DOI: 10.48047/intjecse/v18i1.6 ISSN: 1308-5581 Vol 18, Issue 01 2026

Bureaucracy: A Sociological Approach, Between Comprehensive Organisation and Functional Imbalances

Dr.Mahmoud Khenfer [1]*
kmkhenfer@gmail.com
ORCID ID:https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3009-9446
Dr. Daouia Bouzbid2
b.daouia1975@gmail.com
ORCID ID:https://orcid.org/0009-0000-3808-4332
Pr. houidi Abdelbasset[3]
abdelbasset-houidi@univ-eloued.dz
ORCID ID:https://orcid.org/0009-0008-7157-5932

Abstract: This intervention, tagged with: "Bureaucracy between Totalitarian Organization and Dysfunction" aims to analyze the bureaucratic phenomenon from its historical beginnings, and to highlight the studies' attitudes about bureaucratic organization, both from its perspective as a totalitarian organization in Marx and Michaels and the rational proposition of Max Weber , or as a dysfunction posed by functional constructivists from Merton, Selznick and Goldener in their functional analysis of modern bureaucratic organizations.
Keywords: bureaucratic phenomenon; bureaucratic organization; job analysis; dysfunction.

1. Introduction

Bureaucracy as a concept and social phenomenon is not new; it has been present since the emergence of organisations and human interaction. From Hammurabi in Mesopotamia and his laws, to the pharaohs of the Nile Valley, to Confucius in China, to the Roman emperors in Greece, civilisations arose and established institutions with administrative functions commensurate with their size, importance and methods of organisation in accordance with the size of those countries and the level of sophistication their civilisations had reached in accordance with those circumstances, which proves their existence as a lived reality. The realisation of something is achieved through sensory perception and then translated into a name. Something will not exist in our perception unless it gives rise to an idea that becomes proof of its existence in our minds, entering the realm of our knowledge to become a real presence (Malik, 2000, p. 21). We also see bureaucracy as an idea in Plato's statement: We must organise our country in a thoughtful and consistent manner (Gaston, DT).

At a time when Western European societies were backward and ignorant, living under the tyranny of the Church (the Middle Ages), administrative functions were in the hands of the king and feudal lords, while the rest of society worked to serve them, enslaved and oppressed. Islam emerged in the East, calling for science and knowledge (read), urging hard work to exploit resources (if one of you does a job, do it well), encouraging the mind to think, reflect and meditate, and incorporating in its applications what organisational behaviour dictates today: planning, organisation, supervision, leadership, responsibility, social and human relations, participation and consultation in decision-making (democratic management), as well as acting according to the requirements of the situation (situational theory) and working with the idea of order (systems theory) (Dham, 2008, p. 3).

During its golden age, Islamic society presented humanity with an integrated and harmonious political and administrative model, as detailed by Ibn Khaldun in his

introduction. When discussing the state in Andalusia, he said: (... Then they divided his plan into categories and assigned a minister to each category, so they appointed a minister for accounting, a minister for dispatching, a minister for considering the needs of complainants, and a minister for considering the conditions of the people of the frontiers ..." (Ibn Khaldun, 2000, pp. 190-192)

At a time when Islamic society was shifting from a stage of spirit and reason to a stage of instinct, the Age of Enlightenment emerged in European societies, and signs of renaissance and development appeared on the horizon in the West. In this regard, the thinker Hermann D. Kerslang says in his book Analytical Research on Europe: " The greatest foundation of European civilisation was its religious spirit... By spirit, I do not mean logic, reason, or abstract principles, but rather, in general, that powerful feeling within human beings that gives rise to their inventions, perceptions, and communication of their message, as well as their hidden ability to perceive things" (Malik, Conditions of Renaissance, 1987, p. 62).

It had an impact on material, social and intellectual life. Major cities sprang up, the economy grew, the movement of money accelerated, banks appeared, and philosophers and researchers contributed to the flourishing of scientific and intellectual life. Science became a turning point and a system based on strict methodological principles that manifested themselves in the form of precise logical characteristics that defined the clear boundaries of scientific phenomena. (Al-Bayati, 2002, p. 15) With the increasing pace of the establishment of industrial institutions and administrative and service organisations, and the accompanying complexities of an industrial society that had become firmly established, social structures and systems were formed that differed greatly from those found in traditional societies. This change in social relations, administrative policies, laws, regulations and systems resulted in new complexities in economic, social and administrative life, which required study and consideration. Some scholars turned their attention to studying organisations critically and systematically, analysing and interpreting them, clarifying and explaining them, and investigating the social reality that is classified and translated into concepts. Thus, the concept of bureaucracy became a reality. It has been said that the term bureaucracy was first used in 1745 by the French economist Jean-Baptiste Say, who spoke of bureaucracy in relation to public offices as the general administration of the government, i.e. the category of workers in the offices of administrative bodies (Tashma, 2012, p. 3).

The philosopher Hegel (1770-1831), who is considered one of the leading theorists of bureaucracy, wrote that the employees and assistants who help the king perform his duties are a rational tool necessary for the continuity and stability of government. Therefore, bureaucracy is the bridge that connects the base to the top (Halabi, 2004, p. 141).

The developments, transformations and events that followed the Industrial Revolution and the French Revolution at all levels during the 19th century led to the emergence of the free capitalist economic system, creating new complexities in social, economic and administrative life, with fingers pointing at bureaucracy, which was originally established as a rational tool for solving administrative problems. At the beginning of the 20th century, the first signs of the study of organisations in the United States of America emerged, led by engineer Frederick Taylor (1856-1920) in his book Principles of Scientific Management, published in 1911. His study focused on the time and movement of workers within industrial institutions (Abdul Rahman, 2007, p. 80). This coincided with the work of Henri Fayol (1841-1925) in France, who studied functions and administrative divisions and published his findings in a book entitled

General Industrial Management in 1916 and translated into English in 1949. Fayol focused on administrative issues and principles that could enhance the development of organisations and institutions, and defined the elements of management in six functions: planning, organising, issuing orders, coordinating, supervising, and controlling, after classifying tasks into six groups through his analysis of the manifestations of real activity within industrial institutions. (Abdul Rahman, 2007, pp. 88-93). Not far away, specifically in Germany, bureaucratic theory was developed by one of the pioneers and founders of sociology and its various branches, Max Weber (1864-1920), who proposed the ideal model of bureaucracy as a rational organisation and considered it the best system under the rule of law, which works to solve problems in the best way.

Then came a series of critical and constructive analyses of bureaucratic organisations by researchers, each from their own perspective and vision of organisation. We find that the human relations school, led by Tun Mayo, viewed organisation as interaction and emphasised the importance of informal relationships. Meanwhile, the decision-making school, led by Herbert Simon, viewed all administrative processes in organisations as decision-making processes. Other studies, including Arthur Stincumb's 1959 study, took a new approach to the sociology of organisations by examining the dimension of adaptation processes imposed by the changing environment on modern organisations (Maamari, 2009, pp. 23, 37).

In this article, we will discuss bureaucratic organisation from a holistic perspective and from the perspective of dysfunction in some detail.

2. The perspective of totalitarianism

2.1. Marxist theory: Karl Heinrich Marx (5 May 1818 – 14 March 1883)

Karl Marx: was a German philosopher, economist, historian, sociologist, political theorist, journalist, critic of political economy, and socialist revolutionary. His most famous works are The Communist Manifesto (1848) and Capital, a four-volume work. His theory of dialectical historical materialism is one of the most important fundamental theories in Marxist thought, explaining history, society, and politics in a dialectical materialist way. Marx believed that human societies evolve through class struggle. In the capitalist mode of production, this manifests itself in the struggle between the ruling class, which controls the means of production, and the working class (the proletariat). He also believes that understanding the phenomenon and knowing its current and future developments and transformations requires knowledge of its history. It should also be studied from a materialistic economic perspective, as reality (the sum of social and economic factors, i.e. the infrastructure) influences consciousness (ideas, beliefs and values, i.e. the superstructure). The aim of historical materialist analysis is to reveal the contradictions inherent in capitalism, which can be applied to any social phenomenon or problem (Ihsan, 2015, p. 155).

Bureaucracy Resembles the State:

Marx's study of bureaucracy came in the context of his study of the state apparatus, its administration, bureaucracy, and its relationship to the construction of power in society. Through his critique of Hegel's philosophy of the state, which views public administration as a link between the state and civil society, meaning that bureaucracy forms a bridge between them. Marx believed that bureaucratic organisations, like the state, are nothing more than a tool, as they resemble the state and represent the private interests of the ruling class. Through bureaucracy, the state exercises its control and exploitation of the vulnerable working class.

Its function is therefore to impose a system that supports exploitation and class division. This function is hidden behind the label of “representing the public interest”,

which is nothing more than maintaining the status quo of the ruling classes exploiting the ruled classes. (Al-Husseini, 1985, p. 41)

Bureaucracy as a Form of Alienation:

Marx places bureaucratic organisations within the framework of class struggle, viewing them as a form of alienation that represents the culmination of the capitalist system, whereby social forces escape human control and achieve an existence independent of humans, subsequently turning against their interests.

This is also the case in bureaucratic organisations when they achieve independence. Marx refers to alienation from the perspective of the alienation of the environmental context of the productive organisation from the natural environmental context surrounding the productive organisation, where the factory mode of production is characterised as an alienated mode. (Layla, 2014, p. 52).

Alienation also extends to individuals within the organisation itself in the context of the system of specialisation and division of labour, through the imposition of a specific chain of command, strict adherence to the system, and excessive respect for authority, all of which are forms of alienation. Productive organisation using machines represents another type of alienation, as it excludes human innovation and capabilities.

Bureaucracy and the Proletariat:

Marx emphasised that workers in these organisations lack initiative and are afraid to take responsibility, in addition to the conflicts that arise between them over status and promotion. (Al-Husseini, 1985, pp. 41-42)

Bureaucratic organisations destroy individual efficiency and hinder creativity. Marx emphasises that they are a tool for the capitalist class, which controls the means of production and appropriates surplus production. In these organisations, the individual is a cog in a complex mechanism.

Those who contemplate bureaucratic organisation as the destination of the capitalist system see it as a coherent causal structure in which a series of processes interact: the division of social labour, the generation of surplus value, alienation, declining rates of profit, concentration, centralisation, impoverishment, and then the proletarian revolution. Each process carries the seeds of its own demise, as Marx posited. For example, the division of labour leads to increased production and is therefore a factor of growth, but at the same time it is the beginning of the reduction of the working man and is therefore a factor of destruction. (Layla, 2014, p. 83) With the outbreak of the proletarian revolution and the emergence of a classless society, the state disappears and its bureaucratic apparatus is destroyed.

Although Marxist theory challenged capitalist organisations and contributed to the development of Western theorising, it was unable to develop its theoretical propositions, which were born at the dawn of industrial society, to keep pace with the constant changes in social reality and new organisations.

This changing and evolving social reality became more comprehensive than the theory itself, as it focused its analyses on the professional aspect of social structure as an entry point for understanding class structure, and did not analyse the nature and distribution of professional roles within the bureaucratic organisation. (Layla, 2014, pp. 93-94). The proletariat class, which Marx considered to be a unified and homogeneous class in his time, no longer has the characteristics he described, given the hierarchy and class divisions within the working class in this era.

Since the early 20th century, modern bureaucratic organisations began to emerge in the industrial field, spreading and expanding into various areas of human activity. With the growth of these organisations, researchers turned their attention and minds to

studying them, theoretically, analytically, and empirically, to determine the extent to which bureaucracy is a rational solution to the complexities and problems that arise with each era.

2.2. The ideal model of bureaucracy: (Max Weber 1864-1920)

Maximilian Karl Emil Weber:

He is considered one of the most prominent scholars of his time and one of the fathers of sociology, alongside Auguste Comte, Karl Marx and Émile Durkheim. He wrote on sociology, politics, economics and history, and made outstanding contributions to sociological theory and methodology.

In his study of capitalism, he contradicted Karl Marx's thesis and presented a positive view of it, proposing religious and bureaucratic values as variables responsible for the growth of the capitalist system. His theories and research formed fundamental dimensions in the construction of branches of sociology, whether religious, political or economic. His theory of bureaucracy also played a distinguished role in administrative sociology and management science (Laila, 2014, pp. 189-191).

In his approach to bureaucracy, he focused on his conception of the nature of power relations in organisations, which was reflected in his interpretation of how human behaviour is controlled within capitalist organisations.

In his view, bureaucracy is a social phenomenon that accompanies the emergence of the modern state, which represents the true image of all other types of organisations (Bouhous, 1982, p. 29).

Bureaucracy and Rationality:

Bureaucracy plays a pivotal role in activating the orders of the capitalist system and works to stabilise it and preserve its capabilities, as it is the most important control and regulation mechanism that the capitalist system has to control its individuals and subject them to achieving its goals and objectives (Layla, 2014, p. 247).

In an encyclopaedia of social sciences, Harold Laski defines bureaucracy as: ‘a system of government administered by a number of officials who have a degree of power that enables them to control the freedoms of civil citizens’ (Halabi, 2004, p. 141). Bureaucracy thus plays a role in enabling a certain number of individuals to legitimately and legally control and dominate the rest. In order to exercise legal control, subordinates must feel obliged to obey the orders of their leader, while the leader has the right to issue orders to his subordinates, and this can only be achieved through administrative means.

Weber analysed Prussian administration, distinguishing between three types of authority or control: traditional, based on custom; charismatic, based on personal status; and rational, based on logical legal rules. He concluded that the legal-bureaucratic form represents the rational form when compared to the traditional and charismatic forms, as authorities and functions do not have hereditary characteristics, which is the essence of their difference from traditional authority. Furthermore, authorities and functions are impersonal, unlike charismatic authority (Morris, 1991, p. 189).

Based on this, we can say that Max Weber provides a standard, or rather a mental construct, against which we can measure the degree of bureaucracy in real-world organisations, i.e. using an ideal type in the analysis of bureaucracy, which is called the ideal model of bureaucracy.

Weber's Ideal Model:

This bureaucratic model, which has been the source of many empirical studies, is defined by Max Weber as a mechanism and tool on which the system is based, and bureaucracy is the way in which rational and scientific thinking is expressed in an

organisational form (Abdul Jawad, 2011, p. 181). It is a form of modern management, in which rational action is a characteristic and advantage, where the efforts of actors are directed towards achieving the goals and objectives of the organisation. In political and social terms, it means the enforcement of laws in a functional society, the division of labour, specialisation of tasks and functions, the appointment of competent employees based on technical criteria, a hierarchical structure of authority, administrative hierarchy, and working in accordance with laws and regulations.

Weber describes the bureaucratic model as a fully mature organisation with high performance efficiency. He based it on logic rather than empirical evidence (Jackson et al., 1988, p. 185). Weber presented a set of characteristics for this organisation, which we summarise as follows:

A. Organisational relationships are formal and impersonal:

Rationality and prudence prevail over personal and emotional factors, and favouritism and nepotism must be eliminated.

B. Recruitment and promotion based on technical ability and performance:

This is the fundamental basis for the legitimacy of authority, as it ensures that qualified individuals are appointed.

C. Job specialisation and definition of responsibilities:

Each employee has a specific area of responsibility for the tasks and activities assigned to them, and their authority does not extend to the work of others.

D. Specific and orderly rules and procedures governing work performance:

These standardise the level of operations and decisions, serve as a repository of prior knowledge, protect those who hold the position, and ensure fairness in treatment. Learning the rules also provides a great deal of technical ability.

E. Hierarchy of positions, with each position governed by a higher position:

The hierarchy of authority is objective and based on rules, with organisational levels taking a hierarchical form.

F. Complete separation of management from ownership:

Preventing personal demands and desires from interfering with the rational performance of the organisation's work.

These are the basic features of Max Weber's bureaucratic model, whose studies have become a starting point for many influential thinkers in the field of organisational studies (Jackson et al., 1988, p. 187).

Weber is thus considered the founder of bureaucratic theory. In contrast, there are interpretations that view bureaucracy as a means of perpetuating tyranny, through the monopolisation of power by those in senior administrative positions within the organisation and its exploitation for their personal gain.

2.3. Oligarchy within the organisation: (Roberto Michels, 1876-1936)

Roberto Michels: was an Italian-born sociologist. He is best known for his book Political Parties, published in 1911, which contains a description of the ‘iron law of oligarchy’. He also contributed to the theory of the elite.

The Dictionary of Sociology states that the elite refers to a group of individuals or a class that occupies advanced positions in the organisation of which they are members, whether in terms of remuneration, influence, competence or talent. (Ferriol, 2011, p. 78) When power is concentrated in the hands of this elite, aristocracy, or small group, whether or not they exploit their power in the organisation, it is called oligarchy.

In his 1911 theory, based on his study of organisations, Robert Michels put forward his famous saying (the iron law of oligarchy). In his analysis of socialist parties and trade unions in Europe, particularly in Germany, he found that leaders in various positions tend to remain in power and maintain their positions by various means or by

appointing their successors through a form of selection. Even if the structure is formally democratic, it tends to give rise to an oligarchic structure in reality (Morris, 1991, p. 179). He believes that the style of leadership depends on the size and form of the group, whether formal or informal, and on its strength or weakness. The role of the leader and the scope of his authority are linked to the size of the group he leads. As the group grows and expands, the need for specialisation and technical skills increases, and with it comes the beginning of a separation between the leadership and the group, as the leader singles out a minority of assistants with different skills, who are loyal and faithful to him, thereby ensuring his continued power and control. This shift in power relations within the group, where the minority separates itself, retaining the sources of power and control in the leadership and monopolising capabilities from the rest of the group, is what Michels explains as the trend towards oligarchy. He also believes that the division of labour and specialisation within organisations pushes towards the same trend, which is a result of the complexities arising from the increase in the size of the organisation and the adherence of individuals to specialisation (Alam, 1994, p. 205), where a pattern of power emerges, with specialised expertise limited to a few in the organisation. Conflict begins on the basis of interests, the strongest prevail and take control of the organisation, and the organisational elite emerges to tighten its grip on power, working to remain in power and focusing on unity and the public good to conceal its true motives. Not only that, but it also sets strategies for survival, which is what Bottomor (1974) argued, namely that the ruling elite works to ensure its continuity through the inheritance of wealth, educational privileges and professional opportunities (Bottomor, 1981, p. 163).

In contrast, Roberto Michels views bureaucracy as a phenomenon and a form of tyranny, whereby any group that monopolises power and exploits it for its own purposes after acquiring senior administrative positions and securing its interests, thereby eliminating the spirit of participation in decision-making. (Bouhoush, Bureaucracy in the Administrative System: The Old Mindset Must Change, 1987, p. 77).

With the focus on achieving subjective goals, the organisation's objectives are diverted from their original purpose, resulting in a shift in the organisation's democratic goals, or ‘replacement of goals,’ as Michels pointed out.

From this Perspective:

Bureaucracy is blamed as a source of tyranny and oppression, and Marx's writings in the same context predict a future in which bureaucracy will be eradicated by a proletarian revolution. However, reality and history refute Marx's prediction, with the proletarian revolution in industrial societies and the fall of the capitalist system, which led to the collapse of bureaucracy, even though oppression did not stop, tyranny increased, and the problems of daily life became more varied. This calls for other interpretations in a time of change. Some believe that the campaign is directed at the core of the problem, which is the administrative complexities that increase with social development and institutional expansion. Bureaucracy is nothing more than a specialised administrative apparatus that works to resolve complications and is an indispensable tool in light of the excessive increase in jobs and specialisations, serving as a bridge between the state and the people, as expressed by Hegel. This is what Weber proposed in his rational model, regarding the prominent role it plays in rational and rational management and control to achieve maximum efficiency.

As a specialised administrative body that implements the general policies of the state. An elite or upper class may monopolise the bureaucratic organisation and exploit it for personal purposes and interests, making it a target of criticism and accusation.

Nevertheless, bureaucracy remains for many the most common and valued approach to understanding and building organisations.

3. The functional imbalance perspective

3.1. Robert K. Merton and "functional impediments" (1910-2003)

He was an American sociologist, university professor and major contributor to social theory, the sociology of science and the sociology of crime. He is also considered one of the functionalist scholars.

Merton set out to formulate his medium-range theory, introducing three analytical tools: latent functions versus manifest functions, functional impediments versus functions, and functional alternatives versus the traditional assumption that no society can perform its functions better than it does under existing patterns of relations (Al-Hourani, 2008, p. 118).

The Intellectual Roots of the Functional Impediments Model: Merton drew on Roberto Michels' (1876-1936) discussions on the substitution of goals by organisational leaders, and John Dewey's (1859-1952) on the concept of professional psychosis, which is the apathy that afflicts individuals due to monotony and routine at work towards some things, while they are enthusiastic about others. He also drew on Thorstein Veblen's (1857-1929) discussions on the term trained energy deficiency, which refers to the failure to properly employ the experience gained from training while performing work (Alam, 1994, p. 159).

He presented his article entitled: " Bureaucratic Structure and Personality , published in 1940, which focused on the link between action and response. When members of an organisation generalise their responses to certain situations to responses in similar situations, unexpected and undesirable results arise for the organisation (Al-Husseini, 1985, p. 80).

Rigidity and Inflexibility: Members of the organisation respond in a consistent manner to similar situations without taking into account the variables between one situation and another, resulting in unexpected outcomes. Merton recognised the undesirable or unintended consequences of bureaucracy, and believed that rules, procedures, and regulations whose function is control and coordination serve to achieve rational organisational behaviour and help predict behaviour, while at the same time, focusing on them makes bureaucratic behaviour rigid and inflexible, resulting in irrational outcomes. (Jackson et al., 1988, p. 161).

Rationality and efficiency: Merton questions the extent to which bureaucratic organisation achieves rationality and efficiency, which Weber's discussions did not clarify. The reality of organisation requires limits of precision, honesty, experience and efficiency, and at the same time, it concerns the individuals within the organisation. In order to ensure consistency and predictability in organisational behaviour, the importance and necessity of control within the organisation becomes apparent, as pressure is exerted on individuals to ensure their commitment to specific behaviour patterns aimed at achieving maximum rationality.

What is required to achieve consistent and predictable behaviour is continuous monitoring and follow-up on the implementation of rules, regulations and procedures. This continuity, in turn, results in two things:

1- A reduction in the amount of personal relationships: informal relationships are limited to the bureaucratic organisation, as employees deal with other members not on the basis that they are unique individuals, but because they represent functional positions that entail specific rights and duties. (Marsh and Simon, 2001, p. 162)

2-Increased emphasis on compliance with the rules, procedures, and instructions of the bureaucratic organisation, which are formulated as means to achieve the organisation's goals. This shifts attention to them and their details, making these rules not merely ways to achieve the goal but an end in themselves, which leads to a substitution of goals. Emphasis on total compliance with the rules by the organisation enables individuals to adapt them after understanding them well and use them to serve their own purposes (Alam, 1994, p. 162).

Functional Analysis of some Bureaucratic Characteristics:

Robert Merton believes that organisational structure carries with it the seeds of dysfunction, leading to reduced organisational efficiency. He addresses:

Division of Labour:

As a result of the division of labour, individuals feel alienated not only from their tasks and work, but also from the organisation itself.

Hierarchy:

Hierarchy, or what is known as hierarchy within the bureaucracy, is used to illustrate the control of the higher level over the lower level. It also emphasises coordination between activities within the organisation. At the higher levels of the organisation, specialised knowledge and experience are concentrated, which is acceptable in stable environmental conditions, but in unstable conditions, organisational efficiency may not be achieved. In this case, it may result in dysfunction due to the insistence of the top of the organisation on compliance by the lower levels of the organisation.

Abstract Rules:

Individuals' understanding of rules and procedures makes them a flexible tool that they can use as a cover to hide their true motives, or they can adhere to them literally if necessary. In this case, the individual has three options:

- The individual uses the rules as appropriate to the situation.
- They refer the matter to their immediate superior.

They take the decision themselves according to their own judgement. Here, Mertone believes that this behaviour causes functional obstacles and a decline in productivity. (Alam, 1994, p. 163)

While Merton's analytical vision focuses on formal rules and their functional implications and on control within the bureaucratic organisation from an abstract perspective, Philip Selznick's empirical study addresses the area of delegation of authority and its consequences in the bureaucratic organisation.

3.2. Philip Selznick and "Delegation of Authority" (1919-2010):

Philip Selznick is considered a sociologist, legal scholar, and theorist of functionalist organisational theory, like Talcott Parsons and Robert Merton, but he differs from them in his analytical vision and empirical study. Selnik believes that the complexity of tasks and increased responsibilities in organisations that are considered cooperative economic entities necessitate control through the delegation of authority to sub-systems in order to achieve the overall objectives of the organisation. However, the subsystems have their own interests and objectives that may not coincide with the objectives of the organisation, which leads to unexpected functional results, with the subsystems expected to oppose the formal control exercised over them by the organisation. This requires a return to centralised control (Lutfi, 2007, p. 159).

Empirical study: Selsnik's (1949) study was an empirical study of the Tansi Valley Organisation, an American organisation that aims to raise the standard of living in certain rural areas and provides various services. However, the educated elite group of farmers exerted pressure on the organisation's policy, prompting the organisation to modify its objectives to suit the circumstances of those communities.

External Environmental Pressures: Through his analysis of the study's findings, Philip Selznick concluded that bureaucratic organisations and their sub-systems are subject to pressures exerted by the external environment, and therefore formal rules (official behaviour) are not sufficient to achieve harmony, especially in the organisation's relationship with the external environment. The organisation was only able to spread its standards and rules to the local community (external environment) after involving the educated elite among the peasants (informal behaviour).

Informal Mechanisms Can Perform Positive Functions: In this regard, he points out that the organisation's adaptation to the environment and the achievement of a temporary balance had unexpected results. The failure of formal methods to meet the organisation's needs after facing the problem of satisfying basic needs with those methods calls for the emergence of functional alternatives. Therefore, informal mechanisms (attracting and involving prominent individuals from the local community in the management of the organisation) may perform positive functions for the formal organisation (avoiding opposition from the local community to the organisation's policy) more than the motivation of its members. (Alam, 1994, p. 165)

In summary, presenting organisation as a dysfunction does not mean abolishing Fibrian assumptions. Selznik presents organisation as a cooperative system and a consensual social construct formed among groups and formal and informal relationships, and that modern organisations are structured, rational and complex (Maamari, 2009, p. 55). He presented a functional structural analysis that achieves integration between organisational variables and adaptation to the surrounding environment from the perspective of delegation of authority and the idea of tension or rebellion that characterises social action and causes a disruption in the continuity of harmony. The lack of alignment between individuals' personal goals and the official goals of the organisation generates resistance on the part of individuals to the official methods adopted. From this perspective, he demonstrated what Merton called dysfunction, adding to it complexity to emphasise the phenomenon of 'pattern reinforcement', proposing five requirements, namely

- The importance of complete secrecy for the organisation and its relationship with the external environment.
- The need to work towards stability in lines of authority and means of communication.
- The importance of informal relationships as a mechanism that helps to stabilise the organisation.
- The development of an organisational policy and the identification of its various sources.
- The need for harmony between different roles. (Alam, 1994, p. 166)

Empirical studies by functionalist scholars have accumulated to help build knowledge in the sociology of organisations, including Art Goldner's (1955) study analysing the relationship between the requirements of rational management and inhuman aspects of work.

3.3. Art Goldner and 'Group Tensions' (1920-1980)

Goldner is a functionalist scholar who taught sociology at several American universities. Among his early works is Patterns in Industrial Bureaucracy (1955). Goldner formulated his theory using Weber's concepts of bureaucracy, Merton's view of formal rules and control, and Selsnik's discussions. This was after his empirical study of a gypsum mine and manufacturing plant in Buffalo, USA. He focused on studying the results of using rules and procedures as a means of control in bureaucratic organisation, and discussed how the control methods imposed to achieve

balance between units and sub-systems can lead to tension and conflict, concluding what is known in theoretical literature as 'group tensions' (Alam, 1994, p. 167).

Goldner proceeds from the assumption that the formal and objective rules used by the organisation to achieve control are imposed by the upper echelons of the organisation. This use makes it difficult to understand the power relations within the organisation, which is reflected in the legitimacy of supervisory functions, adding to their ambiguity. This explains the conflicts, tensions and disagreements that arise within the organisation.

On the other hand, Goldner believes that decision-making in the organisation necessarily produces predictable results, and that the more objective the rules of the organisation are, the more likely it is to survive, given that the rules are the basis for the expectations of the members of the organisation, define the responsibilities of senior positions, and provide an opportunity to determine the minimum acceptable behaviour.

A **third consequence** of this is that general rules impose on the leadership a certain perception of performance standards, on the basis of which optimal performance is determined.

It can be concluded that the expected results of clear organisational rules are offset by a kind of imbalance that leads to a decline in performance. This requires supervision and monitoring of the work group, at which point power relations become clear and easier to understand. At the same time, however, tension within the organisation increases and conflicts arise that threaten the balance achieved by the objective rules. (Al-Husseini, 1985, p. 92)

He shows that the control method designed to maintain the balance of the organisation's subsystem disrupts the balance of the larger system of the organisation, with subsequent feedback to the subsystem (March and Simon, 2001, p. 110).

It can be seen from all this that Goldner was concerned with the increasing bureaucratisation of modern society, continuing his criticism of Weberian bureaucracy. He distinguished between coercive bureaucracy, which relies on punishment as a means of management, and representative bureaucracy, which is based on democratic principles and reflects a level of job satisfaction, all within the framework of analysing the relationship between the requirements of rational management and inhuman manifestations at work. (Maamari, Organisation in Sociological Theory, 2009, p. 60) .

In this perspective:

Studies of bureaucracy represented a body of knowledge that emerged through the analyses presented by sociologists and organisational theorists. The rationality of Weberian bureaucracy and its contribution to the various organisational elements in achieving organisational effectiveness and efficiency have failed to reveal the functional obstacles inherent in these elements, as presented by Merton in his study, which shows how formal rules produce unintended consequences that cause functional dysfunction. Similarly, the empirical studies of Selznick and Goldner confirm the imbalance in the mechanistic model, due to the exaggeration of rules and procedures, which have become ends in themselves rather than means to an end, showing that organisation is human in nature and operates in an environment that requires it to adapt. However, American studies raise a new question: to what extent can their results be generalised? They were conducted at a specific time for a specific institution with its own circumstances and organisational structure, which raises another question: is there a single bureaucracy, or does each society have its own

bureaucracy? This corresponds to its way of thinking, level of culture and degree of civilisation.

4. Conclusion:

Bureaucracy as an administrative apparatus continues to play a key role in the major transformations and rapid changes taking place in societies, and countries rely on it, especially in their various organisations, despite the problems they face in its application, such as decision-makers monopolising power and not consulting specialists and those affected by the decisions taken, as well as adhering to the letter of the rules and laws in their application, and even adapting them as necessary to become a tool of rule rather than a tool of governance. This raises many questions about the effectiveness of their application in modern societies, based on Weber's proposal, which was made nearly a century ago, based on his environment, surroundings and culture. Even if the proposal is rational and reasonable, it is not without flaws, as demonstrated by many studies that have analysed the bureaucratic phenomenon and continue to do so, presenting perceptions, opinions and corrections to Weber's proposal, a problem of accumulated knowledge on which to base thinking about alternatives appropriate to the specificities of each society.

References

1. Ittimam Muhammad Allam. (1994). Studies in Organisational Sociology. Egypt: Anglo-Egyptian Library.
2. Al-Sayyid Al-Husseini. (1985). Social Theory and the Study of Organisation. Cairo: Dar Al-Ma'arif.
3. Ibn Khaldun. (2000). Introduction to Ibn Khaldun. Beirut: Dar al-Qalam.
4. Malik Bennabi. (1987). Conditions of Renaissance. (Omar Kamel Masqawi and Abd al-Sabur Shahin, translators) Damascus: Dar al-Fikr.
5. Malik Bennabi. (2000). The Problem of Culture. (Abdul Sabur Shahin, translators) Damascus, Syria: Dar al-Fikr.
6. Gaston Bachelard. (ed.). History of Sociology. (Abdoun Ghoneim, translators) National House for Printing and Publishing.
7. Boumediene Tachma. (2012). Bureaucratic Expansion: The Forgotten Link in the Development Process in the Arab World. Politics and Law Journal, 4 (7), 1-30.
8. Thomas Bottomore. (1981). Sociology and Social Criticism. (Mohammed Al-Jawhari, et al., translators) Cairo: Dar Al-Ma'arif.
9. John H. Jackson, et al. (1988). The Theory of Organisation. (Khalid Hassan Zarouq, translators) Saudi Arabia: Research Administration.
10. Gilles Verriol. (2011). Dictionary of Sociology Terms. (Ansam Muhammad al-Asaad, translators) Birat: Dar al-Hilal Publishing House.
11. James G. Marsh and Herbert A. Simon. (2001). Organisations. (Abdul Rahman Ahmed Hijan, translators) Saudi Arabia: Research Centre.
12. Dufourget, Maurice. (1991). The Sociology of Politics. Beirut: University Foundation for Studies, Publishing and Distribution.
13. Talaat Ibrahim Lutfi. (2007). Sociology of Organisation. Cairo: Dar Gharib Publishing House.
14. Abdul Sattar Ibrahim Daham. (2008). Bureaucratic Organisation in Contemporary Administrative Thought: A Theoretical Framework. Anbar University Journal of Economic and Administrative Sciences (2), 3.
15. Abdullah Muhammad Abdul Rahman. (2007). Industrial Sociology: Origins and Recent Developments. Beirut: Dar Al-Ma'arif Al-Jami'iyya.

16. Ali Layla. (2014). Modern Social Theory: Classical Patterns. Cairo: Anglo-Egyptian Library.
17. Ammar Bouhoush. (1987). Bureaucracy in the Administrative System: The Old Mindset Must Change. Annals of the University of Algiers, 2 (1), 73-82.
18. Ammar Bouhouche. (1982). The Role of Bureaucracy in Contemporary Societies. Amman, Jordan: Publications of the Arab Organisation for Administrative Sciences.
19. Lahbib Maamri. (2009). Organisation in Sociological Theory. Fez: Postmodernism Publishing House.
20. Lahbib Maamri. (2009). Organisation in Sociological Theory. Fez: Postmodernism Publishing House.
21.Mohammed Al-Hassan Ihsan. (2015). Advanced Social Theory: An Analytical Study of Contemporary Social Theories. Jordan: Wael Publishing House.
22.Mohammed Al-Said Al-Halabi. (2004). A Critical Analytical View of Bureaucracy. Al-Ma'rifa (Issue 495), 140-150.
23. Muhammad Abdul Karim Al-Hourani. (2008). Contemporary Theory in Sociology. Jordan: Majdalawi Publishing and Distribution House.
24. Mustafa Khalaf Abdul Jawad. (2011). Contemporary Sociological Theory. Amman: Dar Al-Masira.
25. Yas Khudair Al-Bayati. (2002). Social Theory: Its Historical Roots and Pioneers. Benghazi, Libya: National Book House.