** i) Use the space given below for your answers.
ii) Check your answers with those given at the end of the Unit.

- 1) What is the nature of bureaucracy?
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
- 2) Briefly describe Mill’s views on bureaucracy.
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
- 3) Write a brief note on Hegel’s views of Bureaucracy.
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
- 4) Discuss the main aspects of bureaucracy as identified by Karl Marx.
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

4.4 THE BUREAUCRATIC APPROACH OF MAX WEBER

Max Weber has had an overarching influence in the development of the sociological analysis of bureaucracy in relation to its political and organisational dimensions. His conceptual and historical analysis provides a theoretical grip for establishing connection

of bureaucracy as an administrative organisation with politics and society. He asserts that the process of rationalisation was a determinant factor of modern society and finds that rationalisation had penetrated deep into the political, social, and economic life, thus, paving way for modernisation. Apparently, his observations on bureaucracy emerged out of socio-historical forces, such as the period of absolute monarchy in the West and the subsequent phase of national sovereignty, growth of industrial community and working class traditions.

● *The Context*

Max Weber's 'The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism' is generally considered as an outstanding work for its understanding on the emergence of modern capitalism. Nevertheless, his essays on bureaucracy may be regarded as an influential work in the relevant academic disciplines of sociology, political science, history or public administration. To begin with, the central idea in Weber's bureaucracy cannot be restricted to merely providing guidelines to managers. Indeed, Weber inclined to address a perennial debate put forth by Hegel and Marx with reference to the basic nature of domination in society.

As discussed in the previous section, Hegel recommended that the State administration serves as an instrument to achieve general will of the people (idealism). Later, Marx disagreed with this recommendation on the pretext that in a capitalist society, the State and its bureaucracy obliges to serve the interests of the economically dominant class who control the means of production (materialism). Hence, Marx speculated that the wealthy and powerful elite could exhibit control over the lower classes.

According to Weiss (1983), Weber's writings on "bureaucracy were composed as responses to the Marxian perspective" and "was roughly half way between the idealism of Hegel and the materialism of Marx". Weber agreed with Marx's contention that the State bureaucracy is no less than an apparatus that exhibits domination in society. However, Weber anticipated that domination based on knowledge including both technical knowledge and knowledge of the concrete fact as legitimate (legal-rational) and far superior than other forms of dominance. Historically, Weber identified two types of dominance, namely, traditional and charismatic. For Weber, leadership and authority gained its basis either through traditional or charismatic dominance. To illustrate, dominance based on traditional set up may be patrimonial or feudal in nature. On the other hand, dominance based on charisma indicates the traits of a leader who possesses exceptional qualities. Unlike, the other two dominance structures vis-à-vis traditional and charismatic, Weber recommended a new organisational structure based on rational principles, such as logic, efficiency and reason. In Weberian version, this is termed as 'legal-rational authority' and signifies such an organisation as the hallmark of modern civilisation.

● *The Ideal Type Bureaucracy*

To make sense of the historical events and patterns on dominance and administration, Weber made efforts to understand bureaucracy on heuristic lines. Rudolph (1979) points out that this heuristic understanding "became the means for demonstrating historical change from traditional to modern (rational-legal) authority". Weber's methodological stand with regard to ideal types can be understood as an interpretation of human events and experiences. For Weber, human events have been governed primarily by meaning and not by laws. In this regard, Rudolph (1979) notes that ideal types are imaginary constructs or game plans to tell us how they would be put together and make it work. For purposes of understanding complex reality posed

by modernisation, Weber asserts that ideal-types could serve as a strong “conceptual instrument for *comparison* with and the *measurement* of reality”.

In his concept of bureaucracy, Weber included the following components: formality, continuity, sphere of competence, role segmentation, hierarchy, merit based recruitment, selection, career, training, and written documents. For Weber the goal of bureaucracy is to maximise efficiency for the reason that a technically sound administration will enable all employees towards optimum performance. Keeping in mind the objectives of ‘efficiency’ and ‘predictability’, Weber conceptualised his bureaucracy to cater to the complexities of modern societies. Weber believed that the organisational decisions would be more neutral and unbiased and guarded against personal, irrational, and emotional aspects. Importantly, Weber also provides scope for steady improvement of functioning through training and constant practice.

● *Critique of Weber’s Ideal Type*

Weber points out that his ideal type cannot be found empirically anywhere in reality and has no connection at all with making value judgments. However, Weber’s bureaucracy was criticised from the standpoint of applicability of the model and is also described as huge, inert, inefficient structurally, it could lead to an increase in the hierarchical rigid structures, ambiguous rules, expenditure on structure and personnel on the other hand, behaviourally, bureaucracy is dominated by secretive functioning, alienation from public scrutiny, and over-reliance on technocracy. To illustrate, critics point out that functional maladies are ailments of organisation and cautioned that over-reliance on rigidity and secretiveness may lead to withdrawal from public interest. Critics like Warren Bennis, have contended that the traditional bureaucratic model is an outdated type of organisation in the contemporary complex, dynamic, and globalised society. Meier and Krause (2003) note that Neo-liberal critics like Gordon Tullock, Anthony Downs, William A. Niskanen etc. portray bureaucracies as huge machines that are out of control and hypothesise that if bureaucratic behaviour is not held under tight supervision in the form of rigid rules, it is likely to maximise autonomy. Misra (1977) refers to another critic Robert K. Merton, who claims that in its obsession to build rigidities and conformity to rules, bureaucracy interferes with the organisational goals. On these lines, several scholars were engaged in empirical analysis of administrative organisations and its impact on social reality.

Despite criticisms from far and wide, Weber’s ideal type of bureaucracy has remained undervalued because of misunderstandings of ideal-typical method. To illustrate, Bartel (2009) while reflecting on the criticisms of ideal types emphasises that the question whether bureaucracy is outdated, oversized or too powerful is subject to empirical research and it is invalid to make comprehensive claims on its dysfunctions without solid empirical evidence. In the ensuing sub-section, we will discuss about the implications of bureaucratic theory.

● *Implications of Weber’s Bureaucratic Theory*

Unlike his predecessors, Weber’s writings imparted a degree of clarity and technical sophistication to the study of bureaucracy. Meier and Krause (2003) indicate that Weber’s explanations give an appropriate way to technically design organisations in terms of division of labour, specialisation and training, formal hierarchical structures, explicit rules and procedures. Weber claims that his theory of organisation is applicable not only to government bureaucracy, but to all other modern organisations either social or economic. The key feature of this organisation is that the rules and regulations

do not contradict each other; and the rules are applicable to everybody irrespective of their class or creed. It can be construed that since the authority is derived from law, there is no room for arbitrariness. In his own terms, Weber holds the view that bureaucracy can serve any master which means irrespective of the nature of the organisation his theory of bureaucracy could be considered as an 'Ideal type'. But the relevance of bureaucracy will depend on the quality of the master to whom it serves.

One of the core values of bureaucracy, as glorified by Weber is its 'neutrality' from vested interests. In this regard, Weber considered bureaucracy as an epitome of modern State, and placed a fundamental difference from feudal government, which was based on personal ties and privileges. Indeed, Weber anticipates that *"bureaucracy develops more perfectly, the more it is 'dehumanised,' the more completely it succeeds in eliminating from official business love, hatred, and all purely personal, irrational, and emotion elements"*. Nevertheless, Weber was well-aware of bureaucratic dysfunctions. To illustrate, Misra (*op.cit.*) cites that Michels was sceptical about the co-existence of bureaucracy and democracy, not to forget that Weber did suggest a number of mechanisms to limit the scope of misuse of authority, such as, collegiality, separation of powers, amateur administration, direct democracy, and representation. These mechanisms will be separately discussed in our other Course, in the Unit on Max Weber.

4.5 POST-WEBERIAN BUREAUCRATIC NARRATIVES

Although several scholars had given their appraisal on Weber's Ideal type, it is essential to understand their perspectives on bureaucracy in terms of organisational, political, and social contexts. In this regard, the following Section will focus on the following approaches, namely, Public Choice Approach and a General Theory of Bureaucracy.

- ***Public Choice Approach***

Public Choice Approach (which will also be discussed in a later Unit of this Course) presents an alternative to the view that bureaucrats act as trustees of public interest. This Approach focuses on problems of control and responsiveness that is inherent in Weber's bureaucracy. The major contribution of this School was to link bureaucratic behaviour to resource optimisation and the notable thinkers in this Approach include Gordon Tullock, James M. Buchanan, William Niskanen etc. To illustrate, Niskanen (2012) while deliberating on Tullock's bureaucratic model finds its foundations based on three assumptions: (a) bureaucrats are primarily motivated by selfish pursuits; (b) public agencies are not constrained by effective competition; and (c) as the size of public sector is an unmanageable size, it is difficult to measure its performance.

Tullock asserts that the primary motivation of bureaucrats is the desire to increase their career prospects, especially, in getting oneself promoted. In pursuit of getting ahead of others, the bureaucrat maximises his attention in pleasing his/her superiors. Tullock points out that in a competitive market, merit occupies a central criterion for promotion, whereas in public sector, Tullock finds no such objective criteria for performance measurement. Consequently, he laments that the effort towards achieving organisation goals gets diluted, thus, leading to bureaucratic dysfunctions like inefficiency, inertness, inaction, corruption, rigidity etc.

One of the root causes of inefficiencies as highlighted by Tullock is their monopolistic

competition, that is, imperfect competition. Tullock adds that in an imperfect competitive environment the presence of external checks and balances to uphold law are completely absent. To put it in other words, the presence of external scrutiny ensures that no one person or department has absolute control over making decisions. Further, Meier and Krause (2003) analyse that public choice theorists strongly advocate elevating of the role of people to that of customers so that they can choose among the providers at a minimum cost. For instance, Niskanen claims that bureaucracy is preoccupied with budget maximisation and in that process tends to become monopolistic in delivering public services. Hence, he considers public service delivery as inefficient and unresponsive to citizens' preferences. Therefore, the general tone of Public Choice Approach is to decentralise government bureaucracies into agencies, which deal with each other on a user-centric basis.

● ***General Theory of Bureaucracy***

Elliott Jaques, a social scientist in his Book “A General Theory of Bureaucracy”, assumes bureaucratic organisation as an indispensable entity. In this Book Jaques intends to build a general theoretical construction of how social institutions and human nature influence each other with special reference to bureaucracy. Waldo (1978) points out that Jaques's views bureaucracy as a strategy to which organisation could imbibe its strengths rather than be afflicted by its dysfunctions.

Ramaswamy (1979) notes that Jaques's attempts to humanise bureaucracy and provide competitive service to the needs of the society. Based on the vast experiences gathered from Glacier Metal Project of the British Ministry of Trade, Jaques could provide a blueprint for constitutional bureaucracy. To illustrate, Jaques advocated for an interactive participation on constitutional grounds, wherein at least one source of authority at every community level vis-à-vis factories, offices, schools, government departments, hospitals, and other social institutions could engage with each other and overcome differences. In this way, he was of the view that bureaucratic power could be made more relevant and legitimate. To a large extent, Jaques believed that such exercises could lead to ‘humanising bureaucracy’:

i) Jaques' Classification on Competition

Jaques' classification with regard to competition has two dimensions: (a) Service-providing competition: This type of competition could be witnessed in free market societies to cater to consumer needs; (b) Labour-exploitative competition: this type of competition intends to get the cheapest labour from the existing market. Unlike labour-exploitative competition, Jaques views that service-providing competition serves the societal interests.

Needless to say, Jaques was well-aware of the discrepancies associated with the ‘competition’ in both capitalist and socialist systems, such as, undermining public interest (capitalist system) and the spirit of serving customer needs (socialist system) respectively. To overcome this scenario, Jaques recommends a simple solution – the state of mixed economy wherein a bureaucratic system mandated by the Rule of Law can be used as a force to check any forms of discrimination in the society. According to Jaques, the underlying idea is to liberate the humans from exploitative work, while at the same time providing quality services.

ii) Internal Organisation

In line with humanising bureaucracy, Jaques mentions about the *two* major social requirements. They are: (1) to ensure that every employee works according to his

work capacity, and (2) to ensure an equitable relationship between work and remuneration. He points out that to meet the requirements, bureaucracy is expected to delineate the criteria for individual accountability. Elliott Jaques’ views that the manager-subordinate relations will be compatible if the bureaucratic structure focuses on organising these relations. For example, when the work capacity of the individual changes, they need to be relocated in the bureaucratic design so as to avoid role ambiguities.

Jaques acknowledges that no industrial society could survive in a democratic system if its bureaucracy is not rooted firmly on the principle of ‘employee consensus’. He clarifies that consensus is required for organising policies and not for executive decisions. He perceives in his theory of bureaucracy that the appraisal of subordinates would be highly subjective, however, in case of any grievances, the subordinates could be provided with the provision to make an appeal to the higher-ups.

iii) Time Span Discretion

One of his Jaques’ biggest contributions has been the ‘time span discretion’. This is an approach to review and evaluate jobs based on the time taken for making decisions by his or her superiors. In this regard, the lower level job occupies a brief span and the job is frequently monitored, whereas at the highest level, the effectiveness of the decisions may take several years to review.

iv) Post-Weberian Perspectives

Both the above mentioned perspectives on bureaucracy enable us to have a comprehensive view on bureaucracy and make an effort to understand what motivates bureaucrats. *Firstly*, the Public Choice Approach insists on measuring performance and in fixing criteria for career prospects. Though this Approach takes weightage of merit, the critics of this Approach question the bureaucrats’ tendency to maximise their self-interest over public interest.

Given the context that Public Choice Approach poses a serious problem in developing countries in terms of citizen apathy, the logic of Public Choice Theory is questionable. *Secondly*, A General Theory of Bureaucracy comes as an alternative to traditional bureaucratic system, where Jaques himself laments that “the system we have now is much more crushing to the individual”. Hence, he envisions a humanising bureaucracy embedded in a democratic system. However, its relevance may have to be tested empirically in contemporary society. Ramaswamy (1979) anticipates that the validity of Jaques’s theory of bureaucracy may have to be proved in a pluralistic society.

Check Your Progress 2

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answers.

ii) Check your answers with those given at the end of the Unit.

1) Explain the significance of Max Weber’s Ideal type bureaucracy.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

2) What are the implications of Bureaucratic Theory?

3) What are the assumptions of Public Choice Approach on bureaucrats?

4) Explain Elliott Jaques' views on bureaucracy.

4.6 THE WAY FORWARD

From the arguments that we covered in the previous sections, we can conclude that no single approach is adequate for the development of theory in bureaucracy. Bureaucracy, market, and constitutional bureaucracy are usually considered as alternatives based on the principles of hierarchy (Weber), performance measurement (Public Choice), and cooperation (A General Theory of Bureaucracy). Logically, there have been different mechanisms to achieve rationality, accountability, mobilising resources and compliance. As already indicated earlier, in pluralistic societies with diverse demands and benchmarks delivering services, it is necessary to require more complex systems that cater to citizens' needs. In retrospect, bureaucracy came as an alternative to survive in a complex system, which Weber viewed as modernisation. He regarded bureaucracy as a universal phenomenon and reiterated that a rule makes everyone clear about the outcome of any action and helps promote objectivity. It even prevents irrational action, favouritism and discrimination.

Schumpeter (1976) notes that "Bureaucracy is not an obstacle to democracy, but an inevitable complement to it". With the rise of network State, the inevitability of bureaucracy has been confirmed more than ever by the scholars. Jaques (1976) asserts that "the simplest fact is that if we decide to proceed with the development of industrialised societies, then bureaucracies on a large-scale are here to stay". As we discuss these perspectives, we need to understand the question of how effectively we could organise and fix accountability mechanisms on bureaucracies in this age of

citizen engagement. Interestingly, the more answers we find, the more questions we have. Probably, Waldo's position could be the way forward as he insists, "It hasn't been my aim to tell people what to think...I have tried, rather, to tell them how to think-specifically, of course, about public administration". Given the fact, one of the noteworthy suggestions given by Denhardt (2011) was a model of New Public Service that is based on democratic citizenship and service in tune with public interest. For Roberts (2008), this is "*the age of citizen engagement*" and confirms that "*citizen engagement is no longer hypothetical and it is real*". With the current dimension peppered by social media technologies, the way people relate to each other using citizens' surveys, panels and focus groups to voice their opinions, the interaction between government and citizens is likely to shape the wider community.

Check Your Progress 3

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answers.

ii) Check your answers with those given at the end of the Unit.

1) Briefly explain the nature of power-elite concept.

Right

2) “Bureaucracy is not an obstacle to democracy but an inevitable complement to it” Comment.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

4.7 CONCLUSION

Prior to Weber, there have been thinkers like Mill, Hegel, Marx, Michels etc., who have explored bureaucracy in relation to politics, economy and society. In the context of democracy, Mill identifies a potential role for bureaucracy in the states' progress and citizens' development. Another thinker who pointed out the structural attributes of bureaucracy as comprehensive as Weber's ideal type was Hegel. It can be construed that Weber's theory of bureaucracy is characterised by technocracy and compliance to rules, whereas Hegel's theory of bureaucratic activity is based on practical philosophy.

One of the influential thinkers who revolutionised the domain of social sciences through his power structure of society was Karl Marx. He cautioned about the inherent tendency of bureaucracy to manipulate knowledge into secrecy and competence into mystery if economically dominant class influenced the State. Indeed, Marx's

views could be used as an analytical framework to understand and assess the dysfunctions of bureaucracy in developing countries. On these lines, Michels and Mosca made attempts to study the way bureaucracy functions in the hands of politically dominant classes.

One of the core values of bureaucracy, as glorified by Weber is neutrality from vested interests. Weber advocated for a dehumanised bureaucracy on the pretext that it would deal in an impersonal and formalistic manner in their relations with others and also in the execution of their official duties. He believed that it would eliminate personal, irrational and emotional elements. However, this neutral attitude isolated bureaucracy from being human. Hence, A General Theory of Bureaucracy comes as an alternative to traditional bureaucratic system, where Jaques proposed for a humanising bureaucracy vis-à-vis community involvement, employee consensus, mixed economy. With this the content of bureaucracy deviated from Weber’s legal-rational model. Public Choice thinkers strongly criticised bureaucracy for being unaccountable and irrational in making budgets.

Therefore, Public Choice recommended for measuring official performance, criteria for making promotions, and optimum utilisation of resources. In the twentieth century, the scope of both bureaucracy and civil liberties have had concurrently widened and deepened. Consequently, there have been rising networks between government-citizen-business groups, which eventually looked for an alternative in engaging citizens in every day affairs. This reoriented the focus and locus of bureaucracy towards citizens at the heart of governance vis-à-vis citizenship, civic participation and community governance.

4.8 GLOSSARY

Heuristics	: It is an approach to problem solving to reach a solution or output within a shortest span of time. It is chosen over conventional methods as they are slow. Focus in Heuristics is on trial and error, assumption and optimality. Speed of the approach matters more in heuristic approach.
Positivist	: It is a term that derives from Positivism, a western philosophical thought which relies on scientific knowledge and empirical evidence.
Technocracy	: A group of elites with technical expertise.

4.9 REFERENCES

Adler S. P. & Borys, B. (1996). Two Types of Bureaucracy: Enabling and Coercive. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 41(1), 61-89.

Bartels, P. R. K. (2009). The Disregard for Weber’s Herrschaft. The Relevance of Weber’s Ideal Type of Bureaucracy for the Modern Study of Public Administration. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*. 31(4), 447-478.

Bhattacharya, M. (2008). *New Horizons of Public Administration*. New Delhi, India: Jawahar Publishers.

Denhardt, R. B. & Denhardt, J. V. (2011). *The New Public Service: Serving Rather than Steering*. New York, U.S: M.E. Sharpe.

- Dwivedi, O.P., Graf, W. & Nef, J. (1985). Marxist contributions to the theory of the Administrative State. *The Indian Journal of Political Science*. 46(1), 1-17.
- Eisenstadt S. N. (1959). Bureaucracy, Bureaucratisation, and Debureaucratisation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 4(3).
- Meier J. Kenneth, & Krause A. George (Eds.). (2003) *Politics, Policy, and Organisations* (2005). Michigan, USA: University of Michigan Press.
- Mill, S. J. (1861). *Representative Government*. Adelaide: University of Adelaide. Retrieved from https://ebooks.adelaide.edu.au/m/mill/john_stuart/m645r/index.html
- Misra, B.B. (1977). *The Bureaucracy in India: An Historical Analysis of Development up to 1947*. New Delhi, India: Oxford University Press.
- Niskanen, A.W. (2012). *Gordon Tullock's Contribution to Bureaucracy*. *Public Choice*. 52(1/2): pp. 97-101.
- Ramaswamy E.A. (1979). A General Theory of Bureaucracy by Jaques Elliott. *Indian Economic Review*. 14(1): p. 65.
- Riggs, F.W. (1997). Modernity and Bureaucracy. *Public Administration Review*. 57(4): pp. 347-353.
- Roberts, N. (2008). *The Age of Direct Citizen Participation*. Armonk, New York, U.S: M.E. Sharpe.
- Lloyd, R.I. & Rudolph, H.S. (1979). Authority and Power in Bureaucratic and Patrimonial Administration: A Revisionist Interpretation of Weber on Bureaucracy. *World Politics*. 31(2): pp. 195-227.
- Sager, F. & Rosser, C. (2009). Weber, Wilson, and Hegel: Theories of Modern Bureaucracy. *Public Administration Review*. 69(6), 1136-1147.
- Shaw, C.K.Y. (1992). Hegel's Theory of Modern Bureaucracy. *The American Political Science Review*. 86(2): pp. 381-389.
- Warner, E.B. (2001). John Stuart Mill's Theory of Bureaucracy within Representative Government: Balancing Competence and Participation. *Public Administration Review*. 61(4): pp. 403-413.
- Weiss, M. R. (1983). Weber on Bureaucracy: Management Consultant or Political Theorist? *The Academy of Management Review*. 8(2): pp. 242-248.
- Waldo, D. (1978). Review: Organisation Theory: Revisiting the Elephant. *Public Administration Review*. 38(6): pp. 589-597.

4.10 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS EXERCISES

Check Your Progress 1

- 1) Your answer should include the following points:
 - Bureaucratic literature addresses two points of view about its nature.
 - The first viewpoint indicates bureaucracy as an instrument to achieve goals.
 - The second viewpoint implies that bureaucracy is an instrument of power to exert control.

- 2) Your answer should include the following points:
- Mill views bureaucracy as an institution of experience, skill and knowledge.
 - Mill cites that bureaucracy is the permanent strength of public service.
 - Bureaucracy should function in a neutral way.
 - Public bureaucracy is not just legitimate but essential element of good government.
- 3) Your answer should include the following points:
- Hegel upholds the role of bureaucracy as a ‘universal class’.
 - He envisions a modern bureaucracy with characteristics of merit, separation of office, hierarchy etc.
 - Hegel’s bureaucracy bears a close similarity to Max Weber views on bureaucracy.
 - Bureaucracy could serve as a new means for sustaining the Constitution.
- 4) Your answer should include the following points:
- Marx perceived bureaucracy on the premise of reflecting the interests of economically dominant class.
 - Marx viewed bureaucracy that exhibited the repressive character of State.
 - His views on bureaucracy could be better understood in his critique on Hegel’s Philosophy.
 - Marx cautioned that bureaucracy has a tendency to be secretive and reflects a fixed attitude.

Check Your Progress 2

- 1) Your answer should include the following points:
- Ideal types are imaginary constructs to put things together and make it work.
 - To make sense of historical events and patterns on dominance and administration.
 - It helps us to interpret human events and experiences in an organised way.
 - It serves as an instrument to compare and measure reality.
- 2) Your answer should include the following points:
- It helps to technically design organisations on rational lines.
 - Weber’s claim that his bureaucratic model had universal relevance.
 - Weber justified that his bureaucratic model could serve any master or any society.
- 3) Your answer should include the following points:
- Bureaucrats are primarily motivated by selfish pursuits.

- Public agencies are not constrained by effective competition.
- As the size of public sector is unmanageable it is difficult to measure its performance.

4) Your answer should include the following points:

- Jaques' views on bureaucracy explores a general theoretical construction of how social institutions and human nature influence bureaucrats.
- Humanisation of bureaucracy could be achieved through mixed economy.
- Employee Consensus is an important principle for the internal structure of bureaucracy.
- 'Time-span discretion' is an important contribution of Jaques to review jobs and evaluate decisions.

Check Your Progress 3

1) Your answer should include the following points:

- It is based on politically dominant class principle.
- Mosca viewed that the ruling elite wields more power in the society.
- He recommended the system of vote to reflect wider societal interests.
- Vilfredo Pareto introduced the principle of elite circulation wherein continuous flow of ideas take place.

2) Your answer should include the following points:

- The rise of network State and social media technologies have made bureaucracies indispensable.
- Citizens' engagement is no longer hypothetical. It is rather real.
- New Public Service advocates the role of democratic citizenship, civic participation and community governance as inevitable.